

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Board of Directors
May 2, 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, May 2, 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
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Councilmember
Jeff Hamm, C-TRAN Executive Director/CEO
Jim Herman, Port of Klickitat Commissioner
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver Council
Jerry Oliver, Port of Vancouver Commissioner
Ron Onslow, Ridgefield Mayor
Eileen Quiring, Clark County Councilor
Jeanne Stewart, Clark County Councilor
Kris Strickler, WSDOT Regional Administrator

Voting Board Members Absent:

Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor
Tom Lannen, Skamania Co. Commissioner
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:

Brittany Bagent, CREDC
Mike Bomar, CREDC
Joshua Egan, Citizen
Jim Hagar, Port of Vancouver
Lee L. Jensen, Citizen
Matt Kunic, WSDOT HQ
David McDevitt, Citizen
James Moeller, Citizen
Scott Patterson, C-TRAN
Sean Philbrook, Identity Clark County
Mike Pond, Citizen
Kari Schlosshauer, Safe Routes to School National Partnership
Celia Sherbeck, C-TRAN
Ty Stober, Vancouver Councilmember
Marc Thornsbury, Port of Klickitat
Margaret Tweet, Citizen
Michael A. Williams, WSDOT SW Region

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

ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MAY 2, 2017, MEETING AGENDA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY JACK BURKMAN AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Kris Strickler entered the meeting at 4:05 p.m.

III. Call for Public Comments

Margaret Tweet from Camas said if more tax dollars are spent on the Columbia River crossing I-5 replacement bridge many cost management solutions need to be implemented. She said a bridge design option with Bus Rapid Transit should be considered versus a more costly light rail. She also said accurate, up to date water levels for the Columbia River should be obtained. This would ensure that the bridge is not too low or not too high for the air traffic above. Ms. Tweet asked the Board to take these requests into account. A copy of her comments was submitted.

IV. Approval of April 4, 2017, Minutes

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 4, 2017, MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY RON ONSLOW AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

V. Consent Agenda

A. May Claims

B. Regional Traffic Counting Services Contract, Resolution 05-17-06

ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA MAY CLAIMS AND RESOLUTION 05-17-06. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY PAUL GREENLEE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VI. FY 2018 Unified Planning Work Program, Resolution 05-17-07

Lynda David referred to the resolution included in the meeting packet along with the draft 2018 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) document that was distributed and Metro's draft 2017-2018 UPWP that was available electronically.

Ms. David said the Board is being asked for action to adopt RTC's FY 2018 UPWP as outlined at the April Board meeting. The UPWP is a federally required document that describes transportation planning activities anticipated in the region in the fiscal year. The development of the UPWP is one of the core metropolitan planning elements mandated in federal law and required for the receipt of all federal and state transportation funds to the region. The FY 2018 UPWP covers the year from July 1, 2017 through to June 30, 2018.

Ms. David provided an outline of the UPWP format with its four major sections. The final page of the document provides a summary spreadsheet showing revenue sources and expenditures. This outlines how the federal dollars will be used. In a region such as RTC, where there are two Metropolitan Planning Organizations, RTC and Metro, it is necessary for both organizations to coordinate on development of the draft UPWP and endorse each other's work program. This

has occurred through mutual representation on RTC's Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC) and Metro's Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC), RTC Board, and Metro's Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), and at meetings with the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration and both states Departments of Transportation at a meeting on February 23, 2017.

RTC Board action is requested to approve Resolution 05-17-07 to adopt RTC's FY 2018 UPWP. Adoption will allow RTC Executive Director the authority to file applications for federal funding, execute grant agreements, and to file any assurances or required documentation relating to FY 2018 Unified Planning Work Program. Adoption of the resolution will allow RTC as the Metropolitan Planning Organization local funding agreements with local jurisdictions to help to provide the local match in federal funds.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 05-17-07 TO ADOPT RTC'S FY 2018 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY JACK BURKMAN.

Jerry Oliver said he has read the entire document. He thanked Mr. Ransom for the nine pages of acronyms. He said he could not find the meaning for federal STP. Mr. Ransom said STP stands for Surface Transportation Program. Mr. Ransom said the STP program was called that prior to the enactment of the FAST Act. After the FAST Act was enacted, the program, according to congress, was renamed STBG, Surface Transportation Block Grant. Ms. David said it was at the request of the Federal Highway Administration to change the acronym.

Commissioner Oliver wanted to clarify that the total revenue dollars that come to RTC is \$1,957,700. Ms. David said total funding listed for FTA is shown as \$326,000. The reality is that FTA has not released $\frac{3}{4}$ of the funds for 2017. She said they had just received word this week that they released those funds.

