

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Board of Directors
January 7, 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, January 7, 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
Jack Burkman, Vancouver Council Member
Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor
Bill Ganley, Battle Ground Council Member
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Council (Alternate)
Jeff Hamm, C-TRAN Executive Director
David Madore, Clark County Commissioner
Doug McKenzie, Skamania Co. Commissioner
Tom Mielke, Clark County Commissioner
Larry Smith, Vancouver Council Member
Steve Stuart, Clark County Commissioner
Don Wagner, WSDOT Regional Administrator

Voting Board Members Absent:

David Poucher, White Salmon Mayor
Melissa Smith, Camas Council Member
Jason Tell, ODOT Region One 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:

Ed Barnes, Citizen
Mike Bomar, CREDC
Katy Brooks, Port of Vancouver
Mark Brown, Connections Public Affairs
Elizabeth Campbell, Citizen
Bob Carroll, IBEW
Eric Florip, The Columbian
Heath Henderson, Clark County
Lee L. Jensen, Citizen
Jim Karlock, Citizen
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver Council
Paul Montague, Identity Clark County
Sharon Nasset, Citizen
Jerry Oliver, Port of Vancouver Commissioner
Kelly Parker, Greater Vancouver Chamber
Philip Parker, WA Transportation Commissioner
Scott Sawyer, City of Battle Ground
Sandra Towne, City of Vancouver
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

II. Approval of the Board Agenda

STEVE STUART MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 7, 2014, MEETING AGENDA.
THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY PAUL GREENLEE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

III. Citizen Communications

Sharon Nasset from Portland referred to the Public Participation Plan and noted the page referencing the three counties that RTC covers, Clark, Skamania, and Klickitat. RTC is the MPO for Clark County and the RTPO for Clark, Skamania, and Klickitat Counties. Ms. Nasset also spoke to the voting of Board members.

Ed Barnes from Vancouver said he felt Senators Don Benton and Ann Rivers are not friends of Clark County and should step down. He said we need someone in the legislature that will fight for transportation projects here in southwest Washington. Mr. Barnes said RTC elected officials should call Governor Inslee and tell him that no transportation package should come across his table unless it has the Columbia River Crossing project included. He said it is critical to this region to get our transportation headed in the right direction.

Jim Karlock from Portland said he thought it was sad to hear someone have negative thoughts about your hardworking representatives in this area. He said it was also sad that someone would promote their own interest over the interest of the region.

IV. Approval of December 3, 2013, Minutes

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 3, 2013 MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY STEVE STUART AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

V. Consent Agenda

A. January Claims

STEVE STUART MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA JANUARY CLAIMS. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY LARRY SMITH AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VI. Public Participation Plan, Resolution 01-14-01

Lynda David referred to the resolution included in the meeting packet along with the final draft of RTC's Public Participation Plan. She noted that the draft update was introduced at the October Board meeting when the federal and state regulatory framework and requirements were reviewed. The draft Plan's content was fully reviewed at the November meeting prior to its release for a mandatory 45-day public comment period that lasted until December 30. As a result of comments received, some minor revisions were made to the Plan as documented in the Plan's Appendix C. RTC's updated Public Participation Plan now provides a broad framework for the organization's Public Outreach efforts.

Ms. David said the Board is being asked to complete the update process by taking action to adopt RTC's Public Participation Plan. Following adoption, the updated version will be circulated to public libraries in the region and will be posted on RTC's Website. There will be future opportunities to update the Plan because RTC will review its public outreach strategies and the contents of the Public Participation Plan on an annual basis to evaluate its effectiveness and will update the Plan as necessary.

Steve Stuart asked if any responses were received. Ms. David said comments received were listed in Appendix C.

David Madore asked when RTC's new Website would be launched. Matt Ransom said the new Website would go live by the end of January. Mr. Ransom said the Public Participation Plan in part is just a record of what our strategy is, but the most important thing about a strategy is execution. He said they need to execute and engage the public and be proactive. The Website is one of our key medium moving forward. Mr. Ransom said that is how people interact today, and they are going to rely on the Website as one of our key platforms.

Bill Ganley said he agreed. He has seen the shift that has been dramatic among young people. He also said he thought it important to have some way of measuring this use by starting with a base and see the numbers shift and watch where focus is needed or if it is working and we're getting the feedback. Mr. Ganley said he finds it interesting to see the busiest intersections. Things available like this get people engaged.

