



The Regional Transportation Advisory Committee meeting will be held on **Friday, February 15, 2013**, from **9 a.m. to 11 a.m.**, in the **6th Floor Training Room 679**, Clark County Public Service Center, 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington.

A G E N D A

- I. Call to Order and Approval of January 18, 2013, Minutes, Action
- II. Approval of MAP-21 Transportation Alternatives Program and Project Selection Process, Action
- III. FY 2014 Unified Planning Work Program: Draft Review, Discussion
- IV. Local Agency Federal Obligation Authority (OA) Policy, Discussion
- V. Metropolitan Transportation Plan Capital Facilities Review
- VI. Other Business
 - A. RTAC Members
 - B. RTC Staff

*Served by C-TRAN Route 3 or 25
If you have special needs, please contact RTC*

20130118_RTAC_Agenda.docxx

An advisory committee to:

Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council

1300 Franklin Street, Floor 4

P.O. Box 1366

Vancouver, Washington 98666-1366

360-397-6067

fax: 360-397-6132

<http://www.rtc.wa.gov>

**Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC)
Meeting Minutes
January 18, 2013**

I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes

The meeting of the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee was called to order on Friday, January 18, 2013, at 9:00 a.m. in the Public Service Center 6th Floor Training Room, 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington. Dean Lookingbill, RTC Transportation Director, served as Chair for the meeting. Those in attendance follow:

Jennifer Campos	City of Vancouver
Jim Carothers	City of Camas
Rob Charles	City of Washougal
Mike Clark	WSDOT
Tony Cooper	City of La Center
Lynda David	RTC
Michael Derleth	Clark County
Brendon Haggerty	Clark County
Mark Harrington	RTC
Dean Lookingbill	RTC
Bob Hart	RTC
Mark Herceg	City of Battle Ground
Mike Mabrey	Clark County
David Madore	Clark County Commissioner
Chris Malone	City of Vancouver
Paul Montague	Identity Clark County
Randy Mueller	Port of Ridgefield
Josh Naramore	Metro
Scott Patterson	C-TRAN
Chris Rall	Transportation for America
Sandi Roberts	RTC
Dale Robins	RTC
Bill Wright	Clark County

Dean Lookingbill, RTC, asked for any changes or corrections to the November 16, 2012, meeting minutes.

JOSH NARAMORE, METRO, MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 16, 2012, MEETING MINUTES, AND SCOTT PATTERSON, C-TRAN, SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Commissioner David Madore stopped by the RTAC meeting and Dean asked RTAC members to go around the room and introduce themselves.

II. 2013-2016 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Amendments, Action

- Clark County Bridge Grants
- Clark County Signal Optimization Projects
- WSDOT Interstate Maintenance Projects

Dale Robins, RTC, presented these agenda items. He said Clark County recently received \$4.1 million in federal Bridge funds to replace one bridge and upgrade four other bridges and is requesting that these projects be added to the 2013-2016 MTIP. The Bridges include: 1] Fifth Plain Creek Bridge Replacement, 2] Big Tree Creek Bridge Seismic and Scour Mitigation, 3] Brush Prairie Bridge Seismic and Scour Mitigation, 4] Blair-Zeek Bridge Seismic Mitigation, and 5] Van Atta Bridge Seismic and Repainting.

Clark County is requesting an MTIP amendment to restore two Clark County Signal Optimization Projects to the 2013-2016 MTIP. The projects were in the 2012 MTIP but experienced unanticipated delays. The projects include: 1] 78th Street Signal Optimization Project (Hazel Dell to St. Johns, and 2] Highway 99 Traffic Signal Optimization (Ross to 117th Street).

WSDOT is requesting an amendment to reduce the cost of one project and add another project to the 2013-2016 MTIP. First, WSDOT is amending the I-205, SR-14 to Fourth Plain, Pavement Project. This project is currently in the MTIP, but following design work the engineers are reducing the scope and cost of the project. Second, WSDOT is adding \$2.6 million for the design and construction of the I-5 SB Ridgefield to E. Fork Lewis River Bridge Paving project.

BILL WRIGHT, CLARK COUNTY, MADE A MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF ALL THREE 2013-2016 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AMENDMENTS. JIM CAROTHERS, CITY OF CAMAS, SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

III. Federal Functional Classification Change Request: Pioneer Street, from Main Avenue to Mill Street, Ridgefield, Action

Lynda David, RTC, presented this agenda item and said the highway functional classification is a cooperative responsibility and RTC (as MPO) must review any requested changes. WSDOT's website provides information on federal functional classification and the current functional classification map for the Clark County region. RTAC is asked to consider and recommend the federal functional classification of an extension of Pioneer Street, from Main Avenue to Mill Street, requested by the Port of Ridgefield.

Lynda explained the Port of Ridgefield has proposed the federal functional classification of an extension to Pioneer Street and rail overpass, from Main Avenue to Mill Street, as a rural collector. The existing Pioneer Street is currently classified as a rural Major Collector but the proposed extension and bridge does not currently exist and so is unclassified. Randy Mueller, Port of Ridgefield, said the request is supported by the City of Ridgefield.

