OZARKS TRANSPORTATION ORGANIZATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING MINUTES

October 18, 2012

The Board of Directors of the Ozarks Transportation Organization met at its scheduled time of 12:00 p.m. in the Ozarks Transportation Organization Large Conference Room, in Springfield, Missouri.

The following members were present:

Mr. Harold Bengsch, Greene County Mr. Jim Krischke, City of Republic (a) Mr. Brian Bingle, City of Nixa (a) Mr. Aaron Kruse, City of Battlefield Mr. Steve Bodenhamer, City of Strafford (a) Mr. Lou Lapaglia, Christian County Mr. Phil Broyles, City of Springfield (a) Mr. Bradley McMahon, FHWA

Mr. Jerry Compton, City of Springfield (Chair) Ms. Robin Robeson, City Utilities Mr. Tom Finnie, Citizen-at-Large Mr. Dan Salisbury, MoDOT (a) Mr. J. Howard Fisk, Citizen-at-Large Mr. Jim Viebrock, Greene County Mr. Nick Heatherly, City of Willard (a) Mr. Brian Weiler, Airport Board (a)

1. *Denotes alternate given voting privileges as a substitute for voting member not present*

The following members were not present:

Mr. Mokhtee Ahmad, FTA Mr. Tom Keltner, City of Willard

Ms. Becky Baltz, MoDOT Mr. Bill Kirkman, City Utilities (a) Mr. Thomas Bieker, City of Springfield (a) Ms. Susan Krieger, City of Strafford

Mr. Shawn Billings, City of Battlefield (a) Mr. Steve Meyer, City of Springfield (a) Mr. Richard Bottorf, Airport Board Mr. Shane Nelson, City of Ozark

Mr. Brian Buckner, City of Republic Mr. John Rush, City of Springfield Mr. Steve Childers, City of Ozark (a) Mr. Mark Schenkelberg, FAA

Mr. Sam Clifton, City of Nixa Mr. Tim Smith, Greene County (a) Mr. John Elkins, Citizen-at-Large (a) Mr. Bob Stephens, City of Springfield Ms. Teri Hacker, Citizen-at-Large

Others Present: Ms. Sara Fields, Mr. Curtis Owens, Ms. Natasha Longpine, Ozarks Transportation Organization; Mr. Dan Smith, Greene County Highway Department; Ms. Stacy Burks, Senator Roy Blunt’s Office; Mr. Frank Miller, MoDOT; Mr. Ray Weter, Christian County; Ms. Cinda Rodgers, Cinda Rodgers, CPA; Mr. Keith Ray Mackie, Missouri Senator Bob Dixon’s Office.

Mr. Compton called the meeting to order at 12:04 p.m.
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###### Administration

* 1. **Introductions**
  2. **Approval of Board of Directors Meeting Agenda**

Mr. Weiler made the motion to approve the October 18, 2012 Board of Directors

Meeting Agenda. Mr. Lapaglia seconded and the motion was approved unanimously.

###### Approval of the August 16, 2012 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Broyles made the motion to approve the August 16, 2012 Meeting Minutes. Mr.

Lapaglia seconded and the motion was approved unanimously.

###### Public Comment Period

None

###### Executive Director’s Report

Ms. Fields informed the Board that Safe Routes to School applications are due

November 5. Safe Routes to School funding is 100 percent whereas Enhancement funding is 80/20. Staff recommends submitting projects for both types of funding if eligible. OTO will have Enhancement and Transportation Alternatives Funding available December 14. This due date provides enough time for agencies to submit applications. This timeline allows for ONEDOT approval by April with construction in 2014 and 2015.

OTO is developing an On-System Bridge application cycle. Qualifying bridges need to be deficient and on the federal-aid system as a collector or higher. Staff has shared a list of qualifying bridges with the Technical Committee and Ms. Fields offered to share this with the Board if there was interest.

Applications for federal functional classification systems have been made available and are due October 31. These applications are requested once a year.

Staff attended a FHWA roundtable meeting in Jefferson City to discuss fiscal constraint and the planning process. FHWA appeared impressed with how OTO conducts the planning process. Discussion also included how OTO projects funding figures for the Transportation Improvement Program.

The Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission was in Springfield in September. The Chamber hosted the event with Springfield, Greene County, and OTO. One of the issues discussed was MoDOT’s customer survey, which had positive results.

