

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Board of Directors
October 4, 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, October 4, 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
Kelly Brooks, ODOT (Alt.)
Jack Burkman, Vancouver Councilmember
Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor
Mike Dalesandro, Battle Ground Council (Alt.)
Bart Gernhart, WSDOT (Alt.)
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Councilmember
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver Council
Jerry Oliver, Port of Vancouver Commissioner
Julie Olson, Clark County Councilor
Scott Patterson, C-TRAN (Alt.)
Jeanne Stewart, Clark County Councilor

Voting Board Members Absent:

Jeff Hamm, C-TRAN Executive Director/CEO
Jim Herman, Port of Klickitat Commissioner
Doug McKenzie, Skamania Co. Commissioner
Ron Onslow, Ridgefield Mayor
Kris Strickler, WSDOT Regional Administrator
Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1 Manager

Nonvoting Board Members Present:

Jim Moeller, Representative 49th District

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
Sharon Wylie, Representative 49th District

Guests Present:

Ed Barnes, Citizen
Al Bauer, Citizen
Jim Hagar, Port of Vancouver
Carolyn Heniges, Clark County
Laurie Lebowsky, Clark County
David McDevitt, Citizen
Jason Ruth, HDR Engineering
Robert Schaefer, Citizen
Ron Swaren, 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

II. Approval of the Board Agenda

ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 4, 2016, MEETING AGENDA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY PAUL GREENLEE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

III. Call for Public Comments

Chair Burkman said this is the final opportunity to provide public comment on the 2017-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) document. When Public Comment concludes today, that will also conclude the public comment period for the TIP process.

Ed Barnes of Vancouver said that everyone understands the conditions on the I-5 Bridge and the I-5 corridor with the congestion. He stated again that the RTC Board needs to write a letter or resolution asking the Legislators, city and county councils, and more to come forward to support the Legislature in 2017 to produce some type of a bill to have the I-5 Bridge replaced. Mr. Barnes said our Governor Inslee met with Oregon Governor Kate Brown and both agree something needs to be done with the I-5 Bridge. Mr. Barnes proposed that RTC should support a resolution to designate the I-5 Bridge project as a project of Statewide Significance. He said there is a state law regarding this already written that was put there by Senator Al Bauer and Speaker Schaefer several years ago. Mr. Barnes distributed a handout with information on the legislation. He said work needs to begin now so when the Legislature starts up in 2017, we are ready to get something done. He noted the serious consequences that businesses and commuters face every day on I-5 and the bridge.

Marc Boldt entered the meeting at 4:10 p.m.

Al Bauer of Vancouver said he spent 30 years in the legislature. He said he had the privilege of having Bob Schaefer counsel him on many things. He said Mr. Schaefer took this legislation to the legislature in the 1980s. In 1997, John Pennington sponsored HB 2170. It was a unanimous House and Senate vote to make an opportunity for certain industries and businesses to have a Statewide Significance designation. This would give local, state, and federal agencies the opportunity to help pay for a project to encourage and increase industry to the area. Senator Bauer said the I-5 Bridge is the most important piece for Statewide Significance designation.

Robert Schaefer of Vancouver offered two observations. He said for the World's Fair in Seattle in 1964, Senator Magnuson appropriated enough money for a light rail system in Seattle. Folks argued and could not agree saying it is too early to have that type of system. All that money went to Atlanta, and Atlanta now has a wonderful light rail system. Mr. Schaefer said Seattle got the Monorail, and it certainly isn't doing much for Seattle to help with their traffic congestion today. Secondly, Mr. Schaefer said this is a long process, but they made compromises, and many groups were involved. When Wafer Tech and SEH America were coming out, Statewide Significance was the reason that the 192nd Avenue project happened. Specifically, under that legislation, it designated that border crossing projects, involving both private and public investments, carried out in conjunction with adjacent states or a private industrial development with private capital investments in manufacturing or research and development qualify for this special designation. The existing bridge congestion is impacting the industries that have been designated as Industries of Statewide Significance and the economy of SW Washington and the Portland Metropolitan area. Mr. Schaefer said it is incumbent upon all our elected officials to look seriously about making the I-5 Bridge replacement a project of Statewide Significance. He said it is the right thing to do, and it is supported by the High Tech Council.

Marc Boldt said as local officials around this table, with the exception of a few, the state and feds are silent, and they let us beat up each other. He said the question or maybe a plea is to talk to the people, because it is not our bridge. It is the state and feds who own the bridge. Councilor Boldt asked if there is some movement there.

