

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council  
Board of Directors  
April 2, 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 Vice Chair Scott Hughes on Tuesday, April 2, 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:

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  
Tom Lannen, Skamania County Commissioner  
Temple Lentz, Clark County Councilor  
Gary Medvigy, Clark County Councilor  
Eileen Quiring, Clark County Councilor  
Melissa Smith, Camas Councilmember  
Ty Stober, Vancouver Councilmember (Alt.)  
Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1 Manager

Voting Board Members Absent:

Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor  
Jim Herman, Port of Klickitat Commissioner  
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver Mayor

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  
Ed Barnes, Citizen  
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Councilmember  
Jim Hagar, Port of Vancouver  
Larry Keister, Port of Camas-Washougal Commissioner  
Jim Kepner, Citizen  
Scott Langer, WSDOT  
John Ley, Citizen  
Scott Patterson, C-TRAN  
Mike Pond, Citizen  
Carter Timmerman, WSDOT HQ  
Walter Valenta, Citizen  
Susan Wilson, Clark County

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 APRIL 2, 2019, MEETING AGENDA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MELISSA SMITH AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

## **III. Call for Public Comments**

Jim Kepner is from Washington County in Portland, Oregon. He said Washington County has put together a 20- to 50-Year Road Transportation Plan, and he provided a map of a Northern Connector Concept. Mr. Kepner also provided a handout with two project proposals for crossing the Columbia River around the current I-5 Bridge.

Rian Windsheimer entered the meeting at 4:07 p.m.

John Ley, from Camas, Washington, spoke about the need for future new transportation corridors and bridges across the Columbia River.

Ed Barnes, from Vancouver, Washington, said the I-5 corridor needs to be fixed first. He said any other corridor option would have to have coordination with Oregon and be studied prior to considering building, all costing even more money.

## **IV. Approval of March 5, 2019, Minutes**

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

## **V. Consent Agenda**

### **A. April Claims**

### **B. RTC Member Contributions (Dues) for YR 2020, Resolution 04-19-06**

### **C. TIP Amendments:**

#### **a) Project Removal – Chelatchie Prairie Rails with Trails, Resolution 04-19-07**

#### **b) WSDOT, SR-500/NE Robinson Rd. and NE 3<sup>rd</sup> St., Resolution 04-19-08**

MELISSA SMITH MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA APRIL CLAIMS AND RESOLUTIONS 04-19-06, 04-19-07, AND 04-19-08. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY CARLEY FRANCIS AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

## **VI. Transportation Programming Guidebook – TIP Policies and Procedures, Resolution 04-19-09**

Dale Robins referred to the resolution included in the meeting packet. He said he wanted to outline the adoption of the obligation policies and procedures that the Board has previously adopted. They are also seeking RTC Board approval to modify the current call for projects to manage their immediate shortfall in obligation. Attached to the resolution was the

Transportation Programming Guidebook. It outlines the current information on policies that they follow in developing their grant process and the Transportation Improvement Program.

They have two additions that they would like to add to the Guidebook. These are things that they are already doing in their process. They have a grant award letter that they put out. On page 11 of the Guidebook, they are proposing to add that they will put out these grant award letters that will identify the funding amount, what the funding year is, and what the requirements associated with the grant are. The second thing they want to point out is the project data base. They have been doing this for well over a year; it was just not listed in the document. It provides a history of current grants and past projects that they have done. Mr. Robins displayed the project database as it appears on RTC's website. He noted that the projects listed are those that the Board has seen when Project Showcases are presented to the Board monthly. Also, RTC requires a Before and After Report, which talks about the goals of the project and whether the project accomplished the goals that was outlined in the project. They are usually two to four pages. There is a lot of information and a lot of projects provided. It is a nice addition to help track the projects that the RTC Board has been selecting.

There are a number of requirements that are associated with the grant process, the federal funds that come to our region. WSDOT has a requirement that they may need to obligate their federal dollars that come to the state. They have delegated some of that obligation authority to RTC as the MPO for Clark County, and we need to meet our obligation policy. If WSDOT doesn't meet their obligation, other states can take their money. Similarly, what they have done with the MPOs is that it is a use it or lose it policy. Funds are allocated to us; if we don't use it, they can go to other parts of the state or WSDOT can obligate those funds for us, and they would be lost to our region.

With that in mind, RTC took over that obligation authority in 2013. Mr. Robins presented a chart with federal obligation totals since 2013. The 2013 totals were a bit higher than other years, because there was a carryover from 2012 of funds that were not allocated. Local agencies really stepped up and obligated projects. They were about \$14 million ahead going into 2016. That is well over a year in advance of what our allocation is. The state does allow us to go a little bit early. In 2017, things started to slow down, and 2018 slowed down even more. In 2019, they have a project that in late March obligated about \$900,000. They have three or four other projects that are anticipated to be obligated in the month of April. They expect to be up to about \$2.2 million, but that is well short of their \$4.5 million that they have to obligate if they are to not lose funds.

Mr. Robins reviewed the issue that they are facing in 2019. They have many state and federal policies that they must follow. Some of the rules tell them to spend the money quickly, and others are hurdles to stopping them from obligating their funds. Also, they have increased revenue. They are receiving about \$1.1 million additional federal funds per year, starting in 2018. This means that they have about \$2 million extra money that they had not programmed in the Transportation Improvement Program by this year. They received notification about those funds in November and February, so it has been quite soon that they found out just how

much additional money that they had. They have also had project delays that have occurred. They have had a number of projects that have hit the maximum three-year project delays, and they have other projects that have been delayed one or possibly two years.

What these issues have done is create a constraint on RTC. In 2019 and 2020, they are having some difficulty in hitting their obligation targets to ensure they don't lose money. Currently, the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC) is meeting and developing a process. They anticipate that they will be back to the Board next month to have the discussion about what can be done to ensure that they meet their obligation targets.

