

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council  
Board of Directors  
April 1, 2014, Meeting Minutes**

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

The Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council Board of Directors Meeting was called to order by Chair Jack Burkman on Tuesday, April 1, 2014, 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  
Bart Gernhart, WSDOT (Alternate)  
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Council (Alternate)  
Jeff Hamm, C-TRAN Executive Director  
David Madore, Clark County Commissioner  
Doug McKenzie, Skamania Co. Commissioner  
Tom Mielke, Clark County Commissioner  
Ron Onslow, Ridgefield Mayor (Alternate)  
Larry Smith, Vancouver Council Member  
Steve Stuart, Clark County Commissioner  
Jason Tell, ODOT Region One Manager

Voting Board Members Absent:

Bill Ganley, Battle Ground Council Member  
David Poucher, White Salmon Mayor  
Melissa Smith, Camas Council Member  
Don Wagner, WSDOT Regional Administrator

Nonvoting Board Members Present:

Ed Orcutt, Representative 20<sup>th</sup> District  
Liz Pike, Representative 18<sup>th</sup> District

Nonvoting Board Members Absent:

Curtis King, Senator 14<sup>th</sup> District  
Norm Johnson, Representative 14<sup>th</sup> District  
Charles Ross, Representative 14<sup>th</sup> District  
Don Benton, Senator 17<sup>th</sup> District  
Paul Harris, Representative 17<sup>th</sup> District  
Monica Stonier, 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  
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  
Katy Brooks, Port of Vancouver  
Eric Florip, The Columbian  
Heath Henderson, Clark County  
Carolyn Heniges, Clark County  
Lee L. Jensen, Citizen  
Jim Karlock, Citizen  
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver City Council  
Jerry Oliver, Port of Vancouver Commissioner  
Kelly Parker, Greater Vancouver Chamber  
Philip Parker, WA Transportation Commissioner

Staff Present:

Lynda David, Senior Transportation Planner  
Mark Harrington, Senior Transportation Planner  
Bob Hart, Transportation Section Supervisor  
Matt Ransom, Executive Director  
Dale Robins, Senior Transportation Planner  
Diane Workman, Administrative Assistant

## **II. Citizen Communications**

Ed Barnes of Vancouver distributed a handout with his comments along with history on the I-5 Bridge and its replacement. Mr. Barnes discussed the condition and safety of the I-5 Bridge and the need for its replacement.

Representative Pike asked Mr. Barnes to provide the documentation that says that the maintenance on the bridge was \$1.2 million for a one-year period. The Website that is listed on the handout provides that information.

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

SHIRLEY CRADDICK MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 1, 2014, MEETING AGENDA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY LARRY SMITH AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

## **IV. Approval of March 4, 2014, Minutes**

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 4, 2014, MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY LARRY SMITH AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

## **V. Consent Agenda**

### **A. April Claims**

### **B. 2014-2017 TIP Amendment: Clark County NE 119<sup>th</sup> Street, Resolution 04-14-05**

### **C. VAST Regional Communications Plan, Resolution 04-14-06**

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA APRIL CLAIMS AND RESOLUTIONS 04-14-05 AND 04-14-06. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SHIRLEY CRADDICK AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

## **VI. Safety Management Assessment for Clark County (April 2014), Resolution 04-14-07**

Dale Robins referred to the resolution included with the meeting packet along with the attached safety report. He noted that at the February RTC Board meeting, they reviewed the Safety Management Assessment process and initial collision data. Since that time, the collision data has been further analyzed, a safety committee was formed, recommendations were developed to advance transportation safety, and a final report was developed.

The Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC) reviewed the final draft Safety Management Assessment at their March meeting and has recommended adoption by the RTC Board.

Safety is an important National Planning Factor, and Federal Legislation requires each State and MPO to incorporate safety. Adoption of the report before the Board today is an important initial step to meet federal requirements. Following the Board's adoption, the recommendations of the safety assessment will be incorporated into the next update to the Regional Transportation Plan.

Recently, the Federal Highway Administration has released proposed rulemaking on highway safety performance measures. The proposed rules will require states and MPOs to develop targets to reduce the numbers of fatalities and serious injuries. The targets will likely need to be

set sometime in 2015 and will be discussed more at future meetings, as will other required performance measures.

