

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Board of Directors
September 3, 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, September 3, 2013, at 4 p.m. at the Clark County Public Service Center Sixth Floor Training Room, 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington. Attendance follows.

Voting 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
Don Wagner, WSDOT Regional Administrator

Nonvoting Board Members Present:

Ed Orcutt, Representative 20th District

Voting Board Members Absent:

Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor
David Poucher, White Salmon Mayor
Steve Stuart, Clark County Commissioner
Jason Tell, ODOT Region One Manager

Nonvoting Board Members Absent:

Curtis King, Senator 14th District
Norm Johnson, Representative 14th District
Charles Ross, Representative 14th District
Don Benton, Senator 17th District
Paul Harris, Representative 17th District
Monica Stonier, Representative 17th District
Ann Rivers, Senator 18th District
Liz Pike, Representative 18th District
Brandon Vick, Representative 18th District
John Braun, Senator 20th District
Richard DeBolt, Representative 20th District
Annette Cleveland, Senator 49th District
Jim Moeller, Representative 49th District
Sharon Wylie, Representative 49th District

Guests Present:

Ed Barnes, Citizen
Katy Brooks, Port of Vancouver
Pete Capell, Clark County
Eric Florip, The Columbian
Chuck Green, C-TRAN
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Council Member
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver Neighborhood Assoc.
Paul Montague, Identity Clark County
Sharon Nasset, Citizen
Jerry Oliver, Port of Vancouver Commissioner
Philip Parker, WA Transportation Commissioner
Greg Prothman, Prothman Company
Matt Ransom, City of Vancouver
Scott Sawyer, City of Battle Ground
Steve Schulte, Clark County
Larry J. Smith, Vancouver Council Member
Jeff Swanson, Clark County
Tad Winiecki, Citizen
Bill Wright, Clark County

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 August 6, 2013, Meeting Minutes

NANCY BAKER MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 6, 2013, MEETING MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MELISSA SMITH AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

III. Citizen Communications

Ed Barnes of Vancouver said that Commissioner Madore was listed on the agenda to request to pull the CRC off the MTP list. He said his concern is that congestion is only going to get worse.

He said 26th Street off of I-5 gets completely blocked with trucks. Mr. Barnes said on Mill Plain into downtown Vancouver, the trucks and traffic are thick, and removing the CRC project will kill the Port of Vancouver and the City of Vancouver. This is because unless they rebuild Highway 14, Mill Plain, Fourth Plain, and the interchange at SR-500, the Port at some point in time is going to have such heavy truck traffic into the Port that the City Council will make a moratorium that trucks can only drive in from 10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. Mr. Barnes said it is crazy to even think of pulling the project off the Plan. The Port of Vancouver is the only one that has created any jobs, and they have made development to bring people in. We will lose new businesses if they are limited in their ability to transport goods.

Tad Winiecki of Vancouver commented on a few implications of driverless cars. He said car-sharing will be more efficient with driverless cars, because a car will come to you when you need it. The same will apply to rental cars. Taxis will be more efficient if you don't need a driver to carry the luggage, etc. When you consider all the costs, automated taxis will be more economical than buses. Another implication is fewer DUI cases. Those without a driver's license will be able to go places. There will be fewer collisions and traffic violations. Mr. Winiecki said it is going to take a few years for this to happen. Old technology beats new technology until the new technology has developed sufficiently.

Sharon Nasset of Portland referred to the Bi-State Coordination Committee. The committee was established to discuss bi-state transportation issues between Clark County's RTC and Portland Metro's JPACT. The Columbia River Crossing project was one of the products of their discussions. The committee has not met for about three years. Ms. Nasset said the Bi-State Coordination Committee needs to come back together again to meet on a regular basis and discuss a new river crossing.

Jack Burkman said that at a JPACT meeting two months ago, he asked for the Bi-State Coordination Committee meetings to resume. They have since then had a meeting. Those that met include Mr. Burkman as the City of Vancouver representative, Commissioner Stuart who is Co-Chair of the Committee along with Metro President Tom Hughes who is also Co-Chair. The expectation is that the Committee will restart in October. This will not just be on transportation, but also issues of economic commonality between the regions. That conversation is indeed restarting.

IV. Consent Agenda

A. September Claims

JACK BURKMAN MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA SEPTEMBER CLAIMS. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MELISSA SMITH AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

V. 2035 MTP Capital Facilities Process Update

Lynda David referred to the memo in the meeting packet along with the attached sub-area information sheets. Ms. David said this presentation follows up from last month's agenda item and will provide an update on work to review the list of capital transportation projects identified in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan to identify the most-needed capital facilities projects in the Clark County region. She will answer the questions posed at last month's meeting by

comparing transportation system performance results at both the region-wide and sub-area levels using both the existing 2035 MTP growth forecast and with using a 2035 slower growth forecast. The presentation will conclude with discussion of how these results can help inform the growth forecast and transportation capacity analysis in the upcoming MTP update process.

