

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council  
Board of Directors  
May 5, 2015, Meeting Minutes**

**I. Call to Order and Roll Call of Members**

The Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council Board of Directors Meeting was called to order by Chair Melissa Smith on Tuesday, May 5, 2015, at 4:00 p.m. at the Clark County Public Service Center Sixth Floor Training Room, 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington. The meeting was recorded by CVTV. Attendance follows.

Voting Board Members Present:

Nancy Baker, Port of Vancouver Commissioner  
Jack Burkman, Vancouver Council Member  
Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor  
Bill Ganley, Battle Ground Council Member  
Jeff Hamm, C-TRAN Executive Director  
David Madore, Clark County Councilor  
Tom Mielke, Clark County Councilor  
Larry Smith, Vancouver Council Member  
Melissa Smith, Camas Council Member  
Jeanne Stewart, Clark County Councilor  
Don Wagner, WSDOT Regional Administrator  
Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1 Manager

Voting Board Members Absent:

Doug McKenzie, Skamania Co. Commissioner  
David Poucher, White Salmon Mayor

Nonvoting Board Members Present:

Liz Pike, Representative 18<sup>th</sup> District  
Lynda Wilson, Representative 17<sup>th</sup> District

Nonvoting Board Members Absent:

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

Guests Present:

Ed Barnes, Citizen  
Pete Capell, City of Camas  
Joshua Egan, Citizen  
Eric Florip, The Columbian  
Tim Gargham, Citizen  
Bart Gernhart, WSDOT  
Heath Henderson, Clark County  
Lee L. Jensen, Citizen  
Jim Karlock, Citizen  
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver City Council  
Sharon Nasset, Economic Transportation Alliance  
Scott Patterson, C-TRAN  
Scott Sawyer, City of Battle Ground  
Tracy Schreiber, SWWDC  
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 Smith reminded everyone to please be kind and respectful to one another including all citizens who testify. She also reminded that they get only two times to discuss an issue, but only after everyone has had a chance to speak.

Chair Smith said given that this is the last RTC Board meeting for the retiring Don Wagner, she had something to read in his honor. Mr. Don Wagner – A Career in Retrospect. Don graduated from OSU as a professional engineer. He spent the next 23 years working for ODOT in many different technical, managerial, and leadership positions. His last position at ODOT was as Regional Manager of which is equivalent of the Regional Administrator at WSDOT. He was the Regional Manager for three of ODOT's five regions; the last one as the Regional Manager of the Portland Metropolitan area. In 1997, he went to work for WSDOT as the SW Regional Administrator. Don has been WSDOT's SW Washington Regional Administrator ever since. During his tenure as Regional Administrator, Don and his team have overseen many significant safety and capacity improvements to the Washington highway network. Don has served on the MPO Board of both RTC and Metro. Don's tenure on the RTC Board has been robust, always serving the Board and public with his insight and focus on transportation system safety and improvements. For that service and his long tenured career of serving the public in both Washington and Oregon, we thank you sincerely. Don and his wife Theresa are moving to Kona Hawaii shortly after his retirement. All gave him a standing ovation.

Jack Burkman offered his personal thanks to Don. He has had the opportunity to work with him in many different capacities, including working directly under him. Council Member Burkman said that Mr. Wagner has done an exemplary job working for the public in some contentious trying issues. He has handled it consistently in a very professional manner; he will leave some very big shoes to fill. Mr. Wagner voiced his thanks.

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

Ed Barnes of Vancouver thanked Mr. Wagner for all his service. He wished him congratulations and the very best.

Representative Lynda Wilson entered the meeting at 4:07 p.m. Councilor Shirley Craddick entered the meeting at 4:08.

Mr. Barnes asked Mr. Wagner what the consequences would be if they lose the Record of Decision from the Federal Highway Administration for the Columbia River Crossing. He said he was glad to hear that some now recognize the need for an I-5 Columbia River Crossing.

Council Member Bill Ganley entered the meeting at 4:10 p.m.

Mr. Wagner said it depends on what exactly happens as they move forward. The Record of Decision is a federal decision that says that the project as designed is admitted through the NEPA process as the least amount of environmental harm and gave approval to move forward. Any major modification to that would require, basically a restart of the NEPA process, not necessarily the technical process. That could take quite a bit of time to where significant change would probably necessitate starting over with the design of the structure as well as the

environmental assessments. The critical point at this point is the funding. Mr. Wagner said both Oregon and Washington recently asked Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration to extend our period of time. If they cannot start construction within a period of time after starting the federal dollars to the program, they have to repay all federal dollars that were used. They gave them a couple years extension. Mr. Wagner said he was not sure if Oregon is the same as Washington's, but he said he believed it was 2019 that the extension runs through. After that time, there will need to be conversations with the federal government about repayment of the federal dollars.

Mr. Barnes encouraged the legislators to move forward with the CRC project so the money would not have to be repaid and our people would not have to suffer.

Jim Karlock of Portland distributed copies of his comments. He said light rail has no useful purpose that cannot be served by buses. He said buses are much safer and flexible. Mr. Karlock also spoke of data about C-TRAN.

Sharon Nasset of Portland spoke about the Record of Decision and federal money. She also spoke about the Columbia River Crossing project, and she said she hopes they put together a subcommittee to address the issues.

