

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Board of Directors
December 2, 2014, 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 Jack Burkman on Tuesday, December 2, 2014, at 4:00 p.m. at the Clark County Public Service Center Sixth Floor Training Room, 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington. The meeting was recorded by CVTV. Attendance follows.

Voting Board Members Present:

Nancy Baker, Port of Vancouver Commissioner
Kelly Brooks, ODOT(Alternate)
Jack Burkman, Vancouver Council Member
Bart Gernhart, WSDOT (Alternate)
Jeff Hamm, C-TRAN Executive Director
David Madore, Clark County Commissioner
Tom Mielke, Clark County Commissioner
Ron Onslow, Ridgefield Mayor, (Alternate)
Larry Smith, Vancouver Council Member
Melissa Smith, Camas Council Member
Jeanne Stewart, Clark County Commissioner

Voting Board Members Absent:

Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor
Bill Ganley, Battle Ground Council Member
Doug McKenzie, Skamania Co. Commissioner
David Poucher, White Salmon Mayor
Don Wagner, WSDOT Regional Administrator
Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1 Manager

Nonvoting Board Members Present:

Nonvoting Board Members Absent:

Curtis King, Senator 14th District
Norm Johnson, Representative 14th District
Charles Ross, Representative 14th District
Don Benton, Senator 17th District
Paul Harris, Representative 17th District
Monica Stonier, Representative 17th District
Ann Rivers, Senator 18th District
Liz Pike, Representative 18th District
Brandon Vick, Representative 18th District
John Braun, Senator 20th District
Richard DeBolt, Representative 20th District
Ed Orcutt, Representative 20th District
Annette Cleveland, Senator 49th District
Jim Moeller, Representative 49th District
Sharon Wylie, Representative 49th District

Guests Present:

Gary Albrecht, Clark County
Ed Barnes, Citizen
Katy Brooks, Port of Vancouver
Eric Florip, The Columbian
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Council Member
Heath Henderson, Clark County
Karen Hengerer, Citizen
Roy Jennings, WA Transportation Commissioner
Lee L. Jensen, Citizen
Jim Karlock, Citizen
Dale Lewis, Rep. Herrera Beutler's office
John Ley, Citizen
Dick Malin, Citizen
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver Council
Bobbi Olson, Citizen
Patrick Sweeney, City of Vancouver
Sandra Towne, City of Vancouver
Steve Tubbs, Citizen
Damon Webster, MacKay Sposito
Bill Wright, Clark County

Staff Present:

Lynda David, Senior Transportation Planner
Mark Harrington, Senior Transportation Planner
Bob Hart, Transportation Section Supervisor
Matt Ransom, Executive Director
Dale Robins, Senior Transportation Planner
Diane Workman, Administrative Assistant

Chair Burkman welcomed newly elected Clark County Commissioner Jeanne Stewart. He also noted that Rian Windsheimer, who has been the alternate for ODOT, is now the primary member, and he welcomed Kelly Brooks, who is now the alternate.

II. Call for Public Comments

Karen Hengerer of Vancouver provided written copy and spoke to the RTP. She said the 2014 update is indicative of a thorough process and a great deal of work. However, she said an area of discussion that needs to take place is the increase in hazardous freight traffic on our rail lines and the impact on our region's transportation planning. Ms. Hengerer encouraged RTC to address this issue.

John Ley of Camas commented on the need for new bridges across the Columbia River. He referred to the Corridor Visioning Study, and said the solution is to move forward with an east county bridge.

Steve Tubbs of Vancouver provided written comments and had additional comments to the RTP. He said the Plan is good, but it needs to take a much broader view. Mr. Tubbs said planning efforts should include a commitment to materially reduce greenhouse gases.

