

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Board of Directors
February 2, 2016, Meeting Minutes**

I. Call to Order and Roll Call of Members

The Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council Board of Directors Meeting was called to order by Chair Jack Burkman on Tuesday, February 2, 2016, 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:

Marc Boldt, Clark County Councilor
Kelly Brooks, ODOT (Alternate)
Jack Burkman, Vancouver Councilmember
Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Councilmember,
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver Council
Jerry Oliver, Port of Vancouver Commissioner
Julie Olson, Clark County Councilor
Ron Onslow, Ridgefield Mayor
Scott Patterson, C-TRAN (Alternate)
Jeanne Stewart, Clark County Councilor
Kris Strickler, WSDOT Regional Administrator

Voting Board Members Absent:

Jeff Hamm, C-TRAN Executive Director/CEO
Doug McKenzie, Skamania Co. Commissioner
David Poucher, White Salmon Mayor
Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1 Manager

Nonvoting Board Members Present:

Nonvoting Board Members Absent:

Curtis King, Senator 14th District
Norm Johnson, Representative 14th District
Gina McCabe, Representative 14th District
Don Benton, Senator 17th District
Paul Harris, Representative 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
Jim Hagar, Port of Vancouver
Lee L. Jensen, Citizen
Bryan Kast, City of Ridgefield
Bridget McLeman, Citizen
Sharon Nasset, Third Bridge Now
Dameon Pesanti, The Columbian
Scott Sawyer, City of Battle Ground
Peter Silliman, Clark County
Ty Stober, Vancouver Councilmember
Jeff Swanson, Clark County
Patrick Sweeney, City of Vancouver
Michael A. Williams, WSDOT
Susan Wilson, 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. Approval of the Board Agenda

Chair Burkman noted the Amended Agenda that was provided. Item VI, the resolution for a TIP amendment for the Bus on Shoulder Feasibility Study was removed from the agenda and would be brought back to the March meeting. The TIP amendment for Battle Ground Resolution 02-16-02 listed as part of the consent agenda would move into the item VI position.

ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE AMENDED FEBRUARY 2, 2016, MEETING AGENDA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY RON ONSLOW AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

III. Call for Public Comments

Ed Barnes of Vancouver said when the Governor was in town on January 13 he met with the Labor Council and discussed several topics. One of the main subjects they discussed was the replacement of the I-5 Bridges. The Governor said he was in favor of it, it needed to be done, and that it is critical to this community. Mr. Barnes said we need to replace the bridges now and not wait.

Shirley Craddick entered the meeting at 4:08 p.m.

IV. Approval of the January 5, 2016, Minutes

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 5, 2016, MEETING MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

V. Consent Agenda

A. February Claims

SHIRLEY CRADDICK MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA FEBRUARY CLAIMS. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY JEANNE STEWART AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VI. 2016-2019 TIP Amendment: Battle Ground, Resolution 02-16-02

Dale Robins said the Connecting Washington Act that was passed by the Washington Legislature awarded \$7.7 million for improvements near the intersection of SR-502 and SR-503. Battle Ground and WSDOT have been in discussions over the last few months, and they have agreed to move the money from WSDOT to Battle Ground. He said there is one slight caveat to that. All changes with this package do need to have approval of the State Legislature, and that should be coming in the near future. By making this amendment, it allows Battle Ground to get moving forward so when that approval happens, they can move forward with the projects.

The amendment transfers \$7.7 million from WSDOT to the City of Battle Ground. There are a number of projects included in this funding, and they were listed in the resolution. These improvements will allow traffic to move much better in the SR-502 / SR-503 interchange area.

Jerry Oliver questioned that the total of the listed projects did not reach \$7.7 million. Dale Robins said the funding package is more than a four-year package. The Transportation

Improvement Program (TIP) is only a four-year program. Some of the projects are outside the 2016-2019 TIP period; they are in the 2020-2023 TIP period.

Shirley Craddick said these are already in your RTP, and asked if this will just move them up to be able to get to construction. Mr. Robins said this does not move the projects up, it only changes which agency will take the lead on them.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE 2016-2019 TIP AMENDMENT: BATTLE GROUND RESOLUTION 02-16-02. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ANNE MCENERNEY-OGLE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VII. Growth Management Act – RTC Certification Process Guide and Checklist

Matt Ransom said the goal for today's presentation is to check in on the process. He said they want to ensure that the Board is comfortable with their role in GMA. Mr. Ransom said as Lynda presents the Guidebook, it is the synthesis of what RTC's role is. Prior to bringing this back for adoption in March, they want to make sure that any questions Board Members have about RTC's role in GMA, or how their staff might use the Guidebook that there is opportunity to do so. This will return to RTAC for their endorsement at their February meeting.

Lynda David referred to the memo and Guidebook included in the meeting packet. As the state-designated Regional Transportation Planning Organization for the region, RTC has certain responsibilities under the state's Growth Management Act. Last month Ms. David provided some background on RTC's role in the GMA certification process. Today she would briefly recap as well as review RTC's draft Certification Process Guide and Checklist.

In summary, RTC's certification is a step that has to be completed in order for local jurisdictions to comply with the Growth Management Act and for RTC to fulfil its duties as required under the GMA. As introduced at the January meeting, there are four key elements that RTC has to complete in order to certify that local jurisdictions have complied with the Growth Management Act.

