

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Board of Directors
April 7, 2015, Meeting Minutes**

I. Call to Order and Roll Call of Members

The Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council Board of Directors Meeting was called to order by Chair Melissa Smith on Tuesday, April 7, 2015, at 4:00 p.m. at the Clark County Public Service Center Sixth Floor Training Room, 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington. The meeting was recorded by CVTV. Attendance follows.

Voting Board Members Present:

Nancy Baker, Port of Vancouver Commissioner
Jack Burkman, Vancouver Council Member
Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor
Bill Ganley, Battle Ground Council Member
David Madore, Clark County Councilor
Doug McKenzie, Skamania Co. Commissioner
Tom Mielke, Clark County Councilor
Scott Patterson, C-TRAN (Alternate)
Larry Smith, Vancouver Council Member
Melissa Smith, Camas Council Member
Jeanne Stewart, Clark County Councilor
Don Wagner, WSDOT Regional Administrator
Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1 Manager

Voting Board Members Absent:

Jeff Hamm, C-TRAN Executive Director
David Poucher, White Salmon Mayor

Nonvoting Board Members Present:

Paul Harris, Representative 17th District

Nonvoting Board Members Absent:

Curtis King, Senator 14th District
Norm Johnson, Representative 14th District
Gina McCabe, Representative 14th District
Don Benton, Senator 17th District
Lynda Wilson, Representative 17th District
Ann Rivers, Senator 18th District
Liz Pike, Representative 18th District
Brandon Vick, Representative 18th District
John Braun, Senator 20th District
Richard DeBolt, Representative 20th District
Ed Orcutt, Representative 20th District
Annette Cleveland, Senator 49th District
Jim Moeller, Representative 49th District
Sharon Wylie, Representative 49th District

Guests Present:

Ed Barnes, Citizen
Pete Capell, City of Camas
Elizabeth Campbell, Citizen
Eric Florip, The Columbian
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Council Member
Roy Jennings, WA Transportation Commissioner
Lee L. Jensen, Citizen
Jim Karlock, Citizen
John Ley, Citizen
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver Council Member
Audrey Miller, Citizen
Sharon Nasset, Economic Transportation Alliance
Jerry Oliver, Port of Vancouver Commissioner
Ron Onslow, Ridgefield Mayor
Mike Pond, Citizen
Tracy Schreiber, SWWDC
Patrick Sweeney, City of Vancouver
Bill Wright, Clark County

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. Call for Public Comments

John Ley from Camas spoke about the I-5 / Mill Plain Interchange project and questioned its review process and project details.

Chair Smith asked that everyone be respectful and courteous and refrain from personal attack against staff and any other individual. Such comments will not be acceptable.

Representative Paul Harris arrived at the meeting at 4:08 p.m.

Ed Barnes of Vancouver spoke about the need of a new I-5 Bridge saying it should have already been up and running. He said our Legislators and elected officials need to work together to achieve something instead of knocking down projects.

Jim Karlock of Portland distributed a handout with his comments. He spoke about the Complete Streets agenda item. He said it was about "smart growth" and felt that forced people to live in high density housing, travel by foot, bicycle, or transit, and will make Clark County more like Portland.

Chair Smith requested that once someone spoke about an item/issue, they would not have a second time until everyone else who wished to speak to that item had done so. She said she would ask for a motion for action items and discussion would follow. The subject would be discussed one at a time.

III. Approval of the Board Agenda

LARRY SMITH MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 7, 2015, MEETING AGENDA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BILL GANLEY AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Councilor Stewart questioned the handouts distributed at the table for Board Members. Mr. Ransom provided clarification of the provided documents including: Draft copy of the FY 2016 Unified Planning Work Program, a copy of the slide presentation for Agenda item 6, a graph for agenda item 6 A, and a copy of the slide presentation for Agenda item 7.

IV. Approval of March 3, 2015, Minutes

JACK BURKMAN MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 3, 2015, MEETING MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY LARRY SMITH AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

V. Consent Agenda

- A. 2015 RTC Budget Adjustment (RTC Insurance Premiums), Resolution 04-15-05**
- B. April Claims**
- C. Complete Streets Policy Review – Professional Services Contract, Resolution 04-15-06**

David Madore asked that Items B and C be pulled for discussion.

JACK BURKMAN MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA ITEM A. RESOLUTION 04-15-05. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BILL GANLEY AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

David Madore addressed Item B, Claims List for March 4 to April 7, 2015. He questioned the payment to Harvard Kennedy School Executive Education in June and asked what that was. Matt Ransom said as part of RTC's budget this year and part of his review, the Review Committee concurred that he should go to a residency executive education program, which is typical of new executive directors. He said he looked at programs that were available, applied, and was accepted into this program. The claim referred to is the tuition amount. It was established in the 2015 budget and listed under registration/tuition. Councilor Madore asked the name of the course. Mr. Ransom said it is the Harvard Senior Executives in State and Local Government in the residency program.

