
Minutes of Meeting

PRTPO EXECUTIVE BOARD

September 20, 2019

10:00 – 12:00

Jamestown S’Klallam Community Center – Red Cedar Hall

1033 Old Blyn Highway

Blyn, WA

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Annette Nesse called the meeting to order at 10:00.

ATTENDEES

Executive Board:

Jefferson County	David Sullivan
Kitsap County	Andy Nelson (<i>via phone</i>)
City of Port Angeles	Lindsay Schromen-Wawrin
City of Port Orchard	Bek Ashby
City of Port Townsend	Ariel Speser
City of Sequim	Dennis Smith
City of Shelton	Diedre Peterson (<i>via phone</i>)
Jefferson Transit	Tammi Rubert
Kitsap Transit	John Clauson
Port of Allyn	Judy Scott
Port of Port Angeles	Chris Hartman
Port of Shelton	Dick Taylor
WSDOT Olympic Region	Dennis Engel
Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe	Annette Nesse
Makah Tribe	Bud Denney

Staff:

Ed Coviello, Kitsap Transit – Lead Planning Agency
Thera Black, PRTPO Coordinator

Others:

Ron Allen, Jamestown S’Klallam Tribal Chair
Gil Cerise, Puget Sound Regional Council
Wendy Clark-Getzin, TAC Chair and Jefferson County Alternate
Sara Crouch, Jefferson Transit
David Garlington, City of Sequim Alternate
Cliff Hall, WSDOT Multimodal Planning Office
Yvette Liufau, WSDOT Olympic Region

Welcome and Introductions

Chair Nesse called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone to the Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe’s Red Cedar Hall. Self-introductions were made around the room.

Due to the lack of a quorum at this time, action items on the agenda were deferred and Item 4 was advanced.

4. Update on Draft Regional Transportation Plan 2040 Outreach

Ms. Black provided a status update on outreach activities for the draft plan, noting that the public comment period extends from September 3rd through October 18th, at the conclusion of the Board’s October meeting. She reported on the four public meetings that kicked off the review process, beginning in Port Angeles and including Port Townsend, Bremerton, and Shelton. Ms. Black advised that a second meeting in Mason County is being arranged because the Shelton open house inadvertently coincided with the regular Mason County TIP-CAP meeting, a citizen advisory group focused on transportation issues.

Some comments were submitted at the open houses and more have arrived via email. Ms. Black highlighted some common themes that have emerged to date, including:

- Concern that the plan does not reference climate change
- Support for transit and more intercity regional services
- Improved facilities for active travel and extension of the Olympic Discovery Trail and connections
- Specific consideration of freight mobility, especially in downtown corridors
- System vulnerabilities associated with reliance on US 101 with few alternate routes

Ms. Black noted that the TAC will discuss the draft plan and comments to date at its October meeting. TAC and public comments will be presented to the Board for review and discussion in October. Direction from the Board at that time will inform final plan revisions. A final draft will be presented to the TAC for review and recommendation before presenting to the Board for approval in November. She asked for any comments or questions.

Chair Nesse reported that she had attended the Port Townsend open house and found it to be well-attended. She noted that the discussions had been lively and diverse. Mr. Sullivan also attended the Port Townsend event and added that the attendees connected climate change with the need for more transit. He observed that there is much more support for expanded transit services than there is funding available for this.

Ms. Black reported that the additional meeting in Shelton will be on October 9 at the TIP-CAP meeting, which will be held at Mason County Public Works. Discussion of the RTP will be on their regular meeting agenda.

There was discussion about outreach efforts and meeting attendance. Ms. Black described the outreach and notification mechanisms. Mr. Coviello noted that the meetings appear to have gotten the word out as comments continue to arrive via email.

5. PSRC Passenger-only Ferry Study

Mr. Gil Cerise, Program Manager for the Transportation Division at the Puget Sound Regional Council, presented an overview of the upcoming Passenger-only Ferry Study that he will be leading. Board members received a copy of the presentation in the agenda packet.

Mr. Cerise began with a brief history of Puget Sound waterways, explaining that ferry routes were the highways before there were highways. He reviewed the importance of the Puget Sound Mosquito Fleet to travel and

commerce in 1900 and explained their consolidation and eventual decline as rail and auto travel outcompeted the ferries. In 1951 the state took over operation of ferries.

