

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council  
Board of Directors  
June 4, 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, June 4, 2013, at 4 p.m. at the Clark County Public Service Center Sixth Floor Training Room, 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington. The meeting was covered by CVTV. Attendance follows.

Board Members Present:

Nancy Baker, Port of Vancouver Commissioner  
Jack Burkman, Vancouver Council Member  
Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor  
Bill Ganley, Battle Ground Council Member  
Bart Gernhart, WSDOT Alternate  
Jeff Hamm, C-TRAN Executive Director  
David Madore, Clark County Commissioner  
Tom Mielke, Clark County Commissioner  
Melissa Smith, Camas Council Member  
Jeanne Stewart, Vancouver Council Member  
Steve Stuart, Clark County Commissioner  
Ed Orcutt, Representative 20<sup>th</sup> District  
Liz Pike, Representative 18<sup>th</sup> District

Board Members Absent:

Doug McKenzie, Skamania Co. Commissioner  
David Poucher, White Salmon Mayor  
Jason Tell, ODOT Region One Manager  
Don Wagner, WSDOT Regional Administrator  
Curtis King, Senator 14<sup>th</sup> District  
Norm Johnson, Representative 14<sup>th</sup> District  
Charles Ross, Representative 14<sup>th</sup> District  
Don Benton, Senator 17<sup>th</sup> District  
Paul Harris, Representative 17<sup>th</sup> District  
Monica Stonier, Representative 17<sup>th</sup> District  
Ann Rivers, Senator 18<sup>th</sup> District  
Brandon Vick, Representative 18<sup>th</sup> District  
John Braun, Senator 20<sup>th</sup> District  
Richard DeBolt, Representative 20<sup>th</sup> District  
Annette Cleveland, Senator 49<sup>th</sup> District  
Jim Moeller, Representative 49<sup>th</sup> District  
Sharon Wylie, Representative 49<sup>th</sup> District

Guests Present:

Edward L. Barnes, Citizen  
Katy Brooks, Port of Vancouver  
Bob Carroll, Citizen  
Mike Clark, WSDOT SW Region  
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Council Member  
Jim Karlock, Citizen  
Dale Lewis, Rep. Herrera Beutler's Office  
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver Neighborhood Assoc.  
Sharon Nasset, Citizen  
Jerry Oliver, Port of Vancouver Commissioner  
Jodi Guetzloe Parker, Columbia Pacific Building Trades  
Philip Parker, WA Transportation Commissioner  
Greg Prothman, Prothman Company  
Matt Ransom, City of Vancouver  
Scott Sawyer, City of Battle Ground  
Ray Shank, WSDOT SW Region  
Larry J. Smith, Vancouver Council Member

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 May 7, 2013, Meeting Minutes**

STEVE STUART MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MAY 7, 2013, MEETING MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MELISSA SMITH AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

**III. Citizen Communications**

Edward Barnes of Vancouver said he has some concerns. He said Legislators have made reports on what is happening regarding the budget and the transportation package. Mr. Barnes said Senators Ann Rivers and Don Benton have decided to go with the people up north and use the

\$450 million for the CRC to fund State Routes 167 and 509. He said he hoped that was not the case and that they would look for money for projects in our region. Mr. Barnes referred to the recent collapse of the I-5 Skagit River Bridge, and said if any of his family members would be hurt on the Columbia River I-5 Bridge, he would be looking at the elected officials tied to the Columbia River Crossing in a lawsuit. He said we need to have that bridge built and move forward.

Jodi Guetzloe Parker of Vancouver said she is in support of the Columbia River Crossing for many reasons. She said she was asking for the Board's support for the CRC. Part of the mission statement for the RTC is about providing transportation through the region. She said the bridge is critical to our region. She said being on the current bridge can be frightening, and she does not want bad things to happen to us referring to the Skagit River Bridge. Ms. Parker said our bridges are old and falling apart, and we need to invest in our infrastructure and build a new bridge.

Bob Carroll of Vancouver is a business representative with IBEW Local 48. He said there are about 1,150 members that live on the north side of the river including Clark, Cowlitz, Wahkiakum, Skamania and Klickitat Counties. Mr. Carroll said they are overwhelmingly in support of building the Columbia River Crossing. A single crash on the bridge several weeks ago had traffic tied up across the region for a very long time. There are not three through lanes on the I-5 bridges. Now is the time to build a new bridge.

