

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Board of Directors
September 5, 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, September 5, at 4:00 p.m. at the Clark County Public Service Center Sixth Floor Training Room, 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington. The meeting was televised and recorded by CVTV. Attendance follows.

Voting Board Members Present:

Marc Boldt, Clark County Councilor
Jack Burkman, Vancouver Councilmember
Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor
Shawn Donaghy, C-TRAN Exec. Director/CEO
Bart Gernhart, WSDOT (alternate)
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Councilmember
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver Council
Jerry Oliver, Port of Vancouver Commissioner
Eileen Quiring, Clark County Councilor
Jeanne Stewart, Clark County Councilor

Voting Board Members Absent:

Jim Herman, Port of Klickitat Commissioner
Tom Lannen, Skamania Co. Commissioner
Ron Onslow, Ridgefield Mayor
Kris Strickler, WSDOT Regional Administrator
Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1 Manager

Nonvoting Board Members Present:

Nonvoting Board Members Absent:

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

Al Bauer, Citizen
Rian Davis, Clark County Assn. of Realtors
Lori Figone, WSDOT Vancouver
Carley Francis, WSDOT Vancouver
Scott Hughes, Port of Ridgefield Commissioner
Sarah Kohout, Rep. Monica Stonier's Office
David McDevitt, Citizen
Mark Nickerson, WSDOT Olympia
Scott Patterson, C-TRAN
Mike Pond, Citizen
Xavier Reynolds, Citizen
Natalie Richards, Citizen
Ty Stober, Vancouver Councilmember
Carter Timmerman, WSDOT Olympia
Richard Warren, WSDOT Seattle

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

Mr. Ransom noted the meeting room has been updated with new audio/visual capabilities. This is the first full meeting test, so he asked that all bear with them in working with the new system.

II. Approval of the Board Agenda

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 5, 2017, MEETING AGENDA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MARC BOLDT AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

III. Call for Public Comments

Natalie Richards from Vancouver spoke about a need for an HOV lane implementation. She and 16 coworkers are working to move this forward. She said they have contacted FHWA in Washington D.C. and local WSDOT and also said that C-TRAN's ridership would support HOV. Ms. Richards said they are going to have a petition to have a ballot measure to hopefully get the HOV implementation done. That won't occur until 2018, because the cutoff for the 2017 November ballot was June.

Chair Stewart asked if she was part of a group. Ms. Richards said yes; she and 16 coworkers as private citizens. They commute back and forth to the same company in Portland every day for work.

Shirley Craddick arrived at the meeting at 4:05 p.m.

IV. Approval of the August 1, 2017, Minutes

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 1, 2017, MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE AND APPROVED. BART GERNHART ABSTAINED.

V. Consent Agenda

- A. September Claims**
- B. FY 2018 Unified Planning Work Program Amendment – Human Services Transportation Plan Update, Resolution 09-17-13**
- C. 2017-2020 TIP Amendment: WSDOT I-5/E. Fork Lewis River Bridge NB Replacement, Resolution 09-17-14**

ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA SEPTEMBER CLAIMS AND RESOLUTIONS 09-17-13 AND 09-17-14. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY PAUL GREENLEE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VI. 2021 Regional Grant Program – Project Evaluation and Prioritization

Dale Robins said RTC, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Clark County Region, is responsible for selecting projects for regional allocation of Federal Highway funds. This includes the Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG), and the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funding. Federal regulations require that this be done through a competitive

process; allocations are not allowed. The goal of RTC's process is to assist local agencies in implementing the Regional Transportation Plan.

Mr. Robins highlighted the grant schedule. It began in June with the call for projects. It will end in October when the RTC Board awards grants. RTAC is also involved in making recommendations as they move through the process.

RTC received a total of 15 grants in July; 11 were eligible for the STBG and 4 for the CMAQ funding. Local agencies submitted their priority projects that are consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan. The total request was for \$15.6 million in funding. This means that RTC will be able to fund over half of the total requests.

Last year the Board adopted the Transportation Programming Guidebook that outlines the process that is used for the grant process. The three step process consists of: project screening; evaluation and ranking by selection criteria; and project selection and programming. All 15 projects were evaluated to be eligible for funding.

Mr. Robins listed the rank order and highlighted the 11 STBG projects. 1) RTC 2020 Regional Household Travel Survey; 1) RTC UPWP and CMP Support; 1) RTC VAST Coordination and Management; 4) Clark County Highway 99/NE 99th Street Intersection; 5) Vancouver SE 1st Street, 164th Ave. to 177th Ave.; 6) Battle Ground Eaton Boulevard, SW 20th Ave. to SR-503; 7) Clark County NE 99th Street, 94th Ave. 117th Ave.; 8) Vancouver Jefferson-Kauffman Realignment; 9) Clark County NE10th Avenue, 149th St. to 154th St.; 10) Battle Ground SW 20th Ave., SW 6th St. to Scotton Way; 11) Battle Ground SW 20th Ave., Eaton Blvd to Scotton Way.

