

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Board of Directors
February 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 Vice Chair Jack Burkman on Tuesday, February 3, 2015, at 4:05 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:

Nancy Baker, Port of Vancouver Commissioner
Kelly Brooks, ODOT (Alternate)
Jack Burkman, Vancouver Council Member
Bill Ganley, Battle Ground Council Member
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Council (Alternate)
Jeff Hamm, C-TRAN Executive Director
David Madore, Clark County Councilor
Tom Mielke, Clark County Councilor
Larry Smith, Vancouver Council Member
Jeanne Stewart, Clark County Councilor
Don Wagner, WSDOT Regional Administrator

Voting Board Members Absent:

Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor
Doug McKenzie, Skamania Co. Commissioner
David Poucher, White Salmon Mayor
Melissa Smith, Camas Council Member
Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1 Manager

Nonvoting Board Members Present:

Don Benton, Senator 17th District

Nonvoting Board Members Absent:

Curtis King, Senator 14th District
Norm Johnson, Representative 14th District
Gina McCabe, Representative 14th 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
Eric Florip, The Columbian
Tim Gaughan, Citizen
Heath Henderson, Clark County
Karen Hengerer, Citizen
Lee L. Jensen, Citizen
Ann Laurier, Citizen
Dale Lewis, Senator Herrera Beutler's Office
Jerry Oliver, Port of Vancouver Commissioner
Ron Onslow, Ridgefield Mayor
Scott Patterson, C-TRAN
Scott Sawyer, City of Battle Ground
Tracy Schreiber, SWWDC
Margaret Tweet, 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

Margaret Tweet of Camas urged the Board to honor the advisory vote and stop funding bus rapid transit and light rail. She spoke about the C-TRAN district and taxing. Ms. Tweet said she objects to the removal of one of the Clark County Commissioners from the nine voting member C-TRAN Board. Ms. Tweet submitted written comments for the record.

Ed Barnes of Vancouver had a proposal for the RTC Board. He said over the last month, he has met with several groups of people and most do not understand what RTC does or the need for the money to do the projects in SW Washington. He proposed that four meetings be set up in Clark County: one each for Camas / Washougal; Battle Ground / Hockinson; Ridgefield / La Center; and Vancouver. The Director/staff could explain to the public the cost of projects and why they are necessary. Mr. Barnes said the average citizens, not the elected officials need to know this in order for SW Washington get their share of funds for our region. They can then contact their legislators to push for the needed funding for projects.

III. Approval of the Board Agenda

LARRY SMITH MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 3, 2015, MEETING AGENDA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY PAUL GREENLEE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

IV. Approval of January 6, 2015, Minutes

JEANNE STEWART MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 6, 2015, MEETING MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY LARRY SMITH AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

V. Consent Agenda

A. February Claims

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA FEBRUARY CLAIMS. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY TOM MIELKE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VI. Commute Trip Reduction Program – Local and Regional Plans Update

Matt Ransom said the Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) presentation will be handled by Lynda David, RTC staff and Jan Bowers, CTR Program Administrator for the Regional Program and an employee of the City of Vancouver. The nature of the discussion is to describe to the Board RTC's role in planning for the Commute Trip Reduction Program. This is a mandate under state statute that major employers participate to try to reduce trips. Mr. Ransom said consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan that the Board adopts, one of the goals is to manage demand on the system and by that provide options. To the extent people want to choose other options to defer an auto trip, we provide programs and policies to try to achieve that. The CTR program fits in an implementation system within achieving that policy goal. Mr. Ransom said Lynda would frame what the RTC Board needs to do this year and Jan would provide information about the program itself.

Lynda David referred to the memo included in the meeting packet. She would provide information on the State's Commute Trip Reduction program and its implementation at the local and regional level. She said this is because they are anticipating having to update local and regional CTR plans later in 2015 to satisfy state requirements. There will be policy issues the RTC Board may want to consider. The intent of the State's CTR law is to reduce congestion on state highways, improve air quality, and reduce dependency on foreign oil.

The state legislature passed the first Commute Trip Reduction law in 1991. Washington's CTR program is employer-based and intended to decrease the number of commute trips made by people driving alone. The law focuses on the largest employers with over 100 employees arriving at work between 6 and 9 a.m., year round. In 2006, the state legislature updated the CTR law with the Commute Trip Reduction Efficiency Act intended to make the program more efficient.

