

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Board of Directors
September 4, 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 Chair Ron Onslow on Tuesday, September 4, 2018, 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
Carley Francis, WSDOT (Alternate)
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Council (Alternate)
Bart Hansen, Vancouver Councilmember
Jim Herman, Port of Klickitat Commissioner
Scott Hughes, Port of Ridgefield Commissioner
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver Mayor
Ron Onslow, Ridgefield Councilmember
Scott Patterson, C-TRAN (Alternate)
Mandy Putney, ODOT (Alternate)
Eileen Quiring, Clark County Councilor
Jeanne Stewart, Clark County Councilor

Voting Board Members Absent:

Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor
Shawn Donaghy, C-TRAN Exec. Director/CEO
Tom Lannen, Skamania County Commissioner
Melissa Smith, Camas Councilmember
Kris Strickler, WSDOT SW Region Administrator
Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1 Manager

Nonvoting Board Members Present:

Vicki Kraft, Representative 17th District

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
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, I-5 Bridge Group / LRSW
Jennifer Campos, City of Vancouver
Sorin Garber, Columbia Corridor Association
Carolyn Heniges, Clark County
Eric Holt, Citizen
Scott Langer, WSDOT SW Region
Sharon Nasset, Citizen
Ahmad Qayoumi, Clark County
Ron Swaren, 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
Shann Westrand, Administrative Assistant

II. Approval of the Board Agenda

Ron Onslow asked for a motion to approve of the September 4, 2018 Meeting Agenda.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 4, 2018, MEETING AGENDA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

III. Call for Public Comments

Ron Arp, Identity Clark County, spoke about the Regional Transportation Summit held last week on an update of the I-5 Bridge.

Ed Barnes from Vancouver spoke of the I-5 Bridge Resolutions.

Ron Swaren from Portland spoke about the I-5 Bridge Resolution mentioning to have it include various alternatives, and he provided a handout titled "Portland Transport" regarding public transit in the Portland/Vancouver area.

IV. Approval of August 7, 2018, Minutes

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 7, 2018, MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BART HANSEN AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

V. Consent Agenda

A. September Claims

B. Port of Ridgefield Project Delay Request: Pioneer Street Railroad Overpass, Resolution 09-18-17

C. City of Vancouver Project Delay Request: Mill Plain Boulevard, 104th Avenue to Chkalov Drive, Resolution 09-18-18

D. Regional Origin Destination Study: Professional Services Consulting Agreement, Resolution 09-18-19

E. Urban Freeway Corridor Operations Study: Professional Services Consulting Agreement, Resolution 09-18-20

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA. THIS CONSISTS OF THE SEPTEMBER CLAIMS AND RESOLUTIONS 09-18-17, 09-18-18, 09-18-19, AND 09-18-20. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VI. Memorandum of Understanding Between Metro and Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council, Resolution 08-18-14

Mr. Ransom gave a quick introduction. The item had been removed from the Consent Agenda at the August meeting for discussion, and the Board requested it be addressed at the September meeting. Mr. Ransom included a track changes version of the Agreement that represents the nature of the changes.

Lynda David summarized that RTC is asking for the Board's adoption of the updated memorandum of understanding between Metro and RTC which is part of the federal

metropolitan planning process to promote Collaboration, Coordination and Cooperation between MPOs. RTC and Metro are two MPOs both serving the Portland/Vancouver urbanized area; Metro on the Oregon side and RTC on the Washington side. The two MPOs must coordinate their transportation planning work. Federal law requires that an MOU is in place to outline how the two MPOs will work together to promote the three C's planning process emphasizing Coordination, Cooperation and Collaboration between two MPOs. The MOU between Metro and RTC has been in place since 1998 and is updated at least every three years. As stated in article three, section two on page three of the MOU: "The MOU may be modified or terminated at any time with a mutual written consent of the two parties".

The MOU attached with the resolution today is updated from the version adopted in 2015. Though only minor changes were made, primarily the only changes update the references to the US Code found in recitals 1, 2 and 3 on Page 1 of the MOU. The MOU defines roles and responsibilities for bi-state MPO cooperation. For example: in use of the transportation planning tools where the development of the region's travel forecast model between RTC and Metro and with a review of transportation policies, plans and programs where there is interstate interest. Coordination mechanisms are described in article one on pages one to two of the MOU with Washington representation on Metro's JPACT and TPAC committees, and Oregon representation on the RTC Board of Directors and RTAC Committees.

On page two, section five, there is also description of the bi-state coordination committee and its role. In conclusion, RTC is asking for adoption of resolution 08-18-14 which will authorize RTC's Executive Director to sign the updated MOU between Metro and RTC.

Vicki Kraft, Representative 17th District, said her understanding is that this is a process document, but asked if there was any way or had there been any thought given to trying to address the current contract that's in place with C-TRAN and Tri-Met? Noting it's a very specific portion of this overall process and a pretty important one. Lynda David noted this memorandum of understanding is between RTC and Metro not the Transit agencies. Representative Kraft said she is guessing this is an umbrella document, but wondered if that is something that can be called out or noted in this process. Ms. David said it wouldn't be part of this memorandum of understanding as it is between the two metropolitan planning organizations, not the two transit agencies. Ms. David asked Scott Patterson, C-TRAN, if he had any comment on contracts in place between the two transit agencies.

Mr. Patterson indicated some background in terms of when it was signed and believed to be in 2014. It was a separate contract between C-TRAN and Tri-Met that didn't fall under any of the inter-local agreements being discussed at this meeting. It was through the normal course of work as sponsoring agencies as part of the, now no-longer, CRC project.