Jack Burkman asked with the funding available, how many of these projects could be funded with this scoring list. Mr. Robins said it would fund projects 1 through 6 and half of the number 7 project, NE 99th Street.

Eileen Quiring asked about the Regional Household Travel Survey. With the survey done every 10 years, she asked if the same questions were asked. Mr. Robins said people are asked to keep a travel log of their trips. It helps to understand how people are traveling and how travel behavior is changing over a decade. Councilor Quiring said she wanted to understand what they do with all of the questions. It seemed a bit like "Big Brother" to her when she first read it. She asked how the information was actually used, and asked if they couldn't just ask how many times a day your vehicle was used.

Mr. Robins said they really need to understand what type of travel behavior people are making: are they combining trips, are they stopping at the grocery store on their way to work, how many people are traveling from Ridgefield to downtown Portland, and such. Mr. Robins said they get percentages based on the sample size. This is actually a region-wide survey. Metro is funding the exact same thing on their side of the river so it is to understand the travel behavior for the whole region. They don't have information about specific names of people, but they roughly know the number of people who are going from the various travel zones and what their behavior is. This helps them to understand the capacity that they need on a road system. It is not based on an individual. It is based on the behavior that people travel.

Mr. Robins said the survey is voluntary, and they are asked to track their travel behavior over a period of time. This helps them to calibrate the regional model so they can look at the loads that are put on the various road systems.

Mr. Ransom said this survey project is a couple years out. Mark Harrington is RTC's technical staff on the project. He said as they get closer to moving forward with the project, they would provide a more thorough briefing for the Board. There has been a lot of change in technology since the last survey. They used to complete the survey by hand in a log. Now, the technology allows them to put a transponder on the volunteer's vehicle with GPS, so it is more accurate. Mr. Ransom said they would bring this back to the Board in the future.

Mr. Robins said the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) fund had 4 projects eligible for funding. These are projects that benefit air quality and reduce congestion. The ranking is 1) Clark County NE 134th Corridor Adaptive Traffic Signal; 2) WSDOT I-205 NB at Mill Plain Ramp Meter; 3) Clark County System-Wide Signal Enhancement; and 4) C-TRAN 4, 40' Battery-Electric Replacement Buses.

Mr. Robins said with the Boards acceptance of the evaluation and ranking of projects, the projects will go to RTAC at their September 15 meeting. They will discuss a recommendation for funding. That will be brought back to the Board at their October meeting for approval.

Jack Burkman asked how many of the ranked CMAQ projects could be funded.

Mr. Robins said they would be able to fund all four projects, with only partial funding for the fourth project.

ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE GRANT PROJECTS' EVALUATION AND RANKING. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SHIRLEY CRADDICK AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VII. Regional Transportation Plan – 2018 Update, Population and Employment Forecast

Mark Harrington referred to the memo included in the meeting packet. Staff would be asking for Board adoption of the 2040 population and employment forecast for use in the 2018 RTP update. These forecasts will serve to form the land use in the future that they plan to address as well as provide a major input to regional transportation forecast modeling tools that will be used during Plan development.

Mr. Harrington reviewed the needs and requirements of the forecast. He said the RTP is required to have a 20-year planning horizon. The RTP has to be consistent with local adopted land use plans. They want to use the same growth assumptions and forecast that are used in local Comprehensive Plans so they maintain consistency. The population and employment forecasts are a major input into the regional travel forecasting models that are used during Plan development as well as continuing project development by jurisdictions throughout the region.

To address their 20-year horizon, it has been recommended that they adopt a 2040 forecast year for their horizon in the Plan. They understand that this is slightly beyond local jurisdictions 2035 forecasts used for the Comprehensive Plan. They have taken the 2035 forecast used in

the Comp. Plan and added five years beyond the existing adopted forecast. Mr. Harrington said they have coordinated with local jurisdiction planning staff to develop the five year jump to 2040.

For the 2040 population and households, it uses the same OFM medium population forecast that was adopted in the 2035 County Comprehensive Plan. The Comp. Plan for the County and local jurisdictions add another 15,224 persons to the forecast on top of that 2035 OFM. This brings the population to 600,361 persons in 2040. For persons per household, the Comp. Plan uses 2.66 persons per household in 2035. This takes it to 225,700 households in 2040.

For 2040 employment, they use the jobs to households' ratio from the Comp. Plan's 2035 forecast of 1.07 jobs per household resulting in 241,499 jobs in 2040.

The resulting growth from 2035 to 2040 is 22,930 people; 8,620 households, and 8,999 jobs.

Mr. Harrington said after adopting the 2040 forecasts, they will prepare the forecasts and allocations for use in the regional travel forecasting processes to support the RTP development.

Shirley Craddick asked if the population numbers are based on the MPO boundaries. Mr. Harrington said it was based on RTC's MPO boundaries. RTC is MPO to Clark County, so it is Clark County boundary. Mr. Harrington said when they do regional modeling, they do include the metropolitan area. They rely on the data from Metro for their population and employment figures in the modeling effort and vice versa. When Metro is doing their modeling, they rely on the numbers that RTC provides them.