Paul Greenlee said his action noted the scribe's errors, and Jack Burkman supported that.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VII. Regional Economic Development Plan Update, Columbia River Economic Development Council

Matt Ransom said he invited Columbia River Economic Development Council president Mike Bomar to present this afternoon. He said the intention of the presentation was to put before the Board discussion of the Regional Economic Development Plan. This is important at this time because he had heard the Board express their interest in economic development and in particular their how RTC's actions, as transportation investment and policy, affect the development of jobs within the community.

Mr. Ransom said it is pretty clearly understood the linkage between infrastructure investment and job development and activity. He said there is much more nuance that needs to be understood in this area when they look to infill and where the jobs are and the skills, needs, and gaps. Any of these items that CREDC can bring to the table based on their research that can inform how we look at infrastructure that we need and perhaps maintain, as well as fill in

any gaps. Those are useful insights that will inform us as we go through this process. Mr. Ransom thanked Mr. Bomar for his participation.

Mike Bomar thanked the Board for the opportunity to bring economic development into the community. Mr. Bomar said their mission is to accelerate business growth and innovation in Clark County, Washington. He said they do that in partnership with their public sector, private sector, and education departments in the community. They serve two main roles: to be a concierge to existing businesses and those looking to relocate into the area as well.

Mr. Bomar said they have a team of seven at CREDC; four directors, a marketing manager, a fiscal administrator, and himself. They are focused around their existing economic development plan. Now it is their previous economic development plan and transitioning. He said it is a great team. Mr. Bomar said they are a part of the federal economic development district that recognizes the economic development unit of this region, in Portland, Hillsboro, and Vancouver, MSA. It is a seven-county region: Columbia, Washington, Yamhill, Clackamas, Multnomah, Clark, and Skamania Counties. This is where the work force comes from, where they move and operate, and how the goods and services move throughout the system. They try to work with their regional partners on making sure they leverage the political differences in terms of tax structure and the opportunities that happen on both sides of the river to try to tailor any opportunities that they have.

Activity to date – Mr. Bomar said it has been a very, very active year with a lot of events in manufacturing; a lot of foreign direct investment. They see this as a good thing overall. They are looking at bringing new investments in and helping existing companies expand. In 2017, there have been a lot of out-of-area companies looking to relocate or expand within Clark County. Most recent is a wearable technology firm. This allows a construction helmet to capture an on-site work area to a screen where someone behind a desk with more experience is able to work with an apprentice or someone else to help them through the project.

The Employment Land Study was completed in November 2016. Mr. Bomar said they are currently going through the policy recommendations and looking at ways to incorporate that work. They are looking at those key sites; how to prioritize, how to better understand their employment land so it lines up with the type of companies they want to see and timelines that they have to be in.

Mr. Bomar said one of the biggest things that they as an organization have developed is the comprehensive Economic Development Plan. They have done the data work, the Phase 1 Vision and the principles around that. They will be working on the Economic Development Plan Update. The Regional Marketing is a third initiative. This is to coordinate and leverage marketing efforts with regional partners.

The Employment Land Study looked at 56 sites - 20 acres or larger (3,000 net developable acres). This was across seven jurisdictions. They have 15 sites that are Tier 1, which is 6 months to development-ready; 29 sites at Tier 2b, which is 13-30 months to development-ready; and 12 sites at Tier 3, which is 30+ months to development-ready. In addition to what

they did in the 2011 study, they did a Phase II look at specific uses. If it is a tech park or an office campus, actually look at that use for the specific site, and what that gap might be for a developer if they were trying to put that use for the site. Mr. Bomar noted that transportation was one of the biggest, over half of the investment. They saw about \$40 million in investments to lead to over \$70 million in terms of tax revenue over a 20-year period.

In Phase I of the Economic Development Plan Update looked at their strategic goals with their 20-year vision. Their guiding principles were industry driven, existing businesses first, people and business, inclusive community, and value of place. Phase II would be to finish up in Q3 of 2017.

Their Vision Statement: Clark County is one of the most inclusive, healthy, and amenity rich communities in the country. With a continued focus to grow a diverse base of community-minded employers, talent (inside and outside the region) sees greater opportunity here than anywhere else in the country.

They looked at broad benchmark counties in areas, not just looking at the major metropolitan cities, but areas that were most like Clark County. They looked at a couple different factors: what the primary city was, the major metro, and if they had a university. The biggest takeaway, and a bit of a shock to them was that when compared to the Portland MSA, we are lacking still on education attainment. We are slightly older on the age side. We still depend heavily on regional talent in terms of both businesses that our companies work with and the employees themselves. Business formation is lagging.

