

Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization Executive Board Meeting Minutes

September 18, 2015

Mason Transit's Transit Community Center

Shelton, WA

Attendees

Executive Board

Wendy Clark-Getzin, Clallam Transit
Laura Dubois, City of Sequim
Genaveve Starr, City of Sequim
David Sullivan, Jefferson County
Andrew Nelson, Kitsap County
Greg Cioc, Kitsap County
Steffani Lillie, Kitsap Transit
Mike Oliver, Mason Transit
Judy Scott, Port of Allyn
Dick Taylor, Port of Shelton
Tracy Moore, City of Shelton
Annette Nesse, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe
Jody Rosier, Skokomish Indian Tribe
Marty Allen, Skokomish Indian Tribe
Kevin Dayton, WSDOT

Staff/Guests

John Donahue, WSDOT
George Kovich, WSDOT
Dennis Engel, WSDOT
Debbie Clemen, WSDOT

Introductions

David welcomed those in attendance. He then initiated self-introductions of those present and commented that Annette Nesse is participating by conference call. Debbie Clemen relayed that a meeting quorum of members are now present.

Practical Design & Least Cost Planning

John Donahue from WSDOT's Headquarters' Design office presented WSDOT's new way of doing business, practical design and least cost planning. Least cost planning and practical design are two important reforms that WSDOT is undertaking to make more sustainable transportation investment decisions. WSDOT has been working on the reform for the past two years trying to figure out how they will work together now and in the future.

What has inspired this change in doing business? Several elements have inspired this change such as a change in trends, technical advances, changes in travel habits, data and research on how we consider the safety of the road, and it is the era of the retrofit.

WSDOT is not alone in implementing this approach to save money. Idaho, Missouri, New Jersey, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Utah and New Mexico as well as FHWA and the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) are all launching performance-based practical design approaches in order to save money. The 6 strategic plan goals are: 1) Strategic Investments, 2) Modal Integration, 3) Environmental Stewardship, 4) Organizational Strength, 5) Community Engagement, and 6) Smart Technology.

The basics of practical design consists of the following strategies:

- Performance Based versus Standards Based
- Focus on need and least cost solution
- Results geared to benefit the transportation system
- Emphasis on community engagement
- Interdisciplinary and collaborative decision making
- Design based on context land use and transportation
- Data driven strategies.

Assisting with the implementation of practical design is a primary effort for the Development Division. Significant design policy changes are currently underway that will address practical design. However, you can do practical design right now using current guidance, processes, and methods. Clarify the need for the project. Repeatedly ask “why with an interdisciplinary tem of peers. Understanding what thresholds were the initial triggers for creating a project within the subprogram is another way to identify the most basic need. After developing the revised need statement, it is necessary fo the region Program Management and Capital Program development and Management to ensure the agreement is understood, and update any documentation needed. Practical design calls for innovation and a multidisciplinary effort to evaluate and understand the project needs.

Updating the WSDOT's Design Manual

- In January of this year, WSDOT initiated effort to replace the design matrices..
- In March, initial Design Manual content was drafted.
- In April, a Design Manual draft preview was released to WSDOT's region offices for comments.
- In June, WSDOT addressed the preview comments.
- In July, an internal draft was prepared and meetings were held.
- In August, a statewide draft Design Manual update was prepared.
- In September, the document was released for statewide review.
- In October, WSDOT hopes to gather approvals.
- In November, WSDOT hopes to implement the Design Manual updates.

Practical design is an approach to making project decision that focuses on the need for the project and looks for the lowest cost solutions. It engages local stakeholders at the earliest stages of defining scope to ensure their input is included at the right stage of project design.

With practical design, decision-making focuses on maximum benefit to the system, rather than maximum benefit to the project. Focusing on the specific project need minimizes the scope of work for each project. The goal is to allow more needs to be addressed system wide by reducing spending on lesser priority items on each project.

Practical design is an important component in implementing WSDOT's strategic plan:

- Innovation and solutions are encouraged
- No compromises to safety
- Community engagement is important to making decisions
- Collaboration ensures a wide array of perspectives

By using practical design, project decisions will build the most efficient solutions for the state's transportation needs. Please note however, that this is a WSDOT initiative for DOT projects only. All federal and state rules and regulations are still applicable to local jurisdictions.

WSDOT's Corridor Sketch Initiative

George Kovich commented that the Corridor Sketch Initiative is one way WSDOT is implementing Least Cost Planning at the corridor level. He explained that WSDOT's Corridor Sketch initiative is a new way for WSDOT to work jointly with partners to capture and document consistent baseline information about each transportation corridor around the state in order to inform future investment decisions. He relayed that a corridor sketch pilot program has been developed by WSDOT to evaluate the planning and programming concepts which will shift the agency's current programming focus on highway capacity investments to a new approach that would develop cost-effective integrated sets of demand management, operational improvements, and highway capital investment strategies.

