

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Board of Directors
November 3, 2015, 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 Melissa Smith on Tuesday, November 3, 2015, 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:

Nancy Baker, Port of Vancouver Commissioner
Jack Burkman, Vancouver Council Member
Jeff Hamm, C-TRAN Executive Director
David Madore, Clark County Councilor
Doug McKenzie, Skamania Co. Commissioner
Tom Mielke, Clark County Councilor
Ron Onslow, Ridgefield Mayor (Alternate)
Larry Smith, Vancouver Council Member
Melissa Smith, Camas Council Member
Jeanne Stewart, Clark County Councilor
Kris Strickler, WSDOT Regional Administrator

Voting Board Members Absent:

Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor
Bill Ganley, Battle Ground Council Member
David Poucher, White Salmon Mayor
Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1 Manager

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
Judy Bumbarger-Enright, Citizen
Dan Enright, Citizen
Lori Figone, WSDOT SW Region
James Foley, Citizen
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Council Member
Jim Hagar, Port of Vancouver
Peter Harrison, Citizen
Carolyn Heniges, Clark County
Colleen Kuhn, Human Services Council
John Ley, Citizen
Ken McDaniel, Citizen
Merridy McDaniel, Citizen
Shamus Misek, WSDOT Olympia
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver Council
Heidi Owens, Citizen
Scott Patterson, C-TRAN
Scott Sawyer, City of Battle Ground
Tim Shell, City of Ridgefield
Patrick Sweeney, City of Vancouver
Michael A. Williams, WSDOT SW Region

Staff Present:

Matt Ransom, Executive Director
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. Call for Public Comments

Ed Barnes from Vancouver spoke to the I-5 replacement bridge that Representative Liz Pike has been promoting. He noted the need for a new bridge in the I-5 location and not in East County or to the west.

Judy Bumbarger-Enright from Vancouver is the Chairman of the Sunnyside Neighborhood Association. She commented on what she would like to see added to the transportation options in Clark County. She lives off 86th Street close to 94th Avenue, and there are no buses on 94th Avenue. She would like to see bus routes added to 94th Avenue and the surrounding area. She would also like to be able to take a bus to the train station and to the airport. Ms. Bumbarger-Enright said more park and rides are needed, and noted an option is to make arrangements to use church parking lots during the week. She is in favor of more frequent service, bus lanes during rush hour, and light rail.

Merridy McDaniel said she has lived in Vancouver since July when her and her husband moved here from Atlanta, Georgia. She said they watched public transportation get voted down over and over while the population went from 1 million to 6 million, and the city is in total gridlock all the time. She said in looking at the traffic here and across the bridges, she would like to support light rail, commuter rail, and bus transportation. She said it would be wonderful if they could make Vancouver a city that has the best possible transportation.

III. Approval of the Board Agenda

LARRY SMITH MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2015, MEETING AGENDA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY JACK BURKMAN AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

IV. Approval of October 6, 2015, Minutes

LARRY SMITH MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 6, 2015, MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY RON ONSLOW AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

V. Consent Agenda

A. November Claims

JACK BURKMAN MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA NOVEMBER CLAIMS. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY LARRY SMITH AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VI. Master Interlocal Services Agreement Between RTC and Metro, Resolution 11-15-18

Matt Ransom said this is another one of their interlocal agreements among members so they can contract for services. It is an efficient way to do business between members.

Mark Harrington referred to the resolution included in the meeting packet. They are asking for Board approval of Resolution 11-15-18 to enter into a Master Interlocal Services Agreement with Metro. RTC's established Interlocal Agreement among member agencies provides that RTC may contract on a fee-for-service basis with parties to the agreement. RTC has a number

of these types of interlocal agreements in place with RTC members including Clark County, City of Vancouver, and C-TRAN. They allow RTC to perform work for members as task orders and to contract for various services such as IT and HR services that RTC receives from Clark County.

As the two Metropolitan Planning Organizations that serve this bi-state metropolitan region, the RTC and Metro consistently coordinate and partner on various planning activities. This agreement will facilitate the use of each other's personnel and expertise when appropriate to increase efficiency as both MPOs seek federal transportation planning requirements.

David Madore asked how much flow went back and forth between Metro and RTC, if Metro requested something and paid us or the other way around.