Ms. David said key changes to the CTR program in 2006 were to focus the program on the most congested urban growth areas, rather than on entire counties and to foster the program coordination among local jurisdictions, regional transportation planning organizations, and the state. With the Act, the state's CTR Board was established to guide the program.

A slide with a statewide map was provided showing the location and affected urban growth areas under the 2006 CTR Efficiency Act. In Clark County, the areas are the UGAs of Vancouver, Unincorporated Clark County, Camas, and Washougal.

Ms. David summarized the requirements of the CTR Efficiency Act of 2006 including: review of existing conditions, setting goals, identifying strategies for meeting the CTR goals, conducting employer outreach, preparation of a financial plan and implementation plan, and preparation of an optional Growth and Transportation Efficiency Center Program (which was established for downtown Vancouver, but the GTEC program is no longer funded.)

In 2007, the RTC Board approved CTR plans developed for the four affected Urban Growth Areas, for the region, and for the Downtown Vancouver GTEC. The local CTR Plan included goals for reduction in the proportion of single-occupant vehicle commute trips. In 2007, the Board also adopted the Regional CTR Plan which included: regional CTR goals for Urban Growth Areas, a description of strategies for achieving the goals, a sustainable financial plan describing projected revenues and expenditures to meet the goals, and a description of the way in which progress toward meeting the goals will be measured.

Existing conditions in 2007 relevant to implementing the CTR program include: transit service is limited to many of the affected worksites; the majority of the sites offer free parking, though at some sites parking spaces are limited; the majority of sites have good pedestrian facilities; and carpooling is the most popular option for non-drive alone travel.

Strategies for meeting the CTR goals include: work with employers to offer incentives and subsidies for carpooling and vanpooling; enhancing transit services to CTR work sites; where applicable, implement parking management at work sites; develop telework programs; and work with developers to offer site amenities.

Ms. David introduced Jan Bowers with the City of Vancouver to have her describe her work as the CTR Administrator for the region. Ms. Bowers said that Lynda described the details and the laws of CTR, but said she gets to do the fun part and is out in the trenches. She meets with the employers and the liaisons that are promoting the program at their work site. Ms. Bowers highlighted what she does as a Commute Trip Reduction Administrator.

Ms. Bowers said her most important role is her work with the Employee Transportation Coordinators (ETCs). Each worksite must have an ETC. That is the go-between, between her, the office of the CTR Program, and their employees. They are the ones who get the information out. Ms. Bowers said she works primarily with the ETCs at the 60 worksites that are currently affected by the CTR Law. She is responsible for making sure the worksite is in compliance with the law, doing their reporting, information is posted, surveys are being conducted, and more.

Ms. Bowers said she is also responsible for the marketing piece of the program. She represents the SW region on the Technical Advisory Group for the State. She also administers the www.ClarkCommute.org website. A map of Clark County showing the CTR-affected worksites was displayed. Also listed on the map was a list of bus routes that go by those worksites, whether the worksite has free parking or not, and what amenities they may have. Ms. Bowers said they are in the process of updating CTR Plans for the future, so it is important to know what kinds of amenities are available to the worksites.

Requirements for CTR worksites include: designate Employee Transportation Coordinator (ETC), distribute information, submit annual reports, implement at least 1 program element, and reduce number of drive alone commuters by 10%. Ms. Bowers said when an employer finds out that they are affected by the CTR law, it is met with resistance. She said she tries to help the employer see the value added for the CTR program, and has tried to create a turnkey program for their ETC. She said the program she has put together is very simple and just needs to be distributed to the employee. Ms. Bowers provided examples of what a new employee kit would include. It must contain a brochure of what their CTR element includes at their worksite. Ms. Bowers said they had an opportunity to not require an annual report; they only require a full report every other year, so they took advantage of that change in the law. They are required to have at least one program element such carpool parking, bicycle racks, showers; and such. The goal is to try to deduce the drive alone commute by 10%, but there is no penalty if they do not achieve it.

Ms. Bowers provided examples of some of the display posters used to promote Bike to Work Week. They provide all the posters to promote CTR at the worksite. Ms. Bowers works hard in getting the community engaged. She said US Digital has given them access to their meeting room to have a mid-Vancouver meeting so ETCs can come to a meeting there, and they meet on the West side at City Hall.