Ms. David added for information that there's a memorandum of agreement between RTC, Washington State Department of Transportation and C-TRAN, which is another federally required agreement that needs to be in place and was updated within the last few years. Washington State DOT takes the lead in putting together the basic memorandum of agreement

and then the MPOs and transit agencies and Washington State DOT work together to refine and make it specific to the region that they're in.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 08-18-14, MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN SOUTHWEST WASHINGTON REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL AND METRO AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO SIGN. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Jeanne Steward did comment that she had met with Matt Ransom and talked about some of the interrelated committees that are named, in particular was the bi-state committee, which has not met for a long time. She wanted to make sure that the committee is recognized as still being in existence and can meet as issues come up for bi-state. She also mentioned there probably should be a bi-state meeting before year end to get up to speed on bi-state matters.

VII. 2022 Regional Grant Program – Project Evaluation and Prioritization

Matt Ransom provided a brief introduction noting that this is where they talk about money and the awarding of money to agencies that submitted project applications during this year's open grant cycle. The action before the Board this evening is not policy, but it's an action to proceed. At the conclusion of tonight's report, they're asking for a motion to proceed and then will wrap up the process next month with the adoption of the formal grant awards and Transportation Improvement Program.

Dale Robins noted RTC has some responsibility for regional transportation grant programs. They have about \$9 million per year. The process that they're going through this time is the STBG Urban and CMAQ programs. The purpose of the grant program is that it is required that RTC have a competitive process. Their process is outlined in their guide book that was adopted a couple years ago. Action on this agenda item will be for concurrence of the evaluation, and next month they will come back for approval of the overall grants and adoption of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). They do take everything to the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC) prior to the Board.

Mr. Robins noted that of the 11 grants received, all were eligible for STBG grants and four were eligible for both STBG and CMAQ grant programs. RTC uses the same evaluation criteria for both; the only difference is air quality points are tripled for the CMAQ program. The basic three-step process consists of a project screening, evaluation by the adopted criteria, and then selection projects.

Dale noted in the Screening process, all the projects were deemed to be eligible for consideration of funding once a couple minor adjustments were made. The Congestion Mitigation Air Quality grant program evaluation point totals were indicated and it is shown where RTC thinks funding will run out, and only the top priority project will receive CMAQ funds. On the STBG evaluation, the top seven projects would be funded. Mr. Robins gave a brief description of each project included in the Memo. This will go to RTAC at their September meeting and return to the Board's October meeting for adoption including approval of the grants and also approval of the TIP.

Mr. Robins stated the action before the Board is acceptance of the evaluation process and ranking of projects.

Eileen Quiring wanted to inquire about the C-TRAN bus rapid transit on Mill Plain, STBG Project #5, and asked if this was for infrastructure. Mr. Robins indicated the project description notes the project would construct transit improvements needed for Bus Rapid Transit, and that it would be similar to the project

for the Fourth Plain BRT Vine but include stations that allow at-level boarding and Ticket Taking at the stations. Mr. Robins also noted this is a small portion of the overall project cost and that C-TRAN is also seeking statewide grants and are eligible for federal grants for the roughly \$50 million project. Scott Patterson added to clarify that he believes the year those dollars are expected to become available is in 2022. Based on C-TRAN's current schedule for planning and project development, C-TRAN is anticipating to be well into construction at that time and this portion of funds would be specifically earmarked to help pay for the construction.

Jeanne Stewart said it would be interesting to take into consideration with Mill Plain being a major east/west thoroughfare and how it will tie to all other construction that is going to be ongoing, including changes on SR-500 and diverting traffic. Ms. Stewart wondered if they are looking at timing with a fair amount of traffic that was displaced off Fourth Plain. The Bus Rapid Transit stations and lane changes were being implemented for quite a long time, and asked if they will be integrating all this so that they can reduce frustration of vehicular traffic and drivers.

Mr. Patterson indicated that to the best of C-TRAN's ability, they will be doing that. C-TRAN is partnering with the Washington State Department of Transportation, the City of Vancouver, and City of Camas and meeting regularly. They are part of the technical advisory committee so that when C-TRAN moves into the engineering for the stations and infrastructure on the corridor, that will be one of the things they will be taking a close look at in terms of coordinating with other projects and minimizing the impact to local businesses, as well as automobile and other users of the corridor.

Ms. Stewart asked if there is a timeline for construction from the very beginning to the very end and will it take as long as it did on Fourth Plain? She was concerned that some businesses really suffered on Fourth Plain BRT. Mr. Patterson noted that is one of the things they will be looking at and at this time don't have a start date and end date yet. The general assumption based on it will come down to the number of stations ultimately planned along that corridor. And we are already talking about staging the construction with some of those stations where in you will likely see a longer construction calendar than we saw with Fourth Plain.

Ms. Stewart said she would be really interested to see "statistically" how many more people they are carrying on bus rapid transit. When they talk about these long periods of disruption, she likes to try to think about what the net gain is. Ms. Stewart said maybe she and Mr. Patterson can set up a meeting and talk about how much improvement there is in ridership and functionality from bus rapid transit. Ms. Stewart said that as BRT is our high capacity transit, she would be interested in how that converts to real numbers of people riding.

Mr. Patterson indicated C-TRAN would be happy to meet and that ridership is significantly up 45% in the first year and 20 to 22% on top of last year's numbers for this year. Mr. Patterson said C-TRAN can bring all that data. Ms. Stewart noted the data for the period of construction where people are maybe not riding as often can be taken out. Mr. Patterson noted C-TRAN would be happy to meet.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED THE BOARD ACCEPT THE EVALUATION RANKING SUBMITTALS AS RECOMMENDED BY RTAC AND PROCEED WITH PROJECT EVALUATION. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BART HANSON AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VIII. MAP-21/FAST Act Performance Measures and Target Setting: Status Report

Mr. Ransom noted this is several years in the making, and they are here to present a status report in preparation of what they hope to be the final adoption of a couple of targets. Mr. Ransom recalled the targets were brought to us, or at least the intent to establish targets by U.S. Congress when they adopted the MAP-21 and readopted when they ratified the FAST Act. Mr. Ransom stated they have been well served by the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) in all their work in technical expertise, data assembly, and inventories, and much of RTC's work has been completed by them. What RTC is reporting this evening are targets that WSDOT is recommending on RTC's behalf, and RTC finds to be reasonable and valid for this region. Next month, this item will return for final ratification.