Paul Greenlee said in reading recent news about Websites, he suggested that since we are not under a deadline, it is more important that it work well before launching.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN, RESOLUTION 01-14-01. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY LARRY SMITH AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VII. 2014 Legislative Session: Transportation

Mark Brown would provide a State Legislative overview relating to transportation. Mr. Brown said this is close to the 20th year that he has provided this preview to the RTC Board. He usually has the County lobbyist Mike Burgess participate with him, but he had a conflict and was not able to attend today.

The 2014 Regular Session begins on January 13 for 60 days. Mr. Brown said there are questions over supplemental budgets such as operating, capital, and transportation. There is pressure to spend little and save most. Mr. Brown said the long term outlook for the State of Washington in terms of the state general fund is challenged. A big unanswered question is whether or not there will be action on a comprehensive transportation revenue package and related policy bills. Mr. Brown said he did not think so. He said there is a significant structural transportation funding shortfall over the next eight years across all accounts. There are still three local Nickel and Partnership projects that are not yet completed. He said they want to make sure that there are not challenges there in terms of protecting those revenue streams.

Mr. Brown reminded Board Members that in 2010 RTC was handed an assignment by the Washington Transportation Commission (WTC) asking all the MPOs and RTPOs across the state to come up with a Top Ten list in terms of what needed to be done. RTC did the same as King County and said the need is greater than ten projects. RTC ended up with 19 regional projects and 14 local projects with a combined price tag of about \$1.3 billion. This does not include the Columbia River Crossing project and does not include maintenance and preservation.

As a result of the WTC effort, the Governor convened the Connecting Washington Task Force in 2011 and directed them to focus on the need for the next decade. Also, the need to address the fact that 90% of current revenue at that time were dedicated to debt for current projects; maintenance/upkeep will suffer and no money for new projects. The Task Force had an initial recommendation of \$50 billion. They were told that was not a realistic number in this political

and economic climate. They ended up with a \$20 billion recommendation. The funding mix for the \$20 billion investment included a number of fees including tolling, a number of taxes including a gas tax, and also some enhanced local options available to local governments.

Mr. Brown said the question is whether or not there will be a significant revenue package approved by the Legislature. There were very modest revenue packages approved in 2012 and 2013 but nothing that would be considered comprehensive or major. They did not make much of a dent at all in terms of what everyone would agree at that huge transportation infrastructure deficit.

Since that time, there have been months of negotiations involving the five corners: the Majority Coalition Caucus in the Senate, the Democratic Caucus in the Senate, the Democratic and Republican Caucuses in the House, and the Governor. Representatives of those entities have been meeting and have had a number of sessions over the last few months. The reality is that those talks broke down and ended on the 18th of December.

Mr. Brown said that in early December CREDC Director Mike Bomar was moderating a panel involving seven of our local legislators. He asked them if they will support a comprehensive transportation revenue package, including a significant increase in the gas tax, if it included necessary reforms and if there would be a vote/referral to the people. All but one of seven hands went up. Mr. Brown said that in that question, Mr. Bomar identified the land mines: the size of the package/mix of taxes and fees; the question of the vote of the people; and reforms. Added to this is another major issue and that is the makeup of the project list and whether Clark County receives some measure of “fair share” distribution.

Mr. Brown said reforms that are in play and in dispute include the following: 1) A priority of the Majority Coalition Caucus shifts the State General Fund sales tax that is now collected on transportation projects and moves it over to the Motor Vehicle Fund to be used to finance transportation projects. This is a \$750 million value over a 12 year horizon of time. 2) There is also interest in taking Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) funds and transfer for transportation storm water projects. This would be \$10 million in the first biennium and then \$60 million in the outlying biennium. 3) Changing prevailing wage survey reporting requirements for employers. 4) Changing percentage of apprenticeship hours required on certain transportation contracts. 5) A big dispute is the funding and distribution for transit/bike/pedestrian projects. 6) The question of whether there would be a vote of the people.

Reforms that have been agreed to include: 1) Modifying the build-in Washington requirement for future ferry contracts. 2) Authorizing some form of General Contractor Construction method of delivering projects. 3) Add congestion relief to the list of transportation goals. 4) Adopting environmental permitting streamlining proposed by Representative Zeiger.