Students are not a part of the CTR program. They just target employees and employers; however, it is known that Clark College has a parking challenge. Ms. Bowers said she was able to find a little money that was not tied to CTR, and she contacted Clark College to see if they

would like some help reaching out to their students and getting their students to think about other ways of getting to school. She said they were very receptive to that and displayed some examples of posters used. Ms. Bowers said one of the nice things about CTR is making the connection between health and CTR. She said there is a great connection. Employers are interested in lowering insurance and creating a healthy work environment, and CTR is a great partner for that.

Vice Chair Burkman said it was evident that that Ms. Bowers has a passion for the CTR program, and she does a great job at it. He said people hear about carpooling and biking but asked her to talk about the "Emergency Ride Home."

Ms. Bowers said they are very fortunate so far in that her funding has enabled her to continue to offer the "Emergency Ride Home" program to the worksites that are affected by the law. The reason they offer this program is that one of the biggest barriers that prevent people from leaving their car at home and trying something else is the question of what happens if an emergency happens while I am at work? How will I get to my sick child or to home? What happens if I drove the carpool and I get sick during the day, and my rider is stranded? The CTR program provides the "Emergency Ride Home." They allow up to three cab rides a year for someone who has taken an alternative commute to work up to 50 miles one way. Ms. Bowers said one of the reasons they are able to do that is because it is like insurance. It is peace of mind insurance, and like most insurance, we usually don't have to take advantage of it, but it is there just in case. She said it is not used a lot, but it is there just in case.

Paul Greenlee said when the CTR came before their Council in 2007 or 2008, there was some resistance from some members on the Council until Charlie Bishop from Pendleton Woolen Mills came to the meeting. He said they were great supporters of this program. He said it really works for them and asked that they not take it away. Mr. Greenlee said Pendleton Woolen Mills is their largest employer. Ms. Bowers said the City of Washougal is the other large employer in Washougal.

David Madore noted Ms. Bowers' enthusiasm, inspiration, and practical presentation of the CTR program and thanked her for her good work.

Lynda David provided an update regarding the CTR program at the statewide level. She said as in 2006, the CTR Board is always looking at how the CTR program can be made even more efficient for participants. The CTR Board is also attuned to how the CTR program fits in with statewide goals for efficiencies in the transportation system. Ms. David noted that attached to the Memo is the state CTR Board's 2015-2019 work plan. In 2015, they have been forewarned by the CTR Board that local and regional plans will need to be updated. Local and regional staff have begun to meet to discuss these Plan updates.

Ms. David provided a status report on the 60 affected worksites in the affected Urban Growth Areas in Clark County. In the most recent survey of CTR program participants, the 60 affected worksites returned 9,985 surveys documenting the commute trip of participants. Of these, 15%

of the trips were non-drive alone trips; 15.6% non-drive alone to the 43 worksites in Vancouver and 16.3% non-drive alone to the 2 affected worksites in Washougal.

A graphic was provided that documents the most recent survey results and shows the travel modes used by those working at affected worksites. Overall, 84.2% are drive alone trips. The favored CTR mode to affected worksites in this region is carpooling at 6.9% of trips. Other modes surveyed include biking (which is showing an increase from prior surveyed years), vanpool, as well as alternatives to working at an employment site such as telecommuting or working a compressed work week which results in fewer trips on the system in peak hours.

As they work on updating the CTR Plans in 2015, there are policy issues to consider. They are now provided more local flexibility than in the past, but they are expected to make meaningful contributions to state goals of reducing congestion, auto emissions, and fuel consumption. They need to consider setting achievable goals for this region, and they need to consider how to best tailor CTR programs to our local conditions. They also need to consider how the CTR program and its implementation are funded.

A slide summarized the role of agencies, the transit provider, and employers in the Washington State CTR program. It also highlighted the need to review, update, and implement local and regional CTR plans in 2015.

The final slide listed key pieces of the update process. The RTC Board will be expected to consider and adopt the CTR Plan updates, but the timeline for Board action is dependent on the CTR Board who has yet to announce their deadlines for updated Plan submittal. This will come back to the Board for further discussion and consideration.