Lynda David stated the purpose of the memo is to update the board on the status of implementing transportation performance based planning with the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration's decision on what aspects of transportation performance should be measured, and the state's work in coordination with the Metropolitan Planning Organizations to set targets for transportation measures. Lynda quickly reviewed performance management and the required performance measures for transit asset management for PM1, which is Safety. PM2 relates to Pavement Conditions and Bridges and PM3 relates to Transportation System Performance, Freight Performance and Air Quality. Lynda will also go over the status of target setting by WSDOT and the Metropolitan Planning Organizations such as RTC. This is an information sharing agenda item and will prepare the Board for action on performance measure target setting for transit asset management for PM2 and PM3 later this fall.

A slide provided a recap of key concepts of transportation performance management which is a strategic approach that uses data and system information in order to make an informed transportation investment and policy decisions. The aim of the USDOT is for greater consistency in the reporting of transportation conditions and performance at regional, state and national levels.

A graphic showed component pieces of the transportation performance management approach. Performance measures and targets are put into place, monitored and then reported on. The USDOT will be compiling data and monitoring progress toward reaching national goals. The State Department of Transportation and the MPOs are to set targets for the performance measures.

The USDOT, state DOTs and the MPOs each have a role in the performance management framework. In MAP-21, Congress set seven national goals. The USDOT used those goals to establish performance measures. State DOTs and transit agencies are responsible for establishing performance targets for these measures and for developing performance plans.

RTC as this regions MPO also has a role in the process and once the Department of Transportation and transit agency established performance targets, then the MPO needs to review the targets, agree to support them, or set their own. Also, they need to address

performance based planning in Regional Transportation Plans and in Transportation Improvement Programs and track projects over time for consistency with plans and to help make progress towards the targets and national goals.

They reviewed the status of implementing the performance measures and target setting for each of the performance measure components, Transit Asset Management, Safety Targets, Pavement and Bridge Condition and Highway Performance, Freight and Air Quality.

WSDOT has informational portfolios available on their website for each of these performance categories and they were attached with today's packets. Table one on page two of the memo has a summary of the transportation performance measures now established by the USDOT.

The status of transit asset management or TAM was provided. Back in December 2016, C-TRAN set initial state of good repair targets, and the RTC board took action to concur with C-TRAN's targets in June of 2017. The federal government acknowledged that transit agencies weren't given sufficient time to gather all the needed supporting data in the time given to come up with the initial targets. So they gave transit agencies additional time to complete a TAM plan and established targets. C-TRAN will complete the TAM plan targets this month and will be taking these to their Board in September. The MPO, which is RTC, must adopt the transit agency state of good repair targets within 180 days of the transit agency establishing its targets. RTC must address TAM targets in both the RTP and the TIP, if they are adopted after October 1, 2018, so the upcoming TIP and RTP update must address these transit asset management targets.

The state of good repair targets are to be reviewed and updated by C-TRAN every year, and the TAM plan that C-TRAN puts together must be updated at least every four years.

The RTC board has already addressed the first round of safety targets. You may recall that in January of 2018, the RTC board reviewed the safety performance targets already established by Washington State DOT. The Board voted to support attaining WSDOT Safety Targets, and these targets are based on achieving Target Zero. WSDOT has to review and adopt safety targets annually. And as MPO, RTC is awaiting for the updated crash data on which WSDOT will base these updated targets. Again, RTC has to address safety targets and both the RTP and the TIP after October 1, 2018. There is a WSDOT safety folio available on their website if you would like to look at this. It was reviewed by the Board earlier this year before the initial Board adoption of the safety targets.

Ms. David turned attention to what is known as PM2, PM3 performance measures for which WSDOT has already set targets for which RTC must establish targets or choose to support the state's targets within 180 days of the WSDOT setting targets. Lynda wanted to be sure the Board was prepared for upcoming Board action in the future months.

First there are pavement condition targets. The WSDOT pavement portfolio is attached with the memo, and it outlines the pavement condition targets set by WSDOT in May of 2018. For the National Highway System (NHS) which is the interstate system, state routes, and some principle arterials, WSDOT set two year and four-year targets. The RTC Board must consider and adopt the pavement conditions within 180 days by November 20th of this year. Next,

there are targets for bridge conditions. The WSDOT bridge folio is also attached with the memo and outlines the bridge condition targets set by DOT in May 2018 for the NHS bridges. The RTC Board must consider and adopt the targets within 180 days by November 20th of this year.

Finally, there are what is known as the PM3 performance measures and targets for system performance. WSDOT performance portfolio outlines the target set by DOT in May of 2018. The performance measures include travel time reliability on the interstate and non-interstate NHS and truck travel time reliability on the interstate system only. The RTC Board has to consider these and either support the state's targets or adopt their own by November 20th. The way staff has looked at this, they're probably best to try to support the state targets. RTC is an air quality attainment area, so the air quality performance targets don't need consideration.

The final slide where they consider the next steps is where they are preparing for RTC Board action to support C-TRAN's targets for transit asset management and to support the WSDOT established targets for pavement and bridge conditions and for system and freight performance. After the initial targets are set, RTC, DOT, and C-TRAN will need to coordinate on the next round of data review and target setting. It's an ongoing cycle. With this year's transportation program and adoption of the updated RTP in early 2019, RTC will need to address these performance targets in the plan and in the improvement program. And they'll need to describe the targets established for the transit asset management and PM1 safety. In upcoming years, they'll also have to address the PM2 and PM3 performance measures and targets.

