

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council  
Board of Directors  
March 3, 2015, 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 Melissa Smith on Tuesday, March 3, 2015, at 4:00 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.

Voting Board Members Present:

Kelly Brooks, ODOT (Alternate)  
Jack Burkman, Vancouver Council Member  
Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor  
Bill Ganley, Battle Ground Council Member  
Jeff Hamm, C-TRAN Executive Director  
David Madore, Clark County Councilor  
Tom Mielke, Clark County Councilor  
Larry Smith, Vancouver Council Member  
Melissa Smith, Camas Council Member  
Jeanne Stewart, Clark County Councilor  
Don Wagner, WSDOT Regional Administrator

Voting Board Members Absent:

Nancy Baker, Port of Vancouver Commissioner  
Doug McKenzie, Skamania Co. Commissioner  
David Poucher, White Salmon Mayor  
Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1 Manager

Nonvoting Board Members Present:

Nonvoting Board Members Absent:

Curtis King, Senator 14<sup>th</sup> District  
Norm Johnson, Representative 14<sup>th</sup> District  
Gina McCabe, Representative 14<sup>th</sup> District  
Don Benton, Senator 17<sup>th</sup> District  
Paul Harris, Representative 17<sup>th</sup> District  
Lynda Wilson, Representative 17<sup>th</sup> District  
Ann Rivers, Senator 18<sup>th</sup> District  
Liz Pike, Representative 18<sup>th</sup> District  
Brandon Vick, Representative 18<sup>th</sup> District  
John Braun, Senator 20<sup>th</sup> District  
Richard DeBolt, Representative 20<sup>th</sup> District  
Ed Orcutt, Representative 20<sup>th</sup> District  
Annette Cleveland, Senator 49<sup>th</sup> District  
Jim Moeller, Representative 49<sup>th</sup> District  
Sharon Wylie, Representative 49<sup>th</sup> District

Guests Present:

Katy Brooks, Port of Vancouver  
Elizabeth Campbell, Citizen  
Pete Capell, City of Camas  
Eric Florip, The Columbian  
Bart Gernhart, WSDOT  
Heath Henderson, Clark County  
Karen Hengerer, Citizen  
Lee L. Jensen, Citizen  
Dale Lewis, Senator Herrera Beutler's Office  
John Ley, Citizen  
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver Council  
Sharon Nasset, ETA  
Ron Onslow, Ridgefield Mayor  
Tracy Schreiber, SWWDC  
Sandra Towne, City of Vancouver  
Steve Tubbs, Citizen

Staff Present:

Matt Ransom, Executive Director  
Ted Gathe, Legal Counsel  
Lynda David, Senior Transportation Planner  
Mark Harrington, Senior Transportation Planner  
Bob Hart, Transportation Section Supervisor  
Dale Robins, Senior Transportation Planner  
Diane Workman, Administrative Assistant

## **II. Call for Public Comments**

Steve Tubbs from Vancouver spoke about the driverless vehicles to be coming out in 2020. He said his concern is that transportation planning has involved a sense that the use of vehicles operated by a driver will continue for some time in the future. He said he thinks this planning organization should institutionalize some means by which a broader planning perspective is offered.

John Ley from Camas referred to the Senate transportation budget proposal that included an 11.7% increase in the state's gas tax along with several local transportation projects. Mr. Ley referred to some of the proposed projects and the fact that there is no proposal for funding of a new I-5 Bridge. If the proposal is signed into law by the Governor, the projects for widening SR-14 between I-205 and 164<sup>th</sup> and the widening of SR-14 over the Camas slough bridge would be funded and needed for both current and future transportation capacity. He encouraged the Board to move forward with a new East County bridge at 192<sup>nd</sup> Avenue or further to the east in Camas or Washougal.

Sharon Nasset from Portland distributed a handout with her comments. She said she has been to Olympia and testified and referred to HB2124. Ms. Nasset referred to Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and Regional Transportation Planning Organizations (RTPOs) and noted that both RTC and Metro are MPOs. She spoke about the composition and representation of Metro, RTC, JPACT, MPACT, and the Bi-State Coordination Committee.

## **III. Approval of the Board Agenda**

LARRY SMITH MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 3, 2015, MEETING AGENDA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BILL GANLEY AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

## **IV. Approval of the February 3, 2015, Minutes**

JACK BURKMAN MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 3, 2015, MEETING MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY LARRY SMITH.

David Madore said there was a lengthy discussion and a vote on projects in ranking order. He said what is listed on the Web page is not the list that was voted on and asked if that had been changed as requested.

Matt Ransom said that question does not pertain to the February 3 meeting minutes. That took place at the January 6 meeting. They have posted on the Web site with the January materials the meeting handout. Mr. Ransom said the meeting handout is the document he believes the Councilor is referring to. It was a strike out version of the 10 Year Report that was presented at the meeting as a discussion aid so the Board could understand what was changed in the final report from the prior version which was published initially in 2012. In order to allow for navigation of that dialog, they have posted that meeting handout. The handout however was not the action item. The action item was the Report with the appropriate amendments that

came forward. Mr. Ransom said he reviewed the meeting minutes from January 6 and said they appear to be correct.

Councilor Madore thanked Mr. Ransom for posting the item.

THE MOTION WAS APPROVED. SHIRLEY CRADDICK ABSTAINED.

**V. Consent Agenda**

**A. March Claims**

**B. 2015-2018 TIP Amendment: WSDOT Projects, Resolution 03-15-03**

Jeanne Stewart requested Consent Item B. be pulled for a question.

JACK BURKMAN MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA ITEM A. THE MARCH CLAIMS. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY LARRY SMITH AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Jeanne Stewart asked Mr. Ransom if the TIP Amendment WSDOT Projects were being added or if the value of the projects were being changed. Mr. Ransom invited Dale Robins, RTC's TIP Manager to respond to the question. Mr. Robins said the WSDOT projects are all new projects to be added into the Transportation Improvement Program. He said WSDOT has completed a four-year budgeting process and has selected projects over the next four years, and they are being added to the Transportation Improvement Program at this time, so they are all new projects. Councilor Stewart asked how they would be added into the RTP Plan. Mr. Robins said these projects are all consistent with the current adopted Regional Transportation Plan. They are all maintenance/preservation type projects and safety projects. Councilor Stewart asked if they were already listed in the RTP priority work plan. Mr. Robins said they were not in the Transportation Improvement Program previously. Generally, projects that don't add capacity aren't specifically listed in the long range Regional Transportation Plan, only the actual capacity type projects are called out. These are all new projects.

