

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Board of Directors
November 7, 2017, 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 Jeanne Stewart on Tuesday, November 7, 2017, at 4:00 p.m. at the Vancouver City Hall Aspen Meeting Room, 415 West 6th Street, Vancouver, Washington. The meeting was televised and recorded by CVTV. Attendance follows.

Voting Board Members Present:

Marc Boldt, Clark County Councilor
Kelly Brooks, ODOT (alternate)
Jack Burkman, Vancouver Councilmember
Shawn Donaghy, C-TRAN Exec. Director/CEO
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Councilmember
Tom Lannen, Skamania Co. Commissioner
Anne McEnerney-Ogle, Vancouver Council
Jerry Oliver, Port of Vancouver Commissioner
Ron Onslow, Ridgefield Mayor
Eileen Quiring, Clark County Councilor
Jeanne Stewart, Clark County Councilor
Kris Strickler, WSDOT Regional Administrator

Guests Present:

Ron Arp, Identity Clark County
Todd Boulanger, Citizen
Jim Hagar, Port of Vancouver
Daniel Lautzenheiser, DJ&A, P.C.
Dale Lewis, Congresswoman Herrera Beutler's Office
John Ley, Citizen
Scott Patterson, C-TRAN
Mike Pond, Citizen
Ty Stober, Vancouver Councilmember
Carter Timmerman, WSDOT
Neal H. Walker, Citizen

Voting Board Members Absent:

Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor
Jim Herman, Port of Klickitat Commissioner
Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1 Manager

Nonvoting Board Members Present:

Paul Harris, Representative 17th District

Nonvoting Board Members Absent:

Curtis King, Senator 14th District
Norm Johnson, Representative 14th District
Gina McCabe, Representative 14th District
Lynda Wilson, Senator 17th District
Vicki Kraft, 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
Monica Stonier, Representative 49th District
Sharon Wylie, Representative 49th District

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. Approval of the Board Agenda

Chair Stewart asked for approval of the Board Agenda.

Jerry Oliver said he did not have an amendment; however, he wished to communicate at the end of the meeting under other business from the Board he will propose the discussion of a letter that is addressed to the Oregon Department of Transportation and is provided at the table for Board members.

ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE BOARD AGENDA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SHAWN DONAGHY AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

III. Call for Public Comments

John Ley from Camas thanked ODOT for having Eileen Quiring on the Value Pricing Policy Committee and said he thought she would do a superb job. The Vancouver City Council was briefed on the Value Pricing and the Policy Advisory Committee. He said the stated purpose of Value Pricing was to reduce congestion. Mr. Ley said if the real goal is not revenue generation but reducing congestion, then he suggested an easy no-cost fix to help in reducing some congestion would be to eliminate the only HOV lane in Oregon. He also suggested adding new through lanes on I-5 in the congested area to add more capacity and to add a bypass so vehicle traffic headed to Washington County and the coast would not have to go through downtown Portland. Mr. Ley said this would reduce the vehicles on I-5, I-405, and Highway 26. Mr. Ley said in the 1970s, the region had planned a ring road; they built the eastern half of the ring, I-205, but did not build the western half. Mr. Ley said the region needs congestion relief by adding vehicle capacity, and this needs to be done by not putting tolls at the border.

Todd Boulanger from Vancouver said overall, he values the work that RTC does, providing a cohesive support for all of our cities and counties. Regarding the topic of tolls on I-5 and Value Pricing, he welcomed new tools regarding mobility being looked at, pricing of HOV lanes or HOT lanes; all options need to be looked at. Specifically, Mr. Boulanger said he wanted to speak to two agenda items. He recommended the 2018 budget include specific items regarding bicycle and pedestrian and transit data collection. He has had past conversations with staff, and he utilizes the RTC data counts very often, both planning transportation facilities and lane allocation. Often the regional facilities that are recorded for cyclists traveling through our cities have not been updated for 10 to 20 years. He suggested staff look at arterials that have a regional bicycle, or pedestrian, or transit component in addition to the more traditional private vehicle function. He also recommended the VAST program also specifically include a portion for bike, pedestrian, and transit information with the ITS capability. Mr. Boulanger said he valued the work that RTC does and their forum to provide sharing of information.

Kelly Brooks entered the meeting at 4:10 p.m.

Neal Walker, a behavioral health advocate, said our infrastructure, specifically the I-5 Bridges, is vulnerable to a seismic event. If there was to be a large earthquake, he feels very concerned about the stability of the bridges being able to withstand an earthquake as well as mobilizing first line responders, police, and military. Another event that could really complicate our bridges is that a seismic event might damage the Bonneville Dam, and this would only add another layer of complexity to our bridges east and west of I-5. Specifically, Mr. Walker said he thought it is a military and a federal interest to build a new I-5 bridge and toll it. He suggested Japanese consultation on how to build bridges that are seismic resistant. Building a new I-5 bridge would create better flow of traffic, and he said to toll it and toll I-205. Mr. Neal said he believes in ODOT leadership and healthy and stable leadership from Salem. He thanked the Board for their time, and he said we need a new I-5 Bridge.

Paul Greenlee entered the meeting at 4:14 p.m.

IV. Approval of the October 3, 2017, Minutes

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 3, 2017, MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

V. Consent Agenda

A. November Claims

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

VI. Vancouver Area Smart Trek – Professional Services Contract, Resolution 11-17-19

Matt Ransom said Bob Hart would provide the presentation on this item. He said they have updated the solicitation for this contract, and the committee that evaluated it recommends the proposed contractor.

Mr. Hart referred to the resolution included in the meeting packet. He said today's request is for Board approval to enter into a contract with DKS Associates to provide technical services for the 2018-2019 VAST Program not to exceed \$80,000. In March of this year, RTC obligated funds with WSDOT Local Programs for the VAST program including funds for consultant technical assistance.

