

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Board of Directors
August 6, 2019, Meeting Minutes**

I. Call to Order and Roll Call of Members

The Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council Board of Directors Meeting was called to order by Chair Anne McEnerny-Ogle on Tuesday, August 6, 2019, at 4:00 p.m. at the City of Vancouver Aspen Meeting Room, 415 West 6th Street, Vancouver, Washington. The meeting was televised and recorded by CVTV. Attendance follows.

Voting Board Members Present:

Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor
Mike Dalesandro, Battle Ground Mayor
Shawn Donaghy, C-TRAN Chief Executive Officer
Carley Francis, WSDOT Regional Administrator
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Councilmember (Alt.)
Bart Hansen, Vancouver Councilmember
Scott Hughes, Port of Ridgefield Commissioner
Tom Lannen, Skamania County Commissioner
Temple Lentz, Clark County Councilor
Anne McEnerny-Ogle, Vancouver Mayor
Gary Medvigy, Clark County Councilor
Mandy Putney, ODOT (Alternate)

Voting Board Members Absent:

Jim Herman, Port of Klickitat Commissioner
Eileen Quiring, Clark County Councilor
Melissa Smith, Camas Councilmember
Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1 Manager

Nonvoting Board Members Present:

Vicki Kraft, Representative 17th District

Nonvoting Board Members Absent:

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

Guests Present:

Pat Anderson, Citizen
Ed Barnes, LRTSWW
Lindsay Bershauer, Citizen
KiKi Bittner, Citizen
Monica Fowler, C-TRAN
Chuck Green, Otak
Jim Howell, Citizen
Michael Jennings, Citizen
Larry Keister, Port of Camas-Washougal Commissioner
Jim Kepner, Citizen
Lisa Holcomb Krahl, Citizen
Carol Lenanen, CCCU, Inc.
John Ley, Citizen
Jeffrey Mize, The Columbian
Sharon Nasset, Third Bridge Now
Scott Patterson, C-TRAN
Adriana Pereira, Citizen
Sean Philbrook, Identity Clark County
Bob Post, AECOM
Ron Rasmussen, Citizen
Richard Rylander, Citizen
Ron Swaren, Citizen
Margaret Tweet, Citizen
Walter Valenta, Citizen

Staff Present:

Matt Ransom, Executive Director
Lynda David, Senior Transportation Planner
Mark Harrington, Senior Transportation Planner
Bob Hart, Transportation Section Supervisor
Dale Robins, Senior Transportation Planner
Diane Workman, Administrative Assistant

Chair McEnery-Ogle said they would move to agenda item III while waiting for a couple more members to make quorum.

III. Call for Public Comments

John Ley from Camas spoke about the 2008 Visioning Study and the need for a new corridor crossing over the Columbia River.

Shirley Craddick, Bart Hansen, and Tom Lannen entered the meeting at 4:04 p.m.

Richard Rylander from Battle Ground spoke about the need for other bridges and traffic corridors.

Vicki Kraft entered the meeting at 4:10 p.m.

Ed Barnes from Vancouver spoke about the need to replace the I-5 Bridges first then look to other corridors and crossings.

KiKi Bittner from the Vancouver West Minnehaha neighborhood spoke about the need for a third bridge crossing.

Mandy Putney entered the meeting at 4:15 p.m.

Ron Swaren from Portland spoke of the need for more bridges over the Columbia River and different types of bridges.

Pat Anderson from Vancouver spoke of the congestion on our corridors and the need for a new bridge on the east side of I-205 first while they plan the I-5 Bridge. She provided a handout.

Ron Rasmussen from Vancouver spoke of the need for a third and fourth bridge.

Lisa Holcomb Krahl from Sherwood, Oregon spoke of the congestion and the need for a third bridge east of I-205 with no light rail.

Margaret Tweet from Camas spoke of support for a western bypass Port to Port new bridge over the Columbia River now and an eventual I-5 Bridge replacement with no light rail. She provided a handout.

Michael Jennings from Ridgefield spoke about building a tunnel across the Columbia River at Woodland and have a western I-5 bypass into Oregon.

Lindsay Bershauer from Newberg, Oregon spoke about transportation issues and needs in Oregon and also a third bridge over the Columbia River on the east side. She provided a handout.

Ann Donnelly provided written public comment that was distributed about the need for a third bridge crossing over the Columbia River.

Chair McEnery-Ogle said they had a quorum so they could begin with approval of the Board agenda.

II. Approval of the Board Agenda

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 6, 2019, MEETING AGENDA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SHAWN DONAGHY AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

IV. Approval of July 2, 2019, Minutes

SHAWN DONAGHY MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE JULY 2, 2019 MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY PAUL GREENLEE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

V. Consent Agenda

A. August Claims

B. 2019-2022 TIP and 2020 UPWP Amendment: Columbia Connects Bi-State Study, Resolution 08-19-20

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA AUGUST CLAIMS AND RESOLUTION 08-19-20. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY TOM LANNEN AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VI. Transportation Corridor Visioning Study (2008) – Retrospective Review

Lynda David referred to the memo included in the meeting packet. This agenda item is to provide a review of the 2008 Transportation Corridor Visioning Study. A full copy of the study report including the full report appendixes is available on the RTC website under the Information Publication Archive section <https://www.rtc.wa.gov/studies/vision/>

The memo distributed guides through a number of questions that people may have about the study; its purpose, land use growth assumptions, primary study findings and the studies recommended next steps.