Councilor Madore said related to this, but not exactly on this, was the project I-5 Interchange at Mill Plain. Councilor Madore said he has been searching to find what that project is from many jurisdictions, and all he can get is a general, no specifics improvement. He asked who was guiding that, where it was coming from, where they could get specifics on it, and what the public process was to authorize that.

Jack Burkman stated point of order that this has no bearing what so ever with the consent item.

The point is well taken and Chair Smith respectively asked Councilor Madore to take up the discussion with the City of Vancouver who is leading that project. The discussion can be brought forward under Other Business From the Board.

JACK BURKMAN MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA ITEM B. THE 2015-2018 TIP AMENDMENT: WSDOT PROJECTS, RESOLUTION 03-15-03. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY DON WAGNER AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

**VI. RTC – C-TRAN Master Interlocal Services Agreement, Resolution 03-15-04**

Matt Ransom said they are seeking RTC Board approval of this resolution. In RTC's Master Interlocal Agreement among all members, it provides specifically that when two members want to engage in business together, they need to do so under an Interlocal Agreement, which is allowed under RCW 39.34. C-TRAN has broached this topic with RTC; they are seeking technical assistance services and other project management support for some functions that they currently don't have staff capacity to provide. They have crafted the Agreement to enable those types of services in exchange for resources. When a task is offered, an agency that seeks the task would reimburse the other agency for services and time and materials.

Mr. Ransom said the policy implication of this resolution is fully supported by the Master Interlocal Agreement of the agency. The budget implication is none. Each party requesting service covenants by executing a work order that it has or will have sufficient resources to reimburse the other party for services rendered. Mr. Ransom said RTC has four or five such agreements with Clark County and one with the City of Vancouver all for specific services. This is more of a standard of operations when two governments engage in work between the two.

Shirley Craddick asked how the work load was dealt with. Mr. Ransom said operationally, if the Executive from C-TRAN were to contact him with some work, he would evaluate his staff capacity. If that capacity was available, they would develop a task order. A task order would be executed between the agencies according to their procurement thresholds.

Jeff Hamm said he could speak to the genesis of this. In the 2009-2010 timeframe, when we were in the depth of the great recession, C-TRAN made a lot of cutbacks in terms of administrative staff and they reduced their planning and developing staff. One of the positions was a GIS mapping position. He said they have an occasional need for those now, especially with Title VI compliance. The notion is to be able to perform some of these services with the RTC as opposed to hiring new staff. Mr. Hamm said that is their wish with this Services Agreement.

Jeanne Stewart asked if this was a new agreement between RTC and C-TRAN. Mr. Ransom said yes it was. Councilor Stewart asked if there had been previous. Mr. Ransom said not that he was aware of. He said there have been specific project agreements where across the years with RTC, members have joined together to fund a study where there was a joint funding partnership which was executed under a separate agreement. With this agreement in place, you could also execute that type of exchange upon this type of agreement. This is an umbrella that allows for work exchange; it doesn't commit the work exchange.

Councilor Stewart said if C-TRAN would find this valuable because they have, due to previous recession staff reduction, the inability to do certain kinds of work on their own or maybe a shortage of staff then she has a similar question about contracting that to RTC, whether they have that capacity. Councilor Stewart asked if there were any projects discussed that they were anticipating would come forward from this agreement, an example.

Mr. Ransom said Mr. Hamm had mentioned one project. C-TRAN has a duty under federal law to produce a Title VI Report. It is a compliance report that relates environmental justice, access to people with disabilities, etc. In order for them to continue to be a recipient of federal funds, they need to have that plan be in place. They have a need for data research that RTC readily has the capacity to provide. That could be anything from mapping, producing a map and querying demographic data and details about populations that reside within the C-TRAN service area and then producing a report or data worksheets. Mr. Ransom said this would be limited effort and something that he would determine whether and when they could fulfill a work request. If they could do it according to the terms that they have for them, then they would do it. If they could not, then that would be communicated back to them.

Councilor Stewart asked if there would be a circumstance that they would have to add staff or subcontract out. She also said she would want to see the expenditure for C-TRAN's cost when looking at their budget. Mr. Ransom said if a member agency would ever want to contract, with this being an example of that through an Interlocal Agreement, and it would be such a significant contract that it would compel them to add staff, that would be something that would be brought to the Board for consideration. This type of agreement is typically within the capacity that they have. Mr. Ransom said if it is above and beyond that, it is a budgeting question for the Board and he would bring it forward accordingly. An example would be if they have the capacity to provide it, and they wanted to bring on a summer intern and it had been discussed with C-TRAN that they would manage an intern to do the work. That could be an example of a subcontract. He said that would be de minimis in that it doesn't affect RTC's ongoing operating budget. If it affected that from a staffing or organization standpoint, that is a matter for the Board. This agreement is below that; it is piecework, task oriented, and has limited duration. Mr. Ransom said they have these types of contracts with Vancouver and Clark County for these types of services. RTC has an Interlocal Agreement with Clark County for GIS support. If they have technical mapping that is above their capacity, they contract with the County GIS Department, and they charge us on a reimbursement basis. This is just like that. It is a good way for organizations to share without, in this case C-TRAN, having to hire someone. RTC has the capacity so they can exchange. Councilor Stewart said she understood the point, and she said that RTC does have some staff that has some high levels of specialty as well.

LARRY SMITH MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 03-15-04, RTC - C-TRAN MASTER INTERLOCAL SERVICES AGREEMENT. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SHIRLEY CRADDICK AND APPROVED.

## **VII. Transportation Alternatives Program Process**

Mr. Ransom said they are asking for Board endorsement of the TAP process which will allow them to release a call for projects and proceed with the regional selection of TAP projects for the 2017-2018 funding years. This is a grant program that they administer. It is a \$1.5 million call for projects.

Dale Robins referred to the memorandum included in the meeting packet along with the draft Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Guide. He said RTC is responsible for selecting

projects for the three-county RTPPO region of Clark, Skamania, and Klickitat Counties. The TAP program is a federal program that provides for a variety of community based alternative transportation projects. This includes bicycle and pedestrian improvements, viewing areas, preservation of historic transportation facilities, and other types of projects. Projects that are eligible are listed on page 2 of the Guide.

