

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Board of Directors
March 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, March 7, 2017, 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
Mike Dalesandro, Battle Ground Council (Alt.)
Bart Gernhart, WSDOT (Alt.)
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Councilmember
Jeff Hamm, C-TRAN Executive Director/CEO
Tom Lannen, Skamania Co. Commissioner
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver Council
Eileen Quiring, Clark County Councilor
Jeanne Stewart, Clark County Councilor
Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1 Manager

Voting Board Members Absent:

Jim Herman, Port of Klickitat Commissioner
Jerry Oliver, Port of Vancouver Commissioner
Ron Onslow, Ridgefield Mayor
Kris Strickler, WSDOT Regional Administrator

Nonvoting Board Members Present:

Nonvoting Board Members Absent:

Curtis King, Senator 14th District
Norm Johnson, Representative 14th District
Gina McCabe, Representative 14th District
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:

Brittany Bagent, CREDC
Ed Barnes, Citizen
Al Bauer, Citizen
John Blom, Clark County Councilor
Megan Channell, ODOT
Lori Figone, WSDOT
Jim Hagar, Port of Vancouver
Sally Hart, Citizen
Heath Henderson, Clark County
Lee L. Jensen, Citizen
Temple Lentz, Citizen
David McDevitt, Citizen
Bridget McLeman, Citizen
Jim Moeller, Citizen
Mark Nickerson, WSDOT
Sean Philbrook, Identity Clark County
Robert Schaefer, Citizen
Ty Stober, Vancouver Councilmember
Ron Swaren, Citizen
Patrick Sweeney, City of Vancouver
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

JACK BURKMAN MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 7, 2017, MEETING AGENDA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY PAUL GREENLEE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Shirley Craddick entered the meeting at 4:04 p.m.

III. Call for Public Comments

Ed Barnes from Vancouver thanked the RTC Board for putting the two resolutions regarding the I-5 Bridge as a project of statewide significance on the agenda. Mr. Barnes said he has made several trips to Olympia. The feedback he has heard regarding the bills relating to this topic has been positive in both the House and the Senate. He said the Senate passed it 45 to 4 and the House passed it 60 to 38. Mr. Barnes said the Legislators are requesting and he is encouraging all to continue to send emails and pass resolutions in support until the Governor signs the bill. Mr. Barnes encouraged all to continue to get the message to Olympia of RTC support.

Robert Schaefer from Vancouver also thanked the Board for considering this legislation on the I-5 replacement. He said he thinks it is important. Mr. Schaefer said he wanted to compliment the House members who yesterday passed under the direction and support of Sharon Wylie who was the major sponsor of the bill. He said Paul Harris, Brandon Vick, and Monica Stonier did an outstanding job in their testimony in that hearing. He said it is important to understand what message we are sending to Oregon by claiming this as a project of statewide significance and asking them to do the same. Mr. Schaefer said it is important to our community to show that we really care about this situation and not be distracted by other projects. Show that this is our number one project, and then face the other bridge areas after this is fixed.

David McDevitt from Vancouver distributed a newspaper article from the Oregonian published on March 1, 2017. The article referred to a legislator in Oregon that is making a proposal for a \$20 billion toll road west of I-5. Mr. McDevitt applauded the efforts of the Washington legislators on their efforts to push forward the set of bills to get the I-5 project declared a project of statewide significance. He said at JPACT they were discussing whether or not to have sidewalks. Mr. McDevitt said this highlighted just how far apart Oregon and Washington were as to critical projects in transportation infrastructure. He proposed a joint powers authority with equal seats at the table for both states so they can address those bigger joint projects; the I-5 Bridge is one of those projects.

Lee Jensen from Battle Ground said he has followed the I-5 development and all the work that has been done in both states for a long time. He said he appreciated the Board taking on the discussion of making the I-5 Bridge a project of statewide significance. He urged the Board to vote for that.

Ron Swaren from Portland said he thought the I-5 bridge replacement was a pie-in-the-sky idea. He noted the challenges with a non-opening bridge including lengthy and steep ramps and the

challenges of a bascule opening bridge. Mr. Swaren said both options would be a very difficult engineering feat, and he said it would not be a simple replacement bridge.

Tom Lannen entered the meeting at 4:15 p.m.

IV. Approval of the February 7, 2017, Minutes

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 7, 2017, MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE AND APPROVED. SHIRLEY CRADDICK ABSTAINED.

V. Consent Agenda

A. March Claims

B. RTC – Clark County Interlocal Cooperative Purchasing Agreement, Resolution 03-17-05

MARC BOLDT MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA MARCH CLAIMS AND RESOLUTION 03-17-05. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VI. *Tabled at February Meeting: Designation of I-5 Bridge Replacement as a Project of Statewide Significance - Resolutions 02-17-03 and 02-17-04*

Matt Ransom referred to the staff report and two resolutions included in the meeting packet. He said the Board decided to take up this discussion of designating an I-5 Bridge replacement project as a Project of Statewide Significance at their December meeting. The Board discussed the matter at the December, January, and February meetings. At the February meeting, two resolutions were brought forward that the Board asked for in January. There was discussion, deliberation, and a motion on one of the resolutions. Mr. Ransom said the staff report was updated with what has changed since the February meeting. He highlighted two topics.

