

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council  
Board of Directors  
November 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, November 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 (Alt.)  
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Councilmember  
Jeff Hamm, C-TRAN Executive Director/CEO  
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  
Ty Stober, Vancouver Councilmember (Alt.)  
Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1 Manager

Voting Board Members Absent:

Jim Herman, Port of Klickitat Commissioner  
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver Council  
Kris Strickler, WSDOT Regional Administrator

Nonvoting Board Members Present:

Nonvoting Board Members Absent:

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

Guests Present:

Ed Barnes, Citizen  
Al Bauer, Citizen  
Jim Hagar, Port of Vancouver  
Tom Hunt, Citizen  
Roger Hanson, C-TRAN  
David McDevitt, Citizen  
Scott Patterson, C-TRAN  
Mike Pond, Citizen  
Jason Ruth, HDR  
Scott Sawyer, City of Battle Ground  
Robert Schaefer, Citizen  
Marc Thornsbery, Port of Klickitat

Staff Present:

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

## **II. Approval of the Board Agenda**

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

## **III. Call for Public Comments**

Bob Schaefer from Vancouver said he is a part of the I-5 Bridge Replacement Group. Mr. Schaefer said they have drafted a resolution that they have given to Councilor Boldt and would distribute to Members. The resolution is for application to the Department of Commerce for status of Statewide Significance for the I-5 Bridge Replacement. Mr. Schaefer said they have talked with Oregon and they are amazed that they are looking at this. He said they are now talking about trying to do something like this statewide significance in Oregon. Mr. Schaefer said it is his belief that if they work on this properly and work at it as a public works project, besides being a highway project and a light rail project or a mass transit project, that they will have an opportunity after the election is over to maybe have some public works funds appropriated to show how important this bridge is to the I-5 corridor. This is from Canada to Mexico and important to the economies of the states of Oregon and Washington and all the other western states. Mr. Schaefer said he hoped the Board would consider passing the resolution and making the application. He said the CREDC is working on the private investments that are going to be made concerning the Bridge saying there are going to be major private investments all over the downtown area and it will affect the industries of statewide significance.

Marc Boldt asked Mr. Schaefer if this process involved the legislature. Mr. Schaefer said the legislature has nothing to do with this type of action. This is an application to the Department of Commerce. The way this act was written, is that the Governor makes that designation. If you meet the qualifications and have the community support, he thought the Governor would support this. The legislature would only be considering if you wanted to pass a joint resolution with Oregon saying that it is a project of statewide significance for both states. The act already has a provision in border crossings. The act would not have to be amended. The only concern of the Department of Commerce was concerning the private investment.

Jerry Oliver entered the meeting at 4:10 p.m.

Ed Barnes said in working with Mr. Schaefer, one of the things that they hope for in dealing with the legislators, both Democrat and Republican, they have indicated that they are willing to proposed two bills in the legislature; one to do with statewide significance and one to remove some obstacles that were put in by a Senator. Mr. Barnes said he thought they were headed down the right path. To go forward with this would show that the folks in southwest Washington can get along in order to make this bridge happen. Mr. Barnes encouraged jurisdictions to send the clear message to Oregon that we mean it.

David McDevitt of Vancouver said he strongly advocates between Oregon and Washington a joint powers authority. He said he supports the efforts of Mr. Barnes and Mr. Schaefer, saying

we need the labor and jobs here, but we also need to consider the fact that our transportation needs are significantly greater than just the I-5 Bridge. He said rebuilding the bridge will only put the funnel further south into Oregon; the issue is the number of vehicles on the road. Mr. McDevitt said they need to consider solutions that can encourage people to leave their vehicles in Clark County and consider some of the needs in Oregon particularly in Troutdale and Gresham. He suggested looking at a mass rapid transit solution that is not encumbered by vehicles in front of them or by cross roads. These solutions could be extended further north up the I-5 corridor perhaps to Olympia and something circular to benefit Oregon going through Gresham and Troutdale to get traffic off I-84 as well. Mr. McDevitt encouraged this direction and to keep the conversation open.

Rian Windsheimer and Shirley Craddick arrived at the meeting at 4:15 p.m.

Marc Thornsby, Executive Director for the Port of Klickitat, thanked the Board for their support, and spoke briefly about the Bingen/White Salmon Circulation Study. He said they are grateful for the study. RTC has taken this on in support of WSDOT. Mr. Thornsby said this project was funded through the legislature and the transportation package. The responsibility was assigned to WSDOT, and they requested that RTC take over management of the project.

#### **IV. Approval of the October 4, 2016, Minutes**

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 4, 2016, MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY JEFF HAMM AND APPROVED. TY STOBER ABSTAINED.

#### **V. Consent Agenda**

##### **A. November Claims**

##### **B. Bingen/White Salmon Circulation Study Contract, Resolution 11-16-25**

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA NOVEMBER CLAIMS AND RESOLUTION 11-16-25. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY RON ONSLOW AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

#### **VI. Agreement to Extend Social Security Coverage to Eligible Employees, Resolution 11-16-26**

Matt Ransom said this is the final step in the process of RTC approving and the Chair signing the Agreement attached to the resolution to become a full participating member in the Social Security programs offered by the federal government, administered by the state. Mr. Ransom recalled that earlier this year, they were made aware that RTC when established in 1992 had never signed this agreement. This spring the Board authorized a resolution to trigger a vote of current RTC employees. The vote occurred early this fall; the conclusion of the vote was that RTC employees as a group, the majority of which decided that they wished to retain their participation in the Social Security program. The law holds that vote binding upon RTC signing the agreement. The agreement backdates RTC's participation back to July 1, 1992 so there is no loss of benefits. Signing the agreement, RTC would for evermore be a participant in the Social

Security programs. There would be no opportunity to remove participation. Staff is recommending signature by the Chair to the Agreement thus concluding the process.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 11-16-26 TO AUTHORIZE THE BOARD CHAIR TO SIGN THE AGREEMENT TO EXTEND SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE TO ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEES OF THE SOUTHWEST WASHINGTON REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY JEANNE STEWART.