Looking at the specific clusters being industry focused. In 2011, they had tech services and products, wealth management, agricultural processing, healthcare management, and logistics and distribution. Last year, Greater Portland Inc. had a 2020 plan that had metals and machinery, computer and electronics, clean tech, athletic and outdoor, software and media, and health sciences and technology.

They looked at their location quotient that looks at how likely someone here would be working in a certain field, their skillset. What is the industry cluster both in the size of the companies that we have and the amount of companies that we have in the area? What is their growth projection for those industries in the next five years? Regionally, what does that look like in terms of supply chain account? They came up with software, computer/electronics, clean tech, metals and machinery, and life sciences (manufacturing).

Their 2011 Economic Development Plan really resolved around being a high tech hub, attracting foreign direct investment, leveraging their educational partnerships they have, building a business growth lifeline, and lands for jobs.

The shift for their 2017 Economic Development Plan is about supporting existing businesses first, supporting the people, and creating a place. It goes back to focusing specifically on what our industry clusters need in terms of transportation and land and siting.

In the 2011 Plan, the I-5 Bridge was specifically called out as a project that they should support; as well as the road infrastructure investments to move workforce and goods throughout the county, and investing in freight rail capacity. It is a place where road, river, rail, and runway all come together.

The new Plan focuses on Goal 1 of Expanding the Existing Base: becoming industry experts, strategically market industry clusters, and build a startup ecosystem. Goal 2 Support People: foster skills development, prepare youth for economic opportunity, launch a brain gain initiative, and promote an ethical and socially just society through an intentional commitment to inclusion, equality, and diversity. Goal 3 Create Place: all of Clark County's cities and Ports are looking at specific strategies for each of those places; embrace economic opportunity in our urban center recognizing that Vancouver has its own economic development opportunity; CREDC tells the story of place with custom tours and partnerships; make employment areas desired by industry clusters shovel ready; determine all transportation needs on a regional level specifically to support economic development.

Mr. Bomar highlighted some hot topics. Parking demand: Parking in the Vancouver core area is limited. The I-5 Bridge and corridor: They gave 80 of their major employers to WSU surveys and interviewed 25 of those. Far and away the biggest issue hindering economic growth was congestion on the I-5 corridor. Active transportation projects: throughout the region have a lot of interest. Outliners with significant regional impact (i.e. Ilani Casino and Resort): Computers and electronics' role in emerging transportation systems (i.e. smart vehicles, autonomous vehicles).

Paul Greenlee asked what the demand was that they are trying to fill, the size, and the infrastructure need. Mr. Bomar said for smaller sites (20 acres or less) specifically, a lot is market driven and around location and amenities associated with that. It depends on what you are trying to attract. Having urban amenities with a rural opportunity and a cost savings associated with being a bit further out is a good combination.

Jeff Hamm said he assumed that the 3,000 acres line up with the County's Comprehensive Plan for industrial land. He asked if RTC's RT, travel demand model takes this into consideration. Mark Harrington said they are working with the County and cities' staff to update their land use forecast for 2040 based on the recently adopted Comp plans. They had 2035 and are updating to 2040 with additional households and employment allocated to 2040. It should take into account what the local jurisdictions have planned. So the 3,000 acres are included in that model.

Jerry Oliver said parking was an issue for the core area. He asked if there were long-term plans to address it. Mr. Bomar said it is a hot topic, but not the core requirement for most of the companies that they are working with. The challenge they see from their client's standpoint is that the expectation for parking is higher than what can be offered. He said some type of public/private partnership opportunity would make sense. He said a lot of employers, particularly on the tech side and software side, really want to be walkable to downtown in the

next year. Most of them are still driving. If there is not a mass transit option here to get them here, BRT is a benefit in terms of opportunity and a way to market what those options are.

Marc Boldt entered the meeting at 4:45 p.m.

Jerry Oliver asked about the volume of interest that they are getting from companies who want to locate in the core area. Mr. Bomar said it is pretty steady. For tech/manufacturing it is in the outlying areas, but for software specifically, it is usually for the mix of downtown.