RTAC is proposing that the same process from 2013 be used in 2015. This process includes evaluation of projects by an Evaluation Team that includes members from WSDOT, C-TRAN, Clark County Health Department, Clark County Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, and RTC. The evaluation Team would evaluate and rank projects by the criteria approved in 2013. RTAC would then recommend a list of projects for funding to the RTC Board. The RTC Board will then make final selection of projects at their June meeting.

RTAC is recommending two changes from the 2013 process. The first change proposes that \$200,000 per year of the region's CMAQ dollars be added to augment TAP funding. These funds could only be spent on CMAQ qualified projects within the Vancouver Air Quality Maintenance Area. The second proposal changes the local match to 13.5%, which is the minimum allowed local match.

The proposed TAP call would provide a total of just over \$1.5 million. The money does have allocation to urban and rural areas with a minimum of \$193,000 for the rural area.

The action before the RTC Board is to accept the TAP process as outlined in the Guide and recommended by RTAC. With action, RTC staff will quickly extend a call for projects.

Jeff Hamm asked how they arrived at the \$200,000. Mr. Robins said that was a recommendation by RTAC. It was what we could currently afford to allocate over. The rest of the money is pretty much already programed in the CMAQ program, and they had about \$400,000 left over that they could shift over. Mr. Robins said they are talking about establishing it as an annual process of allocating \$200,000. He said in the current criteria bicycle and pedestrian projects do not do very well under the STP and CMAQ programs, and this is a way to make sure that this mode gets a better share.

Shirley Craddick asked if the projects were pulled from the Regional Transportation Plan and then decide which ones get funded. She asked if there was a priority system established for the process. Mr. Robins said local communities identify their priority projects that are eligible under this program, and they will propose them to RTC. They do have to be consistent with the long-range Regional Transportation Plan, but local agencies bring their priority projects forward to RTC. Councilor Craddick asked if specific corridors or trails were specified. Mr. Robins said it is up to the jurisdiction as to their preference.

Jack Burkman said he appreciated the list of evaluation criteria and points available that was listed in the Guide. Mr. Robins said the Evaluation Team will allocate the points to the projects. Council Member Burkman said this way the jurisdictions know when they submit a project how it will be evaluated. This may affect how they choose some of the projects to submit. Mr.

Robins agreed that jurisdictions will look at the criteria to see which of their projects will compete well.

Larry Smith said in looking at the evaluation criteria, the public benefit is 25 points and safety is 20 points. He asked why safety was so low. Mr. Robins said often these types of projects don't have safety issues because they are usually off the road system. The exception might be a bike lane adjacent to the road. He said it is a tough criteria to evaluate on many of the projects. Council Member Smith asked what was meant by public benefit. Mr. Robins said that is probably the most subjective criteria they have. He said it is about how it is connected to the land use. It is how the evaluators see its benefit to the greater Clark County community also.

Councilor Craddick said she is really glad to see this brought forward. These groups of projects are really important to find funding for and a good way to set a certain amount aside for them. She would be voting for this.

Jack Burkman said he would assume that if Vancouver had a bike system and Camas had another one that ties them together, those two would benefit in more points because they would be creating a link in the system. Mr. Robins said yes, and also in the criteria they give additional points for having a local community plan that supports their project.

JACK BURKMAN MOTIONED TO MOVE FORWARD WITH THE TAP PROCESS. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SHIRLEY CRADDICK AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

### **VIII. Legislative Update**

Matt Ransom noted the memo distributed for Members. He said the Legislative activity is ongoing, and the memo contained information as of Noon that day. Mr. Ransom noted the status of Bills since the last meeting. He said the Senate Transportation Committee has released and passed forward a series of transportation revenue bills, reforms, and a new-law revenue transportation project list. Nearly all the related revenue bills, reform bills, and the new-law revenue project list passed the full Senate and are headed to the House of Representatives for further consideration. One spending bill has not made it off the Senate floor and that is the bonding bill.

Mr. Ransom said for our region, he provided two sheets attached to the memo. The first is the project list. His understanding is that list of projects is attached to the new-law revenue list, which they call Connecting Washington Projects. The list contains the projects for Clark, Skamania, and Klickitat Counties both road projects and transit projects that were identified specifically as an earmark on that list.

Mr. Ransom said the second sheet is important to look at as well. He said it is not all about specific earmarks. Part of the Transportation Investment Program also relates to local options and some special grant programs. He said the list shows where the money would be spent in each of the specialty grant programs. He said there is a grant program that had never been funded, which is proposed to be funded here. That is the Complete Streets Grant Program at \$160 million. Mr. Ransom said that was set up in a prior transportation bill, but there was not

funding allocated to it. This proposal has funding allocated to it. He said earlier this year they were just starting their Complete Streets policy review, and that sets them on a course to ensure that they are eligible regionally for those types of grant funds. The Vanpool Grant Program is important to the region with C-TRAN increasing deploy of its fleet of vanpools. Mr. Ransom said the Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board has more funding allocated than they have seen in the past. These funds are for freight specific projects.

Mr. Ransom said he has also been tracking some policy bills and will continue to track and monitor and be engaged with members and legislators. Mr. Ransom said he has been contacted by our Legislative contingent asking for RTC's validated numbers and project information, and he contacts the local agency so they are aware of the questions. This allows our Legislators to be up to speed and able to advocate on our behalf.

David Madore referred to the list of our region's projects included with the new-law revenue. He said the I-5/Mill Plain Interchange project was included, and an important economic development project, the I-5/ 179<sup>th</sup> project was not listed. Councilor Madore noted the importance of leadership of this Board. He said he assumed that the Legislature is looking to the Board for priorities. He questioned why the I-5/179<sup>th</sup> project was not on the list and the Mill Plain Project is more expensive and was included. Councilor Madore questioned Mr. Ransom's time advocating these projects.

