

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Board of Directors
January 6, 2015, Meeting Minutes**

I. Call to Order and Roll Call of Members

The Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council Board of Directors Meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Jack Burkman on Tuesday, January 6, 2015, at 4:00 p.m. at the Clark County Public Service Center Sixth Floor Training Room, 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington. The meeting was recorded by CVTV. Attendance follows.

Voting Board Members Present:

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

Voting Board Members Absent:

Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor
Melissa Smith, Camas Council Member
Don Wagner, WSDOT Regional Administrator
Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1 Manager
David Poucher, White Salmon Mayor

Nonvoting Board Members Present:

Don Benton, Senator 17th District
Paul Harris, Representative 17th District
Jim Moeller, Representative 49th District
Lynda Wilson, Representative 17th District

Nonvoting Board Members Absent:

Curtis King, Senator 14th District
Norm Johnson, Representative 14th District
Gina McCabe, Representative 14th District
Ann Rivers, Senator 18th District
Liz Pike, Representative 18th District
Brandon Vick, Representative 18th District
John Braun, Senator 20th District
Richard DeBolt, Representative 20th District
Ed Orcutt, Representative 20th District
Annette Cleveland, Senator 49th District
Sharon Wylie, Representative 49th District

Guests Present:

Ed Barnes, Citizen
Mike Bomar, CREDC
Katy Brooks, Port of Vancouver
Mark Brown, Connections Public Affairs
Bob Carroll, IBEW 48
Eric Florip, The Columbian
Heath Henderson, Clark County
Roy Jennings, WA Transportation Commissioner
Lee L. Jensen, Citizen
Vicki Kraft, Citizen
Dale Lewis, Rep. Herrera Beutler's Office
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver Council
Paul Montague, Responsive Leadership
Jerry Oliver, Port of Vancouver Commissioner
Ron Onslow, Ridgefield Mayor
Scott Patterson, C-TRAN
Scott Sawyer, City of Battle Ground
Shane Bowman, Battle Ground Mayor
Tim Shell, City of Ridgefield
Ron Swaren, Citizen
Tad Winiecki, Highway Transport Research

Staff Present:

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

II. Citizen Communications

Tad Winiacki from Vancouver said he represents Highway Transport Research. He thanked all who worked to keep our roads smooth and safe with the 2014 road improvements throughout Clark County. Mr. Winiacki said the best alternative for traffic congestion is to plan ahead for new right of way and utility easement and build the infrastructure before or concurrent with the construction. He provided suggestions for preventing and reducing traffic congestion. Mr. Winiacki spoke about bridge design for heavy and light vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians. As a bicyclist, he said the I-5 Bridge is very scary, and he would really appreciate a bridge that has the big vehicles on a top deck and a lower deck that is covered for bicycles and pedestrians.

Katy Brooks, Director of Business Development for the Port of Vancouver, offered her support for the Clark County Transportation Alliance that was on today's agenda. She said the Port has participated on the CCTA for many years. It is critical as the legislature gets into session that we in Southwest Washington have one voice around what transportation projects are key to our success. She said the CCTA Statement supports that, not only individual projects, but all coming together to identify which ones are priority reaching across jurisdictional lines and that is important. In the past, the Port has received federal and state funding. They have been a beneficiary of helping support some of our region's transportation infrastructure which results in economic growth, job generation and support for our community. Ms. Brooks highlighted some of the projects, their dollar amounts, and the importance to our community. She offered the Port's support of the CCTA.

Ron Swaren from Portland said the comments he plans to present he also has presented to TriMet and Metro. This is about interstate travel and our transportation needs. He believes the I-5 Bridges are in reasonably good condition. A facility at UC Berkeley, PEER (Pacific, Earthquake Engineering Research), is an advisory to Caltrans and provides seismic evaluation and upgrading design for their bridges. He suggested that they could perhaps evaluate the I-5 Bridges. Mr. Swaren also said that in Washington County two major employers are gearing up for expansion that would provide about 10,000 new jobs between Nike and Intel and can provide opportunities for Clark County. This could produce some transportation problems. He said the solution would be another Interstate crossing, which he calls the Western Arterial Highway. It has also been referred to as a Port to Port crossing, but this would go all the way to US 26. Mr. Swaren said in this session of the Oregon legislature, he plans to ask for a study of this route. He feels it is the best solution.

Ed Barnes from Vancouver said in 2014, between where Highway 99 meets I-5 and the Delta Park area, there were over 300 accidents. He said he has witnessed at least 4 accidents on the I-5 Bridges and the number will only increase. He said this is because our Legislators would not get a transportation package approved. We need to have the support of our elected officials for our region in order to receive any transportation funding.