Matt Ransom said a lot of the work is just coordination at no cost. Mark along with another RTC staff, Shinwon Kim, meet, attend, coordinate, and develop tools with Metro staff, and that is reciprocal. They help us and we help them. This task order work would be more specific. For example, this year they are doing some joint training that the Board approved at their September meeting. They are paying for a consultant to provide training to RTC and Metro. Mr. Ransom said in the past, a lot of the work has been pro bono; in moving forward, a lot may be on a reimbursement basis. This would be for specific activities, such as training or a new modeling tool that is to be developed. If Metro hires a consultant, but they need our supplement to the funding, then we would enter into a task order to supplement the funding for a consultant. Mr. Ransom said they anticipate that for next year, because there are some new modeling tools that are in development.

Councilor Madore said it sounded like not much money exchanged hands; it was more information, pro bono most of the time. Mr. Ransom said yes, most of the time, but they are budgeting next year \$15,000 to help support consulting services that they jointly procure.

Jeanne Stewart asked if Metro would ask RTC to facilitate a study on our side of the Columbia River with specifics as to what they wanted, such as a goal of how to get people out of their car, she said she thought that would be the wrong question. She said she might be concerned about us doing a study and providing the information, where it may or may not necessarily be in the best interest of our citizens on this side. Councilor Stewart said there is a little difference in the approach that Metro has to transportation management than we have; we don't share an identical vision of what transportation management should be. Councilor Stewart asked if this issue would be a possibility. Councilor Stewart also asked if the task order would come to the Board for approval if it was over \$15,000.

Mr. Ransom said the "WHEREAS" clauses narrow down the focus of what the agreement covers, and that is primarily travel demand forecasting model tool development. That includes collecting traffic count data and having a consultant develop a software tool for traffic flow. It is very detailed to more of the mechanics of forecasting and the traffic modeling process. The question that Councilor Stewart is asking is in part policy. This agreement does not cover a policy type study. It pertains to travel demand modeling, so he did not think it was an issue.

In regard to the budget and task orders, the budget that is proposed for next year has a line item of modeling services for \$15,000. That would be the Board's authorization of work. Anything above that would have to be brought to the Board for discussion.

NANCY BAKER MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 11-15-18. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY JEANNE STEWART AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VII. Washington State Public Transportation Plan Update

Matt Ransom said the next two presentations are being presented by Washington DOT staff. The first is by Shamus Misek from the Public Transportation Division in Olympia. They have a statewide Plan that they have been working on, and they are out seeking public comment and presenting to MPOs. The second presentation was shared with local agencies' technical staff at RTAC last month. They felt it was beneficial and saw value in sharing this with the Board. It is a report on the 18th Street interchange at I-205 and how WSDOT is looking at how to do projects from a new more cost effective, practical design, and practical solutions. This is a larger initiative that DOT is working on.

Shamus Misek introduced the draft Washington State Public Transportation Plan that they are out seeking public comment on. They are currently in the public engagement process. They have 60 presentations planned across the state from October 21, 2015, to January 4, 2016. They are soliciting comments from the public so their input will be part of how the Plan looks.

Mr. Misek said the reason that they are updating the Plan is because they realize that things are changing. They need to look at the way they manage transit and ensure that they better address the needs of the communities, people of Washington, the businesses, and how they connect and travel and get around the state. The Plan has been over a two year process of collaboration with all of their partners. That includes transit agencies, planning organizations, cities, counties, state agencies, employers, as well as non-profits.

Through the process they have identified four major challenges that the State faces. One is demand. The demand for access to jobs, schools, services, and community is growing, but public transportation providers' ability to meet this demand has been constrained. A second challenge is congestion. Congestion is hurting our economy and quality of life, and they must find ways to move more people with even greater efficiency. A third challenge is funding. Traditional methods for funding mobility are increasingly unsustainable. Lastly, there is disruptive change. Emerging technologies and business models are challenging organizations to redefine how people communicate, work, travel, and transact.

Washington's Public Transportation Plan is a blueprint to give some guidance on how they are going to move forward for the next 20 years and better integrate all modes of transportation to meet the needs of Washington's people. In the Plan, public transportation is broadly defined. It is any form of transportation that is accessible and available to everyone and does not involve a single person in a motorized vehicle.

The Plan contains a Vision Statement: All transportation partners in Washington work together to provide a system of diverse, integrated public transportation options. People throughout the state use these options to make transportation choices that enable families, communities, the economy, and their environment to thrive.

