

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Board of Directors
March 5, 2013, 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 Bill Ganley on Tuesday, March 5, 2013, at 4 p.m. at the Clark County Public Service Center Sixth Floor Training Room, 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington. Attendance follows.

Board Members Present:

Nancy Baker, Port of Vancouver Commissioner
Jack Burkman, Vancouver Council Member
Bill Ganley, Battle Ground Council Member
Jeff Hamm, C-TRAN Executive Director
David Madore, Clark County Commissioner
Doug McKenzie, Skamania Co. Commissioner
Tom Mielke, Clark County Commissioner
Melissa Smith, Camas Council Member
Jeanne Stewart, Vancouver Council Member
Steve Stuart, Clark County Commissioner
Don Wagner, WSDOT Regional Administrator

Board Members Absent:

Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor
David Poucher, White Salmon Mayor
Jason Tell, ODOT Region One Manager
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, Labor/Citizen
Mike Bridges, IBEW 48
Dick Sohn, Citizen
Eric Florip, The Columbian
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Council Member
Jodi Guetzloe Parker, Columbia Pacific Building Trades
Jim Karlock, Citizen
Dale Lewis, Rep. Herrera Beutler's Office
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver Neighborhood Assoc.
Paul Montague, Identity Clark County
Sharon Nasset, Citizen
Ron Onslow, Ridgefield Mayor
Philip Parker, WA Transportation Commissioner
Scott Patterson, C-TRAN
Matt Ransom, City of Vancouver
Rod Richardson, IBEW 48
Scott Sawyer, City of Battle Ground
Andrew Young, MacKay Sposito

Staff Present:

Lynda David, Senior Transportation Planner
Mark Harrington, Senior Transportation Planner
Bob Hart, Transportation Section Supervisor
Dean Lookingbill, Transportation Director
Dale Robins, Senior Transportation Planner
Diane Workman, Administrative Assistant

II. Approval of February 5, 2013, Meeting Minutes

STEVE STUART MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2013, MEETING MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY DON WAGNER AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

III. Citizen Communications

Sharon Nasset from Portland had comments on the RTC Bylaws. She said RTC is comparable to Metro on the Oregon side. She said Metro have officials that are elected to their Board, where RTC has elected officials that are on the RTC Board. RTC has a voting Metro member and non-voting legislators on their Board. Ms. Nasset felt that Metro should be non-voting as well. She said the Oregon and Washington Department of Transportation positions are not elected and felt it is a conflict to have them in voting

positions. She thinks they should be non-voting. Ms. Nasset said she thinks that the legislators should be allowed to have a representative of their choice at the table to have a voice even though non-voting.

Ed Barnes of Vancouver clarified that RTC is comparable with the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), which is a subcommittee of the Metro Council. Clark County region has three voting positions. Mr. Barnes said the State of Oregon has approved both the House and the Senate, the money to come forward for the Columbia River Crossing. He said the Washington Legislators need to get it together and do what is right for our community. We need this bridge for our future, our economy, and jobs in our communities so they do not have to travel to Oregon for work. Mr. Barnes encouraged all to contact their legislators in support of the CRC project.

Jodi Guetzloe Parker of Vancouver said she was a representative for the Columbia Pacific Building Trades association based out of Portland, Oregon. She said they represent nine counties across the river and three counties on the Washington side. Ms. Parker noted the funding that the State of Oregon has identified for the Columbia River Crossing as Mr. Barnes had said. She said she would like to see some support from Washington to build the bridge. The bridge will represent training opportunities to provide for apprentices to learn skills in different building trades. Ms. Parker said they are looking at future needs for our communities as well as the future movement of freight along the I-5 corridor. She asked them to help build the bridge.

Jim Karlock of Portland said the place we need a new bridge is at 192nd Ave., but we won't have the money to build it there or near the railroad bridge, or anywhere because of the money that has and is being spent.

Dick Sohn of Vancouver said he is against the CRC project. He said he has devoted a lot of his time over the last couple years to defeat the project. He said at meetings he has always seen labor and the construction industries saying we need to build the bridge because we want jobs and training. He said he is not looking forward to the mess that it may create. He said he is one of the people who will have to pay for it and he will not be trained or get a job out of it. Mr. Sohn said we should be looking at how we are to build a bridge not about how we can get people employed, trained, or a piece of it. He does not want to pay taxes for it or pay to cross it.