Mr. Robins reviewed RTC's policies. They require obligation of projects by August so that they can meet the State deadline. They allow projects to advance one year. They anticipate that there might be a project or two that gets delayed in any given year, but they also anticipate that they will have a project or two that will proceed a year early. They anticipated that that would balance out. There are projects that were programmed either in late 2015 to early 2016; there are three of them that have hit that maximum three-year project delay. They did a quick review of what other regions are doing. They found that RTC's delay policies are quite lenient compared to other regions. That has created a little bit of a problem.

The three projects that have been delayed include: Battle Ground - Chelatchie Prairie Rails with Trails (\$225,000), Port of Ridgefield - Pioneer Street Railroad Overpass (\$2 million), and Vancouver - Mill Plain Blvd., 104<sup>th</sup> Ave. to Chkalov (\$2 million). The Chelatchie Prairie project was under the TIP Amendments earlier under Consent. They turned back their money because of issues in meeting that project. They just can't move forward at this time. These three projects will hit their last year of obligation in August this year.

Mr. Robins said they do have policies in the Guidebook that he referred to earlier. Policy 5.8.1 says "If delay is likely to impact regional obligation authority, all future funds will be removed from the project." What this means is that those projects that are programmed this year, including those two projects that have hit their maximum delay, they would take their money away; they would then come up with a strategy to fill in the hole behind those and obligate those, and they would have to seek funding in future years. The RTAC Committee is going to try and come up with a fair and equitable way to do that. They are hoping that those two projects can go forward. There is a good chance on both of them, but there is a chance also that they could be delayed more. The Port of Ridgefield project is waiting for a contract to be signed by the railroad, and the Mill Plain project has some right-of-way issues that are delaying the project. Mr. Robins said he would return next month to discuss more of what RTAC thinks is a strategy that they should implement.

As for the 2019 Grant Process, to help with the 2020 year obligation target, RTAC has proposed and recommended at their March meeting, that they add two additional points for roundabout only corridors under operational improvements. This does not increase the number of points available, but it allows two additional points under operational to a maximum of eight points that are available under that category. The thinking is that with a roundabout only corridor,

there are some operational improvements with such a corridor. The City of Vancouver's 137<sup>th</sup> Avenue is a good example of that. Also recommended was to allow a "one-time exception" to the cost limit. They currently have a cost limit of \$4 million per project. This would allow these larger capital projects that are ready to proceed by August 2020 to have an additional \$500,000 for right-of-way and \$1 million for construction. They identified four potential projects; that was narrowed down to three projects. They think that is going to be about \$2 million additional that would go forward for those projects; one would be for construction and two for right-of-way. That could still change in the next few months as they look at whether they could deliver the project by August. Mr. Robins said it is not a lot, but it will give us a little shot in 2020 to make sure we hit our obligation targets. Other than that, the call would be a regular call for projects. Mr. Robins would talk about that under the next agenda item.

The action before the Board is for adoption of Resolution 04-19-09, which includes re-adoption of the Transportation Programming Guidebook, adding two points to the evaluation criteria, and allowing a one-time exception to the project cost limit.

SHAWN DONAGHY MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 04-19-09 AS NOTED. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MELISSA SMITH AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

#### **VII. YR 2023 Regional Grant Program – Call for Projects**

Dale Robins referred to the memo included in the meeting packet. He said they would like to ask the RTC Board permission to move forward with their 2020 to 2023 call for projects. RTC has programming authority for a portion of the STBG and CMAQ funds that come to the Clark County region. As required by Federal rules, they will have a competitive process. The recommendation from RTAC was to follow the same process as they did last time with the additional two points that was discussed. They are seeing a Federal increase as mentioned earlier. They are getting about \$1.1 million. It has always been around \$9 million per year that they receive between the three Federal programs that come to RTC. They now have jumped to \$10.1 million. The additional \$1 million is greatly needed. They want to get that out to local agencies so they can start programming those in their projects.

Mr. Robins said in all the years that he has been with RTC, he has never seen a call for projects as large as what they are proposing this time. They have STBG Urban Funds that are \$9 to \$10 million. Those are variable a little by what RTAC comes up with to help in 2019 year to ensure we meet our obligation. CMAQ funds are \$4 to \$5 million. They have already issued the Transportation Alternatives Call for Projects. It was about \$1.8 million, but with the additional funds, they are proposing that be increased to \$2,350,000. That comes out to be about \$14 to \$17 million total.

The schedule includes applications due in July for STBG and CMAQ grants. In September, staff will return to the RTC Board for the evaluation process. In October, the Board will be asked to select the projects for the grant funding.

The action being asked of the Board is for consensus to authorize RTC to move forward with the call for the STBG and CMAQ call for projects and increase the funding for the Transportation Alternative Grant Program.

BART HANSEN MOVED FOR APPROVAL TO MOVE FORWARD WITH THE CALL FOR THE STBG AND CMAQ CALL FOR PROJECTS AND INCREASE FUNDING FOR THE TA PROGRAM. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MELISSA SMITH AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

### **VIII. Unified Planning Work Program for Fiscal Year 2020 – Draft Review**

Lynda David referred to the memo included in the meeting packet that outlines the information on the Draft of the Fiscal Year 2020 Unified Planning Work Program. Also, a paper copy of RTC's Draft FY 2020 Unified Planning Work Program was available at the table for Board Members, and an electronic version was made available with the Board meeting packet on RTC's website.

The Unified Planning Work Program describes transportation planning activities anticipated for the region in the next state fiscal year. They are bringing the Draft document to the Board today to give them an opportunity to provide any comments prior to staff asking for Board adoption at the May meeting. The Unified Planning Work Program is prepared annually by RTC to meet the requirements specified for the Metropolitan Planning Organization in Federal Regulations. It is one of the core metropolitan planning requirements for receipt of both Federal and State transportation funds for transportation planning in this region. The fiscal year 2020, the grant cycle that began with the Board's adoption of RTC's 2019 calendar year budget is continued with the FY 2020 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). It runs from July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.

