

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Board of Directors
January 5, 2016, 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 Jack Burkman on Tuesday, January 5 2016, 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
Bart Gernhart, WSDOT (Alternate)
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Council Member
David Madore, Clark County Councilor
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver Council
Doug McKenzie, Skamania Co. Commissioner
Tom Mielke, Clark County Councilor
Jerry Oliver, Port of Vancouver Commissioner
Ron Onslow, Ridgefield Mayor
Scott Patterson, C-TRAN (Alternate)
Jeanne Stewart, Clark County Councilor

Voting Board Members Absent:

Jeff Hamm, C-TRAN Executive Director/CEO
David Poucher, White Salmon Mayor
Kris Strickler, WSDOT Regional Administrator
Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1 Manager

Nonvoting Board Members Present:

Nonvoting Board Members Absent:

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

Guests Present:

Ed Barnes, Citizen
Mike Bomar, CREDC
Terry Conner, Citizen
Lori Figone, WSDOT
Tim Gaughan, Citizen
Jim Hagar, Port of Vancouver
Heath Henderson, Clark County
Lee L. Jensen, Citizen
Dale Lewis, Senator Herrera Beutler's Office
John McKibbin, Identity Clark County/CCTA
Bridget McLeman, Citizen
Julie Olson, Clark County Councilor
Jason Ruth, Citizen
Tracy Schreiber, SWWDC
Melissa Smith, Camas Council Member
Ty Stober, Vancouver Council Member
Jeff Swanson, Clark County
Ron Swaren, Citizen
Michael A. Williams, WSDOT

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

Chair Burkman welcomed everyone in the new year. He recognized and welcomed new members to the RTC Board: Vancouver Port Commissioner Jerry Oliver, representing the Ports (Vancouver, Ridgefield, and Camas/Washougal); Vancouver Council Member Anne McEnerny-Ogle; Washougal Council Member Paul Greenlee, representing Washougal and Camas; and Ridgefield Mayor Ron Onslow representing Ridgefield, Battle Ground, La Center, and Yacolt.

II. Approval of the Board Agenda

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 5, 2016, MEETING AGENDA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY RON ONSLOW AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

III. Call for Public Comments

Ron Swaren from Portland, Oregon, distributed a handout showing two arch bridges that were recently built in the United States along with information. He spoke about arch bridge design. Mr. Swaren said we need to have a western arterial highway with a crossing.

Ed Barnes from Vancouver said in 2019, the northbound I-5 Bridge will be shut down for one week to one month for trunnion replacement. He said that will devastate Clark County and the businesses here. Mr. Barnes noted the congestion that is on I-5 every day. He said the I-5 Bridges need to be replaced.

Metro Councilor Shirley Craddick entered the meeting.

IV. Approval of the December 1, 2015 Minutes

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 1, 2015, MEETING MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BART GERNHART AND APPROVED. ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE AND JERRY OLIVER ABSTAINED.

V. Consent Agenda

A. January Claims

B. 2016-2019 TIP Amendment: WSDOT Projects, Resolution 01-16-01

ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA JANUARY CLAIMS AND RESOLUTION 01-16-01. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY PAUL GREENLEE

Jerry Oliver asked if the TIP amendment for the WSDOT projects affected any of the projects on the existing TIP list.

Bart Gernhart said no they do not. The northbound weigh station project was in different funding pots, and they are moving those funds. The second project is funded through the statewide funding as well. They will not affect any of the funds for other projects.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VI. Clark County Transportation Alliance – 2016-2017 Washington State Legislative Policy Statement

Matt Ransom would provide a brief staff report and have John McKibbin, Identity Clark County President, provide additional comments about the CCTA statement. Mr. Ransom said the action being requested is endorsement of the policy statement, and he provided some background information.

The Clark County Transportation Alliance (CCTA) is an alliance of public and private organizations formed to advocate for policies in funding for transportation projects which benefit the Clark County region. It is primarily focused on Clark County and does not address many of the issues that are in the Gorge communities. Those are handled elsewhere. The CCTA advocating for Clark County focused projects is really an attempt to be cohesive, regional in nature, and get everyone pushing in the same direction. Members of the CCTA are volunteer participants. Typically in the fall of each year, they start to organize around a statement, refine it, and make comments. This year that began in the fall, and on November 17 the group convened to finalize the statement and release for agency endorsement. That is the process now.

The policy implication and the reason that the RTC Board is reviewing this is as an organization, RTC has typically endorsed this statement. It is an opportunity for the Board to present a unified front saying we advocate and support these types of initiatives and projects. As it relates to current Board policy, that being the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), it is consistent with implementation. They also find that many of the initiatives or projects are also consistent with the RTP in implementing the different conditions contained therein.

Mr. Ransom said they find it consistent with the objective of implementing the 20-year plan and are seeking Board endorsement. By endorsing the statement, Mr. Ransom will participate in CCTA related activities. He said if the Legislators ask questions about a project or initiative, he will provide the information that he has. This provides an avenue for the Board to push in the same direction as other members within the region. Mr. Ransom invited John McKibbin to speak.