MIKE MABREY, CLARK COUNTY, MADE THE MOTION TO RECOMMEND RIDGFIELD'S PROPOSED FEDERAL FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION CHANGE REQUEST AND RECOMMENDED FORWARDING THE REQUEST TO WSDOT LOCAL PROGRAMS. JOSH NARAMORE, METRO, SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

IV. MAP-21 Transportation Alternatives Program: Draft Process, Discussion

Dean noted in December an RTAC subcommittee met to begin discussion of the Transportation Alternatives Program. The worksheet reflects the input from that meeting. RTC staff wants RTAC's feedback on the program proposal and the kinds of projects to support. Dean introduced Chris Rall of Transportation for America. Chris provided some background on the Transportation Alternatives Program and provided a template for potential project evaluation criteria.

Dale Robins presented the Transportation Alternatives Program worksheet. The worksheet provides background information on the proposed program. Dale said the Transportation Alternatives (TA) Program is a new federal transportation funding program authorized in the current federal transportation act, MAP-21. The Transportation Alternatives Program replaces the Transportation Enhancement Program. Dale pointed out that often a mission statement is articulated to help identify the purpose of the program. RTC's proposed mission statement could read: *"Transportation Alternatives projects are federally-funded community-based projects that expand travel choices and improve the travel experience."*

Dale said the 2013 three county RTC regional sub-allocation is \$553,803, of which approximately 52% must be spent in the Vancouver Urban area, 12% in rural areas, and 36% can be spent anywhere across the region. The split between urban and rural is highlighted on the map at the back of the worksheet. RTC is proposing a four year selection of projects with TA funds of approximately \$2.2 million.

RTC is proposing to form a TA Project Evaluation Team of five made up of staff and citizens from local agencies and interest groups. The general project selection criteria were discussed. RTC will come back with more detailed criteria for discussion next month. RTC is proposing that the call for projects will be issued on March 8th. Project applications will be due on April 26th, with selection at the July 2nd RTC Board meeting.

RTAC discussed the type of projects with the Committee having a preference for bike and pedestrian projects though they did not want to exclude other types of projects. RTAC members discussed the project needs of their communities and there was need for a mixture of large and smaller projects.

V. I-205 Access and Operational Study Scope of Work, Information

Bob Hart, RTC, presented an overview of the I-205 Access and Operations Study scope of work, including the need and purpose of the study. He also requested that RTAC members inform their respective Board representatives that the purpose and need for the study will be presented at the

February RTC Board meeting. The new Access and Operations Study is the result of the I-205 Corridor Study recommendations, adopted by the RTC Board on November 6, 2012. The recommendations identified a set of core capital projects that focus on mainline improvements intended to address future growth with limited transportation revenue. These core capital projects are considered the top tier capital improvements for funding in the I-205 corridor.

He said that the I-205 Study recommendations also included moving forward with the I-205 Access and Operations Study. He outlined the study need by saying that there are already significant capacity and reliability problems in the corridor and that the trends will continue in the future with anticipated household and employment growth in east county. In addition, there is very limited future transportation revenue available for capital projects and that without new revenue agencies will have to dedicate most of their revenue to preservation and maintenance. With this in mind, it is essential that operational improvements be considered before adding new capacity in the corridor.

The study purpose is to conduct a detailed examination of low-cost operational strategies, transit, and transportation demand management to maximize the efficiency and performance of the I-205 corridor without building new mainline capacity beyond currently funded projects and the core capital projects. The study will look at short-term operations, further refine the core projects and examine long-term operational strategies.

Bob noted the I-205 AOS TAC is meeting in February to review and finalize the purpose/need and scope for work. In addition, planning for a transportation management and operations workshop is underway. He said the purpose of the workshop is to assist the TAC in identifying, screening and selecting a set of operational strategies for analysis in the I-205 corridor.

Dean summed up by saying this is a bread and butter study in the sense we are trying to take a focused look on I-205. Josh Naramore, Metro, noted that ODOT has completed an operational study for all of their mainline facilities and suggested contacting their staff regarding the work as many of the I-205 study element are similar to ODOT's effort. Dean said that this Study may leverage some transportation demand management opportunities better identifying TDM's role in the corridor. It may be less about the technical evaluation of TDM but more about giving TDM strategies some focus for discussion.. Jennifer Campos, City of Vancouver, offered the City's assistance with the TDM component.

VI. MAP-21 National Highway Performance Program, Discussion

Dean introduced the agenda item saying we are focused on the National Highway Performance Program (NHPP) that funds the National Highway System (NHS). Under MAP-21, principal arterials are now added to the NHS with performance management of the system being a key issue. Lynda commented that compliance with MAP-21 will be a recurring item throughout 2013 as we try to meet the requirements of Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century.

Lynda noted that prior to MAP-21, the National Highway System (NHS) system in Clark County comprised of: I-5, I-205, SR-14, and limited segments of SR-500, SR-501, SR-502, and SR-503. She referred to the maps: "Metropolitan Transportation Plan for Clark County 2011 (Designated

Highway System)” showing the designated regional highways, “National Highway System, Pre MAP-21”, and a third map, “National Highway Performance Program National Highway System, MAP-21 (2013). The addition of principal arterials to the NHS system increases the NHS in Clark County from about 78.5 centerline road miles to about 148.5 centerline road miles. Under MAP-21, the NHPP is the largest of federal highway funding programs with \$21.88 billion available nationwide in 2013 compared with \$10.0 billion available under the federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) program.

RTAC discussed issues related to the NHS and NHPP: 1) NHS Changes, 2) Project Selection, 3) Design Standards, 4) Project Oversight, and 5) Performance Standards and Measures. Lynda said RTC staff will provide the RTC Board with information on the NHS and NHPP as part of an agenda item that will review transportation networks and introduce the Board to performance-based transportation planning and investment decision-making under MAP-21.