Each year, RTC as the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the region is granted Federal Highway Administration PL dollars for planning as well as Federal Transit Administration planning funds to carry out the core requirements of the Metropolitan Transportation planning process. The UPWP outlines how the federal dollars as well as state and local funds will be used for regional transportation planning purposes.

The UPWP needs to reflect transportation planning emphasis areas which are identified by the U.S. Department of Transportation and also the State of Washington. These emphasis areas are outlined and described in the Draft Unified Planning Work Program beginning on page X. The UPWP also has a description of key transportation issues which are facing the region, and that begins on page XVI or 16. After the introductory information, as in previous years, the Unified Planning Work Program has four major sections. The first three sections include descriptions of individual work elements that RTC will be working on. The fourth section, beginning on page 39 of the document, describes transportation planning activities anticipated by RTC's planning partners: WSDOT, Clark County, the Cities, and C-TRAN. On the final page of the document, page 59, there is a revenue summary spreadsheet that shows the revenue sources that will support each of the work elements. Ms. David pointed out that some of the work elements are multiyear.

Ms. David said this is an informational item to give Board Members an opportunity to ask questions or comment on the draft document. They will be returning to the RTC Board at the May meeting to ask for adoption. The Draft FY-2020 UPWP has been reviewed by RTC's Regional Transportation Advisory Committee or RTAC and also by officials from the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration and WSDOT Headquarters staff, as well as bi-state partners at meetings that were held on March 6, both at Metro and at RTC. After review of the UPWP Draft document at today's meeting, the Draft will be posted to the RTC website for public review. The RTAC committee will be asked to recommend RTC Board adoption at the RTAC's April meeting, and staff will return to the Board for adoption on May 7.

#### **IX. C-TRAN Mill Plain Bus Rapid Transit Project and Facilities Update**

Chair Hughes said they would have an update on C-TRAN's Mill Plain Bus Rapid Transit project and the facilities by Scott Patterson.

Mr. Patterson thanked the Chair and members of the Board for the opportunity for C-TRAN to come before RTC and provide an update on what are some very exciting projects that have been underway for some time. There is the Mill Plain Bus Rapid Transit project and a number of plans for their current facility that have been years in the making and are coming to a head. Mr. Patterson said he wanted to take a few minutes at the end of his presentation to update them on a proposed service change that C-TRAN has out for public review currently. Also, he noted that copies of C-TRAN's Annual Report were distributed to members that contains additional information as well.

Mr. Patterson provided some information about the Mill Plain corridor and specifically why it was chosen as the next BRT project for C-TRAN. He said he was sure that everyone around the table knows C-TRAN has their first Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) corridor in operation on Fourth Plain. It began service very early in 2017, and they have had some real tremendous success in terms of ridership in the first full year growing 45%. Last year, they had another 19% increase on top of that. The Board was very proactive in terms of continuing to move down the path and examine which corridor would be the best for BRT. Mr. Patterson said they quickly landed on Mill Plain. It has some similarities, but also some differences to Fourth Plain. They have about 3,000 boardings per day, which actually puts them in a strong category in terms of how FTA, the Federal Transit Administration, views a project like this. They also have a high number of ramp deployments for mobility devices and other physical needs of their passengers. They have a transit travel time that is nearly double the auto time for that comparable trip from east Vancouver all the way into downtown. They also have a couple pinch points; in particular, as most are well aware of the I-205 area on Mill Plain. Their buses, at times, can average below 8 miles per hour going through that section. Their average time that is spent, they call it dwell time, where the bus is sitting at the stop, particularly when you have a lot of boardings and people are paying with cash on the bus, or they may be boarding with a mobility device, so that average time is about 50% more than what they see on the Vine BRT on Fourth Plain today. Of course, he said they have a number of very closely spaced stops, as well.

As they set out to begin the planning this initial phase early last year for Mill Plain BRT, they really focused in on developing early on some of the key alternatives that they have of course completed. They went through and conducted a significant amount of public and stakeholder involvement. They initiated some of the early environmental analysis that is needed particularly as it relates to working through the Federal Transit Administration program that he would talk a little more about later. They initiated some of the design and the engineering work, especially early on.

Mr. Patterson said that he mentioned that I-205 in the Mill Plain area is one of the pinch points. He said they wanted to send their design team out to look at some options really very early on in the project, and that is progressing and developing quite well. One of the key milestones in this initial phase was actually just culminated here just this past month when the C-TRAN Board of Directors unanimously endorsed the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). They are now at the very end of phase one as their team is taking that LPA and turning that into about a 15% level of design.

Mr. Patterson provided a map that laid out the alignment options that they studied initially. They have some different options both on the west side, in terms of how it would route into and out of downtown Vancouver, as well as the east side. They currently have on the east end Fisher's Landing Transit Center south on 164<sup>th</sup> adjacent to Highway 14. It currently serves as a very robust park-and-ride, as well as a transit center. However, with a lot of the new development that is happening east of 164<sup>th</sup>, along Mill Plain, it really presented a unique opportunity for C-TRAN to take a look at potentially a little bit of a different service model for east Vancouver. So what they looked at is the potential of a transit center more along the lines of what you see out of Vancouver Mall; not a park-and-ride. Just a transit center for their other local routes to connect to that would terminate closer to 192<sup>nd</sup>, while still providing fixed route and commuter service out of the Fisher's Landing Transit Center.

So they took those concepts, as well as some preliminary station locations, out to the public. They held three different Public Open Houses, what you would call more traditional Public Open Houses. They also held an online Open House over a period of about 30 days. They received a lot of very good comments. They worked with both a Technical Advisory Committee of agency staff including RTC, the City of Camas, the City of Vancouver, and C-TRAN and WSDOT. They also had a Corridor Advisory Committee that consisted of a number of the local stakeholders, business owners, residents, and riders of the system. They met at various points throughout the year last year, and ultimately, led to the recommendation for the Locally Preferred Alternative that the C-TRAN Board approved. They did door-to-door outreach along the corridor, as well, to more than 400 businesses and residences. They had briefings with a number of neighborhood associations, as well.