RTC in collaboration with their partner agencies has utilized consultant professional services to the VAST program since 2001. They provide critical expertise to RTC and the VAST partners in transportation system management and operations, for policy and planning, ITS project development, as well as project and system integration, and development of the use of ITS communications infrastructure such as fiber assets. The current firm has provided excellent support since 2013; however, RTC and VAST members determined that the selection process should be updated periodically.

An RFQ was released on August 25 with responses due on September 7. They received one response, DKS Associates with support from IBI Group. An evaluation team made up of Clark

County, City of Vancouver, WSDOT, C-TRAN, and RTC reviewed the proposal. The selection team unanimously agreed that the DKS team was highly qualified and would provide excellent technical support, and recommended them to provide technical assistance to the program. They had the broad knowledge area that they needed to perform the program. They have done work in traffic operation analysis, traffic signals and systems, and for ITS and communication elements of the VAST program.

The Scope of Work is very similar to technical services from previous years. It will fall under three tasks: VAST Committee Meeting Support; TSMO Policy and Planning, Project Implementation, and Integration Technical Support; and ITS, Communications and Network Technical Support. The Scope of Work was attached to the Resolution.

Mr. Hart said staff requests RTC Board approval of Resolution 11-17-19 to authorize RTC's Executive Director to enter into a contract with DKS Associates for the VAST Program technical services not to exceed \$80,000.

Chair Stewart referred to page 3 of the Scope of Work under Relationship to Other Regional Plans and Programs. She asked for an example of who other partners in the region would be. Mr. Hart said that would be the VAST partners, which includes Clark County. An example would be with the work that Rob Klug does for Clark County in term of some of the traffic operations projects, making sure they have consistency with the overall VAST program and the goals they have set.

Jerry Oliver asked if the \$80,000 funding was a two year contract. Mr. Hart said it is a year to a year and a half contract. He said that is because it is for core planning for basic support for the program. In addition to that they also request an on-call services task for assistance on any new or ongoing VAST projects. Depending on how much they need to do, it could be a year or it could be a little longer.

Commissioner Oliver said he understands the \$80,000 is in the proposed budget for 2018. He asked if any of that was covered by grant funding and/or what the source was. Mr. Hart said the funding that primarily supports the VAST Program is regional federal funding of STP funds plus our local match. A portion of that goes to RTC to manage the program and a set aside for the consultant services portion.

Shawn Donaghy said it was interesting that IBI was initially the lead on the project and now they are going to be doing the assisting for DKS. He asked what IBI's role is going to be now that they are not the primary lead on the project.

Mr. Hart said that in the past they had IBI as the lead and DKS as the sub. He said people change firms. In the early stages with IBI they had a team that had a lot of experience in fiber assets as well as operational issues. Things changed with staff changes, and the operations side and planning the fiber assets side were both important, that is why they switched to have DKS as the lead instead.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE VAST PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT, RESOLUTION 11-17-19. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY JACK BURKMAN AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VII. Vancouver Area Smart Trek – Annual Program Update

Bob Hart referred to the memo included in the meeting packet and said this agenda item is an annual update on the VAST program, accomplishments, and ongoing activities. The program links Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) technology and infrastructure projects with agency collaboration to improve the operation of the transportation system.

Mr. Hart said RTC manages the VAST program with the partner agencies on project development, planning, and sharing resources for ITS operations. The partner agencies include WSDOT, Clark County, City of Vancouver, City of Camas, and C-TRAN. There are three committees that work on the program. The Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) Steering Committee meets quarterly consisting of transportation planning and traffic operations staff. They set the overall vision for operations. The VAST Steering Committee is made up of traffic operations staff. They work to implement, develop, and fund ITS and operational projects. The Communications Infrastructure Committee (CIC) is a mix of transportation and IT staff that work together on sharing assets, maintenance and standards for the communications technology and the fiber need to support the operations of the projects.

The VAST program supports federal requirements to develop and maintain a regional ITS architecture and Congestion Management Process requirements to collaborate on operational strategies. They have been successful over the years to build projects, and VAST Partner agencies secured \$27 million in federal funding over the last 15 years.

The types of projects funded through VAST include central signal system upgrades, new signal controllers, signal optimization projects, freeway and arterial detection, cameras, variable message signs, transit signal priority, and fiber and network communications needed for connecting ITS devices and infrastructure.

Mr. Hart displayed the list of VAST projects for 2016 totaling \$1.1 million in federal funds and \$350,000 in local funds to build those projects.

VAST agency collaboration and federal funding through RTC has also led to successful agency partnerships. Some of those projects include the following.

The Portal Data Archive: RTC and the VAST agencies have an ongoing partnership with Portland State University in the regional transportation data archive known as Portal. The Portal archive contains, in a single location, historical and real-time transportation data from agencies in the Vancouver-Portland region. This information warehouse can be used by researchers, planners, traffic engineers, and the public to look at multimodal transportation performance throughout the region. Currently, WSDOT, Clark County, and C-TRAN are sending data to Portal. They have plans to make improvements every year. In 2017, RTC worked with Portal staff and VAST agencies to implement enhancements to the archive site. Mr. Hart accessed the Portal website

and highlighted some of the capabilities available such as travel speeds for the same time period for the last five weekdays to get a sense of how they are currently and how they are averaged over the last five days. You can look at specific areas in specific corridors at a specific time for travel speeds. There is also a transit data option. C-TRAN is currently on a demo page, but they hope to have that live on the site soon.

The Regional Communications Plan: This was done last year, and it identifies fiber and communications needs for the VAST agencies and what is currently existing, programmed, and planned. Also shown are the shared fiber routes. They currently have 37 fiber permits and about 115 route miles of shared fiber. Estimated regional savings between \$17 m - \$21 m as related to new fiber construction.