Ms. David said these requirements are not new. RTC has worked alongside local jurisdictions in Growth Management planning since the Growth Management Act was passed in 1990. The RTC Board last adopted a certification process back in 2003. What is new is that RTC has put together a certification process guide to help provide background information and clarification of RTC's role in the certification process for the transportation elements of local Comprehensive Growth Management Plans. The Process Guide was developed by RTC staff together with the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee. At the very back of the guide is a checklist for local jurisdictions to fill in which should ease the certification process. RTC will work with local jurisdictions to complete this step in the certification process.

Ms. David said that in conducting this certification process it's important to keep in mind that they are trying to ensure the Spirit of the GMA is met; that is, that planning partners should coordinate to ensure that local agencies and RTC conform to the state's law. A coordinated planning process leads to consistency in understanding, in approach, and results. State law

requires that each RTPO establish guidelines and principles that provide direction for the development and evaluation of the transportation elements of comprehensive plans and to ensure that state, regional, and local goals for the development of transportation systems are met. RTC relies on the RTP's policies, its Vision and Goals, as well as Clark County's County-Wide Planning Policies to guide the certification process. More detail on the transportation policies that guide the transportation plans is included in Appendix B of the Certification Guide on pages 36-37.

Kelly Brooks entered the meeting at 4:17 p.m.

Ms. David said RTC has to ensure that the Transportation Element of local comprehensive plans "Conform with the Requirements of the Growth Management Act". The Act prescribes what the local plan transportation element should address. The Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTC) must certify that the local transportation element addresses all of the required components. The full list of required components of a transportation element are listed on page 8 of the Certification Guide and are also part of the checklist for local jurisdictions to complete.

"Consistency between the transportation element of the local Comprehensive Plan and the Regional Transportation Plan" is another issue to be dealt with in the certification process. There are 8 factors that are significant and consistency with these factors will meet the consistency requirement under GMA. The 8 factors are listed in the Certification Guide on pages 10 and 11 and again as part of the checklist in Appendix E, on page 44 of the Process Guide.

Level of Service is used to gauge performance of the transportation system. As part of the certification process, RTC must ensure the local comprehensive plans address LOS for arterials and transit system in order to assess transportation performance and must address methodology used in addressing levels of service. Impacts to state-owned transportation facilities resulting from land use assumptions in local Comprehensive Plans must be estimated, and actions must be identified for deficient facilities. These could include potential transportation projects or strategies to address transportation system performance such as increased transit service, demand management and/or system management strategies, depending on the deficiency and the context. The Certification Guide provides more information on LOS on pages 13 through 15 and in Appendix D on page 40.

The steps that will be followed to complete the certification process for upcoming local Comprehensive Plan updates include the following: Local jurisdictions will need to submit the updated plan and completed certification checklist to RTC at the same time as submittal of draft Comprehensive Plan updates to the State Department of Commerce as part of the Notice of Intent to Adopt the Plan, at least 60 days prior to Adoption. The RTAC would deal with any certification issues that arise. After Comprehensive Plan updates are adopted, the RTC Board will be asked to adopt resolutions to complete the certification process.

Ms. David emphasized that there is nothing new about this certification process, but what is new is RTC's draft Process Guide and the checklist. This should ease the work of RTC and the local jurisdictions. The next steps will be in February, RTC staff will again consult with RTAC and RTC will seek RTAC recommendation to bring the Certification Process Guide and Checklist to the RTC Board for adoption so the Guide and checklist can be used by local jurisdictions as part of the local Comprehensive Plan update. Ms. David said it is anticipated the Guide will be brought to the RTC Board for adoption at the March 1 meeting.

Marc Boldt asked if this included the 13 goals of the GMA that the County must follow. Ms. David said it does in that it addresses primarily the transportation element. Also, there has to be coordination and clarity that we are applying the countywide planning policies with coordination between RTC, the State, the region, and local jurisdictions. It comes down to making sure that we comply with the Growth Management Act and the spirit of the Act, which is coordination, conformity, consistency, and certification.

Councilor Boldt asked if they look at their Capital Facilities Plan. Ms. David said yes, that the finance plan has to be part of the transportation element. Councilor Boldt asked when they are due. Ms. David said what they foresee is that local jurisdictions should submit their Plans to RTC with the checklist 60 days before the Plan is submitted in sync with submittal to the State Department of Commerce. Ms. David said there is no timeline for the RTC Board to take the final adopted action for certification. If the local jurisdictions submit Plans in June, it might be October when the resolution is brought for final Board certification.

Chair Burkman asked what the consequences were of saying it does not certify. Ms. David said there are no consequences under the Growth Management Laws, but if Plans are not certified, it may be that the RTC Board decides that the jurisdiction that does not gain certification perhaps may not be able to seek grant funding. The discretion with grant funding is the RTC Board.

Shirley Craddick said the Guide was a nice job. She asked what prompted putting it together. Ms. David said local jurisdictions work well together. They know what each other are doing, and they meet monthly as part of the RTAC committee. She said they wanted to make sure that there was more clarity. They thought that if this Guide was put into place, it would simplify what the local jurisdictions should submit to RTC in terms of the checklist.

