Clark County Public Transportation Improvement Conference
Meeting Record
October 27, 2015

Vancouver Community Library
Columbia Room
901 C Street, Vancouver, WA
Vancouver, WA
3-5 pm

Conference Members
Mayor Jeff Carothers, City of Yacolt
Mayor Sean Guard, City of Washougal
Councilmember Al Swindell, City of Woodland
Councilmember Jack Burkman, City of Vancouver
Mayor Ron Onslow, City of Ridgefield
Mayor Jim Irish, City of La Center
Councilmember Greg Anderson, City of Camas
Council Chair David Madore, Clark County
Councilor Jeanne Stewart, Clark County
Councilor Tom Mielke, Clark County
Councilmember Lyle Lamb, City of Battle Ground

Meeting purpose: The purpose of this meeting is to convene the conferees, to identify what needs to be done (orientation), how to do it (organization), and the resources needed for decision making (interests and needs).

Actions Taken

Election of chair
Burkman nominated Guard and Mielke nominated Madore for chair. Votes were cast with three for Madore, six for Guard, and two abstentions.

Election of vice chair
Burkman nominated Onslow and Mielke nominated Madore for vice chair. Votes were cast with six for Onslow and three for Madore with two abstentions.

Motion 1: Desirability of changing the boundaries of the PTBA
Motion by Burkman, second by Onslow that it is not desirable to change the boundaries of the Public Transit Benefit District.
Madore requested a roll call vote.
Yes: Burkman, Anderson,Onslow, Irish, Swindell
No: Madore, Mielke, Carothers, Lamb

Abstain Stewart, Guard
Motion carries.

Motion 2: Conference shall not fix a date for a public hearing
Motion by Burkman, seconded by Anderson that this PTIC conference shall not fix any date for a public hearing to change the boundaries of the CTRAN public transit benefit area.
Madore requested a roll call vote.
Yes: Burkman, Anderson, Onslow, Irish, Swindell, Guard
No: Madore, Mielke, Carothers, Lamb, Stewart
Motion carries.

Motion 3: PTIC requests that CTRAN establish a working group to review issues of service area and equity
Motion by Burkman, seconded by Carothers that the PTIC requests CTRAN convene a working group with representatives from all jurisdictions, including Woodland, for the purpose of investigating equity and service area issues.
Motion carries.

Motion 4: Public comment
Motion by Madore, second by Mielke to open the agenda to public comment.
Amendment to motion by Anderson, seconded by Madore to allow the public a maximum of three minutes per comment.
Amendment to motion carries.
Motion carries.

Motion 5: Adjourn
Motion by Onslow second by multiple persons to adjourn at 4:40 pm.
Motion carries.

Discussion

All appointed members were in attendance. Madore opened the meeting as a welcome and asked for nominations for chair. Guard asked if the county would have one representative or three and if the county wanted to identify one primary representative in the event later discussion concluded the county should have only one representative. County representatives declined. Action on elections transpired.

Stewart asked for clarification on the purpose of the conference. Members referred to the statute and past history of CTRAN boundaries. Madore cited the BOCC resolution calling for the conference as rationale for the PTIC. Members question several sections of the BOCC resolution. Issues discussed included use of the word gerrymandering, the claim the boundary was amended in 2005 purely for taxing purposes, the former countywide boundary did not have county wide service, the definition of service islands, etc.

Burkman said even though there may be questions about the resolution of the BOCC it would be more productive to move forward with the process. Motion 1 was entered to the floor. This motion suggested the PTIC find it is not desirable to change the boundaries. Discussion focused on:

- It is healthy to have a conversation about the service area. Some people believe, however, the PTIC not the correct venue and the conversation is more appropriately had by the CTRAN board where there are adequate information resources to support the conversation.
- There needs to be a discussion of equity, and the PTIC is not convened for the larger conversation, it is convened to talk about boundaries.
- It has been 10 years since a boundary conversation and it is good to have the conversation.
- The PTIC is the best process for conversation, not the CTRAN board.
- Don't confuse the service area and the taxing area.
- Continue this process and have a hearing to allow the public to weigh in.
- The county claims it can require a hearing, but other legal counsel disagrees.
- Please rescind the motion.

Members asked for clarification from county legal counsel on the issue of the BOCC being able to require a hearing. The county prosecuting attorney office stated they cannot advise the PTIC, as they are the counsel for the county councilors.

Guard asked, before the vote, if the BOCC wanted to identify one primary voter in the event later investigation shows the county is entitled to only one vote. The BOCC declined. Motion 1 votes were cast and the motion carried.

Motion 2 was entered onto the floor. This motion proposed the PTIC not set a hearing date. Discussion included:

- A request to withdraw the motion, on the basis it excludes citizen input from deliberation.
- Members clarified their interpretation that the motion, if carried, applies only to this PTIC and do not apply to future PTIC if convened.
- This motion is illegal because the county or two communities can require a hearing.
- Members clarified their intent this motion does not preclude the CTRAN board from discussing services and costs.

Motion 2 votes were cast and the motion carried.

Motion 3 was entered. This motion requested the CTRAN board to convene a working group including all jurisdictions to discuss service and equity issues. Motion 3 votes were cast and the motion carried.

Members noted the agenda distributed was administrative and organizational in nature and did not include public comment. Some members wanted to allow public comment, while others felt it was not appropriate because the agenda did not include a time for comment, and some persons who wanted to comment may not have attended or may have left the room. Motion 4 was entered to allow public comment, with an amendment. Votes were cast and the amendment and the motion carried.

Four members of the public spoke with opinions including supporting and opposing expansion.

Motion 5 was entered into the floor proposing adjournment. Motion carried at 4:40 pm.

*10/30/2015 revised