III. Approval of the Board Agenda

Vice Chair Burkman said the Executive Director would like to add an item to the agenda. Copies of the revised agenda and staff report were distributed. Mr. Ransom said the proposal is to be added as item VI. It is a Staff Report/Resolution that would amend the Unified Planning Work Program to allow them to utilize some grant funds that they were made aware of as of yesterday. The State is able to allocate some additional grant funds for RTC's use, and it would support their program and policies they are developing. Mr. Ransom said the proposal is for the Boards consideration to amend the agenda with this action item, FY 2015 Unified Planning Work Program Amendment: Complete Streets Policy, Resolution 01-15-02.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE REVISED AGENDA FOR JANUARY 6, 2015. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY LARRY SMITH AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

IV. Approval of December 2, 2014, Minutes

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 2, 2014, MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY NANCY BAKER AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

V. Consent Agenda

A. January Claims

LARRY SMITH MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA JANUARY CLAIMS. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY PAUL GREENLEE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VI. FY 2015 Unified Planning Work Program Amendment: Complete Streets Policy, Resolution 01-15-02

Matt Ransom said the Unified Planning Work Program is the Federal Work Program that is adopted annually, typically in April or May, for the purposes of the receipt of federal funds. It is where we document what is being done with the funds and how the work program is executed as a duty under the MPO rules at the federal level. As part of that, they also document what is done under the duties under state law to satisfy the RTPPO requirements. Mr. Ransom said they had been working with the WSDOT State Planning Office and had recommended that they had additional work they could do should funds become available. That work is described in the staff report and the attached document. The work is to do some research and develop, ultimately for Board consideration, best practice recommendations and perhaps a policy to implement what is referred to as Complete Streets. Complete Streets is at the federal and state level an idea that streets need to be built for ADA accessibility, multi modal, etc. It doesn't mean that every street has to be that, but it means that before you construct using federal or state funds, you need to consider those factors and plan appropriately.

Mr. Ransom said what they are seeing both at the federal and state level is that many of the fund programs are starting to align behind that policy, so because we have a gap in our policies here at the RTC level, there is some value and some need for us to evaluate what we should put

in place at the RTC Board level and correct policy that would bring us in alignment with state and federal trends.

Full details are listed in the document. Mr. Ransom said the basic tasks would include some peer review, develop some policy concepts, and those concepts are ultimately documented in a report. Through that process the RTAC committee would be engaged and the findings and recommendations would be presented to the RTC Board for their consideration.

The funds made available for that work is \$13,500. The proposal before the Board is to amend the Unified Planning Work Program to reflect that we are to receive that. The amendment would enable them to obligate the funds and enter into a contract with WSDOT to expend those funds. They anticipate that those funds would be used both for RTC staff purposes as well as retain the services of a consultant.

Mr. Ransom said at the County level, throughout Clark County, the Department of Public Health over the last couple of years has been doing quite extensive work in this area. He said it is work that we can build upon. Several of the local jurisdictions have a Complete Streets policy. This would allow RTC at the MPO level to develop a policy that could apply for the use of the federal funds that they have discretion and selection over.

Action on this would allow them to begin work. The funds must be expended by June 30th. This is the reason for bringing it forward today for consideration.

DAVID MADORE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 01-15-02, FY 2015 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM AMENDMENT: COMPLETE STREETS POLICY. LARRY SMITH SECONDED THE MOTION.

Jeanne Stewart referred to the third paragraph in the Introduction of the resolution. She said this would be useful to be able to participate in this. She said what she questioned was that every street in every municipality is not suitable for all modes of transportation. She said in the more urban areas, streets are designed for multiple size vehicles, bikes, and pedestrians and potentially for bus. She said to design and plan a street for certain types of high capacity transit and require that be done, she has concerns for the implications for the cost.

Mr. Ransom said this work is what would compel us to look at that. This would allow us to look at our regional roadway system under RTC's planning framework; local streets are not. When discretionary funds are used, which RTC Board ultimately has selection over, this would address how those funds should be spent, what the expectations are in terms of features of the system such as sidewalks, ADA access, etc. Many of these things are already mandated under federal and state law. This would be documenting the policy approach so that people would know that if they want to apply for these funds, these are the expectations. The key and purpose for the policy evaluation is that it is not a one-size-fits-all. That is the discussion that will be brought to the RTC table.

Councilor Stewart said she agreed with that. She said her assumption is even though the grant is \$13,500, by accepting it, we're agreeing that it is a reasonable policy and that is where follow-up conversation is important. Mr. Ransom said more specifically, it is in the interest of RTC directly and the members as a recipient of RTC's funds to get this policy work underway. Because what is being seen both at state and federal levels is that they are going to mandate them anyway. This would get us in alignment with where the trends are headed in terms of Complete Streets being a fundamental expectation. Not in terms of specific items, but having a policy framework, a cohesive strategy for how we are building out the regional network.

Councilor Stewart said to some degree we are already doing this if we accept state and federal grants. However, she said when we talk about city streets that are constructed without grant money it is different, and she said that is the discussion that she wants to discuss in the future. Councilor Stewart said a street that would have routine bus traffic, she assumed would be more expensive to construct. This would mean an increase in the cost for construction of streets that meet this requirement. She said there needs to be discussion of how they would fund those increases in costs.

Paul Greenlee said he understood that this is a planning grant that lets you look into a series of questions to develop answers. As such, it does not require any actions to be taken to adopt a Complete Streets program. This is a way to look into it.

Mr. Ransom said that was correct. He said it is in the interest of RTC to get on this issue quickly. The Governor is proposing to fund, as a grant fund set aside, the Complete Streets Program that is already codified in state statute. This means that at the regional and or local level to be eligible for that pot of funds, he was sure that there would be a prerequisite requirement that regions and or cities/counties have a Complete Streets Policy on their books before they are even eligible. If we want to keep in the queue for eligibility, it is time for us to take up these issues for discussion.

