

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Board of Directors
May 3, 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, May 3, 2016, at 4:00 p.m. at the Clark County Public Service Center Sixth Floor Training Room, 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington. The meeting was recorded by CVTV. Attendance follows.

Voting Board Members Present:

Marc Boldt, Clark County Councilor
Kelly Brooks, ODOT (Alternate)
Jack Burkman, Vancouver Councilmember
Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor
Mike Dalesandro, Battle Ground Council (Alt.)
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Councilmember
Jeff Hamm, C-TRAN Executive Director/CEO
Jim Herman, Port of Klickitat Commissioner
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver Council
Doug McKenzie, Skamania Co. Commissioner
Jerry Oliver, Port of Vancouver Commissioner
Julie Olson, Clark County Councilor
Jeanne Stewart, Clark County Councilor

Voting Board Members Absent:

Ron Onslow, Ridgefield Mayor
Kris Strickler, WSDOT Regional Administrator
Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1 Manager

Nonvoting Board Members Present:

Nonvoting Board Members Absent:

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

Guests Present:

Jim Hagar, Port of Vancouver
Dale Lewis, Congresswoman Herrera Beutler's Office
Dameon Pesanti, The Columbian
Mike Pond, Citizen
Scott Sawyer, City of Battle Ground
Ty Stober, Vancouver Councilmember
Marc Thornsbury, Port of Klickitat
Damon Webster, MacKay Sposito
Michael A. Williams, WSDOT

Staff Present:

Matt Ransom, Executive Director
Ted Gathe, Legal Counsel
Lynda David, Senior Transportation Planner
Mark Harrington, Senior Transportation Planner
Bob Hart, Transportation Section Supervisor
Dale Robins, Senior Transportation Planner
Diane Workman, Administrative Assistant

Chair Burkman welcomed Port of Klickitat Commissioner Jim Herman who is the new member representing Klickitat County. Commissioner Herman was a City of White Salmon Councilor for 12 years and is now in his seventh year as a Port Commissioner.

II. Approval of the Board Agenda

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MAY 3, 2016, BOARD AGENDA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

III. Call for Public Comments

There was no one who wished to provide public comment.

IV. Approval of the April 5, 2016, Minutes

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 5, 2016, MEETING MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MARC BOLDT AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

V. Consent Agenda

A. May Claims

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

VI. FY 2017 Unified Planning Work Program, Resolution 05-16-08

Matt Ransom said the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) is the federal and state work program. It is adopted in advance of RTC's annual work program that is adopted in December and helps inform what that will be. The UPWP is adopted on the fiscal year, and RTC's work program is adopted on the calendar year. Mr. Ransom noted an amendment to the financial table that is listed at the back of the document. After meeting materials were sent out, RTC received a correction from the state. Copies of the corrected table were distributed.

Lynda David referred to the resolution included in the meeting packet that outlines the Unified Planning Work Program or UPWP and reflects the action before the Board. Copies of the UPWP were also provided.

Ms. David said they are asking for adoption of RTC's FY 2017 UPWP. She said as she had outlined at last month's meeting, the UPWP is a federally required document. It describes transportation planning activities anticipated for the region in the next fiscal year. Development of the UPWP is one of the core metropolitan transportation planning elements mandated in federal law and required for the receipt of all federal and state transportation funds to this region. The fiscal year 2017 UPWP covers the year from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017.

A slide that was presented at the April Board meeting was provided that gave a summary outline of the UPWP with its four major sections. After introductory information about RTC's organization, committee structure, planning emphasis areas, and key regional transportation

issues, the first three major sections describe RTC work elements. The fourth section describes Transportation Planning Activities of State and Local planning partners. On the final page, page 57 of the document, there is a summary spreadsheet showing revenue sources that will support each work element and support the metropolitan planning activities over the next year. This is the table that Mr. Ransom referred to. Ms. David referred to the corrected page provided. She said after the meeting materials were sent out, they received notice that their Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) funds will be reduced by \$6,000. The new table shows a total of \$578,000 for FHWA PL funds. Those changes will result in changes to the financial tables on pages 6, 8, 30, and 37 to reduce the total amount by \$6,000. Ms. David said the changes will be made to the document prior to submittal to the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration.

