

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council  
Board of Directors  
March 5, 2019, 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 Anne McEnerny-Ogle on Tuesday, March 5, 2019, 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:

Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor  
Mike Dalesandro, Battle Ground Mayor  
Shawn Donaghy, C-TRAN Chief Executive Officer  
Carley Francis, WSDOT Regional Administrator  
Bart Hansen, Vancouver Councilmember  
Scott Hughes, Port of Ridgefield Commissioner  
Temple Lentz, Clark County Councilor  
Anne McEnerny-Ogle, Vancouver Mayor  
Gary Medvigy, Clark County Councilor  
Eileen Quiring, Clark County Councilor  
Melissa Smith, Camas Councilmember

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 14<sup>th</sup> District  
Chris Corry, Representative 14<sup>th</sup> District  
Gina Mosbrucker, Representative 14<sup>th</sup> District  
Lynda Wilson, Senator 17<sup>th</sup> District  
Paul Harris, Representative 17<sup>th</sup> District  
Vicki Kraft, Representative 17<sup>th</sup> District  
Ann Rivers, Senator 18<sup>th</sup> District  
Larry Hoff, Representative 18<sup>th</sup> District  
Brandon Vick, Representative 18<sup>th</sup> District  
John Braun, Senator 20<sup>th</sup> District  
Richard DeBolt, Representative 20<sup>th</sup> District  
Ed Orcutt, Representative 20<sup>th</sup> District  
Annette Cleveland, Senator 49<sup>th</sup> District  
Monica Stonier, Representative 49<sup>th</sup> District  
Sharon Wylie, Representative 49<sup>th</sup> District

Guests Present:

Ron Arp, Identity Clark County  
Dave Barcos, Friends of Frog Ferry  
Susan Bladholm, Friends of Frog Ferry  
Brett Bybee, Friends of Frog Ferry  
Monica Fowler, C-TRAN  
Sorin Garber, SGA Consulting  
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Councilmember  
Jason Irving, MacKay Sposito  
Larry Keister, Port of Camas-Washougal Commissioner  
John Ley, Citizen  
Scott Patterson, C-TRAN  
Judith Perez, WSDOT  
Mike Pond, Citizen  
Magan Reed, Port of Vancouver  
Justin Sheets, WSDOT  
Scott South, Friends of Frog Ferry  
Ty Stober, Vancouver Councilmember  
Marc Thornsbury, Port of Klickitat  
Carter Timmerman, WSDOT HQ  
Peter Wilcox, Friends of Frog Ferry  
Michael Williams, WSDOT

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**

EILEEN QUIRING MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 5, 2019, MEETING AGENDA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MELISSA SMITH AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Carley Francis entered the meeting at 4:05 p.m.

**III. Call for Public Comments**

John Ley, from Camas, said the RTP includes a replacement of the I-5 Bridge and what they really need is new bridges and new corridors.

Susan Bladholm, founder of the Friends of Frog Ferry initiative, and she thanked RTC for including it in the RTP. Ms. Bladholm had four of their team members introduce themselves: Scott South, Peter Wilcox, Dave Barcos, and Brett Bybee.

**IV. Approval of February 5, 2019, Minutes**

SHAWN DONAGHY MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 5, 2019 MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MELISSA SMITH AND APPROVED. GARY MEDVIGY ABSTAINED.

**V. Consent Agenda****A. March Claims****B. 2019-2022 TIP Amendments: WSDOT, Resolution 03-19-03**

MELISSA SMITH MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA MARCH CLAIMS AND RESOLUTION 03-19-03. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SHIRLEY CRADDICK AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

**VI. Regional Transportation Plan for Clark County, March 2019 Update, Resolution 03-19-04**

Chair McEnery-Ogle said the new updated RTP document was distributed to members. She said if they wanted to look at the language considering the passenger ferry service discussed, that was listed on page 287.

Lynda David referred to the resolution included in the meeting materials along with the updated document. She said an electronic version is listed on RTC's website that has hyperlinks to reference documents that mutually support the Regional Transportation Plan. Ms. David said after almost two years of work, the RTC Board is being asked to consider adoption of the 2019 Update to the Regional Transportation Plan for Clark County. The Board reviewed the draft of the RTP update at the December 4, 2018 meeting and also at the February 5, 2019 meeting.

The Regional Transportation Plan is the long-range plan for the region's transportation system required by the Federal Government and a condition for the receipt of Federal transportation

funds to this region and a requirement of the State Laws. The RTP must be regularly updated at least every five years for the Clark County region. It must include multiple modes of transportation and be fiscally constrained; meaning that there must be reasonable expectation revenues will be available to construct or to implement the transportation projects and strategies identified in the plan. The RTP is the result of a collaborative process to make sure there is consistency between federal, state, local, and regional plans.

The Regional Transportation system focuses on a designated regional transportation system including all state transportation facilities and services, all local freeways, expressways and principal arterials, all high capacity transit systems, and all other transportation facilities and services including airports, transit service and facilities, roadways, rail facilities, marine transportation facilities, and so on, that are considered necessary to complete the regional Transportation Plan.

Ms. David provided a map of the regional transportation system. It has been in a number of iterations over the year. The only change made to the designated regional transportation system this time around is for the connection coming off the SR-502/I-5 Interchange to the south Ridgefield area.

The RTP is multi-modal, and multi-dimensional. The RTP's framework is that it should address regional transportation system development to achieve the land use vision presented in local Comprehensive Plans, support economic growth and vitality, and sustain the region's quality of life.

The RTP's transportation policy themes were discussed at past Board meetings and include: safety and security, accessibility and mobility, finance, economy, management and operations, environment, vision and values, and preservation. The goals are addressed in Chapter 1 of the Plan.

Chapter 2 of the Plan addresses land use and demographics. Ms. David provided a slide that summarized the forecast. The forecast is for 2040 that underpins the RTP update. The forecast for the 2040 population is 600,000 people in Clark County, which is within the forecast population range provided by Washington Office of Financial Management in 2017. The employment growth forecast is for about 241,500 jobs in the County.

Maybe the most important section of the Regional Transportation Plan is Appendix B, where projects and transportation strategies are identified as needed in the RTP. This section is important because projects must be identified in the RTP before they can be programmed for funding in the Transportation Improvement Program. Ms. David provided a map that indicates where transportation projects on the Regional Transportation System are located. Potential projects come from WSDOT, C-TRAN, local jurisdictions' Transportation Improvement Programs and Capital Facilities Plans. Local jurisdictions come up with a list of projects to address transportation system deficiencies as part of their local Capital Facilities Plans, and RTC uses this information to build the transportation networks in the regional travel forecasting model to forecast future transportation system performance.