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

SHIRLEY CRADDICK MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MAY 5, 2015, MEETING AGENDA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY LARRY SMITH AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

### **IV. Approval of the April 7, 2015, Minutes**

LARRY SMITH MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 7, 2015, MEETING MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY JACK BURKMAN AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

### **V. Consent Agenda**

#### **A. May Claims**

David Madore had emailed Mr. Ransom this day requesting more information about Claim 81 for Ted Gathe Legal Services for \$1,300 and Claim 90 Matt Ransom Travel Reimbursement for \$981.48. Mr. Ransom had responded by email to the request. Councilor Madore had not read the email and asked to hear the information. He asked if Mr. Gathe provided any other service or just provided coverage for the Board meetings. Mr. Ransom said yes, Mr. Gathe participates in responding to queries that Mr. Ransom has for him that might relate to Board business, procedure, etc. The invoices that are submitted by Mr. Gathe are itemized by the work that was done by hourly increments. There is a high level of detail in the billing statement. Mr. Ransom provided that in the email. This is a one month billing, which RTC requests customers to submit an invoice on a 30 day cycle. Councilor Madore referred to Claim 90 and asked what the travel expense was for. Mr. Ransom said this last month he attended a national conference in Seattle. The American Planning Association has national conferences annually, and it was in Seattle this year. Often times, they are held at major cities across the United States. Mr.

Ransom attended the conference for three days with various sessions. He also attended a late afternoon training on volunteer service, leadership training for volunteers. Organizations like the RTC that pull together volunteer groups, how to motivate volunteers, etc. All of that documentation is included in the email. Councilor Madore asked if there were further costs for hotel and the conference. Mr. Ransom said that is inclusive in the claim; hotel, meals, travel, and parking costs. Mr. Ransom said when he or other members of the RTC travel, they operate on a reimbursement basis. Under current policy, they do not prepay for travel. This may be something to address in the future.

LARRY SMITH MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA MAY CLAIMS. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY DON WAGNER AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

**VI. RTC-Clark County Interlocal Agreement for Reimbursable Services – IT Services, Resolution 05-15-07**

Matt Ransom referred to the Resolution and Interlocal Agreement included in the meeting packet and also Supplemental Edits to the Interlocal Agreement that was distributed. Mr. Ransom said the edits will need to be ratified to the Agreement prior to approving for signature.

Mr. Ransom said this is a standard reimbursement agreement that they have with Clark County. They are proposing to renew the agreement, which is for IT services including internet connection, Help Desk services, host Web server, email server, etc. Mr. Ransom said they have determined over time that it is a cost effective way to procure that service. The agreement needs to be updated and that is what they are proposing. They have worked with the County IT Department and their legal staff to prepare the agreement for consideration.

Mr. Ransom referred to the Supplement Edits. He said after the RTC Board meeting materials were sent out, they received comments from Clark County, and those are noted in the Supplemental memo. It refers to Section 10, which is associated with termination clauses. The change is noted in Section 10. C. with the additions underlined and the stricken text removed. Staff recommendation is to incorporate these changes by motion into the primary agreement, and then move for ratification of the primary agreement.

Shirley Craddick asked the reason why the County asked for the edits. Mr. Ransom said with due respect, when it comes to legal counsel's review, terms and phrases are often written better than what staff does. He said this is a legal way to say that if we are doing something and we terminate the agreement, we need to pay for what we have already committed to do.

JACK BURKMAN MOVED TO MODIFY RESOLUTION 05-15-07 TO INCLUDE THE CHANGES SHOWN IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL EDITS. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SHIRLEY CRADDICK AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

JACK BURKMAN MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE REVISED RESOLUTION 05-15-07. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY LARRY SMITH AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

## **VII. Memorandum of Understanding Between Metro and Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council, Resolution 05-15-08**

Lynda David referred to the Resolution and Memorandum of Understanding included with the meeting materials. She said staff is requesting Board action to adopt an update to the Metro and RTC Memorandum of Understanding. She said this was presented to the Board for review at last month's meeting. The agreement was first required under the Federal Transportation Act ISTEA in 1991, and the requirements continued under the current Transportation Act MAP-21 as part of the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process codified in US Title 23 CFR § 450.

The agreement describes general transportation planning efforts of coordination between RTC and Metro; two Metropolitan Planning Organizations working in the bi-state Portland Metropolitan area. The MOU also meets the intent of a recent 2015-2016 Federal Planning Emphasis Area that promotes models of regional planning cooperation across MPOs and across state boundaries. The agreement between Metro and RTC has been in place since 1998 and is reviewed at least every three years, with the last review in 2012.

Action requested is for adoption of the MOU update between Metro and RTC to comply with federal requirements.

SHIRLEY CRADDICK MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 05-15-08. JACK BURKMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

David Madore said that Article II Section 3. of the agreement states that Metro and RTC are responsible for the joint development of the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan area travel forecasting tools and processes. It also says it will be maintained to conduct bi-state analysis. Councilor Madore also said that Section 4. talks about the responsibility including the travel forecasting process for the Portland Metro area and RTC is the lead agency for the travel forecasting process within Clark County. Councilor Madore asked with this two state area, who maintains the bi-state concurrency and the travel forecasts. Who has those responsibilities, RTC or Metro?

Matt Ransom said the core of the regional travel forecast model is largely managed by Metro. The reason for that is that they are experts in the region; they, for all intents and purposes, are experts nationally. They have the knowledge and have a much larger staff that manages it. RTC manages all the inputs that come from Clark County, and Metro manages the inputs for their three counties, which make up the core. The outputs are reviewed by both organizations and proof testing is done as a joint activity.

Councilor Madore asked if we actually gather the traffic counts that cross the two bridges. He asked if that was presented in a way that was informative for long term trends.

Mr. Ransom said every traffic count that would make sense to be used for regional traffic modeling is used. In specifics, the bridge volumes, which they will be presenting some of that data later today for the last year, is a database managed largely by ODOT; WSDOT has their

count data. Those counts and current counts across the regional network are used to calibrate the traffic model. The calibration is largely done by a team, and RTC as manager of our piece of the model are evaluating and making sure the outputs make sense for us.

Councilor Madore said that it is a joint effort of RTC and Metro. Mr. Ransom said that was correct.