The TSMO Vision is to: Develop and implement strategies that promote more efficient and cost-effective use of existing transportation system, providing increased accessibility, reliability, and safety for people and freight.

One of the chapters of the TSMO Plan is devoted to Emerging Issues and Trends. Mr. Hart highlighted some of those elements. Projects that Support Emerging Operational Strategies include the following: C-TRAN SR-14 Bus on Shoulder demonstration project began on October 23, 2017. The early returns on it have been very good. It has been saving a lot of time for bus operators and better on-time performance for the buses. In addition, WSDOT has programmed funds for ramp meters on SR-500 to I-205 north and Mill Plain to I-205 north. Those funds are programmed, but not in place yet. WSDOT also completed a freeway ramp meter study this year that identified future needs, priorities, and locations for Clark County freeways. That is in the planning stage.

Projects that have Bi-State Coordination include the following: Clark County is sending data to Portal over dedicated fiber strands so it doesn't need to use the Internet, which is more efficient for the agencies. A bi-state travel time project on roadside signs and WDOT's traveler information website is shared by WSDOT and ODOT. The two DOTs share dedicated field devices. Mr. Hart displayed WSDOT's traveler information page with the travel time information. The HOP Fastpass began in September. It is the new integrated regional electronic transit fare collection system between C-TRAN and TriMet. Technical Issues and Trends include the following: Smart Cities, Connected and Autonomous Vehicles, and Data and Integration and Sharing.

RTC's VAST Program areas for 2018 remain the same with the focus areas he already discussed both for operations and for ITS.

RTC is hosting a Smart Cities Workshop on December 6 and 7 at the Fisher's Landing Park and Ride. A "Save the Date" flyer was distributed at the table for Board members. Invitations to Board members would be sent later in the week. Smart Cities is the term most used for this type of work, which is not quite accurate. It is also beginning to be referred to as Intelligent Communities. This shows the connectivity of technology for managing things like transportation, street lighting, water, and sewer. It is not just the big cities that benefit; it is

also something that benefits small cities and rural areas as well. Day one of the workshop is 2 hours long, a high level discussion on Smart Cities in general, focused for policy makers and transportation professionals. It will introduce the concept of Smart Cities and give examples around the country, and talk about what the Port of Ridgefield is doing for future Port development. Day two is 3 hours long that picks up where day one left off. It is more focused for transportation planners and traffic operations folks. It will be focused on mobility and issues around roads and infrastructure, connected vehicles as well as the policy and planning issues around autonomous vehicles and what that might look like in the future.

Mr. Hart provided a brief video of Google/Waymo showing applications for autonomous vehicles and what that changes. He said that Waymo is getting a pilot project in Phoenix to test the use of these cars with no driver in the front seat, but one in the back seat. He also provided a video clip by Intel with LeBron giving a driverless vehicle a try.

Tom Lannen referred to slide 5 listing the 2016 VAST projects. The STEVE 2 project refers to Bluetooth travel time data, and Commissioner Lannen asked how that works. Bob Hart said Clark County is working to expand their Bluetooth technology. Bluetooth is a technology to put roadside devices out there that read signals from Bluetooth devices such as smart phones. This allows them to collect real time travel time information in different corridors, and it allows them to get origin and destination information as well. This can be used for analysis purposes and a historical look at past performance. The County's plan is to get more devices out there and also a dashboard that allows them to get radar detection information and traffic counts. Those are information that helps them see how the system is performing at any given time. If something is not working right they can see that and get the details without having to go to several different sources to get that information.

Jeanne Stewart referred to the Bus on Shoulder pilot project and asked how that was going and if there have been any comments or complaints from the public. She asked if comments would go to WSDOT or C-TRAN, and she asked to be kept up to date on the project and the comments.

Kris Strickler said the collection of the data will go to C-TRAN. Comments are received by both WSDOT and C-TRAN all the time. If there are conditions regarding the roadway, they would contact WSDOT; if it was in regard to the bus conditions, they would contact C-TRAN.

Shawn Donaghy said C-TRAN has posted on their website and social media, that if there are any issues surrounding Bus on Shoulder they need to reach out and contact C-TRAN, and if they need to, C-TRAN will contact WSDOT. Mr. Donaghy said they have received positive feedback. So far they have received a couple inquiries about how fast the bus can go if the traffic is at a dead stop. They have had a few questions, not so much concerns about that. Mr. Donaghy said C-TRAN has made it obvious through their modes, that if there are any questions or concerns to please direct them to C-TRAN and they would be glad to answer those the best they can.

Chair Stewart said she appreciated that, and at some time she would like an update on the Bus on Shoulder project brought to the RTC Board. She would also like to know the comments that they have received.

Eileen Quiring questioned if one of the reasons for Bus on Shoulder was to help traffic move better and if that was happening.

Mr. Ransom said one of the primary criteria for Bus on Shoulder was better transit performance and on-time reliability.

Councilor Quiring said she would like not just a report about complaints, but about how it is working for on-time, etc.

Chair Stewart said they would like a report on the performance, if it is performing as they anticipated. Mr. Donaghy said they would do that.

Jack Burkman said the program only started on October 23. He asked how long the program should run before they would have reasonable data on the performance.

Mr. Donaghy said they should be able to provide data in December for the month of November.

Mr. Ransom said one of the principles in the agreement for the pilot project between WSDOT and C-TRAN is to produce a final assessment. That final assessment would include an analysis of the data and the public comments and so forth. That analysis would be the decision-making document informative to a decision as to whether the pilot project proceeds beyond the pilot phase or not. Mr. Ransom said he believed the duration of the pilot is 18 months. Relative to RTC's work program, it would be appropriate at some juncture next year to provide a formal update, a status report, possibly at a 6 or 12 month interval to provide statistical validity.

Chair Stewart said she wants to know how it is performing and asked when that status update would be provided.