The RTP has to be fiscally constrained meaning the forecast revenues have to balance with project cost estimate, and WSDOT in recent years has had more emphasis on seeing more emphasis on seeing practical solutions to transportation challenges; looking at shorter term and less expensive solutions to provide relief to traffic congestion.

WSDOT and local planning partners are currently working on several system management projects and operational studies. The RTP project list includes the States Connecting Washington funded projects, C-TRAN's Capital projects, which include new bus rapid transit corridors on Mill Plain and Highway 99, and the RTP also includes numerous projects in smaller cities to support the smaller cities growth and development. To fund Clark County's regional transportation system capital project list through 2040 will require about \$1.8 billion in revenues and that is not including a new Columbia River crossing. Summary information on revenues and costs are found in Chapter 4 of the Plan.

At last month's meeting, Ms. David reviewed public and consultation comments they received to date and comments that they have received up to February 25. They are now included in the RTP's Appendix M, which is at the back of the document. In summary, the majority of the comments that they received were in support of the ferry, with 19 comments, and two more were received after Board packets were mailed out the previous week. There were also various opinions on the need for a Columbia River crossing, as well as those that did or did not support light rail transit, and one comment that focused on opposition to Oregon tolls.

Ms. David said they work in close coordination with Metro as they are two Metropolitan Planning Organizations working in one Metropolitan Region, and as such, RTC reviewed Metro's draft Regional Transportation Plan update in the fall of 2018, prior to Metro's adoption in December 2018. Likewise, Metro reviewed RTC's 2019 Regional Transportation Plan Update and provided a letter on page 333 of the document emphasizing our coordinated transportation planning efforts. RTC also received a letter from the Safe Routes to School National Partnership, which is on page 335 of the RTP, urging our region to enhance transportation planning related to access to services, transportation demand management, safety and security, and active transportation.

Ms. David explained at last month's meeting that RTC had completed a State Environmental Policy Act or SEPA checklist and a Determination of Non-Significance issued and made available on Washington State Department of Ecology SEPA register. This allowed for consultation agencies to review their draft Plan, and since Board Packets were mailed out last week, RTC did receive a letter from the Washington State Department of Ecology with comments that there was no mention of greenhouse gas emissions in the SEPA checklist, though these were addressed in RTC's RTP document itself. Ecology noted that transportation is the leading contributor to Washington States greenhouse gas emissions. The Department of Ecology's letter will be incorporated into the final RTP, and RTC will note that in addition to the description of greenhouse gases and carbon emissions in Chapter 5 of the Plan, Washington State links these emissions with vehicle miles traveled, and this is addressed in Chapter 3 of the

Plan. RTC recognizes that this is an issue of state concern, but technology will solve some of our air emissions issues, but land use and community development also play a role in the emissions.

After adoption of the 2019 RTP Update, work never really stops on the Regional Transportation Plan and on its development. Some significant post adoption activities include specific modal plans that will be integrated into the Regional Transportation Plan and also development of RTC's four-year Transportation Improvement Program where projects and strategies identified in the long-range Regional Transportation Plan are programmed for funding. This occurs on an annual basis as does reporting on RTC's Congestion Management Process, which three years ago focused on increasing congestion in the I-5 corridor and two years ago focused on increasing congestion in the I-205 corridor and last year focused on the region's arterial system. Following RTP adoption, RTC staff will work with planning partners to develop an Active Transportation Plan which will meet federal requirements coming out of RTC's Certification Process. RTC conducts periodic safety assessments which will likely occur in early 2020 that will take advantage of the timing of the State's Target Zero Action Plan Update scheduled for later in 2019. It will also be able to make use of the third round of federally required safety performance measures target setting and updated collision data and will have the benefit of the Federal response to the State's progress regarding safety targets. The first response from the Feds is due in December of 2019, and Ms. David will address this in the next agenda item.

In 2020, RTC and C-TRAN are likely to partner in reviewing and updating the High Capacity Transit Plan as suggested by RTC's Chair at last month's meeting. That has been noted at the end of chapter 5 of the Plan with issues that they need to track and update. The update would reflect progress made to date and plans for future corridors and updating of the Federal Transit Administration's HCT program and policies. Also for update is the Freight Transportation Plan which can incorporate updated freight classification data, freight analysis framework, land uses, and will reflect update to the state's Freight and Goods Transportation System and support for the region's economic development.

As part of the RTP review process, the RTP was reviewed by the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC) at its February 15 meeting, and at that meeting RTAC recommended RTC Board action to adopt the 2019 Plan update. Therefore, the action requested is for the RTC Board to adopt the 2019 update to the Regional Transportation Plan for Clark County, Resolution 03-19-04.

Shirley Craddick said the Metro Regional Government is the MPO for the Portland Metro region, and that includes the 24 cities and 3 counties in the urban area of Metro. She said each jurisdiction has their own TSP and they become the region's RTP. For the Washington side of the river, each county has their own RTP, but not a combined RTP. There is one for Clark County, one for Klickitat County, and one for Skamania County. Councilor Craddick asked if that was correct.

Ms. David said that was correct; there is not one combined RTP for all three counties. Ms. David said they wanted an RTP to cover the MPO, which is Clark County. Additionally, it is a

state requirement for RTPs for the more rural two counties, which are Skamania and Klickitat Counties. They do address in each of the plans the connectivity between the three counties.

Councilor Craddick said with the Metro RTP, they have a group of policies that govern the distribution of funds and where the priorities and how the funds get distributed, and that oversees the entire area. She asked if each of the three counties get their own funding.

Ms. David said the only revenue that comes to the three-county region is the Transportation Alternatives program funds. Even with that, there are limitations on what can be used at the urban versus the rural areas. So, each of the counties has their separate allocations. A lot of the policies are really based on what comes out of the Federal directives and also the State Laws. The policy themes are very similar for each the three regions. The density of population is so different in Skamania and Klickitat Counties compared with the more urban nature of Clark County.

Matt Ransom said that was a good response. It really comes down to the function of the organization. For Clark County, RTC functions as a Metropolitan Planning Organization; for Skamania and Klickitat Counties, RTC doesn't function that way. It is more a regional entity not prescribed by federal law. Funds are managed differently. Also, they are not the urban metropolitan area, so by virtue of their needs, they're different and we reflect those differently.