George commented that the Highway System Plan (HSP) is a document that provides a 20-year plan for state highways. This plan identifies the vision, goals, performance gaps and strategies consistent with Results Washington. Corridor Sketches are a key component of the HSP. The sketches are aligned to the Transportation Policy Goals. Washington's highways were divided up into 291 corridors statewide. There are 62 identified corridors in WSDOT's Olympic Region (Clallam, Jefferson, Mason, Grays Harbor, Thurston, Kitsap and Pierce counties). The following roadways have been grouped together by county. Some segments include more than one highway to form the corridor for the sketch:

Jefferson County

- US 101 (two corridor segments)
- SR19/SR 20/SR 116
- SR 104

Mason County

- US 101 (two corridor segments)
- SR 3
- SR 8
- SR 102
- SR 108
- SR 106
- SR 119
- SR 300
- SR 302

Clallam County

- US 101 (two corridor segments)
- SR 104
- SR 117
- SR 110
- SR 112/SR 113

Kitsap County

- SR 3
- SR 16
- SR 160
- SR 303
- SR 304
- SR 305
- SR 104/SR 307
- SR 308
- SR 310

A corridor sketch is a container of consistent information about each corridor that includes a description including lane use and a vicinity map, corridor vision, current and future functions, expected performance and performance gaps, what is working well, what needs to change, community concerns, issues and opportunities, strategies from adopted local and regional plans, and cost-effective strategies (future). A corridor sketch is not a substitute for detailed planning and analysis nor is it a list of investments or projects.

The corridor sketch development will be conducted in two phases. Phase I will consist of documenting the vision, existing conditions and performance targets for each corridor throughout the state. WSDOT will coordinate with local jurisdictions at the MPO/RTPO level and coordinate with tribes on an individual basis as required. Local land use planners, transportation planners, transit, tribal representatives and interested elected officials are invited to attend the workshops. WSDOT will capture the local vision and corridor perspective, issues

and planned developments for each corridor. Phase 1 began in September and will continue through January 2016. The collection of comments from the public for Phase 1 is scheduled for the spring and summer of 2016. The first workshop will be in Grays Harbor County because they have the least number of corridors and we can use them as a test case. Phase II will use performance targets as the basis for identifying and ranking cost-effective multimodal investment strategies and continue with community engagement.

Corridor Sketch Timeline

- August 2015 Corridor Sketch Statewide Implementation
- Sept. – Dec. Community Outreach with jurisdictions and agencies
- March 2016 Phase 1 Complete
- Spring 2016 Commence Phase II
- Spring 2016 HSP Comment Period
- Summer 2016 Revised HSP

Regional Transportation Plan Update

George Kovich commented that the Peninsula RTPO's Regional Transportation Plan has been updated and staff is looking for approval of the revised document. He then relayed that a member admitted to using the original plan as a door stop because it was so big. In the past, the TAC had reviewed the document every 2 years and would update a single chapter at a time. This was the first major update of the document since 1995. The plan was reduced in size from 270 pages to 121 pages, efforts were also made to make the plan more reader friendly and easier to use. After developing the initial draft plan, staff conducted public outreach including 4 public open forums, holding 4 countywide meetings, and an internal and another final review of the document by the TAC. One hundred and twenty comments were received on the plan.

The RTP addresses all modes of transportation as well as issues that impact or are impacted by the regional transportation system such as economic and community development.

Revisions to the RTP include the following:

- A Preface replaced the Executive Summary as an introduction to the PRTP. The Preface doesn't include a recap of the document.
- The Introduction section improvements include added graphics, a purpose, expanded roles and responsibilities section, expanded regional conditions section to include Land Use and Maps.
- The Finance section improvements included the addition of a more State/Regional/Local focus over the existing federal focus. It also highlights revenue sources and constraints discussion and provides revenue forecasts.
- The Regional Transportation Summary includes an expanded chapter containing a
 - A more regional/local focus
 - Designation and an inventory of the Regional Transportation System
 - Discussion of the travel trends
 - And more maps and graphics
- Challenges to the Proposed Future Area Network chapter includes a more regional/local focus, input from countywide discussion and a section on challenges.

- The appendices include a glossary, traffic forecasts and transportation funding sources.

Note: members will need to review and amend the RTP to account for new performance targets and the regional priorities and projects list.

David called for a motion to approve the Revised Regional Transportation Plan. Dick Taylor motioned to approve the RTP as written and Terri Jeffreys seconded the motion. The motion was carried with no further discussion.

Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

Debbie Clemen relayed that staff is looking for approval of the required annual RTIP and STIP documents. Jurisdictions input their projects into the SecuredAccess Washington (SAW) Software. The data is compiled to generate the RTIP and STIP. Debbie commented that the RTIP is the PRTPO's 6 year financial plan that identifies and prioritizes federally funded transportation projects. There are 175 projects listed in the RTIP including both secured and planned projects this year.