Mr. Schaefer said you have to send the message. First of all, we are part of a metropolitan area. The bridge is a necessary part of the metropolitan area. If all the rest of the metropolitan area is served by light rail, then it is crazy that we are not going to be served by some type of light rail system. Mr. Schaefer said he believes this strongly. He said some people think it is too early to have a system like that. He said what is happening across the country, and what is happening in Seattle today is all of the big construction on light rail. He said we should be working together and sending messages to the metropolitan area that we are willing to work and we are willing to compromise. We thought we had a compromise, and they thought we had a compromise, but we didn't.

Ron Swaren of Portland, Oregon said he attended the World Urban Forum in Vancouver, B.C. where political leaders discuss cost effective ways to solve their problems. Mr. Swaren distributed a hand out of the Western Arterial Route: An Affordable Solution. He said this is not a US bypass, but a US highway where local roads could contribute as matching funds. He said they don't need a light rail system, and they don't need to spend \$4 billion on a bridge. In the Washington County Transportation Futures Study, this is called the "Northern Connection" option. Mr. Swaren highlighted several bridge types. Further information on the Western Arterial Route can be found on the handout.

David McDevitt of Vancouver said over the last year, he has had the opportunity to run for the US Congress. He was ousted in the primary in August, but had an opportunity to talk with many people over the year. He said a big part of his platform was transportation and the infrastructure issues that the entire region faces up and down the I-5 corridor. He said the three things that he talked about were a west side road for freight only to get freight off of I-5 in the Portland area specifically; he talked about mass rapid transit to get people out of their cars and into their jobs in Portland; and he talked about replacing the I-5 Bridge. Mr. McDevitt said he also met with folks in Skamania County, and they also have bridges in need of repair. He said he was seeking a federal office understanding that significant amounts of the funding come from the federal government. He said he learned that in 1921, Congress specifically authorized a joint powers authority for the New York/New Jersey area run by the New York/New Jersey Port Authority. They have complete responsibility over bi-state solutions. Mr. McDevitt said he believes that we should be moving in the direction of asking Congress to approve such of a project.

IV. Approval of September 6, 2016, Minutes

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 6, 2016, MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

V. Consent Agenda

A. October Claims

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

VI. RTC Procurement Policy, Resolution 10-16-21

Matt Ransom said the procurement policy was presented in draft form at last month's meeting. He said the organization has had its procurement policies in multiple different locations, some of them not documented clearly. Mr. Ransom said he flagged that a couple years ago when he joined the organization and has been working to consolidate and prepare what is before the Board today. This is a summary of the Board level policies which will document how procurement is carried out and the different authorities that the Board and Executive Director have to administer purchasing within the organization.

Mr. Ransom said since the last meeting, there has been some reorganization of the outline of the policies, and they have added several supplemental provisions. In working with the Board's general counsel, they determined that it should be in the Board's policy and not an administrative document. With that, they have taken some items, such as bidder's responsibilities, up to this level of Policy so it is clear if you are intending to do work with RTC these are the responsibilities as a potential contractor and likewise the responsibilities of the organization in being clear and fair to the bidder in contracting with the organization.

Also addressed are Guidelines. The guidelines stipulate that as an organization that uses several different funding sources, we must follow the guidelines of the state and federal government if using their funds and if not, use RTC guidelines.

Purchasing Thresholds are covered. This lays out who has the authority to approve contracts. This is the area that provides the most clarity. It is an issue of efficiency for the organization. The Executive Director would have the authority to approve small contracts, assuming that there is budget authority, and any contract above a certain dollar amount, the Board would have to authorize as has traditionally been done. Other supplemental provisions have been added to ensure that we are as transparent as possible with anyone who intends to do work with RTC.

Mr. Ransom said there is no budget implication. This is just policy in nature. He said this is very beneficial to have both for audits and day to day administration and to clarify responsibilities. Staff is recommending adoption.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 10-16-21, RTC PROCUREMENT POLICY. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY JEANNE STEWART.

Shirley Craddick asked what the policies were regarding minorities, women, and embracing small businesses. She said she did not see a reference to that, and asked if there were policies to try and recruit these types of businesses.

Mr. Ransom said using RTC funds, they have no expressed policies. This is in part because the majority of RTC's funds are not RTC owned. Where state and federal policy would invoke those types of requirements, as the guidelines lay out, they would have to follow those. If they use federal aid funds to hire a consultant to do work, and the dollar of the funds to be expended was so high, they might have a requirement provided to them by the state through the feds. They would have to then adhere to that requirement. They have had contracts in the past where they have had performance goals in that way.