Chair Burkman asked how many jurisdictions would be submitting. Ms. David said there are eight jurisdictions that will be updating their Growth Management Plans. C-TRAN also has to submit updated Level of Service Standards. Ms. David said they want to readdress level of service standards and do it as part of the Regional Transportation Plan update. Chair Burkman said this means that nine organizations will be working with this same template.

Kris Strickler entered the meeting at 4:25 p.m.

VIII. Transportation Improvement Program – Regional Grant Process

Matt Ransom said this is the second of a multi-part engagement process with the Board. Dale and jurisdictions' technical staff along with RTAC have been meeting for months reviewing the grant program process. Dale would provide some of the feedback received in that process. Mr. Ransom said at last month's meeting, the question arose about carving out a bit of money for maintenance or for other specific modal goals. Mr. Ransom said they would like to get some direction from the Board if that is where they want to head.

Dale Robins said RTC as a Metropolitan Planning Organization receives an allocation of federal highway funds that come to our region, and the RTC Board has selection of the projects for funding. There are some stipulations to the funds, but ultimately the purpose is to take those funds and build our 20-year transportation plan, the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Staff is seeking Board strategies and policy direction. This will be discussed over the next several months.

Mr. Robins displayed a slide showing how the funds have come to RTC over the last eight-year period. They received about \$87.2 million. In 2010 there was \$9 million in ARRA funds. This was a stimulation package that was given to transportation projects across the United States. The largest of the funding programs is the Surface Transportation Program (STP). The others are Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) and Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). The STP and TAP funds are further delineated between urban and rural areas. Mr. Robins said in Washington State, all of the federal programs are required to have a 13.5% local match. Anything that is not federal funding can provide local match, such as a state grant or local dollars. Generally, these funds must be spent on the federal-aid system which includes the arterial road system and the transit system.

The Surface Transportation Program (STP) is the most flexible of all the Federal Highway programs and can be used for a wide range of projects such as auto, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, and planning projects. Funds are allocated between urban and rural areas. The urban areas include Vancouver, Camas, Washougal, and Battle Ground. Everything outside that is considered rural. The urban area gets about \$4.6 million annually, and the rural area gets about \$800,000. Urban projects are selected annually, while rural projects are selected every other year. The majority of the funds over the last few years have been used for multi-modal arterial improvements. They have taken a lot of the rural arterials with two lanes and ditches and made them urban corridors often with curbs, sidewalks, bicycle lanes, etc.

The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program must be used on projects that improve air quality. RTC must provide Federal Highways annually with the air quality benefit that each of the projects that received funding in this program. This funding source can be used for transit, operational improvements, such as signal timing, transportation demand management projects, and other multi-modal improvements. Funds must be spent in the Vancouver air quality maintenance area. Mr. Robins said the STP program and the CMAQ program boundaries are set; we do not have control of that. The U.S. Census defines urban and

rural area boundaries. The air quality boundary was set by Federal Highways. RTC receives approximately \$3.1 million annually in CMAQ funding.

The Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funds must be used on one of the nine qualifying activities, including trails, bicycles, pedestrian, overlooks, and rehabilitation of historic transportation facilities. These are improvements to the transportation system "outside the curb." The TAP program also has urban and rural areas. With the TAP rural program, it covers three counties, Clark, Skamania, and Klickitat. Everything outside the urban boundary is part of the rural area. RTC Generally receives about \$.5 million a year. RTC Board made a decision previously to move \$300,000 of CMAQ dollars per year toward this program. Predominately, this has funded bicycle and pedestrian projects. This provides \$700,000 allocated to the urban area and \$100,000 allocated to the rural area.

Chair Burkman referred to the \$9.1 funding allocation for one year. He said at last month's meeting there was discussion if some of the funds should be designated to maintenance. Mr. Robins said maintenance funding would have to come from the STP program. CMAQ and TAP funds cannot be used for maintenance.

Mr. Robins referred to the handout of the slide presentation. He noted the grants by phase from 2010 - 2017. There were 51 Preliminary Engineering (PE) projects, 5 right-of-way projects, and 68 construction projects. In dollar amounts, the PE was about \$13 million, and the construction was close to \$70 million. This shows that the regional program has been very successful in providing seed money for projects to get started, but it has also been successful in the ultimate goal to actually get those projects constructed and have the improvements for our region.

Mr. Robins referred to the slide that broke those grants down by mode. This included 7.5% bike/pedestrian; 4.3% planning; 9.9% for preservation; 3.1% for rail; 49.7% for road improvements; 7.7% for transit; and 17.8% for TSMO projects (technology based projects that improve the operations such as signal timing).

Mr. Robins also referred to the grants by funding size. He said a majority of the grants have been projects that are small dollar amounts. He said 69 projects were under \$.5 million. Annual Regional Funding is \$14.9 million. RTC receives \$9.1 million of Federal Highway funds and in addition \$5.75 million of Federal Transit funds come to C-TRAN.

At last month's meeting it was requested to see how other regions spend their money. Mr. Robins provided this information for the top 20 MPO's in the nation spend their dollars for expansion versus operations and maintenance. Mr. Robins said this is comparing very large MPOs (over 2-4 million people) to RTC under half a million people. Overall, it was about 75% went for operations and 25% for expansion. The Northeast MPOs (New York, Boston, and Philadelphia) spent 90% on operations and maintenance. Other MPOs were at 62% and Seattle at 57% for operations and maintenance.