VII. FY 2014 Unified Planning Work Program: Overview and Timeline, Discussion

Lynda said RTC is developing the FY 2014 UPWP which begins July 1, 2013 and runs through June 30, 2014. A draft 2014 UPWP document is being prepared and will be available for review at the February 15 RTAC meeting and at the February 20 federal and state review meeting.

Lynda reminded RTAC members she had sent an e-mail out requesting any changes to Section IV of the UPWP that reflects transportation planning efforts of WSDOT SW Region, C-TRAN and local jurisdictions. She said the allocation of federal PL funds among Washington’s MPOs has not yet been decided though RTC is anticipating an increase in PL funds and slight increase in FTA funds resulting from MAP-21. Lynda also reviewed the draft timeline with anticipated RTC Board action at its May meeting on both RTC’s UPWP and concurrence with Metro’s UPWP because we are a bi-state region. Lynda noted there will be more information at the next RTAC meeting

VIII. RTC’s Concurrence with C-TRAN’s Designation as Recipient of Federal Transit Administration Section 5310 Funds, Review

Lynda said RTAC has the opportunity to review steps RTC must take to comply with MAP-21 to enable FTA Section 5310 funds to come to this region. MAP-21 included reducing the number of funding programs while making remaining programs more flexible to use. Lynda said under MAP-21, FTA’s Section 5317 and 5310 programs are consolidated. Section 5317, the New Freedom program, goes away. Its activities are now eligible under FTA’s Section 5310 program, the Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities program, intended to enhance mobility by providing funds for programs to serve the special needs of transit-dependent populations beyond traditional public transportation services and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) complementary paratransit services.

Lynda noted another change under MAP-21 is in allocation of funds. Large urban areas with populations over 200,000, such as the Portland-Vancouver region, will now receive Section 5310 funds through a formula allocation based on the number of seniors and individuals with disabilities within the region. The RTC Board will be asked to take action at its February 5

meeting to concur with having the Governor of Washington designate C-TRAN as a Section 5310 fund recipient in the Portland region. The C-TRAN Board will be asked to take a similar action. For the first half of FY 2013, \$397,836 is allocated to the whole Portland-Vancouver urbanized area, with the Vancouver urbanized area set to receive about \$135,638 of these funds based on population over 65 years of age and the number of individuals with disabilities in the region. TriMet and Metro will also be taking similar actions to agree with the Governor of Oregon designating TriMet and SMART (Wilsonville) as designated recipients of FTA Section 5310 funds allocated to the Portland-Vancouver urbanized area.

IX. RTC 10-Year Priority Projects and Paladin Software, Information

Dale said Forward Washington is a recently initiated statewide web application and online portal that provides a tool to manage, display and share information about priority transportation projects. It is to be used by state legislators needing to know information on a region's priority projects and help them reach transportation decisions. The website can be viewed at <http://www.forwardwashington.net/>. Dale provided a demonstration of the web site and an overview of what the site offers. Dale said additional information is needed and improvements to the database and website are to be made. Dale will send an e-mail out with a link to the site.

X. Other Business

A. RTAC Members

B. RTC Staff

• MTIP Corrections

- 1 NE 10th Avenue (154-164 Street)
- 2 NE 119th Street (72nd-87th Avenue)
- 3 I-5/NB 179th Street to N Fork Lewis River Bridge
- 4 I-5 Columbia River Crossing Project

Dale Robins, RTC, reported that minor corrections to the project descriptions were made in the STIP for projects 1, 2 and 3, listed above. For the I-5 Columbia River Crossing Project, several phases were already obligated last year and were mistakenly included in the current STIP.

Lynda noted in 2013, RTC is going to start a review of the 2035 transportation system needs. Last year we looked at the 10-year priority needs as we face economic realities and changing demographics. RTC will start reviewing what we have for 2035 transportation capital facilities needs which will involve a review of the 2035 population and employment forecast. Washington Office of Financial Management (OFM) has an updated population forecast we may want to take into consideration. This study is a preliminary activity prior to scoping the next MTP update due in late 2015. Mark Harrington will be asking for some information from jurisdictions. Dean said this study will take a more conservative look at the future compared with the existing Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Mark will send out an invitation for a meeting to get started on this study.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:37 a.m. The next meeting will be Friday, February 15, 2013.



MEMORANDUM

TO: Regional Transportation Advisory Committee
FROM: Dale Robins
DATE: February 8, 2013
SUBJECT: Approval of MAP-21 Transportation Alternatives Program and Project Selection Process

As RTAC members are aware, the Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) is a new federal transportation funding program authorized in the current federal transportation act (MAP-21). The Transportation Alternatives Program builds upon the previous Transportation Enhancement Program by clarifying the program's goals. The goals address the following: 1) expanding travel choices, 2) strengthening the local economy, 3) improving the quality of life, and 4) protecting the environment.

Since the first of the year, RTC staff has worked with RTAC members to develop the draft Transportation Alternative Program that describes the process by which TAP projects would be ranked and selected across the three-county RTC region. The attached TAP program is now proposed for approval by RTAC and for recommendation to the RTC Board at their March meeting. Additional work may be required to further refine the project selection criteria. This discussion and any changes will be carried out prior to adoption. Given the RTC Board's approval on March 5th, the call for projects would be able to proceed by March 8th.

Please come to the February RTAC meeting with any changes to the evaluation criteria and be prepared to offer a recommendation to the RTC Board.