Mr. McKibbin said the Clark County Transportation Alliance has been around for a couple decades. It is an effort to show unity among the County leadership mostly in the public sector but some private. It differs from the private sector in that there is a joint agenda put forth by the CREDC, the Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce, and Identity Clark County. It is very similar, because the private sector list parallels the RTC priority list. It shows to those people in the legislative ranks when they attend on the alliance day a unified community. He said he hopes they will have that again this year.

Mr. McKibbin said the alliance statement has been approved and reviewed by most of the 30 participants from last year. They have reached out. He said there are just two major items that tend to call some attention to our Legislators this year that it is different from what they have seen in the past. He said it is the elephant in the room, which is the I-5 Bridge and its

replacement. The I-5 corridor is a problem for us and remains the conversation piece as he goes around the county and works with others throughout the area that provide leadership positions, not only in transportation, but primarily in the private sector. This is addressed in the I-5 corridor conversation as a problem area that has been exacerbating over the last year and will continue to get worse. Mr. McKibbin said parenthetically that Identity Clark County spends a great deal of effort on this and is, along with Legislators and local leaders as well, working on a path forward. He said he thinks they will see some activity in this area in 2016, which would be very fruitful.

Mr. McKibbin said the other area is the local finance opportunities for municipalities in Clark County. The Public Works Trust Fund has been robbed every year to a diminished level where it has no longer any capacity to support local endeavors. Mr. McKibbin said they would like to see a major attention and effort made for this over the next 2016 and 2017 to restore some of these local option funding vehicles to local governments.

Mr. McKibbin said the greater part of the statement was already in the package for last year and carried over for 2016. It is nothing new. The RTC endorsed it last year, and it was consistent with your priorities.

Shirley Craddick said our transportation system is a combination of our highway system, our transit system, or getting around by walking or bicycling. She said she thought there was a lot of emphasis in the policy statement regarding highway projects and asking for funding for paratransit. She asked why it is very specific in the highway projects but not in other projects, particularly in transit which has a significant benefit on reducing congestion and helping our climate.

Mr. McKibbin said they take a collaborative approach. They approached C-TRAN and asked for specific language, and in large part, this is what they provided. It is a reflection of their priorities.

Shirley Craddick asked C-TRAN if they didn't have a more specific plan for transit on this side of the river.

Scott Patterson said C-TRAN's 20-year Transit Development Plan was approved by the board in 2010. They have a number of specific projects that are included in the Plan. However, with the hiatus of the Columbia River Crossing project, a lot of those improvements were brought about by having potentially light rail coming into downtown Vancouver. Now that that is not in the cards, they are working with their Board to take a fresh look and update their 20-Year Plan. The need is still there for those additional future capital projects they have a list of. They are working collaboratively with their Board to update that 20-Year Plan to have that specific project list. Mr. Patterson also pointed out that their most significant capital project in the agency's history is their BRT project. That is currently in construction. Through some of the collaborative assistance with Mr. McKibbin's group and others, they have been able to secure some state funding to help on the BRT project.

Shirley Craddick said for the record, from her perspective this is not quite as complete as it could be as a legislative package. She said it should be more specific in all the fields, not just in the highways.

Tom Mielke said he is disappointed. This is doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different outcome. Councilor Mielke said one of the most important projects they recognize at the County level is the 179th Street interchange, which is for economic development. He is disappointed that they can't move off looking at the I-5 corridor. He said the Oregon corridor is at capacity, not the bridge, and not I-5 in Clark County.

David Madore asked Mr. McKibbin when all the brainstorming and collaboration was taking place if it ever ended with any discussion or interest to advance additional bridges across the Columbia River, additional corridors. He said if the focus is placed on replacing the bridge, they haven't addressed the corridor. Councilor Madore asked if there was interest and did they consider it. He asked if there was hope for them to pursue an additional third or fourth bridge across the Columbia River.

