

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council  
Board of Directors  
May 7, 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 McEnery-Ogle on Tuesday, May 7, 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  
Jim Herman, Port of Klickitat Commissioner  
Larry Keister, Port of Camas-Washougal Comm. (alt.)  
Tom Lannen, Skamania County Commissioner  
Temple Lentz, Clark County Councilor  
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver Mayor  
Gary Medvigy, Clark County Councilor  
Eileen Quiring, Clark County Councilor  
Melissa Smith, Camas Councilmember  
Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1 Manager

Voting Board Members Absent:

Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor  
Scott Hughes, Port of Ridgefield Commissioner

Nonvoting Board Members Present:

Paul Harris, Representative 17<sup>th</sup> District  
Larry Hoff, Representative 18<sup>th</sup> District

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  
Vicki Kraft, Representative 17<sup>th</sup> District  
Ann Rivers, Senator 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  
Ray Delahanty, WSP  
Monica Fowler, C-TRAN  
Sorin Garber, SGA Consulting  
Chuck Green, Otak  
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Councilmember  
Kevin Greenwood, Port of Hood River  
Jim Hagar, Port of Vancouver  
Paul Koch, Port of Cascade Locks  
Sarah Kohout, Representative Stonier's Office  
Scott Langer, WSDOT  
Dale Lewis, Congresswoman Herrera Beutler's Office  
John Ley, Citizen  
Scott Patterson, C-TRAN  
Sean Philbrook, Identity Clark County  
Mike Pond, Citizen  
Ty Stober, Vancouver Councilmember  
Ryan Vollans, Port of Cascade Locks  
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**

TEMPLE LENTZ MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MAY 7, 2019, MEETING AGENDA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MELISSA SMITH AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

**III. Call for Public Comments**

John Ley from Camas spoke about the need for 20-year planning for future bridges and corridors.

**IV. Approval of April 2, 2019, Minutes**

SHAWN DONAGHY MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 2, 2019 MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MELISSA SMITH AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Jim Herman entered the meeting at 4:07 p.m.

**V. Consent Agenda****A. May Claims****B. Unified Planning Work Program for Fiscal Year 2020, Resolution 05-19-10****C. 2019-2022 TIP Amendments: WSDOT, I-5 Active Traffic Management, Resolution 05-19-11****D. Lease Agreement between Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council and Clark County, Resolution 05-19-12**

MELISSA SMITH MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA, AND SHAWN DONAGHY SECONDED THE MOTION.

Gary Medvigy asked to pull item B., the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), for discussion. He said he didn't see any work being specifically done on looking at additional corridors, and he thought that would be important in the Unified Planning Work Program.

Mr. Ransom said there is not a specific work task associated with the study of an additional bridge. In part, the Board has not as a group asked for that. If the Board chooses to pursue that, that is something that they can look out for in the 2020 budget purposes. That is why it is presented as it is.

Shawn Donaghy asked to clarify a point. He said the UPWP doesn't prohibit us from doing that. There is nothing in there that says that we can't do that.

Mr. Ransom said that was correct. For the most part, this Planning Work Program is prepared for the purposes of us utilizing State and the Federal Planning Funds that come to the agency. That is primarily how they fund operations. They are asked to prepare a Work Program on a yearly basis. What this agency does is prepare an annual calendar work program, which the budget and the work program was reviewed by the Board beginning in November and approved in December. That is a more typical budgeting process, work programming process. What they try to do in the UPWP is reflect what the Board is committed to. Schedule wise, if there is an inquiry that they want to pursue, they talk about it and staff prepares a scope for

that and figure out what kind of resource allocation it might require. It would then come back to the Board, and if that is part of the work program for 2020, they can consider it.

Mr. Donaghy said that he was not suggesting that they do that. It is pretty well laid out what they do. He just didn't know if the councilor was suggesting amending or if they have the autonomy to do that in the document that is already written.

Mr. Ransom said this question comes up regularly. The last time that he briefed this Board on prior studies and next steps was in March of 2015. This included the Transportation Corridor Visioning Study of 2008. There might be value, particularly in light of conversations this evening and ahead, to brief this Board so there is contemporary understanding of what work has been done in the past. There is an ability of staff to explain what that work meant and what it didn't mean. That would give everyone a solid basis to have a conversation about how to fit in the strategic questions with the near-term projects that we have that are regional priorities.

SHAWN DONAGHY MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEM B, THE UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM RESOLUTION 05-19-10, AS WRITTEN. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MELISSA SMITH.

Councilor Medvigy said the Visioning Study was in 2008, and a review of that was provided to the Board in 2015. In today's briefing, he said the scale of congestion is moving farther away from the bridge and getting worse. He said we need to have strategic planning for these corridors, and he would like to get that discussion going so they can look at additional corridors. Councilor Medvigy said in another ten years, those corridors will probably be lost to us.

THE UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM RESOLUTION 05-19-10 WAS APPROVED AS WRITTEN.

THE CONSENT AGENDA WITH THE REMAINING ITEMS WAS APPROVED.

## **VI. 2019 Obligation Strategy, Resolution 05-19-13**

Dale Robins referred to the resolution included in the meeting materials. He reviewed what was discussed at last month's meeting. They talked about why they are in the situation where they are struggling to hit obligation levels.

To begin with, Washington State Department of Transportation has a responsibility to meet statewide Federal obligation levels or they could potentially lose funds to other states. They have never done this, to his knowledge. They have always been good and proactive. In addition, they delegated some of the responsibility to obligate funds to regions, such as RTC. We have a responsibility to obligate STBG, CMAQ, and the Transportation Alternative Funds. We have targets that we try to hit every year. Mr. Robins showed a chart of obligations totals beginning in 2013 when they were given the responsibility up to the present. In 2013, they obligated more money than they had coming in. They did have a higher 2013 because of carry-over from 2012. They continued through 2016 to outpace the allocation in obligating funds. Since 2016, they have slowed down. They entered this year only needing \$4.7 million out of their \$10 million allocated to their region to hit their obligation target. They just barely cleared \$1.1 million about a week ago. They are lagging behind. There are more projects planned. Several of the projects have potential to have issues. One has a right-of-way issue. The other

one is working with the railroad. If those two projects do not obligate, they won't hit their target; so that is why they are in a situation where they are.

As to RTC's policy, they formed a subcommittee. The policy says if delay is likely to impact the obligation targets, that they will form a strategy on how they will do that. They formed a subcommittee of RTAC to discuss and come up with a strategy. That was taken to the April RTAC meeting, who is now recommending the proposal that is in this resolution before the Board today.

The 2019 strategy proposed by RTAC is that they would program \$1 million for project development or preliminary engineering for the Mill Plain BRT project. That would be amended into the 2019 element of the Transportation Improvement Program. C-TRAN would proceed with obligation by August 1, 2019. This project was the highest evaluation last year in their process. They limit how much money is allowed per year. So they would have had to come back a second year to get the last \$1 million allocation. This is just jumping ahead to help them insure they meet the obligation target. Programming that and with C-TRAN obligating that, the risk of us not hitting the obligation dramatically decreases. Mr. Robins said we are likely to hit it and not have to use additional strategies that he has listed on the next slides.