In the 1980s Washington State Ferries initiated its first passenger-only ferry service which it maintained for about two decades. In 2006 the Legislature determined that passenger-only ferry service is a form of public transportation and directed WSF to provide multi-modal service that accommodates vehicles in addition to passengers. WSF terminated its passenger-only service and shortly thereafter, King County and Kitsap Transit began operating their own services to fill the void. During this time, PSRC completed its first passenger-only ferry study in 2008.

Mr. Cerise advised that the 2008 PSRC study looked primarily at routes serving the Puget Sound region, but also looked at some external routes such as Port Townsend. It looked at the feasibility of routes to determine near-term, medium-term, and long-term viability. He noted that all the feasible near-term routes identified in that study are in service today. He highlighted the six current routes and the upcoming Southworth to Seattle route opening in 2020, noting that the times indicated in the slide are “dock-to-dock” times.

Mr. Cerise explained that where the passenger-only routes overlap with the WSF routes, they offer service that takes about half the time as state ferry routes. In other cases, the service connects communities that couldn’t accommodate a big state ferry. This helps to explain the significant growth in passenger-only ferry ridership over the last five years. While all ferry ridership is up, growth is strong on the King County and Kitsap Transit passenger-only routes. Mr. Clauson pointed out that the 2018 figures for Kitsap Transit ferry service include only about six months of operations of the Kingston ferry service and that 2019 figures should be quite a bit higher.

The legislature funded a \$350,000 update of PSRC’s 2008 study to account for the new services and identify future needs. Mr. Cerise noted that the legislature directed that the study scope should be expanded to include all 12 counties that border on Puget Sound, regardless of whether they currently have ferry service. The evaluation will include future services and capacity needs and will look at ferry terminal locations not just on Puget Sound but also on Lake Union and Lake Washington. He added that the scope also includes consideration of some environmental measures like electrification of the ferry fleet and extensive stakeholder engagement.

Mr. Cerise reviewed the general approach for the study and the schedule, which is just getting underway with the consultant selection process. He highlighted some of the evaluation criteria outlined in the implementing legislation, adding that additional factors will emerge from the stakeholder process. PSRC’s Transportation Policy Board will be the primary group focused on this. PRTPO Vice-Chair Bek Ashby is on the Transportation Policy Board. Most of the work will occur in 2020, with a final report due to the legislature in January 2021.

Mr. Cerise concluded by reiterating his interest in hearing what ideas and suggestions PRTPO Board members have at this time since they can help inform the scope of work under development. He encouraged people to contact him at gcerise@psrc.org if ideas or questions come up after the Board’s meeting.

Discussion ensued about the potential of passenger-only ferry electrification, and the perceived benefit of that compared to electric vehicle ferries that are transporting gas powered vehicles. Mr. Schromen-Wawrin noted that it makes more sense environmentally and fiscally to focus on electric propulsion for passenger-only ferries than on vehicle ferries. He pointed out that transit agencies are looking at the logistics of recharging electric buses and asked whether this study will take a similar look at the logistics of recharging electric ferries. Mr. Cerise replied that it is the intent to look at the effects of electrification in order to be able to compare emissions across modes, including potential shifts between modes. While the study scope details aren’t yet defined, this is likely to include a high-level look at vessel charging though by necessity, it cannot go into great detail.

Mr. Schromen-Wawrin added that transit agencies in California are looking at hydrogen fuel cells as an electric alternative and encouraged the PSRC study to consider whether hydrogen fuel cells offer a competitive alternative to electric-power that is constrained by battery technology. Mr. Cerise noted that hydrogen-electric technologies are being deployed now and so will probably be considered. Mr. Clauson added that Kitsap Transit is about to deploy its first hybrid hydrogen ferry, explaining that the technology is similar to what is used on buses. He pointed out that electric propulsion for passenger-only ferries – especially high-speed ferries – would require so much power that an electric-only ferry would have to recharge for a few hours before it could complete the return trip. Similar to buses, hydrogen may offer a more practical clean alternative than electricity.

Mr. Clauson explained that beyond questions about fuel and propulsion, ferry operations require coordination with completely different regulatory agencies including the Coast Guard, which must approve the ferry fuel and propulsion systems. This can be a challenge.

