

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Board of Directors
March 1, 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, March 1, 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
Jack Burkman, Vancouver Councilmember
Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor
Bart Gernhart, WSDOT (Alternate)
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Councilmember
Jeff Hamm, C-TRAN Executive Director/CEO
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver Council
Doug McKenzie, Skamania Co. Commissioner
Jerry Oliver, Port of Vancouver Commissioner
Julie Olson, Clark County Councilor
Ron Onslow, Ridgefield Mayor
Jeanne Stewart, Clark County Councilor
Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1 Manager

Voting Board Members Absent:

David Poucher, White Salmon Mayor
Kris Strickler, WSDOT Regional Administrator

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
Lori Figone, WSDOT
Tim Gaughan, Citizen
Jim Hagar, Port of Vancouver
Dena Horton, Senator Cantwell's Office
Dale Lewis, Senator Herrera Beutler's Office
Scott Patterson, C-TRAN
Dameon Pesanti, The Columbian
Mike Pond, Citizen
Peter Silliman, Clark County
Bryan Stebbins, Senator Murray's Office
Ty Stober, Vancouver Councilmember
Jeff Swanson, Clark County
Ron Swaren, Citizen
Patrick Sweeney, City of Vancouver
Margaret Tweet, Citizen

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
Diane Workman, Administrative Assistant

II. Approval of the Board Agenda

Chair Burkman said he would like to add item XII. a proposed meeting location change. This would move the current XII. to XIII. The purpose of this has been looking at a different possible location for the meeting to address some of the issues that they've had with the room they are using. A resolution that goes along with it was distributed. The Bylaws state that any meeting location change has to be made by a resolution.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF MARCH 1, 2016, MEETING AGENDA WITH THE NOTED CHANGES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY RON ONSLOW AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

III. Call for Public Comments

Ron Swaren of Portland, Oregon, distributed two handouts. He spoke about the regional transportation needs of the interstate. He is in favor of a project he calls the Western arterial highway shown on a map. Mr. Swaren referred to the second handout showing a network tied arch bridge, and he spoke of the bridge's qualities.

Ed Barnes of Vancouver, Washington, distributed packets with information regarding the I-5 and I-205 Bridges. This included history, statistics, and the Record of Decision. Mr. Barnes said we cannot wait; we need to build a new bridge now in the I-5 corridor.

Shirley Craddick entered the meeting at 4:10 p.m.

Margaret Tweet of Camas, Washington, said the voters rejected light rail in Clark County. The most recent was in 2012. She also spoke about light rail, C-TRAN, bus rapid transit, and sales tax. She asked members to respect the wishes of the voters and citizens.

IV. Approval of the February 2, 2016, Minutes

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 2, 2016, MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

V. Consent Agenda

A. March Claims

ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA MARCH CLAIMS. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY JEANNE STEWART AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VI. Bus on Shoulder Feasibility Study, Resolution 03-16-03

Matt Ransom said agenda items VI. and VII. will be presented concurrently, and action will be taken separately. Bringing this study forward for the Board's consideration is a culmination of over a year's worth of effort. This has been work with WSDOT, ODOT, C-TRAN, TriMet, and Metro. This study was identified as a priority emphasis activity in the 2016 Work Program.

Bob Hart said Resolution 03-16-03 amends the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to add the Bus on Shoulder Feasibility Study using \$150,000 in CMAQ funds and it also amends the 2016 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to include the study. It is already in the 2017 UPWP, but this will allow them to begin work prior to July 1, 2016. Resolution 03-16-04

authorizes the Executive Director to enter into an agreement for professional services for the study.

The Bus on Shoulder (BOS) Feasibility Study is a follow up to the I-205 Access and Operations Study recommendations adopted by the RTC Board in November 2014. The corridor recommendations were made up of long term improvement for 2015 that were incorporated into the RTP and a set of short term operational projects to be implemented by WSDOT in coordination with local agencies. The transit recommendation called for a feasibility study of bus on shoulder operations in the I-205 corridor. This was based on a preliminary assessment.

The assessment found that it had many potential benefits: transit reliability, travel time savings, and expanded transit ridership, but it still had a lot of unknowns about how it works alongside the traffic lane as well as how it works in coordination with emergency management and law enforcement/public safety needs. They also need to learn more about the roadway infrastructure requirements of a Bus on Shoulder system such as shoulder width and pavement depth and how I-205 characteristics fit with those requirements.

During 2015, RTC worked internally and with other agency staff to complete a draft scope of work in preparation for a consultant selection process that occurred late last year.

The Feasibility Study is a Phase One Study, and could possibly lead to a Phase Two Study. Phase one is to identify engineering, technical, operational, institutional, and policy considerations for BOS. It will also determine the viability and recommend whether the region should proceed with a comprehensive phase two implementation planning study. If stakeholders agree to advance phase two, they could consider adopting regional BOS policies to guide how and when to consider BOS in other corridors.