Councilor Craddick asked why the focus is just on Clark County when the MPO boundary is larger. Mr. Harrington said the MPO boundary is Clark County. RTC's state RTPO is Clark, Skamania, and Klickitat Counties. Skamania and Klickitat Counties have their own Regional Transportation Plans.

Eileen Quiring asked if they were aware that there was a little controversy over the numbers that were used from the OFM for the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Harrington said yes, they were aware of that. Mr. Harrington said they were relying on is their need to base their future off of adopted land use plans. They don't want to see a land use plan under one assumption and another plan with a different assumption. They don't want to lead out in making land use decisions. They take their cues from adopted land use plans. In this case, they took the assumptions used in the plans to add the five years.

Eileen Quiring asked if this can be revisited if they see things changing. She asked if there was some flexibility in that if there were changes at the County with updates, would RTC do those updates as well. Mr. Harrington said the Regional Transportation Plan is a federal requirement that has to be updated at a minimum of every four years. There are things that may trigger it to be updated earlier than four years; that could be if there was a new update to a land use plan that would mean updating the Regional Transportation Plan so that the two are consistent.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE 2040 POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT FORECASTS FOR USING IN THE 2018 RTP UPDATE AS RECOMMENDED BY RTAC. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY JACK BURKMAN AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VIII. Washington Transportation Plan 2035 – Phase 2

Matt Ransom introduced Richard Warren with WSDOT who would be presenting the Washington Transportation Plan. He said the purpose for the next two presentations, Richard's and the following one from Mark Nickerson, WSDOT Rail, Freight, and Ports Division, is to attune the Board to issues and plans that are being reviewed at the state level. Most of the discussion around the Board's table is focused on our component of a Plan, often times not having a larger view. Mr. Ransom said needless to say, what the State does affects this region. The State Transportation Plan is the WSDOT policy/strategy of how they are seeing the future of transportation across the state. That is the focus of the first presentation. Mr. Ransom said he has been serving as a representative for MPOs as part of that planning process, so he has had the opportunity to meet with Richard and his team to discuss the policies that WSDOT is pursuing and how they might affect our region. Also, it is an opportunity to look at how we might take those strategies and policies and bring them down to the regional level.

Richard Warren is with the Multimodal Planning Division at WSDOT, and he would present the long range transportation plan for the state, the Washington Transportation Plan – Phase 2. He said Phase 1 was developed by the Transportation Commission, and that was adopted just short of two years ago. Phase 1 laid out the policies; Phase 2 is implementing those policies. They will be releasing the Draft Plan within the next two weeks for public comment and review. They look to complete the Plan by the end of the year with the Transportation Secretary's signature on it. They have had involvement with the Transportation Commission. As Matt had said, he represented the MPOs and RTPOs on both the Advisory Group and the Steering Committee.

The WTP Vision: By 2035, Washington's transportation system safely connects people and communities, fostering commerce, operating seamlessly across boundaries and providing travel options to achieve an environmentally and financially sustainable system.

In Phase 1, they had about 150 findings and suggestions. They also did a 2015 Voice of Washington State (VOWS) Survey. This is a platform that the Washington Transportation Commission uses that goes out to about 35,000 people around the state, and they received a 20% response rate. They also did data analysis. This concluded with four focus areas.

The focus areas include: 1) maintain and preserve assets, 2) manage growth and traffic congestion, 3) enhance multimodal connections and choices, and 4) align the funding structure with the multimodal vision.

Mr. Warren said three years ago, the Governor issued an Executive Order that said when WSDOT updates this Plan, they have to do a Scenario Planning analysis on that Plan. This resulted in two issues of concern: climate change and technology. Climate change because of the affects it has on the transportation system. If the climate continues to be unpredictable,

will all of our resources just go to emergency repair? Technology because of the impacts it has on the transportation system with drones and autonomous vehicles. Can the public sector keep up in the regulatory framework with the changes in technology? Mr. Warren said the WTP is not prescribing anything for the state. It is setting up plausible futures. With that, they had 11 action items that were effective, feasible, relevant, and resilient.

In their MPO outreach for this region, Mr. Warren listed some of the top priorities. Those include connecting truck, rail, and river freight movement; access across the Columbia River, and managing population growth impacts to transportation.

Included in the distributed materials was a handout explaining each of the 11 action items. Over the next three to five years, they will be looking at what they need to do to implement the action items. Those items that tie back to RTC's priorities were highlighted. Those include: promote transportation-efficient communities, prioritize access for people and goods, support funding flexibility, and diversify and strengthen transportation revenue sources without compromising existing indebtedness.

Mr. Warren said they would continue to work with their Advisory Group and the Steering Committee on finalizing the Plan. He said they look forward to any input the Board has on the Plan.

Jerry Oliver said there are four focus areas. He said he did not think that they were all equal. He asked what their prioritized focus areas were and the resources that were available to address them.

