

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Board of Directors
November 6, 2012, 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 Marc Boldt on Tuesday, November 6, 2012, at 4 p.m. at the Clark County Public Service Center Sixth Floor Training Room, 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington. Attendance follows.

Board Members Present:

Nancy Baker, Port of Vancouver Commissioner
Marc Boldt, Clark County Commissioner
Rex Burkholder, Metro Councilor
Jack Burkman, Vancouver Council Member
Bill Ganley, Battle Ground Council Member
Jeff Hamm, C-TRAN Executive Director
Tom Mielke, Clark County Commissioner
Melissa Smith, Camas Council Member
Jeanne Stewart, Vancouver Council Member
Steve Stuart, Clark County Commissioner
Don Wagner, WSDOT Regional Administrator

Board Members Absent:

Paul Pearce, Skamania County Commissioner
David Poucher, White Salmon Mayor
Jason Tell, ODOT Region One Manager
Jim Honeyford, Senator 15th District
Bruce Chandler, Representative 15th District
David Taylor, Representative 15th District
Don Benton, Senator 17th District
Tim Probst, Representative 17th District
Paul Harris, Representative 17th District
Ann Rivers, Senator 18th District
Ed Orcutt, Representative 18th District
Liz Pike, Representative 18th District
Craig Pridemore, Senator 49th District
Jim Moeller, Representative 49th District
Sharon Wylie, Representative 49th District

Guests Present:

Todd Bachmann, Citizen
Ed Barnes, Labor Council
Katy Brooks, Port of Vancouver
Pete Capell, Clark County
Jim Karlock, Citizen
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver Neighborhood Assoc.
Sharon Nasset, Citizen
Jerry Oliver, Port of Vancouver Commissioner
Ron Onslow, Ridgefield Mayor
Philip Parker, WA Transportation Commissioner
Matt Ransom, City of Vancouver
Scott Sawyer, City of Battle Ground
Larry J. Smith, Vancouver Council Member
Andrew Young, MacKay Sposito

Staff Present:

Lynda David, Senior Transportation Planner
Mark Harrington, Senior Transportation Planner
Bob Hart, Transportation Section Supervisor
Dean Lookingbill, Transportation Director
Dale Robins, Senior Transportation Planner
Diane Workman, Administrative Assistant

II. Approval of October 2, 2012, Meeting Minutes

STEVE STUART MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 2, 2012, MEETING MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY JACK BURKMAN AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

III. Citizen Communications

Todd Bachmann is from the Vancouver Arnada Park neighborhood. He said he would like to see increased bike safety on NW Lower River Road. He said he likes to take his children to Frenchman's Bar or Vancouver Lake and tried once to bicycle to the lake with his children but will not do it again. The speed of the trucks and vehicles is very fast, and the bike path is the shoulder of the road and does not feel safe. Mr. Bachmann said the park area is a good resource, and he and some friends are looking into any movement for bike safety on that road. The Port of

Vancouver plans to build a bike path from their administrative offices to Gateway Avenue. He said this is great, but it leaves the remaining stretch on NW Lower River Road from Gateway Avenue to the parks the same. Mr. Bachmann said he contacted Clark County and was directed to address the RTC. He would like to further approach the issue of bicycle safety on NW Lower River Road. Chair Boldt said that Dean Lookingbill would contact Mr. Bachmann for further discussion with RTC Staff.

Sharon Nasset of Portland said she wants it to be acknowledged that light rail is not a requirement for federal funding for a new bridge. It was chosen as a locally preferred alternative for the CRC project which includes RTC and C-TRAN. Ms. Nasset said she would like a letter stating this.

Ed Barnes of Vancouver said nothing is required, but sometimes in life you have to do different things. He said if we didn't we would still be using the Pony Express, stage coaches, wagons, and ferries to cross the river to get to jobs. He said this region chose light rail as an alternative for the bridge along with bike and pedestrian paths. Mr. Barnes said the bridges we now have are over full and one accident on either the I-5 or the I-205 makes for major delays to cross the river. He said it is time to get it built.

IV. Consent Agenda

A. November Claims

B. Vancouver and RTC Interlocal Service Agreement, Resolution 11-12-17

Steve Stuart asked for a brief outline of the Interlocal Service Agreement with Vancouver and RTC. Mr. Lookingbill said the agreement is to be used should RTC and the City of Vancouver want to enter into an arrangement for services, this provides that mechanism. It does not set forward any budget amounts. That would be set forth along with the scope of work. An example could be RTC providing modeling expertise for the City of Vancouver.