Jerry Oliver asked if there was any fiscal impact. Mr. Ransom said no; current participation rates would remain unchanged. They would adjust over time as they would for any organization participation.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

## **VII. Skamania County Regional Transportation Plan Amendment, Resolution 11-16-27**

Matt Ransom said Dale would provide a brief report. He said this is before the RTC Board in support of the Policy Committee in Skamania County, who moved this amendment forward this summer. Staff felt that it was appropriate that the RTC Board being the overall Board of the RTPO activities confirm their endorsement of this amendment.

Dale Robins referred to the resolution included in the meeting packet. He said State law requires the development of a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for each of the counties that participate in the Regional Transportation Planning Organization process. Skamania County's Plan was adopted in 2014. As they did their regular review, which is every two years, they identified that they would like to strengthen the language that would reflect the significance of the Bridge of the Gods to Skamania County. Mr. Robins displayed a map with the location of the Bridge of the Gods, just west of Stevenson. It provides access between Cascade Locks in Oregon to Stevenson, Washington. It does serve the most populated portion of Skamania County and is vital to the wellbeing of Skamania County. The language that was added was a paragraph inserted in Chapter 3 of the RTP, and that was listed in the resolution. The wording recognizes the significance of the Bridge of the Gods and encourages the toll revenues to be used to implement the Ten-Year Maintenance Plan.

RTC staff is seeking adoption of Resolution 11-16-27 which would amend the Skamania County RTP to better reflect the significance of the Bridge of the Gods. This action was recommended by the Skamania County Transportation Policy Committee.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 11-16-27 SKAMANIA COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN AMENDMENT. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY JERRY OLIVER.

Shirley Craddick asked with this statement, what would be different that is not occurring now.

Dale Robins said in the current Regional Transportation Plan, it just says that all Columbia River bridges are important to Skamania County. They are served by both the Hood River Bridge and the Bridge of the Gods. This adds language specifically saying this bridge is important to them. It is probably the most important bridge to them in the heart of Skamania County.

Shirley Craddick said the Port of Cascade Locks maintains the bridge. Mr. Robins said that was correct; they own the bridge. Councilor Craddick said so Washington does not contribute to the funding of the maintenance of the bridge. Mr. Robins said through the tolls they contribute. Councilor Craddick asked if funding would be developed by RTC for this bridge. Mr. Robins said no. What Skamania County is saying is that they want to make sure the bridge is there forever. It is an old bridge, about 92 to 94 years old. It is aging, and this statement is to encourage the Port of Cascade Locks to maintain that bridge because it vital to Skamania County. Councilor Craddick said so it is to make sure the message is clear that this is an important bridge to the State of Washington in this part of the region. Mr. Robins said that was correct.

Doug McKenzie said Skamania County experienced a huge impact to the County when they first discovered some maintenance issues with the bridge and applied some load limits. For a lot of commerce this impacted the log trucks. He said it was an eye opening to them. Then they doubled the toll from \$1.00 to \$2.00, which impacted their tourism among other things. Fortunately, they did make some concessions for locals on the tolls. One of the things that they discussed was to encourage some of these toll dollars to be used to keep the bridge in good repair. He said it was not real clear that that was the intent. Commissioner McKenzie said they wanted to put some wording in that would encourage toll dollars to be used to help continue operation of the bridge for many years to come, especially with a double to the toll. Commissioner McKenzie said that was the reason they had quite a discussion at their RTPO meeting about it. He said even though the Port owns it, that bridge is very important to Skamania County.

Rian Windsheimer said a lot of times tolls are also used for replacement, which this just speaks of maintenance. He said given the revenue that they have, they also need to think of how they are going to replace it. Mr. Windsheimer asked if there was any thought of the language to also reflect starting to plan for the replacement with those toll dollars.

Dale Robins said currently, when they put that statement in there, when they compare this to the Hood River Bridge, it is already on a course toward replacement and the ultimate goal. The Hood River Bridge has a lot more issues. The Bridge of the Gods is more structurally sound, and does not have a lift, and a lot of other things that would make them believe that in the near future, the next 50 years, with proper maintenance the Bridge of the Gods could be maintained. Commissioner McKenzie said the Port has been working aggressively with the appropriate people in Oregon for improvements. He said they just want to ensure that it is continually maintained so they do not see an impact to their county.

Marc Boldt said this resolution is primarily for cross circulation for Skamania County. When there is a problem with I-5 or I-205, the Bridge of the Gods is still used as a backup from our area as well. He asked if that cross circulation from state to state is within that language.

Mr. Robins said they did not really address that in the statement, but overall, when they talk about the regional system, they talk about the importance of the bridge. When any one of the

bridges crossing the Columbia River is caused to be out of use, it has an impact; the same goes for SR-14 or I-84. There is a lot more cross river traffic.

Shirley Craddick said she thought that most of the bridges crossing the Columbia River are maintained by Oregon agencies. Mr. Robins said the Columbia River bridges are jointly owned by ODOT and WSDOT except for the Hood River Bridge owned by the Port of Hood River and the Bridge of the Gods owned by the Port of Cascade Locks. Councilor Craddick said the reason that she asked is because she wondered if there was any consideration of more joint support with the funding for the upkeep of this bridge. Mr. Robins said he did not think the current owner wanted that.