IV. Consent Agenda

A. March Claims

B. TSMO/ITS Program: Technical Services Contract, Resolution 03-13-06

C. 2013-16 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program Amendment: Quick Response Safety Grants, Resolution 03-13-07

D. 2013-16 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program Amendment: Safe Routes to School Grants, Resolution 03-13-08

Jeanne Stewart asked to pull items C. Quick Response Safety Grants and D. Safe Routes to School Grants. Council Member Stewart said the Quick Response Safety Grants are for some very much needed projects. She said normally we pass these things on as consent, a routine type of business. Transportation people get these grants in the budget that are much needed and it goes through a whole process. When it gets to RTC it is routine and we say that's great. Ms. Stewart said she just wanted to bring attention to them. This is a good example of how transportation money is being effectively used to make a safe community. She said this includes the guardrail improvements on Pacific Hwy, Hayes and Cedar Creek Roads in Clark County. Also included are the City of Vancouver's Fourth Plain Blvd. upgrade to the pedestrian crossings and a much needed traffic signal at SE 137th Ave. and SE 7th Street. The Safe Routes

to School Grants include: the City of Battle Ground School Zone Safety Improvements, crosswalk, signage, signals, education, and enforcement; Sacajawea Elementary Pedestrian Safety, Clark County, sidewalks, signage, education, and enforcement; and Endeavour Elementary Pathway and Safety Improvements Project in Vancouver. Ms. Stewart said these are key issues that affect quality of life in our community. She said she was encouraged and pleased to see them coming forward. She thanked RTC and local jurisdictions and school districts that have moved them forward.

STEVE STUART MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA MARCH CLAIMS AND RESOLUTIONS 03-13-06, 03-13-07, AND 03-13-08. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY JACK BURKMAN AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

David Madore asked to have a resolution to consider added to the agenda. Chair Ganley said he could address the Board under Other Business From the Board. Commissioner Stuart asked as Point of Order, if it is something that hasn't been noticed as part of the agenda for the meeting, is it something to add to this meeting or something to add to the next meeting so adequate notice has been given. Chair Ganley said Commissioner Madore could be the first Board member to speak during Other Business.

V. MAP-21 Transportation Alternatives Program Process

Dale Robins said an overview of the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) was provided at the February meeting. Today, Mr. Robins would provide a brief overview and seek RTC Board approval to begin the process that will result in the selection of projects.

The Transportation Alternatives Program is a new federal transportation funding program that builds upon the previous Transportation Enhancement Program. Primarily, the program is expected to fund community based bicycle and pedestrian improvements, although other types of projects are also eligible.

With RTC Board approval, the TAP process will begin. There will be a call for projects this week, with RTC Board project selection occurring at the July Board meeting. The RTC Board will make final selection based on a recommendation from RTAC and an evaluation committee. Approximately, \$2.2 million in projects will be selected to fund the program over the next four years. To the most part, the process is the same as outlined at the February meeting. The only changes are the finalization of the selection criteria and the project application form.

Jack Burkman asked if any of the percentages for the selection criteria changed. Mr. Robins said the percentages are the same as listed in the memorandum.

Mr. Robins noted projects that were funded through the previous Transportation Enhancement Program during the past decade. These include: Evergreen Trail, School Sidewalk Projects, Ridgefield Welcome Center, Confluence Land Bridge, Lyle Path, Chelatchie Prairie Railroad Trail, and Downtown Washougal Improvements. Although, there are some changes with the TAP program, Mr. Robins said they expect similar type projects to be funded through this program.

Mr. Robins said staff is seeking RTC Board approval of the Transportation Alternatives Program process.

Jeanne Stewart referred to page 3 of the TAP document. She said RTC is proposing that a TAP Project Evaluation Team of five people be formed to evaluate and rank the 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. Ms. Stewart said it is important to have input from these groups, but questioned them actually evaluating the program, and asked if they would also be prioritizing the projects.

Mr. Lookingbill said the agencies (RTC, WSDOT, and C-TRAN) would not have projects, so they would not be evaluating their own projects. The other groups would have experience with the types of projects

and how they might apply. The role of the committee would be to score each of the projects. They would then go to the Technical Advisory Committee. RTAC would subsequently make a recommendation to the RTC Board and the Board would have the final decision. Mr. Lookingbill said the Evaluation Committee was seen as a supporting group to help look and evaluate projects. Ms. Stewart considered having the technical group evaluate first.

Mr. Lookingbill said the committee would be staff from RTC, WSDOT, and C-TRAN along with someone from the Health Department and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee who would have some familiarity with the projects. There will also be public outreach on this. Mr. Lookingbill said an example could be the City of Vancouver applies for a project, so the information on the project comes from city staff.

Tom Mielke asked what role RTC had in this process. Mr. Lookingbill said this is a new program that allows the RTC Board to make a project selection for our region. The decision on projects is not made by the State, but is made locally.

David Madore questioned if this is how it was done in the past, with a five member committee. Mr. Lookingbill said TAP is a new federal program. There are two other programs that have dollars that come directly to the region and the Board makes a similar decision. RTC staff ranks the projects; they then go to RTAC, and to the RTC Board for final decision. Because of the nature of this program, they offered a wider point of view and thought it would be good to include them. Commissioner Madore said for the flexibility if there were one or two individuals who would like to participate; don't limit the committee to five. List it as "at least five". Chair Ganley said it could be listed as "five to seven" or "no less than five" or "no more than seven" to offer flexibility.

Commissioner Madore said all the projects would be scored, and asked if any of the projects would be filtered out or eliminated. Mr. Lookingbill said none would be eliminated from initial consideration. All the project applications would go through the process and come before the Board for recommendation.