Mr. Warren said they have not looked at any types of funding allocation at this time. He said that type of discussion will come out when they look at how they are going to implement these by putting a price tag on them.

Shawn Donaghy said when looking at aligning the funding structure with a multimodal vision, the partners include several that are state run and local government agencies. He asked if there was going to be some private partnership in there as well. Mr. Warren said there is. He said they did have private participation in their advisory group, and they have been reaching out to those organizations to stay connected and to stay involved with the action items.

Anne McEnery-Ogle said besides congestion, they have a lot of comments on the maintenance of I-5, the roadside trees, vegetation, and garbage. She said it is not listed in the Plan, and if it isn't discussed, she is afraid it won't get funded. Ms. McEnery-Ogle said it may be a low priority, but for Vancouver it is a huge priority. She asked where that type of maintenance comes into this Plan.

Mr. Warren said for current that is something that is something that the area would need to work with WSDOT and the Regional Administrator and their staff. In the WTP, that will come out when they start formulating the steps in the policies that could be developed, what the long-term maintenance and preservation is going to look like. It is a funding issue of where the resources are going to be allocated.

Ms. McEnerny-Ogle said they have worked with WSDOT and they have done a good job with what they have, but additional funding needs to be put in that package for them.

Mr. Warren said that is also something to work with the local elected officials that are in Olympia and look at funding packages there. They are not developing funding packages with the Plan. They are developing policies that the state can position itself in over the next number of years.

Ms. McEnerny-Ogle said perhaps that becomes one of our issues that we talk with our legislators about. She said it continues to be an issue throughout SW Washington, not just through Vancouver, but all through the interchanges.

Chair Stewart agreed saying soon she would be meeting to discuss with Mr. Ransom about creating some kind of legislative direction that will be brought back to the Board for their input.

Ms. McEnerny-Ogle said as the entry into the state of Washington, they like to have a good appearance.

Bart Gernhart said he agreed with what was said. This is the first of the four focus areas, to maintain and preserve our assets. It is maintaining our roadways, potholes, and guardrails, and it is also the vegetation and the garbage. He said their top priority after this past winter snow and ice removal, they have been trying to patch potholes. He said the guardrail is pathetic still because of all the wrecks last winter. They haven't been able to get to that. It is money, but it is also resources. They do appreciate it; it is a high priority for WSDOT. He is glad to hear the locals coming to help support that.

Paul Greenlee said with the mention of guardrails, he wanted to thank WSDOT for fixing the guardrails on SR-14 in Camas. There were some gaping holes from some serious accidents, and they have now been fixed.

Chair Stewart said when she looks at the four focus areas, they are identified as our keys to success. For maintaining and preserving our assets, she said we need to work on that through every process. Enhancing multimodal, she said she has seen tremendous dollars being spent in that in the Portland area and SW Washington. Aligning funding structure with multimodal, she has seen tremendous dollars targeted toward that. However, she said the biggest failing is managing growth and traffic congestion. She said it is the largest failing of system that we have in SW Washington and into Oregon. Chair Stewart said it is frustrating to her that we don't seem to have an effective plan for managing that. She said they are not focusing on the worst problem that we have in the region and that is the I-5 corridor and the I-205 corridor. It is a huge negative for the growth of Clark County, for quality, and for the value of people's time. Chair Stewart said we cannot ignore our single biggest problem.

Matt Ransom said he has seen in his participation with this WTP and with the MPOs, how WSDOT is responding to their new Secretary, Roger Millar. He said his perception of Secretary Millar is a bold vision, a strategic thinker, boots on the ground, and knows how to get things done. That timing with a Plan update that is really looking at some strategic issues allows us to

move on a few things. He said he thinks there is some good leadership at WSDOT, and the Plan gives them a fresh outlook.

IX. 2017 Washington State Freight System Plan

Mr. Ransom said the reason that they invited WSDOT to present their Freight Plan is that it is out for public review. RTC with local jurisdictions' staff are going through a detailed review. Lynda David is coordinating that on behalf of RTC and local staff. Mr. Ransom said because this state's economy is so freight centric, he thought this would be a good presentation to put into focus one of the drivers of our economy and also the investments that we need to be making to ensure we have a healthy network that is supportive of freight.

Mark Nickerson with WSDOT Rail, Freight, and Ports Division presented the 2017 Washington State Freight System Plan. He said this is a FAST Act requirement put forward by the Federal Highway Administration, although it touches upon more than just the highways in the state of Washington. There are funds for the successful completion of this Freight Plan, a little over \$1 million. Mr. Nickerson said they are interested in getting comments through the month of September; they will be spending October and November to fold in the comments and concerns that they receive. They will complete the Freight Plan on December 4, 2017.

The purpose of the Freight Plan is our economy; it is very freight dependent. Washington is second only to the state of Michigan in terms of the importance of trade in the nation. Washington has \$126.8 billion in total imports and exports value. There are 1.41 million jobs in freight-dependent industries and \$550.5 billion in gross business income for freight-dependent sectors. Washington State is a global gateway with access to international markets. They also have some very active programs such as the Made in Washington program for goods manufactured or produced in Washington, which includes aerospace and medical, grain, and fruits and vegetables that Washington is known for.

