

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Board of Directors
February 7, 2017, 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 Jeanne Stewart on Tuesday, February 7, 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
Mike Dalesandro, Battle Ground Council (Alt.)
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Councilmember
Tom Lannen, Skamania Co. Commissioner
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver Council
Jerry Oliver, Port of Vancouver Commissioner
Scott Patterson, C-TRAN (Alt.)
Eileen Quiring, Clark County Councilor
Jeanne Stewart, Clark County Councilor
Kris Strickler, WSDOT Regional Administrator

Voting Board Members Absent:

Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor
Jeff Hamm, C-TRAN Executive Director/CEO
Jim Herman, Port of Klickitat Commissioner
Ron Onslow, Ridgefield Mayor
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
Lynda Wilson, Senator 17th District
Paul Harris, Representative 17th District
Vicki Kraft, 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
Monica Stonier, Representative 49th District
Sharon Wylie, Representative 49th District

Guests Present:

Ron Arp, Identity Clark County
Sam Atkinson, Citizen
Trish Atkinson, Citizen
Ed Barnes, Citizen
Al Bauer, Citizen
Mark Brown, Connections Public Affairs
Jim Hagar, Port of Vancouver
Sally Hart, Citizen
Heath Henderson, Clark County
Lee L. Jensen, Citizen
Abriel Johnny, Cowlitz Indian Tribe
David McDeviitt, Citizen
Jim Moeller, Citizen
Mike Pond, Citizen
Cindy Potter, WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff
Scott Sawyer, City of Battle Ground
Robert Schaefer, Citizen
Ty Stober, Vancouver Councilmember
Marc Thornsbury, Port of Klickitat
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

II. Approval of the Board Agenda

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 7, 2017, MEETING AGENDA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Paul Greenlee noted that he would need to leave at 5:30 p.m. in order to get to Washougal for interviews with the 10 candidates for the vacant city council seat.

III. Call for Public Comments

Sam Atkinson from Vancouver said he thought they need to rethink the I-5 Bridge replacement. He said the sprawl that is building is along the I-5 corridor and not benefitting downtown Vancouver. He doesn't want to see the downtown area taken up with a massive bridge structure and the necessary infrastructure.

Ed Barnes from Vancouver thanked the RTC Board for having the I-5 Bridge Replacement on the agenda. He also thanked the City of Vancouver for the action that they took the previous night to agree on RTC's support of Designation of the I-5 Bridge Replacement as a Project of Statewide Significance. Mr. Barnes said the 14th of February is the 100th Birthday of the I-5 Bridge. At that time, Multnomah County put up \$1.25 million and Clark County put up \$500,000 to build the first I-5 Bridge. He said they had a lot more foresight than what he sees today. Mr. Barnes stressed the need for more bridges, but said there are not highways to other bridges. The infrastructure corridor is already in place for the I-5. He said the old bridge was the first bridge across the Columbia that was built for cars. He said a new bridge is needed and urged the Board to designate the I-5 replacement as a project of statewide significance.

Robert Schaefer from Vancouver complimented the Board for considering the importance of the I-5 Bridge and the importance it is to our community. He said the discussion that they have had and the realization of the importance of it has been brought out not only at these meetings but in discussions at the individual cities and organizations. Mr. Schaefer also complimented the City of Vancouver for the action that they took the previous day. He encouraged the Board to pass the resolution for designation of statewide significance to help move this project along.

David McDevitt from Vancouver spoke about the I-5 Bridge and other transportation issues. He said Clark County is likely not in a place where it is going to stop the growth. He said population and housing growth will continue, and there is need to prepare for additional job growth. Mr. McDevitt said all are aware of the gridlock, and as a consequence they need to look at a number of alternatives. He said in the past he has suggested strongly that they need to get Congressional action to establish a joint powers authority. Mr. McDevitt said they need something that establishes an equal presence at the table. A joint powers authority at a federal authorization would be one way to achieve that.

IV. Approval of January 3, 2017, Minutes

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 3, 2017, MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY JACK BURKMAN AND APPROVED. EILEEN QUIRING ABSTAINED.

V. Consent Agenda**A. February Claims**

ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA FEBRUARY CLAIMS. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY PAUL GREENLEE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VI. 2017 Legislative Briefing

Mark Brown does governmental relations work, largely for organizations in Southwest Washington, including the City of Vancouver and the City of Ridgefield. He has provided this to the City of Vancouver for over 20 years.

