

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Board of Directors
February 6, 2018, 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 Vice Chair Anne McEnery-Ogle on Tuesday, February 6, 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:

John Blom, Clark County Councilor (Alternate)
Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor
Mike Dalesandro, Battle Ground Mayor (Alt.)
Shawn Donaghy, C-TRAN Exec. Director/CEO
Scott Hughes, Port of Ridgefield Commissioner
Tom Lannen, Skamania County Commissioner
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver Mayor
Eileen Quiring, Clark County Councilor
Melissa Smith, Camas Council Member
Jeanne Stewart, Clark County Councilor
Ty Stober, Vancouver Councilmember (Alt.)
Kris Strickler, WSDOT Regional Administrator
Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1 Manager

Voting Board Members Absent:

Marc Boldt, Clark County Councilor
Jim Herman, Port of Klickitat Commissioner
Ron Onslow, Ridgefield Mayor

Nonvoting Board Members Present:

Nonvoting Board Members Absent:

Curtis King, Senator 14th District
Norm Johnson, Representative 14th District
Gina McCabe, Representative 14th District
Lynda Wilson, Senator 17th District
Paul Harris, Representative 17th District
Vicki Kraft, Representative 17th District
Ann Rivers, Senator 18th District
Liz Pike, Representative 18th District
Brandon Vick, Representative 18th District
John Braun, Senator 20th District
Richard DeBolt, Representative 20th District
Ed Orcutt, Representative 20th District
Annette Cleveland, Senator 49th District
Monica Stonier, Representative 49th District
Sharon Wylie, Representative 49th District

Guests Present:

Ron Arp, Identity Clark County
Ed Barnes, Citizen
Al Bauer, Citizen
Edward and Marlene Beyer
Rian Davis, Citizen
Lori Figone, WSDOT
Carley Francis, WSDOT
Sorin Garber, SGA
Chuck Green, Otak
Frank Green, WSDOT
Jim Hagar, Port of Vancouver
Sally Hart, Citizen
Heath Henderson, Clark County
Larry Keister, Port of Camas Washougal Commissioner
Laurie Lebowsky, Clark County
Dale Lewis, Congresswoman Herrera Beutler's Office
Casey Liles, WSDOT
David McDevitt, Citizen
Jim Moeller, Citizen
Diane O'Regan, C-TRAN
Scott Patterson, C-TRAN
Mike Pond, Citizen
Robert Schaefer, Citizen
Marc Thornsbery, Port of Klickitat
Steve Tubbs, Citizen
Walter Valenta, Citizen
Neal Walker, Citizen

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

JOHN BLOM MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 6, 2018, MEETING AGENDA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MIKE DALESANDRO AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

III. Call for Public Comments

Edward and Marlene Beyer from Vancouver said they strongly oppose tolls on the bridge across the river. They asked if the RTC has anything to do with the tolls and if there was an opposition to that.

Vice Chair McEnery-Ogle said at this point there are three representatives from Washington State on the Policy Advisory Committee. She serves on the committee along with Eileen Quiring and Kris Strickler. There was an Open House for the project at the Vancouver Library on January 30, and she asked if they were able to attend.

Mr. Beyer said they were not aware of it and that they just received a letter regarding this meeting the previous night.

Vice Chair McEnery-Ogle said the RTC Board does not make that recommendation. In moving forward she recommended going to the state of Oregon website for Price Valuing.

Ms. Beyer said they were talking about the tolls on the bridge proposed by the state of Oregon.

Vice Chair McEnery-Ogle said they are not proposing to toll the bridge. The proposal is to toll the I-5 and I-205 corridors, not on the bridge.

Mr. Beyer asked where they expected the tolls to be located.

Vice Chair McEnery-Ogle said at their next meeting on February 28, they are to show the committee eight different scenarios to answer that question. Those scenarios will be posted on the Oregon State value pricing website: www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Pages/Value-Pricing.aspx and can be tracked as to when they will be making recommendations. At this point, they are still studying the corridors on the two freeways for that.

Rian Windsheimer said they just had an open house in Vancouver at the library that talked a lot about this. They will continue to do outreach, and they also have an online open house that is going on and encouraged the Beyer's to participate and share their views. The Policy Advisory Meeting will also allow for public comment as well. The meetings are listed on the web page, and the meetings are also broadcast by a live stream. Mr. Windsheimer provided them his business card to send them a link to the website.

Eileen Quiring entered the meeting at 4:06 p.m.

Steve Tubbs from Vancouver thanked Matt Ransom for adding language to the 2018 Regional Transportation Plan Update that specifically talks about emerging transportation technologies. He said he believed it was absent in the 2035 plan. Mr. Tubbs said that component is necessary in order to look ahead at what is to come into the future. Mr. Tubbs said his comments relating

to financing go in part to the Federal Representatives. First he said there is a fleet gas requirement that applies to cars, but it does not apply to light trucks. As it happens, light trucks include SUVs, trucks of all sizes, and vans. It applies to a very limited segment. He said the Feds need to be asked to apply a uniform standard for all kinds of vehicles that most home owners are driving. Also, he said in that regard, with the federal gas tax, it hasn't been raised in years. The cost of living since it was last established has increased by 63%. Mr. Tubbs said if they are looking for some money to build the things that they want to build, maybe talk to the Feds about considering these two elements. Lastly, he urged them to free the City of Vancouver from the constraints of the 1980 agreement that it had with C-TRAN that prevents the City from engaging in mass transit activities. This would allow the City of Vancouver on its own initiative and own nickel without a vote from anybody outside the boundaries of the City of Vancouver can entertain the possibility of extending the light rail from the exhibition hall to some place in downtown Vancouver.

