

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Board of Directors
April 5, 2016, Meeting Minutes**

I. Call to Order and Roll Call of Members

The Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council Board of Directors Meeting was called to order by Chair Jack Burkman on Tuesday, April 5, 2016, at 4:00 p.m. at the Clark County Public Service Center Sixth Floor Training Room, 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington. The meeting was recorded by CVTV. Attendance follows.

Voting Board Members Present:

Marc Boldt, Clark County Councilor
Jack Burkman, Vancouver Councilmember
Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Councilmember
Jeff Hamm, C-TRAN Executive Director/CEO
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver Council
Jerry Oliver, Port of Vancouver Commissioner
Julie Olson, Clark County Councilor
Ron Onslow, Ridgefield Mayor
Jeanne Stewart, Clark County Councilor
Kris Strickler, WSDOT Regional Administrator
Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1 Manager

Voting Board Members Absent:

Doug McKenzie, Skamania Co. Commissioner
David Poucher, White Salmon Mayor

Nonvoting Board Members Present:

Nonvoting Board Members Absent:

Curtis King, Senator 14th District
Norm Johnson, Representative 14th District
Gina McCabe, Representative 14th District
Don Benton, Senator 17th District
Paul Harris, Representative 17th District
Lynda Wilson, Representative 17th District
Ann Rivers, Senator 18th District
Liz Pike, Representative 18th District
Brandon Vick, Representative 18th District
John Braun, Senator 20th District
Richard DeBolt, Representative 20th District
Ed Orcutt, Representative 20th District
Annette Cleveland, Senator 49th District
Jim Moeller, Representative 49th District
Sharon Wylie, Representative 49th District

Guests Present:

Ed Barnes, Citizen
Carolyn Crain, Citizen
Lori Figone, WSDOT
Tim Gaughan, Citizen
Jim Hagar, Port of Vancouver
Jim Karlock, Citizen
James Maynard, Citizen
Scott Patterson, C-TRAN
Mike Pond, Citizen
Eileen Quiring, Citizen
Ty Stober, Vancouver Councilmember
Margaret Tweet, Citizen
Michael A. Williams, WSDOT

Staff Present:

Matt Ransom, Executive Director
Ted Gathe, Legal Counsel
Lynda David, Senior Transportation Planner
Mark Harrington, Senior Transportation Planner
Bob Hart, Transportation Section Supervisor
Dale Robins, Senior Transportation Planner
Diane Workman, Administrative Assistant

Chair Burkman noted the slight changes in the room set up. Meeting materials are available outside the door at the entry.

II. Approval of the Board Agenda

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 5, 2016, MEETING AGENDA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY RON ONSLOW AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

III. Call for Public Comments

Jim Karlock of Portland, Oregon distributed a handout highlighting his comments. Mr. Karlock said cars beat transit for energy, CO₂, cost, time, and convenience, and he explained the reasons.

Ed Barnes of Vancouver, Washington said he has concerns with using the shoulder for buses. Mr. Barnes said David Evans and Associates did an excellent job in working on the I-5 Columbia River Crossing project. Mr. Barnes said if they would have gone through with construction on the I-5 Bridge, the first bridge would have been opened next year. He noted that it was unfortunate that the project was stopped, but that it would be built. He urged the RTC to stand up and do their job and support the I-5 crossing.

Chair Burkman clarified that for several months they have had a policy documenting the agenda that says that all public comment cards will be collected by the Board Chair before comments begin. This is the reason that he asked for cards before comments began. Two additional cards were submitted after public comment began.

IV. Approval of the March 1, 2016, Minutes

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 1, 2016, MEETING MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY RON ONSLOW AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

V. Consent Agenda

A. April Claims

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA APRIL CLAIMS. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VI. Bus on Shoulder Feasibility Study – Consulting Services Agreement, Resolution 03-16-04

Chair Burkman said at last month's meeting the Board approved Resolution 03-16-03. That action amended the 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program to program \$150,000 in CMAQ funds, and it amended the FY 2016 UPWP to include a description of the Bus on Shoulder Feasibility Study. After the Board approved that they moved to the Consulting Services Agreement for the study with Resolution 03-16-04. A motion for approval of that resolution was made by Mayor Onslow and seconded by Councilmember Greenlee. After discussion, the Board tabled this motion until the April meeting. Chair Burkman said that is where they would resume the conversation.

Matt Ransom said since the meeting in March he has electronically distributed two memos to Board members. Copies of those memos were also provided at the Board members table. Mr. Ransom said at the March meeting and during discussions questions arose as to RTC's procurement process as well as the qualifications of the proposed vendor (David Evans and Associates).

