

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Board of Directors
July 2, 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, July 2, 2013, at 4 p.m. at the Clark County Public Service Center Sixth Floor Training Room, 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington. The meeting was recorded by CVTV. Attendance follows.

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
Melissa Smith, Camas Council Member
Jeanne Stewart, Vancouver Council Member
Steve Stuart, Clark County Commissioner
Ed Orcutt, Representative 20th District

Board Members Absent:

Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor
Tom Mielke, Clark County Commissioner
David Poucher, White Salmon Mayor
Jason Tell, ODOT Region One Manager
Don Wagner, WSDOT Regional Administrator
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
Annette Cleveland, Senator 49th District
Jim Moeller, Representative 49th District
Sharon Wylie, Representative 49th District

Guests Present:

Ed Barnes, Labor Council
Katy Brooks, Port of Vancouver
Pete Capell, Clark County
Bob Carroll, Citizen
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Council Member
Jim Karlock, Citizen
Harry Kiick, Citizen
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver Neighborhood Assoc.
Paul Montague, Identity Clark County
Sharon Nasset, Citizen
Jerry Oliver, Port of Vancouver Commissioner
Jodi Guetzloe Parker, Columbia Pacific Building Trades
Kelly Parker, Greater Vancouver Chamber
Philip Parker, WA Transportation Commissioner
Debbie Peterson, Citizen
Kimberly Pincheira, Senator Cantwell's Office
Matt Ransom, City of Vancouver
Margaret Tweet, Citizen
Bill Wright, Clark County

Staff Present:

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

Because quorum had not yet been reached, the meeting began with Citizen Comment. After Citizen Comment, quorum had been reached and action was taken on the June Meeting Minutes.

II. Approval of June 4, 2013, Meeting Minutes

STEVE STUART MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 4, 2013, MEETING MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MELISSA SMITH AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

III. Citizen Communications

Margaret Tweet of Camas said one of the problems with the CRC project was the projections. She said the population and employment growth figures were overly optimistic. She urged members to review those figures. Ms. Tweet said the HOV lanes south of the bridge are from 3:00 to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. She said this is terrible traffic and the HOV lane does not have enough use to justify taking the lane from other users. Ms. Tweet said they can get rid of the HOV lane even without a new bridge and make the traffic flow better. She urged members to work with Oregon on that.

Ed Barnes of Vancouver said he was very disappointed on the actions of our legislature regarding the loss of the CRC project. Mr. Barnes said Senator Benton and Senator Rivers had an opportunity to do something for this community, and instead, now 17 years of work is lost and shut down. Mr. Barnes said to remember at election time that a drastic change in who holds office in SW Washington is needed.

Bob Carroll of Vancouver said regarding the HOV lane, that it just took him 40 minutes to get from the Fremont Bridge to this meeting. He said the HOV lane was full. There just isn't enough room on that highway. He said once you get across the bridge, the traffic opens up. The bridge is the choke point. Mr. Carroll said he cannot believe the shortsightedness of not increasing the capacity on this highway with a new bridge and improved on and off lanes. Not having the CRC project is going to be hard on our children. Mr. Carroll said our parents and grandparents stepped up and paid the price to create the infrastructure, and now our republican caucus has turned their back on us and our children. He said it is a sad day.

Debbie Peterson of Vancouver said it is not politicians, or republicans, or Don Benton that caused the CRC project to fail. She said it was incompetence and laziness or ignorance by the staff. Ms. Peterson said this Board supported what was being done, and the good politicians are the ones who saved us from having it go forward.

Sharon Nasset of Portland said some are looking at the CRC as a lose situation. She said it is not a loss when you open a project and look at other alternatives and go forward with something that everyone can respect. Ms. Nasset provided a handout and invited members to an open house regarding options post CRC. She also provided handouts with items for immediate congestion relief on I-5 and items that a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement should include. Ms. Nasset highlighted some of these items.

Paul Montague representing Identity Clark County expressed his disappointment in the failure of the Senate to fund the 10-year transportation package and with it the Columbia River Crossing. With the decision of the Senate, they have tossed 20 years of work, \$170 million worth of effort, and the inputs of communities on both sides of the river. Mr. Montague said ultimately, the responsibility for this decision is that of the Senate Coalition Caucus in Olympia. With that decision, our region, our state has lost face with our federal partners and Oregon partners. We have lost the credibility. The question now is where do we go from here? How do we rebuild partnerships that took decades to build at the federal and state level, and how do we come together as a community, Vancouver and Clark County and the other side of the river to design a new solution? How do we move forward with that, and what do we do when we get there? Mr. Montague said it is disappointing, and he hopes we are able to recover and move forward.