Chuck Green from Vancouver said at last month's meeting, there was a discussion on a couple things that he wanted to clarify. One topic was mega projects. There was discussion about how these projects are getting funded if tolls are a component of the funding. Mr. Green said yes, tolls are a component of the funding of these projects with two exceptions. One is the Woodrow Wilson Bridge in the Washington, DC area that was funded without tolls, but it took an act of congress to do that. The other project is the SE corridor project in Denver, and instead of tolls, which were never a part of the discussion, there was a local option tax that was passed by a vote that funded part of that mega project. Mr. Green provided a one-page handout with a spreadsheet of mega projects listed on one side, and a Public, Private Partnerships (P3) map was listed on the other side. At last month's meeting, he said Kris Strickler correctly advised that the private share is the financing share of a P3 project; it is not funding or a grant. The public entities would like to get paid back somehow, as a return on their investment. The P3 map was from the Federal Highway Administration's website that listed public, private partnership facilities across the U.S., and it was noted if it was an express toll or fully tolled facility. A number of the cases are variable tolls depending on what they want to get out of that ; congestion relief or some type of value pricing. Local P3 projects include the Airport MAX Red Line and the Vancouver Waterfront project. Both of these do not have tolls as an investment return; they had land development that was part of those considerations.

Robert Schaefer from Vancouver said he is working with Ed Barnes and Al Bauer on the I-5 Bridge Replacement Group. He thanked the Legislators for trying to set a priority on the I-5 Bridge by making it a project of statewide significance. He said the concern that the Bridge Group has is that they basically know how long it takes to build a project. Mr. Schaefer said the I-5 Bridge project really started in 1996, 22 years ago. For the I-205 bridge, it took a total of 27 years. The question for the I-5 Bridge is if we want to start all over again. Mr. Schaefer said with all of the work that has been done and the money that has been spent on that project, they have to realize the opportunities they had. When the money comes available from the federal government or any other type of infrastructure and they have to have projects ready to go to take advantage of those funds. Mr. Schaefer said his greatest example is that when he

was in the Legislature in 1960, U.S. Senator "Maggie" Magnuson appropriated enough money to build a complete light rail system for the city of Seattle. What they have done now is voted to pay for it themselves at about ten times the price that it would have cost at that time. Mr. Schaefer said there are these windows of opportunity and we are not really taking advantage of them the way that he hoped they would do. He hoped that they can work with the state of Oregon using as much of the CRC funding, availabilities, improvements that have been made, and the designs so they can expedite this project and make it happen sometime, not in his lifetime, but in many of others' lifetime.

Edward Barnes from Vancouver said he thought the Republican and Democrat elected officials of SW Washington did a great job in the Legislature when they passed the bill for the I-5 Bridge to be of statewide significance in both the House and Senate. Mr. Barnes said he understood there was a bill to remove it from commerce and put the same bills back into transportation so that it fits better to get those passed so they can get on with getting the bridge built. Mr. Barnes said he thought it was important for folks to know that it took 33 different groups from this community to go up to the Legislature to say that we need to get this bridge built. They did a great job in presenting themselves. He said he hoped that in the future they can get 33 and more different groups of people from SW Washington, Skamania County, Klickitat County, and Oregon to cooperate and make sure the bridge project happens. Mr. Barnes said the President has proposed \$1.5 trillion for infrastructure and \$200 billion for transit, and this is an opportunity if they all work together. They need to convince Oregon that it was Washington's fault when the Senate voted to not push forward to build the bridge. Mr. Barnes said he hoped that they can get the project lined up and ready to go, so when the opportunity arises, they can take advantage of that. Mr. Barnes also noted the number of accidents on the bridge.

IV. Approval of January 2, 2018, Minutes

SHAWN DONAGHY MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 2, 2018, MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY TY STOBER AND APPROVED. JOHN BLOM, SCOTT HUGHES, MELISSA SMITH, AND JEANNE STEWART ABSTAINED.

V. Consent Agenda

A. February Claims

B. Indirect Cost Plan, Resolution 02-18-03

TY STOBER MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA FEBRUARY CLAIMS AND RESOLUTION 02-18-03. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VI. RTC Procurement Policy – Amendment, Resolution 02-18-04

Matt Ransom said for the Board's consideration is a periodic update to the procurement policy. This is a policy adopted by the Board that governs how the Executive Director administers procurement and the authorities that they have to oversee those exercises. The recommended changes primarily relate to keeping the policy consistent and synchronized with state and

federal regulations. They have gone through it at the end of the year and noted several areas they need to either clarify or augment the policy. They also noted a series of scrivener's corrections. Mr. Ransom noted the memorandum included in the meeting packet along with a track change version of the RTC Procurement Policy with comments shown in the right hand column.

Listed in the Policy section 1.3 Code of Ethics, they are recommending a clause that stipulates that the Board's Executive Committee (Chair, Vice Chair, Counsel to RTC, and the Executive Director) would review any matters related to conflict of interest and recommend action as appropriate.

Under Supplemental Provisions they are recommending exempting from procurement the purchasing of accounting, actuarial, or audit services. Mr. Ransom said RTC's audits are done by the State Auditor's Office (SAO). It doesn't necessarily have to be done by SAO; they theoretically could go out for a bid. It is customary being an entity created by Interlocal Agreement of Governments that they are audited by SAO, which is the most appropriate. They have no intention to go out for solicitation, but they could if they chose to.

Under the provision of purchasing credit cards, they are adding a clause that would clarify that they shall not purchase any gift cards.