David Madore referred to the graphs listing the surveyed travel modes. He asked if the bus mode included all of the express buses that cross into Portland. Ms. David said no, because the charts shown are reflective of the commute trips to the affected worksites, the 60 worksites in Clark County. It does not reflect worksites in Oregon. Councilor Madore said it would be interesting to see the graphs of transit over time and asked if that was available. Ms. David said the WSDOT has that information for our area. Councilor Madore asked for a link to be made available for that information. Ms. David said WSDOT is currently updating that information, but they could make that available when it is complete.

Councilor Madore questioned the PowerPoint presentation being made available. Mr. Ransom said as of January they have started to post the presentations on the Web site with the other meeting materials after they have been presented at the meeting. Councilor Stewart said there is a lot of good information in this PowerPoint, especially the slide that lists the responsibilities and how the program is integrated.

Councilor Madore said in Jan's presentation, there was mention of incentives and subsidies and asked what was available for the businesses. Jan Bowers said in terms an incentive for a business, the state currently has a tax credit program if they provide subsidies. There is a break for businesses, but it is a small amount from WSDOT for the state level. In terms of incentives for participants, they have the Emergency Ride Home program. In the past they have offered

gift cards, prize packages, etc., and those usually take place during the campaign time when they are trying to encourage people to get out of their cars and give it a try. Currently, they are not able to use state money for things of that nature any longer. They will see a decrease in this area with that. They can use the money to provide C-TRAN day passes, so employees who want to give transit a try, but are not ready yet for a full commitment. Ms. Bowers said the program purchases these from C-TRAN. Councilor Madore said the subsidies are from the employer to the employee, and the incentives are discounts or tax deductions from the state to the employers. The Emergency Ride Home is not funded by the employer; it is funded by the CTR Program. He asked how that worked. Ms. Bowers said they just formalized an agreement with Clark County Cab. She said each worksite has vouchers with instructions on how to use it. If the employee needs it, a voucher is filled out and given to the Cab Company, and the Cab Company bills the CTR Program. Ms. Bowers said there have been some instances when it was used inappropriately, and she gently and kindly let them know that they were responsible for the bill. She monitors and is guarded with the program's money. The subsidies are offered by the employers. She said employers are not required by the law to offer subsidies. That is an option that they have. Ms. Bowers encourages prizes, etc., but it is not an obligation of the employer.

Jeff Hamm asked if there was any noticeable change in level of interest due to the reduction of gas prices. Ms. Bowers said while we personally like gas prices to go down, that is the worst enemy to the CTR program. When the gas prices go up, there is a lot more interest; people are more conscientious about trying to figure out how to save some money. Also, our abundance of free parking in our area is nice for an employee and offers good wages. She said it is an uphill battle to get people out of their cars. This is why she works so hard to get people to see how good the program is for other reasons.

VII. Legislative Session Update

Matt Ransom said since the Board adopted the policy framework for his involvement related to one of the primary goals of the 2015 work program, which is to work with members and our state and federal delegation on new revenue to address our regional transportation needs, he has spent quite a bit of time conferring with our legislative delegation, answering questions, and responding to their inquiries about projects. He has been working with jurisdictions' staff in preparation of project fact sheets that respond to the Ten Year Priority List. He said there has been a lot of good collaboration.

The first week in January, a meeting was convened with the Governor's Chief of Staff here is Vancouver along with the Transportation Policy Director. They met with the coalition of interested stakeholders, and asked what they could do as the Governor's office. He said the Governor's Transportation Revenue Proposal included zero projects from SW Washington. He said that is unacceptable given the needs that we have here. Mr. Ransom said they had a good meeting on that Wednesday. They made a request to us at the meeting, which was to have a unified proposal presented to the Governor that Friday afternoon. He said there was a lot of work in haste to look at the Ten-Year Priority List. They gave them a few criteria: It could not be

too expensive, maybe a couple hundred million dollars' worth of projects. Given that we don't have a single project on the Ten-Year List that is at that value, we had to compile a proposal. The proposal was also based on the criteria that they were given, which was have it relate to freight, commerce, economic development, key attributes of the Governor's own proposal, which is to enhance the economy. Through that, the stakeholder group rapidly developed the proposal that was distributed to members. Mr. Ransom said he had sent an email to Board Members which described the RTC's involvement and the proposal.