Ms. David said the purpose of the Capital Facilities Review is to review the adopted MTP's identified regional transportation system projects in light of a slower growth projection scenario. The work effort focuses on the MTP's capacity needs and identified projects and allows us to analyze which are the most critical for internal Clark County's transportation system in the 20-year timeframe. Ms. David said to keep in mind that slower growth would also likely mean lower transportation revenues available than what was forecast in the current MTP. The scenario analysis also allows us to begin to address transportation system policy which will need to be reviewed as part of the MTP update with consideration of a shift from past emphasis on mobility and capacity expansion to an emphasis on reliability, accessibility, modal choices, and priorities.

Ms. David recapped the demographic comparisons presented at both the March and August Board meetings. She provided a slide showing a comparison between 2010 base year demographics, the MTP forecast for 2035 and the slower growth scenario being considered. Both 2025 forecasts fall within the Washington Office of Financial Management's range of population projections which must be used for local growth management planning purposes. The OFM periodically updates future population forecasts and the slower growth scenario aligns with OFM's latest medium population forecast.

A slide was provided showing a chart comparison between the two 2035 forecasts. The slower growth scenario has 12.4% less population, 15.7% less households, and 18.9% less employment than the forecast used in the current Metropolitan Transportation Plan. The household and employment growth forecasts pivot off the OFM population forecast.

The 2035 analysis for both the existing MTP and the slower growth have transportation trip generation and trip travel demand assigned to the committed network. The committed network includes today's transportation system together with state-funded Nickel/Partnership projects and improvements included in local six-year Transportation Improvement Programs. Committed system projects were reviewed at last month's meeting, and were provided on a slide.

The regional travel forecast model allows us to assess transportation system performance. Ms. David provided three slides that focused on some of the performance measures for the PM Peak one-hour. As requested by the Board, the charts compare performance of the 2010 transportation system with the 2035 existing MTP forecast and the 2035 slower growth forecast. Both 2035 forecast trips are assigned to the committed transportation network.

Lane Miles of Congestion is a good measure of the overall performance of the transportation system. Congested lane miles are defined as those that operate at a greater than .9 volume to capacity ratio during the full p.m. peak hour. The measure is used to assess future congestion given the forecast increase in travel demand. On the total highway system, the slower growth scenario results in 55% less lane miles of congestion than the existing MTP. On the interstate system, there are 63% less lane miles congested and on Expressways and Principals, there are 132% less lane miles congested.

For the percent of lane miles congested in the PM peak hour with the slower 2035 forecast, over 8.4% of the total transportation system will be congested compared with 18.6% in 2035 with the existing MTP's 2035 forecast. The analysis points to the significance of the regional transportation network because it is the regional system links, the higher classification facilities, the interstates, expressways and principal arterials that get most congested in the future. With the 2035 MTP level of travel demand, 38.7% of lane miles on the interstate system will be congested by 2035, and with the slower growth scenario, 23.7% will remain congested. With the MTP travel demand, 24% of expressways and principals will be congested and with slower growth, 10.4% of these facilities will be congested.

A third measure for evaluating overall highway system performance is vehicle hours of delay. This is significant in terms of system reliability and travel experience of system users. The chart showed comparison between 2010 and the two 2035 scenarios.

Ms. David said the conclusions that can be reached in looking at regional transportation system performance, there appears to be many highway links with insufficient capacity even with the 2035 slower growth scenario, and there are certainly transportation improvements beyond what is included in the committed system needed to accommodate 2035's travel demand.

The next set of slides that Ms. David provided focused on sub-area analyses, which were introduced at last month's meeting. These maps were attached to the memo. This month, there were congestion comparisons between the 2035 MTP and the 2035 slower growth scenario. Ms. David highlighted each of the sub-area comparisons for Camas/Washougal, Discovery Corridor, Battle Ground, West Vancouver, and East Vancouver. She also noted key transportation project needs in the sub-area.

The comparison exercise shows the difference in transportation system performance depending on forecast growth. What they have learned is that even with a slower growth forecast for 2035, there are still transportation capacity issues that need to be addressed. At this stage, they are not making conclusions regarding the solutions that should be applied. This will come as part of the MTP update process to be undertaken next year. Ms. David said this exercise has allowed us to consider demographic forecasts, how they influence transportation system performance and consider where there are capacity issues which need to be addressed in the MTP update process.

As in previous MTP updates, the MTP process has proven to allow for transportation system analysis, identification of travel needs and transportation projects and/or strategies to address the needs, cost estimation of projects and strategies, the exercise of fiscal constraint and public input at stages of MTP development.