First, Mr. Ransom said there are several agencies around the table that have adopted resolutions that in some form recommend moving forward with planning towards replacement of the I-5 bridges and supporting designation as a Project of Statewide Significance. These include the City of Vancouver, the City of Battle Ground, and the Ports of Vancouver, Ridgefield, and Camas-Washougal.

The second matter is regarding state Legislation. There were three bills introduced this session in both the House and Senate that pertain to bridge replacement discussions. Those three bills include HB 2095, SB 5806, and HB 1222. The current update on those is that HB 2095 and SB 5806 have respectively moved through and been approved by their respective chambers. Mr. Ransom said it is his understanding that there are slight differences between those two bills in terms of how they characterize their proposal. He said at this point procedurally they have to go through some type of reconciliation process so they might establish a common bill among the two chambers. Mr. Ransom said they don't know what that outcome might be. The third bill, HB 1222, recommends establishment of a bi-state bridge legislative review committee. That did not pass out of chamber.

Referring back to the two resolutions, Mr. Ransom said staff has reviewed the resolutions, and in crafting the language wanted to stay within the parameters of current RTC Board policy. That policy being the Regional Transportation Plan adopted in 2014. They found that the resolutions are consistent in their basic intent, that being that the Board has established a policy and project priority that a project to replace the I-5 Bridge is a priority and should occur within the 20-year planning horizon. He said they believe that these resolutions stay within that policy framework and would be consistent with implementing or moving forward with the said project replacement.

The budget implications to RTC, should the resolutions move forward, have no budget impact.

Mr. Ransom said Resolution 02-17-03 was moved forward at the last meeting, but tabled for final deliberation and action. That is back before the Board for consideration should they take it off the table. Resolution 02-17-04 was not moved forward, but the Board did ask in the deliberation at the last meeting that that be brought back and be noticed for action. Mr. Ransom asked Ted Gathe to give a review of the procedural matter in front of the Board, given they have a motion that has been tabled and how they might address that.

Ted Gathe recalled that at the last meeting these two resolutions were listed as discussion only rather than action items, and he was asked to opine on that. He advised that because they were listed as discussion, they should not be voted on formally at the February meeting, but go to the March meeting. However, at that point, there had already been a motion made to approve Resolution 02-17-03. So in the ensuing discussion a motion was made to table that particular item, which was then approved by the Board. There was no motion officially dealing with Resolution 02-17-04, but there was direction given to the Executive Director to return that item to the Board for action at the March meeting.

Procedurally, at this point Mr. Gathe said they need to have a motion to take from the table Resolution 02-17-03. That will bring it back before the Board for discussion. Resolution 02-17-04 is already a part of the agenda, and no other action needs to be taken procedurally until they decide to vote on that particular item.

Chair Stewart asked for an explanation of the differences between the two resolutions. Mr. Ransom said Resolution 02-17-03 has the Board resolving that it recommends that the State of Washington designate a future I-5 Bridge replacement as a project of statewide significance. Mr. Ransom said they decided in crafting this resolution to not cite a particular RCW in state statute that has a process of application for said designation. In crafting the resolution as presented, Mr. Ransom said he wanted to give the Board wider latitude to say they recommended that without addressing that matter directly. He said that is an issue for the Legislature administratively within the state to deal with. This Board does not need to get bound up in that process.

The second Resolution, 02-17-04, was crafted to say that RTC supports clearing of impediments in current law which precludes the planning, funding, and construction of a future I-5 Bridge replacement project. This could be things such as restricted funding limitations, project

delivery methods that could allow more efficient development of a project or construction. This is to ensure that barriers don't stand in the way.

MARC BOLDT MOVED TO TAKE FROM THE TABLE RESOLUTION 02-17-03 AND PUT IT BACK ON THE AGENDA. PAUL GREENLEE SECONDED THE MOTION AND IT WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Jack Burkman said he made the motion last month and with it back for discussion, he reiterated that he thought it appropriate to pass this resolution. He said the timing is particularly good because the Senate has passed a bill from the floor and the House has also passed and they will be doing reconciliation. Mr. Burkman said there is a hearing on Thursday before the House Transportation Committee and the passing of this resolution would be beneficial to represent RTC's position at that hearing.

Paul Greenlee asked if a motion was on the floor to pass this or if a motion was needed. Mr. Gathe said the motion was tabled, so now the motion is back in play at this point. There was a motion by Mr. Burkman and a second, and it is now before the Board.