Mr. Brown said that he and Vancouver Councilmember Anne McEnery-Ogle are just back from a trip to Washington, D.C. He said there is a lot going on back there that is relevant to the work of this Board. He said his primary focus is on what is going on in Olympia. Mr. Brown acknowledged Mr. Bauer and Mr. Schaefer and the mentorship that both have provided him over the years.

Mr. Brown said there is a lot going on in D.C. The day that the Vancouver delegation met with Senator Murray, she was also planning to meet with the new Secretary of Transportation. With the new President and new Secretary of Transportation, there is a lot going on in terms of talk and speculation. There is not a lot of specificity in association with the President's \$1 trillion infrastructure initiative. Mostly what they heard was that there are not a lot of specifics on the table. Mr. Brown said what they know from the campaign trail was that the President was talking about \$1 trillion, but when you get into it, you discover that is in the form of federal tax credits to incent private/public partnerships. That is not new money directed to specific projects. It is a little different approach. Mr. Brown said that could have some value to us here, and perhaps something worth thinking about in terms of the role that private/public partnerships could play in dealing with the growing transportation infrastructure deficit here in Clark County.

Mr. Brown said that they learned that during her confirmation hearing both Secretary Chow and also the incoming Secretary of Commerce said that in addition to the private/public partnership incent through federal tax credits there also might be the need for some direct federal funding for projects. He said that is still a moving target, but it looks like at least those two new cabinet officers, Commerce and Transportation, are suggesting there needs to be some federal funding in the game as well.

The last day that they were in D.C., Chairman Shuster, Chair of the House Transportation Committee, held his first hearing on the question of how they address what he identified as a near \$4 trillion transportation infrastructure deficit. (That number is a 2020 value.) He has his focus on roads, transit, and bridges. Mr. Brown said he was very candid and said that one of his challenges is finding new money in a new tax adverse congress. Chairman Shuster pointed largely to his own side, the republicans, as those that bring that view to the table in the discussion.

Mr. Brown said there was talk about repatriation, the notion that you find a way through tax law to incent people to return dollars now vested overseas into markets here, and as a result, you get a rate, new federal tax revenues, that somehow are captured and put toward this specific use. Chairman Shuster also talked about gas tax and tolling. He said he saw value in President Trump's private/public partnerships, but said it was not really of great value in rural areas. Mr. Brown shared a quote from Chairman Shuster saying that it was relevant in the context of what might happen with bridge replacement here. Chairman Shuster said "there are things that you can do with tax breaks that will attract private capital, but I don't think states can do it without federal government coming to the table with a piece of the funding solution." Mr. Brown said at least we have the House Committee Chair saying that they need to do more than just incent private/public partnerships.

Mr. Brown said the National Governors Association put a call out to all the governors asking them to identify major projects of statewide significance that could benefit from a new transportation package. Mr. Brown said the letter that Governor Inslee sent to the National Governors Association was distributed to the RTC Board Members. He identified four categories of projects. The first one was deficient bridges, and he listed the I-5 Columbia River as one bridge that fit that definition that could benefit from a federal package.

Mr. Brown said that they heard primarily from Senator Murray's staff that private/public partnerships are particularly problematic in the state of Washington because it constraints the current state law. Mr. Brown said this is not an area that he has profound knowledge, but he said he does think it is something worth looking at. He said earlier in the day he had a chance to talk with one of his lobbying colleagues, Jennifer Ziegler. She was Governor Gregoire's Principle Transportation Advisor. She works for Mr. Brown and does some work for him on behalf of his clients. Mr. Brown asked if she generally agreed with the statement about the private/public partnerships. Ms. Ziegler said that she did agree. Mr. Brown said that it is something to flag and think about. He said if private/public partnerships are part of how we address transportation infrastructure, and it has application here in the region and the state, we might need to take a look at how we eliminate any impediments to that that we now find in state law.

On the Federal front, Mr. Brown said they learned that Tiger Grant reauthorization of new infusion of funds into that program is likely. The new administration was saying positive things about that in the confirmation hearings. They also learned that there is a real interest in moving beyond these never ending continuing resolutions and actually appropriating money for a given budget cycle. That would mean that there would be an opportunity to do new authorization. Mr. Brown said there is broad bipartisan support, and the Administration has signaled their interest in this. The idea is that there is something in the \$4 to 525 million range is what is being discussed.

Mr. Brown said from their work in Washington, D.C., Vancouver and the Port of Vancouver have a project already identified which is the 32nd Avenue extension and the Fruit Valley Road Bridge

as a likely candidate if there is in fact an infusion of real money in the new round of Tiger grants.

