

ATTACHMENT A

Minutes of Meeting

PRTPO EXECUTIVE BOARD

October 18, 2019

10:00 – 12:00

Bremerton Airport Administrative Office

8850 SW State Highway 3

Bremerton, WA

CALL TO ORDER

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

ATTENDEES

Executive Board:

Clallam County	Bill Peach (<i>via phone</i>)
Jefferson County	David Sullivan (<i>via phone</i>)
Kitsap County	David Forte (alternate)
Mason County	Randy Neatherlin
City of Port Orchard	Bek Ashby
City of Poulsbo	Michael Bateman
City of Sequim	Dennis Smith
City of Shelton	Deidre Peterson
Jefferson Transit	Tammi Rubert
Kitsap Transit	John Clauson
Mason Transit	Mike Ringgenberg (alternate)
Port of Shelton	Dick Taylor
WSDOT Olympic Region	Dennis Engel
Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe	Annette Nesse

Other Attendees:

Wendy Clark-Getzin, Jefferson County and TAC Chair (*via phone*)
Sara Crouch, Jefferson Transit
Roger Gay, South Kitsap Taxpayer
David Garlington, Sequim
Steve Gray, Clallam County (*via phone*)

PRTPO Staff:

Thera Black, PRTPO Coordinator
Edward Coviello, Kitsap Transit Lead Planning Agency

1. Welcome and Introductions

Chair Nesse called the meeting to order and welcomed members attending in person and via teleconference. Introductions were made around the room and via phone. Chair Nesse affirmed the presence of a quorum.

2. Approval of Agenda, Minutes, and Consent Calendar

Ms. Black advised that an additional agenda item is needed to ask Board approval for adding a Clallam County project to the STIP due to a recent funding award.

ACTION: Mr. Taylor moved, seconded by Mr. Forte, to approve the agenda as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

ACTION: Ms. Ashby moved, seconded by Mr. Taylor, to approve the minutes from September 20, 2019 and the consent calendar. The motion carried unanimously.

(New Item) Approval to Amend New Clallam County Project into the Statewide TIP

Mr. Coviello briefed the Board on the need for an amendment to the statewide TIP (STIP) to add a newly secured project for Clallam County. The project, Sequim-Dungeness Way and Woodcock Road Intersection Improvement, was selected for funding by WSDOT with a Highway Safety Improvement grant. The project was included in Clallam County's six-year TIP but since it had not yet secured funding, it was not included in the STIP.

The project is an intersection safety improvement of Sequim-Dungeness Way and Woodcock Road. It will convert the existing intersection to a roundabout. As a part of the STIP amendment process the project will go through a 30-day public review and comment period. Mr. Coviello advised that he is looking for Board approval to amend this project into the STIP and invited Mr. Gray to provide an overview of the project to the Board.

Mr. Gray provided an overview of the project. He explained that the project is at the intersection of two rural major collectors. Currently the east-west Woodcock Road is stop-controlled at Sequim-Dungeness Way, on which the average travel speed is 45 miles per hour. The County applied for a safety grant because Woodcock Road and Sequim-Dungeness Way are the County's 2nd and 3rd highest crash-prone facilities, respectively. This intersection alone has experienced ten serious crashes in recent years.

The project was identified in Clallam County's current TIP but at the time of approval, no outside funding sources had been secured. Clallam County applied for a safety grant and was notified of the \$400,000 funding award earlier in October. Mr. Gray explained that the STIP amendment at this time enables Clallam County to proceed with preliminary engineering and design, with the goal of obligating construction funding by April 2021. Achieving that timeline saves the County a \$40,000 match on the construction funding, a significant savings.

Mr. Gray advised that the County conducted a public review of the draft TIP before its adoption in November 2018, including three meetings around the county, a hearing before the planning commission, and a hearing before the Board of County Commissioners. This project was a major focus of a recent listening session in Sequim. It is in the County's current six-year TIP which is going through its review and approval process. It is consistent with the County's Comprehensive Plan and the regional transportation plan. He concluded that approval at this time will help Clallam County achieve its obligation deadlines for project delivery.

ACTION: Mr. Neatherlin moved, seconded by Mr. Forte, to approve amending the Clallam County Sequim-Dungeness Way and Woodcock Road Intersection Improvement into the STIP. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Gray thanked the Board for its expedited consideration of this request.

