

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Board of Directors
November 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 Chair Ron Onslow on Tuesday, November 6, at 4:00 p.m. at the Vancouver City Hall Aspen Room, 415 West 6th Street, Vancouver, Washington. The meeting was televised and recorded by CVTV. Attendance follows.

Voting Board Members Present:

Marc Boldt, Clark County Councilor
Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor
Shawn Donaghy, C-TRAN Exec. Director/CEO
Carley Francis, WSDOT (Alternate)
Bart Hansen, Vancouver Councilmember
Scott Hughes, Port of Ridgefield Commissioner
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver Mayor
Ron Onslow, Ridgefield Councilmember
Eileen Quiring, Clark County Councilor
Melissa Smith, Camas Councilmember
Jeanne Stewart, Clark County Councilor

Voting Board Members Absent:

Jim Herman, Port of Klickitat Commissioner
Tom Lannen, Skamania County Commissioner
Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1 Manager

Nonvoting Board Members Present:

Nonvoting Board Members Absent:

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

Guests Present:

Ron Arp, Identity Clark County
Ed Barnes, Citizen
Dustin Cooley, PBS USA
Rian Davis, Clark County Assoc. of Realtors
Sorin Garber, SGA Consulting
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Councilmember
Larry Keister, Port of Camas-Washougal Commissioner
Laurie Lebowsky, Clark Co. Community Planning
John Ley, Citizen
Ryan Makinster, BIA of Clark County
Kelly McNutt, Kiewit
Sharon Nasset, ETA / Citizen
Gavin Oien, DEA
Scott Patterson, C-TRAN
Diane Pudans, Kiewit
Ahmad Qayoumi, Clark County
Carter Timmerman, WSDOT HQ
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

SHAWN DONAGHY MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 6, 2018, MEETING AGENDA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MELISSA SMITH AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Eileen Quiring entered the meeting at 4:04 p.m.

III. Call for Public Comments

John Ley from Camas spoke of the Update to the Regional Transportation Plan for Clark County and the replacement of the I-5 Bridge along with other needed projects.

Shirley Craddick entered the meeting at 4:08 p.m.

Ed Barnes from Vancouver spoke of the resolutions that support getting funding from the Legislature to get an office in SW Washington to help move forward on the I-5 Bridge replacement.

Sharon Nasset from Portland, Oregon, provided a handout and had a display board. She spoke about the I-5 Bridge and a third bridge project option.

IV. Approval of October 2, 2018, Minutes

SHAWN DONAGHY MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 2, 2018, MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

V. Consent Agenda

A. November Claims

ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA NOVEMBER CLAIMS. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MELISSA SMITH AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VI. Regional Transportation Plan for Skamania County, Washington, Resolution 11-18-25

Dale Robins referred to the resolution included in the meeting packet along with the RTP for Skamania County. He provided some background information about Skamania County. Skamania County is immediately east of Clark County. It is a rural county with a population of 11,890 and about 2,300 in employment. Mr. Robins said 80% of the land is in public ownership, which means they do not collect taxes. It is a recreational area that includes the National Scenic Area, National Forest, and Mt. St. Helens. Twenty years ago, the industry used to be tied to the forest industry, but now it is more tied to service, government, and schools.

Connecting Washington was a funding package passed a couple years ago, and Skamania County received a project to improve the intersection of SR-14 and Wind River Road. The intersection is at a skewed angle. It used to be if you were traveling from the west, you would use Wind River Road to access there. If you were coming from the east, you would use Hot Springs Avenue. Hot Springs Avenue is along Sand Hill. It is sliding into the Wind River. This SR-14 Wind River Road project is desperately needed to allow west-bound traffic for people

coming from the east to access up into the Carson valley area. They are looking forward to this project that should start construction in 2019.

Key transportation needs of the County include: maintenance and preservation of the existing system; safety improvements; and economic development. The obstacle to meet those needs is funding.

Mr. Robins highlighted the priority projects in the region. First are the SR-14 Cape Horn improvements. In the last several years, there were improvements made to take out some of the most dangerous curves, but there are several that remain. There is a second phase to that project that would cost about \$8,000,000. It would improve the safety. It doesn't completely remove the curves, but makes them to a level that can be driven safely without dropping to 30 miles per hour.

The next project is the SR-14/Bridge of the Gods Intersection. This intersection has some site visibility issues, and it is extremely difficult with high speeds to make left-hand turns after crossing the bridge. It hasn't been determined what the improvement would be; it might be a roundabout or some other improvements, but that intersection is in need of improvement for safety. Similarly, SR-14/Hot Spring Way, the access to the Port property near North Bonneville, this will be acceleration / deceleration lanes to help large trucks at that property as it begins to be developed.

Mr. Robins also said SR-14 Rockfall safety is Skamania County's 4th priority project. He noted a recent article in the news where a large rock went through the windshield of a Tesla on SR-14 near Cape Horn. There are high basalt rock cliffs in that area.

Mr. Robins said this was a quick overview of Skamania County's transportation needs. They are looking for action to approve Resolution 11-18-25, which includes adoption of the 2018 update to the Skamania County Regional Transportation Plan.

Chair Onslow said this Plan is endorsed by the Skamania County Transportation Policy Committee and updated every four years.

Eileen Quiring referred to the intersection by the Bridge of the Gods, and she asked if they had considered a signal in that area.

Mr. Robins said nothing has been determined at this point. He said it could be a traffic signal, a roundabout, or lane delineation/turn lanes. There are a number of options that could be used.

Mr. Ransom asked Mr. Robins to describe the process with the Policy Committee.

Mr. Robins said they have worked with the Skamania County Transportation Policy Committee over the last year to update the Plan. They have reviewed it multiple times and worked through the various chapters, much like how the RTC Board has with the Clark County Regional Transportation Plan. At their last meeting in October, the Policy Committee took action to recommend approval of the Skamania County RTP by the RTC Board.

