

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Board of Directors
August 6, 2013, 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 Bill Ganley on Tuesday, August 6, 2013, at 4 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.

Board Members Present:

Nancy Baker, Port of Vancouver Commissioner
Jack Burkman, Vancouver Council Member
Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor
Bill Ganley, Battle Ground Council Member
Bart Gernhart, WSDOT Alternate
Jeff Hamm, C-TRAN Executive Director
David Madore, Clark County Commissioner
Doug McKenzie, Skamania Co. Commissioner
Tom Mielke, Clark County Commissioner
Melissa Smith, Camas Council Member
Jeanne Stewart, Vancouver Council Member
Steve Stuart, Clark County Commissioner
Ed Orcutt, Representative 20th District

Board Members Absent:

David Poucher, White Salmon Mayor
Jason Tell, ODOT Region One Manager
Don Wagner, WSDOT Regional Administrator
Curtis King, Senator 14th District
Norm Johnson, Representative 14th District
Charles Ross, Representative 14th District
Don Benton, Senator 17th District
Paul Harris, Representative 17th District
Monica Stonier, 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
Annette Cleveland, Senator 49th District
Jim Moeller, Representative 49th District
Sharon Wylie, Representative 49th District

Guests Present:

Ed Barnes, Labor Council
Katy Belokonny, C-TRAN
Katy Brooks, Port of Vancouver
Bob Carroll, Citizen
Pete Capell, Clark County
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Council Member
Jim Karlock, Citizen
Dale Lewis, Rep. Herrera Beutler's Office
Paul Montague, Identity Clark County
Sharon Nasset, Citizen
Jerry Oliver, Port of Vancouver Commissioner
Scott Sawyer, City of Battle Ground
Jeff Swanson, Clark County
Margaret Tweet, Citizen
Bill Wright, Clark County

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 July 2, 2013, Meeting Minutes

STEVE STUART MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE JULY 2, 2013, MEETING MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY JACK BURKMAN AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

III. Citizen Communications

Ed Barnes from Vancouver noted a couple of newspaper articles. He said a week ago, the Governor was in town and met with the AFL-CIO at the Hilton Hotel and noted his comments about Senator Benton and Senator Rivers being a brick wall at the legislature. Mr. Barnes also

noted an article about Senator Benton and his role in his new position at Clark County as being a compromiser and someone who helps put people together. Mr. Barnes said if that were the case, then questioned why he and Senator Rivers didn't ask for a vote on the CRC project and the transportation budget in the Senate. Mr. Barnes said these two Senators kept something from happening that would have benefitted our county and brought jobs and economic development.

Commissioner Stuart said Mr. Barnes referred to a Commissioners' meeting that evening. Commissioner Stuart clarified that due to the primary election, the Commissioners held their meeting that morning, and there would not be an evening meeting today.

Margaret Tweet of Camas said she was one of the residents that rejected having C-TRAN bring light rail to Clark County on the I-5 Bridge. She thanked Senators Benton and Rivers for honoring the vote of the people to reject light rail in Clark County. Ms. Tweet again referred to an RTC memorandum of March 29, 2011, regarding the 2035 population and employment forecast. She said RTC is still using high numbers for this forecast and said it was based on rosy predictions that are unrealistic. She said these are not based on reality and they need to stop using them. Ms. Tweet said another piece of misinformation was regarding C-TRAN information that said a wheelchair lift can take three to five minutes per stop and a bike can take about the same time. Ms. Tweet said it takes about 20 seconds to load a bike. The real information needs to be given to the public.

Paul Montague is President of Identity Clark County. He said he is here to talk about the Columbia River Crossing, and his request is to keep the Columbia River Crossing on the MTP long term plan. Mr. Montague said a lot of the reason that the people who supported the project over the last 14 years was for economic development, for congestion relief, for freight mobility, for pedestrian traffic safety, and to have a decent structure. Just because we haven't seen the funding out of the Washington legislature, those issues have not gone away. They are still there. We will see the amount of accidents per year increase if nothing is done. We will still see congestion in the I-5 corridor go from 4 – 6 hours per day to 15 hours per day. We will still see the impact to freight and all the daily commuters that have to cross the bridge. This is because of the failure of our legislature to support funding for a transportation package. Mr. Montague said some of the messages that he is getting from local manufacturing facilities executives is that their headquarter executives in other parts of the world are questioning our willingness to support a healthy infrastructure here. For them that raises questions of whether or not they should continue to invest in their existing facilities or move or grow facilities here in Clark County. Mr. Montague said his request of the RTC Board is to not pull the CRC off the Plan. It needs to stay on there as a place holder, and when we come up with a more politically viable and economically viable and a solution that works, then replace it. Keep it there to represent the issues that need to be dealt with.

Jim Karlock from Portland said there are many ways to make jobs. Now that the CRC is not funded, they can build something that is useful and not have tolls. He said mass transit should not be a goal, because there are few who use it.