Jeanne Stewart referred to Article I Section 1. and asked who the member from RTC was on the Metro TPAC Committee. Mr. Ransom said that Lynda David is the RTC representative on TPAC. Mr. Ransom said TPAC is the equivalent of RTC's RTAC committee, the technical advisory committee, which is staff run and staff managed, that evaluate the technical data.

Councilor Stewart said Section 3. refers to JPACT including three Washington State members from Clark County, the City of Vancouver, and WSDOT, which she is a member. Councilor Stewart referred to the Bi-State Coordination Committee section. She said it states issues of bi-state significance for transportation, land use, economic development, and environmental justice and presenting any recommended action to the appropriate agency considering an issue of bi-state significance. Councilor Stewart said they need to understand the importance of the bi-state coordination, and JPACT, and any transportation project development studies that are done. She said these become more and more significant when we look at major transportation projects. Councilor Stewart said the MOU is an important document, and it is important for them to understand how all the committees interact.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

#### **VIII. FY 2016 Unified Planning Work Program, Resolution 05-15-09**

Lynda David referred to the resolution along with the FY 2016 UPWP document included in the meeting packet. They are asking for adoption of the FY 2016 Unified Planning Work Program that was outlined at the April RTC Board meeting. The UPWP is a federally required document that describes transportation planning activities to be carried out in the region for the next fiscal year. Development of the UPWP is one of the four Metropolitan Planning elements mandated in federal law that are required for the receipt of federal and state transportation funds to the region. The fiscal year 2016 covers the year from July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016.

Ms. David displayed a slide that was also provided at the April Board meeting. This was a summary outline of the Unified Planning Work Program with its four major sections. Ms. David said the work elements in the UPWP reflect federal, state, and local emphasis areas and highlighted those items. The last page of the UPWP is a Summary Revenue/Expenditures Worksheet for each work element including Federal Highways and Federal Transit Administration planning funds granted to RTC to carry out the required Metropolitan Transportation Planning process. The UPWP outlines how these federal dollars will be used.

Mr. David said there have been no substantive changes to the document since it was reviewed by the Board in April. The action requested is to adopt RTC's FY 2016 UPWP. Adoption will allow RTC's Executive Director to sign any assurances or required documentation relating to the

FY 2016 UPWP, and adoption of the resolution will also continue the Metropolitan Planning Organization local funding agreement that helps provide the local match for federal funds.

Jeanne Stewart said no substantive changes have been made. She asked what would be considered a substantive change. Ms. David said no substantive changes have been made since it was presented in April. A substantive change could be if they include a completely new work element. She said the document is almost entirely the same as it was in April apart from a few corrected typos.

David Madore said he wanted to understand the scope of the document. He referred to the map included in the document on page ii and said it only includes Clark County. Councilor Madore asked if this was supposed to address bi-state concurrency and regional issues that include the Portland area.

Ms. David said this document applies to Clark County, but there are coordinating issues. Metro likewise develops a UPWP, and they do coordinate the two documents. Metro plans to adopt their UPWP in June. A link to that document was provided with the documents sent to the Board.

Councilor Madore said Metro has a plan and we have a plan so what is done in the middle? Ms. David said the UPWP is a program. A section that describes bi-state cooperation and coordination is listed on page ix. It describes bi-state coordination activities and parallels what is described in the MOU between RTC and Metro for the Bi-State Committee, JPACT, and the Metro Council.

Councilor Madore asked if was just referring to external documentation and external processes, or if improving connections between our two regions across the Columbia River was in the scope of the document.

Ms. David said as part of RTC's Regional Transportation Plan, they have to look at bridges across the Columbia River or connections to the south. There are sections where the Washington DOT will coordinate with the Oregon DOT, and that is addressed in the UPWP as well. RTC's UPWP is specifically for the Clark County region. The map referred to on page ii shows what our Metropolitan Planning Organization region encompasses, which is Clark County along with Washington, Multnomah, and Clackamas Counties, but our Metropolitan planning process required by the federal government requires us to look at bi-state coordination. Planning efforts are always in coordination with what is happening on the other side of the river from our state.

Councilor Madore said he looks at the bi-state coordination as resolving the congestion on the two bridges. He said on page xvi a Freight Mobility Study was adopted in 2010 with focus on freight-related infrastructure investments. He said he was not aware of this being done, and questioned being in compliance. Councilor Madore said he was not aware of any conversations that address freight transportation between our two states.

Ms. David said as part of our Regional Transportation Plan efforts, freight is addressed as part of that planning process. They are beginning another freight planning effort to look at freight movement and freight traffic counts within this region.

Councilor Madore asked if there was something planned or learned from that study five years ago.

Ms. David said it is addressed in the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan, and with the next Regional Transportation Plan update, it will be readdressed and updated information will be included.

Councilor Madore said he hoped we have the opportunity to address that. This document references our responsibility.

Matt Ransom said largely, this Work Program, as Lynda has stated, is focused on what we are doing. With that said, one of the purposes of the document is also to prompt consultation back and forth. An example of that would be that under the federal rules, we have to sit down with Metro and jointly review both UPWPs. We review theirs, and they review ours. Part of that consultation is to prompt questions of what projects are being done, which also prompts the question of working together on some projects. This would have both bring resources to the table and that would be reflected in both UPWPs showing a joint effort.

Mr. Ransom offered an example of that. He said discussions have taken place around this table, and late last year there was a recommendation for the I-205 Operational Study to evaluate the potential to do a bus on shoulder operation during peak periods to tease out additional capacity on the bridges that we have. Mr. Ransom said they have initiated that work. It is reflected here in the Work Program. That prompted a conversation at the Bi-State Coordination Committee. At the Bi-State Committee, they took this conversation forward and said that the RTC Board had advanced this as an idea. It was in our 2015 work program approved in December. The Bi-State Committee had the opportunity to engage, there was discussion, and ODOT thought they maybe should be a part of that. In summary, Mr. Ransom said there are components of work activity that really do have bi-state implication. This is how these activities move forward and are put in this Program.