Attachment

20130215_RTAC_TAP.doc

MAP-21 Transportation Alternatives Program

Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council

Clark, Skamania, and Klickitat Counties

Introduction

The Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) is a new federal transportation funding program for 2013 as authorized in the new federal transportation act titled, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21). The Transportation Alternatives Program builds upon the previous Transportation Enhancement Program by clarifying the program’s goals that address the following: expanding travel choices, strengthening the local economy, improving the quality of life, and protecting the environment. For more information, please go to the Federal Highway Administration Interim Guidance at: <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/guidance/guidetap.cfm>

The Transportation Alternatives Program allows each region and/or state to develop their implementation program within the guidelines of the program. However, in order to give the proposed program a direction and focus the following goal statement is proposed. “Transportation Alternative projects are federally-funded community-based projects that expand travel choices and improve the travel experience.”

Funding Levels

The Transportation Alternatives funding is suballocated to the RTC three-county Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO) region based on population, with varying amounts being allocated to US Census defined urbanized and rural areas. In addition a portion of the funds are flexible and can be programmed within either the urbanized or rural areas. The attached map illustrates these areas.

The 2013 three-county RTC regional sub-allocation is \$553,803, of which approximately 52% must be spent in the Vancouver Urban area, 12% in rural areas, and 36% can be spent anywhere across the region. This percentage may change over time depending on the amount of population growth between the respective urbanized and rural areas. In addition to the 2013 allocation, the table below estimates the funding for the same 4-year period as the MTIP. This four year is an estimate and will depend upon the new federal transportation bill that follows MAP-21.

Estimated Transportation Alternatives Funding Sub-Allocation

Transportation Alternatives Program	Vancouver Urban Area	Rural <i>Clark, Skamania, and Klickitat Counties</i>	Flexible <i>Any Area</i>	Total
2013 Funding	\$288,000	\$65,000	\$200,803	\$553,803
2013-16 Funding	\$1,152,000	\$260,000	\$803,212	\$2,215,212

Eligible Applicants

- Local Governments;
- Regional Transportation Authorities;
- Transit Agencies;
- Natural Resources or Public Land Agencies;

- School Districts, Local Education Agencies, or Schools;
- Tribal Governments; and
- Any other local or regional governmental entity with responsibility for oversight of transportation or recreational trails (other than MPO's or State agency) that the State determines to be eligible (includes Ports if they own the facility and it is open to the public).

All projects must be administered by a certification acceptance (CA) agency. Non CA agencies can apply for TAP funds but must have a CA agency sponsor the project. The sponsorship must be in place prior to applying for funds.

Eligible Activities

The following is a summary of eligible activities authorized in the MAP-21 Transportation Alternatives Program. Projects will be selected by the RTC Board through a competitive process that will apply evaluation criteria to rank projects on their merit. Eligible projects must meet one or more of the eligible activities and relate to the surface transportation system (except for recreation trails). There is no requirement for equal distribution of funding among the various eligible activities. For a full explanation of eligible activities please review the Federal Highway Administration Interim Guidance at: <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/guidance/guidetap.cfm>

- Construction, planning, and design of on-road and off-road trail facilities for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other non-motorized forms of transportation.
- Construction, planning, and design of infrastructure-related projects and systems that will provide safe routes for non-drivers.
- Conversion and use of abandoned railroad corridors for trails.
- Construction of turnouts, overlooks, and viewing areas.
- Inventory, control, or removal of outdoor advertising.
- Historic preservation and rehabilitation of historic transportation facilities.
- Vegetation management practices in transportation right-of-way.
- Archaeological activities relating to impacts for implementation of transportation projects eligible under this title.
- Any environmental mitigation activity related to highway construction due to highway runoff.

In addition, eligible Transportation Alternatives projects include any project eligible under the Recreational Trails Program, Safe Routes to School Program, and within the right-of-way of former interstate routes. Please note that Washington State is using a portion of Statewide Transportation Alternatives funds to conduct a statewide Safe Routes to School Program.

Screening Requirements

- Project must be consistent with the MTP/RTP
- Project must contain at least one eligible Transportation Alternatives Category
- Must have a direct relationship to the surface transportation system (except trails)
- Funds cannot be used to supplement the construction of an existing project. For example, TAP funds cannot be used to pay for the sidewalk portion on an existing road project.

- Project must be open for public access

General Applicant Information

- The Transportation Alternatives Program is a reimbursement grant program. Only after a Local Agency Agreement has been approved by WSDOT can project costs become eligible for reimbursement. This means project sponsors must incur the cost of the project prior to being repaid. Any work conducted prior to a signed Local Agency Agreement is not eligible for reimbursement.
- A local match of 20% is required for all Transportation Alternatives projects.
- Once the project is programmed in the MTIP, no cost increase or movement of funds between phases (PE, RW, and CN) will be allowed without RTC Board approval.
- All projects must follow federal and state regulations. Including environmental, right of way, ADA, and etc.
- To ensure project delivery an agency may want to split a large project into segments or separate project development phases. Each segment or phase needs to be deemed as a stand-alone project by RTC. For example, an agency could ask for only design funds and come back for construction funding in future. Also, an agency could break a 3 mile long path into two logical segments.

Project Selection

RTC is proposing that a TAP Project Evaluation Team of five people be formed to evaluate and rank projects. The evaluation team could be made of staff or citizens drawn from RTC, WSDOT, C-TRAN, Healthy Community Coalition, Health Department, neighborhoods, Clark County Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, etc. RTC staff will form the committee.