Harry Kiick of Vancouver expressed his disappointment at the failure of the CRC. However, at the same time he said he was happy that the bus rapid transit can now stand on its own merit, and

it is not being looked against only because it was linked with the CRC. He said he is looking forward to the future to hearing decisions made by the RTC and others that are involved in deciding on the bus rapid transit only on its own merit.

Jim Karlock of Portland thanked the Washington State Senate for their decision to not fund the CRC project. Mr. Karlock distributed handouts with information on the decline of transit, the AAA cost of driving, the actual cost of owning a car, and the cost of MAX light rail and highlighted these briefly. Mr. Karlock said this is an opportunity to look at solving the problem which is congestion. The problem is not mass transit; it is insufficient road capacity. Cars are cheaper than transit. He recommends that a new bridge be built, not necessarily at the current location, and that it includes transit in the form of buses in mixed use traffic.

IV. Consent Agenda

A. July Claims

B. 2013-2016 MTIP Amendment: Clark County Signal Optimization Projects, Resolution 07-13-14

C. 2013-2016 MTIP Amendment: Port of Ridgefield Pioneer Street Railroad Overpass-Phase II, Resolution 07-13-15

JACK BURKMAN MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA JULY CLAIMS AND RESOLUTIONS 07-13-14 AND 07-13-15. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY NANCY BAKER AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Chair Ganley reminded members to speak into the microphones to ensure that their voice can be heard in the room and for the broadcast.

V. VAST Program Professional Services, Resolution 07-13-16

Bob Hart said the RTC Board is requested to authorize the RTC Director to enter into an agreement with IBI Group to provide technical assistance for the 2013-2014 VAST Program in an amount not to exceed \$60,000. In May, the RTC Board approved Resolution 05-13-11 to obligate funds for the Program and to release a Request for Qualifications for professional services to support the VAST Program.

Mr. Hart said the VAST Program has utilized professional services since its inception 2001. When needed, these services have provided critical expertise to RTC and the VAST partner agencies in the areas of transportation system management and operations for policy and planning; ITS project implementation as well as project and systems integration; and the development and use of ITS communications infrastructure. Mr. Hart noted the resolution shows a more extensive list of the activities.

There are a limited number of firms that have the broad knowledge needed for the VAST program that covers transportation operations, communications infrastructure, and intelligent transportation systems (ITS). The IBI Group has provided technical support for the last 12 years and has done a great job; however, the VAST agencies thought that it would be good to update the review and evaluation process to get the most qualified firm to continue that support and decided to go through a new selection process. An RFQ was released on May 16 and only one firm, IBI Group teamed with DKS Associates, responded. An evaluation team made up of Clark County, City of Vancouver, WSDOT, C-TRAN, and RTC reviewed the proposal. All concurred

that IBI Group/DKS were highly qualified, would provide excellent technical support, and recommended continuing professional services with the IBI team.

The scope of work is very similar to previous professional services contracts with technical support provided under the following tasks: VAST committee meetings, TSMO policy and planning and project integration, and ITS communications and data networking. Mr. Hart noted that the scope of work was attached to the resolution.

The VAST Program Professional Services Resolution 07-13-16 requests RTC Board authorization to allow RTC's Director to enter into a contract with IBI Group for VAST Program Technical Assistance not to exceed \$60,000. This action supports federal requirements for Congestion Management Process and ITS projects. It is also consistent with the operational efficiency goals of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, Transportation Improvement Program, and the UPWP.

Jack Burkman asked the value of the prior contract. Mr. Hart said the previous contract was \$55,000 for about the same time period.

JACK BURKMAN MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 07-13-16. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY STEVE STUART AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VI. Transportation Alternatives Program Selection FY 2013-2016, Resolution 07-13-17

Dale Robins said the Transportation Alternatives Program is also referred to as TAP. He referred to the Resolution included in the meeting packet and the 11 x 17 map that was distributed. Mr. Robins said RTC as the Regional Transportation Planning Organization is responsible for selecting TAP projects for Clark, Skamania, and Klickitat Counties.

The TAP program is a new federal transportation funding program authorized under the federal transportation bill. The TAP program is similar in project eligibility as the former Transportation Enhancement Program. Mr. Robins noted the list of qualifying activities and said that bike and pedestrian projects are the most common projects applied for in our region.