Mr. Brown said there was not much discussion of the project list. They did not have any detailed focus on how they spend the money in terms of the projects. The only transportation package that passed the legislature was the bill that passed the House in June 2013 at the end of the last Special Session. It totaled about \$8.4 billion. This was accomplished through a 10 cent gas tax increase over four years (5/2/2/1). There was \$450 million for the CRC, but nothing else on the project list from Clark County. There were some enhanced local options. There was direct distribution (1 cent to cities and counties over 12 years. This passed the House and it went to the

Senate. There was an effort by Senate Democrats to relieve the Senate Transportation Committee of that package and bring it to the Senate floor for a vote. That was defeated.

Senator King on behalf of the Majority Coalition Caucus brought a proposal forward during the November Special Session. He had a bigger gas tax increase raising about \$12 billion. There was funding for four projects in Clark County totaling \$41 million out of over \$8 billion. There was one enhanced local option. It also included direct distribution of \$734 million over 12 years. This would amount to \$3 million a year that would come to Clark County, \$1.6 million a year to the County, \$1.3 million a year to the City of Vancouver, and differential amounts for the other cities in the community. This was put on the table after they had adjourned the November Special Session, so it was not considered beyond that. It has not been acted upon in the Senate.

Since that time, the Clark County Transportation Alliance has met. Paul Montague and Mr. Brown are co-chairs of the group. He said they are trying to be helpful and not prioritize and not pass judgment on the value of any of the projects, but put the call out to all of the stakeholders asking what their priorities are. Our State Legislators asked them to put together this list of ten projects. The list is about \$400 million worth of projects, and the CRC is not on the list.

Since then, a number of local organizations have been lobbying their priority projects including the Chamber and Identity Clark County. The County Commissioners sent a letter to the Governor and local legislators asking them to attend to our region and make sure there is fair share distribution. Mr. Brown said local legislators have identified their priorities and shared with their leadership. Representative Moeller is working on a SW Washington delegation letter including the 17th, 18th, 19th, and 49th District legislators. Mr. Brown distributed copies listing the local distribution dollars for Clark County.

Mr. Brown said there have been a lot of positive things from the Governor and others, but it is a 60 day session and an election year. There is not a lot of enthusiasm or positive vibes in terms of action on a revenue package. He said we need a revenue package. Clark County is a poster child for why we need a major revenue package, but Mr. Brown said he did not think it would happen. He said he did not know if there would be a supplemental transportation budget. The Governor has proposed one, but there were no major policy initiatives. Mr. Brown said there is concern that we do not lose funding for our local Nickel and Partnership projects that are not complete. A list of all of those projects and their status was distributed. To be completed: I-5/NE 134th St. Interchange; I-205/Mill Plain Interchange to NE 18th St. Phase 2; and SR 502/I-5 to Battle Ground.

Mr. Brown said he did not think there would be much of other issues except what was discussed in terms of this legislative session in transportation.

Shirley Craddick said coming from the Oregon side of this discussion, she asked what the goals of the projects were. She asked what was trying to be accomplished statewide and region wide to come out at the other end. Mr. Brown said that was a good question. Some of the best visioning that he has seen done in his 43 sessions has been done by the Connecting Washington Task Force. It was one of the most comprehensive, more visionary, and more strategic efforts they've seen in recent years. Mr. Brown said he could send her some of the preamble and prioritization they did in terms of how dollars should be allocated. That was 2011, and now we are in 2014 and a lot of that is almost irrelevant. A lot of focus is primarily on projects. This

brings in safety, capacity, and freight and rail issues. Mr. Brown said he had asked Senator Frasier where the vision was for where they were taking transportation and transportation funding for the state of Washington. Mr. Brown said different people have different visions depending on their philosophy and point of view. He said there is no comprehensive transportation vision or plan that has been adopted. The Transportation Commission and the Department have done a fair amount of work on this over the years, and historically, they update the work they have done. That is long-term and strategic, but that has never been affirmed by anyone in terms of any plan of action for moving forward. Mr. Brown said there has been a lot of good work done, but the State of Washington does not have anything that he can hand to you that says this is the path forward, and these are the priorities.