Mr. McKibbin said yes, there always is hope and always opportunity and that is the role of RTC in his opinion. He said they did address the corridors; the two main corridors are SR-14 and I-5. Both corridors are severely taxed at certain times. Mr. McKibbin said they have one project before them that clearly is needed. He said the bridge is a problem, and it does need to be addressed. Mr. McKibbin said that in discussions in his role that he has everywhere he goes across the county, they are all asking what can be done about the bridge. The high tech firms, small businesses, or medical facilities are asking the same question, what is being done about this corridor. Mr. McKibbin said it has and remains the number one priority. Does that mean we shouldn't be looking at other bridges? Not necessarily. He said we need to take a long look at our transportation system, but right now ICC will continue to promote that bridge solution in some way, shape, or form. Mr. McKibbin said the language used in the statement is the same that was used last year. He said the County had declined to be a part of the Clark County Transportation Alliance last year. He said he hoped that is something they could change in the future. Mr. McKibbin said not everyone agrees with everything that is in the statement, but what they are trying to do is present to the Legislature that this community has its act together. He said they have not done very well at that in the last couple years. Mr. McKibbin said everyone is entitled to their opinion and position, and he understands that; but one of the primary purposes of this document and why ICC was created was to bring the community together with a voice on community agenda items so we could succeed. Mr. McKibbin said they did this for almost 20 years, very successfully. It is the reason we have WSUV; it is a prime example of how to collaborate and how to get it done.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED TO HAVE THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL ENDORSE THE CLARK COUNTY TRANSPORTATION ALLIANCE 2016-2017 WASHINGTON STATE LEGISLATIVE POLICY STATEMENT. ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Jeanne Stewart said in reviewing the Clark County Transportation Alliance Policy Statement for over the past 10 years, there are aspects that she disagrees with and priorities that she may not agree with. She said she has sat in venues where she said no to the CCTA policy, because she thought there should be other balances included. Councilor Stewart said for the purposes for tonight, she said she is going to abstain from voting on it at all, because on December 22, Clark County passed eight resolutions, and many of those resolutions established Council policy on bridges, locations of bridges, on transit, and certain kinds of transit. She said until she understands how integrated all that is, it will be hard for her to vote on any of the items tonight related to transportation. Councilor Stewart said it is an awkward situation for a Vice Chair to be in.

Tom Mielke said he will not be supporting this, again. He said he has been involved with this for a long time. He said in 1998, they recognized that the corridor itself was at capacity. He said the Legislature was tasked with creating another avenue of roadway, and it was all in lieu of light rail. Councilor Mielke said the Oregon side is not interested in discussions unless light rail is included. He said we need to be listening to the Legislature and what they have been studying, their expertise. We see that the corridor is full. Councilor Mielke said we need to recognize that we need to look to more corridors and more bridges. He would not be supporting the statement.

Councilor Madore said a point he wanted to make is that the CRC project by a different name is still basically a light rail project at any cost. He said this Board needs to move forward to plan for the future to solve the problems for both bridges and both corridors. He said he would not be supporting this.

Ron Onslow said he would speak in favor of the motion, and the only criticism that he has is that it is too general. He thinks there should be a multi-modal aspect to this and more specifics, especially on the Columbia River crossing or I-5 Corridor. He is in favor of the statement and could have more specifics added.

A roll call vote was requested.

THE MOTION PASSES WITH 7 YES: BURKMAN, CRADDICK, GERNHART, GREENLEE, MCENERNY-OGLE, ONSLOW, PATTERSON; 3 NO: MADORE, MIELKE, OLIVER; AND 3 ABSTAIN: BROOKS, MCKENZIE, STEWART.

VII. Transportation Improvement Program – Regional Grant Process

Matt Ransom said the regional grant process is one of the core missions of RTC. This is the roughly \$9-10 million of regional flexible funds that are passed from the federal transportation authorizations to the state and then to the regions. Periodically, they convene a complete audit and review of the program to ensure that the monies are being distributed according to the way the grant program is developed. As part of the audit, they take the opportunity to review the broad policies of the program. Many of those policies are then set by the Board. Today is the first of two to three briefings to the Board. It will then culminate in adoption of a

guidebook by June of this year, in advance of the next call for projects scheduled to be released in June/July of this year. Staff is seeking input from the Board to take back to the technical committee for further refinement.

Dale Robins said as the Metropolitan Planning Organization, the RTC Board has the opportunity to select projects that are funded through those federal programs as Matt discussed. These are important programs, especially to the local agencies.

Mr. Robins provided a diagram outlining how the regional grant process will be updated, listing the steps and the action. Mr. Robins said staff will be returning and bringing more detailed information back to the Board as they move forward. The process will conclude with the final approval at the June meeting. There will be several opportunities for additional comments on various elements of the program as they move forward.

Guiding the investment of the regional transportation system is the policy framework established in the Regional Transportation Plan. These goals support a strong economy, safety and security, accessibility and mobility, management and operations, environment, vision and values, finance, and preservation.

The regional process is a locally driven process, as local agencies submit their priority projects. These are reviewed for consistency and evaluated by criteria. Projects are then selected for funding based on the objective criteria evaluation and then programmed into the Transportation Improvement Program.

Mr. Robins displayed a summary of the existing scoring criteria for the urban STP and CMAQ programs. The criteria is intended to advance the goals of the Regional Transportation Plan while providing objective metrics to the projects.

Mr. Robins said the need for transportation improvements exceed the available revenue. To accomplish this, the region has a competitive process to evaluate projects to select the highest priority projects. Mr. Robins is seeking the Board's feedback on funding strategies that he would present. He asked members to ask themselves this question "Do the current Funding Strategies align with the interests of the region and inform the distribution of limited grant funds?" The intent of these strategies is to promote multi-modal projects and leverage other revenue resources.