Relative to the RTP, Mr. Ransom said probably the most significant freight improvement that continues to be a prominent project in the Regional Plan is the replacement of the I-5 Bridge. That itself is a major freight corridor, it comprises where the majority of freight is flowing, and where the two international ports are serving directly off of I-5. That would be an example of a project that not only was identified in the 2010 Freight Mobility Study as an important regional project, but it then continues to be represented in our RTP as well as Metro's RTP. There were other projects identified in the 2010 report that are less of the planning phase and now up to the agencies to implement the projects.

Lynda David offered other examples of bi-state cooperation or coordination in freight planning for example. She said they are working with Metro, because Metro is looking at updating their travel forecasting model. They are looking at how to improve the freight modeling and

forecasting piece of the model. Mark Harrington is meeting with Metro staff on Friday to look at ways to improve the model for freight forecasting. Another example is that the Port of Portland recently led an activity to look at the regional freight forecast. They are looking at the whole metropolitan area including Clark County's side of the river. RTC was a part of that coordinating process, and the results of that consultant's report are going to be made available on the Port of Portland's website. She said there is always freight forecasting and planning effort underway to look at bi-state.

Councilor Madore said forecasting has been for five years and all that has come out of it is the possibility of bus on shoulders in I-205. He said there has been no discussion of a third bridge or anything other than the I-5 replacement.

Matt Ransom said the adopted policy of the Board is the RTP, the Regional Transportation Plan. There are many projects that you can put in the freight category, but he would not go through each project that might be freight related. The project that is bi-state in nature is the I-5 Bridge replacement. That is the current Board policy.

Jack Burkman referred to page 31 of the UPWP under the Regional Transportation Program Coordination and Management including those activities on page 33. He said this deals with what Councilor Stewart had talked about. Council Member Burkman said the RTC had adopted Plans to address the issues on I-5 through the Columbia River Crossing Project. That did not come to fruition, so a new conversation needs to start. The Bi-State Coordinating Committee was then called back into action, because it is the body that sits in that coordinating position. They need to look at how they can stitch something together that addresses an issue of bi-state significance. That is what is documented in the UPWP; the coordinating with Metro's regional growth forecasting strategies, bi-state transportation strategies, and participating in any bi-state studies. Mr. Burkman said his belief is just as Councilor Stewart had stated; the Bi-State Committee is the place to have those conversations and an important role. Council Member Burkman said we don't have any plans to replace what had been on our books before. He said they have talked about that as a body before. Instead what we have are the beginnings of a process to talk about how we might address that. There has not been any conversation around a third bridge, fourth bridge, or fifth bridge, because so far all policies adopted by this Board have been related to I-5 and I-205.

SHIRLEY CRADDICK MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 05-15-09. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY LARRY SMITH AND APPROVED WITH ONE NO VOTE, MADORE.

#### **IX. Commute Trip Reduction Program, Resolution 05-15-10**

Lynda David said action is requested to adopt an update to the regional Commute Trip Reduction Program including an update to the regional CTR Plan and review of updated local CTR Plans. The attachments included with the Resolution include: The Commute Trip Reduction Board State CTR Plan 2015-2019; four local CTR plan updates; a CTR Goals and Targets Worksheet 2015-2019; and the Regional Commute Trip Reduction Plan Update. Updates of local and regional CTR plans have Goals and Targets worksheets that are on templates that are

provided by the state CTR Board. Ms. David said the CTR program and the updates were presented back at the February 2015 RTC Board meeting; Jan Bowers, the region's CTR Administrator, provided a presentation explaining the program.

Regarding the CTR Efficiency Act, the intent of the State law is to: reduce congestion on state highways, improve air quality, and reduce dependency on foreign oil. The Legislature passed the first CTR law in 1991. In 2006, the CTR Efficiency Act intended to make the program more efficient. The focus of the program is on the most congested urban growth areas.

In Clark County there are currently four CTR affected jurisdictions: Vancouver, Camas, Washougal, and Unincorporated Clark County (UGA), and each need to have a local Commute Trip Reduction Plan in place.

Washington's CTR Program is employer based. It is 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 6:00 and 9:00 a.m. year round.

In 2007, the RTC Board approved CTR Plans for each of these four jurisdictions as well as RTC's Regional CTR Plan and a plan for the downtown Vancouver Growth and Transportation Efficiency Center (GTEC). Updates to the local plans are now required to address updated local CTR goals.

In 2007, a Regional CTR Plan was also adopted that included goals for the Urban Growth areas, strategies for achieving the new trip reduction goals, a financial plan, and a description of the ways a program toward meeting the goals will be measured.

The CTR Board for the state issued a new plan to cover the years 2015 to 2019. Its focus is again on making more program efficiencies allowing more flexibility for locals and regions in decisions about Commute Trip Reduction targets and goals. Also, connections between statewide transportation policy goals and the local Comprehensive Plan and Regional Transportation Planning processes were reemphasized.

Transportation demand management is an element that must be addressed in the Regional Transportation Plan and the transportation element of the local comprehensive plans, and the CTR Program is a component of this.

At the local level, 60 worksites are affected by the CTR law. The state provides a biennial survey tool to ask employees at the affected worksites how they get to work and what transportation they choose to get to and from their work place. In the most recent survey of the CTR program participants in the region, the affected worksites in Clark County returned 9,985 surveys documenting the CTR participants, of these 15 % were non-drive alone trips.

The local and regional CTR Plan updates are now complete and were included with the Resolution in the meeting packet. The updated local CTR Plans take advantage of the new state provision allowing for more flexibility to determine locally defined performance goals and targets. This allows locals to have a more flexible plan and design a CTR program and set

targets that are realistic based on the transportation demand management infrastructure in place in this area, congestion levels, as well as any challenges faced by this region.