Mr. Ransom said the time he spent in Olympia has been advocating for all of the projects on the 10-Year Report. How individual projects made this list is up to Legislative advocacy from those Senators. He said he couldn't distinguish between our advocacy and what they do behind the scenes in caucus to put it on the list. Councilor Madore said it may have been something to do with the I-5/179<sup>th</sup> Street Interchange being last on the list that we sent to Olympia, and the Mill Plain Interchange high on the list. He said he is puzzled by the outcome of this and feels there is a dysfunction here. It is too late to change it at this point, but he said it is very disappointing to see inappropriate priorities.

Jack Burkman said he has been involved in a number of discussions with Legislators and 179<sup>th</sup> Street has been represented in those discussions, not as a priority less than the others, but as one of the set of projects. Council Member Burkman said he did not know whether discussions occurred among the Legislators that resulted in this, but his understanding was that this is the Senate's package. This is the list that came out of the Senate Transportation Committee in which there are a number of representatives from the 18<sup>th</sup> District and 17<sup>th</sup> District who are well aware of this project.

Councilor Madore said we sent them a list with the 179<sup>th</sup> Street Interchange last on the list and the Mill Plain high on the list. He said we have a \$15 billion funding package; even just this short list ends up being 1.3 percent to Clark County, which is crumbs. The fair share for this County is around 17 percent, which is more than 10 times this and yet we are being ignored. Councilor Madore said that was unacceptable, and unfair to the citizens of Clark County.

Council member Burkman said he could not disagree with anything that Councilor Madore had just said. He said they represented that at length. The Senate Transportation Committee with our local representative Senators in that made that decision.

Councilor Craddick asked if Clark County lobby for specific projects and has their own lobbyist. Councilor Madore said they did. He said they also looked to gain support, because the only project that Clark County had was the last one on the list. They want to be good neighbors with all the jurisdictions that are represented for regional transportation solutions.

Jack Burkman asked when the next cutoff was for anything else. Mr. Ransom was unsure.

Don Wagner said they have about 20 days for the House to address bills that have come to them, other than budget bills. The same type of information that was provided to the Senate Committee would go to the House Committee.

Councilor Madore said he wanted to be on record to be opposed to this package, because he said we only get less than 10 percent of the money that Clark County pays back for this. He said it is a bad deal for our citizens.

Matt Ransom said he and the other members of the coalition of the Clark County Transportation Alliance have their lobby day on Tuesday, March 10. RTC cannot lobby, but attends to share information. A contingent from SW Washington will be in Olympia that day with specific meetings of House and Senate leadership on Transportation Committees. He said the Alliance leadership has invited the Governor to sit in. Mr. Ransom said his participation will be to share and advocate for the projects on the 10-year Report and the CCTA Statement. He said they will continue to push for all the projects that need to be funded. It is up to the caucuses to determine what that looks like.

Councilor Madore questioned whether when Mr. Ransom goes up to the Legislature and advocates for or against a bill that it was lobbying. Mr. Ransom said no, he considered it to be interjecting information in the process. Legal counsel Ted Gathe clarified what Mr. Ransom was referring to. Mr. Gathe said testimony before a Legislative body would not constitute lobbying. Individual contact with Legislators with regards to specific projects would constitute lobbying. He said as he and Mr. Ransom have discussed, there is some leeway for a governmental nonprofit such as this body, as well as others, to do a limited amount of lobbying, and there is no federal prohibition against that, but there are some restrictions.

Councilor Madore said the particular bill he is referring to is the bill to change the representation on the RTC Board so that the voting members were only from Washington. He said when Mr. Ransom went forward and opposed that bill without direction from this Board; he did not think that was appropriate.

#### **IX. Transportation Corridor Visioning Study (2008) – Retrospective Review**

Matt Ransom said this agenda topic is at the request of the Board at their December meeting where the Board adopted a Regional Transportation Plan 2014 Update. There was a discussion about the Strategic element of the RTP. The Strategic element of the RTP is where they have

discussed the results of the Transportation Corridor Visioning Study. Those results were the identification of perhaps some corridors east and west. They are defined so loosely that they don't represent a project, so therefore, are not appropriate for inclusion in the RTP. It is something manifest in the Plan that they take a look at, be mindful of, and when the time is appropriate, continue to have dialogue. Mr. Ransom said the Board was interested in refreshing, having a retrospective review on what the 2008 study is and perhaps what it is not. Mr. Ransom said staff has crafted the presentation within the framework of trying to provide the Board a simple overview of what the study was, what the objectives were, and what some of the next steps and follow-up activities were when the study was concluded. The point in today's discussion is primarily just informational. There might questions that come out of the dialogue that they follow up on and come back to the Board with. Mr. Ransom said this could be perhaps the first of what could be a couple of touch points this year on this topic of what corridors might this community need in the future if we grew and developed out beyond what is forecast today. Lynda David would provide the presentation, and copies of the PowerPoint presentation were distributed.

Lynda David said she would provide a review of the 2008 Transportation Corridor Visioning Study. A full copy of the Study Report including full Report Appendices is available on RTC's website at [rtc.wa.gov](http://rtc.wa.gov) under the Information Publications Archive section. Ms. David said the memo included in the meeting packet will guide Members through a number of questions that they may have about the Study including its purpose, land use assumptions, primary study findings, and the Study's recommended next steps.

The Transportation Corridor Visioning Study was concluded between 2006 and 2008 in an effort to identify and assess potential new, longer-term, regional transportation corridors in Clark County. The suggestion for the Study came from the then Mayor of Battle Ground, John Idsinga, who asked that the future need for a corridor between the two rapidly-growing communities of Battle Ground and Camas be explored. The Study also had a secondary purpose in addressing whether any potential new corridors had possibilities for extension across the Columbia River. RTC Board members were concerned that the fiscally-constrained, 20-year planning process of the Regional Transportation Plan and the County's Comprehensive Growth Management was not a long enough horizon for future transportation corridor planning, and using the Padden Parkway Corridor as an example, noted that significant transportation corridors can take 50+ years to plan, develop, and construct.

The Study was led by an RTC Board appointed 8-member Steering Committee and 8 accompanying senior staff members with the Committee meeting 11 times between October 2006 and April 2008. The Steering Committee asked that the Study begin to seek answer to the question they posed: "How would we get around within our own community in the longer-term future if our County reaches one million in population?" The Study was meant as a first phase in establishing a 50+ year transportation vision for the County. This first phase Study was viewed as an initial effort with planning analysis at the "50,000-foot level." In other words, it

was a broad-brush, first look at where potential corridors may be needed in the future but was limited in its scope.