Jeanne Stewart asked if this meant the sharing of staff. She said she missed the City Council meeting when this was discussed. Mr. Lookingbill said there are staff relations that happen on an informal basis. This would be for a particular project with a specific request. Ms. Stewart asked if there were employees sharing work where there would be grant money going from one agency to the other. Mr. Lookingbill said no, that typically if the City would contract with RTC the source of revenue would be the general fund. If RTC would contract with the City, it would come from local funds not specific to a grant.

JACK BURKMAN MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA NOVEMBER CLAIMS AND RESOLUTION 11-12-17. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY NANCY BAKER AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

V. I-205 Corridor Study Recommendations, Resolution 11-12-18

Bob Hart said this resolution is to seek RTC Board adoption of the I-205 Corridor Study recommendations. The study recommendations have two primary elements: the core projects for mainline improvements on I-205 and an Access and Operations Study. He pointed out that the study focused on identifying a set of critical capacity improvement projects to address both the high level of growth and limited future transportation revenue. He also noted that while the set

of core capital projects can address the I-205 mainline mobility needs, further operational, transit, and transportation demand management strategies will be needed.

Mr. Hart said the I-205 corridor serves as the backbone for regional and bi-state travel in east Clark County for both internal trips and for bi-state trips. The I-205 Corridor Study process began with the list of highway and transit service improvements contained in the adopted Metropolitan Transportation Plan. This list of MTP projects had been developed through a series of corridor planning studies dating back to the late 1990's. Mr. Hart provided a slide with the household and employment growth. The population and employment growth assumptions underlying the study are contained in the adopted Clark County GMA land use plan. Given the GMA plan, the level of growth anticipated in 2035 for the I-205 subarea is significant. The subarea served by I-205 is forecast to have 87,700 households along with 88,800 jobs. This 2035 forecast would be an increase of 32% and 66% over 2010. Not surprisingly, the growth in travel on the corridor tracks closely to the growth level. From 2010 to 2035, PM peak vehicle volumes on I-205 were forecast to double between SR-500 and Padden Parkway, while the traffic volumes between SR-14 and Mill Plain volumes would increase 50%.

Mr. Hart displayed maps with the projects that are funded in the I-205 corridor that are currently programmed including the completion of the Salmon Creek Interchange project and the 18th Street Interchange and frontage roads. He also showed the full set of MTP projects that are planned in the I-205 corridor, which was the starting point for their narrowing the list down to a smaller set of recommended projects for the corridor.

The study recommendations identify the most critical set of projects for funding that ensure a reasonable long-term level of operation of the corridor. The recommended core set of projects for I-205 include the following projects: I-205 Widening (SR-500 to Padden), SR-14 Widening (I-205 to 164th), new SR-500 off-ramp/auxiliary lane from Mill Plain to SR-500, Padden Interchange improvements with 72nd Avenue slip ramp, and I-205 Park and Ride at 18th Street. The I-205 TAC agreed that the recommended projects need a more detailed analysis to fully understand operational issues associated with the projects and examine feasibility and constructability concerns. The further exploration of these issues will occur during the access and operational study.

Mr. Hart referred to a diagram included with the meeting packet that shows the process they are proposing for the study. The purpose of the Access and Operations Study is to examine a wide range of strategies for the I-205 corridor that do not add mainline roadway capacity. It will investigate approaches to improve the performance and efficiency of the I-205 corridor more cost effectively.

Mr. Hart said action on Resolution 11-12-18 would include adoption of core capacity improvements for the I-205 corridor and approval of the Access and Operations Study.

Jeff Hamm said the I-205 Park and Ride at 18th Street is listed as one of the core set of projects, but is not on the map and the cost is not listed. He asked if it was one of the core projects. Mr. Hart said it is one of the core projects, but he did not have a cost for it, and the map only showed the highway projects. Mr. Lookingbill confirmed it was listed in the resolution as one of the core set of projects. They did not have an exact location to put it on the map.