In terms of what is going on at the state level, Mr. Brown said it is a relatively quiet session on the transportation front. This is the full two-year transportation budget cycle. There will be a transportation biennial budget approved before this is all over. In any event, there is no money for new projects. Most of the \$4 billion goes to fund state agencies; WSDOT, State Patrol, and Department of Licensing are paid out of the transportation budget. Mr. Brown said there is a lot of discussion going on in terms of how to adjust, advance, or move money that was authorized in the Connecting Washington package from one project to another or move money forward for advancing design and engineering. Mr. Brown said he thought some of that may happen, but he said in a meeting the previous week with one of the four principle transportation leaders who said everybody knew what those timeframes were and they were not going to be making changes in those timeframes. He said if your money is four years away, you will get it in four years. If it is six years away, you will get it in six years. Mr. Brown said he thought some changes will still be made. A project for the City of Longview received nearly \$90 million, but the way it is laid out, they are actually going to start the project and then shut it down for two years and start it again. Mr. Brown said he was not sure exactly how the Legislature planned for sequencing these dollars over that twelve-year horizon. In that particular case, it doesn't make a lot of sense.

Mr. Brown said he thought the Legislature would be successful in dealing with the real ID problem and the fact that the enhanced driver's license and normal driver's license are not going to be adequate to satisfy federal requirements for proof of citizenship. He said he thought they found a middle pathway, and before this session is over they will deliver something to the Governor that will take care of that.

Mr. Brown said Microsoft and the Business Roundtable have passed and there is an active discussion about financing a high speed rail study. Originally that was going to be Seattle to Vancouver, B.C. Now they are looking at Vancouver, Washington to Vancouver, B.C. That is something that is in play and under consideration. At a briefing late last week, a Governor's staff person was in talking about this. Senator King said that is a good idea, but maybe we should have a little private money going in to help us do this study and analysis. That is under consideration and discussion.

Mr. Brown highlighted what is going on with our delegation's efforts to find a pathway forward to address the failing I-5 Bridge crossing. He said equally important is how wonderful it is to see the level of collaboration, bipartisan, bicameral, democrat/republican, House and Senate, months long to try to find that pathway forward. He said they have exerted an enormous amount of effort. They have brought transportation leaders from the House and Senate into that discussion. Mr. Brown said it has not always been that way. That collaboration and cooperation is in place today, and he acknowledged how positive that is.

Mr. Brown said there was a meeting that night. He said the delegation who has worked so hard on this is so close to having the bill that can be what they call “dropped” and then introduced to assign a bill number and assign the committee. That could happen as early as tomorrow. Mr. Brown said he has talked with six of them just in the last 24 hours. He said one of the Speakers mentioned that in relationship to Representative Pike’s bill is that when they drop a bill is in fact a bi-state task force comprised of Legislators from Washington and Oregon, both Senate and House members that would be tasked with trying to focus on what a project might look like to replace those two bridges. That focus would be what the solution to the problem looks like. The second piece would be trying to find a way to get the Governors of the two states into that discussion and the Departments of Transportation from both states into that discussion. Largely focus then on if we get a project that has some specificity agreed to, how do we build it, finance it, and make it happen in reality. A third aspect of this is a way of designating whatever project this bi-state Legislative group hands off to the Governors to build designated as a project of statewide significance. There was action taken at the City of Vancouver the previous night, and there are some resolutions that are before the RTC Board. Mr. Brown said all of that will be a part of this and makes sense. The final piece is to get rid of the language that was put in the statute associated with impediments to having a robust, appropriate, timely bi-state conversation. Mr. Brown said that language is only in the budget, only stands for two years, and it automatically comes off the book on June 30, 2017.

Mr. Brown gave a reminder to those with the Clark County Transportation Alliance that February 28 is their lobby day. He said Amber Carter, who represents the Port of Vancouver and Identity Clark County, is trying to get all four of the transportation leads (the two chairs and two ranking members) in attendance. Mr. Brown said his colleague Jennifer Ziegler is trying to get the Transportation Secretary or Deputy Secretary there as well. He said he has invited the entire local delegation to join them during the lunch hour and also invited the Governor to drop in. This is from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. Mr. Brown said Ron Arp has been the organizer of this for Clark County and asked that those planning to attend to contact Mr. Arp.

Marc Boldt asked in the conversations that Mr. Brown had with Senator Murray and Representative Herrera Beutler, if Senator Murray would be willing to come back into the conversation. Mr. Brown invited Councilmember McEnery-Ogle to also contribute to the response since she was in all of the meetings. He said when they were able to share with the delegation, including Congresswoman Herrera Beutler, she was particularly pleased to hear that there is this high level of bipartisan, bicameral collaboration. Mr. Brown said that is the sort of thing that needs to happen to trigger what might be next steps in terms of federal involvement. The reception to that news was very positive.