The RTC Board action requested is to adopt RTC's FY 2017 UPWP with the changes made to reduce the FHWA PL anticipated revenues. Adoption will allow RTC's Executive Director authority to file applications for federal funding, to execute grant agreements, and to file any assurances or required documentation relating to the FY 2017 UPWP. Adoption of the resolution will also continue the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Local Funding Agreement that helps to provide local match for the federal funds for transportation planning.

Jerry Oliver clarified that this is an annual exercise that is done at this time of the year. Ms. David confirmed that this was done every year.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 05-16-08, FY 2017 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM WITH THE NOTED CHANGES INCLUDED. SHIRLEY CRADDICK SECONDED THE MOTION.

Jeanne Stewart referred to the resolution under the budget implication. Ms. David said the noted change to the budget would also be reflected in the resolution. Councilor Stewart asked if the total dollar amount listed was for one calendar year. Ms. David said that was correct; although some of the elements carry over to two years. The core of the metropolitan transportation planning elements: the Regional Transportation Plan, Transportation Improvement Program, Data Forecasting, and Coordination and Management are just one year.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VII. Transportation Improvement Program Guidebook - DRAFT

Matt Ransom said this presentation is the third in a series this year which recaps the development of both the program policy as well as the Guidebook for the synthesis of all the procedures and policies related to the administration of the RTC's grant programs. Mr. Ransom said Dale would bring them up to speed in terms of the behind the scenes work. Much of that has been work with the technical committee, the RTAC, as well as a subcommittee that was formed. The subcommittee was made up of those RTAC members that wanted to talk about money, grants, criteria, and etc. They met six times starting back in November 2015.

Dale Robins referred to the memorandum included in the meeting packet along with the attached Guidebook. Mr. Robins said RTC as the Metropolitan Planning Organization has the responsibility to develop a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the region each year. That is a four-year listing of the projects that are anticipated to receive funding over the next four years. The Guidebook is a new document that staff has prepared as a resource for RTC's member agencies and their staff.

Mr. Robins displayed the process they have used for development of the regional grant process that is incorporated into the Guidebook. In January and February, the Board provided policy guidance pertaining to the overall grant policy framework. He said today they will talk about the draft Guidebook and then return next month for a final recommendation from the Board.

As a reminder, all regionally significant projects must be programmed in the TIP. The TIP shows which regional projects are funded over the next four years. The projects are selected by many agencies including RTC, but all projects must be reviewed for consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan before they can be programmed in the TIP.

As stated earlier, they met in February and the Board affirmed the guiding policy for the TIP is to implement the goals of the Regional Transportation Plan. Also in February, the Board affirmed the guiding strategies, which includes the leverage of other grant resources, implementation of TSMO projects, and building of multimodal urban arterials.

Mr. Robins said the RTC Board has adopted overall selection criteria and provided a slide listing the criteria and points. RTAC is recommending that the overall criteria not change, but did recommend a few minor refinements to the Urban STP/CMAQ technical criteria to better assess individual project merits. The overall criteria are the same as adopted in the past. For the CMAQ projects, the air quality points are tripled.

A slide with the selection criteria for the Rural STP funds was provided. RTAC did not recommend any changes to these criteria. They also deferred review of the TAP grant criteria until next year when that grant program comes up.

The Guidebook is a resource document that will ensure consistency for the TIP development process. The Guidebook outlines the policy framework and clarifies programming policies and procedures. For example, the guidebook outlines how a project scope can be modified. The Guidebook brings all of the TIP policies and procedures into one document, rather than the need to refer to multiple resolutions. It also adds clarity to the process. The Guidebook is a working document that will be changed any time the RTC Board changes policies or procedures.

A draft of the Guidebook was developed last year and has been utilized over the past year. Member agencies have found it to be helpful. RTAC is very supportive and has recommended the draft Guidebook for the Board's review.

Mr. Robins provided slides that outlined a few of the new policies and procedures included in the document. He highlighted the outline of the chapters of the Guidebook.

The new policies and procedures are listed in the memorandum beginning on page 4, and Mr. Robins highlighted those.

Policy 1.4 - CMP Toolbox Checklist: This is a simple method for the region to ensure that they meet the federal requirement that applicants consider alternatives to traditional road widening prior to adding general single occupant vehicle capacity. On average, less than one project a year would be required to complete the Checklist.

Policy 3.2.1 – Scope Modification: This policy clarifies how scope modification will be handled.