Lee L. Jensen of Battle Ground referred to bridges over the Columbia River. He said the promoters of the east county bridge at 192nd have not consulted with the chambers of commerce or business groups on either side of the river concerning the feasibility of their proposal, and there has been no contact with WSDOT or ODOT. He said in order for a bridge to be built, both sides of the river have to want it and it has to be justifiable to each state's taxpayers. Portland has no need for a bridge at 192nd, and all roadways between I-205 and 192nd would require development. The majority of businesses on both sides of I-5 want it replaced at its current location, and it already has infrastructure supporting it on both sides of the river. The other bridge proposals do not have infrastructure. Mr. Jensen said the current location of the I-5 Bridge is the best location at this time.

Ed Barnes of Vancouver said there have been a number of accidents recently on the I-5 Bridge both northbound and southbound with several major injuries. The bridges need to be replaced. He said you can talk about building bridges in other locations, but that will not take care of the problems that are on I-5. Mr. Barnes said this affects the commuters, citizens, and freight, and an east county bridge will not help this. The I-5 Bridge needs to be replaced.

III. Approval of the Board Agenda

Chair Burkman said there has been a modification to the agenda which was distributed. It is a minor change to agenda item IX. The following was added for clarification: "*Further action will or will not be taken following the executive session.*"

MELISSA SMITH MOVED FOR APPROVAL TO AMEND THE CHANGES TO THE DECEMBER 2, 2014, MEETING AGENDA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY NANCY BAKER AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

LARRY SMITH MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE REVISED MEETING AGENDA FOR DECEMBER 2, 2014. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY RON ONSLOW AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

IV. Approval of the November 4, 2014, Minutes

LARRY SMITH MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 4, 2014, MEETING MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MELISSA SMITH AND APPROVED. JEANNE STEWART ABSTAINED.

V. Consent Agenda

A. December Claims

B. Disposition of Depreciated RTC Equipment, Resolution 12-14-22

LARRY SMITH MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA DECEMBER CLAIMS AND RESOLUTION 12-14-22. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY RON ONSLOW AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VI. 2015 RTC Work Program and Budget, Resolution 12-14-23

Matt Ransom referred to the resolution included in the meeting packet along with the 2014 Work Program that was presented to the Board at the November meeting. He said at the November meeting there was a good discussion of the Work Program. He said that dialog reinforced some of the emphasis areas for 2015 including freight.

Mr. Ransom highlighted the 2015 budget. He said most of the revenue that funds RTC's programs is derived from federal and state sources. These are grant contributions that come through the administration of the Regional Planning Program. In the 2015 budget, local dues paid by members participating in RTC remain unchanged. No change in the dues is anticipated. Other miscellaneous project fees are those that are charged to private consulting companies that seek our services and other special projects we might do on behalf of members and or private entities.

In terms of expenditures, RTC's budget in part is driven by the professional services that we offer. The special projects this next year have increased emphasis in our ITS and advanced traffic signal program (VAST) along with supplemental resources for the study of freight. The budget presented is constrained within the resources that RTC has available and is balanced on those merits.

Commissioner Stewart referred to the consultant item listed under the professional Services expenses. She questioned the change from \$93,000 in 2014 to \$174,000 in 2015, and asked if that was for the VAST program that was mentioned. Mr. Ransom said yes, primarily. He said they have a couple of contracts. One recently adopted by the Board is for asset management software and data collection for fiber assets to better understand what is available in the regions network. Also included is the program management for VAST. That includes consulting services to help update our strategic plan for ITS. RTC does not have the specialty services in house, so it is hired out.

Commissioner Stewart said the listing of miscellaneous registration and tuition went from \$3,000 to \$15,500 and asked if that was for staff development. Mr. Ransom said that was correct. He said in years past, they have constrained ability to train staff and register them for programs. This is recommending an increase in that in order to keep skills up to date. They try to keep

training regional to the extent that it is available. If there is opportunity in traffic modeling for instance, that is of a national scale, it is important to attend that.