Mr. Hart said given that there are several new Board members this year and the recommendations were adopted over a year ago, he would give a brief overview of what Bus on Shoulder (BOS) is. Basically, it is a system where transit vehicles can use the shoulder when mainline speeds fall below a predetermined speed or threshold. It is not all the time; it is just when the conditions warrant it. In some regions, buses stay on the shoulder continuously past interchanges, while on other systems, buses will move back on the main line to get around a heavy volume interchange and then return to the shoulder after it passes the interchange. In most areas of the country, the traffic speed threshold is generally 35 mph, with buses allowed 15 to 20 mph faster. BOS is different than hard shoulder running which can carry general purpose traffic and carpools during peak hours and have much higher vehicle volumes. The design thresholds are much more stringent than a BOS system. In 2014, there were 15 BOS systems in the US.

Mr. Hart displayed an example of a BOS system in Minneapolis – St. Paul. He said that region is the gold standard for BOS, and they were an early adapter. Each system has its own characteristics and unique operational rules. Mr. Hart highlighted the MetroTransit BOS system of Minneapolis-St. Paul. Mr. Hart also provided a brief video clip onboard a bus using the BOS system of Triangle Transit in Raleigh-Durham, North Carolina. He said Triangle Transit has had a BOS system for about three years and highlighted the characteristics of their system.

Marc Boldt said with road designs for the state or county, safety is a key issue along with sight distances. He asked if that would be studied as well. Mr. Hart said safety is one of the criteria that they will look at. The roadway design will be studied to better understand what is needed for BOS and what our characteristics are for freeways that are being considered both in Washington and Oregon. The right operating rules in place that dictate how the bus uses the lane, how they operate and move on and off of the shoulder addresses a lot of the safety concerns.

Jeanne Stewart asked the population of Minneapolis-St. Paul. Jeff Hamm said the population of Minneapolis-St. Paul was about 2.5 million people. Councilor Stewart questioned what they got for \$173,000 for an assessment in phase one before moving to phase two. She said there needed to be conversation, information, and discussion along the way.

Mr. Hart said that is all a part of the study. The scope of work summarized in Resolution 03-16-04 lists those tasks for the feasibility phase one. They will be developing different concepts for possible ways to build, looking at the different areas where reconstruction might be needed along with areas that might be easy to accommodate. Different concepts will be looked at along with the costs. Mr. Hart said an important task planned is a Technical Workshop. This is intended to help understand all the issues.

Councilor Stewart said she would like to see the federal government standards for lane width on Interstates based on safety, their minimum standards, and their standards on Interstate bridges. She would like to know how they accommodate safety when the emergency lane is in use by a bus. Councilor Stewart said there is a 150 page document with Federal Transit Bus on Shoulder information. She said she has not read all of it, but she was very interested in the effect on congestion when an emergency happens on an Interstate bridge and there is no emergency lane. She was also concerned with the effect of congestion at an intersection. She asked how that information would all be imported into the study.

Mr. Hart said all the questions that she is asking are the things that they want to understand before they embark on something. This is to look at all those issues to see if it is feasible or not. Mr. Hart said for the Workshop, their objective is to invite not just policy makers and managers, but also the State Patrol and other stakeholders so their issues and concerns and questions are addressed as part of this. Mr. Hart said he has read the document that Councilor Stewart referred to, the Transit Cooperative Research Project Report 151, and safety, for most regions, has not been an issue. It is controlled by all the rules that are put in place to ensure that and how the drivers are trained. This includes priority for shoulder use is always for emergencies and law enforcement.

Councilor Stewart asked how soon in the study they would receive information to discuss as a Board before looking at phase two.

Mr. Hart said the workshop that they are planning will take place in September.

Chair Burkman clarified that this phase one study will conclude by coming back to the Board for approval before they move to phase two. Mr. Hart said at the end of phase one, they take a

pause and come back to the Board to discuss the findings and recommendations, and it is the Board's decision to move forward or not.

Ron Onslow questioned how the buses cross an exit where others are exiting. He also asked about signage and restricting general purpose traffic from using the shoulder as well. Mr. Hart said there is significant signage, but it did not appear in the video clip. In Raleigh, North Carolina, they spent about \$2,000 a mile for signage, pavement markings, and such to show that the shoulder was for bus use at certain times. Mr. Hart said it is a challenge for us. We are not clear on the use, even though they are used elsewhere in the country. Part of the workshop effort is to educate others on what they are and how they work.

Jerry Oliver asked the area that the study will cover. Mr. Hart said it is I-205 from 18th Street to I-84. They have also added SR-14 from 164th Ave. to I-205 because that is a main bus line that serves from Fisher's Landing Park and Ride to I-205.

Shirley Craddick asked the process that has to occur to approve this to move forward given that there are several jurisdictions such as WSDOT and ODOT. Mr. Hart said that will have to be further defined. He said the partners that are involved directly and were on the advisory committee, WSDOT, ODOT, C-TRAN, TriMet, Metro and RTC have to all be on board.

Jeanne Stewart said this topic came up at JPACT last week, and she said it seemed that some of the Oregon partners were caught off guard about the discussion. She asked who we were working with on the Oregon side. Mr. Hart said the Oregon Department of Transportation, TriMet, and Metro.