Policy 3.2.2 – Build to Project Scope: This policy clarifies that agencies must build to grant application scope of work or correct construction work.

Policy 3.3 – Recognition of Grant Award Through RTC: This policy is intended to improve the awareness of RTC's contribution to regional transportation projects.

Policy 3.4 – Project Showcase: This policy requires the development of a one-page Project Showcase following the completion of a project. This allows the RTC Board to see the public benefits of regionally awarded grants.

Policy 3.6 – Regional Selection of First 3 years of TIP: The region has obligated funds at such a fast pace over the last few years that obligation needs to slow down or projects will no longer be able to proceed. This policy will allow only projects programmed in the first 3 years of the TIP to proceed on a first come basis.

Policy 4.5 – Move Regional Funds Back to Later Phases: This policy allows cost savings from design to be moved back to construction without amending the TIP. They do not receive more money.

Policy 5.7 – Project Delivery Deadline Not Met: This policy clarifies how a project will be handled if a project delivery deadline is not met.

Policy 6.1 – Construction Funding: This policy ensures that a project is far enough along so that construction delivery becomes reliable.

The Transportation Programming Guidebook is currently out for partner agency review and comment. It will be in final form for RTAC review and endorsement at the May RTAC meeting. The Transportation Programming Guide and RTAC's recommendation to the RTC Board will be presented at the June RTC Board meeting for review and adoption.

Kelly Brooks asked in moving funding from the design phase to the construction phase if there was a threshold and if it would also work the other way around to use construction funds for design. Mr. Robins said their policy does not allow the funds to go the other way around. He said what happens when that was done years ago, people would then not have enough money for construction and ask for more money. If they save money in an earlier phase, they can apply it to the next phase.

Jeff Hamm referenced the Urban STP/CMAQ program screening criteria and the evaluation criteria for mobility and asked what they use as a factor in determining that. This was page 21 of the Guide document.

Dale Robins said they use a lot of criteria in mobility. They look at hour conditions, volume to capacity ratio, and for transit projects they automatically get 6 points out of 10 just for being a transit project. Other projects are mainly volume to capacity ratio, scoring between 3 to 10 points. They also look at how the project works in the 20-year model, if it makes any change in the model. They look at the Congestion Management Process and whether it is identified in the Congestion Management System. They look at network development and freight movement in the corridor.

Mr. Hamm asked if network development would include connectivity, so a particular corridor segment being added would improve connectivity network-wise and would score well. Mr. Robins said that was correct. They actually give points by the volume, so if they have over 1,500 vehicles, they score 4 points. That is to separate a principle arterial from a minor arterial.

Jeanne Stewart referred to page 3 of the memo and the STP and CMAQ strategy to not use these funds for preservation of the transportation system. She said several times RTC Members have raised the issue of whether money would be available for preservation of existing system. Councilor Stewart asked if it was a local policy decision to not use these funds for preservation.

Dale Robins said that was a decision that the RTC Board supported in February. Mr. Robins said they had discussions at the technical committee, and they had asked that the funds not be used for that purpose. Automatically, the cost of a project will jump 30% higher when federal funds are used for preservation projects. The committee felt it was not the best use of those funds. Also, there is a lack of opportunity to leverage other grants with preservation projects. It was felt that local resources would be much more affective for preservation.

Jeanne Stewart said she remembered the discussion, but not that they had reached a conclusion. Mr. Robins said it was brought up as a concern in January, and in February they brought it back with the response from the RTAC committee.

Chair Burkman said the answers and RTAC's position were provided in February. The Board had discussion on how it related to the grants and how it related to the federalizing of a project. The consensus of the group was that we wanted to stay the course with this policy: the funds are to be used for capital not for preservation.

Paul Greenlee thanked Councilor Stewart for bringing the topic up. He said he was the one who originally brought it up in January. Councilmember Greenlee said he ended up being convinced that because of the loss of leverage and not getting matches, it did not make sense.

Chair Burkman agreed that all jurisdictions are continuing to struggle on how to preserve their systems. The outcome of the discussion was that it is not worth sacrificing our ability to create capital projects, but we still have a need for preservation dollars.

Jeff Hamm referred to page 16 and policy 1.4 referring to the CMP Toolbox Checklist. He asked to have that sent out again prior to the next meeting so they can see that again. Dale Robins said they could do that. He also said it is available on RTC's website listed under the TIP Program.