Sharon Nasset of Portland noted the Coast Guard meetings regarding the Columbia River Crossing are from 5-8 p.m. at the Jantzen Beach Red Lion today and tomorrow June 5 from 5-8 p.m. at the Hilton. Ms. Nasset said one crash does take out our bridge because we don't have enough alternatives. She said we need a third bridge and alternatives. The CRC needs to look at alternatives.

Jim Karlock of Portland said he is not paid to be in attendance or to speak at the RTC meetings in opposition of the CRC. Mr. Karlock said some others in favor of the project may be paid or benefit by the project. Mr. Karlock said a couple months ago some members of the C-TRAN Board submitted a number of questions to the CRC. He referred to some of the questions and the answers.

#### **IV. Consent Agenda**

##### **A. June Claims**

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

#### **V. FY 2014 Unified Planning Work Program, Resolution 06-13-13**

Lynda David referred to the resolution included in the meeting packet along with the draft UPWP document distributed to Board members. Ms. David said electronic copies of both RTC and Metro's UPWPs were provided in the May and June meeting materials.

As outlined last month, the Unified Planning Work Program is a federally required document that describes transportation planning activities anticipated for the region in that fiscal year. Each year RTC, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization for this region, is granted Federal Highway Administration PL dollars and Federal Transit Administration planning funds to carry

out the metropolitan transportation planning process. The UPWP outlines how these federal dollars along with state and local funds will be used for planning. The Fiscal Year 2014 covers the year from July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014.

The UPWP needs to reflect transportation planning emphasis areas identified by the U.S. Department of Transportation and the State of Washington. The UPWP also has a description of key transportation issues facing this region. The UPWP has four major sections. The first three sections include descriptions of work elements that RTC will participate in, and the fourth section describes transportation planning activities of state and local agencies including WSDOT, Clark County, the cities, and C-TRAN. The final page of the document is a revenue summary spreadsheet.

The UPWP has been reviewed and endorsed by RTC's Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC) at its May meeting, and by officials at Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, WSDOT, and bi-state partners at a meeting held on February 20, 2013. Metro's JPACT committee and Metro's Council has already taken action on Metro's UPWP.

Action on this resolution will adopt RTC's FY 2014 UPWP, authorize the Transportation Director to file applications for regional transportation funding, to execute grant agreements and to file any assurances or required documentation relating to the FY 2014 UPWP. It will also continue the MPO funding agreement. Action also includes the endorsement of Metro's FY 2013-15 UPWP. This is required because we are a part of a bi-state region.

Commissioner Madore said the action is to adopt the Metropolitan TIP. Ms. David said this is not the TIP. The TIP is the Transportation Improvement Program, which is a program of projects. This document is the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) which is planning for transportation, not project development. It is the first step in the planning process.

Jeanne Stewart referred to Metro's UPWP and asked if that was reviewed before we adopt our Program and look to see if there is consistency between the two. She also asked if that is done, she asked when there is opportunity for us to comment on their program. Ms. David said the two UPWPs for the respective MPOs are developed early in the year, so the first opportunity to review is when they meet with the Federal partners usually in February of each year. Throughout the course of the development of the UPWPs, RTC staff participates at the TPAC meetings at Metro and Metro staff participates at the RTAC meetings. The Metro draft was also provided at the May RTC Board meeting for any comments. There is participation and coordination throughout the development process. Ms. Stewart asked if RTC has a seat on TPAC and JPACT. Ms. David said yes they did.

Jack Burkman said there are three seats on JPACT for SW Washington, the City of Vancouver, Clark County, and WSDOT. Steve Stuart said they do have a voice through the seats they hold on JPACT, and JPACT does review Metro's UPWP as well. Jeanne Stewart said she could connect with City staff to have routine meetings to keep updated.

Commissioner Madore said staff participates on this, but he said that the Board should have discussions before adopting something. He said it would be premature to adopt it.

Dean Lookingbill said the RTC Board is being asked to adopt RTC's UPWP, which follows the adopted Board's budget and work program for the next year. Council Member Stewart was

referring to Metro's UPWP. RTC is asked to endorse Metro's UPWP. The federal agencies want to see that the bi-state projects, the large projects include a planning coordination. All that is being adopted is RTC's plan, and that has been before the Board several times.

Commissioner Madore said the top two projects that it focuses on are the CRC and bus rapid transit. He said he wants to make sure they are on the right track. If the legislature does not fund that project, it would be premature to adopt this plan.