Under Protest and Appeal Process Section 6.1 they are adding several clauses. These are clauses that relate to syncretizing with best practice and federal regulation stipulating how they would administer any protest or appeal and clarifying the exercise.

The last area of change is related to corrections to scrivener's errors.

Mr. Ransom said the policy implication for the Board is to keep the policy up to current best practice conditions and to make sure that they are aligned with appropriate regulations. There is no budget implication.

Vice Chair McEnery-Ogle asked for clarification in section 5.1 if No cash advances allowed and No gift card purchase allowed were both listed as one item under "c". Mr. Ransom said No cash advance would be "c", No gift card would be "d", and regarding the payment of bills would be "e".

TOM LANNEN MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RTC PROCUREMENT POLICY – AMENDMENT, RESOLUTION 02-18-04. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY EILEEN QUIRING AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VII. Regional Transportation Plan – 2018 Update, Policy Framework

Matt Ransom said there are two presentations as part of the Regional Transportation Plan Update. The first presentation relates to policy, mostly in relation to Federal and State requirements, but they do have opportunity to identify areas where they want to express an objective or policy. Lynda would describe a few areas that are noteworthy. The second presentation relates to existing conditions. Much of this is to create a base understanding of the regional planning for Clark County for the Board. They would also characterize some of the

conditions so the Board would have a better understanding. After these presentations today, they will start to move into project development, working with member agency staff in projects they hope to nominate for inclusion in the Plan.

Lynda David referred to the memo included in the meeting packet along with two attachments. She said today provides the opportunity for the Board to discuss the policies, which is significant as they provide the framework for the Regional Transportation Plan's update. Ms. David said she would review the transportation vision as currently expressed in the existing 2014 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). She would review existing transportation policies and consider adding a new policy on emerging transportation technologies. They would review public participation opportunities as they develop the RTP update and seek Board input.

Ms. David said they reviewed the key RTP milestones at the April 2017 Board meeting when they discussed scoping of the 2018 RTP update. Milestones were again assessed in October 2017 as they reviewed trends in regional growth and demographics that influence regional travel and some of the steps in the process of being addressed concurrently. To date, they have confirmed Federal and State policies and requirements. The growth forecast and allocation was addressed in September of 2017, and today they have the opportunity to address the regional policy framework.

An overview of the RTP update was provided. The RTP for Clark County is the region's long-range Regional Transportation Plan that must cover a period of at least 20 years. The 2018 update to the Plan will have a horizon year of 2040. The federal requirement for Plan update is at least every five years in areas such as Clark County that are now air quality attainment areas. The Plan must be multi-modal, must address automobile travel, rail, bicycle, pedestrian, transit, demand management, system management, and freight and goods movement. Federal requirements are for a fiscally constrained Plan, meaning forecast revenues and project cost estimates should balance. The RTP is a result of a process that requires collaboration, coordination, and consultation to make sure there is consistency between Federal, State, and local Plans.

The RTP Vision and Policy is the foundation basis to guide the Regional Transportation Plan's development. Provided on a slide and in paragraph one of Attachment 1 was the Vision Statement in the current 2014 RTP for Clark County. The vision articulates general themes that guide the RTP's goals which in turn set the framework for development of the region's transportation plan and attainment of the vision. The vision statement allows them to take a concise look forward to the important outcomes the RTP's implementation should lead them toward. Ms. David said if this vision statement is to be retained for the RTP update in 2018, then the horizon year would be changed from 2035 to 2040. Ms. David asked if there were any comments on the vision statement or if there was acceptance of the statement to be maintained for this Plan update.

Shirley Craddick said that there was nothing about safety in the vision statement.

Ms. David said safety is addressed as part of the policy themes, but they could look at adding safety into the vision. She asked if Board members had input on adding safety into the statement. No comments were made at this time.

Ms. David next considered the existing Policy Themes. She said there needs to be consistency between federal, state, regional, and local transportation plans so they are not at odds. This consistency requirement also applies to the goals and policies in the Plan. There is currently consistency in the basic transportation policy framework at all four levels of government: federal, state, regional, and local. Consistent policy themes listed include: economic vitality, safety and security, accessibility and mobility, management and operations, efficiencies, environment, preservation, community vision and values, and finance. The required federal planning factors lead off with a significant goal of having the transportation system contribute to the economic development and vitality of the nation. In Attachment 1, there is a table that provides how these policy themes are articulated in federal planning factors, state policy goals, and regional policies. Ms. David noted that with passage of the federal FAST Act, there are added planning factors that they need to address in the regional plan. They are resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reduction or mitigation of storm water impacts resulting from surface transportation and enhancement of travel and tourism. These factors will be integrated into the 2018 RTP update.

The Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC) has had discussion on key RTP policy issues. RTAC members felt the core to provision of transportation system and services are safety and security, accessibility, and mobility. However, RTAC members are most concerned about two major issues: finance and economy; specifically, how to deal with financing the transportation system now and into the future. Regarding the economy, RTAC members spoke of the need to ensure that the transportation system can help to sustain the current range of businesses and industry in our region, as well as serve as an attractor for new jobs to the region.

Proposed for addition to the RTP with the 2018 update are policies on emerging transportation technologies. Transportation technology that can impact transportation networks and performance are developing rapidly. There is a wide array of the emerging technologies including advances in intelligent transportation system technology with improved traffic control systems, data collection and management, traffic management, and communication tools such as greater use of smart phone technology to summon transportation services or to gain information about transportation services. There are autonomous vehicles, self-driving cars and trucks with limited or no human interaction, and use of transportation network companies known as TNCs, for example Uber and Lyft. Rapid growth and implementation of transportation technologies makes it very difficult to predict the total impact they will have on transportation in the 20-year timeframe. Ms. David said as they think about these emerging technologies, they need to keep in mind the transportation outcomes they would like to see for the region. For example, provide better mobility, better access, and equity for passenger and

freight movement. With these principles in mind, proposed policy on emerging transportation technologies were shown on a slide and listed in the memo on page 5.