DAVID MADORE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM PROCESS. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MELISSA SMITH AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VI. Metropolitan Transportation Plan Capital Facilities Review

Lynda David referred to the memo included in the meeting packet along with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) list of identified projects and map showing locations of the projects. Also provided were paper copies of the PowerPoint presentation.

Ms. David said they are beginning a work element which was described in RTC's 2013 work program. The work element intends to review the list of capital transportation projects identified in the MTP and test the impacts on the transportation system with a new demographic forecast. Staff is asking for Board input at the outset of this work element.

In summary, the purpose of the work element is to look at the Metropolitan Transportation Plan's 20-year list of capital projects, test the impacts on the transportation system if we use a more conservative 2035 growth forecast than that used in the current MTP. The new forecast would be consistent with the updated Washington Office of Financial Management's "medium" forecast. The intention is to analyze which MTP projects are most critical for the Clark County region.

This work follows on the 10-year transportation project priorities the Board addressed last year, responds to changing trends both in demographics and in reduced revenues for transportation system improvements, follows the approach to transportation system projects now used by WSDOT with the Moving Washington initiative; "to operate efficiently, manage demand and add capacity strategically"

and uses a consistent approach to the work RTC is already undertaking in the I-205 corridor which was presented at last month's meeting.

Ms. David said transportation system monitoring and performance evaluation are now the focus of regional transportation planning required by the new federal transportation act, MAP-21. The MTP system and project evaluations to be carried out as part of this work effort will help us in meeting MAP-21's performance-based transportation planning and investment decision-making and will help in preparing to scope the next MTP update.

The current Metropolitan Transportation Plan was adopted by the RTC Board in 2011. The MTP for Clark County is the long-range plan for the region's transportation system. The Plan is a federal requirement as a condition for receipt of federal transportation funds to the region. The Plan must be regularly updated every four years, must address multiple transportation modes, must be affordable, and be consistent with state and local plans. In order to identify needed transportation projects, the long-range transportation planning process considers land uses defined in local comprehensive plans, uses a growth forecast, and models future travel demand before arriving at a set of fiscally-constrained transportation projects. The current adopted MTP used this process and the same process will be employed in review of the MTP's capital facilities projects.

Both local Comprehensive Plans and the MTP comply with the State's Growth Management law which requires consistency between plans. The current MTP, to comply with federal requirements, has a horizon year of 2035 and uses growth trends consistent with the local Comprehensive Growth Management Plans which had a 2024 horizon year. Per the Growth Management Act, Washington's Office of Financial Management projects population by County. OFM releases a range of low, medium and high projections. These OFM population projections are updated periodically and must be used by local jurisdictions in the Comprehensive planning process. The 2007 adopted Comprehensive Plan used the higher end of the OFM projected population range in place at the time. Ms. David provided a Clark County Demographics slide showing Clark County population, housing and employment for base year (2010), the forecast used in the Comprehensive Plan (2024) and the MTP's 2035 forecast. The Clark County Growth Management Plan was adopted in 2007 with a horizon year of 2024 and the current MTP, adopted in 2011, uses consistent trends with a 2035 horizon year.

Ms. David said they are most concerned with households as the unit of trip production when they develop a regional travel demand forecast. Household size, ages and income influence trip making and travel behavior. She provided a slide showing persons per household decreasing from a current 2.7 persons to a forecast 2.58 persons per household used in the 2035 MTP. In 2010, there were 0.84 jobs per household with Comprehensive Plans and MTP using consistent and optimistic jobs per household of 1.03.

Ms. David provided a series of three slides to show how transportation projects tend to follow and support development showing Clark County between 1980 and 2010. Since the early 80s to about 2008, Clark County saw robust growth and development. Roadway projects primarily focused on increasing capacity as well as safety. In this timeframe, C-TRAN became a countywide transit system and was in a system expansion mode with annual service hours increasing from about 67,000 in 1981 to 223,000 by 1994. Roadway improvements from 1995 to 2004 saw more projects now focused on suburban growth areas. Also included were roadway improvements from 2005 to 2010. C-TRAN experienced up and down levels of transit service in this time period due to revenue fluctuations.

Looking forward to year 2035 in the 2011 adopted MTP, the map included in the meeting packet locates identified MTP projects. Projects tend to address capacity and safety needs both within Urban Growth Areas and between UGAs. Given the 2035 population and employment projections used in the 2011 adopted MTP, the extensive list of regional capital facility projects would be needed. However, with the current economic slowdown, the region's 2035 growth projection may not be realized until the year 2040

or beyond, and with more limited transportation revenues and a new 2035 population forecast released by OFM, they want to move ahead with a review of the 2035 MTP project list given a more conservative growth projection. Comparison between system performance given different growth scenarios and transportation project assumptions can provide useful information in preparation for the next MTP update in 2015.

Ms. David said the meeting packet includes an excerpt from the current MTP with a list of all identified capital projects assumed to be in place in the next 20 years with the exception of the projects already programmed for construction in the 4-year Transportation Improvement Program. The listed projects total \$2.8 billion in estimated project costs. WSDOT projects total 25 in number at a cost of about \$1.4 billion which emphasizes the significance and expense of the interstate and state system. The MTP also includes 85 local highway projects at a cost estimate of \$750 million.