Shirley Craddick acknowledged that they use the policies of the other agencies and asked why they did not have their own policies. Mr. Ransom said most of the work they do is using state or federal funds so they don't need to restate those policies. Those organizations have evaluated the merits of the

requirements. For RTC funds, the amount of contracts that RTC renders using just RTC funds is very limited. RTC funds are used singularly for items such as computer or equipment purchase. Often times they use RTC funds to match; but if they are matching state or federal contract funds, they have to adhere to those guidelines. Mr. Ransom said their funds are used so seldom in isolation that in purchasing a supply, there is really no value added to have a performance target.

Chair Burkman reminded members as he stated last month, we are transitioning from an organization that operates predominately by practice and putting that into policy. This is the first step in that translation from practice to policy.

Jeanne Stewart asked Mr. Ransom in addressing that issue if there was anything in the current policy presented here or in the past policy that would have precluded minority contractors from submitting applications. Mr. Ransom said no there was not. Councilor Stewart said these are practical policies which have been followed and will now be actually written into policy. This is not to tie the Executive Director's hands; it is to secure Board involvement for larger amounts and to quantify it so there are not ongoing questions about where the authority lies. This will allow for relatively routine items to move ahead with ease. Councilor Stewart said she thought this was put together well and the amounts he reflected were reasonable.

Jerry Oliver referred to paragraph 8 Suspension and Debarment. He said RTC recently awarded a contract to a contractor that played a significant role in the Columbia River Crossing Project. He asked if paragraph 8 gave the Executive Director authority to debar a contractor the Board deems inappropriate for consideration.

Mr. Ransom said to date, the organization has not written in policy how the organization itself could debar or suspend a potential contractor. There are federal and state guidelines that they have been relying on. This puts in writing how the organization itself could carry out such an act. The reason they are including that is to make very clear that they have that authority independent of state or federal oversight to make those determinations and lay out the causes. The key would be it is an administrative review, and they have put forward, subject to the Director's interpretation, triggers or causes that may cause him to invoke such a ruling. There would then be a notice and a reinstatement provision. Mr. Ransom said the intent is to put in writing the rules we are to use, and therefore, in any future procurement if there be a query that were be brought forward, he would follow what has been written to determine if there is merit or not and follow that process.

Chair Burkman said as he reads this, the action that was taken before does not change. There were no grounds for debarment before, and having this in written policy, there are still no grounds for debarment on the previous contract. He asked legal counsel for clarification.

Ted Gathe said that was correct. The allegations that were raised with regard to that particular vendor, none would meet the criteria listed that would provide for any kind of debarment. Chair Burkman said this does clearly state how we would evaluate that.

Jerry Oliver asked if they needed to modify the paragraph to address a circumstance as with the noted vendor such as "at Board direction".

Chair Burkman said they could not just say they did not want them applying. There has to be a specific reason, and since the organization we are talking about went through a complete review and not found to be at fault, they are not different than any other organization.

Ted Gathe said they could not have a provision that says "at the Board's discretion, they may choose to debar a particular applicant" without specific criteria that are spelled out in the document. He said he did not know how they could add that to this policy given that the findings in that particular case were that the vendor had not committed any acts that would result in debarment.

Chair Burkman said the reason he brought it up this way is because they did have legal counsel go through and evaluate could we have debarred, and legal counsel said no there was no legal criteria by which you could have used. Since we didn't have legal criteria then, we can't put that in the policy.

Anne McEnery-Ogle said that Mr. Ransom had referred to RTC's audit and having the procurement policies. She asked if this was a request of the auditor. Mr. Ransom said no, they did not flag it as something the RTC needed to do. The pieces were all there, just not all in one document. He felt best practices were to put everything in one place. That way, if in reviewing our financial records and transactions there is any question, we are able to bring this out in one single document and show that these are the rules that are adopted by policy. Mr. Ransom said what he didn't mention is that there is an administrative document, which he had a copy of, that gives the guidance to staff as the steps to follow and templates for forms, etc. This is not policy of the Board. It is how to carry it out and ensure that all is legal and compliant.

Jeanne Stewart said to Commissioner Oliver's point, which she thinks is well taken because of the considerable discussion about the contractor that was about to be selected. Councilor Stewart asked what the majority of the Board can exercise their judgement and prerogative legally.

Ted Gathe said again, if you are talking about a debarment action, it would have to be based on some specific criteria. Councilor Stewart asked without technical debarment, what the latitude for the Board to use its own judgement would be on the selection of contractors.

Mr. Gathe said if the contractor that was recommended to the Board can't meet the requirements of fulfilling the contract for one reason or another, then the Board may have the right to make a decision rejecting them, but the bottom line is that there has to be some criteria that it is based on. It can't simply be that you didn't like the way this particular contractor performed a contract in the past, but doesn't rise to the level of some inappropriate conduct.