Matt Ransom thanked Mr. Bomar and his team for participating today. Mr. Ransom said his intention is to invite CREDC back to present some of their findings and conclusions later this fall. Relative to this Board and the work that staff is doing in getting our Plan off the ground; most of the work they will be pursuing this summer is the background work. Mark spoke about the travel modeling work that they are starting to prepare. They will be doing some conditions reporting assessment, what has changed, population and employment, job development, infrastructure conditions, and etc. This is to take inventory of where our Plan was, where we are now, and what factors have changed. This summer they will also be prepared to roll out some type of community engagement process. This is the last report until fall. The bridge corridor is currently part of the Plan. Legislatively, it looks like some things are starting to take shape. Mr. Ransom said he thought active transportation projects are key for this region. He said the commuting pattern of past and commuting pattern of 20 years from now both in terms of behavior and the method of commuting needs to be inventoried and taken in stock and learn from that. He said the autonomous vehicles, smart cities, and smart infrastructure is a significant issue in front of us in looking at the Plan update. He said they need to look at how to start to lay the ground work using the resources that we have to make smart investments, and also to lay out a regional plan or strategy.

Jeanne Stewart said in talking about making autonomous vehicle plans, she said the practical sense of her says we need to look at our transportation gridlock first and deal with that; get the bottleneck unleashed before we spend a lot of time looking at other things. Councilor Stewart said some of it will likely be parallel. She said progress on reducing congestion needs to be a key focus in whatever is done.

VIII. 2016 Congestion Management Process, Initial Data

Matt Ransom said building on the comments that were just made, one of the key responsibilities of an MPO under federal law is to produce a congestion monitoring report. He said each MPO does this slightly different. It is the governing Board of this body and staff have collaborated on what we report, which is primarily focused on collection of data then monitoring that data year after year so we can understand trends and implications. Dale will begin to share this. It will be the first of three sessions on this.

Dale Robins said this is initial data collected within Clark County for the Congestion Management Process or CMP. Mr. Robins said further information will be provided to the Board for discussion at the June meeting and final input and adoption at the August meeting.

Mr. Robins said the CMP process is a federal requirement. The Federal Highway Administration requires all Metropolitan Planning Organizations of our size to do this, but they do give flexibility on how each region addresses it. RTC chooses to do an annual monitoring report. The CMP is a systematic and data driven approach for monitoring congestion. Local agencies really need to take this information and develop action strategies.

Mr. Robins said with continual growth in regional employment, population, and economic activity, the region is experiencing additional demand on many of the critical transportation corridors. He said this is a good thing, compared to high unemployment and a slowing economy. However, with this growth, they are seeing additional delay on bi-State corridors, less reliable travel times, arterial congestion, and delay at major intersections. This congestion is most apparent during morning and evening commute periods. Mr. Robins said we need to understand that congestion is part of a thriving urban environment. All urban areas have congestion. We do not have the ability or resources to build a transportation system to accommodate the peak one hour. What we can do, is analyze this data and develop solutions to optimize the transportation system we do have.

Mr. Robins presented several slides that provided a quick summary of some of the initial bi-state data from 2016 (I-5 south, I-205 south, and SR-14 central). The first slide displayed how the morning peak speeds have changed over the last five years (2011 – 2016). The good news is that the I-5 south corridor did not get any worse between 2015 and 2016. However, the region did experience a significant decrease in speeds along the I-205 corridor as the average speed decreased from 48 mph to 25 mph. Speeds on these critical corridors decreased between 55% and 71% over the last five years.

Jack Burkman asked what segments of I-5, I-205, and SR-14 this referred to. Mr. Robins said I-5 south is from Main Street to Jantzen Beach. This corridor experienced an increase in delay of about 18 minutes over the five year period. The I-205 south corridor is from SR-500 to Airport Way. This corridor experienced about an 8 minute delay. The SR-14 central is from 192nd Avenue to I-205, and this corridor also experienced about an 8 minute delay.

Chair Stewart asked about the section of I-5 not being worse than it was seven years ago. Mr. Robins said their data actually showed a 20 second improvement in 2016 over 2015. That is within the margin of error, which means that we are pretty much at the same level of 2015. He said it might be that corridor is averaging 9 mph, it can't get too much slower than that. Chair Stewart said that is what she was getting at. It can't get much worse; it is just bad. Mr. Robins said it is bad; there are times when the backup will go further north.

Jack Burkman said at 9 mph, many people choose to leave I-5 and find other ways through the city or try other routes. It may not accomplish much, but many do divert. This may not show up in the timing.

Marc Boldt said they have information on I-5 from Main Street to Jantzen Beach. He asked if they have the same information from Jantzen Beach further south for the same time period. Mr. Robins said they will have more information at next month's meeting. He said they have

that information on I-5 down to I-84 and would provide that next month. Councilor Boldt said he would like to compare this information with that on the same slide to actually see that the bridge has something to do with it. Mr. Robins said he would provide that next month.