Mr. Greenlee said he also supported this resolution.

Anne McEnery-Ogle said this motion also supports the many months of work that our three Senators and six House Representatives that have worked to bring this forward. She said this is a small step so that we have the opportunity to discuss how to solve the problem.

Eileen Quiring said in looking at the resolution, she agreed with the first four listed "whereas" but disagrees with "whereas" five and "whereas" six. She said they have already spent a great deal of money studying this replacement project. She said she is not for replacing the bridge at this time. She said she thinks they need to address the corridor, but that they should look at other avenues of getting over the Columbia River while this waits for repairs if necessary in the future. Councilor Quiring said she thought it would be devastating to be working on the I-5 Bridge and not have somewhere else for individuals or freight to go across the river.

Rian Windsheimer said he also supports this motion. He said he thought having a conversation about how to continue to address where there is clearly a need is a good idea. He said he will be abstaining from the vote though, because he felt it needs to be a conversation that Washington needs to have with its legislature. He said he appreciates the conversation and offers his support.

Shirley Craddick asked what impact this would have with the Legislation that is underway and the benefit that it would be to help get the Legislators together. Mr. Ransom offered a brief comment related to the role of RTC as the Metropolitan Planning Organization. He said in his opinion, he found no more important issue than for the Board to discuss and support moving projects forward that are identified in the Plan. A resolution such as this that would suggest a move forward with implementing the Plan is very consistent with the role of the organization. He said it is something that Boards of this nature should be engaged in; conversations around

how to move and build the infrastructure that is identified as the strategy in your Plan. He said he thought it was a positive statement.

Councilor Craddick said as a Metro Councilor in Oregon, she would be supporting this motion. She said she hoped that this Legislation, as Mr. Windsheimer mentioned, will create discussions between the two states and be able to get discussions going again. She said the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), which is the counterpart to RTC in Oregon, has put money forward to help work on some of the roadblocks that are in the I-5 corridor, such as the Rose Quarter. She said they will be doing their part and continue to help reduce congestion on the I-5 corridor. Councilor Craddick said she would be voting for this resolution, and that it was time to get the discussion going.

Bart Gernhart said WSDOT supports the concepts in the resolution, however, because of the nature of the resolution in recommending the State of Washington to do something; he will abstain from the vote.

Marc Boldt said he appreciated the comments on this. He said when they first started on the I-5 project 15 years ago, they did brilliant work about explaining the project; somehow that got lost. Councilor Boldt said six months ago when they talked about the weave on I-205 was one of the best sessions that he has had at RTC. He said the problems we have on I-5 are about the weave and what to do about the intersections getting on and off the bridge, the whole concept. He said he hoped that RTC takes more of an active role this time; last time they were more passive. Councilor Boldt said he hoped they would take their job responsibly and move forward on this.

Jeff Hamm said he would be voting in favor of the resolution. He said they discussed this item at the C-TRAN Board in February. His vote in favor is with the understanding that the term replacement bridge is interpreted broadly. Mr. Hamm said this meaning that it is a structure or a project that is designed and built for the whole range of modes of transportation: auto, freight, bicycle, pedestrian, and public transportation.

Chair Stewart said she had two primary concerns about identifying this as a project of statewide significance. She said that is related to the RCW that indicates a project of statewide significance means a border crossing project that involves both private and public investment carried out in conjunction with adjacent states or provinces. Chair Stewart said she was very concerned about the requirement, because it says it will include the private. She said when it is private she is uncomfortable because to her that means tolls. She said she resists the idea of tolls, because the people who this will hurt the most are the people who live in Clark County and need to commute to Oregon. In her book, that is an unfair burden.

Another concern that Jeanne Stewart had was in regard to JPACT. She is a member on the JPACT committee. She said at the last meeting, a legislative agenda was approved by the committee that mentioned the Rose Quarter improvements but no discussion of the Interstate crossing was in the two-year plan. She said the Oregon side and the Washington side do not have aligned priorities, and that is a problem. Chair Stewart said one of the pieces of legislation

is asking for a bi-state legislative committee. She said that could be useful, but that is what our legislators are offering and she said she did not know what the response for that is on the Oregon side.

Jack Burkman said he agreed with Chair Stewart that we do not have aligned priorities between Oregon and Washington. But, he said he believed that is because the sequence of events that transpired caused Oregon to not engage. Mr. Burkman said right now we have legislators, House and Senate, who are trying to restart that conversation. He said he did not see us restarting the conversation simultaneously in two states. He does see a great effort occurring in our legislature to say they will take the lead and bring Oregon into the conversation because the bills are all around a bi-state conversation, bicameral. Mr. Burkman said someone needs to start it, and to him that is what this means. To him, adopting this resolution supports that bill. Statewide significance means it is very important, and the bill says they will work with Oregon. His expectation is that two years from now when the legislative agenda comes out, the replacement of the I-5 crossing would be on the agenda, but would be hard pressed to understand how or why Oregon would do it at this time.