Overall, in the 2015 to 2019 timeframe, local jurisdictions in Clark County have opted to work to try to decrease the drive alone rate by increasing carpool and bicycle mode shares while continuing general CTR efforts to promote transportation options. Ms. David said at the February meeting, they provided more detail on the CTR program within this region.

Ongoing tools to help CTR affected employers and employee participants include a website ClarkCommute.org. It outlines the Commute Trip options including carpool, Emergency Ride Home (ERH) program available, network meetings/trainings for Employee Transportation Coordinators, and promotional activities.

The action requested is to adopt Resolution 05-15-10. The action will adopt the Regional CTR Program update including the Regional CTR Plan and review of local CTR Plans. With adoption, the adopted plans will be forwarded and submitted to the CTR Board for their approval. With CTR Board approval at their June meeting, will allow state funds to continue to come to this region and continue the work of the region's CTR Program Administrator.

Jeanne Stewart asked if this was mandated or if employers volunteer for the program. She asked regarding the goals, how much was voluntary participation and if any part of it was mandated.

Jan Bowers said employers are all participating because they are mandated by law. If a work site in the region, as Lynda has said, has 100 or more people arriving at work between 6 and 9 a.m., 35 hours a week, 12 months of the year, by law they have to participate in the CTR Program. That means they must promote alternative transportation. They must have an employer liaison, called the Employee Transportation Coordinator, and they must have at least one CTR element in place, such as carpool parking, bike parking, and others.

SHIRLEY CRADDICK MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 05-15-10. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY LARRY SMITH AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

#### **X. Transportation Programming Guidebook, Resolution 05-15-11**

Dale Robins referred to the Resolution along with the Guidebook that was included in the meeting packet. The Transportation Programming Guidebook is a new document developed by RTC staff in conjunction with member agencies. The Guidebook is a result of RTC staff looking for ways to improve our customer service to member agencies. The Guidebook brings the overall TIP process, policies, and procedures into one document. Once adopted by the RTC Board, the Guidebook will be placed on RTC's TIP website for use by local member agencies. A new or seasoned staff member can then use this resource document to clarify the process or answer a programming question.

The Guidebook was developed based on the existing RTC Board adopted policies and procedures. The document does add clarifying language to help describe the process, and RTAC has recommended four new policies for RTC Board consideration. These new policies include:

Policy 1.4 would require CMP toolbox checklist be completed for projects that add capacity. This will ensure that the region remains in compliance with federal requirements. Policy 3.2 would increase recognition of grant awards by the RTC Board. Policy 4.5 would allow savings in early phase of a project to be utilized in later phases. For example, if an agency saved \$5,000 during design, these funds could be used in the right of way or construction phase. No additional resources are added to a project but provide for flexibility if cost savings accomplished. Policy 5.7 deals with project delays and how these delays will be dealt with based on if the delay could result in the region losing federal funds.

RTAC has recommended adoption of the Transportation Programming Guidebook by the RTC Board with approval of Resolution 05-15-11.

David Madore said on page 1 it refers to developing regional solutions for long term transportation needs. The RTP establishes the long term vision and goals for the region and identifies projects and strategies that will be needed to meet that vision. Councilor Madore said he understood that last time that they developed a long-term vision and goals was in 2008 with the Transportation Corridor Visioning Study. He submitted that we don't have a vision; no plan to fulfill that vision or a strategy to get there. He said he didn't think we were fulfilling our responsibility to do so. Councilor Madore also said on page 3 it states that WSDOT is responsible for selection of projects for allocated state and federal highway funds. It also says that we have a responsibility to reduce congestion, and since the need for transportation improvements exceed the available revenue, a competitive project selection process is conducted for the distribution of RTC's regional federal funds. Councilor Madore said that the biggest project in this area, the Mill Plain / I-5 project does not line up. He said it is not a competitive process, and incompatible, obsolete, and left over from the CRC. He said if these policies and procedures allow for that, we should not adopt it.

Representative Pike asked about the Guidebook being new and not having been undertaken by RTC in the past. Mr. Robins said it is not new. Previously, agency staff had to refer to a resolution in 2013 and another in 2012, and others. There are a number of policies that have been adopted by the Board over the years, and agencies would have to go to the correct document to get the information. This Guidebook just collects all that information and brings it together in one document.

Representative Pike referred to the TIP development process diagram on page 2. She wanted to ensure that the document would not preclude the State Legislatures of Oregon and Washington from developing an improved corridor project, and allow this body to have authority over the two State Legislatures in moving a project forward. She wanted to make sure that the document did not override the authority of the Legislature and the Transportation Committees in both Chambers and for both states.

Dale Robins said the TIP process illustration referenced is addressing just that. If the State or Federal Legislature selects a project, it has to go through our filter to make sure it is consistent with our Regional Transportation Plan, but other than that, we do not have authority over

selecting money that the Legislature has authority over. Representative Pike said she thought the mission of the RTC was to just rate and rank transportation projects.

Dale Robins said there are two parts. All projects that are being programmed, no matter who the selecting source is, have to be listed in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The money that is specifically allocated to RTC, they have the authority to go through the TIP process and to then select.

Representative Pike added that if the Oregon and Washington Legislatures along with the Federal Government decide to plan to do something in the I-5 corridor, she hoped the RTC Board would not undermine that effort. She said she would like to see more shown to underscore that. Representative Pike also said if this is the first time the Board has seen this document, she felt it best to come back for action.

Mr. Robins noted that on page 3 under Other Selected Projects, it states this could include the use of local funds, legislative selected projects, and statewide or nationwide competitive grant programs. This explains that there are others who have the authority to select projects. They just have to be programmed in the TIP. RTC does not have authority over the Legislature. A project would have to be listed in the long range plan RTP (Regional Transportation Plan) before it can be listed or programmed in the TIP (Transportation Improvement Program).