The first memo dated March 9 broadly describes the procurement process which was a Request for Qualifications, reviewed by multi agency review team, and a conclusion by the review team that the proposed vendor was most qualified.

The second memo that was distributed the previous week dated March 28 was a more specific review of the eligibility of the proposed vendor to contract with RTC. In the memo, Mr. Ransom did review to ensure that they were not debarred from work on federal aid projects; he summarized the RFQ process, and looked at past audits. One of those audits was in relation to the Columbia River Crossing Project where that firm was a prime consultant. He looked at the audit and spoke with WSDOT staff that was involved to ascertain if there were any letters of concern or something of that nature that might warrant our consideration. Mr. Ransom also did an internal review of the history of that vendor and consulting and contracting with RTC. He talked with two project managers at RTC that oversaw work with that vendor. Mr. Ransom said his determination was that he found no reason to not consider them the most qualified.

With that, Mr. Ransom said they have outlined a couple next steps available for the Board as listed in the memo. Option 1 is to ratify the proposed resolution. Option 2 is to delay ratification if there is any new information or any questions that have not been addressed to this point. Option 3 is to reject authorization of the contract rejecting all responses. Mr. Ransom said with those options available, he could answer any questions that members may have regarding the review. He said as RTC's custodian of their procurement process, staff's recommendation remains unchanged.

Chair Burkman noted on the second page of the memo attached to the Resolution. This was a note regarding Option 3 (rejecting all responses). It states that unless otherwise disqualified for cause, RTC is not able to craft criterion that would prohibit an eligible firm from applying for work or being fairly evaluated in a competitive RFQ solicitation process. Chair Burkman said this is in follow up with conversations with our general counsel. This goes back to the motion that was carried over from last month which is to approve this, so the discussion will be on that motion.

Jeanne Stewart asked where the note that was referenced was located. Chair Burkman said it was in the meeting packet for Item VI. as a cover memo to the original resolution.

Jerry Oliver said at last month's meeting he suggested that in his experience at the Port of Vancouver they fail to even consider some firms that they felt, for a variety of reasons, might be licensed and certified, but they were anxious about. He said possibly they were not local or they had not worked with them before, but did not choose the lowest bidder. Commissioner Oliver said in looking at option 3, he would like to reject all solicitations to the RFQ. He said he

would like to see the study. The implication is that we provide further guidance to the Executive Director. Commissioner Oliver said it states “unless otherwise disqualified for cause”, and he suggested that the vendor has exhibited cause by their inattention to details in his opinion. Commissioner Oliver said he would not be able to support any effort to allow them to continue as a contractor.

Anne McEnery-Ogle addressed legal counsel referring to the section stating debarred from work and asked who bars someone from work.

Ted Gathe said if a firm is found to have violated its contract or federal or state law or may be involved in some kind of fraudulent conduct; it could be a variety of reasons. An agency can list them, and there are several different resources to look at online and elsewhere to determine if they are on any of these lists. An agency can indicate that they will not do business based on certain behaviors that are engaged in. As the Executive Director has indicated, there is a certificate of debarment that any applicant has to sign indicating that they are not debarred, and DEA has signed that. In addition, staff went one step further and looked at online lists to determine whether there was any evidence or indication that David Evans and Associates was on any list, federal or otherwise that would have prohibited them from competing for this contract. They found no such evidence. Based on that, there is really no basis for disqualifying them or from not allowing RTC to contract with them as a valid legal contractor.

Councilmember McEnery-Ogle said she had heard from a colleague that some groups are allowed to not accept a bid because they are not a local bid. She asked if this agency can do that.

Ted Gathe said you have to separate Public Works provisions from Professional Service Contracting. Public Works provisions are much stricter, and they are generally interpreted to not allow that distinction to be made. In other words you cannot disqualify someone because they aren't a local contractor or maybe out of state. Professional Service contracts have no state statutory overview except in the case of Ports. Ports do have a specific Professional Service Contracting provision, but for all other agencies, such as RTC and local governments, there are no overarching state provisions. It gives the local agency a much freer hand in determining its criteria and awarding this kind of contract.

Matt Ransom said as part of the funding the Board approved for the proposed work, is substantially a federal aid grant, and those grants themselves have requirements that they must adhere to on procurement, that being open and fair competition. Mr. Ransom said he was not aware of the permissibility of prohibiting vendors from consulting to agencies where they use federal aid funds, to crafting criterion that say you have to be a local constituent. He said they need to be careful about that when they use federal aid funds. If they were using exclusively RTC general funds and not any grant funds, then there would be more discretion for those types of criteria.