Mr. Hamm asked the number of projects that were subjected to that process. Mr. Robins said this was implemented last year, and so far they have had one project, the 18th Street project.

Mr. Hamm asked about the 179th Interchange project. Mr. Robins said it is a little more involved. When you are adding single occupancy capacity, it also incorporates the length of a project. An interchange would not have to do the Toolbox Checklist. It is usually a linear road that would have to do that process. Mr. Robins said if you go to three lanes such as a two-lane rural road and adding a center turn lane, you would not have to do the Checklist. If you were widening it to four or five lanes, it would have to be done. Interchanges do not have to because of the length factor per federal rules.

VIII. 2015 Congestion Management Process – Initial Data

Matt Ransom said as part of RTC's annual monitoring, they will provide a three-step process. Today's report will provide a snapshot of the initial data and is primarily focused on the interstate corridors. They are seeing some prominent conditions, which many people in the public are experiencing, and provide some related data. Next month they will provide a draft review of the entire monitoring report. The final review will be in July.

Dale Robins began by trying to define congestion. Congestion is a condition where the volume exceeds the available capacity. RTC's congestion management process uses multiple measures, because the use of one measure can never fully capture the complexity of the transportation system. Mr. Robins said all too often we hear the volume to capacity ratio; that is one factor, and not the only factor.

Each Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) with a population of over 200,000 people is required to have a Congestion Management Process. As part of RTC's process they prepare an annual monitoring report. Each MPO can do their own process. This is a process that they have chosen to use.

The Congestion Management Process report provides a consolidated assessment of the regional transportation systems. Local agencies and RTC then use the data findings from the congestion management process to plan projects and develop action strategies. Mr. Robins said it is impossible to totally remove congestion, but we can manage congestion.

The 2015 overall findings include the following, which will be further discussed during the remainder of the presentation. 1) Delay in bi-state corridors are getting worse, especially on the I-5 corridor. 2) Major arterials are showing signs of congestion. 3) Delay at major intersections is increasing.

Mr. Robins said to keep in mind that although RTC is moving to more automated collection of data, much of the data is just a short-term snap shot. For example, they are still utilizing tubes

to perform short-term traffic counts. Although, they are expanding data stations that collect data all year long.

A slide provided Columbia River Delay during the morning peak hour delay (6:30 – 8:30 a.m.) 2011 compared to 2015. Delay in the I-5 South corridor has increased 291% over the last five years, with delay on SR-14 east of I-205 increasing 74%, and delay on I-205 south increasing 14%. When considering this, you must remember that in 2011 the region was coming out of a recession. In 2010 and 2011 they saw some of the lowest congestion levels in many years.

Chair Burkman asked where the I-5 south corridor began and ended. Mr. Robins said this is looking from Main Street to the Jantzen Beach exit, 3.6 miles. SR-14 is I-205 to 192nd Avenue, and I-205 south is from SR-500 to the airport exit.

Another slide further explained the 291% delay on I-5. What that means is that travel time for the 3.6 miles has increased by almost 19 minutes, from approximately 6 ½ minutes to over 25 minutes.

C-TRAN transit travel times were shown for 2011 to 2015 from the 99th Street Transit Center to downtown Portland. They similarly experienced a 19 minute increase in travel time over the last 5 years. Mr. Robins said much of the delay in that corridor is just north of the bridge.

Julie Olson said this provides the traffic southbound and asked if they have the data for the traffic in the northbound lanes.

Mr. Robins said they are seeing the same issue with the northbound traffic. They did not collect that data, but they do have it available through Portal that they can calculate. They do plan to include that in the Congestion Management Report, but he does not have it at this time.

Councilor Olson asked if the collection was only on peak hour, Monday through Friday. She said traffic on I-5 north on a Sunday afternoon is as bad as a weekday peak hour.

Mr. Robins said with the Congestion Management System, they are just looking at Monday through Friday, a.m. and p.m. peak periods. They are not considering the weekend; that would be an expansion of what they are doing. They could do that. Mr. Robins agreed weekend evening travel in the corridor is very congested.

Chair Burkman said that is something that he recommends staff takes a look at. That is a growing question of what happens on the weekends. He asked when they would see the results of the northbound traffic. Mr. Robins said they should have that for next month's meeting.