David Madore referred to the claim for travel reimbursement for Mr. Ransom and asked if that was normal. Mr. Ransom said that was reimbursement for attending a quarterly meeting of MPO directors and registration for a conference in Seattle. This is not a normal cost for every month, but this is a typical quarterly cost when MPO meetings occur.

David Madore said Claims 67 for American Planning Association and 70 for Urban Land Institute was for annual dues and questioned the advantage they were to the agency. He said when he looked them up they both listed global warming, and he questioned how that advantaged us for transportation solutions. Councilor Madore said these optional organizational dues would be something that the Board should consider before they are signed up for. He said they might not necessarily agree that they are solutions for our future.

BILL GANLEY MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEM B. APRIL CLAIMS. SHIRLEY CRADDICK SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION PASSED WITH 2 NO VOTES, MADORE AND MIELKE.

David Madore referred to Consent Item C. for a Complete Streets Policy services contract and distributed a handout with his comments. He read the document saying complete streets is a euphemism for shrunken streets and part of Smart Growth or centralized government planning. Councilor Madore said he thought this would be inappropriate for this organization. He said he believed this policy would be in direct conflict with mission of this organization, that of addressing the needs of our community, primarily but not exclusively, through road and corridor improvements. He said he would be voting against this item.

JACK BURKMAN MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEM C. RESOLUTION 04-15-06, AND SHIRLEY CRADDICK SECONDED THE MOTION.

Jack Burkman said he was looking at Complete Streets on Wikipedia, and it matches his understanding. He said it is a transportation policy and design approach that requires streets to be planned, designed, operated, and maintained to enable safe, convenient, and comfortable travel and access for users of all ages and abilities regardless of their mode of transportation. Complete Streets allows for safe travel by walking, bicycling, driving automobiles, riding public transportation, and delivering goods. The term is an important aspect of developing our urbanized areas in particular so we respect all people's ability and inability to get around.

Shirley Craddick said one of the responsibilities that they have as an MPO is their air quality conformity. She said they have to meet their air quality standards, and they know that auto emissions are a significant contribution to their air pollution and CO² levels. One of their jobs is to make sure that there are other options to get around besides automobiles, so they look at all forms of mobility including the automobile, transit, walking, and bicycling. There is a direct link to what the role complete streets have to help them meet their air quality standards.

Jeanne Stewart questioned why they need to go outside and engage in a contract. Employees of RTC are highly trained and very professional and knowledgeable. She asked why it could not be done in-house rather than contract out.

Matt Ransom said there were two factors involved. He said when the Board approved the amendment of the work program in January to receive the state funds that are the funding for this contract, they indicated at that time that this is a short turnaround. They have to expend the funds and get through this plan analysis by the end of June. Given their resources, they simply do not have enough staff time. That combined with the fact a third party facilitator with a certain level of knowledge and expertise that it might take staff weeks to research and they have already done that research and can bring to RTC some ideas or concepts. What they are seeking with this is a review and recommendation for best practice ultimately the policy that this Board adopts is theirs alone. They have two months to complete this work, and it is best to be done by a consultant that knows this content on a larger scale than they do.

Jeanne Stewart said this is a state grant that we are expending to this consultant. Mr. Ransom said that was correct. She asked if our staff will learn from this for future helpful use, because we would get the grant whether we passed it through or not.

Mr. Ransom said if they had 12 months, they could organize through their own resources the capacities to do this work. This is not just an RTC staff conversation. This is a conversation around the table with jurisdictions technical committee to begin with. It is members to all the jurisdictions that are a part of RTC. Mr. Ransom said the project manager, Lynda David is already an expert in many regards in this area. He said she can utilize the support that will be provided by this consultant. Once they leave, it will become our responsibility to carry on, and he said Lynda certainly has the capacity to do that.

Jeanne Stewart asked how this crept up to have such a short window to do the work and use the funds.

Mr. Ransom said this happens at the state level and will be discussed in the UPWP agenda item. He said when the state provides the MPOs through the state allocation of funds, which is a portion of our budget, some regions do not spend all of their money. The state office recognizing that there might be an opportunity to continue to progress planning and ideas in regions sends a message out to the regions at the end of the year asking who has some work that is as yet unfunded. Mr. Ransom said in our case we thought it might make sense to do this kind of analysis to see if there might be a policy that makes sense for RTC. RTC recommended that they had a project, and they funded the project. This resulted in RTC having less than six months to complete the work. This is common with these last minute grants. The funds are received, but it needs to be turned around very quickly.