Mr. Hart addressed the consultant selection process with regard to Resolution 03-16-04. He said an RFQ was advertised on October 21, 2015. They had three responses submitted: David Evans and Associates (DEA), HDR, and AECOM. After the initial scoring by the selection committee (WSDOT, C-TRAN, ODOT, TriMet, Metro, and RTC), they interviewed all three teams. After the interviews, all agreed that DEA was the most qualified. The DEA team is headed by Scott Harmon as Project Manager who has guided efforts for ODOT to develop advance traffic management strategies for freeways in the Portland region. The team also includes Nick Thompson, a nationally known expert with direct knowledge in all phases of BOS planning and implementation.

RTC will be the project lead for the overall study and will be supported by agencies that would be directly involved or affected by a bus on shoulder operation as the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) as already mentioned. The TAC will provide support regarding analysis approach and results, and input on development of scenarios and operational protocols. They will also work with RTAC and the RTC Board providing updates as well as with JPACT and the Bi-State Coordination Committee. They also plan to engage with the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration to inform them of the study progress and ensure coordination on transit use of interstate facilities and regulatory or other requirements.

The Technical Workshop is one of the many tasks, and a key element of the engagement process. This will include agency stakeholders and policy makers. It will consist of two parts. The first part will be mostly educational to inform on engineering, operational, and technical

issues along with operating rules and policies in general and what the experiences has been for other parts of the country. The second half of the workshop is more technical. They will focus on I-205 and its characteristics. One of the outcomes of the workshop is to support the development of a draft BOS operating concept for the corridor.

The study budget total is \$173,410. The TIP Amendment programs \$150,000 in CMAQ funds with \$23,410 in local match funds by C-TRAN as listed in Resolution 03-16-03. The total budget is for \$137,600 in professional services as listed in Resolution 03-16-04 and \$35,810 in agency funds for RTC project management and data support.

Matt Ransom referred back to Jerry Oliver's question about the Scope of Work. He referred to Task 10. The primary emphasis for the Scope is the I-205 corridor and connecting SR-14 from I-205 to Fisher's Landing Transit Center. There is an optional Task that has been identified which is a high level assessment of the I-5 corridor as well as north on I-205. The point of that high level assessment is to gauge if they make progress and there is some thought that this is a viable concept regionally, they could authorize Task 10. It could provide a quick scan assessment, since the consultant team would be on board and have the expertise to utilize.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 03-16-03 TO AMEND THE 2016-2019 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM TO PROGRAM \$150,000 OF CMAQ FUNDS AND THE REQUISITE LOCAL MATCH AND TO AMEND THE UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM FOR FY 2016 TO INCLUDE A DESCRIPTION OF THE BUS ON SHOULDER FEASIBILITY STUDY. ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Councilor Marc Boldt said he sees the benefit and need of this; but he said as you know, we live in kind of a tense time in our life between the bridge, The Vine, and everything else. He said he just didn't know if it was the right time to push this subject. This is a concern of his.

Jeanne Stewart said she supported what Councilor Boldt said. In addition to that, she realized today that Resolution 03-16-04 for the consultant contract was with David Evans and Associates. Councilor Stewart said this was the firm that did the CRC, and she claimed it was an outrageous act to consider them. Councilor Stewart said we should pause from approving this action today, because the next resolution is for the contractor.

Jeff Hamm said he understood Councilor Boldt's concerns, but said this is a feasibility study. It is educating ourselves and the public to a concept that might have great benefit for the region. He said we all know what has occurred in the Interstate corridor crossing the bridge since the recession ended. Now congestion has built back up to higher than it has ever been; there are hundreds and thousands of people stuck in that. Mr. Hamm said there is no other operational change to the interstate system across the river that can be implemented in a short period of time for any relief to that, except this. He urged Councilor Boldt to "stand tall" to the criticism and think of the benefits of those individuals and our economy.

Shirley Craddick said her comments were similar to Mr. Hamm's. She said she sees this study and hiring a contractor is going to give us some of the answers that are being asked today. She encouraged moving forward on this before getting to the political side. This is not approving a Bus on Shoulder program today; we are trying to get some information to allow us to figure out

if this is a program that would be of benefit to both sides of the region. Councilor Craddick said in looking at I-84 and all the traffic and all the people who use the MAX, if all of that is added up, MAX carries 1/3 of the people who travel that corridor. A bus system can really be a benefit to help relieve congestion. She said she didn't think we have a choice any more. We are in a constrained world. We don't have the money or the physical ability to build wider freeways. Councilor Craddick said she thought they need to look at this and move forward to allow them to at least get the information to allow them to make a better decision.

Jerry Oliver said he sympathized with Councilor Boldt. He said that maybe now is not the time to move forward and perhaps a pause of even a few months would give us a chance for each of us to consider this. Commissioner Oliver said it is an option and perhaps one worthy of consideration, but not at this time.

Bart Gernhart said they are running out of low cost options to address congestion. He said Jeff Hamm spoke about the congestion on I-5. Mr. Gernhart said I-205 is also considerably worse than it was pre-recession. There really are not too many options left for them to look at. He said they could possibly consider ramp metering, but this BOS is one to at least have in their portfolio to consider and understand the issues. This is not to say they will implement. Mr. Gernhart said this is not implementation; this is understanding some options that are out there that he felt the Board should consider.