Mr. Lookingbill said this is the Unified Planning Work Program. The Fourth Plain BRT project that is shown is describing the whole project, which is before the C-TRAN Board for their decision making process. It is in the UPWP because there is a small amount of \$23,000 that RTC has participated in in terms of some of the technical analysis and the modeling. The reason it is listed is not because of RTC making an additional decision on that project. It is part of the federal planning coordination process, we must show all the sources of money. That is why it is listed in the plan.

Commissioner Madore asked if that means that we are participating with but not specifically endorsing any of the projects listed. Mr. Lookingbill said this is a list of planning studies of which there are federal resources, and as Ms. David said, it is a continuation of the local MPO funding. It is not an endorsement of the projects. An example is the I-205 Study. It is underway; there is not a conclusion on that, but it is listed because it is a planning study that is underway.

Commissioner Madore said the bus rapid transit still has funds remaining to study. He asked at what point do we acknowledge that it doesn't make sense to continue to spend money on it. Mr. Lookingbill said they would look to the C-TRAN Board. If that is a project that is discontinued by the C-TRAN Board, then there would be no reason to use that money, and they would amend the UPWP to remove it.

Jack Burkman said the UPWP is adopted annually. It is how we let the federal agencies know how we plan on partnering with other organizations to allocate this money to projects. It is a working document and redone on a regular basis. With respect to the Metro endorsement, Mr. Burkman said as a JPACT member, he has looked closely at that. It is a policy that has been set by various jurisdictions and very much in line with the work that we have done with no surprises. There are no major projects, for example, right against our border. This is about coordination of the two staffs and thorough participation between the two, which is the key of the endorsement.

**JACK BURKMAN MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 06-13-13, FY 2014 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY STEVE STUART AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

## **VI. 2010 U.S. Census Urbanized Area and Federal Aid Urban Area Boundary**

Lynda David referred to the memorandum included in the meeting packet along with the attached map. The purpose is to ask for endorsement of the adjusted Federal Aid Urban Area Boundary and allow for submittal to the Boundary Review Team and seek Federal Highway Administration approval.

Ms. David said every decade, RTC as the MPO, is asked to review and adjust the Urban Area Boundary. This is a Federal Transportation requirement. At a minimum, the Urban Area

Boundary must include the Census-defined urbanized area, based on population densities and it has to encompass the municipal boundaries within the Census urbanized area. In this region, it includes Vancouver, Battle Ground, Camas, and Washougal. Urban Area Boundaries (UABs) are relevant in establishing the federal functional classification of streets because the UAB delineates the boundary between rural and urban functional classifications. The UAB also has implications for capital transportation project funding such as distribution of federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds and Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funds and are distributed based on the urban area boundary. State County Road Administration Board (CRAB) funds are available to roads in rural areas outside the urban area boundary.

Ms. David referred to the Proposed 2010 Federal Urban Area Boundary map. The 2010 Census Urbanized area was shown in tan, and in green, the map shows the proposed areas to be added to complete the 2010 Urban Area Boundary. These added areas ensure the Urban Growth Areas, as well as the city limits of Vancouver, Battle Ground, Camas, and Washougal are encompassed within the proposed adjusted 2010 UAB. Staff and local jurisdictions and the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee members provided input to RTC on the adjusted Urban Area Boundary.

Steve Stuart said he had a couple of concerns, but most of the green additions make sense. He questioned the tan area in Battle Ground at 219<sup>th</sup> St. west of Dollars Corner and north of SR-502 on both sides of 50<sup>th</sup> Ave. He said that area is not urban; the population densities are low and rural in any classification. His concern is that now the classification would be urban, and that would mean bike and pedestrian facilities and sidewalks required.

Ms. David said that at a minimum, it has to include the U.S. Census urbanized area, and that tan area is defined by the U.S. Census Bureau. We have no discretion on that decision. Commissioner Stuart asked what determining factors were used to set that as an urban area boundary for transportation. Ms. David said one of the issues is that because Battle Ground has over 5,000 population, it has to be linked with the rest of the urban area, which includes Vancouver, Camas, and Washougal. The Census Bureau has to make a link to the Vancouver urban area. Ms. David said ten years ago, they chose to make that link up SR-503, which makes sense. This time they chose to use SR-502 as the link.

Commissioner Stuart asked what happens if they do not endorse the adjusted Urban Area Boundary. He said changing a rural road classification to an urban road classification has impacts on the County road budget. Ms. David said if it is not endorsed, the WSDOT headquarters staff and Federal Highway Administration will decide for you.

Mr. Lookingbill clarified that SR-502 is a state facility and a border facility so it can be determined as in or out of the urban boundary. The county roads cannot be changed, and their Federal designation that will affect their source of funds.