Kelly Brooks asked if this funding was both Federal Highway and Federal Transit funding. Mr. Robins said yes, this included both funding sources. Ms. Brooks said that could have an impact on the percentages. Mr. Robins agreed, saying that also explains the big cities as well. Expansion of a system is more difficult in the large cities and more is needed for operations and maintenance.

Chair Burkman questioned the pots of money that the 35% operations and maintenance for RTC was from. Mr. Robins said of the \$14.9 million annual funding, just under \$6 million is for transit. He said C-TRAN might be spending 90% of their money on maintenance and operations. Under the Federal Highway funds that RTC receives, we are closer to about 15%; so combined that is about 35% operations and maintenance (O &M).

Chair Burkman asked where that 15% was from. Mr. Robins said the 15% is from both STP and CMAQ. Signal timing and TSMO type projects fall under operational improvements (operations and maintenance.) Mr. Robins said that would also include C-TRAN's 5307 funds that automatically go to preventative maintenance on their vehicles.

Jeanne Stewart referred to the O & M Versus Expansion Funding comparing the Top 20 MPOs versus RTC. She asked what the percentages reflected. Mr. Robins said this shows the Northeast is not experiencing rapid growth and trying to maintain their system. They are spending the highest in the nation to maintain what they have. When looking at RTC and the south, it shows more of an even share. We are not like a large urban area where you are very limited on your expansion. We do spend more on expansion.

Chair Burkman said it is more challenging in that both FTA and FHWA are combined. He asked if just looking at Federal Highway, how our 15% compares. Mr. Robins said that is something he was unable to get from other MPOs. He said he would imagine that in the larger MPOs you will begin to see more money going towards operation and maintenance than what we are doing.

Shirley Craddick said to follow up on Councilmember Burkman's comment that we wanted to look to see if some of this money could be used for maintenance. She said she thought that meant fixing potholes. What she said she was hearing is that the maintenance that is being referred to is really regarding transit, the transit system, and TSMO type projects; it is not putting pavement on the road. Mr. Robins said it would include that as well. It is all operational improvements and any maintenance. Councilor Craddick said the Northeast has a much more robust transit system, so it is likely that a lot of funding that they are using for maintenance is regarding the transit system. Mr. Robins said they are likely using more of their Federal Highway money on road repair as well. They don't need to widen the roads or don't have the space to widen the roads.

Marc Boldt said it would be interesting to know what similar counties that are growing like us are doing. He said his question is compliance with this versus compliance with GMA. Compliance with GMA is really handling new roads for growth.

Mr. Robins said it is difficult. They looked for an agency that would be close to RTC and Spokane was the closest. Spokane is a big city; we are part of the Portland metropolitan area. We are in a different situation even from an MPO of the Northwest of similar size. Oregon didn't have any that matched. Mr. Robins said we are very distinct.

Mr. Robins said they did a comparison using the 2010-2017 time period and took an example of 20% allocated to preservation projects to see what it would look like. He said he was surprised at what they lost. To summarize, Mr. Robins said they would have seen in the selection process, the small cities would have predominately not received any of the grants they received over the last eight years, and Clark County projects that are on the urban fringe would disappear as well. That is what they would have lost; projects such as 119th Street.

Chair Burkman asked if this is because of the scoring criteria, it would have had to have a higher score to qualify. Mr. Robins said yes, those projects scoring at the bottom of the lists drop off.

Mr. Ransom clarified that the 20% would roughly be \$1 million per year of the STP allocations. STP is really the only fund that can go toward maintenance purposes.

Ron Onslow said haven driven quite a bit of the highways in Philadelphia, Washington, D. C., and New York, if you take all of the major highways in Oregon, Washington, and California, there is not a single one that is as bad as the ones around Philadelphia. Mayor Onslow said they are taking highways in existence and trying to make them passable. He said he understands why a lot of their money is going for maintenance, because they are horrid. Mayor Onslow said a lot of those morphs into light rail where they have a tremendous amount of expense and a lot of ridership.

Dale Robins referred to the slide with Needs Compared to Revenue. He said we really have about \$5.2 billion of need identified over the next 20 years in the Regional Transportation Plan. Those funds are broken down by operation and maintenance, local improvements, and regional improvements. Mr. Robins further explained the comparison. He said a key policy consideration for the distribution of the regional federal grants is how the money can be leveraged to create maximum impact across the region. Given the past program emphasis on allocating funds to create leverage and to build projects, the historical record of leverage capacity is robust. While each project funding formula is different, on average it is estimated that the regional grant program funds leverage 2-3 to 1. This means for every dollar of regional federal funds allocated to a project the local agency is able to secure an allocation up to 2-3 times the amount in other federal, state, or local funds. The leverage ratio means that the RTC grant program acts, in some manner, as a seed capital fund for local agencies to either start or complete major investment projects.

Mr. Robins said the RTAC sub-committee, which contains all of the RTAC members, but they met for four additional meetings to discuss the TIP process. At the last meeting on January 28, they discussed several policy issues. In the discussion of operation and maintenance related projects, the RTAC sub-committee concurred that no funds be used for maintenance. Some of the reasons include: that there are limited resources, and they prefer that the funds could be

better utilized in regional improvements where they can leverage additional dollars. They also noted that anytime that you federalize a maintenance type project, the cost increases about 30%. They also talked about how when improvements are made it also reduces future maintenance.