Councilor Madore said he understood that this is to undertake a study, and the acceptance of this grant does not commit us to something that somehow drives up the cost in areas that are inappropriate. Mr. Ransom said that was correct.

Councilor Mielke said we need to recognize that we all come from different parts, and there are some roads that are impossible to do this. When we make a broad brush, we could be eliminating funds from a source to improve a county road that is impractical to put a bike lane on. He said he doesn't want to have a standard that would restrict us from using state or federal money and wants to have a broader statement, or say within the Urban Growth Boundary.

Mr. Ransom said this staff report/resolution is not describing policy, it is just saying that when we begin this work, we need to look at the universe of this mix. Building a street network is a mix of things, and Complete Streets policy is saying recognize that mix and start to array it in

certain ways based on what you are trying to accomplish recognizing all of the attributes that have been discussed.

Councilor Madore said he assumed that when the results of the study come forward and the recommended policy, that we retain the flexibility at that point to have dialog and apply to some areas where it's more appropriate than others.

Vice Chair Burkman said this resolution does not adopt any policy. It is modifying our work program so we can meet requirements to receive the money to start the conversation.

Bill Ganley said when he served on the Transportation Improvement Board for eight years, they have urban areas and rural areas, so there are different guidelines, but there was always a section which they could amend it. We just need to make certain that there are tools for our engineers to modify it if needed.

RESOLUTION 01-15-02 WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VII. 10-Year Transportation Project Priorities Report – Update, Resolution 01-15-01

Matt Ransom said during the Regional Transportation Plan update process this last year, they committed to review the 10-year report and make any adjustments necessary to bring it in alignment with the RTP once it was adopted. Since the RTP was adopted in December, they have undertaken that work. It has been reviewed by the technical advisory committee, and Lynda David would present the results and recommendations.

Lynda David referred to the resolution included with the meeting materials along with the attached report. Ms. David said today's action is to adopt an updated 10-Year Transportation Project Priorities Report for the Clark County Metropolitan Planning Organization region.

As part of the Regional Transportation Planning process, their commitment was to review the list of 10-year transportation priority projects for the Clark County region and its inclusion in the Regional Transportation Plan update process. The proposed resolution updates the 10-year list of both regional and local projects.

The 10-Year Priorities Report was put together following the adoption of the 2011 RTP and was first adopted by the RTC Board in November 2012. Three emerging projects were added to the list of priority projects by the RTC Board in March 2014. The report itself documents the work completed in 2012 and the proposed update to the list of regional and local project priorities to make the 10-year report as consistent as possible with the Regional Transportation Plan adopted in December 2014 as well as consistent with the Clark County Transportation Alliance Statement.

Projects considered as part of the 10-year Transportation Priorities process were drawn from local Transportation Improvement Programs, WSDOT's Highway System Plan, and C-TRAN's Transit Development Plan. Projects are consistent with the RTP, and the priority transportation projects support the local jurisdictions' Comprehensive Plan and land uses.

The lists of both regional and local projects considered in the process are included in the report. Pages 10 and 11 of the report list the regional projects followed with a location map. Projects are listed by project type: interstate, arterial, and modal projects. All projects listed are priorities for the region. Page 10 lists the projects that are more likely to be able to progress in the shorter term timeframe if funding were made available. Page 11 lists more priority projects that will probably require a little more time to get underway, and are therefore listed in the possible 7 to 10 year window. Page 14 of the report lists the priority local projects recommended by local jurisdictions.

Ms. David noted that distributed to members was a track changes version of the lists in order to see what changes had been made between the original report and this updated version. Updates made to the report include: deleting projects that are now complete or projects that are no longer part of local Transportation Improvement Programs or local Capital Facilities Plans, State Plans or C-TRAN Plans. Project cost estimates, titles, and project termini are updated to make them consistent with the 2014 update to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Ms. David said since the Board packet materials were distributed, there have been some changes proposed by local jurisdictions. Washougal has proposed adding three projects to the local project list. These projects are included in the RTP, and they complement the regional project listed on the regional list (27th Street Rail Overpass.) The three projects proposed in the 7 to 10 year timeframe include: 1) A Street/Addy Street connection from 20th to 27th Street, 2) Addy Street widening from 27th to 45th Street, and 3) Ford Street extension from 27th to 32nd Streets. These three projects have a combined cost estimate total of \$17 million. A simple change needs to be made to the regional map. It needs to be corrected to show the full extent of Clark County's 119th Street project terminate at SR-503 not at 72nd Avenue as currently shown.

Additionally, RTC staff received an email from Councilor Madore who has proposed a change in the language for the SR-14, I-205 to 164th Avenue project. Slides of the project were provided. Councilor Madore said the widening of SR-14 between I-205 and 164th Avenue is a step in the right direction. He said he would like to ensure that there was the flexibility to add not just one lane but potentially two lanes, especially in the eastbound direction. He said he wants to ensure that the flexibility is there so that we don't later have to redo a sound wall because we have boxed ourselves in one lane instead of two. Councilor Madore said it would be helpful to allow for one or more lanes.