Shirley Craddick asked how the Census does this. Ms. David said the Census looks at urban areas of over 50,000 population and other municipalities in the same region that may have over 5,000 population at the time of the decennial Census. They then make some calculations based on population densities for the Census geography. That is how they arrive at the tan area boundary on the map.

Ms. David noted concern with the designated urban area along the Washougal River Road that. She said by the Census calculation, it is determined as urban. But as Mr. Lookingbill said, it is a peripheral road so we have the discretion to make that a rural road since they know that it will not be urbanized.

Jeanne Stewart asked if the Battle Ground issue was tied to the expansion of their urban growth boundary. Mr. Lookingbill said it was not tied to the expansion of their GMA urban growth boundary. The urban designation is per the Census defined urban geography.

Jack Burkman asked if there was a way to send a letter to request clarification on how the Census boundary was set. Ms. David said the methodology is used nation-wide. She said we can send comments to the Census Bureau saying that when this is addressed in the next ten years, these are the changes that we request be used. For the 2010 Census, we don't have that opportunity.

Bart Gernhart said they will try to implement as much sense into this Census data as they can when it goes up to WSDOT headquarters. He said they have been working on widening SR-502 for some time with the City of Battle Ground, Clark County, and others through that corridor. They are planning on keeping the rural sections generally rural and the urban sections like urban. Around Dollars Corner there will be bike lanes and sidewalks. Between Battle Ground and Dollars Corner it will be 50 mph.

Representative Orcutt said he is used to being able to make amendments to things. He questioned the process of accepting or not. Ms. David said they have to accept what is shown in tan on the maps, and they have to also include the municipal boundaries of the four cities. They do have some discretion whether or not areas that are part of the urban growth area under Washington State Growth Management Law are in or out of this proposed urban area boundary. Representative Orcutt asked what the time was that this must be approved and the process to make the changes if we desired. Ms. David said the Urban Area Boundary must be submitted to the Department of Transportation before the end of June, and it is the Federal Highway Administration that makes the determination of the boundary. If we do not give our endorsement, they will make that decision based on the Census defined urbanized area as well as the municipal boundaries. Ms. David said our hands are tied; it is a nationwide determination as to what the boundaries should be.

Mr. Lookingbill said they could take a collective account of these issues and formally send that letter along with our submittal. One area to include would be SR-502 especially west of Dollars Corner as discussed by Commissioner Stuart. Mr. Lookingbill asked if there were other areas to include on the list. The Washougal River Road was noted.

Commissioner Madore said this has been years in the works and asked why they were just now receiving it. Mr. Lookingbill said staff has only had it a short time, and took it to the RTAC Committee to get their recommendation. Ms. David said they received it very late in March. Ms. David said it seems it is always about three years after the Census has taken place that the urban area boundary has to be reviewed and determined and approved by the Federal Highway Administration. It comes back to the jurisdictions later in the year, because by the end of this year, that boundary that is set will be used to decide on federal functional classification updates, which are rural and which are urban roads. Ms. David said in working with county staff, the

preference is to keep as many roads rural so they have access to CRAB funding for preservation and maintenance projects on county roads.

Commissioner Madore said in order to improve work in the future, even though staff and the technical committee may be involved with things that come from the federal jurisdictions, it may be good to pass that through the Board even though it is being worked on by the advisory committee. Ms. David said it will be 2018 before this will surface again. Chair Ganley said they would submit a letter with the submittal. Commissioner Madore said he would like to expand that to not just be this particular document. He said that would include anything that comes to the RTC that they don't even have a month to look at it. He said they want at least one meeting in advance to get an opportunity to review anything. Ms. David said in the past they usually receive the information earlier, but this time they did not receive the information from the Washington division of FHWA until quite late in the process.

Council Member Jeanne Stewart said it is disconcerting to be put in a position as the RTC Board that we're being asked to approve something because we have to, even though we know that it is not right. She said she understands how this is passed down to us. Ms. Stewart said we should suggest what is more appropriate.

Council Member Melissa Smith said the Washougal River Road is rural and should be noted as rural.

Jack Burkman said he has heard three issues. The most heated is generated around the Census organization that made some decisions. Even if we send a letter, it is clear that will go into the queue for ten years. A second item is around an action item. Any item coming for action, should have a workshop/discussion the previous month. This is an unusual case and not the normal practice. The third issue is regarding the green parts of the map, those areas that RTC is recommending for addition. He understood that those could be changed.