In December 2012, they began the process to develop the TAP selection process. In February, the Board reviewed the draft process, and at the March meeting the Board approved the overall selection process. The adopted schedule targeted the proposed project selection decision.

Based on the 2013 allocation of funds, RTC staff anticipates approximately \$2.2 million to be available for the TAP program over the next four years. Of this total, approximately \$260,000 must be spent in the rural areas. The rural area includes the area outside of Vancouver, Camas, Washougal, and Battle Ground. This includes all of Skamania and Klickitat Counties.

Ten projects were submitted to RTC. Eight projects within Clark County and one project each in Skamania and Klickitat Counties. Mr. Robins referred to the distributed map showing the geographic distribution of the ten projects. Mr. Robins noted the Resolution listed each of the projects with a brief description.

After receiving projects and prior to the evaluation process, staff invited the public to comment on proposed TAP projects. The public could comment through RTC's website or by attending an Open House. The written comments that were received were all in support of projects.

Following the public input, an evaluation team evaluated and ranked projects. The evaluation team included two citizens, and staff from C-TRAN, WSDOT, and RTC. Projects were

evaluated based on the criteria adopted by the RTC Board. Evaluation Team scores and ranking were presented to RTAC at their June meeting. RTAC discussed the evaluation and ranking and concurred with the evaluations. RTAC is recommending that the top nine projects be funded, and the tenth ranked project to be funded for design only. Page four of the resolution listed the ranking of projects. It is important to note that although the Evergreen Trail will only receive funding for design, the project would be eligible in future TAP calls for right of way and construction funding.

Jack Burkman asked if the \$100,000 listed for the Evergreen Trail was for design or a subset of that. Mr. Robins said that is the design amount only. The request was for full funding, but there is only enough funding for the design phase.

Mr. Robins said RTC Board approval of Resolution 07-13-17 will select the projects and amend the projects into the 2013-2016 Transportation Improvement Program.

Commissioner Madore asked the difference of a multi-use pathway, a multi-modal path, and a shared-use path. Mr. Robins said all three are the same, basically bicycles and pedestrians. It is just different language used by different agencies applying for projects.

STEVE STUART MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 07-13-17. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY DOUG MCKENZIE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VII. Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program Call for Projects

Dale Robins referred to the memorandum included in the meeting packet. He said the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program or MTIP is a program of regionally significant and federally funded transportation projects for the Clark County Region. Within the MTIP, the RTC Board has selection and programming authority for three federal programs (STP, CMAQ, and TAP). The memorandum is intended to provide information on that portion of the MTIP for which the RTC Board has programming authority. Specifically, this discussion is on the STP and CMAQ project selection process, as the TAP selection process was just covered.

RTC has issued a call for projects from local agencies within the Clark County region for the STP and CMAQ programs. There will be \$7.3 million for the STP-Urban program, \$2.2 million for STP-Rural program, and \$4.5 million for the CMAQ program in this year's call for projects.

After projects are submitted, they will be evaluated by RTC Board adopted project selection criteria. This evaluation will be reviewed by RTAC, and then by the RTC Board at their September meeting. RTC staff will then return at the October 1 meeting for adoption of the full MTIP.

One change from previous years, is a new WSDOT "use it or lose it" statewide local agency federal obligation authority policy, which was presented to the Board at their March meeting. The new policy requires that as a region, we meet our federal obligation authority target by August 1st of each year. If we fail, we can lose a portion of our federal funds. Because of this policy, RTC staff has worked with local agencies to refine MTIP development procedures to help ensure that our region can meet our Obligation Authority limits. These procedures are based on the strategies the Board agreed to at their March meeting and are supported by RTAC. The key changes include: increased project cost limitation; modification of project delay policy; modification of when construction can be selected; and documentation of project accomplishments. The new procedures will help our region meet future obligation authority limits. The full text of the procedures is attached to the memorandum.

Mr. Robins said he is glad to report that the region has exceeded their 2013 obligation target. Through good communication and diligent work from local agencies, they have exceeded their target by just over \$2 million. If other regions around the state fail to meet their targets, RTC would be eligible to receive a portion of those unobligated funds.