Mr. Greenlee asked about pavement performance, pavement management; the City of Washougal uses a City-wide Pavement Management Index and if the same measures were used with this.

Mark Harrington indicated the state is doing their own measurement of the entire NHS system, whether that is state owned or locally owned. And currently they've done an IRI, an index of "the roughness index", and will add two of the measurements to that with cracking and rutting. There are different parameters and to say whether those are good, two of those have to be good and there's a whole matrix of how that works. Their measurements will be independent of local jurisdictions, but in developing this management system the state has talked with locals as well. To get information on pavement degradation and various climates around the State and what happens in Spokane is different than what happens here in SW WA and Seattle. So they try to look at the life cycle of pavement around the state.

Chair Onslow asked if there were any other questions. Marc Boldt had the same question. The County Road Administration Board (CRAB) has their own pavement and they think they're better than the City. Councilor Boldt said they have talked a lot about CRAB and that there are differences between state pavement management systems and the county. He asked how they align them or if they are going to align them with CRAB.

Mr. Harrington indicated the state system is going to be used for this particular performance measure for MAP-21. But this goal is a statewide number; it's not particularly here within Clark

County, this is your particular goal. They're going to be in support of a statewide goal of some of the percentage being good and of a percentage being poor. This allows the State flexibility of how they address that target geographically speaking. But that's their proposed method.

Mr. Boldt just stated he hopes they have communication as both the agencies are statewide, and Clark County handles most of the traffic.

Ms. David said the thing that has to be remembered is it applies to the NHS so it's the principle arterials in Clark County that the local jurisdictions would have to be reporting on.

Mr. Boldt said they started out as a county road.

Mr. Onslow said to Mr. Boldt, if he wanted to talk about some of the county roads, he is welcome to do that some time.

Eileen Quiring asked as it looks like these are performance measures and targets and asked if at some point there's going to be a list or if it is going to be percentages. She also said the presentation stated that we are going to be asked to actually live by this. In other words, prioritize what we're doing in accordance with these measurements and standards.

Ms. David said she thinks that was the desire and aim of the USDOT and to compare different states and how they perform or how projects might help towards the targets within your state.

Ms. Quiring asked if there is paperwork for this.

Ms. David said at the present, the only penalty that might be in place is if you don't implement projects that can help reach the safety targets, and WSDOT looked overall how the state was performing. WSDOT viewed it as not a problem with trying to implement the safety program because they're already dedicating sufficient funds towards safety.

Representative Kraft asked to understand correctly, these performance measures are what are going to be adopted potentially, or some custom version of this. She asked if they know if there is any prioritized ranking of these measures that comes down nationally. She said many are important, certainly, but she was just curious.

Ms. David indicated the performance measures summarized on page two are already in place at the national level. The National Highway and Federal Transit Administration have already set these performance measures, so it's the state DOTs and the MPOs that have to set the targets toward reaching national goals relating to these measures. So we don't have any flexibility on the performance measures. As far as prioritization, being as the only performance measure at the moment that has a penalty assigned to it is Safety. We could say safety is the priority at the national level because of that.

Ms. Quiring asked if some of these safety issues come up in our area, will they see a list of where that should be going.

Ms. David stated RTC will review the safety performance in the area every one to two years and how, statewide level, we are doing or how the state is doing towards attaining target goals.

Mr. Ransom said that he thinks Congress wanted a dashboard in 2012 when they adopted MAP-21. They wanted a performance dashboard because it didn't exist at the national level. I think what we have concluded with RTC and staff and the work the DOT has done is best just to get this dashboard put together and as you go through the cyclical process of update and review knowing that we have to review every couple of years. We'll start to understand how it works or doesn't, and we get to the questions and observations which are how are we spending our money and are we getting an impact. When we adopt these this fall, we've committed to agree with the state, but it could be that three years down the line or four years down the line, that we may want to think if there's a local issue. We don't know now because we've never measured things consistently. It's actually been a struggle over six years to get to this point, and I think I'm willing to say, let's set the dashboard up and see how it works.

IX. Regional Ramp Meter Implementation – Guest Presentation by WSDOT

Mr. Ransom introduced Scott Langer, Assistant Regional Administrator – Operations and Planning at WSDOT. Scott gave this presentation to RTAC last month and is a strong representation of what the department is trying to do right now in our region on getting more sophisticated using signal technology and management strategies to get the most out of our system.

Scott Langer noted his presentation really gets into some of the details of the I-5 corridor between the bridge and 99th Street project including more of the background of why WSDOT is doing this and the importance of these types of treatments. Mr. Langer went over WSDOT's "Practical Solutions" approach to operate and maintain the state's transportation system, ensuring the use of the current facilities in the most efficient use quickly and inexpensively, with projects that don't take 30 years to implement and to get the project in the ground quicker. This is much along the lines of performance measures to be performance based and driven. Where has this been done already; What benefits have they seen; and How can we apply that? Particularly, WSDOT will be concentrating on safety Target Zero and transportation system management and operations.

Mr. Langer went over slides that included pictures of what WSDOT calls bottlenecks. WSDOT spends a lot of money on this 40% of the congestion, which is where there is a problem and WSDOT tries to fix the one area and which only accounts for 40% of all the congestion. WSDOT found that 60% of congestion can be broken down into this non-reoccurring. It's not only the daily congestion, it can be an accident or crash or a work zone or even a signal timing that doesn't react to changing conditions. That's more of their operational target. They're still targeting the peak hours, because they still get some benefit, but they get a lot of benefit out of the non-peak hours. Good performance measure that comes with operations is reliable.