SCOTT HUGHES MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 03-19-04, THE RTP FOR CLARK COUNTY. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY CARLEY FRANCIS AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

## **VII. MAP-21/FAST Act Safety Performance Measures and Target Setting, Resolution 03-19-05**

Lynda David referred to the Resolution included in the meeting materials on Safety Performance Measures and Target Setting along with the attachments. At RTC Board meetings in 2017 and 2018, staff provided information on the federally required performance based planning and programming. The Board will have to take action to set performance targets for the required performance measures. Ms. David will provide brief background information on the required performance management program, provide an annual update of the second round of safety targets now set by WSDOT for traffic safety performance measures and request Board adoption of the resolution that would reaffirm RTC's current strategies to support the WSDOT 2019 safety targets.

Ms. David recalled that the federal Transportation Act MAP-21 passed in 2012 set in motion the requirements to have a performance driven outcome based transportation planning and decision making process. Performance measures and targets are put into place. They are monitored and reported on. The USDOT compiles data and monitors progress towards reaching national goals. The USDOT, state DOTs, and Metropolitan Planning Organizations each have a role in the performance framework.

A recap of the key concepts of Transportation Performance Management was provided. It is a strategic approach that uses data and system information in order to help make informed

policy investments and policy decisions. Cooperation and coordination among the agencies and DOTs, and MPOs are key to establishing performance measures and targets. Transportation performance management is systematically implied as part of an ongoing process. So, it is hoped that the approach will help to improve communications between decision makers, stakeholders, and the traveling public on transportation decision making. There are a total of 17 required performance measures which the RTC Board addressed at previous meetings. Today's focus is on the five safety performance measures and safety targets established and now subject to the annual update and the second round of target setting.

Key dates in developing the safety performance targets were provided. Federal Highway Administration issues a final rule making regarding safety measures back in April 14 of 2016. They gave Washington State DOT until August 31, 2017 to establish the first round of 2018 statewide safety targets and then Metropolitan Planning Organizations, such as RTC, had 180 days thereafter to set the MPO targets by February 27, 2018. Any Regional Transportation Plan or Transportation Improvement Program published after May 27, 2018 had to address the safety performance measures and targets set. RTC has complied with the requirement in the 2019 to 2022 Transportation Improvement Program adopted by the Board back in October of last year and also in the 2019 Regional Transportation Plan Update that was just adopted.

The reality is, in the first go round of target setting, RTC did not set safety targets for the RTC MPO region, but instead agreed to support the state in attaining statewide safety targets. Every Metropolitan Planning Organization in Washington State did likewise. WSDOT is now in round two of Safety Target Setting, and by August 31 of 2018, WSDOT set the 2019 Safety Targets.

At the February 15 meeting of the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee for Clark County, RTAC reviewed the new targets. RTAC members recommended that the RTC Board agree that RTC should continue to assist the State in trying to meet the newly-established targets rather than set some targets for the RTC region specifically.

Ms. David noted that attached to the Target Setting Resolution is WSDOT's updated MAP-21 folio published in January of this year and a similar folio published back in September 2017 and distributed to the RTC Board at that time, prior to the RTC Board action on the initial Safety Targets which the Board adopted in January 2018.

In the first round of Target Setting, WSDOT established 2018 targets based on the states Strategic Highway Safety Plan known as Target Zero. It aspires to reach zero fatalities and zero serious injuries due to traffic collisions by the year 2030. WSDOT continues with these aspirational targets in the second round of safety target setting though with use of an updated methodology as described in the folio on page two.

Ms. David said the next five slides she had duplicated the graphs shown on page 3 of the folio and document the statewide updated Safety Targets for 2019 which uses a 2017 baseline for data. The first graph shows historic data for number of fatalities in Washington State together with the target set for 2019. There were two additional attachments with the resolution. The

second attachment provided more detail on the number of fatalities and serious injury statewide and provided trend lines. The third attachment showed comparable data and graphs for the Clark County region. As seen from the slide, over the past years, the number of fatalities has been trending upward in reverse to what the aspirational targets set by the state DOT. Some are trends being observed in Clark County.

The second safety target is for Fatality Rate per 100 million vehicle miles traveled. There is an upward trend observed in Washington State and likewise in Clark County. The third graphic showed the number of serious injuries statewide. Again, it shows the 2019 newly established target for WSDOT. The fourth geographic shows the serious injury rate for 100 million vehicle miles traveled for the status with the 2019 target set. The fifth graph showed the number of non-motorized pedestrian and cyclist fatalities and serious injuries with a 2019 target set. In comparison with Washington statewide, Clark County appears to be trending downward for the targets between 2016 and 2017, whereas, statewide the numbers are trending upwards.

The table provided on page three of the Resolution provides the targets set in the first round using a baseline of 2016 for setting the 2018 targets for all the five safety performance measures and then compare them with the targets set for 2019 using 2017 baseline data. Again, WSDOT took the lead in analyzing the crash data for the 2019 targets, and WSDOT continues to work in close coordination with the Metropolitan Planning Organizations in the state. The new 2019 targets were shown in red.

The action requested of the Board is to adopt Resolution 03-19-05, the MAP-21/FAST Act Safety Performance Measures and Target Setting, which would have RTC as the Metropolitan Planning Organization for Clark County continue to help support WSDOT attain statewide Safety Targets for 2019 as established by the State DOT in August of 2018 rather than adopt separate regional targets. Ms. David added that this is going to be an annual reporting to the RTC Board for the Safety Targets.

Eileen Quiring asked about the history of the aspirational zero fatalities by 2030. She asked when that was established and the history of it.

Ms. David said Target Zero is the statewide Safety Plan which has to be put into place. She didn't recall when it was first adopted, but it was some time ago. The state set an aspirational goal, because they didn't want any fatalities or serious injuries if they could avoid it. They pointed out that a newer vehicle fleet would help us in reaching the targets, because a lot of the vehicles these days almost take over the driving. On the other hand, we're dealing with human behavior, and it is really tough to reach a zero aspirational target when you have people's behavior that has to be taken into consideration. The state is beginning the process to update the Target Zero Plan this year, and they have been told that it is going to be a lot more performance based and look seriously at what can be done to try to reduce and set the trend downward with the number of fatalities and serious injuries and also non-motorized modes.

Councilor Quiring said she can see the purpose behind setting the target at zero, because one life is too many lives. She said it really is not reachable at any time. Councilor Quiring asked if

there was a stated real goal. She said she sees that there are some baselines they are basing new information on from the previous year, but it seems setting a target that can never be reached doesn't work.