Bart Gernhart said the bridges are not jointly owned; they have joint agreements to split the costs for both maintenance and construction. Oregon owns the Astoria Megler Bridge; WSDOT owns the Lewis and Clark Bridge; and ODOT owns the I-5 and I-205 Bridges. The next two bridges are privately owned. The Port of Cascade Locks owns the Bridge of the Gods, and the Port of Hood River owns the Hood River Bridge. They cannot use public funds to repair those. That is a state law. The 197 Bridge at The Dalles is owned by ODOT and the Biggs Bridge is owned by WSDOT. Each bridge is split 50/50 in all costs to maintain except Hood River and Bridge of the Gods. They are trying to get the privately owned law changed. Mr. Gernhart said even though they have a huge backlog in WSDOT in bridge maintenance and are unable to take on more maintenance of private bridges, they still support and understand the importance to the communities.

Commissioner McKenzie said there was a lot of discussion regarding a privately owned bridge and repairing it with public dollars. He said he believed they went to ODOT and some other agencies to help with repairs. (Washington and Oregon have different laws.) Some constituents were up in arms that this privately owned bridge was not prepared with funds to repair it. He said that is part of the reason they wanted the emphasis on the fact they need to save some of these tolls for the next time there is need for repair, especially since they doubled the toll.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

#### **VIII. Public Participation Plan, Title VI, and Limited English Proficiency Plan Updates, Resolution 11-16-28**

Matt Ransom said Lynda would provide the report. He said as noted at last month's meeting, these three plans are compliance plans. With the proposal for adoption today, they will be fully compliant with federal regulations. That is important, because when RTC is audited early next year for our certification by FHWA, it is nice to have this in place.

Lynda David referred to the resolution included in the meeting packet along with the attached Public Participation Plan, Title VI Plan, and Limited English Proficiency Plan. The update process was introduced at the May 2016 Board meeting, and the draft Plans were presented at the September Board meeting prior to release for a mandatory 45-day public comment period that lasted until October 24.

Ms. David said as explained at the prior meetings, there are not many changes to these plan updates. They were updated to refer to the current Federal Transportation Act (FAST Act) and maps and demographic data were updated using the 2014 American Community Survey (ACS) data from the US Census Bureau. Text was inserted into the Public Participation Plan to refer to C-TRAN's Program of Projects.

Today, the Board is asked to complete the update process by taking action to adopt the updates to RTC's Public Participation Plan, Title VI Plan, and Limited English Proficiency Plan. Following adoption, the updated versions will be posted to RTC's website. There will be future opportunities to update the Plans, because RTC periodically evaluates the effectiveness of its public outreach and participation strategies and updates may be brought to the Board as needed.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 11-16-28 THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN, TITLE VI, AND LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY PLAN UPDATES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY JEANNE STEWART AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

**IX. Comprehensive Plan(s) Transportation Element Certifications, Resolution 11-16-29**

Matt Ransom said this has been before the Board a couple times this year. He said in looking at RTC's role within the confines of state law, one of RTC's responsibilities is to review Comprehensive Plans and certify those Plans. They are not looking at the entire Plan, but focusing on the Capital Facility Transportation Element. Mr. Ransom said staff has worked closely with jurisdictions' staff, and RTAC has made a recommendation for the Board's approval. The only Plans not before the Board because they were not required to do a periodic update are the City of Vancouver and Yacolt. All other jurisdictions within Clark County are included.

Lynda David referred to the Resolution included in the meeting packet. The transportation network maps for each jurisdiction were attached. Today they are asking the Board to consider certifying the Comprehensive Plan updates from jurisdictions that have completed the Comprehensive Plan update in 2016. The jurisdictions are Clark County, Camas, Washougal, Battle Ground, Ridgefield, and La Center.

Ms. David said to consider what the certification by RTC means. In summary, it is a step that has to be completed in order for local jurisdictions to comply with the state's Growth Management Act and for RTC to fulfill its duty as a Regional Transportation Planning Organization as required under the state's Growth Management Act. The certification occurs in GMA which requires coordination, conformity, and consistency between Plans and between Plan partner agencies; in this case, between RTC and related transportation agencies together with local jurisdictions in planning for a transportation system that can support local and regional guidelines.

There are four elements to the certification process: Guidelines and Principles, Conformity with Growth Management Act, Consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan, and they must meet the requirements of the State Level of Service law.

Local jurisdictions now use RTC's Certification Process Guide and checklist adopted by the RTC Board in March of 2016 and made available on RTC's website. The guide provides direction for development in evaluation of the transportation element. After RTC staff review of the transportation element, the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC) reviews the checklist for recommended certification by the RTC Board, which is the final step the Board is being asked to complete today.

Ms. David highlighted each of the six jurisdictions adopted comprehensive plan updates that were noted in the resolution and shown on the individual maps.

The action asked of the Board is for adoption of Resolution 11-16-29 which completes RTC's certification of local Comprehensive Plan updates for Clark County, City of Camas, City of Washougal, City of Battle Ground, City of Ridgefield, and City of La Center.

Marc Boldt asked if each jurisdiction has to prove that it is reasonably funded for the six years. Ms. David said yes; the six-year window has to be reasonably funded. For the longer-term, they have to have a reasonable forecast. It is at the regional level that they have to have a constrained transportation plan that will compile all of the local jurisdictions capital facilities plans and look to see if it can reasonably be funded as part of the Regional Transportation Plan update.

Councilor Boldt asked who the certification is sent to. Ms. David said they will send the Certification to the Department of Commerce to acknowledge that the plan was certified as far as RTC is concerned for the transportation element, and they will also send a copy of the signed resolution to the local jurisdictions to keep on file.