LARRY SMITH MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 12-14-23 FOR THE 2015 RTC WORK PROGRAM AND BUDGET. MELISSA SMITH SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VII. Regional Transportation Plan for Clark County – 2014 Update, Resolution 12-14-24

Matt Ransom said staff is pleased to present this for the Board's consideration. This is a culmination of over a year of effort for all members around the table. The RTP was presented on the agenda every month this year except May and June. The Board's input in terms of policy and strategy has helped refine the Plan being considered. A Memo was handed out with a record of supplemental comments that were received. Comments included in Appendix M of the document are those public comments received before RTC Board packets were distributed on November 25, 2014. Additional comments received in the past week between the time of the RTC Board packet distribution and today were attached to the Memo and will be appended to the RTP's Appendix M. The memo also lists the disposition of the SEPA checklist process which concluded with no substantive comments received.

Mr. Ransom offered observations that he saw that are three-fold. In looking at the governing documents to the RTC, and in the Intergovernmental Agreement in 1992, it describes some of the duties of the RTC. One of those duties is to prepare a Regional Transportation Plan and that that Plan be consistent with local plans, state plans, transit plans, etc. Mr. Ransom said in accordance with one of the duties they have as an organization that the plan presented is consistent and complies with that duty and requirement.

Under State Statute, one of the duties as a Regional Transportation Planning Organization is to prepare a Regional Transportation Plan. Again, those Plans described in State Statute should be consistent under the Growth Management Act with local, state, and transit plans, etc. This Plan is consistent under those merits.

Under the Federal layer of Metropolitan Planning Organizations, there is a requirement under Federal Statute that the local plans be consulted with, that we partner with members and local agencies, and that there is some relationship to the community growth plan and development plan. Mr. Ransom said the Plan presented is consistent and honors those requirements. There has been consultation around the table with members as well as member representatives on the technical advisory committee.

Mr. Ransom said the RTP presented is consistent across these merits and ready for the Boards review and consideration. He said the public comments received this year are many and important. He said they have done their best to consider and address them. Mr. Ransom said the Plan is not permanent. They review it about every two years, and will be back in 2016 at this same juncture. He said things may have changed, projects might have been developed, and they are prepared and need to be responsive. Mr. Ransom said Lynda David would provide a brief report.

Lynda David referred to the RTP resolution in the meeting packets as well as the full draft Plan that was provided to members. Ms. David said that after over a year's work, the RTC Board is

being asked to consider adoption of the 2014 update to the Regional Transportation Plan for the Clark County region. At the November meeting, the Board had opportunity to review the Plan's draft. Since then, RTC has received a significant number of public comments which are incorporated into the Plan itself in Appendix M with their disposition noted. For the additional comments received since the draft Plan was distributed to the RTC Board last week, a Memo summarizing these additional comments and their disposition was distributed to members.

Adoption of Resolution 12-11-24 will enable RTC to forward the Plan to the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration. These two Administrations would need to give their approval of the Plan's air quality conformity determination.

As with the 2011 version of the RTP, this draft Plan has been developed to be best accessed electronically so the reader can link to additional information and Plans related to this Regional Transportation Plan.

At last month's meeting, they considered what has changed since the RTP was last adopted back in December 2011. They feel these changes need to be reflected with a 2014 Regional Transportation Plan update.

First MAP-21, the current Federal Transportation Act, was passed in July 2012. Ms. David said this Act sets the stage to move us toward transportation performance measurement and monitoring together with the setting of performance targets which our transportation investments should help us to achieve. The federal rulemaking associated with MAP-21 has not progressed as quickly as they had anticipated at the outset of this Plan update, but it nevertheless sets the way forward for full MAP-21 implementation.

In 2013, an updated transportation Urban Area Boundary was set in place resulting from the 2010 federal census. The new Urban Area Boundary is shown on page 40 of the draft Plan. The Urban Area Boundary affects allocation of transportation funding to the region as well as the federal functional classification of roads. With passage of MAP-21, the National Highway System was updated to include all interstates, expressways, and additionally, all principal arterials as noted on page 38 of the draft Plan.

In 2014, the Washington State Transportation Commission has been working on updating the Washington Transportation Plan with the updated Plan nearing completion. Both the Washington Transportation Plan and our Regional Transportation Plan updates focus on policy issues surrounding transportation system finance and how the transportation system can support economic development for both the State and this region.