Regarding emerging technologies: there is work underway by other MPOs in Washington and Oregon; Puget Sound Regional Council has a draft appendix to its RTP focused on technology available for review online; and in this region, Metro is currently working on its 2018 RTP update and has draft policies for an emerging technology strategy also out for review and discussion. RTC conducted two workshops in early December 2017 focused on Smart Cities and covered adaptation to smart mobility solutions, including connected and automated vehicles. Governor Inslee convened the Governor's Autonomous Vehicle Work Group, and in 2017 signed an Executive Order to further support the safe testing and operation of autonomous vehicles. In the Washington Legislature, currently there are several bills proposed to address emerging technologies: HB 2970 proposes establishing an autonomous vehicle work group to be convened by the Washington Transportation Commission; and Senate Bill 6043 concerns transportation TNCs such as Uber and Lyft. This bill proposes statewide regulations governing TNCs themselves, TNC drivers, and TNC vehicles.

Ms. David told Board Members that if they have any comments, they will be used to determine whether there needs to be any updating of the current RTP policy framework. These vision and goals will guide RTP development, but it can be revisited at any time during the course of RTP development this year as they learn more about the transportation system and future transportation needs, and as they hear from the community. As noted in the memo, RTC's website is being used as a showcase for the RTP update and allows for the public to provide feedback to RTC and it allows staff to in turn pass it along to the Board as they hear from the public.

Ms. David said the next agenda item is also on the RTP. Mark Harrington is going to focus on existing conditions of the transportation system.

Matt Ransom said he understands that this is a lot of policy and planning information. He said each member has seen this kind of work in their own organizations. He had a couple points of emphasis. He thanked members for the input in terms of the vision and safety. He said he thought that they should consider some type of phrase to include. This work is not done; it is continuing to be developed. The emerging transportation technology issue is the most significant and transformative in terms of what local agencies will be doing to invest and accommodate in their systems, and the most transformative in terms of looking back 20-30 years from now, and what was being done to make the system more efficient. Mr. Ransom said they have proposed some ideas, and the principles are the key: we should be open to innovation; we should use our flexible funds to promote innovation; and make sure members' investments are open. He said they will be working with jurisdiction staff, and he asked Board Members to contact him if they have any comments on any of this.

Mr. Ransom said all the presentations and information presented today will be available following the meeting on RTC's website at [February 6, 2018 Meeting](#)

VIII. Regional Transportation Plan – 2018 Update, Existing Conditions

Mark Harrington referred to the memo included in the meeting packet along with the attached DRAFT chapter of the RTP of the Existing Conditions focused on the movement of people. He said that is what he was going to primarily look at today. They will be coming back to the Board with a look at goods movement as well; they understand it is not just the movement of people.

Mr. Harrington said as they move forward with the update of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), it is important to have a good understanding of the existing transportation system. He said they would look at just what the regional transportation system is as it is the focus of the RTP. They would then look at the performance of those systems.

The movement of people and goods in our region is made possible by a vast multi-modal system of interconnected transportation networks. They are comprised of federal interstate systems, state highways, local roadways, public bus routes, paratransit services, vanpools, intercity and interstate bus and rail service, bike lanes, sidewalks, multi paths, freight rail, airports, and marine freight. All of these different systems and components make up parts of the regional transportation system. The RTP focus is on what they call designated regional transportation systems, and they have defined this in accordance with state and regional transportation planning program planning standard. They are required to include all state facilities and services, required to include all freeways and expressways and principle arterials, required to include all high-capacity transit systems; and to include other transportation facilities that they deem to be important to the regional transportation system. That includes things such as airports, marine facilities, and rail facilities – both passenger and freight. Mr. Harrington said if they had a pipeline through Clark County, they would include that. Mr. Harrington provided a slide of the regional system and highlighted the roadways.

Tom Lannen asked about Williams pipeline that comes across Skamania County. Mr. Harrington said he would have to look into that.

Mr. Harrington said this integrated multi-modal system is responsible for the movement of freight and goods and people within our region. Today's focus is on movement of people, and they would return to the Board to look at goods movement at a later time.

Clark County residents travel 1.7 million person trips per weekday. These are not auto trips; these are person trips including walking, biking, and transit. About 85% of these occur between 6 a.m. and 6 p.m. for the average weekday. This is about 10 trips per household. Mr. Harrington highlighted the trip purposes, the percentage of all trips, the average travel time, and the average trip distance. He also highlighted the travel mode including walk, bike, auto driver, auto passenger, transit, paratransit, school bus, and other. Also provided was the percentage of all trips and the average travel time for each mode.

Next addressed was the Clark County roadway network. In Clark County, there are over 2,300 centerline miles of roads maintained and operated by state and local jurisdictions. Annually, there are over 3 billion vehicle miles traveled on those roadways within Clark County. That is up from a little over 2 billion back in 1990. This has been the growth of vehicle miles traveled

over the past 26 years. Vehicle miles have grown because our population has grown, more people, more travel, but people aren't traveling in cars at the same amount. In 1990, there were between 8,500 and 9,000 miles annually per person in Clark County. That has been steadily decreasing until about 2008, and has remained relatively flat since that time at about 6,500 vehicle miles per person within Clark County. There are more people, but they are traveling less miles by car than in the past. The future is a big question with the new technology and how that plays out.

