



**Regional Transportation  
Advisory Committee**

The Regional Transportation Advisory Committee meeting will be held on **Friday, March 16, 2012**, from **9 a.m. to 11 a.m.**, in the **6th Floor Training Room 679**, Clark County Public Service Center, 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington.

## **A G E N D A**

- I. Call to Order and Approval of February 17, 2012, Minutes, Action
- II. Congestion Management Process – Data Collection, Discussion
- III. Ten-Year Transportation Project Priorities, Workshop Discussion
- IV. Other Business
  - A. RTAC Members
  - B. RTC Staff
    - UPWP: Federal Review

*\*Materials available at meeting  
Served by C-TRAN Route 3 or 25  
If you have special needs, please contact RTC*

20120316\_RTAC\_Agenda.doc

An advisory committee to:

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council**

1300 Franklin Street, Floor 4

P.O. Box 1366

Vancouver, Washington 98666-1366

360-397-6067

fax: 360-397-6132

<http://www.rtc.wa.gov>

**Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC)  
Meeting Minutes  
February 17, 2012**

**I. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes**

The meeting of the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee was called to order on Friday, February 17, 2012 at 9:00 a.m. in the Public Service Center 6<sup>th</sup> Floor Training Room, 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington. Lynda David, Senior Transportation Planner, RTC, served as Chair for the meeting. Those in attendance follow:

Katy Brooks	Port of Vancouver
Ken Burgstahler	WSDOT
Jim Carothers	City of Camas
Ralph Drewfs	ODOT
James Dunn	City of Washougal
Mark Harrington	RTC
Bob Hart	RTC
Mark Herceg	City of Battle Ground
BJ Jacobson	Human Services Council
Ryan Jeynes	City of Battle Ground
Sandi Roberts	RTC
Bart Stepp	City of La Center
Bryan Snodgrass	City of Vancouver
Steve Wall	City of Ridgefield
Bill Wright	Clark County
Phil Wuest	City of Vancouver

Lynda David, RTC, asked for any changes or corrections to the January 20, 2012, meeting minutes.

RALPH DREWFS, ODOT, MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 20, 2012, MINUTES AND BILL WRIGHT, CLARK COUNTY, SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

*(Added to the Agenda STIP Amendment Request: Salmon Creek Interchange Project (SCIP))*

**II. STIP Amendment Request: Salmon Creek Interchange Project (SCIP), Action**

Bill Wright, Clark County, said some time ago Clark County was awarded HPP-STPUL funds for the Salmon Creek Interchange Project (SCIP). Bill pointed out that now the project is entering its final construction phase, the project partners, WSDOT and Clark County, find that a small amount of federal construction funds remaining in the grant would be better spent on the NE 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue (141<sup>st</sup> to 149<sup>th</sup> Street) Project, allowing SCIP construction to be completed without federal funding.

Therefore, Clark County would like to move the remaining \$1,400,000 in construction funding from SCIP to our NE 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue (141<sup>st</sup> to 149<sup>th</sup> Street) Project. He said the NE 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue project is already "federalized" with some previous federal funding. Furthermore, this project was originally included in

**February 17, 2012**

**RTAC Minutes**

**Page 2**

the scope of SCIP, is covered by the environmental documentation for SCIP and is eligible to use these particular construction funds.

Bill said Clark County will be completing 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue in 2013 and should be able to close out the PE and Right of Way with SCIP and the final construction phases will be 2014.

KATY BROOKS, PORT OF VANCOUVER, MADE A MOTION TO FORWARD THIS MODIFICATION FOR APPROVAL TO THE RTC BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR FEDERAL FUNDING FOR \$1,400,000 IN CONSTRUCTION FUNDING FROM SCIP TO OUR NE 10<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE (141<sup>ST</sup> TO 149<sup>TH</sup> STREET PROJECT. STEVE WALL, CITY OF RIDGEFIELD, SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

### **III. Federal Functional Classification Change Request: Clark County 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue from NE Minnehaha Street to NE 78<sup>th</sup> Street, Action**

Lynda said functional classification is the grouping of highways, roads and streets by the character of service they provide, recognizing that travel involves movement through a network of roads. Functional classification defines the part that any particular route should play in serving the flow of trips through a highway network. WSDOT's website, <http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/mapsdata/travel/hpms/functionalclass.htm>, provides information on federal functional classification as well as the current functional classification map for the Clark County region. At today's meeting, RTAC is asked to consider and recommend a functional classification request by Clark County for NE 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue, from NE Minnehaha Street to NE 78<sup>th</sup> Street, which currently has no federal functional classification. A map is attached to the memorandum for RTAC members to view.