Larry Smith asked how do we as a state talk about economic development and at the same time don't fund the very fundamental that economic development is made after, which is a good transportation system. Mr. Smith said he didn't understand the people who don't get the connectivity of why a business would want to locate in the State of Washington when it is not progressive enough to keep up with its transportation and move us into another century. We are competing with other states, and there is economic growth taking place. Other states have great transportation efforts. Mr. Smith said he didn't understand why that message is not getting across, the long-term viability of your own State of Washington.

Mr. Brown said he would think that a vast majority of Washington State Legislators agree with what Mr. Smith has said. He said the devil is in the detail. Some are saying reform before revenue. There are some that were elected to the legislature on a no tax and spend platform. There are many factors and getting to 25 votes in the Senate and getting to 50 votes in the House is very, very difficult. The bad news is the longer we wait, the bigger the number. It is one of the greatest challenges facing our state.

Larry Smith said he thought the letter that Representative Moeller was working on was probably dealing with a fair share package. He asked where the business community was to step up and put the pressure on the local elected and make the same case of the importance of the vitality of your own state to be competitive.

Tom Mielke said promises don't mean anything. Now we have to face it. Our state is no different than any other. Fifteen years ago, the same reforms were listed, and we haven't made any reforms in 15 years. He said elected officials are accountable to the voter. Commissioner Mielke said transit/bike/pedestrian funding was listed under the reforms. He said that funding was about 40% of the transportation package, when only 3% of the people use it. They have to come back to reality, and they have to answer to the voters. It is a hard place to be. We all see the need.

Don Wagner said he would like to further address Councilor Craddick's question. Mr. Wagner said there is a basic tenet that all of the programs were put together around, which is to preserve and maintain what you have on the current systems, then move on to the next part, which is finish what you have started. There were several big projects that got some funding but not all of the funding in the last packages. Lastly, was to invest in choke points strategically, a capacity issue. This principle was generally agreed to by both Houses, both Chambers, and the Governor's office. When getting into the details, everyone seemed to see it a little bit

differently. He said packages came together with much divergence in the solutions and said they still are. The tenets are still there.

Councilor Craddick asked Mr. Brown when he said 90% of the state's revenue is tied up in debt service was he referring to the total state revenue or just the transportation revenue. Mr. Brown said it is the gas tax revenue.

Jeff Hamm said two years ago the legislature convened a Blue Ribbon Commission that included some business community representatives to try and find what the state interest was in public transportation. The outcome was inconclusive. Mr. Hamm said he thought what you see at the moment in Olympia is that debate still going on. This is one of the reasons why public transit is part of the problem, why there isn't consensus behind a project. This is especially in the Puget Sound. The feeling of some of the Legislators there was that there wasn't enough in the package for public transportation, that it was too much pavement and highway. That is one of the reasons that it's been held up. Mr. Hamm said to the extent that policy question hasn't been settled, is still a hang up.

David Madore asked how much of the present gas tax is being used for nothing but debt service, what percent. Mr. Brown said that 90% of current gas taxes are fully obligated.

VIII. I-205 Access and Operations Study Update

Bob Hart said the I-205 study is looking at both short and long term performance in the corridor. The short term analysis is looking at 2022 operations with only funded projects in place and how adding low cost operational strategies can help better vehicle flow in the corridor. This is consistent with both Moving Washington and Least Cost Planning to look at ways to improve performance with low cost approaches without expanding capacity. Long term analysis is looking at 2035 transportation performance with the core capital projects adopted by the RTC Board last November. The adopted MTP has \$540 million of projects in the corridor. The core project list represents the most critical projects to address future capacity needs with a capital cost of \$138 million. Mr. Hart said the existing problems in the corridor are not primarily capacity related. North of the bridge is below capacity. The bridge approaches capacity occasionally, but the main problem is at the entry and exit points of the freeway causing turbulence and delay. SR-14 operates over 90% of capacity, which is more of a problem than the bridge itself. A lot of the problems that occur at those areas are because of the exits and entrances to the freeway and the turbulence is because of the interchange and not the mainline itself.

Mr. Hart referred to the map attached to the memorandum showing the I-205 corridor with the 2022 capital improvements. The 2022 transportation network includes the nickel/partnership projects and the six-year transportation improvement program projects. Mr. Hart highlighted some of those projects that have been completed.