Shirley Craddick said her understanding is that this is a different dynamic and circumstance in a situation involving the hiring of David Evans with RTC. With two joint DOTs working on the CRC,

they were the ones who hired David Evans, and the work was different. In this situation, she said RTC staff will be monitoring this closely, and it is not a large contract. She said she was confident that awarding this contract, they don't have to have the same concerns that they might have had with the CRC.

Jeanne Stewart said she wanted to be clear about what was just said. She said on this item we are picking up from where we left off from the prior meeting. Chair Burkman said a motion was made by Mayor Onslow and seconded by Councilmember Greenlee. There was extensive discussion. Councilmember McEnery-Ogle motioned to table the item, and Councilmember Greenlee seconded the motion and that froze the process and was tabled to this meeting. That is why it is the first item for action. The motion is to approve Resolution 03-16-04 for Bus on Shoulder Feasibility Study – Consulting Services Agreement.

Councilor Stewart said they have three options today listed. Chair Burkman said those are options following the action on this motion.

Councilor Stewart said she does not support approving the contract. She referred back to the results of the audit. She said she didn't doubt that we have a linear process as RTC that we use in our process for Request for Qualifications, and she doesn't doubt that there is a practice and a step-by-step process, and we get responses. The factor that she thinks they need to consider is that RTC's criteria doesn't include the criteria that significant audit results from a project maybe should not be able to be considered in a Request for Qualifications. Councilor Stewart noted her concerns and said it made no rational sense to her to hire this firm. She said she would hope to reject all the responses and ask to put it out again. Councilor Stewart said she has safety concerns with the Bus on shoulder and hoped that this is not approached with a foregone conclusion. She does not support moving ahead with this contract.

Jerry Oliver spoke to Shirley Craddick's point that this is a different level of job than the CRC with the same company. He said he views it as rewarding poor behavior in what he considers to be misuse. He said for that reason, he cannot support it.

Shirley Craddick pointed out that the audit was really giving direction to WSDOT as opposed to David Evans. It focused on their contract and practices. David Evans was guided by WSDOT and ODOT. The recommendation was directed to WSDOT not David Evans. From that, WSDOT followed up and requested some of those funds back. She said there are two different dynamics that she expects if they agree on this that the RTC with Matt's guidance will be very careful in monitoring this and will provide reports and follow up to make sure that we are comfortable with how it is progressing. This is a way to protect RTC and ensure that this contract is being followed carefully.

Jeanne Stewart said that she wanted to object in the strongest possible way to any assertion that accepting billings is not the responsibility of the people creating and sending the billing. She said DEA is just as responsible as WSDOT. WSDOT was a checkpoint, but it is also an issue with the person who is doing the billing.

Jack Burkman said he would be supporting this motion. He said he has talked to their attorney, and that is why the statement was included that he noted earlier. Unless disqualified for cause, they don't have the ability to go back and craft criteria that says if DEA applies, they may not have the contract. He said he did not believe it was appropriate to say that David Evans and Associates may not do any business in SW Washington because of an audit that occurred but was brought to closure. There was compensation made back and reimbursement. There were cost escalations, but that audit was completed with no durable penalty such as debarment. Chair Burkman reinforced that the purpose of this study is to study something that we don't understand. It is not a foregone conclusion we will use bus on shoulder. He said a number of people are talking about not having shoulder use for emergency use. The plan is not to investigate something that would take over the shoulder, but would periodically use the shoulder when it was safe during periods of extreme congestion. This is to gain better understanding, and no action will occur before it comes back to the RTC Board.

Paul Greenlee since there has been so much talk about the audit report he read the first paragraph of the actual report. There were no findings, just some guidance letters to WSDOT.

Results in Brief

Our audit of the Columbia River Crossing Project did not identify any financial misconduct or abuse. With few exceptions, we found that billing rates paid to most consultants on the project agreed to contract rates and audited rates, when applicable. We did however identify opportunities to improve controls over consultant services contracts on future projects. We also identified excess and questionable costs attributable to WSDOT policies and procedures.

A roll call vote was requested for the motion to approve Resolution 03-16-04 the Bus on Shoulder Feasibility Study – Consulting Services Agreement.

THE MOTION WAS APPROVED WITH 8 YES VOTES: BURKMAN, CRADDICK, GREENLEE, HAMM, MCENERNY-OGLE, ONSLOW, STRICKLER, WINDSHEIMER AND 4 NO VOTES: BOLDT, OLIVER, OLSON, STEWART.