A map showing 2035 year travel demand on a highway network with only projects programmed in the 4-year MTIP constructed was provided. With the regional highway system in this scenario, there are 427 lane miles of congestion on the whole highway system, amounting to 18.1% of the system. Next the MTP's 2035 travel demand is assigned to a highway network with the full list of MTP projects assumed to be constructed. In this scenario, there are 227 lane miles of congestion on the highway system, amounting to 9.1% of the system, with 22.1% of the interstate lane miles experiencing congestion. This compares with 38.6 % of the interstate system congested if only the 4-year program of projects was constructed.

Next, Ms. David asked Board Members to consider what is changing and why we want to review the MTP's project list given recent demographic and financial trends. These national trends all influence travel and trip making: the nation's population is aging (which usually results in lower household size), minority populations are increasing, lifestyle expectations are changing (we've witnessed the twenty-somethings without jobs returning home to live with parents), and incomes are flat or decreasing.

In Clark County, population is still increasing but at a very slow rate compared with the 1990s and early 2000s. In the 1990s the average annual growth rate was over 4% but had decreased to 0.6% growth between 2010 and 2011. The population aged 65 and over is increasing, minority populations have also increased from 15.9% of the County's population in 2000 rising to 18.2% by 2010. Net migration (people moving into and out of Clark County) has decreased. In 1997/98, net migration increase amounted to 10,476 people, but between 2009 and 2010, 1,091 more people left the County than arrived. Note that population growth or decrease is also a function of births and deaths in the County. Residential building permits and construction have decreased over the past few years compared with the years of robust growth between the mid-1980s to late 2000s.

Census data shows that in 2000, 9.5% of the County's population was aged 65 or over, rising to 11.5% in 2010. By 2035, Washington Office of Financial Management forecasts over 20.8% of our County's population to be aged 65 and over. Data also shows that from the mid-1980s to the late 2000s, Clark County experienced robust development in its residential sector. For the decade of 1990-2000 Clark County was the fastest growing county in the state. For 17 of the last 22 years, the number of new residential units exceeded 3,000 new units per year. Then the recession hit and things changed. Starting in 2007 the drop began. The number of units fell below 3,000 and down to about 1,300 in 2010.

Ms. David said it is because of these changed trends as well as a new county population forecast released by OFM in 2012 that RTC is going to review the MTP's identified capital facilities. The new 2035 OFM medium population projection is what RTC is proposing to use in reviewing the MTP's identified capital projects. This will allow for comparisons of transportation system performance between the existing MTP and the new 2035 forecast to both maintain a connection with Growth Management planning and to prepare for scoping of the next MTP update due in late 2015.

New Household and employment projections pivot off this new OFM Medium population projection. The Comprehensive Plan and existing MTP assumed a lower number of persons per household that trends now suggest for Clark County. Therefore, the new 2035 forecast is projecting 2.68 persons per household. Although the population is aging, which usually results in a lower population per household number, this is countered with an increase in the minorities population and this demographic has a higher than average persons per household number. Jobs per household for the new 2035 is proposed to be 0.99, which is probably more realistic than the former 2035 projection of 1.03 jobs per household. These new demographic projections are proposed for use by RTC to test the impacts on the transportation system.

Ms. David said the proposed timeline is to conclude the 20-year capital facilities review by September. They intend to report back to the RTC Board in May on MTP projects and travel demand. By July they should be able to provide a report on comparisons of transportation system performance between the currently adopted MTP and the new 2035 growth forecast. This should help to determine the most needed transportation projects in the 20-year timeframe. They are set to conclude the capital facility projects review by September which will then provide input to the scoping of the next MTP update due for adoption in late 2015. It can also provide useful data and transportation system analysis to use in MAP-21's required system performance monitoring and evaluation.

Next steps include working with the local jurisdictions on the new 2035 demographic scenario and allocation to land uses. They will develop a regional travel demand model and analyze the differences between the existing MTP 2035 and the new 2035 transportation system performance. Ultimately, the goal is to make fiscally responsible decisions about the future transportation system and the most needed projects which would benefit the County most. Staff will provide progress reports at future RTC Board meetings and asked for any comments and guidance on this work.

Jack Burkman asked how this fit in with the Comprehensive Plan update that is going to be occurring. Steve Stuart said the next update to the Comprehensive Plan is due in 2016. The state requirement is to review and revise as necessary. There is a check list that they have to go through for that. They have to stay within the low and high range of the OFM population projections. The changes to the OFM population projections will be part of their analysis. The question is if their projections were within the low and high range. If they are within the range, (RTC is using the medium range for their look), they are still legally allowed to move forward with the Plan as it exists. As they adjust the 20 year population projections, they then adjust the 20-year land supply. If they already have enough land, they do not have authority to add land capacity, because their 20-year land supply is already provided for. The 2016 Plan will go out to 2036 so it will overlap the MTP timeframe. Mr. Burkman said the MTP review might provide a look at the impact of what might be the transportation system with these assumptions around population. Ms. David said in an ideal world, the Growth Management Planning update process would be in sync with the MTP, but they must comply with federal mandates and requirements as well as state. Commissioner Stuart said their first work session on the GMA update will be in June or July of this year.