Matt Ransom told the Board that the authorities are described in Title 23 of the US code which lays out who is responsible for approving the TIP and how it is done, etc. RTC cannot write anything that would change that. The document is consistent with that in terms of who has less of authority. What Dale is saying is that regardless of who selects the project, it has to come to the RTC table to be programmed in the TIP. Programming in the TIP is not anything that they can change. There is no way to come outside this table to program it in the TIP. That is where the authority of this Organization is vested and laid out in federal statute. The same is true for state statute in terms of this Board's responsibility. For example, if the Legislature would want to identify a project, they would come to this Board and there would be a consistency check review. Is it consistent with the long range plan? Is it consistent with the expectations vision, etc. of this region? The Board could consider amending the Plan to make it consistent, or the Board could say it is inconsistent so therefore continue to work to evaluate the merits of the project. RTC cannot do anything in terms of programming funds that would deviate from what is already a vested authority in State and Federal statute.

Don Wagner said if a project is not in the TIP, which is the responsibility of the RTC Board, it cannot spend State or Federal money on the project. If the RTC Board were to say they do not like a project that comes forward as a Board and they are not going to put it in the TIP, then they would not be able spend any State or Federal dollars on that project. That is established law as Matt stated. The process must go through the TIP before it can go into the STIP (State Transportation Improvement Program) before getting state and federal dollars.

Representative Pike asked if new capacity in the I-5 corridor was listed in the TIP. Matt Ransom said they have identified a project and the Board has approved an RTP that says replacement of

the I-5 Bridge and its associated improvements yet to be fully defined, is a priority project over the next 20 years; it is in the long range plan.

Jack Burkman said his understanding is that what is before them is not policy action. It is a resource tool for staff and a tool for members to describe the processes that we already have. This is a working tool, and all the policies override this. The four new policies are basically operational and not what the Board decides. Council Member Burkman said in regards of the first part that Councilor Madore referenced in terms of the RTP, his understanding is that we do have an RTP. It was created earlier, and the Board reviewed, revised, and unanimously adopted the update in December 2014. That is the framework; and from there, we agreed upon the list of projects for the short term. We do have an approved Regional Transportation long range Plan.

Jeanne Stewart asked who the Guidebook is to guide. Dale Robins said it is for technical staff from RTC's local agencies so it can help them prepare their projects that they want to go forward for regional funding. It also helps other agencies such as C-TRAN or WSDOT who might have projects that they move through our program so they can use the state and federal dollars. Councilor Stewart said since it was to be used by staff and a process that currently used, she did not see why RTC Board would need to take action on it.

Matt Ransom said their recommendation for action is based on the assembling process, pulling all the pieces together in one document. He said having the Board adopt it as a Programming Guidebook reinforces the rules of engagement and how the projects are developed.

Councilor Stewart said if action is expected and since it is a draft, she wants to be able to re-read it to further understand. She would like to move action to the next meeting.

JEANNE STEWART MOTIONED TO HOLD ACTION ON THE GUIDEBOOK UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING IN JULY. JACK BURKMAN SECONDED THE MOTION, AND THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

## **XI. YR 2019 Transportation Improvement Program Call for Projects**

Dale Robins referred to the memo included in the meeting packet. He said this item is intended to notify the RTC Board of a call for the Urban STP and CMAQ projects using estimated 2019 funding levels. The call will be for \$4.5 million of Urban STP funds and \$2.9 million in CMAQ funds. The process will be handled as outlined in the Transportation Programming Guidebook and also in accordance with the policies that have already been adopted by the Board. The call will go out this month with applications due in July. RTC staff will return to the Board in September and October for project selection and programming of those funds.

Councilor Madore asked the basis of the \$4.5 million and \$2.9 million, and also asked why the memo stated STP projects every other year and not this year, yet it is listed.

Mr. Robins said that is referring to the STP rural funds that occur every other year. The STP program has urban and rural funds. The rural projects will not happen this year. The call is for urban STP projects. The estimation of the funds available is based on the current allocation.

Congress does not have a Transportation Act that goes out to 2019. We are assuming that the programming will remain the same. If this year or next year they adopt a new Transportation Act and more money is available, when they make a call for projects next year for 2020, they will add in that extra money. If less money is available, they will have to lower the call for 2020. Mr. Robins said they are moving forward as long as they have authority with these assumptions. They are planning ahead, which gives people an opportunity to anticipate funding so they can implement projects in a timely fashion. Councilor Madore said this is estimating based on past experience as a best guess. Mr. Robins said yes.

## **XII. Congestion Management Process – 2014 Initial Data**

Dale Robins referred to the memorandum included in the meeting packet. The purpose of the presentation is to provide an overview of the initial data from the 2014 Congestion Management Process. The Congestion Management Process is also referred to as the CMP. It is a federal planning requirement for all MPOs with a population over 200,000. There is a six-step federal process which the region must follow. The CMP process assesses the regional transportation system's operating conditions to identify needs and projects to manage congestion.

Mr. Robins said there are three overall findings from the initial analysis of the CMP data. 1) The delay on the I-5 and I-205 bridges has significantly increased. 2) Despite the growth in overall volume, arterials continue to maintain similar travel flows. 3) In summary, the region needs to continue to focus on enhanced traffic operations, add select capacity improvements, and address strong demand for bi-state travel.

In the four county metropolitan area (Clark, Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington), the region added 100,000 new jobs over the four year period from 2010 to 2014, and Clark County added 17,400 new residents over the same time period. This increase in employment and population has resulted in additional trips during the peak commute periods.

The data shows that both I-5 and I-205 return to pre-recession congestion numbers in 2013 and continue to grow in 2014. The growth in travel during 2014 seemed to push delay on the two bridges to significantly higher levels. Mr. Robins displayed a chart that showed that delay during the morning peak hour increased 57% on I-5, 26% on I-205, and 37% on SR-14 approaching I-205. On I-5 from Main Street to Jantzen Beach, it takes an extra 6 minutes and 18 seconds for the average person traveling. It went from 11 minutes to almost 18 minutes to make that morning commute.