For STP and CMAQ grant funding, they have identified four major strategies.

Leverage Other Grant Sources: One of the successes of the regional grant process lies in its flexibility allowing local governments to create projects that fit their local needs and use regional federal funds to leverage other grants to complete priority projects. Mr. Robins said on estimate, each STP grant dollar leverages nearly three dollars from other sources.

Implement Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) Improvements: TSMO strategies provide money-saving, multi-modal solutions that relieve congestion and optimize infrastructure investments. This includes projects such as signal timing and bi-state travel signs.

These are fairly low cost projects, but they improve the efficiency of the existing transportation system.

Build Multimodal Urban Arterials: With the rapid growth the region has experienced, there are many rural arterials serving urban areas. There is a need to improve these facilities to urban standards. Arterials built to urban standards provide an efficient, balanced, multimodal regional transportation system that improves safety, reduces congestion, and supports economic development.

No Preservation of Transportation System: Local agencies have the primary responsibility to maintain their transportation system and regional federal funds will not be used for maintenance or preservation projects.

Under the Transportation Alternatives (TAP) Program, the main strategy is that there is a strong need for stand-alone bicycle and pedestrian projects that improve the multi-modal travel experience and benefit local communities.

Mr. Robins said he would like some feedback on the funding strategies.

Paul Greenlee said preservation funds are excluded from this funding. Mr. Robins said as a region, we have determined not to use our regional federal funds for preservation; it is an eligible expense. Councilmember Greenlee said it is the decision of the Board as opposed to a legal requirement. Mr. Robins said that was correct.

Councilmember Greenlee said he has heard that preservation at this point is such a serious problem, that we might want to relax that criteria. He said he sees in Washougal that you can spend a few tens of thousands of dollars a mile maintaining the pavement or wait 15 years and then spend millions of dollars a mile. This might be something to consider.

Mr. Robins added to that principle saying that decision was made some time ago that preservation is a critical criteria and a critical need. It is really the local agency's responsibility to maintain what they have built. It is not the regional funds. That is what the decision was based on. It is not that preservation is not important; it just should not come from this source.

Jeanne Stewart said that we know that preservation is a critical need and asked if there are any jurisdictions within RTC that have adequate money now for preservation. She said she didn't think there was. She said she sees Mr. Greenlee's point. Councilor Stewart asked if federal funding was for new construction. Mr. Robins said that was correct, for improvements.

Councilor Stewart said part of the theory is that if you build it, you will have to maintain it on your own; so, if you can't maintain it, don't build it. She said that is not a very progressive transportation. She asked if that is based on the limitation of dollars. Mr. Robins said yes; even with improvements, we can't fund half the needs. If we would use the funding for preservation only, a lot of the improvements that we have seen in the county on the arterials would have never occurred. They would have all been preservation projects. Mr. Robins said it is not that preservation is not important; they just think it is a primary responsibility of the local agency to make sure if they are building it, they can maintain it as well.

Jeanne Stewart referred to the TAP strategies to build bicycle and pedestrian projects; she said most would agree that those would be nice and useful. She asked how much money proportionally is used for that when we know that we need travel lanes for vehicles.

Mr. Robins said that we receive an allocation of TAP funds, and there are a limited number of uses for those funds. What the region has determined is that bike and pedestrian projects are the priority. It is not that others are not important; it is just that those are the priority of the region.

Councilor Stewart said we find those funds at the federal level, but they are narrowly designated. Mr. Robins said the TAP funds are allocated to us, and there is a dollar amount allocated to our region, about a half a million dollars per year. Councilor Stewart asked how we could influence the portion we receive federally. Mr. Robins said we have no impact on that allocation. It is based on the population of our region and the allocation to the State of Washington.

Jerry Oliver said he has concerns about the prioritization of this funding. As just said, the TAP funding for bike lanes is important. He asked if TAP funding could be used for other projects. Mr. Robins said there are some other TAP related options such as scenic vistas, but it is non-road projects. Commissioner Oliver said the Port of Vancouver has constructed this year a new trail and bike lane. They went after specific funding for that. He said building bike lanes is something they aspired to do, but not as a primary focus for the Port of Vancouver. It was noted that TAP funds were used for the project.

Commissioner Oliver said going back to the concerns that Mr. Greenlee expressed. He asked what the prioritization was for other funds that are not designated in the grant process. He asked if there was anything that we could change to offer greater priority to maintain the system that we have.

Mr. Robins said the STP funds are very flexible and can be used for a wide variety of transportation projects. The CMAQ program funding is for projects that improve air quality. Usually, with every federal program, they are very specific on the type of projects that can be funded; the exception to that rule is the STP program which is very flexible. Mr. Robins said last year we were allocated about \$5 million in STP funds.

Matt Ransom said to answer Commissioner Oliver's question, the most flexible source of funds that the Board has the responsibility to grant is about \$5 million per year with the STP category. Within that, the past Boards have said this is how we want to use the funds, and have cut off the use of funds for preservation wanting to build new things versus repair things with that \$5 million. The question for the Board now is asking if that is still consistent with the interest of the region.