Sharon Nasset from Portland thanked the County Commissioners for putting alternatives on the county ballot. We do need alternatives and need to relook at the project. Ms. Nasset said the project should not be called the Columbia River Crossing; it should be called Alternatives that

Cross the Columbia River. Ms. Nasset referred to modeling accuracy and model runs by Metro and RTC.

IV. Consent Agenda

A. August Claims

B. 2013-2016 MTIP Amendment: WSDOT I-5/NE 39th Street to NE 99th Street Paving, Resolution 08-13-18

JACK BURKMAN MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA AUGUST CLAIMS AND RESOLUTION 08-13-18. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MELISSA SMITH AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Chair Ganley welcomed Councilor Shirley Craddick and Representative Ed Orcutt.

V. Congestion Management Process: 2012 Monitoring Report, Resolution 08-13-19

Dale Robins referred to the resolution included in the meeting packet with a summary report attached. Copies of the full report were distributed to members. Mr. Robins noted that at last month's meeting, the packet included an overview of the 2012 Congestion Management Process including chapter 1 of the full report. This month, he would review the report, including key data and findings. The Board would also be asked for their endorsement of the 2012 Monitoring Report.

Mr. Robins said the Congestion Management Process is a Federal transportation planning requirement. It is integrated into the Metropolitan Planning Process. There is a federal process outlined that they must follow. The purpose is to analyze travel delay and apply strategies to improve system performance. Mr. Robins said it is important to note that this is about existing travel patterns and traffic.

Mr. Robins referred to the full Report which is divided into three chapters. Chapter 1 provides an overview of the Congestion Management Process including the process, goals, objectives, and identification of the system. Chapter 2 is the data chapter, which provided 15 different measures of congestion for both the morning and evening peak periods. The data is multimodal and includes information on automobiles, trucks, and transit. Chapter 3 provides information to help identify the appropriate congestion management strategies for the region. Because each roadway corridor is different and has its own characteristics, the congestion management provides a list of strategies that can be considered, but it is up to the local agency to decide which strategies are appropriate.

Mr. Robins referred to the Summary Report attached to the resolution. The 2012 CMP monitoring has shown a continuing trend towards slower travel times and system unreliability. The region has responded by investing in traffic management and operational improvements. This includes things such as traffic signal coordination, incident management, advanced traveler information, and more.

Mr. Robins highlighted some of the key data from the full Report. Page 2 of the Summary identifies the five worst traffic volumes to capacity ratio corridors. Volume to capacity ratio is

an indicator of how well a roadway carries the volume of traffic. I-5 south, I-205 South, SR-14 Central, 18th Street and Fourth Plain East are the most congested corridors in the region.

Page 3 of the Summary identifies the five worst corridors with the lowest percentage of speed as compared to posted speed limit. The lower speeds are directly connected to delay at signalized intersections. Improved signal coordination will increase speed, reliability, and safety. Generally, a corridor with a travel speed lower than 60% of the posted speed limit is below average and is an indicator of significant delay. The five lowest percent of speed corridors include 112th Avenue, Andresen South, Fourth Plain East, Mill Plain East, and Highway 99 North.

Consistent with federal guidance, the overall strategies for addressing congestion include: preservation of the existing system; improving roadway performance through traffic operational and management strategies; where possible, provide mode choice options; and add lane capacity at key bottlenecks.

Mr. Robins said in coordination with local agencies, RTC utilizes the Congestion Management Process to identify needs, which are incorporated into the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Sponsoring agencies give consideration to the needs and submit priority projects through the regional process for programing through the Transportation Improvement Program.

The action before the Board is adoption of Resolution 08-13-19, which includes endorsement of the Congestion Management Process 2012 Monitoring Report and its findings.

Commissioner Stuart asked on the lowest speed percentage corridors, if one of the tools in the toolbox is to suggest to those who set the speed limit to lower them. He said because when you talk about 60 percent of the posted speed limit, he questions whether the traffic is going too slow or is the speed limit too high. He said looking at Highway 99 as a good indicator of that as an urban arterial and a lot of businesses ingress/egress along that corridor. He said people are not going to go 40+ MPH along that corridor with all the turn moves. Businesses are not necessarily looking to move people faster through the corridor. Mr. Robins said they are not necessarily looking to move people fast; it is also to have reliable travel times. He said most people do not want to spend 40 percent of their time stopped at a signal. You want them to be flowing. The posted speed is something you can look at adjusting. He said however that the report did not identify that as a solution. Commissioner Stuart said he understood, but did not think it was a problem in the corridors that were listed. He would like one of the solutions to be discussed to be determining the appropriateness of the speed limit itself.

Commissioner Madore said the second volume to capacity problem corridor listed is SR-14, I-205 to 164th Ave. He said there is a plan to go from two lanes to three lanes on that stretch of the corridor. The third corridor is listed as I-205, Airport Way to SR-500. Commissioner Madore said even if this report is submitted, he assumed this report was also to inform us of areas to concentrate on and address. He said he hoped the Board would have an opportunity to brainstorm and participate in the strategies rather than just adopt and endorse what is determined here. Commissioner Madore said listed under strategies the high capacity transit is listed above improving roads. He said he didn't think the report was ready for us to send in, because it refers to the locally preferred alternative for the Fourth Plain Corridor and transit-oriented economic development. It also refers to C-TRAN's 20-Year Transit Development Plan. He said all of

these things have changed, and he did not think they should be referred to because they were obsolete. Commissioner Madore said he did not think they should endorse it like it is, they should determine if it was appropriate for their strategy to move forward in the future.