Mr. Harrington said all roadways are not the same. They are classified by function. There is the Interstate system, arterial system, collector system, and the local street system, and he highlighted these systems.

There are 125 total centerline miles of state highways in Clark County. That is about 5% of the total lane miles, but it carries about 45% of the annual vehicle miles traveled in the system. The state system will not represent a lot of centerline miles, but there is a vast majority of vehicular travel within the County.

There are about 300,000 daily crossings of the Columbia River in 2016. That is up from 108,000 in 1980. Bridge traffic has been going up. Mr. Harrington highlighted 2016 travel speeds in the I-5 and I-205 corridors for southbound in the a.m. and northbound in the p.m.

The duration of congestion (45 mph or less) was addressed in the a.m. peak period for SR-14 - Camas to I-205; I-205 – SR-500 to bridge; and I-5 – SR-500 to bridge in 2014 and 2016. Travel time versus travel reliability was also addressed in those corridors. The uncertainty in how long it is going to take to get from one place to another varies from day to day. Often that is a greater source of frustration.

Mr. Harrington next addressed non-state roadways in Clark County. There are about 2,200 non-state centerline miles of roadway in Clark County. They serve about 1.7 billion vehicle miles traveled annually. About 70% of that is classified as local streets. Within the Federal Urban Area Boundary, which includes the Vancouver urban area, Camas, Washougal, and Battle Ground, there are 230 centerline miles of arterials and 160 centerline miles of collectors.

The high volume arterials were addressed for 2016 along with the highest volume intersections and the amount of intersection delay.

Public Transit: C-TRAN was presented. There are 3 transit centers, 6 park and rides, 945 bus stops, 179 passenger shelters, and 79 dual seats at the bus stops. The times of service for the transit system were listed. C-TRAN has 1 BRT line, 19 local urban lines, 2 regional limited lines, 7 premium commuter lines, C-VAN paratransit service, and 3 special connector services providing C-VAN like connections within Camas, La Center, and Ridgefield. There is also a bi-monthly shopping shuttle that C-TRAN provides every other week on the first and third week of the month to some areas of Clark County. There are nearly 6 million riders in the overall C-TRAN system for 2016. Mr. Harrington highlighted the number of riders for the local service, commuter, C-VAN, events/other, connector, and vanpool. Other public transit available in Clark County include the following: Intercity bus (Greyhound Portland Station, Skamania County

Senior Services, and Cowlitz County Lower Columbia River CAP; passenger rail on Amtrak; Human Service Council Transportation Brokerage; taxi services; and commercial ride sharing – Uber, Lyft, etc.

Mr. Harrington addressed travel to work from the 2011 – 2015 five year ACS data from the Census. The mean travel time to work is 25.3 minutes. Average commutes under 15 minutes are 24.2% of those. Commutes of 45 minutes or more are 13.5%. Commutes by transit of 45 minutes or more are 56.4% of transit trips. People depart for work between 5 and 9 a.m. are 68.1% of all commuters. The majority of Clark County residents work in Clark County at 102,410. Clark County residents that work in Multnomah County total 46,315; in King County 11,042; Washington County 9,820; Clackamas County 6,496; and Cowlitz County 4,672. Work locations for Clark County residents were provided. Also provided was the home county of those commuting to Clark County jobs and the mode used to travel to work. For those who use transit to travel to work, 11.3% of transit commuters have no vehicle available to their household, compared to 1.5% of all commuters have no vehicle. About 23.7% of transit commuters are minorities and while 17.9% of all commuters are minorities. With 13.3% of transit commuters live below the poverty line, while only 5.1% of all commuters live below the poverty line. There are 60.9% of transit commuters that work out-of-state.

Vice Chair McEnery-Ogle said that given the time, if members have questions that don't get answered please contact Mr. Harrington and he would be happy to respond.

Melissa Smith said she appreciated the a.m. peak numbers for the duration of congestion and asked if they know the p.m. peak numbers. Mr. Harrington said for the p.m. peak travel time, once you cross the bridge speeds are at the flow. Within Clark County, they are not experiencing the congestion in the p.m. in the locations that is seen in the a.m.

Eileen Quiring asked for clarification on the counting of trips. She said if someone leaves home and drops off a child at daycare, then goes to the dry cleaner, and then to work, is that 3 trips? Mr. Harrington said it is 4 trips – you and your child are 2 person trips plus 1 person trip to the cleaners and 1 person trip to work.

John Blom asked on the average commute time to work, he questioned what year this referred to. He said the commute of 45 minutes or more only being 13.5% and the number of commuters going into Multnomah County, the number seemed low. Mr. Harrington said the data was from 2015 Census. Since that time, they have seen some marked increases in the level of congestion.

IX. Columbia River I-5 Bridge Planning Inventory

Matt Ransom said that last year the Washington State Legislature approved and the Governor signed a Bill, Substitute Senate Bill 5806 (SSB 5806). This included a requirement to assess past work efforts for the I-5 Bridge Replacement. Mr. Ransom said this asks how to move forward both the conversation and then a practical assessment of the I-5 Bridge and steps that might be appropriate to advance a replacement thereof. They have asked WSDOT staff to brief the

Board with the most recent activities related to SSB 5806 and put some facts on the table. There are steps still yet to come, but this would be an initial briefing of that past work. Carley Francis and Casey Liles would present this item.