Marc Boldt referred to the times when I-84 is shut down on the Oregon side of the river. He asked how that plays out when the Oregon traffic from I-84 uses the Washington side of the river on SR-14.

Carley Francis said they do work together, but she hasn't sat in the seat to understand exactly how that works. She said a similar situation took place in the Portland / Vancouver area when ice was so bad a couple years ago. Oregon typically doesn't use some of the products that we use here, but they were able to work a swap. Ms. Francis said they do have the opportunity to do active management type relationships there. She said she doesn't know exactly the parameters of that because she has not been party to that.

Councilor Boldt said the question he is really asking is if Oregon helps us in getting money. He said it seems like there should be a conversation that we are a part of Oregon's Plan when their road shuts down. Councilor Boldt said it is the other way around too, but it seems like it is happening more and more.

Ms. Francis said she could not speak to whether or not there is an imbalance there, or if there is a balance there based on when our road is shut down or not.

MARC BOLDT MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 11-18-25, REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN FOR SKAMANIA COUNTY, WASHINGTON. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SHAWN DONAGHY AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VII. Regional Transportation Plan for Klickitat County, Washington, Resolution 11-18-26

Dale Robins said Klickitat County has a very similar process as Skamania County. They have been working this last year with the Klickitat County Transportation Policy Committee. They have been reviewing the chapters as they have developed the update. At their October meeting, they recommended approval of the Klickitat County Regional Transportation Plan by the RTC Board. Klickitat County's Plan is very similar to Skamania County's Plan, although some of the issues differ a bit. Klickitat County is a fairly rural county with almost 22,000 people and almost 11,000 jobs. The biggest issue in Klickitat County is that they are already at 25% of the population is age 65 plus years of age, and they are expected to get older over the next 20 years. That does develop some interesting issues. Klickitat County's major industries are agriculture, forestry, landfill, aerospace, and wind power.

Klickitat County also has a Connecting Washington project that was funded. It is an economic development project which will provide access into the Port of Klickitat property at Bingen Point, just east of the town of Bingen. It would include a roundabout on SR-14, a road that curves over and connects into the Port road system. This is a location of many of the major employers in the Bingen / White Salmon area and can help encourage economic development to the region. Construction is anticipated to begin in 2020. Although, WSDOT is currently working with the railroad, and they might be able to do the undercrossing piece beginning in 2019, but the road construction won't begin until 2020.

Mr. Robins said the needs are similar to what they see in Skamania County. It is not a highly congested area. There is some congestion in the Bingen downtown area. For the most part, this is an area that needs to maintain and preserve what they have. They need to make safety improvements and economic development. They also lack revenue.

In looking at their priority projects; their number one priority project is the Hood River Bridge. It was originally built in 1924. It has 9 ½ foot travel lanes, and most travel lanes are 11 feet. It is a little narrow. Many people who drive RVs lose mirrors or awnings as they cross the bridge. Mr. Robins said they have completed a Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Currently, the Port of Hood River is beginning work to begin a Final Environmental Impact Statement. The previous work was done by RTC, but now the Port of Hood River is taking the lead.

Priority two is rebuilding their arterial system to allow all weather roads. They have a much higher freeze/thaw problem in the county. Roads take a harsh hit in the winter time, and these arterials need to be maintained so people can get to work and goods can get to market. It is a critical need.

Priority three is in downtown Bingen. They have the SR-14 Oak/Maple Street to Bingen intersection. It is a high priority to improve. They are one block offset and that is where probably the major activity center in Bingen. They have completed the SR-14 Study through this area and have some recommendations, but they need to move forward with implementing those.

They do have rockfall in the county, but a little bit lower priority.

They are looking for approval of Resolution 11-18-26, Regional Transportation Plan for Klickitat County.

BART HANSEN MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 11-18-26, REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN FOR KLICKITAT COUNTY. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MELISSA SMITH.

Anne McEnery-Ogle confirmed that this was a toll bridge.

Mr. Robins said yes, that the Hood River Bridge is currently a toll bridge, and it is owned by the Port of Hood River.

Mayor McEnery asked what the Port did with the tolls.

Mr. Robins said some of the money is reinvested in maintaining the existing bridge, and some of it goes into the Port economic development. It's a sore point for those who live in Washington.

Mayor McEnery-Ogle said before money is given to replace the bridge, can a Memorandum of Understanding be written so that if it continues to be tolled, the toll would actually go to the maintenance of the bridge?

Mr. Robins said Federal Highways has a requirement that says before you can receive Federal funds, any toll money collected has to go back into the existing facility. So if the bridge was to

be replaced and Federal money was involved, that money would have to go back into the bridge.

Chair Onslow asked if they were thinking of expanding or widening the bridge at all.

Mr. Robins said no; currently, the draft Environmental Impact does have a preferred alternative, a concrete segmental bridge. It would be a two-lane bridge with shoulders that would be wide enough that if capacity was needed in 30 or 40 years, they could do a directional peak lane added near the shoulders. It would also include bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Jeanne Stewart asked what the current toll fee was. Mr. Robins said it is \$2.00 if you pay cash; it is \$1.00 if you have a Breeze pass, which is like the Tacoma Narrows Bridge.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VIII. Human Services Transportation Plan for Clark, Skamania, and Klickitat Counties, and Consolidated Grant Project Ranking, Resolution 11-18-27

Lynda David referred to the resolution in the meeting packet along with the attached Draft 2018 Human Services Transportation Plan. Staff is asking for RTC Board action to adopt the 2018 Update for RTC's Human Services Transportation Plan and also to endorse the regional ranking of projects that are seeking WSDOT Consolidated Grant Program which is a statewide competitive funding source.