Dale Robins clarified that this report does not recommend any single strategy. It identifies a range of strategies to consider. It is up to the local jurisdictions to determine which strategies and projects are appropriate.

Council Member Burkman asked if the strategies listed were in a prioritized order. Mr. Robins said no they were not.

Commissioner Mielke asked of the corridors listed with the speed issues, was it taken into consideration that these have projects for improvement in place at this time. Mr. Robins said that this information was 2012 data and would not therefore include projects completed in 2013. Next year's report would include the 2013 data. Commissioner Mielke questioned giving the government a report with 2012 information. Mr. Robins said that the congestion monitoring report is updated each year, so they would see where improvements would have been made over the year. Commissioner Mielke said this lagged by a year and asked if there wasn't anything more current. Mr. Robins said their ITS process is working on the Portal access for real-time data. The goal is to collect the data real-time, so there is not the year lag.

Chair Ganley said that he noticed the congestion on 112th Avenue. Also, that the speed limit on Mill Plain is 40 MPH. As Commissioner Stuart said, that seems like a high speed for the amount of traffic on that corridor.

Jack Burkman said his understanding is that this is a report, not a plan. The problem areas that show up raise and flag the issue and the need to address it.

Jeff Hamm said there are varying interpretations in terms of the impact to plans and changing conditions whether it is the CRC or otherwise. In terms of C-TRAN's 2030 Plan, it is an adopted Plan that was adopted by the board in 2010 as the result of a two-year planning process, and it is still in effect.

Shirley Craddick asked what the next steps are, the process that begins the strategy. Mr. Robins said the object would be that potential projects would be identified that address the congestion monitoring data and may become part of the long range transportation plan. Mr. Lookingbill added that the traffic monitoring data helps to identify existing needs. The strategies that are listed provide a framework under which they might look at their own specific project needs. Part of RTC's federal requirements as a Transportation Management Area and as an air quality area is a congestion management process. This includes looking at different strategies as a part of the process for identifying additional highway capacity. The congestion monitoring process is a federal condition for receiving federal money into our region.

Council Member Burkman said that Commissioner Madore pointed out that there was a deficiency on I-205. He said his understanding is that there is a process in place for I-205 analysis. He asked how that would be reflected back into the report and if they could forecast projects that may come out of it. Mr. Robins said this report measures the data collection and looks at the process. What would happen is that as part of the process, those projects would be put in the long range plan and once it is programmed and implemented, it would be very apparent to the report that the issue was addressed. This is a base line look.

Commissioner Madore said he didn't have a problem with the process. He said he assumed that if they endorse this the way that it is, that we retain our ability to have flexibility for the future. He said what may be inconsistent with the future is that we are considering is a new crossing across the Columbia River. There is nothing in the report about that. He asked if we would still retain the ability to take on such a project or would they say that you are not consistent with what you endorsed. Mr. Lookingbill said the Columbia River Crossing project is not conditioned one way or another on this report. This report is about data and monitoring process. Whether we do or do not go forward with the Columbia River Crossing or whatever other projects, this report is not making a call one way or another. This report looks system-wide at congestion per set and agreed to criteria. Commissioner Madore said that means we retain our full flexibility to consider major changes because this is so broad.

JACK BURKMAN MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 08-13-19. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SHIRLEY CRADDICK AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VI. 2014/15 MTP Update and MTP Assessment/Amendment Process

Dean Lookingbill referred to the memorandum included in the meeting packet. Also attached was the memorandum from the July meeting addressing the MTP Assessment/Amendment Process, a one-page summary of the Federal Planning Requirements and a one-page summary of the Federal Transportation Project Funding Elements.

Mr. Lookingbill highlighted the land use and transportation planning cycle with a slide. He said land use and transportation are interrelated and they interact with each other in a cyclical fashion. The Washington State Growth Management Act has recognized this important interrelationship and requires that the transportation element be consistent and implements the land use element. Land use drives travel demand; RTC uses a regional travel model to assign that travel demand to the highway and transit networks and to identify where transit and highway facility improvements are needed; and from there identifies the cost for the list of improvements and looks at revenue sources and where the priorities are.