Ms. David displayed a slide that provided a contextual time-frame and summary of existing planning products required of federal and state laws and sets the context for the much longer-term transportation corridor visioning study. Under the State's Growth Management laws, the County is tasked with establishing a Community Framework Plan with a 50-year horizon. Then the County's Comprehensive Plan, and accompanying Capital Facilities Plan, C-TRAN's Transit Development Plan, and RTC's Regional Transportation Plan have a 20-year time horizon and use fiscal constraint in their development. In addition, the region has looked at its 10-year priority transportation projects, locals have 6-year Capital Facilities Plan, and the region's Transportation Improvement Program has a 4-year horizon. In comparison, the Transportation Corridor Visioning Study had no timeframe, but looked at a single vision for the County's land use when the County reaches 1 million people.

Ms. David summarized the Study's population and employment assumptions for Clark County and the metropolitan region as a whole, with population in Clark County at 1 million and jobs at half a million. Portland-Vancouver region-wide population is assumed at 4 million with 2.5 million jobs. To put this in context, Ms. David said the demographics are similar to that seen in the whole Puget Sound metro region today (King, Snohomish, Pierce, and Kitsap Counties).

A slide showed population data, both actual and forecast along with a similar slide with employment data, both actual and forecast. Ms. David highlighted these charts. What it shows is that the 1 million population in Clark County may not be realized for perhaps 70 plus years.

In the Study, they were looking at accommodating more than twice today's population and employment in the Clark County region. The land use scenario assumed in the Corridor Visioning Study was for continued growth patterns similar to the growth patterns accommodated in existing 20-year Comprehensive Growth Management plans with expansion of urban growth areas. The amount of population and employment growth that would need to be located would push out the Urban Growth Areas. Not all of the growth to a million people could be accommodated within the extended Urban Growth Areas so there was some densifying of populations in existing Urban Growth Areas, about 10 percent average increased densities in certain target growth nodes. A map of the growth assumptions was provided.

The next series of maps showed location of households in Clark County from 2004 up to the Visioning Study's horizon with 1 million people. In 2004, the County had a population of 391,675 and 146,147 households. In 2024, the County was forecast to have just over 580,000 persons in about 226,000 households. The growth spreads out within Clark County. Most of the growth is kept off steep slopes above 800 foot contour which are difficult to build on. Growth avoids floodplains and conservation districts.

Key assumptions for transportation were addressed. RTC and Metro's 2030 Regional Transportation Plan networks were used as the basis for the transportation modeling work. A new 10 to 12 lane I-5 bridge is assumed and significant urban upgrading (five-lanes) of existing

County corridors such as 179<sup>th</sup> Street, 199<sup>th</sup> Street, NE 72<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, and so on. The 2030 bus transit network was assumed.

Ms. David displayed a map that summarized the transportation corridor findings of the Study. New candidate corridors were mapped as wide swaths because the Study focused on planning at the 50,000 foot level, not on specific alignments. The Study found that with 1 million people and a half million jobs in the County, there was demand for new north-south corridors on both the west and east-sides of the County as well as a new east-west corridor in North County. The map showed the candidate corridor segments. Ms. David said they may have assumed new corridors would carry primarily regional (that is, longer distance trips of over 8 miles in distance) to bypass the congested I-5 and I-205 corridors; however, the Study found a significant demand for sub-regional trips of less than 8 miles distance made on these candidate new corridors. Not surprisingly, the Study found that most creek and river crossings were well over capacity. The Study also found that new river crossings would carry a mix of both regional and sub-regional trips, longer distance and shorter distance trips.

Ms. David highlighted the key findings of the Study. She said at one of its final meetings, the Corridor Visioning Steering Committee wanted to ensure that the Study Report emphasized the Study was exploratory and informational in nature. The Study actually raised more questions than perhaps was anticipated when the Study was first initiated. It was recognized that the Study had used just one future land use scenario and Land Use assumptions would require further policy decisions; after all, it is land use that generates transportation demand so where land use activities are located is key. Steering Committee and RTC Board members also wanted to make clear in the report that participation in the study did not mean a policy commitment to the land use or transportation corridor vision identified. If any of the new candidate transportation corridors were to move forward with right of way preserved for these corridors, it would have to be included in a fiscally-constrained local Comprehensive Plan as well as the Regional Transportation Plan. If new corridors are to be included in these Plans, then other projects would probably need to be excluded from the Plans because of fiscal considerations.

The next focus was on the west-side of the County. Ms. David pointed out that it was not envisaged that there be two new corridors on the west side; rather, the map shows potential new corridor segments. The Study found that there are land use implications on both sides of the river as these new corridor options traverse environmentally sensitive and/or existing urban areas with impacts to Port of Vancouver's activities, downtown Vancouver, and the Wildlife Refuge area. Cross-river connections could also impede Port of Portland activities. Corridor segments on the Washington side carry both regional and sub-regional trips; that is, the corridors carry both longer and shorter distance trips, though a new river crossing would serve predominantly regional trips. A new crossing would provide minor relief to I-5 traffic with some I-205 trips opting to use the I-5 Bridge. Some minimal relief would be provided to the I-205 Bridge's traffic. Cross-river travel increases by about 3 to 4% due to latent demand.

The focus next was on the east-side of the County. Ms. David pointed out that it was not envisaged that there be multiple new corridors on the east-side; rather, the map shows potential new corridor segments. It was found that a new East-side corridor would result in land use implications on both sides of the river. The candidate new corridor options traverse environmentally sensitive lands, for example in the Lacamas watershed. There would be impacts to downtown Camas if the east side option was selected, and the one option uses the 192<sup>nd</sup> corridor, the south part of which is already largely built-out with significant Right of Way implications. In addition, the Study found that because of the highly parceled land in Clark County, a new east-side corridor would be greatly challenged because right of way acquisition would have to be negotiated with numerous land owners. Corridor segments on the Washington side as well as a new potential Columbia crossing carry largely sub-regional trips; that is, shorter distance trips. It would provide minor relief to I-5 traffic with some I-205 trips opting to use the I-5 Bridge. A new river crossing on the east side was found to provide no impact to I-5 corridor traffic and some relief to the I-205 Bridge's traffic. Cross-river travel increases by about 7 to 10% due to latent demand.