The Human Services Transportation Plan is one of the Plans that they put together that covers all of RTC's three county region. It covers Clark, Skamania, and Klickitat Counties, and as the Regional Transportation Planning Organization for the three-county region, RTC's role is in developing the Human Services Transportation Plan, processing and working with stakeholders to rank project applications for the DOT funding source.

At last month's RTC Board meeting, they spent time discussing development of the 2018 Human Services Transportation Plan update. To recap: it addresses the transportation needs of the elderly, young, people with disabilities, low income, and rural residents unable to provide their own transportation. Generally, the Plan addresses the special needs transportation needs of those who cannot drive themselves. The Plan is a federal and state requirement with update needed every four years to identify the special transportation needs in the region. The Plan then paves the way for project development and supports applications for the DOT Consolidated Grant Funding Program, and also for the use of FTA Section 5310 funds which come to the urban portion of Clark County with C-TRAN as the designated recipient.

At the October Board meeting, Ms. David provided background on the Plan and the process to develop it. She also reviewed key demographic data, existing services, the transportation challenges faced by special needs populations and the identified needs and strategies described in the draft Human Services Transportation Plan (HSTP) which is made available in the meeting packet.

Ms. David spoke of the Plan's required elements at last month's meeting and recapped those. The Plan must address the coordination of stakeholders, emergency management, data and information, unmet transportation needs, and strategies to meet special transportation needs of the region. In talking about data, Ms. David said it is notable that of the three counties, Klickitat County has the highest percentage of population 65 years and over. That is almost 25% of its population. It also has the highest number with disabilities at 19% of its population experiencing disabilities and the highest percentage of persons below the poverty level at 15.7% of its population. In Clark County, the 65 plus age group will grow from about 50,000 to over 125,000 people: from 11.5% of Clark County's population to 21.5% of the population between 2010 and 2040. More detail on this data and information on all of these elements can be found in the Human Services Draft Plan.

Ms. David said today they would pay more attention to the projects submitted for statewide competitive funding from this region and provided some background information. Each biennium, DOT solicits projects to compete for funding from the Consolidated Public Transportation Grant Program and through the program DOT distributes both state and federal funding for rural public transportation as well as transportation services for seniors, those with low income, and people with disabilities. In the current biennium, about \$51 million in funds have been made available to fund Consolidated Public Transportation Grants. As the RTPo for the three-county region, RTC has a role in the grant process, because projects must be supported by the Human Services Transportation Plan and the needs identified in the Plan. They also have a role in the convening of the stakeholders who decide on the project application and rank the project.

For this grant cycle, RTC received 10 project applications to screen and take through the evaluation process. The Accessible Transportation Coalition convened on October 5th to decide on the project rankings. The Accessible Transportation Coalition used evaluation criteria for the project ranking as shown on a provided slide as their guide to rank the projects. The evaluation criteria is also listed in the Human Services Plan on pages 5 and 6.

The project rankings have been reviewed by stakeholders, the Accessible Transportation Coalition, the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee in Clark County, and by the Transportation Policy Committees in Skamania and Klickitat Counties.

Based on population numbers in various categories, RTC has the ability to assign 6 A ranked projects and 6 B ranked projects. Pages 3 and 4 of the resolution explain the rankings of the projects. Ms. David highlighted the ATCI/RTC 6 "A" ranked projects. The 6 projects are proposed by the Human Services Council, Mt. Adams Transportation Services in Klickitat County, Skamania County Senior Services, and Mid-Columbia Economic Development District spanning the Oregon and Washington sides of the Columbia River. All of the projects will continue existing services which are in place today. With the exception of the Gorge TransLink project from MCEDD, all are requesting funds from both the 2019 to 2021 and the 2021 to 2013 biennium. More detail of the projects can be found on pages 4 and 5 of the HSTP Plan update.

The total funds sought by the “A” ranked projects amount to just under \$2.3 million for the 2019 to 2021 biennium.

Next highlighted were the 4 “B” ranked projects from this region proposed by Mt. Adams Transportation and Skamania County Senior Services. The total funds sought by the “B” ranked projects amount to just under \$785,000 for the 2019 to 2021 biennium. In the current biennium, 2017 to 2019, this region was successful in obtaining just over \$2.4 million, which is about 4% of the statewide share. For the 2019 to 2021 biennium, the total request from this region for the ten projects ranked “A” and ranked “B” amount to about \$3 million.

In addition, the Clark County urbanized area received an allocation of about \$330,000 per year in FTA Section 5310 funds for the Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities in the Clark County Urban region. For transportation use over and beyond that required by the American’s with Disabilities Act. C-TRAN is the designated recipient of the funds, and C-TRAN uses the funds to support its popular Travel Trainer program and also works with sub-recipients of the funds such as the nonprofit Human Services Council that runs a mobility management program and with Catholic Community Services that runs volunteer driver programs. Also, the Human Services Council’s Reserve a Ride Program received some supplemental funding through the FTA Section 5310 funding.

Ms. David said today they were asking for RTC Board adoption of Resolution 11-18-27. It includes the adoption of the updated 2018 Human Services Transportation Plan and Endorsement of the Regional Project Ranking for DOT Consolidated Grant Applications from the region.

JEANNE STEWART MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 11-18-27, THE HUMAN SERVICES TRANSPORTATION PLAN FOR CLARK, SKAMANIA, AND KLICKITAT COUNTIES AND CONSOLIDATED GRANT PROJECT RANKING. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY EILEEN QUIRING AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

IX. Regional Transportation Plan for Clark County, 2018 Update

Bob Hart referred to the memorandum included in the meeting packet. He said the Finance Plan is an important element of the 2018 update of the ‘Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This update provides information on the initial forecast of transportation revenues, capital costs, and revenue needs for the 2019 RTP. The last update to the Board was in June. At that time, they talked about the finance plan requirements. Mr. Hart pointed out a couple of those requirements. The RTP must be fiscally constrained, which means that there has to be a reasonable expectation to fund, that the revenues are available to fund the capital projects in the Plan. Project costs for the RTP include things like roadways, transit, bike and pedestrian improvements, as well as projects for intelligent transportation systems, systems management and operations, and transportation demand management projects.