Projects will be evaluated and ranked by the TAP Project Evaluation Team. The evaluation team ranking will then be taken to RTAC to recommend a list of project for selection by the RTC Board. The RTC Board will make final selection. Along with this selection process a local public involvement process will be included. This public involvement process will be developed to inform the selection process.

Project Application

A project application will be developed once evaluation criteria are determined.

Evaluation Criteria

(The following is an initial list of potential project evaluation criteria for discussion. The criteria would be defined and have points assigned and then used for ranking Transportation Alternatives Program projects. RTC is looking for discussion and feedback on these or other criteria.)

- Project helps to achieve an identified/planned need and has a public benefit:
 - Describe how the project relates to an adopted plan such as the GMA plan, modal plan, neighborhood plan or other planning process. Describe how the project will improve the public travel experience and travel options.
- Multimodal, Intermodal Connectivity and Access to Jobs, and Services.

- Describe how the project provides a connection between modes, or improves transportation choices, or connects to land use services such as job locations, a civic center, library, grocery market, playground, retail center, medical office, school, and other.
- Accessibility/Equity
 - Describe to what extent the project will improve mobility for disadvantaged populations. For example is the project close to affordable housing, will the project improve low income access to transit, essential services, education opportunities, and others.
- Safety
 - Describe how the project improves public safety for transportation system users. For example, does the project address a specific safety issue, or does it address pedestrian or bike safety?
- Financial Support and Project Readiness
 - Describe how the project is funded, level of design, environmental approvals, and project schedule.

Timeline

As part of the application process, local agencies will be required to include a reasonable timeline for the implementation of preliminary engineering, right of way, and construction. It will be essential for agencies to obligate project phases on time according to the identified timeline.

Proposed TAP Program Development Schedule

The following is a proposed schedule for the development, selection, and programming of the regional TAP process:

December 21, 2012	RTAC subcommittee reviewed TAP process
January 18, 2013	RTAC reviewed draft TAP process
February 5, 2013	RTC Board overview of TAP process
February 15, 2013	RTAC recommends TAP process
March 5, 2013	RTC Board adopts TAP process
March 8, 2013	Call for TAP projects
April 26, 2013	TAP project applications due to RTC
April 29-30, 2013	RTC staff screens applications for eligibility
May 1-June 7, 2013	Evaluation Team ranks TAP projects and public involvement process is conducted
June 21, 2013	RTAC recommends ranking and selection of TAP projects to RTC Board
July 2, 2013	RTC Board selects TAP projects and amends MTIP
August 2013	TAP projects proceed to implementation



MEMORANDUM

TO: Regional Transportation Advisory Committee
FROM: Lynda David
DATE: February 8, 2013
SUBJECT: FY 2014 Unified Planning Work Program: Draft Review

INTRODUCTION

At the January 2013 RTAC meeting, the process to develop the FY 2014 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), its timeline and planning emphasis areas were discussed. To recap, the UPWP is a federally-required document prepared annually by RTC. It describes the transportation planning activities to be completed as part of the regional transportation planning process. The UPWP also details the funding sources required to carry out the program and addresses the major transportation policy issues of the upcoming year. FY 2014 runs from July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014. This month's agenda item provides RTAC members with an opportunity to review and provide input on the draft FY 2014 UPWP. The RTAC review will take place prior to RTC's review meeting with state and federal staff on Wednesday, February 20.

FY 2014 PLANNING EMPHASIS AREAS

As outlined at the January RTAC meeting, the UPWP is expected to reflect federal, state, and local transportation planning emphasis areas. The Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Transit Administration, and Washington State Department of Transportation identify transportation planning emphasis areas (PEAs) to promote priority themes for consideration, as appropriate, in metropolitan and statewide transportation planning processes. The emphasis areas are intended to provide federal/state guidance for the development of local work programs.

Federal:

In FY 2014, FHWA and FTA anticipate MPOs to focus on compliance with MAP-21, and continue to implement a metropolitan transportation planning program that meets the requirements of 23CFR 450.308 and 23CFR 420.111. This includes addressing the eight federal transportation planning factors as outlined on page xii of RTC's draft UPWP. The UPWP must include a discussion of the planning priorities facing the MPO (see page xiv of RTC's draft UPWP).

State:

The Growth Management Act sets up Regional Transportation Planning Organizations as the venues for identifying regional priorities and coordinating transportation planning at all

jurisdictional levels with local comprehensive plans. The regional transportation plans prepared by RTPOs play an important role in achieving consistency between state, county, city, and town plans and policies. The Regional Transportation Planning Organization should continue to implement the GMA and support the six legislative transportation system policy goals of RCW 47.04.280. These goals are:

1. Economic Vitality
2. Preservation
3. Safety
4. Mobility
5. Environment
6. Stewardship

WSDOT also notes that RTPOs are likely to want to stay informed on and/or be active partners in shaping the statewide themes through involvement in statewide planning, WSDOT region planning, state and national legislative activities.

FY 2014 UPWP FORMAT

As in previous years, the draft UPWP has four major areas: (1) Regional Transportation Planning Program, (2) Data Management and Travel Forecasting Process, (3) Transportation Program Coordination and Management, and (4) Transportation Planning Activities of State and Local Agencies. In Transportation Management Areas (TMAs), such as Clark County, the UPWP must include a discussion of the planning priorities facing the metropolitan planning area and describe all metropolitan transportation and transportation-related air quality planning activities (including corridor and subarea studies) anticipated within the area, regardless of funding sources or agencies conducting the activities (Metropolitan Planning Rule § 450.314).