David Madore said the idea is to review the adopted list and to conduct an analysis and provide an opportunity to consider alternative approaches with least cost planning. It must be affordable and must be consistent with state and local plans. Commissioner Madore said he wanted to see if they had the freedom to consider the appropriateness of the decisions that have already been set. He said he wanted to make sure that we can adapt and follow the most appropriate path forward. He said there are a lot of good projects listed, yet he said there are some that he thinks merit the reconsideration by the Board in order to really consider some of the very large projects as the best use of our resources. In particular, Commissioner Madore referred to page 2 of the MTP's 2035 project list (Appendix B) and the listed I-5 Columbia River Crossing project. He said rather than just assume that we are moving forward with it that they would have an opportunity to consider the appropriateness of that project consuming a lot of the dollars of the projects. Commissioner Madore referred to page 3 listing the Bus Rapid Transit project for

Fourth Plain. He said both of these projects have gone to a vote to see if they can receive funding and have been rejected. Rather than just assume we are going to move this forward, he said we need to consider this.

Jeff Hamm said the Bus Rapid Project is part of the now adopted C-TRAN 2030 Plan. The C-TRAN Board is in discussions about the future of that Plan. At the last Workshop, the Board decided to look at the BRT project separate from the light rail CRC. Mr. Hamm said it seems the fate of that project and the allocation of funds for it lies within the purview of the C-TRAN Board. Until they dictate otherwise, he said it would be appropriate to keep it in there so they are eligible for federal funding.

Dean Lookingbill clarified the proposed 2035 Capital Facilities review process. He said we have the adopted 2035 MTP and that is linked to the existing adopted GMA Plan and the 2035 forecast. This effort is asking what happens if we were not to see the level of the previous 2035 growth forecast. This is an exploratory activity in preparation of a future MTP update. What Commissioner Madore is suggesting amounts to taking projects on or off the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. That would be a formal MTP amendment process. This was intended to be an informational review of the MTP list of projects, given a smaller 2035 growth forecast.

Commissioner Madore asked what was needed in order to make a formal MTP amendment. Mr. Lookingbill said the RTC Board adopts and approves the MTP. Commissioner Madore asked if the Board had the freedom to make changes to remove or lower the priority of these, or make them contingent upon funding being provided by a vote.

Mr. Lookingbill said there are many interconnected parts to answering that question. He said there are federal air quality requirements as well. They would have to rerun the analysis to make sure they meet all of the federal requirements along with all of the other requirements. They would then have to look at all of the implications in terms of the whole system performance, because the MTP is a system plan. This Plan is owned by the RTC Board. There would be an extensive process in doing what was suggested, but that is the Board's choice.

Commissioner Madore said he is not suggesting that everything on the list be rehashed, but to be able to evaluate one or two of the major items on the list for consideration to be in a holding pattern; to adapt with minimal effort.

Commissioner Madore asked if they could pull one or two out at this point. Linda David said the best opportunity would be at the next MTP update which is in 2015. There is much work to build up to that with looking at and testing different scenarios of high growth and lower growth forecasts. At that point when the whole system is looked at and evaluated as part of the MTP update.

Commissioner Madore asked if this meant that there was not an opportunity to pull any projects out of the MTP before the year 2015. Mr. Lookingbill said the MTP has to be consistent. It is not as simple as pulling a project out of this plan. It is pulling it out of C-TRAN's Plan, the GMA Capital Facilities Plan, and the local jurisdictions' plans, because the MTP has to be consistent with all of these plans. It is not a stand-alone set of projects; it is connected to all of the other local plans.

Commissioner Madore asked if this Board could pull one project off of the list before 2015.

Jack Burkman said while he appreciated what Commissioner Madore was talking about in terms of simplicity; there needs to be understanding that this has been built by a series of layers and levels of conversations by all jurisdictions and prioritization and criteria so that all the projects are interwoven. No one project stands unto itself. In theory, we could go back and rebuild the entire Plan from the ground up, but the idea of pulling one out, any one project, has so many other ripples in the system. That then falls into the regular update so we don't inadvertently upset other jurisdictions. Council Member Burkman said his understanding is that no single project stands unto itself. There is an elaborate process to go back

to say what if we change one of those projects. There is a regular cycle. As a Board, we could redo the whole cycle, but he said he is not in favor of doing that at this point.

Commissioner Madore said it would be good to go back to some document that clearly specifies the process, the limitation, and the freedom to be able to pull one project off of the MTP list. He said he did not want to make such a significant decision based on an opinion, when you don't go back to the original documentation that says what governs this process.

Jack Burkman said that is the Metropolitan Transportation Plan update that they have gone through multiple times, and that is the Plan that is documented by the RTC Board. He said we can go back and revisit the whole Plan, but the City of Vancouver does not look at individual projects here. They look at their role in the overall system that is countywide.