RTC worked closely with the Finance Division of WSDOT who provided most of the information used for the forecast for revenue, which included both historical, state and federal revenues and expenditures by category for 2013 and 2017, receipts and expenditures for Clark County and the local cities from 2003 to 2016. In addition, the state Office of Financial Management

provided information under the forecast of statewide Gross Motor Vehicle Fuel tax revenue by year from 2018 to 2029.

Mr. Hart provided a high level summary of the methodology. Only about 23 cents of the 49.4 cents gas tax for the state is available for RTP capital projects in the Plan. Other state funds from previous funding packages like 2003, 2005, and Connecting Washington, all of those are either dedicated to debt service or to projects and are not available for other capital projects in the Plan.

In addition, the forecast uses only 80% of the revenue contributed by Clark County residents, because not all the dollars that are generated here come back here. We have to assume we don't get everything back we contribute. In addition, future funds are reduced by revenue used for preservation and maintenance, so they are not available for capital either. Future growth of revenue is based on annual rate of growth and gross fuel tax revenue provided by OFM. Federal gas tax revenue uses the same approach.

For local and transit revenue, the local revenues and expenditures (debt service, preservation and maintenance and traffic policing) are calculated for Clark County and local cities; future growth is applied by category to calculate annual receipts and expenditures out to 2040. Local revenue for capital is estimated by deducting debt service, preservation and maintenance and traffic policing from total receipts. C-TRAN leads the forecasting of transit revenue and costs for the RTP and is responsible for balancing future revenues and costs for the transit element of the Plan.

Mr. Hart displayed a chart of RTP Revenue for 2040 for a total of \$1.762 billion in revenue, which the state makes up the largest portion, followed by transit, and local funds, with federal revenue at the smallest portion. Mr. Hart said it is not surprising given that federal gas tax has been frozen at 18.4 cents a gallon since 1993. There has been no change there. As an example, before 2003, the federal share was 27% of the total gas tax in the state. The last RTP was 33%, so it has gone down. He said we are lucky the state increased the gas tax to make up some of the revenue.

In looking at the chart of RTP capital costs by mode, the total is \$1.79 billion with roadways the largest mode followed by transit. A side by side comparison of the Plan for revenue and cost shows revenue need of \$30.9 billion in order to be fiscally constrained. That is new revenue that we need. It is not quite a margin of error, but smaller than last time we did the RTP four years ago. The finance information in the 2018 Plan compared to 2014 has differences.

A chart listed non-transit costs and revenues. The revenue row in 2018 is \$102 million lower than it was four years ago. At the same time, RTP cost has gone down by almost \$220 million from 2014. So we have a much lower revenue shortfall from the last update. A lower capital cost in the 2018 Plan with less revenue is what derived the less revenue need for this Plan update.

Comparing roadways to transit shows a different perspective. While roadway costs have gone down since the last update, transit capital has almost doubled. There are a lot of good reasons

for that. We have the Mill Plain and Highway 99 Bus Rapid Transit system, the 219th Park and Ride facility, east Vancouver, Camas Park and Ride facility and system wide fleet replacement and expansion of the system, and other projects as well.

A new revenue need is small and would be an equivalent of fuel tax increase of 1.1 cents a gallon beginning in 2021. Agencies were more conservative in this update and identifying project needs partly because of the uncertainty for future revenue reducing the overall plan costs. If you compare the 2014 capital cost with this current revenue forecast, we should have a shortfall of \$250 million to put in perspective. Other options for revenue in addition to fuel tax could be local revenue options, tolls, and mileage based fees. For local revenue: agencies can form Transportation Benefit Districts, impose various fees such as sales tax, vehicle license fees, impact fees, and other revenue tools. In the last several years, Vancouver and Battle Ground have both established Transportation Benefit Districts using the local revenue, local vehicle license fees as a revenue source. There is also a separate RCW that authorizes an additional \$15 vehicle license fee that can be imposed. In addition, with voter approval, a 10% surcharge can be imposed on state fuel tax within the county with revenue shared among county and cities based on population. These are just a few of the tools.

For major capital projects, such as the I-5 Bridge, replacement may require new funding programs. Some examples include road usage charges, project specific tolling programs, and public private partnerships. The revenue needs are very small in the 2018 update; however, policy makers might consider looking at other revenue sources in the future to be prepared if revenue or capital conditions change or for a future Plan update.

Mr. Hart said they are in the process of completing the development of the preservation and maintenance costs for state, local, and transit facilities. They have some preliminary data that indicates the base year costs for 2018 roadways have gone up 14% since 2014. In addition, in looking at the full 21 year preservation and maintenance costs, they made up about 38.4% of revenue four years ago and up to 44% now. That cost continues to increase with more funds dedicated to maintain our system as we have it now.

Mr. Hart said they will complete the Finance Chapter of the draft 2018 RTP for RTC Board review in December.

Jeanne Stewart said the Transportation Benefit District is allowed through an RCW. She said the City of Vancouver charges \$40 per license vehicle per year. She asked if that was the maximum allowed.

Mr. Hart said he could find out; he was not sure.

Chair Onslow said Seattle is \$80.

Mr. Hart said he thought up to \$100 was the limit.

Councilor Stewart asked what Battle Ground was charging.

Mr. Hart said Battle Ground is currently at \$20.