Jeanne Stewart asked if this went out on an RFP. Mr. Ransom said that it did, and two responses were received. It was advertised in the Seattle Daily Journal of Commerce and the Portland Journal of Commerce and was posted on RTC's Web page.

David Madore said this organization has a responsibility for clean air. He said congestion relief directly does that. He said even though we have public transit, he believed the buses were the number one source of exhaust pollution in the county.

THE MOTION WAS APPROVED WITH 2 NO VOTES, MADORE AND MIELKE.

VI. FY 2016 Unified Planning Work Program – Draft Review

Matt Ransom said this agenda item along with item 7 is being presented to the Board in advance of a request for resolution adoption next month. Mr. Ransom said the UPWP is RTC's federal work program. He said when the annual work program is prepared for RTC, there is also a follow up with a federal and state work program which is what the UPWP is. The timing off set is that the state and federal fiscal years are different than RTC's calendar year. This is structured in such that the Board adopts a work program at the end of the year (for 2015). That is then followed up with the UPWP that matches the same scope, resulting in the two sets.

Lynda David referred to the memo included in the meeting packet. A draft copy of the FY 2016 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) was distributed to members and also made available electronically. Ms. David said the UPWP describes transportation planning activities anticipated in the next fiscal year. The draft documents are provided today to provide an opportunity to provide comments prior to asking for Board adoption in May. She said a May adoption will meet the Washington State's Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, and Federal Transit Administration time lines for adoption and implementation.

The Unified Planning Work Program is prepared annually by RTC to meet the requirements specified for Metropolitan Planning Organizations in federal regulations, specifically US Code Titles 23 and 49, as one of the core Metropolitan Planning Requirements for receipt of all federal and state transportation funds to the region. The Fiscal Year 2016 UPWP covers the year from July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016. It completes the grant cycle that began with the Board's adoption of RTC's 2015 calendar budget and work plan adopted in December 2014.

Each year RTC as the MPO for this region is granted Federal Highway Administration PL funds and Federal Transit Administration planning funds to carry out the required Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process. The UPWP outlines how these federal dollars as well as state and local funds will be used for the regional transportation planning program.

The UPWP needs to reflect transportation planning emphasis areas identified by the US Department of Transportation and the State of Washington. These emphasis areas are described in detail in the UPWP beginning on page x. The UPWP also has a description of key transportation issues facing the region on page xv.

Ms. David said as in previous years, the UPWP has four major sections. The first three sections include a description of RTC work elements, and the fourth section describes transportation planning activities of state and local agencies within the Clark County region including Washington State Department of Transportation, Clark County, the Cities, and C-TRAN.

The final page of the document on page 56 provides a revenue summary spreadsheet that shows the revenue sources that support each work element in the program. MPO funds contributed by local jurisdictions remain the same as in 1992 at \$104,500. Ms. David noted that Mr. Ransom would address this following her presentation.

Ms. David said the draft FY 2016 UPWP is being reviewed by RTC's Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC) and by officials from the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Transit Administration, and by Washington State Department of Transportation Headquarters staff, as well as bi-state partners at meetings held at both RTC and Metro on February 17, 2015. After RTC Board's review today, the UPWP will be posted on RTC's Web site to allow for public review. Ms. David emphasized there is consistency between RTC's work program and budget for calendar year 2015 and continuation into 2016 with this FY 2016 UPWP. This is an informational item to provide an opportunity to review the draft document and offer any comments. They will be returning to ask for Board adoption at the May meeting.

David Madore said there is a responsibility to have a basis for our objective of appropriation of our funds that is proportional. He said the dues formula and total contribution per member has remained unchanged since 1992, and the county has changed substantially since 1992. He said Vancouver city limits have increased and the unincorporated Clark County has shrunk along with other jurisdictions. Councilor Madore pointed out that three member agencies that vote on the RTC Board pay zero dues; ODOT, WSDOT, and Metro. Councilor Madore rather than adopt something out of date, he said it would be appropriate to come up with an objective means that would look at this and come up with a better fit for the dues.

Jeanne Stewart asked how long this financial structure has been in place for the contributions. Mr. Ransom this has been in place since RTC was formed in 1992. The Board has not had the policy discussion of the dues in terms of the formula that he was aware of.

Councilor Stewart questioned if there would be value in developing a subcommittee to review that issue and have a discussion; a small group to bring a discussion back to the Board.

Mr. Ransom said that he had intended to provide a brief staff report on this item after the discussion of the UPWP. Councilor Stewart said she would like to hear that staff report before any action on a committee was taken.