Commissioner Madore said this is a request to submit projects and asked who was submitting the projects. Mr. Robins said local agencies, such as the cities, ports, Clark County, and C-TRAN, submit projects to RTC and the Board ultimately selects the projects. Mr. Madore said individuals submit their projects and questioned that RTC does not have a role in that process. Mr. Robins said that RTC does not tell local agencies what projects to submit. They choose their projects consistent with the long range 20-year Metropolitan Transportation Plan. They develop their projects based on the plan. Commissioner Madore asked if RTC Board evaluated those projects and chose those for funding according to our judgment. Mr. Robins said there are established evaluation criteria that the RTC Board has adopted, and staff evaluates those projects that are submitted according to that criteria. The projects then are reviewed by the jurisdictions technical staff through the RTAC Committee and concur or raise questions about the ranking of the projects. Projects are then recommended for funding in rank order based on the amount of funding available. RTAC would recommend their decision to the RTC Board for their approval. Generally, the RTC Board does not review every application. This is done by the technical staff.

Commissioner Madore questioned the Board's role in the process. He said their responsibilities include leading and visioning solutions for the region, and this method does not look to be that role. Mr. Robins said the visioning comes from the long range transportation plan. Mr. Madore asked how the Board offered improvements for the region.

Mr. Lookingbill said the long range 20-year plan, the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), is where future visionary projects are included. The Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) is for jurisdictions to choose their priority projects that are consistent with the MTP and to request project funding. Mr. Lookingbill said the RTC Board has established a process and procedures along with a set of evaluation criteria for jurisdictions to submit their projects to be programmed for funding. The MTIP is the end of the planning process; local jurisdictions usually select their projects from their Capital Facilities Plans. The projects are seeking federal transportation dollars that are regionally allocated, and the RTC Board has the final decision.

Commissioner Madore encouraged jurisdictions to submit their priority projects but said he did not understand the role of the Board in visioning solutions for our region. Mr. Lookingbill said that the transportation system visioning is tied to the long range Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) process. This year RTC is revisiting the list of adopted projects in the 2035 MTP. They are looking at this with a lower population and employment forecast to see which might be our most critical projects. This is in anticipation of the next update to the MTP. We are gathering information now and plan to start the process formally next year to update the long range plan.

Jack Burkman said his understanding is that the MTP is redone every four years, and that is when the RTC Board decides what that overall Plan will be. He said this keeps from constantly changing long term plans and adds some stability to it over the four years. Mr. Burkman said that all jurisdictions know the criteria and know their priorities, and the projects are already listed in the MTP. There is not enough money to do all the projects, and this TIP call for projects is a

process of which projects come next. The process allows all jurisdictions to participate so one jurisdiction does not get all the funds that come to our region.

Melissa Smith asked if that meant the CRC could be taken off the list. Mr. Lookingbill said that refers to the MTP. Today's discussion is not about updating the MTP. It is about choosing which projects to be programmed for federal funding. Jack Burkman said that is why he spoke of the MTP being updated every four years. He said the CRC is a big project. The availability for potential funding and how we are developing means greater needs in one area over another, but it affects all other jurisdictions not just the City of Vancouver. It is interwoven. Mr. Burkman said next year in addressing the MTP in regard to the CRC as any other significant project, we may say that we don't have that, but we still have that same need. Vancouver still has the same transportation levels, same air quality issues, so the question is how we address those.

Ms. Smith said the MTP process was confusing. Mr. Lookingbill said when Camas does their GMA Capital Facilities Plan it's about long range projects. That is parallel to the MTP. When the City of Camas does their Transportation Improvement Program and looks where they are going to budget money to build a set of projects, that is parallel to the process we are addressing today. The CRC project is tied to the MTP like your projects in your Capital Facilities Plan.

Jack Burkman said some of the work has already begun for the MTP revision. Dean Lookingbill said yes, that given the lower population and employment, they will look at what seems to be the most critical. Next year, the plan is for the larger policy discussion, the alternatives, etc. Mr. Burkman said by the end of next year, we should expect a new MTP. Mr. Lookingbill said that is the goal.

Jeanne Stewart asked when the suggestion is made that we review our MTP at the end of next year, is that a federal restriction or are these timeframes up to RTC for the review time or is that changeable? Mr. Lookingbill said the MTP was adopted in 2011, so we must have a new fully adopted Plan by 2015. Based on RTC Board's 2013 work program, staff has begun some of that work this year. Next year is intended to address the policy development, alternatives analysis, and transportation system impacts. The Federal requirement is to review and adopt an MTP at least every four years, so we are required to have a newly adopted MTP by 2015. Mr. Lookingbill said RTC, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization, has certain federal requirements that we must do in order to be eligible to receive these federal funds. One of those requirements is to review and adopt the MTP at least every four years. Ms. Stewart said she understood the complexity of the review process.