Mr. Gernhart asked Mr. Ransom if the two resolutions are tied together as one action or if they could come back and revisit the second resolution regarding the consultant review. Mr. Ransom said the consultant review process according to their procurement standards was implemented by the script. They advertised it publically, it was in trade journals, and they had responses that were submitted according to the criteria that they established. They had a multi-agency review team that has already been discussed that participated in an oral interview phase of the evaluation. The unanimous conclusion of the interview team, both in the technical review of the application and the oral interviews, was the consultant that is recommended for the contract. Mr. Ransom said they followed their procurement process, he was not sure there was a basis to reconsider that selection.

Paul Greenlee said he wants to know whether this makes sense. He said we won't know until some professional people look at this question. Councilmember Greenlee said until we have that information, it is very hard to think if it makes sense or not. It may or may not. Our local conditions are different than Minneapolis, but Metro's are about the same size. Councilmember Greenlee said he would like to know whether this makes sense or not and what kind of improvement we would see, if any, in the I-205/SR-14 corridor. He said the SR-14 corridor is a daily challenge for him.

Chair Burkman said he shared the same perspective; he would like to know more about this. He agrees it is a sensitive area. He said he is troubled with the concept of stopping everything relating to improving our transportation system waiting for the big fix. Any big fixes that we have are years if not decades down the road. He questioned how the Board could start moving forward step by step. Chair Burkman said he does share Councilor Stewart's concerns in regard to quickly jumping to phase two; that would be problematic. He said his expectation as Chair

would be to make sure we have at least two work sessions on this as part of our meeting in order to understand these questions.

Chair Burkman said they have a motion on item VI. Resolution 03-16-03 and item VII. is to implement that with a consulting services agreement. He said he was not sure what the issues are associated with revisiting the recommended vendor to the process.

Mr. Ransom said in consultation with legal counsel, when it comes to their procurement process, they would have to reject all solicitations that they received and reopen the advertisement and solicit proposals again. Mr. Ransom said they don't have any basis right now in their procurement guidelines for prohibiting any vendor who qualifies under our criteria from submitting. If there is an adverse opinion against a particular entity, we have nothing in our rules that would prohibit them from soliciting a proposal again.

Anne McEnerny-Ogle said that was her question. She said they are currently voting on Resolution 03-16-03, and the next opportunity would be to discuss Resolution 03-16-04. She asked how procurement would change. What changes would there be in the next selection process? She said it doesn't sound like there would be any.

Mr. Ransom said his interpretation according to the procurement guidelines is that the Board would have to establish a prohibition by name rather than some other criteria to prevent them from considering a duly submitted proposal. All the proposals that they received comply with their criteria as it was published. Mr. Ransom said the entity would have to be prohibited, and he was not sure under the law that was possible.

Ted Gathe, RTC legal counsel, said the RTC, as many governmental agencies, has the right to reject all bids, which means you would then start the process over. That is an inherent right that RTC has. So far as the individual entity that they are proposing the contract be entered into, he knows of no basis upon which that entity has been debarred, that is prohibited from participating in public contracting. Unless there is information to that effect, then they would have the right to participate in any new process that is established as well. Those are the options that are before the RTC Board at this time.

A roll call vote was requested for Resolution 03-16-03. This action amends the 2016-2019 TIP to program \$150,000 in CMAQ funds and it amends the FY 2016 UPWP to include a description of the BOS Feasibility Study.

THE MOTION PASSES WITH 9 YES VOTES: BURKMAN, CRADDICK, GERNHART, GREENLEE, HAMM, MCENERNY-OGLE, MCKENZIE, ONSLOW, WINDSHEIMER AND 4 NO VOTES: BOLDT, OLIVER, OLSON, STEWART.

VII. Bus on Shoulder Feasibility Study - Consulting Services Agreement, Resolution 03-16-04

RON ONSLOW MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 03-16-04. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY PAUL GREENLEE.

Jeanne Stewart said she would be frank and direct and voiced her strong opposition to the consultant selection referring to their involvement in the Columbia River Crossing project.

Anne McEnery-Ogle said Councilor Stewart had brought up some information that may not be out in the public. She asked Chair Burkman if this is an opportunity to table this motion until the next meeting to gather that information.

Chair Burkman said the issues that Councilor Stewart brought up have been out in the public. They were a part of the CRC project. He said what he is hearing from legal counsel is that really the only option that we have is to deny this motion and make another motion to reject all bids and send it back out for bids again, although we would be prohibited from barring any individual company from applying. We would still have a process to go through.

Ted Gathe said that was correct. He said if some additional information would be helpful to the Board, delaying this or tabling the motion to the April RTC Board meeting would not be unacceptable from a legal perspective. He said at some point, they would have to come to a decision or reject all bids.

ANNE MCENERY-OGLE MOVED TO TABLE THE MOTION UNTIL THE APRIL MEETING. PAUL GREENLEE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Jeanne Stewart said when she hears that the only control over who we would expect to engage in contract with is based on our criteria, she thinks it is preposterous. She said it is outrageous to expect we would have to put something in our criteria that is a matter of good business practice.