Paul Greenlee referred to the resolution for RTC to ask for the designation of statewide significance. He said at one point in the discussion several months ago, some suggested that we might be offending some of our legislators if we weighed in on this. Mr. Greenlee asked if this made any sense to Mr. Brown.

Mr. Brown said he is transparent in what he does for his public agencies. He said he was asked the question by the City Manager of Vancouver how our local legislators felt about that. Mr. Brown checked it out and reported back that they all think it is a great idea. He said he has not heard any of the legislators that he has talked with suggest anything other than that.

It was noted that Robert Schaefer wrote the Bill for the designation of statewide significance in 1997.

VII. Designation of I-5 Bridge Replacement as a Project of Statewide Significance - Resolutions

Matt Ransom referred to the memorandum included in the meeting packet along with the two resolutions that were attached. Mr. Ransom said this is the third discussion of this item. It began in December with a brief review of a proposed resolution brought to RTC through a Board introduction in November. The December discussion focused on the state statute whereby projects could be designated as a project of statewide significance. A legal opinion was written at that time and also a review of what that statute might mean for this proposed resolution.

At the January meeting there was discussion about impediments in a state statute specifically focused on a provision in the current state transportation appropriations budget that limited WSDOT's ability to spend money on any efforts related to I-5 Bridge replacement discussion. Both WSDOT and ODOT currently partner on projects like the trunnion replacement and other maintenance activities, but there are limitations specifically to WSDOT related to new project activities. At the conclusion of the January meeting, the Board requested the presentation of two resolutions. One resolution for consideration deals with the project of statewide significance issue and a second resolution deals with the impediments that exist in state statute.

Mr. Ransom said new and relevant information has come forward that has influenced how he crafted the resolutions. He said work has been ongoing as it relates to investigation of the application of the state statute RCW 43.157 relating to the designation of statewide significance. There is also a Washington Administrative Code that helps staff administer that process. It is not clear that RCW 43.157 specifically matches the proposed resolution. It is not clear whether it does or does not. Mr. Ransom said that may not be the point. The way he crafted the resolution was if the state should designate this project as a project of significance to the state. That is where the RTC Board could weigh in, keeping itself outside of a specific application process.

Regarding the appropriations bill, it was clearly stated by Mr. Brown and discussed at the January meeting that proviso in the appropriations budget lapses at June 30, 2017. Without direct intervention it is gone. With that in mind, Mr. Ransom chose to take a larger view and support the clearing of impediments in current law which precludes the planning, funding, and construction of a future I-5 bridge replacement project.

Mr. Ransom noted the letter attached to the memo that was from the Governor and sent to the National Governors Association. At the Executive Branch level of the State of Washington Government, I-5 Bridge replacement continues to be a project of significance. It made the top 5 list in the matrix presented by the Governor to the National Governors Association. There continues to be speculation of what might happen in Washington, D.C. Mr. Ransom said no formal bill or proposal has been dropped in congress for deliberation at the committee level. While there has been conversation, nothing has formally been introduced.

RTC's existing Board policy and project priorities are expressed in the current Regional Transportation Plan. Mr. Ransom said the two Resolutions re-affirm existing regional intent which is to progress towards the funding and construction of an I-5 Bridge replacement project within the 20-year planning horizon.

As for the policy implication, the proposed Resolutions fall within the parameters of current RTC Board policy and authority. As proposed, the Resolutions would act as an RTC Board statement of support to external parties for advancing a project already identified as a priority in RTC planning documents. No additional refinements to policy are needed in support of the proposed Resolutions.

There is no budget implication to RTC with these Resolutions. Should any project effort at some future date be reinitiated, budget issues would be addressed at that time. In terms of RTC's direct involvement, it would most likely be as a supporter.

Resolution 02-17-03 recommends that the State of Washington designate a future I-5 Bridge Replacement as a Project of Statewide Significance. Resolution 02-17-04 supports clearing of impediments in current law which precludes the planning, funding, and construction of a future I-5 Bridge replacement project.

Jack Burkman said it was helpful to hear from Mark Brown that we now have bicameral, bipartisan work on this project. He said it is the right time for this organization that represents the entities around Clark County and adjacent counties to send a message to them that says we are doing the same thing here. What our Director has provided is a generalized statement without getting into the details, so we don't get trapped into a particular place. Mr. Burkman said in the conversations that he has had with legislators, they have said this is helpful to them. If the message goes that our legislators bicameral, bipartisan are working together and Clark County is working together and that goes south to Oregon, that is a message. As it goes east to Washington, D.C. that is a message as well. Mr. Burkman said it is important for this Board to not only support this, but ideally support this unanimously to send that strong message.