Councilor Craddick said she appreciated Councilor Burkman's comment, and she agreed. She said she thought the initiative that the State of Washington is taking in the legislature will help initiate discussion on the Oregon side. She said the Metro Council and JPACT legislative prioritization excludes this, because this really is a matter at this moment in Oregon for the state legislature to address. She said she thought there would be support from JPACT after they learned that their state legislators were supportive.

Jeanne Stewart said she didn't agree. She said under our jurisdiction as an MPO it requires us to work jointly on projects. It is important to address the bi-state issues by both sides, by JPACT and RTC.

Chair Stewart asked if WSDOT has done an assessment of the impact to the I-5 corridor when a project southbound would be underway, a major construction project, and whether or not I-205 has the capacity to absorb this.

Bart Gernhart said they will have to revisit that after or during their visiting of the process to agree on a concept. They have to start the dialogue, go through the process, and agree on what is built. Part of that is an assessment of how they build it and how they stage it and allow traffic to flow. This is a critical element in any of their projects. Mr. Gernhart said they need to know what is planned before they can make those assessments. Mr. Gernhart said he thought the question was going to be how they were going to report the details of the inventory of existing planning work, which is part of the bill that is being proposed. He said the staged construction and traffic flow should be addressed as part of the process as they move forward.

Chair Stewart said there is a motion on the table to approve Resolution 02-17-03.

THE MOTION WAS APPROVED WITH 9 YES VOTES, 1 NO VOTE: EILEEN QUIRING, AND 2 ABSTAINED: BART GERNHART AND RIAN WINDSHEIMER.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 02-17-04. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED WITH 9 YES VOTES, 1 NO VOTE: EILEEN QUIRING, AND 2 ABSTAINED: BART GERNHART AND RIAN WINDSHEIMER.

VII. Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) – Call for Projects

Dale Robins referred to the memo included in the meeting packet along with the attached Transportation Alternatives Program Guide. Mr. Robins said the details of the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) were discussed at the February meeting, and the TAP Guide was distributed. He said everything remains the same as last month except for an increase of \$10,000 in funding, as they received updated estimates from WSDOT which had another \$5,000 for each year.

RTC has selection authority for this program in Clark, Skamania, and Klickitat Counties. This program funds a variety of alternative transportation projects with bicycle and pedestrian improvements being the most common project type.

The current call for projects will be for \$1.7 million based on estimated 2019 and 2020 funding levels. RTC staff will return at the August meeting for the Board to make their final selection of projects.

Paul Greenlee said this item is listed as an action item, and asked what that would be.

Matt Ransom said what is desired of the Board is a motion to release for grant solicitation of the TAP Program at the noted funding levels. He said it is not a policy so it is not a resolution.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED TO PROCEED WITH THE RELEASE OF THE CALL FOR THE TAP PROGRAM PROJECTS. JACK BURKMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Jeanne Stewart asked if RTC has an apportion policy for transportation dollars that come in that a certain portion goes to the TAP program and a certain portion goes to streets and highways. She asked if there was an established plan for those portions.

Dale Robins said WSDOT has a formula where they allocate funds out to various regions. Those funds that come to RTC, about \$1.1 million, a portion has to be used in the rural areas, a portion has to be used in the urban areas, and a portion is flexible that can be used in either urban or rural. Mr. Robins said the Board has also endorsed RTC staff to allocate \$600,000 in CMAQ dollars toward the TAP projects. The total dollars is \$1.7 million.

Chair Stewart asked about eligibility. She asked of the transportation money that comes in from the state and the feds if there was an estimated portion for improvement for motorized vehicles versus alternatives programs of one to the other.

Mr. Robins said funds are allocated by the funding programs. RTC also receives an STP allocation, which is about \$4.6 million that is flexible and can be used for a wide range of projects. They also receive CMAQ funds that can be used for projects that improve air quality. The next agenda item will talk about the funds that come to RTC and how they are allocated by

modes. That will be discussed with the allocation of funds, how the funds were distributed last year.

Eileen Quiring asked what determines the amount that goes to rural areas versus the urban areas.

Mr. Robins said that is calculated by WSDOT. That is mainly based on population. Listed in the TAP guide is the funding sub-allocation. The \$135,000 has to go for Rural projects and \$530,000 has to go to the Urban projects and \$450,000 is flexible for either of those. Those are all based on population formulas.

Paul Greenlee said the \$600,000 of CMAQ funds must be spent on congestion management and air quality projects. Mr. Robins said that was correct. It also has to be used within the air quality boundary, most of the urban area.

Mr. Greenlee said the TAP projects have a fairly narrow list of things they can be spent on. Mr. Robins said that was correct. They don't have to fund the entire project; as long as the project has one of the eligible project components, it can qualify for TAP funding.