The next strategies are if we don't hit the target, the projects that are programmed in 2019 element that are required to be obligated this year that are not obligated by that time would be pulled out of the Transportation Improvement Program. That would be necessary so they could program additional money in and be financially feasible. The backup for the projects would be that there is only one project really that is eligible for the Rural STBG Funds. That would be if the Pioneer Street project is delayed, it would be the Northeast Blair Road project. It would give them \$800,000. That should be enough to hit our targets. Then, if the Mill Plain 104<sup>th</sup> to Chkalov project is delayed, they would give \$1 million to Northeast 137<sup>th</sup> Avenue for right of way. With these changes, they all stay within the cost limitations of what is allowed within our policies. It would allow making sure that we could meet our obligation target and it would really be given authority to the Executive Director to pull the trigger on August 16 if it is necessary. The hope is with the additional \$1 million for the Mill Plain BRT project, they didn't think that would be necessary, but if it is and the Director has to do that to ensure they hit their obligation target, they would do so.

Mr. Robins said they are looking for approval of Resolution 05-19-13 by the RTC Board. This would approve the strategy that was just outlined.

Chair McEnery-Ogle said they want to keep RTC compliant with all of our federal grants and obligation requirements, and there are two pieces to this listed on page 4 of the Resolution.

BART HANSEN MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 05-19-13. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY TEMPLE LENTZ AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

## **VII. Hood River-White Salmon Bridge Replacement Project and Bridge of the Gods Project Updates**

Matt Ransom said the purpose of this item is to provide to the Board activities that are ongoing within the Columbia River Gorge region. RTC covers Clark, Skamania, and Klickitat Counties, and often times, the Board does not have a lot of briefings about activities in Skamania and Klickitat Counties. These two bridges are not unlike the I-5 Bridge; they are old and in need of maintenance. There are activities ongoing both at the Port of Cascade Locks, which manages the Bridge of the Gods and the Port of Hood River, which manages and owns the Hood River Bridge.

Mr. Ransom introduced Kevin Greenwood the Port of Hood River Bridge Project Manager and Paul Koch, General Manager of the Port of Cascade Locks and Ryan Vollans, the Bridge Manager with the Port of Cascade Locks. Mr. Greenwood would provide information on the Hood River Bridge project, and Mr. Koch and Mr. Vollans would provide information on the Port of Cascade Locks and the Bridge of the Gods project. Mr. Ransom noted that RTC is a participant in the EIS working group committee, which is the committee overseeing and helping Mr. Greenwood in the EIS work for the Hood River Bridge project. They attend periodic meetings and provide input, and provide a sense of needs for Washington regional transportation issues. They are thankful to have the opportunity to represent jurisdictions in Washington on that committee.

Kevin Greenwood provided a slide presentation. He said he appreciated the opportunity to come to RTC and show the region's appreciation for what this organization has done for the replacement of the Hood River-White Salmon Bridge. Mr. Greenwood said this has been a long process and provided some history of the Hood River – White Salmon Bridge.

The Bridge opened in 1924. It is the second oldest bi-state bridge on the Columbia River. It was actually one of the original public-private partnerships. It was built by a private company called the Oregon-Washington Bridge Company. Originally it was named the "Waucoma Interstate Bridge" at river mile 169. The toll was originally set based upon livestock crossings; a dime for every cow that crossed the bridge. An important element of this is that there has never been any state gas tax involved in the operation or construction of this bridge. In 1937, the Bonneville Dam was opened and forced the bridge elevation to be raised. In 1938 a lift span was installed and major reconstruction took place. During this almost 100 years, there has been over \$25 million of repairs and replacements. In 2012, there was a cost estimate of \$290 million to replace the bridge. In 2016, there was an engineering project to assess what type of repairs needed to be done to keep the bridge safe and operational. It identified \$51 million worth of repairs over the next 15 years. Based upon that, the Port Commission bumped up the cash toll from \$1 to \$2 to be placed in a reserve account for those \$51 million for repairs over the next 15 years.

Mr. Greenwood said in going back to the long history between this bridge and RTC, Dale Robins was a part of the work that RTC did at that time. Representative Linda Smith was able to obtain an earmark to get the initial Feasibility Study in the early 1990s funded. RTC was the local sponsor/facilitator of that early effort. There was a Purpose and Need Statement established to

improve the movement of people and goods across the Mid-Columbia River Gorge region. Six corridors were assessed; five different corridor crossings areas with one of the areas having a high corridor and a low corridor in the middle section between Hood River and White Salmon. The Feasibility Study identified that tolls could cover 30% to 40% of total replacement project cost. Ultimately, the existing low corridor was selected for a more detailed study. The preferred alternative for replacement is about 50 yards to the west of the current bridge. In 2003-2004, the Draft EIS was conducted, and the continuation of the Feasibility Study. This ramped up the public involvement portion. There was extensive bi-state involvement. Three build alternatives advanced for study. The preferred alternative established: high-level, fixed span bridge west of the current bridge.

A few years went by, and again RTC stepped up and was able to help facilitate another earmark from Representative Doc Hastings out of the Washington 4<sup>th</sup> District. Prior to getting that earmark, the communities on both sides of the river in 2008, passed a Memorandum of Understanding. This was the communities of Klickitat County, Skamania County, and Hood River County to say that all parties would move forward to secure funding for the Type Size and Location Study and the Final EIS. They were not able to get the full funding, so only the Type, Size, and Location Study was funded, but what was critical from that work was that it established design criteria for what that preferred alternative bridge could look like. Mr. Greenwood provided a couple of images from the study. It has a 12 foot pedestrian/bike lane, removed the lift span, and increases the vertical clearance to 80 feet, two 12-foot travel lanes with 8 foot shoulders, and a storm water collection system.

In 2017, the Hood River community lobbied the Oregon Legislature to make the effort to move this project forward. There were two successful pieces that came out of that session. One was the House Bill 2750 that allowed the Port of Hood River to consider public-private partnerships. Before that, that was not an option. It is not to say that the P-3 is actually the Port's preferred financing tool, but they wanted to actually have the rules in place so that if it turned out that that was an option for the region, it was all set up. The actual dynamics of P-3 would need to be determined through a Scope of Work at some point in the future. The other element, which was huge, was the \$5 million appropriation to complete the NEPA process. Mr. Greenwood gave a huge shout out to Rian's team in ODOT Region 1. They have been working very close with ODOT's Kristen Stallman and the environmental team. They have the IGAs signed with ODOT and WSDOT to reimburse the agencies for the technical review of the process. They actually had a Bi-State Evaluation Committee that the Port of Klickitat was involved with. A shout out was given to Commissioner Herman who was in attendance from the Port of Klickitat. It was a six-member committee that scored all of the NEPA proposals. The Port Commission ultimately selected WSP to conduct that NEPA work. They are looking at a 30-month contract to produce the NEPA process by December 2020. That just simply provides the environmental clearances. There will be very low-level engineering completed and no permits.

The RTC did actually develop the Scope of Work that they went out to bid on for the selection of the team. Mr. Greenwood said Dale was a great part of that process, and he certainly thanked the RTC's involvement there.