They have identified six main themes of the Plan. 1) Broadly defines public transportation as any form of public or private transportation that is accessible and available to the public and does not involve a single person in a motorized vehicle. 2) Recognizes that a connected, coordinated transportation system that serves all people is instrumental to thriving communities. 3) Supports widespread innovation to improve customer experience and boost the efficiency and resiliency of the transportation system. 4) Advocates for an ongoing emphasis on delivering positive customer experiences and continuous improvement. 5) Provides framework for market-driven, performance-focused and integrated transportation planning, design, construction, operations, policy, and investments. 6) Advances the state's interest and role as a public transportation partner.

There are five proposed statewide public transportation goals: Thriving Communities, Access, Adaptive Transportation Capacity, Customer Experience, and Transportation System Stewardship.

Mr. Misek said they would like to receive comments for input into their plan. Once they receive comments, they will make revisions to the Plan. Mr. Misek provided two handouts. The first sheet listed the website for the Washington State Public Transportation Plan along with the contact information for the person to send your comments to. The second handout was a folio of the Plan giving a brief overview.

David Madore said he thought WSDOT focused on highways, roads, and motor vehicles funded by the transportation budget. He said he was not aware that WSDOT was also in public transit. Mr. Misek said they do receive a number of grants that they assist public transportation agencies in providing public transportation. They help a number of non-profit agencies that provide public transportation as well. This is provided through state or federal grants. Councilor Madore said so the public transit is not funded by the transportation budget, but by grants. Mr. Misek said they are grants that are allowed that the state Legislature make directly to WSDOT. An example is the Vanpool program that provides grant funds to provide them to buy vanpool vehicles.

Councilor Madore asked if he understood correctly that the Washington State budget includes a transportation fund that is constrained by the constitution that can only be used for highways and roads and not for public transportation. Mr. Misek said he would have to get back with that information. He was not sure, but there were restrictions as to how that can be used.

Mayor Onslow asked if they were asking all of the public for comment; something that they should get out to their cities and county. Mr. Misek said they want comments from everyone.

Jeff Hamm said he could shed a little light on the funding issue. He said there is a constitutional prohibition in the constitution in spending gas tax money on public transit, but there are other

revenue sources that come to WSDOT, motor vehicle fees and so forth that don't have that prescription on it. That is where funding for transit comes from through WSDOT and through the Legislature. Mr. Hamm also said that WSDOT has had a role through the years in helping local communities to form their public transit organizations, PTBAs and PTICs, for the first time. There are now 30 public transit agencies across the state, and WSDOT has had an active role in just about all of them as they formed most of those in the early 1980s. Mr. Hamm said WSDOT does have a role in funneling federal dollars to rural areas. Those rural areas don't have the capacity to receive those directly from the federal government. Typically, they are funneled through the state organizations and the Public Transit office does that.

VIII. Regional Project Update: I-205 / NE 18th Street Interchange

Matt Ransom said the I-205 / NE 18th Street Interchange is the final project to be completed from the two prior Legislative funding packages, the Nickel package and the Partnership package. The Battle Ground to I-5 project (the SR-502 project) is nearing completion. The 18th Street project is mid-way to completion. When this is complete, the WSDOT will begin to look at how to move forward on the projects that were just appropriated by the Legislature.

Lori Figone with WSDOT's SW Region provided a PowerPoint presentation and a one page handout of the I-205, Mill Plain to NE 18th Street project. She explained the new lane configurations and on and off ramps. The project will improve safety by reducing the weaving between Mill Plain and 18th Street, ease congestion, and reduce collisions on I-205 caused by backups from Mill Plain.

Ms. Figone provided the history of the project. It began in 2002 when WSDOT and the City of Vancouver get Federal Approval of Interstate Access Conceptual Plan. At that time it had a lot more than what they are building now. In 2003, the City got a \$3 million earmark to begin the project NEPA for Stage 1 and Stage 2. In 2003 the Legislature approved the Nickel Package including Stage 1. In 2005 the Legislature approved TPA including Stage 2. They started Stage 1 construction in 2007 and completed it in 2008. In 2014 Stage 2 construction began.

The project purpose is to improve safety by easing congestion and reduce collisions on I-205 caused by backups from Mill Plain. Additionally, the project will provide new Interstate access for cars and buses and promote economic opportunities for east Vancouver.