Mr. Ransom said he would have to confer with the partners and determine when the data is assembled and analyzed. That would be more for formal reporting. He said what has been suggested is an ongoing status update.

Bob Hart said he believed for the purposes of the evaluation there has been steps of 6 months, 12 months, and 18 months.

Chair Stewart asked if 6 months would be when they could anticipate an update. It was agreed that would be a good time to have valid information.

Ron Onslow asked why they couldn't have an update a little earlier so they could see what is going on.

Chair Stewart said that was her point. If it is a smashing success, then they could stop worrying about it. She said if it is not that, it would be good to have a heads up.

Jack Burkman said his concern is the statistical validity. If you measure too short of a time period, it might look really good when it is not, and it might look really bad and it is not. He

suggested checking with the experts to see how much information is needed to get an accurate report.

Shawn Donaghy agreed that was a good point. He clarified that there is more that goes into it than just the on-time performance. From a 6 month perspective, there is a lot that all of the partners are going to have to talk about. Mr. Donaghy said they could provide an update status of how the project is going from month to month.

Paul Greenlee agreed with what Jack Burkman had said. He said that the only way that you can distinguish between noise and data is over time. A week or month is probably noise and not data.

Chair Stewart said it may be noise, but it is noise that the elected officials who made the decision may want to know about. She said there is no insinuation here that we are going to get information in a month or two and eagerly pull the plug on it.

Eileen Quiring said some of the anecdotal information would be a nice update. She said they don't need all the statistics; it would just be good to hear about any accidents or if things are going well prior to an actual report with all the necessary statistics.

Chair Stewart thanked Representative Paul Harris for attending the meeting.

Representative Harris said he would think that having the bus use the shoulder should provide faster times.

Chair Stewart said on-time performance for the bus is one measure. If it creates confusion or other delays in the line of traffic that is another thing they should be aware of, along with people getting used to seeing a vehicle on the shoulder.

Mr. Ransom summarized in saying the question might arise occasionally about who is talking about the future and autonomous vehicles; does the city regulate it or is it state or federally regulated? RTC's role in the VAST program is to convene a committee as a standing committee where agency partners gather together to lay out a strategy for ITS (signal, fiber, and related assets). He said they are then talking about how these assets can then accommodate the future of connected vehicles. Mr. Ransom said they want to ensure all the agencies have an aligned strategy for investment in signal technology, and fiber assets and sharing. When it comes to the future of autonomous vehicles, etc., so much is going to be regulated at the federal and then state level. The thought here regionally as the committee discusses it, they are asking if that is on their horizon, thinking about it, setting in motion investments that would accommodate and not preclude, then those are good courses of action. The actual implementation is probably sooner than we think. Mr. Ransom said within the next 20 years, chances are we are going to be traveling a little bit differently. That may be a good thing when it comes to safety. There is uncertainty, but at least the conversation is taking place. Mr. Ransom thanked Mr. Hart for his work and also the partner agencies.

VIII. Bylaws of the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council - Amendment

Chair Stewart said they hope that this is the final amended version of the Bylaws for discussion. Mr. Ransom said this is the final review draft presentation to the Board. There are two substantive things that have occurred since the last meeting. The first is that he has met individually with a few members and distributed an update to the Bylaw Committee saying there are some additional revisions. Those are noted on page 2 of the Staff Report included in the meeting packet. The second piece that came up (identified by general counsel to the Board) at the last meeting was the need to cross check RTC's Articles of Incorporation to make sure the "conflict of interest" provision proposed in the Bylaws and the Articles of Incorporation didn't conflict. General Counsel's review found there was a conflict, and he is recommending the Articles of Incorporation Article 9.2 be modified to be consistent with the recommendation for the "conflict of interested" statement in the Bylaws. The proposed language for the Articles of Incorporation is listed on Page 3 of the staff report.

Mr. Ransom said this has been one of the major administrative issues for himself and for other members of the organization that served on the committee. He said he appreciated their support and attention to the matter. Listed in the staff report were all of the committee meetings and briefings given to the Board. Mr. Ransom said he felt with the proposals before them, that they meet the intent which is to bring the Bylaws up to a contemporary and eliminate extraneous language or areas of confusion over time. They had not been substantively reviewed or modified since 1992 when RTC was formed. Mr. Ransom said he would be content to bring these forward for action at the December meeting. The action in December would be two separate actions: one for the Bylaws and a separate action to amend the Articles of Incorporation.

Mr. Ransom clarified the change to the Articles of Incorporation Article 9.2 brings the wording to be consistent with the wording of the conflict of interest matter in the Bylaws.

Jack Burkman asked if it took a majority of the body present to amend the Bylaws or a majority of the membership. It was clarified that a Bylaw amendment required an affirmative vote of 60% of all voting Board Members in order to pass. RTC's full Board is 14 members.

Jack Burkman also asked if there were any specifics for the Articles of Incorporation. Mr. Ransom said the Articles of Incorporation state that the Articles of an organization need to be adopted either at a Special Meeting or the Annual Meeting of the Board of Directors. The December meeting is in fact the Annual Meeting of the Board of Directors. Mr. Ransom said this is in part why this discussion is taking place now.

Eileen Quiring asked if the Articles of Incorporation change was saying the same thing. The original text was a bit convoluted.

Mr. Ransom said there are three governing documents to RTC from an organizational standpoint. The formation document is an Interlocal Agreement among government entities. There are the Bylaws, the rules of the Board, and there are the Articles of Incorporation. The

Articles exist because of the establishment of RTC. RTC was established as a nonprofit governmental entity.

Councilor Quiring asked if the new language in the Articles of Incorporation were essentially the same as the original. Mr. Ransom said it does say the same thing in a more simplified way.