Mr. Greenwood provided a schedule for the current process. They are right in the middle of Technical Review. They are working closely with Rian's ODOT Team and Carley's WSDOT Team. The FHWA Oregon division is the Lead Agency; ODOT recently was elevated to the Co-Lead status. The prior work had actually been done through the Washington Division of FHWA, primarily through the funding coming through the Washington Legislative earmarks, so there was the agreement that the Oregon division would pick it up since the funding came out of Salem. The Agreement, as far as the level of analysis that would take place since it had been a considerable amount of time that had passed since the Draft EIS, was to do a full Supplemental Draft EIS to update the technical reviews. But then in a real cost savings to the project, FHWA agreed there would be an Abbreviated Final EIS, which will be a much more streamlined process.

Mr. Greenwood touched base on the Working Group. This is in essence a PAC. They took some time to figure out the correct name for this group, and Working Group was the selected group name. Matt represents the RTC, and Mr. Greenwood said he appreciated his very active involvement in this group. He provided a list of the Working Group members, noting that there are Klickitat County representatives. Marc Thornsbury represents the Port of Klickitat. Mr. Greenwood said this is really an opportunity for members of their local government folks to provide a feedback loop from the consultants. The consultants do the technical reviews, and bring it to the Working Group. Local elected officials provide feedback and take that information back to their Boards and their constituents. It has provided a pretty good feedback opportunity. There has not been the whole discussion about future operations of the bridge and the control of the bridge, and the setting of the tolls is not part of this specific NEPA effort. That will be a subsequent phase. The next meeting, these are public meetings, is May 23 in Hood River. Mr. Greenwood thanked the Board for their time.

Mr. Greenwood added that at this point, it is very unclear what the role of the Port of Hood River will be in a replacement bridge. It is very unusual for small local governments like the Port of Cascade Locks and the Port of Hood River to own a bi-state highway bridge anywhere in the United States, so they certainly realize that this will be a marathon. They have got the baton right now. They are certainly looking forward to partners to either hand the baton off for the next phase or keep moving the project forward.

Mr. Ransom thanked Mr. Greenwood for his presentation. He said he was representing RTC as the regional planning entity in Washington State, so at the appropriate time, at a major milestone probably when there is reporting coming out of the Supplemental EIS and then the Final EIS; it would be opportune to come back and present the status to the Board. Most of the work that is happening in Klickitat County with our partners is happening on an every-other month basis; Dale Robins leads the Technical Committee work out there. This is the prime

agenda item on most meetings. As it relates to this Board of Directors, Mr. Ransom said he believes he will bring it back at milestones to keep everyone apprised.

The next presenters Paul Koch and Ryan Vollans with the Port of Cascade Locks have an equally significant task in managing the Bridge of the Gods. It is very important. Both of these are really representative of what it takes to do bridge work, which is a bi-state partnership. RTC does the same amount of work in Skamania County. Every other month, RTC hosts a Technical Committee meeting. Either Paul or Ryan attends and provides updates to the partners in Skamania County and what they are working on. In some instances, they tried to partner on recent grant applications that they may share a message about.

Mr. Koch said he would provide a quick overview of the history of the Bridge of the Gods, and then Ryan, who is their Bridge Manager, would provide some idea of where they are going in the future. Mr. Koch provided copies of the budgets and the 15-year Maintenance and Preservation Plans for the Bridge of the Gods for the meeting record.

The Port of Cascade Locks purchased the Bridge of the Gods in 1962 from a private company with the sole purpose of driving economic development in Cascade Locks. The secondary thought was the ongoing maintenance and what it means to take care of such a resource. In 2013, the State of Oregon and the Federal Highway Administration placed a severe weight limitation on the Bridge of the Gods that pretty much decimated the economic development in Southwest Washington. The Port of Cascade Locks was able to partner with WSDOT and ODOT and the Federal Government, to pull off what they call the ODOT miracle in Cascade Locks, which was finding \$1.25 million and getting a four-year project done in four months. They knew because Rian Windsheimer and Matt Garrett let them know they had to throw 150 of their employees in to get that done. Upon Completion of that project at the end of 2013, the Port committed to the development, which at that time was a 10-Year Plan. They have since converted it to a 15-Year Maintenance and Preservation Plan; so they can tell every year for the next 15 years to the total of \$78 million what needs to be done to the Bridge of the Gods to keep it as a viable transportation link between Oregon and Washington and the National Scenic Area. Mr. Koch said the 15-Year Plan is color-coded, and it will tell you where they need Federal and State help and where the Port will fill in. They spend about 60% of the funds that come in from the bridge right now on general operations. By policy, their Board has adopted a Plan to reverse that and get to where 80% of the funds stay at the bridge and 20% come to pay for the operations of the Port. Also, they are pursuing other Economic Development opportunities to kind of make it happen. They are moving forward to Phase I of their technology, and Ryan Vollans would bring them up to date on that.

Mr. Vollans said one of the things that they have been working on that is very important for them for the bridge is the automated tolling technology. He said if you have been through Cascade Locks through the summer, Friday evenings you will see that they are having issues managing the traffic backup through town across the bridge. They are following the lead of the Port of Hood River and working on installing automated tolling technology. They have some infrastructure in place currently at the toll booth. They have some more of the technology

going in at the end of this month, and they will continue through the summer. Right now what they are currently working on is their back office Tolling Services Agreement with the Board of Hood River. They are working to develop that agreement to share Breeze By with the Port of Hood River. Right now their projected go-live date is December 31. They had originally planned on wanting to go live about this time of the year, but it has taken a little longer to get things moving. So, at the end of this year, they will go live with their toll technology at the current toll booth. That will phase out their current system, which is a local sticker and bridge coupons, which is how their folks get the discount right now. The transponders will be the main avenue for getting that discounted crossing across the bridge. They will have about a three- to six-month transition period where they will accept coupons and local stickers as they transition into the transponders. This is quite a change at the Bridge of the Gods where, traditionally, they just had cash and manual tolls. It really should help alleviate the traffic and the backup issues that they are seeing. Then a couple of years out, they are looking at going fully automated, moving the toll booth to a new location to completely automate that. They are about two years out for that plan for full automation.

Some of the other projects that they are working on currently are pedestrian signing and striping improvements. One of the issues they have at the Bridge of the Gods is their pedestrian traffic. The Pacific Trail crosses the Bridge of the Gods so they have to accommodate pedestrian traffic there. They put in cross walks and signage at the toll booth to help way finding and to improve safety. That piece is done. They plan on doing the same thing on the Washington side, which should go in this fall. Another issue they are working on is the Washington approach bridge deck preservation. They had some issues on the Washington side with the approach, mainly the southbound lane. There is some rutting, potholes, and delamination. They did some chloride testing, and they found some of the salt potentially coming off SR-14 is causing delamination and the breakdown of the concrete there. What they have planned this fall is a rehab project to repair it; to remove and repair delaminated concrete in the southbound lane, remove the chloride, which is tracking on, and to seal the concrete bridge decks on both Oregon and the Washington approach span. They are in the process of putting that schedule together, and they are looking like that is going to happen this September. It would involve one to two weeks of closure on the southbound lane. They will have to set up portable traffic signals. Once they get a schedule set with that, they will have to work with WSDOT and ODOT for that. It is a big repair project on the Washington approach side.