Bart Gernhart questioned the Clark County map. He said it shows a line in yellow off the 219<sup>th</sup> interchange going west as a WSDOT project. He said he was not sure what is planned, but it really wouldn't be a state highway. Ms. David said they would have to address that as part of the Regional Transportation Plan update.

Shirley Craddick asked for a clarification saying she thought that she heard that the city of La Center has not yet approved their plan. Ms. David said they have updated their Comprehensive Plan, but in the cyclical nature of planning, they are just completing the Transportation Capital Facilities Plan update. They went through their Comprehensive Planning Transportation piece of it, but they are making sure that their Capital Facilities Plan is now complete and up to date. In part, it is tied to transportation impact fees, so they have to have a listing of projects that they may want to tap into at some time to make sure that their impact fees are paid.

Shirley Craddick asked how that impacted this if we approve this today, and they modify it in some fashion. Ms. David said they would have to notify RTC if there were modifications made.

Chair Burkman said action taken today certifies what they have to date. Ms. David said that was correct.

Jeanne Stewart said it states that the City of Vancouver and the Town of Yacolt will update their Plans in the future. She asked why they will update later.

Ms. David said they are in between Comp. Plan updates; on a different cycle. Councilor Stewart asked if the City of Vancouver amends anything other than what we see here, will those come back to RTC for approval. Ms. David said yes that was correct. In past efforts, RTC has issued Certification when they have gone through the Regional Transportation Plan update cycle, and they have included the part in the RTP resolution adopting the RTP saying that they have worked with the local jurisdictions and they have updated their Comprehensive Plan and Transportation Element. Now, they have a defined Guidebook and Checklist, so they have formalized RTC's certification process. This is the first round using the new format and new process adopted by the RTC Board in March. These jurisdictions are ready to go forward with the new process, and Vancouver and Yacolt, as they update their Plans will come through RTC to seek certification.

Councilor Stewart said she didn't know that jurisdictions could have a different timeline. She thought they all had to be incorporated into what the County process was. Ms. David said she believed that they could have their own timeline as long as it satisfies what the Department of Commerce needs.

Jeff Hamm said the supplemental material that was supplied in the transportation needs maps were pretty street and highway intensive. He said it did mention multi-modal in Ridgefield. Mr. Hamm said his presumption is that in the certification, you have taken a look at those other multi-modal elements such as bike and pedestrian and are meeting what is necessary.

Ms. David said yes; each of the Plans had mentioning to describe multi-modal transportation system elements. She said some of them have quite detailed maps that have multi-modal considerations, others have text with a description, but they all included multi-modal transportation development.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TRANSPORTATION ELEMENTS CERTIFICATIONS RESOLUTION 11-16-29. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY RON ONSLOW.

Paul Greenlee said that Washougal has chosen to essentially stay status quo on the current Comprehensive Plan. Once they do that, they can't change the Plan until next year in 2017. Jeanne Stewart said Washougal has submitted a letter to the County stating that they did not intend for more annexation; they were going as status quo. Councilmember Greenlee said one of the reasons is that in order to meet the deadlines, they would have had to come up with \$750,000 in consulting fees and such at a time when their budget was under serious problems because of the recession. That is why they put things on hold.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

## **X. RTC Bus on Shoulder Feasibility Study - Update**

Matt Ransom said the Board authorized this study this spring. There has been a lot of work with jurisdiction technical staff including C-TRAN, WSDOT, TriMet, ODOT, and Metro. Bob would provide a quick briefing. There will be a more extensive briefing after a workshop that Bob will invite Board Members to. That briefing will most likely be in January 2017.

Bob Hart said the Board approved the Bus on Shoulder (BOS) Feasibility Study at their April 5 meeting. That came about as a result of a recommendation from the Access and Operations Study conducted by the Board in 2014. The recommendation was to examine the potential of operating a Bus on Shoulder on I-205 and SR-14.

The purpose of the study is to examine the technical, operational, geometric, and policy options regarding part-time shoulder running for transit bus operations along I-205 and SR-14. This effort will result in findings and recommendations on its viability and if warranted, a recommended BOS concept within the bi-state region. The study area is I-205 from 18<sup>th</sup> Street to I-84 and SR-14 from 164<sup>th</sup> Ave. to I-205.

The Technical Advisory Committee is made up of C-TRAN, WSDOT, TriMet, ODOT, and Metro. They have had two meetings, with the kick off in June. They reviewed the study purpose, goals, and data collection needs. They have inventoried and collected data and roadway geometrics. The data includes mapping of roadway geometry, traffic volumes and speeds, detailed bus speeds, and crash data. At their September meeting they reviewed the collected data for accuracy, and they began talking about and planning a Bus on Shoulder Workshop.

They have a Workshop planned for December 5 and 6 at the Rose Besserman Room at the Fisher's Landing Park and Ride facility. They will have two half-day sessions. Session One will be about three hours long in the afternoon of December 5. It will have a high-level focus with policy, management, and technical staff. Session Two is in the morning on December 6 for four hours and will have an engineering emphasis. It will be made up of technical and operations experts. For both sessions, they want to include other stakeholders such as state police and incident management personnel to get their perspective on the Bus on Shoulder. They are also going to invite a C-TRAN bus driver to get their perspective on issues as well.

Session 1 will provide: an overview of BOS, stakeholder input and policy/funding considerations, and guidance to inform screening and evaluation. Nick Thompson, a national expert on Bus on Shoulder systems, will lead this part of the effort. The workshop will present information about existing conditions, geometrics, and characteristics in the study corridors and also include technical information on a potential pilot project on SR-14.

Session 2 will identify and discuss potential BOS concepts and associated engineering, operational, and geometric issues for the candidate corridor segments with the goal of selecting a feasible BOS strategy for the study corridor.