Going back to the UPWP, Jack Burkman asked staff if there was anything unusual in the UPWP such as anything that the Board has not talked about or anything from last year that is significant in terms of staff time that is not part of our regular work.

Ms. David said there is a lot of recurring work, continuation of work being done. One of the emphasis areas they will be focused on will be performance measures and performance management per the federal transportation act MAP-21. Ms. David said they will be ramping up those efforts in FY 2016. There has been some discussion at the statewide level and perhaps for an agenda item at a future meeting. That is the major change between the 2016 UPWP and prior years.

Council Member Burkman said he really appreciated pages 43 to 46 that list all the various planning activities that are occurring in the various jurisdictions. It describes what all are working on. He said it helps describe the amount of planning that goes across all of our jurisdictions; there is a lot.

Jeanne Stewart said on page 3 of the memo it lists the Bi-State UPWP requirements. She was not familiar with the TPAC Committee and asked for clarification.

Ms. David said TPAC is basically Metro's equivalent of RTC's Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC). It is their technical committee.

Matt Ransom said the draft UPWP will be posted on RTC's Web site, and if there are any questions to email him.

A. Annual Contributions Paid by RTC Member Agencies

Mr. Ransom referred to the memorandum included in the meeting packet. A chart with historical data was also distributed. Mr. Ransom said one of his major efforts on behalf of the organization last year was to dive deeply into the Bylaws and Interlocal Agreements and all the governing documents. One of the provisions of the Bylaws stated that at each April meeting of the Board, the Board would have the opportunity to review the dues and presumably make adjustments. Mr. Ransom said he was not aware of the number of times that occurred formally. He said he thought this year would be a good opportunity to bring it formally forward to the Board for discussion. This memo is to fulfill the commitment established in the Bylaws to review this.

Mr. Ransom explained the reason for review of the dues in April. The federal work program, which is the primary source for most of RTC's operating budget, needs to be adopted by May for implementation in July. The dues, being one of the primary sources of local match for the grants, are reviewed to ensure that there is balance between the grants that are anticipated for the federal work program and the state grants and the local match; for our ability to ensure that the resources are there to provide the match and operate the organization. Review at this time also allows time, if there are adjustments, for organizations to have several months to make adjustments their budget process as well.

In looking at this year's review and the proposed 2016 UPWP, Mr. Ransom said he concluded that the \$104,500 is sufficient to provide the local match resource for the grants that they are expected to receive. As stated in the memo, for the purposes of matching grants they don't need to make adjustments to the dues for the current UPWP. He said they built the UPWP budget based on the \$104,500.

Mr. Ransom also noted however, that looking forward there may be some value in evaluating the dues formula to ensure long term financial sustainability and sufficient local match. He referred to the distributed chart showing RTC Revenues/Expenses/Dues from 1992 to 2014. In 1992 when the organization was founded, the dues as a percentage of the total budget were a lot higher. The organization had just begun, and they needed to establish a good funding for stability. It could have been that all of the grant resources that are now available to the organization were not available, so dues made up the higher percentage of the total operating budget. Over time, based on projects or special grants to the organization, the chart shows some spikes. One example would be when RTC did the High Capacity Transit Study for the region. That was a special grant that was earmarked out of the federal budget, so that spiked

the organization around the 2006 timeline. Over the course of 22 years, there is about a 68% increase in just the consumer price index. Generally speaking, costs have gone up, but the dues have remained the same. Mr. Ransom said there are sufficient dues to match the grants, but they have remained flat since 1992.

Mr. Ransom said he has read the memo that refers to the formula. It is a very brief description. He said it appears a group looked at the best way to divide up the costs, and they came up with something. It is not, however, what other MPOs do. Spokane for example, does it per population, so every year there is a new population forecast, and every year the formula for dues is adjusted accordingly. That has not happened at RTC, because the formula possibly is not that directly tied to an element like population. That is just one option to provide just a very easy indicator in terms of an annual recalculation. Mr. Ransom said it is up to the Board as to where they go from here.

Larry Smith thanked Mr. Ransom for the history of this. He asked how the review and process was done the last time and how the formula was based. Mr. Ransom said the only reference is a single memorandum for reference. The historical reference is that RTC was forming, but was still a part of the predecessor organization, the Intergovernmental Resource Center (IRC). The IRC was disbanding, and in the enactment of one of the federal transportation bills, which created the MPO framework, RTC was started. A subcommittee of some sort at the IRC got together and figured out a formula. Mr. Ransom said the memorandum does not show a numerical tie to specific elements such as population. It simply shows three distribution options with the adopted option circled. He does not have the IRC history or minutes that have any reference.