Mr. Patterson presented a map showing the alignment and the proposed station location decision that is contained in the Locally Preferred Alternative. Their station spacing is about a half a mile. He said a lot of work and analysis really went into that. When looking at the infrastructure associated with Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), whether they are heavy BRT and

dedicated fix guideway or lighter BRT like what they have on Fourth Plain, the more you can do to speed up the trip. Mr. Patterson said he is not talking about necessarily the bus traveling faster, but in terms of more strategically placed stations, level boarding at those stations, off board fare collection, and some of the other technology they have embedded, it really speeds up and improves the travel time, while increasing the reliability. What they have seen on Fourth Plain certainly indicates that. A lot of this is built on lessons learned from Fourth Plain, but trying to optimize it for the Mill Plain corridor.

They are now in the process of moving from Phase One to Phase Two, which is referred to as Project Development. They are working through the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) again to be in line to receive up to a 50% capital construction grant. The Federal Transit Administration earlier this year approved C-TRAN's entry into Project Development and did so in a very short period of time. Mr. Patterson said it really is positioning this project to compete, they think, very well nationally. There are a lot of systems across the country that are now trying to get into that BRT pipeline, but based on how they have begun to position the project for a whole host of reasons, they are feeling really good about where they are at, at this point.

As they move into Phase Two and they begin to step up the design levels all the way through final design, they will also be completing the Environmental Analysis that is required as part of the FTA program. They have already completed obtaining commitments of all of their non-Small Starts funding, which is one of those categories that really sets their project apart from most of them across the country. That typically is the very last thing that projects come up with, and to have that in place right now will, they think, allow their project to move through even quicker. As they work their way through next year, they are looking at receiving an FTA evaluation rating and approval and ultimately completing that grant agreement so they can move into construction.

At this level, they are looking at a total project cost of something close to but not more than \$50 million, with about half of that coming through the Small Starts program at the Federal level. They then have \$3 million in committed regional funds, and Mr. Patterson said thanks to RTC for their support of that portion of the project. They have \$22 million that has been allocated as part of C-TRAN's adopted budget, as well as the Capital Program that is part of that budget.

Mr. Patterson said they will, and he stressed this point, continue to work very closely with their partners at the state level to secure additional state grant funding. There is a Regional Mobility Grant Program that they think this project is already positioned pretty well to receive. It may be a couple years before they get those funds. The idea is that any additional funding would help offset that C-TRAN local share, so that \$22 million would ultimately be hopefully a much lower amount.

Mr. Patterson highlighted some of the Mill Plain BRT key milestones. He said he would call it aggressive but also very realistic and achievable. They are looking at this summer to be at about 30% design level, and also shortly thereafter, or right about the same time being able to

complete the environmental work, which really constitutes an Environmental Checklist. They think they are at a Documented Categorical Exclusion. All signs are certainly pointing in that direction. They will then move throughout the remainder of this year and into early next year looking to get to a 60% design level. It is at that point that they complete a formal, what FTA refers to as a Risk Analysis. Once that work happens, then they are essentially beginning the process to secure the Federal Small Starts Grant with FTA that may take a number of months. At this point, they are looking and feeling pretty good they could be in a position to get the funds by certainly before the end of next year with construction beginning in 2021.

Mr. Patterson provided an update on C-TRAN's facility needs. Early last year, the agency completed a Facility Master Plan Update, and it's really driven by the fact that C-TRAN's current facility which was built back in the early part of the 1980s, and is well over capacity. In fact, the facility was built for a system that had about 100 total vehicles. They are approaching three times that amount. So, they have been constrained for a very long time. Those constraints with the current facility are making it that much more difficult to be able to expand service and also look at bringing on alternative fuels, which is something that the whole transit industry is moving quickly into. Being able to address their short-term facility needs will allow them to advance forward and complete some of the major capital projects as well as meeting the service increases that are part of the agency's adopted 20-Year Plan.

Mr. Patterson provided a map of the current property layout off of 65<sup>th</sup> Avenue, just north of 18<sup>th</sup> Street and south of Fourth Plain, and as said earlier, it was built in the early 80s. About 13 or 14 years ago, they added some portable buildings that have housed their operations center but are now past their useful life. They did have a modest expansion associated with the Fourth Plain BRT project which provided some additional bus space to be able to work on the longer articulated coaches, but it really wasn't able to do anything to address the system needs as a whole. So there are a number of phases that are contemplated to be implemented over the course of a number of years. But for the purpose of their presentation today, and because they have a short-term plan over the next two to three years to do the first four phases that were listed on the slide, Mr. Patterson wanted to take just a few minutes and walk them through what each of those phases consists of.

The first Phase, which they are calling their Administration Relocation, has been somewhat of a recent development. The Facility Master Plan had actually assumed constructing an administration building on the property that C-TRAN currently owns. However, as they began to dive a little deeper into what a facility like that may cost, they began to pursue alternate locations off-site that would still house the main administration functions of C-TRAN but leave the existing facility to really focus on meeting the needs of the maintenance and operations. So, last year the C-TRAN Board approved the purchase of the acquisition of the old Gifford Pinchot building. They will soon be neighbors with their friends at WSDOT. A picture of the facility was provided. There are some improvements that are being made on the interior in terms of lighting and carpet and paint, but they do expect to be able to move in within the next couple of months. They are pretty excited about that.