A question came up as to whether this study will align with the Governor’s “Maritime Blue” initiative. One element of that group’s work is electrification of marine vessels, creating a possible opportunity for coordination. Mr. Cerise made note of the initiative, observing the potential overlapping interests.

Mr. Sullivan asked about the role of Sunday service in the feasibility analysis, noting the relationship with transit and the combined importance for the region’s tourism industry. Mr. Cerise responded that the feasibility analysis will look at market potential by route but will probably not get to the level of detail about Sunday service feasibility. He added that the value of passenger-only ferry service depends on landside support, primarily transit and that the study will likely speak to that. Mr. Sullivan pointed out that the ability to attract people to weekend festivals and events without relying on driving depends on having Sunday service. Vice-Chair Ashby noted that the Port Orchard-to-Bremerton ferry service offered by Kitsap Transit does not run on Sundays, but because it is important to two cities, they pitch in to fund Sunday service. While this is an important route for tourists, experience has shown that ridership is minimal unless it is a festival weekend.

Vice-Chair Ashby added that while the foot ferry serves a demand for walk-on service from Port Orchard to Bremerton for jobs at the shipyard or to pick up the Fast Ferry to Seattle, it does create parking issues in downtown Port Orchard. There are a lot of landside issues associated with passenger-only ferry service that must be considered.

The Board adjourned for a five-minute break while the conference phone was set up to accommodate remote access for some members. The Board reconvened at 10:45. Andy Nelson from Kitsap County and Diedre Peterson from Shelton joined the meeting via phone. The Board achieved a quorum and addressed action items previously deferred.

2. Approval of Agenda and Approval of Minutes from August 16, 2019

ACTION: Ms. Scott recommended approval of the agenda and of minutes from the August 16th meeting. Vice-Chair Ashby seconded. The motion passed. Mr. Schromen-Wawrin abstained, noting he was not at the August meeting.

3. Approve 2020-2025 Regional Transportation Improvement Program

Mr. Coviello briefed the Board on development of the draft Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), acknowledging support from WSDOT and from the local partners as he prepared the RTIP for the first time. He explained that inclusion in an approved RTIP is a prerequisite for inclusion in the Statewide

Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The RTIP and STIP are developed and maintained in an online database. The process, his first developing the PRTPO RTIP, went smoothly.

There are 152 projects in the RTIP, with the majority being state projects. Mr. Coviello explained that the PRTPO website has projects broken out by jurisdiction to facilitate review and commenting. A public review and comment period has been underway. Today's action by the Board is required for funded projects in the RTIP to be advanced to the STIP.

ACTION: Ms. Scott moved, seconded by Vice-Chair Ashby, to approve the 2020-2025 Regional Transportation Improvement Program. The motion passed unanimously.

Vice-Chair Ashby observed that it is difficult to review 152 pages of project information. Ms. Black concurred and advised that consideration will be given to making the 2020 process more meaningful in reviewing the projects ahead of time.

6. WSDOT Update on State Projects

Mr. Engel updated the Board on WSDOT projects in the PRTPO region. He pointed out that WSDOT projects located in Kitsap County are not included in the PRTPO RTIP because they are included in the PSRC RTIP instead. Mr. Engel included those projects from the PSRC RTIP in his presentation. Mr. Engel acknowledged the work of Ms. Liufau in assembling his presentation and for her work in developing the PRTPO RTIP in previous years.

Mr. Engel referenced a handout that had been prepared listing all projects in the four-county region and explained that highlighted projects at the end of each county's list are those longer-range projects that are outside of the four years of the STIP. He advised that some adjustment of schedules is to be expected. He also explained that some projects in this biennium will complete just one phase of a project, for example the design phase. Future biennia will include funding for right-of-way or construction, but funds have not been secured.

The presentation featured a GIS map with markers highlighting the location of each project. Mr. Engel pointed out that many of the projects are environmental retrofits primarily oriented toward fish passage barrier removal. WSDOT is hiring a consultant to complete 22 projects within the Peninsula region.

Clallam County Projects

Of the 20 WSDOT projects in Clallam County, 12 are fish passage barrier retrofits.