The proposal was "Clark County: Ports, Freight and Commerce Access Strategy." There are a series of projects, primary freight routes or access to the Port or Port properties. The projects address immediate deficiencies, bottle necks on the freight/commerce system, and economic development related projects. The combined projects cost is about \$215 million. Mr. Ransom said he presented that proposal to the Governor in his office that Friday afternoon on January 9. On top of that they had a response from the Governor dated January 29, 2015, addressed to Senator Cleveland from the 49th District, primarily, the source of the engagement with the Governor. The Governor's letter doesn't directly say that they are now in his proposal, but that they will work with the delegation to try to include this. Mr. Ransom said he thought it was a promising statement from the Governor.

Mr. Ransom has heard that conversations and negotiations are ongoing within the Senate in terms of what a project list might look like. He said it is still unknown if there will be a new revenue bill. Mr. Ransom said they are still trying to earnestly and aggressively push RTC's 10-Year Priority List. However the project is composed, whether it is based on freight commerce or safety, if there is a bucket to fill, we have a project to put in that bucket.

Vice Chair Burkman pointed out the handouts, and the projects presented to the Governor that are on RTC's 10-Year List. All projects were discussed at last month's meeting.

Councilor Madore asked how they could find out more details about the projects. Vice Chair Burkman said all of the projects were taken off the Plans that were presented to RTC and discussed last month. Councilor Madore referred to the I-5 Mill Plain Interchange for \$80 million. He said he thought it was originally to allow for light rail. Mr. Ransom said a summary of the project is provided, but City staff would have any more detail on the project. Councilor Madore questioned the \$80 million cost of the project. Vice Chair Burkman said these are projects that we have already discussed and listed on our priority list, so they are brought forward by each jurisdiction.

Councilor Madore questioned why they would rebuild the Mill Plain I-5 interchange. Don Wagner said at this stage, the best way to address it is to say for all of these projects we should have a document that says what the purpose of the project is rather than the details to get to the purpose. Mr. Wagner said the Mill Plain interchange has substantial issues from the Port in bringing in some of the oversized loads that are not being able to make the turns on and off of the freeway. That is primarily what this project is addressing as he understands it. He said the

dollar amount is not something that WSDOT put together. The main factor for each of the projects is what the problem is that they are trying to solve, the purpose.

Councilor Madore asked if they were going to post more detailed information on the I-5 Mill Plain project. Mr. Ransom said the information that is provided is what they received from the City. The listed summary provides a description and what problems it is to address.

Councilor Madore said it is already a very wide over pass and questioned additional width needed; he said he was curious. He said he had the gift of suspicion here and asked "is this a light-rail component going on here in disguise?" Councilor Madore said he wanted to know, and asked what is this thing? He added that it might not be, but he wanted to make sure.

Paul Greenlee said maybe he didn't understand, but all of these projects are from last month's list. Councilor Madore said yes they were. Councilor Greenlee said he didn't understand his question. Councilor Madore said he wanted the basics, what is envisioned.

Larry Smith said in reading the letter from the Governor to Senator Annette Cleveland, he asked if there was anything new that he didn't know beforehand. He said he didn't see a commitment from the Governor for any of the projects. It states bipartisan support and asked what that meant; what kind of progress are we making?

Vice Chair Burkman said that was a good question. He said in the meeting that they had with the Governor, he was receptive to the fact that there were no projects on his list directly dedicated to SW Washington and a growing sensitivity that we have a lot of heartburn about that. Vice Chair Burkman said he did not hear and has not heard concrete plans to change his proposal that has been brought before the legislature to add any specific projects. Councilor Smith said then he holds our legislators from this particular area responsible.

Jeanne Stewart said that brings up a good point. She said that the Governor was in town late last week and wondered if any of our local representatives met with him. She asked if there was any outreach to anyone on RTC or in local jurisdictions to meet with any of us. She said she was not aware of it and others said as well. Matt Ransom said RTC did not. Councilor Stewart questioned the possibility of having a forum with him, because Larry Smith's question is absolutely correct. Transportation is one of our key issues, and Councilor Stewart said there were talks with economic development interests. Economic development for a large part is dependent on transportation infrastructure. Vice Chair Burkman said that is the very message that was conveyed to him, that we need investments in our transportation infrastructure. That is why the title of "Ports, Freight and Commerce Access."

Councilor Madore said the combined list of projects totaled \$215 million. He asked what percentage that was of the total package and asked if Clark County's fair share was about 17% of any statewide funding package.

Vice Chair Burkman said he thought the Governor's package raised about \$2 billion in revenue. Matt Ransom said the total spending plan was \$12 billion. He said they have done analysis in the past, but did not have that in front of him to put a number to what a fair share would be.