Staff is currently working on “Save the Date” invitations they hope to get out this week. They will be sent to RTC Board members, C-TRAN Board members, Technical Advisory Committee members, as well as other agency staff and stakeholders.

Julie Olson questioned the invite to a C-TRAN bus driver. Mr. Hart said they hoped to get the bus driver to both sessions. Councilor Olson asked how many bus drivers there were. Mr. Hamm said they have 250+ drivers. Councilor Olson said other bus drivers may have different opinions on this project. She asked if they had considered a survey of some kind. Mr. Hart said they have not talked about that yet. They have talked about inviting the driver that trains the drivers. Councilor Olson suggested more than one individual because there may be a difference of opinion. Mr. Hamm asked if she meant that some might be opposed to it. She said she would think possibly they would. Mr. Hamm said not many.

#### **XI. C-TRAN 2030 Plan Update**

Matt Ransom said he wanted to afford the opportunity for C-TRAN to present their Plan update for conversation and status report. He said the same presentation was presented to the technical staff at RTAC.

Jeff Hamm introduced Roger Hanson, C-TRAN’s Senior Planner who is leading the 2030 Plan Update. Copies of the presentation were distributed. Mr. Hanson said as C-TRAN started looking at their 2030 plan, the first thing they looked at was what was said and what was adopted in 2010. One of the key elements was the Columbia River Crossing Light Rail Project. Also included were the local route improvements they were looking to do. They were going forward with a 0.3% sales tax in Phase One where 0.2% of that would have been to sustain the existing system and 0.1% to support the High Capacity Transit element. Later in Phase Two, they would go for an additional 0.2% sales tax.

Mr. Hanson said what has changed is that there is still no Columbia River Crossing or Light Rail being built. Most of the local route improvements had to be deferred. They did gain the 0.2% sales tax approved in 2011, but a measure in 2012 for the 0.1% sales tax was rejected for the High Capacity Transit. The Great Recession impacted how the sales tax was performing. With that, C-TRAN, over the course of the first five years of the Plan, mainly focused on containing expenses and preserving the service that they had. What that means is that a lot of that service that they did not put out that they had hoped to so \$22 million was not incurred. This increased their reserves by \$8 million.

As they looked at a lot of the information, most of the background information still applied. The approach that they took was to focus on the next five-year period and what needed to be done. Within the existing document, they called out the changes. They did not remove anything from the adopted plan, but they added some new text to clarify some of the things that were significantly different.

The proposed implementation strategy for C-TRAN 2030 compared to the adopted 2010 shows that they have fewer resources than forecasted. This resulted from the Phase One funding not

fully approved, the Great Recession, and less federal capital than anticipated. A strong sales tax may allow for up to a 10% increase in service. At the same time as they looked back, they have accomplished many of the large projects that they hoped to do. They have moved forward with the BRT line - The Vine, which is to open on January 8, 2017, and as part of that project, they tied in a maintenance facility expansion. They have the Fisher's Landing park and ride expansion adding 200 spots on September 17. They have also been working on bus replacement, which has been a little more challenging because part of the state mandate for cleaner fuels has raised the cost to purchase a bus compared to what they had initially planned.

In looking at what's next, they see that the sales tax revenue is robust; they are not currently planning to look at the additional sales tax measure; they went through a major route restructuring on September 4, 2016 to make their service more efficient; they are asking if there is a role for Uber or a similar car-hailing service, as well as other technology.

They reached out to local jurisdictions and asked what role they are anticipating for transit in their Plans. They received letters from many of the jurisdictions outlining some suggestions, thoughts, and ideas. In evaluating those, they ended up looking at about 148,000 additional annual hours of service needing about 32 more vehicles. That is about a 50% increase in service. In looking at the goals of the Plan, a lot of similarities still existed: concentrating most of the service in the major corridors, looking for more Park and Rides, and adding more express service.

In discussing this with the C-TRAN Board, it was reiterated support for 80% of service designed for productivity and 20% for coverage service. Growth in coverage should consider a more dynamic service delivery approach using technology not anticipated in 2010.

The 2016 elements of the 2030 update will look to up to 10% service increase in the next two years; using the 80% productivity/20% coverage split; identify/prioritize next BRT corridors; and productivity increase will mostly be in the existing service area. They will look to innovative coverage – Mobility on Demand. They will look at additional park and ride locations, and they will increase their base capacity, their facility itself. They also need to stay on top of the paratransit needs.

They are in the process of three public open houses. They held one the previous week and will hold one the following day on Wednesday in Salmon Creek along with one on Thursday in Camas. They have been having social media outreach, and the document is available on C-TRAN's website. They will be going out to anyone in the community that would like to hear more about the Plan and providing presentations. The November 8 C-TRAN Board Meeting will include a Public Hearing. The C-TRAN Board will take action at their December 12 meeting.

Jeanne Stewart asked the purpose of the three open houses. Mr. Hanson said they are showing the community the 2030 Plan and to answer any questions that they may have, as well as take suggestions or comments that they have. He said this includes the elements that he referred to, the updated list with the things that they are clarifying and adding to the Plan.

Jeanne Stewart asked what would be considered the biggest changes. Mr. Hanson said they are staying within the existing planning that they have and moving forward trying to incorporate the technology to provide a more efficient system with those resources. They are presenting to the public the elements that he discussed. They are a short summary of what is changing.

Shirley Craddick referred to the two slides that referred to the 2016 elements of the Plan. She asked if those are what they are seeking public feedback on. Mr. Hanson said yes, and referred to the map that was also with the list of elements. He said this showed what they are looking at over the next 5 to 7 years and lays out the zones on the map, such as park and rides and the areas that they are looking at. They have not identified exact locations yet, but they want to identify and pursue to get a better understanding of it. Councilor Craddick asked if they were looking to prioritize the elements or to get an idea of what folks have to say about it. Mr. Hanson said they want to see if there is support on the ideas, and they have received comments on where the next park and ride should be. Councilor Craddick said she is interested in hearing what the public has to say about the next BRT. Mr. Hanson said they are also planning a study as well in their next budget year to look at that.