The next series of slides that Ms. David presented showed how transportation projects support development. The MTP allows for transportation system needs to be identified, projects proposed and eventually, leads to programming of projects for funding in the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program. The MTP's development synchronizes with the land use plans in local Comprehensive Plans. Washington State's Growth Management laws now require consistency between the plans.

The first map showed roadway and interchange improvements made between 1980 and 1994. Between 1980 and 1994, Clark County saw robust growth and development and roadway projects focused primarily on increasing capacity as well as safety. Notable projects proposed in

the MTP and subsequently implemented include widening of I-5 through Hazel Dell, Mill Plain widening and improvement and construction of I-205.

The second map showed the improvements made from 1995 to 2004. More projects focused on suburban growth. Notable projects identified in the MTP and subsequently constructed included further widening of I-5 further north through Hazel Dell and rebuilt or new interchanges, as well as the 164th and 192nd Avenue corridors and interchanges with SR-14 in East Vancouver, Padden Parkway, and widening of SR-503 in the Battle Ground area. The third map adds roadway improvements from 2005 to 2010.

Ms. David said the current MTP adopted in December 2011 has projects identified on a map with Regional System Improvement Projects 2011-2035 and can be found in the MTP document on RTC's website.

Ms. David said today's focus was on regional performance measures and sub-area analyses comparing results for the existing 2035 MTP growth forecast and a slower growth forecast. This helps in the scoping of the 2014 MTP update. The exercise focuses only on the highway capacity issues but with the 2014 MTP update, there needs to be consideration of transportation policy, multiple transportation modes, meeting the needs for transportation of both people and freight. Also, the MTP update process needs to be carried out in the context of an updated federal transportation act that requires transportation performance measurement, monitoring and reporting and in the context of state Growth Management laws that requires consistency between national, state, regional, and local plans for the transportation system. The MTP update process is set to launch in November and continue into 2014.

Commissioner Mielke said with all the information that was provided, it did not show the benefit of the projected improvement projects. Ms. David said they could provide the PowerPoint presentation on RTC's website, and that would provide the committed transportation system list of projects. They are fairly minimal compared with what we have seen in the past. They include the projects included in the Transportation Improvement Programs of the local jurisdictions as well as the Nickel and Partnership projects. There are not many projects in line that make up the committed system. Ms. David said as they launch the MTP update, they will need to look at where the travel demand needs are and look at identifying the best solutions. Commissioner Mielke said he thought they needed to look at a two hour peak period to better reflect the congestion. Mr. Lookingbill clarified what the Commissioner was asking for. He wants to see what it looks like with all of the projects, not just the committed list.

Jack Burkman wanted to clarify that what we are doing now is setting the foundation for what our assumptions are going to be for population and employment and then build from that. He said we may or may not keep what is currently on the MTP as we go forward. Mr. Burkman said building on what Commissioner Mielke had said about the peak hour, as we get to these levels of congestion, he said he believed that there may be more than an hour of congestion. He asked how that was measured if it was spread over two to four hours and not missing it. Ms. David said it is an influence of travel demand and capacity. Mr. Lookingbill said one suggestion was to look at the total demand over a two-hour average instead of a single hour. If the congestion extended past a two hour period, they will look at how to adjust the numbers to get the two hour average.

Commissioner Madore said it would be beneficial to plug in each of the projects and let the computer run through the projects and give us the best bang for our buck combination at the end. Mr. Lookingbill said the optimal system is different things in different people's eyes. He said with this capacity analysis, it is saying even with a slower growth scenario, we can still find bottle necks and those should be the first set to address. Those are going to be facilities that due to the level of growth, there may be more cost effective ways of getting there, but there is probably going to be a capacity solution to get there. There are also safety issues to bring into corridors and access issues and others. This is only one look, not all of those dimensions. Commissioner Madore said this is a tool that can allow us to be much more informed.

Jack Burkman said that is what is done with the Metropolitan TIP. He said we have a series of projects that are brought forward and various jurisdictions wrestle over who gets what money and where. He asked if those models are run to tell us the benefits to compare against another project. Mr. Lookingbill said yes, and that can be seen in the next agenda item. There is a set of criteria that the Board has said these are the benefits that we are looking for, and that analysis is run.

VI. Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program: 2016-2017 Project Evaluation and Ranking

Dale Robins referred to the memorandum included in the meeting packet along with a white paper that summarizes the TIP selection process. Included at the table for members were packets with copies of each of the applications that were submitted. They were also available electronically. Mr. Robins said the applications were in alphabetical order by jurisdiction.

As the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Clark County region, RTC is required to develop a TIP. The TIP is a four-year program of planned regional transportation projects. It identifies how funds will be obligated or spent. It only includes federally funded or regionally significant projects and not all locally funded projects. The TIP shows how priority projects from the long-range plan can be funded over the next four years.