Ms. David said that most of the green areas for addition are municipal boundaries, but they are municipal boundaries that include the Census geography. For example, if there was a small part of the municipal boundary of Washougal, it has to be included and they have to go out to the nearest Census block to get that.

Jack Burkman asked which of the green areas could be changed today versus those that we are required to have. Ms. David said there is a small area of West Vancouver Lake that is north of the City limits. Given the advice from WSDOT, they could bring that back to the City of Vancouver city limits. Ms. David said they were including the Census block geography in the West Vancouver area.

Commissioner Stuart said he appreciates the comments to be sent. As for the process for not including the local jurisdictions or really the state in the federal Census conversation associated with determining these boundaries, he would like to see that added within the comments that are sent. We are required by state law, to plan transportation infrastructure as well as growth including our capital facilities planning of transportation infrastructure and to not have us be a part of that conversation creates odd results. State Growth Management Act requires that we have physical boundaries between jurisdictions, yet this is saying that we have to have a connection on the urban area transportation map between jurisdictions, which doesn't follow GMA requirements. That state and local agencies are not included within that creates awkward

results at best. The list should include Washougal and Battle Ground and note the use of SR-503 in the previous 10 year version. He said to ask for an explanation of why they changed from SR-503 to SR-502 so the next time around we can understand their logic.

Commissioner Madore said he suspected that this is nationwide, and we are not the only jurisdiction that has this feedback. He suggested having a different color for those areas that could be determined by the local jurisdictions.

Chair Ganley asked Shirley Craddick to ask her staff if they have any problems similar to this on their federal urban area boundary map.

Ms. David said at the next UAB review, Ridgefield will be at the 5,000 population and included.

Jeanne Stewart said that much of the area around Vancouver Lake is in environmental protection. It is either state or federal wetlands. She asked how they could label it as urban. Ms. David said the Vancouver city limits includes a good part of that area so it must be included.

MELISSA SMITH MOTIONED TO ENDORSE THE ADJUSTED 2010 FEDERAL URBAN AREA BOUNDARY ALONG WITH ATTACHING A LETTER AS DISCUSSED. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY JEANNE STEWART AND APPROVED.

Commissioner Madore requested that a copy of the letter be sent to Board members.

## **VII. I-205 Corridor Study**

Bob Hart said the I-205 Study was presented to the RTC Board in February 2013 and provided an update on the activities since that time including the development of transportation modeling effort, an overview of the I-205 operations workshop, as well as the preliminary operational strategies and evaluation measures being developed in coordination with the I-205 Technical Advisory Committee partners.

The first phase of the study recommended a core set of capital projects in the corridor that are most critical and a top priority for I-205. The set of core projects include: I-205 Widening (SR-500 to Padden); SR-14 Widening (I-205 to 164<sup>th</sup>); New SR-500 off-ramp/auxiliary lane from Mill Plain to SR-500; Padden Interchange improvements with 72<sup>nd</sup> Avenue slip ramp; and I-205 Park and Ride at 18<sup>th</sup> Street. Mr. Hart highlighted these projects and displayed a map. The Study also recommended that operations and access related to the core projects should be analyzed to determine their feasibility and constructability and to evaluate impacts on the adjacent arterials. The estimated cost of the core projects is \$138 million compared to the cost for the full set of MTP projects in the I-205 corridor at \$540 million. Mr. Hart displayed a map with the MTP projects. A map with the funded projects was provided. These include the Salmon Creek Interchange that will be completed early next year and the 18<sup>th</sup> Street Interchange project that will go to construction in 2014.

Commissioner Stuart referred to the Core Projects map and the SR-14 project from I-205 to 164<sup>th</sup> rebuilding to three lanes, which he said was a good project. He asked if there had been an analysis of the actual traffic improvement in that area by just doing that segment and not doing the braided interchange with it. Mr. Hart said that is part of their core project analysis, to make those comparisons.

Commissioner Madore asked what the difference was between I-205 widening to 3 general purpose lanes verses rebuild to 3 lanes as on SR-14. Mr. Hart said the rebuild of three lanes is adding a through lane in each direction on SR-14. The general purpose lanes on I-205 from SR-500 to Padden is adding a through lane along the corridor plus an add/drop lane.

Commissioner Madore said on SR-14 is adding one lane, but he said a good portion of that could be adding two lanes. He asked how much it would be to add two lanes each direction versus one lane. Mr. Hart said early on, analysis showed there was not a need for two additional lanes in each direction, but what they need to do for the operational analysis is to assess how the weaving and merging work in that section.