Commissioner Madore recommended at the next Board meeting, the governing documentation that answers this question be brought to the Board to refer to the source itself.

Jeanne Stewart said a few months ago she raised the issue about her concerns that incrementally RTC and other organizations were moving forward with the Columbia River Crossing, light rail, and tolling. She said her concern is that they get financial updates that tell them reasonably what the financial viability is, and the reason that she was asking that was because they have a ballot measure that failed. She wondered what that meant to the process here at RTC as we continue to move things forward. At what point do they look at the Plan and ask if it is being sustainable as financially feasible? Ms. Stewart said it worries her that the web is so tangled that if they go down the road, they can never go back. Hypothetically, she said what if the feds say they have no money for light rail, that we don't meet the timing for the bridge, and they can't fund the bridge in this cycle. She said she was pretty sure that we would come back and say that it can be revised now. Ms. Stewart asked where the flexibility is and said maybe the Governor's piece gets to that. Ms. Stewart said she understood that this was in part a C-TRAN project approved by C-TRAN who used the High Capacity Transit Study recommendations which became a part of C-TRAN's long range plan, RTC's long range plan, and the City of Vancouver's. The plans are integrated, but there is a point when we need to ask if it continues to be financially viable.

Jeff Hamm went back to the MTP Capital Facilities review and referred to the demographic of the aging population. He asked if they would be looking at reviewing the capital facilities plan with that in mind as well, such as greater signage or illuminated lanes or such. He said it does make sense to rethink about how we are building things as we have an older population.

Ms. David said these are certainly all considerations that they need to come to terms with as they move forward toward the update of the MTP in 2015. This work activity was put together to look mainly at the capital facilities plans, but they do need to make sure that they are in tune with the demographic trends and forecasts. It is an opportunity as well to think about what policies are in place and what policies should be in place at the next MTP update. The aging demographics is one that we should be paying attention to and put to the attention to Clark County's work efforts. Jeff Hamm questioned if they should be asking if they should build differently. Ms. David said yes they should.

Tom Mielke said he was bothered by this discussion. He said he thought that this was a proposed long-term plan, and what he is hearing is that it is woven together and he is not comfortable with that. He said again that we are putting the cart ahead of the horse. This makes it not flexible to our needs.

Jack Burkman said he is troubled by this conversation as well, because he said he is hearing a range from flexibility to change projects one meeting to another to never changing it. He said to him it is neither one. He recommended that staff put together a basic primer of what the planning processes are that we layer up to arrive at a conclusion. This Metropolitan Transportation Plan is a conclusion of vested judgment. These are the projects that we commit to at this time so that we can get in line and get the appropriate

funding, but we go back periodically and review it just as the Comprehensive Plan is done. This is not a daily review, but a six month, one year, or two year cycle depending on what that cycle is. Mr. Burkman said if that can be presented to the Board and get everyone on the same page as to what the process is, it will be a healthier conversation.

David Madore said he heard Mr. Burkman say he wanted to review how we got to this point. He said what he wanted to add to that is to have a clear indication of what the process is and make sure that we can move forward and gain insight and adapt to the downturn of the economy. He said he doesn't want us to move forward because we said we would a long time ago and fail to adapt.

Melissa Smith noted that the memo clearly states that the MTP for Clark County is the long-range plan for the region's transportation system. The Plan is required by the federal government as a condition for receipt of federal transportation funding to the region. The Plan must be regularly updated, must address multiple transportation modes, must be affordable, and must be consistent with state and local plans. She said basically, all they need to know is when they regularly update the MTP. This is not a concrete commitment yet; we're just getting projects in line. These requirements state that we have to have the funding, and it is regularly updated.

Chair Ganley said that is what staff is in the process of doing. We are getting updates and changes are being presented.

VII. New WSDOT Federal Obligation Authority Rules

Dean Lookingbill provided an overview of WSDOT's new policy regarding the delivery of the local share of the State's federal obligation authority (OA). This "use it or lose it" policy will impact how RTC manages the region's obligation of federal projects. RTC receives a direct allocation of federal funding for the Surface Transportation Program (STP), the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ), and the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). The 2013 local federal obligation target has been set by WSDOT to be \$10.8 million, of which about \$5 million has already been obligated. Obligated means that there is now a contract with WSDOT Local Programs to execute the project.

This new policy will have an impact on RTC's obligation process. The new policy proposes a two tiered process for how local agencies must reach their targeted level of obligation authority. By June 1, our region must obligate at least 90% of its targeted OA level (\$10.8 million). Funds below 90% target will be "sanctioned" and the respective lead agencies will be warned that funds may be lost if not obligated. By August 1, our region must have obligated 100% of its targeted OA level. Any remaining funds not obligated will be fully sanctioned and will be made available for statewide programming. RTC will work closely with the local agencies to manage each year's list of projects to help ensure that the region will reach 100% of its target by August 1. These are projects that are ready to go and are listed in the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) not the long-range MTP.