Ms. David said that is why there is an annual update, and the state will review the numbers and look at whether or not they go away from that aspirational target. Each year they will be looking at the collision data and fatalities and serious injuries and they might update. She also said we might choose to set our own target ultimately. Ms. David said their thinking this time around is the Federal Government has to respond to these first rounds of performance targets which were set by the state back in 2017 and by the RTC Board in 2018. The Federal Highway Administration's first reporting will be in December of this year. She said she thinks the state is taking a wait-and-see approach to see how the Feds respond or react, because the state is supposed to be showing that there is progress being made towards the target. It is the Safety Performance Measures and Targets is the only set of Performance Measures that actually have a penalty attached to it, and it really revolves around how much the state is spending on safety improvements. Ms. David said she thinks they will be looking to RTC as the MPO for looking at what projects can improve safety in our region.

Temple Lentz said in the staff report, it says that there actually aren't any penalties for not achieving these targets. She was curious about that.

Ms. David said there are no penalties for the Metropolitan Planning Organization, for our region. It is the state that has to address. At the moment, the state feels confident they are spending adequate amounts, and the Federal Government will agree that the state as a whole is spending the percentage that needs to be spent on safety. But, on the other hand, they are waiting to see what the Federal response will be in December of this year. Because, nationwide there has been a tendency for upward trends for the number of fatalities and serious injuries over the last few years, and it might be that coming out of the recession, there is more traffic on the roads and there is increasingly distracted drivers and so on.

Councilor Lentz said that is the question that she was going to ask. If there are no penalties and we've been seeing the upward trend, and we want the targets to be as low as they are, but the trends are in the opposite direction of our targets, if we don't make adequate progress towards these targets, will there be additional help to get us there?

Ms. David said she doubted that, unfortunately. She said funding seems to be ever shrinking, and there is a lot of need out there. Again, she said it is a balance between some of the other performance measures dealing with pavement conditions, bridge conditions, and there is just a lot of competing needs. That is why Washington State DOT and the Safety Commission for Washington State will take a serious look at the update at the Target Zero Plan as to what can be done.

Shirley Craddick asked if Target Zero is comparable to Vision Zero.

Ms. David said yes, it is.

Councilor Craddick said traditionally, when you have a Vision Zero program, there are some performance expectations to where your goal is to build some traffic calming amenities to help slow traffic and make it safe for pedestrians and bicyclists and merging techniques and such. It sounds like that isn't part of this plan. Councilor Craddick said she was going back to her experience on the Oregon side of the river on what Vision Zero is, because what comes with it are a lot of amenities that you will build to be able to help make the roads safer. It doesn't sound like that occurs in this program.

Ms. David said with the Target Zero Plan for Washington State, there are suggested improvements that can be made such as crosswalks for pedestrians and some programmatic improvements. They look to the local Transportation System Plans and the Capital Facilities Plans from local jurisdictions to make some of these improvements and also to the WSDOT and the MPO to program funding for transportation improvements to improve safety. The City of Vancouver took a look at safety issues and needs in their jurisdiction last year. It all gets bound to the Washington State Plan itself, not specific projects, but the types of projects such as traffic calming in a neighborhood.

Councilor Craddick asked if there was not a priority process where if Target Zero is adopted, the funding has to be accommodated, that funding is moved in that direction.

Ms. David said it can be at the local level, and at the state DOT, they address this in the folio provided about funding expenditures that are made at the statewide level.

Gary Medvigy said when he read through the charts the previous day, what struck him was that there was nothing underlined in the data. He asked how policy decisions were to be made if they don't know if this is a mechanical failure that is increasing, or is it caused by drug use or alcohol use. Should they put money in addiction programs instead of a bypass lane? Councilor Medvigy said he was just questioning why they don't see anything as to the underlying cause for fatalities or traffic accidents in general.

Ms. David said at previous Board meetings, about a year and a half ago, they reported on the factors that play into fatalities and serious injury accidents, and they have that data available. It will be updated as part of the Target Zero Plan update. They will have updated information to be able to provide to the Board as that planning process plays out. They did bring this information to previous Board meetings. This tends to be a numbers game rather than what the factors are behind it in this Federal Performance Measures and Target Setting. It is very data driven rather than looking at what is causing the accidents or fatalities. Ms. David said they would bring that updated information to the Board as soon as they get it.

Carley Francis said that Target Zero was adopted by the State in 2000, and as Councilor Craddick mentioned, it is echoed in other states so it is a wave across the country that is in a lot of places, saying any life is too many. The challenge that Councilor Medvigy pointed out is cross-cutting beyond what the funds at an organization like this can necessarily address. So the Target Zero Plan for the state really covers a broad array of tactics that can be implemented by different entities. The primary things such as education, enforcement, engineering, emergency

medical services, and also leadership of policy, and it really requires to address this issue and the cross-cutting that RTC isn't cross-cutting in that way. In this space, Ms. Francis said they focus on the physical types of adjustments that make sense, and they will be tailored to the situation. This data is aggregated to the level that can't get down to that detail to get underlying causes, but she said she thinks the program as a whole is intending to address the array of things driving the outcomes.

Shawn Donaghy offered a point of clarification. He said the Resolution that is in front of us is to approve the Safety Measures in order to sustain funding not necessarily relational to Target Zero, which is trying to mitigate fatalities throughout the state; so one is not necessarily the other. To that point, he said he had an issue with that, maybe they shouldn't correlate simply because to all of the Councilors points, we are really trying to find a way to dial down that data and find out what the issue is from a fatality standpoint or serious injuries, whether that is distracted driving, road conditions, land use, or whatever. Specific to the Resolution, it is simply a matter we have identified that these are our target goals in order to ensure funding for such programs.

Ms. David said they have heard from the Washington State DOT colleagues that they are trying to reconcile the Target Zero Planning and the Performance Measures that came out of MAP-21, the Federal Transportation Act. She said a number of states are trying to do that as well; they're trying to synchronize them better. Ms. David said they are bringing this to the Board fairly quickly, because there has been a lag time between the Washington State DOT setting their new targets, and they have been trying to work with the Traffic Safety Commission on the Target Zero Plan. They are trying their best to see how they can make it a better process in the future.

**BART HANSEN MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 03-19-05, MAP-21/FAST ACT SAFETY PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND TARGET SETTING AND RE-AFFIRM RTC'S SUPPORT. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SHAWN DONAGHY AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**

Matt Ransom offered an additional comment, and thanked the Board for their participation in this discussion. He said they have been working on Performance Measures as Federal mandate enacted into law over five years ago. It's taken many years. He described it in previous settings as everybody wants a dashboard, so congress wanted a dashboard, same data, same sources, same way to report across the nation; a very difficult exercise. He said regarding the conversation that the Board just had; there is probably not a more important public policy question which is safety of the users on the system, whether it is vehicles, pedestrians, bicycles, and so forth. Mr. Ransom said after this meeting he would recirculate the factors presentation that they gave, and it may be a little outdated, but generally speaking would be reflective of the trends.