This is why that is important. Mr. Langer gave an example; if you're a shift worker, how many times a month can you be late to work, maybe once. Once a month you can get away with it. If the facilities you use for travel have multiple crashes, you're going to have to balance your time in for that incident for the whole month. Maybe it normally takes you 20 minutes, but twice a

month it might take you 30. If you can't be late for a shift start, you're going to leave based on the 30 minutes. Our goal is to try to shrink down that area where you see the incidents. And really try to shorten that up so we have a more reliable travel time. WSDOT is working at getting to that smaller number rather than the big number and not having to account for the big incident type events. This is also important to the manufacturing industry. A recent tour at Boeing, a little over a year ago, they try not to warehouse anything. They want the product to show up when they are ready to put it on the plane. If your system is unreliable and they're having incidents and not getting them cleared quickly, what ends up happening is they cannot depend on that product to get there on time. The person driving the truck is essentially driving for free as truckers are paid by the mile. WSDOT's main tool in dealing with reliability is the incident response trucks. They can get out, push a crash out of the lane, and get the lane back open. Active traffic demand management is what WSDOT will be trying to address reliability; to dynamically manage the system, attacking reoccurring and non-reoccurring congestion and getting the most out of their system as they can.

Mr. Langer stated a lot of what they do is static management, which is setting up signal systems, and retiming them every three years. Where WSDOT wants to go is to be able to respond to what is actively happening in the system at that time. Whether an incident, weather, anything like that. They want to be able to do that on the fly. FHWA has a list of the ATDM strategies. The three they're going to focus on include: Adaptive Ramp Metering, Dynamic Lane Use Control and Dynamic Speed Limits. The public generally has a hard time understanding the benefit of these strategies, especially something like ramp metering. Mr. Langer showed a graph of the data from Highway 405 in Seattle. This is repeated in almost every corridor we have. He said what we know is that we don't actually get the max capacity of free flow speeds. It's about where you get to the point of the 40, 45, 50 mph where cars get closer together and you get more vehicles through. There comes a point where we turn the corner where there is too much demand and where we slow the speeds down too much and no longer getting the benefit. The graph also shows that as speeds drop from the capacity of 2400 down to 1400, which means that during the highest demand periods, we are losing 1,000 vehicles an hour. The existing capacity we have out there is variable; and the closer we get to that break down point, the closer we get to it growing tremendously.

Mr. Langer went on to report that WSDOT wants to use ramp meters to help before getting to that breakdown point. The goal is to hold the facility at the 45 miles per hour range getting the most out of our existing lanes that we can and to prevent getting to the flow breakdown area. A lot of times during the heaviest peak hours, we can't completely stop that, but it can delay it or at least get the system to recover quicker. Even if you take 15 minutes of each end of that peak hour congestion, that's 30 minutes more of that freeway moving and goods are getting through there. Mr. Langer went over a case study that was done by Minnesota DOT in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area. When Jessie Ventura was elected, he didn't like their ramp meters so they did a study by having a good share of the metro area ramp meters shut off for six weeks and hired an independent consultant to come in. They found when they turned the ramp meters off they had a 26% increase in crashes; 91% decrease in reliability; 22% increase in

travel time; and a 14% decline in throughput. This study was done for a six week period so it was long to get a full result.

Mr. Langer then went over Dynamic Lane Control which helps to notify vehicles that something is happening in the corridor ahead, which is beneficial in preventing a secondary crash on the system. So we have a crash, let's say down in the corridor. We have curves in the corridor. Allowing drivers ahead of time to know there is an incident ahead is important, and it is important for first responders' safety. The big benefit is that drivers are no longer coming up on the fire truck and slamming on their brakes. They're at least slowing down and looking for it.

Mr. Langer also went over Dynamic Speed Limits. These are where certain speed limits are set during the day, but they found in Seattle that they had a hard time enforcing them. WSDOT does not plan on using this system and decided they didn't need that function.

WSDOT did need the Dynamic Advisory that ODOT is extensively expanding which is designed to give drivers a warning that something is coming. What they found in Seattle with the regulatory system, drivers may not have been hitting the brakes right away when it comes up, but they're starting to. They're starting to slow down and are aware of something ahead that they need to be ready for. An early result from ODOT is the reliability factor with the shrinking travel times allowing drivers to have a more reliable estimate on how long it's going to take them to get from one place to the other.

In finishing, Mr. Langer mentioned the benefit costs from practical solutions of less expensive solutions and getting most for our money. For every dollar you invest into the facility, you get about \$3 back in economic benefit from improved operations; folks not sitting in congestion and the crash function. WSDOT has estimated with this project, the benefit will be for every dollar spent on it there will be \$12 back. A lot comes out of the crash reduction.

Mr. Langer noted there is one ramp meter coming on line and a second one at SR-14 and I-5. The next will be I-205 at SR-500 northbound. The other benefit is being located so close to WSDOT's office they can get the public perception standpoint, and WSDOT staff is going to have to sit at a ramp meter too to get the benefit.

Mr. Langer stated this is a funded safety project and actually found across the country the great operational benefit is the number one impact of crash reduction, not operational. This was on part of the statewide screening list from 2009 to 2013. That's why Mr. Langer was showing that data. That's actually where they qualified for the project. No surprise here in that corridor between the bridge and 99th street. Lots of rear ends, side swipes, and injury crashes as well.

Mr. Greenlee asked "What is a PDO?" that shows up on the crash summary.

Mr. Langer indicated PDO is "Property Damage Only", i.e., fender benders. The bridge itself had a number of crashes during that point. So to point at the ATM system being able to warn ahead of time the crashes on the bridge or a stalled vehicle is beneficial. One thing they looked at is the benefits over not just the morning peak hour but across the day. One thing that is

starting to develop on I-5 is not just the morning peak but around the noon hour. They're starting to get times where I-5 is breaking down southbound at the noon hour. No surprise that's the secondary spike in injury crashes as well. So that's an area where they think they'll get some benefit out of the commute time but also looking at the other 20 hours of the day and trying to stop this from happening, and really, again, reestablishing the reliable corridor outside of those peak hours.