Commissioner Oliver said perhaps they need to review the lists and give greater emphasis to preserving and maintenance. He asked if that was what Mr. Greenlee had said.

Councilmember Greenlee said there are a lot of different funding sources which have different requirements. He said he didn't want to throw a wrench in the works here, but he said we need to advocate for preservation because nobody else will.

Commissioner Oliver asked how they go about changing the list if that is what the Board wishes.

Chair Burkman said that is why this the first month of a three month process. This is the start of this discussion for staff to hear. Chair Burkman said they have had this discussion in the past, and one of the battle points is where are we likely to get money for preservation or are we likely to get money for new projects. The question is posed if jurisdictions have enough money for preservation, and also do jurisdictions have enough money to expand their systems to accommodate the increase in populations. The discussion is how we want to balance these. The CMAQ and TAP money, because they are air quality and non-road projects, are not really part of this conversation. It is really around STP funds. Chair Burkman said he is hearing that if we have \$5 million maybe we can amplify that and leverage it to \$15 million. How do we want to proportion that? We want to give guidance to the RTC staff.

Mr. Robins noted that preservation would probably not leverage any dollars. Chair Burkman said that is good information to know.

Kelly Brooks spoke about the leveraging of projects. She asked how broad of a leverage definition was being considered. She also asked if there was a federal match requirement established.

Mr. Robins said there is a federal requirement of 13 ½% local match. He said they consider anything other than these funds to be matching dollars: local agency, state grant, federal grant, anywhere else you can get funding is leveraging as far as they are concerned. Mr. Robins said they do reward agencies for providing a higher local match, and the scoring criteria can award agencies extra points for match up to about 40%; the higher the match, the higher the points. Mr. Robins said what they have seen with this program is that the cities and the County have been very effective on leveraging funds from the Transportation Improvement Board.

Shirley Craddick asked if the funds that they are talking about are comparable to the Regional Flexible Funds on the Oregon side. Mr. Robins said that was correct. These are flexible that they are able to use in a variety of ways that are not mandated on how they get used. Mr. Robins said the CMAQ and TAP programs have some requirements. Councilor Craddick said the question is how to leverage these funds to bring in more funds. She asked if there had been any discussion about increasing the match, which is 13 ½%. She said if they go back and talk to their Congressional Delegation, Congress is saying that they want to put more responsibility on the state and local jurisdictions. Councilor Craddick asked if there was consideration to up the match; to have local jurisdictions begin to look at bringing more onto the table than what they are now. She said she was not necessarily suggesting that, but wanted to plant the seed for something to consider. She said that might help leverage more federal dollars. Councilor Craddick emphasized that these are the only dollars that we have available to us that are

flexible. They are not highway dollars; they are dollars that can be used for projects that we may not necessarily have funds for. Projects such as sidewalks, transit projects, and projects that will help benefit a highway project. You might find money to build a highway, and now you can match that with dollars that might help build a sidewalk and the access to a transit mall. Councilor Craddick said these are just things to think about.

Councilor Craddick said when they went back to meet with their Congressional Delegation, they heard that they need to step up their game and be able to be more active on the funding side.

Mr. Robins said that is really what has happened. The projects that are the most competitive in our region have been over matching, and that is what it takes to get these projects done. There is not enough money to build with just the existing dollars.

Shirley Craddick spoke in regard to the comments on repair. She said the Congestion dollars can help benefit repairs too. It is not to be used for paving, but can also leverage projects that also need repair. There is a way to use the dollars to help improve sections of the road in an area that need extra help. It is not out of the question. There are other funds that are available that each state has that are for repair. It is a shame to have to take these dollars to use to do repair.

Anne McEnery-Ogle said her question is similar along those same lines. She said they have several communities that want to replace bridges over rail road crossings and those kinds of things. She said a replacement is not a preservation project. Councilmember McEnery-Ogle asked if a replacement of a bridge would qualify for STP funds. Mr. Robins said yes; however, bridges are very expensive and they only have \$5 million.

Scott Patterson asked for some insight on the funding for CMAQ dollars. He said those are dollars that C-TRAN has been able to tap into to help a number of different projects over the years. They have had some recent conversations internally discussing these things. He said there is strong interest on C-TRAN's part about what opportunities are going to be out there and how the funds are dispersed. Mr. Patterson said it might be helpful since this is the beginning of the conversation, to highlight what some of the other MPOs are doing in terms of how they disperse their funds. C-TRAN and bus transit agencies across the country lost a significant amount of funding with MAP-21. Some of that funding has been restored. Mr. Patterson said it might be helpful to take a look at how those funds are dispersed, and get on a more regular cycle where they could better predict the funding levels that are there to help the system.