Mr. Robins said they experienced similar delay in both the I-5 and I-205 corridors during the morning commute for transit service.

Jack Burkman asked that the definitions for each of the corridors be noted on the slides in order to clarify which section is being referenced. Mr. Robins noted that the memorandum also has more detailed information on the data.

Over the last five years, they have seen average Columbia River Bridge Crossings across I-5 and I-205 bridges increase by over 24,000 vehicles a day. However, due to congestion, they are seeing a through put decline during the morning and evening peak periods. Mr. Robins said this is similar to pouring water through a funnel. If you pour too much at once, water will back up and overflow. During peak times, they are putting too many vehicles on the bridges at once and they are seeing a backup. Comparing 2011 to 2016 between 6:00 and 8:00 a.m. southbound they are getting approximately 500 less vehicles across the two bridges. Between 4:00 and 6:00 p.m. northbound they are getting 900 less vehicles across the two bridges.

The region is experiencing peak spreading as trips start either earlier or later to avoid the most congested times. The peak hour has become a peak 4-hour period. What that means is that we are still able to get more vehicles across the two bridges during a four hour peak period, while we get fewer vehicles during a peak two-hour period.

For bi-state transit, C-TRAN's ridership for commuter routes did grow over the last 5 years. One of C-TRAN's strategies to enhance service has been to use the I-5 corridor HOV lanes in the evening peak period to save travel time for both I-5 and I-205 commuter routes.

Mr. Robins showed how speeds have decreased in the I-205 corridor. Through the whole corridor they see a decrease in speeds, but they saw less of a decrease from SR-14 to Airport Way. This seems to indicate that what they are seeing is that at SR-14 and the bridge, they are seeing additional congestion causing a backup further north as traffic is backing up at SR-500. That area has slower speeds than once you are past SR-14. The same thing is occurring in the I-5 corridor. Peak speeds pick up once you get south of Mill Plain and more once you are south of SR-14. SR-14 in the morning peak is backed up until you get on I-205 and head south. That is where most of the traffic is going. Also, SR-14 speeds pick up westbound after I-205.

Mr. Robins said the Bi-State Regional Transportation Plan strategy includes a long-term I-5 Bridge replacement with additional lanes. A short-term strategy is to get the most out of the current system. This includes a freeway operational study, which is programmed in the Transportation Improvement Program.

A new item that they will discuss in this year's report is arterial active traffic management. One example of active traffic management is the work completed along Andresen Road between 63rd Street and 88th Street by Clark County. As part of the TSMO Phase 2 project, the County

made signal improvements that resulted in positive impacts on north/south traffic flow along this corridor. Basically, drivers will approach more green traffic signals and less red, thus increasing the flow of traffic.

Mr. Robins provided a few slides with corridor congestion indicators. For Corridor Capacity Ratio, I-5 south is still the slowest corridor followed by 18th Street, SR-14 Central, Main Street, and I-205 South. Corridor Speed Percentage has I-5 South, SR-14 Central, Andresen, I-205 South, and SR-500 West. Intersection Delay shows Fourth Plain/Andresen northbound in the p.m. peak period tops the list with an average delay of 256 seconds. This is followed by Fourth Plain/SR-500 with 180 second delay in the eastbound. SR-500/Falk Road eastbound has 146 seconds delay followed by Padden/94th Avenue, and 134th Street/NE 20th Avenue.

Chair Stewart referred to the SR-500/Falk Road interchange and said it is becoming increasingly dangerous, not just because of volumes but that stretch of roadway has no lights. She also noted the merging lanes add to the danger at that intersection.

Jack Burkman said this is another area that he recommends pushing on the legislature. On our priority list, the number one project for interstate/state expressway projects is SR-14 from I-205 to 164th. The next project is the SR-500/Falk Road.

Mr. Robins said they will complete analysis and return next month with additional data. They will have data review, and in August, they will have the final report and action.

Marc Boldt referred to the presentation last year on the weave movements on I-205 from SR-500. He said it would be interesting to know where the spots are and what can be done. Mr. Robins said a Freeway Operations Study is programmed in the TIP to look at those types of issues and decide what kind of low cost improvements can be made to make the system operate better.

Eileen Quiring referred to slide 6 with the morning peak southbound travel speeds over the river that are increasingly congested. She asked what is expected in the long term I-5 bridge replacement as far as reducing the congestion. She asked how wide the bridge is going to be and how much will it reduce when really much of it goes through the Rose Quarter where there is another big backup. She asked if we shouldn't be more forward thinking in our planning about some other corridors to go over the bridge. Councilor Quiring said it is glaring to her that we only have two corridors, and it seems a much better solution to try to increase the corridors rather than repair something that really isn't going to do much to alleviate it.