The Safety Management Assessment analyzes regional collision trends to identify safety needs within Clark County. It is a transportation system management process that is data driven to identify the most common factors associated with fatalities and serious injuries. It recommends regional strategies to improve transportation safety. It builds upon Washington statewide safety plan, Target Zero. As part of the process, RTC formed a regional Safety Committee to review collision data and develop recommendations. The committee was a critical component of the overall plan development. The goal of the Safety Management Assessment is the same as that of the Washington State Safety Plan, Target Zero, which is to reduce traffic fatalities and serious injuries to zero by 2030. This represents a vision that every life is important.

In order to meet the regional goal and reduce fatalities and serious injuries to zero by 2030, the region must take action to implement the recommendations of the Safety Management Assessment. Mr. Robins referred to page two of the Resolution listing six recommendations and highlighted these recommendations: implement strategies identified in Target Zero, focus on addressing the most common factors for fatalities and serious injuries, increased effort towards factors that are showing an increase, follow the recommendation of the regional Safety Committee, develop regional traffic signal control standards, and implement the national safety recommendation.

Mr. Robins said the next steps that should be completed over the next several months include the following: the VAST Steering Committee should consider and develop regional standards for traffic signal control; RTC should reach out to partner agencies through existing safety forums to build partnerships and resources to reduce traffic fatalities and serious injuries in the region; and RTC should use this analysis to help develop and implement safety performance measures that will soon be required.

Action before the Board is adoption of Resolution 04-14-07, which includes adoption of the 2014 Safety Management Assessment for Clark County including the plans recommendations.

Commissioner Stuart asked if the report included the State Routes. Mr. Robins said this includes all routes in Clark County, local and state. Commissioner Stuart said given some of the accidents that have occurred, he asked if median strategies are being looked at for the Interstate and state routes. He referenced the widening of SR-502 and higher speeds, higher traffic volume, with opposing traffic. Mr. Robins said in looking at the data, opposite direction collisions are not that high of number of collisions, but they are very serious when they do occur. When you look at where the collisions are located, they are very random. Generally, where there are higher speed facilities, the more serious the collisions. Mr. Robins said that WSDOT has a process in place where they are upgrading those center medians to make them safer by using cable, jersey barriers, and more.

Commissioner Stuart referred to the tragedy where someone got on the freeway at the off ramp at SR-502 and I-5. Bart Gernhart said a witness at the rest area confirmed that that driver came from the rest area.

Commissioner Stuart said a lot of talk is about young drivers, but what is not talked about is our aging population. He said he didn't see anything about impairment associated with age.

Commissioner Stuart said that more and more incidents are being seen that are related to the increasing population of drivers that are older.

Bart Gernhart said of the referenced SR-502 corridor, they are planning a median barrier down the middle. He said that has been planned for about 10 years and will start construction this year. The median barrier probably won't be put in until the last phase, which will be in 2016. Mr. Gernhart said for the median on I-205, they did a median upgrade three years ago, but that doesn't mean that they can't do more. As they move forward, they clearly will have to do more to get to Target Zero. The roughly low-cost cables are not necessarily liked by folks, but they do save lives and are a cost effective solution.

Dale Robins noted the issue of the elderly drivers. He said on page 6 of the report lists injury factors related to collisions. Older drivers that are 75+ years are listed as a priority three. They are related to 9% of the fatalities and about 5% of serious injury accidents. When they looked at these, what they found is that these drivers were more experienced and often can avoid the more serious collisions than the younger, less experienced drivers, generally.

Paul Greenlee said in looking at the trend lines, the ones that are particularly scary are the pedestrians and motorcyclists. However, the total numbers are small enough that the variance is probably huge. Mr. Greenlee asked in the case of motorcyclists if they had a way to make the number fatalities/serious injuries relative to the number of motorcyclists on the road. Mr. Robins said they do look at the data. Motorcyclists do account for a small percentage of the overall vehicles on the road. He said he believed it was under 5%, fairly minor. What happens with pedestrians, motorcyclists, and bicyclists is that don't have anything to protect them, and when they are involved in a collision, it often is very serious.

Mr. Greenlee asked if they had any data on the number of aging motorcyclists to be increasing. Mr. Robins said the statewide data has that information. The Washington State Target Zero addresses that in particular. They are seeing an issue of older drivers over 65 on motorcycles increasing.

Commissioner Madore said this is strong in assessment and strong in reporting, but to strengthen it, it would be in corrective measures that are simple and save lives. Commissioner Madore said an example would be on the I-5 and I-205 Bridges; the bridge lifts are foreseeable, so inform drivers ahead of time on I-5 so they can make a choice to take I-205 to cross the river.