The Transportation Corridor Visioning Study found that before any of the potential new candidate corridors could proceed, there would need to be further refinement of the region's long-term, land use vision. After all, the Study focused on only one potential land use scenario. There would also have to be advanced study of candidate corridors and review of their land use impacts. In addition, the largely research-oriented Transportation Corridor Visioning Study was exploratory in nature, so there would be need for in-depth public outreach and participation asking the residents of Clark County whether this is the land use vision they have for the County and what about their transportation vision for the longer term future.

Ms. David re-emphasized that the Visioning Study looked at just one possible land use future and with this land use future, it asks if there are potential new limited access highway corridors. The Study was limited in its scope, acknowledged by findings discussed at the Visioning Steering Committee.

After the RTC Board endorsed, rather than adopted, the Study findings in April 2008, some post-Study steps were taken. The Federal Highway Administration and Volpe Institute conducted a Transportation and Land Use Scenario Planning Workshop here in April 2011 with guest speakers emphasizing the need to take an integrated approach to land use and transportation futures, looking at various scenarios for the region's future. Also, it was recognized that people's values are important when considering land use and transportation. A core values assessment process was discussed similar to the Envision Utah process. Alan Matheson, who directed the development and implementation of a publicly driven growth strategy to maintain and enhance quality of life and prosperity in Utah, provided some guidance to the region.

Ms. David said she wanted to make clear that the Study was "exploratory and informational" in nature; it is future land use visions and plans that are key to defining future transportation infrastructure needs. As put into practice elsewhere in the United States, a regional scenario

planning Study could be the way to develop a 50+ year vision for this region that could inform comprehensive planning activities.

Matt Ransom offered that he was not at the RTC when this Study was done. He has taken the opportunity over the last year to look at this and get a sense of what this study was. He said one thing that is profound is that the land use scenario that was evaluated was never approved as the regionally sanctioned vision. That is one of the shortcomings of the study. The study made out some broad assumptions in terms of how growth would array on the landscape. An example of that would be the densities of the Hockinson area, according to this orientation of land might be subdivisions that you might find in Cascade Park, eight units per acre. The study did not answer the question if that was what this County wanted, the growth pattern. That is the vision that they are saying it never got that far. Mr. Ransom said with the question of new corridors now they find themselves asking what the land use plan is. This was a concept. There are dozens of other concepts that need to go through the rigors of public discourse and dialog before we really land on where the growth will be and what facilities are needed to serve it. Mr. Ransom said as RTC took out this scenario planning process, there was an attempt to enliven that dialog about that visioning process, but it didn't advance. Mr. Ransom said the corridors shown are completely predicated upon the land use concept and if that concept changes then the corridors and strategies change as a result.

Larry Smith said in looking at the key assumptions, he said he didn't see anything related to job growth and development and the unique and differences that we live in this community are impacted and Portland impacts us. He said when we have 60,000 people who are traveling, it relates to values. People draw some values to live here and fight an hour or hour and a half of traffic to work at Nike or Intel. Council Member Smith asked why the job growth and development wasn't looked at and the impact as well when you live next to a large metropolitan area such as Portland and the significant impact on our transportation. He asked why it wasn't mentioned or if it was dealt with in other studies.

Lynda David said employment growth was assumed in the study at a half a million. She said they did put maps together as to where they located the employment in the community, but they still recognized that we are a part of one larger metropolitan area. So there still would be cross river travel demand.

Tom Mielke said he found it interesting and educational when you go back and look at what we saw and planned and what we have done. What was proposed on the west side is the same that was proposed 20 years ago, yet seven years ago, it was looked at again. He said it is wasted motion and something else has to be done. He said seven years ago, they recognized that we need additional corridors, and we have not done a whole lot for that. Seven years ago, there had been talk of the Discovery corridor to create those jobs along the I-5 corridor. Now, he said we have not done too well.

David Madore said he looks at the Study and sees that they had vision back then to do something. He asked what happened between then and now, and he said we still have an

opportunity. He said it not just this organization, but our neighbors to the south. He asked what ODOT, WSDOT, and Metro are planning. He said we are a metro area. Councilor Madore said we need to look out 50 years. He said because we did not follow up on the 2008 study, the east county bridge proposal is a lot more difficult now. The connection the east county bridge would have made to I-84 is now occupied by warehouses that make it more difficult to connect there. Councilor Madore said this body needs to engage in a vision for the future. He said we have a 20 year Regional Transportation Plan, but we don't have a third bridge across the river planned. He said we need to consider that and study it and do something. Councilor Madore said we need to get our vision back and on track, and get a third bridge going. We need to seriously consider an east county bridge.

Chair Smith said the warehouses that Councilor Madore referred to on the other side of the river were already there in 2005. That was a booming area and built up quickly.

Jack Burkman referred to the map with the corridors across the County. Council Member Burkman said he was involved in the Visioning Study. He said several people around the table were. He said it was a vision. What he remembers most was that if we were serious about the vision, we needed to find some way to preserve the access to those corridors. Forget the bridges to start, because it doesn't make any difference having the bridges if you can't get people to them. Council Member Burkman said there was a lot of conversation about the corridor in the east that runs north-south. It needs to be able to allow the traffic and freight to flow from Battle Ground down to Camas, and there is where there are a lot of issues, as Lynda pointed out, the parcelization. The way the County land use process has gone through, the people have small lots that are getting smaller over time, from various policy changes. To go through and claim all those for a new transportation road is really hard. Council Member Burkman said that is why it comes back to the land use. That is why experts were brought in. Experts as in people who have gone through this in other areas, like Utah and the Envision Utah process, where they had the conversation with their community. The conversation was not about where do you want the road; the conversation started with what is important to you? Do you want to densify? Do you want to protect the environment? Do you want to open it up and have suburbia? Council Member Burkman said that is where this came to a halt. He said because until we have that conversation with our residents, we don't know what the future looks like. He said to him the good news is that last week there was the release of the 500k Voices Survey. Oregon for quite some time has been doing periodic surveys of values and beliefs. Community Foundation in partnership with WSU Vancouver just did this and released the information. Now, they are starting to have that conversation around what kind of vision do we want to put out in front of our community for the values that are important that we want to hold on to. In conjunction with that, WSU Vancouver has announced that they have formed the Institute for Public Deliberation. They are bringing students and classes together to provide to our community a resource where skilled students go out and help foster these conversations. To put people with different perspectives around the table and have a neutral party help them arrive at some conclusion of what might the future look like. Their first set of discussions is open forums on affordable housing. That is just one of several opportunities that

they will have to start these conversations. Council Member Burkman said he looks forward to having this vision that we will have an interconnected transportation system throughout Clark County and into Portland and over into Skamania County that is in alignment with the values that our community has that have been translated into the land use patterns where they will buy and develop property. He said to him it is sequential. You can't start with a bridge; we start with the land use patterns and with the values. Council Member Burkman said if this is what we want to go ahead with, then we need to work with WSU-V and have those conversations.