Commissioner Madore said he drives that roadway every day and felt it could accommodate two new lanes versus one. He asked the cost difference between building one lane versus two lanes in that area. Mr. Hart said he did not have that additional cost amount with him.

Councilor Shirley Craddick asked how they work in making these decisions, if they work with ODOT on complementary projects on I-205. Mr. Hart said they have had some discussions with ODOT. As they get further along in this process, they will be talking with them more. He said they had a recent workshop that ODOT talked about their Congestion Operational Study.

Councilor Craddick asked how this works regarding air quality standards. She asked if Vancouver was a part of the Portland Metro region air quality standard area. Mr. Hart said for ozone, they are the same, both are in attainment. They have separate air quality areas for carbon monoxide (CO). Mr. Hart said for our region and for CO RTC must assess each project that gets programmed for funding for air quality impacts. Ms. Craddick said this will add the possibility of more cars to the freeway system and asked how that fit meeting the air quality standards. Mr. Hart said at the planning level that they are currently working, it is not funded so they would not do a detailed air quality analysis. He said while we do not know the exact impact, but believe it would not exceed air quality standards. Ms. Craddick said they must meet the standards in order to get the funding. Mr. Hart said that was correct.

Jeff Hamm said the I-205 park-and-ride cost was not included in the core project cost. With it a part of the core projects, he felt the cost should be included in the total cost of the core projects because it will be a costly to build.

Jeff Hamm asked how the RTC adopted and the C-TRAN adopted the high capacity transit portion of I-205 with a bus rapid transit line was being incorporated into the study. Mr. Hart said as part of this analysis they will be looking at bus-on-shoulder operation to see how that works along with additional service. Mr. Hamm said it might be good to vary the levels of service of transit to see what kind of a difference that makes in traffic volumes and perhaps the air quality. Mr. Hart said they will work with C-TRAN staff.

Commissioner Madore said he thought it would be good to have some references that could inform them of some basic assumptions in air quality. He said it could be the opposite of what we assume. Mr. Lookingbill suggested that this type of information could be brought back to the Board at another meeting. Our region has an official air quality status given the federal regulations and the health standards for both ozone and CO. Mr. Madore said he also wanted to know how to achieve those standards. Mr. Lookingbill said there are some overarching

conditions as to what impacts ozone versus CO, but more precise impacts come down to the exact project and its air quality impacts.

Mr. Hart addressed the travel demand modeling work that is being conducted for the study. A modeling team made up of technical staff from WSDOT, Clark County, Vancouver, C-TRAN, and RTC has been meeting the last several months to discuss the type of analysis needed for the study, the transportation modeling tools available, and the technical protocol for quality control and review of model results. The modeling group identified the regional travel model and VISSIM microsimulation as the two primary transportation models to use for the operational analysis. The regional travel model used by RTC will anchor the analysis, but will be supplemented with a microsimulation tool to simulate vehicle traffic and how it reacts and operates. The modeling tool can identify congestion hotspots, ramp operations, merge/weave problems at freeway entrances, and lane queuing on the freeway. Mr. Hart said the microsimulation tool is a very time consuming and detailed effort. WSDOT has been working on this modeling piece. Mr. Hart introduced WSDOT's Ray Shank, who has been the key builder of this along with Mike Clark, Project Manager for the SW Region. They have been key partners in building this effort. Mr. Hart said besides getting a lot of data from this, it provides a good picture of how traffic operates. Mr. Hart provided an example of the microsimulation: a flyover picture of the I-205 corridor representing the PM peak period traffic beginning on SR-14 and traveling north on I-205 noting traffic backups and queuing along the way ending at the I-5/I-205 split. Mr. Hart said the simulation is set in about double time, meaning a ten minute drive takes about 5 minutes to watch in the simulation.

Councilor Craddick asked what RTC's policy is regarding the number of freeway lanes for the region. Mr. Lookingbill said that while there is not an overriding policy, the Metropolitan Transportation Plan identifies any additional lanes on a project by project and freeway by freeway basis. Mr. Lookingbill said I-5 is largely built out, so the Plan does not show any major changes in the I-5 corridor. This is part of the reason for the analysis of I-205. This would not just be widening; it would include operational strategies.

Jeff Hamm asked if they would be looking at VISSIM modeling applying to operational strategies. Mr. Hart said that was correct. That is the main purpose of doing the VISSIM piece of it. Jeff Hamm asked if the HOV lane was part of the analysis. Mr. Hart said it was not.