The Freight Plan is broken down into four components/parts: truck, rail, marine, and air cargo. They are also interested in the local delivery, because that is becoming more and more of importance, whether it is UPS, US mail, FedEx, or drones.

The objectives of the Plan include the following: to provide information on the importance of freight to the economy of the state; to develop a working definition of the freight transportation system; to provide an analysis of conditions and volumes and a forecast for freight; to identify the major freight trends, issues, and needs; and to provide a blueprint of strategies to address the identified trends, issues, and needs. A key component is to come up with a Freight Investment Plan that describes key funding sources, networks eligible for funding, and projects identified on those networks. Another component is to be fiscally constrained. One of the new things that have not been included previously is a Marine Ports and Navigation Plan that describes the marine system and assesses the transportation needs of marine ports, including navigation. This is considered a foundational document.

The key federal requirements of the Freight System Plan include: identification of multimodal freight corridors and facilities; description of how the plan meets the national multimodal freight policy goals and the national highway freight program goals; strategies to mitigate significant congestion or delay caused by freight movement (they are tasked with separating the freight component of congestion); and development of a Freight Investment Plan, including a list of freight priority projects.

Trends and issues include economic vitality; efficient flow of freight through gateways, competition facing ports in the state of Washington, and preservation of industrial sites. Preservation of aging infrastructure and waterway channel maintenance is another issue. Safety is an important issue looking at truck related crashes, truck parking shortages, and highway-rail grade crossing improvements. There are 4,000 at-grade crossings in the State of Washington. These were narrowed down to the 300 worst and then to the top 50 worst.

Other trends and issues include mobility, intermodal connections, new logistics and distribution models, and urban goods movement. Issues with the environment are being taken into account such as climate impact vulnerability, emissions, and hazardous material risks. Stewardship is looked at in terms of system resilience, (landslides in terms of the I-5 rail corridor), congestion caused by freight, and data and communications.

Mr. Nickerson highlighted their volumes and forecasts. In the next 20 years they expect truck to increase about 43%, rail they expect a 25% increase, water a 19% increase, and air an increase of about 100%. Multiple modes, not included with the others are expected to go up about 72%, and pipeline is expected to go up only about 17%.

The Marine Ports and Navigation Plan is what they regard as a foundational document. It is their first attempt at dealing with the marine freight ports. These are ports that are identified as both on the water and also shipped by water. It is a standalone document, so it is one component of the overall Freight Plan. It is a requirement of the state, and they felt this was a good place for it.

In looking at the Freight Plan schedule, they are looking for feedback in September. In October and November they will complete the Draft and submit it to the Federal Highway Administration.

Shawn Donaghy asked if the freight forecasts began with current year or 2014 numbers. Mr. Nickerson said they were 2015 to 2035 numbers. Mr. Donaghy said at that time in 2015, from a freight perspective we were still somewhat coming out of the recession. He said he imagined the focus at that point in time was specific to moving freight off of air, and focusing on inland ports and rail corridors. He asked if they have seen a shift in that with the economy getting better, that there may be more of a focus on air or if they thought it would continue to be on rail. Mr. Nickerson said he couldn't speak that much towards the air piece of that. That was put together by their aviation group. He said air is becoming far more important especially as they are dealing with specialized like medical devices that the state of Washington produces

quite a few of. Mr. Nickerson said the other piece is the containers; they are seeing fairly robust growth this year. They are up 7-8%, not just here in Washington but also nationally.

Marc Boldt referred to the truck parking issue. He said it is very hard to find a place to park trucks, and it is very hard for local government to locate those areas. He asked what they are looking at. Mr. Nickerson said they have completed a truck parking study highlighting some of the issues that are confronting local communities not just on the I-5 corridor, also in eastern Washington. It looks at the causes and looks at what some of the solutions can be. They also produced a brochure that basically shows places where drivers can park throughout the state, the network spots, where they are roughly located at, and who they are, and so forth. That is available on their website. Mr. Nickerson said it wasn't his department that produced it, but the area that did is proud of their work and has many brochures available.

Mr. Boldt said drivers are hard to come by and rail is going more and more containers. He said container yards are usually located currently in Portland. He said other local governments are trying to figure out where to do container yards and asked if they are also looking at that. Mr. Nickerson said these are usually the class 1, the Union Pacific and Burlington Northern. They will work with them as far as assisting them in where they are located, but it is private industry. They are locating where they have the systems in place, the highway access, and the yards. He said it is complicated. Where they are is, in a sense, partially because that is where they were 100 years ago.