Matt Ransom said he had an opportunity to discuss this with WSDOT staff, Bart Gernhart, this afternoon. No one from WSDOT was able to attend today's meeting due to the fact that they were dealing with several roadway washouts at the coast caused by recent storms. Mr. Ransom said in October 2014, the RTC Board deliberated the I-205 corridor projects and that included a project on SR-14 as described. The narrative of the discussion as listed in the minutes, document that WSDOT in their engineering process, when they enter into the final

engineering, they will in fact evaluate how many lanes are needed in that location. It is at that juncture that they make the final engineering decision based on the traffic forecast and volumes and environmental and physical constraints, etc. This includes what will fit and how much is needed to support the capacity requirements of the roadway. As a result, the policy of the Board, in the RTP, it says add one lane. In the I-205 project strategy, it says add one lane. The October meeting minutes reflect that WSDOT will look at how many lanes are needed. Mr. Ransom said he did not want to revise the policy, but note that this will be evaluated when the project is funded for construction. At that point it is based on what is actually needed to serve the community at that time.

Vice Chair Burkman said he understood this to mean that the document they have as it is listed does allow what Councilor Madore has asked for when the design moves forward. Mr. Ransom said he believed so. He said to take the listing and add an s to lane. He said it is not inconsistent with the RTP, because again, the proposal is to add lanes to the roadway. The question is how many lanes, and that answer, as Mr. Gernhart said today, can't be made until they get it funded and at that point update the traffic forecast and make that decision.

Mr. Ransom said they were not revising the policy in the RTP or the I-205 Corridor Study. That still clearly said add one lane in each direction, recognizing that the dialogue with WSDOT around this table in October is that they will evaluate the final need once it is funded for construction. If it is not funded for construction for ten years, it may be different and will need to be updated.

DAVID MADORE MOVED TO AMEND ITEM 1 ON THE 10-YEAR PRIORITIES LIST TO READ "SR-14, I-205 TO 164TH AV., ADD LANES". PAUL GREENLEE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Jeanne Stewart said in looking at the estimated cost of the project, she questioned how that would address this change to the project. Mr. Ransom said he interpreted the amendment to not be prescriptive, rather it is intended to add lanes, recognizing that that decision would be made when it is funded for construction. Councilor Stewart asked why the estimated cost was changed from \$37 million to \$38 million. Ms. David said the change was made because the \$37 million was in the 2011 MTP. The \$38 million is the updated cost estimate by WSDOT in the 2014 RTP.

Jeff Hamm said he was uncomfortable with just changing it to lanes, which sounds prescriptive. He said he would find it more comprehensive to say "add lane or lanes".

DAVID MADORE MODIFIED HIS MOTION TO CHANGE THE WORDING TO "AMEND ITEM 1 ON THE 10-YEAR PRIORITIES LIST TO READ "SR-14, I-205 TO 164TH AVE., ADD 1 OR 2 LANES IN EACH DIRECTION." PAUL GREENLEE SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

David Madore said he had an additional amendment for modification to the list. He said he has said no to funding for bus rapid transit multiple times, and the first item listed under the Modal Projects is the Fourth Plain Transit Improvements, Bus Rapid Transit.

DAVID MADORE MOVED TO STRIKE THE FOURTH PLAIN TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS, BUS RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT FROM THE PRIORITY LIST. TOM MIELKE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Jeanne Stewart said the Bus Rapid Transit project is listed at \$53,404,000. She said her understanding is that C-TRAN believes that they can finance bus rapid transit totally within their own budget without requiring state money, and asked if that was correct. Councilor Stewart said from the C-TRAN budget, that amount is listed in the budget for funding bus rapid transit. Jeff Hamm said the C-TRAN budget lists bus rapid transit as \$6.7 million. She questioned what the \$53 million was for. Mr. Hamm said that is for the total cost of the project which includes the work that has been done so far, the preliminary engineering and design, which they have had federal funding and some C-TRAN funding. The bulk of that is a \$38.7 million federal Small Starts Grant that is in the President's budget that has passed congress. Councilor Stewart asked if the list was for funding from all sources for all agencies. Vice Chair Burkman said the list showed total project costs. Councilor Stewart asked how they accounted for what was already paid or already funded.

Matt Ransom said that is not reflected in this list. He said this report is a subset of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). In 2012, it was recognized that the Legislature might pick up a conversation about new revenue, new funding, and what the priority projects were. It was the decision of the Board at that time to say we can't go to the Legislature with 100 projects worth \$2 billion, we need to narrow it down to the most important projects based on some ranking priority system, and that is what is represented by this 10-Year Priority List. Mr. Ransom said we are now in that same place. The Governor now has put a bill on the table and presumes that the Legislature will take it up in the 2015 session. He said we are put in a position to say what the most important projects are from this region. This is a subset of the RTP with the total project costs. Councilor Stewart said it looks as though these are all new requests or ongoing requests, where some of the funding for these is already from other places.

Councilor Stewart spoke to her concern of bus rapid transit included in the list. She said the last time BRT went to the citizens for a yes or no vote, it was combined on a ballot measure with sales tax increase. She said the question to C-TRAN area residents was if they wanted to pay for that. The response was no, but it was combined with light rail. She said the uncertainty, is if they were saying no to light rail or no to BRT or no to both. If C-TRAN could put this back on the ballot to the citizens for just BRT and the citizens vote in the affirmative, she would support BRT going forward. She said the problem is that the last she heard from the citizens was no for BRT. Councilor Stewart said she did not want to say no to the whole transportation plan because that issue is included, but it is a factor of how she would support it or not.