Mr. Ransom provided a second comment saying he thought this question of where they can make improvements in how they distribute RTC funds that enhance safety, they should look for every opportunity to do that. They could encourage members, whether at the county level, city

level, or transit level, etc. to nudge the importance of safety. They should have that conversation around this table. There are so many other partners in the conversation. He said he has seen in the last couple years at the state legislature an enactment of laws that prohibit with severe fines using cell phones. That is a Legislative response to the notion of distracted driving, meaning make it hurt so you don't do it again. There will also be the money questions. Mr. Ransom said he sort of views the "at zero sum", as Lynda pointed out, if you take money from bridges to beef up safety, then your bridges don't have enough money. So, his hope would be, and this gets to the net new funding, which is really what we all need, the Feds have not addressed or increased the federal gas tax since 1993. If this benchmarking across the nation helps the federal government say we need more money, then it is an exercise worth our time, and he hopes that they do that.

### **VIII. 2018 Annual Listing of Federal Project Obligation**

Dale Robins referred to the memo included in the meeting packet along with the report that was attached. Mr. Robins noted that if someone accessed the report prior to this week, it had an error in one of the graphs on page 5. The report in today's meeting materials is accurate as is the version available online.

Mr. Robins said RTC, as the Metropolitan Planning Agency (MPO), has a federal requirement that requires them to publish a list of federally obligated projects each year. This is just federally obligated projects; it does not include state or local money or anything else except federal dollars. This varies year by year; if it is a big project, it does create a bit of variation. Obligation is basically a process of Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration giving entities permission to spend federal monies. The actual expenditure on a project occurs after obligation and can often take years.

Mr. Robins displayed a graph with federal obligation totals over the last five years. In 2015, it was a huge year; that year we had \$36 million obligated for the Fourth Plain Bus Rapid Transit system. That was why that year was so much higher than the other four years. One project made a difference. Mr. Robins said the last year, 2018, is the lowest year he has seen in over a decade. The last decade has all been higher than 2018. He said they saw a slight slowdown by local agencies and saw less federal monies spent by Washington State Department of Transportation in the region. The State is managing federal and state money, and so they might have spent more state dollars and less federal dollars in 2018. It is not unusual, and nothing to be concerned about at this point.

A pie chart showed how the money was allocated by the project type. Eight percent of the money was spent on projects primarily for safety. The state has established safety grants for local agencies, and WSDOT has focused more and more dollars towards safety. It is not the largest program when looking at where money was spent. Preservation is where over a quarter of the federal dollars was spent. Transit comes in second at 22% and then road improvements at 17%. Mr. Robins said they talked about safety projects, but he said you have to consider that just about every project that goes forward has a safety element. When you are improving the

road, you're designing it to hopefully facilitate safety. There is some crossover, but the percentages show the primary purpose of each of the projects.

In addition, RTC has federal dollars allocated to them that they distribute to local agencies to implement projects. This last year, RTC had \$7.5 million obligated among the three programs allocated to them. Mr. Robins said RTC has about \$10 million allocated to them on an annual basis. He said they have over spent in previous years and hit their obligation target quite early. He said they hit it in April and the federal fiscal year goes until the end of September. We are obligating ahead even though we did not obligate a full amount the previous year, we obligated a lot of money.

Mr. Robins said that is a summary of the obligation. Pages 8-10 of the report provide a list of obligated projects by agency and what the federal funding source was. He said they like to have their money obligated, and they look forward to a successful obligation in 2019 and in the future.

Eileen Quiring had a question about the pie chart that was displayed. She asked if the design of a project was part of the planning piece shown or part of the road improvement piece shown. Mr. Robins said design is part of the road improvement project.

#### **IX. SR-500/Fourth Plain Blvd. Study**

Matt Ransom said at last month's meeting, Bob Hart, RTC staff, gave a review of all of the studies that are ongoing within the Vancouver region, two lead by RTC and one lead by WSDOT. WSDOT has asked to give a review of one of their studies. They will present one of the high priority, unfunded projects, the SR-500/Fourth Plain Operations Study. Later this summer, they will return when they have narrowed down what the preferred alternative is.

Judith Perez with WSDOT SW Region's Planning Office and Justin Sheets with the SW Region's Traffic Operations Office would provide a brief overview of the SR-500/Fourth Plain Operations Study.

Judith Perez said SR-500 and NE Fourth Plain has been identified as the most congested and most traveled intersection in Clark County. Currently, they are experiencing about 70,000 drivers per day traveling through that intersection. In looking at SR-500 and Fourth Plain, SR-500 is a four-lane facility, and it has a turning lane, and Fourth Plain is also a four-lane facility, and it has two turning lanes. It is not uncommon if you are at that intersection that you will have two light cycles to pass through. There are an awful lot of vehicles trying to get through. From a multi-modal perspective, they have limited active transportation facilities. There are bike lanes on Fourth Plain from SR-503 to NE 102<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and there is no other active transportation facility in that intersection. There are two transit routes, currently in the study area. Route 7 goes from the Mall to Battle Ground, and because of the lack of reliability, that route has been rerouted so it doesn't actually go through that intersection. Also, they have Route 74 that goes from the Mall to 164<sup>th</sup> Avenue and loops back.

The goal of the study is to develop a list of cost-effective strategies or projects to increase safety, reduce congestion, and to improve travel reliability at the intersection. Typical studies focus on 20 years out. However, with this study they are trying to improve what they have right now. Emphasis will be on strategies and projects that could be implemented within five to ten years. They have a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for the group. It includes representatives from the City of Vancouver, Clark County, C-TRAN, and RTC. The TAC is helping identify the potential strategies based on the effectiveness, cost benefits, and ease of implementation.

Justin Sheets said he would get into where they are with the project and also into some of the data they have looked at. As Judith said, the three categories they are focused on are safety, mobility, and reliability. In terms of safety, they are looking at where the crashes are occurring, what types of crashes are occurring, with an emphasis on pedestrian and bike crashes, and the more serious crashes that are happening. In terms of mobility, they are looking at, essentially, people getting through the intersection, whether it is motorists or all users. For reliability, they are looking at how much the trips are varying day to day. That is very important, and that is how people plan their trips.

As well as safety, reliability, and mobility, there are other considerations. They are looking at low cost, and more operational solutions. In the past, they have looked at this intersection with very big capital improvements: interchanges, flyover ramps, very costly projects that have never been funded in the past and it's questionable if they will be in the future. They are taking a fresh look, seeing what they can do with the existing pavement for other low-cost things they can implement in the near term.