Commissioner Madore said he wanted to understand the mission of RTC. He said much has changed with the CRC and the Bus Rapid Transit. He said we should not take that list that was adopted in 2011 and choose projects from that. He said we need to examine that list before choosing. Mr. Lookingbill clarified that the MTP list of projects is not the objective of the agenda item under discussion. The item before the Board is to consider the MTIP call for projects to be submitted to be programmed for federal funding dollars. In order for projects to be eligible for federal funding, they need to already be listed in individual jurisdictions' Plans, which means they also need to be consistent with the adopted Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). An example of the type of project the MTIP funds is the 119th Street/72nd – 87th Avenue project. The discussion Mr. Madore referred to is the redevelopment of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Commissioner Madore asked if this is an annual process the Board goes through. Mr. Lookingbill said this programming of projects in the Metropolitan Transportation

Improvement Program (MTIP) is done annually. Commissioner Madore referred to how often projects were selected and was unclear.

Commissioner Madore asked if that included bus rapid transit. Mr. Lookingbill said that the MTIP call for projects could include that project. Commissioner Madore said he thought they should have a discussion about that before looking at the list that includes the bus rapid transit that was a part of the CRC that is no longer funded. He said he felt this needed to be done.

Representative Ed Orcutt said he expressed the same concern as Commissioner Madore. He referred to the previous agenda item regarding the TAP projects and said not enough information was provided and they were asked to vote on it. He said he was concerned that we are rubber stamping things to come through here, and much more specific information needs to be provided.

Mr. Lookingbill said a whole project selection process has been conducted in getting to the TAP projects recommendations. They went through a set of criteria that evaluated the eligible projects. Local agency staff looked at the specifics of the projects before they were brought to the Board, which has been the customary practice. If the Board wishes the full applications, that can be done. Mr. Lookingbill said the RTC Board has been viewed as a policy organization, but if that level of detail is wanted, staff can provide that. The TAP projects have come from local jurisdictions from their individual plans; projects that are ready to be built and have the matching funds for that segment of money.

Jack Burkman said this is getting to a fundamental question that Mr. Lookingbill addressed, which is "How does this body want to operate?" Historically, what we've said is that this is a policy body. In the case that Representative Orcutt brought up, we've had the conversation around what the criteria was going to be and how the scoring was to work. We've had workshops on this, and we've agreed that this is the way to go. We've said evaluate against that and come back to us and report back what the scoring is. We can have the details; we haven't done that to date. It is always accessible to us, so when we receive the report, we can get that information. Staff evaluates and says these are our priorities, but a lot of it is deferring to the judgment of the local jurisdictions; what is most important to them. We as a body have said from a policy level, these are our policies through 2035, and every four years we move out another four years. From that we develop more detailed plans, and it is cascaded down into the communities. That is where we end up with the list. We have said this is a policy set for our region, and this is what we want to do next. Each jurisdiction should be able to choose its own priorities. Mr. Burkman said he did not think that is what RTC should be doing.

Commissioner McKenzie said he would like to emphasize what Mr. Burkman said. He said he thought we need to give some credit to the agencies that are requesting these funds for projects. They also represent the tax payers. Commissioner McKenzie said for example in Skamania County, the project in Stevenson is very important to their community. He said he is very familiar with it, but we do have to give credit. These people are doing the same thing we are, and they represent the tax payers as well. He said he has a bit of faith in the fact that they are making a commitment for the improvement in their community.

Representative Orcutt said his concern is that if all he does is set policy and never see how that policy is working because he doesn't get details on projects they are getting because of that policy, he said he thought we need to change that policy. He also said he didn't know whether staff is really doing what we directed them to do if he doesn't see any additional information. Mr. Lookingbill said all of that information can be made available online.

Jeff Hamm said perhaps once the projects are called for and they are ranked by staff, you could have those projects come back and in the course of the description give a presentation to the Board of each project in ranked order. Allow an opportunity to ask questions of the staff. Members can also ask questions of their staff about their own projects as well.

Commissioner Stuart said he appreciated the Legislator's opinion on having better information, because it does help. Performance measures or some way to measure success would also be helpful. He said we set the criteria by which we would allocate the federal funds, but actually creating performance criteria and then measures for success on this helps us tell the story. This is something that is missing in the dialog, not just here but in some of the work at the state level, is creating measurements for success so that people can see, whether it is the citizen tax payers or the legislature we ask for funds or the federal delegation we ask for funds, the success in the projects that are created. Commissioner Stuart said he appreciated Commissioner McKenzie's comment on the project from his county. He said there are projects on the TAP list that he knows will have great benefit, but unless they have the detail to show that success, it's hard to see.