Bart Gernhart said they do have advance signs for the Interstates. They have additional signs that they can use if they have more advance notice of the lifts. They are moving forward with the project to put in the times to destinations in different locations. Jason Tell said the amount of advance notice that is given for a bridge lift varies. The bridge tenders make the decision on what is happening, the time of day, or if there are other boats nearby; it is dependent on the conditions. Mr. Gernhart said here they are trying to address the fatalities and serious injuries. The rear-enders are right at the vicinity of the bridge, and not like the serious injuries seen elsewhere. Mr. Gernhart also said in regard to I-205, the 18<sup>th</sup> Street project goes to construction this summer. The first phase of that, the 112<sup>th</sup> Avenue connector, was built in 2007-2008. They have just received the first study of that. They were averaging 40 accidents on I-205 per every two years, for the previous three biennium prior to the project. After the project, on I-205 they

are averaging 11 per two years. Mr. Gernhart said when they finish the 18<sup>th</sup> Street interchange project, they think they will see a similar benefit further north as well.

Commissioner Madore said regarding the bridge lifts, even though all of them are not foreseeable, those that are, can benefit from the early messages.

Jason Tell said they notify drivers ahead of time when they know a lift is coming; they also notify the media. This allows radio to get the word out as well.

Commissioner Madore said the bridge log book is like the 1950s in paper and pencil. He said if that could simply be provided on line that would be very helpful. Jason Tell said that all bridge information is distributed electronically through their dispatch and tracked as well. Commissioner Madore said he would like to know more about that since all he has seen is the paper copy.

Commissioner Mielke said this data is three years. He would like to see current numbers. Chair Burkman said that was discussed at last month's meeting. Dale Robins said there is now another year of data available. The state data base has about a two year lag. The reason they chose these years was to match up to the statewide plan in order to compare how we compare with the state. Mr. Robins said he does now have 2012 data.

Chair Burkman said this is not to set up a particular goal on safety. We're documenting improvements. Mr. Robins would provide the 2012 information to members at the May meeting.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 04-14-07 SAFETY MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT FOR CLARK COUNTY. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SHIRLEY CRADDICK AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

## **VII. Regional Transportation Plan – Policy Review and Demographic Trends**

Matt Ransom said at last month's meeting, staff presented an initial conversation about the RTP's Vision and Goals. It was very robust, and they ran out of time to complete the conversation. Part of today's presentation is to complete that. After the March meeting, Mr. Ransom distributed a memo to Board Members to provide follow-up questions the Board may want to consider prior to today's presentation by Lynda David. Mark Harrington would provide a presentation on 2035 population growth forecasts and demographic trends.

Lynda David referred to the memorandum included in the meeting packet along with the attached memo that was distributed after the March meeting. Ms. David briefly highlighted where they had left off in March. The Regional Transportation Plan is the region's long-range regional transportation plan that must cover a period of at least 20 years. The federal requirement is for Plan update at least every 4 years. The plan must be multimodal. Federal requirements are for a fiscally constrained Plan. The RTP is the result of a process and requires collaboration, coordination, and consultation to make sure there is consistency between federal, state, and local Plans.

At last month's meeting, they reviewed the federal and state mandates for development of the RTP. The Board reviewed the broad transportation plan vision statement for year 2035 and took action to accept the statement. RTC staff noted the Board's discussion as documented in the

March Board Minutes and will be looking at ways to incorporate points made by Board members as the Plan update is developed.

At the March meeting, they had time to overview the basic transportation policy themes that are reflected in federal, state, regional, and local transportation plans. These basic themes include: Economy, Safety and Security, Accessibility and Mobility, Management and Operations, Efficiencies, Environment, Community Vision and Values, Finance, and Preservation.

Ms. David recalled that last month they talked of the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC) discussion which resulted in RTAC members agreeing there needs to be no significant changes to the RTP's broad policy framework. RTAC members felt that core to provision of transportation system and services were 1) Safety and Security, and 2) Accessibility and Mobility. However, RTAC members felt most concerned about two major issues; Finance and Economy. 1) Specifically, how to deal with financing the transportation system now and into the future and 2) Regarding the economy, RTAC members spoke of the need to ensure the transportation system can sustain the current range of businesses and industry as well as be an attractor for new jobs to the region.