THE MOTION WAS APPROVED.

VIII. 2016 Federal Obligation Report

Dale Robins referred to the memorandum included in the meeting packet with the attached report. Mr. Robins said annually, each MPO is required to publish a list of projects for which federal transportation funds were obligated in the previous year. At RTC, they go beyond a list and develop a short report that summarizes the status of federal obligation. Obligation is a term which means that the federal funding agency (FHWA or FTA) enters into an agreement to reimburse a local agency for the federal share of a project. The actual reimbursement generally occurs over the next year or two following obligation, as the local agency implements the project.

It is important to note that federal obligation levels vary by year, and one or two projects in our region can significantly impact obligation levels in any given year. This also only represents federal obligation and would not show the state funded or locally funded projects that have occurred over the last few years.

Over the last five years, obligation levels have varied by year. For example, 2015 obligation levels were elevated as C-TRAN obligated over \$38 million for the Vine BRT system. Year 2016 had the lowest federal obligation level in these five years.

Mr. Robins displayed a pie chart of federal obligation by project type. Again, this chart varies significantly year by year, but in 2016, 40% of the federal funding went to roads, with significant amounts allocated to preservation, safety, and transit.

Last year, \$10.9 million in federal funds were obligated for RTC selected projects for the Surface Transportation Program (STP), Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ), and Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). A little over half of the funds that were obligated

last year were regional dollars. The rest were probably obligated by WSDOT and C-TRAN. With the region receiving approximately \$9 million a year, we obligated more money than we receive on an annual level. The State does allow a variation as you obligate. Our region continues to obligate in advance of what our actual allocation is. This is good because it allows us to get the dollars at today's value rather than next year's value.

Mr. Robins said the last few pages of the report are the required list of projects. Projects are listed by agency. He said Members could see what their agency has obligated last year.

IX. Rose Quarter Project Update

Matt Ransom introduced Megan Channell, Principal Planner/Project Manager for ODOT who would brief the Board on the Rose Quarter Project. Mr. Ransom said they have been discussing the I-5 corridor for the last four meetings and for years, for that matter. He said consistently, within the community, he is asked what is happening in the Rose Quarter and consistently he said he hears misinformation and incorrect facts about what is occurring or what is funded. Mr. Ransom said in an attempt to put facts on the table, and to share with the Board what happens in an urban area, which is to a project here and a project there. Sometimes they line up concurrently and other times they are sequenced. Mr. Ransom thought this presentation would be a good opportunity to baseline the information. There has been significant action in progress.

Megan Channell said this project is for improving I-5 in Portland's Rose Quarter area between I-405 and I-84. She said this is a significant area in terms of transportation and goods movement where the Broadway – Weidler interchange funnels traffic that is coming from I-5, I-405, I-84, and HWY 30. In this location, I-5 narrows down to two lanes in each direction and limited shoulder width. The project will address key bottlenecks to improve safety, as well as congestion for freight and auto drivers, and provide economic benefit to the bi-state region. At the local level, there is also improvement to reconnect areas on each side of the highway with two lids that would go over I-5 and improve overcrossings.

Ms. Channel said there is a lot of history to get to where they are today. She said this project has been developed out of many years of planning and partnership with State, regional, and local agencies. I-5 was originally constructed in 1960, and this section has not been improved since, even though they see about two times the drivers using this portion today. Prior ODOT studies have really narrowed the scope of I-5 improvements starting in the 1980s to refine improvements, refine the costs, and look to reduce community impacts associated with improvements to this area. It has involved extensive state and local agency collaboration. There were 79 options that were considered to get to what they see as the proposed project today, which was also unanimously approved by the Oregon Transportation Commission and Portland City Council in 2012.

The reason this project is being done is for highway safety. I-5 Rose Quarter has the highest crash rate in the state of Oregon. In the five year period, they saw over 830 crashes from 2010 to 2014. Vehicles are often merging and weaving in very short distances. Within a two-mile

segment through Rose Quarter they are seeing in the southbound direction five on and off ramps and in the northbound direction six on and off ramps. Ms. Channell said there is a lot of action and friction happening in a short distance. This causes frequent rear end collisions and sideswipe collisions. Absence of shoulders also leads to collisions and crash related delays which further stall freight and cars.

The project proposes to add auxiliary lanes to I-5. The auxiliary lane you take to get on the on ramp to I-5 will extend continuously to the next off ramp, which will allow more time to make the merge into the main line of I-5 and more time to merge to the exit ramp as well. With this improvement, they will see a reduction in crashes. Simulations show it will be about a 50% reduction in crashes on I-5. The most profound reduction in crashes is in the southbound direction; seeing north of Broadway where I-5 narrows to two lanes from three lanes and where the queues from I-84 often backup to. Fewer crashes mean better travel time reliability.