Marc Boldt said they are to notify the Executive Director of their intent to stay on the Board by January 31 of each year. Also, at the Annual Meeting in December, one of the purposes is to elect the Board officers.

Chair Stewart asked if those jurisdictions that change or appoint or reappoint board members will need to inform the Executive Director by December.

Mr. Ransom said no, it is proposed in the Bylaws by January 31 to allow new councils and commissions to appoint committee assignments.

Chair Stewart referred to the proposed amendment for Article 9.2 of the Articles of Incorporation. It states "Should any Board member or officer of the Corporation have a personal financial interest either directly or indirectly in any contract, transaction or issue relating to the operations of the Corporation, the Board member or Officer must ensure that they are in compliance with the RTC Procurement and Ethics Policy and with all applicable conflict of interest and related provisions of federal and state law." Chair Stewart asked how the Board member or officer would ensure they are in compliance. She asked what we expect them to do to ensure.

Mr. Ransom said he would think the administration of that would occur as follows: the first duty would be of the Board Member to declare a conflict and recuse them self from participating in a decision that might be substantive to the conflict. To the extent that they didn't notify and the Director became aware that a conflict may exist, then there are provisions in the Procurement Policies where the Director would follow up on that matter and confer with the counsel to determine if that conflict in fact was substantive. The Bylaws, Articles of Incorporation, and Interlocal Agreement established upon formation doesn't prohibit, say if a Board Member also runs a consulting company and that company was intending to bid on work with the RTC, there is no prohibition. The key would be that if there was an appearance of conflict, the duty would be on the Board Member to declare.

Chair Stewart added that they would declare or recuse them self from the decision making and provide some documentation to that. She said that could not really be defined. It would have to be approached depending on the circumstance. Mr. Ransom agreed; on a case by case basis.

Chair Stewart recommended the Bylaws and Articles of Incorporation amendments be placed on the December agenda for action. Mr. Ransom agreed to do that and asked Members to contact him with any further comments.

IX. YR 2018 RTC Work Program and Budget - DRAFT

Mr. Ransom said this item is substantive to the organization, but RTC is unique in that they prepare two different work programs. One was provided at the table for Members; the 2018 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). This is very detailed and developed every spring on the state fiscal year. It identifies resource allocation grant funds that RTC is going to secure. RTC Board also adopts an annual budget on a calendar basis. That is what is being presented today. The two are consistent. The annual budget is simplified, but it refers to the UPWP and flags a couple issues that are important that have emerged since the UPWP was adopted in May of 2017.

Mr. Ransom referred to the 2018 Work Program memorandum included in the meeting packet. An outline of the 2018 work program was attached to the memorandum. This lists the major activities also referred to as emphasis areas of the organization. Mr. Ransom said the Board is aware that staff are working on the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update due to be completed by the end of 2018. In that work effort, they anticipate a lot of staff time. They are also recommending setting aside some professional services funds in the budget for consulting assistance. They are identifying bringing on some students as they have just this last year; perhaps extending those or bringing in some new students to help on specific project tasks associated with the RTP.

Mr. Ransom said there are several regional studies. The Board allocated some funds to do a freeway operations study. This is where they need to delve in a greater depth of detail what can be done on our urban freeway segments in a shorter term horizon outside a big capital improvement project to make some efficiency upgrades, enhancements, etc. They intend to begin scoping and developing some partnerships, asking for money from member agencies, to perhaps supplement the funds that the RTC Board has set aside. While the actual planning study may not be underway until fourth quarter of next year, there is going to be a lot of work to get that project off the ground. They think, as the Board identified it in the Congestion Management Process, it is an important issue in front of them right now.

Another study they will be doing next year is the Human Services Transportation Plan. This is a periodic update when they look within their three counties and identify improvements for populations with special needs, working with their partners in setting up a grand strategy for those enhancements. They will be checking in with Skamania and Klickitat Counties identifying if there is a need for any Plan updates within their RTPs. They will continue to work on the VAST program.

Other projects that are more emergent; they are not led by RTC but they are partners to them. Those include, undefined yet, what they expect to be quite a bit of work next year with support of WSDOT and to the extent necessary, a legislative Task Force that was formed out of SB-5806. This is the work of our delegation this last year. They will be convening and discussing a path forward on the I-5 corridor or bridge replacement. They expect RTC to be engaged; it is just not clear at this point. They expect supporting C-TRAN in their next corridor evaluation. They believe that to be Mill Plain Bus Rapid Transit project development process. RTC's support

would likely be technical. They expect to support one of their partners in the Gorge, the Port of Hood River. They received some money through an Oregon Transportation Bill for an EIS study for the replacement of the Hood River Bridge. RTC led the proceeding study and managed that on behalf of the members in the Gorge community. RTC has a lot of existing knowledge and technical understanding that they have committed to contribute as part of that effort. Lastly, for the ODOT Value Pricing evaluation, RTC will provide technical staff support on the modeling. Staff has already been a participant in some modeling evaluation committee efforts. RTC does not have any direct role in any advisory committee capacity, but they expect that they will be engaged, and at a minimum they will be tracking that at the policy and project level and bringing information to the Board. Given that this will be a topic for next year, Mr. Ransom provided the Board with a supplemental memo of what the 2018 work program related to RTC's monitoring of the ODOT Value Pricing Study. He said in 2018 they would schedule briefings as information comes forward on the proposals. Most importantly, when they have information and an actual concept or concepts to react to, they would bring that back to the Board for direct feedback/input/comment to be delivered to the Oregon Transportation Commission for their consideration.

Mr. Ransom said on the administrative side of the program, they will continue the ongoing review of administrative policies and procedures. In 2018, they will be dealing with an ADA evaluation of RTC facilities. This is one of the recommendations that came forward as part of RTC's four-year audit with the Federal Highway and Federal Transit Administrations. They are going to be doing some work in their accounting program and changing financial management systems. These are things that will keep our systems running well and keep us in compliance.