Mr. Sheets provided a little about the data. They just wrapped up doing a full crash analysis of the main intersection of 500 and Fourth Plain as well as the surrounding area. In the last five years, in this area, they have had almost 400 crashes. Luckily, they are lower severity crashes, so generally, people are not getting hurt. There are still a lot of crashes happening. It is what you would expect in a congested area; a lot of rear ends and sideswipes. They are mostly fender benders, but there are 4% of crashes involving pedestrians and bicyclists. The bike crashes typically involve bicyclists riding on the sidewalks because there are no bike lanes or facilities in the area. Often, what Mr. Sheets said he has noticed, the bicyclists are not even going in the direction of traffic, so that could explain why they are not as expected.

The heart of the project is on improving mobility. Basically, all of the intersections in the area are failing based on 2018 data. Most of these intersections are failing in the morning peak hour, as well as afternoon peak hour.

Mr. Sheets looked at the travel patterns in this corridor. In the morning they have drivers heading southbound on SR-503 and westbound on Fourth Plain, basically heading towards I-205, and likely heading to Portland. What that causes is very heavy left turns from Fourth Plain heading westbound and taking the left to southbound SR-500. This is currently two left-turn lanes, and what is very common in the morning is that it backs up through all of the

upstream traffic signals and causes issues in the through movements as well. In the afternoon, they have the opposite trend. People are heading northbound and heading home, heading eastbound. What is interesting about the afternoon is that all of the movements are higher. The afternoon is quite a bit worse than the morning, but the morning is failing as well.

The last category they are looking at is reliability. They looked at the travel times northbound and southbound on SR-503 from Padden Parkway to I-205. The average trip takes 5 minutes, but once a week or once a month it can take over 20 minutes. You can see how this can really complicate things if you need to be somewhere on time. Mr. Sheets said one of the reasons for this is because of the lack of good alternate routes. When something happens at this corridor or intersection, it messes up the whole corridor. Also, if something happens on I-205 or one of the adjacent routes, it forces people on to the route, because there are no other good options. Also, the crashes factor into the reliability part. If you're having 400 crashes in five years, that causes a lot of delays and blockages.

Mr. Sheets said they have just finished the data analysis. They had a workshop two weeks ago with all of their TAC members, and they started to talk about potential strategies. Their focus is on signal timing modifications, arterial travel times, non-motorized improvements, spot improvements, and adaptive signal control. These are more of their low-cost operational near-term fixes. Signal timing modifications are something that they do on a routine basis, but there could be some merit if they were to take a different approach. This has been talked about with their TAC members. It is a very low cost to implement, but something they do on a routine basis. It was also mentioned that if they post the travel times on their arterial streets, that could help out just like they do on the freeways in terms of reliability. The medium cost fixes they are looking at would be where it would make sense to add turn lanes, where it would make sense to signalize new intersections, and the counter to that of where it makes sense to remove a signal or convert an intersection to a right-in right-out only. This seems to have support from the TAC members. Adaptive signal control is something that they will look at. They don't have any in this region, but it will probably be looked at.

The last three potential strategies are higher cost capital solutions that they are not focused on, but Mr. Sheets said they should mention them because they are in the Regional Transportation Plan. One would be grade-separation; that could be an interchange or a flyover ramp. They listed Padden Parkway interchange, because that is part of the study area and any big capital fix could probably change travel patterns and influence that interchange. There could be corridor-wide improvements.

Ms. Perez provided an overview of the study schedule. She said the study is aggressive. She said the team is planning to have the report finalized by the end of June. She said as Justin mentioned, they are working on the potential strategies and projects. They intend to start going out to the public next month. They have a comprehensive outreach process. They are talking to the businesses with the East Vancouver Business Association, neighborhoods, stakeholders, and agencies such as RTC, C-TRAN, the City of Vancouver, and Clark County. Their outreach process has two stages.

They just completed stage one where they are trying to identify the purpose and needs of the study. They conducted a survey and had almost 3,000 participants. Most of the participants were folks that drove their own cars, single occupancy vehicles, and they were residents of the study area. Their main purpose was either commuting or to shop in the area. They said that when the intersection gets very congested, they tend to use I-205 or Padden Parkway as an alternate route. Ms. Perez said they sent out mailers to folks in the study area and did the regular social media reach out.

Stage two focuses on identifying how well the strategies and projects that were identified met the purpose and need. They will have an Open House in May, and they will also have an online open house for public feedback. They will also have many one to one stakeholder meetings with different stakeholders, neighborhoods, and business groups.

The next steps include all the different meetings that they have. In April, mainly they are focusing on the strategies and the projects. They want to make sure they communicate with the public. They will spend April and May talking to folks at the Open House. They will have a report in June, and they are hoping to come back to this Board in July to tell them what they learned and where they are headed.

#### **X. State Legislative Session Update**

Matt Ransom provided a memo and shared information on activities in the State Legislature and reviewed what he has been following in Oregon. The most consequential activity that he has been monitoring and following and recently attended a public hearing the previous week is the Senate Transportation Committee has introduced and held a preliminary hearing and formal public hearing on a New Law Transportation Funding Revenue Package and Project List. He would spend a few minutes describing that. This has been prepared to address unfunded state needs and also enhance funding programs that are statewide competitive that would benefit all of us, direct distributions to local government. Funding programs that are specific to transit, Ports, etc. It is a \$16 billion funding proposal, and Senate Transportation Committee Chair Hobbs introduced it in his presentation last week at the public hearing. Mr. Ransom said there is a lot to like and a lot maybe not to like. He said as they review it, context is everything. He said as Board Members fully understand and the policy work that they do, there is never going to be a package that addresses completely everybody's needs nor would it satisfy everybody's sensitivities to new funding and having to pay more fees in taxes, etcetera.

Mr. Ransom focused on the top line for this region. Good things in the project list. He provided the detailed project list. Part of the \$16 billion would be earmarked to specific projects. He reviewed the two most important projects unfunded within both Clark County in our Regional Plan and Klickitat County in their Regional Plan. Number one on the list: the I-5 Bridge Replacement. The state would not commit \$3 billion to that. What that is attempting to describe is there would be a state commitment, and the funding formula would very likely be a combination of federal dollars, state dollars, which this would address the state contribution, tolls would be a user fee component, and there might be others. Contextually, when this was

introduced formally last week, both the Chair and the Vice Chair to the Committee the first words out of their mouths in describing the purpose and the intent were we need to address the Columbia River Bridge, bottom line. Mr. Ransom said he found those to be both affirmative and optimistic, basically speaking the truth. Those bridges need to be addressed. It is an unfunded state need. Number 11 on the list is the most important project in our Klickitat RTP, which is send some state contribution in some form for the replacement of the Hood River / White Salmon Bridge. There would likely be a funding formula established. At some point this year, they hope to have a briefing on this specific project. Currently, the Port of Hood River is in the process of completing an EIS for advancing that project. Similar to the I-5 Bridge replacement, it would be an Oregon and Washington contribution, a combination of federal, toll, and other dollars. There are many other projects on the list, and they are listed by the Legislative Districts. Notably, many projects within the 14th Legislative District, which covers Klickitat, Skamania, and a sliver of Clark County, for Senator King, the Ranking Member on the Senate Transportation Committee, has been able to introduce many projects for potential earmark covering needs within the Gorge community; for example rock fall and bridge pave or deck replacement on The Dalles Bridge.