He said it is not 17%, but more on the order of 6 to 7%. He said he could distribute that. In any case, he said \$215 million is not that. Mr. Ransom reemphasized that this project proposal before them was a response to a specific request from the Governor's staff; so it was modeled around the parameters that this group was given. That is why it is constructed this way. Should that have been around the models of safety or some other criteria, then it would probably be a different sort in the projects. Mr. Ransom said the direction, clearly from the RTC Board, is the 10-Year Priority List, then a subset which is more of a lobby statement that is the Clark County Transportation Alliance (CCTA) Statement. The CCTA statement is on the order of over \$500 million. Those combined is more akin to what a fair share would be, several hundred million dollars. Mr. Ransom said he thought they understood, he does not want to convey that this proposal that was presented to the Governor is representative of this region's ask; it is not. This region's ask is the 10-Year Priority List or a subset of that, which would be the CCTA list. That is what we should be aiming for. This is simply what we presume by definition of the Governor's staff what he wanted to see, so he was delivered a proposal. Mr. Ransom said it was important to also note that neither the Senate nor the Governor has at that point submitted a new revenue bill. He said all of the conversation to this point is just jockeying for position on a new revenue bill. He said to the extent, they need to continue to jockey and compel our delegation to jockey for our fair share. That is what we are doing, and should be doing at this juncture. Mr. Ransom said he does not know when a bill would be introduced. Vice Chair Burkman said we have created that Priority List, so we have all of our projects out there.

Senator Benton said he would provide an update. He said this is interesting to listen to, but the Governor does not decide what projects are going to be paid for in the Transportation Budget. Senator Benton said in fact, he has very little influence on that; that is pretty much determined by who votes yes on gas tax, at least that's been the tradition in the legislature. Senator Benton said the House will not move on a Transportation package until the Senate does. It has been made very clear by the Chairman of the House Transportation Committee. The ball is in the Senate's court. The Senate has already been meeting. He said they briefed their own caucus the previous day. Senator Benton said he serves as Vice Chair with Chairman King and Vice Chair Fain, and there have been meetings already taking place. He said unless there are reforms accepted by the Governor's office, there will be no new revenue package. It is a package of reforms and revenue, and the reforms have to come first. Once they are signed into law, they will be presenting a package of revenue. Senator Benton said if they get to that point, the list for the revenue package in terms of projects will be significantly improved over the last list for the Legislature for Clark County. Senator Benton said it is dependent upon reforms. Senator Benton said that Councilman Smith asked what they could do. He said that they could contact their Legislators and ask them to stand strong for reforms and how we do transportation in this state. Senator Benton said if we get reforms in how we do business, there will very likely be momentum for a gas tax package, but it will not be a one-sided deal. Senator Benton said as for the list of projects presented to the Governor, in the end, it is rarely the list that is adopted. He said it is usually almost always driven by the Legislators.

Vice Chair Burkman thanked Senator Benton. He reinforced what the Executive Director said. The presented list was not brought to the Governor; it was a specific request from the Governor.

Councilor Madore said if Clark County would get the projects listed, it would be less than 2%, which he said is unacceptable.

Matt Ransom referred to the memorandum included with the meeting materials. He said there are many bills affecting the various constituencies, but he identified three bills that have been introduced in the Senate that directly affect RTPOs, which are those that would substantively affect RTC. He said he is monitoring those and tracking what is going on to the extent that he needs to provide testimony consistent with the Board policy. He said he would make himself available to the Legislature to do that. One that he did provide testimony to the Senate Transportation Committee on is SB 5199. They had a public hearing on January 26, 2015. This has to do with voting membership and privileges. He said he would continue to monitor those bills that substantively affect RTC as an organization.

Vice Chair Burkman asked when the next cutoff was for bills. Senator Benton said he thought February 20 was the deadline for bills to be out of committee for the Senate and the House unless it is a finance committee, which has an additional 7 days.

Mr. Ransom said as was stated in the 2015 Work Program, he would continue to monitor proposed bills, and RTC staff will provide information and input to the Board, Legislators, and RTC Member agency staff as requested and will provide testimony as appropriate to legislative hearings which advance the interests of current RTC Board policy.

Senator Benton encouraged people to notify him in advance when they travel to the Capital in order to have time for him to meet with them.