Paul Greenlee referred to one of the FAST Act requirements for identification of congestion or delay caused by freight. He said the City of Washougal has a single grade-separated crossing, which is too narrow to allow a left turn lane at the busiest intersection in the city. They have five at-grade crossings, plus two private crossings. The grade-separated crossing is on a state highway (141). None of the other crossings are; they are on city streets. Mr. Greenlee said the crossing at 32nd Street, fairly often backs up out onto SR-14, and rail traffic has increased. He asked if these are the kind of problems that they are looking at. Mr. Nickerson said the study recognizes that, but the focus on the at-grade crossings is with the JTC (Joint Transportation Committee). They have a significant study of all the crossings in the state, identifying the 300 worst and then the top 50. He said he thought Washougal was in the top 300 but not the top 50.

Matt Ransom said the Washougal Mayor was on the statewide Advisory Committee that helped develop that at-grade crossing review. It was completed. None of the projects in our region were part of the top 50 project list. However, the Legislature did authorize a refresh of that study, which the JTC has just announced a resetting, because the data needs to be updated. The JTC made a request to the MPO/RTPOs to ask for advice and input. Mr. Ransom is putting together some thoughts he will transmit to them. He said he was hoping that we would have at least one, because that queues you up for funding a little higher. Based on the criteria, we are not part of the top list.

Chair Stewart asked if Washougal submits that directly or if they submit through Mr. Ransom. Mr. Ransom said they can do both. They can route it through the MPO and we can transmit it, or they can go to the source. Mr. Nickerson said the JTC knew that there were going to be criticisms of their study, but they felt they really needed to start a dialogue. What they have available, they can reweigh things and they have identified all the crossings, and they know the traffic models, etc. They are interested in comments and input as to the validity of their Plan.

Paul Greenlee asked under the definition of marine, if that included Columbia River traffic above Vancouver. Mr. Nickerson said yes, it includes Clarkston, Tri-Cities, and the Port of Pasco. He said they took the opportunity when they were doing the Marine Plan to basically go out and survey all 75 Ports in the state of Washington whether or not they had water.

Mr. Greenlee said Amazon and FedEx have announced substantial air freight expansions at the Troutdale Airport. He said that will certainly have significant trucking impact on I-205, and he asked if that was part of their modeling. Mr. Nickerson said he did not know. As said, the aviation portion of this he was not that involved in. He said those are the comments that they would be interested in hearing from the various MPOs/RTPOs.

Chair Stewart told Mr. Greenlee he could work with Mr. Ransom on putting together some of the information.

Mr. Ransom said they are working with local agency staff to review the Freight Plan. Lynda David has a meeting the following week to meet with them and discuss the draft Plan and provide comments. Mr. Ransom said because we are a bi-state region, these freight issues as they may manifest across the river, actually affect our systems so there needs to some response to that. He said he believed the Plan has become more in tune with that. Mr. Ransom said RTC has 10 projects in the Plan with a priority array. Most of the roadway system projects that relate to freight have been identified, and the need for the channel deepening refresh is included, which is a strategic Port freight issue long term for this region. Mr. Ransom said they look forward to putting their comments out and sending them out to the State.

X. Other Business

From the Board

Bart Gernhart noted the wild fires in the Columbia River Gorge. On the Oregon side, I-84 is closed to all traffic from Troutdale to Hood River. On the Washington side, SR-14 is closed to trucks over 10,000 lbs. from Washougal to Dallesport. They hope the fire does not get any closer to SR-14 that would cause it to be closed. They encourage use of SR-14 for local traffic only and discourage use if it is not necessary so it is available for emergency services and evacuations. They don't have the capacity to handle the freight traffic that is normally on I-84 on SR-14; that is why they are prohibiting vehicles over 10,000 lbs. on SR-14 at this time.

From the Director

Mr. Ransom said there was a new program funded as part of the FAST Act called the National Highway System Asset Management Program, essentially a pavement management funding pool. This was a statewide call for projects that was held earlier this year. Three projects were

funded out of the Clark County RTC region, two for the City of Vancouver and one for Clark County. The total funding award is \$5.4 million. Mr. Ransom said this was a good share of the funding pool.

At the federal funding level, Mr. Ransom said this is something that people want to pay attention to. This fall Congress is evaluating funding appropriation bills. USDOTs funding is part of that. There are significant funding reductions to a couple of programs that are of importance to our region. One is the Tiger Program, a competitive grant program that the Port of Vancouver has received funding through for their rail improvement. As proposed, there would be significant rollback in that funding program. The most significant rollback would be on the transit side. As proposed in the funding appropriation bills, to almost eliminate entirely the New Starts and Small Starts competitive transit programs. Here regionally, we are aware that the Vine project was funded using the Small Starts grants, so it could be a significant hit to the transit investments across the nation. Also, proposed rollbacks in interstate passenger rail service. These are significant hits to the USDOT budget, which could affect and ripple down to us regionally.

Shawn Donaghy said from C-TRAN's perspective, they are working at it from two angles. One through the American Public Transportation Association and the other one through the Bus Coalition, specifically on New Starts and Small Starts programs. There are quite a few agencies throughout the United States that have come together to provide that information to the federal government so that they are not trying to overwhelm them from a multiple agency aspect. He said if they were to lose some of those New Starts or Small Starts funding, it would significantly impact their ability to try new programs within transportation in the region. He said any support on that from an agency's perspective would be most welcome.