Staff continues to attend training, including webinars on MAP-21. Though information is being continually released, a lot is still unknown, especially regarding the funding for the Springfield area TMA. Staff has attended training on congestion

management in Fayetteville, Arkansas, as well as MPO training and modeling training.

Staff worked with a consultant to conduct travel time runs. Those results are expected in November. These factor into the congestion management process which will compare how the roadways are performing compared to four years ago.

The web-based Transportation Improvement Program has been developed and staff is currently entering data.

There is an upcoming meeting on the Cheyenne/CC intersection improvements, as well as a meeting for James River Freeway and the Campbell Avenue corridor.

The OTO has hired a new staff member. Melissa Richards is the multi-media coordinator for OTO. She will be working on the OTO public input process, as well as OTO’s electronic and web presence.

###### Legislative Reports

Ms. Burks stated that there was not much new news to share. MAP-21 is an

authorizing bill not an appropriations bill. The 6 month extension does not include MAP-21 increases in funding. Those levels will not be enjoyed until the time a new appropriations bill is out. In terms of the “fiscal cliff” and the sequestration, much of the Highway reauthorization money or MAP-21 will not be touched. Additional money from general revenue that will be transferred to the Federal Highway Trust fund might be subject to cuts.

###### New Business

* 1. **Amendment Number One to the FY 2013-2016 TIP**

Ms. Longpine stated that there are four items included in the amendment. The first one is to update the Route 65/Battlefield Interchange project to reflect the cost share agreements and to program the construction. The design was included in the TIP before, so this increases the total programmed amount to $13 million. The East Chestnut Expressway railroad overpass is also being updated to reflect the cost share agreements. That project is a little over $11 million. The Route 65 south bound bridge over I-44 has been updated to show an earmark received totaling $166,000. Route 160 and Hunt Road Intersection is another cost share that is being updated, where Willard is providing $21,000 for a total project cost of $614,000.

Mr. Bengsch made the motion to approve Amendment Number One to the FY 2013- 2016 TIP. Mr. Lapaglia seconded and the motion was carried unanimously.

###### STP-Urban Report

Ms. Longpine stated that there is an updated STP-Urban Balance Report. The report

is prepared every year to reflect the amount of funding that is coming in and what has been obligated by the jurisdictions. MoDOT has a policy whereby the OTO is allowed to accumulate up to three years of funding before it is subject to rescission by

MoDOT. This policy allows OTO to use future cost shares toward meeting that goal. Accounting for cost shares, OTO’s balance is just over $2 million. Without considering cost shares, the overall balance is just over $20 million. The issue is that the federal government can rescind unobligated funding at any time. So even though the funds are safe on the MoDOT side, the reports are prepared to show the total balance subject to rescission.

Mr. McMahon stated that in regards to the Federal Highway Administration direction concerning rescissions there can be some discussion about that. It is the MoDOT policy, and it is not clear that is the federal law. Ms. Longpine stated that Congress can pass a rescission at anytime and that is why jurisdictions are encouraged to obligate the funds.

Mr. Broyles wanted to clarify that any funds that MoDOT has committed does not expire in three years. If MoDOT is obligated to do a project with the county, city or otherwise then that funding is still there for that purpose.

Mr. McMahon stated that obligation verbiage means that the project is placed under a federal-aid project agreement. Federal Highway has authorized the work with that action as well as obligated the funds. Then it is billed against for reimbursement. The obligation is an action in the management system where the money is locked down and then the work can be done and reimbursed. Up until that time it is only available to be programmed, that is why obligation is emphasized.

###### Air Quality Report

Ms. Longpine provided an update to the Board of Directors on the air quality for the past year. Ozone season officially concludes at the end of October, but the high values for the year have likely been reached given the weather in the summer. The OTO region had some really good years the past few years. The standard is set at 75 ppb and for the previous two years the OTO’s annual readings were 67 and 69. This summer there were some really hot days which affect the local ozone levels the most. The current 3-year design value actually bumped up to 74, which is one point away from the standard. The number for this specific year was actually 80, which for next year means that the OTO cannot go over 71. The OTO is keeping an eye on the situation. EPA might not designate non-attainment during off review years so that gives the OTO some time to move back into attainment, if the weather cooperates. The OTO embarked on an EPA program called Ozone Advance. This is a voluntary program where the EPA works with the OTO region in trying to work on voluntary strategies to keep ozone levels down. This can impact whether the region is considered in non-attainment.