Councilor Madore said he had a couple observations. First, he said Council Member Burkman stated we don't know what the future looks like. He said we know what the present looks like, and the present is unacceptable when we have failing congestion across two bridges. Councilor Madore said the other point is that those citizens have always found their way to those two bridges. They are already there, and it is only going to increase. Councilor Madore said the East County bridge requires zero parcels necessary to take on the Washington side and a handful of parcels on the Oregon side. If we had started before the two buildings that are under construction now that were not there a year ago, we would not have to take any on that side, just make provision for it there. He said because of inaction, it has become more difficult. He said we need to start somewhere, and the problem is that we have not started at all. However that starts, he said the leadership responsibility starts with us and a vision that says we are going to be proactive in order to do something about the present day congestion. Councilor Madore said he is onboard to move forward with a third bridge across the Columbia River at whatever corridor that is necessary. He said if it ends up starting with some other corridor that is going to delay this 20 or more years, he said we are starting at the wrong end. He said a simple solution, with the most relief, in the biggest congestion areas already, is a good place to start.

Councilor Craddick said she wanted to follow up on Council Member Burkman's comment. She said the reason people are traveling across the bridges is that they're going to jobs. She said she would think that Clark County's role in this is looking at land use and what they can do to foster more jobs on their side of the Columbia River. The land use has to be determined before the transportation, because the transportation is the support system for the land use. Councilor Craddick said at this moment, Oregon does not have plans for a third bridge. There are no plans, so a part of that is that if you are going to have that discussion, you need to begin to look at that as a State and not as one county with another county. Currently there are no plans to add any bridges to the Columbia River.

Councilor Madore said he would take that as Oregon looking at Washington to lead. He said if this \$15 billion funding package goes through, we had the opportunity to fund a third bridge here, if we would have been ahead of it. He said he is hoping that it doesn't go through, because he hopes between now and next year, when the legislature is in session again, we will be ready and onboard to do something about it. Councilor Madore said Clark County is the

fastest growing jobs community on the west coast, and they're doing everything they can to make that happen.

Councilor Mielke questioned why they haven't built those jobs here. He said they have one of the biggest economic development areas on 179<sup>th</sup> Street, and they have nothing on the scope.

Don Wagner said he also was here when they did the Visioning Study. He said rather than a vision, it was more questioning. They had heard the projections that there were going to be a million people in Clark County. He said we questioned where we would put a million people. The dot maps that were displayed really made some broad assumptions. Mr. Wagner said he didn't want folks to think nothing has been happening in the world of transportation since the early to mid-2000s. He said they have invested over three quarters of a billion dollars on corridors on the maps that have been displayed. They are either the broadcast corridors or the corridors that were the immediate need areas such as better access to Ridgefield, better access to Battle Ground, improved interchanges on the freeway, modifications to the freeways, and the 134<sup>th</sup> Interchange. Mr. Wagner said those are projects that have advanced because this community came together with all of our differences and convinced our Legislators that we needed something, and we got it. He said he agreed with Councilor Madore in that the funding package that we see today seems to show a different message. It is disappointing.

Jeff Hamm said he thinks there was a vision in the community for across river transportation. It grew out of the I-5 Trade and Partnership Study that was done in the late 1990s and a set of improvements laid out for the I-5 corridor to address many of the issues noted. This includes adding the third lane from Salmon Creek down to the Bridge, adding the lane on Victory Blvd. on the Oregon side, and a CRC project and a bridge. That vision is now gone. He said a good question was raised; that is: what is the new vision? He said given everything that has gone into that other vision, it is tough to totally throw it overboard and come up with something new that we are all supposed to climb on board with without having really put to bed the old one. Mr. Hamm said he was not sure that we put to bed the old one. He said he didn't think we would be able to move forward with a new vision until we get past that.

Jack Burkman said he wanted to reinforce what Mr. Wagner had said. He said he remembers most distinctly from this process a mental image of the dot map with 1 million people. He said when we have a million people every parcel in the County up to the 800 foot elevation will have somebody living on it. Is that where we want to go? Mr. Burkman said that turned out to be the essence of the question. That is what gets to the land use and jobs and quality of life. The question then didn't become how do we move those people around; it was is that where we want to see our county go.

Councilor Madore addressed Councilor Craddick saying that if she represented Oregon in this conversation, then he understood that Oregon is not going to provide any leadership on any bridge or in solving the I-5 corridor congestion bottleneck that exists in Portland. Councilor Madore said the greatest risk that we can take on the I-5 corridor is to widen our side to go the bottleneck in Portland. Councilor Madore said we have an east-west corridor that can provide

relief on SR-14 and I-84, and he suggested a simple solution is to connect at 192<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. Councilor Madore said we need to show leadership and get our vision back.

## **X. Other Business**

### From the Board

Chair Smith said that the voting on JPACT had been referenced earlier and clarification was requested by Councilor Craddick. Council Member Jack Burkman addressed the issue. He said he has answered the question of voting on JPACT many times. He is a board member of RTC and JPACT. Council Member Burkman said there are two different transportation planning structures. RTC is the Regional Transportation Council and board members vote and it enacts our land use planning. Oregon has the same thing; they just split it between two groups. There is JPACT, and there is Metro, and Metro may not do anything until JPACT approves it. If Metro and JPACT were in one room and voted, it would be like RTC. JPACT is not an advisory committee. If Metro does not agree with something from JPACT, it goes back to JPACT to readdress. RTC has an advisory committee, RTAC, Regional Transportation Advisory Committee. JPACT has TPAC, Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee. Mr. Burkman said both Oregon and Washington has representatives on both of those committees. Both have advisory groups that go to decision making groups. JPACT and RTC are the decision making groups.