Chair Burkman asked in talking about matching funds, what opportunities are available for matching funds for filling potholes. Mr. Robins said they are very, very limited. The vast majority of the grant opportunities often go for improvement type projects. Transportation Improvement Board does have a preservation program for small cities. Again, when looking at the regional system, they might have a road that is in the regional system that could receive money, but it is not likely.

Chair Burkman asked what leverage rate they have been using in order to acquire the larger projects. Mr. Robins said they have found over the last several years that in the STP program they have been able to leverage about \$3 for every \$1. It is a little lower in the CMAQ program, about \$2 for every \$1. If an operation and maintenance project was funded by STP funds, it would increase the project cost by 30%, and it would not be able to leverage any additional dollars.

Jerry Oliver said RTAC is opposed to using these funds for maintenance. He asked what the source was for doing maintenance projects, the alternative. Mr. Robins said there are limited grant sources; it is really the local agencies' responsibility to figure out how to generate the revenue to do that work. He said they have had several examples in Clark County over this last year. Battle Ground and the City of Vancouver have raised fees for maintenance so they can do a better job of maintaining the roads. The County already has a Road Fund, which allows them to keep up their roads. This is a separate item on property tax.

Jeanne Stewart said RTAC preferred that no funds be used for maintenance projects. That committee is one the Board relies heavily on for their knowledge and expertise. She said it is the RTC's decision. Mr. Robins said the RTC Board ultimately has to make that decision not RTAC. They are just advising the Board; they are engineers and planners from local agencies that are meeting on a regular basis to keep the Board advised. Councilor Stewart said they value their advice.

Councilor Stewart asked if RTAC had any suggestions for alternatives for other funding for how to improve the maintenance formulas. Mr. Robins said the discussion the committee had was about the recommendation for the use of the federal funds for the Board, not about other options.

Councilor Stewart asked if they could broaden the question to include suggestions. Mr. Robins said they could certainly ask. Chair Burkman said the question that we had addressed to them was the use of STP and CMAQ funding, so that was answered; this is a broader question.

Paul Greenlee said he was the one who originally brought up the question about maintenance funding. He said he went back to his Council and staff and the general opinion was very strongly that leverage is almost everything. He said since there is no leverage on the

maintenance projects, it didn't make sense to them to make an allocation that way. It actually makes more sense to say we are going to allocate based on percentage of leverage that they can get. Councilmember Greenlee said the only counter example that was given was that we don't want to ever leave any money on the table. If there were funds that otherwise would be lost, could then be used for maintenance. Councilmember Greenlee said that was the general thinking from both his elected and staff.

Chair Burkman said he was not aware of any money being left on the table. It was more of which did not make it past the cut off mark.

Dale Robins said there were some issues brought up at last month's meeting about allocating funds to various modes. The Federal rules do not allow allocating funds to various modes. You can set goals to work toward, which is similar, but not allocating. Mr. Robins said RTAC preferred no additional modal goals. They see that there are limited resources, and they want to make the best effort to continue to leverage the funds. They looked at the modal balance and that transit gets their allocation through FTA; they felt there already is a modal balance being achieved. If additional modal balance is needed, they could take the existing system and improve criteria to improve that mode.

Chair Burkman asked which modal goals RTAC were talking about. Mr. Robins said there was some indication that they would like to see some carved out for transit. There was also some discussion about allocating funds towards bike and pedestrian type improvements. Mr. Robins said the \$300,000 of CMAQ dollars that they move to the TAP program that he mentioned earlier was felt to be more than adequate for that program.

Scott Patterson said based on what he heard, RTAC still has some work to do to look at some modifications to the scoring criteria in order to address the sub-committee's process. Mr. Robins said RTAC had discussion to answer the questions that the Board had from last month, and they tried to answer those. They are trying to get some policy feedback from the Board, and from that RTAC will start to design how that process should go. Mr. Robins said he is hearing a very similar process as last time.

Chair Burkman said as Councilor Stewart said, the Board sets the policy, and RTAC then designs the criteria scoring to meet those policies.

Chair Burkman said he wanted to find out the Board's position. He said at last month's meeting there was discussion about possibly carving out funding for maintenance, and asked how many would like to pursue that change. He did not see interest from the Board for change. He asked the Board about the modal goals, shifting beyond what they now have in ratios for transit or bike and pedestrian.

Councilor Stewart said in regard to modal goals, she heard that RTAC was suggesting more transit. Mr. Robins said no, he did not think so. He said overall, he understood that they did not want to change the modal goal; they wanted to make sure the criteria provide a fair opportunity for transit to pursue funding. Not a change in the modal goal, but to give a fair

evaluation. Councilor Stewart said not increasing proportionally, just so they have a fair representation for transit. Mr. Robins said that was correct.

Chair Burkman said he is hearing hold steady the course that we have done the last couple of years and do some technical tuning and how it is measured with not affecting the policies that we have.