Mr. Coviello advised that he will develop a standardized process for addressing future amendments with the Board. Mr. Forte noted that the aim should be to streamline the process as much as possible since time is so critical in meeting state obligation deadlines. An obligation request is often delayed due to a very minor issue with the description or entry field. Fixing that issue may require a STIP amendment at the last minute. He encouraged staff to think about a quick-response approach for these kinds of minor corrections that enable an agency to make necessary adjustments and hit the obligation deadlines as planned. Ms. Black asked if he was referring to an administrative amendment process to address minor corrections as well as a regular amendment process to add a new project. He noted that this could work but it would be incumbent upon the Board to specify in its policies what criteria could warrant a streamlined administrative amendment.

3. Transportation Funding 101: Federal Funding

Ms. Black introduced the briefing by noting that over the next several months the Board will make awards of Transportation Alternatives program funding grants to priority projects. This briefing is meant to be an introduction to that upcoming process, focusing specifically on considerations related to federal funding and project delivery. [A [copy of the presentation](#) is with October 18 meeting materials on the PRTPO website.]

In her briefing, Ms. Black reviewed basics of federal funding programs available to PRTPO members, addressed challenges associated with the use of federal funds, identified some project types that are often overlooked as potential funding candidates, and concluded with insights on two upcoming federal funding opportunities.

PRTPO or its members have discretion over two of the federal funding sources that support project needs in the region:

- Regional Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) funds are programmed by counties in the region to priority projects. The Puget Sound Regional Council also has a regionally competitive program in which Kitsap County agencies participate. Other STBG-related funds are programmed by WSDOT.
- Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funds are programmed by PRTPO onto regionally determined priorities. A smaller subset of TAP funds are programmed by WSDOT onto Safe Routes to Schools projects.

PRTPO also has a role in prioritizing projects to be considered for statewide competitive awards of Consolidated Grants funds for transit and special needs transportation projects but has no say in final funding decisions.

She explained how “local match” works, noting that especially in competitive statewide processes, extra points are awarded for exceeding the minimum match. Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) funds are the only federal funds that can be used to match a federal TAP or STBG grant.

Ms. Black talked about the challenges of using federal funds, noting that agencies often find that federal funds are easier to get than to spend. She reviewed what “project obligation” means, explaining that this is a complex process for certain types of projects and project phases. Missing deadlines can have serious consequences for the project sponsor and the region. This is tied closely to the STIP and was central to the previous discussion about amending the Clallam County project into the STIP at this time.

Federalizing a project – that is, putting any amount of federal funds onto a project – has consequences on the cost and schedule for project delivery. Care is needed to be sure that only appropriate projects are federalized. The Transportation Improvement Board rewards project applications that have no federal funds as a part of the funding package because of the effects on overall project delivery costs. Ideally projects would not have small amounts of federal funding as a part of their revenue package. PRTPO and its most rural partners only have small amounts of federal funding to award to priority projects so must be diligent in their programming efforts.

Ms. Black noted that some projects tend to be less complicated to obligate and administer than traditional capital construction projects. These include:

- Transit and vanpool vehicles, shelters, station area and curbside amenities
- Roadway resurfacing with the existing paved footprint for certain road types
- Transportation planning, plans, studies, and public engagement activities

In terms of upcoming federal funding opportunities, the Federal Lands Access Program is targeted to those facilities and services that provide access to federally managed lands, including the Olympic National Park and the National Forest as well as the region's military bases. Ms. Clark-Getzin noted that the next call for projects will be in May 2020. Ms. Black added that either she or Mr. Coviello are available to help PRTPO members interested in pursuing a FLAP grant to get information about the region and the regional plan that will help to make their applications more competitive.

The second federal funding opportunity coming up is a call for projects in early 2020 that the PRTPO Board will conduct for TAP grants. Ms. Black offered a high-level overview of the program, noting that it would be the subject of a more focused discussion in November.

Mr. Forte asked about the availability of TAP funds by year for the 2020 process and how that might affect a multi-year programming effort. The concern is that WSDOT may require funds associated with specific years to be obligated in that time frame. Vice-Chair Ashby concurred, noting that the region currently has a balance of 2019 and earlier funds that may be at risk if they are not programmed and obligated quickly. Mr. Coviello confirmed that there are carryover funds from earlier years that are not programmed onto any projects.

Ms. Black advised that the worst-case scenario for the region would be that PRTPO needs to program its allotted \$215,000 per year to hit annual targets. This scenario allows no flexibility for the region to identify a bigger project and direct multiple years of funding to it if desired. She said that she and Mr. Coviello are scheduling a sit-down meeting with Local Programs staff to talk about the PRTPO program and what opportunities exist given that the aggregate resources are so small. She added that these are questions that need to be ironed out before the TAC begins its process discussions in November.