Staff compiles the RTIP and then sorts out all of the secured projects to be incorporated into the STIP document. The STIP is a 4 year, financially constrained document highlighting those projects with FHWA or FTA funding and any project deemed regionally significant. Yvette also created a spreadsheet depicting the agency, the number of secured projects with type and amount of funding and the number of planned projects with type and amount of funding. Overall there were 175 total projects, 71 secured and 104 planned.

David called for a motion to approve the RTIP and STIP documents as presented. Laura Dubois motioned to approve the RTIP and STIP and Dick Taylor seconded the motion. The motion was carried with no further discussion.

FY 2015 Fourth Quarter Budget Report

Debbie Clemen reviewed the fiscal report for the fourth quarter, April 1st through June 30th 2015. She commented that Kitsap County really came through for us and was able to spend their remaining allocation of the PRTPO's Regional Model before the deadline. This quarter, staff spent \$67,414 with \$4 remaining in the overall budget. Debbie commented that everything just fell into place and expenditures were right on target.

Peninsula RTPO's Program Year 2016 UPWP Budget Revision

Debbie Clemen commented that there is a budget revision for the PRTPO's 2016 Program Year allocation. When staff prepares the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), WSDOT Headquarters provides an estimated budget allocation. The final allocation is determined in the July timeframe. The PRTPO's allocation was \$342 less than estimated in the UPWP. Staff proposes reducing the funds for the General Program Administration by #342 to cover this shortfall. For program year 2016 the overall budget of \$134,000 is now reduced by \$342 to \$133,658.

David requested a motion to approve the revised FY 2016 budget allocation. A motion to approve the revised budget allocation was made, seconded and carried with no further discussion.

2-Year Review of the PRTPO's Bylaws

Debbie Clemen commented that according to SECTION 13 of the PRTPO's Bylaws, members are required to review the bylaws at least every two years. At this meeting we will review the bylaws and make any revisions. Then at the November meeting, staff will seek approval of those changes. After review and discussion of all 13 sections the following revisions were proposed:

- Throughout the document, the word “bylaws” is spelled three different ways. For consistency sake, members approved spelling the word “bylaws” as a single word with no hyphen or space.
- SECTION 1: AUTHORITY
No suggested revisions.
- SECTION 2: OFFICERS/DUTIES
No suggested revisions.
- SECTION 3: MEMBERSHIP
 - o Replace the word “policy board” with “Executive Board”
 - o Revise the number of member alternates.
“Member entities will submit a signed letter designating a representative and up to 2 alternates.”
 - o Delete third paragraph
“If neither the duly designated member representative nor the officially designated alternate member representative is able to attend a specific meeting, then the jurisdiction may designate, for that meeting only, an additional alternative member representative. This additional alternate must have all rights, privileges, and authorities exercised by the member representative and the alternate.”
- SECTION 4: MEMBERSHIP RESPONSIBILITIES
No suggested revisions.
- SECTION 5: NEW MEMBERSHIP REQUESTS
No suggested revisions.
- SECTION 6: MEETINGS
Removed Chair’s signature requirement revised sentence follows:
“The Board Secretary shall ensure that official minutes are taken for each meeting and approved by the Board.”
- SECTION 7: QUORUM
No suggested revisions.
- SECTION 8: VOTING
No suggested revisions

PRTPO Bylaws Review continued

- SECTION: 9: ANNUAL WORK PLAN AND BUDGET
Typo in subsection B. *"In developing thee Work Plan,..."*
- SECTION 10: CONTRACT SERVICES
Contract services provided by members should take priority over outside. Staff will research compliance in contract serves and the legal counsel to prefer member services. This entire section needs to be rewritten. Staff will research legalities and draft revised text for members review.
- SECTION 11: TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Missing word "have" in subsection B. "Each organization shall have one vote at any meeting."
- SECTION 12: LEAD PLANNING AGENCY
No suggested revisions.
- SECTION 13: BYLAW REVIEW AND AMENDMENTS
No suggested revisions

Staff will send out a revised copy of the bylaws prior to the November 20th meeting for members review.

Public Comments/Announcements

Belfair Bypass Project

Mason County Commissioner, Terri Jeffreys thanked all who helped get the Belfair Bypass funded and to WSDOT for featuring this project on their priority list. Kevin Dayton stated that the \$65 million allocated to the Belfair Bypass by the legislature will make it happen. WSDOT will put together the purpose and need.

Thank you PRTPO Members

City of Shelton Commissioner, Tracy Moore thanked members for visiting Shelton. Tracy encouraged members to stay for lunch and go shopping. She even distributed several lunch menus for local eateries.

Officer Nominations

Debbie Clemen reminded members to be thinking about officer nominations for the November meeting. According to the new bylaws David and other officers are eligible to run for a second term.

Adjournment

David Sullivan noted that the next Executive Board meeting is scheduled for November 20, 2015, at the Kitsap County Public Works Annex in Bremerton. David adjourned the meeting.

###