Mr. Robins said reflective of the travel time increases, he provided what was happening to the speeds in the same segment of I-5 south. In 2011, the speed was 31 mph, and in 2015, it is 8 mph.

A slide with I-5 south morning volumes 2011 vs 2015 from 5:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. displayed congestion spreading. Spreading occurs when trips shift to the hours before and after the peak. During 2011, traffic would reach the peak traffic flow of approximately 5,400 cars an hour

during the 7 and 8 o'clock hours, with traffic tapering off on the hours before and after. In 2015, traffic is peaking during the 6 o'clock hour (an hour earlier), but congestion is getting so bad that fewer cars are getting through the corridor over the 7 and 8 o'clock hours (previous peak). This is similar to what happens when you try to pour something too fast into a funnel and it backs up. In 2015, between 5 a.m. and 11 a.m. over 500 more vehicles are traveling southbound over the I-5 Bridge, but over 1,000 fewer cars across the bridge between 7 and 9 a.m.

The I-5 corridor between Portland and Vancouver has been identified as one of the most congested corridors in the nation. The situation on I-5 has got to the point that doing nothing is not an option. Staff, using their toolbox of options, believes that the region should consider a Corridor Operational Study. The study would evaluate the effectiveness of the Congestion Management Process Toolbox of low cost Transportation Demand Management and Transportation System Management strategies to enhance movement of people and goods within the corridor and propose short-term actions. Some options include: transit, carpooling, ramp metering, variable speed signs, and many others. If they can improve the flow, they should be able to get more vehicles through the corridor and make it work better. Mr. Robins said short-term strategies can have an impact over the next few years.

Chair Burkman asked how that would be initiated, if it would take direction by the Board and a financial investment. Matt Ransom said he envisioned that this is an idea, and the tools that are now available. He said in the 20-year plan, they have identified the need to replace the I-5 Bridge and do corridor interchange improvements. That is one of the key projects in the 20-Year Regional Transportation Plan. In the short term, which is what this is geared for, they have three sets of tools. Transit is one of them. The Board initiated last month, the Bus on Shoulder Feasibility Study, which is directly applicable to this corridor. The question would be when that study matures and findings come out, could that be a short term strategy on the I-5 corridor. C-TRAN as an agency could choose whether they want to add more service. On the TDM and TSM, the same question is before the Board. Would they be interested in staff exploring a scope of work, exploring this opportunity with our partners, and then come back to the Board if that is something that they endorse as part of the report? That could be incorporated as a proposal. The proposal would be in more detail as part of the 2017 work program. He said it is something that could be initiated within the next year.

Marc Boldt said he would be interested in the key components that start congestion in the first place. Councilor Boldt said when ramps were first started, freight really was usually on the corridor. Now, ramps are full of trucks. It is fine in a car, but the heavy weight of trucks limits the ability to get up speed and they get backed up. These small things all contribute to congestion.

Shirley Craddick asked what options are available that they can use for tools to help mitigate. Mr. Robins said he mentioned a few, but he said in reality if they open it up to any project idea and look at all the issues. Councilor Boldt brought up some real good issues. He said they need is to look at what is causing the issue and then follow with any strategies that may help resolve

those issues. It may be additional storage for trucks at the ramps to help give them more time to get up to speed before they enter the freeway. There are a number of things that can be looked at to resolve issues.

Matt Ransom said the key emphasis is operations focused short-term actions that are readily available and low cost; this is not replacing the target in the 20-year plan, which is to ultimately improve the corridor with a bridge replacement and interchange improvements. This is to look for short-term strategies, such as the Bus on Shoulder, and possibly another ramp meter. They can also benefit a long-term improvement, but also provide an interim relief component.

Paul Greenlee said he would like to look at short term as innovative as they can imagine. He said there has to be some means to get a little relief. Anything to help keep the flow would be of benefit.

Jeanne Stewart said we have transit, carpooling, ramp metering, and just about every other short-term thing that can be done. She said we still need to address the problem that there is a greater volume of vehicles that are trying to get across the river than we have the capacity to do that. She said those are not necessarily regional. Councilor Stewart said she thought it was a mistake to think that it is a commuter problem. She said it is a volume and capacity problem. She said that is why Councilor Olson's suggestion to look at weekend traffic. That says they are not work commuters who are going to take the bus. Councilor Stewart said a third crossing is imperative. She said she did not know if it should be on the east side or the west side. She said they need a team of people to sit down and start talking about another bridge. Councilor Stewart said they need to get that started, because even short-term they are not solving it and there won't be any significant mitigation. She said that Metro has some differences philosophically about how many freeways there should be and number of single occupancy vehicles. Some of those we share, but she said she saw no reason why the Oregon side and the Washington side can't sit down and talk about a third bridge and have a productive conversation and end product. Councilor Stewart said she thought they should come back and rebuild the I-5 Bridge after the third bridge is onboard.