Don Wagner said it looks like our dues are about \$100,000, and we're spending about \$1,500,000 a year. He asked who pays for that other 92% of our expenditures. Mr. Ransom said the UPWP budget table shows the best example. The majority of RTC's operating funds come from the federal pass-through grants. Federal gas tax flows to the state for planning purposes and from the state they are allocated out to the regions. The other portion received is state funds. Mr. Ransom said his understanding is the reason that the state, WSDOT, does not pay a dues payment to RTC now is because in fact the state legislature allocates funds to RTPOs and RTC is an RTPO as well as MPO. The conversation when RTC was being set up was that the state is already paying through this other avenue so they would not pay another due on top of that. The state contribution is normally about 10%. Lynda David said the state contribution is \$172,000 a year. The majority of funds come from federal funding, Federal Highway Administration PL funds at \$548,000 per year. Mr. Ransom said it is about 84% federal, +-10% state, and the remainder is local dues. Mr. Ransom said there are nominal collections for fees for services provided to consultants.

Don Wagner said the state provides \$172,000 to RTC's operating budget, and the MPO dues total \$104,500. He said he would be happy to enter a conversation about dividing that cost by all.

Shirley Craddick wanted to clarify that neither of the MPOs pay dues because it is reciprocal. The RTC does not pay dues to Metro, and Metro does not pay dues to RTC. That has been in place for a long time. Mr. Ransom said that was correct.

Jack Burkman concurred with what Councilor Craddick had stated. He said he is on committees at Metro, and there has never been a question about paying dues. He said his understanding of what is being asked of the Board is to agree to keep the dues what they are for this UPWP, because it is already in the process. He said he thought it makes sense for the next UPWP for 2017 to come up with a formula of some kind. He said he appreciated our Executive Director digging into the Bylaws and finding what we have and have not been doing on a regular basis. He recommended staying the course for now. He said the UPWP submittal is early June, and he did not think that we could complete a process to revise and adopt in that time frame. He said they would have to go back through the review process for the various jurisdictions with any changes.

Tom Mielke said what came to their attention was that the Board did not follow what was done previously and select the County as Chair or Vice Chair yet they are paying dues. Councilor Mielke said he did not recall anything in the RCWs that requested any local government body adding to the dues. He said whether it is state or federal funds, it still comes from the taxpayers. He said he thought there was time to look at it.

David Madore said Southwest Washington does not have a reciprocal relationship or equivalent on the Oregon side other than advisory. He said our Washington members serve as advisory board members there, not on policy making board members. Metro has a voting member seat on RTC Board. Councilor Madore added that the County's share is \$36,300 with most others at \$500. Councilor Madore also said this issue was previously addressed and requested a look for options to share the cost.

Councilor Craddick wanted to verify that both the City of Vancouver and Clark County have a voting seat on JPACT as does WSDOT.

Council Member Jack Burkman said he serves on JPACT and Councilor Stewart serves on JPACT now. Metro is a different organization in Oregon, but it performs the same function. RTC sits around one table and casts votes as policy makers. In Oregon, there are two bodies; the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and Metro Council. They happen to have two separate meetings, but at the end of the day, they both have to fully agree before anything advances. So they are both voting members. They could recreate this body if they put both those groups in the room at the same time. At no time is it an advisory. They have their equivalent technical team that is advisory just like we do. In the six years that he has been on JPACT, when he casts a vote, he is casting it as a voting member completely.

Chair Smith asked if the Board would like to recommend a subcommittee created and put this on a future agenda.

DAVID MADORE MOVED TO CREATE A SUBCOMMITTEE TO ADDRESS THE APPROPRIATENESS OF SHARES. JACK BURKMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Clarification on the motion was requested.

JACK BURKMAN MOTIONED TO AMEND THE MOTION TO CLARIFY THAT THE SUBCOMMITTEE'S REPORT WOULD RESULT IN ACTION FOR THE 2017 UPWP AND THEY WOULD MOVE FORWARD WITH THE CURRENT PLAN FOR THE 2016 UPWP. DAVID MADORE ACCEPTED THE AMENDMENT. THE AMENDMENT PASSES WITH 1 NO VOTE, MIELKE.

THE AMENDED MOTION PASSES WITH 1 NO VOTE, MIELKE.

VII. Memorandum of Understanding Between Metro and Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council - Draft Review

Matt Ransom said this is a compliance issue where they have agreements with various organizations. Last year they did a three-party agreement with WSDOT and C-TRAN for the purposes of MPO certification. This is also an MPO certification agreement with Metro. Being a two MPO region, federal requirements mandate that the two MPOs have an agreement in terms of how they are going to work together.