The original design of the project when it started a number of years ago had two lanes for both the on ramps and the off ramps that ran under the 9th Street Bridge that would need to be replaced. The bridge is working well, is 30 years old, and in excellent condition, so they looked at a way to not replace a bridge that was working well. In addition, the 18th Street Bridge was to be widened to accommodate traffic projections with a parallel structure designed to provide 6 lanes total, including two left turn lanes onto Southbound 205 with traffic signals at both ends of the bridge.

This is where WSDOT's Practical Design came in. This is where they address the primary purpose and need of the project and not try to build out 20 or 30 years. They have been doing

this for a number of years, but it is now a formal process. They refined some of the design of the project. They were able to not replace the 9th Street Bridge and make it single ramps under the bridge. The 18th Street Bridge is not widened or supplemented. They constructed a roundabout at 18th Street southbound on ramp avoiding the 18th Street Bridge by eliminating the need for two left turn lanes. They restripe to provide three lanes and move the sidewalk to the north side of the structure only. The reconfiguration will allow a fourth lane in the future. This process saved more than \$6 million, reduced the project's footprint, and ensured it aligned with what the City of Vancouver was planning for the future.

Ms. Figone highlighted some of the key design considerations as they pertain to how they got to the final configuration. She noted the roundabout paving and sidewalk has been completed. They did some seismic retrofitting of the bridges since they used the existing bridges. Ms. Figone said there are a lot of walls on this project with 11 walls, plus noise walls. This was in part trying to stay within the right of way that they had.

The upcoming milestones include bridge formwork and paving of Mill Plain Off-ramps in November; wall fascia, bridge deck pours, and noise walls in December; permanent signing, paving, barriers, and concrete grind mainline in February, and paving/stripping and tentative opening in April/May. This is weather dependent, but they are committed to have it open by fall. The handout that was distributed also has website information for more information about the project.

Larry Smith asked about the landscaping for the roundabout saying if there are trees or shrubs, they need to be taken care of, which becomes a cost. He said it more beneficial to use rock of some kind and asked if that would be integrated into the roundabout or any other part of the project. Ms. Figone said she did not believe there was rock. She said most of the time the center of the roundabout needs to be traversable, such as a truck going through that drives on the truck apron. They don't want to put a hazard in the center of a roundabout; it is usually a low shrubbery, low maintenance, native plants. She was not certain what would be used. She said there are no plans for some type of art.

Jeanne Stewart said years back this seemed to be a funded project. Ms. Figone said it was with the TPA funds. Councilor Stewart asked if a project is fully funded say with TPA funds and they reconfigure the project and save money, does the money that is saved go back into local transportation projects or back to the original source.

Ms. Figone said when a project is selected, it has an estimated cost. When they design it, they come up with a new budget; the money that they save would go back to the program. With this project, there was actually not enough funding to cover it due to escalation.

Kris Strickler said with the TPA funds, they would go back to the program, but with the TPA projects there was significant escalation element in the overall program, so many projects were coming in over budget. This meant that the project teams had to find ways to save money. What they saw through this project process, for example, was that there was not enough funding allocated for the project to build it as it was designed. The team went back and scaled

it back to fit within the budget that was identified for it to receive. In advancing Connecting Washington, Mr. Strickler said WSDOT realized some lessons (from the previous programs) and set in place the Practical Solutions approach as noted. WSDOT has shown some capacity and capability to save money on projects. In the TPA projects, they are scaling back dozens of projects all across the state to try to fit within the escalated budget. With Connecting Washington as they move forward, the intent is if you have identified savings for a project, the funding goes back into a new program, and that pot of money gets distributed by the Legislature.

David Madore said if this is an example of the benefits of a practical solutions approach, it is a job well done.

Jack Burkman said this has been a great project for citizens to watch; it is a big project. Councilmember Burkman said he appreciated WSDOT working with the City of Vancouver. When they realized that there was not enough funding to complete it as originally planned, the City was involved in the conversations. He said while this is a great use of practical design, there is a compromise. That compromise is that this is not good for 20 or 30 years. This is a shorter term solution, and more investments are needed in that area.

Kris Strickler said he wanted to acknowledge a few things. He thanked everyone for their words of praise and said it really goes to Lori and her team. They have done a great job of finding ways to save money on projects. This is a model for them as they go forward, different ways to implement very similar solutions but a lower cost. It creates conversations that could be controversial at times as it relates to improvements that we all wanted versus the improvements that are necessary to go forward. The work is not just engineering work, but it is the coordination, the presentation, and the effort to make the whole thing work.