Paul Greenlee said he did not want to change the policy, but he would like to encourage the TAP program to do more than just bike and pedestrian projects. Dale Robins said all projects that are eligible are able to compete. He said the City of Ridgefield a few years ago received a project under this program to do the entrance to the Welcome Center for the Wildlife Refuge.

Shirley Craddick said she was not clear on the goals that the region is trying to achieve. She asked what the goal was around congestion management and improvement. She asked if it is more focused on transit, or going to try and get more people out of cars and into other modes of transportation, or continued focus on road widening? She said that needs to be considered when looking where funding should be going.

Jerry Oliver said when talking about modal, C-TRAN will think of transit; he thinks about freight. He asked what the consideration was for freight. Mr. Robins said the criteria does include freight. More points are given for a freight corridor. He said they don't address water or rail very much, but they do look at the trucks on the roads and freight corridors.

Jeanne Stewart responded to Councilor Craddick's comment. She said that as a Clark County representative, getting people out of their cars is not her goal. Having people have options for how they travel is more of her interest: different people, different modes of transportation, not precluding surface transportation, including motor vehicles.

Mr. Robins said the funding strategies for STP and CMAQ include: leverage other grant sources, implement Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) Improvements, build multimodal arterials, and no use of these funding sources for preservation of the system. Funding strategies for TAP include building bicycle and pedestrian projects.

Chair Burkman said he is hearing stay to the course as we have been doing, do the tuning that RTAC staff feel is necessary and bring back to the Board to see the detail. He said he thought it would be good to send out the higher level description of the points that are allocated in each of the categories along with the lower level sheet of how RTAC allocates those points out. This answers the questions about freight and the different modes. Chair Burkman said if they have that next month along with the summary, then they can start moving toward adoption.

Mr. Robins said he thought that information was sent to the Board after the last meeting. Mr. Ransom said they could send that again.

IX. RTC Board Sub-Committee – Member Dues Review Report

Chair Burkman said the Board convened a sub-committee to review the RTC Member Dues. They have worked through this and at last month's meeting, the report was provided. Chair

Burkman said the intent is to have an overview today, discuss it with no action taken today, but have members take the information to their jurisdiction and come back to the Board for action in April.

Matt Ransom said the goal overall in looking at the dues is to ensure that RTC's finances and ability to run the organization is whole and complete. The dues that have been collected over time at this juncture are insufficient to match the federal funds that are made available to the organization to operate. He said after 24 years of operation, it is time to look at the dues. They have not changed since 1992. Mr. Ransom noted the six members who comprised the sub-committee. Those still on the Board include: Jack Burkman, Jeanne Stewart, Doug McKenzie, and Jeff Hamm. They met over the course of four meetings.

Mr. Ransom said the expenditures from 1992 to 2014 have increased, and the dues have stayed at the same rate since 1992. Mr. Ransom said this may raise the question of how RTC has been matching the grants that have been made available. Dues in the amount of \$104,500 do not provide all of the local match necessary. In the 2000's RTC was doing a lot of consulting to the DOT in conjunction to the Columbia River Crossing project. Those contracts were RTC staff working on a fee basis and collecting money. There was not a need to raise dues, because of the consulting fees associated with that. They do not have those consulting fees now, and over the course of 24 years, they have a divergence of costs as well as dues. It is to the point that it needs to be dealt with.

Mr. Ransom said from 1992 to 2014 the growth in Clark County population has an increase of 68.3%. In 1992, the population was 282,390 and in 2014 it was 477,034. The Consumer Price Index has increased from 140.3 to 236.7; an increase of 68.7%. RTC's average annual expenditures have increased 68.1%. Mr. Ransom said their operating costs have grown in concert with the CPI as well as the expansion of the community.

They did an assessment of MPOs across the northwest to see how they assessed dues to their members; did they assess dues and if so, how? Most of the distributions of dues that are collected by other MPOs are based on some formula of population. They pro rata share out based on population, and then collect. The question if others besides general government, such as DOTs, transit agencies, and Ports, pay dues, the answer is yes they do in many cases. Most often, because there is not necessarily a population associated with a DOT because it is a large statewide service area and some of the population boundaries aren't coincident, often times they are assessed a flat fee. A few agencies assess based on a combined formula of regional share of population and assessed property values, and complicated formulas. Mr. Ransom said they didn't seem to make sense for here within Clark County. Attached at the back of the report was a spreadsheet with all of the data points that Mark collected, and provides a complete assessment of what others are doing.

Mr. Ransom said many members set dues as part of their local government whether it is transit fares, or traffic impact fees, or other fees collected. He said it is known that in a question of a dues evaluation, the question really is if it needs to be reset and how high that needs to be

reset. Mr. Ransom said over the course of 24 years for the organization, of course that needs to be reset. He said the question is what factor to use to establish that reset. Mr. Ransom said they looked at CPI, Construction Cost Index, Employment Cost Index, and population growth. He said but most importantly, how much money is needed to match the grants. Mr. Ransom said when looking at the different factors and the match needed they are all about the same. He said there has been a lot of growth over the last 24 years and consistency in terms of the rate of growth. The report reflects that the committee felt confident that heading in the direction of what the reset recommendation is was consistent no matter what index was used.

The recommendation was to reset dues baseline 2014 to \$180,000. The match needed is about \$184,000. The match need may vary slightly year to year. Mr. Ransom said if they can't match the grants, they can't use them, so they need revenue to do that.