Commissioner Madore said we are asking entities to choose from the MTP list of projects. Mr. Lookingbill said no, that was not correct. Each jurisdiction is asked what projects they want to submit for this year's funding. Each jurisdiction would look at their own Transportation Improvement Program and Capital Facilities Plan projects that they plan to do, and pick projects to submit.

Commissioner Madore said several meetings ago, he saw a list and at the top of it was the CRC project. He asked what that list was. Mr. Lookingbill said that is the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) a 2035 long range plan. Commissioner Madore asked what we do with that list; is it related to this call for projects. Mr. Lookingbill said if a project is listed in the MTP long range plan then it is eligible for these federal dollars. If a project is not listed in the MTP long range plan, it is not eligible for federal funds. The MTP is a list of projects from all the entities combined in one place.

Commissioner Madore said he wanted to make sure that we are able to lead and not follow. He questioned the mission statement and the role of the RTC Board. Mr. Lookingbill said there are two roles. One is on a federal side and one is on a local side. It is to bring together local jurisdictions to a long-range, multi-modal transportation plan that meets the areas' land use plans. This body is responsible for bringing all of the transportation plans together.

Jack Burkman said it is also important to say what we are not. We (RTC) do not take the place of Vancouver planning or Skamania County for example. We rely heavily on the local jurisdictions to do their planning and say what projects they want to do. Mr. Burkman said we need to be careful, because based on this conversation, we could quickly go into an area where we are doing all the transportation planning for all the jurisdictions. Commissioner Stuart said that is Metro. Jack Burkman said that was right, and that is not what this is. It is not intended to be. The primary mission of this organization is to pull everybody together from all jurisdictions and figure out how we prioritize things among ourselves.

Chair Ganley said in going back to this item's call for projects. He said he served almost nine years on the state Transportation Improvement Board (TIB). It takes 3.4 cents of every gallon of gasoline sold in the state of Washington which goes into about nine different grant programs. The TIB set up criteria for each of those programs. Chair Ganley said while serving on that

Board and still today, a project he still gets questioned is South Parkway and when it will be fixed. He said staff showed him the criteria. It has sidewalks, no accidents, no economic development, and no bus lines. They showed him how it scored, because he wanted to know why they couldn't get state dollars to fix that road. They had been to Washington, D.C. and Olympia and RTC. South Parkway scored at the bottom. He said he has fought for it for years. What this says is that you have to put projects forward that are going to get done or the money is going to someone else. You need the project in your budget and have the matching funds secured and ready to go. If you don't get it done, it is not going to go forward. Sometimes local jurisdictions have put projects forward, and they never get built. There needs to be accountability. Submit good projects. That money just can't be spent in certain areas. Hopefully, our engineers and policy makers are bringing the positive. Chair Ganley said Battle Ground just finished their six-year transportation plan, and the Rails-with-Trails project listed in the TAP project list was included in their plan.

Commissioner Madore said there is value, and no one knows their own home turf except the people who are there. He said he didn't want to send the wrong message. Each person who goes through their list has only their piece of the pie. This is called a regional transportation council, because he said to consider the big picture. He said we should be proactive in visioning that, and said he does not have that list and is not informed so he cannot support this with what we have.

Commissioner Stuart suggested that Mr. Lookingbill work with Commissioner Madore to better understand. Mr. Lookingbill said he can help by relating how it interconnects with the County's TIP process.

Representative Orcutt said he would like to make a motion to approve. Chair Ganley said there is no action needed on this item. Representative Orcutt said he thought making a call for the projects is a good idea. He said the discussion around the table shows that they would like a little more information on scoring and how effective a project was along with projects that didn't make the list and why.

VIII. I-205 Corridor Study Update

Bob Hart said he would update the Board on the I-205 Corridor Study with a focus on the types of strategies and measures to be used for the 2022 short term analysis. First, Mr. Hart said he wanted to answer the questions asked about the study from the June RTC Board meeting. Attached to the memorandum included in the meeting packet was a list of those questions along with the responses. Mr. Hart did not intend to go through all of the questions, but would be happy to answer any questions members have about the attachment.

Jeanne Stewart said in looking at the list of questions, she is concerned with an issue that is listed as a question. The question is "Why not have high occupancy vehicle lanes in the I-205 corridor?" Ms. Stewart said the whole issue of listing the HOV question and having that discussion is how they start moving. It sends its own messages, and becomes something to be considered. She said she would like to see it removed from the list and does not see it as useful.