Matt Ransom offered an opportunity for any member to give an update on legislation they were following. The Legislature will be in session for a while, so there will be future opportunities.

VIII. Other Business

From the Board

David Madore said Kevin Peterson, a transportation architect that has been working in our region for some years has provided an inquiry that challenges our baseline assumptions for the region when it comes to our corridor through Portland and the I-5 corridor, the I-205 corridor, and a third bridge corridor. Councilor Madore said he forwarded that to Matt Ransom asking that we respond to those questions. He noted that it may take staff some time to consider those baseline assumptions and those that relate to the 2008 Corridor Visioning Study. Councilor Madore said he would like to see the support of the RTC Board for RTC staff to answer those questions. Councilor Madore said Mr. Peterson is not charging for his time and asked the Board for their support for Matt and staff to respond to his inquiry.

Vice Chair Burkman asked for clarification that Councilor Madore was asking that the external consultant's product be reviewed by the RTC staff and critiqued. Councilor Madore said he would not call him a consultant because he is not being paid by anybody to do this. He said Mr. Peterson is a transportation professional who has thought about the regional significance of RTC's decisions and the base lines that they are founded upon. He is asking the RTC to consider all base line assumptions.

Vice Chair Burkman said he used the term external consultant, saying there are a number of groups, organizations, and professionals from all perspectives on transportation that bring forward plans and would like RTC to invest in critiquing, reviewing, and modifying those and he said he was not sure where to draw the line on that. He asked counsel from Board Members, because it is not originating out of RTC. This is one person asking, and a number of these could come. This is precedence set.

Paul Greenlee asked how much of our assumptions are ours to make as opposed to handed to us by other organizations. He used the example of the County not being able to modify their population projections. They are handed to the County by the state, and similarly, Washougal doesn't get to modify its employment or population totals, they are handed it by the Growth Management Act Plan, the Comprehensive Plan created by the County. Councilor Greenlee asked how much we actually had control over the data assumptions.

Tom Mielke said they get information from the state, and they do make that choice with their partners in the eight cities of the County. Councilor Mielke said he didn't want to think that we had a closed mind and was not interested in listening to anyone else with expertise any more than we would close our mind to public testimony. He encouraged listening to see if it covers an area that we have not visited.

Vice Chair Burkman said he agreed with that. He said he was not hearing "listen"; he was hearing "invest that time in a cooperative involvement of critique and review." That is an investment level. Vice Chair Burkman asked if this inquiry would require more than De Minimis investment of staff.

Mr. Ransom said he received a white paper by an outside party. That white paper makes certain prognostications and assumptions. He said the request being asked by Mr. Peterson is to RTC as the regional planning agency to test or provide him critique of his prognostications and assumptions. Mr. Ransom said the difficulty that he has had, and he has responded as such, to the extent RTC has published information where they have a forecast or a model that is published. That is the best reference set, and that is what he would advise the author to refer against. The published information is the endorsed reference set of this organization that has been approved by the Board. Mr. Ransom said he found it difficult to be put in a position to render a formal critique of a white paper, because white papers exist across numerous fronts and many different constituencies. He said his response back to the author is that he could not provide a formal critique. He suggested to the Board that he not be put into a position to provide a formal critique, because that in some instances could be construed as validating or

not validating. Mr. Ransom said if resources were available, and he was not sure how much resource that might be, he has conferred a bit with staff, but has not read the papers himself; they are a broad forecast, broad assumptions, and broad prognostications that would take an indefinite amount of time to try to figure out. He said he could not say how much time it would take. He said it would be more than just looking at it and saying I agree or disagree. Mr. Ransom said he was not sure he wanted the organization to be put into a position of rendering a formal statement that way at this juncture.

Vice Chair Burkman said he was hearing that if someone wants to bring forward a critique and present to this body their perspective, a white paper as such, in contrast to the work that has been done here, that can be provided to us and we can take a look at that ourselves, different opinions. But if we want to invest in a process that starts bringing those together, it takes an investment of this organization, an investment of resources. Vice Chair Burkman said his recommendation is that if that is to be done, that be done by a vote of the Board directing our Executive Director to do that.

Matt Ransom said he has not read the papers, so he is unable to tell the Board what the resource commitment might be. He has many other things to do, but could possibly read it in the evening. If the Board wishes, he could work with staff to see what that commitment could look like.