As an organization, RTC has two missions. The first is in Clark County as the MPO and the largest, and the second is service to the Gorge communities as RTPO. Mr. Ransom said the services provided to the Gorge are not substantial, but they meet every other month, and RTC provides other services. Based on 2014 time sheets, they assessed that as an organization they might spend about 4% a year on services to the Gorge communities. This would amount to a 4.2% share of the total amounting to \$7,600.

For the MPO the remainder 95.8% totals \$172,400 to be divided for Clark County. The committee said the first part of that would be 70% to general purpose government, then 20% associated with transit (C-TRAN), and 10% to would go to the Ports. Within those groups, the Ports would be distributed based on the population within the Port district; the cities and the County were distributed based on populations established by OFM. C-TRAN was reset at a baseline 20%. The Gorge communities were set at a flat share not based on population. The population within some of the Gorge communities is so small, the committee decided to set a flat rate of \$1,000 for the two counties and \$800 for the others. The current fee for dues is \$500 across the board. The Skamania County Commissioner who was on the committee thought it appropriate that the two counties pay a little more than the cities and Port districts within the Gorge area. Mr. Ransom referred to the summary of the proposed dues.

Anne McEnery-Ogle confirmed that the Ports were assessed the amount based on their port district population. This was correct. She asked how the split of 70%/20%/10% was established. Mr. Ransom said it was policy driven. The committee looked at what a fair distribution would be for the Clark County piece. Based on services provided to the County, the cities, the Ports, and to C-TRAN, since there were different needs, they felt that 70/20/10 was an appropriate distribution. They also looked at the historical distribution as the dues are currently established, and they were somewhat within that same range. The committee didn't want to depart too far from what it was, and the 70/20/10 would just set a policy in place to start.

Council Member McEnery-Ogle said the historical level was what she was looking for. She referred to the amount of increase for the Port of Vancouver, which was very different from what was established 24 years ago. Mr. Ransom said that was the biggest change in terms of

percentage of increase. He said that has the most to do with how disproportionate it may have been. It seemed disproportionate that the Port of Vancouver was so low compared to the other two Ports that are very small. The current population use reflects that.

Mr. Ransom said that is a theme. He said if you step back and look at the big picture, basing the distribution of the pie among members based on population gives the Board, as well as members, a clear number to use in the future for reset.

Mr. Ransom said with the baseline reset and the dues table suggested there are two other considerations the committee recommended that are operational. The first is that dues for MPO members are recommended to be adjusted annually using a Bureau of Labor Statistics national cost index: Employment Cost Index – State and Local Government professional workers series. The recommendation is that annually in April a review of that index. The Board would have the opportunity to adjust or not adjust. This would not be an automatic increase. The Board would have to act on this each year. This would establish a consistency.

For the second recommendation, rather than adjust population every year, there would be a 5-year full review of the population. This would also give the subcommittee of the Board an opportunity at the 5-year review to make any other adjustments to the distribution formula at that same time.

Julie Olson asked in regard to population figures, when there are overlapping jurisdictions like the Port of Vancouver, the City of Vancouver, and Clark County, are these double counted or subtracted out? Councilor Olson asked how those were managed.

Mr. Ransom said the population share for the 70% from general purpose governments do not have boundaries that overlap. The 10% from the Ports is exclusive to just the Ports, so their population used is set to their boundaries which don't overlap.

Jerry Oliver asked why WSDOT, ODOT, and Metro are not dues paying members. Mr. Ransom said WSDOT does not provide dues, but they provide operating revenues through the Legislative action as part of the operating budget, about \$172,000 per year. The Interlocal Agreement to the organization is prescriptive about ODOT and Metro, which says they are not dues paying members. Chair Burkman also added that we have representatives from our area that sit on their MPO, and we do not pay dues to them.

Shirley Craddick said at Metro no dues are assessed. It is a different system. The dues are actually taken from the amount that is allocated to the MPO in the STP and CMAQ funds.

Paul Greenlee said it is obvious that a lot of work has gone into this. He thanked staff for all their work.

Chair Burkman asked if this was sufficient information to take back to individual jurisdictions for conversation. He said this would come back to the Board for action in April. He said to feel free to contact Matt with any questions that may arise.

Mr. Ransom said he has been invited to a work session with the Clark County Council the following week to present this information. He said he would be communicating with the various executives to member organizations. He would be presenting this to the Skamania County Policy Committee and the Klickitat County Policy Committee the following day. He said he would be available for participation with those that wish.

X. State Legislative Session Update

Matt Ransom referred to a memorandum that was distributed. Mr. Ransom will track any bills that are in process as well as interact with State Legislators during session to provide information about regional priorities. He identified two bills that are of regional interest.

House Bill 2414 is a bill that would establish a bi-state legislative work group to reengage in dialog around the Columbia River Bridge replacement on I-5. It has gone through House Transportation Committee Hearing and as of the prior day was scheduled for Executive Session where they review it to see if they want to push it out to the Rules Committee. It is in progress. The perceived impact to RTC as the Bill is written is incidental, because most of the emphasis is around State Legislative participation. Mr. Ransom said certainly, as a regional agency, we would be drawn into discussions. He said at this point the impact is to be determined.