FUNDING ESTIMATES

The table below presents the WSDOT funding estimates for allocated federal PL and FTA funding and an estimate of state Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO) funds RTC may receive to carry out the FY 2014 regional transportation planning program. The distribution of these estimated revenues to work elements is summarized on the final page of the draft FY 2014 UPWP.

FY 2014 Estimated MPO Funding:

FHWA PL	\$559,705
FTA Section 5303	\$165,936
RTPO Planning	\$170,000

FY 2014 UPWP DEVELOPMENT: DRAFT TIMELINE

A summary of the proposed timeline for FY 2014 UPWP development, given WSDOT’s UPWP Transportation Planning Guidance document, is provided below:

RTC’s FY 2014 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT		
DATE	MEETING	ACTION
Fri. Feb. 15	RTAC	RTAC comments on draft FY 2014 UPWP.
Wed. Feb. 20	RTC at 1:30 p.m.	RTC meets state and federal representatives at PSC to review draft FY 2014 UPWP. Metro review begins at 9:00 a.m. at Metro
Tue. May 4	RTC Board	Review of draft FY 2014 UPWP.
by Wed. May 15		WSDOT submits comments on draft UPWP to MPOs/RTPOs
Fri. May 17	RTAC	Recommend RTC Board adoption of FY 2014 UPWP.
Tue. Jun. 4	RTC Board	Adoption of FY 2014 UPWP.
by Fri. Jun. 14		Submit adopted FY 2014 UPWP electronically to WSDOT PO
by Jun. 17		Adopted UPWPs sent by WSDOT to FHWA/FTA for approval.
Jun. 28, 2013		FHWA/FTA UPWP approval due to WSDOT Planning Office
Jul. 1, 2013		Approved FY 2014 UPWP takes effect

The FY2014 UPWP will be reviewed at the February 15 RTAC meeting in preparation for Metro and RTC’s federal and state UPWP review scheduled for Wednesday, February 20, 2013. RTC’s review is scheduled to begin at 1:30 p.m. in room 679 (6th floor) of the Public Service Center. WSDOT SW Region and C-TRAN staffs usually participate at RTC’s UPWP review. Metro’s review is scheduled to begin at 9:00 a.m. at Metro.

NEXT STEPS

Following the receipt of state and federal comments on the draft UPWP, RTAC participants will have further opportunities to review the document and a recommendation to forward the UPWP for Board adoption is likely at the May 17, 2013 meeting prior to anticipated RTC Board action at the Board’s June 4 meeting.

Attachment: RTC’s Draft FY 2014 UPWP



MEMORANDUM

TO: Regional Transportation Advisory Committee
FROM: Dale Robins
DATE: February 8, 2013
SUBJECT: Local Agency Federal OA Policy

INTRODUCTION

RTAC members are familiar with the importance of obligating our region's share of the annual obligation authority or OA. The expiration of SAFETEA-LU in 2009 and the many continuing resolutions to extend the federal transportation funds created an environment of uncertainty in federal funding levels. This further led to a conservative approach in obligating projects. Now with MAP-21 in place and a different revenue environment the past practices for OA are changing. This memorandum and the attached Local Agency Federal OA Policy address a new era where meeting our region's annual OA level become critical and could lead to the loss federal funds.

In past years, the practice has been that WSDOT would "use up" the unobligated portion of local OA on state projects to ensure that overall Washington State used all of the State's OA for that particular fiscal year. In 2012, WSDOT had to use almost \$30 million of the local portion of federal OA to ensure that the State met its target level. WSDOT local programs then would carry forward the unobligated local agency OA and allow them to use it in the following year.

Given WSDOT's financial situation, and a more limited set of projects to shift OA to WSDOT is not going to continue this practice. In other words WSDOT is no longer able to compensate for the lack of project delivery by local agencies. Beginning in 2013, this fiscal year, local agencies will need to meet their local obligation authority limits.

With the help of MPO's from around the state a Washington Local Agency Task Force was put together to draft a policy for ensuring the delivery of the local share of the federal program. RTC participated in this process. On February 1, 2013, RTC staff provided the first draft of this policy for review by RTAC members. This memorandum provides an overview of the draft statewide policy for the delivery of the local share of federal OA. In addition the draft Local Agency Federal OA Policy is attached for your review. The memorandum also presents draft strategies that could be adopted to ensure that OA levels are met and that the region does not lose any federal funds.

FEDERAL OBLIGATION POLICY

To start the new OA policy takes a two tiered approach as described below.

Tier 1: By June 1st, each region must obligate at least 90 percent of their OA target. Funds below 90 percent target will be "sanctioned" and the respective lead agencies will be warned that funds may be lost if not obligated. RTC will work closely with the local agencies to manage that year's list of projects to help ensure that the region will reach 100% of its target by August 1st.

Tier 2: By August 1st, the region must have obligated 100 percent of the targeted OA level. Any remaining funds not obligated will be fully sanctioned and be made available for statewide programming. The draft policy is proposing that any unutilized funds will be lost to the region and be made available to other regions that have projects ready to proceed. Funds received from a region that did not use their obligation authority would be a bonus.

POTENTIAL OBLIGATION STRATEGIES

RTC staff is proposing that in order to meet the restrictions of this new federal OA policy, new MTIP management strategies will need to be adopted. Given the feedback from the February 1st 2013 RTAC subcommittee meeting, RTC staff is proposing the following draft strategies for further discussion.