Dean Lookingbill said the list were simply questions that were raised at the last meeting. The HOV question is not within the scope of the I-205 Study. The intent was to provide a response to some of the questions that were raised at the last meeting. An HOV lane is not being looked at in the I-205 Corridor Study. Ms. Stewart said it states that under different circumstances, it

might be justified. Mr. Lookingbill said existing policy listed in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and among the RTC Board, does not include an HOV lane in the I-205 corridor.

Jeanne Stewart said she is very concerned about this issue and said that restricting a lane would be damaging. She said she will be watching carefully to make sure that is not offered as any option.

Mr. Hart said their I-205 technical advisory committee met to talk about a range of strategies. When they talked about HOV, it was clear that it should not be a part of the I-205 corridor analysis or study. Ms. Stewart said with I-205, ODOT is a part of it. She said one of her concerns is that what we need and our philosophy about improving the transportation system is not necessarily identical to the Oregon side. Ms. Stewart said there are some similarities, but there are a number of issues that are significantly different.

Jeff Hamm said the question regarding I-205 and HOV was initiated by him. He said it is an operational strategy that is used in many metropolitan areas to increase person capacity. Mr. Hamm said in looking at the big picture, it may not be HOV lanes but HOT lanes, which is adding a lane and pay to use with a single occupant vehicle or shuttle ride-share vehicles and buses in the lane. The notion was to make sure that we are still open to those big visionary operational strategies. Mr. Hamm said he agreed they are not just going to work in Clark County, but would need to work in Oregon as well. If we are looking at big visionary things on the operational side, it might be worth just looking at it.

Jack Burkman said the intent is to put all kinds of options on the table. Mr. Burkman questioned the second attachment to the memorandum titled "Candidate Operational Strategies." Mr. Hart said the list of operational strategies provided a menu of ideas that are a part of the broader discussion about those that might be considered in the I-205 corridor and how they are applied. Mr. Burkman said the list did not include HOV. Mr. Hart said the list includes what the I-205 Technical Advisory Committee discussed and HOV was not part of that. Mr. Burkman concluded that decision.

Commissioner Madore referred to the second to the last question listed on the attachment that stated "It would be beneficial to conduct sensitivity analysis of transit service at higher levels than that assumed in the adopted MTP" and asked where that came from. Mr. Hart said that came from C-TRAN to look at the potential of future transit service beyond those that are listed in the Plan. Currently, Mr. Hart said there is service planned for coming from the new park and ride at 18th Street and I-205 down and across the river and also from the Fisher's Landing transit center. Commissioner Madore asked if that was offered during the last meeting. Jeff Hamm said he raised that issue at the meeting. Mr. Hart said RTC staff will meet with C-TRAN staff to determine what levels of future transit service should be tested in the I-205 corridor.

Mr. Hart referred to page 2 of the memorandum listing the most promising set of operational strategies for 2022 short term analysis and highlighted those strategies. He said they have also developed 15 performance measures that need to be narrowed to a smaller set.

Mr. Hart displayed a graph showing 2012 travel times in the I-205 corridor from the Glenn Jackson Bridge up to I-5. An average day travel time through the corridor is pretty consistent, except from 3:30 to 6:30 p.m. Even then, the peak is at about 5:45 and it takes 12.3 minutes compared to 11.5 at other times of the day. The graph also showed a buffer of how much additional time it could take to get through the corridor. It's a measure based on travel time

variability and reflects incidents or other events that can occur in the corridor. Even though the travel time is 12 minutes, you should plan for more than 15 minutes to get through the corridor.

Mr. Hart displayed a series of four maps of the I-205 corridor with 2010 northbound PM Peak speeds along the corridor from the VISSIM travel model. It showed average weekday speeds for all lanes, no accidents or events. Beginning at 2:15 p.m., the bridge is the only segment that shows any slowing in speed. An hour later, at 3:15, there is slowing on the bridge and speeds drop south of Mill Plain and between Mill Plain and SR-500. At 3:45, there is further drop in speed north of Mill Plain and also a drop north of SR-500. By 5:30, the bridge has further slowed.