Shirley Craddick said the JPACT, Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation, makes a recommendation to the Metro Council on transportation policy decisions and funding decisions. The Metro Council has two choices; they can approve what JPACT moves forward, or they can send it back to JPACT, but they cannot veto it. JPACT has a lot of influence on the decisions that are made about transportation planning and funding in the Portland Metro region.

DAVID MADORE MOTIONED TO MAKE IT A REGULAR AGENDA ITEM TO DISCUSS A THIRD BRIDGE ACROSS THE COLUMBIA RIVER. TOM MIELKE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Jack Burkman said he would vote against the motion. He said this is a cart and horse issue. The last step is the bridge and exactly what the details are. The first step is the values and the land use and the next would be how we tie a system together. Council Member Burkman said we can talk about doing something to address just the I-5 Bridge, and it is not going to help because we still need the ramps and everything else. There is a sequence this organization goes through to approve things, and he does not want to see them move away from that.

Tom Mielke said the first step would be to economic development and back to 179<sup>th</sup> Street. He said we're not doing that, and 12 years ago, we put the I-5 Bridge first. The reason he seconded the motion was he wants to see the discussion happen. If there is no discussion, we become narrow minded.

David Madore said to Jack Burkman that we have a system, an existing system of SR-14 and I-84 to connect. Councilor Madore said it may be the last step, but right now we have no steps. He said at least one step is to discuss that third bridge corridor. A roll call vote was requested.

THE MOTION FAILED WITH 7 NO: BROOKS, BURKMAN, CRADDICK, GANLEY, L. SMITH, M. SMITH, WAGNER; 2 YES: MADORE, MIELKE; AND 2 ABSTAIN: HAMM, STEWART.

Councilor Madore said in reference to the I-5/Mill Plain Interchange project, he has made requests and not received adequate information about the project. He asked for more details about the project. Councilor Madore said he drives through that intersection daily, and it is currently a very wide intersection with ramps and ample vertical room for trucks to travel under the freeway. He said he cannot envision any significant \$80 million tear down and rebuild that whole interchange more than the 179<sup>th</sup> Street Interchange. He questioned why that intersection would be a priority when he can't get any specifics on the project and doesn't know who the lead is on the project.

Jack Burkman said he would not put his judgement on other engineers. This is a conversation that needs to occur between the county staff and the city staff. This is not the Executive Director's call; it was the Board's call. We reviewed all the projects and have over a period of years. That is one of the top projects and it has floated to the top per many discussions. Council Member Burkman said in looking back at some of the records, and in 2011, the Mill Plain/I-5 Interchange as part of the Columbia River Crossing set of projects was listed at \$80 million. It had nothing to do with the bridge directly. There is a series of projects associated with feeding on to and off of any improvement in the bridge. The \$80 million times 3.5% for inflation brings it exactly to the numbers in the list. Council Member Burkman said he could probably trace it back to some of the WSDOT files for the Columbia River Crossing where they did the engineering and what it takes to do that. He said he didn't have access to do that. He said he didn't want to get into a process where he is debating with someone whether their numbers are accurate or not. He said we bring things forward as a jurisdiction and trust each other that our staffs are doing the appropriate job. Council Member Burkman assured Councilor Madore that while he made some valid observations visually about that bridge, the ability of oversized loads, such as the wind power turbines, that are being transferred through there is far from being a functioning system.

Councilor Madore said the question is how they can get details on the project. He said the CRC project is no longer alive. He asked if this was building the CRC project one step at a time.

Council Member Burkman said he believed the CRC project was seven interchanges, two bridges (Columbia River and Hayden Island), a light rail system, and many lanes. He asked when referring to the CRC if he meant the bridge or all the individual projects leading into that, because individual projects we still have need for. We still need the Fourth Plain Improvement and that is \$140 million. We still need to improve SR-500 as it enters I-5. Those are current projects that we need. They were called for in the Columbia River Crossing because they were

a part of it. They could probably do the same thing on the Oregon side, but it's not directly related to the bridge.

Councilor Madore said certainly the rebuild of an interchange would make sense; it would have had an increase in capacity across the river and through the I-5 corridor through to Portland. He said what you are saying is that you don't know about the project and nobody here knows about the project and we should trust the staff that they know about the project and yet we can't get anything from the staff. Councilor Madore said the project was pushed forward to the Governor, and he said it doesn't pass the snuff test. He said this project was on the list, and the County did not get their project on the list; something was not right.

Council Member Burkman advised him to have this conversation with the City Manager. This is not our Executive Director carrying the project forward; he carried the message of this body's vote forward.

Councilor Madore said as an elected representative of the City of Vancouver, he thought it would be appropriate for him since it was a City of Vancouver project, to share what it was, the vision, sell it to them, and tell them what it is.

Council Member Burkman said he could tell him very simply at a high level. They have a waterfront project and over \$1 billion worth of project development going in. They are having substantial growth on their downtown area, as is the Port of Vancouver. That is the core key access to all that area. That is the vision.

Councilor Madore referred to RTC's website homepage and a link to the Identity Clark County website and a list of their priorities. He said that was not discussed by the Board. He said if the use of the website is to provide relevant news that is of transportation interest, but not necessarily approved by this Board, there is also other relevant news that this month it is the County Councilor's priority to adopt a resolution of the East County Bridge. That also would make news on RTC's webpage with a link to the East County Bridge site.

Matt Ransom said the article with the link referred to notes that Identity Clark County and RTC being involved with the Southwest Washington Freight and Commerce Task Force. This was shared with the Board; the Board adopted it in the Work Program that describes that we will get involved in freight issues, freight planning, and freight data collection. That is specifically part of our Work Program this year adopted by the Board in December. RTC has been a participant in development of the Task Force that is referenced in the article. The Task Force is sponsored and promoted by Identity Clark County. That Task Force will be brought forward for discussion with the Board at some point. He said he finds it completely consistent with the Work Program adopted by the Board, which is to focus on freight issues, which are extremely important to this community.

Chair Smith entertained a motion for adjournment.

LARRY SMITH MOTIONED FOR ADJOURNMENT. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY JACK BURKMAN AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

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

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, April 7, 2015, at 4 p.m.

---

Melissa Smith, Board of Directors Chair