Paul Greenlee said he is a fan of leveraging and said he wouldn't want to throw away an opportunity to use these funds for leverage if there is not any matching sources. He said the City of Washougal has its own strings on its resources, for instance, transportation impact fees. You are pretty limited as to how you use them. Councilmember Greenlee said with all the moving pieces, it is a complicated problem. He said he agreed that he would hate to give away our discretionary funds that we can use to use to generate big leverage. He said as Councilor

Stewart said, there is not a jurisdiction in this part of Washington that has money that is anywhere close to adequate to simply maintain our pavement.

David Madore said there is a lost opportunity when we automatically rubberstamp and presume it is always going to be the same. He also said it doesn't need to be an all or nothing solution. The innovation and ideas for flexibility to changes is a policy. He said it not something that staff says how it is going to be. Councilor Madore said staff can help us understand where that flexibility is. He said there are alternatives, a matching system, and scoring system to help move projects forward, and it has been very successful. He said the Board has not considered that, and they should have that discussion. Councilor Madore said they should see the scoring details, not just the bottom line, all of the work. He said 179th received low scores, and the County sees that as the number one economic development project in Clark County. He said we should see the scoring details from the previous time when the scores were provided so they could see what took place. Councilor Madore said with that said he would make a motion.

DAVID MADORE MOTIONED THAT AT THE NEXT RTC MEETING THEY DESIGNATE A FOCUS TIME OF DISCUSSION REGARDING THE FLEXIBILITY AND SCORING OF FUNDS AND CONSIDER THIS POLICY.

Chair Burkman asked legal counsel about the motion. He said that this item was not advertised as an action item for a motion. It was for discussion, and the public was not aware of any action to be taken.

Ted Gathe said this agenda item was for discussion purposes only. Since it was not advertised for any action to be taken, he said he did not believe a motion would be in order at this point.

Chair Burkman said he appreciated Councilor Madore's comments, but he took exception. He noted on page 2 of the memorandum that provided a schedule for the review of the regional grant process. The process began October-December 2015, and is before the Board this month in January. Chair Burkman highlighted the steps for each month until June when the Board would be asked for approval of the call for projects. This is a regular process that we go through and talk about each year. He said staff is asking for direction from the Board; do they want some kind of proposal brought back next month as how they might balance adding in preservation to remove the no preservation statement and talk about how it might be blended together? Chair Burkman said that is the direction he senses they are going.

Jeanne Stewart agreed adding so that they can consider alternatives and priorities.

Chair Burkman said the first step is for staff to hear what is said today and bring back some options. He said bring back some options to incorporate preservation in a way to help meet being leveraged, to address shortfalls in communities, and still does enable some other new projects to occur. Chair Burkman asked by show of hands who would like to see us revisit some proportional use of these funds for preservation next month. It was about a 50/50 count.

Bart Gernhart said he supported the general concepts that were brought up as to sharing the other items that can follow the TAP funds, and also some of the flexibility options for CMAQ to help understand these better. STP funds were discussed, but further options are also helpful.

Paul Greenlee said he does not understand what the costs of adding preservation would be, not so much in terms of financially, but in terms of loss of options. That is what he would like to have an understanding of.

Shirley Craddick said in following up on what Scott Patterson said regarding the distribution of funds. She asked if they had decided to assign percentages to the distribution of funds. On the Oregon side, they take the funds and 25% goes to freight and green economy and 75% goes to multi-modal. It allows an opportunity to make sure, since they are flexible, they can fund projects that they could not fund otherwise. It protects the dollars for those projects that don't have another option. At the same time, those dollars can be leveraged. If you have a multi-modal project, but at the same time you have applied to the state for funding the road where a multi-modal project is going to be built. You put the two groups of funds together to have a better product.

Chair Burkman referred to page 4 of the memo listing the criteria used for each of the funding sources. The criteria were weighted by points, and he highlighted those. Chair Burkman said that was the guidance that the Board gave to RTAC to use for scoring in assessing how well each project met those criteria. The outcome of that was the prioritized list. An example is the 179th project; it was really strong in economic development, but not in some other areas. Chair Burkman said the conversation will continue in February. He asked members to talk with their jurisdictions about how they might want to see RTC balance between preservation and new construction.

Tom Mielke said this will be brought back for discussion. He would like to see a percentage go to preservation and look at the need that we have in our region.

Chair Burkman said the plan and process is to have the conversation of how we want to balance all this, give it to staff, have staff bring it back, and continue to fine tune it over the next few months so we end up with one set of criteria that we all agree on. This will allow for members to take information back to their jurisdictions for review to be brought back to this table for discussion before action is taken. Chair Burkman encouraged members to discuss this with their jurisdictions. They want to decide how they want to balance between preservation projects and capital projects.

VIII. Growth Management Act – RTC Certification Process and Policy

Chair Burkman said he wanted to preserve about 10 minutes at the end for the updates from the Executive Director. He said since the County Councilors have a meeting at 6:00 p.m., RTC's meeting would end at 5:45. Chair Burkman said they may not have enough time for item IX, the FAST Act discussion.