David Madore asked if this is a request for state funds only. Matt Ransom said Board policy is represented in the Regional Plan that the Board adopted in December. When member jurisdictions as well as the RTC as a representative go to talk with Legislators, whether that be state or federal, the often asked question is what our priority is. The Board in 2012 decided that we needed to narrow it to a shorter list, which is the priority list. That is what this

represents. This is not crafting new policy. It is just representation of the sorter list. Mr. Ransom said this is an array of priorities. They are not necessarily more important than the other, but each member here has a set of priorities, and this is a representation of the whole. Councilor Madore asked why we would bring this forward to the state for future funding for a project that C-TRAN has already identified funding for. Why even have it on the list.

Vice Chair Burkman said his understanding is that the RTC Board adopted a process by which we would categorize all the projects that appear in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) according to the criteria listed (safety, mobility, multi-modal, and economic development.) Through that system they were prioritized in the RTP, and the top tier projects were then narrowed to this priority list without regard to whether local, state, or federal funding. For the region, these are the top projects; that is what this list represents.

Matt Ransom said the review process for these edits was consistency with the RTP and also review by RTC Board's technical advisory committee, RTAC. They did not receive communication from C-TRAN to remove the project because it was already funded. Therefore, it is still represented on the list.

Paul Greenlee said if you look at the Transportation Capital Plan for the City of Washougal, the estimated project cost will be carried on the Plan until the project is completed. It would only be adjusted if the cost estimates would change, not if money is spent. Councilor Greenlee said if they have a list with six projects on it, and suppose that they get grant money for number 6 but not for number 1. Number 6 will become the number 1 project. He said these estimated projects costs and priorities, we have set our own scoring, but the various funding authorities have different scoring, so what may score number 1 for us may not score that high for one of the funding authorities.

Jeff Hamm asked if a project is removed from the 10-Year Priority List, is it then removed from the RTP. Mr. Ransom said no. None of this 10-Year List revises the RTP. The RTP is the pinnacle of RTC Board policy. That is the regional plan for the region. That would be a whole process and deliberation to go back and amend that. What we want to have is consistency; consistency in project titles and costs. He said they have had this request from Legislators both at the state and federal level. It is confusing to have a different project description. Striking a project from this list does not strike it from the RTP. It would be removed from the priority array list that would go to the legislature.

Mr. Hamm said the West Vancouver Freight Access is noted as funded, but it is still on the list and being represented as a priority, which he said would be the same for the Fourth Plain Bus Rapid Transit project, although they have not yet signed the SSGA with the FTA to have the \$38 million in their pocket. Mr. Hamm said this has been assembled from the jurisdictions that are part of the RTC. The C-TRAN Board has voted this as a priority project and to proceed. He said he understood that there is a minority of the C-TRAN Board that believes otherwise, but this still is a project that a majority submitted to the RTC as a priority project.

Vice Chair Burkman reminded the Board that this is the outcome of the process that we agreed upon, which is to categorize each of our projects with a certain scoring. It is not part of our process to then at the end arbitrarily start pulling project out. If we start doing that, it will become a very challenging document to use in both state and federal legislation, because we are not following the process that we have set up. Given some past history, this Board decided to use a more academic process and agree on criteria and then have our experts tell us how the projects scored.

Lynda Wilson questioned why some project costs were much higher and some had gone down. She asked how often they were reviewed. Mr. Ransom said the interval for review is just after the RTP adoption process. The RTP process enabled each jurisdiction to reset their cost estimates. That was part of the deliberation of the project process last fall for the RTP. RTC does not audit those numbers. It is the local agency that is sponsoring the project and submitting it. There is no set preset interval for review again, but his assumption would be that the real value here is a legislative tool. This is an information tool to our state and federal Legislators. The value would be, if there is a need in the next session, and they would get a refreshed list. If there is action on a bill in the Legislative Session 2015, and there is no new bill for another ten years, this might sit dormant for a while until there is a reemergence of a need for a priority list. This is RTC's narrowed priority array list.

Councilor Madore said there has been some reference that it would be arbitrary for us to pull the BRT project. He said it would not be arbitrary to pull the project, given that the people said no to the project.

Vice Chair Burkman said this is an accumulation of projects coming from jurisdictions that each jurisdiction has arrived at from their own policy process vote. The fact that there are modal projects on the list such as from C-TRAN says that organization has spoken and said this is a project for our organization just as all other jurisdictions have done.

Senator Benton said the list is referred to as an array. He said the list is ranked. Vice Chair Burkman said the projects were ranked given the four criteria listed for each project as this Board agreed to use to evaluate all projects. The Interstate/State/Expressway projects are shown ranked 1 to 10, the Arterial projects 1 to 7, and the Modal projects 1 to 5 based on the four criteria.

Senator Benton said the most important economic development project for the County is the last project on the list. He said the I-5 and 179th Street interchange is critical to this county and should not be last on the list and voiced his concerns.

Lynda David said it is an array of projects, and yes there was a ranking and an evaluation. The findings in the report conclude that we should all mutually agree to these as the priority projects and not necessarily go in the order of the ranking, but all mutually pursue funding for all of the projects on the list. Senator Benton said he would then suggest removing the ranking numbers. A numbered list will be read as 1 is first and 10 is last.