Issues they are currently working on are updated bridge clearance signs to protect the structure of the bridge from the overhead strikes from trucks that are too tall. They are looking at replacing some of the existing clearance signs, putting in new warning signs, black and yellow warning signs, adding vertical clearance signs at the portal frames, and then early warning signs on SR-14 and Wa Na Pa Street to reroute the trucks before they commit to the bridge.

Mr. Koch added that a couple years ago working with ODOT, they had the Bridge of the Gods added to the National Highway System. Then the folks of Skamania County and RTC, which the

Port participates in heavily, the Bridge of the Gods is now a part of the Skamania County Transportation Plan.

Matt Ransom asked if he could explain the FLAP (Federal Lands Access Program) grant. There is a Federal Grant Program that they collectively, many of the partners within the region, pursued and may pursue again. He asked for a quick description of what they were attempting to do and where they could make improvements in the next call that may come up in the future.

Mr. Koch said they embarked a few years ago, working with the Pacific Crest Trail Association, to build a bike, pedestrian, and horse crossing at the Bridge of the Gods. At that time, it was considered to be an element of the bridge itself. They got to the point where they got one award for the FLAP grant to do the engineering and the design. They were notified by the Federal Government that under Title 23, if you take Federal funds, then 100% of your total revenues must go to that bridge. They could not afford to do that, so backed away. Mr. Koch said they are working in Washington, D.C., with Jaime Herrera Beutler, Greg Walden, and Ron Wyden to change the wording of the Federal Law that requires that, so if they are successful, they will get a ten-year waiver of that requirement to be able to put that bike-pedestrian crossing at the bridge.

Rian Windsheimer said since they are on the topic of grants, they, ODOT, are also working with the Port of Cascade Locks and the City of Cascade Locks looking at improvements to basically where the bridge touches down on Wa Na Pa Street. They are talking about how they might fund that and about potentially a Build Grant application. Mr. Windsheimer said he raises this because if that is something they end up pursuing, they may want to come back to this group and talk about how that improvement would help function and serve Washingtonians as well. That's a bi-state structure and seeking this board's support, he believes it will give them a better chance of success. Mr. Windsheimer said Cascade Locks is a beautiful place to visit. This coming summer, they will be working on some new ADA ramps that will go throughout Wa Na Pa Street, and they will be paving it early in the spring as it comes to next summer.

Mr. Koch thanked Mr. Windsheimer. He said over the last five years, the Port of Cascade Locks has been responsible for bringing ten new businesses to Cascade Locks and over 85 new employees. Over the next two years, they will add two new businesses with over 40,000 square feet of space in their business park and over 100 new jobs. They will quickly change the flavor of Cascade Locks. There will be two new brew pubs in downtown next spring. Thunder Island Brewery that is currently in Marine Park will move to WA Na Pa Street with a new 3,000 square foot building. A Portland Developer purchased some property they owned in downtown. Their first building is going to be a brew pub. Mr. Koch said their good friends at ODOT are going to pave WA Na Pa Street next year, so things are changing for the good. Transportation becomes very, very important to keeping cars and trucks moving across both bridges and through the communities in an efficient way.

Representative Paul Harris said he has driven across the Bridge of the Gods numerous times. He asked how much foot and bike traffic they have on the bridge.

Mr. Koch said he didn't have an exact number, but it was near 7,000. He said about half of that is Pacific Crest Trail hikers and the other half is really tourists, people coming out to take pictures on the bridge or enjoy the view. It's become kind of an attraction; of course a nuance, a safety issue with the amount of traffic it has. That traffic goes up every year.

### **VIII. 2018 Congestion Management Process – Initial Data**

Dale Robins referred to the memo included in the meeting packet about congestion. Rather than going through the data, there is a lot of data, Mr. Robins would provide a brief overview of what is in the memo. Mr. Robins said there are a few things to understand when it comes to the data. I-5 and SR-14: I-5 southbound basically from Main Street to the bridge and also SR-14 East of I-205, they saw improved speeds. It appears that Active Traffic Management has been part of what has happened there: using variable message signs telling people to move over; the ramp meter at SR-14 and I-5 metering that. WSDOT has worked quite hard at that. It appears to have positive results. The backup on I-5 isn't as long as it was a couple years ago. Traffic speeds have improved. They have gone from 10 miles per hour up to about 13 to 14 miles per hour in the AM peak. They are moving along quite fast. Also, NE 18<sup>th</sup> Street, the City of Vancouver completed that project late in 2017. So, this is really the first year that they see the full improvements, benefits of it. It removed one of the bottlenecks that they consistently saw on the Congestion Management Process, especially when the interchange opened at that location. WSDOT made some improvements to SR-500 to remove the traffic signals. That was done in early November. All of this data was collected in September and October, so that is not reflected in this data.

Mr. Robins provided some of the findings that they found in Clark County. In Clark County, freeway congestion is more prominent in the morning hours. Everyone is trying to head to Oregon and the backups that occur with that. Morning I-5 congestion is resulting in diversion to Main Street and St. John's. It is real obvious that those two arterials that are running somewhat parallel to that facility have a significant higher traffic volume in the AM peak than what they see in the PM peak. Evening freeway congestion is predominantly on the Oregon side. That is the positive for those who live and work on this side of the river. For those who live on the Oregon side, it's not a positive. C-TRAN transit ridership saw an increase in the overall ridership again this year, which is a positive thing to have happen.

Additional findings: they continued to see transit commuters to Portland ridership decline slightly, about a 1% decrease in ridership. That is not a large number, but it has been fairly consistent. Across the nation, and in other cities even outside the nation, they have seen transit struggle a little bit as the convenience of an automobile and the economic conditions have increased. That is always a battle that transit has to fight with.

Also, arterial congestion continues to increase, especially in the PM peak hour. They are starting to see more and more congestion points on the system within Clark County. Volume to capacity ratios are increasing. Average speed is declining. Intersection delay is up. What they are really saying is that there is a number of critical intersections that are becoming huge

bottlenecks to the congestion system, such as Fourth Plain – Andresen Road and Fourth Plain – SR-503/SR-500 intersections. Those intersections have so much volume and traffic is being backed up more than one light cycle at times. This is causing a real bottleneck within the congestion system. There are other intersections, too, in that situation.

Mr. Robins provided some of the bridge data. This is using their floating car methodology. This means that they have someone drive the corridors as many times as they can between 6:00 and 8:00 in the morning, for two days in a row, and they get the average speed. They do see a little variation, but as he reported, the bottom line on the graph is the I-5 south corridor. It shows that in 2012, when we were a little bit in a recession, the speeds went up quite a bit, and as we came out of the recession, speeds went down to around 10 miles per hour. We jumped up to about 13 miles per hour in this last year. On SR-14 from 164<sup>th</sup> Avenue to I-205, it bounced around a little. They did see the impacts of the Active Traffic Management telling people to move over a lane if you are going through. They saw an increase in the speeds in 2017 and 2018. On I-205, it was very up-and-down; it is variable on I-205. It can be worse that I-5 some days and other days it's not quite so bad. There is congestion on it every day, but the speeds vary quite a bit. They saw speeds varying down to as low as 18 miles per hour, but more consistently, the speeds are probably more in the low 30s is what they are seeing. When they tested it, it went down in the mid-20s this year around 24 miles per hour.