Jeff Hamm asked if they have found ways to incorporate esthetics into parts of the project, such as the stamping of the noise walls so they are not just blank walls. Ms. Figone said they do have an architect who gets involved in the shape of the columns and what the pattern is on the walls. She said they want to have continuity on a corridor, so they will look at what the overpasses are on other places on I-205 and other wall panels. They do not usually have special designs, they have standard forms. Kris Strickler said they have a typical form finish that is a vertical line structure. It allows them to have less maintenance. Typically, more decorated features take more maintenance and cleaning.

IX. YR 2016 RTC Work Program: UPWP and Emphasis Activities

Matt Ransom said the 2016 Work Program will be an action item in December. It is a two-part discussion. The first is to discuss the Work Program, and the second is to give an update on the 2015 budget and the proposed 2016 budget. The memo on the work program was distributed with the meeting packet. A memo on the budget was emailed to board members the prior day and distributed at the table.

The work program for RTC is based on the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). The UPWP is typically adopted in the spring every year; it corresponds with the federal fiscal year cycle. It is an annual work program that is the bulk of what RTC delivers on behalf of members so that they keep their program compliant with federal and state regulations to ensure that the money for grants keeps flowing.

Mr. Ransom has identified some additional emphasis activities. Some are incorporated into the UPWP and others might need to be incorporated when they do the next update. These are activities in addition to the normal routine work that is done. Mr. Ransom highlighted the seven emphasis areas.

Regional Project Funding - This is to completely review the grant program criteria and policies. A multi-agency task force of member agencies' senior technical staff convened this last month to begin the review of the grant criteria. They intend to bring that discussion to the Board and have it completed by the spring. The Human Services Transportation Plan will have another cycle of grant reviews.

The 2035 Regional Transportation Plan Implementation – A lot of time will be spent in coordination with members and Clark County in particular on Growth Management Act (GMA) compliance issues. One of the mandates under State Statute is GMA certification. This will be an action item for the Board. Upon the County adopting the GMA Plan Update, then RTC will review it for consistency with transportation planning assumptions, etc. Work has begun with the technical group, and it will be brought to the Board in January for discussion. There will also be a lot of work developing the regional travel forecasting model. As requested by the Board, a special report will be given on I-5 Bridges Seismic Conditions. Also, corridor operations planning on I-5, similar to what was done on I-205.

David Madore said in regard to the Seismic report, he would also like to include the comparison of the seismic vulnerability of the I-5 spans in comparison to the other bridges in the area. He said that would be helpful, because there may be other bridges that are much worse than the I-5 spans. Look at I-205 and the bridges in Portland.

Major Studies - Mr. Ransom said the major study that they have initiated that will be underway next year is the Bus on Shoulder Study on I-205. They have released a Request for Qualifications, for a consultant to do that study. The technical review committee will review the qualifications by the end of the year. A proposed contract will come before the Board in 2016, and phase one work will begin.

Regional Freight / Commerce Planning – This was a priority this year, and they collected a host of data that they are just now assembling and reviewing. They plan next year to provide to the board a snapshot of the freight flow within our three-county region. This region is so freight focused in terms of being an international port destination and the whole I-5 corridor. They have also committed to the Gorge community to take a look to see if there is something within

the Gorge region that needs further study. They also have partnership relationships that they want to continue to develop. One is with an organization that Identity Clark County has established, the Southwest Freight and Commerce Task Force. This is a business oriented group that is trying to organize around advocacy for freight improvement projects across the region. Greater Portland Inc., which is the economic development agency, recently released their five-year Economic Development Plan with an emphasis on bi-state freight movement and commerce.

Map-21 Performance Measures – This is the federal bill. The bills that have been reviewed in the Senate and House still include performance management and monitoring as the key component of the federal statute. The responsibility for monitoring and some goal setting falls to the regions. RTC will have a role in setting performance targets. This discussion has not yet come before the Board, because the Feds are too far behind in setting the actual rules and administrative law. One performance target they expect to be finalized and ready for regional review and target setting, and that relates to safety.

Partnership Building – RTC will continue to develop agenda and meetings with the Bi-State Coordination Committee. They will continue outreach and engagement with CREDC, ICC, etc. They will continue to be available for consulting to member agencies. Mr. Ransom said he has identified a need for staff to continue to think of what educational forums or training forums we can provide to members and peer professionals. He noted the forum last month that Bob Hart hosted about the VAST program. That is something that RTC manages and all the members are involved in. Mr. Ransom plans to host at least one forum, possibly two next year that people across the region can attend. One possibility is around the issue of traffic modeling, traffic studies. Many member agencies staff at the engineering planning level review traffic studies, and there is a relationship between what RTC does and how it actually manifests itself in a traffic study.