Jeff Hamm referred to the diagram of the Access and Operations Study. He questioned how the short term operations relate to the final decision of the core projects. He asked if some of the shorter term improvements might influence the core project list. Mr. Hart said the core projects are long-term improvements for 2035 forecast. The short term analysis focuses on what can be done quickly to improve the performance in the corridor, short of doing something big. This could be TDM, transit, or bus on shoulder operations. Mr. Lookingbill said they are not certain, but this analysis shows that the set of core projects are needed to handle future growth in mainline traffic. Ultimately, as they go through it to the long term, there could be an impact and a different decision to be made at that point. Mr. Hamm said some of the short term projects are not cheap. He said the RTC Board will need to look at trade-offs, whether it wants to wait to put the money in long-term core capacity projects, or spend money in some of the short-term projects. Mr. Lookingbill said when the information comes forward, that will be brought forward.

Steve Stuart referred to the Padden core project with 72nd and asked if they would be doing an analysis of how that affects the Padden and Andresen intersection. Mr. Hart said the intent is to not just analyze the mainline, but also adjacent arterial impacts.

Steve Stuart referred to the I-205/I-5 split at 134th and said in the short-term operations, the flyover ramp from 134th to I-205 south is being analyzed. It serves the east side and WSU Vancouver. Commissioner Stuart said WSU Vancouver fills out its master plan, so they will need that capacity. Mr. Hart said they would include that in their discussion.

Jeanne Stewart said in reading the resolution, she felt there wasn't much said about transit and how it would fit in. She said in tying in with what Jeff Hamm said about the 18th Street park and ride, clearly they are discussing this. That is intended to be something for a transit connector. Ms. Stewart asked if the types of transit modes are going to be incorporated into this and what their locations are. Also, she asked if that is to come, at what point would they be looking at that. Mr. Hart said their next steps with approval would be to scope it out in more detail. They plan to spend more time confirming the transit strategies and the types of things they want to look at for transit. It is something they plan to include as an alternate analysis. They will plan to look at transit under the short term operations analysis. Ms. Stewart asked when they would start looking at that information. Mr. Hart said their next effort would be to scope the work out and identify the tasks and budgets. The scope of work would then come back to the RTC Board for approval. Mr. Lookingbill said they will begin the analysis by looking at what is listed in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. The MTP identifies the I-205 as a high capacity transit corridor. At this point, it does not necessarily need a BRT type of vehicle, but they do need to provide treatment for the transit to get on and off the freeway quickly as it mentions the park and ride. Mr. Lookingbill said the I-205 Access and Operational Study will be one of the major study efforts in the 2013 work program. Ms. Stewart said it is early on, but she asked how they will know if there is any part where tolling on I-205 is going to have to be a part of a finance plan. Mr. Lookingbill said he did not have an answer for that. They were not entertaining a tolling direction in this study. If tolling for whatever reason was to surface, it would happen out of some issue outside this study process. That is not wired in as a traffic management strategy.

STEVE STUART MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE I-205 CORRIDOR STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS, RESOLUTION 11-12-18. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY TOM MIELKE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VI. Ten-Year Transportation Project Priorities and Clark County Transportation Alliance Statement, Resolution 11-12-19

Lynda David referred to the 10-Year Transportation Project Priorities Report, the resolution, and the attached Transportation Alliance statement. She said they are reaching the conclusion of the 10-year prioritization process and seeking Board action to adopt the ten-year transportation project priorities. The resolution also requests action on the Clark County Transportation Alliance statement.

The 10-Year Transportation Project Priorities Report documents the work completed this year on the 10-year transportation priority projects. It includes descriptions of the prioritization process, policy direction, a 10-year revenue outlook, 10-year lists of both regional and local priority projects, and concludes with a series of findings.

Ms. David recalled their discussions about revenues. She said at the outset, their intent was to look at various new funding scenarios, (federal, state, regional, and local) with the potential to help fund transportation needs into the future. Then, as time elapsed, a new federal act, MAP-21, was enacted in June 2012 and no new regional or local funding proposals emerged. So, the focus became the need for a new state revenue package.

As they looked at the transportation revenue situation with continuation of current laws and no new revenues, preservation and maintenance of the existing transportation system is of primary importance. Forecasting revenues into the future, local planning partners foresee preservation and maintenance consuming most of their transportation revenues leaving little for safety and mobility projects. Ms. David said our 10-year revenue forecast shows a need for an average \$62 million a year to preserve and maintain this region's highway system. Our local governments do not currently have this level of revenue.