RTC has responsibility for selecting projects for three federal transportation programs: Surface Transportation Program (STP), Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Program, and Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). The TAP projects were selected in July. Mr. Robins said today's discussion will focus on the STP and CMAQ programs. Mr. Robins provided an overview of the project screening and ranking steps. He said next month, staff will return with the selection and programming step. In addition to the regional selected programs, other regionally significant projects selected at the state and federal level will be included in the final TIP document.

For the TIP, projects are selected by the RTC Board using a competitive process that utilizes selection criteria. Federal regulations require that TIP's be developed through a competitive process. The RTC Transportation Improvement Program procedures were approved by the RTC Board at their July 2, 2013, meeting. The RTC Selection Criteria were approved by the RTC Board at their September 4, 2012, meeting.

The TIP uses a three-step selection process that includes project screening for eligibility, evaluation and ranking by selection criteria, and selection and programming of project for funding. Local agencies draw priority projects from the region's long-range plan. Each agency

submits their priority projects to RTC by completing a project application. The project applications that were received were available at the table and were made available online with the mailing of meeting packets.

Project applications were reviewed for eligibility, including consistency with transportation and land use plans. All 19 projects submitted this year are considered eligible to compete for STP or CMAQ funds. The total request was for over \$25 million, with approximately \$13 million available. The total project cost for all projects submitted is over \$141 million.

Each project is evaluated by technical staff and ranked against a set of selection criteria, which have been approved by the RTC Board. The selection criteria reflect the system performance goals and measures from the long range plan. Criteria are included on the back of the TIP Process Summary.

Mr. Robins provided a brief summary for each of the 19 submitted projects that included a picture, description, score, rank, federal request, and any noted issues. A table listing the projects and their ranking are on page three of the [memorandum](#).

At their September 20th meeting, the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee will be asked to make their technical recommendation on selection and programming. Their recommendation will then be brought to the October 1st RTC Board meeting for the Board's consideration and action. The Board's action will include the adoption of the 2014-2017 TIP.

The Regional Transportation Advisory Committee has reviewed the screening and evaluation step and is recommending that the RTC Board of Directors concur with the ranking of the projects. Action on this item will include concurrence with the evaluation and ranking of projects based on regional selection criteria.

Commissioner Madore asked how they could put two of those projects on hold. Chair Ganley said this is just the ranking of the projects. This is not moving them forward. It is like giving them a grade. The project selection process will take place at the October 1 meeting.

Commissioner Madore said he is referring to two projects, but would speak to one of them, the bus rapid transit project. He said there is an upcoming vote on that project and if we approve the ranking as number 1 today, then we will be ahead of the voters. He said that would not be an appropriate move. Chair Ganley said this is a grade that gives more information to the voters. Commissioner Madore asked if they could amend it to approve the others and hold that project until after the vote.

Dean Lookingbill said this is the evaluation and ranking of the 2016-2017 projects. The action the Board will be asked to take in October will be given that ranking and given the available amount of funds, what set of projects will be selected and then programmed into the MTIP for 2016-2017.

Commissioner Madore said one step to move this set of projects forward to next month and the other would be to move forward those things that have no reason for us to hold. Chair Ganley said Battle Ground's Parkway project is last on the list. He said it is pretty clear that it is not going to get funded, but it is still listed as it was ranked.

Jack Burkman said he understood this process as the RTC Board revised the selection criteria for the scoring. We said all of us want to submit projects and have the experts score them and report

back to the Board. For example, Vancouver submitted 18th Street and asked for it to be scored. He said they did not ask SE 1st Street to be scored even though it is a really high profile project that they need to get done. He said they have design and right of way, but are not ready to go through this scoring process, because they would not score well at all. This list is the scoring. Next month, projects are selected based on the direction that the Board gave to staff.

Dale Robins said this is just how the projects scored against the criteria the Board adopted. They will then use that information to make a funding recommendation with RTAC's advice.

Commissioner Mielke said he doesn't want the BRT to be considered for funding, because it hasn't been approved. In November, the people have to approve it. He said to set aside dollars for it without the approval in November is the wrong thing to do. It should be removed so the others can use the funding or add another project to the list.

TOM MIELKE MOVED TO PULL THE BRT PROJECT FROM THE RANKING LIST TODAY UNTIL AFTER NOVEMBER. ED ORCUTT SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Ganley said so you want to remove the project from a ranking list, a grading that was provided to us. Funding selection is not until October. Commissioner Mielke said yes, because he did not want it to go forward for that option.

Jack Burkman said this project was submitted by C-TRAN, just as other jurisdictions submitted their projects, which is what the Board of Directors asked. Mr. Burkman asked for clarification. Jeff Hamm said that was correct. Mr. Burkman said he wanted to be careful, because to him it is inappropriate for this body to remove from consideration something that another body has submitted through their Board following the criteria. That would be arbitrary and capricious.