She pointed out Clark County has proposed the federal classification of NE 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue, between NE Minnehaha Street and NE 78<sup>th</sup> Street as a collector and NE 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue is not currently classified under the federal functional classification system. This would help the commute to industrial lands, and Clark County has talked to WSDOT Highway and Local programs and they have suggested that it would be a good addition to the Federal Function Classification System as a collector facility.

Lynda directed the group's attention to the "Federal Functional Classification Request" form that was attached to the memorandum and said Clark County has filled out the form, and this will be forwarded to WSDOT with RTAC approval. She described the details of the colored map: the red lines are the principle arterials, the green lines are the minor arterials, and the purple lines are the collector facilities. Since we made copies of the form, the County has filled in section (12) which is the estimated and future traffic counts, the existing traffic on south 78<sup>th</sup> Street is 1,295 vehicles per day, future traffic is 5,800 vehicles per day, and just north of 63<sup>rd</sup> Street existing vehicles are 656, and future traffic 20 year projection are 2,750 vehicles per day.

Bill Wright, Clark County, said it was identified as a collector in our countywide system but not classified in the federal system, which WSDOT noticed. He said to apply for TIB money it has to be a collector in the federal system.

PHIL WUEST, CITY OF VANCOUVER, MADE A MOTION TO RECOMMEND FORWARDING THE CHANGE REQUEST TO WSDOT THAT CLARK COUNTY PROPOSED FOR THE FEDERAL CLASSIFICATION OF NE 47<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE, BETWEEN NE MINNEHAHA STREET AND NE 78<sup>TH</sup> STREET AS A COLLECTOR. JIM CAROTHERS, CITY OF CAMAS, SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

*(Lynda noted she was reminded by WSDOT that later this year and early next year we will have to update our urban area boundaries because it will have gone through analysis of the decennial census and if it has expanded as what has existed, this goes hand and hand with the federal functional classification and will have to be changed from rural to urban). This may be a good opportunity to look at the whole federal functional classification and make it as close as we can to the counties functional classification system.*

#### **IV. FY 2013 Unified Planning Work Program: Draft Review, Discussion**

The "Draft Unified Planning Work Program for Fiscal Year 2013" was provided for RTAC members. Lynda said RTC meets state and federal representatives at Public Service Center to review the draft FY 2013 UPWP, Wednesday, February 22. At the April 20 meeting RTC will be asking for RTAC's recommendation of the UPWP and Tuesday, May 1, RTC will be asking RTC Board of Directors for adoption of FY 2013 UPWP.

Lynda wanted to thank RTAC members for the edits regarding chapter 4, which illustrates a summary of each jurisdiction anticipated planning efforts which will take place in FY 2013. Lynda directed RTAC to turn to the last page of the UPWP FY 2013 "FY 2013 Summary of Expenditures and Revenues: RTC", and noted this will help RTC to conduct the Metropolitan Transportation Plan activities in FY 2013. She said these are estimates at the moment and was provided by the Department of Transportation in Olympia: FHWA PL, \$465,574, FTA Section 5303, \$153,181, and RTPO Planning \$175,108. Because of the recession we may receive less than anticipated.

She directed RTAC members to page IV and pointed out the Region's Key Transportation Issues. Lynda said during 2011 Clark County continued to experience high unemployment rates and the economic downturn continues to challenge the region. The slow economic recovery in 2011 is continuing to challenge the region's ability to make progress in addressing its pressing transportation issues. Some of the key issues are providing a safe transportation system, ensuring sufficient funds are available for preservation and maintenance, and making sure we can implement the Nickel Partnership which is state funded projects in the region. We are coming to the end of that program and the projects that are underway are: SR-500 – St Johns, Salmon Creek Interchange, SR-14 Widening, SR-502 widening to Battle Ground, making sure we can plan and fund the Transit System, making sure we can work with local partners on special needs transportation, and we have the emerging aging population and demographics issue to contend with.