Chair Burkman said he respected what Councilor Stewart was saying, but at the same time we are as a Board obligated to follow certain laws of procurement, even if we disagree with them. That is why he had asked for confirmation from legal counsel.

Julie Olson asked if there was nothing that they could do as a Board to deal with a contractor that they have legitimate integrity concerns about. She said she found that difficult to believe.

Ted Gathe said he did not know that there has been any evidence during the selection process that you have an irresponsible contractor or one that is not responsible under state law or local procurement processes. Unless that information is forthcoming, at this point, no there is no basis for that. He did suggest that this body could continue the hearing on this matter and look into that if there are legitimate issues that need to be reviewed.

Jerry Oliver said in business conducted at the Port, they have had times when they have rejected the low bidder, because they felt they were not qualified or not appropriate. Those are their guidelines. Commissioner Oliver agreed with Councilor Olson, saying that it's curious that we can't set the standards of who can bid.

Chair Burkman said there is a motion to table this item. He said his understanding is that if that passes, the event is to work with legal counsel and executive director to provide information and bring it back at the April meeting. This does not approve the consulting services agreement nor does it stop the process. It just holds it till next month.

Doug McKenzie asked if they go through the process again and the same contractor gets the bid again, will this same discussion happen.

Chair Burkman said if this is tabled today, that is part of the discussion they will have next month after more information is provided.

Jeff Hamm asked for clarification that this table motion does not mean we are rejecting this contract and going out again. Chair Burkman said that was correct. We had a motion for approval of Resolution 03-16-04. That motion is stopped by this tabling action, and will be coming back before us next month.

THE MOTION TO TABLE WAS APPROVED WITH ONE OPPOSED: CRADDICK.

VIII. Growth Management Act – RTC Certification Process Guide and Checklist, Resolution 03-16-05

Chair Burkman said this item has been before the Board several times; the intention today is to take action on resolution 03-16-05.

Lynda David said they hope to conclude work on this Guide and Checklist as they ask for the Board to consider adopting Resolution 03-16-05. Ms. David said as discussed at previous meetings, RTC has certain responsibilities under the state's Growth Management Act and certifying local comprehensive plans. The transportation element in particular is one of those tasks and responsibilities.

The four key roles that RTC has to fulfill include: Establish guidelines and principles for certifying the local transportation elements of comprehensive plans; RTC must certify conformity of local comprehensive plans with the Growth Management Act; RTC must also certify consistency between local comprehensive plans and RTC's Regional Transportation Plan; and must certify that locals have met the requirements of the state's Level of Service Bill.

Ms. David said these are not new requirements, but what are new are the guidance document and the checklist which should help the local jurisdictions in taking the certification steps with RTC.

Local jurisdictions will need to submit the updated plan and completed Certification Checklist (found at the back of the Process Guide) to RTC at the same time as submittal of draft Comprehensive Plan updates to the State Department of Commerce. The Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC) would deal with any certification issues that arise. After comprehensive plan updates are adopted by local jurisdictions, the RTC Board will be asked to adopt resolutions to complete the certification process.

Staff is asking for Board action on Resolution 03-16-05 to adopt RTC's Certification Process Guide and Checklist as recommended by the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC).

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 03-16-05, GMA: RTC CERTIFICATION PROCESS GUIDE AND CHECKLIST. DOUG MCKENZIE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Marc Boldt asked if they look at the County's Capital Facilities Plan. Ms. David said yes, because that is part of the transportation element. Part of the certification is looking at what revenues

are expected to transportation facilities and what solutions there might be to address level of service issues.

Jerry Oliver referred to page 6 of the Guide with a List of Guidelines and Principles. The first two listed were concentration of economic activity and residential density. Commissioner Oliver asked if those were goals that we are addressing in the update.

Ms. David said they are general guidelines and principles that are contained in the Growth Management Act and what we should be considering as part of the Comprehensive plan. They relate somewhat to transportation facilities and services, economic activity and residential density. Ms. David said primarily, they will be looking at policy themes that are addressed on page 5. That is what they have established as a way that they would evaluate and consider certifying the local Comprehensive Plans. These are policy themes that are very consistent between federal, state, and their Regional Transportation Plan. The list of guidelines and principles on page 6 comes from the Growth Management Act itself.

Commissioner Oliver asked how those guidelines meld in with the update that is proposed.

Ms. David said, they would look, for example, economic activity at the Port, to see if access for the Port is adequate, such as the Mill Plain corridor. This would be to make sure the transportation elements address those access routes to centers of economic activity. Also, residential density comes into whether or not the transit system can be effective in addition. Those are some of the reflections they would make on whether the transportation elements have adequately addressed those sort of issues.

Jeanne Stewart said the Growth Management Plan for Clark County has begun a process, and it's moving forward. She said Capital Facilities Plans are not done yet, and the ones that have been done are expanded and improved by the cities. Councilor Stewart asked how the implementation of GMA and the transportation component interfaced and if this was more general.