JACK BURKMAN MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 02-17-03 THAT RECOMMENDS THAT THE STATE OF WASHINGTON DESIGNATE A FUTURE I-5 BRIDGE REPLACEMENT AS A PROJECT OF STATEWIDE SIGNIFICANCE. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE.

Chair Stewart said this item is listed as discussion today, not an action item.

Jack Burkman said because of the timing of the legislature, to move to another month puts it deep in the session. He asked if they were able to have action this month.

Ted Gathe said from an open meetings perspective, it is listed as a discussion item. It could be argued that people would have attended had it been listed as an action item. He would recommend that action not be taken this evening on this item.

Chair Stewart said Mr. Burkman's points were well taken, and those are the points that can lead us in a direction for whether we want to recommend this come back next month.

Jack Burkman said the City of Vancouver Council did discuss this the previous night. He said there was unanimous agreement for Councilmember McEnerny-Ogle and himself representing the City of Vancouver to support both resolutions. The Council wanted a resolution back before them of a resolution of support in the same manner directed to the City of Vancouver.

Chair Stewart said the City of Vancouver has taken action on these two proposed resolutions. Councilmember Burkman said there was no action. For items that may have controversy or they need further discussion, they return that back to the council and have that discussion. The direction that they received unanimously was that if this comes up for a vote to support it.

Paul Greenlee asked Counsel if it would be appropriate to have the motion tabled until the next meeting. Mr. Gathe said that would be appropriate.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED TO TABLE THE MOTION UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING.

Chair Stewart asked for the process. Mr. Gathe said the motion has been made, and it needs a second. Then there should be a vote on the motion to table the matter.

Jack Burkman said before he made a second on the motion, he asked if seconding the motion would stop further discussion on the item. Mr. Gathe said no that it would not. There would be further discussion on the item.

JACK BURKMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Stewart asked Counsel to clarify the implication of this vote before it was taken. Ted Gathe said a motion has been made and seconded to table the motion as made, and that now leads to a period of discussion by the RTC Body and following that a vote on the motion to table.

Paul Greenlee said his understanding was that by tabling it until the next meeting it places it on the agenda as an action item. Mr. Gathe said it does have that effect.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Mr. Ransom said he would post these resolutions as written for action at the March meeting.

Mr. Ransom said as a representative of RTC, he would be attending the Clark County Transportation Alliance Legislative Day. He said in any briefing that he provides he would let participants know that the Board has two resolutions and action has been tabled until March.

Chair Stewart said it needs to be clear that these will come back for discussion and a vote.

Jack Burkman said given that our Legislators of both the House and Senate are working on this, he wondered if it would be helpful to have a discussion about this in order to help them understand where the jurisdictions around the table are inclined to support this or inclined to oppose.

Chair Stewart said she had some concern about that process. She said it looks like we are lining up the votes before the votes come. Chair Stewart yielded to legal advice on the matter. Mr. Gathe said from a parliamentary procedure aspect, you can certainly have the discussion. Since it was officially voted to table the matter, the action would be to open up the agenda as a discussion item, which would require an agenda amendment. In terms of have that discussion at this meeting, there is nothing inappropriate about that as long as the actual vote is taken at the next RTC meeting. He said the vote to table occurred and there was no discussion, so now you would be asking to amend the agenda to have a discussion on this item.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED TO AMEND THE AGENDA TO HAVE THE DISCUSSION ON THESE TWO RESOLUTIONS. JACK BURKMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION FAILED.

VIII. Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) – Grant Program

Dale Robins referred to the memo included in the meeting packet along with the attached Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Guide that describes the overall grant process that is being proposed for our region. Mr. Robins said the purpose of this presentation is to provide the RTC Board with an overview of the TAP Program and seek their input into the grant process. At the March meeting, staff would return for final approval of the process and announce the call for projects.

RTC has selection authority for the three county RTPPO region of Clark, Skamania, and Klickitat counties. TAP funds can only be used for non-road projects that enhance the travel experience. In our region, this has predominately included bicycle and pedestrian improvements, viewing areas, and historic transportation projects. A full list of eligible activities is included on the second page of the Guide. Because of the size of the funding program, RTC selects projects every other year; in the odd years (2017).