The Transportation Corridors Visioning Study was conducted between 2006 and 2008 in an effort to identify and assess potential new longer-term regional transportation corridors within Clark County. The suggestion for the study came from then Mayor of Battle Ground, John Idsinga who asked the future need for a corridor between the two rapidly growing communities of Battle Ground and Camas be explored. The study also had a secondary purpose in addressing whether any new potential corridors have possibilities for extension across the Columbia River. RTC Board members were concerned that the 20-year planning process of the Regional Transportation Plan and the County's 20-Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan was not enough of a horizon for future transportation corridor planning. Using the Padden Parkway corridor as an example, they noted that new transportation corridors can take 50 plus years to plan, develop, and construct.

With this background information, RTC wants to make clear what the Corridor Visioning Study was and was not. The study intended to identify connecting routes between outer communities in Clark County. There was only limited evaluation of long-term growth and demographic assumptions. The study only had internal evaluation being led by an RTC Board appointed eight-member Steering Committee together with eight accompanying senior staff members from the jurisdictions. The committee met 11 times between October 2006 and April

2008. The Steering Committee asked that the study seek answers to the question of how do we get around within our own community in Clark County in the longer-term future if our county reaches a million people in population. The study was meant as a first phase in establishing a 50 plus year transportation vision for the county. In other words, it was broad brush first look at potential future transportation corridors but was limited in its scope. The study was not a plan. It was not adopted as a policy at the time, and the study was not a reflection of the community's vision for growth. That was intended to be addressed in a future phase by land use agencies.

Ms. David displayed a slide that provided a contextual time frame and summary of existing planning products to meet federal and state growth management laws and set the context for the much longer term Transportation Corridor Visioning Study. Under the state's Growth Management laws, the County established a Community Framework Plan in 1993 with a longer term horizon. The County's Comprehensive Plans and accompanying Capital Facilities Plan, C-TRANS Transit Development Plan, and RTC's 20-Year Regional Transportation Plan, they all have a 20-year timeframe. In addition, the region has looked at 10-year priority projects. Locals have a six-year Capital Facilities Plan and Transportation Improvement Programs, and the region's Transportation Improvement Program has a four-year horizon. In comparison, the Transportation Corridor Visioning Study had no timeframe, but looked at a single vision for the County when the County reaches 1 million in population.

The next slide summarizes the study's population and employment assumptions for the Clark County and metropolitan region as a whole, with populations in Clark County at 1 million and 500,000 in jobs. The Portland-Vancouver region-wide population is assumed at 4 million with 2.5 million in jobs. Ms. David emphasized that assumptions were used for analytical purposes only. They were not validated, endorsed, or coordinated with applicable agencies, and the assumptions do not reflect community Comprehensive Plans required under Washington's Growth Management Act. To put these growth assumptions in context, the demographics are similar to those of the whole Puget Sound metropolitan region including King, Snohomish, Pierce, and Kitsap Counties in the mid-2000s.

Next was a summary of population data, both actual and forecast. The first focus was on the red line which shows population growth in Clark County between 2000 and 2014. The purple diamond shows the forecast in the 2007 Comprehensive Plan, which at the time used the high end of Washington population forecast range. This forecast was set in prerecession times, a time when Clark County had been experiencing rapid growth more than a decade. The yellow diamond showed the Corridor Visioning Study population assumptions of 1 million people. The dotted green line shows the trend toward the 2035 population forecast for the Clark County region. What the chart shows is the one million population in Clark County may not be realized for perhaps 70 plus years.

A similar chart was provided focusing on employment with the red line showing actual employment numbers in Clark County from 2000 to 2014. The purple diamond represents the Comprehensive Plan's 2024 forecast, and the yellow diamond is the half million in employment.

The green dotted line represents the trend line between 2014 and the 2035 forecast in place at the time.

Households in Clark County were presented. Each dot represents 20 households with green dots showing location of households in 2004. The yellow dots represent growth in households between 2004 and forecast 2014 per the 2007 County Comprehensive Plan. The yellow dots are concentrated at the periphery of the urban growth areas as well as infill within urban growth areas and scattered throughout the rural areas. The red dots represent assumed locations of growth between 2024 and the Visioning Study's horizon, which would bring the County's population to 1 million people.

Following existing trends at the time, growth spreads out within the County. Most of the growth is kept off land that is difficult to build on, such as steep slopes above the 800 foot contour. Floodplains are avoided, and conservation districts are avoided. As can be seen, most of Clark County's land is built out at that time. In the study, they were looking at accommodating more than twice today's population in employment in the Clark County region. The land use scenario assumed in the Corridor Visioning Study was for continued growth patterns similar to the growth patterns accommodated in the 20-Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan with the expansion of urban growth areas. The amount of population and employment growth that would need to be located would push out to the urban growth areas to the outer red line marked on the map. Not all of the growth to a million people could be accommodated within the extended urban growth areas, so there was some densifying of population within the existing urban growth areas and about 10% average increase in densities was assumed in certain target growth nodes.