VII. RTC Member Contributions (Dues) for YR 2017, Resolution 04-16-07

Matt Ransom said at the April 2015 RTC Board meeting, Board members suggested the reevaluation of member dues. As a follow up to that, RTC staff and Board Chair composed and populated a Dues Review Subcommittee. This included six members of the RTC Board. The Subcommittee met over the course of four meetings in the fall of 2015 and finalized their work in the development of a report which was published and distributed to the Board in January. The report was presented in detail in February.

The report recommendations are based on the need for RTC to provide local funds to match the federal aid grants and state aid grants that they receive. The Subcommittee recommended that the dues for members to the organization increase and that those dues be reflective of the list

that is Attachment One to the staff report included in the meeting packet and scheduled for January 1, 2017.

The Subcommittee also made two other recommendations. One being that RTC not wait 23 years to review dues again. The dues were set in 1992 upon formation of RTC and had not been reevaluated in a formal process since that date. The Subcommittee recommended in providing for recurring review as listed in the staff report. The first policy is that the RTC utilize an Employment Cost Index – State and Local Government professional workers series. They would take current dues and evaluate costs according to that index and bring back to the Board on an annual basis a review of dues and how they might be impacted. That would be presented to the Board for consideration in advance of the April meeting. This would evaluate whether there is a need for an update, be presented in February or March, and a final staff report in April based on the feedback.

The second policy is that every five years a Subcommittee reconvene and perform a full review, population estimates will be evaluated / adjusted and member shares adjusted to reflect the updated figures and other relevant factors and to have an overall sense of RTC's budget and the need for local match. This would provide two opportunities to ensure not having big jumps in the amount of dues.

The recommendation is to adopt the dues as listed in the Resolution as Attachment One effective January 1, 2017, and direct staff to implement the Recurring Review Policies as noted.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 04-16-07 RTC MEMBER CONTRIBUTION (DUES) FOR YR 2017 AND IMPLEMENT THE RECURRING REVIEW POLICIES. JEANNE STEWART SECONDED THE MOTION.

Councilor Stewart said she was a part of the Subcommittee to review the dues and said it was shocking that they had not changed since they were established. She said indeed a review was necessary and appropriate. Councilor Stewart said she was not thrilled with the \$57,000 for the County, but she understood how the amounts were calculated, and there was some justification to that. As careful as we all want to be in spending money, support of RTC and support for the role in assumptions they serve in is critical to our community and our region. In that sense, she said she would be supporting the motion.

Ron Onslow said he agreed with Councilor Stewart's points. He said he did have connections with North County, Battle Ground, Ridgefield, Yacolt, and La Center. Mayor Onslow said Mayor Johnson from Battle Ground said it right. He said there is some grumbling, but fair is fair. Mayor Onslow said he agreed with the motion and would support it.

Shirley Craddick said she would be abstaining on this motion. She said the two Metropolitan Planning Organizations, Metro and RTC, don't exchange dues so she would abstain.

Paul Greenlee thanked Councilor Stewart for her work on the Review Committee. Councilmember Greenlee said when he took this item to both Washougal and Camas, both cities said it was a bargain.

A roll call vote was requested.

THE MOTION PASSED WITH 11 YES AND 1 ABSTAIN: CRADDICK.

VIII. FAST Act Funding

Matt Ransom said this is a follow up to last month's meeting when he presented a more thorough briefing on the FAST Act and some of the policy changes and funding. Mr. Ransom said he would like to engage the Board and elicit feedback in terms of what individual organizations might be doing. He said the intent of the update is not to necessarily craft RTC policy per se, but to provide information so members are aware of this conversation and engage as local constituents in case there is an alignment of interest. Mr. Ransom referred to the memo included in the meeting packet and also provided copies of the slide with highway funding charts.

The President signed into law the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act in December 2015. It resulted in an increase in the federal aid program for all states. This is a first time in over a decade that federal aid funding has increased. They are estimating over a 6% increase. That increase would flow to the State of Washington. Today's conversation about who benefits is certainly an outcome of that.

RTC has three grant funding programs: STP (urban / rural), CMAQ, and TAP (Transportation Alternatives Program). The TAP program is for the three-county region, where STP and CMAQ just relate to Clark County. The total of annual funding available for distribution to local government is about \$8,596,000. That number is based on the old funding formula. When discussions are about the opportunity to revise the funding formula, one of the implications could be either an increase or decrease to this grant pot that RTC administers currently at \$8.596 million. If there is no change in policy, it is presumed that that pot of funds would increase slightly, possibly upwards of \$200,000.