Kelly Brooks said that ODOT looked at the congestion on Highway 217 and what could be done about eight years ago. She said crashes were determined as part of the cause. They have seen an improvement and increase in travel time. Ms. Brooks said she would be happy to share what they have done for mitigation in that corridor.

Councilor Boldt said this is a capacity problem on I-5, but there is a lot of traffic taking alternative routes. He said it would be helpful to look at those routes as well.

Chair Burkman said clearly, there is great interest in this. He asked how rapidly they could get started on a study like this. Mr. Ransom said if the Board is interested, and it can be discussed further over the next two meetings. They would scope this as an organization much like the recent Bus on Shoulder Study. They would engage their partner agencies and look at what ODOT has done, look at what the Puget Sound area has done, and similar types of studies. Start to look at what this study could encompass, the questions that need to be asked, and develop

the thought and the scope and then a proposed budget. That would then be in front of the Board for the 2017 Work Program. Then the budget would be in place to start next year. Mr. Ransom said they wanted to ensure that if they pursue this again, separating long-term strategy set in place by the Board which is replacement of the I-5 Bridge and corridor improvements. This would be short-term strategy.

Chair Burkman asked if there was a way to begin sooner. Mr. Ransom said theoretically there is, but he said he wants to be mindful of partner engagement, the DOTs, the transit agencies, and allow them some time. He said between now and the next meeting, and ultimately in June, they would give it more thought given the interest of the Board. There may be an opportunity to accelerate.

Chair Burkman requested that this be on the June agenda for an update.

Jerry Oliver said he wished to echo Councilor Stewart's recommendation and said we need capacity. Commissioner Oliver said we need to make it our primary responsibility to be leaders in the region and partner with our colleagues across the river, and we need to have a third bridge and then at the appropriate time rebuild the I-5 Bridge.

Chair Burkman said at the June meeting they could have a conversation not about a third bridge but about a third corridor. He said a bridge by itself is not a solution; it's a system. They need to look at how they want to prioritize that relative to improvements in the I-5 corridor.

Paul Greenlee said they would like to move as quickly as possible. If there is a way to move before January, he would like to see that happen.

Jeff Hamm said at the risk of invoking the CRC, as Mr. Ransom knows, when the project was being planned, there was an extensive effort at construction mitigation where there was an extensive list of short-term operational improvements that would be put in place during the extended construction period. He said that might be a resource document to look at.

Dale Robins provided additional data information on some of the system-wide performance including the arterial system. He identified corridors with the worst Capacity Ratio. He said it is much related to what is seen currently. The number 1 corridor is I-5 South in the a.m. peak period, which is now also impacting Main Street, the number 5 corridor. Also included are 18th Street, SR-14 approaching the I-205 bridge, I-205 South, Fourth Plain East, and SR-503 South.

The corridor speed percentages show how well a corridor is performing. The desire is not to have fast corridors, but have corridors operate near their posted speed limit. Freeways generally operate near the posted speed limit, while arterials generally operate at 60%-80% of the posted speed limit. Facilities operating at 50% or lower generally experience congestion. Those include: I-5 south as number 1, followed by Andresen South, SR-14 east of I-205, Fourth Plain East, Mill Plain in the downtown area (Apartment construction taking place), SR-500 West, and 164th Avenue South.

Councilor Stewart referred to the Main Street congestion in the mornings as a result of the congested I-5. She said living just off that street she witnesses the severity of the issue and said they are starting to see the effect on the quality of life in the neighborhood.

Mr. Robins said the backup on Main Street also leads to cut-through traffic in the neighborhood.

Anne McEnery-Ogle said that exactly leads into the Westside Mobility Study that will be presented tonight at 6:00 p.m. at the Vancouver Library on C Street. Chair Burkman said that study is looking at the west side of Vancouver from 78th Street down to the river. This is a study by the City of Vancouver.