Ms. David provided a graphic to illustrate preservation and maintenance issues. The chart showed the 2001 to 2009 trend toward expending a higher percentage of available transportation revenue on preservation and maintenance in comparison with expenditures on construction. While total transportation expenditures have decreased, the percentage spent for preservation and maintenance increased from 30% in 2004 to 50% in 2009.

Projects that were considered as part of the 10-Year Transportation Priorities process are drawn from existing local Transportation Improvement Programs (also known as TIPs), WSDOT's Highway System Plan, and C-TRAN's Transit Development Plan. To varying degrees, they are projects already in the programming process and all are consistent with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) as well as the Clark County Comprehensive Plan, and they support the Comp Plan's anticipated land uses.

Ms. David noted that lists of both the regional and local projects considered in the process are included in the 10-year report. She referred to pages 10 and 11 of the report listing the regional projects along with a location map.

Ms. David said projects are in ranked order according to project type. At this point, she said they do not know what any state revenue package may look like so staff is not suggesting what the top priority is. It will be dependent on the next funding package proposed and what type of projects the funding package is proposed to fund. All projects listed are of priority for this region. On page 10 are the projects that are more likely to be able to progress in the shorter-term time frame if funding were made available. On page 11 are more priority projects, but they probably would require a little more time to get underway and are therefore listed in a possible 7 to 10 year window.

Ms. David referred to page 15 with the listing of priority local projects recommended by the local jurisdictions. These projects are included in the Report as the Board requested at last month's Board meeting.

Jack Burkman said the priority listing has been covered several times over the last few months, and he asked if anything had changed in the scoring or prioritization. Ms. David said no, that there have been no changes since the last time it was presented.

Ms. David said in summary, the report includes the findings. The findings really reflect the Board's policy positions from discussions from previous meetings. Those include: Preservation and maintenance in the existing transportation system is the first priority but need for capital projects remains to meet safety and mobility needs of residents and for transportation choices and economic recovery. Our collective mission is to mutually support the listed regional and local priority projects and to pursue funding opportunities strategically.

Ms. David said the focus on a potential new state revenue package for transportation projects led to the realization that there is an opportunity to combine the output of our 10-year transportation project priority process together with the 2013-2014 Clark County Transportation Alliance policy statement intended for presentation to the state's legislative delegation. The Alliance's statement has been developed by partner agencies and authored and reviewed by the Clark County Business Roundtable.

The one-page draft policy statement was attached to the resolution. It outlines the transportation interests of the Clark County region, includes a call to action, talks of the need for a new comprehensive revenue package, and acknowledges the local government need for preservation and maintenance revenues. The policy statement also addresses the CRC, public transit and transportation needs to support Port activities, and urges legislators to rely on RTC's identified priority transportation projects.

The action requested for the Board is to adopt the Ten-Year Transportation Project Priorities and to adopt the 2013 Clark County Transportation Alliance statement that will be forwarded to the region's legislative delegation.

Rex Burkholder referred to the graph that displayed the cities and county expenditures. He said he projected out that maintenance is actually taking 100% of funding as of 2012. The issue that comes forward is a critical one relating to the last discussion on I-205. It becomes a question about all these needs if there is not funding in the maintenance and preservation of the existing system. Mr. Burkholder said it is a critical issue that they face too. They have built a system that takes a lot of money to keep it going, and there is still a desire to build more of it. As leaders/elected officials, they need to face this. He said most of the public doesn't understand. It

may look like money is coming and it can be deceptive, when really they can barely get by. Ms. David said that is why they have reiterated throughout the Report the priority for preservation and maintenance and how much it will cost into the future.

JEANNE STEWART MOTIONED TO DETACH THE TRANSPORTATION ALLIANCE STATEMENT FROM THE RESOLUTION FOR THE 10-YEAR TRANSPORTATION PROJECT PRIORITIES. She said this was for two purposes. One is to reflect who all the members of the Transportation Alliance are. In the past, all of the participants that reviewed the statement and agree to it are identified with it. The second reason is that she said it is important for the Statement to go to the other agencies for review and approval first before RTC takes action.