Going back to their current facility, the next phase, Southern Lot Expansion, has work going on right now related to utilizing that section, which is Phase 2. That will be improved to accommodate some parking, both for facility needs as well as employee parking. As they look to meet those needs from the maintenance and the operations side, they are going to be looking at a northern expansion building off of what is their current facility in Phase 3. They will be building out up to three additional bus bays that will allow C-TRAN the opportunity to have a more efficient space to work on coaches, but it would also include the capability to introduce and bring on some of the alternative fuel technologies that they are looking at, such as electric buses. They are moving forward with this very quickly. They plan to complete design this year, and move into construction as early as next year. The fourth Phase is adding both maintenance and operations offices that would be attached to that maintenance bay that was mentioned as part of Phase 3. Mr. Patterson said this really is utilizing the most of that additional space and co-locating both operations where the drivers report and operations support staff, as well as maintenance staff that are supporting the work that is happening out in the maintenance bays. They are expecting to be able to move into this project very quickly. Design is currently underway, as it is for the south lot in Phase 2. They are hoping that construction could be complete later in 2021, certainly before they are bringing the new Mill Plain BRT buses on site.

Overall, when they are looking at the immediate needs and being able to fund those from where they were with the Facility Master Plan, they have been able to bring down those costs quite notably. They would be moving into the new administrative building at about \$8 million (Phase 1), with just over \$2 million for the Phase 2 work, and about \$15.7 million, which is the current estimate for the maintenance garage and the maintenance operations support facility for a total cost around \$26 million. This work right now is identified to be funded in C-TRAN's adopted capital budget. However, like the Mill Plain BRT project, they continue to aggressively pursue state and federal funding to help offset those costs.

Lastly, Mr. Patterson said he would close by mentioning with everything else that is going on at the agency these days, they are looking at the potential for a pretty major service change that would be implemented in September of this year. They typically look at service changes of this nature once every couple of years. Their last major service change was in September 2016. The following year was when they implemented Fourth Plain BRT, and the C-TRAN Board when it adopted the current biennial budget allotted for about a 6,000 service hour increase or a 2% increase in total service hours. It really presented them a unique opportunity this year to look at making some changes. They do this because the community continues to grow. They have got corridors that currently have no service. Yet, they have a lot of residential and in some cases multifamily residential, which generally is very transit-supportive in terms of being able to attract riders. They also have very specific service goals and service strategy metrics they are trying to achieve. Mr. Patterson provided a chart comparing the percentage of C-TRAN ridership growth compared to comparable systems of its kind around the country. Dating back to the 2016 service change followed by the implementation of the Fourth Plain BRT, C-TRAN quickly jumped into the net positive category. They have now had two years of positive system-wide ridership growth, and they believe that trend will certainly continue. They also want to be

taking advantage of opportunities that are out there in the existing system to be able to make improvements where needed. As mentioned, they have got about 6,000 hours that are part of the adopted budget. Also, based on the proposal that is out for the public review and the public comment right now, they plan on recommending reallocating 2% of the service that is considered low performing. So in this case, they would be reducing service that has the lowest ridership and reallocating that to make the service increases more notable and hopefully more impactful. They are looking at bringing high-frequency service back to Highway 99. Some may recall, a lot of the discussion that they have had, as well as the adopted High Capacity Transit System Plan has Highway 99 as that third corridor that has the potential to make a good BRT project in the not too distant future. However, for various reasons, the frequencies in the recent years have had to be scaled back due to a number of factors. What they are proposing is to bring that back up to a 15-minute headway, which is consistent with what they have on the Mill Plain corridor, and then actually extending the current Highway 99 route south into downtown Vancouver and serving the waterfront as well. In addition to that, they are looking to increase the frequencies on three local routes: in addition to Highway 99, the Route 19, and the Route 78. They would also be providing service for the first time to the Portland International Airport. They are making some additional improvements that will increase the reliability on three of the other local routes. Details on this are all on C-TRAN's website. Mr. Patterson said they are currently out; they had the first Open House last week, and they have the second Open House actually happening right now out at the Fisher's Landing Transit Center. On Thursday of this week, they will be in downtown Vancouver at the Community Library. Because they have all of this information online, they are already getting lots of really good comments from lots of folks throughout the community on their website via email, social media, and other venues. They will follow that up with the C-TRAN Board meeting next week with a Public Hearing; an opportunity for anyone interested to speak directly to the C-TRAN Board on the issue. They may make adjustments at that time, and they could be coming back with a request for possible adoption at the May C-TRAN Board of Directors meeting.

Scott Hughes asked how far north on Highway 99 they planned.

Mr. Patterson said currently it would go to their 99<sup>th</sup> Street Transit Center.

Tom Lannen asked if they look at cost per mile of ridership, the net end effect of costs.

Mr. Patterson said they do have that. He said since Shawn has come on board in the last couple of years, they have really stepped up in terms of how they are analyzing and measuring really about every important measurable category throughout the agency. They have those metrics available. He said he would be happy to meet with him separately to go through those, given that they are somewhat time limited today. Mr. Patterson said there is information on time performance, cost per passenger mile, and many other metrics that they look at that are incorporated into their Service Standards as well. This allows them to measure that success. That is also one of the reasons why, as difficult as it is, to propose reducing service that we know will impact some people; at the end of the day, if we have service that isn't meeting

where we need to be, we need to look at doing something to reallocate to be able to better adapt and adopt to what our community needs the most.

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

Mr. Ransom referred to the memo that was distributed and said he would offer his insights. He also welcomed other Board members to share their perspectives as the Legislative Session heads toward its finish at the end of the month on the 28<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Ransom said in talking with a couple people in Olympia today, they said and he thinks the big outlier here is if they end on time. They don't have that many big policy Bills that are outstanding; not that many that should hold things up. The second criteria or factor is money. The State released their budget forecast for overall statewide operating, and budget Bills that have been presented and that are working their way through right now. There is not a big gap between the revenue available and what the budgets are proposing. It was described to him that these gaps that are in front of them are easily resolvable based on the accounting methodology and how they are forecasting some of the revenues that they are expecting. Bottom Line is: things should wrap up on time, and then they will see the Legislators back here in the district.