Jeanne Stewart said the ranking is important, because it will be an indication at the time we fund what we are going to fund. She said the BRT was submitted by C-TRAN, and asked what the affect would be if there is a ballot proposition by Clark County that puts a question to the voters whether they want to oppose all BRT in Clark County and the voters vote yes they want to oppose all BRT in Clark County. Ms. Stewart said she is not following whether or not that is a binding vote on C-TRAN or if it is enforceable by the County. Commissioner Mielke said it is an advisory vote. Ms. Stewart said she understands it is just an advisory vote, but that it's not without influence to County Commissioners. Ms. Stewart said if we adopt this ranking now, and later on there is action taken by the citizens or by this Board to change our funding priorities, at what point do we have the opportunity to go back and rescore and change the funding. She asked what the opportunity is for this Board under any circumstances to go back and look at an item and rescore and make a decision about funding priorities.

Dean Lookingbill said should the ranking go forward today, and in October the project selection authority is made by that ranking and the project gets the CMAQ funds. If at a later time, the C-TRAN Board decides to not move forward with the project, that amount of CMAQ money would go back in the RTC regional CMAQ pool of funding.

Jeanne Stewart said last November there was a vote to the citizens to use a sales tax increase to support light rail and bus rapid transit. They were combined on the ballot. The citizens said no, they did not want to fund those two modes of transportation. Ms. Stewart asked Mr. Hamm for the BRT what impact that had on the Board decision, and asked if there is dedicated funding for the part that C-TRAN must provide.

Mr. Hamm said there have been different interpretations of the vote last November. One interpretation is that it is against the project, and the voters have said it should not happen. Another interpretation is that the voters said we're not passing judgment on the project itself, but we are telling you we do not want you to increase your sales taxes in order to fund that project. Those are the two competing interpretations. The Attorney General's office was asked to render an opinion that in the absence of C-TRAN seeking a sales tax increase under RCW 81.104 would the agency have to ask the voters for permission to proceed with the project. The answer to that was no; it does not have to do that. At the present time, C-TRAN is proceeding with the development of the project. At the August Board meeting on a 6-3 vote, Commissioners Mielke and Madore were in the minority, action was taken to authorize Mr. Hamm to represent to this Board that for C-TRAN this is an active project, and that they should continue to pursue and it wishes to seek funding to continue the design and the environmental work to bring the project forward. It is not a decision to construct it. They still have the financing to put together, an application to put in to FTA, but there is expectation that those pieces can come together. This funding will assist in that process.

Melissa Smith said she understood that this is really a grading step, because as far as she knows, Camas won't get their signal project on 6th. She referred to the 2016-2017 C-TRAN 4th Plain BRT project, and asked Commissioner Madore if he was speaking on behalf of C-TRAN that he wanted the project removed from the list. Commissioner Madore said he spoke as an individual C-TRAN Board member, as a representative of all of Clark County, one Commissioner. Ms. Smith said this is a ranking. She said she felt it was her obligation to go back to the City of Camas and the City of Washougal and explain to them to see what concerns they have so that she can be more informed when she comes back in October to discuss the funding. She said there is \$13 million available for all of these projects. Ms. Smith requested that this vote be a roll call vote, because she would like to take that back to her respective cities.

Nancy Baker said this is an educational process. RTC is a policy Board. RTAC is an advisory group that supports us, gathering all the information, supplying us with what we need to know, and doing things that we don't do. She asked why you would ask someone to give you a report, and then say I don't like that part. That's like going to the doctor and saying you want a physical, but I don't want you to tell me anything that I wouldn't like to see. That doesn't make good sense. We have a report that has opportunity later to change something, why would you pick it apart.

Representative Ed Orcutt said he had to take issue with something that Jack Burkman said, that support of this might be deemed to "be arbitrary and capricious." Representative Orcutt said he did not think it was at all. He said it is a value judgment that is being made. It could be easily argued that the ranking is arbitrary and capricious. To say that to do this project is going to be better for air quality than to do a different project that would move vehicles faster and reduce congestion might be deemed to be arbitrary and capricious. To say that this was brought by the C-TRAN Board so we should not say no to it, he questioned why they were even here. He said we are here to oversee these different things. Representative Orcutt said for him to attend these meetings for two hours each month, he should have a voice and be able to say we don't like this and don't think this is the right priority; the ranking maybe is inappropriate. This may be the wrong time for this to be put out there. Just because a particular Board or entity put something

forward, maybe this Board thinks it's the wrong thing. Representative Orcutt said he felt it was appropriate to have this motion and this kind of discussion.