Mr. Ransom referred to the 2018 budget memo included in the meeting packet. Mr. Ransom said a lot of their budget is already established in the UPWP. He would give the Board a status report of where they are financially against the 2017 budget and a couple recommendations to bring forward for December.

A table on page 2 of the memo lays out expenses for the 2017 budget, actual and forecast, and the difference. They are projecting to spend about \$100,000 less than budgeted. The primary reason for this is that a couple of the consulting activities just didn't get off the ground. There was a little offset in salaries and benefits, which was in part of a transition of RTC's accounting team so they had to incur some extra expenses in cross training and bringing the other person back to assist in order to maintain our reputable financial processes.

In looking at the budget for 2018, Mr. Ransom said he was confident they would receive the revenues listed. This is due to the fact that RTC is largely funded on grants through federal and state sources. On the expense side, Mr. Ransom identified a few areas where there is going to be additional expense. He said RTC needs to sign a new lease at the Clark County Public Service Center. It is expected that their lease will cost about \$10,000 more a year than currently budgeted. This is because RTC will be occupying a different space within the building. The new space is bigger so therefore the cost is larger. RTC currently spends about \$60,000 a year for rent, and it will probably increase to about \$70,000. The final number won't be established

until they have the actual delineation of space and they sign a lease contract. On the one-time expenses, as noted in the work program description, they didn't utilize the funds this year, but are recommending a one-time allocation of \$75,000 to provide capacity for bringing on professional services / consultants to help with the RTP update to fund any student projects, etc. The second one-time expense that is forecast is with the move and establishment and setup of the space, they will need to purchase some items like tables. Most of the furniture and cubicle space is provided by the County. The recommendation is a one-time expense up to \$50,000 for what is necessary. A side-by-side comparison of the 2017 budget and draft 2018 budget was provided in the memo.

Anne McEnerny-Ogle referred to the "other expenses" miscellaneous dollars for the 2018 budget and asked what the \$51,000 was for. Mr. Ransom said the \$51,000 reflects the \$50,000 for the moving expense. Councilmember McEnerny-Ogle said she thought it would make sense to write that out and show it separately. Mr. Ransom said he would do that.

Chair Stewart said RTC has been in the Public Service Center since it was built. At the time they moved in the building, they had departments surrounding them. RTC has never really had the independence of having their own door or own autonomy; it was really shared office space. Chair Stewart said last year they started looking at other space for RTC, and even though this is more money per year, this provides for RTC to have their own space and at the same time, the County needed the space they are in. Other locations were looked at. Chair Stewart asked Jack Burkman the details of the look for other space.

Jack Burkman said last year there was an extensive effort by the Executive Director to look at options that ranged from Vancouver City Hall to private buildings, to a variety of locations. When all was said and done, it was very expensive to move and they really didn't gain anything; so the plan that was recommended was to stay the course and see where the County ended up as they reworked their layout. This is the outcome of that, about 18 months of work.

Chair Stewart said it is to a mutual advantage, and it will be a better operational space for RTC.

Eileen Quiring said Anne McEnerny-Ogle already asked her question of where the \$50,000 was listed. Councilor Quiring also commended RTC for not spending their entire budget this year. That is always good to see additional dollars. Councilor Quiring asked where the other one-time \$75,000 expense was listed.

Mr. Ransom said that was listed under Professional Services and included with the total for Consultant. The total listed \$220,000 includes the \$75,000. Mr. Ransom noted the variance listed from 2017 to 2018. In 2017, RTC acted as project manager for WSDOT on behalf of helping the Gorge communities, specifically Bingen and White Salmon do a circulation study. Those expenses were shown as consultant. That is the reason the consultant budget was higher in 2017.

Mr. Ransom said this would come back to the Board for action in December.

X. Other Business

From the Board

Chair Stewart began a discussion of the Oregon Value Pricing Study, observing that RTC has been in a reactionary mode to the Oregon Legislature's decision to do Value Pricing. Chair Stewart also observed that in recent months JPACT are actively reprioritizing and adding new projects to the Metro MTIP, and are vastly amending their Transportation Plan.

Chair Stewart observed that in recent months, portions of the RTC region's congressional and state legislative delegation have begun to weigh in on the Oregon Value Pricing proposal.

She said she thought it was important that we track that and that we know what is being done and that we get ongoing updates about how that process is going and what the numbers are so that we can constantly be aware. She said it is important that we figure out where and when we can have some input to mitigate or change impact on Southwest Washington.

Chair Stewart also expressed interest in the FHWA governed laws and rules pertaining to implementing tolling. She said we need to know more about that, and if that is true, at what point can we assert ourselves. Chair Stewart said RTC is our regional Southwest Washington group; that is what we do. Chair Stewart said she would meet with Matt to discuss where we could have some impact and how. She said RTC has made no comment about this at all. She said we are responding in some our work plan, but she thinks it is not wise to be benign. She thinks it is wise for us to know what rights we have, what protection we have under federal law, and then how we can start getting some leverage about that.

Chair Stewart asked when looking at tolling, what was the farthest southern region they are talking about doing value pricing, and she asked what the locations are going to be.

Kelly Brooks asked if she was asking the southern termini for what was in House Bill 2017. She said the southern terminus is the I-205 / I-5 junction on the southern end and the northern terminus is the state line border. That is what is in the Bill. Ms. Brooks said she could provide the verbiage that is in the legislation. Ms. Brooks would provide a copy to Matt to distribute to the Board.