Lynda pointed out under the existing Federal Transportation Act, SAFETEA-LU, continues to be extended beyond its September 30, 2009 scheduled expiration. Under SAFETEA-LU, the scope of the transportation planning process provides for consideration of projects and strategies that will address the Federal planning factors contained in CFR 450.306 to: 1] Support economic vitality of the metropolitan area, 2] Increase the safety, 3] Increase the security of the transportation system, 4] Increase accessibility and mobility of people and freight, 5] Protect and enhance the environment, 6] Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, 7] Promote efficient system management and operation, and 8] Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system. These are the underlying planning factors we need to keep in mind as we conduct the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process.

Lynda summarized by saying this will come back to RTAC for action at the April meeting and will be asking for recommendation from the RTC Board of Directors of the FY 2013 UPWP. She asked RTAC

**February 17, 2012**

**RTAC Minutes**

**Page 4**

members to take this document and notify her of any changes that need to be made by e-mail or phone call. The Federal and State review will be February 22, 2012 meeting.

## **V. Ten-Year Transportation Project Priorities, Workshop, Discussion**

Lynda said a major portion of time today, RTC staff wants dedicate the time to addressing the Ten-Year Transportation Project Priorities work effort in a workshop setting. We are asking RTAC members for their expertise relating to their jurisdictions and agencies to contribute to the Ten-Year discussion. In particular, we want to focus RTAC discussion on policies and investment goals, TIPs/project priorities and transportation budgets. Lynda noted that the RTC Board of Directors asked that RTAC be involved in the policy discussion and weigh in on the relative importance of transportation investment categories and choices over the next 10 years.

Lynda said what we are trying to do in this 10-Year Transportation Projects Priority is anticipate the needs of transportation system over the next 10 Years. As RTC put together the Metropolitan Transportation Plan we took a 20-Year look at the transportation system and had a very optimistic growth forecast of population and employment. The 10-Year look will consider a more conservative assumption for population and growth and match that growth with some revised funding scenarios. Lynda said we are going to have some challenging trends that will have to look at over the next few years we want to look at the realities and how is this going to impact local jurisdictions. RTC wants to look at two funding scenarios: 1] one would be assuming no new funding would be available, 2] or assuming that there will be new funding. We want to give some consideration if that affects our transportation project priorities? What happens if it is new state funding, or are local jurisdictions thinking of terms of local optionally funding?

She reviewed the Transportation Investment Categories: 1] Preservation/Maintenance, 2] Safety, 3] non-highway modes – transit, freight, bike/trail, 4] Operational Improvements to Existing Facilities, 5] Highway/Street Capacity Expansion (existing needs, future needs), and 6] Economic, as directed by the RTC Board. Transportation Investment Goals: 1] Protect Investment in Current Network, 2] Support Economic Development/Jobs, 3] Improve Mobility, 4] Improve Accessibility, 5] Improve Reliability, 6] Reduce Traffic Accidents, and 7] Increase Proportion of Alternative Modes.

Jim Dunn, City of Washougal, asked if RTC has looked into Railroad traffic, because he said it will increase substantially. In the freight study that RTC did a few years this was addressed. The lack of grade-separated rail crossings in Washougal does adversely affect mobility and reliability.

Lynda noted what the RTC Board was asking for data on what is happening to the transportation system and budgets for transportation in all jurisdictions.

Bill Wright, Clark County, said that a good project would cut across many of the investment categories and address multiple goals. Phil Wuest, City of Vancouver, noted that under the Transportation Investment Category of Highway Capacity Expansion, there is a difference in a capacity expansion on a roadway that already is built to urban standard and an urban upgrade. The county has grown so much as well as all jurisdictions in the last 15-20 years; we have a lot of urban roadways that are still rural. Phil suggested before we think about expanded urban standard roadways we need to bring existing urban roadways up to urban standards first. Mark Harrington, RTC, noted that there are “gaps” in the existing urban network that can be address by completing established corridors.

**February 17, 2012**  
**RTAC Minutes**  
**Page 5**

Lynda said we will have to come up with some type of performance measurements as we try to deal with project priorities. As she pointed out local jurisdictions each have a 6-Year Transportation Improvement Program. We need to have discussion today of what is in each jurisdiction's 6-Year Transportation Improvement Program with the assumption that these Programs will provide the basis from which to work on Ten Year Transportation Priorities. Lynda said we need to know if these projects are realistic or whether you feel as time goes by the last few years that you have had to cut projects because of budget changes, are we seeing more expenditures and revenues having to be dedicated to preservation and maintenance verses new projects. How are RTAC members seeing things shifting over time? Again RTC wants to deal with project and strategy priorities, but what is a realistic starting point as we put a project list together. Lynda noted RTC will be working with you over the next few weeks to see what your top priorities are; and keep in mind what would be your top priorities if you have no new revenues available. What would be your new priorities if you have new state or local funds that would be dedicated to transportation?