Mr. Ransom spoke to the formula of funding as it relates to the FAST Act. Money flows from the federal aid program and is distributed out to each state by formula. That money at the state level is distributed out. The state keeps a certain amount, and a certain amount is then distributed to local governments, either directly through competitive grant programs that are eligible for local government application and also the MPO programs where that \$8.5 million is what RTC manages. The historical distribution or split of that formula is roughly 66% of those discretionary funds are held by the state and 34% are distributed to the competitive programs. The last time that formula was reviewed was several programs ago. Most recently in MAP-21, there was a very brief conversation about should that formula be revised, and the conclusion was to retain that formula. That formula is what exists today.

Since the federal act was adopted in December 2015, the Legislature convened, and they are establishing through supplemental budget this last legislative session of funds through the remainder of the 2017 biennium. Currently, the funds that are flowing to the state continue to be distributed based on that 66%/34% formula. What they have heard from the state through

the Governor's office is that the Governor would like to open up the discussion among all partners, (state, regions, MPOs, local governments, etc.) asking if that 66%/34% formula be revised.

Mr. Ransom addressed some of the policy implications. Should that formula be revised, then that \$8.5 million depending if it revises upward or downward could fluctuate. There is a direct implication to the RTC and the programs that they manage. There is also an implication potentially to counties, cities, etc. in terms of some of the programs that they are eligible to apply for as well as some direct distribution that they might receive. Certainly, from a constituent standpoint, there might be an interest in advocating one direction or the other.

Mr. Ransom referred to the funding chart displayed and copies distributed that was put together by Washington State Association of Counties, Association of Washington Cities, and Puget Sound Regional Council. The charts showed the programs with the 66%/34% that would have an impact. There are five programs. The first is National Highway Performance Program, the largest program, and 56% of the total formula funds that flow into the state are within that pot of funds. The second program is the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program, followed by the Highway Safety Improvement Program, the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality, and the National Freight Program.

The National Freight Program is the net new revenue program in the FAST Act. This new flow of funds is the win in the new Act for states and regions. The estimated five-year allocation to the state is about \$108 million or \$20 million a year. That program would be influenced by the formula.

Mr. Ransom said for the most part, most of the funds flowing to the state would pivot one way or the other based on the formula. Mr. Ransom said this presentation was to provide more information to better understand for discussion. He said at last month's meeting, it was briefly discussed. He asked if people were engaged on this issue, or if jurisdictions were taking a policy position, and asked if there was any interest or adequacy one way or the other that might be of interest to the region.

Paul Greenlee asked what kind of projects would be eligible for the National Freight Program. He spoke about putting a roundabout on SR-14 that improves access to the Port of Camas Washougal industrial area. Councilmember Greenlee said another possibility would be a railroad overpass that would make available for potential commercial development the northeast quadrant of Washougal. He asked if these types of projects would go for Freight Mobility funding.

Mr. Ransom said they could be. He said within that National Freight Program, the \$108 million listed on the chart as the estimated allocation to the state over five years is the formula portion of the program. Those funds will flow to the state, and there is a decision in front for the state and others, which is how do we allocate those funds. Mr. Ransom said it is his understanding based on a supplemental budget that was approved in the last Legislative Session that through the end of this biennium those funds are being purposed for maintenance. That is what the

Legislature has committed those funds to. Beyond this biennium, then the question is open as to how those funds should be purposed. Should there be a more statewide competitive review, or should they go to regions? Should FMSIB take the lead in designating the funds for strategic improvements on the freight system? The policy question is something that is in front of them. Mr. Ransom gave a comparative example. He said those funds, the equivalent formula flowing to the state of Oregon, the Oregon Transportation Commission which has a little bit more oversight over project selection, has actually designated specific projects. So, as opposed to what our Legislature did, which is to say at least in the absence of direction, commit them to maintenance and then figure out what to do. Oregon went through a process of actually nominating projects and selecting those projects using that formula.

Mr. Ransom said there is a competitive grant program which is not listed in the chart, because it is competitive across the nation. Both projects that Councilmember Greenlee mentioned could be eligible in formula assuming that is open for competition. They are likewise equally competitive for the national program like the TIGER grant program. Mr. Ransom said he has been consulting, as has other RTC staff and WSDOT, with the City of Washougal in the application process in trying to figure out if the projects that are of interest to the City of Washougal and the Port might be competitive. He said it is their determination that they think they would be very competitive. He said he thought they might go after an application next cycle.

Jerry Oliver asked for clarification on the flow of the funds and who receives them. Mr. Ransom said the programs listed with the funding for the most part, WSDOT is the manager of those funds. He said within the Highway Safety Improvement Program, there might be a specific set aside that WSDOT uses within their budget to correct system safety, efficiencies, etc. Also, a sliver of that might also roll out in a statewide competitive program. Each program pot of funding might be subdivided further. Generally, WSDOT would be the cohesive designer of the management of their piece of it.