Councilor Stewart said this needs more discussion. She doesn't like to hear that the Board would not have the prerogative to just say that contractor is not acceptable.

Mr. Gathe said the Board certainly has the prerogative to reject all contracts. That was the prior policy, and that was clearly written in this policy. Councilor Stewart asked if this was only if they gave cause. Mr. Gathe said no, if you choose to simply reject all contracts and rebid it; you have that authority. Councilor Stewart said so there is a Board judgement and prerogative that can enter into the process.

Chair Burkman said he wanted to be careful here, because we are recreating the conversation that we had at that time. He reminded the Board that we had options presented to us. One of those options was to reject all bids. Had we done that, the next step would have been to reissue a call for bids with new criteria. The legal counsel that we received was that there was not a way to write into a new bid legal criteria that would cause that bidder to be excluded.

Jeanne Stewart said she understood that objective. She said her objective is for this Board to understand that if there is a time that it lacks confidence in a contractor based on the judgement of the Board, they can reject all bids. Ted Gathe said the Board can reject all bids without any specific reason

for doing so. Councilor Stewart said it is important for the Board to use sound judgement in their decision making, and just because someone has applied as a contractor, doesn't necessarily lock us in.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VII. Transportation Programming Guidebook, Policy Amendments, Resolution 10-16-22

Matt Ransom said agenda items VII, VIII, and IX are all related. Dale would provide the report for each of the three. To local agencies, one of the most attractive roles of RTC is giving out grant funds. These funds support local projects, whether they are roadway, bicycle, pedestrian, or transit improvement projects. Tonight they would present the culmination of the work that has been over a year in consultation with local agencies' staff, applications by those staff, and through the review process. Mr. Ransom said this is a very important annual activity to award grant funds.

Dale Robins referred to the resolution and attached Guidebook included in the meeting packet. He said the resolution seeks to amend the previously adopted Transportation Programming Guidebook. The changes are highlighted in red text in the document, with most at the back section of the document.

The Guidebook outlines the overall TIP development and RTC's grant processes. These processes are further defined through policies and procedures. The Policies and Procedures are critical in that they support a clear and effective TIP process by providing guidelines on how RTC will develop the TIP and what agencies can and cannot do.

Mr. Robins said as this has been discussed over the last few months, the programming policies need to be amended in order to implement statewide obligation policies and to deal with the region's over-obligation of federal funds.

The Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC) has reviewed the Guidebook and is recommending that the following policies be revised: Policy 4.1 would be modified to clarify that there would be an annual limit of \$2.5 million per project. Overall, projects are eligible for \$4 million but can only have \$2.5 million per calendar year. Policy 5.1 would limit implementation of projects to those listed in the first two years of the TIP. Policies 5.3 through 5.5 would tie obligation date to the program year. This would mean if there was a call for projects for 2020 that is the year that the project would be tied to for 2020 funding. Policy 6.1 would clarify that RTC's grant awards will be tied to the year of funding.

In summary, these policy and procedure changes would provide a clear and fair TIP development process that would align the regional and statewide policies and allow the region to control obligation levels within allowable levels. These policy changes only modify timing of projects but will not result in any project losing funding.

Mr. Robins said RTC reviewed the impacts to existing projects and identified one project that would be significantly impacted by these policy changes. That is the Clark County project of NE 10th Avenue over Whipple Creek. This project has a Corps of Engineers permit that expires in March of 2017. The project is programmed in year 2019, and under new policies would not be allowed to proceed until year 2018. Staff is recommending that the NE 10th Avenue project be allowed to proceed with Advanced Construction funding. This term that the state uses means that the County would be allowed to proceed using their own dollars and would have to wait until 2018 to receive payment back for the dollars. This would ensure that obligation authority was not used so that other programmed projects would not lose funding, and the County could proceed without costly delay of re-permitting.

Chair Burkman asked if this ensured reimbursement for the County. Mr. Robins said once a project is obligated, it would ensure reimbursement.

Staff is seeking adoption of Resolution 10-16-22 which would revise the Transportation Programming Guidebook as explained.

ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 10-16-22, TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMMING GUIDEBOOK POLICY AMENDMENTS. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY PAUL GREENLEE.

Chair Burkman acknowledged the good work and amount of effort that has gone into it. He said it truly is a guidebook to help guide jurisdictions and keep all playing by the same rules. It is a collaborative process and documented very well. Paul Greenlee agreed.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VIII. 2020 Regional Competitive Grant Awards, Resolution 10-16-23

Dale Robins referred to the resolution included in the meeting packet. The resolution seeks selection of the 2020 regional competitive grant awards. Last month there was discussion of the evaluation of the grants, and today would be the awarding of the grants.