Commissioner Madore said there are three candidates for CMAQ funds that are competing for funds, and the BRT is the number 1 position for \$2 million so it does pull from positions 2, 3, and 4. He said number 4 should be included on the list. Referring to when Commissioner Baker said we have an advisory committee to assist and advise us. Commissioner Madore said why would we consider not simply doing what an advisory committee says. He said it's because they are not voters. He said the voters rejected funding for BRT and light rail, and there have been claims that there are possible different meanings for that. That really wasn't on either one of those issues, so that is why the Commissioners have put the right question on the ballot this November that says Do you support bus rapid transit? And Do you support light rail? Commissioner Madore said we would be ahead of the voters if we follow the advice of a small body that did not represent the voters.

Melissa Smith said this is just a placeholder. She said she felt waiting for the voters is wrong for this Board. This is information and a grading, and it is not going to hurt anything to keep it on. Once you take it off, what if the voters say yes, we want it now. You have lost your place, and you have lost the funding once you take it off. Dean Lookingbill said if this body was to remove the project from the list today, it would be ineligible for funding this year. Ms. Smith said she would like to see it remain on the list. It is information for the citizens.

Commissioner Madore said he has heard that term as the justification why we would leave the CRC project on there, it is just a placeholder; just as this project is just a placeholder. He said he would think that each of these projects has a specific application that makes it qualify. If we leave this project on the list and the voters say no and we take it off and assign the money to a different project, Commissioner Madore said he thinks that is violating the process, and asked Mr. Lookingbill if that was correct. Mr. Lookingbill asked for clarification of the question. Commissioner Madore said if we put projects on the list as placeholders and we get funding for that, are we free to do whatever we want with the money because we are not going to use it for what we intended to. Mr. Lookingbill said all of these projects have been submitted by those agencies as real projects to be funded. The submittal of this project, as Mr. Hamm described the C-TRAN Board's action to move forward with the application and work through the process for the design with full anticipation that the project would one day be implemented. The placeholder notion is that if this stays in place here, and receives funding, these are regional dollars and they stay in the region. Should the vote go positive, the money would be there. Should the vote go negative, the money goes back in the pool or if C-TRAN decides not to do it, it goes back in the pool. These are CMAQ dollars and they stay in the CMAQ pool of funds. Mr. Lookingbill said as Dale explained, we are talking about STP and CMAQ dollars. That is regionally allocated money. Agencies make submittal, should any of the other projects not be fully funded or have some other circumstance, the money does not go away. It stays in the region. We need to take it through a subsequent year's process to allocate it.

Jack Burkman spoke to the motion on the floor. He said as a Vancouver City Council Member, he would be opposing it. The Vancouver City Council has taken by formal resolution position supporting CRC and BRT on Fourth Plain. To be in favor of it would be going in opposition to stated policy of the Council.

Jack Burkman said he is troubled by the discussion. This is a core foundation for how this body works together. What we have said is that we don't come here and just make decisions based on information that we want to bring to the table. We use a predefined process so we can all compete equally. We have agreed upon that process. That is this scoring process we agreed upon. We said each jurisdiction submits what you want, and have our experts grade that and report and bring it back to us. What this discussion is saying are we going to accept what our experts said in terms of the ranking. He said yes, he would accept that. Do we end up funding the projects at the end? It is open for discussion as to where the money ends up going. We have agreed to this MTIP process.

Commissioner Madore said this board is made up of both elected representatives and nonelected staff members. Each of us has a vote. As an elected representative, the process and the principle that apply here is that we represent our citizens that put us here, and we speak for them. That process trumps all of the bureaucratic processes, all advisory boards, and all staff member reports. Commissioner Madore said it would violate his conscious to follow some other process.

Melissa Smith said that is why she wants to take this back to her citizens in Camas and Washougal, and come back in October with the decision. Chair Ganley again said this is a ranking, a process of grading.

Jeff Hamm reemphasized that on a 6-3 vote last month, the C-TRAN Board of Directors voted to continue to advance this project to the RTC for funding.

Representative Orcutt said getting back to Council Member Burkman's point and Commissioner Madore's point. He asked if this is the time to take it off the list or is not the time to take it off the list. If there is a more appropriate time to take it off the list, when is that? Chair Ganley said that would be at the October 1 meeting. He said he wants people to be sensitive to the concerns of the citizens as to whether or not this is a priority project for them. He said he also wants to consider what process we set forward to get unbiased data.

Jeanne Stewart said she is concerned about the timing of this coming to RTC on October 1, because the voters will see in the headlines that RTC funds BRT. That can impact the ballot, and make people wonder if it is a done deal. Jeanne Stewart asked why October 1 was the deadline. Mr. Lookingbill said it is a state deadline. The state takes all of the individual programs and rolls them together to get a State Transportation Improvement Program; that then goes to the Federal Highway Administration. This is in order to have funds available for all of the projects January 1. If we were to delay, and go to another time, you jeopardize that funding for the rest of the projects by January 1. Ms. Stewart said that was the information she wanted to confirm.