Administration – Mr. Ransom said there will be a lot of administrative work next year. RTC will be going through their Federal MPO program certification that takes place every four years. This is with the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Association. This is basically an MPO audit, to ensure that all federal statutes and laws are being followed. They issue a lengthy report that lists any necessary improvements along with what is in place. That will take place in the fall. In advance of that, there are a number of things that need to be done. We need to update our Public Participation Plan, Title VI Plan, and develop a new Tribal Consultation Policy. The Dues Committee recommendation will be coming forward in December.

Mr. Ransom referred to the Budget memo. He said the organization has a federal fiscal year, state fiscal year, and a calendar year, and RTC's budget is on a calendar year basis. It is more of a planning document. RTC is largely funded by state and federal grants, some member dues, and a little amount of enterprise activity. When the budget is not spent, the grant is not billed,

so that means they have the capacity to bill the grant the next year. Mr. Ransom said the 2015 budget underspends what they had planned to spend by about 7%. Most of the savings are under professional services, benefits, or miscellaneous.

In looking at the 2016 budget, the overall proposed budget would increase about 2.9%. The budget is primarily staff and professional services expenses. In building the 2016 budget, it is aligning with County policy, for accounting, HR, and other areas that we pay for support. As the County has cost increases, that is reflected in the cost to RTC. Mr. Ransom said some adjustments have been made based on the activity in 2015 to better align. The budget is fully funded based on the grants that RTC has in hand or expected to receive during the 2016 time horizon. Mr. Ransom said they are not making any adjustments for dues for this budget. In discussions with the Dues Committee, any adjustments would be effective January 2017. If a change is approved, that would show up in the 2017 budget. Mr. Ransom said this Work Program and Budget would be presented at the December meeting for adoption.

Jack Burkman said he appreciated the single page emphasis areas. RTC does so many different things that it is hard to explain to people, this is a good way to see that. Councilmember Burkman said we see business each month, but not listed for the whole year.

X. Other Business

From the Board

Chair Smith said that members should have received an email from her containing the Executive Director's performance review on Survey Monkey. She noted the last day for the survey submittal is November 17.

From the Director

Matt Ransom said they have another Project Showcase, the Bi-State Travel Time Project. This is a regionally funded project that has been implemented in the field within the last month. Bob Hart was a part of this project through the VAST program. A handout highlighting the project was distributed.

Bob Hart said the Bi-State Travel Time project went live on October 22. It was a joint effort between WSDOT and ODOT. It provides real-time travel information to the public along the I-5, I-205, and SR-14 corridors. The project consists of white on green guide signs showing travel times to specific destinations along a route. The project promotes more travel options and provides travel times to various destinations for commuters and travelers within, into, and through the Vancouver/Portland region. RTC programmed over \$700,000 in CMAQ funds for the Vancouver portion of the project. RTC's role was to facilitate meetings between the two states to talk about technical issues, data sharing, and data integration. Each state had different data formats so that took some time to resolve. In addition, although it is not live yet, the two DOTs are talking about publishing travel times on their webpages. They are spending a lot of time right now trying to figure out which state's webpage shows which route information, and which to show the same route information on both. Certain bi-state destinations will be

shown on both states' webpage. They expect sometime after the first of the year to see travel times published on the webpages.

Mr. Ransom said the Dues Review Subcommittee had their third meeting in October and a final meeting planned in December. Staff is working on a recommendation memo. That will be presented to the Subcommittee for their ratification or edits. They expect the report to be finalized in December. When the report is finalized, it will be distributed. It will be distributed at the January meeting, and brought to the February meeting for the major discussion.

Mr. Ransom said JPACT meets Thursday, November 12, 2015, at Metro at 7:30 a.m., and the Bi-State Coordination Committee follows at 9:30 a.m. at Metro. An agenda has been published for the Bi-State Coordination Committee. He said it looks to be a good meeting. They are having a report from the Greater Portland Inc. about their Economic Development Plan, discussion of Growth Management planning, and bridge planning coordination update.

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, December 1, 2015, at 4 p.m.

LARRY SMITH MOVED FOR ADJOURNMENT. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY JACK BURKMAN AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Melissa Smith, Board of Directors Chair