LARRY SMITH CALLED FOR THE QUESTION. PAUL GREENLEE SECONDED THE MOTION AND MOTION CARRIED.

The motion on the table was made by Councilor Madore to strike the Fourth Plain Transit Improvements, Bus Rapid Transit project from the Priority list and seconded by Councilor Mielke.

THE MOTION FAILED WITH 3 YES: MADORE, MIELKE, STEWART, 7 NO, AND 1 ABSTAIN: HAMM.

DAVID MADORE MOTIONED TO MOVE THE NUMBER 10 RANKED PROJECT, I-5 AT 179TH STREET INTERCHANGE, TO THE NUMBER 5 RANK POSITION ON THE LIST. TOM MIELKE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Paul Greenlee said that from where he lives, number 6 is much more important to economic development in his part of the county. He observed that we have a process here which we agreed to. It seems inappropriate to mess with the process, because it turns into an argument as to whether I get my project or you get your project. He said he didn't think that was productive.

Jeanne Stewart questioned the numbering of the ranked projects. Mr. Ransom clarified that a track changes version of the list was provided at the table to see what had changed. The staff report in the meeting packet has the final list with the changes made. The final list has 10 projects, with projects shifted up.

Lynda Wilson asked how they got ranked in the first place; who made that decision. She said at a meeting earlier in the day at the City, they indicated that RTC staff ranked the projects.

Lynda David said the RTC staff ranked the projects based on the criteria of safety, mobility, if multi-modal, and economic development. Ms. David said the economic development included whether or not the road segment were categorized by WSDOT depending on the tonnage carried on the facility. It also included how many existing jobs were served by the facility, because there are existing jobs that we want to commit to keep within our community and served by a transportation facility that works. Additionally, economic development also considered what additional jobs might be provided if the land use developed around the project area. Those three factors were considered within the economic development criteria.

Vice Chair Burkman clarified that in referring to RTC staff, which is RTAC, the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee, which is the technical staff from all of RTC's jurisdictions.

David Madore referred to the priority list. He said each of the jurisdictions has an interest in those areas and a number of those fall within the city limits of the various cities. None of them fall within the unincorporated area of Clark County. Councilor Madore said they would like to be recognized to have one project for the County and move the project to the number 5 position. He said he thought that was a reasonable request and asked that all have an interest in moving the County forward as good neighbors reach out to each other.

Vice Chair Burkman said this is a conversation that we have each time for projects that fall lower on the list, but we agreed because of the prioritization that we use, that is where we are.

Tom Mielke said things do change, and our economy did. The state of Washington and Clark County and the City of Vancouver is focusing on economic development and creating jobs. That is tied to the 179th Interchange project, because it is the beginning of the Discovery Corridor. He said under economic development's possible 28 points that project received 11. Councilor Mielke said that is one example of someone losing the priority of creating jobs, and that is what that project is about.

Jeanne Stewart asked what the earliest possibility of reprioritizing anything on the list would be if they are not able to get a consensus to move the 179th Street project to a higher priority tonight. Councilor Stewart said I-5 at 179th Street is crucial for I-5 flow. The fair or any big event has impact, and that community is growing a lot, from Ridgefield to Woodland. This intersection will become an increasingly important intersection. Councilor Stewart asked what information would be needed, and what would be a timeframe for that to be reevaluated as a priority.

Matt Ransom said this is largely a tool that RTC and the Board would adopt that would inform the Legislators in terms of a priority list. The score ranking was designed and the intent is to be quantitative so there is really no new information that you could bring to the table, because they have already screened and ranked the project according to how the numbers played out. The numbers are what they are. Mr. Ransom said as Lynda stated, part of the economic development is not just new jobs, taking 0 and creating 10, but in fact, look at how many are existing, and how do you grow or how do you retain those. There are multiple variables within each of the categories. They have ranked it according to the criteria. They have all been ranked the same way. He offered that unless time, three to five years, and circumstances change and the data changes, that if they re-rank them right now, they would rank the same way. Mr. Ransom said that is why it was done quantitatively, to be able to present a quantitative assessment of a ranked array.

Jeanne Stewart asked if he meant that there was nothing that could happen in that area or a need to develop right now that would re prioritize the project. Mr. Ransom said the project was ranked less than a year ago. It was the Board's suggestion at the February meeting and adopted in March to add this project to the list. At that time it was ranked using the same data set that was used for the other projects. There is no new data set to bring to the table that would alter the ranking as it is now.

Jeff Hamm said the numbers are what they are because of the information that was used to evaluate this particular project. He suggested that in the course of the RTP update, which will take place over the course of the year, that we need something upon the County to demonstrate to the rest of us how important that 179th/I-5 area really is for economic

development, because it is not apparent right now from the information that we have. Mr. Hamm said that would be the opportunity to make the case for raising it on the priority list.

Vice Chair Burkman said there was a motion on the floor to move item 10 to the item 5 slot. This will change the placement of the I-5 at 179th Street project from number 10 to the number 5 ranking.

THE MOTION FAILED WITH 2 YES: MADORE AND MIELKE, AND 9 NO.