Jack Burkman said studies were done during the Columbia River Crossing project time that are very illustrative of the amount of time that does get saved, even including the congestion around the Rose Quarter. He said we need to fix the first problems first, which is the I-5 corridor. He said Councilor Quiring was right, we do need additional crossings. About ten years ago, a transportation study for the region said we do need more, but that doesn't alleviate the issue that occurs with the I-5 corridor. This is a corridor, because when talking about other bridges across the river, it is a corridor question and how it is addressed. It is a matter of sequencing.

Chair Stewart followed up on Councilor Quiring's question. She said in her experience in looking at the I-5 crossing, the original CRC, she still questions whether fixing I-5 is the first priority and finding a third corridor or at least simultaneously working on a third corridor is not the most sensible long-term plan. She said they need to remember it is not just where we can land it on the Washington side; it is the will of Metro and other organizations coordinating that. Those discussions need to be happening and happening in an environment where we openly listen.

IX. Transit Asset Management Performance Targets

Matt Ransom said staff presented their first report on MAP-21 performance planning requirements last month. The report was about safety and the work that they needed to do by the end of the year to develop their regional targets in consultation with the state. This is one of those requirements where C-TRAN is the lead agency, and under federal rules has to report to the MPO Board, and the MPO Board needs to concur with their performance targets. Lynda will present what has been presented to the C-TRAN Board which they have concurred with.

Lynda David referred to the memorandum included in the meeting packet. She will provide a review of Performance Based transportation Planning and Programming first required by the previous federal transportation act, MAP-21; will look at the timeline for addressing Transit Asset Management and review C-TRAN's initial State of Good Repair targets as part of the TAM program; and will consider the role of RTC in Transit Asset Management.

Performance Based Planning and Programming first required in the federal transportation act, MAP-21, passed in 2012, and continued with the current FAST-Act. Following MAP-21's passage, federal grant recipients are required to transition to performance-driven, outcome-based programs; linking investment priorities programmed in the Transportation Improvement Program to achieve performance targets, and in the case of transit agencies, there is the requirement to develop Transit Asset Management Plans.

Performance based planning has been addressed at previous RTC Board meetings. Performance measures were addressed in general at the August 2016 Board meeting and then last month the presentation focused on highway safety performance measures. This month they are focused on one of the required transit performance measures; transit asset management and how to keep transit assets in a State of Good Repair.

Performance management is a strategic approach that uses performance data to inform decision-making and outcomes. When implemented effectively, performance management can improve project and program delivery, inform investment decisions, focus on leadership priorities, and provide greater transparency and accountability.

In MAP-21, Congress set seven national goals and charged the USDOT to use those goals to establish performance measures. State DOTs and transit agencies responsible for the relevant performance measures and goals have to set performance targets and develop performance plans for those targets.

The MPO, RTC, also has a role in the process. Once the DOT and transit agency establish performance targets, then the MPO needs to review the targets, certify them, and also track projects over time to make sure projects are consistent with Plans and help to make progress toward the targets and national goals.

Ms. David said they reviewed the seven national goals at the August 2016 meeting which she provided on a slide. The goals look to achieve a reduction in traffic and serious injuries on all public roads, maintain transportation infrastructure and assets in a state of good repair, achieve a significant reduction in congestion on the National Highway System, improve the national freight network to provide access to national and international trade markets, and support regional economic development. The performance-based transportation planning process is designed to work toward achieving these national goals. The two national goals for which transit agencies have to have performance measures are 1) Safety and 2) Infrastructure Conditions. Today, they are focused on infrastructure condition and the need to keep transit assets in a State of Good Repair.

In a series of rulemakings published in the Federal Register, the FHWA and FTA are establishing national performance measures in areas of safety, infrastructure condition, congestion, system reliability, emissions, and freight movement. FTA and FHWA published the final rule on Statewide and Metropolitan Transportation Planning on May 27, 2016, and FTA published the final rule on Transit Asset Management (TAM) on July 26, 2016. The final rule on planning establishes the requirement that states, MPOs, and operators of public transportation use performance measures to document expectations for future performance.

As the MPO for the region, RTC has a role in performance based planning and programming. Specific to transit asset management, the rules establish new requirements for MPOs to coordinate with transit providers, set State of Good Repair performance targets within 180 days of the transit agency, and integrate those performance targets and performance plans into the MPO's planning documents; the Regional Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program, for Plans and Programs adopted by the MPO on or after October 1, 2018. RTC's next Regional Transportation Plan update will have to include these transportation performance measures and targets.