Ms. Channell addressed operations. She said the Rose Quarter segment experiences some of the highest traffic volumes in the state with over 140,000 vehicles using this road per day. A substantial portion of traffic is coming from and going to Clark County. During the afternoon peak period, which is 4:00 to 6:00 p.m., 46% of I-5 northbound traffic between I-84 and I-405 is going to Clark County. During the same time 23% of traffic in the southbound direction is coming from Clark County. This segment of I-5 is also Oregon's worst bottleneck. They are seeing over 12 hours of congestion each day. Lack of shoulders also contributes to this where there is no space for vehicles to stop or for emergency responders to move.

I-5 is also the most critical component of their regional and national freight network. Freight volumes also are expected to double in the next 20 years. A recent analysis of top freight bottlenecks also ranked this segment of I-5 as number 41 on a top 100 list of freight bottlenecks across the nation. Ms. Channell said they understand that travel time and certainty for commuter and freight movement is quite important, not only just to keep us moving, but it is important for a bi-state economic competitiveness.

Ms. Channell highlighted the travel time savings the project would provide with added auxiliary lanes and shoulders in the two-mile segment of I-5 southbound from Going Street to Burnside Street. She said they studied a number of design options to arrive at the preferred choice.

Ms. Channell said there are a number of local improvements in line with the City of Portland and the North/North East Quadrant Planning Vision. There are a number of bicycle and pedestrian improvements that are proposed that are on top of the lid structures that would go over I-5.

Ms. Channell provided an overview of the project highlighting the full shoulders and auxiliary lanes on I-5 between I-405 and I-84. The lid structures were done from a constructability and cost perspective. In order to add the new auxiliary lanes and full shoulders to I-5, the structures over Broadway, Weidler, Vancouver, and William all had to be reconstructed; the columns would need to be moved. They looked at different ways to do that cost related and constructability wise. It is actually cheaper to drop in a lid structure rather than reconstruct all

the different bridges. It is more time efficient from a construction perspective, which means fewer impacts, not only to the community but to I-5 drivers. Ms. Channell highlighted the new bicycle and pedestrian improvements for local activity enhancements and a new bicycle and pedestrian overcrossing at Clackamas. She also noted that the I-5 on-ramp southbound currently at Winning Way would be relocated up to Weidler. This will reduce the number of conflicts that vehicles accessing I-5 would have to make in the local intersection areas and also reduce the conflicts at Vancouver.

Ms. Channell said a lot of work has been done since 2012 when this concept was designed. ODOT has done a number of studies that seeded on the 2012 Facilities Plan for the refinement and design concepts and for conformance feasibility. This includes cost benefit analysis and constructability concept plans, some initial environmental review to determine what they will be doing for their next phase, and the local improvement study as relative to the I-5 access that she just talked about. All of this information was developed to inform what they are embarking on now, which is the environmental review process.

Starting this spring, ODOT will initiate an Environmental Assessment, which is a requirement of the National Environmental Policy Act. Whenever there is federal funding for a project, you are required to go through the NEPA process. They will be evaluating the short-term impacts associated with project construction and the long-term impacts associated with project operation. There will be a robust community engagement process with that as well. The Draft Environmental Assessment is scheduled to be published in the summer of 2018. There will be a formal public comment period; although, leading up to that time, many of their partners will be engaged throughout the process. Fall of 2018 is their scheduled time to have the Decision Document, the finalization of the Environmental Assessment. The completion of the environmental phase allows the project to move forward into further design and construction.

In terms of funding and economic benefits, this project is projected to cost about \$400 million to \$450 million, and that includes the design and construction. Currently, they have funding through the environmental working phase. They are engaged with their state Legislature in seeking future funding for the project, as well as a number of other opportunities for funding: grant opportunities, regional bond measure, and local funding opportunities.

In terms of the economic benefits, once the project is built, and it functions for 20 years, they are expected to see about \$732 million of benefit from this. The majority of those benefits are actually from travel time savings, at about \$630 million of the total. They also see economic benefits for auto reduced crashes, vehicle operating savings, and reduced vehicle emissions.

Rian Windsheimer said they have been talking about this project area for a very long time. He said they reached an agreement with the City of Portland in terms of what would serve the local land uses and what would also be acceptable in terms of a construction footprint. All of these happening back in 2012; it was a real breakthrough point. Mr. Windsheimer said they now are talking about how they will do it. They recently had their Governor put forward a Visioning Committee, a Legislative Committee that toured all around the state. One of the key

components they heard around the entire state was the Portland area congestion was a problem. There has a renewed focus on it being time to take a look at some of these larger scale projects in terms of how they can be addressed.

In terms of the process, Mr. Windsheimer said they have talked with their Commission about getting some of FAST Lane funding that would be dedicated towards continued design, and they have some STP funding. They only have funding to get them through this Environmental portion. He said they are relying on their state Legislature and other STIP update processes to get the remaining funding. Mr. Windsheimer said there seems to be a lot of renewed interest in moving this project forward.