Mr. Ransom said he would keep the Board attuned. He said as with anything in Congress, he would not predict where it would end up.

Mr. Ransom referred to the tolling evaluation that ODOT is initiating through the Oregon Transportation Commission. RTC has been invited to participate through ODOT on the technical modeling committee. Mark Harrington will be reviewing traffic modeling work that they are doing. Mr. Ransom said they were provided a copy of a Policy Review Report that was done by ODOT this last summer and published in June. It is a very good tolling research and policy 101. He said if anyone is interested, it really covers the gamut of the options, federal law, and state law. It is a good information piece as at the Board level and individual agency level engage on this issue over time. Mr. Ransom said they could also bring down the state Transportation Commission of Washington, which has an extensive tolling program to provide background information as well.

Chair Stewart said she thought it would be good to have that distributed to Board Members. Also, as opportunities open up for RTC Members, RTC Executive Director, or RTC Chair to participate in committees, she asked that that information be passed along. She said they

would see that it gets out to the Board. Mr. Ransom would distribute the Tolling and Congestion Pricing White Paper to Board Members.

Eileen Quiring asked if Mr. Ransom was asking Members and their various Boards to provide input on the tolling issue.

Mr. Ransom said no, that his thought is that when it comes to technical participation such as the traffic model work, as an organization they are positioned to do that and commit some staff time to do that. When it comes to the policy review, his intention is that when there is information to share from a regional perspective he will present that to the Board. A lot of this is 2018 work program, where there will be touchpoints for engagement. If there is a proposal put on the table, there certainly is a forum here to discuss that proposal, including the Bi-State Committee.

Jack Burkman said at the last JPACT meeting, he specifically made the request that someone from SW Washington be on any committee that they form. He said he pointed out the role of the Bi-State Coordination Committee, because they do have an Interlocal Agreement that says that anything affecting both states should be coordinated with that group. He said we do have to speak up so they hear that we want to be a part of that process.

Mr. Ransom referred to the Bylaws Committee Recommendation memo included in the meeting packet. With the Chair of the Bylaws Committee not able to attend the meeting, Mr. Ransom would provide a summary of the Committee's recommendation. The Bylaws currently state that they should be reviewed every several years. The Bylaws establish that there is a review process and that a committee is formed. The committee reviews and comes forward with a final report. That report recommends to the Board the scope of the edits. The Board cannot take action on any edits to the Bylaws unless they have come through the committee. Once the Board is comfortable with any edits to the Bylaws, approval needs to be by a 60% threshold.

This year was the five year mark for review. Mr. Ransom said when he joined the organization several years back, pieces of the organization had not been reviewed since formation in 1992. One of those pieces was the Bylaws. They had not been amended in substance for over 20 years, so they looked at what needed to be brought more to the contemporary to reflect policies and contracts that the Board might have implemented in the interim. Mr. Ransom said a couple years ago he flagged this as an issue to work. In considering the scope of the edits that are proposed, take it in the context of over 20 years without thorough review.

There were five committee members along with the Executive Director and RTC's General Counsel for legal review. The committee met on four occasions. At each meeting Mr. Ransom brought forward suggested edits. They discussed those edits, and Mr. Ransom changed and modified as suggested. The edits are in the following categories: 1) clarifying the language, create new language to reflect contracts or policies that the Board has adopted; 2) removing extraneous language, there were a few areas that did not pertain so were removed; 3)

reorganizing the language, moving language so it was with similar items/topics and easier to read. There were three new policy proposals.

The committee has recommended the changes as shown in the color marked version of the Bylaws attached to the memo. After this is reviewed by the Board, it would come back on the agenda for action by the Board by resolution.

Chair Stewart said she wanted it to be clear that this has just been received by the Board, and she wants members to have time to review this and discuss this. She said it will probably come back in October to take action.

Mr. Ransom would describe the edits and identify the new policy proposals. They could then have any discussion or questions. He noted that the red text was deleted text, yellow text was new text or numbering, and bold text was moved unchanged text. A column on the right side of the page provided a description of why the edit was made.

The three new policy proposals are on page 9. The first proposal is Section 6.7 Parliamentary Authority. The Bylaws have been absent of a reference to the authority document. The Committee proposed to add Meetings shall be conducted in a general accordance with Roberts Rules of Order Newly Revised or adopted supplementary Board rules governing procedural and process questions. In the future, the Board could choose to adopt meeting procedures.

The second proposal is Section 6.11 Participation by Communications Equipment creates a clear statement of intent. You can participate in board meetings by communications equipment, and it lays out some parameters for that participation.

The third proposal is 6.12 Meeting Procedures is a placeholder for meeting procedures if the Board chooses to adopt supplementary procedures to augment Roberts Rules of Order.