Jack Burkman said WSDOT has done a good job over time of cushioning us allowing us flexibility because of capital plans. He asked if there was something they could put in place locally so that say if the City of Vancouver is behind on something, Clark County might pick it up. Mr. Burkman asked if they could add that flexibility here. Mr. Lookingbill said these sorts of ideas are a part of the management of the program that staff is suggesting.

Jack Burkman asked how to get something obligated at WSDOT. Mr. Wagner said there is a process described in federal law about how a project gets obligated. Basically, it means that you say you are ready for construction and demonstrate that you are ready for construction. This is not really a new policy for the Department of Transportation. The Department has been able to cushion the local agencies for the last 15 years because there are two reasons that it is important. The first is that if the state as a whole does not obligate all of its federal funds, we can lose those funds to other states. In the past, they

had enough state money that could transpose dollars, take the federal dollars into the state system, and then build projects and use it all. They tended to go out after money that other states lost and get those funds into our state. Mr. Wagner said they no longer have the cash at the state level to be able to do that. If the locals cannot meet their federal obligations, the state won't meet its federal obligation, and we would be giving up the funds to other states that have met their obligations. This is not a change in policy; it is just that they now do not have the money to match at the state level.

Jeff Hamm asked if obligation authority targets are comprised of federal funds awarded from previous years, not necessarily 2013. Mr. Lookingbill said the \$10.8 million is the 2013 target. He said they have carried obligation authority over from one year to the next, but local programs is changing this policy.

VIII. Other Business

From the Board

David Madore distributed copies of a resolution he was asking the Board to consider. Commissioner Madore read the complete list of WHEREAS items included in the resolution referring to the CRC project and funding of light rail and operations and maintenance and the Fourth Plain Bus Rapid Transit project. The resolution ended with "NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that this Board of the RTC supports the opportunity for the voters of this community to more clearly indicate their support or rejection of these projects in a future election."

Chair Ganley questioned what Commissioner Madore was asking of the Board. Commissioner Madore said the resolution was not binding the Board to do anything. He said it says that we support the opportunity for a future election.

Commissioner Mielke said he understood the resolution to say that under RCW 81.104 it requires the vote of the people, and this is asking the RTC Board to recognize that it requires the vote of the people. He asked if that was correct.

Commissioner Madore said it says that we welcome the opportunity for the people to have a voice in the matter in the future, and it is a friendly process.

Jack Burkman said he appreciated Commissioner Madore bringing this to the Board, but he said this was very sudden and thought it was poor policy. If there was a particular item that was out there that was going to be taken to a vote, it would have been before the Board and discussed at individual jurisdictions to gather a concurrence on whether to support or oppose. That would have been a viable process. The resolution content has not been discussed at this Board nor have members had the discussion with our individual jurisdictions. Mr. Burkman said given this process, to support a vote that is related to these projects is a precedent that they don't want to set.

Melissa Smith said she respected and agreed with Mr. Burkman. She said coming from Camas, this is really not their battle. She said she did not think this was the right forum for it. Ms. Smith said she believed that the people will have a chance to speak in the future regarding this topic. She said she thought they need to focus on other things and not just the light rail project.

Steve Stuart had a factual update regarding the listed WHEREAS about the legal requirements under RCW 81.104 and the statement of no alternate means have been authorized to lawfully fund the proposed CRC project Light Rail O&M or for the proposed bus Rapid Transit project. Commissioner Stuart said they have two attorney opinions on this subject and they are divergent. One opinion says that 81.104 as the means for funding light rail or high capacity transit system, thus requires a vote; any high capacity transit system would require a vote. Another opinion from the C-TRAN attorney specifies that 81.104 is simply one section of Washington's code and there are other authorities granted to transit agencies. Representative Moeller has asked for an Attorney General's opinion to figure out what is right. The

Attorney General's office did accept the responsibility to offer a formal opinion as to whether or not this is actually even correct. A decision from the Attorney General should come back in May to clear this up.

David Madore began a motion to adopt the proposed resolution. Chair Ganley said this could be put on as a future agenda item, because this was not publicized and we also need to have discussion with our jurisdictions.

Jack Burkman requested that a motion be made as to whether this should be moved forward to an agenda item or not.

David Madore said he respected the process, and we always want to follow the process, but he said to keep in mind that our responsiveness needs to be timely. Our State Legislature is debating this issue right now, and they will be done next month.

Jack Burkman asked if he was proposing that we do this with no public input or notice. Commissioner Madore said he was proposing that we voice to our community, nothing binding, but simply a trust and respect for an opportunity for them. He said this is not obligating us to do anything. This says that we are supporting the opportunity for them to be heard in the future. It is not a binding resolution.

Commissioner Madore said he was very careful on the wording of this not to assert one position over another. Commissioner Stuart said that there was an assertion made when it states no alternate means have been authorized to lawfully fund the proposed CRC project light rail O & M or for the proposed bus rapid transit project. It assumes the outcome of the opinion that we are waiting for from the Attorney General's office.