Mr. Lookingbill listed the top 5 reasons RTC does an MTP and highlighted each one. #5 It's a Federal Mandate: Federal USDOT regulations require metropolitan regions to maintain a Metropolitan Transportation Plan with updates every four years. The MTP must look out to a 25 year planning future. Failing to update the MTP results in a stop to the flow of federal transportation funds to the region. #4 It's a State Mandate: The State statute charges RTPO's with coordinating transportation planning on a regional basis and developing a regional transportation plan. The GMA requires that RTPO's certify that countywide planning policies and the transportation elements of local comp plans are consistent with the GMA and regional transportation plans. #3 Regular Updates Help: Regular updates help to ensure the region's transportation decisions reflect current conditions such as new economic and demographic trends, recently adopted corridor plans, and new policies. Regular updates help avoid RTP amendments for individual projects. #2 MTP is Linked to the Federal Clean Air Act: The MTP must conform to clean air standards in order for federal transportation funds to flow into the region. The MTP must help achieve clean air standards and be "fiscally constrained". For Ozone, RTC AQMA is an unclassifiable/attainment area and for carbon monoxide, RTC AQMA is a maintenance area.

Commissioner Madore said the MTP is fiscally constrained, and said many of the items are very low cost. Many small projects could be done as opposed to one of the bigger projects. He said that should be considered when they are evaluated. Mr. Lookingbill said those are decisions that the Board would make.

#1 Metropolitan TIP Draws Projects from the MTP: The Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) draws its projects for federal funding from the MTP. TIP projects must be listed or consistent with the MTP. Local agencies receive federal funds for projects in their Transportation Improvement Program.

Jack Burkman said the conversation around the Columbia River Crossing and where it fits in this, he said that would fit under #3 Regular Updates. Mr. Lookingbill said that was correct. David Madore said the updates are every four years at a minimum, but there is nothing to prevent us from updating it sooner than that.

Mr. Lookingbill said that was correct and referred to the 2014/15 MTP Update and MTP Assessment/Amendment Process memorandum that is proposing to start the MTP update in 2014. The mandatory update would not have started until later 2014 or early 2015. The update needs to be complete by the end of 2015. The memo lists key reasons/issues for starting in 2014. Some of those include a slower growth forecast, changes in the economy, more limited transportation revenues, and emerging transportation policy trends. They need to maintain consistency with the GMA update to reflect changing regional transportation system needs. They also want to include strategic input from freight/business leaders and community leaders, possibly with a type of committee. Then go through a systemic reevaluation of regional transportation alternatives.

A general time line would start with the Fall of 2013 to conclude the 2035 MTP Capital Facilities Review. January 2014 begin scoping of the MTP Update, vision/goals/desired outcomes, review growth projections, and confirm decision-making elements and process. In the Spring/Summer 2014 conduct a system-wide alternatives and needs analysis, identify projects, and develop revenue assumptions and finance plan. In the Fall 2014/Spring 2015 complete the evaluation, draft recommendations, comprehensive public review process, decision making, and plan adoption.

Jeff Hamm said that MAP-21 has included a new variable in the MTP project selection process, which is the application of performance measures. He asked how that would impact this process. Mr. Lookingbill said those things are being decided upon, and there is a rippling in that there is one set at the federal level, at a state level, and then we as a metropolitan area have a role of setting the final target. Mr. Lookingbill said he should have included that in the steps that will be taken. It is planned to be included in the update. We would not get federal approval without applying those performance measures.

Jack Burkman asked when we can start involving the public in this process. Mr. Lookingbill said that is for the Board to decide. To some extent, the Board may want to first articulate their vision and goals so there are some parameters to begin with and then look to the Spring of 2014. It will be up to the Board as to how the structure of the freight/business leaders group is set. Mr. Burkman said he assumes that the Board will work on the January 2014 list and start involving

the group and the public in the Summer, because the Board would then have established their goals and scope. Mr. Lookingbill agreed.

Bill Ganley asked when the County would be going through their GMA process and be complete. Commissioner Stuart said the County's GMA updates are due in 2016. They have had their first work session to start off and have communications with the cities/jurisdictions. They will be working on it between now and 2016. The update will include the additional population forecast information (lowers population forecast significantly), new information on ordinances, and a lot of new information.

Jack Burkman said he thought over the next couple months, staff could break that down and include it with the MTP timeline so they stay on track and consistent. Mr. Lookingbill added that in times past, often times the MTP has followed the GMA process. Mr. Lookingbill said the RTC Board does not make the land use decision, but given all the considerations on the table, if we parallel and stay connected, it can really help each other. RTC can even help inform through some of the analysis that they will be doing on the regional transportation system. As local jurisdictions are doing their transportation capital facilities, they will have some information.

Mr. Lookingbill referred to the memorandum from the July meeting which stemmed from an earlier discussion around written Board policy for an MTP amendment process. The purpose of an MTP assessment/amendment process is to preserve the comprehensive, long range, and multimodal role of the MTP, and provide regular amendment opportunity. Mr. Lookingbill said a two-step process is proposed. In January of any given year, jurisdictions, members of RTC, and the Board would have an opportunity to consider amendments to the Plan in between full Plan updates. The annual assessment process would conclude at the March RTC Board meeting with a list of findings, and a recommendation to pursue or not to pursue any amendments in the MTP. From March to December work would include data and system analysis, policy consistency, and evaluation with possible action. Depending upon the amendment and its impact to other jurisdiction's adopted plans, the RTC Board may need to coordinate with the jurisdiction prior to their taking action to adopt or reject a proposed amendment.