Carley Francis said copies of the I-5 Bridge Planning Inventory Report were distributed to Members along with a copy of the bill SSB 5806. Ms. Francis said the SSB 5806 did two things primarily, but with a trajectory and interest in starting a conversation around the idea of restarting development around a project to replace the I-5 Bridge. It directed WSDOT to complete a planning data inventory of past work, which was due December 1, 2017. That was submitted by them on that date. It also established a Joint Legislative Action Committee. The joint committee refers to Oregon and Washington potentially participating in that committee and looking at a variety of activities. That includes how to restart a process for project development to look at roles and responsibilities and also to do some things that were more specific and detailed that will be more work for them to do over the next year. This includes looking at mass transit options, looking at bridge authority, and financing for a potential project, and putting that information into a report to Legislature that is due December 15, 2018.

There is a component of the bill that is about how much work might be reusable from the work completed before. There is an interest in the bill that speaks specifically to non-duplicative decision-making as a value and interest, and there are pieces of data from the work before that are unchangeable type attributes, and there are other things that change over time. The unchangeable type attributes are things like the soils in the river and how far down you go to get a firm foundation to build a bridge on and other components like that. There are a significant number of other things that they have a lot of information on already, but for where they are in the process would require some additional work to bring back.

As for the content of the inventory, there are a variety of sections. One section is on preliminary work. That is before the Columbia River Crossing project started. The rest of it is about work that was conducted under the auspices of the project.

There were a couple of planning studies that came first. This is specific to the long range activities that happened that represent a voice from the region about the importance of looking at I-5 as a facility and also looking more targeted at the five miles around the river crossing itself.

There was the Bi-State Freight Study that was completed. It also identified the fact that for investments of this type, that traditional funding sources were likely insufficient to be able to fund it on their own. Both that study and the Trade and Transportation Partnership Study involved significant public involvement, significant local agency involvement, the RTC Board at the time, and other Boards and Councils across the region. It specifically identified the fact that I-5 was a priority for the region and also identified a variety of projects that were critical bottlenecks to address. Three of the five bottlenecks have been completed to date. The Oregon Transportation package that was passed last year provides funding to consider and

address over time the Rose Quarter area (I-405 to I-84). The remaining project is the five miles around the crossing over the Columbia River. The report documented in the context and constraints section that dealing with the five miles in totality is important. There is not a way to carve that out into smaller pieces when having the conversation about to identify what the problems are and how to address them. It is complicated and this identifies that the five miles needed to be considered comprehensively.

The work with the CRC was conducted with significant public involvement. They worked early and often with Boards and Councils and also with a 26-member Task Force. They started from the point of having the conversation with the public about what visions and values they saw for the corridor, to identify what problems they saw, and specifically to identify a purpose and need. For those not familiar with an environmental process, the purpose and need is a critical component of that process and provides a set of problems that were identified and used to screen anything throughout the process to say any solution has to address these six problems. If it doesn't, it doesn't actually meet the test of being a solution to consider in the project. The six items: growing travel demand and congestion, safety, impaired freight movement, limited public transportation, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and seismic vulnerability were all critical to determining what things might be viable for construction through the project.

Other context and constraints were the distances between interchanges in the corridor. Ideally, for safe merge and diverge activities, you want at least a mile between interchanges. A map with interchanges on I-5 from Denver Avenue in Portland to 39th Street in Vancouver showed seven interchanges with less than one mile between each. This was the driving force for why the five miles needed to be considered in totality. There is not a place where that mile requirement or desire is covered.

Additional constraints include that both the Port of Portland and Port of Vancouver have key locations where they enter and exit the freeway in that section around the bridge. There is the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, which is a federal historic site and has ties to the Native American community. There are significant connections to state facilities, two airports to navigate space around, and it is also an active shipping channel in the river.

Ms. Francis again noted the constraints of the three lanes with the many interchanges and on and off movement of vehicles. She said many, many folks, (2/3 to 3/4) are using one or more of the interchanges in the project area.

Ms. Francis spoke about finance and listed funding sources, costs, and the section covered by the funds. She said there was an assumed \$850 million contribution from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Based on language that Senator Patty Murray had gotten through Congress, they were able to consider the cost contribution from FTA as a component of total project cost. What that really meant was the ability to have FTA essentially fund all of the light rail costs that were a part of the project. Those are funds that are Federal so it is part of the Federal gas tax and are competitive nationally. Also noted was the fact that there were a lot of costs that were not about the river crossing itself. In the past, folks did not understand how a

bridge could cost \$3 billion. The fact was that there were significant highway costs to address those merging and diverging movements and the closely spaced interchanges along with the cost for transit.

In the breakdown of federal and state funding and user fee costs, tolling was considered to be an essential component of funding the project. There was no way to make ends meet on what was anticipated to be necessary to be able to build the project without tolling. Ms. Francis said they completed an Investment Grade Analysis as part of the project. The Investment Grade Analysis is specific to having the backing information so you could go to lenders and they would loan you money based on tolls to know that there was enough sufficiency of information and enough conservativeness of how they were considering those funds to know that they would lend you those funds. It demonstrated that the tolls needed to fund the project would be able to be generated by traffic that was anticipated. There was also a reference to an FHWA contribution of \$400 million; that was an early assumption of the project. Eventually, based on needing to have certainty around funding, it was determined that that was no longer likely to come to fruition, so later in the project, that \$400 million was taken off the table and continued to work on the finance plan without that assumption.

Casey Liles presented the Project Management section of the report. He said throughout long range planning and project development, project management required extensive communication and coordination with the local agencies, elected officials, and the public. They maintained an integrated office that was co-located in downtown Vancouver. Numerous interagency and advisory groups and coordination processes provided input and guidance to inform the project development and decision making.