LARRY SMITH MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 01-15-01 AS AMENDED. BILL GANLEY SECONDED THE MOTION.

Jeanne Stewart asked for the motion to be restated.

Vice Chair Burkman clarified the motion is to adopt resolution 01-15-01 as amended that changed item 1 to "add 1 or 2 lanes in each direction." The resolution is for the 10-Year Transportation Project Priorities Report-Update, which has the changes shown in the track changes version provided.

Tom Mielke remarked about the scoring process. He said he understood that the Board had given direction to staff to score the projects. He said the 179th Street project was not scored correctly and drastically flawed and should be reconsidered under the criteria.

Senator Benton said he wanted to make sure they understand that when the Transportation Committee looks at the list, the last two projects will not be funded; they will be lucky to get funding for the first three, if there is a Transportation package. Senator Benton said it is a slim possibility that we will have a Transportation Revenue Package. He said if we do, it certainly won't be big enough to fund items at the end of the list. He said the project will be doomed for at least four or five years if there is a Transportation package and it is not funded. He said the last project, 179th Street, will not be funded unless something different is done. This list will doom the economic development in North County.

David Madore said he wanted to confirm that this does not include to Governor's Transportation Investment Package "Let's Move Forward" document that was in the meeting package. Vice Chair Burkman said Resolution 01-15-01, 10-Year Transportation Project Priorities Report does not have any of that included in it. The purpose of this resolution is to seek RTC Board adoption of the Priorities Report for the Clark County Region.

Councilor Madore said he wanted to be on record to oppose light rail, tolls, and bus rapid transit that is not approved by the voters. He said if he votes yes on this, he wanted it on record that he objected to those things with that understanding. He would like to see some of these projects move forward.

A roll call vote was requested.

THE MOTION PASSED WITH 8 YES: BAKER, BROOKS, BURKMAN, GANLEY, GREENLEE, HAMM, MCKENZIE, L. SMITH, AND 3 NO: MADORE, MIELKE, STEWART.

Vice Chair Burkman said the County Councilors meeting begins at 6:00 p.m. He suggested that given the limited amount of time left, they move to the last agenda item to have Mark Brown provide a brief outlook on the 2015 Legislative Session. He said that leaves two items, the Clark County Transportation Alliance Policy Statement and Governor Inslee's Transportation Investment Package. He said they could address those if time allowed. Board Members agreed.

VIII. 2015 Legislative Session Outlook Briefing

Mark Brown represents a number of interests in Clark County both private and public including the Cities of Vancouver and Ridgefield. He provided an annual preview of the 2015 Legislative Session. This is the 43rd legislative session that he has worked with. Mr. Brown said there are also other good people who represent interests here including Mike Burgess who represents Clark County and C-TRAN. Mr. Brown consulted with Mr. Burgess on this briefing. Rick Wickman represents the Port of Vancouver and Identity Clark County, and he consulted with him as well.

Mr. Brown said he would walk members through the Clark County Transportation Alliance Statement and pivot his thoughts based on that, since that represents a position paper of where many of the major private and public sector organizations would like the Legislature here to head in terms of transportation policy.

Mr. Brown said the question is if there will be action taken in this session on a comprehensive major transportation revenue package. He said they have been in a state of deadlock for a number of years. What has changed from a year ago is: the cost of fuel has fallen; the Governor has decided to intervene directly by putting his own proposal on the table; the Senate Majority Coalition is no longer a coalition; it is an outright Senate Republican Majority; there is a single chair on the Senate Transportation Committee, Senator King from Yakima; there is a new Ranking Member on that committee, Representative Hobbs from Lake Stevens; On the House side, there is a narrower Democratic Majority.

In 2013, the House passed a \$12 billion package, but they passed it with just 50 votes, the minimum necessary and only one republican. Their majority is reduced to 51. There is a change in the political terrain that could have some significance, and there is a lot of concern over the management of a number of mega projects, such as Bertha. The House Democrats have announced that they will not act on a package until the Senate acts first and sends a package to them. There are in recent days a number of House and Senate Republicans who have called publically for action on a comprehensive package. Some of these changes seem to improve the climate for action on a revenue package; others would suggest that the terrain is more difficult.

Mr. Brown reminded all that the Clark County Transportation Alliance, which Mr. Brown Co-Chairs, was able to get all the major transportation policy leaders here in recent weeks, Senator King, Representative Clibborn, Representative Orcutt, and some of our local legislators were a

part of some of those tours. Mr. Brown said at lunch with Representative Clibborn and Representative Orcutt, they were asked about the next legislative session and action on a transportation package. Representative Orcutt said no action on a comprehensive revenue package until 2017, reforms first. Representative Clibborn said she was confident that they will act on a comprehensive revenue package in 2015. Mr. Brown said he did not know if there would be action on a Transportation Package in 2015. It's possible, but not likely.

Mr. Brown said many want to see reforms. He said every major reform that has been proposed is still on the table. Mr. Brown referred to the handout of the Governor's proposal that was provided. He said the Governor has proposed six reform items that are included in the document.

Mr. Brown encouraged endorsement of the Clark County Transportation Alliance (CCTA) Statement. He said ten critical projects were identified. The CCTA did not invent any of the projects. They were brought to the Alliance by the participating members and agencies saying this is one of their priorities they want on the list. The list coincides with the project list that the RTC Board just took action on. The CCTA does not prioritize projects. Good projects are put on the list, and then it is up to the Legislators and others to decide whether they also will assign value and priority to those and are willing to work for funding those projects.