Mr. Robins provided three slides with pictures of recent TAP projects. He noted that this was only a sample, as there have been 16 grant awards over the last couple grant cycles. These projects have had strong community support. The three highlighted projects include: Camas' NW 18th Avenue Path; Clark County's new sidewalks along Hazel Dell Avenue; and the Port of Vancouver's path along SR-501.

The Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC) reviewed the TAP process at their January meeting and is recommending that the region use the same process that was used in the last grant cycle, but they did also recommend that the program be augmented with an additional \$100,000 of CMAQ funds per year. That would make the pot of money \$200,000 larger than before. There are some restrictions on the CMAQ money. Those projects would have to be used for eligible projects within the air quality boundary.

If that recommendation is approved, the funding availability would include about \$1.6 million total available. With this program, some of the funds have to be used in the urban area, some in the rural area, and some funds are flexible and can be used in either the urban or the rural

areas. The urban area is predominately Vancouver, Camas, Washougal, and Battle Ground. All the rest of Clark County and Skamania and Klickitat Counties are in the rural area.

Mr. Robins reviewed the TAP process. He said there would be a call for projects in March. Projects would be submitted in May. (Local agencies submit their projects to RTC.) They also have a public involvement process in May. They provide an opportunity for the public to comment on any of the projects that have been submitted. They then form an evaluation team that will evaluate the projects. They are proposing the evaluation team include a representative from RTC, WSDOT, C-TRAN, Clark County Health Department (Healthy Communities), and also a citizen representative from the Clark County Bicycle Committee. In July RTAC would make a recommendation on projects being funded after the evaluation by the committee. In August the RTC Board would make the final selection. Those projects would then be programmed (listed) in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) in October as part of the TIP adoption. These projects are for the 2019 and 2020 funding cycle. Money would not be available until January of 2018.

Mr. Robins said there is a lot more detail listed in the Guide Book. He said staff is looking for any input on the program, and can answer any questions Members may have.

Marc Boldt asked if the urban area is the cities' boundaries or the Urban Growth Boundary. Mr. Robins said it is actually a Federal designation of an urban boundary. It doesn't match up with the city boundaries; it is a bit larger than the city boundaries. Councilor Boldt asked if Hazel Dell would be in the urban area. Mr. Robins said yes that it would be. In that area the boundary goes up to about 119th Street. Mr. Robins noted the map included with the information.

Paul Greenlee said this has been a wonderful program for Washougal. He said they have a Safe Routes to School problem; their middle school is outside the city limits and technically in the Gorge Scenic Area. For them to do Safe Routes to Schools along the old Evergreen Highway, it is beyond the authority of the City. They really need the multi-jurisdictional assistance of RTC to help with projects like that. Mr. Greenlee said the Port of Camas Washougal is redeveloping a large former mill site. They have built a beautiful trail along the Columbia River. They lack about 800 feet of connection of that trail to the dike and the tunnel that goes under SR-14. That will be a very expensive trail to build given the necessary requirements. The TAP program has been useful to them, and he is pleased to see the program go forward and also with additional funding.

Mr. Robins said there has been great community support for the projects that have gone forward with this program. He said 16 projects have been funded over the last four years through this program. The Vancouver Waterfront Trail was also funded through the TAP program.

Jerry Oliver said the Port of Vancouver has also been a beneficiary of this program. He said he highly favors its continuance, because they have three more projects to do. He said they always have people attending their meetings to say they really like their trail and ask when they

are going to finish it. He said their reply is as soon as funds are available. He said it is a wonderful program.

Eileen Quiring asked if the flexible funds could be either urban or rural depending on the project. Mr. Robins said that was correct.

IX. Bus on Shoulder Feasibility Study - Update

Bob Hart referred to the memo included in the meeting packet along with an informational packet that was distributed at the Bus on Shoulder Workshop in December. The RTC Board was given an update on the Bus on Shoulder (BOS) Study last November. The Study is examining the technical, operational, geometric, and policy options regarding part-time shoulder running for transit bus operations along I-205 and SR-14. It will result in findings and recommendations on its viability and if warranted, a recommended BOS concept for the corridors.

The study corridors are SR-14 from 164th Ave. to I-205 and I-205 from 18th Street to I-84. The Bus on Shoulder on I-205 was first identified as a result of the 2008 Clark County High Capacity Transit Study. That study recommended several transit options for improvements on I-205 including Bus on Shoulder. This was followed by a recommendation in the Access and Operations Study adopted by the RTC Board in November of 2014 that called for evaluating the potential of Bus on shoulder on I-205 and SR-14 corridors.