Last month, the Board had little time to discuss the Economy and Finance policy issues, so at the Board's suggestion, staff mailed out some questions and points to ponder relating to these policies (attached to today's memo)

Related to Economy, the current policy reads the RTC should "support economic development and community vitality." The question to the Board was "How can transportation policies guide investment to best support economic vitality?" Chair Burkman said this asks should we make economic development a priority for our investments, changing the emphasis.

Paul Greenlee said he would be in favor of that, but we would have to be careful of keeping up existing structure. Maintenance is as crucial to economic development as building new roads is.

Shirley Craddick said the question should not only be "should economic development be a priority?" but "what kind of economic development do you want to focus on?" There is more need than there are funds available.

Chair Burkman referred to page 2 of the memo listing staff generated comments as to the implementation strategies, which is just what Ms. Craddick was speaking to. Given the broad stand of support to economic development, he asked how far they should go in the RTP. Ms. David said the RTP points out the integration of land use and transportation, and perhaps in the update of the RTP supplement the sections they have addressing the integration of land use and transportation. That is important. They also might want to make recommendations related to how they might prioritize projects, both in the RTP and moving into the future. This could allow the RTP to be a takeaway for the Transportation Improvement Program where funds are programmed for specific transportation projects. Chair Burkman said this is where the scoring system is used that the Board has agreed upon, but that is something that we might revisit if there is a different emphasis on economic development.

Commissioner Madore said he hoped that if we are spending large sums of money that it is something that the community supports. He said the focus should not just be to get more funds but to use the funds more wisely.

Paul Greenlee said he hoped that as far as economic development, the focus would be job growth. Mr. Greenlee said the Port District in Camas – Washougal is a main economic driver. All the industrial land in Washougal is in the Port District. He said to focus on those kinds of projects would be the smart use of money.

Chair Burkman said he was hearing economic development as a priority around jobs. Mr. Greenlee said in addition to jobs, look at the implications for tax revenue or other revenue. Chair Burkman said he was also hearing a balance between expansion and preservation with finance.

Jeff Hamm said it currently states “support economic development and community vitality.” He asked if this discussion was to change that so that it is not just support, but the priority of the RTP over the other goals and objectives of the RTP. Chair Burkman said that is what is being asked.

Representative Pike asked where freight mobility and congestion relief fall into this discussion. Ms. David said they need to account for freight mobility and people movement in the RTP. Anything that talks of economy, there is obviously freight and goods movement as well as people traveling to jobs or traveling to services and they all need to be accounted for.

Chair Burkman said if the policy is to put a priority on economic development, then we would be looking at Ports and freight, and employees being able to move reasonably from one location to another. He said maybe that is community vitality but probably not a heavy emphasis on residential.

Jeff Hamm said in looking at the list of nine policies, he said it is tough for him to take economy and put it ahead of all the others without knowing the context and the decisions that are being made for those investments. He said he thought they are equally important and the discussion should circulate equally among all of them as decisions are being made. Mr. Hamm said he was not really in favor of putting it ahead of all the others.

Commissioner Madore said he would like to separate the discussion from what is not in here, and that is that freight mobility and congestion relief are not listed. It is implied, but it should be included in the language.

Chair Burkman referred to the discussion last month where each of the policies was discussed in depth. The Accessibility and Mobility policy captures freight. Ms. David said currently the RTP speaks of mobility for people and for freight and goods.

Chair Burkman brought the discussion back to whether or not there should be an emphasis of priority on economic development as it relates to jobs or put it as Mr. Hamm had said and put it equal of the others so all are looked at. Currently, none have a priority. Ms. David said that there is cross over among the policies. She said they may want to wait until later to add words when they have the discussion of finance and where we have the needs in our transportation system. This discussion helps to realize the tradeoffs that will need to be made later on.

Chair Burkman asked if they could start some document that captures the Board’s concerns. Such as: Do we prioritize economic development, and if so, what is the impact on other areas? Where does freight mobility and congestion relief appear?

Jason Tell said he thought the economy is very important. His concern with the general statement that is there today is trying to apply it when we go after a grant or dividing up the TIB

money. For instance, is developing industrial land the priority, or is it any projects that help freight mobility, or are all freight mobility projects equal? It is so broad. Mr. Tell suggested that staff look at this over the next few months and figure out what information the Board needs to make a decision. Mr. Tell said at the JPACT table, they did it a little differently. Instead of doing it in the RTP, the long range plan, they did it at the TIP level when they set up the criteria for prioritizing TIP projects. They prioritized access to industrial land, very specific areas. He said next time they may change that to a different thing that emphasizes the economy. Mr. Tell said there are other ways of dealing with that and not in this big document that is so complex. Chair Burkman said they could do that in the scoring elements for their TIP.