Shirley Craddick said Councilor Stewart had asked earlier about the commitment that JPACT had regarding support for this I-5 corridor. She said this is a good example of being able to demonstrate some of that support. Councilor Craddick said that JPACT doesn't have it specifically in their legislative priorities; they are committed in other ways. One of those is they have used regional flexible funds to help support the design of this work that they are doing. They are working together as a region to lobby the state Legislature on a state tax package. In addition, they are working on a possibility of a regional measure of some sort in the future that would help support this project. Councilor Craddick said she thought this was a significant amount of commitment on the Oregon side for this project and other projects to improve the I-5 corridor.

Councilor Stewart said she appreciated that. She said again that she was concerned that their legislative agenda had no comments about an interstate bridge crossing.

Jeff Hamm said C-TRAN operates all of their express bus service through the Rose Quarter. It is a significant delay point for them. The HOV begins just north of this location. He asked if they are looking at design things to help them through that area to hook up with the HOV lane or if it was too late to do that.

Rian Windsheimer said he had requested a letter from C-TRAN with this consideration, and he received the letter from Mr. Hamm. He said he forwarded the letter to the project team, and it will be considered in the process. Mr. Windsheimer said they are in the very early stages of trying to figure out how it operates and in terms of an HOV lane or not. He said they don't have an answer for that yet, and it will be some time before they do. He thanked Mr. Hamm for bringing this up and said he was glad it is on the table. They just don't know how it is going to operate yet. Mr. Hamm said that was totally fair.

Chair Stewart said this was a good presentation and timely based on a lot of things that are going on right now. She thanked Mr. Ransom for facilitating the presentation and asked to have a copy of the presentation. Mr. Ransom said they would post the presentation on RTC's Website with the March meeting materials.

Mr. Ransom said he participated in the Clark County Transportation Alliance day in Olympia last week. He said partners around the table were in attendance and meeting with our state delegation and also collaborating on transportation issues and how we move forward as a

region. Mr. Ransom said he mentioned this presentation when the Legislators were present with them over lunch. He said they, also being ex-officio members on the RTC Board, will get a copy of the presentation. He said several of them were very interested in the status of this project. Mr. Ransom said this is timely, and it is important for all to have the same facts. He thanked Mr. Windsheimer and his staff for presenting this.

X. Regional Transportation Plan – 2018 Update, Preliminary Scoping

Chair Stewart said given the time, they might need to bring this item back at the April meeting and have Mr. Ransom give a brief overview. Mr. Ransom said this memo is a kick off to the 2018 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update. On their current cycle with their federal partners, they have committed to update their RTP by December of 2018. In the developmental process and in RTC's work program for this year, they have identified this as a major activity. Today was going to be the beginning of that discussion. Lynda David, the project manager, has presented the memo included in the meeting materials. Mr. Ransom encouraged members to take a look at the memo to start to think about the issues they feel are prominent and want to be on the table for discussion. The memo lists things that have changed since the last update and projects that have been completed. Also listed are some of the policy or trend issues that we may want to be aware of and consider. Mr. Ransom said in anticipating this discussion, he received an article from Jeff Hamm about autonomous vehicles. He said this being a trend issue that is within the planning horizon. He said the question for the Board and the community would be how we are planning and how we are investing in infrastructure, and can it accommodate changes in technology such as that. Mr. Ransom said they had a briefing with the Board last year on the VAST program where they are trying to make signal investments and other technology investments that would be supportive of those systems. They would bring this item back at the April meeting.

Marc Boldt said Clark County is thinking about opening the framework of the Comp Plan, which will be huge between the County and the cities. He said in the next couple years, the household survey will really be important to all of them.

XI. Other Business

From the Board

Bart Gernhart apologized in behalf of WSDOT to the Commissioner from Skamania County and the citizens of Skamania County and Klickitat County as well for the complete failure of sections of SR-14. He said they have had a terrible winter, and the roadway has not fared very well. Mr. Gernhart said he and staff have been working very hard last week and this week trying to pull together the funding sources. He said as soon as it stops raining they are committed to put something down to keep it bearable in the short term and working on the long term in sections. Mr. Gernhart said they will focus on that because they know how bad it is for the community. They are holding an open house in Stevenson tonight, and half of the meeting will be about the bad roadway and WSDOT's commitment to do all they can to make it work.

Commissioner Lannen thanked Mr. Gernhart and said the citizens will be appreciative of a timeline.

Chair Stewart asked what funding sources are available when talking about this kind of badly damaged roadway. Mr. Gernhart said it is very difficult. Statewide, they are looking at both their maintenance program and their preservation program. They are also looking at the potential for federal emergency money. They have never been able to get federal emergency money, but they are going to try again. Their maintenance budget has been hit very hard. They were doing great through November, but it has been devastating. Mr. Gernhart said the cities and counties are facing similar type challenges. He said they will fix the roadway and deal with the money issue as best they can.