Mr. Liles highlighted the project development. A slide provided a look at the timeline from 1999 to 2013 for WSDOT and 2014 for ODOT. The CRC's multi-year development phase encompassed planning and engineering activities. Early planning framed the problem and established evaluation criteria. Component screening and alternatives evaluation lead to three remaining alternatives that were recommended to be evaluated in the DEIS. Through their open process, the Task Force chose to add two more alternatives to make it five total alternatives. They included the No Build, Replacement Bridge with Light Rail, Replacement Bridge with Bus Rapid Transit, Supplemental Bridge with Light Rail, and Supplemental Bridge with Bus Rapid Transit. The DEIS was published in 2008, and the locally preferred alternative (LPA) was selected to move forward through the FEIS. A significant amount of engineering work then ensued and was completed during this time: to make refinements to the LPA, complete environmental analysis, and progress towards reaching some significant regulatory milestones. They secured the Biological Opinion, Published the FEIS, and received approval from FHWA and FTA on a Record of Decision. One other very difficult but significant task was they completed the US Coast Guard Permit, which was signed in late 2013.

Public outreach was critical throughout the development to a broad set of community audiences. A significant amount of outreach was conducted on both sides of the river. Community input shaped project development, further outreach, and design.

The Locally Preferred Alternative was defined as a replacement bridge with 3 through lanes and up to 3 add/drop lanes in each direction, light rail transit to Clark College, and highway and pedestrian/bicycle improvements. The LPA was endorsed by all the local Boards and Councils. It did have numerous requests for further study and clarification that took the next two years to analyze and conduct independent reviews while moving towards completion of the FEIS. In 2011 the FEIS was published and was subsequently approved by FHWA and FTA with a Record of Decision. Design and permitting work continued after receiving the ROD including the development of procurement documents.

Throughout project development the project managed risk and refined estimate ranges utilizing expertise and best practices through value engineering studies and risk assessments. In addition, executive leadership from both states requested further external review and validation through review panels.

Mr. Liles discussed project delivery. The CRC project team analyzed and planned for probable project delivery. This included procurement methods as well as phasing, sequencing, and packaging the project elements. Numerous key factors informed this framework, such as interdependencies, jurisdictional boundaries, schedule criticality, financial cash flow for productions, and several others.

For operations and maintenance, the state DOTs share the financial responsibility for the border bridges, but one agency is lead for the bridges. The Interstate bridges are operated and maintained by ODOT. More discussion is anticipated regarding operations and maintenance responsibilities with a replacement bridge. In addition, tolling introduces additional agreement discussions between the states.

Mr. Liles provided a few notable items. Last year the northbound bridge reached its 100 year mark built in 1917, and the southbound bridge was built in 1958. Also of note, by 2040 estimates to maintain and operate the bridges add up to approximately \$300 million, and that does not include seismic retrofit.

The report, key reference documents, and repository of electronic files can be found on WSDOT website at www.wsdot.wa.gov/accountability/ssb5806

Tom Lannen asked the total number of lanes on the locally preferred alternative bridge.

Mr. Liles said there are 3 through lanes on each end of the five mile stretch of the bridge influence area in each direction. Within the bridge influence area, there are also up to 3 additional lanes, add/drop lanes in each direction. At the close of the project they had 2 additional lanes on the bridge and between the intersections in each direction. The add/drop lanes are to address the merge/diverge issues.

Shirley Craddick asked if the Legislation included anything to direct the Governors to interact.

Carley Francis said there is no direction in the Legislation for Governors to have a Governor to Governor conversation. The direction does suggest that Washington Legislature should invite Oregon to the table. That is an activity that they are working on. The Legislative Action

Committee met their first time on December 14, 2017. At that meeting and that conversation in Olympia, they spoke about working on having a letter or other invite over to Oregon. Ms. Francis said they are trying to figure out how to make that ask.

Shirley Craddick asked about the information that they were gathering and working on before the project closed and how much of that is usable for the project and how much rework needs to take place before the project could be viable.

Ms. Francis said the Senate Bill asked WSDOT to be supportive and to provide information and it sets the Legislature in the driver seat. So, that question is highly dependent on what they might choose and how they might figure out a pick up point within the work that was done before. There are a couple categories of information. One category includes those things that don't change – geology. That is information that they have and can still use. With any other portions of the work depends on where they want to pick up the conversation in the project, and also then to make sure there is sufficient information to complete environmental documentation at that point.

Matt Ransom told Board members that when they receive questions from their constituents about this project, he encouraged them to direct them to this report and use it as a tool for information.

X. SR-500, 42nd and 54th Study

Mr. Ransom said he wanted to invite Carley Francis to make a brief presentation. He said the DOT requested this presentation. It is a very important study that is taking place.

Ms. Francis this study is specific to those high volume and high congestion intersections. She said she wanted to explain the context of how they are approaching this study. It is very important and about WSDOT transitioning how they do business to what they call a practical solutions approach. This means bringing folks from across the expertise groups within their department as well as outside of their department to the table to try to figure out what array of solutions might be valuable.

Ms. Francis said not every problem needs an interchange as a solution. Solutions could come in the form of a variety of different types of tools. That also is context specific, so recognizing the state system sits within the local system, sits within the city, or other land based context. Recognize that solutions may be specific to state systems or there may be a more advantageous use of funds on a local system to address that state system problem. It is also about a performance based approach. Once you identify what those problems are collectively with local agency partners and the community, to figure out what it means to address that problem. What type of performance are we seeking out of the solutions that they are proposing? Once you have that expectation of performance, then you analyze all those solutions against that performance expectation. The idea is that once you meet that performance expectation, you would stop escalating solutions, or ways to address the problem. You find the lowest cost effective way to address the problem. Some examples are system management: adaptive

ramp meters, queue warning systems; operational changes: restriping roads, lanes, or ramps or bus on shoulder.