Tom Mielke said he thought this is very soft and that the Board just recognizes and supports the opportunity for the voters to someday vote on this. Commissioner Mielke said he would support it if it was brought back at the next meeting. He thought it was representative of the people.

Chair Ganley said he could place this on the next meeting agenda. Jack Burkman requested that this be done by a roll-call vote.

DAVID MADORE MOTIONED TO HAVE THE DISCUSSED RESOLUTION WITH SOME MINOR FINE TUNING ON THE AGENDA FOR THE NEXT RTC MEETING. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY TOM MIELKE.

Jeanne Stewart said the principle of this is sound. She said she hoped the fact that this is being offered in a formal meeting that it is encouraging the voters that they are a part of government decisions and what they want is valid. Ms. Stewart said she agreed with that. She said she hasn't seen this resolution before today, and she was nervous moving it forward or even making a motion for this meeting to get it on an agenda. She said she needed more time to think about the resolution and what it says and incorporating the information about the legal opinions. Today is the first time she has heard about the two legal opinions. She would like a copy of those legal opinions. Ms. Stewart expressed her nervousness on moving this forward at this meeting, and asked if there was any way of postponing this.

Commissioner Madore said the motion is to consider it at the next meeting. Commissioner Mielke said this is a motion to support the opportunity for the voters.

Commissioner Stuart said he would not be supporting the motion, because they will not receive the Attorney General's opinion to know if this is factually correct until May. He said he is not willing to move forward on an item when we don't know if it is factually correct. Several of the points that are made leading up to a conclusion that we don't know if those are true.

THE MOTION FAILED IN A 2-8 VOTE WITH DAVID MADORE AND TOM MIELKE IN SUPPORT AND JEFF HAMM ABSTAINED.

Chair Ganley said RTC Director Dean Lookingbill has informed them that he will be retiring in March 2014. He said he would like to send out a Request for Qualifications to secure services for an executive search consultant. Chair Ganley said they need to start this process as soon as possible. The results of the RFQ and the decision of which firm to hire will come to the Board at their May meeting. An estimated cost for the search and work is about \$30,000-\$40,000. More information will be provided at the May meeting. Chair Ganley said local funds will be used; no state or federal dollars will be used. Vice Chair Jack Burkman said he and Chair Ganley have gone over the timeline for the process, and it is an aggressive timeline with some overlap time with the director. There may be some special meetings later in the process. Mr. Burkman said they felt it is necessary to have some overlap time. The list of RFQ's will be brought to the May meeting with the Chair and Vice Chair's recommendation, and from that a scope of work and then set the price.

From the Director

Dean Lookingbill said that CVTV can video record from the Training Room, but it would not be live and they would need to set up two cameras in the room, and run cords to a remote production setup just outside the room costing \$675 per meeting. If the meeting was moved to the Hearing Room next door, which is already set up for recording live, the cost is \$530. The meetings are then archived. Mr. Lookingbill said Melissa Smith had suggested looking at the program that the City of Camas uses. This program has a much broader base that incorporates all the packet materials along with the video. It is a more costly program.

Melissa Smith said at some future meeting, she would like to invite members to hold the RTC meeting in Camas to see how the system works. She said the program is very helpful for staff.

Jack Burkman said he confirmed that when CVTV tapes the meeting, it would be broadcast live on the cable system but also simultaneously streaming on the Web site so anyone outside Comcast can watch live.

Mr. Lookingbill asked which room the Board wanted to use. If the Hearing Room was used, it would be very difficult to be finished in time for the County Commissioners meeting at 6:00 p.m. It is something for the Commissioners to consider since it would probably mean that their meeting would have to be moved to a later start time.

Commissioner Stuart said their question was whether it was a significant imposition to continue it in the Training Room. He said it is a little over \$100 in extra cost. Mr. Lookingbill said the extra cost is for the camera and production set up. Commissioner Stuart suggested continuing with the meeting in the Training Room.

Jack Burkman said if the meeting was held in the Training Room, it would not be live and he asked if that would be a concern. Members did not think that it would be.

Commissioner Madore said there is already a room with a production booth and all the equipment. Mr. Lookingbill said the Training Room is not wired for use of the production room.

DAVID MADORE MOVED TO HAVE CVTV PROVIDE COVERAGE IN THE TRAINING ROOM AS PROPOSED. STEVE STUART SECONDED THE MOTION.

Tom Mielke said he thought it would be very inconvenient to record from the Training Room and that they could be flexible and move their meeting a half hour later. He would not support the motion.

THE MOTION PASSES WITH ONE OPPOSING VOTE BY TOM MIELKE.

Mr. Lookingbill noted JPACT meets Thursday, March 14, 2013, at Metro at 7:30 a.m. C-TRAN Board of Directors meets Tuesday, March 19, 2013, 4:30-5:30 p.m. for a Board Workshop and at 5:30 p.m. for their Board meeting at C-TRAN.

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, April 2, 2013, at 4 p.m. (*The April meeting was later cancelled. The next meeting is May 7, 2013.*)

The meeting was adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

William J. Ganley, Board of Directors Chair