Dale Robins presented delay at intersections. Long average delay for the through movement at an intersection adds to the overall travel time and can create a backup resulting in it taking multiple light cycles to clear an intersection. Mr. Robins presented intersections with a thru movement with an average delay of 90 seconds or greater. He said the top four intersections are most notable not only for the delay, but that all four are for the peak direction movement. This means that delay at these intersections impact the most vehicles. The number one is Fourth Plain/Andersen with northbound traffic experiencing 182 seconds average delay. Some of this could be affected by C-TRAN construction taking place. Number 2 is Mill Plain/Columbia and could also be related to the construction of apartments in the area. Number 3, Fourth Plain /SR-503 had a 154 seconds delay. Number 4, SR-500/Falk Road had a 120 seconds delay.

Mr. Robins said they will complete the analysis of data and coordinate results / action strategies with RTAC. A Draft Report will be brought back in June and a Final Report and Action in July.

IX. Public Participation Plan Update and RTC Tribal Consultation Policy

Lynda David referred to the memo included in the meeting packet. She said this agenda item is to present introductory information on an update to RTC's Public Participation Plan and the related Title VI and Limited English Proficiency Plans as well as introducing a Tribal Consultation Policy they have been encouraged by federal and state Departments of Transportations to initiate.

Ms. David said the Public Participation Plan is a key component of the metropolitan transportation planning process. This was required initially by the 1991 federal transportation act, ISTEA. RTC first adopted a Public Involvement Plan in 1994 with updates in 2001, 2007, and 2014.

The Plan has to be reviewed periodically and updates made accordingly. This year, they have a few minor edits that need to be made. They will bring the edits to the Board at a future meeting prior to sending the Plan out for a required 45-day public comment period. Today, they wanted to let the Board know that the work is now underway and provide the earliest opportunity for their input. Ms. David said there are both federal and state laws that require a Public Participation Process and Plan.

Ms. David provided an outline of the existing Public Participation Plan with its seven major sections, and the Appendices include federal and state laws pertaining to public participation and a menu of public participation techniques. She said they are not anticipating changing the outline and framework for the Public Participation Plan in 2016. They do have a few minor updates that need to be made.

While they are reviewing the Public Participation Plan, they will also take the opportunity to review two other related documents, the Title VI Plan and the Limited English Proficiency Plan to see whether any update is needed. Both were last updated in 2014.

On the subject of Tribal Consultation, within the three-county area the RTC serves, there are tribal lands of the Cowlitz and Yakama Nation. Ms. David said in recent meetings with US DOT and WSDOT, they have been encouraged to establish an RTC Tribal Consultation Policy as have other Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Regional Transportation Planning Organizations in Washington State and throughout the nation. Tribal Sovereignty, whereby Indian Tribes have the right to self-governance, self-determination, and economic self-sufficiency, is recognized in the consultation process.

The Federal Highway Administration's website describes tribal consultation as the mandated process for timely and meaningful notification, consideration, and discussion with tribes on actions proposed by federal, state, and local governments that may impact tribal lands and property. The words timely, meaningful notification, discussion and consultation are words found throughout RTC's Public Participation Plan. Currently, RTC does address tribal consultation in the existing Public Participation Plan, but federal and state authorities recommend that RTC establish a formal, stand-alone Tribal Consultation Policy. To help put the policy together; WSDOT published in 2015 a Tribal Consultation Best Practices Guide for Metropolitan and Regional Transportation Planning Organizations in Washington State. Ms. David said they would be relying on that guidance document as they put together the Tribal Consultation Policy.

As they put together the Policy they need to be mindful of the three principles of consultation: communication, coordination, and cooperation.

As for process and timeline: they are seeking any RTC Board comments today at the outset of the update process. They have no hard deadline that has to be met, but they are aiming to complete the update process in summer 2016. They will first review any updates and policy with the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee in Clark County and Skamania and Klickitat County Transportation Policy Committees in the Gorge area. They will come to the RTC Board prior to release of any draft Public Participation Plan update for public review for the required minimum 45-day public comment period. The update release will coincide with publicity, media releases, and legal notices of the update.