Mr. Hart displayed maps that show northbound 2022 p.m. peak speeds along the corridor from the VISSIM model by the time of day. Beginning at 3:30 p.m. it shows with some slowing on the bridge, more slowing on the bridge at 4:30, and further slowing at the bridge at 5:30. By 6:30, except for minor slowing at the bridge, the corridor is operating pretty well, and by 7:15, the corridor is essentially at full speed.

A second map that was attached and displayed showed the 2022 operational strategies that they have analyzed and are working on. Mr. Hart highlighted some of those strategies including a northbound ramp meter at Mill Plain Blvd. to I-205 north.

A 2022 PM peak period operations visualization was provided for I-205 northbound mainline Mill Plain to 18th Street. Mr. Hart highlighted the travel movements.

Jack Burkman asked when the Mill Plain to 18th Street project would be completed. Mr. Hart said it would be completed in 2016. There was discussion of a roundabout above grade west of I-205 on 18th Street to be used instead of a traffic signal. This will be the first to this region.

Commissioner Mielke referred to the visualization of the I-205 corridor. He said it is surprising when you go to the legislature and ask them to fund certain projects, and they have something envisioned in their mind, but not a frontage road that is a mile and a half long. They then wonder why the cost is so great. He said the intent is to help the weave and merge problems, but the distance seems excessive to him on the I-205 project.

Mr. Wagner said this is a funded project. Mr. Wagner said they are trying to take the conflicts off of the interstate and give the people who want to go slower to exit to these various locations on a frontage road. I-205 south of the bridge at Gleason, Stark, and Washington, there is this same configuration. Vehicles exit early and they have an opportunity at three or four different intersections to make their moves on what they are doing. The state of Washington generally has not been using frontage roads very much, but it certainly is one of the new techniques that utilize the space on the interstate for through traffic, and takes the weaves out which cause congestion. That is what they are trying to do. If you want to build a new freeway lane to full standards to address that, you would probably have to add two lanes to the freeway rather than one frontage road. This project was funded by the Transportation Partnership Account. They are finishing up the design now with the City, County, WSDOT, and RTC all working together to come up with a solution that meets the community's needs best for the lowest cost.

Commissioner Mielke asked if it was about \$2 million for a lane mile. Mr. Wagner said currently in an urban section with interchanges, they have to modify it about every mile and a half. This cost is around \$10 million a lane mile for an interstate in an urban area. In a rural area, where the interchanges are seven or eight miles apart, the cost is down to the \$2 million and \$3 million.

Chair Burkman asked what the lane cost was for a frontage road. Mr. Wagner said in this case they don't have to rebuild the overpass structures, so they will be in the range of \$2 million a mile. He said he has not seen the figures for that yet.

A second 2022 PM peak period operations visualization was provided for a Mill Plain to I-205 northbound ramp meter. Mr. Hart highlighted the ramp's function.

Steve Stuart asked how they chose this interchange for a ramp meter. Mr. Hart said they looked at the traffic earlier at a workshop with local agencies and WSDOT and collaborated on what kind of northbound strategies would be worth analyzing along with southbound strategies. They had a menu of strategies they thought were worth looking at given the current forecast conditions at those hot spots. Commissioner Stuart asked if that looked at the traffic volumes or what criteria were used. Mr. Hart said part of it was based on the traffic engineers at WSDOT in identifying these merge hot spot locations that are in the corridor both north and south bound.

Don Wagner said to not take this as a priority. He said this is a first look, and other areas are still to be analyzed.

David Madore said there is a lot of green space between the north and south bound lanes. He thought that was set aside to provide widening these and adding a lane. Why not just add another lane there on the inside so the traffic can get on without meters.

Mr. Wagner said the medians are not necessarily designed for future capacity additions. In some cases they may have been purchased with that in mind, but basically, the safest median that you can have is 50 feet wide without guardrails or anything in the middle of it. If you narrow it down, you must have some sort of barrier in the middle. Barriers are safer than hitting each other, but hitting barriers is not the safest thing. They are trying to get the best clear space on both sides of the freeway. Mr. Wagner suggested rather than have these types of conversations at this point, to come back with some type of workshop where the policy issues around what the interstates are there for and what can be used and what they can't and why some of these techniques are now showing up. He said we are approaching capacity on our system, and they are running out of money to add lanes. The operational issues are going to become more and more of an issue for low cost improvements. Mr. Wagner said they have had a fairly good success rate with the City, County, and RTC on a few of the ones they have tried so far in smoothing things out. It won't get rid of all congestion, but it will make it safer and you will be able to see some improvements out there.