Mr. Bateman spoke about the differences and similarities between the PE phase of projects and planning studies. He noted that much of what is accomplished in a PE phase can also be accomplished in some planning studies without triggering construction considerations the way that obligating a PE phase will do. Mr. Forte agreed, but noted that in past processes PRTPO had a policy that directed funding towards construction projects instead of planning studies. This policy would need to be revisited if the region's TAP program is to be more flexible in this regard.

Mr. Neatherlin asked about partnership projects with tribes, specifically whether the project must be on a facility that is part of the officially designated inventory of tribal roads in order for tribes to be able to use BIA funds on it. Chair Nesse clarified if this is a distinction between projects on trust lands (or reservation lands) versus fee lands. Mr. Neatherlin confirmed that this is a question about partnership projects located on fee lands and whether local and tribal partners can collaborate on these kinds of projects.

Chair Nesse explained that in order for a tribe to spend money on a project it must be on a facility identified on the tribe's roadway inventory with the BIA. That official inventory includes facilities that are on trust lands, fee lands, and lands the tribe has no control over at all. She used US 101 as an example, noting that the Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe includes parts of US 101 on its BIA inventory even though they don't own it, because of its

importance for essential access to the Tribe's cultural lands and facilities. Inventory roads are considered vital to each tribes' transportation system. This means that the Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe can spend its monies on US 101 and on county roads included on the inventory, in addition to the Tribe's own roads.

Mr. Garlington confirmed with Chair Nesse that the underlying ownership is not important so long as the facility itself is on a tribe's inventory. Chair Nesse confirmed that the tribe can spend funds on any road regardless of who owns it as long as the facility is identified on the tribe's BIA inventory. She explained that there is a process involved in this and the underlying government owner of the facility must formally concur with the requested designation. She added that tribes sometimes have access to revenues that counties, cities, or state don't have access to.

Mr. Neatherlin noted that if tribes can partner with local agencies using BIA funds to match TAP or STBG grants on inventory roads then it may open up new opportunities for collaboration and possibly help in future considerations about expanding trust lands. Ms. Black offered to get clarification from Local Programs on the ability of tribes to partner with local agencies on projects identified on the BIA inventory using BIA funds.

4. PRTPO Website Home Page Banner

Ms. Black explained that the PRTPO website needs to be updated with the new logo and that creates an opportunity for a quick refresh of the home page to better reflect the new organization. Lead Planning Agency staff in Kitsap Transit's graphic design department developed two concepts for consideration. One is similar to the old banner with a photo spread across the top. The other is a cleaner concept that prominently features the new logo. The graphic design team would like direction as to the Board's preference.

Members discussed what they like about the two concepts. They talked about the importance of getting the right image if a photo banner is used. It must be of a place within the region. The challenge comes in getting a single picture that truly represents the diversity of the region. A carousel of pictures is one option for addressing that in the future, but that is not practical on this old website platform.

Mr. Gay, attending as a member of the public, noted that in terms of clarity and ease of reading and orientation when first getting to the site, Option #1 works best. Others spoke of its cleanness and simplicity compared to the photo banner, which requires the PRTPO logo to be all in white.

There was discussion about coming up with some hybrid options, but members realized that the entire site will be overhauled in the not-too-distant future so that this will only be an interim banner. Spending additional time and resources to come up with hybrid options is not necessary now and so a vote was taken on the two options.

ACTION: Mr. Clauson moved, seconded by Vice-Chair Ashby, to approve Option #1 for the PRTPO website home page banner. Nine voted in favor of Option #1 and two dissented, preferring Option #2. Option #1 passed.

5. Draft Regional Transportation Plan 2040 Input and Response

Ms. Black introduced the discussion with an overview of the public engagement process, noting that a fifth meeting had been scheduled. It was a discussion with Mason County's TIP-CAP on October 9th. She reported that the TIP-CAP briefing had provided additional insights on the comments that had been received to date. For example, many of the public comments faulted the plan for being silent on climate change and the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. TIP-CAP members noted that divergent viewpoints around the region might not rally around climate change as a driving force, but they would be more likely to coalesce around the need

for system resiliency in the face of increasingly severe weather events, earthquakes, and tsunamis. The TIP-CAP briefing provided good context and balance in rounding out the comments.

Ms. Black advised that in light of the comments received and the substantive nature of the handful of topics, that it would be difficult to adequately address them in final edits to the existing draft plan. Incorporating them in a meaningful way would be a big undertaking. Few have been discussed by PRTPO in terms of regional issues and approaches. Much work would be needed to address them in more than a symbolic way.

Instead, she suggested the draft RTP speak to the regional significance of those big topics identified in this review process and use them to help frame PRTPO's regional transportation planning activities in 2020. Ms. Black noted that the Board will discuss the 2020 work program in more detail in November, but that this approach to responding to important issues identified in the draft plan review aligns with that planning process.