Ms. David highlighted key dates in implementing Transit Asset Management. The final rule for Transit Asset Management was published in July 2016 with the final rule becoming effective on October 1, 2016. Transit agencies had to set initial targets for State of Good Repair by January 1, 2017 with the MPO establishing targets within 180 days. This 180 days deadline is why staff has brought this to the Board with a presentation on the subject and will ask for concurrence with the initial State of Good Repair targets at next month's meeting. C-TRAN has until October 2018 to develop their Transit Asset Management Plan with the Plan being good for four years, though amendments can be made at any time. C-TRAN will need to submit reports on their assets' State of Good Repair to the National Transit Database annually.

A slide listed the Federal Transit Administration's Transit Asset Management requirements of a Tier 1 agency such as C-TRAN. This list was also provided in the memorandum.

For several years, C-TRAN has already been working on some of the elements. C-TRAN already has an inventory of all capital assets, and on an annual basis reviews and assesses the condition of the assets and reports to WSDOT. With FTA's new Transit Asset Management requirements, C-TRAN may need to modify the methodology used for assessing the condition of assets and there will be time and effort expended on developing the TAM Plan.

The FTA defines four methods that can be used to define whether or not transit assets are in a State of Good Repair. They range from simple age-based methods to condition-based where assets are replaced once deterioration is observed or performance based where assets are replaced when their condition results in reduced speed or reliability. The comprehensive method may include age, reliability, and maintenance history in determining the state of repair. This may be the most accurate at determining the State of Good Repair but requires greater resources to make the assessment.

Ms. David provided a slide that summarizes the initial State of Good Repair targets reviewed with C-TRAN's Board last December and established by C-TRAN by the January 1, 2017 deadline. These were also listed in the memorandum. These are the targets staff will be asking for the RTC Board's concurrence with at next month's Board meeting.

C-TRAN is required to report on three asset categories: Rolling Stock, Facilities, and Equipment. Targets relate to the Useful Life Benchmark for both rolling stock and equipment. The Useful Life Benchmark (ULB) is the expected lifecycle of a capital asset or the acceptable period of use in service for a particular transit provider's operating environment. The initial targets set by C-TRAN which relate to life benchmarks are consistent with what is emerging as the transit industry's norm.

C-TRAN's target is for 80% of their rolling stock vehicles to be within their useful life or younger and 70% of their equipment. For facilities, C-TRAN will use a TERM scale which is a fairly simple condition scale ranging from 1 which is excellent (or nearly new condition), to 5 which is poor condition. C-TRAN believes these initial targets represent a good balance between capital availability to fund assets and maintenance, and the system's safety, performance, and reliability.

Next steps include the following: At the next RTC Board meeting on June 6, the Board will be asked for concurrence with C-TRAN's initial State of Good Repair targets. Unlike the highway safety measures previewed at last month's Board meeting, there are no penalties or incentives for meeting or missing a TAM performance measure target. C-TRAN has until October 1, 2018 to establish its Transit Asset Management Plan. Regional Transportation Plans and Transportation Improvement Programs adopted by RTC after October 2018 will need to reflect the Transit Asset Management performance measures and targets, and there will be annual reporting on the status of State of Good Repair by C-TRAN.

Marc Boldt said as a C-TRAN member, safety and good repair are important. As an RTC member, he asked if our concern was related to a bus breaking down and blocking the roadway or how that relates. Ms. David said RTC, as the regional transportation agency, needs to be aware of the condition of assets of C-TRAN because we will need to program in the Transportation Improvement Program if the assets are not being kept in a state of good repair. The RTC has a balancing act to do. They have not only the transit asset management; they have transit safety along with all the other highway performance measures they have to balance. They reviewed safety at last month's meeting. If we are not making progress towards the safety performance target, then there are some repercussions on the use of the transportation dollars statewide. Some of those dollars would have to be put toward safety projects. Ms. David said they also have to look at pavement conditions. If a jurisdiction is doing a great job, they won't necessarily get dollars, but if their pavement condition is poor or deteriorating, then they will need to address that. She said they will need to get good at the balancing act. Ms. David said the goal is to have the data so they know the condition and can anticipate where there may be an ensuing issue or problem.

X. Other Business

From the Executive Director

Matt Ransom provided three Agency Project Showcases. The first project is 94th Avenue, Padden Parkway – NE 99th Street. This was a roadway project for Clark County. The investment from RTC in this project was \$3,600,000 with a total project cost of \$8,922,000. This was an arterial upgrade.