Shirley Craddick said another way to look at this is that all of these policies are important, and we don't want to overlook any one of them. She said you may want to apply these policies to a specific geography or a specific focus. She said it is already identified in the memo under staff comments as existing GMA growth centers, town centers, corridors, access to the Ports, and development sites. She said to look at how you apply those policies to those specific areas, and as funding becomes available, how do you guide that funding to focus on these areas.

Commissioner Madore said he could not imagine any project that is not going to hit one of the policies. He said a more helpful guide for us would be to prioritize the criteria that would indicate what is more important than another.

Chair Burkman referred to the scoring of projects to prioritize for funding. RTAC would use their technical judgment to apply points to the projects and then bring the list back to the Board.

Commissioner Mielke said one of the biggest breaks that they have seen on all of the projects they have tried to do is financing. That goes back to economic development. He said it is the economic driver that that brings in the financial obligation to meet other obligations. He said there is a priority of doing that.

Following what Commissioner Mielke said, Commissioner Stuart said one of the struggles that they have had with the Legislature as a whole is proving that construct to them, that an investment in infrastructure results in economic development and benefitting revenue that can actually be rolled back into other needs. The conversations that have happened in Olympia have been that the transportation infrastructure investment produces a long-term benefit to the economy, but does not present a short- or medium-range return. That is one of the reasons when they were talking about the Public Works Trust Fund and the benefits associated with it, that they weren't very good short- or medium-term investment. They were better long-term. The more we can do to show the bang for the buck, the return on the investment, the more that we can start papering that so our legislators have that information, the better off we will all be in getting those investments made. Commissioner Madore said that translates to business development. Commissioner Stuart agreed.

Larry Smith said this is a struggle for him when it comes to prioritization. He said it is so situational. For example if we had a large industrial area such as Columbia Tech Center that has a large company that wants to relocate here (i.e. Intel), how would this apply and how would this fit on the set of criteria. He said he struggles with something that is short-term that you can do, but at the same time have something long-term that can guide you as you go through. You want something flexible enough that can move with the economy, to move with expansion and growth

that doesn't limit anyone from locating here. Mr. Smith said that is a struggle. He said he sees many of this being weighted, very situational where they are oriented, and the type of company that may be looking at locating here and how you best support them. The talk of ultimate gain being job development and economic development, he asked how we facilitate that.

Chair Burkman said he heard Members saying that they want to add more criteria to the economic development scoring that is done. Does it self-generate revenue, short-term, medium-term, or long-term? Does it open up new opportunities? There is a series of these. The outcome of this RTP cycle could be that the TIP scoring is little more elaborate.

Paul Greenlee said being new at the table, he was not familiar with the scoring of projects. He asked if the experience shows the projects that make the most sense to people generally rise to the top score. Chair Burkman said clearly yes and no. It is in the eyes of the jurisdiction. It is a balancing act. The criteria that are developed to score are very important. Once that is determined, that is what they consistently follow.

Lynda David said the next challenging policy issue that RTAC raised was finance. She said the questions of how do we afford to maintain and preserve the existing system, and how do we meet transportation revenue needs into the future? It is challenging to finance a transportation system at the regional, state, and federal level. There are unknowns regarding what the reauthorization of the federal transportation act might bring. The Highway Trust Fund is in a poor situation, and a statewide transportation revenue bill needs a fair share to Clark County. Moving into the future, she asked if they need to look at different funding strategies in order to fund transportation infrastructure needs within the Clark County region. Ms. David said this might be a policy issue that they bring back when they are dealing in detail with the finance plan related to the RTP update. Ms. David said these are issues that RTAC have. She said they feel very challenged by meeting those financing needs for infrastructure.

Chair Burkman asked the question if we want to state in some way that there is a priority on preservation.

Commissioner Madore referred to page two of the memo referring to local option revenues such as a regional gas tax and/or regional license tab fees. He said the focus is on getting more money and said they should not focus on that without first focusing on prioritizing and ensuring the funds that we do have are well spent. That is not listed. Commissioner Madore said before we raise our gas tax or license tab fees, we need to include that.