Another chart provided showed peak spreading across the two bridges. Peak spreading leads to flattening and longer peak periods as trips shift to periods immediately before and after the peak demand due to congestion impacts. It is like you try to get too much traffic through at one time, and it actually gets worse. You get fewer cars through, and the cars shift to earlier and later peak period. Between the seven hour period of 2 to 8 p.m. more vehicles cross the two bridges over the last decade (in 2014 as compared to 2005); However, during the three hour peak period of 4 to 7 p.m. there are 2,000 fewer vehicles getting across the two bridges.

Other findings include volume to capacity ratios. The volume to capacity ratio provides an indication of how well the transportation facility carries the existing traffic volumes. All of these five corridors experience congestion as demand is near or above capacity: I-5 South (AM); 18<sup>th</sup> Street; I-205 South (AM); SR-14 Mid (AM); and Fourth Plain.

Another factor is speed. Speed that is significantly lower than the posted speed limit is another measure of delay and congestion. A lower travel speed will limit a facility's ability to carry planned traffic as fewer vehicles can get through during peak congestion. These eight corridors are all experiencing speeds below 60% of the posted speed limit: I-5 South (AM); SR-14 Mid (AM); Main Street (AM); Fourth Plain; 164<sup>th</sup> Avenue; Mill Plain East; SR-500 West; and Highway 99. Mr. Robins said this does not necessarily mean that they have congestion, but it is a level where they start to look and see if there is congestion. As listed in the report and memo, the first three listed in the AM peak are significantly slower than the posted travel speed.

Mr. Robins said the next steps that they will complete between now and the July meeting include: completing the analysis of the data, coordinating the results and action strategies with RTAC, and finalizing the report to present at the July RTC Board meeting.

David Madore said he wanted to draw a contrast between two components here. He said he thought we were doing one in a way and not doing the other. He said this seems to be focusing on passive observation. This is called a congestion management process, which is intended to inform a planning requirement. He said he would like us to focus on a solution, because according to this, things are getting worse and we're not necessarily doing anything about it. He would like to get ahead of this, and take some significant steps to make it better. Councilor Madore said this is one observation. The other is if there ever was an opportunity for us to present intelligent, useful information where the data can speak for itself, this is that time. He said a trend graph of what has happened every year over the last 20 years; traffic counts on the I-205 and I-5 so the data would speak for itself. This provides data from 2013 and 2014 showing it gets worse. He would like to see a bigger picture and provide solutions with a plan. He doesn't want to restrict the traffic in order to manage congestion, but identify where they can increase capacity in order to enable the free flow of traffic.

Chair Smith noted that this is presenting the initial data. The next steps are to complete the analysis of the data, coordinate the results and action strategies with RTAC members, and finalize the report to return to the Board in July. This is an initial look at the data.

Councilor Craddick noted to Councilor Madore that we do have a plan and solutions, and that is the Columbia River Crossing. The data is referring to the I-5 corridor, and there is a plan to replace the bridge across the Columbia River. That is the plan.

Jeanne Stewart said she is interested in the next steps and completing the analysis of the data and asked who would be doing that analysis. Mr. Robins said RTC staff will do the analysis and coordinate the results with RTAC, the technical staff of local agencies. They will be a part of the discussion and provide input of the analysis. Councilor Stewart said she would be interested in the recommendations for action strategies. She asked who else might be able to have input

and ideas for action strategies besides technical staff. She said she would like an opportunity for Members to get data and information for discussion with RTC Board. Her concern is that our technical people will coordinate the results and action strategies.

Mr. Robins said action strategies does not mean coming up with a project or solution. It is about how to address these in the long term, so they might say yes we need to address the bi-state bridge crossing and start the process. It is not saying this is the solution.

Councilor Stewart said she would like the Board to see the data. She said professional staff input is crucial to her, but she would like to look at the data and not simply be provided with what staff thinks the strategies are. Councilor Stewart said she would be interested to hear what they say, but she would like another perspective of input as well; have the data come to the Board where they can look at it and have ideas as well.

Council Member Burkman said he was not seeing new information. There was a period of time during the recession when things quieted down, but now the information coming out is that now it looks just like it did when we talked about it a few years ago. That resulted in the RTP, as just mentioned earlier, with the plans long-term of the areas that we need to address, and also the projects that are in the TIP that the RTC Board adopted. This included a lot of projects to address the issues, and we looked to the Legislature for help for money. None of that is new. The I-5 corridor is clogged and slowing down, which was predicted for many years. I-205 is not far behind it.

Larry Smith said he agreed with that. This is not a surprise. He asked if the consistency of these numbers over the years has been done the same way; nothing has changed. Mr. Robins said that was correct. Council Member Smith said he remembers 10 or 15 years ago looking at the demographics of this area and said this should not come as a surprise. As the area grows and you don't have increased capacity on your system, you are going to get this kind of congestion. He said he expects this area to grow even more. Council Member Smith said Councilor Craddick was right. There was a solution; it was called the CRC. That was the solution worked on for over 15 years. Council Member Smith said he remembers the initial project looking at the same numbers. Looking again, if we don't fix this, this is what is going to happen. We are back to where we are again.

Jeff Hamm said to Councilor Stewart's point, perhaps at the July meeting instead of having a final report come to the Board, have an interim report with staff having put together ideas, perhaps a short workshop to explore those ideas and contribute additional ones.

Councilor Stewart said that was what she was trying to get at. She said to Jack Burkman's point, it's not getting better; it's getting worse. It is to be expected. As the economy builds, it will become exponentially worse.