In August 2012, the Washington Office of Financial Management updated population forecasts for counties in Washington State. The RTC Board chose to base this Regional Transportation Plan update on the mid-range OFM population forecast for year 2035 of 562,207 people in Clark County by 2035; a 29% growth from 2013.

Ms. David said Plans are continually evolving and developing. Washington State's Growth Management Act requires plan consistency between state, region, and local efforts, and this RTP update notes the beginning of Clark County's Comprehensive Plan update and commits to continued collaboration between planning partners. Ms. David noted that another reason to update the RTP is to update hyperlinks to other plans and information useful to readers who

access the RTP electronically. Many Plans have been updated and links changed from the previous 2011 Plan, and this keeps RTC's Plan as current as possible.

The RTP update has been a year-long process as noted earlier. Ms. David provided a slide that summarized some of the key elements of the 2014 RTP update and the Plan chapters in which the key elements are addressed. Elements include update to the RTP's financial plan in chapter 4, the 2014 Safety Assessment adopted by the Board in April of this year as outlined in the RTP's Chapter 5, and updates to the Plan addressing the current status of plans for Transportation System Management and Operations together with an updated list of projects and strategies to address transportation system needs.

The Regional Transportation Plan is the long-range, 20-plus year plan for the region's transportation system. It is required by federal laws as a condition for receipt of federal transportation funding to this region and is also a requirement of state law. The Plan must be regularly updated, must be multi-modal, fiscally constrained, and maintain consistency between federal, state, and local plans. While acknowledging the policy directives of federal and state laws, the RTP development process really begins with local jurisdictions.

RTC takes local comprehensive plans as the basis for the RTP as well as local capital facilities plans. In turn, the RTP can also help to inform the next local Comprehensive Plan updates. Transportation Projects and Strategies in these local plans are incorporated into the Regional Transportation Plan.

Chapter 5 of the Plan addresses regional transportation programs, strategies and projects for meeting future transportation needs. These include a range of operational improvements identified in the Transportation System Management and Operations Plan, modal treatments, and highway capacity projects.

One of the most important RTP elements is the list of projects. Projects must be identified in the RTP before they can be programmed for funding in the Transportation Improvement Program (or TIP). Project lists are included in Appendix B of the Plan, and the regional project list is also included in Chapter 5. Project locations are shown on the map.

The projects' list is a compilation of projects that have been identified through corridor and sub-area planning studies as well as operational analysis and are identified in WSDOT's Highway System Plan, Local Capital Facilities Plans, Local Transportation Improvement Programs, and C-TRAN's Transit Development Plan. Regional project costs for projects in Clark County amount to about \$1.8 billion in current dollars.

During the course of the 2014 RTP's development, RTC has provided for public participation in a variety of ways. Outreach has included web-based information provided on RTC's website, an April workshop and two open houses (one in early September and another on November 19), citizen comment time at monthly RTC Board meetings with all comments at these meetings becoming part of the meeting record recorded in Board meeting minutes. There has been communication and meetings with organizations, neighborhood alliances and business groups, as well as media releases, and there have been additional opportunities for comment including electronically. Public comments received by RTC and their disposition are documented in the RTP's Appendix M. The most recent comments are reported in the addendum to Appendix M in

the distributed Memo. Altogether, RTC received over 170 comments on the Plan, most focused on cross-river travel. In addition to these comments, they have also relied on representatives of local jurisdictions bringing any issues from their public to the attention of the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC).

Ms. David said as part of the RTP review process, the draft Plan was reviewed by the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee at its November 21 meeting. At that November meeting, RTAC recommended RTC Board action to adopt the 2014 Plan update. Therefore, the action requested today is for the RTC Board to adopt the 2014 update to the Regional Transportation Plan for Clark County.

Commissioner Madore said that he sees the individual pieces that each jurisdiction has added to the Plan. He asked about bi-state concurrency and our role to consider cross-river connections.