Julie Olson asked how many open houses they had scheduled. Mr. Hanson said they had one last week and two scheduled this week. She questioned other presentations to groups. Mr. Hanson said they presented to the RTAC group the previous week, and would be presenting to the County Council. Councilor Olson asked what the attendance of the open house was. There were four attendees. Councilor Olson said her thought is about how they are getting the word out, that it is available and they want feedback. Mr. Hanson said that is part of the reason that they asked individual jurisdictions to provide their input to get feedback from staff and the technical level.

Chair Burkman said C-TRAN also has a Citizens Advisory Committee. Mr. Hanson said they presented to them the previous week as well. C-TRAN has their own Citizens Advisory Committee, where they take items they are considering and get their input as well as their recommendations. When they put this 2030 update to the Advisory Committee, they were in support of moving forward with this concept and how to grow service. The 80% / 20% is one of the elements that they endorsed as important and they did like the idea of the Mobility on Demand approach.

Julie Olson asked if the updated portions of the Plan were available online on C-TRAN's website. Mr. Hanson confirmed that it was.

Jeff Hamm said C-TRAN's Citizens Advisory Committee is a 15 member committee, and is a cross section of the community including a commuter into Portland, a person of disability, a business representative, a neighborhood representative, a senior, and a social service organization. Mr. Hamm said they will also be giving a presentation on the proposed Plan to the Battle Ground City Council on December 5.

Jeanne Stewart referenced the 2016 elements and specifically the one for up to 10% service increase in the next two years. She asked what was meant by service and what it was 10% of; was it more riders or adding more routes?

Mr. Hanson said they are talking about adding service hours, more hours that buses are in operation. That can be in many different ways: increased frequencies on routes, extend the span of service, extend the number of days of service, and look for new routes. Part of this 10% increase will be in the Mobility on Demand demonstration project.

Councilor Stewart said she heard operational savings potentially for C-TRAN. She asked how they related to the actual people who use the service. She asked if service increase is not service to the rider; it is ways to find operational cost savings.

Mr. Hamm said no, they are talking about actual service to the riders. This is a fixed route system and buses, and the total number of hours that they have the buses on the street providing service to the customers. They are proposing a 10% increase in that over the next two years. That is a direct benefit for the customers.

## **XII. YR 2017 RTC Work Program and Budget - Draft**

Matt Ransom referred to the two memos, one with the draft 2017 Work Program and one with the draft 2017 Budget. He said RTC's work program is driven in part to ensure the work is compliant and delivering the programs that are required of MPOs under federal law and RTPOs under state law. Much of RTC's funding comes from state and federal sources through formula distributions. Each year in the spring, the Board adopts the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), which was included with the meeting materials. That is the statement of the entirety of the work program and is adopted on a fiscal year.

For the 2017 work program on a calendar year basis, they refer to the UPWP, and along with that, Mr. Ransom provided an outline of the emphasis areas for 2017. He said in addition to the UPWP, the core program, they will be emphasizing the completion of two of the studies that are underway. One is the Bus on Shoulder Study, which will probably conclude by the second quarter of 2017 with the final report. The second study is the Bingen / White Salmon Circulation Study.

There are some new activities that are being proposed for 2017 that are going to support moving forward with an update to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which is scheduled by year end 2018. Mr. Ransom said he has identified a need for some pre development activities. Also, there will be a lot of emphasis next year in moving forward with implementing the Performance Planning requirements that were adopted into Federal Law in MAP-21. They have some need for technical assistance in that area. Mr. Ransom said for those two activities, he has identified a need to set aside \$75,000 in the budget for professional services support. Those two efforts are listed on page 2 of the work program memo.

For the 2018 RTP Update, there is a need regionally to engage the public a little more in-depth. Mr. Ransom said he has started to develop some thoughts around a scenario planning, more

from a risk based scenario planning process. He would like to get these activities developed with jurisdiction staff, the RTAC committee, and the RTC Board. With these underway, they can engage and learn where they stand as a community in terms of some of the values and needs as it relates to transportation regional systems. Also, perhaps, deploy a technical exercise where they do some risk planning, because there are some significant risks that lay ahead. Possibilities could include "What happens if they don't replace a bridge?" or "What happens if population grows much faster than it is forecast to?" Mr. Ransom said they need to start to think about how they would respond. These are some things they could use some technical assistance on for the 2018 RTP Update.

On MAP-21 Performance Based Planning, technical assistance is needed to help shape the framework for how they integrate in performance based targets. To date, they have largely been relying on the work that the state is doing. At the staff level, both Mr. Ransom and Lynda David are involved in state-level committees where they are monitoring and tracking the federal rule making. Ultimately, it falls down to the region, and how they integrate and set those targets are decisions that are ahead of them this next year. Mr. Ransom said they need some technical support in this area.

Mr. Ransom referred to the outline of the emphasis areas and said these are in addition to the core program. He noted the Complete & Safe Streets Policy Review & recommendations to the Board. Mr. Ransom said in 2015, the Board authorized a limited review of the regional policy for that, and they have been working with local jurisdiction staff. He said there are some recent developments in state funding through the state Transportation Improvement Board that in order for a jurisdiction to be eligible for this special program set-aside, a local agency has to have a Complete Street Ordinance. Mr. Ransom said he would like to bring that conversation back to the Board and repose that question of the merit of a regional policy in terms of how they might administer the regional funds.