In looking at the I-5 a.m. southbound speeds using the data stations with the ODOT and WSDOT data stations. Whether it's the radar or the loop detectors, they detect what the speeds are at the stations. The graph showed the Washington side I-5: Main Street to the Bridge and the Oregon side I-5: Bridge to I-405. It shows the I-5 morning peak is 6:00 a.m. We hit the peak and it lasts pretty well through 8:00 a.m. It is probably not until about 10:00 a.m. before it is fully recovered as far as the speeds. Mr. Robins said his impression as he uses the corridor is that it actually starts about 5:45 a.m. That is increased, so what they have seen over the last few years is the peak period is spreading. People are leaving earlier or later and the peak period is becoming bigger and bigger. On the Oregon side, it is an hour later where the congestion happens, so they are backed up in Washington. By the time enough cars get through that, the Oregon traffic joins in. From 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. is that peak congestion on the Oregon side. On I-205, there is not severe congestion, but they see 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 a.m. is where the peak is with 7:00 to 8:00 a.m. being the peak hour we see congestion on the Oregon and the Washington side. Again, on the Washington side, it is a little bit more severe in the a.m. peak because the traffic is fighting to get across the bridge.

In looking at I-5 p.m. northbound speeds, on the Washington side, traffic is pretty good. There is a little blip in the 5:00 hour, but on the Oregon side, it starts about the 12:00 hour and it goes all the way to 8:00 p.m. On I-205, it is similar. There is a little blip on the Washington side around 5:00 p.m. It's really minor in the 205 corridor, but again on the Oregon side, it starts at 2:00 p.m. and it travels through about 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Robins said that was a quick update of the data they found for congestion. They plan to come back next month with the Executive Summary to talk about what they think the overall

findings are of the Congestion Management. It is getting worse on the arterial system in Clark County, and they have a lot of congestion on the I-5 and I-205 corridors.

Councilor Medvigy said this was the data that he was alluding to earlier. He said he thinks it's fair to say that the commute is getting longer in duration; it is getting worse.

Mr. Robins said it has actually improved in the last two years.

Councilor Medvigy said with the exception of the metering that they have seen some success with the metering. He said they identify both I-5 and I-205 as choke points. They are basing that now on 300,000 vehicles a day coming across. He asked if that is worse than it was four years ago.

Mr. Robins said they actually saw a slight improvement because of some of the Active Traffic Management. He added that he forgot to mention that WSDOT was planning to do more Active Traffic Management. They will see ramp metering going in, in 2020. That was part of the amendments that were approved earlier in the meeting. They are hopeful that that will improve it. Having congestion is part of being an urban area. There is always going to be congestion. With only two bridges going across and the number of lanes that are there, it is a constraint on the need for people to travel to Oregon, especially during the work hours they are seeing that.

Councilor Medvigy said the gist of his question really was at 300,000 vehicles today, is that worse than it was four years ago? He said he recognized that there have been somewhat marginal improvements with metering, removal of other choke points, and bypass lanes improving north and south of the bridges, but he wondered if it had gotten worse over the last four years from when it was somewhere around 250,000 vehicles.

Mr. Robins said he didn't bring that data with him, but if you look at the growth on the two bridges, the growth that they have seen is pretty substantial. They have data that goes back to 1961 on their website. If you look underneath the traffic count data, you can see the growth. When the I-205 bridge was built, opening in late 1993, they saw substantial increase in the number of people going across the river. In essence, it induced some trips. Congestion got not as severe. They saw a lot of congestion before the recession in the mid-2000s. They saw a lot of congestion on the two bridges. Things improved during the recession that they experienced in 2010-2012. Now they are back to where they are, and what they are seeing now is not so much the growth. They did see a little bit of through-put improvement with the Active Traffic Management in the peak hour, but most of the growth they are seeing now is off-peak. They are seeing more and more traffic at 11:00 at night. That is where the volumes are growing greatest, mid-day and late at night.

Councilor Medvigy asked if they forecast it will get worse as far as heavier traffic. Do you think the Active Management is really going to keep up? If we lose a few miles per hour is not a big deal?

Mr. Robins said no, the hope is that you improve traffic flow. Part of what the Active Traffic Management really does is it improves safety. That is one of the key factors in there. He said he heard a WSDOT employee say there is generally in the peak hour, one out of every four days there is a collision or something that is impacting traffic on the I-5 corridor. Active Traffic Management can reduce that. So maybe they get it down to once a week there is a major collision causing backup. Those are all positive things to move more people across. Mr. Robins said we will grow. As we grow, the population is growing. We will see more and more congestion, not just across the bridge, but they are seeing it on all the arterials.

Eileen Quiring entered the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

### **IX. State Legislative Session Recap**

Matt Ransom would provide the Legislative Session Recap and then have a round table discussion. He said he appreciated the two State Representatives that are in attendance today, and said they might have insights in terms of what was happening behind the scenes. Mr. Ransom referred to the memo with an attached map and a handout of the Legislative Statement.

He began with the Legislative Statement that nearly all of the agencies around the table adopted in November/December, being the Clark County Transportation Alliance 2019-2020 Legislative Policy Statement. He had highlighted those items where progress was made. He began with the most significant action item 1. They were asking for State Legislative Appropriation to restart the project office and EIS work scope planning for the replacement of the I-5 Bridge. The Legislature did appropriate. It hasn't been signed by the Governor, so all of these are still pending Governor signature. There were budget provisos in two sections of the Operating Bill for WSDOT providing \$35 million to primarily restart project activities, planning, design engineering, and the stakeholder involvement. The second proviso pertained to opening a project office and reinitiating a formal project effort. This is significant progress. This is in excess of the request made, at least for the project office piece. Then they still have room to work upwards in terms of the EIS. Once that work scope is developed, very likely would need more resource to complete it.

The second thing is within the City of Washougal. They have had a long-standing need to improve access in and out of their town across a railroad track. There was \$300,000 that was conditionally committed for the Preliminary Engineering, Design Engineering for the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue undercrossing. "Conditionally Committed" meaning that the way the Proviso is written, there had to be a certain amount of money and a fund to release it. Assuming that occurs, that would be the commitment that has been made.

Through the WSDOT Public Transit Division administered Competitive Program called "Regional Mobility Grant Program," \$4.9 million has been set in the operating budget for the C-TRAN I-5 Bus on Shoulder Project. Two other pieces of note in the broader WSDOT Competitive Grant program: C-TRAN is on the next project up list, or contingency list, to potentially receive funds for their Maintenance Building Replacement and Mill Plain BRT. If somebody else in the State

doesn't proceed, the projects might move up the list, which would be great if they did. There was another budget proviso for \$250,000 for Ridgefield southbound I-5 access planning and that addresses economic development and regional mobility as a policy priority. Also, \$1.5 million for Chelatchie Prairie Railroad track upgrades, which the CCTA Statement recognizes as a need. To the Port of Vancouver \$4.7 million for Terminal 1 upgrades, primarily related to storm water enhancement and pier reconfiguration and upgrade at the Amphitheater Pier Terminal on the Vancouver Waterfront.