Jeanne Stewart referred to the memorandum where it stated that RTC and C-TRAN have already identified a change that will need to be made to RTC's Public Participation Plan and how it relates to C-TRAN's Program of Projects (POP). Councilor Stewart asked if it was only in that

program that there are changes or if they knew the scope of the changes. Ms. David said they do not know. This is just the outset. That is one issue that they need to address in the update. It was pointed out in C-TRAN's tri-annual review that they rely on RTC when they go out for public participation and input for their Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). In the TIP document are C-TRAN projects that are included. C-TRAN relies on our public participation efforts. At their review, C-TRAN was told that should be noted in RTC's next update to their Public Participation Plan.

Councilor Stewart asked what the venue would be for submitting public comment and if they would all come to RTC or some to C-TRAN.

Ms. David said the issue with C-TRAN is related to RTC's Transportation Improvement Program and if C-TRAN has projects listed. It would be RTC that would receive the public comment at that stage. During the development of the project, C-TRAN may outreach to the public and they would receive it. Councilor Stewart asked if that was when it would go into the 45-day comment period. Ms. David said the 45-day public comment period relates to the Public Participation Plan update. The Transportation Improvement Program usually has a 30-day public comment period. That is what the Public Participation Plan tries to outline; what the procedures are for outreach to the public for each of their reports and documents.

Councilor Stewart asked when the opportunity for the public to comment was and to whom they comment to for their comments to go in the formal record. Ms. David said they would comment to RTC. Throughout the years they have found the most useful way to comment is through RTC's website, and they will have comment forms available.

Shirley Craddick said it looks like you have a packaged system. For people who want to comment, you have systems in place to allow them to do that. You have systems for people who have limited English proficiency to participate. These are all packaged systems. What she sees as missing in this is an active system where you reach out to these specific groups to involve them in the discussions and get feedback; such as people of color, African Americans, Asians, immigrants, and Slavic groups.

Lynda David said currently, in their Public Participation Plan they have acknowledged that they reach out to those communities usually through people who represent them. Staff attends, presents, and participates with different groups such as the Human Services Council, SW Washington Healthy Living Collaborative, and the Accessible Transportation Coalition Initiative (ATCI). That is how they reach out to the communities in Clark County.

Councilor Craddick said you do have some active effort, so somehow that should be reflected in the Public Participation Plan.

X. Other Business

From the Director

Matt Ransom said they have completed their annual financial audit by the State Auditor's Office. The Chair, Vice Chair, and Legal Counsel were in attendance with him at an Exit

Conference held by the State Auditor's Office where they concluded and reported to them the findings of the audit. In summary, the findings were clean. There were no findings or recommendations. RTC's financial affairs are in order in their assessment. There was also a review of RTC's compliance with federal grant requirements, and administration of one of the primary grants, the FHWA grant. They found that we were administering the grant in accordance with federal requirements and regulations. Mr. Ransom said as soon as that report is available and published, he would distribute it to the Board along with the final report. Mr. Ransom said they had some very nice comments made about staff, particularly about our finance and administration staff, led by Patty our accountant and assisted by Diane and Shann. Mr. Ransom noted that in summary they said RTC is a dream audit. Everything is in order, the notebooks are complete, the tabulations of the figures are correct, and all the documentation is readily available. As crazy as it sounds, they enjoy their audits with RTC, and they feel comfortable with how we put together the documentation.

Chair Burkman said this means that since the inception of RTC, there has been nothing but perfect audits. Patty has done this for RTC for over 12 years which is quite an accomplishment. Mr. Ransom said it is a team effort among the three staff.

Mr. Ransom noted the Washington State Transportation Commission will hold their June meeting in Vancouver at the Port of Vancouver office. The Commission meeting session is on June 15 and June 16 is a field trip. He has extended the invitation to many of the member agencies. There will be presentations from Vancouver, C-TRAN, WSDOT, and Mr. Ransom will be hosting a panel along with a few others. Mr. Ransom said on June 17, they are holding a three-state Commission meeting including Washington, Oregon, and California. The three Transportation Commissions are convening in Portland for a Tri-Commission meeting where they will be discussing issues of interest along the west coast including emerging technologies, vehicle emissions, and fuel standards. As that information is available, Mr. Ransom would pass it along to the Board. When the Agenda for the 15th is available, he would distribute that as well.

JPACT meets Thursday, May 19, 2016, at Metro at 7:30 a.m.

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, June 7, 2016, at 4 p.m.

XI. Adjourn

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

The meeting was adjourned at 5:25 p.m.