###### Bicycle Pedestrian Plan Implementation Report

Ms. Longpine stated that the agenda includes a report on the implementation

activities over the fiscal year. This report is produced annually and includes not just what the OTO works on, but what each of the communities in the OTO region is

working toward in implementing the overall Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. The report outlines the goals and priorities that were included in the Journey 2035. It groups the accomplishments by the five E’s, which are included in the Safe Routes to School Program. It is also part of the Bicycle Friendly Communities Program. The five E’s stand for engineering, evaluation, enforcement, education, and encouragement. There is a lot that has gone on under engineering this year, including trails and sidewalks in the various communities. Springfield has done a lot with bicycle lanes this year. The Link is near implementation for the northern section. Evaluation includes Bike/Ped plan updates by both the OTO and the City of Springfield.. Under Enforcement there was a course offered for the Springfield Police Officers. Education and encouragement encompasses Safe Routes to School and the “Lets Go Smart Springfield” program that Terry Whaley presented to the Board of Directors a couple of months ago. Additional work through the Ozarks Greenways and STAR Team and then numerous events in the area encourage people to get out and be active and use the infrastructure for transportation.

Mr. Compton stated that there seemed to be confusion with the public on the sharrows, in particular the Sunset sharrow. People are reluctant to drive in those lanes and as Campbell is approached there are sharrows in both lanes. He inquired if there was any public education campaign planned. Mr. Broyles agreed that it was probably something that the City of Springfield’s Public Works should do. There is a difference between a bike lane and sharrow. People need to understand that when the end of the bike lane comes into an intersection that cars and bikes need to share the lane. Mr. Compton reiterated that cars seem reluctant to use the lanes since they are unsure what it is about.

###### Audit Report

Ms. Cinda Rodgers thanked the Board of Directors for the opportunity to serve as

auditor this year. The object of the audit was to opine that the financial statements are fairly stated in accordance with the basis of accounting. It is not a fraud audit or an internal control audit. These items are considered in the course of the audit but are not the primary focus of the audit. There are a lot of misunderstandings on the kind of audit performed here since there are many of types of audits. She stated that she was not an IRS auditor.

Ms. Rodgers reviewed the Independent Auditor’s Report. The opinion is unqualified which is the best opinion that can be given by the auditor. There are not qualifications on the auditor’s opinion of the financial statements which are considered a clean opinion. The OTO financials are based on a modified cash basis of accounting. It is a cash basis with a couple of modifications and those are in-kind and also a couple of small liabilities that are presented on the balance sheet. Otherwise cash is the basis. The reason for the cash basis is that it is simpler to understand. It is simpler for the Board of Directors to understand and the citizens to understand. It also reduces the cost and the audit fees, it keeps things simpler.

Ms. Rodgers pointed out that the balance sheet is in an unusual format which is unique to the governmental area. There are basically two different balance sheets. It

is required to present a statement of net assets and a fund balance sheet, which this page presents both. If the OTO was on the accrual basis there would be some differences between these two. That is the reason for the adjustment column on the page. The two are presented on a slightly different basis and those differences are reported as adjustments. There are no differences on those two statements because of the modified cash basis but it still is required to be shown. The cash basis balance sheet does not have a lot to be shown. It shows the cash, and the organization has opted to include some payables, specifically the credit card payable. The equity is basically cash with a small adjustment for the liability.

The Income Statement is in two different statements as well. The audit requires a governmental-wide statement and also a fund statement. The OTO only has one fund so both statements are the same. There are no adjustments since the OTO is on a modified cash-basis. The bottom line is that revenues exceeded expenses by $29,000 for the fiscal year.

The notes to the financial statements are standard notes that are required to be put in by the type of audit. The notes offer additional explanations on various things in the financial statements and various policies behind the financial statements. If there is a question on the financial statements the notes can be looked at for additional details. There is a budgetary comparison schedule which looks good; with the main point being the OTO is under budget.

This is the first year the OTO had an A-133 audit. This is the schedule of expenditures of federal awards, so basically it just shows any federal grants and any amounts expended under those grants. The OTO had one grant and it was over

$500,000, which is when the single audit kicks in. There have been questions about what an A-133 means. An organization may have several grants from several different federal agencies each having their own audit requirements The organization may also be required to have a financial statement audit. They are combined into a single audit. The auditor may look at several programs. In this case there is only one program. The single audit requires that the auditor test compliance with the federal program, federal grant and the internal controls over compliance. Mr. Krischke had inquired about which areas of compliance were tested. OMB lists 14 general areas of compliance for federal grants. The auditor determines what areas apply to the grant. The areas that were tested were activities allowed. Basically, whether the OTO spending is the money on what the organization said it would spend the federal money on. Allowable costs are the amounts that are spent under the grant and are reviewed to see that they are properly documented and authorized.