Communication: Communication will be one of the keys in order for the region to meet the OA targets. Local agencies will need to communicate with RTC staff the status of their projects. To do this, RTC is proposing that by the second Friday of each month agencies communicate the status of their federal projects. A simplified reporting format would be developed to do this. Also, local agencies will need to provide copies of all authorization letters to RTC. Local agencies will need to be very clear on their project delivery schedules.

Obligate Projects Programmed in Out Years: Statewide policy allows all four years of the MTIP to be programmed and obligated on a first-come basis. If local agencies implement projects from out years, it could help cover projects that experience delays.

RTC Project Delay Policy: RTC's current policy allows for up to three years for project delay. RTC staff would propose that this be moved up to a one year delay. Projects would have one year from the year provided in project applications to obligate funds. If a project is delayed beyond one year, the agency would need to reapply through the regional process.

Change Selection Process: RTC would suggest selecting projects that can be implemented within a 3 year period even though there is four year selection process. This should increase likelihood that projects in out years could be obligated sooner if needed.

OBLIGATION TARGET

The Clark County 2013 local federal obligation target is \$10.8 million; of which \$1.9 million has already been obligated. This leaves approximately \$8.9 million to be obligated by June 1st. Local federal programs include STP, CMAQ, and TAP.

RTC in conversation with local agencies has a commitment that there is the ability to obligate enough projects to exceed the federal OA target for 2013. While this is excellent on paper, close communication will still need to continue. If just a few projects experience delays it could cause the region to not meet our OA target.

WHAT IF THE REGION DOESN'T MEET ITS OBLIGATION TARGET

While it appears that the region can meet obligation target. The development of strategies in the event that doesn't happen needs to take place.

Attachment

Local Agency Task Force

Local Agency Federal OA Policy

January 31, 2012

Washington's Local Agency Task Force was asked to develop a strategy to ensure delivery of the local share (34 percent) of the Federal Highway (FHWA) program. Through discussions, the Task Force has established a Two Tier Local Agency Federal OA (obligation authority) Policy that sanctions unutilized allocation from MPO/RTPO/County lead agencies that are unable to deliver their annual target. In addition, it positions local agencies to obtain additional obligation authority for local projects, in the event other states fail to deliver their program (re-distributed OA). In the event all MPO/RTPO/County lead agencies delivery their OA, projects will be authorized through the Advanced Construction (AC) process.

MPO/RTPO/County lead agencies are provided annual allocations and corresponding obligation targets based upon estimated OA available for the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY). The OA targets are developed based upon a formula utilizing localities carry-forward balance and annual allocation. The following goals and processes are in place to assist in timely delivery and positioning the state to obtain additional obligation authority for local projects.

The timeline below identifies the obligation expectations and the steps taken to ensure local program delivery and the consequences if a MPO/RTPO/County lead agency is unable to deliver.

<u>Schedule</u>	<u>Goal %</u>
March 31 st	45%
June 1 st	90%
August 1 st	100%

The first goal is to obligate at least 45 percent of the MPO/RTPO/County lead agency total obligation target by March 31st.

- To assist MPO/RTPO/County lead agencies, WSDOT will provide:
 - ✓ Monthly obligation reports to each MPO/RTPO/County lead agency that includes all federal activity in their respective area; and
 - ✓ An updated Target Delivery table to show the status of the programs overall.
- MPO/RTPO/County lead agencies are to follow-up with all their project sponsors with programmed projects not yet obligated for the FFY to:
 - ✓ Ensure delivery of the projects programmed for the FFY;
 - ✓ Identify the projects that are delayed into a future FFY; and
 - ✓ Identify additional projects that are ready to go and able to be delivered this FFY.

The purpose of the following Two Tier approach is to ensure that the local OA levels are met by providing opportunities for additional priority projects that are ready to go either in the specific regional area delayed in delivering federal funds; or in other areas of the state that can move forward immediately.

- ❖ **Tier 1** – By June 1st, each MPO/RTPO/County lead agency receiving an allocation must have obligated or have submitted to WSDOT complete funding packages for at least 90 percent of their total obligation target.
 - If 90 percent of the target amount is not obligated by the MPO/RTPO/County lead agencies, the difference between the 90 percent target amount and the actual obligation amount for the current federal fiscal year will be sanctioned by the Task Force.
 - Sanctioned funds will be identified and any ready to go eligible project will be considered for funding through MPO/RTPO/County lead agency contingency lists or as emergent projects.
 - ✓ Localities are to continue to deliver their projects.
 - ✓ Task Force will message to all MPO/RTPO/County lead agencies that funds have been sanctioned and additional priority projects should be identified and programmed for obligation. Projects include those identified in contingency lists approved in current TIPs and forwarded for inclusion in the STIP.
 - ✓ Priority will be given to projects in the areas where funds were sanctioned.
 - ✓ Priority will be given to projects that have a documented schedule for delivery.

Example:

<i>\$'s in millions</i>					
MPO A	Total Available	Target Allocation	June 1 Obligated	June 1 90% Goal	June 1 Sanction
STP	15.0	10.0	6.2	9.0	-
CMAQ	8.0	5.0	4.5	4.5	-
TAP	4.0	2.0	2.5	1.8	-
TOTAL	27.0	17.0	13.2	15.3	2.1

- ❖ **Tier 2** – By August 1st, each MPO/RTPO/County lead agency receiving an allocation must have obligated or have submitted to WSDOT complete funding packages for 100 percent of their total targeted amount.
 - The Task Force will sanction the remaining targeted funds not yet obligated for statewide programming.
 - Task Force will message to all MPO/RTPO/County lead agencies that funds have been sanctioned and additional priority projects should be identified and programmed for obligation. Projects include those identified in contingency lists approved in current TIPs and forwarded for inclusion in the STIP.