As the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Clark County region, RTC is responsible for selection of regionally allocated Federal Highway Funds. This includes the Surface Transportation Program (STP), Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Program, and the Transportation Alternative Program (TAP). Federal regulations require that projects be selected through a regionally competitive process.

RTC's competitive selection process includes three steps. The process begins with local agencies' staff identifying and submitting priority projects to RTC for consideration. 1) Projects are screened for consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan; 2) Projects are evaluated and ranked based on needs criteria. (This was done at the September meeting.); and 3) Projects are selected and programmed. (This will be done with the adoption of the resolution.)

The Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC) at their September meeting recommended the RTC Board select ten projects for \$8.8 million in regional competitive grant awards. This is six STP projects and four CMAQ projects. This \$8.8 million in federal money will leverage an additional \$12.9 million of other funding. Mr. Robins said one of their primary goals is to leverage additional dollars.

Mr. Robins referred to the list of STP Projects. The first three projects support RTC's work program including the Urban Freeway Operations Study that will look at how we can get the most out of the existing I-5 corridor. The other projects funded include construction of 119th Street East, 87th Ave. to 112th Ave.; NE 137th Avenue, 49th St. to Fourth Plain; and rural STP funding will go to the NE Blair Road project. The list of the four CMAQ projects includes funding for technology to improve traffic flow and C-TRAN buses.

A slide was provided showing the distribution of funds by project type. The majority of the funds are going to road improvements at 57.40%, followed by transit at 21.90%, TSMO at 10.80%, and non-capital at 9.90%.

As recommended by RTAC, staff is recommending adoption of Resolution 10-16-23 which includes the selection of ten projects for approximately \$8.8 million in regionally allocated STP and CMAQ funds.

Chair Burkman noted that the dollar amount awarded to each of the projects does not mean that the projects would be completed with that amount. It will cover one of several stages of a project.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 10-16-23, 2020 REGIONAL COMPETITIVE GRANT AWARDS. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY JULIE OLSON.

Jerry Oliver referred to the NE 119th St. East, 87th Ave. to 112th Ave. project saying that is about a mile long piece of the project. He said it is a large ongoing project. He asked if there was also a mile to the west of 76th Ave. that is planned for that project as well. Dale Robins said the County does have another project west of 72nd Avenue that is already 100% funded. Commissioner Oliver said as Chair Burkman pointed out, this is not all of the construction of the project. He asked what the next phase of the project was. Mr. Robins said the County's 119th Street project would be concluded with the construction. The 137th Avenue, 49th St. to Fourth Plain City of Vancouver project is for right of way in that segment. Mr. Robins said it will continue to be a two-lane street with roundabouts.

Commissioner Oliver said he was not familiar with the County's NE Blair Road project and asked for some background information. Mr. Robins said it is in the Camas Washougal area off of the rural part of SR-500. It is a fairly major collector road in the area. It would upgrade the road with paving, signage, striping, and guardrail to all help improve safety. Commissioner Oliver asked the distance of the project. Mr. Robins said he thought it was over two miles; it was a sizable project. Given that it is a rural road with few cross-streets, referring to the milepost is the only way to describe it. Councilmember Greenlee said that Blair Road connects SR-500 with the Washougal River Road where the Little Washougal River joins the Washougal River. He later noted the location on the map at the back of the TIP document.

Kelly Brooks asked with the applications for the grants only asking for funding for certain phases such as the project seeking right-of-way, do they have to list the costs for the other phases of the project that are needed. Mr. Robins said the application does require the full cost of the project. With a right-of-way project, you know that the construction is not funded, so they would most likely come back once they found another grant source.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

IX. 2017-2020 Transportation Improvement Program, Resolution 10-16-24

Dale Robins referred to the resolution included in the meeting packet. The resolution seeks adoption of the 2017-2020 Transportation Improvement Program. As the Metropolitan Planning Organization for Clark County, RTC is required to develop a financially constrained regional Transportation Improvement Program or TIP. The TIP shows how projects will be funded over the next four years. Projects are drawn from the Regional Transportation Plan. The TIP must be adopted by October 15 or implementation of projects could be delayed.

Projects are selected from multiple sources including RTC, C-TRAN, WSDOT, and others. RTC has a responsibility to review each project for consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan, financial feasibility, a reasonable timeline, and other requirements prior to including projects in the TIP.