In sum, Mr. Ransom said in looking at the list, we have the top project. The question right now is how do we keep that project on the list; how do we keep focused? He said that is the work of, not only our State Legislators, but perhaps also the work of us here in local government and constituents. How do we keep focused on the money side of it, which is to keep that conversation and that bridge listed at the top of the list? He provided a list of the different program categories.

Mr. Ransom said on the revenue side, it is a little bit more complicated. The Bill is 5971. The new idea that has been introduced, somewhat controversial, is the introduction of a carbon fee. That carbon fee would constitute revenue up to about \$8 billion. About half the revenue net new would be established through a carbon fee. Some people don't like that. They are trying to tie the carbon fee to infrastructure improvements, but the state's never done this. Any time they do a new program, a fee, or a tax it is going to be met with some degree of consternation. It is scheduled for possible committee action tomorrow. Meaning if they want to push it out of committee now that they have had their hearings, they would perhaps take action on that tomorrow, if not tomorrow, perhaps in weeks ahead or it may go nowhere. If it doesn't go anywhere this year, that's okay. In fact many people predict that it probably won't get to the finish line at the Governor's desk. Mr. Ransom said we now have the introduction of the New Revenue Package, and our projects are prominently listed on that package. How do we maintain over the course of this year, next year, and the future years; how we keep those projects and support of other projects regionally on the list. We need to keep focused. This is more of a long strategy, if they don't deal with it this year.

Mr. Ransom offered a sense of the comments at the Hearing showing the diversity of opinion that exists. These comments came to him through Vancouver's lobbyist, Brian Enslow. He attempted to provide to his client a sense that this is going to be messy. There are people with

diverse interests and perspectives. The Iron Workers love this; just make sure that you have American made steel as a preference and policy. There are others, the General Contractors Association says they love it, but they don't like higher taxes. Clark Public Utilities lobbyist expresses opposition concerned about the carbon pollution fee and its potential impacts to rate payers. As the Chair introduced this, he said he was trying, if that is an instrument that is new to the state, to tie it to infrastructure. In summary, Mr. Ransom said we are very well positioned on this list. He said much of that credit goes to our State Legislators who have been working in front of the scenes and behind the scenes to elevate the importance, the relative awareness of the needs within our region. We should be thankful of that and support them and see how it shakes out. Mr. Ransom referred to a letter attached to the memo. He testified in support of the deliberation and support for the debate of this issue. This is what we need to be doing as a state; it's debating how we improve our infrastructure.

They continue to track two bills, one in the House and one in the Senate that are out of Committee and working their way through rules and probably go to the floor and get voted on and signed by the Governor. This relates to the Project of Statewide Significance designation in creating a process for the Department of Transportation to evaluate, designate, and through some mechanism coordinate streamlining of state agency review for projects that achieve that designation. This Board adopted a resolution in 2017 (attached to memo) supporting that designation process, and the I-5 Bridge could be a candidate for that. The White Salmon/Hood River Bridge replacement could be a candidate for that. A letter of comment was attached. Mr. Ransom said nearly unanimous, our State Legislative Delegation, 17<sup>th</sup>, 18<sup>th</sup>, and 49<sup>th</sup> Districts, with the exception of one Representative out of the 17<sup>th</sup> District all signed on as co-sponsors to the Bill. There was broad support, and we should acknowledge that at the Legislative level and their work on our behalf.

The State Supplemental Appropriations, Mr. Ransom reported on earlier. That will work its way through. There is \$17.5 million for establishment of an I-5 Bridge project office. If we are all patient, when and if that is signed into law, there is going to be a lot of work in standing up a project office. Mr. Ransom said we need to be careful about putting too many demands on the Department. There is going to be an effort to stand that up, to designate the right staffing, to designate even the decision making process they'll all have to go through to really then restart a regional conversational, and in that instance, a bi-state conversation. Mr. Ransom said it's very encouraging to see that the Governor and then the Legislative Appropriations Bill reflect that. When it happens, we can all try to figure out with the Department how we can support their work in getting working on that project again.

Mr. Ransom said one project that he hasn't mentioned, and it is relevant to RTC. One of the Governor's major initiatives is the High Speed Rail Corridor. He, in the Supplemental Operating Budget, puts more money, about \$3.5 million, into further study of this High Speed Rail Corridor. It is from Eugene to Vancouver, British Columbia. It is not proposed to stop in Vancouver, Washington. Possibly when that goes further into the study process, there may be a briefing to this Board. From a multi-state, west coast infrastructure standpoint, it's certainly a

topic. It is a topic down in California that has had some degree of news associated with it recently. Mr. Ransom said he believed that they abandoned their High Speed Rail Corridor. Maybe in the Pacific Northwest that makes sense. If there is something to report in that study as they proceed, Mr. Ransom will bring it back to the Board. It could be another option for constituents here in the County and region to make that north/south trip.

Mr. Ransom said Substitute House Bill 1584 and Senate Bill 5778 is something that he has consulted with Representative Wylie on. She is a member of the House Transportation Committee. A bill was introduced that would affect RTC's governance structure at the RTC Board level. What it would mandate is that under our state function, we would be mandated to include a member of Tribal Nations that have tribal lands within our service area that we would have to allow them, if they so choose, a seat at the Board table to be part of the governing Board. The comments that Mr. Ransom provided to Representative Wylie were that it might cause us to restructure the Board, and would it compel us to take it apart structurally in its governance and then put it back together. Through consultation with RTC's General Counsel, Ted Gathe, his opinion was that we may not have to do that.

Mr. Gathe said the question would be if we would have to go back and revise or amend the Interlocal Agreement that essentially put RTC together 26 years ago. Initially, he said he thought they probably would need to be based on the wording in the Bylaws and Articles. On second review, he concluded that this is probably a form of state mandate. It does not require that the Tribes be included, but it does give them the opportunity to ask for inclusion. Mr. Gathe said because that is a state mandate, it would preempt any opportunity to say otherwise. He said he thought that we could probably accomplish this through a Bylaws revision and not a complete overhaul of the Interlocal Agreement. He said they would see if the Bill actually passes, and they would address it more formally at that time.