Mr. Lookingbill said there was a bit of confusion at last month's meeting, and referred to the two sided handout with Federal Planning Requirements and Federal Transportation Project Funding. This describes RTC's mission statement and role. It explains what the MTP plan, TIP program, CMP process, and UPWP each are. It also lists those federal funds that are allocated or available to our region. These sources of federal dollars have a regional sub-allocation for which the RTC Board selects those projects. That selection process has criteria for evaluation and has the projects coming from local staff.

Jack Burkman said that the two-sided handout was very helpful. He asked if it could be placed on RTC's home page so he could direct people to it. He said what RTC does is very complex, and there are many acronyms. This is helpful information.

Commissioner Madore clarified that the Metropolitan Transportation Plan comes first and what follows that is the Transportation Improvement Program. Mr. Lookingbill said that was correct.

Commissioner Stuart said that in comparison, we all have six-year Transportation Improvement Programs, which are fully funded, six years' worth of projects that we are moving forward, and we all have our 20-year Capital Facilities Plan, which is the broader list of projects to serve 20

years of growth, but you don't necessarily have full funding for all those projects. The six-year program is constrained, and the 20-year plan is not.

Commissioner Madore said we all have our own lists. He asked whose list contains the state routes. Mr. Lookingbill said WSDOT has multiple state transportation system plans, but you are referring to the WSDOT Highway System Plan. That is their longer range plan. They also do a three biennium construction programming process.

Jeff Hamm asked if a major issue arises that we need to amend the Plan on April 1, would we wait until January 1 to initiate the amendment. Mr. Lookingbill said this did not address the emergency situation. The Board would always have that option.

Commissioner Madore said this is a guide and not a system that locks us out from being timely responsive if we need to make changes. Mr. Lookingbill said to keep in mind the purpose statement. The Metropolitan Transportation Plan is a long range plan, just as you have an adopted long range plan. The notion of an amendment primarily is to say we want to preserve that integrity while recognizing we may have amendments.

Jack Burkman said one of the reasons that we do this is so we don't surprise people. We want to follow this step by step and talk about what we are doing each time. He said he didn't think the residents would necessarily appreciate changing things over night.

Representative Orcutt referred to the mission statement where it refers to an affordable transportation system. He said he had just spent three and one-half hours in Olympia working on a study so they can put affordable back into an affordable regional transportation system.

Commissioner Mielke referred to the TIP amendment that they just approved on the consent agenda for I-5. Mr. Lookingbill said that project was included in the MTP and now can receive the federal funds.

Commissioner Madore said the multi-billion dollar project is listed at the top in the MTIP. He asked if there was a down side to keeping such a large project included for a place holder or is it only an advantage in case we want to cash in on it.

Mr. Lookingbill wanted to clarify the difference between MTIP versus MTP. The Columbia River Crossing project is one of the projects in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). It is listed in the MTP, and because of its size and funding means, it also has its own financing section. The Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is for project programming, use of funds. If there are federal dollars used on a project, they have to be programmed and listed in the TIP. In neither of the documents, the MTP nor the TIP, is the CRC project listed at the top of the list and we don't plan to do it before anything else listed. Commissioner Madore said so the list is not prioritized from top to bottom even though it is listed first. Mr. Lookingbill said no it is not.

Commissioner Madore asked again if there was a disadvantage of leaving a major project in that list or is it only for advantage of money that may come. Mr. Lookingbill said it is listed in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan because we have a problem on I-5 in terms of safety, capacity, preservation, and all of those issues. That is why it is in the long range plan. Out of that process, the Columbia River Crossing project was developed. Commissioner Madore asked if any time in our history has a project been put on the list and we should not ever take any one off because it

could still get resurrected and get funding for it. He asked why we would ever take a project off. Mr. Lookingbill said that he can't recall in terms of the long range planning process, taking a project out of the Plan unless it was to replace it with another project idea. We have never taken a project out and left a hole with a question of how to solve that problem. It has been the other way, in that as we have grown over time, and as we begin to anticipate things, we talk about a strategic look at whether we might do a project. Then they develop the idea, and ultimately that project may find its way into the Plan. They have never done the reverse.

Commissioner Madore said even if we had a project that say required a public vote and it is in the Plan and the voters say no, should we responsively still leave it in there? Mr. Lookingbill said it was appropriate for the Board to respond to that. Jack Burkman said he agreed. He said he was not aware of anything ever being pulled out; he said he could see it being replaced. Mr. Burkman said he didn't see where any project harms another project on the list. It is not pulling resources to it, or saying do this and don't do this other project. It is an acknowledgement that there is a problem on I-5. This is the only proposal that has been there. It could be replaced with another proposal; because the same problem exists no matter which proposal is there. We have the same thing on SR-14, and have for quite some time, and the same thing on I-205. We have a variety of projects in there and over time take one out and put another one on. We don't have as much money now, so we have been talking about fewer projects on I-205, but we went through a process that said this is the money that we have, and this is how we might address it, and tuned it. At no time did we say we don't know what to do, pull the projects off, wait, and put them back on.