Mr. Ransom said they will continue to work and have done quite a bit of consulting work this last year with member agencies under the FAST Act and specifics of how they might get some additional funding and money. They have been working with the State on some Freight Plan update, and they see the same emphasis next year.

Mr. Ransom said they did a lot of partnership work this year, and he said he expects to do more next year. That includes consulting member agencies. It also includes the Bi-State coordination efforts, which given the nature of MPO work, has to be a consistent focus. Mr. Ransom said they will continue to try to expand the consulting that they do. This year they held a regional traffic modeling workshop. Out of that workshop, a couple member agencies have come to them asking for help in modeling. Mr. Ransom said making members aware of that service, having them tap into the skills that they have at RTC is something that they need to do and want to continue to promote that.

Ongoing work includes administrative activities. This next year they hope there is not as many administrative issues that they are not aware of like the Section 218 that they had to work through this year.

Councilor Boldt said in 2007 that RTC did a travel study that looked at specific trips per household and that generates many things including their TIF fees. He said it takes two or three years to get that information, and it is very expensive. Councilor Boldt said every jurisdiction is having changes between single-family homes and multi-family homes and the amount of people living in each. He said it seems that before their next Comprehensive Plan, things may really change within that. He said this is the only place that they can get that because it helps every jurisdiction get those numbers. He questioned starting work on that process.

Mr. Ransom said he believed that what he was referring to is the core data development process that MPOs do, which is referred to as a Household Activity Survey and base data collection. Mr. Ransom said in talking with their technical staff last month, RTC does that work in concert with Metro to the extent that they can coordinate as a region and they build their model at the four-county regional level. Within the next two to three years, they will be gearing up for another round of that. They want to keep that data fresh, about every ten years, which in this kind of work, that is the interval. It is expensive and time consuming, but also, trends seem to have not been changing. Back to the scenario planning concept that he mentioned developing; those are the kind of risks that he thinks we need to be exploring. He questioned what would happen if our trip behaviors changed significantly, would it change anything? It does pose the question, and then talking about it and maybe developing responses to that would help us to respond at the 20 year horizon. Mr. Ransom said to Councilor Boldt's question that work is not this next year, but they are seeing it on the horizon. They will have to budget for that for it will be a significant expense for RTC's contribution.

Paul Greenlee said for Complete Streets, RTC has to take action, but asked if the local jurisdictions all need to have Complete Streets Ordinances. Mr. Ransom said yes, so the study they did two years ago was an assessment of a best model for a regional policy. The conclusion was that you really don't need a regional policy. The change, however, has been the way the state has structured their funding program. They are now very specific to say if you want to access this TIB money, you as a local jurisdiction actually have to have an ordinance. There is no requirement on the region. Mr. Ransom said the question that comes back at the policy level is if we are headed in the right direction. Are people making good multi-modal investments? If money starts to be restricted for projects that contain all these component parts or based on a policy at the local level, what do we need to be doing at the regional level to embrace that and advance that. Mr. Ransom said it includes questions of if we are doing enough or not enough, or could we do more. These all need to be on the table for discussion. We need to ensure as the MPO that we are not holding people back or not have all the pieces in place to support a local initiative, and that initiative being multi-modal improvements on the roadways.

Paul Greenlee said his city staff says that RTC is a pleasure to work with. Mr. Ransom thanked him, and said that Washougal is one of the agencies that they have been consulting.

Jeff Hamm said it would be helpful to have the breakdown of the \$376,000 for consulting. Mr. Ransom referred to the Budget memo, and said they do have that breakdown and he would send that out to Board members following the meeting.

Mr. Ransom said the first part of the Budget memo shows the status of expenditures to Date (thru October claims) and with anticipated expenditures thru the end of the year they are expected to be at the 2016 budgeted amount. Mr. Ransom said they are spending less in most categories, but this year they took on a few extra projects. Those projects came with revenue. An example is the Bus on Shoulder project, and C-TRAN contributing a match contribution. They should end the year on target or under.

The second part of the memo lists the draft 2017 projected budget, and for the most part baseline. They are not projecting increases in categories except for increases to wages and benefits costs, based on RTC's compensation plan and the benefit package that they buy from Clark County. Those costs are based on current policy and in their contract with the County for medical, dental, etc. which is a good cost contract. This year they have reflected the increase in member dues, which does help slow down the offset between revenues and expenditures. On the consultant side, they see an increase in activity. That is due in part to the projects that they have underway that were previously discussed along with the new activities as discussed. Mr. Ransom would send a breakdown of those costs to Board Members.

Mr. Ransom said this is for the Boards consideration. He said if there are any questions before the December meeting to contact him. This budget will be before the Board for approval at December meeting.

Julie Olson referred to the benefits costs they have with the County. She said the benefits are about 50% of the salaries, and that seemed a little high. Mr. Ransom said he could provide more detail on that. He couldn't explain it now without their accountant there to clarify. Mr. Ransom said rather than RTC going out and solicit bids for health care, which would be very inefficient for a small agency like RTC and not very cost competitive, through their agreement with Clark County they buy into their program. He said every year they receive notice of the cost increases and fold those costs into the budget. Mr. Ransom said he would provide that detail to the Board as well.

### **XIII. Other Business**

#### From the Board

Marc Boldt asked what the process was to bring the proposed resolution that was presented by Mr. Barnes and Mr. Schaefer to the Board for discussion.

Chair Burkman said the process to get something on the agenda for discussion requires a motion to put it on a future agenda; a vote by the Board. It also allows members to review it before discussion.

MARC BOLDT MOVED TO HAVE THE NOTED RESOLUTION ON THE DECEMBER AGENDA FOR DISCUSSION. PAUL GREENLEE SECONDED THE MOTION.