Mr. Langer wanted to also share what happened between 2011 and 2016 on I-205 and SR-14 as well. While delays went up on them, it wasn't as significant as the I-5 corridor. He said he thought there's a story to be told on this. That goes back to the 2013 and 2014 morning peak data showing speeds around 40 mph and the 2015/2016 data shows the drop down to 30 mph. The huge jump shows the threshold has been crossed and gotten to the point where they're losing capacity on the corridor. Mr. Langer wanted to show this to demonstrate that when they get to that point of breakdown, it's not equal. They get a 3% growth in traffic, therefore, they get a 3% increase in travel time. If they cross that threshold to a certain point, it's more than that. It's going to grow exponentially. That's kind of where they are on the corridor and part of the reason they're trying to attack that corridor for these reasons. The ramp meter proposal would be adding ramp meters in the southbound direction between the river and 99th Street. The ATM in the similar corridor doing advisory speed we are able to use a lot of existing structures. In Seattle, because they did regulatory, they had to worry about placement because it is a legally enforced speed limit. Because WSDOT's will be advisory, they could reuse a lot of existing structures within that corridor which brought their costs down. Currently they're in design. The goal is to complete prior to the trunnion work on the I-5 Bridge in the fall of 2020. They would be hoping in the spring of 2020 to have a system on and ready to go.

Ms. Stewart asked about the slide of the I-5 corridor 99th Street to the river and what it was supposed to say.

Mr. Langer indicated that's just, really, the point of the slide that it is a very variable corridor. Because they have a lift bridge and they don't know when it's going to lift, they have this variability where they have traffic coming through the corridor, coming at full speed and they ask them to stop because they lift the bridge. What the ATM system does is they are trying to prevent crashes as a result of the change, and the ramp meters they are trying to show how they can get the system back up to operating as quick as they can after a bridge lift. This corridor has a lot of variability from the curves and everything else.

Ms. Stewart then asked about the I-205 northbound that says to install one ramp meter. She asked if they were implying that on this next slide I-5 corridor, 99th Street to river. Are they going to install ramp meters on those on-ramps?

Mr. Langer said that was correct; they will be on the southbound direction.

Ms. Stewart asked if all the ramps for I-5 will be metered.

Mr. Langer indicated that for now, that is the scope level plan. They're in design and part of that design is making sure that all those ramps are capable physically of being able to handle

that in a safe manner. So that will be determined as they get into the final design. Their funding is based on being able to basically retrofit what is there.

Ms. Stewart asked if they looked upstream or downstream at the impacts of where the people will be waiting for the ramp meter and it begins to back up.

Mr. Langer said these are fully dynamic meters. These are not the meters of the 1980s. They have detection on the ramps. On streets where they don't currently have backups, for example, Fourth Plain and as you go further up. The goal there at the ramp meter is to break up the platoons that are coming up on the freeway from the signal. What it's going to do is monitor that ramp. So when a queue gets backed up to a certain point where it's getting in danger of getting back onto that side street, it starts plugging traffic faster to prevent that. They don't want to gridlock the local system. It's a huge part of the transportation system in general. So the systems that they have today are set up to recognize that.

Ms. Stewart then said the other problem that you get with this is people who can see that it's a possibly unpredictable amount of time you could be on that ramp, so it diverts traffic. So roads and streets that didn't have as much traffic are going to have more traffic as people are looking for a closer route to the bridge.

Mr. Langer said that where the congestion goes back onto Main Street, these meters will actually keep them on I-5. It will take away some of that advantage of trying to jump the cue, because the meter will hold them back. The goal is to get I-5 moving at a rate that is more beneficial to stay on the highway than use the local streets. WSDOT also wanted to do this in a corridor approach compared to one off-ramp to keep from redistributing traffic.

Ms. Stewart's other question was about the crash summary. She said they know there are accidents and crashes, and asked if they have looked at the ratio of the number of crashes to the total volume of traffic that uses the bridge.

Mr. Langer indicated Yes.

Ms. Stewart asked how that compared with other thoroughfares.

Mr. Langer indicated it is pretty high. That's why it was on the state screening criteria. They factor that into the volumes and crash rate as well.

Ms. Stewart said she would be interested in those counts and statistics and will contact WSDOT for that information.

Carley Francis, WSDOT, interjected that she would say from a historical perspective from the CRC days, whether or not that reads to you, that's fair. They saw folks were three to four times more likely to get in a crash on this facility as compared to other comparable facilities in the region. That's a piece of information from that timeframe.

Ms. Stewart said it seems like that number could be important. This is a huge volume of traffic.

Mr. Langer agreed. Ms. Stewart thanked Mr. Langer.

Mr. Onslow thanked Mr. Langer very much, and said it was interesting.

X. Resolution Supporting the Replacement of the Interstate Bridge between the State of Washington and the State of Oregon

Mr. Ransom noted that this Resolution is for discussion this evening and went over the list of resolutions that have been adopted by this Board in years past that relate to or support a project to replace the I-5 Bridge. He said he considered that sort of the policy backdrop this Board could use in their discussion. He noted the first resolution to this effect was adopted by the Board of RTC back in 2002, and subsequently, during the I-5 Columbia River Crossing EIS process, there were several resolutions adopted. Most recently, this Board adopted a series of resolutions adopted last spring that supported an initiative under way by our legislative delegation to establish in law a frame work for designating this bridge as a project of statewide significance and also clearing impediment of law that existed in one of the appropriations bills out was a law by the Board last year. In summary, he considered the topic and subject to be of interest. There's probably some timeliness as well, if you follow SB-5806 in the intent to establish review of past work. Mr. Ransom said the Board heard from regional administrator Kris Strickler earlier this year that they've worked on that and delivered a report to the legislature. That would be the Inventory. The Board heard a briefing this spring and the intent of the state legislature is to convene a bi-state meeting to reinvigorate the conversation about the I-5 bridge replacement. Mr. Ransom said to his knowledge, a joint bi-state meeting has not been held, but he does know that the Washington delegation met at least on one or two occasions to continue the conversation. It's important the question of how we take and move forward on an important regional project and there are probably any number of ways to do that. In conclusion, Mr. Ransom said he thought the discussion this evening is really around whether they would like to put this on for action at a forthcoming meeting, maybe in October or in the future, to take this resolution as-is, do nothing, or revise it.