Matt Ransom said yes, that part of the statute in a bi-state region would be to coordinate with our partners, which include Metro, the equivalent MPO in Oregon. Part of that coordination occurs at this table through their membership on RTC, and RTC has the same in Oregon at JPACT. The Bi-State Coordination Committee meeting in May took up an issue of Bi-State river crossings and recommended at that meeting the continued inclusion in Metro's RTP and the same for RTC's of improvements on the I-5 corridor. Relative to consistency, we are consistent under federal rules for bi-state coordination.

Commissioner Madore asked if there was anything in our future where there would be dialogue at this table to discuss if we are meeting the needs for bi-state concurrency. Chair Burkman said at last month's meeting, Commissioner Madore raised the question around the Transportation Corridors Visioning Study. Chair Burkman said we had said that we would bring that back for discussion of how we want to approach that. That is the last activity around cross-river traffic and alternatives identified in that study. He said that is to be brought back as a refresher of the study, since it has been a number of years since it was undertaken.

Commissioner Madore said this 20-year Plan does not have any bi-state concurrency. Chair Burkman said the Plan does address bi-state concurrency. It reflects the priority of this organization addressing bi-state issues associated with the I-5 corridor as the top priority and that continues in the Plan. It does not preclude adding others in the future, but there are no other projects that have been defined that this organization has worked through and said that we want as a priority.

Matt Ransom referred to the Strategic component listed in Appendix I on page 252 that identifies issues of strategic significance that are not ready for specific project inclusion in this RTP, but are presented for strategic identification. One of those areas of strategic interest is High Capacity Transit system implementation, which goes back to the RTC study of High Capacity Transit System Routes, BRT routes as well as other corridors. Because only one HCT project has been programmed for funding within the region, other corridors would need further discussion before a project is included in the RTP. Under the Corridor Visioning Study, there is discussion that further review is needed and strategic dialogue around that and the recommendations that were contained in that identified on page 255. Mr. Ransom said on pages 256 and 257, they tried to enumerate a discussion around how to engage in a dialog around those strategic issues of bi-state crossings. It is a strategic issue that needs conversation. The Work Program for 2015 is

programed to include a specific discussion in the first quarter, in part on recent advisory votes, a refresher on the Corridor Visioning Study, what it was, and what the next steps were recommended. Regionally, there is a conversation about that, and it is strategic. Around the RTC table is where that conversation can occur, among other places of local government. For the purposes of regional planning, the RTC is that forum designed for that. Mr. Ransom said that is why it is in the Strategic Plan at this point. It is identified as an issue.

Chair Burkman directed members to page 254. He said it talks about the Corridor Visioning Study, and that the map is not an adopted plan, that all corridors would require further study before any are added to the fiscally constrained RTP or the local comprehensive plan. The study recommended that regional (Clark County and Oregon) land use planning review and analysis is needed prior to further review of potential new crossings of the Columbia River, to gauge whether future growth forecasts warrant such a project discussion. Chair Burkman said that lays the groundwork for the next steps that we take, because it is a multi-step process.

Commissioner Madore said he assumes that will be brought forward at several meetings in 2015 to address this. Mr. Ransom said that was correct. He said that they identified it in the RTP, and most of the comments that came in were related to a river crossing. He said a river crossing is of great interest to this community, and we have an obligation as the MPO in Clark County and our partners across the river the same to continue to have dialogue and productive discussion around those issues. Mr. Ransom said they are long term in nature, strategic maybe even beyond 20 years. He said in 2015, the discussion should be opened up again for those topics. He said he is prepared to bring to the Board the Corridor Visioning Study.

Chair Burkman said when the Transportation Corridors Visioning Study was conducted, it included a couple subcommittees, one with technical staff and one with policy makers. That provided the ability to have conversations and report back to the Board. The study was a year-long effort with many meetings.

Commissioner Madore said they could begin with the 2008 Study, look at those next steps, and build on that direction.

Mr. Ransom said they will look at what the study was, what the recommendations were, and continue to have dialogue around that issue. Chair Burkman also noted that the study was just before the recession hit us, and there might be some changes that might occur.