TOM MIELKE SECONDED THE MOTION. He said they still have money to spend, but they are being delayed in the process because of regulations.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

STEVE STUART MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE TEN-YEAR TRANSPORTATION PROJECT PRIORITIES. TOM MIELKE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Jack Burkman said he appreciated what Rex Burkholder had said and said he agreed. He said we continue to wrestle with this. He said our revenue is going disproportionately to maintenance and preservation. He said the policy Statement deals a lot with that. He said we are getting better in communicating that to our residents, but the question is if there were more money for transportation, what would you do? Mr. Burkman said for him, that is where this 10-year plan comes in. Money would first be used for maintenance and preservation, and then we could look at new projects.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Chair Boldt asked who had taken action on the Alliance Statement. Mr. Lookingbill said he did not know. He said the City of Vancouver will address it on November 19, and C-TRAN will address it at their December meeting. Mr. Lookingbill said it was brought to the RTC Board for an opportunity for any comment or discussion and to also understand the connection with the ten-year list of priorities.

Steve Stuart said he appreciated the conversation and said this is an opportunity to see this early and put in our thoughts. Commissioner Stuart said the piece that Commissioner Mielke mentioned has not been in any of our documents here. He said the business community and the Identity Clark County and others who have been a big proponent of the Alliance Statement have been supportive of their work in trying to get fair and reasonable storm water regulations. They see the increase to the cost of doing business. The same applies for the regulatory reform necessary within the transportation arena as well. He said storm water is a big piece of that. There is also regulatory reform within the project permit timelines. Commissioner Stuart said he would like to see a regulatory reform piece be included. Currently, projects take too long to build, and adding accelerated project permitting with regulatory streamlining would move projects quicker and use less money.

Jack Burkman said he agreed with Commissioner Stuart, and in addition, he would add protect what we have. Don't raid the existing funding that we have. Mr. Burkman said the Alliance

Statement is an important document for the legislature when they convene. He said he also agreed that the supporting agencies need to be identified, and when they have agreed bring it back to RTC.

RTC Board agreed that Mr. Lookingbill and RTC staff should work with local jurisdictions to introduce some of the language that was suggested.

VII. Proposed 2013 RTC Work Plan Emphasis Areas

Dean Lookingbill noted the memorandum included in the meeting packet. The 2013 Work Plan Emphasis Areas is for Members review. It will be brought back to the December meeting with any comments along with the 2013 budget proposed for action. Mr. Lookingbill said the 2013 Work Plan lists the major project activities including continuing the I-205 Access and Operational Study, supporting C-TRAN's project development phase for the Fourth Plain Transit Improvement Project, continuing coordination of the CRC project, MAP-21 implementation, and a placeholder for support in a Communities Core Values Assessment. The Work Plan also lists the Continuing Transportation Program Activities and Program Coordination. One of these activities includes Scoping the Next MTP Update. MAP-21 begins a new era of performance-managed transportation system investment. This will incorporate a "least cost" project planning approach. Also included is the continued support to the Skamania and Klickitat Counties Transportation Policy Committees.

VIII. Other Business

From the Board

Chair Boldt said they will nominate RTC Chair and Vice Chair at the December meeting. Dean's evaluation will take place in November, and members will be receiving information regarding that review by e-mail. Chair Boldt, Vice Chair Ganley, and past Chair Jack Burkman will conduct his review on November 20.

From the Director

Dean Lookingbill referred to a memorandum included in the meeting packet for Consolidated Grant Proposals. The RTC Board will be asked for action on these in December. This grant program includes Clark, Klickitat, and Skamania Counties.

Mr. Lookingbill noted a memorandum distributed to Members regarding a change in RTC state legislative districts. By RCW, RTC is required to have any members of the House of Representatives or the State Senate whose districts are wholly or partly within the boundaries of the RTPO are considered ex officio, nonvoting policy board members of the RTPO. As a result of the 2012 statewide legislative redistricting, RTC's RTPO area (Clark, Skamania, and Klickitat) will lose the 15th district and will gain the 14th and 20th legislative districts. In order to be consistent with the RCW, this would require a bylaw amendment. Members agreed to bring this for action at the December meeting.

Mr. Lookingbill noted JPACT meets Thursday, November 8, 2012, at Metro at 7:30 a.m., and C-TRAN Board of Directors meets at 5:30 p.m. on Tuesday, November 13, 2012, at C-TRAN.

Mr. Lookingbill said the first Tuesday in January 2013 is the 1st. Board members were in favor of cancelling the meeting.

BILL GANLEY MOTIONED TO CANCEL THE JANUARY 2013 MEETING. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MARC BOLDT AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, December 4, 2012, at 4 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Marc Boldt, Board of Directors Chair