Ms. David said it is somewhat more general. They are just making sure that those component elements are part of the Comprehensive Plan and as part of the transportation element, finance and revenues need to be addressed, whether or not there is an adequate finance plan, whether or not there are solutions for transportation inadequacies or deficiency, and whether or not priorities have been established, along with shorter term and longer term transportation system elements that need to be implemented. These are the sort of issues that they are looking for to make sure they are a part of the plan.

Chair Burkman said this description says that RTC staff will not pass judgement over whether it is right or wrong, but if it was considered and if it is documented as such.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 03-16-05 WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

IX. Federal Legislative Update: FAST Act

The memorandum on the FAST Act was distributed for the February meeting, but time did not allow for presentation so it was brought to the March meeting. Mr. Ransom recognized the

leadership in Washington, D.C. by our Congressional delegation, Senators Cantwell and Murray and Representative Herrera Beutler. Each voted for this new transportation Act.

The President signed into law the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act or FAST Act on December 4, 2015. On December 18, Congress approved an appropriation bill that funded the Act in full. The Act provides five years of full funding certainty, although Congress does have to appropriate the funds or at least portions of the funds annually because there is supplement funds coming outside the Highway Trust Fund that are transferred in. Unlike MAP-21, this does provide five years of financial predictability. Mr. Ransom said that will manifest in the State OFM. They have taken the Federal FAST Act revenues and fully programmed into their forecast which provided DOT a better certainty in terms of what their operating budget and capital budget would be through the five years of the Act – a very important outcome.

Mr. Ransom said the key outcome is more money. The Act actually rises by year. Unlike previous Acts, there is more money flowing through this Act. Mr. Ransom displayed a pie chart showing how the programs are apportioned. He said there is a new program focusing on freight and goods movement. He recognized Senator Cantwell's leadership in really pushing forward this new policy initiative at the federal level. This is very important to our region given our trade dependency between the two Ports and the interstate routes. Mr. Ransom showed the flow of dollars that come to Washington State.

The new Freight Program has two provisions. One is a formula set aside, and a second is a new capital grant program. The new capital grant program just had a notice of funding availability distributed by USDOT a week ago. This is very important for both states and this region. This states what projects can compete for this new capital freight program. The emphasis is on eliminating freight bottlenecks, interstate routes, and multimodal connections. The key for our region right now is that the projects that are eligible for application really are coincident with what is designated on the National Freight Network (I-5, I-205, and the connector into the Port of Vancouver). These are big projects within the region that are more or less shovel-ready or near shovel-ready that perhaps compete under this program. Mr. Ransom said this is going to be like the Tiger Program. There would be an annual call for projects, evaluated by USDOT, perhaps some Congressional involvement in review, DOT submits the proposals to Congress, and Congress ultimately ratifies that. This is similar to the New Starts or Small Starts process.

On the Planning side, the MPO program is retained in the Act. There are some clarifications in terms of consultation. The consultation lays a little more emphasis in terms of consultation with private transportation providers such as private interstate bus companies, possibly even the Ubers and taxi companies. It encourages MPO consultation with other types of planning activities. There are some clarifications in terms of who can sit around the MPO table, clarifying that transit does have a roll. Mr. Ransom said this speaks to our leadership. Maybe some states and regions needed to be told that in law.

The MAP-21 performance based program emphasis in federal law is retained. It has been pushed forward and refined in this Act. Mr. Ransom said we continue with our state partners to work on performance analysis. Soon they should see the first performance target administrative rule signed by the US Secretary within the next couple months. This is in the

category of analyzing our performance of safety of the system. Mr. Ransom said perhaps later this year when that dialog emerges at the state level and their target setting process will start that with this Board.

Mr. Ransom said in summary: it is a five-year bill, and it has a funding plan that is committed. The net new program where the new revenue is largely is in the freight program. It is a statement of encouragement. He said he would like to organize a discussion with the Board perhaps later about what projects within this region might be eligible and start to have that conversation. The MPO process is enhanced and refined and performance target setting and monitoring is retained from MAP-21.

Mr. Ransom referred to a grey handout of the FAST Act that was also distributed at last month's meeting. He said in the Federal Act, the money flows out to the states and then the states pass down money to the regions. The formula in each state is different, because in federal law there is a minimum floor, but every state and the Governor can review the process to revise that formula, essentially give more money to the regions. A Formula Committee, which has not been convened in a while. With MAP-21, the Governor's office determined that since there was no new revenue, there was no reason to shift formulas. However, the Governor's office has now alerted the MPO regions, state DOTs, and leaders of the House and Senate Transportation Committees that he intends to organize the Formula Committee later this spring. The intent of the committee is to look at how much money the state gets and how much money the regions get. These are the STP funds, CMAQ funds, and NHPP, etc.

The handout was a position paper with the proponents of the Association of Washington Cities (AWC), Washington State Association of Counties, and the Puget Sound Regional Council. They have laid out an argument that maybe the formula needs to be shifted, and a little more money given out to the regions that ultimately would flow down to project selections for city/county/transit type projects.