Shirley Craddick said she was trying to understand the 66%/34% formula. She said the 34% includes the counties and MPOs lumped together and asked if that was correct. Mr. Ransom said yes, it is like state management versus either competitive or directly distributed funding. The competitive or directly distributed would be the local piece of it; what is available for local projects.

Councilor Craddick asked how that compared to how Oregon or ODOT distributes their funds. Mr. Ransom said that was a good context question. He said it is his understanding based on peer review that Washington allocates a higher percentage (the 34% would represent the high range of an allocation across the nation.) There are some states that allocate significantly less than that 34%, where the state management holding is well in excess of 66%, up to 80%. Mr. Ransom said he did not want to create the impression that, which is important from a policy standpoint, that Washington policy is behind the times. In fact, he said across the nation it is considered progressive in that distribution.

Councilor Craddick said the MPOs are considered on the same level as a county. She said an MPO is multiple counties sometimes. She said she thought in the formula, they would have their own distribution piece of the formula. Often times she said if you have a larger chunk of money that might go to an MPO, you can then leverage that with county money and city money to get to be able to build those larger projects. Councilor Craddick said she was surprised that there wasn't a three way distribution as opposed to a two way distribution.

Mr. Ransom said it is the way that it is allocated. He said there are many formulas behind these numbers. So part of the conversation at the MPO level will be to talk about the recalculation of for example the CMAQ program formula. How that might impact RTC would be competing with other regions in addition to the balancing act between the states. Mr. Ransom said he is deeply engaged in this conversation, because he thinks it is of interest to the organization to monitor whatever formulas come out to ensure that things are inline. Mr. Ransom said if there is a need or desire to push for a formula in a certain direction, he would welcome the input. He said this needs to be monitored. If jurisdictions are engaged at the local level, he would like to know what that engagement is, a letter to the Governor's office or others he would like to be copied on to have a sense of what they are advocating for at the local level. He said if they work together, they can ensure that both the state's interest and the local interests are all balanced and there is a good distribution of funds.

Jeff Hamm asked if the AWC, Association of Counties, and PSRC are working on a proposed new formula and set of criteria, rationale behind that. He also asked if WSDOT was looking at this and has an opinion on what is going on.

Mr. Ransom said based on what he knows, behind these advocacy or information pieces, people that know a lot more about the formulas are crunching numbers. It is very detailed in terms of all the implications. If something is changed, it changes another; it is multi-dimensional. Mr. Ransom said he was advised by RTC staff, who is very familiar with this process, which at the end of the day, tweaking it here and there the up or down to RTC's receipt of funds (\$8.5 million) is not that big. He said even if it is changed in a significant direction, we are not going to receive double regional allocation funds to RTC that we currently receive. Mr. Ransom said he believed that the State is working on this, but he is not aware of what their position is.

Paul Greenlee said this is a lot to understand and very detailed. He said he hoped Matt would communicate with the advocacy groups to find out what their thinking is.

Chair Burkman referred to the sheet attached to the memorandum that was put out by the advocacy groups: Washington State Association of Counties, Association of Washington Cities, and the Puget Sound Regional Council. It shows that the current policy is 66% to state highways and 34% to local transportation, along with that it shows that 14% of road miles are state and 86% are in the city streets and county roads. He said he thought that would stimulate some of this conversation. He encouraged everyone to go back to their jurisdictions and have a conversation with their transportation staff as to how this might be approached.

Chair Burkman said the City of Vancouver Council received an update the previous day on the outcome of the Legislative Session. He said it is pretty distressing how local jurisdictions were treated. The Public Works Trust Fund is in the process of being virtually swept out of existence. He said the current forecast for the future for the state projects a \$750 million shortfall next biennium and that is without addressing maintenance funding somewhere between \$3 and 5 billion. They were told that no one will be taking anything less than about \$3 billion. These are all stressors on the state budget that he believes could likely cause this ratio to go the other way, because the state is trying to pick up money. Currently, they are looking and sweeping funds from various prior programs that benefited cities and counties trying to fix the state issue. Chair Burkman questioned why this would be any different. He said in that environment he believes it is in their best interest to have our jurisdictions not only working individually but work together through RTC to at the very least maintain the status quo. Chair Burkman said it was pointed out in the handout he referred to that historically cities and counties could count on about 50% of the state fuel tax to cover the basics and now they are down to about 30%. He said they want to be actively involved in this, because whatever is decided by the Governor in this will become the formula for the next five years.