*City of Vancouver*, the answer to those questions is the same; we will try to finish urban arterial system, where we are seeing growth are, SE 1<sup>st</sup> Street, 18<sup>th</sup> Street, 137<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

*Clark County*, have a few projects that will be built that are listed in the TIP, and will not be able to finish projects like we use to. What the County is doing is designing a number of projects and hopes we may get new funding or get previous funding reinstated. Bill felt like they are lucky to get a medium size capital project every two or three years and no ability to do a large project like Salmon Creek Interchange or a 503 Padden Interchange, it is not possible to tackle projects of that scale with current funding.

*City of Camas*, use to use real estate excise tax for transportation projects and now trying to get grant funds, now they are focused on upgrading NW 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue/SE 20th Street Corridor, and Goodwin Road.

*City of Ridgefield*, they are just filling in the gaps on projects and are focused on arterials.

*City of Washougal*, stated that the Economic Development is the big push, and looking at the north of the city, 32<sup>nd</sup> Street with the grade separation that will be important for their future. They have used real estate excise tax as well, and it has dropped off the same as other jurisdictions. They have new construction on E Street which helps out but worry about funding preservation and maintenance of the existing system.

*City of Battle Ground*, they have a very limited budget as everyone else and are working on getting some grant funding, they are working on South Parkway which is a top priority and finishing Grace Avenue. They will need to put a connection in place for access management; the question is how to fund it.

*City of La Center* has the La Center Road Interchange at I-5. Cowlitz Tribe is in the process of privately funding Interchange Justification Report, of an expansion of that Interchange and will try to get it approved by the end 2013.. In the TIP is the intersection of 4<sup>th</sup> and Pacific, they had a traffic signal in their Capital Facilities Plan, and now in the process of purchasing some property in the corner and will be ready to put in a Roundabout. They are hoping by the end of the year to have acquired the property and have the surveying, and preliminary engineering done. Construction may not happen for a couple of years.

Lynda noted that *C-TRAN* was not at the meeting to discuss transit needs.

February 17, 2012

RTAC Minutes

Page 6

BJ from Human Services Council is here to discuss special needs and Lynda said we need to have RTC Board of Directors consider special needs transportation and the aging demographic. She didn't know if it would materialize, but things she has read about the High Speed Rail could have stops in Olympia, Kelso, Vancouver, and Portland which could help the community.

*Port of Vancouver*, they are going for the federal grant funds and they have asked for \$80 million and looking at light industrial parks development in the Lower River Road area. Therefore there will be improvements to SR- 501 and the new intersection. She said there is some new interest in development and new grants coming through for economic side of the state that may help get the grants faster and hope to get started on improvements on Fourth Plain and hope the Tigard Grants will help with that improvement. Looking at Tiger Grant funding, she felt it is best to prioritize together based on certain types of criteria, working collectively as a region to secure funding.

Lynda noted when we look at priorities we need to look at the process and criteria that Tigard Grants use to determine the best decision on projects choices, if we are going to get large amounts of funding for our critical transportation needs. Katy said there was a considerable amount of funds that were received in other jurisdictions for grade separations. The reason they received large amounts of funds was because they worked together.

*ODOT*, Ralph said the successes that they have had in the Portland-Metro area with three counties and thirteen cities, rather than competing with each other we have teamed up with TPAC and JPAC.

Bill Wright, Clark County, said there is lots of competition for funding. Lynda said if we don't have dollars for local match and then we are not competitive, and for example for Tiger Grant Applications, they rely on what has already happened or what can the local region commit to the project. That is where our projects cannot compete in the future.

Bob Hart, RTC, directed RTAC to the hand out "Expenditures for Clark County and Cities" he said each chart shows transportation expenditure information for 2000-2009 categorized by construction and preservation/maintenance. The charts included information for Clark County and Cities together, Clark County only, and for each individual city. The charts illustrate the trends over time by expenditure category. Bob said that the chart of expenditures for all jurisdictions demonstrate how much the proportion of funds dedicated to preservation and maintenance has increased over the last 10 years, going from 26% in 2000 to 50% in 2009. . Lynda said we want to bring this to the table for agencies to check if the figures are correct that it would be good information for the RTC Board as it definitely tells the story of what the trends are. It was noted the dollars won't buy the same now as they did in 2000. In addition, a higher percentage of funds go for environmental mitigation than in the past. It was also noted that given the needs, it shows what we are spending and not what need to spend. Pavement condition in Vancouver is going down with no clear strategy to maintain roadway within current budget constraints.