This approach would mean the Board receives a final draft plan to review and approve in November that looks substantially like the existing draft. The final draft would incorporate any corrections that have been identified by reviewers – typos and fixing small errors – and a substantive rewrite of chapter 7 that lays out the next steps and calling attention to these topics for follow-up. It would also include a new appendix that documents the public engagement process and comments and makes a link back to the next steps. The final draft for approval would make no effort to change the existing narrative in the body of the text to incorporate the big topics.

Mr. Forte sought clarification about how the big topics are characterized in terms of follow-up activities. They are input to that bigger strategic planning process; they are not the parameters for it. He cautioned care in how they are described in the chapter seven rewrite.

Ms. Black agreed fully and asked for future input if the language in any way conveys a determined outcome. The intent is to honor the public input and indicate in the plan how it will be used without predetermining what the outcome of that bigger regional process will be. Mr. Coviello added that it is input to that process with a clearly documented link back to the regional transportation plan and its public comments. The Board will be able to demonstrate how public input shaped its process going forward.

Mr. Neatherlin supported the approach to wrapping up the plan. He noted that making substantive changes would require going back out for public review which might entail more substantive changes before people feel the changes are adequate. Mr. Neatherlin explained that he read every comment, and encouraged everyone else to do as well. There are some big ideas worth looking at but there are also a lot of opinions. He likes the idea of letting the public know that they were heard and how their comments will be used but would not want to see the plan try to address all the opinions with actions.

Vice-Chair Ashby noted that a lot of work has gone into developing the plan. Making corrective edits is appropriate but trying to address substantive changes at this time is not appropriate in terms of cost or schedule. She supports the approach suggested for completing the plan.

Chair Nesse affirmed with Ms. Black that the final plan will comply with state requirements and expressed appreciation for the work that went into it. She noted that the Board will adopt it in November.

6. Planning for Effective Legislative Engagement as an RTPO

Ms. Black introduced the policy maker discussion by explaining that a regional legislative agenda is useful for educating and informing the region's legislators from the 23rd, 24th, 26th, and 35th Districts, all of whom are ex officio members of PRPTO. It helps them to understand regional transportation issues and priorities as they prepare for the upcoming session, and as they consider the effects of statewide policy and funding decisions on transportation and mobility concerns in the Peninsula region.

She explained that PRPTO has put together a project list and short list of topics the last couple of years. Today's discussion is to assess how the Board might approach that agenda this year. She added that this is fairly late in the year to be starting this discussion, reminding Board members that this will need to wrap up in November. Ideas may come up that point to strategies for next year. Insights and guidance now will help in developing an information sheet for this year and start thinking in advance about how to approach 2021.

Chair Nesse recalled that in years past a small group of Board members went to Olympia to meet with the region's legislators. She put this out there as a concept that may be worth considering.

Mr. Sullivan explained that years ago the PRPTO leadership team would go to Olympia to meet with the legislators. They would organize a meeting with the legislators over lunch, well before the session got underway in January, to talk about projects and other coordination needs. He said that the legislators, though busy, would always be willing to meet over lunch and appreciated the information they received. He noted that it demonstrated solidarity to the legislators and provided them with useful, easy to understand information. Key is getting it organized at the right time. Mr. Sullivan recalled the meeting being scheduled in late November.

Mr. Neatherlin reiterated the importance of knowing regional priorities and showing a unified front in talking with legislators about regional priorities. He pointed out the value of knowing regional priorities when individual Board members meet with their legislators about local needs. It demonstrates regional coordination, which they like to see. This coordination helps account for some of the big project successes in the past. A one-pager would be helpful. Mr. Neatherlin spoke in favor of collaboration and partnerships in getting things done in Olympia.

Chair Nesse agreed with the need for a one-pager. She floated the idea of trying to arrange a meeting outside of Olympia, perhaps inviting them to attend a PRPTO meeting or event.

Vice-Chair Ashby called attention to the content of the regional agenda, noting that in the past the region identified some projects and talked broadly about a few big things like ferry funding. What subjects should it address now? Should PRPTO just promote local agency projects? Should it address policy decisions the legislature may consider?

Discussion ensued about the most recent agenda and whether it can be a basis for the 2020 agenda. It is a short session and there is not a funding package on the near horizon. It may be most expedient to simply refresh the 2019 agenda for this year and take a more comprehensive look at the 2021 agenda. Mr. Sullivan observed that priorities may be different by the November meeting. The agenda may need to speak to Initiative 976.