Mr. Ransom said he would focus most of his discussion on WSDOT's operating budget. That is the news out, and it was reported last week in the paper. Mr. Ransom offered a quick report. He said every Legislative Session the Legislature does a Supplemental Appropriation for operations in WSDOT. That is where the bulk of the regional funds, those being for Connected Washington Funds, for other specific earmarks, projects that were allocated through other means, policy initiatives, and so forth, they run through WSDOT's operating budget. When they look at that, they flag, as they have this Session, key issues of interest for this region. At the top of the list, and the most important issue that we are all working toward is progress in development of the I-5 Bridge replacement project.

Mr. Ransom said as he has described the I-5 Bridge Replacement project in previous memos, it has been proposed by the Governor and included in at least early looks at budgets and now proposed in both House and Senate Operating versions of WSDOT's budget, two different iterations of the same goal. This is to move the project forward and to allocate through a budget proviso some initial funding and lay out some parameters and scope, and so forth. Mr. Ransom noted that at the bottom of page 1 of the memo, he has described a summary of both the House and Senate versions of the budget proviso related to the I-5 Bridge Replacement project and work moving forward. In the Engrossed Substitute House Bill, which means that it has passed off the House floor, 1160, the Budget Proviso sets forth \$8.75 million. It describes the basic parameters for the project reengagement, stakeholders and so forth, and sets out some milestones for the Department to report back to the Legislature with progress. Alternatively, Substitute Senate Bill 5214 is still working its way through the Senate process, and that appropriates through the Proviso \$8.5 million. There is a little difference in the money. Work efforts are generally the same; although, there is further description of the tasks in the Senate's version, which is to explore Bridge Authority and Bi-State Compact Governance Model. This is something described in previous Legislation in Senate Bill 5806 which was

approved and signed into law two years ago. It laid forth some similar expectations, which is the study of that issue and reporting back.

Mr. Ransom said this is interesting, and the Board has seen this presented before. Engrossed Substitute House Bill 1994, this is the Project of Statewide Significance designation. That has moved its way through the House Chamber and now sitting in the Senate. The Budget Proviso for I-5 assumes that that is signed into law. It is somewhat unique that they would reference in a Budget Proviso that something has to be implemented, that it hasn't been signed into law, but it is presumed that it has been signed into law. It's basically sort of a done deal; knowing that it is not done until it is signed. Another significant difference is essentially, the Senate version gives the Department a little bit more time.

The key takeaways from this are, depending on how both Chambers resolve, the House has already finished their work on that. Let's assume the Senate pushes forward, which they have to under the law to establish the Operating Budget, they end up with differences. The differences will be resolved in a Conference Committee they convene between the House and the Senate Committee Chairs and appointees, and so forth. They conference and they work through the resolution. They get the language straight, and they send it back to the respective Chambers for ratification. Mr. Ransom said he has every reason to believe this will happen. He said they began with the expectation of \$17.5 million, which is what the Governor proposed in his Budget, which is an early look budget that we saw. It is now \$8.5 million. There is a little bit of difference in terms of money. Mr. Ransom said he thinks that we all need to be patient, and we all need to sort of respect the process that lies ahead for the Department, which is to reengage stakeholders, which is first and foremost an important aspect of this work. Second, they have already done the inventory work, and that work can be seen on line, to pull the inventory work back out. They know the starting point. Then, through their development of the work scope, identify those areas where in a technical sense, or maybe a policy sense, they can make some progress. That progress and what that progress is, is probably informed from the stakeholder engagement, and that would be Legislators, regional leaders, as well as the public. Mr. Ransom said we should be patient, and the high level outcome is that progress is being made.

He offered some other observation, which goes back to the new revenue package that was heard in the Senate, that probably doesn't proceed; that is 5970, 5971, and 5972. That has moved out of both the Senate Transportation Committee and the Rules Committee, and Ways and Means. It probably doesn't make its way to the Senate floor. If it does, it probably doesn't go over to the House. It is a big Bill, \$16 billion. The number one project on the Bill is the I-5 Bridge replacement. When you put those two ideas together, new revenue package, the most significant project and number one on the list is the I-5 Bridge Replacement. In presentation from the Committee Chairs in introducing it, and in press conferences out of the House, they speak to clear recognition that within the State of Washington, replacement of the I-5 Bridge is the most important project in the state. It was unresolved in Connecting Washington, and it needs to be resolved in whatever comes next.

That is on the capitol side. In the interim, we have an operating budget that is proposing money for work, so we'll do some work. We as the collective "we" led by the Department and having a budget proviso that moves the ball forward is the outcome, we are looking for. The amounts of money, those are always things that will change based on the circumstance and conditions. The key takeaway is that money will most likely be there. That means work can be done, and we can start to have a conversation in a productive way.

Other things that are generally addressed in the Operating Budget would be to reprogram the funding of I-5/179<sup>th</sup> Interchange work. Mr. Ransom said he didn't believe that would happen. In the budgets that are working their way through, it is not being reprogrammed in terms of the sequencing. In prior supplemental budgets that has happened. Unless there are some behind the scenes conversations, it doesn't look like that is going to be reprogrammed for funding.

One other last piece is more centric to RTC. The Secretary of Transportation is very supportive of the work that organizations like RTC do; they are called an RTPO under State Statute. He had proposed, and the Governor the same, a \$1 million increase statewide for the work. RTC would have received a portion of that. The Budgets that have been released don't include all of that. One of the budgets includes \$500,000; the other one, none. Assuming that there is some reconciliation, maybe there is a little bit more operating money that might flow down to RTC, maybe not. RTC is fine fiscally, but it was a good gesture to see that from the Secretary, recognizing the work we do around the table, and at least trying to push that ball forward. They will pursue it. They hope the Secretary and others would pursue that again in future sessions if it doesn't happen completely. That concludes the summary on House, Senate, and WSDOT Operating Budgets.

C-TRAN is set to receive a Regional Mobility Grant Fund for I-5 Bus on Shoulder. They have two other projects, one of which is their Facility Improvement and another that is a Park-and-Ride Expansion that are right below the cut line in terms of where the projects are funded or unfunded. So assuming that somebody else across the state doesn't proceed or the project is delayed, maybe that presents an opportunity for them to move up the list.