- Remaining funds will be made available based on first come, first serve basis for projects that are programmed and have complete funding packages submitted to WSDOT for obligation.
 - ✓ Project sponsors are to continue to deliver their projects.
 - ✓ Projects must be programmed and obligated by September 15th.
 - This allows MPO/RTPO/County lead agencies to be over-programmed in the August STIP amendment.
 - All MPO/RTPO/County lead agencies that had funds sanctioned are required to reduce their programmed projects accordingly in the October amendment. This ensures fiscal constraint statewide.

Example:

<i>\$'s in millions</i>					
MPO A	Total Available	Target Allocation	Aug 1 Obligated	Aug 1 100% Goal	Aug 1 Sanction
STP	15.0	10.0	6.9	10.0	-
CMAQ	8.0	5.0	5.5	5.0	-
TAP	4.0	2.0	4.0	2.0	-
TOTAL	27.0	17.0	16.4	17.0	0.6

Consequences:

Any sanctioned funds not utilized by the specific MPO/RTPO/County lead agency will be removed from their carry-forward or annual allocation in proportion to each program where they did not meet their target. These lost funds will not be available for future programming by the MPO/RTPO/County lead agency. Sanctioned funds received by an MPO/RTPO/County lead agency are a bonus and will not affect their current or future annual allocations.

Example:

<i>\$'s in millions</i>					
MPO A	Total Available	Target Allocation	Total Obligated	Total Sanction	Carry-forward
STP	15.0	10.0	6.9	0.6	7.5
CMAQ	8.0	5.0	5.5	-	2.5
TAP	4.0	2.0	4.0	-	-
TOTAL	27.0	17.0	16.4	0.6	10.0

Maintaining accurate project schedules and managing to regional OA plans are essential for ensuring delivery of the local program of projects. Late notification of schedule changes limits the opportunity for other projects to be added to the program or advanced to utilize these available funds due to their project delays.

The goal of this process is timely delivery of local projects essential to the public for improving safety and movement of people and goods throughout the state.



MEMORANDUM

TO: Regional Transportation Advisory Committee
FROM: Lynda David
DATE: February 8, 2013
SUBJECT: **Metropolitan Transportation Plan Capital Facilities Review**

INTRODUCTION

RTC's 2013 Work Program, discussed at the November 2012 RTAC meeting and adopted by the RTC Board in December 2012, includes a work element to undertake a review of the MTP's twenty-year list of projects using a more conservative growth scenario than in the existing Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). At the February meeting, RTAC members are asked to discuss the work element ahead of an introductory presentation to the RTC Board at its March 5 meeting.

CAPITAL FACILITIES REVIEW

The RTC Work Plan describes the capital facility analysis, "Related to the plan monitoring and system performance work element is a question of timing for future year system capacity expansion projects. Given the 2035 population and employment projections, the MTP's list of capacity expansion capital projects would be needed. However, given the current economic slowdown, the region's 2035 growth projection may not be reached until the year 2040 or 2045. The purpose of this work activity is to conduct an analysis of which projects are most critical by 2035 versus those that may not be needed for another 10 years given a slower than anticipated growth rate."

- **Plan Monitoring**

The 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan, adopted in December 2011, is consistent with local long-range comprehensive land use plans and meets federal metropolitan transportation planning requirements. However, monitoring of growth and system performance trends is key in preparing for the next MTP update due in late 2015. Since the December 2011 MTP adoption, Washington Office of Financial Management (OFM) has released an updated mid-level population forecast with a lower forecast population for Clark County than OFM's previous forecast. RTC is considering using this new mid-level forecast as a starting point in the 20-year capital facilities analysis.

	2035 Population Forecast
MTP (adopted Dec. 2011)	641,775
OFM Mid-range (2012)	562,207

• **Transportation System Performance**

Much like the 10-year Transportation Priorities project (RTC, 2012), the 20-year transportation system review will look to identify the most needed long-range regional transportation projects, service and strategies. Again, this will be beneficial in preparatory work for the next MTP update and will provide information useful in meeting the requirements of MAP-21 and the transition to a performance based investment decision approach.

TIMELINE

A proposed draft timeline for the MTP Capital Facilities Review is provided below. RTC staff has begun to meet with County and Vancouver staff and will be meeting with staff of smaller cities to discuss the lower growth forecast on February 20.

Date	Activity	Description
Mar. 5	RTC Board	Study kickoff: purpose, scope, approach
May 7	RTC Board	Characterize current MTP project list
Jun. 4 or Jul. 2	RTC Board	Highest priority 20-year transportation facilities following comparison with and analysis of 10-Year, current MTP and new growth forecast transportation system forecast performance
Sep. 3	RTC Board	Conclude 20-year MTP Capital Facilities Review in preparation for scoping the next MTP update (due 2015) and MAP-21 performance managed transportation system requirements

NEXT STEPS

At the February 15 RTAC meeting, we intend to discuss the MTP Capital Facilities Review purpose, scope and approach ahead of the March 5 RTC Board presentation. Input from RTAC members in crafting the scope for the study would be most welcome.