Lynda reported that Dean attended the Clark County Legislation Alliance Day, he passed on to Lynda the status of current local funding option bill, which is SB 6582 preserving local options to have a vehicle fee of \$40 dollars with a majority vote of district governing board or a motor vehicle excise tax up to 1% of the value of the vehicle with a vote of the people. Dean was interested if there were talk of a local jurisdiction level currently having some kinds of local option funding. Some jurisdictions said it has been looked at, but nothing has been set up.

Lynda said in the next few weeks she will be calling on jurisdictions to get a list of the "Top Ten Projects" and strategies, a meeting may be set up outside of RTAC. She and Bob will be working on

revenue projections and what do we foresee in the next 10 years. We will need to work on how do we measure our priorities? Overall today she felt like we had a good discussion. This will be an agenda item for the RTC Board of Directors meeting in April of the 10 Year Project list.

**VI. Other Business**

**A. RTAC Members**

**B. RTC Staff**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:12 a.m. The next meeting will be Friday, March 16, 2012.





**Regional Transportation  
Advisory Committee**

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Regional Transportation Advisory Committee  
**FROM:** Mark Harrington  
**DATE:** March 12, 2012  
**SUBJECT:** **Ten-Year Transportation Project Priorities**

---

A major portion of time at the March RTAC meeting will be dedicated to a continuing discussion of the Ten-Year Transportation Project Priorities work effort. RTC staff will continue to rely upon RTAC members' expertise relating to their jurisdictions to contribute to the Ten-Year discussion and framing both policy and technical issues. In particular, the RTAC discussion will focus on the following:

- A review and summary of transportation investment policy issues discussed in February;
- The development of the 10-Year Revenue Forecast;
- A review of local jurisdiction 6-year Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs) as a basis for a starting point in developing the 10-Year Transportation Project Priorities;
- An introduction to the 10-year travel demand forecast.

### REVIEW AND SUMMARY OF POLICY ISSUES

At the February RTAC meeting, members discussed a number of transportation policy issues, including the prioritization of investment categories, the changing nature of transportation funding and local budgets, and the state of local agency TIPs.

RTAC members reviewed the Transportation Investment Categories and Goals, listed below, for completeness and for priority.

#### **Transportation Investment Categories:**

- Preservation/Maintenance
- Safety
- Non-highway modes – transit, freight, bike/trail
- Operational Improvements to Existing Facilities
- Highway Capacity Expansion (existing needs, future needs)
- Economic

*An advisory committee to:*

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council**

1300 Franklin Street, Floor 4

P.O. Box 1366

Vancouver, Washington 96666-1366

360-397-6067

fax: 360-397-6132

<http://www.rtc.wa.gov>

### **Transportation Investment Goals**

- Protect Investment in Current Network
- Support Economic Development/Jobs
- Improve Mobility
- Improve Accessibility
- Improve Reliability
- Reduce Traffic Accidents
- Increase Proportion of Alternative Modes

RTAC members responded that good transportation projects are rarely described by a single investment category or address a single investment goal. It was also suggested that the highway/street capacity expansion category may not adequately describe the differences between highway system expansion and highway system completion; with highway system expansion indicating the addition of new roadways or capacity, compared to system completion investments in upgrades to urban standards and the removal of system gaps.

The discussion of local jurisdiction transportation budgets, along with charts of capital vs. preservation/maintenance expenditures, raised the issues of the long-term cost of deferring system preservation/maintenance and increasing maintenance costs and needs. Overall, in Clark County the proportion of local funds dedicated to preservation and maintenance has increased from 26% in 2000 to about 50% in 2009. Discussion also identified the limited availability of local funds for capital improvements and federal matching funds.

Overall, RTAC members indicated that system preservation and maintenance should be prioritized above other investment categories due to the high costs of maintenance deferral. Following transportation system maintenance, it was suggested that bringing existing roadways up to urban standards and corridor completion would be the next highest priority. A brief review of local jurisdiction's TIPs indicated that there may not be the funding capacity to address much more than these priorities.