Matt Ransom said this is the first of three consecutive discussions through March, and in March they will present a final certification process and request endorsement. Lynda would describe RTC's role in certifying the Growth Management Act. Today's presentation is largely what the law says and what RTC's role is.

Lynda David referred to the memo included in the meeting packet. Ms. David said RTC as the state-designated Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO) for the Clark County region has certain responsibilities under the state's Growth Management Act. Ms. David would provide background information on those responsibilities which include the requirement to certify the transportation elements of local comprehensive plans adopted by the county, cities, and towns within the Clark County region.

There are four key elements of the Certification Process: Guidelines and Principles, Conformity with Growth Management Act, Consistency with Regional Transportation Plan, and Requirements of Level of Service Bill.

Ms. David said the Board should understand that these requirements are not new. RTC has worked alongside local jurisdictions in Growth Management planning over the years since the Growth Management Act was passed in 1990. The RTC Board last adopted the certification process in 2003. The certification process was included in the Growth Management Act, in part, to ensure that land use and transportation are coordinated and work together. What is new is that RTC is now putting together a Certification Process Guide to help provide further direction and clarification for development and evaluation of local transportation elements to meet State GMA requirements.

State law required that each RTPO establish guidelines and principles that provide direction for the development and evaluation of the transportation elements of comprehensive plans and to ensure that state, regional, and local goals for the development of transportation systems are met. RTC relies on the Regional Transportation Plan's Vision and Goals and the county's County-Wide Planning Policies to guide the certification process.

Ms. David said RTC has to ensure that the Transportation Element of local comprehensive plans "Conform with the Requirements of the Growth Management Act." The Act prescribes what the transportation element should address. The RTPO (RTC) must certify that local jurisdictions have met these requirements of the GMA and that the local transportation element addresses: Consistency with County-Wide Planning Policies, Describes Land Use Assumptions used in estimating travel, and that the traffic impacts to state-owned transportation facilities resulting from the Land Use Assumptions are described.

Additional issues that must be addressed in the local Comprehensive Plan's transportation element include: facilities and service needs, finance, intergovernmental coordination, demand management strategies, and a pedestrian and bicycle component, which is required following state legislation amending the Growth Management Act in 2005.

Another issue to be dealt with in the RTC Certification Process is consistency between the transportation element of the Comprehensive Plan and the Regional Transportation Plan.

There are eight factors that are significant to development of the Plan and consistency with these factors will meet the conformity requirement under GMA. Those factors include: land use forecast; regional travel forecast model network and transit assumptions; Level of Service standards; goals and policies; projects, programs, and services; financial plan and regional transportation funding strategy; intergovernmental coordination efforts; and demand management strategies. Ms. David briefly described these factors.

Level of Service must be considered in local transportation elements. The LOS Bill requires that local jurisdictions must, in the Comprehensive Plan: estimate impacts to state-owned facilities resulting from land use assumptions and have LOS standards for all arterials and transit routes to gauge system performance. This ties together land use and transportation.

Ms. David said there are additional requirements prescribed by the Level of Service Bill adopted by the Washington State Legislature in 1998 that must be addressed in the Transportation Element of local Comprehensive Plans. Those include LOS for Highways of Statewide Significance is set by the State in consultation with locals. LOS for State Highways of Regional Significance but not among the Highways of Statewide Significance is set by the region (RTC). The local Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element must identify specific actions to bring deficient facilities up to LOS standards. The Highways of Statewide Significance in Clark County are I-5, I-205, SR-14, and SR-501 to the Port of Vancouver. The remainder of the state highways in Clark County are SR-500, SR-501 from I-5 to Ridgefield, SR-502, and SR-503.

Steps that will be followed to complete the Certification process for upcoming Comprehensive Plan updates include the following: local jurisdictions will need to submit a consistency and certification report to RTC in synch with submittal of draft Comprehensive Plans to the State Department of Commerce as part of the Notice of Intent to Adopt the Plan, at least 60 days prior to Adoption. The Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC) would deal with any certification issues that arise and after Comprehensive Plan updates are adopted, the RTC Board would be asked to adopt a resolution to complete the certification process.

Ms. David reiterated that there is nothing new about this Certification Process, but RTC is developing a GMA Guide to help clarify the process. The next steps will be: In January, RTC staff will again review the draft Guide with members of the RTAC committee. This has been an ongoing process over the past few months. The draft Guide will be brought to the RTC Board in February, and the timeline calls for Board adoption of the Process and Policy Guide at the March RTC Board meeting. More detail will be brought back to next month's meeting.

Jerry Oliver spoke to the Level of Service Bill and asked how it defines levels of service. He said the presentation seems very broad brush, and he is looking for some specifics. Ms. David said it is very broad brush, but at next month's meeting she would come back with a lot of the details. She would provide a matrix showing what the current Levels of Service (LOS) expectations are. Ms. David said it is complicated. Currently, for example the LOS on Highways of Statewide significance is LOS D in the urban area and C in the rural area.