RON ONSLOW MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 12-14-24 FOR THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN FOR CLARK COUNTY 2014 UPDATE. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY LARRY SMITH, AND THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VIII. Other Business

From the Board

Chair Burkman said the RTC Bylaws state that we will have an annual meeting in December of every year, and this is that annual meeting. It also states that during the annual meeting, we will elect officers. The officers take their positions at the next meeting. A memorandum was distributed regarding the election of RTC Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary, and Treasurer. The

Executive Director is the Secretary and Treasurer. Chair Burkman called for nominations for RTC Chair for 2015.

NANCY BAKER NOMINATED MELISSA SMITH FOR RTC CHAIR. DAVID MADORE NOMINATED JEANNE STEWART FOR RTC CHAIR.

There were no more nominations, and nominations were closed and open for discussion. Commissioner Mielke said traditionally, the Vice Chair has moved into the Chair position.

A ROLL CALL VOTE WAS TAKEN FOR THE FIRST PERSON NOMINATED FOR RTC 2015 CHAIR, MELISSA SMITH. THE MOTION PASSES WITH 8 YES: BAKER, BROOKS, BURKMAN, GERNHART, ONSLOW, L. SMITH, M. SMITH, AND STEWART, 2 NO: MADORE AND MIELKE, AND 1 ABSTAIN: HAMM.

MELISSA SMITH NOMINATED JACK BURKMAN AS RTC 2015 VICE CHAIR. TOM MIELKE NOMINATED JEANNE STEWART FOR VICE CHAIR.

There were no more nominations, and nominations were closed and open for discussion.

A ROLL CALL VOTE WAS TAKEN FOR THE FIRST PERSON NOMINATED FOR VICE CHAIR, JACK BURKMAN. THE MOTION PASSES WITH 7 YES: BAKER, BROOKS, BURKMAN, GERNHART, ONSLOW, L. SMITH, AND M. SMITH, 3 NO: MADORE, MIELKE, AND STEWART, AND 1 ABSTAIN: HAMM.

JEANNE STEWART NOMINATED THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO SERVE AS THE 2015 RTC SECRETARY, AND IT WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

JEANNE STEWART NOMINATED THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO SERVE AS THE 2015 RTC TREASURER, AND IT WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

From the Director

Mr. Ransom referred to the memorandum included in the meeting materials regarding the Transportation Improvement Board Project Selection. He said they were notified by the Transportation Improvement Board (TIB) of several local jurisdictions that were awarded grant funds through the 2014 project selection process, so congratulations go out. The TIB is funded through a set aside of gas tax funds. They primarily fund arterial, preservation, upgrade projects. Regionally, this is one of our critical funding resources that is a select grant program at the state level. Mr. Ransom noted those projects, dollars awarded, and jurisdictions: South Parkway Avenue Improvement/Battle Ground; NE 99th Street and SR-503 Intersection/Clark County; 32nd Street and Evergreen Boulevard Intersection/Washougal; Highway 99, NE 63rd Street to NE 78th Street/Clark County; and SE Evergreen Way, Evergreen Market Place to 34th Street/Washougal. These projects in total are \$7.2 million awarded to Clark County. Mr. Ransom said they are very pleased to secure these funds and bring this money back to our region. These projects are important to both the jurisdictions and the regional system. Mr. Ransom also noted that they hoped the legislature continues to authorize that set aside for TIB. It is a critical program for us here locally and regionally.

Mr. Ransom said the next Bi-State Coordination Committee meeting is Tuesday, December 9 at 8:30 a.m. at the Vancouver Community Library. The agenda is to discuss some regional values work, the 500K Voices work that the Community Foundation and other entities funded to gauge

what the values and interests are here in SW Washington. This is important to Bi-State relationships between here and Oregon. As noted, C-TRAN Board of Directors meets Tuesday, December 9, 2014, at 5:30 p.m. at the Vancouver Community Library, and JPACT meets Thursday, December 11, 2014, at Metro at 7:30 a.m.