Mr. Robins provided an overview of the 69 projects included in the TIP. When looking at just the distribution of the projects, the highest numbers of projects are for road improvements followed by Safety, Bicycle and Pedestrian, and Transportation System Management and Operation.

When looking at the projects by distribution by total funds, it gives a different view of the projects. Highest amount of funds are allocated to road improvements followed by transit and bridges. What they find is that the number of projects is not necessarily tied to the funding distribution.

Mr. Robins displayed a map of the county showing the 69 TIP project locations. A map was also included at the back of the document.

Adoption of 2017-2020 TIP includes \$219.3 million in funding for regionally significant projects of which \$96.3 million are federal funds. Adoption of this resolution also included certification that RTC is following the federal process including public participation, financial constraint, and consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan. Once adopted by the RTC Board, the TIP becomes part of the State Transportation Improvement Program, which becomes effective in January 2017.

RTAC has reviewed the draft 2017-2020 TIP and have recommended to the Board the adoption of Resolution 10-16-24, which will adopt the 2017-2020 Transportation Improvement Program.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 10-16-24, THE 2017-2020 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SHIRLEY CRADDICK AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

X. Comprehensive Plan(s) Transportation Element Certifications, Resolution 10-16-25

Chair Burkman said that given the time, this agenda item would be held for presentation until next month. He said the intent was to certify Clark County, Camas, and Washougal tonight and next month certify other cities. They will just combine them all for action at next month's meeting.

XI. Vancouver Area Smart Trek (VAST), Annual Program Report

Bob Hart referred to the memo included in the meeting packet that provided the annual report to the RTC Board on the Vancouver Area Smart Trek (VAST) program, accomplishments, and activities. Mr. Hart would highlight the main elements of the report and provide a couple videos at the end about automated vehicles.

The VAST program is a partnership of transportation agencies in the Clark County Region that was established to improve system performance. They include WSDOT, Clark County, City of Vancouver, C-TRAN, and City of Camas. They work together on: signal systems; freeway, arterial, and transit management; and traveler information projects that use smart technology with VAST helping build the system infrastructure needed to support them.

As described in the report, the program supports federal requirements to develop and maintain a regional Intelligent Transportation System Architecture, as well as the Congestion Management Process requirements to collaborate on operational strategies before adding roadway capacity. The process has been successful in funding and building ITS and operational projects. Over the last 15 years, VAST partners received more than \$26 million in federal funds.

RTC manages the VAST program, and they have different committees that work together on different elements of the program. The Steering Committee provides the overall operations vision for the region and works to develop, implement, and fund ITS and operational projects. The Communications Infrastructure Committee is a mix of transportation and IT staff that cooperate on sharing assets, maintenance, and standards for the communications technology and fiber needed to support operational projects.

Page 2 of the memo lists a table with operational projects programmed in the TIP last year. These included software upgrades, control upgrades, cameras, and more. The Joint ATMS project moved WSDOT over to the same central signal system that Clark County has to a shared signal system. They can share data and coordinate their systems more effectively.

They have had some successful partnerships in place for several years. VAST agencies have had an Agreement in place since July 2006 that authorizes agencies to enter into fiber asset sharing permits. The agreement has led to better use of existing fiber and communication equipment by sharing available capacity among agencies. Last year, VAST completed permits for C-TRAN to use state and city fiber for BRT communications on Fourth Plain. This saved C-TRAN between \$6-10.5 million. They also have a partnership with Portland State University in the regional data archive known as Portal. Portal contains, in a single location, historical transportation data from agencies in the Vancouver-Portland region. In 2016, in addition to existing freeway and arterial data, RTC has worked with Portal staff and agencies to implement several enhancements to the archive site. Mr. Hart highlighted some of those new features.

One of the projects in the new TIP just adopted today builds on the Joint ATMS project programmed last year for WSDOT. It would add Battle Ground, Camas, and Washougal signals to the single shared ATMS central system with the County and WSDOT and will allow data sharing and better traffic flow and management of corridors along multiple jurisdictions.

The VAST agencies recently completed an update to the Transportation Systems Management and Operations (TSMO) Plan which was first developed in 2011. The updated plan was reviewed and endorsed by the VAST Steering Committee the previous week. The Plan guides the implementation of operational strategies and supporting ITS technologies and is the framework for accomplishing transportation system management objectives. The table listed on page 4 is a sampling of emerging issues from the Plan which will help direct the future focus areas for VAST partners. A few of those issues include ITS Infrastructure renewal and asset management, Regional Performance Measurement, and Connected and Autonomous Vehicles (CAV) which Mr. Hart highlighted.