### **XIII. State Legislative Update**

Matt Ransom said he did not prepare a memorandum for the State Legislative Update saying there is not a lot to pass on. He said the Legislature has reconvened in Special Session. The

Governor called them back to try to work on operating budget issues. On the transportation side, they do know that the House has passed out a recommendation for a transportation operating budget. The Senate has not taken that up yet. The House and Senate are both working on separate and different new revenue proposals. Mr. Ransom asked the State Representatives if they had anything to add.

Representative Pike said from her perspective, the \$15 billion 11.7 cent gas tax proposal is not a done deal. She said both versions that came out of their Transportation Committee are significantly different than the one that the Senate proposed in their Transportation Committee. She said if you are banking on dollars for that, don't be so quick to think that will pass. Representative Pike said the bigger issue that has to happen before they adjourn is a two-year operating budget. The Senate majority, which is controlled by the Republicans, are proposing a \$38 billion no new tax budget. The House majority party of Democrats has proposed a \$39 billion two-year operating budget that includes about \$1.5 billion in new taxes including a capital gains tax and a large number of business taxes. Representative Pike said they are at an impasse, which has resulted in this Special Session. How that relates to the transportation gas tax is that it is going to be very difficult philosophically for the Senate controlled by Republicans to give on an operating budget and increase taxes when they have already put out a \$15 billion gas tax. The Senate Republicans are not going to be able to do both and get away with it. Something is going to compromise. If the Republicans in the Senate compromise on an operating budget and accept some new taxes, she said she doubted they would want to roll out the biggest gas tax in Washington State history.

#### **XIV. Other Business**

##### From the Board

Chair Smith said that Mr. Ransom has worked on the Board's request for a Subcommittee for reviewing dues. Given the limited time, full discussion was not possible, but she said she needed input from a couple jurisdictions. There will be five members on the Subcommittee: 1 Clark County (MPO), 1 City of Vancouver (MPO large city), 1 City of Camas (MPO small city) Melissa Smith, 1 C-TRAN (Special District), and 1 Skamania County (RTPO County). Chair Smith asked Clark County and the City of Vancouver to email her with their choice of representative and alternate. More discussion will take place at the July meeting.

Jeanne Stewart said there will be five members on the committee and Clark County is the highest contributor. She said it was time to do this review.

Don Wagner thanked everyone for working with him over the last 17 years on the RTC Board. He said in 2003 with the first passage of the Nickle Package and in 2005 the 9.5 cent Package that the Legislature passed, in SW Washington they did 49 projects. All are almost complete. Two are under construction currently here in Clark County. The total is \$840 million worth of transportation improvements to our area. Mr. Wagner said they were great partnerships. There were partnerships with the Legislature to get us the money. Partnerships with individual cities and counties to get projects forward that they could all stand behind and ask our

Legislators to fund. He said we can do it. It was an era that was a pleasure to work in; because as an implementer, he said he had lots of projects to build and the cities and counties and their public works directors had a lot of projects to move forward. Mr. Wagner said we can do it. He said he thought we could do better in the future if we partner together to come up with some things that can be brought to the Legislature to say this is what our communities really want and unify the effort. Mr. Wagner again thanked everyone.

Representative Pike said she appreciated the Nickel Package from 2003 and the 9.5 cent package in 2005, but something that Washington residents need to recognize is that we are still paying off those bonds and will be for the next 25 years depending on bond rates. She said 70 cents of every dollar collected in gas tax in Washington goes to bond debt. She said we have all this new capacity from these projects, and now there is much more maintenance and preservation costs associated with those new projects. Representative Pike said they are in a real bind at WSDOT. They have declining revenue sources because of gas tax, with electric vehicles and more fuel efficient vehicles. They need to figure out a better way to deal with maintaining our state highways.

#### From the Director

Matt Ransom referred to the handout highlighting a Regional Project Showcase for the City of Stevenson, the Trail of the Gods project. The project received \$66,400 in TAP funds from RTC. This trail is near the entrance to Skamania Lodge and heads west toward a low volume roadway that serves also as a trail pathway; this is a connector. Mr. Ransom said as the picture on the handout indicates, there was some very difficult engineering issues in trying to pull the trail safely up off the roadway to give pedestrians, cyclists, and such safe egress through the intersection with SR-14 and onward. It is another link in Stevenson's overall trail network. Mr. Ransom encouraged people to go to Stevenson to check out the great job they have done with their trails in the area. Many of these projects have been funded through the RTC competitive grant application process. Congratulations go out to Stevenson. Mr. Ransom said the Trail of the Gods Project Showcase will be posted to RTC's website. He noted that the website is being updated to allow these showcase projects to be a bit more prominent.

Mr. Ransom said there was one Administrative Update to report. He said Board Members had received an e-mail from him late last month indicating that RTC's State Audit was complete. This is RTC's annual financial audit. The report from the State Auditor's Office was very clean, no findings, no recommendations, etc. Mr. Ransom said he wanted to publically thank the staff behind this: RTC's accountant Patty who is only part-time yet manages and keeps the books as tight as they can be, as well as Diane and Shann who are part of the finance checks and balances team. Mr. Ransom said as everyone who has been audited knows, the checks and balances and the controls and to be this clean 20 plus years in a row is really recognition to the staff. Chair Smith also thanked staff.

Mr. Ransom said they have accomplished all the necessary business they have over the next month, so the next meeting will be held on July 7. He has notes of what has been requested and will provide that in July.

The agenda noted C-TRAN Board of Directors meets on Tuesday, May 12, 2015, at 5:30 p.m. at the Vancouver Library, and JPACT meets Thursday, May 14, 2015, at Metro at 7:30 a.m.

The June RTC Board meeting has been cancelled. The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, July 7, 2015, at 4 p.m.

LARRY SMITH MOVED FOR ADJOURNMENT. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

---

Melissa Smith, Board of Directors Chair