Commissioner Stuart addressed the question that Councilor Craddick raised about the number of lanes. He said through the Nickel and Partnership project packages from gas tax increase and through many of the state conversations that have been had, three through lanes on I-5 has been a goal that has been sought from the river north to Olympia. Three through functional lanes can mean adding add/drop lanes or other operational aspects that make it three functional through lanes that have carrying capacity. Ms. Craddick asked if that was just I-5 or I-205 as well. Mr. Stuart said it was primarily on I-5, but they are moving in that direction with I-205. When I-205 was built, there was discussion of a bus-only lane and capacity set aside on the Oregon side to accommodate that. Ms. Craddick said I-205 in the Portland area has much more capacity potential than I-5.

Commissioner Madore said the simulation tool looks to be a wonderful and powerful tool for modeling. He asked if the Portland Metro has used that tool or a similar tool to model what is taking place in their area. He said the Metro area is years ahead of Clark County in terms of

transit emphasis. He asked if the tool has been used to see how accurate it has been. Mr. Hart said the Metro model has been used by ODOT. They have done a Congestion Modeling Operational Study that looked at ramp metering, lane extensions, and different lane assignments. The Highway 217 Interchange Study also used the model.

Commissioner Madore said if we can prove our assumptions based on reality and the models that we predict are only as good as they match reality. He questioned how much this has informed all of our policies, especially on the south side of the river.

Bart Gernhart referred to the last page of the memorandum listing Candidate Operational Strategies. He said that is a partial list of strategies that they look at when they are considering making changes or improvement to the system. Adding lanes are really the last thing that they try to do, because it is the most expensive. They look at all the options, some are applicable and some not, but they still look at the options. Clearly, there are some small sections that may require widening.

Jack Burkman recommended that we invite Metro to come over to show the modeling that they do. He said the modeling that they do is amazingly in depth and validated against what has occurred on the ground, and they have been doing this for many years, possibly 10 years. They can look at what we are doing and see how it affects them and vice versa. Commissioner Madore said he would like to see how that model actually matches what is really occurring.

Jeanne Stewart said further, in that modeling it would be interesting to look at what the predictions were. For example, if light rail had expanded how did that accommodate the reality, the impact of light rail in the reduction of highway traffic. Commissioner Madore requested that be a future agenda item.

#### **VIII. Metropolitan Transportation Plan Capital Facilities**

Due to lack of time, this agenda item would be brought back for discussion at a later meeting.

#### **IX. Overview of Executive Search Process by Prothman**

Chair Ganley introduced Greg Prothman who will be leading the executive search for a new director. Mr. Lookingbill said at the last meeting, the Board authorized moving forward with a consultant to lead the selection process and Prothman was selected. At that time the Board requested to have him attend today's meeting in order to meet him and ask any questions.

Mr. Prothman referred to the schedule for the process, which was distributed at last month's meeting. He said their goal is to have a final interview process sometime at the end of November. Mr. Prothman plans to meet individually with Board members, staff, and many others to develop a position profile. It comes down to him identifying, based on the comments he receives, what it is you're looking for in skills, talents, and abilities in a director. Mr. Prothman said once he has gathered that information and brings it back to the Board for their feedback to have a document that can be used for the advertisement. He said they need to determine how far and wide they search. They can also do a very aggressive mailing to other organizations nationally. It will be open to ad for six to eight weeks. Once they get resumes back in, they will all be filing those electronically on Prothman's Web site. Mr. Prothman will start reviewing those as soon as they come in. Based on what the Board is looking for, he will

start to screen those down to the top 10 to 15 and do semifinal interviews. An hour will be spent with each candidate. Mr. Prothman said he will be giving periodic briefing on the process. At a work session, he will bring back the application, resume, cover letter, requested essay questions, and the results of his interview summarized for the top 10 to 15 applicants. He said they would work to bring the list to 4 to 6 applicants for the interview process. Prior to the interview process, they will do confidential references on each of the candidates. They will come to do the final interviews, and if a candidate rises to the top, and is considered for hire, they will help negotiate a contract. This is about a five month effort.

## **X. Other Business**

### From the Board

Chair Ganley noted that Council Member Smith has received the necessary credentials to use the wireless network and said it was working fine. Commissioner Stuart said information will be given to Mr. Lookingbill to provide to Board Members with the username and password for wireless access to the network. The information will be provided to members at the same time the next meeting packet is sent.