Mr. Ransom said at the quarterly meeting of MPOs last week, there was conversation about this topic. Some MPOs are starting to line up in terms of their own position; whether they take that formally or whether they are just presenting this information and eliciting interest or feedback. People are engaging on this topic. He said it is important because it is about how much money is available within the different pots. Mr. Ransom asked in the different constituencies such as AWC or Washington State Association of Counties if they were familiar with the topic or would like to learn more about it. Ultimately, he asked if it was something that the RTC Board would weigh in on or weigh in through individual constituencies.

Chair Burkman asked members if they want to have this discussion with individual organizations or at this table or both.

Jeanne Stewart asked what organizations he was speaking of.

Mr. Ransom said his assumption would be that if you were a city, you are probably engaged in Legislative outreach lobbying with the Association of Washington Cities. If you are a County, Washington State Association of Counties. The Port districts have their Port lobbyist group. Mr. Ransom said he just wanted to give a sense that this conversation is real, and the Governor

is going to convene this committee. The members around that committee ultimately decide how the funds are allocated across the state. The same conversation exists for Oregon. The Washington Governor has committed to convene this conversation this year.

Paul Greenlee asked what the question was.

Mr. Ransom said the question is if members would like to have more conversation at this Board level around this topic as some peers across the state are expressing their own interests, or are they adequately engaged in their own separate processes and would pursue those separately.

Jeanne Stewart said she thought it would be useful for the Board to have some of the discussion at this table. She said she did not object the discussion going into multiple venues like WSAC and AWC. She said we are in a unique situation here in Clark County. She said with all the jurisdictions around the table, she thought they could have some good collaboration.

Anne McEnery-Ogle said she would like to have a discussion with their group and see this back on the agenda for April.

Jerry Oliver said he did not think it was an either/or discussion. He said the Port takes freight to heart, and it is very important with all the interactions. He said he thought they needed to have the discussion here with input from the cities and county interests.

Paul Greenlee said he would like to have the discussions. He said with the Port of Camas Washougal they have some significant freight mobility issues on SR-14. He said he has not talked with any legislative people and was not aware of this, but he said he will.

Chair Burkman recommended bringing this topic back as an item in April. Between now and the April meeting, he asked RTC staff and Director to reach out to the various jurisdictions to see what their positions are going to be. He said they will have the conversation around asking if the RTC wants to take a position like the Puget Sound Regional Council did or if they want to leave the advocacy up to the individual entities.

X. Public Participation Plan Update and RTC Tribal Consultation Policy

Due to time constraints, this item will be brought back at the April meeting.

XI. State Legislative Session Update

Matt Ransom referred to the memorandum distributed to members. He has been monitoring what has been happening in the State Legislature. The session will conclude on March 10. Some of the Bills that he has been tracking are dead for this session, so he did not review those. Mr. Ransom said House Bill 2815 would establish a new Regional Transportation Planning Organization. This would be a state designation for Island County, which is the Whidbey Island area. RTC and other RTPO's across the state receive a portion of state funds dedicated to RTPO's. Establishment of this RTPO would dilute RTC's share of the RTPO grant funds. The fiscal impact is estimated to be a net loss of less than \$1,000 per year.

Mr. Ransom said in regard to the Transportation Supplemental Operating Budget, there is more money because of the FAST Act. Also notable is the lack of reprioritization of the spending / phasing plan for projects authorized by the Connecting Washington program. Several projects

in the RTC region have been identified as needing re-phasing. Despite local agency requests, the budget proposals from both chambers do not make any adjustments to the program, which leaves agencies focusing those requests on the YR 2017 session.

Further discussion of this topic may be of interest to RTC members and can be planned for future agenda. This could allow the DOT to give a status update on the Connecting Washington projects, remind us what projects were funded, and allow us regionally to get updates from individual agencies about their interest in re-phasing, re-sequencing, and in some examples maybe even re-scoping what the project is. This could also sequence with it a brief discussion of the DOT's emphasis on practical design and working with communities on advancing their projects. This could be a Connecting Washington update later this summer or early fall. This would allow this organization to perhaps position and support of individual member's advocacy. If we think it is in the region's interest to re-sequence a project or re-scope a project, Mr. Ransom said it would be of value for this organization to also offer their support if that is the desire of the Board.

Bart Gernhart said there are a couple projects that local agencies and WSDOT have agreed to shift funds from one entity to the other. He said those changes seem to be moving forward. Also, the City of Washougal's proposed shift from the connection of SR-14 on 27th south of the railroad tracks to focus more on SR-14 seems to be moving forward as well.

Jeanne Stewart said transportation priorities were established in the budget, and some projects that are important to Clark County were at the far end of the spectrum. Is any acceleration or change in those, such as one not ready to go and another is moved forward instead, seen as a possibility of requesting to accelerate a certain project based on how much more needed they are.

Bart Gernhart said there are discussions, but nothing is being advanced as far as they know. He said they have been told as DOT staff, they will not propose, they cannot support, and they are neutral on projects. It is a legislative decision. It is up to the elected, to go and lobby as a group or individual.

Chair Burkman said basically, nothing happened this year. If we want something to happen next year, we need to work on it this summer. It is going to take some work with our Legislators to create that change. He said they have some projects that are not due to receive funding until well after 2020, so we are talking about a decade plus before we see any results. They would like to see funding earlier.