Vice-Chair Ashby asked about construction plans for the Elwha River Bridge replacement and how WSDOT intends to manage traffic during that project. Mr. Engel advised that WSDOT will build a new bridge parallel to the original which will enable them to keep the current bridge open during construction. Mr. Schromen-Wawrin provided more detail on the project, noting that erosion has made the existing bridge structure unstable. It was constructed in an era when foundations were not located on solid bedrock. Because of the erosion, WSDOT has expedited the schedule for the bridge replacement. Construction of the new bridge will also soften a sharp curve in the road that requires a significant speed reduction. Mr. Engel added that sensors have been installed on the existing bridge to help detect any movement and equipment is staged that will allow WSDOT to rapidly deploy an emergency bridge closure if necessary.

Mr. Engel pointed out that the East Sequim project is not included on the list. WSDOT was told it did not need to be included but they are working to confirm that. It is a pre-design project for the Simdars interchange, and funding is secured. Mr. Garlington noted that this will be a project of interest on the October 2nd Joint Transportation Committee tour.

Jefferson County Projects

Of the 15 WSDOT projects located in Jefferson County, 9 are fish passage retrofits.

Mr. Engel highlighted efforts currently underway at SR 104 and Shine and Paradise Roads to improve safety with the addition of roundabout treatments. Two open houses generated a lot of strong public sentiment. Mr. Sullivan noted that the concern most people have is congestion on the bridge and on the east side of the bridge. They typically don't see these intersection safety issues as being the problem to solve. Mr. Engel advised that WSDOT will be installing two roundabouts at SR 104 and SR 19 at the same time, also to improve safety.

He described deck repairs slated for the Hood Canal Bridge, noting that it is structural work under the roadway and so won't be evident to most people. Ms. Clark-Getzin inquired about timing and how WSDOT will notify local agencies and the public about traffic impacts. Mr. Engel was unaware of when the work would occur but explained that the nature of the work will not create much traffic disruption.

Mason County Projects

Of the 13 WSDOT projects located in Mason County, 7 are fish passage retrofits.

The big project in the region is the SR 3 Freight Corridor project, long known as the Belfair Bypass. This \$67 million project recently got underway with some preliminary design work. This project will take several years to complete.

Ms. Scott inquired about the SR 300 / Belfair State Park project, a combination paver / ADA-ramp project. It is uncertain whether construction will be summer of 2020 or 2021. She expressed support for the project, which should make the road safer to travel.

Kitsap County Projects

Of the 8 WSDOT projects located in Kitsap County, 3 are fish passage retrofits.

SR 305 Corridor constitutes a number of safety and mobility multimodal projects between the Bainbridge ferry terminal and Hostmark Street. This is a multiyear project that is getting underway now.

Mr. Engel also reviewed the region's programmatic paver program and guardrail safety program.

Ms. Clark-Getzin asked for insights about funding displacements when projects get pushed out of the current RTIP and rescheduled for later years. She referred to an ADA project on SR 116 that was deferred to 2027 for lack of funding and asked what other projects had been squeezed out of the current RTIP due to lack of funding until the legislature passes a new funding package. Mr. Engel wasn't aware of other specific projects but acknowledged that the WSDOT projects are relatively fluid between biennia depending on availability of funds from different funding sources. Ms. Black asked whether RTPO input can help Olympic Region projects prioritize better in the funding process. He explained that WSDOT's own funding priorities are programmatic preservation, safety, and fish passage needs, not improvement projects. Local agencies probably have the most influence over improvement-type projects through their legislative activities. WSDOT's focus is on taking care of the existing system and there's not enough money for that.

Fish passage barriers are particularly challenging, and Mr. Engel discussed the funding deficit for retrofitting the WSDOT facilities. Mr. Schromen-Wawrin noted that price tag does not include municipal and private culverts upstream and downstream from the state facilities. Municipalities were not included in the court decision, nor is

there any funding for them to proactively address those barriers. Without a systemic approach the state retrofits will have limited effectiveness. He asked how WSDOT considers upstream and downstream blockages in its prioritization of barrier retrofits in the four-county region. Mr. Engel explained that the people who prioritize fish passage retrofits look for those projects that generate the greatest benefit for fish habitat. Upstream and downstream barriers are a factor in that analysis.

Ms. Clark-Getzin reported on a \$1.142 million initiative of the Washington State Association of Counties to evaluate methodologies for identifying and prioritizing fish passage barrier projects. She explained that some methodologies look at upstream and downstream habitat while others don't. The legislature has determined that it needs more guidance on how to allocate state funds to other retrofit projects. This study will put forward some methodologies that can be used statewide to prioritize projects.