The February discussion concluded with an initial discussion of the need to take a coordinated regional approach that will prepare the region to better compete for limited state and federal competitive transportation grants, such as Tiger Grants.

At the March RTAC meeting, there will be further review and definition of these issues to prepare for a policy discussion at the April RTC Board meeting.

### **TEN-YEAR REVENUE FORECAST**

At the February meeting, members also reviewed historical information on transportation expenditures, by agency, for construction and preservation/maintenance. As noted earlier, the trend in the region is that the proportion of funds dedicated to preservation and maintenance has increased from 2000 to 2009. RTAC members agreed that it was valuable information and would be beneficial to present it to the RTC Board. RTAC also discussed several ideas to help

### **Transportation Investment Goals**

- Protect Investment in Current Network
- Support Economic Development/Jobs
- Improve Mobility
- Improve Accessibility
- Improve Reliability
- Reduce Traffic Accidents
- Increase Proportion of Alternative Modes

RTAC members responded that good transportation projects are rarely described by a single investment category or address a single investment goal. It was also suggested that the highway/street capacity expansion category may not adequately describe the differences between highway system expansion and highway system completion, with highway system expansion indicating the addition of new roadways or capacity, compared to system completion investments in upgrades to urban standards and the removal of system gaps.

The discussion of local jurisdiction transportation budgets, along with charts of capital vs. preservation/maintenance expenditures, raised the issues of the long-term cost of deferring system preservation/maintenance and increasing maintenance costs and needs. Overall, in Clark County the proportion of local funds dedicated to preservation and maintenance has increased from 26% in 2000 to about 50% in 2009. Discussion also identified the limited availability of local funds for capital improvements and federal matching funds.

Overall, RTAC members indicated that system preservation and maintenance should be prioritized above other investment categories due to the high costs of maintenance deferral. Following transportation system maintenance, it was suggested that bringing existing roadways up to urban standards and corridor completion would be the next highest priority. A brief review of local jurisdiction's TIPs indicated that there may not be the funding capacity to address much more than these priorities.

The February discussion concluded with an initial discussion of the need to take a coordinated regional approach that will prepare the region to better compete for limited state and federal competitive transportation grants, such as Tiger Grants.

At the March RTAC meeting, there will be further review and definition of these issues to prepare for a policy discussion at the April RTC Board meeting.

### **TEN-YEAR REVENUE FORECAST**

At the February meeting, members also reviewed historical information on transportation expenditures, by agency, for construction and preservation/maintenance. As noted earlier, the trend in the region is that the proportion of funds dedicated to preservation and maintenance has increased from 2000 to 2009. RTAC members agreed that it was valuable information and would be beneficial to present it to the RTC Board. RTAC also discussed several ideas to help

give the expenditure information more meaning in considering future preservation and maintenance needs. In addition, at their February meeting, the RTC Board requested other information to better understand future revenue policy choices. This section combines RTC Board and RTAC discussion to describe what will be prepared for the April Board meeting.

#### Additional Information for the RTC Board

The transportation expenditure bar charts presented at the February RTAC meeting will be updated with preservation and maintenance data displayed at the bottom of the bars to more clearly demonstrate how its share of expenditures changes over time. In addition, RTC staff will include data on the Consumer Price Index from the Bureau of Labor Statistics to show how the purchasing power of transportation dollars has changed between 2000 and 2009. RTC is also working with agency staff to compile information on historical lane miles and pavement condition ratings of the transportation system in the City of Vancouver and Clark County. This data is intended to provide indicators of future agency needs for preservation and maintenance.

One of the concerns expressed by the RTC Board was how environmental permitting and regulations have affected overall project costs. While recognizing that the variability of environmental costs is dependent on each individual project, RTC coordinated with agency staff and identified three representative projects to calculate costs attributable to environmental regulation and permitting. The project examples will include estimates on the percent of cost attributable to environmental factors at both the design and construction phases and will be based on each agency's knowledge and background of the project. Environmental factors that make up the estimate will include: drainage/erosion control, storm water treatment, wetlands mitigation, and environmental mitigation. The projects being evaluated are:

- 88<sup>th</sup> Street (Highway 99 to St. John's Road)      Clark County
- Salmon Creek Interchange Project      WSDOT
- 18<sup>th</sup> Street (I-205 to Four Seasons)      City of Vancouver

#### No New Revenue Approach

The initial 10-year revenue forecast presented to the RTC Board will be the "no new revenue" scenario under current law and economic trends. The approach will be similar to the method used to estimate revenues for the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Data from the Strategic Planning and Finance Division of the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) will be used to derive historical financial data (2004-2009) and projected revenues out to 2017 and applied into the future to 2022.