Ms. Brooks said they do have an opportunity on the horizon for folks from Clark County to weigh in, and they have formed a Value Pricing Advisory Committee. Three members of RTC are on that committee. The first meeting is going to be November 20. They will not get into scenarios at that meeting. That initial conversation will happen at the December meeting. There will be a great opportunity to come and make sure everyone is briefed on the scenarios and provide input to that group. They are the group that will be providing input to the Oregon Transportation Commission on what might make sense in terms of a value pricing scenario on I-5 and on I-205. She said they were thinking about this at the right time. Engaging meaningfully in that process with them would be really helpful. She said it is not just the Washington members; she said they have AAA, truckers, the Westside Economic Alliance, people who travel from Washington every day to get to work, and people moving products for Fred Meyer. Ms. Brooks said these are folks that are looking at this from a point of how they can

make this system work, and how they can put forward a proposal that is equitable. They will also have FHWA participating in the conversations as well. Ms. Brooks said she would provide whatever support that she could to get information needed to Matt. The three members from RTC are Councilor Eileen Quiring, Councilmember Anne McEnerny-Ogle, and Kris Strickler.

Chair Stewart asked if they were appointed on behalf of their jurisdiction or on behalf of RTC. Ms. Brooks said they are appointed on behalf of their jurisdiction, but she does not want to indicate that they wouldn't welcome RTC's comment in this process. She said that is totally appropriate, and there will be opportunities for that. Ms. Brooks said there will be a presentation on the same topic at the next JPACT meeting as well as on November 16.

Jack Burkman said he wanted to clarify his perspective. He also has a seat on the JPACT committee. He said he is not aware of changes that have occurred this year in relationship to the legislation that was passed. Every project that he saw in the legislative package was already part of the RTP or modified on the MTIP. There have not been changes in that.

Chair Stewart said she was speaking about those modified on the MTIP.

Mr. Burkman said those were done before they went into Legislative Session. The ones that were dealt with over the last several months have been internal to the Portland area reallocation of funds not related to the Legislature.

Jerry Oliver said in anticipation of this concern, and after the Clark County Council sent a letter to Ms. Tammy Baney, Chair of the Oregon Transportation Commission, he was deeply concerned and moved that the RTC should weigh in on this issue. He drafted a letter to Ms. Baney, which was distributed at the table for Board members. Commissioner Oliver read the letter to the Board. He said he proposed the letter be sent over the signature of the RTC Chair.

GERRY OLIVER MOVED TO HAVE THE LETTER BE SENT TO MS. BANEY. EILEEN QUIRING SECONDED THE MOTION.

Jack Burkman said Commissioner Oliver is the representative for the Ports of Vancouver, Camas-Washougal, and Ridgefield. He asked if this is a request from those Ports. Commissioner Oliver said no. Councilmember Burkman asked if it was a personal request. Commissioner Oliver said it is a request. Mr. Burkman said his question is whether this is from him personally or if it is coming from his organization. Commissioner Oliver said he was appointed by those three Ports to represent them at this table.

Jack Burkman addressed Chair Stewart and said that a motion was made to adopt something that was not advertised to the public, and there was no visibility even to this body before it was just presented now. If this is to be considered, he said he believed that it must be taken forward to the next meeting. It would be inappropriate to have something come before them, vote, and either pass or deny it without letting the public know what was being done.

Chair Stewart said the possibility of this or something similar coming forward has been discussed by Mr. Ransom, Ted Gathe, and her. She said her understanding is that is correct. If this group is to take action on it, it would need to be published and come forward in the

December meeting. Mr. Ransom said from a parliamentary perspective, yes, at this stage of the agenda, the introduction of a matter of substance for the Board's consideration is wholly appropriate, action is not. The course of action, to the extent the Board wants a discussion either as the letter proposed or of a letter in general, that that matter be posted for either discussion or action on the December or subsequent agendas. That would be the proper form of advancing such a proposal.

Jerry Oliver asked if he would place the letter on the December agenda.

Mr. Ransom said the question for the Board is if they want to take this matter up and in what form. Do they want it as an informational item in December and then decide what they choose to do, or do they want to take a specific matter up like the letter as proposed or a letter they want Mr. Ransom to craft with certain principles. That is the nature of the discussion as it should occur now.

Commissioner Oliver said he wanted this letter to go out over the signature of an elected official of this county. He said he thought it is important for the Board to consider this and that they represent the 475,000 citizens of Clark County who are having a burden placed on them. Commissioner Oliver said he thought it was important for them to act in concert with the Clark County Council and any other entity that seeks to express their concern about these proposed tolls.

Commissioner Oliver proposed that they take it up for action at the December meeting. He said he would withdraw his motion if he could be assured of that.

Chair Stewart said however important the matter, we do need to remember our rules. She said as RTC Chair, the Chair cannot sign anything that has not been approved by the Board. Chair Stewart said Commissioner Oliver spoke about the letter that Clark County Council sent and asked him if he wanted this letter to come from them as well.

Commissioner Oliver said no, that they have already sent a letter. He said he felt we would be acting in concert with them in expressing our opinion.

Chair Stewart said this situation rarely comes up. She said she thought the point of Commissioner Oliver's letter is important. She asked if the Board had interest in putting this letter as it is on the December agenda.

Eileen Quiring asked if she was asking for a vote.

Ron Onslow said there was a motion on the floor.

Paul Greenlee said he believed the motion that was on the floor is out of order. As a motion, it is invalid and cannot be considered in this meeting.

Jack Burkman said that is because of the requirement for notice before action could be taken.

Chair Stewart said it is inappropriate for this Board to take a vote or action on any item that has not been published. For that reason, they could not respond to this tonight. If there is interest

in bringing it back in December or having it discussed by the Board with potential action at the December meeting, there a couple ways that it can get on the agenda.

Anne McEnery-Ogle said the Value Pricing group will be meeting quite regularly very quickly. She said she thought it should be a standing report on the agenda so that all of the individuals are aware of what is going on in those meetings. They are preparing materials, and it will all be electronic. They can pull up the summaries and have that discussion at each and every meeting. As part of the December meeting, they can bring everyone up to speed as to what the first meeting was about and what the scope of the work can be. This body can take up any item that they would like any action on.