Chair Onslow asked for discussion.

Ms. Stewart stated her primary concern about this resolution and other similar resolutions are that it is very general. It has a few specifics and once RTC and other jurisdictions say, yes to rebuild the I-5 Bridge, that says replace and in some places it's referred to as rebuild. I think it was referred to in the County Council as rebuild. At least that term was used. Her concern is based on the experience of having sat through at least 10 years of CRC and seeing how the project changed over time. She doesn't think it's a good idea to give a general approval to either replace or rebuild generally where details of that may not come back. Because both Clark County and RTC are members of RTC, they may see things developing in that rebuild or replacement that they believe are not in the interest of Southwest Washington. So it is too vague in specifics and too general, in her estimation, to be a safe decision in the long term. Her concerns are similar about the County Council review of this same resolution.

Mr. Greenlee said he takes a slightly different point of view. He feels you can't start a project until you start a project. You can't be specific until you start the project. Until you have

agreement that you have to have a project, you can't possibly have specifics. It costs money to make specifics, a lot of money and time. So the other thing is, any delay here is just more delay. We need the bridge and the sooner the better.

Anne McEnery-Ogle stated this resolution was simply to ask the governor to put it in the budget to direct WSDOT to start a project, just to begin a new project and to start the conversation.

Representative Kraft said as this resolution is being considered, she just wanted to bring up a few points. First of all, in paragraph five, where it talks about the existing bi-state public transit service being inadequate to meet demand. Ms. Kraft suggested the whole paragraph be removed or certainly very much more clarified to Councilor Stewart's suggestion. Also if you look at the next page Paragraph 9, where it talks about addressing congestion, she agreed a much more accurate depiction of what that reduction of congestion is going to look like as a target and how they're going to get there. She stated she can appreciate what that project is trying to do, but reducing highway congestion through not just moving people off to transit, which, again, not the demand currently. That's a concern she has, but really getting specific on that reduction of congestion target. Those are some of the primary concerns. She asked the resolution to be updated to reflect those accordingly.

Mr. Herman asked if there has been a study as far as having another bridge further east.

Mr. Onslow indicated this doesn't address that.

Mr. Herman wondered whether it would be advantageous to look at that.

Mr. Ransom stated the most recent review of corridors, RTC commissioned a study through its membership in 2008 called the Future Corridor Visioning Study which is on RTC's website. As part of the report, it took a look at the question if Clark County was a million people population at some future date, would it need additional transportation corridors like highway type corridors where you have more throughput and capacity. One of the conclusions if you grew the same more out versus up, there may be value in creating an east side corridor and west side corridor that would create throughput capacity. As part of that, the study said, if you have these through corridors at the end of the river, would it make sense to extend them across the river. One of the conclusions was, it could, but there was no determination that it made sense. A formal study by sponsoring agencies, let's say for the DOT's or the counties, was suggested. The recommendation to the members of the RTC was, does anybody want to study this further in the growth management plan. Then the recession began, and since then, no one has taken the question up in a formal way. In perhaps good reason; growth management planning is difficult, particularly if it's beyond the 20 year horizon. It's challenging to sort of organize around the long-term questions.

Mr. Greenlee questioned the statement if Clark County grew to a population of a million.

Mr. Ransom clarified that it was a population of one million people.

Mr. Greenlee stated that's more than double the present population.

Mr. Ransom described that the study didn't contemplate scenarios, it contemplated one potential outcome. Mr. Ransom said he thought that is in part one of the reasons no one has taken it up. It's difficult to assess scenarios which is the next step if that should occur. Those are fundamental public policy questions about how and where the community should accommodate future growth.

Mr. Hughes, Port of Ridgefield, noted that is the dream of a lot of planners that they do grow up instead of out, but if you take a look at Ridgefield and La Center, and Battle Ground, you're not seeing that. They have tremendous growth. It's a good planning method to be looking at something like that. Where do we need another freeway? He didn't know if it's east or west. He said as far as all three ports, this bridge is a problem. It's not failing; it has failed. They have a hard time getting businesses here, and you can't ask these businesses any longer to move their hours; they are already doing that. Mr. Hughes thanked Mr. Langer for the great presentation. There are only so many cars that can go over the bridge in an hour; it's been extended out. The quickest fix is to replace the bridge or get something with more capacity or whatever. If they try to do a third freeway around here, which is needed, it will take 30 to 40 years. This cannot wait that long.

Ms. Kraft noted one other quick follow up. She wanted to request on the second page of the resolution where letter B says high capacity transit with a dedicated guideway. She requested that the statement be clarified to ensure it is not interpreted as meaning light-rail transit.

Ms. McEnery-Ogle stated the City of Vancouver purposely crafted the language to be consistent with terminology of the federal transit authority; for a dedicated guideway. Vancouver did not want to drill down to the specifics. The purpose was to get WSDOT to start the conversation. We have 10,000 new people in the City of Vancouver since we lost this bridge project in 2013. We want to start a conversation. We did not have BRT at the time and are excited about the fact it came in on time under budget and has a higher ridership than the fixed route. They want that part of the conversation. They specifically did not want to drill down to specifics on this. They want WSDOT to start a conversation.