Lynda David referred to the memorandum included in the meeting packet with an attached draft of the MOU. Ms. David said a memorandum of understanding needs to be in place to meet federal requirements of Title 23 CFR § 450 where two Metropolitan Planning Organizations serve in the same bi-state metropolitan area. An agreement between RTC and Metro was first required under the federal transportation act ISTEA in the early 1990s. The actual MOU between Metro and RTC has been in place since its first adoption in 1998. The agreement between the two agencies is reviewed every three years, so 2015 is the year for triennial review and update are necessary.

The draft updated MOU presented today describes general transportation planning efforts and coordination between RTC and Metro in the bi-state region. They anticipate bringing the final draft update to the May Board meeting for action. Ms. David said there are not many changes from the previous agreement, and it has been reviewed by RTC legal counsel.

Jeanne Stewart said the MOU is reviewed triennially and asked the start and end dates. Ms. David said it will begin when both RTC Board and Metro have taken action to adopt an update, anticipating by June 2015. It will be reviewed in not more than three years' time. If there is a need to address a review before the three years are up, they will do so. Ms. David said they might want to review if for example if the new federal transportation act which would affect how they do the regional transportation planning or review if US code changes.

Jeanne Stewart said this would go until approximately June 2018 unless there is a need to bring it back. Lynda David said that was correct.

Mr. Ransom said if Members had any comments, just as the UPWP, to let him know.

VIII. State Legislative Update

Mr. Ransom referred to the memorandum distributed. He said he waited until today to prepare the memo, because as we know and Representative Harris can attest, things are fluid at the Legislature. Mr. Ransom said the action in the Legislature this session has been discussion around a New Law Revenue and Reform Bills. At the last meeting he updated the Board that the Senate had passed out some New Revenue and Reform bills. Those went on to the House. The House did take up a hearing on the New Law Bill on March 26. There were several stakeholder agencies, such as the Chamber of Commerce and the CREDC that attended the hearing of the House and provided testimony on behalf of the region advocating that the Legislature should act this session, and there should be new revenue. They probably also stated advocacy for Legislative priorities, such as what is in the Clark County Transportation Alliance and the list of projects that the Board approved. Mr. Ransom thanked these agencies for attending and advocating for transportation investment in this region.

Mr. Ransom said they understand that the House Transportation Committee continues to just have hearings on the various reform bills. They have hearings, work sessions, and have taken them into executive session, but the understanding is that nothing has been pushed out in terms of a formal proposal by the House on a New Law project list. They expect that that is forthcoming. It might be a list the same as the Senate or it may be a whole new list or combination. They will be watching to see what makes the House list, and the reconciliations are likely to take place between the House and Senate.

Mr. Ransom said the less talked about piece of transportation funding is the Current Law Budget. He understands that the Senate and House have been working through that. The notes included in the memorandum are from a report he received from Mark Brown. He indicated some of the differences in funding and programs, etc. between the House and the Senate Current Law Budgets as they work through that.

Mr. Ransom said he would continue to monitor, and any new information received, he would make it available to the Board. Mr. Ransom also noted that after the last meeting, there have been many questions about project information and project data. He emailed the Board, and could resend or send to any interested staff, a link to an FTP site where you can download all the project fact sheets that RTC has compiled. These are the fact sheets that have been produced by the member agency for the project, not by RTC.

Representative Paul Harris said with the House being so close to session, and looking at the projects that SW Washington didn't receive, he said he believed that there will be new projects that will be put on the list to get SW Washington Legislators onboard. Representative Harris said that would be the 49th District which he said he is meeting with the following day and the 17th and 18th Districts. The disparity of economic dollars spent in SW Washington compared to the rest of the state, he said they really feel like we need some more projects. He said they will be asking for more projects for our region and felt that was important. He said we pay about 7%, and we got about 1 or 1 ½%, and we need more than that.

IX. Federal Legislative Update

Matt Ransom noted the memorandum included in the meeting packet. Also, distributed to members was a letter that was signed onto by Representative Jaime Herrera Beutler. Mr. Ransom provided this to show some of the action that was taking place in Congress. Mr. Ransom said he was expecting one of the lobbyists for Battle Ground and the City of Vancouver, Joel Rubin, to do a presentation, but he did not make it. Mr. Ransom had hoped that he could provide a look at what was happening at the Federal level. Unfortunately, dates got mixed up. Mr. Ransom said possibly, that could take place in the months ahead.