Chair Burkman said this is an introduction to this. He encouraged members to ask questions of the Executive Director and staff if they wished to have more specifics. Chair Burkman said there are a tremendous number of pieces to this.

David Madore said this is similar to the last item. It says review, that's why it is previewed, and that's why it is adopted. He said it is an autopilot process. If this is a simple process and a no-brainer, and it doesn't ensure that anything done with this will meet the needs of the Secretary of the State, then we don't really need to be involved in this discussion. However, if there are policies for discretion where this Board should consider, he said there should be discussion, participation, and possible modification. He asked if there were.

Chair Burkman said his understanding is that this process is pretty prescriptive. It is a list of RTC deciding if the criteria is met or not and that is reflected back to the organization.

Ms. David said it is very much a State Rule process. A lot of it is coming from State Legislation that we have to follow. So we don't have much leeway. On the other hand, at next month's meeting, you will have an opportunity to at least have some say on the process.

Councilor Madore said it seems to be a no-brainer process.

Ms. David said they have been discussing this with local jurisdiction staff as part of the RTAC process since last June when they first introduced it. It is not a new process. This is a State requirement process dating back to the 1990s. This is to provide a fresh update.

Chair Burkman said sometimes what we do here is go through a process like this, that is heavy on the education side so that we understand what is occurring within our jurisdictions, what is being asked of our jurisdiction. The outcome of this is a Guide that will go to our jurisdictions, and we each have to provide information back to RTC. Chair Burkman said they may learn things they may not appreciate and may want to talk to our Legislators about. We may not be able to change it by policy, but unless we know about it, we wouldn't have the ability to reach higher in the process to the Legislature for change.

Jeanne Stewart said in the linear big picture, Clark County is the umbrella organization for development of the GMA update. Included in that are local city jurisdictions and they submit their plans to the County. Councilor Stewart asked if the city plans be submitted specifically and reviewed specifically or will RTC wait until the whole combined GMA for the county.

Ms. David said each jurisdiction should be submitting their Comprehensive Plan to make sure that the transportation element includes all that is required by the State law. She said it is recognized that the countywide planning policies are the umbrella policy.

Councilor Stewart asked if the review would also be done for the County GMA update. Ms. David said that was correct.

Kelly Brooks asked when the Guide would be done for the local jurisdictions to be able to use it. Ms. David said they plan to complete the Guide by March, so they are just ahead of the County's timeline for their Plan and submittal to the Department of Commerce. Ms. David said

the Board adopted a certification process in 2003, so that is in place. They just want to make sure everything is updated and consistent with what is necessary.

Jeanne Stewart asked if RTC as the Regional organization, the RCW requires them to do this certification review. Ms. David said that was correct.

IX. Federal Legislative Update: FAST Act

Time did not allow for discussion on this item.

X. Other Business

From the Board

Paul Greenlee said he would like us to begin thinking of the implications of autonomous automobiles. Councilmember Greenlee said we need to start looking at the implications and changes in our transportation modes and models. He said autonomous vehicles roughly can carry three times as many cars as you can with a human behind the wheel in the same lane space. Councilmember Greenlee said last year, it looked like self-driving cars were 15 years away. It is less than half of that now. He said we need to look at how that affects long range planning.

From the Director

Matt Ransom noted the RTC Board Sub-Committee – Member Dues Review Report that was distributed to Board Members. The report has been issued by the sub-committee of the Board. Over the course of four meetings, the sub-committee reviewed the RTC member dues structure. The report reflects the recommendation from the sub-committee. The process for the Board review begins with the distribution today for the Board's review. Mr. Ransom asked members to contact him with any questions. The report will be an agenda item for discussion at the February meeting. Between February and April, Mr. Ransom would be engaging with member jurisdiction executives regarding the recommendation. He offered to present to member jurisdiction councils and commissions. Board action on a final dues structure the Board endorses will be at the April meeting.

Mr. Ransom said Governor Inslee will be in town on January 13, at 1:30 p.m. at the Vancouver Library. Copies of the invitation to the ceremony with the information were distributed. This is a Connecting Washington project sign dedication ceremony. This provides an opportunity to thank the Governor and Legislators for their leadership in pushing forward the Connecting Washington Bill, which funded a series of projects here in SW Washington. Mr. Ransom said he has been invited by the Governor's office to make a few remarks on behalf of the RTC being the regional agency. No RSVP is necessary.

Mr. Ransom noted JPACT meets Thursday, January 21, 2016, at Metro at 7:30 a.m. He said the meeting has changed from meeting on the 2nd Thursday of the month to the 3rd Thursday of the month.

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, February 2, 2016, at 4 p.m.

XI. Adjourn

A MOTION WAS MADE FOR ADJOURNMENT. IT WAS SECONDED AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

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

Jack Burkman, Board of Directors Chair