Mr. Hart said both of those corridors have good existing commuter service, so they are good candidates for BOS. Also, with limited freeway investment in the region, congestion is getting worse and they are looking at innovative ways to manage congestion more effectively. For example, there are several things going on now: WSDOT is leading an effort to look at the benefits and impacts of ramp metering on Clark County freeways; RTC has funds programed for looking at a comprehensive operational study of our freeways as well; ODOT has funds programmed for construction in 2018 to build auxiliary lanes on I-205 northbound from I-84 to Killingsworth; and RTC's Bus on Shoulder Feasibility Study is to examine a transit option that can offer improved mobility and efficiency for transit.

A Bus on Shoulder system is a relatively simple concept in that it allows transit vehicles to use the shoulder on a freeway during times of heavy congestion. Assumptions for the I-205 and SR-14 are that a bus could move to the shoulder when mainline traffic speeds drop below 35 mph. In addition, buses on the shoulder would not operate more than 15 mph faster than the adjacent traffic. The use of the shoulder facility always maintains its priority for emergency stops, incidents, and vehicle breakdowns. In terms of safety, it has been maintained and had safe operations in other regions. Minnesota has 200 miles of BOS in place for many years and has recorded 20 accidents over the last 10 years and most of those have been minor side swipes of broken mirrors. In Miami, over a 3-year evaluation they saw no change in safety, no increase in crashes with BOS. The Puget Sound has had about 3.5 miles of Bus on shoulder on I-405 since September 2015 and has reported no changes to safety in the corridor. Mr. Hart said some of the reason for that is that the bus drivers are professional drivers trained on how to operate in different driving conditions and how to use the shoulder as well. They also have

better visibility than other drivers because they sit higher up than automobiles. The good operating rules that they establish for Bus on shoulder make a big difference as well.

Mr. Hart said the Bus on Shoulder Workshop was held on December 5 and 6 at the Rose Besserman room at C-TRAN's Fisher's Landing Park and Ride. These were two half-day sessions. Session one had more than 50 people comprising a wide array of stakeholders including elected officials, executive staff, as well as public safety and incident management personnel. Also participating were TAC member agencies and representatives from the Washington State Patrol, the Federal Highway Administration, and the Federal Transit Administration. There were also some C-TRAN bus drivers in attendance. Session one was primarily educational and focused on an overview of best practices of Bus on Shoulder around the country and how it worked. Session two had more of an engineering emphasis. It was made up of design and traffic engineers, technical and operational staff, and other stakeholders affected by any proposed system. The key objective of session two was to develop bus on shoulder improvement concepts for the SR-14 and I-205 corridors.

Mr. Hart offered some information on traffic conditions and bus speeds in the corridors. He provided a chart of the deteriorating speeds of the morning peak period bi-state travel speeds for I-5 South, I-205 South, and SR-14 Central from 2012 to 2016. Also provided was bus speed on SR-14 westbound from 164th Avenue to I-205.

Mr. Hart highlighted the preliminary bus on shoulder improvement concept for SR-14. The I-205 bus on shoulder concept is still being reviewed by staff.

The Study participated in a recent briefing with the C-TRAN Board of Directors on January 10. Nick Thompson, the project team's bus on shoulder expert, presented the briefing and focused on the design, operational, and policy issues associated with BOS as well as improvement concepts for a possible SR-14 pilot project.

Mr. Hart said C-TRAN and WSDOT are collaborating on the SR-14 pilot project. He said they are working on the draft Feasibility Report. That will be reviewed by their Technical Advisory Committee in early March. Once the Report has been issued it will be brought to the RTC Board with the recommendations.

Eileen Quiring said that it states that there are adequate shoulders. She asked if that meant they would just do striping or if there would be pavement involved. Mr. Hart said no pavement is involved. He said currently most of SR-14 has 10-foot plus shoulders, and because it doesn't have the same level of traffic as a travel lane, the shoulders do not have to be redone. They are adequate as they are.

Councilor Quiring asked about emergency use of the shoulder by a vehicle. Mr. Hart said when the shoulder is used by a vehicle the bus must leave the shoulder and use the travel lane. The shoulder use for incidents and emergencies takes precedence. With the buses sitting higher up, drivers can look ahead and see if the shoulder is in use.

Chair Stewart said as a County Councilor, she has some questions and concerns about some of the issues. She said some of this information has helped answer some of the questions. She also added that the more information that they receive, the better to help them when they make recommendations. Mr. Hart said he would be happy to do individual presentations or briefings to Board Members if they wished.