Lastly, there was a reform Bill to deal with the MTCA / Storm Water Policy Reform. It is a way to move money around within the State. Mr. Ransom said many local governments then have a boost of funds, if he understands how the formula might work. That was a policy initiative that got enacted into Law.

Mr. Ransom said in looking at the Clark County Transportation Alliance Statement it shows all of the progress in regional initiatives being moved forward and recognizes the work of our State Representatives that advocated on our behalf. He said he considers this to be a Session with some amount of funding success.

Mr. Ransom referred to the memo at the bottom of the first page where he describes some provisions in New Law that have to do more with the policy type bills. One of those is House Bill 1994. This is a Bill that this organization advocated for and that is to create a process and statute for designating projects of Statewide Significance. RTC supported that process with the acknowledgement or the expectation that the I-5 Bridge would become a project that may be eligible for such a designation. That was signed into Law. Now the work turns to the State Administrative Agencies to figure out what the process looks like in the Department figuring out what that looks like. Mr. Ransom said he expects that regionally, a sponsor would probably push that forward as soon as the process is designed in terms of the application and so on.

For House Bill 1584, Mr. Ransom said he would mention this and then they could talk more in depth in the memo about what happens. This was mentioned in prior months that this is a Bill that affects this organization. It compels us to invite, if they choose to accept federally recognized Tribal Nations for a seat on the Board of Directors of the RTPO, which is what we are under state statute. Mr. Ransom would describe it in more detail and what we need to do now. Lastly, this is more for the RTC operating fund benefit. There was a slight increase in the state appropriations to fund the statewide RTPO Planning Program, and the RTC under the formula that is established might receive additional operating funds to just help with the planning and all the work we do with the local agencies across the three counties and the State Department of Transportation.

Mr. Ransom asked members if they had any questions or comments.

Tom Lannen asked on the projects of Statewide Significance, was the Hood River-White Salmon Bridge considered as potentially being able to be designated for that?

Mr. Ransom said for the purposes of our discussion around this table that had never been contemplated as a specific reason why. So our support largely was related to the I-5 Bridge as

part of that process. With that said, he thought that when the State Agencies design what the process is and the eligibility criteria, it is possible that could become eligible. Certainly, we heard in the presentations earlier by any definitions those bridges are of statewide bi-state significance and could become eligible under that designation process.

Carley Francis provided a note about the Project of Statewide Significance. She said the Transportation Budget Bill currently reads that the project office would be working on Administrative Rules for that. So right now, there was a question about who would actually do that work, because it was unfunded as originally proposed in the Bill. The Budget Bill for 1921 per the WSDOT specifically calls out an I-5 Bridge project office to be the entity working on the administrative rule-making.

Mr. Ransom provided further information on House Bill 1584 and the implementation steps we need to take as RTC. He referred to the map attached to the memo. This map illustrates RTC's regional area. Shown in green are those federally recognized Tribes who have Reservations or Trust Lands. It's specific in statute what the eligibility criteria is. So these Tribes; Cowlitz in Clark County and the Yakama Nation in Klickitat County under the definition of the statute are eligible for membership on the RTC Board.

So, here is the process that we need to pursue. Mr. Ransom said he would make some comments and if the General Counsel has comments, they will give the Board a sense of what lies ahead. It is their view, and Ted offered an opinion that this more or less represents what Mr. Ransom has described in the memo, that the statute is mandatory so we do need to invite the Tribes to participate. The statute provides some conditions, meaning we offer the invitation and they have to accept. We don't by right just add them to the Board, but there is a procedure that we can contemplate for inviting them to participate around the table. The statute is mandatory in that they would be voting members of the RTPO Board. So when we think about this in the process ahead, we'll think about that in relation to what it means for the quorum requirements and so on and so forth. Mr. Ransom referred to the bullet points listed in the memo. The law as it was signed is effective August 1. Prior to August 1, we talk about what we need to do process wise. We will communicate, meaning the Chair and Mr. Ransom, to the Tribes after August 1 of the enactment of the statute and the eligibility for participation, and they will send them a letter. They will certainly interact with them to the extent they want in person consultation. Mr. Ransom said he would be available to facilitate that. As it might require, based on customs, we are sensitive to the fact that these are Independent Nations. They have their status under the State and the Federal Law as we deal with them as Independent Nations and they govern themselves. We will deal with them in terms of their customs and how they want to be engaged with. Based on our limited experience, it is different for both the Cowlitz and the Yakama Nation. The process for inclusion very likely would be, as opposed to amending the original Interlocal Agreement, because this is statute mandate not initiated by RTC but by the Legislature that we can amend them in as voting members through an amendment to the Bylaws. That is administratively easier to do. The reason for that both in administration but then also the revision of statute is that we offer them

the opportunity to participate every two years if they choose not to initially. We will have to design a process where every two years, we offer the invitation and that depending on the capacity or the interest they accept it, then we proceed with the administrative outcome at that point.

Ted Gathe said the only thing that he would add to Matt's comments is the original Bill introduced in the Legislature did not contain the two-year requirement or the provision with regard to opening the membership of the RTPO by amending its Interlocal Agreement. Those were added by amendment later on. He said it has not changed his opinion that he offered in regard to the original Bill in that he believes because this is a Legislative mandate, it uses the word must so it is clear what the Legislature intended here. He said he believes the most expeditious and appropriate way and effective way to bring Tribal representatives on to the RTPO, the RTC Board is through amendment of the Bylaws and not through reopening of the entire and original Interlocal Agreement, and he so advised the Executive Director.

Mr. Ransom said the Oregon State Legislative Session is still in progress. He said he is not tracking anything of urgency or interest. He offered the opportunity for Rian Windsheimer to provide any insights or Legislation that we should engage on. Mr. Windsheimer said there was nothing at this time.

Mr. Ransom provided a Federal Legislative Update. He said this is early, but he wanted to give the Board a sense of what lies ahead. That is the Federal Act, which is the FAST Act, expires in 2020. So in congress, they are always talking and musing perhaps what they want to do in the next round of updates. There has been in most recent years a conversation about the re-establishment of some funding earmarking process. There is this up-and-down frequency of there is urgency in the conversation, not urgency; maybe we will do this, maybe we'll do that. Most recently, and of media interest with some announcement last week that there might have been some tacit agreement between the Administration and Members of the House that they were going to pursue, what is significant in any regard, a \$2 Trillion infrastructure package only to find out maybe there wasn't an agreement. There are going to be conversations about this, and the real question is how does it move forward of anything of substance. Mr. Ransom suggested to the Board that when things start to pick up, we may want to take a policy position, something that we could share with our Federal Representatives. Those positions might be certainly funding and the gas tax and the stabilization of the highway funding, because of our interest as it pertains to specific projects to the extent earmarking a type of project dedicated funding comes forward that we have through the CCTA and other legislative documents clear project priorities that have been established. We will figure out some way to engage on that and share it with the Representatives and the Senators so they can advocate on our behalf. Mr. Ransom said Metro is doing the same. He said they will bring it forward at the appropriate time. From the outside looking in, it is interesting to watch congress and how they resolve this next round of the discussions. Mr. Ransom said they would try to keep track of it and at least have a policy position.