Jeanne Stewart asked if RTC intended to formulate a policy and offer it to the Legislature when they reconvene.

Chair Burkman said that is the conversation they need to have. He said they have some time for this. He said there is more interest in finding out what some of the other committees may do, hearing what the Puget Sound and others who are going to be at the table. He said he didn't know where each jurisdiction is, and wanted to provide an opportunity for members to speak with their jurisdictions and staff to ask what makes sense.

Jeanne Stewart said Puget Sound is always at the table.

Matt Ransom said the committee that is put together to address this has two representatives from the MPOs. He said at their quarterly meeting of the MPOs, they nominated two representatives to be potentially on the Governor's committee. The first representative is from the Puget Sound Regional Council, and the second representative is from the Yakima Council of Governments. Those are our delegates, and Mr. Ransom would provide feedback to those two representing MPOs interest for RTC.

Mr. Ransom said what he hears in terms of guidance is to follow and monitor and bring back and apprise the Board. He said he would ask the same if individual jurisdictions are discussing this to keep him apprised of the issue. Interaction and sharing information will provide benefit to all. He said he is not expecting a major shift in policy but thinks we need to be prepared.

IX. Unified Planning Work Program for Fiscal Year 2017 – DRAFT Review

Lynda David referred to the memorandum included in the meeting packet along with the Draft Unified Planning Work Program for FY 2017. The Unified Planning Work Program is the document that describes planning activities that they anticipate for this region for the next

fiscal year. The Draft document is before the Board today to provide an opportunity to review and make any comments, and next month it will be back to the Board to ask for adoption. The May adoption will meet the timeline that they have been given by Washington State Department of Transportation, the Federal Highway Administration, and the Federal Transit Administration. RTC must submit the adopted UPWP to WSDOT and they forward it to the Federal agencies for their review.

The Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) is prepared annually by RTC to meet the requirements specified for a Metropolitan Planning Organization in federal regulations. This is one of the core metropolitan planning requirements for receipt of all federal or state transportation funds to this region.

The FY 2017 UPWP actually covers the year beginning in July 1, 2016 and going through June 30, 2017. It completes a grant cycle that began with the Board's adoption of RTC's calendar year 2016 budget and work plan, which the Board adopted in December 2015. Each year, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization for this region, they have to put together this document and they have to put within the document where they intend to spend the federal PL dollars which come from the Federal Highway Administration as well as the planning dollars allocated by the Federal Transit Administration.

As in prior years, the document is set up in the same way. It has an introductory section that gives a little background on what RTC is, the nature of the Metropolitan Planning Organization, and also the Regional Transportation Planning Organization. The introduction section also has planning emphasis areas documented beginning on page X. Ms. David said not surprisingly, the number one emphasis area is implementation of the FAST Act. The introduction section also has a description on what they understand to be the key transportation issues that are being faced in this region beginning on page XV. It has four major areas. The first three sections describe elements that RTC works on, and the fourth section of the document addresses transportation planning activities by WSDOT, C-TRAN, and by the cities and the county within the region.

Ms. David said they are seeking feedback from Board members or comments they want to provide. They will then take it to the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee at their April meeting for them to have one more review of the document. It will then come back to the RTC Board for adoption at their May meeting.

Ms. David noted that the final page of the document has a summary financial table listing the estimated revenues they will have to conduct planning activities in FY 2017. She said given the action by the RTC Board today, the column listing MPO funds will be changed to include the updated dues that they expect beginning January 1, 2017. Next month when it comes to the Board for consideration, those numbers will be changed.

Chair Burkman said since we are in a major metropolitan area, the Vancouver / Portland area, he asked how this interrelates with what is going on with Metro.

Ms. David said it is a federal requirement that they jointly collaborate and cooperate with Metro because we are a bi-state region. RTC collaborates with Metro as they put together their program. Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration and the State Departments of both Washington and Oregon were here on February 18, 2016, as well as at Metro. They jointly participated in the first review of each of the draft UPWPs. In the meeting packet electronic materials, a draft of Metro's UPWP is provided as well as with the materials provided on RTC's Web site.

X. Annual Project Obligation Report

Dale Robins referred to the report and memorandum included in the meeting materials. He explained about obligation and what the requirements are. He said obligation is a federal term which means that the federal transportation aid agencies, whether it is Federal Highway Administration or Federal Transit Association, have agreed to reimburse a local agency with federal dollars for transportation projects. All federal grants are basically reimbursement grants. What happens is that they obligate the project, meaning that local agencies can start to spend the money and get reimbursed, but the expenditure of funds often occur over the next year or two as the project is constructed. This is why a project that has been obligated is currently under constructed.