Eileen Quiring referred to page 5 Section 4.5 Contracts and Services that referenced RTC's Procurement and Ethics Policy. She said she has not seen this document and would like a copy. (Mr. Ransom would provide that to Councilor Quiring.) Councilor Quiring said in reference to this section, that the Procurement Policy must state that a Board Member must declare that they have a conflict and abstain from a vote. Mr. Ransom said that was correct.

Councilor Quiring referred to page 8 Section 6.5 Study Sessions or Workshops and asked if the Study Sessions were subject to Open Public Meeting requirements. It was confirmed that yes they were.

Councilor Quiring asked with the participation and communications equipment, if there is an Executive Session would that be exempt from electronic participation. General Counsel Ted Gathe said yes, they would be able to participate. Councilor Quiring said she did not think that was a good idea. Mr. Gathe said as long as it is not recorded, that is the key. They could participate, but there would be no recording of the Executive Session. Councilor Quiring said you don't know who is in the room with them. Chair Stewart agreed that they would not know if the person was in a room with a group of people, which breaches the confidentiality. Mr. Gathe said that would need to be clarified with the individual participating remotely in advance

of going into the Executive Session. There is nothing that would preclude that person from participating if they can maintain confidentiality. Chair Stewart said they may have more discussion on this issue.

Councilor Quiring referred to Section 7.1.1 about the Executive Committee and various things that take place with the Executive Director. She asked if there was a time stated how often this takes place, for instance for performance evaluation. Mr. Ransom said performance evaluation by current Executive Director Contract is annual. The matters of the Executive Committee meet no less frequently than monthly in advance of the Board meeting and more regularly if there would be a matter that Mr. Ransom thought needed their attention from an administrative standpoint.

Shirley Craddick referred to section 6.7 and Roberts Rules of Order. She said at the JPACT meeting at Metro, when someone abstains that takes away from the majority vote; it ends up acting as a no vote. Because JPACT follows the Roberts Rules of Order, she asked if this reflects that same process. Mr. Ransom said he was not sure; he would review that and follow up on the question. The question is if you administer the voting in accordance with Roberts Rules of Order, would that then determine how you count an abstention. Chair Stewart said the other question is are you counting that person as present with an abstention, because they might need to be present in order for there to be a quorum to have the vote. Mr. Ransom said once the quorum is established, the vote then falls as it would. Councilor Craddick said the Metro attorney states that whenever there is an abstention, it ends up acting as a no vote. Mr. Ransom said he did not think that has ever been the intention around the table here. Ted Gathe said they used the term "in general accordance with Roberts Rules of Order". This is a technical issue that this Board should consider to decide. If you choose to not follow Roberts Rules of Order with regard to that particular aspect, then that could be stated as a policy if you choose to actually follow as Metro does then that decision can be made as well. That is a decision for this Board to make.

Bart Gernhart said that would be good to clarify. He said there have been situations where he has had to abstain and felt bad having to do so. He said he would prefer to have an abstention not count as a no vote. He said he does like having the new policy of having the Parliamentary Authority statement added; it is helpful.

Mr. Gernhart referred to 6.11 Participation by Communications Equipment and asked if they were thinking about having something like Skype or Go To Meeting or some other way to see a remote location to watch the meeting. More importantly, he said he has been in a lot of teleconference meetings where it is very difficult for you who are on the other end to chime in without interrupting and when it is not appropriate, because the Chair has the floor. He said it would be nice to have Skype or GoTo or those type meetings where they could also use their name cards to show that they wished to speak as well. That would help to be engaged on the other end.

Chair Stewart said they would also have to look at the technology that would be necessary for staff to set that up for a meeting.

Marc Boldt referred to 4.2.3 that says representation on the Board shall be communicated in writing to the Executive Director by January of each year. He asked if that was the end of January. Mr. Ransom said yes, it is just to clarify for consistency and transparency.

Paul Greenlee said in their City Council meetings when someone is attending electronically, they have them on Facetime on an iPad that sits in front of the Chair, so that if you raise your hand, the Chair can see that. This is a simple method, although there is much more complicated conferencing software.

Mr. Ransom said his input is that if you set the basic parameter by policy saying you can participate, then there is a system/mechanism they will have to establish. The policy is laid out that this cannot be done all the time; there are some conditions by which you can do this. That is important, and the policy addresses the issue. The implementation question is what is going to meet the needs of the participants around the table and the participant offsite. What he is hearing from the Board is that they could establish by separate policy criteria that is interactive ability to interject appropriately. It has to work for both parties.

Anne McEnery-Ogle asked if they have small corrections should they just hand them to Mr. Ransom. Mr. Ransom said yes. He asked that Members submit comments to him electronically or call him with questions and comments. He said the intention in the review next month is to have most comments incorporated, but if more work is needed they will do that. Mr. Ransom said after 20 plus years, he felt the committee's work on the Bylaws has taken a major step forward and a good tool for the Board to govern itself.

Mr. Ransom noted JPACT meets Thursday, September 21, 2017, at Metro at 7:30 a.m.

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, October 3, 2017, at 4 p.m.

XI. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

Jeanne E. Stewart, Board of Directors Chair