There was discussion about possibly moving the item to the January meeting, but they held with the December agenda.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Shirley Craddick provided an update on the status of the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) work that is being done in Portland. Over the last few years, the Portland Metro region has been looking at a corridor that a bus rapid transit would travel from downtown Portland out to Gresham. Initially, they started out looking at following the Tillicum Crossing Bridge and come out Powell and move to Division Street via 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and possibly to Mt. Hood Community College. The Steering Committee will be making a recommendation likely this next Monday. As any four-year project works as you learn about the challenges you face in doing the project and the cost, the scope of this project has narrowed a fair amount. The bus now will primarily travel on Division Street between downtown Portland and downtown Gresham and will not be going to Mt. Hood Community College. They are still making a decision on which bridge it will cross, either the Tillicum or the Hawthorne Bridge. The reason it is not for sure the Tillicum, is that there is a railroad in the way, where sometimes there is a 40 minute wait on the train blocking the route. Councilor Craddick said she just wanted to let folks know about the project and that they are getting close to recommending a locally preferred alternative route. She thanked Jeff Hamm and C-TRAN, because one of the questions that the Steering Committee had was how possibly could a 50-foot articulated bus travel Division Street, particularly in the area of Inter-Division where it is only one way each way. It is a very tight, narrow street. They were able to use one of C-TRAN's BRT buses and traveled through the corridor to test it out, and it worked.

From the Director

Mr. Ransom said every fall they produce the Annual Report to the Unified Planning Work Program. It is essentially everything that they did this last year in compliance of the federal and state requirements. It is very extensive, and a majority of the work is behind the scenes. Lynda David produces the UPWP Annual Report; it is a very thorough account of the year. Copies were distributed to Members.

Mr. Ransom said following the discussion at the last meeting, they did issue a letter to the Federal Docket with comments on the proposed rule making for MPOs and how they might need to consolidate or join across state lines or within an urbanized area. Copies of the letter were distributed. Mr. Ransom said they tried to articulate the argument. The area that is the least refined is the expected cost. They essentially said they may need more staff. Mr. Ransom said he has seen other letters that have been submitted by other MPOs across the nation. At a conference he attended this last year, a couple MPOs have joined and they were talking about a multi-year effort and a couple million dollars in cost. The reality is that it may cost a lot of money. The direct impact, at a minimum for us, might be some additional staff. They are hoping that the Feds don't actually adopt the rule.

Mr. Ransom said he attended a conference the previous week. This was the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (AMPO) national conference. Attendees were other Executive Directors of MPOs and staff that work for MPOs. Mr. Ransom said one theme taken from the conference was that people are upset that FHWA and USDOT are writing so many rules and the message back to them was to stop. A second message was that MAP-21 Performance Measure Planning is really a lot of work. That is the reason that he is recommending some resources to have technical assistance. Mr. Ransom said it was good opportunity to meet with colleagues across the nation and make some contacts. He thanked the Board for affording him the chance to go.

Jeanne Stewart said in regard to the Federal Docket and the proposed rule that was discussed regarding joining RTC and Metro as one MPO, and the thought was that the system that exists now was sufficient. Councilor Stewart said the final paragraph talked about combining the Metropolitan Planning Area. She said she is uneasy of the prospect of that saying no one really commented on that. She asked if they knew what that meant for SW Washington and what the impact might be.

Mr. Ransom said no, but their hypothesis as staff is that the geographic boundary, which is the Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA), currently is one boundary which is Clark County and another boundary which is effectively Metro boundary for Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington Counties. For all intents and purposes, the Census Bureau considers this MPA a four county area a PMSA. If FHWA says we need to have one MPA, the substantive affect to RTC may not be that significant if they don't require us to also collapse the organization. Mr. Ransom said they believe that it is possible to have two MPOs within one MPA, because we already do a lot of joint work together. We (RTC and Metro) adopt a UPWP effectively together; we are audited for a certification review together; in federal administrative eyes, we are one region.

Councilor Stewart asked if Clark County and its jurisdictions would lose any of their ability to act independently. She asked if they fully maintain their autonomy under that.

Mr. Ransom said he could not say definitively yes, however he said it is his hypothesis that it would be most likely. He said they just don't know where the Feds will land on this, and they have not defined some of these issues themselves.

Councilor Stewart said Clark County did respond to the Notice of Proposed Rule Making regarding MPOs with a no thank you following the outline that JPACT used, and they also responded with a no thank you to the MPA.

Paul Greenlee asked if they made a big deal out of the inconsistencies between Senate Bill 100 and GMA, because there are some. Mr. Ransom said he thought they did but not in an extensive dialog. They said in part our argument rests on the fact that we are planning under state mandate, which we believe would supersede our mandate under federal, because that is driving the origin and procedure for whereby we are producing our Plan. Mr. Ransom said as a case in point, they just did GMA certifications today. Most regions and states across the nation

don't do that. They may not even do comprehensive planning. He said we are unique in that regard.

Paul Greenlee said Senate Bill 100 is the first comprehensive planning act on a statewide basis in the country. He said there are some significant differences there, and trying to plan the whole thing as if the rules were the same is just difficult. Mr. Ransom said for us it actually creates jeopardy, because the procedure for producing JPACT's RTP is largely driven out of Senate Bill 100 procedures, and we do the same. Mr. Ransom said he thought Mr. Greenlee's argument was correct.

Chair Burkman reminded members that there is a request to complete the evaluation survey on the Executive Director that needs to be completed by the end of the week. He said he would really appreciate everyone participating.

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, December 6, 2016, at 4 p.m.

#### **XIV. Adjourn**

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR ADJOURNMENT. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY DOUG MCKENZIE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

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

---

Jack Burkman, Board of Directors Chair