Chair Burkman said he thought the Bill cutoff was the following Friday. All Bills have to be out of the Committees or they don't advance this session.

Mr. Ransom said Senate Bill 6506 would establish a Legislative task force for rail transportation. This task force would study and make recommendations regarding needed investments in strategic railroad corridors in Washington State. Outreach to the Port of Vancouver says they are tracking this and supportive of the Bill. It has gone through Senate Transportation Committee Hearing and not yet scheduled for Executive Session. Mr. Ransom said he did not see a lot of direct impact to RTC, but they would engage as needed in some type of stakeholder process.

Mr. Ransom said with the adoption of the new Federal Transportation Bill every state within the nation has the opportunity through the Governor and Statute to review the distribution formula. When the money flows from the Feds to the State and then down to the regions like RTC, every state can either keep the distribution formula the same as established in Federal Statute or they can adjust it. In years past, Washington through the Governor's subcommittee has actually allocated more money to the regions than was the minimum required under Federal Statute. The updated federal statute bumps that up a little bit.

Mr. Ransom referred to the position paper attached to the memorandum. Mr. Ransom said the opportunity here and the position paper that was prepared by associations that many are involved in: the Washington Association of Counties and the Association of Washington Cities, argues that more money should be passed through to the regions. Most of the transportation infrastructure asset is either owned by city or county roads or bridges. They are making an argument that if the Governor convenes this committee to review the formula for the distribution of these federal formula funds, the case should be made that more money goes to

the regions. Mr. Ransom said he provided this information, because Members may hear about this in their own associations and take a position as an individual agency. He said that may be of benefit to the RTC region, but he was not advocating for a policy position at this point. Mr. Ransom said he did not think prescriptively that the Governor has to do that this session, but if it does, these associations wanted to be ready with their position.

Mr. Ransom said he does often receive calls from either House Members or Senate Members inquiring about priority projects within the region. He said he provides information to them based on the CCTA statement that the Board adopted at the January meeting. That is the utility of that document; to provide guidance to communicate what the regional priorities are as adopted by the Board.

Jeanne Stewart asked when the Bus on Shoulder Feasibility Study would return to the Board.

Mr. Ransom said that would be on the March agenda. For clarification, he said the reason that was removed from the agenda was that they are reviewing and negotiating a contract with the consulting firm, and it just was not ready to take action at this time.

Shirley Craddick asked regarding the Bus on Shoulder Feasibility Study, if there was an Oregon side to it and ODOT involved.

Kelly Brooks said yes, ODOT is involved and a part of this.

Councilor Craddick asked when this is brought back to the Board, would they take into consideration the work that ODOT is doing. Mr. Ransom said yes, it is a bi-state effort. Mr. Ransom said there is not a financial request or give from Oregon at this point. The work and participation is largely going to be in kind. They are a part of all the technical processes.

XI. Other Business

From the Board

Kris Strickler provided a quick update given all the rain that the region has witnessed. He said they just opened up all the lanes of I-5 by Woodland. They now have an issue on SR-501 to Ridgefield to deal with. They closed a part of the roadway there and will be operating in alternating two-way traffic on a single lane and a temporary signal. Their best guess is that it will take the better part of the month. Mr. Strickler said it is a steep slope that has failed, and a portion of the slope that initiated the failure is actually outside WSDOT right-of way. He said they have some work to get the fix in place. He said there have been similar slides in 2006 and 2013 close by this area, so they have a good idea of what they think the fix would be, but they need GEO Tech analysis to define that.

Ron Onslow said this SR-501 problem is a volatile area, and because of it, they are now focused on one-lane traffic. Mayor Onslow said last summer they had a similar issue, where they had to close Pioneer Street so they could put in the sewage line. He said this just exacerbates the problem that they have, which is that they need to somehow add the 219th Street West entrance into Ridgefield to allow another way to get into Ridgefield.

From the Director

Matt Ransom said the Governor was in town to celebrate and acknowledge the Connecting Washington package and a couple projects received here locally. He was asked to provide a couple remarks on behalf of the region. He did that and thanked the Governor and Legislators within our region for their leadership, as well as acknowledging our confidence in WSDOT and other local agencies in delivering those projects.

Mr. Ransom was also invited to participate in a countywide leadership roundtable at the Governor's Mansion. He said convened at that roundtable were Mayors and Councilmembers, and Chair Burkman also attended in the capacity of RTC Board Chair. Mr. Ransom said he made a few comments in response to the Governor's inquiry, which was that he wants to figure out how to engage again on the I-5 corridor and possible I-5 Bridge. He asked for input on how to engage. Mr. Ransom said he provided the observation that the Bi-State Coordination Committee, a subcommittee of the RTC Board, is committed in the 2016 work program to start some conversation about the I-5 corridor. That committee is both Oregon and Washington MPOs.

Mr. Ransom noted JPACT meets Thursday, February 18, 2016, at Metro at 7:30 a.m. The next Bi-State Coordination Committee is tentatively set to hold the date for Thursday, February 25 at 9:00 a.m. at the City of Vancouver. *(This meeting was later cancelled, and a meeting will be planned for mid-year TBD.)*

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, March 1, 2016, at 4 p.m.

XII. Adjourn

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR ADJOURNMENT. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Jack Burkman, Board of Directors Chair