Chair Stewart said Councilmember McEnery-Ogle would be attending those meetings representing the City of Vancouver. She asked Mr. Ransom if he planned to attend the meetings.

Mr. Ransom said yes, as noted in the work program, RTC is not leading this study, but it is very important to our transportation system so he will commit his time, and he has committed staff time to participate on their technical committee at this point.

Chair Stewart said we should expect regular updates. Mr. Ransom said he certainly could do that.

Chair Stewart said it has, in advance of this meeting, been said this is about how to do tolls, as opposed to if there ought to be tolls. It is a very limited framework, and she said that is a big concern to all the people when they understand what that committee is going to do and what the scope of their decision making is. Chair Stewart said they do need to know what they are doing.

Jack Burkman said since the Chair has effectively ruled that motion out of order saying it is inappropriate for us to take action without notification, he recommended that if Commissioner Oliver wants this letter on the agenda, that he make a motion for that and we vote on it, or we are going to run out of time in this meeting very quickly.

JERRY OLIVER MOVED TO HAVE THE LETTER ON THE DECEMBER AGENDA. EILEEN QUIRING SECONDED THE MOTION. Jerry Oliver, Eileen Quiring, Jeanne Stewart voted yes.

Chair Stewart said they needed to have a show of hands for the vote.

Ron Onslow asked if there was discussion on the motion.

Chair Stewart said yes there was discussion.

Ron Onslow said his thinking is that he has no problem with bringing it forward in the December meeting, but for support from the Ports, it's necessary for him to come forth with the feeling of the Ports that he represents. He said the letter in the present form, he was not sure he could support it in its present form. If it is voted to be on the agenda, then he would recommend that Mr. Ransom come forth with the questions that have been brought up

whether it is legal or not to do this on Oregon's part. If it is not, then it is not necessary to send that.

Chair Stewart said she would like modifications to the letter and to expect it.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED TO AMEND THE MOTION TO ASK MR. RANSOM TO BRING FORWARD THE MATERIAL DESCRIBED BY MAYOR ONSLOW.

THE AMENDMENT DIED WITHOUT A SECOND.

Tom Lannen asked if Mr. Greenlee could restate what they are asking the Director to do, the changes suggested.

Paul Greenlee said Mayor Onslow stated it well. He said his understanding is that there is a serious question as to several legal issues that need to be investigated before we would go forward with anything like this, and furthermore, that the Executive Director in conjunction with the Chair, since the Chair would be expected to sign the letter, should work out the wording together as opposed to bringing this particular document up for a yes or no vote in December.

Tom Lannen asked if he could second the motion at this point or if it had died. It was confirmed that the motion had died.

Kelly Brooks said they would take their input in whatever form they want to provide it. In terms of asking Mr. Ransom to provide a lot of legal analysis, she said they would be better served to have actual study scenarios to evaluate. She said those things will be presented, and they will have an opportunity to comment on them. Ms. Brooks said Mr. Ransom will have a hard time providing that level of analysis with the current level of information that is before the group, because they are really taking live input directly from the Advisory Committee to develop those scenarios. They want that input before they develop them. There is a time for that, but it would probably be more useful once they have some scenarios to assess.

Chair Stewart asked Commissioner Oliver if he would be willing to withdraw his motion.

Commissioner Oliver said he would withdraw the motion if can get it on the December meeting.

Chair Stewart asked if the letter would be as it is written.

Commissioner Oliver said Mayor Onslow has some concerns about the way the phrasing is and asked if there was something in particular he was referring to.

Anne McEnery-Ogle called for point of order. She said they had a motion on the floor and it was seconded and the initial vote has already started. They had the yes vote but not the second part.

It was determined to take the vote by a raise of hands as requested in order to record the vote.

Eileen Quiring asked if Mr. Oliver would entertain if this letter needs to be in a different form or reworded if that would be a part of the discussion in December.

Chair Stewart said it would be advisable to do that in advance.

CHAIR STEWART ASKED FOR ALL THOSE IN FAVOR OF MR. OLIVER'S MOTION TO SUBMIT HIS LETTER AS SUBMITTED FOR A DECEMBER AGENDA ITEM TO RAISE THEIR HANDS.

JERRY OLIVER, RON ONSLOW, AND EILEEN QUIRING VOTED YES IN FAVOR.

JACK BURKMAN, SHAWN DONAGHY, ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE, AND JEANNE STEWART VOTED NO.

KELLY BROOKS, PAUL GREENLEE, TOM LANNEN, AND KRIS STRICKLER ABSTAINED.

THE MOTION FAILED.

From the Director

Mr. Ransom said the December meeting will have a full agenda, it is the Annual Meeting. There will be a lot of material provided. Mr. Ransom said he would take the input just received about updates related to the ODOT Value Pricing Study and see how that works into the work program. He said that would either have its own agenda item or it may be a briefing depending on the substance of the information, but it would be included on the agenda.

Mr. Ransom said they did hold a Bi-State Coordination Committee meeting on October 26. He said it was very well attended. He thanked all that attended. Mr. Ransom said they had a good presentation from ODOT, specifically Kelly Brooks, on their initiative and feasibility review, etc. Mr. Ransom said he would provide a more detailed report in December.

Mr. Ransom said he has been collaborating and helping the Clark County Transportation Alliance prepare their 2018 legislative statement. That will be brought to the Board for introduction at the December meeting and said to expect ratification in January. Mr. Ransom said he would be attending the Clark County Transportation Alliance meeting on November 20 when they will endorse the statement for local agency ratification.

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, December 5, 2017, at 4 p.m.

XI. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Jeanne E. Stewart, Board of Directors Chair