Another area examined is cash management, which tests to see if the organization is sitting on funds for a long period of time in the case of cash advances. The funds should be spent quickly. Also reviewed is equipment and road property management. The main thing looked at is if federal funds are spent to buy equipment and the rules regarding the disposal of the equipment, and the organization’s compliance with the rules. The audit also considered the matching funds and requirements. The amounts that the OTO claimed as matching funds were examined to see that the use was

appropriate. Procurement compliance was another area that was reviewed. The question was if the procurement procedures were appropriate and was the organization following the procedures and the reporting requirements.

The audit also includes a report required under government auditing standards showing compliance, not necessarily with federal grants, but with statute contract regulation. If there is not compliance with that, then there could be a material effect on the financial statements and the auditor is required to report that. There was no non-compliance found. Also under government auditing standards the auditor is required to look at the internal controls over financial statements. The OTO’s internal controls are very good so there are no findings there either. The report includes an executive summary which lists a schedule of findings and questions. This states that there is an unqualified opinion of the financial statements. There were no findings for internal control or compliance of the federal grant. The last page under a single audit requires the reporting of any prior year findings. This is the first year for the OTO so there are no previous findings.

The auditor is finally required to provide a letter to those charged with governance; basically it is the auditor’s communication to the Board. This states if there is anything that needs to be brought to the Board’s attention from the auditor. There really was not anything that needed to be reported. This is where any disagreements with management over the financial statements or sensitive disclosures would be found. Any material adjustments or errors in the financial statements would be there as well. There were none on the OTO’s statements. The books were in great shape. Ms. Parks with the supervision of Ms. Fields have done a great job on the books. There were no problems during the course of the audit with management, and staff was great to work with.

Mr. Krischke stated that Ms. Rodgers did a great job as auditor. Before the Board meeting he had asked to her to go into more detail on the requirements of single audits for the Board. It is important for the Board to understand what this operation is all about. Mr. Compton echoed his thanks to Ms. Rodgers and Mr. Krischke.

Mr. Lapaglia made the motion to approve the FY2012 Audit Report. Mr. Broyles seconded and the motion was carried unanimously.

###### Procurement Manual Revisions

Ms. Fields stated that the OTO was proposing a revision to the procurement manual

for the purpose of purchasing group health insurance. The manual currently requires all purchases over $20,000 to go through a formal bidding process. Since the OTO has fewer than 20 employees, the OTO is required to go through an application process for group health insurance. All of the employees will need to fill out an application on which they will need to list every pre-existing condition, social security numbers, and their family’s pre-existing conditions. This information is sensitive, so it should not be disclosed in a general bidding process.

What staff is proposing instead is an exception for health insurance that allows the staff to get three quotes in order to not disclose the protected health information. The OTO would then use the quotes to determine a good price and the best option. Staff examined the actual grant requirements and formal bidding is required over $150,000 so this would be well under that requirement. The OTO procurement manual is one that OTO staff wrote and adopted. Staff chose the $20,000 threshold, not the granting requirements.

Mr. Bingle made the motion to approve the proposed purchasing manual revisions. Mr. Bengsch seconded and the motion was approved unanimously.

###### Group Health Insurance Benefit

Ms. Fields stated that the OTO employees currently receive $5,000 annually for a

health insurance allowance. This allows the employees to go out and purchase individual or family insurance, whatever meets their needs. It is taxable to the extent that that the employee must choose to run it through the cafeteria plan. There is a

$5,000 flexible spending account that the employee can submit their insurance premium reimbursement request through. The problem is that the new Health Care Act reduces this amount to $2,500. At that point it increases the OTO’s and employee’s tax liability. The easy answer is to run the health insurance premiums through a separate flexible spending account as group health insurance like most other companies. OTO pays for the group health insurance directly and the employee contributions will come out of the payroll. It is a good tax savings for the OTO on the employment taxes side. This will allow not only the employee premiums to run through the insurance cafeteria plan but also the family premiums that the employee pays, freeing up the $2,5000 for the basic medical flexible spending account.