With regard to the Connected and Autonomous Vehicles, Mr. Hart said there is a lot they don't about the impact of CAVs, how quickly they will become more prominent in the vehicle fleet, their impact on congestion, or whether vehicle miles driven will go up or down. They do know they are on the way. Mr. Hart noted the handout of an article from The New York Times about driverless vehicles.

In addition to self-driving cars like the google car and Tesla, many new vehicles have autonomous features. Things like cruise control, lane departure warning, automatic braking, and assisted parking. Mr. Hart said they also know that we need to prepare our transportation infrastructure to handle these changes. The TSMO Plan calls for agencies to "future proof" infrastructure to accommodate CAVs such as the installation of high powered signal controllers that can process large amounts of data and can communicate with vehicles and other roadside devices. Current controllers use 98% of capacity to operate existing timing plans. New ones use 2% for the same operations. Replacing these outdated CPUs is something all the agencies are committed to.

The Federal Highway Administration recognizes the potential safety benefits of autonomous vehicles. They have just released guidance that supports safe design, as well as, development, testing, and deployment of CAVs. They have a 15 point safety checklist for development of CAVs and also encourage the sharing of data and common standards for manufacturers.

Mr. Hart provided a video clip from the General Motors Motorama Exhibit of 1956 that looked ahead to the distant future – to 1976. He finished with a video from Federal Highways which covered the full range of potential for connected vehicles as well as some of the autonomous features we actually see in place today. Mr. Hart said the vision that they see for VAST is to be more mindful of what they need to do.

Shirley Craddick said it would be an amazing system, but all the technology would have to double to make it work. She said phasing it in will be challenging. Mr. Hart said he has read about some of the costs and also about the possibilities of shared vehicles.

Chair Burkman said a report he recently read said the average age of a car is about 12 years, so the turnover is going to take a long time. The Board will have a lot of tough decisions.

XII. Other Business

From the Board

Chair Burkman referred to the memo from him that was distributed regarding the Executive Director's Performance Evaluation. He said the Executive Director was hired in January 2014, and in the hiring process they agreed to do a six-month evaluation after the probation period and that was done. An evaluation was done at the end of 2014 and end of 2015. By agreement the Director's review was to be conducted in a manner which allowed for a "360" evaluation process on a rotating basis (every three or more years). Year 2016 would represent the third year. Chair Burkman said he and the Vice Chair deemed it appropriate to retain an external consultant to conduct the performance review.

The Executive Director has recruited the company, Waldron HR, to do the evaluation primarily by electronic methods, which brings the cost down, but still keeps the effectiveness up. If needed, they could go to one-on-one interviews, but the recommendation at this point is to not do that. They would gather all the information and bring it back to the Board. The cost of that is about \$4,000. If they do one-on-one interviews, the cost goes up quickly.

Jeanne Stewart noted to the Board that Waldron is an experienced company. She has seen their work and thinks they do a good and thorough job. She said in the evaluation, there will be places for comments. She said the comments can be critical to help guide them as to where they are going with RTC, where they need to be, and where they need to expand. She thinks Waldron is a good choice.

Chair Burkman said the survey will go out to Board Members, RTC Staff, and also a set of designated stakeholders in the community. He said Waldron was used by the County in the evaluation of their Manager. The Board agreed to move forward with the process.

From the Director

Mr. Ransom said he briefed the Board this spring and wanted to give a quick update on the Referendum by RTC employees to voluntarily participate in the Social Security program. That concluded this last month with an affirmative vote for volunteer participation. The next step in the process, most likely next month, will be an agreement to extend social security coverage to eligible employees. That Section 218 Agreement will take action by resolution for the Chair to sign and permanently bind the organization with social security participation.

Mr. Ransom said the Board was briefed in August on the Federal Rulemaking and MPOs, and staff submitted comments to the federal docket. This refers to some reforms that USDOT has proposed that might modify how MPOs both are organized and also how they might do their business. This specifically

may affect RTC, because we are one MPO within a region that has two MPOs; the other being Metro/JPACT. After the conversation in August, the comments were submitted. Mr. Ransom said he thought USDOT received so many comments, that they decided they need to go back and clarify what people really meant. He said he believed that they wanted folks to prove it, given the questions that they asked. Those comments include the following: Specific comments on the impact of the proposed rule; specific recommended language about exceptions; and comments about expected cost.

Mr. Ransom said his briefing is to review where they stand. He said RTC staff is reaching out to their peers at Metro to collaborate on comments. Mr. Ransom said on page two of the distributed memo, the input that they provided previously was listed in italics. He said he thought it addressed question two regarding exceptions. We said to grant us an exception and this is how we know that we are due an exception. We already have a structure in place; we have the Bi-State Coordination Committee. Mr. Ransom said also with our Boards of Directors, we both share membership votes on constituents' Board.