Commissioner Stuart said two meetings not listed on the agenda are tonight, June 4 from 5 to 8 p.m. at Jantzen Beach Red Lion and tomorrow, June 5 from 5 to 8 p.m. at the Hilton and will be the meeting of the US Coast Guard with regards to the Columbia River Crossing.

Commissioner Madore said anytime we have public comment time, it would be respectful for us to somehow address them if needed. He said there were comments expressing concerns of the safety of the existing I-5 Bridge. He said it would be good to get input from ODOT on the safety of the bridge. He wanted to know if the safety is not being compromised.

Bart Gernhart said he works for WSDOT, but ODOT does maintain the bridge. He said he was certain they are maintaining it as they should to be safe at all times to the extent possible. They are constantly looking at different projects to maintain. ODOT refers to it as maintenance; WSDOT calls it preservation. This is for different aspects of the bridge from electrical components, to painting, and the trunnions. It is required by federal law to do annual or semiannual inspections. Mr. Gernhart said he felt confident that they are doing their due diligence. It is still a pair of bridges built in 1917 and 1957. These are old structures. Mr. Gernhart said WSDOT pays for half of all the maintenance on the bridges on the Columbia River that are owned by either Oregon or Washington. They have continuing discussions of projects on both sides of the river and work together. He said they have a very aggressive process to plan out the different improvements necessary to keep them in reasonable shape from the Pacific Ocean on up the Gorge.

Commissioner Madore said he would think there is already in writing a stated policy that would reflect their commitment to care for the bridge. That would go a long way to relieve concerns especially after the Skagit River Bridge being taken out. Chair Ganley said possibly they could give an update on their safety and what they do, and future repairs planned.

Commissioner Madore said he is looking for an opportunity to engage in planning the strategy, the priorities of infrastructure. He said that is why we are here. He wants to evaluate what is on the books, what should be considered and what should not, and reprioritize all the potential investments that we can make.

Jeanne Stewart commented on the Skagit River Bridge. She said it is troubling to her that so many people are saying that the bridge was a weak bridge and needed to be replaced. She said the video of the oversize truck hauling steel and going fast across the bridge to her showed the harm being done to the bridge. She said that is different from an old bridge being dangerous. The recognition of what caused the Skagit Bridge to go down was a cause of harm.

Jack Burkman said his understanding of our process, although the Capital Facilities Plan discussion was deferred to the following month, that is one of the series of steps we take, and the next major update for the MTP is due in 2015, which is when we would be working on that. Commissioner Madore's question of how can we go back and look at it, he said he would see that as a series of work program steps for the RTC Board next year. Mr. Lookingbill said that was correct. There will be some scoping this year, but start next year for 2015 adoption.

Representative Liz Pike said she wanted it brought to attention that there is a federal investigation that is ongoing on the Skagit River Bridge. She said we need to wait until the investigation is over to draw conclusions.

Chair Ganley provided final copies of RTC's 2012 Audit Report. He noted that it was a good report with no findings.

Bart Gernhart noted a major closure of I-5 this weekend related to the construction of the Salmon Creek Interchange project. This weekend starting at 11:00 p.m. Friday, June 7, 2013, I-5 will be closed from 134<sup>th</sup> down to SR-500 in order to erect 12 girders over I-5. They are about 175,000 lbs. and 165 feet long each. It takes three large cranes to do the work. The interstate will be closed up to early in the morning of Monday, June 10. Mr. Gernhart said however, they are optimistic and hope that they are able to open the roadway some time on Sunday. As soon as they are able to open the roadway, notification will go out to all the media and the message signs, etc. In Oregon and up to Chehalis and Centralia, they have message boards out to notify drivers what is taking place and the routes to get around the closure. Mr. Gernhart said they are requesting folks to stay home; if you don't need to make a trip, please avoid the area.

#### From the Director

Mr. Lookingbill noted the Obligation Authority topic. He said this has to do with the local agencies executing their projects that are receiving federal funds in a timely fashion. He said RTC staff along with our partner agencies has developed a few modifications to the policies as to how to do that, but that will be brought to the Board at their July meeting. It has to do with the importance of obligating those federal dollars and a policy by WSDOT local programs that we use the money or lose it. Mr. Lookingbill said the good news is that we are in good shape this year, but they want to bring before the Board some amendments in the policy so they can ensure that they stay on track.

Mr. Lookingbill noted C-TRAN Board of Directors meets at 5:30 p.m. on Tuesday, June 11, 2013, at the Vancouver Library. JPACT meets Thursday, June 13, 2013, at Metro at 7:30 a.m.

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, July 2, 2013, at 4 p.m.

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