Shirley Craddick asked how they wanted to spend their money. Of the money that they have, where should it be spent, and how should it be used? That is where you get into specifics, such as the Ports or growth centers. Once you do that, it puts everything else in place.

Chair Burkman said that is part of it. The current RTP policy states that the RTP should "provide for a financially-viable and sustainable transportation system." To Commissioner Madore's point, RTAC felt that efficiencies and transportation system management are key related issues. These don't stand separately. Do the best with what we have, but we also acknowledge that we have a billion dollar shortfall to do the entire list of projects. In order to do some of the projects that we want, we have to find some revenue along with efficiencies and how we want to do that. Chair Burkman said he was hearing the theme that we want to take care of preservation as a priority. That is part of the finance, of how we raise money to do that. Chair

Burkman asked if RTAC offered any change to the current finance policy. Ms. David said not at this stage of addressing the broad policy goals. The expectation is that they will come back and deal with more detail of that when they address the finance plan of the RTP.

Representative Orcutt said they talked about existing GMA growth centers, but he said they do have some growth centers that are detached. Access to ports is listed, so you may also want access to growth centers as well.

Jason Tell said he found the finance theme a bit confusing and needed to be flushed out. He said he heard two different things. One was where the money is going now, make sure it is efficient and going where it should. He said that is something that can be done and can move forward if that is what is wanted, or not worry about the past and just talk about the next round of TIP projects and move forward. He said that is one item. The bulk on finance as listed is really about the need for new revenue, which is really a whole separate work item. Mr. Tell said the big question is what this group wants to do. They can advocate at federal and state levels and put something behind that goal. Another is to help local governments, enable them, and give them tools and ideas. You can also do something regional, which is what this group does. He said it didn't seem clear what the group wants. We need to send direction to staff of what we want them to bring back.

Chair Burkman said he agreed. He said this brings to mind 192<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. That project was declared a regional significance, which caused the broad organization to band together recognizing we needed more funds and worked together.

Steve Stuart said he agreed with Jason Tell in the two different questions that are being asked, at least from the perspective that they have heard from the legislature and what they have talked about. The first step is figuring out how we are spending our money for a couple reasons. First, it is not just about how we are spending our money on individual projects, but how we are developing our systems. Are we developing an efficient system of transportation that is financially viable for the long term? Are lowering the overall operations and maintenance costs associated with it by choosing different methodologies? Are we using system management correctly or can we be doing more? What are we doing and spending our money now? Commissioner Stuart said the reason for that is because if there is new money, we want to make sure we get prioritization to the things that provide the most efficient, effective solutions. Secondly and importantly, there may not be new money; this is the reality that we are living in. There may not be a statewide transportation package. We need to look at what we can do with what we have and how we can be more efficient in what we are doing. If there is new money, we need to be ready for that as well. If we do need to go to a regional package because a state or federal package does not happen, we first need to show our constituents that we are doing a good job with the money that we have. Before we go to them for anything new, we need to be able to say look at what we are doing already.

Jason Tell said he is trying to think how to convert that into something that staff can produce because this group doesn't own or operate the roads; there are cities, counties, state, and transit. As a regional body, we need bring all jurisdictions together. An option is to use a best practices approach where you look around the region or state and identify some of those practices. These would be provided to individual jurisdictions, and they would be encouraged to look at their own practices.

Commissioner Mielke said they need to go back to reform. He said he was not sure that local options would solve the problems.

Shirley Craddick said the situations are different for Oregon and Washington, and said the federal transportation funding policies have changed. It used to be that a majority of our funds that we received for our transportation projects came from the federal government. It used to be a 90% match; now we are lucky to get 50%. The large bulk of the money that we need and have been using in the past for transportation is going away. The question is if this group wants to look at something different, because we can no longer depend on the federal government for that support. She said she can see why you may be resistant to looking at funding, but where most of our money came from in the past is no longer there. Something is going to have to be done. Looking at efficiencies is helpful, but if you really want to go anywhere in the future, we are going to have to look at revenue sources.

Commissioner Madore said the money is available for the wrong purposes. He said if we want to build light rail we can get \$850 million, yet if we want to build a highway, we don't get anything. Commissioner Madore said the money is there; it has to do with priorities and with reforms. He said as a regional body, we need to look at the big picture and collaborate on a big picture project.