Mr. Ransom said he thought we didn't need to reply to the second question since we have already addressed that. USDOT has also said to not resubmit the same comment.

With the first question of impacts, Mr. Ransom said there are any number of potential impacts. The observations are that there are no cost savings; if anything there are cost increases. There are not any efficiencies. It will cost more time and effort to develop the joint planning products. There are some inefficiencies in terms of the offset for timing between when we do our work and Metro does theirs along with the two states. An example would be the TIP, which was adopted this evening. Under the rule, this would have to be a joint document. RTC's TIP has 69 projects at \$219 million. Metro's TIP could be three times that, and their timing is different because the way they receive and the state processes federal funds. It is a mismatch. It is not going to be an easy puzzle to fit together. The loss of local voice and ownership of planning documents as region becomes larger.

The question of expected cost, they don't know how to estimate those costs. It is not without precedent. Mr. Ransom said the UPWP that is approved in the spring is actually a joint planning product. The RTC Board resolution states that the Board accepts Metro's UPWP as well, and Metro does the same for RTC. The UPWPs are developed at the same time. There are inefficiencies when you try to get 50 people together at one time.

Mr. Ransom noted page 3 of the memo refers to a three-party letter that was signed by representatives of National Associations that represent MPOs, Councils of Governments and Economic Development entities. They made comments in their letter that they submitted in August about the costs and inefficiencies. Those comments were listed. Mr. Ransom said he thought that USDOT has heard that it is going to cost more and there are some inefficiencies.

Mr. Ransom said staff needs to submit by October 24, and if they do, they will not repeat what they already said. The status with Metro staff is that at this point, they are not sure if they will submit comments. He said they felt like their August letter may have addressed the issues sufficiently. Mr. Ransom said he predicts that given all of the comments that were received, combined with USDOTs momentum to get something done by the end of the year before they change the administration, he thinks they will see some final rule. That probably does have some recommendation for better coordination.

Jeanne Stewart said there is the first part of the merging of the MPOs and the second part is the merging of the Metropolitan Planning Areas (MPAs). She said the County addressed that specific second

issue as well. She asked if RTC was going to include that as well. The planning area would be Clark County and SW Washington and Metro. She said she did not see how those would be a long term beneficial merger either. She said the MPO and MPA are similar in their nature. She asked if that was going to be specified, and if it is omitted are they going to think it is okay.

Mr. Ransom said the MPO is the organization, the governing Boards, and the other is the actual boundary that the census designates based on population. By any definition, we live in this four-county region in a singular urban area. For the purposes of defining organizations, we have carved out the Clark County piece and said they are separate. He said he does not know what they are going to do. He said he can commit to look at that question again and make sure that their letter addressed it sufficiently. If they can submit comments that have value for this second round of comments, then hone in on that. Mr. Ransom and Lynda David are working on this along with Metro and WSDOT. Most of this will take place before the next RTC Board meeting.

Jeanne Stewart said she appreciated the emphasis on the way we have the formalized committees, membership, and bylaws. That makes a good case for us that we have good communication and cooperation across the river. We have a long history of our formalized work together. That bodes well for our argument that we have a system that works.

Marc Boldt agreed with Councilor Stewart. He said he would hope that we would express our interest again. He said what worries him is that if nothing goes back to the feds, they will think all is well. He said to keep at it.

Chair Burkman said it is confusing as to what they want. He said if they want to try to find common ground for everything, that is going to be expensive and take a lot of time. It will involve our state legislature as well.

Shirley Craddick said the Metro Regional Government goes about establishing their priorities much different that this group does. They have a different emphasis as well. The Washington Legislature makes decision about road projects. In Oregon, policies are established and the Legislature agrees to those policies, and that guides what projects are funded. There are many differences.

Mr. Ransom said they will address this further. He said there will be rule making most likely by the end of the year. He said Lynda attended a conference last week in Seattle where peers across the multi-state area were collaborating with FTA on this. The word from FTA staff was that they were told to get it done by the end of the year. They will continue the collaboration. If comments are submitted, members would be copied on that response.

Chair Burkman concurred with Councilor Boldt drawing off his experience. While they may say not to resubmit comments, that could result with no more comments. He said to duplicate it, and say it again.

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, November 1, 2016, at 4 p.m.

XIII. Adjourn

SHIRLEY CRADDICK MOVED FOR ADJOURNMENT. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY JULIE OLSON AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Jack Burkman, Board of Directors Chair