Mr. Clauson shared the experience of the West Sound Alliance, a coalition of representatives from Kitsap, Pierce, and Mason counties. He explained that the coalition worked together to identify mutually beneficial projects and then promoted those priorities jointly to the lawmakers. He noted that possibly this coalition might be expanded to include all the Olympic Peninsula, or some other configuration created to jointly advance priority regional projects and suggested this be a topic for future discussion. Mr. Engel pointed out that two of the projects on the list he just reviewed with the Board resulted from that effort – the \$66 million SR 3 Freight Corridor (aka Belfair Bypass) project and the SR 305 Corridor Improvement. Vice-Chair Ashby added that the educational opportunity associated with the West Sound Alliance experience was very beneficial. She explained that they did not prioritize the projects, but each jurisdiction educated the whole group on their projects. In this way the whole group understood each other's needs and how the projects worked together to accomplish their mutual objectives so that everyone could speak to the whole list of projects when talking with legislators.

7. PRTPO Coordination Update

Ms. Black introduced the update as a new standing agenda item for the Board. She explained that the intent is to keep the Board informed about on-going coordination activities in which she is participating on behalf of PRTPO, particularly activities that may influence issues or decisions they face as a Board or which may have implications for the region's members or constituents. She advised that she will typically not speak to everything in the report, focusing instead on those topics that the Board wants more information.

She referenced the attached brief and advised that the monthly update will feature key highlights and links to additional information so that it can be easily shared with relevant staff or stakeholders. She encouraged members and their staff to follow up with her if they have questions or need more information on a specific topic. The September brief is a little longer than typical because it includes updates from the quarterly MPO/RTPO Coordinating Committee.

Ms. Black pointed to updates that may shape the Board's work program in 2020. This includes two parallel efforts, one being an update by WSDOT of the Highway System Plan. This will be the first update since 2006. While it is focused on state highways, WSDOT indicated that it will be multimodal in its scope. It also appears that there will be an opportunity to identify programmatic needs like preservation and safety, not just improvement projects. There will also be an opportunity to consider off-system needs that improve highway system performance. The parallel effort is an initiative by the legislature to develop a statewide list of project needs to inform a 2021 funding package. She advised that as details of these two processes begin to emerge, effort will get underway within PRTPO to enable thoughtful input to the process and avoid where possible a rushed or uncoordinated response.

She asked if there were questions about the briefing concept in general or any topics in this first report specifically meriting discussion.

Mr. Garlington called attention to the federal funding update and the message from WSDOT that unobligated projects are at risk of losing their federal funds, including possibly the loss of county allocation authority in favor of a statewide paver program. He explained that the use of federal funds creates significant complications for project delivery that impact both cost and timing. The WSDOT Obligation Authority policy and approach seems more punitive than helpful to small local agencies faced with using those funds. He described efforts underway to allow smaller agencies to trade federal funds for state funds, concentrating federal funds on larger projects administered by large agencies and WSDOT. This opportunity is not reflected in WSDOT's policy or approach.

Ms. Black concurred, adding that his concerns are shared across the state. She noted that this issue was identified in the Transportation Commission's 'WTP 2040 and Beyond' long-range plan presented to the legislature in January. She advised that the TAC will be discussing the status of federally funded projects across the region when it meets in October. Ms. Black explained that this concern about the color of money available for projects in rural areas and small communities is an example of something that the Board may identify in early 2020 as a strategic priority of concern to communities across the region.

Chair Nesse acknowledged the arrival of Ron Allen, the Jamestown S'Klallam Tribal Chair and Chief Executive Officer. Mr. Allen greeted the Board, and welcomed everyone.

Chair Nesse turned back to the funding discussion, agreeing with Mr. Garlington's concerns. She expressed concern about WSDOT's expectations of moving projects faster through the project delivery process. Ms. Black advised that much of this requires hard consideration of whether to even put federal funds on a project and then being realistic about when it will actually get underway. Sometimes agencies are overly optimistic about how quickly they'll be able to get a project obligated. When it slips from a current year to a later year in the TIP problems can arise. Ms. Black referred to the update report and noted that there are links in these blurbs to details on the WSDOT site that can provide more insights into the existing funding status of individual projects.