Recent comments from the Governor noted that he would have liked to do more in his proposal to fund specific projects in our region. He has suggested and his staff has suggested to Mr. Brown that that is difficult to do because what they have said is a lack of agreed to consensus here around a smaller list of projects. Mr. Brown said that is something that they have shared with him, and he is sharing it with the Board. They say that makes it difficult for them and makes the terrain here more difficult for those who want to help our region. Mr. Brown said prioritization is very difficult. He said there is no process here that says these are the projects and fund them in this order. That has not been done before. No matter what RTC does, partner agencies are free to establish their own priority among their priorities. Private sector partners are free to do the same thing. Legislators decide what their priorities are and exchange their vote for the package in exchange for funding those projects.

Mr. Brown said the local options, additional tools for local governments to meet unmet transportation needs, are very much in play. He has a meeting the following day with Representative Clibborn, the House Chair, who is helping them to craft a Bill. That Bill will at least include reforming the Transportation Benefit District statute, making it easier to create TBDs. When the current statute was created, it was assumed that a lot of multiple jurisdictions would form a single TBD, so it was complicated. That has not happened. Virtually, all of the TBDs are single jurisdictions, so all of the complicated process is not needed. The local governments are asking that the \$20 authority on the annual car tab renewal fee be increased up to \$40 in terms of what can be done through councilmanic action. There are some local governments that are asking that the sales tax authority within the TBD be given to the councils to be acted on through councilmanic authority. That is still on the table. There are other

proposals that would provide additional tools for public transit agencies, but those are largely Puget Sound-centric.

On the public transit piece, Mr. Brown said he talked with some of the public transit lobbyists, and most of what they are doing is focused like us on whether or not there will be a package or not, and if there is a package, how do you advantage that. There is not a lot of independent legislation coming out of their state association. There is a proposal to give Sound Transit a significant new operating platform including financing authority to go to the voters up there. They have a long-term multibillion dollar vision, and they would like to have the authority to pursue that.

Mr. Brown said there is a statement that calls for us to support enhanced port surveys and freight mobility. The state Port association is focused largely on the package and looking for opportunities within the package for them to benefit their operations.

Mr. Brown thanked members for asking him. He ended by saying that action on a package is inevitable; it is only a question of when. Mr. Brown said if you support action on a new comprehensive transportation revenue package, then he said to keep pressure on our local Legislators to support a package and give them your justification in terms of your needs and certainly suggest to them that they trade their vote on a package for funding for their priority project. That is the way the system works. Mr. Brown said Mike Bomar, CREDC, has done a lot of work in advocating for a package. He said it is important to have the public agencies in a roll of advocates for this package, and in his opinion, it is more important to have the private sector out talking to Legislators and advocating for this package. Mr. Brown said one of his jobs is to see that this region gets some measure of fair share, whether it is appointments to boards or commissions, whether to capital budget, or whether it is a transportation budget. He asked members to continue to be advocates for some measure of fair share distribution in any final project list. He said we received that with the Nickel Package and the Partnership Package which was shown on the handout that was distributed. Mr. Brown invited all to come to Olympia. The Clark County Transportation Alliance will have a lobby day, just as they do every year.

IX. Clark County Transportation Alliance – 2015-2016 Washington State Legislative Policy Statement

Vice Chair Burkman referred to the Transportation Alliance Statement. He said it is a recap of all that they have been discussing over the last several months. It does not change the prioritization. As Mr. Brown pointed out, it is not a prioritized list. He entertained a motion to adopt the Clark County Transportation Alliance Statement.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CLARK COUNTY TRANSPORTATION ALLIANCE 2015-2016 STATEMENT. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY LARRY SMITH.

David Madore said he supported everything on the statement except the term “to enhance transit” which is said to be a critical need. He said this is mainly because they need reform added to any new transit passage that would respect the vote of the people. He said he objected to continue to enhance more transit funds to fund projects that have been rejected by the voters.

Jeanne Stewart said she sees many good things in the CCTA Statement. She said she was not sure how the critical transit is defined. However, she said the comprehensive revenue package is key, the accelerated permitting with regulatory streamlining is excellent, and protecting existing funding and several other priorities listed are really important. She said she doesn't necessarily agree with every single word, but she said it is a good list to start from.

THE MOTION WAS APPROVED WITH ONE ABSTAIN BY KELLY BROOKS.

X. Policy Summary of Governor Inslee's Transportation Investment Package (December 2014)

Time was not available for further discussion. Copies of the document were available.

XI. Other Business

From the Director

Mr. Ransom said even though there was not time for discussion of the Governor's Transportation Package, they would be monitoring that and the proposed bill, etc. With the Boards endorsement of the CCTA Statement and the 10-year priority list, he said over the next several months he would share the information with the Legislators as requested and be a resource to them. He addressed those present, saying they could access him for information on project details, background, etc.

As noted on the agenda, JPACT meets Thursday, January 8, 2015, at Metro at 7:30 a.m. C-TRAN Board of Directors meets on Tuesday, January 13, 2015, at 5:30 p.m. at the Vancouver Library.

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

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

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.