Mr. Ransom said also included in the meeting packet was a copy of RTC's 2014 Annual Report. This is the first time that RTC has published an Annual Report like this to celebrate the work that is done among all the members across the three-county area. This is not only for the Board or members' benefit, but also the public benefit to get a sense of the work that RTC does and has completed this year. Mr. Ransom said in discussing with staff, the Regional Planning Program this last year has probably been as robust as it has ever been, between the RTP update, Human Services Plan, and many more listed that the Board has adopted. He thanked all member agencies for their support in helping deliver that program. RTC continues to provide very robust technical services and they are getting smarter with their data warehousing of traffic counts and working with local members through the ITS program. Mr. Ransom said they have made major strides forward this year in their communications systems, first with the Website that was launched earlier this year. He noted that during the RTP public comment process, staff commented that never in an RTP update has the organization received that many comments. Most of the comments came through the Web comment interface. He said that is a good indicator and indicative of us trying to deploy better use of technology. People are engaging with us through that media tool, and looking into 2015 and future years, we need to try to expand the use of that. That is how people want to engage with us, not necessarily showing up here for a meeting, but engaging through the media outlets that we have access to. Mr. Ransom said they are off to a good start. Mr. Ransom said they would distribute the 2014 Annual Report to all members and stakeholders.

Jack Burkman thanked staff for the Annual Report. He said he has looked at the electronic version and encouraged others to look at the electronic version as well. He said staff has done a great job with the report. He said this is the first time that he has seen in one place in a handful of pages all the various documents, and it gives a context of how many different pieces of work that this organization completes. With links to all the documents, you can go as deep as you want to go. Chair Burkman asked if it could be listed on our home page so it is prominent. Mr. Ransom said this is the first year that this has been deployed as a tool. He said in years past, it was a long written list; now, it is in a reader friendly format and has hyperlinks to each document. They will post it on the home page, and over time, they plan to have a library of the resources so people have access to the information.

The next RTC Board Meeting will be held on Tuesday, January 6, 2015, at 4:00 p.m. at the Clark County Public Service Center 6th Floor Training Room.

IX. Executive Session, Executive Director Report and Evaluation (15 minutes)
(Further action will/will not be taken following the executive session)

The meeting was adjourned to Executive Session at 5:15 p.m. for 15 minutes. The time was then extended for 15 more minutes. The meeting reconvened at 5:45 p.m.

X. Executive Director Agreement, Resolution 12-14-25

Chair Burkman said they have discussed the Executive Director's report and evaluation. They have a proposed contract and a resolution that authorizes the RTC Chair to sign the employment agreement with the Executive Director. Following their discussions, they have some changes to the agreement. The changes were presented to the Board for inclusion in the final employment agreement. In addition to the revised employment agreement terms, Chair Burkman said there are a few formatting changes. Approval of Resolution 12-14-25 would authorize the RTC Chair to sign the employment agreement with Mr. Ransom.

LARRY SMITH MOTIONED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 12-14-25. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MELISSA SMITH.

Jeff Hamm noted the good job that Mr. Ransom has done over the past year. Chair Burkman said that Mr. Ransom had some big shoes to fill after Dean Lookingbill left the organization he had set up. He said Mr. Ransom has done an outstanding job in keeping the organization intact and helping it moving forward. Larry Smith also thanked Mr. Ransom for his good work, diligence, and experience he has; it is appreciated. Jeanne Stewart said she has worked with Mr. Ransom for multiple years, and said he does a very good job of understanding when the elected officials and transportation professional make a point and grasping the interest that they have and the importance of it. She said that is a refreshing and helpful characteristic that he has, and it takes a long time to develop. Ron Onslow said what Commissioner Stewart just said rings true, especially when it comes to communication with the small communities. He said they really rely on the open communication to be able to get the answers that they need to understand what the process is. Mr. Onslow said he appreciated that and Mr. Ransom's openness with them.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

LARRY SMITH MOTIONED FOR ADJOURNMENT. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MELISSA SMITH AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Melissa Smith, Board of Directors Chair