Shirley Craddick referred back to the statements regarding the federal tax. She said the federal gas tax has not been raised since 1993, for 25 years. She said she was surprised that the revenue that Clark County is receiving is actually diminishing. She asked what else contributed to that, was it inflation or is the tax being used for other purposes?

Mr. Hart said revenue is dampening over time. There are a lot of reasons for it: the better fuel efficiency of vehicles and electronic vehicles. In looking at the gross tax forecast, especially in the last four years from 2025 to 2030, it goes down to a lower rate every year. There is less money being raised.

Councilor Craddick thanked Mr. Hart for the reminder. She said that is really significant.

Eileen Quiring said this is a finance plan, and yet on the back portion of it there are all of these projects listed and various jurisdictions. She asked if this is to show us where you think the money is going to go. She asked what the purpose of the list of projects was.

Mr. Hart said one of the Federal requirements is that if you have an RTP and projects in the RTP, you must demonstrate that you have looked at your revenue sources in the future and you can fund the Plan, so you can't have projects in the Plan that you can't fund. You either have to raise more revenue or scale back the projects in your Plan.

Councilor Quiring said the projects that are listed on the addendum are for various jurisdictions. She asked if these jurisdictions submit these projects.

Mr. Hart said the projects were compiled from the jurisdictions. They look at their needs for their respective jurisdiction.

Councilor Quiring asked if the I-5 Bridge replacement is what WSDOT turned in, the \$3.3 billion for one bridge.

Mr. Hart said that is part of the overall RTP. One thing he pointed out is that the I-5 Bridge will have its own separate funding strategy, like it did four years ago. Whatever funding comes from that will be outside the framework of the regular forecast that RTC does. They have been consulting with WSDOT about the best way to approach that funding strategy.

Councilor Quiring asked about the listed C-TRAN projects and if they went through the C-TRAN Board to be placed in the Plan.

Mr. Hart said yes, he believed they did. When C-TRAN submitted their projects to us, it is a bit different from the transit piece. RTC relies on C-TRAN's expertise to come up with the projects and funding options and funding approach to raise that revenue for those projects.

Councilor Quiring asked for how many years this Plan is for.

Mr. Hart said this RTP covers up to 2040. It does assume that to fund our current Plan, some revenue increase would have to occur. He said when they say an increase of 1.1 cents per gallon for gas tax that is just saying there have been many gas tax increases in the past and it is reasonable to expect there will be additional funds for this in the future over the course of the 21 year Plan or some other means of funding.

Councilor Quiring said she cautioned putting \$3.3 billion for a bridge into this Plan. She said that is a little bit of a scary number, and she doesn't think a bridge replacement should cost that much. She said they should get three bridges for that amount. Councilor Quiring said to load it up at \$3.3 billion is not a good thing.

Carley Francis provided a bit of information in regard to the I-5 Bridge. She said without a project office and without the ability to reengage stakeholders and talk about the problems they see and a revised way to approach them, they don't have a way to inform a better number than that. That number is there as a placeholder; just on an awareness point. It is for folks to be aware of the size and scale of the potential outcomes of a conversation like that. She also clarified that that really was a cost for corridor improvements for a five mile corridor; it is a bridge and other things. That is also a cost that was \$3.3 billion across both Oregon and Washington. The funding strategy between states and what gets covered by local dollars, local tolling dollars, or other dollars versus other funding sources is all to be determined. They don't have a way to inform a better point of information now, because there is really not a specific activity to have a conversation again. Ms. Francis said she thought based on the fact there is a recognized need in the area, just building in that proves an awareness point that there is still a need here. She said this is a scale that was determined to be, maybe not appropriate by some, but deemed to be reasonable based on the needs of the corridor. It's an expectation of awareness from a management point.

Shirley Craddick had a question for the group around the table. She asked if the group had ever worked together to consider a funding mechanism that each jurisdiction would levy, the three counties and the cities of the RTC. Councilor Craddick asked if they had ever had those kinds of discussions and share that revenue amongst them to build some of these projects.

Matt Ransom said that conversation has not yet taken place in a formal way. However, he has had a conversation with a few members, and he suggested that as they look out into the future, that is going to be necessary. An example of that would be under state statute, and Bob mentioned an example, there is the ability on a countywide basis to levy some special fees. There is the ability to levy the vehicle license fee at a countywide level. There is the ability to levy sales and use tax on gasoline at the countywide level. When they look at this Plan, projects sit under the local level and the state level. The state level would be those core critical corridors, I-5, I-205, etc. The local level would be the principle arterials. There are some projects, and he referred to one: the western extension of the 219th interchange into Ridgefield. Another possibility is some improvements at Fourth Plain/SR-503 that are in this middle area where we might need to consider at a countywide level. If we want some of these projects, we need to evaluate a regional assessment. Mr. Ransom said he thought it was in front of them. Although, he said to date, they haven't had to go down that path.

Councilor Craddick added getting the political support as well.

Bart Hansen said he doesn't have a problem with a user fee that has a direct nexus into the project that you want to build. He is concerned about the road usage or congestion mitigation

for things that have more of an ambiguous role in what they're going to be paying for. Those he has a concern with. Relative to the question asked, he said he has been on the Vancouver City Council going on eight years now. When it comes to projects of significance like the I-5 crossing, they were right on board with the user fee to pay for that project. It works when you are able to work with the public when you can say this is exactly where your usage fee is going to go. It is a little bit different when looking at it going into some vague ambiguous pot into somebody else's revenue stream and hopefully you're going to receive something from it. Mr. Hansen said this is one of his concerns.

Jeanne Stewart asked Mr. Ransom if they did go to a three-county model, would they establish a separate body for review of whatever taxing authority there may be or if there was a way to integrate that within the umbrella of RTC. Councilor Stewart said this is preliminary thinking, but asked if Mr. Ransom had some ideas about it.