Federal and preexisting state revenue is being estimated for a 10-year period out to 2022. The following approach is being applied: 1) calculate revenue generated by Clark County from 2004 to 2017; 2) determine average annual revenue; 3) multiply by 10-years to estimate total revenue generated by Clark County to 2022.

## Ten-Year Transportation Project Priorities

March 12, 2012

Page 4

Gas tax revenue generated by the Nickel Package (5 cents/gal.) and the Partnership Package (9.5 cents/gal.) will not be included in the "no new revenue" forecast. Nickel/TPA funds are obligated out to 2017 for projects currently underway or programmed for construction. After 2017, these funds are dedicated to debt service, and therefore, are not available for new projects. While the MTP assumed forecast new state transportation revenue beginning in 2015, the 10-year "no new revenue" forecast will not include any new state or local revenue.

### **TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS AND PROJECT PRIORITIES**

As an element of the 10-year priorities, RTC staff has reached out to RTAC agencies to begin the review of the local 6-Year Transportation Improvement Programs. The 6-Year Transportation Improvement Program, along with other elements, will help serve as the basis of developing the ten-year priority list.

At the February RTAC meeting, RTAC members discussed priorities within each agency and agreed that the 6-year program is a good starting point. On March 1, 2012, RTC staff requested that each agency send a copy of their 6-Year Transportation Improvement Program. At this point, only the City of Battle Ground, City of Camas, Clark County, Port of Vancouver, and City of Vancouver have responded to this request. If you have not already done so, please send a copy of your 6-year transportation improvement program to RTC staff. Along with the 6-year Transportation Improvement Program, RTC staff will be reaching out to RTAC member agencies to review how these 6-year Transportation Improvement Programs relate to 10-year priorities. Please come to the March RTAC meeting prepared to discuss your 10-year project priorities.

RTC staff will also be providing a brief overview of the 2022 travel demand forecast to provide some context the amount of anticipated growth in traffic.



**Regional Transportation  
Advisory Committee**

## **MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Regional Transportation Advisory Committee  
**FROM:** Dale Robins  
**DATE:** March 12, 2012  
**SUBJECT:** Congestion Management Process – Data Collection

---

### **BACKGROUND**

The Congestion Management Process (CMP) is required to be developed and implemented as an integral part of the metropolitan planning process. The objective of the CMP is to provide a continuing analysis of transportation system congestion and help protect the region's investment and improve the future transportation system. The CMP for the Clark County region supports the long-term transportation goals and objectives defined in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and assists in identifying needed transportation improvements. The CMP, through performance monitoring, also helps to identify system bottle-necks and potential solutions.

The purpose of this agenda item is to get feedback from RTAC on RTC's 2010 data collection.

### **DATA COLLECTION**

RTC is responsible for setting up a process for the collection of congestion monitoring data. Some of the needed data is regularly collected by other transportation agencies within the Clark County region. RTC must organize and collect additional data, to supplement the data collected by local agencies.

Member agencies are requested to send any traffic counts, turn movements, or other collected transportation data to RTC for inclusion in the regional traffic count database.

Presented in this memorandum is the data that is proposed for collection in 2012. RTAC members are requested to review the data collection to ensure that RTC's data collection efforts do not duplicate efforts from a local agency. In addition, 2012 data requests were sent directly to Vancouver and Clark County staff that have direct responsibilities for data collection

The data collected by RTC is collected in cooperation and coordination with local agencies. All data is made available to local agencies. For example, travel time data is collected in coordination with the City of Vancouver and Clark County, and the data is then available to meet local needs. This has allowed the City and County to substantially reduce their cost and staff time for travel time collection and removed the duplication of efforts.

Although data is collected throughout a calendar year, the RTC data collection effort will focus on collecting data in the spring of 2012 (April/May). In 2009, RTC entered a 3 year data collection with Quality Counts to assist with this data collection effort. The following summarizes this data collection effort.

*An advisory committee to:*

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council**

1300 Franklin Street, Floor 4

P.O. Box 1366

Vancouver, Washington 96666-1366

360-397-6067

fax: 360-397-6132

<http://www.rtc.wa.gov>

## **Congestion Management Process – Data Collection**

**March 9, 2012**

**Page 2**

### **Travel Time**

RTC will work with Quality Counts to collect travel time data in 18 corridors in the AM peak period and 28 corridors in the PM peak period. The I-5 south corridor in the AM peak period and East Mill Plain in the PM period will both have two runs. See attached Travel Time collection worksheet.