Commissioner Madore asked if there were sensors at the key locations reflecting the speeds and the number of vehicles. Mr. Hart said yes there is, but on I-205 they need more detection, and funding to get more detectors is programmed. I-5 has more detectors along the corridor. Commissioner Madore asked if it wouldn't make sense for us to make that a priority to get this important information. Now that it is post CRC, in order for us to understand what is happening, we need to inform ourselves of what is happening and not wait a year and a half. Mr. Hart said he believed that WSDOT has the funding programmed; it just needs installation. Commissioner Madore asked if we could influence that and move it up and make it a priority. He said we need the data now, not two years from now. Mr. Hart said they can certainly talk with WSDOT to see their plans for construction. Mr. Madore asked if they could pass a resolution or something to reflect this priority that would urge them to go ahead and provide that detection sooner rather than later. Chair Ganley said they could have staff meet with WSDOT regarding that question and report back at the next meeting.

Mr. Hart provided two simulations for 2010 p.m. peak conditions in the I-205 corridor at Mill Plain northbound and at SR-500 southbound. He noted that by 2022 the I-205 mainline vehicle miles traveled (VMT) goes up by 19% and vehicle hours traveled (VHT) goes up by 33%, spending more time in slower traffic. From 2010 to 2022, the percent of congested lanes goes from 0 to 33%.

Mr. Hart said he plans to come back in September to talk about 2022 short term operational analysis and findings with 18th Street in place and with the operational strategies.

Chair Ganley said they have two more agenda items and about five more minutes of time. He asked Mr. Lookingbill if those items could be at the top of the list for the August meeting. Mr. Lookingbill said that could be done. The Congestion Management Process was intended to provide an overview of what would be in the report. This is a federal report that requires monitoring the level of congestion in our region. A sample of the report was provided to members, and Mr. Lookingbill noted that the report has been reformatted this year. The full report will be brought to the Board in August with a set of findings, and the Board will be asked for their concurrence. The Metropolitan Transportation Plan amendment discussion is something that the Board has requested. A first draft was provided with the July meeting materials. It includes the requirements of the MTP and how it has to be consistent with other plans. It also provides a procedure for the Board to discuss how to regularly maintain the nature of the plan and how to amend it. Chair Ganley requested the MTP amendment item to be an August agenda item for discussion, possibly up to one hour, and the Congestion Management Process the second item.

IX. Congestion Management Process, 2012 Overview

To be addressed at the August meeting.

X. Metropolitan Transportation Plan Assessment/Amendment Process, Review Draft

To be addressed at the August meeting.

XI. Other BusinessFrom the Board

Representative Orcutt said he wanted to make some clarifications on what happened in the Legislative Session this year regarding the CRC. He said some want to blame the Senate Republican, Senate Majority Coalition Caucus for the CRC failure, but he said there are a couple things that need to be recognized. He said there was \$81 million for the CRC that was in the operating budget for transportation, and the \$81 million was vetoed by the Governor. One of the other issues with the whole transportation tax package was when the House sent over the tax package, they didn't send over the third key piece which was the bonds. So without that the Senate couldn't approve the budget because it was dependent on the bonding.

Jeanne Stewart referred to attachment 1 list of questions that she discussed earlier regarding HOV and the I-205 Study. She said it states that policy for an HOV lane is not prohibited, but is also not desirable. It goes on to say that it may, however, be justified when the conversion provides greater people-moving capability on the roadway. Ms. Stewart had concern because that to her suggests that it could also be a great thing. The other concern that she has about this is that ODOT clearly has the philosophy that HOV lanes are put in their interests as they have on I-5. She said it is important that if they get the idea to put HOV on I-205, we don't want to be at the end of that discussion. We don't want that to happen. Mr. Lookingbill said he could contact ODOT and WSDOT and ask them to speak specifically to what it would take for them to consider an HOV, since they are the owners of the facility.

Commissioner Madore asked if it would be appropriate for us to pull the CRC off the MTP. Mr. Lookingbill said the MTP amendment process has been moved to the August meeting.

From the Director

Mr. Lookingbill noted C-TRAN Board Composition Review Committee July 9, 2013, at 4:30 p.m. and Board of Directors Meeting at 5:30 p.m. at the Vancouver Library. JPACT meets Thursday, July 11, 2013, at Metro at 7:30 a.m.

Mr. Lookingbill said Greg Prothman, the consultant assisting with the search for a new RTC Director, will be in town on July 16 to conduct interviews with RTC Board members to provide thoughts and ideas regarding RTC and the new Executive Director. Members will be contacted to set up times. An opportunity for public forum will be available from 4:30 to 5:00 p.m. at Vancouver City Hall Balsam Fir Room. Commissioner Madore requested that the questions that Mr. Prothman will be asking be e-mailed to members ahead of time. Mr. Lookingbill said those would be provided by Mr. Prothman.

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, August 6, 2013, at 4 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.