Mr. Ransom said he was not sure that structurally they could convene a three-county assessment. He said he thought the way the TBD statute is implemented is at the County level. These are important questions across all three of RTC's counties, but structurally, it might be just a county to county discussion. In that statute, his understanding is that you convene an Oversight Board that would be separate and apart. Legislatively, you may be able to choose who could take that role, but like in the case of Vancouver and Battle Ground, respectively, they have established that their City Council acts as that Board. It is separately established; they have bylaws, and they have governing rules. They close one meeting and reconvene under a new group. Mr. Ransom said the larger observation is what they are starting to talk about. Mr. Ransom said their partners at C-TRAN often have to when they have to make the case publicly, they go out for a regional levy saying this is the service we're going to provide, and these are the investments that we need to make. We have not yet had to do that at the regional level for streets and roadways, and he is not saying that we will have to, but he said he thinks it is a conversation that we can't be afraid of because there may be critical projects that are not going to be funded by the Legislature. Each jurisdiction has their own maintenance and operations needs at the local level that are paramount and there are a couple of arterials that they will be focusing on. There is a middle area of projects where we might need to ask if this is important to the region and figure out how to assess or create some type of assessment to fund that.

Jeanne Stewart said it might be a good time to start thinking about if that could be done and how would it require by law changes at RTC; how could we maintain some autonomy while we figure out that separate organization or body as we try to figure out the funding packages that would be integrated to get the most accomplished. Councilor Stewart said it might be a good time to start to think about if there is a way to put that together.

Mr. Ransom said that was his understanding. He said this conversation is important, but not pressing in the moment. He said his understanding is with our peers to the south within the three-county Portland region that they will shortly be taking up a multi county conversation about that. Within their Plan, what are the most pressing projects that they need to fund? The

state is not going to fund them in the timeline that may be necessary, so some type of consideration. This is not unique to any major Metro across the western U.S. when faced with needs that are not able to be addressed. You then ask what we can do to help ourselves.

Jeanne Stewart said she was not sure whatever body they're thinking they could create and how that could be different from JPACT except it may be more expensive geographically.

Mr. Ransom said we're attuning ourselves to a conversation which is we can't be afraid of this over the next 10 to 15 years. At some point when faced with needs that are beyond the ability for institutions to pay, if the Feds don't address gas tax (and they have shown over the last 25 years their unwillingness to do so), let's assume that they continue to be unwilling to do so. The State Legislature continues to commit for specific projects, and they do that on a cyclical basis with their transportation bills. If you don't get a project earmarked, then you ask yourself the question if you need to do something locally. If we have needs that need to be funded, and they're not going to be addressed by others, we do have the ability. The question is when we want to have that conversation.

Ron Onslow said if you take small Ridgefield for example, they have to put forth to the RTC with the projects they anticipate in the next 20 or so years. If they want to get anything funded, they have to be on the six-year Plan. They cannot go to the Legislature and say they need this money if they don't have it on the six-year Plan. He said you are always adjusting what you need the most or what your biggest problem you are facing. Mr. Onslow said you work with the RTC, and this is a good discussion; it is probably something that they can get more done as a group better, but who gets to be first.

Shirley Craddick said yes that the Metro Council is forming a Transportation Stakeholder Group that will be looking at in the future. They are targeting 2020 to see if there is support in the region to approach the region regarding a transportation funding package. She said what that looks like, they don't know. That is what the stakeholder group will do. What form of revenue it will be, they don't know that. That definitely is in their regional investment strategy. Councilor Craddick said they would find out if they get regional support on affordable housing that night. They're also looking at the region's investment in the natural areas and from there they move on to transportation.

X. YR 2019 RTC Work Program and Budget - Draft

Mr. Ransom referred to the staff report/memorandum and the attached Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). Mr. Ransom said for reorientation, RTC is a little unique in how they prepare their work plan and budget. They do almost two efforts. The first is the Unified Planning Work Program. That is developed in early spring and brought to the Board for adoption. That is done in that calendar sequence to align with state and federal fiscal year appropriations. The bulk of the work that RTC does is articulated in the Work Program; that is the details. Mr. Ransom said they go through a process of both this Board but also they consult with their partners south of the river to make sure if there are any joint efforts and alignments of interest. They also

consult with Board Members' staff at a very detailed level, and counsel with the Federal Highway Administration, WSDOT, and Federal Transit Administration.

Mr. Ransom said he would refer to their Work Program, which is largely in the UPWP, but they then budget for the purpose of budget planning on a calendar year basis, which is what the memorandum and attachment consists of.

Mr. Ransom provided some background orientation for those going through this for the first or second time. RTC is largely a grant funded entity. They have state and federal grants that they bill for reimbursement. That is their revenue source in combination with dues that are assessed and that members' pay. As seen in the memo, they have some incidental revenues, interest investment, and that's very nominal.

Mr. Ransom referred to the memorandum on page 3. This provided a summary of expenditures-to-date (as of mid-October 2018) and forecast expenditures through December 31. This is spending according to the Plan that was laid out with the Board last year. The bottom line is they had a budget Plan to expend up to \$1.96 million, and they plan to expend only \$1.8 million. The deviations are they didn't need as much professional services money. There were a couple of activities they found as they worked through the MAP-21 technical performance reporting that the state was doing all of the work. They didn't need to do any work locally. They had the capacity to bring in some specialists if they needed to. They ended up not needing that assistance. They were expecting a rent increase that didn't occur this year in combination with their new space they occupy and a one-time set aside for moving expenses they didn't need to capture all of those this year. The bottom line is that they are not going to spend as much as they planned. That is always good. The way they operate their budget is they don't spend what they don't need.