Mr. Ransom said one of the regional priorities and as part of the CCTA statement is to support moving forward funds for the 179<sup>th</sup> I-5 interchange. Right now they are programmed for expenditure in years 2023 to 2025. The request from the County, and there is support regionally, that if there is an opportunity to reprogram those funds earlier, the County and WSDOT are working on development of what that interchange improvement needs to look like.

Mr. Ransom said the big policy Bill that is in the State of Oregon Legislature, does have a transportation implication, the Cap and Trade Bill. This would create a new system of taxing carbon emissions and create credits for trading them. The question related to transportation in Oregon is how the monies are spent. A certain amount of those monies that would be affected by a Cap and Trade scheme would be gas tax related. Those gas tax related components would be subject to Oregon constitutional restrictions, meaning that any revenue generated would have to be restricted to highway purpose expenditures. Mr. Ransom said he talked with Rian Windsheimer briefly before the meeting about this to get his sense of the order of magnitude it might generate. He indicated that it might generate several hundreds of millions of dollars per year in Oregon, and it would be restricted for transportation or highway purpose. That would be a lot of money that is new for them to figure out how they want to program and spend it, if

and when that happens. Mr. Ransom said he understood that JPACT submitted a resolution or reviewed a resolution that was sent to the Oregon State Legislature to say please dedicate some of those funds for regional transportation improvements. Presumptively, if that amount of money were to be generated within the Oregon side of the region, there could be a lot of money to address not only high priority congestion bottlenecks, other transportation improvements in their regional and state Plans. It could be a real change in the funding circumstance in the State of Oregon if that were to happen. Mr. Ransom said he did not have a sense if it may make it to the finish line.

The other item that is not an Oregon Legislative issue, but Mr. Ransom said he thinks it is relative to Metro and a regional initiative. Metro is evaluating the potential to create a regional bond levy for specific transportation improvements. They have formed a Task Force. The Task Force has had one meeting to begin the development and examination of what might be a regional levy. They have a second Task Force meeting tomorrow. Mr. Ransom said he would be monitoring and tracking that. He said we also have a great opportunity with Councilor Shirley Craddick here, who is also the Chair of JPACT, to keep tabs on the development of that project. He asked if she had any points of input.

Councilor Craddick said there is nothing new on that yet. They are meeting tomorrow; it is a 35 member committee. They are meeting at the Oregon Convention Center at 5:00 p.m. It is open to the public if you have interest to sit and listen to the discussion. They are looking at funding options. It doesn't necessarily mean it is going to be a bond measure. They're looking at opportunities that they might find to be able to approach the voters with something that they would accept.

Mr. Ransom said Rian Windsheimer wanted to remind people, and it is not necessarily legislatively related, at the last meeting he did announce to the Board that ODOT is accepting comments on their Environmental Assessment work related to the Rose Quarter improvements that they have proposed. That comment period is still open. Mr. Windsheimer encouraged members to take a look at it if you wish to submit comments. They want to hear from people who use the Rose Quarter from an auto perspective. Mr. Ransom said it is a key improvement for us and our constituencies.

Mr. Ransom said the other policy bill that he saw in Oregon, if it has made it out of committee, is an attempt by motorcyclists to introduce lane splitting, which essentially motorcyclists can run the line between traffic. That is prohibited in the State of Washington by traffic code. In Oregon they are evaluating whether there is merit in doing that. It might be interesting from a regional circulation standpoint being a border city. If they can do that in Oregon and they can't do that in Washington, it raises an interesting dynamic about expectation and for enforcement.

Mr. Ransom said he is very optimistic. Two revenue Bills or two conversations whether it is Metro's whether it is Forward Washington, which is what is happening in Washington State. There is the emergence if we need for mega infrastructure like the two bridges in our region, big dollars, this is the venue for big dollars. The fact that both these conversations are

emerging this legislative session, they may re-emerge the next and the next. He said he has hope that we get to the finish line, and he fully expects the Legislature to see the need and residents see the need. It is very positive in terms of big dollars.

## **XI. Other Business**

### From the Board

Shirley Craddick had a couple other things that she wanted to mention regarding the transportation funding opportunities that Metro Council is looking toward. First of all, they are focusing on corridors and not just on specific projects. They are identifying what the corridors are in the Portland Metro region that would have the most impact if they were able to do multiple projects along that corridor. Also, looking at improving commutes for everyone in the region, not just auto oriented ways to get around, transit, bicycling, and pedestrian. Also looking at both providing racial, cultural, and geographic equity, so there will be something available for everybody in the region. It won't be just Portland centric, but have funding available for people who live in all the cities in the Portland Metro region. Councilor Craddick said it is a pretty challenging charge to this group of people to be able to put this together.

### From the Director

Mr. Ransom provided a Regional Project Showcase from WSDOT. The project completed in 2017, it is the Vancouver Urban ITS Device Infill, the camera systems, and variable message signs, etc. RTC granted over \$700,000 to WSDOT to complete this improvement. The total project was \$875,000. It was a job well done. It will be posted to RTC's website.

Mr. Ransom said each year in March they review RTC Member Dues/Contributions. At this time, member dues represent roughly, +/- 10% of the total operating revenue to RTC. They use the dues to provide local match to grants that they receive and basic operations. For new Board Members, these dues had not been reviewed systematically for decades, but in 2017, the Board took action to say this needed to be done annually so there would not be big jumps in adjustments. This is the annual review. The Board committed by policy that we would use a couple of measures in review. One is if there are major changes in population distribution, basically if annexation skewed where people lived in terms of jurisdictional representation, they take a look at that, and also, just growth in population over time. The second major criteria are an employment index. They reviewed the population distribution and really no changes; a less than 1% change between the different entities, not significant enough to reset the population number. The index series shows an increase of 2.15%. Based on Board policy, staff is recommending an adjustment to dues of 2.15%. This would only affect MPO or Clark County agencies. When the Board adopted this revised dues structure, it froze for a five-year cycle the Gorge communities' dues; in part because they are small agencies and we don't provide as much service to them. The net adjustment this year would be \$3,890 if the Board approves this. This will be proposed to the Board in April for action. A table listing the dues adjustments was included in the distributed memo. These will become effective January 1, 2020. Contact Mr. Ransom if there are any questions.

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, April 2, 2019, at 4 p.m.

**XII. Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

---

Anne McEnery-Ogle, Board of Directors Chair