### **Vehicle Occupancy**

Vehicle occupancy counts will be collected at 4 locations in both the AM and PM peak periods. Total of eight Vehicle Occupancy counts will be collected. See attached Vehicle Occupancy collection worksheet.

### **Transit Ridership**

RTC will coordinate with C-TRAN to obtain C-TRAN 2012 ridership data.

### **Traffic Counts**

RTC will collect traffic counts at 38 locations. See attached list of Traffic Count locations.

## 2012 Traffic Count Locations

ID	East-West Arterial	North-South Arterial	Last Year	Leg	2-Lane	4-Lane+
227	NE 18th Street	112th Avenue	2009	N,S,E	1	2
101	Mill Plain Blvd.	136th Avenue	2009			4
228	NE 18th Street	138th Avenue	2008			4
229	NE 18th Street	162nd Avenue	2009		1	2
217	Fourth Plain	162nd Avenue	2009		1	3
158	McGillvary	162nd Avenue	2008		2	2
3	Ward Road	162nd Avenue	2009	S,E,W	2	1
455	SR-14	192nd Avenue	2009	N		1
318	SR-502	NE 50th Avenue	2004		4	
397	SR-501 (Pioneer)	9th/Hillhurst Road	2006	S,E	2	
40	88th Street	Andresen Rd.	2007		2	2
181	Fourth Plain	Andresen Rd.	2009			4
91	Mill Plain Blvd.	Andresen Rd.	2008		1	3
339	Padden Parkway	Andresen Rd.	2008			4
171	Fouth Plain	Broadway	2007		4	
79	Mill Plain Blvd.	Broadway	2008		2	2
83	W. 15th Street	Broadway	2008	N,E	1	2
178	Fourth Plain	Falk	2009		2	2
165	Fourth Plain	Fruit Valley Road	2009	N,E,W	3	
174	Fourth Plain	Ft. Vancouver	2008		1	3
209	SR-500	Gher Rd.	2007	S		1
255	78th Street	Highway 99	2008			4
85	Mill Plain Blvd.	I-5	2003	E,W		2
170	Fourth Plain	Main St.	2008	N,S,E	3	
79	Mill Plain Blvd.	Main St.	2008	N,S,W	2	1
82	W. 15th Street	Main St.	2008	N,E,W	1	2
408	Fourth Plain	Mill Plain	2009	S,E,W	1	2
425	NW 134th Street	NW 11th Street	Never	E,W		2
307	NE 119th St.	SR-503	2008		2	2
268	76th Street	SR-503	2009		2	2
210	Fourth Plain	SR-503	2008			4
429	Padden Parkway	SR-503	2009	N,E,W		3
320	SR-502	SR-503	2008			4
21	78th Street	St. John Blvd.	2009			4
31	88th Street	St. John Blvd.	2006	N,E,W	2	1
184	Fourth Plain	Thurston Way	2009		1	2
325	SR-501 (Pioneer)	Timm Road	2007	S, E, W	2	
132	Evergreen Blvd.	Ft. Vancouver Way	1997		4	
					49	77



**Vehicle Occupancy Counts (AM/PM)**

		<b>2012</b>
I-5	199th St. Overpass	
I-5	63rd St. Overpass	
I-5	Evergreen Overpass	2
I-205	63rd St. Overpass	
I-205	McGillivray Overpass	
SR-14	Riverside Dr. Overpass	
SR-14	192nd Av. Overpass	
SR-500	42nd Av. Ped. Overpass	2
SR-502	E. of 50th Av.	
SR-503	S. of 199th St.	
Hwy. 99	S. of 78th St.	
St. Johns/St. James	S. of 49th St.	
164th Av.	N. of McGillivray	2
Fourth Plain Bl.	E. of Broadway	
Mill Plain/15th St.	E. of Broadway	
Mill Plain Bl.	W. Andresen	
Fourth Plain Bl.	W. Andresen	
Mill Plain Bl.	W. of 137th Av.	2
Fourth Plain Bl.	W. of 137th Av.	
Padden Parkway	107th Av. Overpass	
<b>Totals</b>		<b>8</b>

AM (6:30-8:30)

PM (16:00-18:00)