Paul Greenlee said it makes sense as Commissioner Stuart and Jason Tell said to look at how we are spending our money now and what the best practices are so we can be reasonably assured of ourselves that we are spending the money wisely. He said his understanding is that there is the RTAC committee, and that seems to be the place to begin the discussion about our best practices and what should be changed or needed. Our staff could begin work at that level, which is their expertise. It is not what we do every day. Mr. Greenlee agreed with Councilor Craddick, that we need to at least look at what revenue alternatives are possibilities. Mr. Greenlee also said in response to Commissioner Madore's comment in terms of a regional policy, he asked what it would mean to create a Regional Transportation Improvement District or Transportation Benefit District throughout the RTC region in Washington. Mr. Greenlee also asked how much tab fee revenues would generate, and would it be enough to be a significant contributor. These fees are for those using the system and used to preserve and maintain the system.

Representative Pike said she thought that there was a general mistrust on the public's perception of how the government does spend the money already. Until we address that, she said she didn't think we will get to the point that we can ask them for more money. Speaking to Commissioner Mielke's point, she said they have been fighting for reforms, and said that is why the transportation package didn't make it out of the Senate this last session. She said there is a new power dynamic in Olympia, and she said she is glad to see it. She said for too long one group has run the table. Representative Pike said people that she represents make it clear that they want us to do with what we already have, no matter if the pockets are all empty. She said this is the new normal until we take drastic reforms and fix the problems. She said everyone needs to talk to those in Olympia who are standing in the way of these reforms and encourage them to embrace the reforms.

Chair Burkman said they made it through half of this agenda item, and the demographic portion of the item will be brought back at a later time.

### **VIII. Other Business**

#### From the Board

Chair Burkman said with Commissioner Stuart leaving, this leaves the RTC Vice Chair position unfilled. Larry Smith asked the history of the Chair and Vice Chair set up along with the small cities role. Chair Burkman said the historical pattern, but not documented in the Bylaws or Interlocal Agreement, has been a rotation through Vancouver, Clark County, and a small city and repeated through. The pattern in that cycle has been the Vice Chair moves into the Chair position the following year.

Steve Stuart said recognizing that the County has the position of Vice Chair and next year would be Chair.

STEVE STUART NOMINATED TOM MIELKE FOR THE VICE CHAIR POSITION. ED ORCUTT SECONDED THE NOMINATION.

PAUL GREENLEE NOMINATED MELISSA SMITH FOR THE VICE CHAIR POSITION. DOUG MCKENZIE SECONDED THE NOMINATION.

Steve Stuart asked if Melissa Smith was aware of the nomination. Mr. Greenlee confirmed that she was aware of the nomination and agreed.

THE NOMINATION FOR TOM MIELKE SHOWED 5 IN FAVOR. THE NOMINATION FOR MELISSA SMITH SHOWED 7 IN FAVOR. MELISSA SMITH IS CHOSEN AS THE VICE CHAIR FOR 2014.

#### From the Director

Matt Ransom said he and Chair Burkman met with the State Auditor's office the previous day in conclusion of RTC's 2013 audit. The audit had no findings, no issues, and a clean audit. He said from the auditor's perspective, they said they enjoy auditing the RTC. Chair Burkman said that is a strange concept, but that is what they said. He said RTC is one of the first to tell them they are ready to have them come and audit. Mr. Ransom said that is likely due to our size. He said also it has to do with the staff. The accountant and the administrative team that supports the accountant are top notch. Mr. Ransom said everything was in good order, and thanked the accountant and administrative staff for their good work.

Mr. Ransom said as was noted at last month's meeting, the Washington Transportation Commission is hosting statewide roundtable sessions on the Washington Transportation Plan 2035. A roundtable session has been scheduled in Vancouver for April 23 from 10:00-12:00 at WSDOT SW Region Headquarters. RTC has been asked to contact stakeholders and key staff or personnel across the county that might be a participant. Board members are welcome to attend.

The Bi-State Coordination Committee has a tentative date to reconvene on May 1 at 8:00 a.m. to take up issues of bi-state significance. Matters related to bridge crossings, etc. might be a topic of conversation.

Mr. Ransom noted C-TRAN Board of Directors meets at 5:30 p.m. on Tuesday, April 8, 2014, at the Vancouver Library, and JPACT meets Thursday, April 10, 2014, at Metro at 7:30 a.m.

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, May 6, 2014, at 4 p.m.

IT WAS MOVED, SECONDED, AND APPROVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING.

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

---

Jack Burkman, Board of Directors Chair