Rian Windsheimer said he had an opportunity to be in Washington, D.C., all last week. It was the day after this \$2 trillion package was released. They got a chance to talk with Chairman DeFazio on the House side about the funding. He disagreed with Schumer's comments and he felt like there was still an opportunity to do it. There were several members they spoke with who encouraged on-the-ground, grassroots sharing of information and hopefully a sharing with members of the Congressional Delegations of an interest in seeing this thing move forward and expressing a willingness to say we do want to pay for it. We understand that there has to be some way to pay for this thing and that we are interested in having that move forward. They felt like it really needed to happen over the next couple of weeks in terms of expressing those types of things and holding events. Councilor Craddick, and unfortunately she couldn't be here today, actually committed to try and hold an event with Chairman DeFazio and Congressman Blumenauer in Portland to talk about the need for Federal funding and trying to rally some of the grassroots support. Mr. Windsheimer said if that moves forward, which he expected that they will be holding that in the next few weeks, he encouraged someone from RTC, possibly Matt could come and participate in something like that, and maybe we need to do additional work. He said that they seemed interested and thoughtful that there may actually an opportunity here, but that they really needed to hear from members around the state and around all the states telling their members there was a willingness to pay for it.

Matt Ransom said the big thing that was not accomplished this session, we talked about it previously, but he considered it to be a positive dialogue, and that was the introduction and hearings in the Senate for what could be the next major statewide transportation funding package. They talked earlier this year about how that project list did identify the I-5 Bridge replacement as number one on the list, certainly a statewide priority. What was meaningful about the Senate holding hearings, notwithstanding to the fact it didn't move to the House and didn't move beyond the Senate, was the first formal discussion. Further, leadership in the Senate, notably the Chief Proponent, the Chair of the Senate Transportation Committee and others, and our Senator Cleveland that serves on the Committee, many other people across the state talked about the extreme importance and the statewide significance of addressing the I-5 Bridge. Mr. Ransom said he considers that to be a very positive sign, positive message. It seems like maybe there is the turning of the corner where we can talk in a proactive way about how that is a statewide priority, and it needs to be addressed. So, it is possible that the next session that there is reengagement on that or a derivative of that Bill. If not, he expects the next session in terms of that issue in terms of a statewide need for additional transportation funding, capital, maintenance, operations, and et cetera is not going away. He suspects that is the first discussion of what might be a series in the coming years to get to the finish line on the next package.

Chair McEnery-Ogle thanked Representative Harris and Representative Hoff for their work in Olympia. They appreciate all the hours that they put in.

Representative Hoff said he heard a little about the Active Traffic Management, and he was encouraged to hear it improved traffic two or three minutes, but he said the commuters aren't

encouraged about that. He said he is excited about the emphasis that we have for continuing the project. He said he just heard about the Federal Funding. He said he has thought long and hard about why our Federal folks aren't contributing more, not only more money because we haven't seen any of that, but more dialogue. That particular event or whatever the case may be, he thinks will be critical for that. He said we need to get them involved; this is a project of federal importance, not just Oregon and Washington. There should be money. Representative Hoff said interestingly enough, you will hear that the budget is tight, there is no money for that, and then money shows up. He said money can show up for this project, too. We just need to squeak a little bit more. One other item, Matt suggested there was successful project funding. He said we did do rather well, but there are some things that didn't get funded that we are excited about. Battle Ground got left out in the transportation side; just essentially some inflation things that should have been picked up. There were different projects around the county that didn't get done either. He said there are 98 Representatives and 49 Senators, and everyone is putting things in here, and they stand in line to see if they can get to it first. He said it is a matter of really emphasizing the value and the critical importance of each particular project. He appreciated the comments about being successful, but some of the folks didn't see the successes as others did.

## **X. Other Business**

### From the Board

Chair McEnergy-Ogle asked the C-TRAN Director if he could give them a quick update on the Mill Plain BRT.

Shawn Donaghy said he would like to do that, and that Scott Patterson and Monica Fowler were also in attendance as well. Mr. Donaghy said the Mill Plain BRT is moving along extremely fast. He said they feel like they are on track to have one of the fastest, if not the fastest BRT project in the history of the Federal Transit Administration. That is really a testament to the community that supports the project, their fantastic Board of Directors, and obviously their employees that push that forward. He said he thinks a few things that have helped them at the Federal level are the last project they did was on time and under budget. They saw significant increases in ridership. But beyond that, it's bigger than a public transportation project, which is really how you have to gauge public transportation in the way we view it these days. It's not just about ridership. It's about economic development; it's about access to jobs, jobs creation, access to education, and quality of life. If you think about the Mill Plain corridor as a whole, you have pretty significant access to education points, both on the east and the west end. He said they talk about predictive and preventative healthcare throughout the county. How they can assist the hospitals and health care facilities and decreasing healthcare costs, especially with the growth in our aging population. The Council on Aging that works through the County has done an amazing job of identifying that we have an opportunity through that corridor to help solve those problems with two or three major healthcare facilities along the corridor. Mr. Donaghy said they saw \$89-\$90 million worth of development of multifamily housing and other units along Fourth Plain. It was not specifically as a result of BRT, but it was a catalyst for it.

This project is moving really fast. They entered in that they call the FTA Warrants Category, which they needed approval on some of the warrants, and some they still have to go back and get approval for. That process usually takes 60 to 90 days. They got an answer back in less than five days. So, the Federal Government is extremely interested in this project, not specifically from the standpoint of the public transportation aspect of it, which is amazing. It's really more about the value capture for the community. It's about the value that it will bring in the various sectors that are not necessarily transportation related. So it is a real win for both C-TRAN from a transportation standpoint because they will see an increase in ridership along the corridor, but also, it's really going to benefit the community at large along the Mill Plain Corridor and connect them probably as far as they have ever been with rapid transit in the eastern quadrant of the county as well. The project is moving forward at a rapid pace, and they look forward to jumping into construction on that.

Chair McEnerney-Ogle said that Carley Francis was going to have some very busy times coming up. She asked if she could provide a quick update each month on what is happening with the I-5 Bridge project. She also asked if there were any updates to the trunnion replacement in 2020.

Carley Francis said the trunnion replacement is still planned for September of 2020. She said that is a little more of ODOT's news than their news, because they take the lead on that. As they do with all bi-state projects, they share the responsibility with Oregon. With respect to the I-5 Bridge Replacement work, she is counseling WSDOT to be very tentative right now, because the work for that project is collaborative with Oregon. She said they anticipate that they will have a good partnership with Oregon. There has obviously been some communication between the Governor and the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) requesting engagement and a response back. Most of that says that they are willing to engage in some conversations, but mostly that will begin following the end of their Legislative Session and once there is project office funding. The other thing she said she would note in that because they have had such a change of population and employment, people in different agencies, and different stakeholders to engage that the early work on that really is going to be about building a good framework to work together between ODOT and WSDOT and the other partner agencies, and how to engage the public. She noted that some of the articles on the I-5 Bridge replacement sort of suggest that maybe that is a turnkey activity and things start up fully on July 1, which is not really the case. She said she thinks, especially with how Washington left the project previously, it's important for them to come back to the table really with a partnership attitude. That is her focus right now, trying to figure out how to make sure they have a good base of decision making activities and engagement; so hopefully, they can find ways to expedite the process once they set the base in an effective way.