The OTO is proposing to purchase group health insurance for employees and their family. The OTO went out for quotes and Anthem Insurance was the lowest price for the benefits. There is a summary sheet included of the quotes. The proposal from Anthem is for a $1,500 deductible with 90/10 coinsurance and $25 copay. If this plan is adopted, then the insurance allowance would stop on November 1st and the OTO would begin purchasing the group health plan. The premiums are calculated at

$66.00 per pay period for children or spouse only and $132.00 per pay period for family. Staff checked the grant and OMB requirements and found that benefits are 100% eligible for reimbursement so with the federal billing and the employee match portion this will cover 100% of the costs which will free up some local jurisdiction dues right now on the 80/20 match for the $5,000 that the OTO is currently covering. The OTO would pay for 100% of the employee coverage and 50% of the family coverage.

The OTO is not guaranteed a rate from the insurance company. The plans are modeled for whatever happens while the employees are on the plan. Anthem traditionally has only done a rate increase on the annual renewal date so that is what the OTO is prepared for at this time. The employees are priced out individually so if one of the employees has a birthday that transcends the age bracket that could result

in g a slight premium increase. Dependants are added on due to a qualifying event and can also be removed resulting in changes to the premiums.

The OTO portion of the health insurance is only $160 over the current allowance so there is not a need for a budget increase. The OTO is not asking for a change in budget just for the purchase of the insurance. This should help with employee retention at the OTO. The non-availability of group health insurance has been an issue for the OTO. With the Affordable Care Act there is a lot of uncertainty. One of which is fines for businesses without health coverage. In summary, the pros are the shift of the local match requirement to the employee. It also results in a decrease in the payroll taxes of about $2,000 a year. It also guarantees the employee is covered at 100 percent. It guarantees that they have insurance and means the OTO meets the minimum participation requirement since 100% of employees participate. The cons are that the OTO does not know what is happening with the federal health care law and the health care exchanges. It will also take additional staff time to administer the plan with checks and payroll. It makes the OTO subject to the Department of Labor Oversight and Audits. It is not liability free but is a good option for the OTO.

.

Mr. Lapigalia stated that this appears to be a wash for the OTO. Mr. Compton stated it should be a huge help in employee retention and something that is really necessary.

Mr. Fisk made the motion to approve the purchase of group health insurance. Mr. Kruse seconded and the motion was approved unanimously.

###### Merit Raises

Ms. Fields stated that in 2009 the Board adopted a salary schedule for the employees

which outline step increases based on a satisfactory evaluation. As long as an employee obtained a satisfactory evaluation there was a 6.5 percent raise. The Executive Committee decided a method based on performance instead of pass/fail would be better. If there is an employee exceeding expectations that employee should get a higher raise than someone barely meeting expectations. The new proposed system would allow employees to be rated on performance. There are currently job descriptions and salary ranges for every employee. The raises would not exceed the salary range that has been approved by the Board. In the future there might be a need to adjust some ranges or job descriptions and those would go through the Board of Directors. The proposal is that within those guidelines of the descriptions and ranges, that the raises be given based on evaluation. Every employee has goals to meet for the year. If the employee exceeds expectations a 4 percent raise would be given, meeting expectations a 3 percent raise, minimum expectations 2 percent, and if the employee fails to meet expectations no raise would be given.

Ms. Fields would evaluate the staff based on the employee goals and objectives and the Executive Committee would evaluate Ms. Fields. This new system would be effective January 1, 2013 and repeal the current step system. Mr. Finnie inquired if this would mean a 10.5 percent raise for an exceptional evaluation. Ms. Fields stated

it would just be a 4 percent increase. Mr. Broyles stated that the 4 percent is the maximum replacing the 6.5 percent.

Mr. Fisk stated that there was discussion in the Executive Committee because many of the jurisdictions that support the OTO have conservative raises. He stated that Ms. Fields agreed that there should not be an automatic raise but instead an earned merit raise. She met the challenge with this proposal. The 6.5 percent would go away and replaced with 4 percent subject to an evaluation.

Mr. Fisk made the motion to approve the merit raise proposal. Mr. Finnie seconded and the motion was carried unanimously.

###### Mission Statement

Ms. Fields stated that the Executive Committee has been working on a mission

statement. It is important for the OTO to have an objective and goals to meet. The mission statement will encompass that work. It should be simple and understandable, something that people could recite. The Executive Committee changed the proposal to read “to provide a forum for cooperative decision making in support of an excellent regional transportation system.” The goals focus on collaboration, regional priorities and partnerships. When it comes to MoDOT, the goal associated with that should be modified to say “to assist in accomplishing their mission statement of providing a world class transportation experience that delights customers and promotes a prosperous Missouri.” The Executive Committee felt it would be important to say that part of what the OTO does is help MoDOT meet their mission statement. The OTO mission statement would be part of the strategic plan document. That is the first step and so the strategic plan document would include other things like what the OTO does and who the OTO’s jurisdictions are, that type of thing. The amended and finalized OTO mission statement is attached to these minutes.