Vice-Chair Ashby described the PSRC process through which Kitsap County communities get their federal funding. She explained that the PSRC process requires applicants to identify the start year of their projects. In the 2020 funding process, PSRC will allocate funds for 2023 and 2024, not for 2020; those projects were selected earlier so that they will be ready to proceed in 2020. The first time PSRC implemented this process was in 2016. In that first round, over \$35 million worth of projects missed their obligation deadlines. PSRC had to go through a complicated but expedited process to shuffle project funding in order to meet that obligation target on time. It was not an easy process and in order to meet the deadline, a number of planning projects were funded. Vice-Chair Ashby underscored the importance of meeting the obligation target deadlines and added that PSRC has committed to not lose any of its federal funds because of missed deadlines.

Mr. Garlington remarked that adjacent states have figured out how to concentrate their federal funds onto a smaller number of large projects and suggested that Washington could learn from those examples. Discussion ensued about the rationale behind the policy and the challenges WSDOT faces in trying to meet its own statewide funding targets. It makes investment plans based on what local agencies commit to delivering in a given year. When projects don't advance as planned it creates the need for a last-minute scramble to keep Washington from losing federal funds to other states. Key is streamlining the administration of federal funds without diminishing the funding availability and decision-making authority currently enjoyed by regions and counties.

Mr. Clauson added that another challenge to using federal funds is that they have a time limit. Once a project gets started, it has ten years to complete. This is straightforward with a bus acquisition or plan or paver project, but it gets more complicated with construction projects that may take longer than ten years to complete. Using federal funds for design or right-of-way commits the agency to completing construction within that ten-year window. Agencies need to be confident that they will be able to secure construction funding or they may have to repay the federal funds already spent. This ten-year rule was an issue recently for Port Orchard.

Ms. Clark-Getzin noted that the Transportation Commission discussed the need to defederalize funding with Clallam County agencies on its tour of the peninsula in fall of 2018 and even included this as a key issue in its annual report. Ms. Clark-Getzin added that the legislature's Joint Transportation Committee will be meeting in Port Angeles on October 3rd, and that this topic will be part of that discussion with lawmakers.

Mr. Sullivan asked about the opportunity to advance this with federal lawmakers like Derek Kilmer. Mr. Hall responded that this would be a very good opportunity to educate them about the challenges rural and small agencies face in using federal transportation funds. He explained that the "take back" from states not spending fast enough is a recent federal initiative that WSDOT must comply with. Federal lawmakers may be able to fix that but only if they know it is a problem. Mr. Sullivan added that federal lawmakers like to know what local agencies need. Some brief talking points could be helpful for Board members in educating their representatives. Mr. Hall concurred, adding that this kind of legislative engagement is part of the power of RTPOs when they speak with one voice on an issue like this. He concluded by noting that if the federal policy were to change this "use it or lose it" issue at the local level would go away though the rest of the challenges remain.

Chair Nesse inquired about the November meeting to be convened by Local Programs and asked if they plan to meet individually with each region. Ms. Black explained that as described, this will be a single meeting with RTPO and MPO staff for a coordinated status update and next steps. She noted that if she learns anything ahead of time that may be relevant to local agencies, she will push out an email message. Otherwise she will report back on the results of that meeting.

Ms. Black briefly reviewed the other topics on the report. Mr. Hall provided historical context for the RTPO planning funding topic. Board members affirmed that this concept will be useful in helping them to stay informed about PRTPO activities between meetings and communicate with colleagues and the public.

8. Public Comments

No members of the public were present to speak.

9. PRTPO Member Updates

Mr. Schromen-Wawrin reported that Port Angeles is completing an overlay of Laurideon Boulevard, a primary east-west corridor. The project includes pedestrian facilities and the design better reflects the community's commitment to safe multimodal mobility.

Mr. Sullivan reported that Jefferson Transit is taking a position against I-976. The agency is concerned about the lack of information out there for people to learn what it will do and its impacts to transit services. It will prepare materials to inform local voters about the effects of this initiative. He noted that local agencies have the ability to take positions on voter issues like this as long as they follow the correct procedures.

Chair Nesse advised that the next Board meeting will be on October 18th at the Bremerton Airport and the next TAC meeting will be on October 10th at the Jamestown S'Klallam facility in Blyn. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:53.