Mr. Hart said the focus of the 2022 operational analysis is examining how the addition of low cost operational improvements to the base case can manage/improve vehicle flow on I-205.

Chair Burkman asked the cost of a ramp meter system. Mr. Hart did not have those numbers with him. Mr. Wagner said the ramp being discussed will be one lane and two lanes when the metering is on, so the shoulders are not the same. That adds substantial cost. If you were to go to a spot that is all on the surface with no structures, it would be a completely different and cheaper cost.

Commissioner Stuart asked if this includes space for queue jumps or are they not being included as part of this analysis. Mr. Wagner said he would like to have that policy conversation again with the Board. He said there are huge issues in that. Mr. Wagner said they have had conversations, and they need to get C-TRAN involved. Putting a bus queue jump in a location that they don't have any buses makes very little sense. The City of Vancouver needs to be involved, because when traffic is backed up too much, those cars will be stored on city streets. Mr. Wagner said these are policy conversation that they need to get into. The ramp being discussed does not have a queue jump.

Mr. Hart displayed a graph with 2022 PM peak mainline travel speeds on I-205 between Mill Plain and SR-500 without metering compared with a ramp meter in place at Mill Plain. Overall, the ramp meter improves the mainline flow.

Mr. Hart provided a table showing hours of congestion at LOS E or worse between Mill Plain and SR-500 with and without ramp metering and for all lanes and right merge lane only. It does have a pretty good impact on reducing those hours of delay. Preliminary results show a positive impact on mainline level of service. It also indicates potential queuing to Mill Plain. Further

study is needed to look in more detail at the location of the meter, ramp meter rate, and vehicle storage capacity on the ramp.

The next steps include analysis of SR-14 exit only lane and Findings on 2022 southbound operational strategies.

Bill Ganley commented on the change to I-205 northbound at the SR-500 exit. He said he was caught off guard when driving that corridor. Mr. Ganley said it is important to have signage and to get the word out about changes to the roadway system. With these changes that will come to I-205, all forms of communications need to be used to get the word out to the public.

Paul Greenlee said he drives from Washougal up I-205 to SR-500 about every two weeks. He said he too was caught off guard with the change, but fortunately it was not during rush hour.

IX. 2014 Regional Transportation Plan: Scoping and Decision Making Process

Lynda David said it is time to begin the process to update the Regional Transportation Plan for the Clark County region. During the course of 2014, development of an updated Regional Transportation Plan will be a recurring item on the Board's agenda as we work through each step of the RTP development process.

Ms. David said previously, they have referred to the RTP as the Metropolitan Transportation Plan or MTP, but to avoid confusion with the MTIP or Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program, they are going to re-title the long-range Plan as the Regional Transportation Plan. The agenda item today will help the Board to understand the decision-making process, the scope of the Regional Transportation Plan update, the transportation issues it needs to address, and anticipated outcomes. Ms. David said they are seeking the Board's feedback at this earliest stage of the Plan's development.

The RTP is the region's long-range, 20+ year, plan for the region's transportation system. The Plan 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 must maintain consistency between federal, state, and local plans.

Ms. David said the current Plan was adopted in December 2011 and was developed under the former federal transportation act, SAFETEA-LU. In July 2012, MAP-21, the new federal transportation act, was passed and included a number of new or refined requirements for the Regional Transportation planning process carried out by Metropolitan Planning Organizations such as RTC. Among the new requirements is the need for a performance-based approach to transportation decision-making with transportation system performance measures and targets established with investments applied toward helping to attain the performance targets.

The 2014-2015 Regional Transportation Plan needs to reflect RTC's compliance with the federal transportation act, MAP-21, and that there is consistency between local Comprehensive Plans, regional, state, and federal plans. Ultimately, the transportation plan should help support local jurisdictions and agencies in making wise transportation investments and help them to be competitive and successful in gaining funds to make needed transportation investments in this region.

Ms. David said the beginning point of a Planning Process should be to confirm the key requirements and decide on key policies and goals that should guide the Plan update. She said as they look forward to the end point of the 2014-2015 RTP update process, they look to have an adopted RTP update in place in about the March/April 2015 timeframe.