The report is for 2015 only. The Federal requirement is to list projects that have been obligated over the last year. These are listed in the last three pages of the report. Mr. Robins said they have decided to do a little more analysis to better help understand what happens with the funds. The table shown on page 3 of the report shows the federal obligation over the last five years. Mr. Robins said the significant increase in dollars for 2015 is due to one grant that made up over 50% of the obligation, the Fourth Plain Bus Rapid Transit project. Mr. Robins said they have seen a shift in dollars, less federal funds being obligated by the state in our region. This does not mean that we are spending less money in our region; there has been a lot of state dollars that have come to the region. The 18th Street Interchange is an example. It is a large project, but a lot of state dollars are being spent. Federal obligation is down by the state over the last two years.

Mr. Robins referred to the table on page 5 of the report showing the 2015 federal obligation by project type. The largest project type was transit. Other project types include bicycle and pedestrian, bridge, planning, preservation, road improvements, and TSMO.

Mr. Robins said another thing that is important to us as a region is that funds are allocated to the MPO. These are the STP, CMAQ, and TAP funds that the Board selects projects for every year. Mr. Robins showed these three funding programs for 2015 with the dollar amount of funds obligated. The total funds that were obligated last year for these three programs were \$13,898,025. He said jurisdictions' staffs have done an outstanding job in moving their projects forward. Mr. Robins said RTC has roughly an allocation of \$8.6 million and obligated almost \$14 million last year. In 2015, they obligated all of their 2016 funds. The state does allow you to up to two years in advance. That way, if you have a larger project you can go a little ahead.

They are cautioning staff to slow a little, because they do not want to go too far in advance. Mr. Robins said this is a good news report, and said jurisdiction staffs are doing a great job.

Matt Ransom said he had asked Dale to produce this report in a way that Members can use to go back to their local agencies and note the good job. Mr. Ransom said in coming from a local agency perspective over the years, he found that you do projects and move on to the next. To have a one-year snapshot of what was done, the dollars spent on the project, and where it is located is captured here and a good resource. Mr. Ransom said they will produce it every year. He encouraged Members to share it with their staffs and offer congratulations on the work that they are doing. This is also available on RTC's Website.

XI. Other Business

From the Board

Chair Burkman said RTC is currently in an audit. He and Councilor Stewart sat in on the Audit Entrance Conference. An Exit Conference will follow the completion of the audit. He said there is a lot of good support from RTC staff.

From the Director

Matt Ransom said in the spirit of providing congratulations to local agencies, they have two project showcases to present. Copies of these fliers were provided and available on RTC's Website.

The City of Camas Project Showcase is NW 38th Avenue Phase 2, SE Armstrong Road to NW Parker Street. There were roughly \$2.2 million in RTC STP funds in the project with total cost of \$6.8 million. The project was a road improvement providing bike lanes, sidewalks, new roadway, turn lanes, and street lights. This opens up an opportunity for development of some of the surrounding land.

The Clark County Project Showcase is the Salmon Creek Avenue Multi-Use Pathway. This project was the recipient of \$500,000 in RTC Transportation Alternatives Program funds. The total cost was \$850,000. This pathway is about 1/3 mile long and a good connectivity piece for those neighborhoods providing safe passage.

Paul Greenlee asked what a HAWK signal was. Mr. Ransom said it is a High-intensity Activated crosswalk beacon. Old crosswalk lights were yellow flashing. The new HAWK beacon is a red flashing light indicating that the motorist has to stop until the pedestrian has crossed. This allows for a much safer crossing for pedestrians.

Mr. Ransom said he has been consulting staff to two agencies that are pursuing FAST Lane Freight grant applications. He said they have been working with the City of Washougal, the Port of Camas Washougal, and WSDOT on looking at the viability on the SR-14 corridor and 27th Street crossing for eligibility under this program. Applications are due the following week. He said there is intent to pursue that this next cycle.

Mr. Ransom said they are also working with the Gorge communities with the Port of Hood River and WSDOT looking at the next generation of applications and work on the Hood River Bridge

replacement. RTC led some preliminary study and Environmental Impact Statement and engineering work on behalf of members in the Gorge region for a feasibility study to replace the Hood River Bridge. The intent of that application might be to pick that work up and take it to a final EIS and more advanced design. Based on our Regional Transportation Plan in Klickitat County, that is a project identified as needed.

Mr. Ransom noted JPACT meets Thursday, April 21, 2016, at Metro at 7:30 a.m.

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, May 3, 2016, at 4 p.m.

XII. Adjourn

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR ADJOURNMENT. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Jack Burkman, Board of Directors Chair