This is how they are approaching the SR-500 NE 42nd/NE 54th Study. These are two signals on a system that otherwise has interchanges. It is also on an east-west corridor that is critical to county movement. There are significant volumes, and there are not that many east-west corridors. It is a significant facility. There are folks locally who will access the corridor at these locations.

It is important to know the number of vehicles that are arriving at that intersection at the peak hour. At 42nd Ave., there are about 12% of folks arriving at the intersection, and at 54th Ave. about 19% of those folks arriving at the intersection. Any type of solution in this area requires a balancing of the through traffic need with some of the local access interests. She said it is important to mention that there is a possibility out of this project that they will look at changes in access for local folks. It may be unpopular, and it may be a challenging conversation, but it is an important conversation to have. It is specifically an important conversation to have because of the crash data. Over the last five years, there have been nearly 400 crashes in the area; that breaks down to is more than one a week. This is a situation in which it calls them to action to look at what they can bring to the area and help to alleviate those crashes.

Ms. Francis said they are looking for cost –effective strategies to address safety issues through practical solutions and also developing information to support funding requests. They have funding to conduct the study. They do not have funding at this time for any of the potential improvements that might be identified through the study.

Ms. Francis addressed their outreach goals, and asked for any feedback. They want to get this information out because of the potential of change to access and also because of the demographics in the corridor. There are three types of questions that they want to be talking about with people. 1) What problems do you see? What needs do you have? 2) Of an array of options, how well do these address problems and needs? What impacts do you see? 3) Of proposed actions, do these effectively address issues and minimize impacts? The audiences they are looking at include neighborhoods, business associations, service providers (school, emergency responders, agencies, and users of SR-500. Demographics in this area identify that there are greater proportions of historically under represented people living in these areas. This tells them that some of their traditional mechanisms for outreach may not be the best tools. They are trying to consider what other options exist. They are also trying to identify local gathering spots so they can meet people where they are at.

They have a Technical Advisory Committee that has already started meeting. They are working with RTC, City of Vancouver, Clark County, and C-TRAN. There is also a Leadership Committee that will meet for the first time in mid- March.

In looking at the study schedule, they hope to mostly conclude things this summer. There is a funding ask that they think they can make this summer, but it is not a certainty.

Eileen Quiring asked if at these intersections people are getting on to SR-500 or just crossing.

Ms. Francis said it is a variety. There are a fair amount of folks northbound at 42nd about 350 vehicles heading north to the intersection and about 180 of those are turning left during the peak hour. That is relatively significant. On the north side coming in southbound, there were lighter numbers. They are paying attention to what those movements look like and considering that as part of what options might be. Councilor Quiring questioned a couple overpasses. Ms. Francis said longer term solutions will also be a part of the conversation, but they are trying to make sure they look at those lower cost enhancements first.

XI. Other Business

From the Board

Rian Windsheimer said they have been doing quite a bit of work on the Value Pricing, and their outreach has been very, very good. They have had almost 1,500 responses to their online survey. A large number of those are coming from Clark County households. In addition they have held three open houses. One in Clackamas County had about 30 attendees. Another held at Lloyd Center had about 70 attendees. The open house at the Vancouver Library had about 150-160 people at the event. Mr. Windsheimer said a report that just came out that day that talked about the Portland area having the 12th worst congestion in the country, and it talks about 50 hours of delay per person in the Portland metropolitan region. The report put a cost on it of \$1,600 per person as time and money wasted in congestion. Mr. Windsheimer said they have not received their data back on the tolling options yet. They will have their next meeting on February 28. Mr. Windsheimer also noted that as part of the Legislature HB 2017, ODOT was required to produce a cost to complete report. This information is available on the Oregon Transportation Commission website. He said it is more efficient to watch their video when they presented the report to the OTC. He would provide the link of the 20 minute clip to Mr. Ransom.

Video Web link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z_rBLCYKK8s&feature=youtu.be&t=4494

Meeting materials link:

http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Get-Involved/OTCSupportMaterials/Agenda_E_HB2017_Abernethy_Bridge_I-205_Widening_Cost_to_Complete_Rpt_PPT.pdf

The report and video talk about what they are doing at I-205 at that bridge, seismic widening, safety improvements, and the lane widening. It is about \$500 million; it's a very expensive project. They will be running out of money this summer and need to identify about another \$34 million to carry them through 2020 and continue to get that design work done. They plan a conversation with the Legislature this month.

From the Executive Director

Matt Ransom referred to the memo included in the meeting packet with Regional Grant Awards. There were two competitive programs at the state level. In the Bridge Program local agencies were able to secure over \$3.6 million for four bridge rehabilitation and maintenance

type projects. Under the statewide competitive Safety Program, three grant awards for over \$2.5 million to local agencies doing safety improvements.

Mr. Ransom referred to the memo handout with the State Legislative Session Update. He said he has sent a couple emails to members with updates on Legislation that they are tracking at RTC.

Mr. Ransom said the RTC Member Contributions (Dues) – YR 2018 Review will come to the Board at the March meeting with a draft 2019 proposal.

Mr. Ransom will be attending the Portland Metro Area Value Pricing Feasibility Study. The next Policy Advisory Committee meeting is on February 28. Mr. Ransom offered any briefing to those Board Members who are on that Committee. The RTC Board will also be receiving their next briefing at their May meeting.

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, March 6, 2018, at 4 p.m.

XII. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 5:47 p.m.

Ron Onslow, Board of Directors Chair