Mr. Compton stated they were trying to keep it concise and yet inclusive of what needs to be done.

Finnie made the motion to adopt the changes to the mission statement as presented. Mr. Lapalia seconded and the changes were adopted.

Mr. Fisk made the motion to approve the proposed mission statement as amended. Mr. Bingle seconded and the motion was carried unanimously.

###### Appointment of a Nominating Committee

Mr. Compton stated that the Board needed to appoint a nominating committee for a slate of officers for the 2013 calendar year. The tradition has been set by the organization for an elected official from Greene County, Christian County and the City of Springfield to serve as Chairman and Vice Chairman on a rotating basis. Mr. Compton nominated Phil Broyles and Steve Childers for the committee and asked for volunteers. Mr. Kruse volunteered.

Mr. Bengsch made the motion to appoint the nominating committee as named. Mr. Krischke seconded and the motion was carried unanimously.

###### Other Business

* 1. **Board of Directors Member Announcements**

Mr. Compton mentioned Becky Baltz had been named to 20 most influential women

of 2012.

###### Transportation Issues For Board of Directors Member Review

Mr. Miller mentioned the trail opening under 60/65. Mr. Fisk mentioned that under

the Bike/Ped report that there was one sentence on enforcement needs. He stated that there needs to be more of a focus for the Bike/Ped since the region is mixing bicycles and vehicles and have spent a lot of money on infrastructure. There does not appear to be enough opportunities for enforcement. Mr. Miller responded that the STAR team discussed it and were researching some type of education program. Barbara Lucks volunteered to help with finding avenues for education.

Discussion ensued about insurance and bicyclists and responsibilities in vehicle/bike collisions and the need for enforcement so all are protected. Mr. Fisk reiterated the need for enforcement so all are protected. Mr. Fisk mentioned an example where bikes are required to be licensed for $5, then required to watch a 30 minute video to get the tag. Mr. McMahon asked the question about using Safe Routes to School non-infrastructure for education efforts.

###### Articles for Board of Directors Member Information

Ms. Fields included the news release from CU on Transfer Station Site. She also

included news releases on other area projects. Mr. Compton welcomed Mr. Ray Weter.

###### Adjournment

Mr. Compton adjourned the meeting at 1:08 p.m.

**Mission Statement**

To provide a forum for cooperative decision making in support of an excellent regional transportation system.

###### Goals

Foster collaboration in the planning, decision-making and construction of the transportation network. Establish regional priorities in which to focus limited federal, state and local funding.

Encourage partnerships to stretch limited financial resources.

To assist MoDOT in accomplishing their mission statement of “providing a world-class transportation experience that delights customers and promotes a prosperous Missouri”.

Conduct short and long range transportation planning through monitoring system performance, forecasting future needs and prioritizing projects.

Provide a fair and impartial setting to conduct a continuing, comprehensive, and cooperative transportation planning process.

Actively seek participation from local stakeholders and the general public. Seek to make decisions which improve the air quality of the region.

###### Objectives

Encourage economic growth and vitality for the region by providing transportation infrastructure and facilities that ensure opportunities for future economic development and promote desired growth.

Develop, implement, and maintain a multi-modal transportation system that supports jobs, housing, education, accessibility, recreation, clean air, water conservation and sustainability.

Improve quality of life and livability by enhancing the effectiveness and aesthetics of the collective transportation system, improving the connectivity and accessibility of the street, pedestrian, and bicycle networks, promoting urban density and efficient development patterns, and increasing the efficiency and convenience of the existing public transit system.

Support the maintenance of streets, sidewalks, trails, transit, and the airport, using the most effective strategies to maximize the efficient operation of the existing systems, keeping in mind safety, accessibility, sustainability, and collaboration.

Ensure the safety and security of all users focusing on reductions in crash rates through engineering, education, enforcement and emergency response, as well as security improvements through incident management and partnerships with local and regional enforcement agencies and the public transit agency.

Monitor the transportation network, providing feedback for the support of the most comprehensive solution for transportation demand, safety, quality of life, economic development, availability of applicable funding, and the maximizing of beneficial returns on transportation investments.