Commissioner Lannen asked Mr. Gernhart to pass on to WSDOT's crews their appreciation for the incredible job they during a very trying time.

From the Director

Matt Ransom highlighted four Project Showcases that have been completed in our region. This shows the community where the regional dollars are being invested. Three of the projects were included in the meeting packet, and the fourth project information was distributed.

The first project was C-TRAN's The Vine was completed in January. Regional RTC funding invested was \$4 million out of the CMAQ program that occurred over several installments. Total project cost was \$53,120,000. It is a nice new bus system between Vancouver and Vancouver Mall.

The second project was a signal enhancement project, TSMO Phase 2, with Clark County being the project lead. RTC funding was \$450,000 out of the CMAQ program. Total project cost was \$520,000. This project improves the signal operations and timing in several signals within Clark County.

The third project was Clark County's Carty Road Reconstruction (NE 10th Avenue – NW Hillhurst Road). Total invested RTC funding was \$1,300,000 out of the STP Rural program. Total project cost was \$2,281,000. This was to install a new culvert/bridge with improvements. This serves the City of Ridgefield and communities west of I-5.

The fourth project was 4th Street at Stonecreek LED Sign for the City of La Center. This project was \$47,260 in TAP funds. Total project cost was \$57,825. This project improved pedestrian safety across one of the City's busiest streets.

Mr. Ransom provided an update on the State Legislative Session and distributed a memo. He said some of the bills listed were already discussed earlier. Given the Board's endorsement of the I-5 Resolutions, Mr. Ransom said he would transmit those to the state legislative delegation so that they understand RTC Board's statement of support as the resolutions articulated. Two other bills are being tracked. One establishes a new RTP in a rural county in Washington, which RTC doesn't have a stake in. Another bill is related to GMA planning, and it has some

reference to RTPOs and their authority under state statute. Mr. Ransom said he would update the Board at the next meeting.

Mr. Ransom distributed a memo in regard to the Member Dues Update. He said last year at their meeting in April, the Board adopted a new member dues schedule and also a recommendation that the Board review annually the dues. According to the Bylaws of the Board, they set dues at the April meeting. That is concurrent with when they look at the Unified Planning Work Program and establish the federal work program requirements. In advance of the April meeting, Mr. Ransom wanted to update the Board on where they stand this year. He referred to the distributed memo. There were two things that the policy resolution recommended staff do and that was to look at an employment cost index and review distributions of populations between the cities and the county, and on a 5-year cycle look at the formula overall. Given that they are in the interim, Mr. Ransom has looked at the employment cost index and the populations, and some findings are included in the memo. Staff is not recommending dues increase this year for these reasons: In their federal funding that comes from the Feds to the State and to the MPO, with the adoption of the FAST Lane Act, at the federal level, there is a slight uptick of formula planning money coming to RTC. The employment cost index didn't show a significant change in cost. The population distribution showed no major changes. Staff is recommending no change to member dues for 2018. They will build the Unified Planning Work Program budget schedule on current dues.

Mr. Ransom provided a memo and said the Bylaws of RTC require that every five years they are reviewed. It doesn't mean they have to be changed, but that there is some review. The last time they were reviewed was in 2012, so this is the five year mark. The Bylaws prescribe the procedure for review. That is that the Chair establish a committee, the committee consist of three to five members, and the Vice Chair is the Committee Chair of the Bylaws Committee. Mr. Ransom said he has talked with the Chair and Vice Chair about this. He is recommending membership and listed in the memo under Sub-Committee members. This includes 1 member of Clark County, 1 member of the City of Vancouver, 1 member of the City of Ridgefield (Committee Chair), 1 member of C-TRAN, and 1 member of WSDOT. Staff support to the committee will be Mr. Ransom and General Counsel to the Board Ted Gathe. They are anticipating three meetings, possibly four. The committee would start up in April and complete the committee work by early fall and bring updates of any changes to the Board with action by December.

Mr. Ransom said he and Ted Gathe have reviewed the Bylaws in their entirety and marked them up and highlighted the areas where language could be improved or even restructured to make them more organized. He said the Bylaws are the governing rules of the organization. These have not been substantively changed since 1992. Mr. Ransom said he thought it was time to take a look at them and make the language clear. Mr. Ransom said they would brief the committee as soon as they convene it.

Mr. Ransom said the Bi-State Coordination Committee will meet after JPACT on March 16 at 9:30 a.m. at Metro. JPACT meets Thursday, March 16, 2017, at Metro at 7:30 a.m.

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

XII. Adjourn

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR ADJOURNMENT. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ANNE MCENERY-OGLE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Jeanne E. Stewart, Board of Directors Chair