X. Other Business

From the Director

Matt Ransom distributed a memo with a State Legislative Session Update. Mr. Ransom said throughout the Legislative Session he would update the Board on bills that would revise laws that govern transportation funding, planning, and RTC operations. There are two bills that staff has been monitoring. HB 1222 is a bill that was proposed by Representative Pike. It relates to the bi-state bridge committee to provide legislative oversight in some type of process to move that initiative forward. It has been referred to the Transportation Committee, with no hearing to date. HB 1147, SB 5096 are the State Transportation two-year appropriations bills. Staff will be monitoring these in relation to the Legislative priorities of the RTC Board and the Clark County Transportation Alliance to see as the budgets come together what projects are being queued up. There is talk about moving projects or repositioning projects, which is part of the Transportation Alliance Statement and supported by this Board. Staff will be monitoring this and weighing in where it would be beneficial for RTC consistent with Board policy.

Mr. Ransom highlighted the Project Showcase: NE 47th Avenue/NE 78th Street Intersection (Clark County). This project was awarded \$1 million of RTC federal aid funds for the intersection improvement. The total project cost was \$2.4 million. The project was a significant improvement to manage the train, vehicle, and pedestrian traffic at this intersection.

Councilor Boldt thanked staff for their involvement on that project. He said they have worked for many years on design to try to correct this intersection. He is glad it finally came through and works well.

A memo regarding the Safety Grant Awards was distributed. Mr. Ransom said these are federal safety funds for safety projects. Clark County received funding for two projects, one for \$331,000 for curve safety improvements and one for \$1,004,000 for adaptive traffic signals. Klickitat County received \$275,000 for highway surface treatment. These projects are enhancements to help improve safety on our roadways.

Mr. Ransom said the Transportation Improvement Board (TIB) established this last year a new program for awarding jurisdictions that have a Complete Street Ordinance and Initiative. They had their first award of projects. This is unique in the sense that TIB rather than give you money to do a project, they actually award you for having done a project. You then take the money and do more projects. It is an incentive program. Three jurisdictions within our region applied. One was awarded to North Bonneville receiving \$125,000 recognizing them for their Complete Streets Program and Initiative and able to continue to do more good work toward establishing complete streets in their community. Mr. Ransom said they are aware that other

jurisdictions within our region are working on their Complete Streets Programs and evaluating their resolutions or ordinances. He said staff attended a session the previous day, when the State came to Vancouver to review the applications and critique. He said they will be consulting with RTAC members and other policy committees to try to get next year's allocation of funds more awarded here in Clark County and Skamania and Klickitat Counties.

Mr. Ransom said every four years RTC, in conjunction with Metro, have their Federal MPO Certification Review. This is when the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Association (FTA) meet with staff to review the organization's program, a performance audit of our program to ensure that we are compliant with federal regulations. Mr. Ransom thanked staff for the great work that they do. He said RTC has a great program, and he said heard many times from both the federal partners and the state partners that we have a model MPO. Mr. Ransom said staff deserves the credit for the great work that is done in terms of keeping the program compliant. Mr. Ransom also thanked Board Members that participated in the listening session. Chair Jeanne Stewart, Former Chair Jack Burkman, and Councilmember Paul Greenlee all attended and gave comments to our federal partners. He said the comments were good, and it was good to hear Board Members speak highly of the organization. Mr. Ransom said he appreciated their support for what is being done. The federal partners will issue a Certification Report in about two months. That report will be brought to the Board when received. The report lists what is being done well and any corrections if needed.

Jack Burkman said the Certification Review was an opportunity for him as past Chair to look at the report that was issued in 2012 listing what was recommended and what was done. In particular, a lot of the items were around public outreach, transparency, and access to information. He said our Executive Director and staff have done an exceptional job of using the website, revising it, and putting documents out where people can see them, taking public testimony that we receive at meetings and incorporating it back into the meeting packet materials for that month on the website. All of those items make it easier to find things and make our work a lot more transparent. Overall, he said staff did a great job. Mr. Burkman also said that in 2012, RTC found itself in the process of losing the prior Executive Director who had been there since its inception. The organization was run a lot on practices that were working well. Since that time, our new Executive Director has gone through and converted many of those into documented policies. This has been a good thing, and he said he thought this meant something to the review team, because the organization continues to grow and evolve.

Mr. Ransom noted JPACT meets Thursday, February 16, 2017, at Metro at 7:30 a.m.

Mr. Ransom will be attending the Clark County Transportation Alliance – Legislative Day in Olympia on February 28, 2017 representing RTC.

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, March 7, 2017, at 4 p.m.

XI. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Jeanne E. Stewart, Board of Directors Chair