Ms. David said the Board can expect to be kept updated on the Plan's development at monthly Board meetings throughout the year, and there are several key policy milestones the RTC Board will be expected to weigh in on. For the transportation planning process, agreement on the demographic growth forecast is a significant milestone. RTC will be working along with the County as decisions are reached on the growth forecast the County will use in its Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update now underway. Board input is also critical in establishing the policy framework to guide the RTP's update.

Ms. David referred to page three of the memo listing elements the RTP update should address and also provided a slide. She said an update to the region's Safety Assessment is currently being worked on and will be incorporated into the RTP update. Since the RTP was last updated, they have noted concerns at Board meetings about keeping up with the system preservation and maintenance. Revenues for transportation projects are limited, and with the State's emphasis on Least Cost Planning, there is heightened interest in transportation system management and operations as well as demand management opportunities.

Ms. David said this is an opportunity for the Board to weigh in on which elements they feel should be given particular attention and focus.

David Madore said the Plan is going forward projecting what is forecast for 2035, and we are asking what areas need attention. He said there is nothing about the current state of what is happening today.

Ms. David said usually they make comparisons when they put together the Plan. When they look at the performance of the system, they look at today's system and how it operates and then they look forward to 2035 to see the comparisons. In the past RTP efforts, they have looked at how the system will perform if we were to make no improvements. Again, this is a gauge of how the demographic forecast and the growth might be affecting the transportation system performance.

Commissioner Madore said if we are forecasting the future and predicting policy of what is going to happen 20 years from now, we need to look first at what is there today. Where is that shown in the list of elements.

Ms. David said that might not be reflected in this list, but certainly, in the planning process they have the Congestion Management Process and the report is put together annually documenting the current conditions in particular on the transportation system. In the RTP update, they will be bringing in a lot of the information available in the Congestion Management Process into the RTP.

Commissioner Madore said he thought that demand management would be one of the first points listed. Ms. David said they could certainly change the list to make sure that it is identified.

Chair Burkman said it is not just a snapshot of 2035; it is the shift. Identify what has developed from now to then.

Chair Burkman asked if the Board will be updating all of the elements or will they need to do some prioritization. Ms. David said to some degree, all of these issues will need to be addressed. She said they were listed so that if there were any that the Board felt needed more focus.

Shirley Craddick wanted to clarify that this is what MAP-21 is saying that needs to be addressed. Ms. David said this is what the Federal Transportation Act requires, the eight planning factors that the MPO needs to address. In addition, there is some state focus. They are still waiting for the rule making related to performance measurement and target setting. They are expecting it out by May 2014. That will need to be reflected in the RTP update.

Councilor Craddick said what we want to accomplish by 2035 should play a role in this. The goals of this agency will really influence this. Ms. David said one of the foundation and key pieces will be for the Board to address what the policy and vision are and what kind of transportation system we want to have in place and can afford to have in place within the 20-year planning process.

Ms. David said in early 2014 they will focus on ensuring the work scope for Plan development will cover all elements required of the Plan. Also, at the outset of the Plan development process, they need to arrive at a consensus for a 2035 demographic forecast and consider the policy framework that guides the Plan.

Commissioner Madore said congestion relief is important and should not be forgotten.

X. Other Business

From the Board

From the Director

Matt Ransom thanked the Board for the opportunity to take on the role of Director for RTC.

Mr. Ransom noted the upcoming meetings listed on the agenda and had two items to bring to the Board.

He said he would like to get to know Board members better, and over the next couple months would like to set up individual appointments to come and visit.

Mr. Ransom said he has identified a gap, initially, in terms of legal services. This organization has not had a contract for legal services. It has been a sort of ad hoc informal relationship with the County Prosecuting Attorney's office, and they have had some transitions and turnover in staff. He is working with their Deputy Civil Chief to talk about the issue and would like to bring back a recommendation next month. It might be contractual in nature to formalize something. Currently, it is quite informal and necessitates a more formal arrangement. The Board agreed to bring something to the February meeting. Shirley Craddick suggested that this person have an expertise in federal transportation law. That is important in how this group operates.

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, February 4, 2014, at 4 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Jack Burkman, Board of Directors Chair