Mr. Ransom referred to the memorandum. He said by May 31, congress needs to provide a new appropriation of funds to backfill the gap between gas taxes collected at the federal level and the expenditure amount. If not, it is possible the flow of federal funds might begin to incrementally decrease. The state receives about \$713 million in annual federal formula funds, and RTC receives roughly \$9.8 million. Those are funds that flow to Members' projects for street improvements, trail improvements, transit improvements, etc. Should Congress fail to act, the flow of funds might incrementally decrease, they might slow down, or they might just reimburse on a delayed basis. They do not know what the true implication is, but there is some threat to how RTC and the state operate. Mr. Ransom wanted to make all aware of this. Mr. Ransom said that Congress will very likely backfill. They typically wait until the last minute, and then they do what is called a continuing resolution, which is how they appropriate funds. It is expected that they will do that.

However, Mr. Ransom said in the background is the need for Congress to perhaps deal with this issue of expenditures exceeding the gas tax revenue, that they have a more systemic solution. The Administration and Congress are both working on it. The distributed letter that was previously noted describes this in part. It is the Members of the House of Representatives compelling their leadership to work on a long-term solution.

Mr. Ransom said the federal gas tax has not been updated for many years. The last time the federal gas tax was updated was in 1993. In any case, when you don't incrementally update some of these revenue sources, then you fall behind in terms of the purchasing power. The buying power is diminished. Mr. Ransom said that affects us. If we can increase the federal share, then we are going to be able to do more things.

Mr. Ransom said prior to this meeting, he met with each of the members of our federal delegation, Senators Murray and Cantwell's offices and Representative Herrera Beutler's office, to gauge where our representatives are. Are they supportive of resolving this issue? Are they looking more for a short-term or long-term solution? They've all said they are absolutely committed, as stated in the letter, to a long-term solution. How that manifests is to be seen. They are each supportive of resolving this issue. They recognize, when it comes to the federal nexus, it needs to become more stable. It needs to become more predictable, and it needs to become more so we can invest in the infrastructure that we need as a community and as a region.

Mr. Ransom said if Congress does not act by May 31st, it becomes a larger issue for the state and regions like RTC. They will deal with that at the time. He recommended at this point to stay the course when it comes to your projects. RTC will be going through a grant selection process this summer that assumes the revenue is going to be there, and he said that is the best course of action to take. It takes years to put these projects together.

Shirley Craddick said that in a few weeks, the JPACT delegation will be going back to Washington, D.C. to Congress to lobby. She said they had many of the same comments that Mr. Ransom had in his presentation. She said she could distribute the document that they will be using to guide their discussion. They will be joining with the Portland Business Alliance and the Oregon Business Association. They will all be going back speaking as one voice.

Representative Harris said currently in the Oregon House, there is House Bill 3152. This bill would open up the HOV lane on I-5 north in Portland. He said Councilor Craddick spoke of the importance of air quality, and he said one of the things that they could do would be to open up the HOV lane. He said in his view, he wished people would carpool, but they are not, and there are a lot of people sitting in two lanes while the HOV lane is wide open. He said that is something that we could look at; if we want to improve air quality, get rid of the HOV lane. He said he has sent a letter on the issue, and many representatives in Washington State have sent letters, and he felt it was an important issue.

Jeanne Stewart asked who from Washington was going with the JPACT group to D.C. Councilor Craddick said at this point no one. She said it is open, and you're welcome to join if someone wants to go. It will be Monday, April 27th. Traditionally, they have gone in March, when the National League of Counties and National League of Cities meet. This year they have postponed it to this later date.

David Madore thanked Representative Harris for the information on the Oregon House Bill 3152.

DAVID MADORE MOVED THAT THE RTC BOARD SEND A LETTER OF SUPPORT TO OREGON FOR HB 3152 TO REMOVE THE HOV LANE AND AUTHORIZE RTC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO SIGN THE LETTER. JEANNE STEWART SECONDED THE MOTION.

Jack Burkman said he has heard some conflicting information that the HOV lane does carry capacity. He asked if that information was available, because they had nothing to base a vote on.

Rian Windsheimer said if you ask if the HOV lane is working, the answer is yes it is. If you ask if more people get through, the HOV lane is being effective of that. They are actually getting more people through using the HOV lane than you would get vehicles through if it was not there. If the HOV would go away, it could also mean even more vehicles depending if those that carpool continue or choose to drive alone. Mr. Windsheimer said currently, the HOV lane is meeting its objective, which is to get more people through the corridor.

Tom Mielke referred to the issue relating to pollution.

Jack Burkman said there is a lot of information that they do not have. He said he is uncomfortable for this organization to take a position and lobbying the Oregon House and Senate without actually having a discussion and information or presentation so they can understand it. He would not approve the motion.