XII. (Amended to Agenda) Board Meeting Time and Location, Resolution 03-16-06

Chair Burkman said in his time on the RTC, they have struggled in trying to use the room for a variety of reasons including: the audio, video, crowded public seating, and the cables don't allow for doors to be closed for an executive session. Chair Burkman has contacted the library and they have agreed to allow RTC to use the Vancouver Community Library's Columbia Room that is set up for CVTV. It would give them more room and the ability to make it more agreeable from an audio/video perspective. It is the pleasure of the Board whether or not they move the meeting. Chair Burkman said Mr. Ransom identified today that RTC Bylaws stipulate

that the RTC Board shall determine the time and place of regular meetings by a Resolution of the Board. Copies of Resolution 03-16-06 were distributed proposing to change the meeting location to the library and held at the same time. Chair Burkman said this change would also save about \$2,500 a year for CVTV charges since it is already set up for the room.

Marc Boldt and Doug McKenzie left the meeting at 5:50 p.m.

Councilmember Greenlee said he would be interested to hear of any downsides to the move.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 03-16-06 CHANGING RTC'S REGULAR MEETING LOCATION TO THE VANCOUVER COMMUNITY LIBRARY COLUMBIA ROOM. JERRY OLIVER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Jeanne Stewart said it is sometimes a little hard to hear in this room, and she said she thought that could be fixed. She said she liked this room for this venue because it is the room that has been used for a long time. People who want to testify know where to come. Councilor Stewart said the setup of tables for the Board is small enough that with a little effort of speaking into the microphones, everyone can hear each other. Councilor Stewart said with three County Councilors on this Board, they would have to leave the building to go to the library, leave the library to go back to the building to attend their evening meeting. She said it would also necessitate the County meeting to change the evening meeting time to start 30 minutes later. Councilor Stewart said the practical side of her suggests that they work on fixing the problem which is the microphone system; currently they were working well. She also said that in attending C-TRAN meetings at the library for a number of years, the acoustics there are worse there than they are here for her. She said the table setup is further apart, and the ceilings are higher; it is very difficult to hear. Councilor Stewart added that for public testimony only half of what is said can be heard. She does not see the benefit and hoped to keep RTC's meetings in the same room location at the Public Service Center. Councilor Stewart said she spoke with Councilor Marc Boldt about the change and moving to and from the building.

Julie Olson said she had two concerns. She said she concurred with Councilor Stewart on her points. In addition, she said it is not just the Councilors moving themselves back and forth to the library and back, it is also folks who want to attend the RTC meeting and then come to the County Council meeting. They will be back and forth as well. She said these are some logistical things that we should consider. Councilor Olson said she was not sure if they should make a decision today. She felt if they were considering making a change that it should be over a longer discussion process. In this case, she would not be in favor of it at this time.

Anne McEnery-Ogle concurred with what the two Councilors had said. She said the parking at the library is very difficult. She said she enjoyed having the opportunity to find parking here.

Jeanne Stewart referred to the parking and starting a meeting at 4:00 p.m. She said to attend the C-TRAN meeting that starts at 5:30 p.m. the businesses are closed and the customers are out of those parking spots on Broadway and C Street, so parking can be found. At 4:00 p.m. if you use parking of a business, they will have you towed.

A roll call vote was requested on the motion to change the meeting location.

THE MOTION FAILED WITH 7 NO VOTES: BURKMAN, GREENLEE, MCENERNY-OGLE, OLIVER, OLSON, ONSLOW, AND STEWART AND 4 ABSTAINING VOTES: CRADDICK, HAMM, GERNHART, AND WINDSHEIMER.

XIII. Other Business

From the Director

Mr. Ransom said last year at a regular meeting the Board had requested that he bring forward a presentation that would present options for seismically upgrading the I-5 Bridge. He said generally speaking, the request was that they wanted to learn more about the options. Mr. Ransom said he has assessed the reports that are available. Also, last year the Board received a memorandum from ODOT bridge engineers that gave a status report on both of the I-5 Bridges with the conditions, capital cost requirements, maintenance requirements, and etc. Every three years, ODOT publishes a bridge condition rating report where it assesses every bridge across the state of Oregon with its relative conditions compared to federal indexes. There is also some other material that was developed as part of the Columbia River Crossing project where they convened a review of experts and assessed the seismic conditions. Mr. Ransom said it is his intension to look at that material, figure out what is most applicable. He said what is important for this Board is to get good real information that is validated by those people in a position to make those kinds of plans and observations. Mr. Ransom said he would provide materials for members to review, and if they want more information, they can consider what the next step will be. Mr. Ransom said there is not a lot of analysis by people in a position to make those kinds of reviews of options for different configurations in retrofitting.

Chair Burkman said the recommendation is to receive written information and take no further action unless the Board requests it specifically from the Director.

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, April 5, 2016, at 4 p.m.

XIV. Adjournment

JERRY OLIVER MOVED TO ADJOURN. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY JEANNE STEWART AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:55 p.m.