Commissioner Madore said if looking at the fiscally constrained part, and a project that has billions of dollars and other projects that are millions of dollars, are they not competing? Mr. Burkman said no. Mr. Lookingbill said projects are not competing. They are looking at a system and varying needs across the system. Mr. Burkman said at Vancouver City Council there was discussion of SE 1st Street. That is a #2 priority for arterials in Clark County. Regardless of what CRC is, it is their #2 priority. Whether it is funded or not, they're not going to pull it. They may not have the money for it right now, but that is their place holder to say something needs to be done to that road.

Chair Ganley said he thought this was a good process to put into place and follow.

VII. 2035 MTP Capital Facilities Review

Lynda David referred to the memorandum included in the meeting packet, and noted subarea maps that were distributed to members. Ms. David said in March they began the work effort to review the list of capital facilities projects in the current MTP, and an introductory presentation was provided to the Board. An item to update the Board was scheduled for June but was deferred due to time constraints at the meeting. Ms. David would give a status report and provide some overall transportation system performance measures using a 2035 slower growth scenario as well as a subarea overview. The work effort is to review the list of capital transportation projects identified in the MTP and test the impacts on the transportation system with a slower growth forecast.

The purpose of the Capital Facilities Review is to review the adopted MTP's list of identified regional transportation system projects in light of a slower growth projection scenario. Slower

growth would also mean lower transportation revenues than what was forecast in the current MTP. The work effort allows them to analyze which MTP projects are the most critical for internal Clark County's transportation system in the 20-year timeframe. It also allows them to consider what this might mean for transportation system policy; it may lead to discussion of a shift from past emphasis on mobility and capacity expansion to an emphasis on reliability, accessibility, modal choices, and priorities.

Ms. David said in March detailed information was presented on making the slower growth demographic projection. She provided a slide with a summary and compares 2010 base year demographics with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan forecast for 2035 and the slower growth scenario being considered. The slower growth scenario aligns with the latest Washington Office of Financial Management's medium population forecast (made in August 2012). OFM's forecast is updated periodically for local growth management planning purposes. This slower growth scenario matches well with the initial forecast proposed for Clark County's next Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update. Ms. David said staff will be working closely with County and City staff to make sure there is consistency between the next MTP update and the local comp plan update.

Ms. David referred to a chart in the memorandum and also displayed on a slide comparing 2010, MTP 2035, and slower growth 2035 demographics. The slower growth scenario has 12.4% less population, 15.7% less households, and 18.9% less employment than the forecast used in the current MTP.

Jack Burkman said the numbers imply a much greater drop in employment than there is in population. The jobs to households ratio is going down. He asked if that matched changes that are occurring or are going to occur in Clark County and the Comp Plan work and if it was tied together. Ms. David said it is being tied together. She said from what she understood from the Clark County kick-off meeting for the Comp Plan update, in forecasting for the new lower growth scenario, the employment numbers that RTC has are higher than what the County is proposing to look at. Mr. Lookingbill said the ratio is .99 households to jobs and the one that the County introduced was .78. Our forecasts were somewhat higher than that. Clearly, this points to an area that we need to have more focus work. Ms. David said the current County Comp Plan has a ratio of 1.03 jobs to households. The trend is definitely down.

Steve Stuart said the trend is down from the adopted 2007 Comp Plan. That Plan set very aggressive targets for employment growth over the next 20 years. It was done for a reason. It was done to make sure that the land was available for industry to be able to turn around the jobs to housing imbalance that we had. He said they knew going into it, that it was a very aggressive target. The trend is going down. The trend of our ratios may not necessarily be going down. Our ratio may still be going down; they may still be getting more jobs per household than we had historically, but not as many as they had anticipated. Ms. David said for consistency purposes, they try to align the MTP with the Comp Plan. She said employment numbers are important for trip generations and for transportation forecasting.

Since the March meeting, RTC has worked with local jurisdictions to allocate the slower growth forecast as a step in preparing the "Slower Growth" scenario's regional travel forecast model. The model is used to consider performance of the transportation system. To date, the focus has been on trips resulting from the slower growth scenario assigned to the Committed regional

transportation network. The Committed network includes today's transportation system together with state-funded Nickel/Partnership projects and improvements included in local six year Transportation Improvement Programs. Ms. David displayed a slide listing the committed system projects and highlighted each project. She said the list is not a very aggressive project list compared to what we might have seen a decade ago. A lot of the projects are already underway. The future beyond this does not look to promising to add projects into the Transportation Improvement Program. Ms. David said the focus on the committed system will allow them to look at where the greatest transportation needs are in the 20-year timeframe to 2035.

Ms. David said the regional travel model allows them to assess transportation system performance. She provided three slides that focus on some of these performance measures for the regional system. They compared performance of the 2010 transportation system PM peak hour with the 2035 slower growth on the committed transportation network and point to a magnitude of change. Ms. David highlighted the three performance measures: Lane miles of congestion, percentage of lane miles congested, and vehicle hours of delay.