Mr. Ransom referred to the first page of the memo. He described where they are going to be emphasizing this next year. He said in looking at his tenure with this organization and the amount of work that he has seen staff do, 2019 may turn out to be the highest level of work that he has seen as an organization. This can be seen in the budget as well. They have many studies, several partnership studies, studies with WSDOT that they are just now initiating, they are wrapping up their RTP, and possibly or likely, they may be reengaged both either in a legislative process or another process related to I-5 Bridge conversation should the request that is headed to the Governor maybe make the end of the budget process with the Legislature. They are going to retool their modeling program as they try to provide better service and so forth to their Members.

Mr. Ransom sees a lot of work for 2019. The budget reflects that, and the documents provided have the details. He said he could discuss those necessary now or in December.

Mr. Ransom referred to page 4 listing their planned revenues. Mr. Ransom said they have both signed contracts and have committed grant revenue for one-time studies and projects as noted with an asterisk. Most other revenues are generally what they receive through their grant flow through from the Feds and State. The breakdown this year is about 68% of our revenue to the

agency to fund operations is Federal money, and about 24% State money. There is a little bit more state money this year because the \$450,000 labeled WS MVA was one-time study money that Regional Administrator Kris Strickler was able to secure for this region and has asked RTC to do a couple studies on the region's behalf. This means a little higher state money next year and local dues and others at about 8%.

Page 5 of the memo lists a summary of the proposed expenses for 2019. There are the typical miscellaneous operating expenses, but the two major cost categories are personnel and professional services, which are staff and studies. Mr. Ransom said there are adjustments to salaries and benefits for 2019, but no increase in staff. Staff committed to the organization is 9.75 FTE with no changes. If additional assistance is needed, that is secured through professional services contracts. Mr. Ransom said he wants to make a commitment to continue to try to figure out how to partner with our institutions, colleges, and WSU Vancouver like they did this last year; bring in some student interns for specific project activity. That is a priority he has for the organization to try to nurture some local talent and create those connections to the university. Mr. Ransom said they are expecting a rent increase, so that is programmed for. They are still committing a little bit of revenue one time to some move related expenses that they have not incurred yet. These are some final finishes on the space they have.

Mr. Ransom said they are committing more revenue this next year on professional services. They have professional services contracts with the County for information, telephone, and computer hookups. They have an Interlocal Agreement with Metro for the joint modeling activities that they produce together for the regional traffic model. They also have fees that they pay the County for Accounting and Human Resources services that they provide. They are, essentially, RTC's bank. There is also the cost to the State Auditor for the annual audit, a legal services contract, and other professional services for uncommitted in case something arises. An example of that would be the increase in requirements to calculate benefits and other technical accounting exercises. RTC does not have the staffing capacity to cover all that may be required.

Page 6 of the memo refers to the planned Professional Services Study Agreements. This is the area of increased budget commitment for next year. These study activities have professional services contracts or committed resource to it. Mr. Ransom said they have the program that they manage on behalf of partners, the VAST program, the regional ITS program. They are doing the Regional Origin Destination Study that the Board has committed to along with the Urban Freeway Corridor Operation Study, and the regional Traffic Count program. An audit recommendation to RTC from the Federal Highway Administration when they did RTC's Certification Compliance Review in 2017 was that RTC needed to prepare an Active Transportation Plan at the regional level. That has not yet been done. There is a commitment of resources to be able to comply with that requirement. The report from Ridgefield City Manager Steve Stuart at last month's meeting was about the North Corridor Study. They are proposing a commitment of resources to partner to that. The City Manager had asked for partners. Mr. Ransom said he thought it would be worth their interest at the regional scale to

figure out the circulation system on that stretch of the corridor. The Columbia Connections Study is a study he had mentioned at the September Board meeting. The study is a joint proposal they have prepared with Metro and a series of partners around this table to initiate a bi-state economic study. Mr. Ransom said it would be a convening opportunity to restart a Bi-State Committee conversation, which is something that has not happened this year. This would be an initiative to do that. They have applied under a demonstration program with Federal Highway Administration to actually be the primary funder of that proposal. If Federal Highways does not fund it, they may not do it. It is one of those with a conditional commitment. This would be their contribution to that effort.

Mr. Ransom referred to the document attached to the memo, the Work Program and Budget - Year 2019 Draft. He provided the Budget Summary highlights. Federal and State grants to RTC will increase slightly for 2019. They have one-time funding commitments from WSDOT for regional studies support professional services expenses. Member Dues will be applied to the budget for 2019. They will do another dues re-examination, as they do annually, in the spring and assess adjustments. Revenues available for 2019 will fully fund RTC operations.

On the expense side, there are no major deviations. They are not increasing the staffing levels. There are no major increases in their indirect costs. They are committing a lot of resource for one-time studies.

Mr. Ransom would take any questions. He said this will return in December for action. This is RTC's budget spending plan. To the extent, during the year if they have activities that a partner wants to do and they have revenue attached to it, they will commit on a one-by-one basis. This is their proposal for 2019 until otherwise revised.

Marc Boldt said he didn't see the Household Survey listed on this proposed year budget, and it is usually done every five or six years. He said with the changes they have for both C-TRAN and especially the vast amount of multi-family growth going on in the county, he thought it was worth looking at. He said schools and everything are coming up, especially with impact fees and they kind of dictate how many trips per household take place along with other things. Councilor Boldt asked if that survey was in the near future.

Mr. Ransom said yes, that on page 2 of the memorandum, that activity is identified to start to develop and scope with their Oregon partners. They are proposing, for both cost efficiency and because their traffic network is regional in scope, to join forces with their modeling partners in Oregon and procure perhaps a combined activity. The programmed year is 2020 for the activity. In 2019, they will have some predevelopment work on the Regional Modeling Program. They are starting to gear up for that. Mark Harrington is the specialist that will be leading that modeling. They might try to use something being looked at called Big Data. Some of the Big Data providers out there, where you used to have to fill out a survey, might be able to capture this data and do other evaluation models. They will report to the Board sometime next year in terms of what that might look like. Mr. Ransom said this Board had also previously committed as part of their grant program two years ago, \$500,000 in grant commitment. That

is an example that the Board has already committed to it in prior grant commitments, and it hasn't shown up in the budget. That will show up in the budget, probably in 2020, as an expenditure item.