Ms. Quiring said she would say a conversation has started. It's already been named a project of state significance. RTC has had it on their plan for years, and they learned that at the last meeting they talked about this. There's no denying that the Ports and freight commuters, everybody that uses this bridge is having a problem. They want to be able to, she said she had two views. One, she would like to create an economic engine right here in Clark County so that so many commuters didn't have to cross. We still have freight. We still have goods that need to move across the bridge. To the comment that these resolutions need to be the same, they do not; they're not a directive. So they do not have to be the same. She would rather have RTC actually come up our own resolution, maybe starting with the executive committee of RTC, come up with a draft of a resolution that we pass. She said she knows the Clark County

Councilors are working on something, but she didn't think we need to use an existing resolution; maybe we could make it more suited for RTC specifically.

Ms. Francis stated that this is really not WSDOT's current conversation, but this is a local conversation and they appreciate there's a robust conversation about I-5. They see it's been a problem for a long time, it continues to be a problem, and it's getting worse. She offered a clarification to Councilor Quiring that this was not named a project of statewide significance. It was discussed but not passed. Ms. Francis also recognizes Councilor Stewart's comment about concerns about coordination into the future and what that looks like. WSDOT's commitment and dedication is working with all partners and moving things forward in whatever way they are offered the opportunity do so thru legislature. She knows that makes others uncomfortable and a little nervous based on language in here, but that it has been done in the past and they plan to do in the future. Also, on the transit question that's been raised, she thinks it's fair to say that the conversation going forward will likely be very different around LRT or BRT or another mode. That is simply because BRT exists here in a way that it didn't before. Being open to those possibilities makes a little bit of sense now to look at the data for what the reliability can be provided through transit options looking forward. The conversation just plainly will be different.

Mr. Onslow said he would like to say one thing about what Mr. Ransom stated in the Staff Report: they can do nothing, they can adopt the resolution as submitted in a future meeting, or they can provide feedback to the executive director for the follow up efforts and/or actions. There are options here. Nobody says it has to be this particular resolution; it can be modified and or defeated or as is.

Ms. Stewart thanked Chair Onslow. As she said, she saw how the CRC developed and mutated, so to speak, and changed and so on and so forth after the fact. She is really concerned that in a resolution what we seem to drag our feet on not insisting on, is that in the development of an I-5 bridge replacement bridge, rebuild. They were not holding firm to the need for adding capacity for motor vehicles. She sees they're going to have bicycles, transit, all kinds of stuff, but the ports and businesses and trucking and other uses, high uses, need more motor vehicle lanes. She said it's senseless to build a bridge that does not include higher capacity for motor vehicles. She would be really interested in seeing a proposal that does that.

Chair Onslow again reminded this is not specific; this is just a starting point.

ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT THE RESOLUTION AS SUBMITTED AT THE OCTOBER MEETING. MR. GREENLEE SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION PASSED WITH ABSTENTIONS FROM JEANNE STEWART, CARLEY FRANCIS, AND MANDY PUTNEY.

Chair Onslow clarified that the Board just moved this item forward to the next meeting. Ms. Quiring asked if that was "As it is" and Ms. Stewart asked if that is an action.

Chair Onslow asked Mr. Gathe if he could explain what took place.

Ted Gathe noted that what the Board just did was a procedural action to move the item to the October meeting where it will be on the agenda as an action item. It was not an action item today. It was procedural and appropriate for the Board to move it forward in that manner.

Ms. Quiring asked if there will be an opportunity to amend the resolution.

Mr. Ransom indicated that there will be an opportunity; any time there is subject to action.

Chair Onslow suggested that if anybody had any questions that they wanted answered that they take the time to put it down and get it to Mr. Ransom.

XI. Other Business

From the Board

From the Director

Matt Ransom provided an update on the Oregon Department of Transportation Value Pricing proposal. There was a meeting of the Oregon Transportation Commission on the 16th of August where they heard the report from the policy advisory committee. A couple of the members of the RTC Board were on what they called the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC). The Commission heard the PAC's report and provided direction to ODOT on how to proceed. Mr. Ransom attached a summary where ODOT documented the two steps they did take. They did take the PAC recommendation and authorized the ODOT staff to prepare an application to federal highway consistent with the parameters of the PAC recommendation. They'll release a draft of the application for OTC review in November. Mr. Ransom said if you look at the intent of the application as he understands it, it is to initiate the process with federal highway asking questions like, what kind of environmental process do they have to go through; and what kind of approvals do they need to secure? A lot may be procedural. They will update this board as it might be appropriate. These will be the comments RTC submitted to the commission this summer.

The second thing is there's a recommendation by the PAC to maybe look more broadly across the system, for example, 84, 26, 217, et cetera. The Oregon Transportation Commission did agree with that general principle and have authorized the department under some future schedule to review those other corridors and maybe go through a similar exercise. Those are the two things that occurred this summer on that issue.

Mr. Ransom also noted the memo of the comments that RTC put together when they reviewed Metro's draft regional plan. At the last meeting, there was some conversation briefly about RTC commenting on their plan, and these comments are included in the memo. They are very high level and very broad since most of their plan and projects relate to city streets. There are few areas of cross over, namely the interstate highways. RTC made comments noting consistency, and didn't make comments in terms of judgment like we think that was a good or bad idea. At this level of review, they didn't have the prerogative to make those kinds of comments. That's what RTC did to follow up since the last Board meeting.

Mr. Ransom pointed out that RTC is hosting a multi-agency open house to discuss regional projects and recognize each of the agencies that will join us September 10th at the Vancouver downtown library. Mr. Ransom thought that all agencies around the table: WSDOT, C-TRAN, Vancouver, Clark County, and a few others are going to be there with projects they want public input on. This is a good opportunity for everyone to join in and highlight a bunch of projects all at once. Mr. Ransom said he appreciates everybody that can attend that evening from 4:00 to 7:00 p.m. It is an opportunity to take comments and show case projects.

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, October 2, 2018, at 4 p.m.

XII. Adjourn

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

Ron Onslow, Board of Directors Chair