Vice Chair Burkman asked the preference of the Board. He said he was uncomfortable with the Executive Director doing this in the evening. This is either RTC work or it is not.

Jeanne Stewart said this white paper has been produced and she would like to be open minded about what is in the document. She would like to get a copy of it to read, and she did not want to make a decision without reading it first. Councilor Stewart said she did see the difficulty in regional planning and in all of the Transportation Plans, the many layers of detail and analysis. She said on one hand, she sees the need for that, on the other hand, sometimes it is so involved, and we don't get a chance to take a look to see if there is danger ahead or if we're missing the point and not moving ahead in the most efficient way. Councilor Stewart said she would like to read the documents and might have some questions for Mr. Ransom.

Jeff Hamm said they are at a considerable disadvantage have a fruitful discussion not knowing the specifics of what the information is. He suggested that the RTC on a regular basis updates its Plans, models, and assumptions and perhaps this is a piece of information that can be incorporated into that updating process if not into it. This is someone who is challenging the travel forecast model of RTC, and that information could be incorporated into the next update of the travel forecast model, if that is going to take place this year. Vice chair Burkman said that is part of the Work Plan.

Larry Smith said he was uncomfortable with this; sometimes these papers are looked at as "professional endorsements," and someone uses that to their advantage, maybe good or maybe bad. He said he did not like getting caught in that type of game. Councilor Smith said he had some concerns with possibly some legality issues associated with that. He was not sure,

but it opens the door. Councilor Smith said there is a precedent of who selects, who doesn't select, who deselects, who is the priority and who makes the decision, and how is that decision made? Who draws the facts and assumptions, and where do they come from? Does the author do that or how is that developed? Councilor Smith said these are some concerns that open it all up.

Councilor Madore said none have had an opportunity to read the papers. He suggested that Mr. Peterson provide to the Members what he would like us to consider. He said he would do what he could to get a possible summary that Mr. Peterson could create. Councilor Madore said he thought it would be helpful if a professional in the field challenges us, and we see what he has to say.

Jeanne Stewart asked if what Mr. Peterson prepared could be entered into the public record for this meeting. Councilor Madore said this came as an email, so it is public record. It should be available to the public as well.

Vice Chair Burkman said the RTC Board has always been receptive to feedback from the public whether it is written outside the meeting or verbal during Public Comments. He said not having read it himself, not having the Executive Director read it, but staff having said it will take some investment to do that, the question is if we want to do that. Vice Chair Burkman said he is hearing that there is an interest in Mr. Peterson sharing the papers and discuss it further next month.

Councilor Madore said he would make it his responsibility to ensure that gets distributed to Board members so they have an opportunity to read it. Vice Chair Burkman asked that he do that via RTC's Executive Director. Councilor Stewart asked that it be entered into the public record.

Councilor Madore said it has already been submitted to Mr. Ransom, so make that a part of the public record for this meeting. Vice Chair Burkman said he thought Councilor Madore said he would work with Mr. Peterson to do a summary of the documents. He asked that the conversation be away from the Board and held with the Executive Director and provide whatever information is appropriate and that will be sent out to the Board members. Councilor Madore said he could do that.

From the Director

Mr. Ransom acknowledged recent grants received by member agencies: Skamania County Bridge Project at \$850,000 for a bridge painting project on the Washougal River Road; Clark County Safety project at \$1.8 million for guardrail repair; and Klickitat County Safety Project at \$900,000 for countywide safety improvements. Mr. Ransom said not all those projects fall on the regional system, but he felt it was important to share the good news.

Late last year Mr. Ransom said they planned to start doing project profiles where projects that the Board invests resources to its grant funds and the agencies complete the projects, they would provide a summary sheet highlighting the project. These would be available on inventory over time. Today's Regional Project Showcase is the NW 18th Avenue Bike and

Pedestrian Trail project for the City of Camas. Funding was \$220,000 in Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Funds along with \$180,300 from the City of Camas.

Mr. Ransom noted C-TRAN Board of Directors meets on Tuesday, February 10, 2015, at 5:30 p.m. at the Vancouver Library. JPACT meets Thursday, February 12, 2015, at Metro at 7:30 a.m.

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, March 3, 2015, at 4:00 p.m.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR ADJOURNMENT. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY JEANNE STEWART AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Melissa Smith, Board of Directors Chair