Scott Hughes said he was in Washington, D.C. in March. He said the attitude from the Oregon delegation was certainly more positive than they have seen in a long time. Commissioner Hughes said he thinks they are getting the message, and Congressman DeFazio was real pleased and wanting to move forward on this.

Mr. Ransom continued summarizing the Bills. He referred to page 3 of the memo where Engrossed Substitute House Bill 1994 was listed. That Bill was proposed by members of our Delegation in the House. It has passed off the House floor and in the Senate for Hearing of the Transportation Committee. It most likely gets to the Senate and moves across. Mr. Ransom said he didn't believe there were substantive changes to it. He said this initiative that this Board has supported as a group as RTC, to have a system in State Statute to designate the I-5 Bridge or other future infrastructure projects, a project of Statewide Significance will make it into law. He said the mechanism for how that then is effectuated and processed is something

that will be forthcoming, but at least the place-holder for that designation would be set in statute. Mr. Ransom said he believed that will happen.

One Bill that is substantive to this organization and how we govern is listed on the bottom of page 3. It is Engrossed House Bill 1584, which means that it has passed the House Chamber; it has passed out of the Committee of the Senate, so it is sitting in the Ways and Means. This is the Bill that is sort of a policy Bill, but it would compel RTC to add Tribal Nation representatives to our Board of Directors. Should this be signed into law, Mr. Ransom would work with Ted Gathe to develop an engagement process with both the Cowlitz Tribe and the Yakama Tribe to invite them to the table at RTC. Likely, they would have to amend the Bylaws to incorporate them as a seated member of the Board of Directors.

Mr. Ransom said he wanted to comment about Oregon Legislation. He said he didn't think it was necessarily something that was happening in the Legislature, but it might be momentarily or in the short term. News out today, was that Oregon Governor Kate Brown issued a letter last week. Governor Brown said "The time to plan new Interstate Bridge is now." Mr. Ransom said it looks like the Oregon Governor is starting to chime in that work needs to begin. He said he hasn't read the letter, but he believes that is a very proactive message. It is certainly something that will be supportive of the efforts of the State of Washington and sort of the reciprocal engagement. Mr. Ransom said our Legislative Delegation through Senate Bill 5806, has been looking for that type of engagement. Late last year, when they held their first meeting with our Oregon partners, there was that question if it was time to go. That might be the message, which is from the Governor and hopefully through the Legislative Branches that it is time for Oregon to engage on that. Mr. Ransom welcomed any input.

Rian Windsheimer said he was going to mention that, and he thanked Matt for doing that. Mr. Windsheimer said the letter that the Governor sent to the Oregon Transportation Commission basically said look, if this funding is approved, Oregon needs to be ready to engage by July 1. So, the Governor has given the direction to the Commission to give direction to the Department to be prepared to fully engage. He said as Matt described it, it is a good step in terms of that direction and that leadership that we are seeing on the Washington side now and reciprocated on the Oregon side.

Carley Francis commented in recognition of the opportunity that Legislature is queuing up for WSDOT. She noted that it is critical for us to remember, and she is keeping this in her mind and saying in front of everybody here that that effort doesn't move forward without us in collaboration with others. That is definitely something they are keeping top of mind in thinking about the work going forward. It's really critical and so is the partnership both among people at this table and also with people in Oregon. She said she just wanted to say that here while we are in the space of everyone being excited about a possible conversation starting again, that we are very much keeping that in mind that it only moves forward in collaboration with others.

Mr. Ransom said attached to the Legislative Update memo are the two pages from both the House Operating Budget and the Senate Operating budget for WSDOT that describe the Budget

Proviso. He encouraged folks to read the top line. That stated Money to Move Up conversation and process forward. He said he considers that to be assuming as signed into law, a good step.

## **XI. Other Business**

### From the Board

Rian Windsheimer noted that the Rose Quarter project Environmental Assessment Comment Period closed the previous day. They are in the process of responding to the comments they received. They look forward to getting that published and continuing to move that project forward.

Gary Medvigy said when they have only a few public speakers, he wondered if they could have a little more flexibility on time, given that someone new to the process may not know the time restrictions. Councilor Medvigy also commented that he didn't see any forward planning on a third or fourth bridge or another tunnel or another corridor. He said it was pointed out that we need funding for any of these projects and that is a lot of money. If we don't long range plan, we will never get the funding. He said he didn't see any long range planning to put ideas on paper that could be studied and matched with some funding. He said we are moving down the road and have some momentum with the I-5 Bridge, and don't want to derail that at all. The other part of that is when you build a bridge, it causes a traffic jam itself. He thought it would have been better to have another corridor in place before that which will be seen when construction of the I-5 Bridge begins. Councilor Medvigy said he is concerned about long-range planning and who is doing it, and he didn't see it in the update.

Mr. Ransom said he would be happy to meet with the Councilor and provide much more information about the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update. Councilor Medvigy said perhaps they could schedule a separate meeting for that discussion.

Mr. Ransom said it is often referenced and this Board has been briefed at previous times on the Future Corridor Visioning Study that the RTC commissioned and this Board conducted in 2008. That is often referred to and referenced when people talk about new corridors. That study makes some, they are not recommendations for new corridors, but some references to if you grew to a certain amount of population in the future, if you had a certain land use pattern, these circulation routes might benefit from improvement. You might need more circulation at the regional scale, like cross-county circulation. So when the Board concluded that work, and we refer to that actually in the RTP Update, which is that might be work that needs to be picked up and advanced further. That might be an example of what Councilor Medvigy is referring to. Mr. Ransom reminded the Board and said he would be happy to brief on that issue again at the appropriate time. Planning well beyond the 20 years, and for those in Growth Management Planning, beyond the 20 years, you start to make assumptions that are beyond sort of our ability to say this is what we can guarantee. This is what we can guarantee in terms of land use rights or zoning, and so forth. It is always a delicate exercise to go beyond 20 years, because then we are making assumptions. Unfortunately, in that study, there was only one alternative. What would need to be done moving forward is a real engagement by all partners throughout

the county. They would like to do this work, but they would like to look at other alternatives as well. The other alternatives might be a denser alternative, or a more expansive alternative, or maybe we don't grow to that population, maybe we are less than that population. Mr. Ransom said it could be a useful exercise, not unlike perhaps what Washington County and the gentleman that spoke earlier conducted. That might be something that he could report back to the Board, and they could talk about that in terms of how one might conduct a study of that nature. The 2008 study in a sense was sort of a What-if exercise, but they are important because they probe on questions that are very important when you speak of infrastructure that takes decades to put into place.