Jeanne Stewart said last May, the City Council approved a resolution to continue to support BRT. She said as an assertion that that means everything from then on, she did not feel was necessarily accurate. In November, the citizens said they did not want to fund BRT and LRT. They may have meant, I will fund BRT, but not LRT. That could be a possible message. Ms. Stewart said the resolution passed in May was sort of a placeholder. When we get to November and the citizens defeat that ballot, that should be meaningful to each elected member. She said they have not readopted BRT.

Commissioner Madore said on the next C-TRAN agenda will be a resolution to hold funding for the BRT until after the vote. The ranking here since the first project, BRT project, consumes \$2

million of CMAQ funds, he said he thought it would be informative to see the other projects that are seeking CMAQ dollars. Mr. Lookingbill said only the three projects listed were submitted. Mr. Madore said if they end up with the funding for the project and there are no other projects, do they look for a good source to use those funds for to add it to the list afterwards. Mr. Lookingbill said they look to the jurisdictions to make application. The funds would go through the next funding cycle next year to identify other projects in the CMAQ eligible category. The evaluation process has been done for this year's full set of projects that were submitted. This evaluation and the selection of projects conclude with these next actions that are proposed. The process begins again next year with a new funding year and a new set of project requests.

Commissioner Madore said if this body passes this and we approve of this ranking today, we can ensure that they are not sending a message that this is a done deal, that it is a number one project for our community. Rather, that we understand the process that has gone into this at this point and the further process that we will be able to pay attention and the turnout for the November election to see if it is appropriate to fund.

Commissioner Mielke said the other problem he has with the BRT ranked as number one is that it is not fully funded. No BRT funding has been identified. Dale Robins said the application would fully fund the PE phase only.

Dale Robins clarified that they will come back in October and ask for a recommendation for selection. Those projects will be programmed in the 2014-2017 TIP. Those funds will not be available until January 2014 at which time that agency will have to submit a local agency agreement to obligate those funds and would come before the Board again.

A ROLL CALL VOTE WAS TAKEN. THE MOTION FAILED 2-8 WITH MADORE AND MIELKE YES AND BAKER, BURKMAN, GANLEY, HAMM, MCKENZIE, SMITH, STEWART, AND WAGNER NO.

JACK BURKMAN MOVED TO ACCEPT THE RANKING AS PRESENTED TODAY. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MELISSA SMITH. THE MOTION PASSED 8-2 WITH MADORE AND MIELKE NO.

VII. Other Business

From the Board

Chair Ganley distributed copies of the new RTC Director profile that had previously been distributed to members for comments. He said they received comments back from Board members and adjustments were made. Greg Prothman was present to go over the information. Chair Ganley asked concurrence from the Board to send the profile as presented.

JACK BURKMAN MOVED TO ACCEPT THE POSITION PROFILE THAT IS PRESENTED. NANCY BAKER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Madore offered amendments to the profile. Under Ideal Candidate on page 4, he wanted to include content that would bring balance between the private and public sector by changing the word urban to include business friendly. Also on the third line at practices of public administration, he would like it to say practices of private business and public administration. Also on the fifth line before economic development, he would add private sector economic development. Also on the seventh line where it says the ideal candidate will have a

hands-on understanding..., replace it with will have a balance of both private and public sector experience. Mr. Madore said he offered these changes because although this is a public position, we serve the private sector.

Jack Burkman asked if he recommended dropping the word urban or inserting text with it. Commissioner Madore proposed to replace the word urban. He said it is already transportation planning, it includes more than urban. Mr. Burkman recommended both "urban, business friendly" because urban transportation planning is a particular part of the field. Mr. Madore asked if it was only urban. Mr. Lookingbill clarified that the meaning of this is to communicate what the job entails. The word urban transportation sends a very clear signal for someone with a set of skills and understands urban transportation systems. It is an important word to communicate the right signal of what the job is. Most of what RTC does is urban transportation planning. Skamania and Klickitat Counties involve some rural transportation issues. Commissioner Madore said maybe it should be urban/rural. Mr. Lookingbill said rural issues are addressed in other areas of the profile.

Greg Prothman said the profile was derived from the consensus of what he heard through all of the interviews. He said his effort was to reflect the majority of the comments from the Board.

Jack Burkman said he heard the change as "urban/rural business friendly transportation planning, private sector economic development." Commissioner Madore added to include "Ideal candidate will have a balance of both public and private sector experience, a hands-on understanding." Mr. Burkman said he found that to be a friendly amendment.

Mr. Prothman said he heard a much stronger preponderance of opinion for public sector experience than private sector experience from the interview comments. He said this instruction would then be to look for private sector experience, which he did not think was relevant for this level of Board from his experience. He asked for clarification.

Commissioner Madore said this was not to switch to have only private sector experience. He said it was to not exclude private sector, to have a balance. Someone who has the insight that comes from private sector to be included also.