Commissioner Madore asked if the facilities would really be that congested. Ms. David said yes. With the slower 2035 forecast, over 8.4% of the total transportation system will be congested compared with just 0.7% in 2010 and 26.5% of the interstate lane miles will be congested. Commissioner Madore asked if this was happening normally all around the United States or are we somewhat of an exception. Ms. David said this is all over the country.

Commissioner Stuart said there has been a dramatic underinvestment in infrastructure across the nation, and the Engineers Association and others have been calling for dramatic action at every level because of this.

Jack Burkman said this does not point to the degradation of the systems that we are not able to keep up on. This assumes that the system that we have stays intact, which is not true. Commissioner Madore said it would also inform us that what we have been doing has been failing. We need to change our course or we can see where the future is going to take us.

Ms. David said as they progress to look at finer degrees of detail and focus on specific transportation network links, vehicle hours of delay is one of the key measures because it is significant in terms of system reliability and to the travel experience of transportation system users. She said clearly, from a look at regional transportation system performance, there is need for transportation improvements beyond what is included in the committed system to accommodate 2035's travel demand, even using the slower growth forecast.

After looking at the region as a whole, RTC staff has conducted some sub-area analysis. These were provided as handouts at the meeting and both the PowerPoint presentation and handouts are available electronically via the RTC Board agenda on RTC's Website. Ms. David said each of the one-page sub-area summaries includes demographic data for 2010 and slower growth 2035 for the area shaded in green on each map. Key sub-area performance measures are shown at the top of the maps. The maps show highway links with a volume to capacity ratio of 0.9 or greater for the travel demand resulting from the 2035 growth forecast assigned to the committed transportation network. The handouts also include a brief listing of key transportation project needs in the sub-area. Ms. David highlighted each of the sub-area maps including Camas/Washougal, Discovery Corridor, Battle Ground, West Vancouver, and East Vancouver.

Commissioner Stuart asked if they had done any cost assessment of all of the links necessary based on the slow growth forecast. He said as they are talking with their legislators and others having an idea of the need both short term and long term and also the maintenance and operation is good to have. Mr. Lookingbill said they have not done that here, but they do plan to. He said they do have part of that process in the ten-year list of priority needs, which would be a good source to look at immediately. This look starts to look out further.

Jeff Hamm referred to the map for Camas/Washougal and said a section of Oregon was included in the map and asked if the summary data numbers shown included Oregon. Ms. David said no, the summary data is only for the green shaded area.

Jack Burkman said he found the information helpful, but had a hard time understanding where we came from because there was not a picture of what it was before the slower growth. He said it would be helpful to understand what changed with these assumption changes. Mr. Lookingbill said the information that they could show is what the previous higher level 2035 and then the slower growth 2035 and where the difference is. Mr. Burkman said that would be helpful.

Commissioner Madore asked if this assumed that the only difference between the before and the after is the population growth or does it also assume that because of population growth decrease, we are not going to build certain infrastructure. Mr. Lookingbill said at this point, it is just the demographic forecast, population and jobs. They have just begun the process, and this is to begin the discussion of what in terms of projects needs to change. They are doing this on just the committed system, so they are not making any assumptions for projects that are not funded at this point.

Ms. David's focus today was on regional performance measures and sub-area considerations. She said the next time she provides an update to the Board, she will report on 2035's highest transportation needs. Ms. David said the Board will have the opportunity to consider how the information will help to frame the next MTP update and help RTC to meet the federal requirements of MAP-21 for performance measurement and monitoring.

Shirley Craddick asked how transit was brought into this. Also, she asked if sidewalk improvements were included along with roadway widening to encourage people to use transit thus, taking people out of their cars and off the road and into a bus to get around. Ms. David said the regional travel forecast model does include transit service, and there is a mode split assignment for how trips are accommodated on the transit network and what you see are the resulting vehicle capacity issues. This is very much a first step at looking at where are there system concerns relating to vehicle and highway capacity, and then if there are limited funds available or if corridors are built out, then we certainly need to look where transit can perhaps help to improve capacity on a corridor. Councilor Craddick said then you are not looking at these roads and saying how can we use transit to help reduce congestion. Ms. David said it certainly will be an issue as they go into the MTP update.

Councilor Craddick asked if it was expected that you would still stay within your air quality conformity with these plans. Ms. David said they don't foresee air quality being a problem.

Jack Burkman said his earlier question of seeing this information prior to the slower growth look, he would like to see the numbers of vehicle miles traveled, vehicles hours of delay, and lane miles congested. Ms. David said when they look at what the highest needs are, they will be

comparing 2010 data with the 2035 slower growth as well as the 2035 existing MTP. The ultimate purpose is to look at the MTP whole list of projects to see whether there are other solutions. Mr. Lookingbill said they could take this same committed network and put the 2035 previous adopted travel demand on it. Mr. Burkman said that is what he would like to see, handouts like what was presented for the slower growth 2035 but with the existing 2035. He said the City of Vancouver is having conversations around how they address their transportation needs, so being able to describe and show those changes is beneficial. Ms. David said we need to keep in mind as well, is that the Metropolitan Transportation Plan didn't fix all of the problems out there either. That is a key issue we need to keep in mind.