From the Director

Mr. Ransom referred to the Before and After Study, a four-page report on the NE 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue/NE 78<sup>th</sup> Street Intersection project that was done by Clark County and was included in the meeting materials. Mr. Ransom said he wanted to share with the Board what they are doing behind the scenes, and this is in working with members' staff. This is in reference to RTC's data base that Dale had reviewed earlier. The reason for the database is that with staff turnover and just time and so forth, it is important for RTC to have a record of what money we have given to whom, which we always have had, but make the record a little more accessible and more user-friendly. So part of the database that Dale highlighted includes this report along with the Showcases, which have been presented to the Board as well. Mr. Ransom said he wanted to highlight and really celebrate and give recognition to the agencies that have completed projects, what has been done. The Before and After Study is sort of an accountability report. What they have seen is that sometimes agencies when they receive money from this organization they implement what they say they are going to do, but sometimes they sort of forget. They have had a few instances where they have had to tell agencies that we thought that they were supposed to do this with the grant application. How that came forward is that we asked them to produce this report. We asked them to go back to what they said their goals were, report on what outcome they achieved, and then do some record. It just helps us understand, a study where we can learn from each other. It allows agencies to share the work they have done. From the accountability standpoint, it lets us monitor what people have done to fulfill their grant position; otherwise, they could apply for a grant application and do something completely different. It also gives us a record so public can see how we are spending these funds, what we are trying to do for the community, and the improvement. Mr. Ransom said he would not bring the Before and After Reports to the Board unless they are interested, but the Board now knows they are out there to check out. It also is available for the public to see what is being done and maintains a record.

Also, at the last meeting, there was an update on the safety performance targets. In that discussion, there was a question about what the factors are that are leading to the collisions. After the meeting, rather than sending the memo out, he would share it today and provide a quick highlight. On page 3 of the memo, there is a detailed table. This data represents data collected between the time periods of 2012 and 2014. It goes through in a high-level detail the different factors that are contributing to the collisions that are measured here in Clark County.

Number one at the top of the list is impaired driver, speeding, and young driver. All insurance companies know the factors are probably at the top of the list. Also included is run off the road, and intersection-related. Other than the intersection-related which might be people not paying attention to red lights and so forth, not a lot of these are engineering related. So when we think of fixing corridors and resolving accidents, from experience over the years and when you look at the data, at the top of the list is about human behavior. Then you add on top of that cell phones and distractions and talking on the phone, talking to people in the car, whatever that might be, it is just the human behavior side of it. Then we start bumping into people. This is what is happening in Clark County. Mr. Ransom said when they get the next batch of the data, they promise to share this, an updated report with the Board. This is in response to the query last month. If there are additional questions, Dale specifically is able to sit down and go through the details and talk you about that.

Mr. Ransom referred to a letter distributed to the Board that was sent to Oregon DOT in response to comments on the Rose Quarter project. He said he felt like this organization given that we had endorsed in several instances in the last two decades, regional strategies that starting with the I-5 Trade and Transportation Corridor Study, then the I-5 Trade Partnership Strategic Plan. This body endorsed resolutions that said you know we should eliminate bottlenecks. Among those within those Plans, the bottlenecks of the Rose Quarter had been identified. Furthermore, the Clark County Transportation Alliance (CCTA) Statement that the Board adopted for 2019-2020 had resolving the I-5 bottleneck a key strategic issue. It's beyond sort of the State of Washington. There are certainly partners within the region. Mr. Ransom expressed support for moving some type of solution forward. It is not this agency's role to be prescriptive about what that is. He said he trust the Department in their technical expertise to navigate the politics and the technical aspects of what that project should be, but as a regional partner, endorsing that we should eliminate that bottleneck, and there should be progressive action to do that.

Mr. Ransom provided a point of acknowledgement. TIB, the Transportation Improvement Board, as part of a very unique process that they started two years ago, called essentially an incentive or reward grant program to promote Complete Streets throughout the state. They had the second round of the Complete Street grant projects and the awards that were just announced just in in the last week. There were two jurisdictions in Clark County that received these reward grants. What is meant by "reward grant" is that most of the time if you apply for money, you say I will do this. In the case of TIB, you are nominated by the stakeholder agency and then you are given an amount of money to then go out and make improvements. So you don't have to specify what you are going to do beforehand. You just say we are trying to promote Complete Streets. Award winners are Vancouver and Battle Ground. Battle Ground is set to receive an award of \$350,000. They are proposing some pedestrian system improvements, 88 ramp replacements, and so forth on some of their streets. Vancouver was awarded the incentive grant of \$700,000. They have a list of four projects, Tech Center Drive on the East side, protected bike lanes, traffic calming, intersection modifications, and enhanced pedestrian crossings. Congratulations to those jurisdictions. Mr. Ransom said two jurisdictions

in Clark County have now adopted a Complete Street ordinance and others are actively working on their ordinance. Mr. Ransom said this is an incentive to do what is obviously in the public interest, which is to complete safe streets. Battle Ground and Vancouver are proof you can get money by doing that through this incentive program. Congratulations to those jurisdictions.

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, May 7, 2019, at 4 p.m.

**XII. Adjourn**

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

---

Anne McEnergy-Ogle, Board of Directors Chair