Carley Francis had one other note, aside from anything else. She said they have an open house for the SR-500/SR-503 Fourth Plain project coming up on May 29. They have been looking at that intersection and the surrounding area. Obviously, with removing the signals on SR-500 further west, that creates that as the first signal that you come to, and so it increases some of

the pressure there. They are looking at that in a system perspective. Ms. Francis said if folks are interested, that information will be coming out in mailers to the local community there.

Councilor Medvigy said he thought he heard Matt offer to present an update. He said the last update regarding the Visioning Study was in 2015. He wanted to read a quoted sentence from Matt based on the 2008 Corridor Visioning Study. "A key next step among the Corridor Visioning Study recommendations was to convene the land use planning agencies, county and cities, for additional follow up and validation of the population employment land use forecasting parameters of the study. This is to preserve the corridors right-of-ways. Without it, we will never have a strategic plan in place and we are going to miss that opportunity." Councilor Medvigy said that was said in 2008. He asked and made a motion to have an update be brought to this table. He said they all heard there is congestion, and it is getting worse. Councilor Medvigy said they need to look ahead and plan and preserve any corridors that they may want to use 10 to 20 years from now.

Mr. Ransom said what he would suggest to the Board, he hears the need. When he hears dialogue at this table over time, he thinks a refreshing of awareness of what that study did and what it was and what it studied would be appropriate. He said he would be happy to do that. He would work with the Chair and the Vice Chair on scheduling that. He said he can see probably by fall, that they can get that on the agenda.

Representative Harris said the Bi-State Bridge Commission will meet with the Oregon Legislature when it gets out of session. He said he thinks that we will have further dialogue on third bridge alternatives and certainly discussing the I-5 Bridge. He said he looks forward to that, and hopefully get back some information to you as both Legislatures meet together. He told Matt, any information on the corridors down the line would help further discussion to take a look at the third bridge alternative.

#### From the Director

Mr. Ransom said he wanted to bring this to the Board's attention, because in the months ahead, they are going to very likely be seeing updates to some of the key business contracts that RTC has with Clark County. He referred to the memo that he had prepared with more in depth information. In the interest of time, he quickly described the back story and then what lies ahead.

The back story is that when this agency was formed in 1992, it entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with Clark County for the County to provide critical business services. Those principally were payroll, accounts payable, accounts receivable, some human resources support, benefit programs, meaning health care, vision, dental, et cetera. If you look at that agreement, in substance, it is less than one page long. The nature of their relationship with the County has worked well, and these business relationships have evolved over time, and there are some pressures on them right now to re-evaluate. That is the real message. Page two of the memo provides a quick snapshot of the different type of agreements that they have. Some of them are in contractual form in the form of an Interlocal Agreement; others are as the Board approved tonight, a lease contract with the County for office space that they use on the first

floor. Mr. Ransom has worked with the County Manager to say that we may want to take a look at the MOU, where we can provide more clarity in terms of what the business relationships are, who does what, and what the expectations are. He said he thinks there is value. Two sentences, while that works well maybe conceptually, but over time it might beg the need for more specificity. Mr. Ransom said what he sees in the months ahead, is that he will be bringing forward recommendations for approving different agreements or contracts. They will relate to the processes as he has defined them. He said he will work with the Chair, Vice Chair and General Counsel from contractual stand point and the nitty-gritty details. They will bring to the Board what is vetted through the business process with the Executive Committee. Mr. Ransom said he probably won't spend a lot of time around this table, because, again, it is more business function, business process related, but he wanted to let the Board know that he is working the details with the Executive Committee behind the scenes. Next month, they may see in draft form a lot of paper, about an inch thick. RTC has not recently adopted its Personnel Policy Manual. It has not been refreshed in many years. Mr. Ransom said when he first came to RTC in 2014, he started to flag issues that needed to be worked on. Now, they are at the point where he has tackled the inch-thick of paper. Because of the historical commitment, more or less, this is the County Personnel Policy Manual. They used that, and it was sanctioned by the Board in 1992. They will readopt it so he can sign it and update it over time for the administrative purposes. It is a lot of paper, but that is the substance of that. In each instance, he will describe the history is and the nature of what they need to do. He said they might also see next month an agreement, a Memorandum of Understanding with the Treasurer. The County Treasurer is RTC's banker under statute, because we are an entity formed under the Interlocal Agreement statute. RTC has to have as the fiduciary banker a County Treasurer or somebody else, but most often is the County Treasurer. They are the ones that make sure that our funds are held in the banks properly, et cetera to comply with the statute. They also manage the investment pool. That Memorandum of Understanding will clarify our relationship with them. That might be representative of really what they are after here, more clarity and more specificity in the agreements. Mr. Ransom said he has under review right now with his team and the County Auditor's Office, their payroll, accounts payable and accounts receivable process. He said most of RTC's funds, they route through the County process for actually redemptions and approvals for AP/AR, payroll. He doesn't know if the process is the most efficient. There are quirks in the system now. He said his duty to the agency is to design it in a way where it is most efficient, minimal cost, and the highest degree of the financial accountability. They might need to change that relationship a little bit. Mr. Ransom is working with the Auditor's Office to make sure that RTC's funds, given their independent status that they have it designed from an accounting stand point, that they have full control and accountability, which they do, but they need refinements to the process. In the months ahead, the Board will probably see redefinition of the payroll and AP/AR. The last note is that they buy their benefits from the County. That is an agreement. They entered an agreement in 2014 to be a part of the Healthcare Benefit Pool, which is what affiliate agencies like RTC can buy into. Mr. Ransom said he didn't see really any changes in that way, but they have evolved their relationship with the county HR. They don't use them as much for

consultation. He is effectively the HR Director. In limited instances, and these issues can get complicated, where he doesn't have the expertise to solve it, he can work with the General Counsel or work with the HR or another if they have a very specific issue related to personnel HR management. The Board will start to see agreements next month, and they will work through them. Overall, their relationships are good. They just need, like everything 27 years later, we need to fine tune it.

The last update is that Mr. Ransom has been invited to participate in a City-to-City Regional Peer Exchange that the City of Vancouver has pulled together. They have invited in regional agencies, as well as their Council and other Commission members that serve to the City of Vancouver are going to attend this. This is the second of what was the first two years ago. This trip is in Denver the week of May 20. Mr. Ransom will be there trying to pick up information, learn, be around colleagues here within this region to see if there might be lessons learned from the Denver Metro area that they can bring back and apply. To the extent things that are interesting and informative he would bring that back in an update next month. Mr. Ransom said he appreciates the invitation and happy to represent RTC in that event.

Chair McEnery-Ogle said they have all been through state audits, so they understand why this is all so very important.

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

## **XI. Adjourn**

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

---

Anne McEnery-Ogle, Board of Directors Chair