Representative Orcutt asked what the assumptions were for telecommuting. He asked if they assumed that there would be no increase in the percentage of people telecommuting and how sensitive the model was to that. Ms. David said the regional travel forecasting model does have telecommuting as a factor. He asked if it assumes that telecommuting is going to increase as a percentage of the working population or assume that it is going to be the same percentage to a larger population. Mark Harrington said the model is not structured to say here is telecommuting and here is our assumption. The look is that telecommuting happens for certain income levels, certain types of households; it's attached to certain types of jobs. They forecast the change in the types of employment. They look at the forecasts that demographics are evolving. As those households and jobs come into existence, they change over time, and then they see that reflected in the behavior of those households. As far as telecommuting, it is talked about, and ten years ago they thought it was going to take off. Actually, telecommuting has been flat. As far as their forecast, the current model is looking at what type of household they are, the type of jobs where people telecommute. If they have a large manufacturing facility, there will not be people telecommuting.

Nancy Baker said in all this planning and prioritizing, freight is very important to all three ports in Clark County. She said we need to keep working at prioritizing freight movement in this community and this region.

Jeff Hamm said we have to continue to remember in the demographic change by 2020, 20 percent of the population is going to be over the age of 65. The fastest growing population cohort is the over eighty year olds. When talking of 2035, we should be thinking broader than just capacity and for automobiles on the highway.

Commissioner Madore asked if the base that we are starting with is assuming that there are no improvements that are going to be made between now and 2035. Ms. David said the base is 2010 with six-year transportation network improvements included. The handouts show this base with 2035 travel demand. Commissioner Madore asked if the system that generated these have the ability to plug in various combinations of improvements that are on the list of improvement candidates and then look at the results. Ms. David said that it does. He asked if that had been done. Mr. Lookingbill said that has been done to get to the current Plan. The current Metropolitan Transportation Plan did that whole process, but we could not meet all the needs that are forecast because of the financial constraint. We have to present a reasonably feasible level of financing, so there are always needs above that. This information today is purposefully beginning to look again at a network both transit and highway that has the slower growth forecast and see which MTP projects are identified as the most important. The focus is on

capacity, because even though we might apply a transit solution in some places, that transit solution may not be enough to address the level of capacity.

Commissioner Madore said he wondered if they were taking advantage of the powerful tools that are at our disposal. He said if we are financially constrained, and we enter the list of all the possible projects that we can build into it and enter the amount of money we have, and ask the model what we can get for the most bang for the buck, the lowest cost that would give us the most benefit. He said the computer model should be able to do that instead of us doing it one at a time. Mr. Lookingbill said there are many, many policy statements imbedded in the regional system that our region wants to have. The model is a tool that can take that future forecast, convert it to travel demand, apply it to various network scenarios to get feedback of volume to capacity or travel delays are better or worse to decide which of those projects per policy objectives and per land use decisions is the recommended choice. This is the beginning of the process.

Commissioner Madore asked why not take advantage of the same tool, the computer modeling and let it run through all these choices and tell us what it arrives at. Mr. Lookingbill said the travel demand forecast model identifies congestion, showing red on a map with I-5. It doesn't know what kind of project to build. That comes down to an engineering analysis of various levels, beginning somewhat conceptual to more and more detail as to what can be built given right-of-way, wetlands, etc. That has to be put back in and run again to see how much that changed it.

Commissioner Madore said that sounded like a manual process. He said if a project is on the list, we know what it does, let the model inform us of the results. Mr. Lookingbill said the model itself does not define the project improvement. The project improvement needs to be defined by transportation engineering staff working with local governments. We would not make Mill Plain an eight-lane facility because it had a capacity need, because there might not be space for that. If it had capacity, then you go through a process of what kind of improvement could you do. The model cannot tell us a project.

Jack Burkman said he is not aware of any system optimization software like Commissioner Madore is talking about.

VIII. Other Business

From the Board

Jack Burkman said voter turnout is very low. Only 16.5% of ballots mailed out have come back in. He encouraged anyone who had not voted to do so.

From the Director

Mr. Lookingbill noted that JPACT met on August 1, 2013, at 7:30 a.m. at Metro. C-TRAN Board Composition Review Committee meets on Tuesday, August 13, 2013, at 4:00 p.m. and Board of Directors Meeting at 5:30 p.m. at the Vancouver Community Library.

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, September 3, 2013, at 4 p.m.

Mr. Lookingbill said at the September meeting, they will provide an update to the Capital Facilities Process. Also, they are in the project programming process; projects have been submitted and will be ranked, and they will share the evaluation and project ranking. They hope to have the New RTC Director Profile for the Boards consideration as well.

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

William J. Ganley, Board of Directors Chair