The City of Vancouver had a signal communications fiber project on 162nd Avenue. This was a federal investment from RTC of \$179,300 with a total project cost of \$211,000.

A grant to the City of Vancouver with RTC funding of \$200,000 with total project cost of \$231,214. This project was under the demand management program. The City of Vancouver developed what they call the Designation Downtown Program. This implemented through outreach campaigns and promotions, incentives for using non-SOV commute trips, increased carpool spaces in downtown, and events and employee workshops. They had good response to the program.

Paul Greenlee asked of the fiber project if there was a lot of available bandwidth. Mr. Ransom said yes, that the Vancouver Area Smart Trek (VAST) program is managed by RTC on behalf of our original partners. One of the components of that program is to have a sharing contract relationship. When a jurisdiction installs the fiber and there are excess fiber strands, this allows the agencies to contract with each other to use the available capacity.

Mr. Greenlee said that was a good partnership. He said he has been encouraging the city of Washougal whenever they open a trench they should bury conduit. Conduit costs almost nothing; a trench costs 100s if not 1,000s of dollars a foot. He said in looking at autonomous vehicles, we need that infrastructure.

Anne McEnery-Ogle said they had an update on the Destination Downtown yesterday. She said it continues to decrease single occupant vehicles an average of 8%; over 1,000 individuals and 500 businesses.

Mr. Ransom has been tracking the State Legislative Session and provided an update with a handout. He said out of the General Session that wrapped up at the end of April, the Legislature was able to pass forward an operating and capital budget for the Washington DOT. That enables them to continue to work on their projects and the projects that were funded through Connecting Washington. Notable changes in the Appropriations Bill include funds from the SR-14/Camas Slough Bridge project moved to the SR-14 (I-205 to SE 164th Ave.) widening project. Funding begins to flow to that project in the 2017-2019 biennium. This is good news for the region. A notable study is funding for a high-speed rail study from Portland to Vancouver, B.C. with a stop in Vancouver. When appropriate, a report will be provided back to the Board with the findings. Senate Bill 5806 was the bill proposed by SW Legislative delegation to initiate a restart of conversations on the I-5 Bridge corridor. This creates a Legislative task force and allows the Department of Transportation to inventory existing projects files. This has passed the Legislature and on the desk of the Governor for signature. A bill that would affect RTPOs across the state is one that creates a new RTPO. It might reduce RTC's funding slightly, but pretty insignificant. RTC's work is done for this session unless something comes up in the special session; staff will pick it up next year.

Chair Stewart said the impact to RTC is to be determined. Mr. Ransom said that was correct. He said on Senate Bill 5806 and the Bi-State Legislative Task force, he believed that as they start to organize (the Legislature group and DOT and others), who is in charge and how this is to be done is forthcoming. He said he would be involved in those conversations and likely be involved in some form or another.

Jeff Hamm asked who would be in charge of spending the \$350,000 to assess the inventory as to what is good and what is not, usable or not?

Kris Strickler said Substitute Bill 5806 that went forward had two elements that changed: the designation of the project to a project of statewide significance was not in SSB 5806. It was left as a recommendation to be made to the Legislative Action Committee. The establishment of the Legislative Action Committee originally was identified as the Governor's establishment and is now established within the House and Senate leadership minority of each house. It is essentially a 16 member group, 8 from Washington and 8 from Oregon. They have tasked the DOT with addressing the inventory of the work by December 1 of 2017. They have tasked themselves of having their first meeting by December 15, 2017. In that they make a request to the Oregon partners; they certainly can't compel the Oregon partners. As part of that, the Legislative Action Committee with their first meeting in December of this year would then direct the DOT to do additional work to answer more questions and address some of the things that are outlined in the Bill and come back to the larger Legislative body by December of 2018 with a report. DOT does the inventory until December 1 of this year with them, and they direct some of the work after that.

Jeff Hamm asked if this is Olympia or SW Region DOT. Mr. Strickler said it is both, but they intend to do the work here in Vancouver.

Mr. Ransom noted JPACT meets Thursday, May 18, 2017, at Metro at 7:30 a.m.

Mr. Ransom said the City of Vancouver has organized a multi-agency contingent and invited RTC to participate in a peer exchange in Minneapolis, Minnesota May 22 – 26. A whole day and a half is set aside to review and learn about regional transportation issues within that metro area. He said he would report back to the Board next month.

Chair Stewart asked if there was an outreach to the County Council. Marc Boldt said Marc McCauley was going.

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, June 6, 2017, at 4 p.m.

XI. Adjourn

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR ADJOURNMENT. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY JACK BURKMAN AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Jeanne E. Stewart, Board of Directors Chair