Jeanne Stewart said she did not have technical data or statistics. She said she has had to sit in the backed up traffic. She said it is dangerous to get trapped in the HOV lane and impossible to move to the other lanes because it is so stacked up. She said she thought it would smooth the flow of traffic if it were opened up. She didn't need a study or statistics to see how she personally is impacted by the congestion. She said we need a better solution to fix the transportation infrastructure. She felt it was a small decision to make for RTC, but a huge decision for those who are trapped in the backups.

Larry Smith said he was more data driven when it comes to transportation, not emotionally driven. He said he gets emotional every time he goes across the bridge. He asked the original intent of the HOV lane, why it was created, what data was used, and if it is achieving that objective.

Rian Windsheimer said yes, it is achieving its objective. It is actually moving more people through than the other two lanes combined. They do have data that substantiates that if you are interested. He said he has shared it with the Board before, but he would be happy to provide it again.

Scott Patterson said that the C-TRAN Board has not taken a position on this, so for a vote he would have to abstain. He did say that C-TRAN did do some analysis in 2012. They have seven different express routes that use that HOV lane. Even #164 which operates out of Fisher's Landing uses that HOV lane in the afternoon; it is shorter to come back using I-5 with the HOV than using I-205. The Key is the fact of moving more people through that corridor. The analysis that was done using 2011-2012 data actually showed needing 6000 service hours if the HOV lane would go away in order to maintain the current level of service. That additional travel time would amount to about \$670,000. These are 2012 numbers, but they are in the process of updating using more current numbers, but they expect that number to be substantially higher because there is more traffic across the bridges today than they have in recent years.

A roll call vote was requested.

THE MOTION FAILED WITH 3 YES VOTES: MADORE, MIELKE, STEWART; 7 NO VOTES: BAKER, BURKMAN, CRADDICK, L. SMITH, M. SMITH, WAGNER, WINDSHEIMER; AND 2 ABSTAIN: GANLEY, PATTERSON.

X. Other Business

From the Board

David Madore asked if there were any plans or draft concept of the Mill Plain / I-5 Project. He said no one has been able to provide anything except a general idea. He asked if a grant application was filled out that has specifics. Councilor Madore said RTC is currently in the

middle of an audit. He said he thinks some justification for \$83 million should exist, something that says what it is for.

Councilor Madore said to anyone here, let this be a Public Information Request that has any plans what so ever on what this project is, anything that has any specifics in it. He asked for a show of hands for anyone who has any specifics on the project. None shown. Councilor Madore proposed that the project be stricken from the list because there are no plans.

Jack Burkman said he is not going to get into a lot of details about the I-5 Mill Plain Interchange. The information has been submitted to RTC. The data appears on the FTP site with all the other projects that the Executive Director has provided to us. There are three pages with a breakdown of the project. A lot of times, these projects are very early in preliminary designs and such. The I-5 Mill Plain Interchange appears on Vancouver's Plans and processes beginning in 2007. It is incorporated in a lot of the CRC documentation, but that is not appropriate to go through here.

Council Member Burkman said at a recent JPACT meeting, TriMet distributed copies of their 2014 Annual Report. He distributed copies for Members information.

Jeanne Stewart commented that it was distressing to sit at a committee table and hear people who have statistics and can prove that the HOV lane is moving so many people and doing good things. She said it is worrisome to hear that there is proof that defies what is seen in person as you sit in the traffic. She said we allow statistics to overrule our own experiences and observations, and we deny what we see with our own eyes.

From the Director

Mr. Ransom said the 2014 Obligation Report was distributed at last month's meeting, but there was not time to discuss it. He said the report is available on RTC's Web site. They are trying to make the report more robust in terms of what they are doing regionally to advance investments in the transportation system. This report is required for the purposes of federal compliance. It is an Annual Listing of Federal Obligations. The report used to be in a spreadsheet. It is now in the form of a report. It is valuable for members, staff, and organizations to take stock of all the federal investment that both RTC Board has a hand in distributing the money, and also individual agencies seeing the number of projects that they have completed. Mr. Ransom said last year, among the projects that were delivered or obligated, which means it has advanced some phase of a project activity, over \$28 million of federal funds were obligated within this region. That is inclusive of street, highway, and transit. RTC local funds specifically were over \$12.8 million. He said they are meeting all the targets that they need to meet, and working with member staff through the RTAC meetings to ensure those dates are met. Mr. Ransom said they can make the report available to the public as well.

Mr. Ransom noted JPACT meets Thursday, April 9, 2015, at Metro at 7:30 a.m. C-TRAN Board of Directors meets on Tuesday, April 14, 2015, at 5:30 p.m. at the Vancouver Library.

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, May 5, 2015, at 4 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Melissa Smith, Board of Directors Chair