Jack Burkman said this is an ad that they are going to place and draw people based on these words. Based on that, he said he would move off the friendly amendment and ask a friendly change that these be distinct amendments to make the changes. He said with private listed many places, that ad will read differently than what was written by Mr. Prothman based on the majority view that he heard during interviews. Mr. Prothman said that was correct.

Commissioner Madore said he also had some changes under Education and Experience. He said there was only public listed and nothing as business friendly or private.

Jack Burkman withdrew his friendly amendment based on the discussion and requested as a matter of process to have each of these be treated as individual amendments.

Jeff Hamm asked for clarification on the first proposed change, and that proposed change is "urban/rural business friendly transportation planning." Mr. Hamm said based on that, he said he understands the perspective of wanting to get public sector included, but going back to Dean's point, urban and even rural transportation planning is a nomenclature that is used to attract the particular candidates that you are interested in. Putting business friendly in there, why not also

freight friendly or pedestrian friendly, or bicycle friendly. He said the private sector should stand alone by itself someplace else. Mixing it with the urban/rural transportation planning would send the wrong message.

Mr. Madore provided the reason that he thinks it should include business friendly. He said they are going to be taking their transportation funds and spend \$80 million to give to private businesses because we are hurting them and most likely move to Kalama. He said that is not business friendly. The leader should know what is business friendly, and should be a priority.

Representative Orcutt said he agreed that business friendly needs to be included somewhere, and he agreed with Mr. Hamm that that was not the right spot for it. He said it does lead to some confusion. Representative Orcutt said he did not want to wordsmith this, but to give basic principles that someone can rewrite this. Basically, changes would be to include private sector experience, urban/rural transportation planning, and business friendly.

Jack Burkman asked if the Board could defer that final decision to the Chair and Vice Chair, in order to stay on schedule.

Jeanne Stewart asked if this definition implied that transit is included, because it does not say that in the document. Mr. Lookingbill said the nomenclature of saying urban transportation planning is inclusive of all modes of freight, transit, highways, and pedestrians. It does communicate that.

Commissioner Madore said under the education and experience section, the same principles could be applied to ensure that we welcome private sector education and experience as well. Mr. Prothman said that is not excluded. Mr. Madore said it is of value and should be included.

THE MOTION WAS APPROVED WITH THE NOTED CHANGES TO BE MADE AS DISCUSSED.

Greg Prothman said they are on schedule and moving forward. It will go to ad late that week or early next week. As resumes start coming in, he will start evaluating them. When he comes to the RTC Board next he will have had all his semifinal interviews, and have the top 10-18 selected. They will then have an Executive Session to review the candidates and what he learned from the interviews. That will take place on November 5. Mr. Prothman said he would get the candidate information to members prior to the meeting to allow for review ahead of time.

Commissioner Madore said given the short amount of time, he would be brief. He distributed a proposed resolution for the Board to consider to put the Bus Rapid Transit on hold until after the November vote, and have it on the agenda at the October meeting.

Commissioner Madore also suggested that the RTC Website be updated and easier to use including the CVTV links. Mr. Lookingbill said the work on RTC's new website is underway. The target is the end of the year. They intend to show the Board some examples, and it does provide a much better opportunity.

Commissioner Madore referred to the current list of RTC Board Members and their contact information included in members' notebooks. He said it does not distinguish the voting members from the nonvoting members and asked for an update as well as identifying that in the minutes.

Jack Burkman said Commissioner Madore took him to task personally in his Facebook page over his role as Vice Chair at RTC and his feedback in response to his wanting to put these agenda items on our agenda. Mr. Burkman said he felt obligated in public session to say this when he takes him to task for not having open transparent government or a predetermined agenda being forced upon people. Mr. Burkman said the request was made by Commissioner Madore to put these items on the agenda, was a repeat of conversations that we have had over and over again. He said his understanding is that the way this Board operates, like most Boards, is when a Board Member has an update of some kind it goes under updates or Other Business from the Board. No individual Board Member puts an agenda item on, if that happened, we wouldn't need a Chair. Mr. Burkman asked concurrence from the Board that that is what we wish to continue to do.

From the Director

Mr. Lookingbill noted C-TRAN Composition Review Committee meets on September 10, 2013, at 4:00 p.m. and the Board of Directors meets at 5:30 p.m. at the Vancouver Library. JPACT meets September 12, 2013, at Metro at 7:30 a.m.

Mr. Lookingbill noted the Transportation Revenue Package Listening Tour and distributed copies of the schedule. The September date listed on the agenda had been revised and was incorrect. The meeting for the SW Region is on October 7, 2013, at the Vancouver Library from 6:00 to 9:00 p.m. Attached to the meeting schedule was the Ten-Year Priority List of Projects for RTC that was done last year in preparation for the 2013 legislative session and that this is the list that would be presented at the October 7 Listening Session.

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, October 1, 2013, at 4 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

William J. Ganley, Board of Directors Chair