XI. Clark County Transportation Alliance 2019 Policy Statement

Mr. Ransom invited Ron Arp to lead this item on the Clark County Transportation Alliance 2019 Policy Statement. He said Mr. Arp is the President of Identity Clark County and one of the cosponsors of the Regional Legislative Statement, which they refer to as the Clark County Transportation Alliance Statement. Mr. Ransom said Members around the table have probably seen this at their own councils and commissions. RTC's role in this process is largely as a consultant to Identity Clark County and partners. RTC's consultant responsibilities would be that they are the holder of the project list. When people bring forward ideas, they try to vet it to make sure it is consistent with our Regional Plan. Also, then make sure the language, identification, numbers, and etc. are something that will be understood. They are also part of the caucus process of the developmental committee to come up with some of the key issues and strategies.

Ron Arp thanked Matt and said it has been great working with him and RTC through this process. For more than 20 years Identity Clark County has worked very closely with the lobbyist with the City of Vancouver to come together and put together a regional strategy. There is a great reason for that. He said we are the second largest metropolitan area in the northwest. We cross two states; we have multiple jurisdictions; we have multiple legislative districts; multiple municipalities, and they only have to work together because our transportation infrastructure affects all of us. When one thing is affected, it affects other things, and we have to work together for an overall strategy. Mr. Arp said they are having about 80% of the funds that we spend on gas tax come back to the region. He would like to see that go higher, and he would like to push harder on that front and through this kind of a mechanism, he hopes they can. Mr. Arp said they end up producing a statement, a Transportation Alliance Policy Statement. It is shared with jurisdictions, and they work through a number of drafts to come up with a final that is presented to the Clark County Government Affairs Roundtable. They then circulate it for endorsement. It is a lengthy socialization process, but a process of familiarizing each other with the needs of the region and identifying those key projects that we would like to have funded as quickly as possible.

Last year, Mr. Arp said they put together a statement, and when they were all said and done with it, they had an all-time record of 45 organizations co-sign and co-endorse the policy statement. This included labor, educational organizations for the first time, organizations in Portland, as well as throughout Southwest Washington. It is reflective of the fact that what happens in Clark County and our strategy in our region has tremendous bearing in our entire regional economy. It certainly is with our Ports and on from there. Mr. Arp said they believe there will be more than 50 organizations this time around judging by the feedback that they have received already. They have already had about 20 organizations endorse this policy

statement for next year. A lot of it is carryover, but there are some specific differences in terms of projects and the way that they structure it.

At a very high level, the document has two main components. The first one is an appeal to move forward in replacing the I-5 Bridge. It is an urgent need. It is considered the greatest economic limiter to our region, and it needs to be replaced. It is 101 going on 102 years old. It is the only draw bridge in the west and a very tired structure. Mr. Arp said for the same reason they need to think about modernizing, and some of the shoulders, and the hump structure in the middle of it makes it very unsafe, the lift capacity makes it very difficult particularly if they end up with any seismic issues. Clearly, the united voice here is that we need to fix I-5, and we need to fix it now. The second piece is a list of key projects that are lifted out of the work that RTC does. They put it into this statement. There is about \$300 million worth of projects in the Alliance Statement.

Mr. Arp said they have worked about six weeks earlier than normal, because as they have been hearing rumblings about possible additional transportation packages and people jockeying for funding and priorities. He said they needed to move the schedule earlier, so they started the day after Labor Day with an intensive effort to put this together. Mr. Arp said the ink was dry on the document when they walked three weeks ago into the Government Affairs Roundtable, and they have been circulating it ever since with the organizations that endorse and support the document.

Mr. Arp said this is trying to galvanize everybody's regional focus on transportation and get behind a common plan and pushing very hard, which they are going to need to do to get our fair share of dollars at State, Federal, regional, and local level.

Matt Ransom said this Policy Statement will return in December for RTC Board endorsement again. He said in his review and participation with this agency find the projects that are identified and that we want to push together toward consistent with the RTP and will be recommending this agency's endorsement. Mr. Ransom said members will also see at their own Councils and Boards as well.

XII. Other Business

From the Board

Chair Onslow reminded members that the survey for the Executive Director's performance review has gone out. He said if there are any questions, they can ask Diane or him. He asked that it please be completed by the following Friday, November 9.

Marc Boldt asked Carley Francis about SR-500 and the changes with restriping.

Ms. Francis said the plan is to close SR-500 the following weekend and reconfigure the roadway with the idea that they will be putting a median barrier in the middle of the intersection where currently you can make turns. There is a median barrier in the road that is between the intersections that will extend across the intersections so you cannot turn left and you can't travel across SR-500 at those locations. They will be removing the signals and restriping the

roadway so that there are acceleration and deceleration lanes so you can effectively slow down out of the travel lane and speed up out of the travel lane before you merge into the two lanes of travel there. That will allow folks to treat it as a merge; you are not going to be turning right into active traffic, you turn into your own lane.

Councilor Boldt said so they must be taking the lights out, because that is not currently possible.

Ms. Francis said the light poles will be removed. She said the other thing to recognize is that the restriping is going to make use of the width of the existing roadway and the fact that the pavement is drivable on the shoulders.

From the Director

Mr. Ransom referred to the pink copy of the proposed meeting schedule for 2019. He noted that because of the holiday conflict in January, they plan to cancel the January 1, 2019 RTC Board meeting. The schedule will be finalized at the December meeting.

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

XIII. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Ron Onslow, Board of Directors Chair