Mr. Peach concurred with Mr. Sullivan's observation about the potential need to address I-976 impacts. He noted that if approved, it is due to go into effect December 15th. The region needs to ask the legislature what it is going to do. This engagement would give Board members information needed to advise constituents on the effects to local projects and services.

Ms. Black offered that in light of timing and uncertainties associated with I-976, staff will start with the most current version of the legislative agenda and freshen it up to reflect current conditions. Working with the Executive Committee, a draft handout will be developed and presented to the Board for discussion in November. Input at that time will be used to make final edits, and a 2020 PRTPO legislative agenda will be sent to all the members. They can be shared when local representatives meet with their legislators as well as distributed to other council members to highlight regional concerns.

She advised that it may be possible to schedule one or more meetings in the window between Thanksgiving and Christmas between the leadership team and legislators. Perhaps more important is the need to start thinking ahead to the 2021 agenda so that PRTPO takes a more deliberate approach to determining priorities and engaging with legislators on transportation issues.

Mr. Taylor reminded everyone that November 15 is the last Board meeting until February. Any decisions need to be made then. It is the last opportunity to get input and so materials need to be ready to review then.

Members supported the approach for organizing a 2020 agenda based on the 2019 format with input from the TAC and thinking ahead about a more strategic approach to the 2021 session, and agreed that election results may shift the focus of the message in this year's agenda.

7. PRTPO Coordination Update

Ms. Black reviewed topics addressed in her coordinator report, pointing out links to additional information and advising that it is intended to be an easily shared resource with staff or colleagues. She invited Board members to identify any items in the report to talk about further.

Mr. Neatherlin reported that 75-100 people attended the open house for the SR 3 Freight Corridor (Belfair Bypass) and explained how the most recent stakeholder meeting had such high levels of community attendance.

Mr. Neatherlin urged PRTPO support for the project that conforms to the existing project parameters, cautioning against looking beyond those parameters out of concern for jeopardizing project funding. He noted that in the future there may be opportunity to expand considerations regarding the new corridor and its function but that for now, it is well defined within the process. The goal right now is to get it under contract.

WSDOT is close to establishing the corridor alignment. There is a challenge at the north end due to the existing land use. It is a licensed marijuana grow facility, which greatly complicates the right-of-way acquisition process. The state is looking instead at realigning Lake Flora and bringing the intersection of Lake Flora and SR 3 further south.

Once the corridor is established there is still a process of restricting access to the new corridor. It is a legal process that takes time and is a part of the right-of-way acquisition process. These are some of the activities that have to be completed before the project can be put under contract.

Mr. Neatherlin commended WSDOT staff for their approach to working in Mason County and with his constituents.

Chair Nesse commented on the updated agenda format and meeting technology, and the efforts to reduce paper by not printing so many agenda packets. People participating remotely commented on the improved audio. Mr. Gray participated through the web-based meeting software and was able to follow along with the

presentations and discussion. Ms. Black advised that they are working to make remote participation a more meaningful process given the distances that people must travel with factors like weather conditions in mind.

8. Public Comments

Roger Gay from south Kitsap County addressed the Board on a few topics:

- Concerning alignment of the new SR 3 Freight Corridor, Mr. Gay likes realigning the new corridor as Mr. Neatherlin described. He spoke in favor of coordination with the Port of Bremerton on the extension of its Airport Road and the possibility of making connections between the two to create a really good freight corridor.
- PRTPO is a stealth organization. Mr. Gay has talked with people in Kitsap County government about the organization and what it does, and did not find much recognition of PRTPO. This was reflected in the low turnout at the RTP open house. He hopes to see more public participation in PRTPO activities in the future.
- He encouraged PRTPO to think more comprehensively about public engagement and what the public is being asked to contribute or respond to. Without more direction, the public doesn't know how to participate. If people participate and feel their comments have no value, they won't participate again.

9. PRTPO Member Updates

Mr. Bateman reported that Poulsbo is about to go out to bid on its segment of the SR 305 corridor project. This segment has been in the works since 1992. The roundabout element is funded with *Connecting Washington* funds.

Mr. Engel reported that WSDOT just hired Parametrix to design and manage construction of 22 fish passage barrier projects, most of which are in the Peninsula region. They expect to have projects out for bid within the year. Mr. Bateman commented that WSDOT might advise the consultants to coordinate with local agencies a little earlier than occurred on past projects to discuss planned detour routes and timing.

Mr. Clauson reported that WSDOT Public Transit Division has community liaisons around the state. The new liaison for the Peninsula region will be housed at Kitsap Transit.

Chair Nesse advised that the next Board meeting will be on November 15th at the Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe's facilities in Blyn and the next TAC meeting will be on November 7th at Kitsap Transit offices in Bremerton. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.