A map was provided with potential new transportation corridor segments that were addressed in the Transportation Corridors Visioning Study. These lines were deliberately mapped as wide swatches because the County focused on planning at the 50,000-foot level, not on specific alignments. Corridor segments are presented at either or potential alignments on the west and east side of the County, as well as east-west future corridors in the north part of the county. Not surprisingly, the study found that most creek and river crossings within Clark County were well over capacity, as well as those over the Columbia River. At the outset of the study, participants assumed new corridors would carry primarily regional trips, trips with a distance of over eight miles to bypass the I-5 and the I-205 corridors. However, the study found the demand for some regional trips of less than eight miles distance made on these candidate new corridors. The study also found that any new Columbia River crossing would carry a mix of both regional and sub regional trips, longer distance and shorter distance trips.

Key findings of the study included there would be some benefit to develop connecting corridors within Clark County to improve travel between urban areas, though they would need to look at the benefit / cost to the corridors and to the numbers of trips served. Before any validation of potential future transportation corridors, there needs to be adoption of longer term demographic assumptions and a look at land uses as part of the Growth Management Act planning process conducted at the local level as part of the comprehensive planning process.

RTC's Regional Transportation Plan would then be updated to be consistent with local comprehensive plans. Some other key findings: A secondary consideration in the Corridor Visioning Study related to the Columbia River Crossing; however, the Study's review was very limited to looking at whether there is a potential for extending new transportation corridors within Clark County and then over the Columbia River. It must be emphasized that the Study did not evaluate the feasibility of connections into Oregon. It did not provide a need or benefit/cost assessment, and the review did not include engagement with affected Washington agency partners or Oregon stakeholders as this was viewed as the first step and exploratory study only.

The Visioning Steering Committee acknowledged in its findings that the study was unlimited in scope. The Transportation Corridor Visioning Study found that before any of the potential new candidate corridors could proceed, there would need to be further refinement of the region's long-term land use community growth vision, because the Corridor Visioning Study focused on only one potential land use scenario and a number needs to be addressed. Local agencies would need to consider how their local Comprehensive Plan update might want to address new transportation corridors with need for additional needs assessment, policy code assessment, and engineering assessment. It would also have to be advanced for the candidate corridors and review of their land use impacts, as well as extensive public outreach and agency participation to ask the residents of Clark County whether this is the land use vision they had for the county, and what about their transportation vision for the longer term future.

After the RTC Board endorsed, rather than adopted, the Visioning Study findings in April of 2008, some post study steps were taken. The Federal Highway Administration and Volpe Institute conducted a Transportation and Land Use Scenario Planning Workshop here in April 2011 with guest speakers emphasizing the need to take an integrated approach to land use and transportation in looking at various scenarios for the region's future. In October 2011, it was recognized that people's values are important when considering land use and transportation. A core values assessment process was discussed, similar to the Envision Utah process which had taken place. Alan Matheson from Utah who directed the development and implementation of the publicly driven growth strategy to maintain an enhanced quality of life and prosperity in Utah came to Clark County and provided some guidance to the region.

In summary, Ms. David said she wanted to make sure that the study was just exploratory and informational. The study actually raised more questions than perhaps anticipated when the study was initiated. It is future land use visions and plans that are key to defining future transportation infrastructure needs. As put into practice elsewhere in the United States, a regional scenario planning study could be the way to develop a 50-plus year vision for this region that could inform comprehensive planning activities. It was recognized that the study used just one future land use scenario, and land use assumptions would require further policy decisions. It is land use that generates transportation demand so where land use activities are located is key.

Steering Committee and RTC Board members engaged in the Corridor Visioning Study in 2008. They wanted to make clear that participation in the study did not mean a policy commitment for the land use or transportation corridor visions identified at the time. If any of the new candidate transportation corridors were to move forward with the right of way preserved for any of the corridors, a corridor would first have to be included in a fiscally constrained local comprehensive plan, as well as the Regional Transportation Plan for the region. Other projects may have to be dropped from the plans in order to fund these new corridors. Again, the key finding is that this was exploratory and informational, and it is the land use piece of the puzzle which needs to be worked on next.

Councilor Medvigy said he is hoping that they can have a substantive discussion here. He said he had a couple questions and that he wanted to compliment Matt on the memo and the presentation. He said it lit some light bulbs for him as to what they were missing. He said there is a large political piece obviously that is missing. Councilor Medvigy said he was trying to find a reason for why Oregon didn't participate in the Visioning Study. He said he has looked back at the minutes to see if they were there, and knows they were not on the Steering Committee. He noted that Ed Barnes attended the meetings and provided public comment. Councilor Medvigy asked why Oregon didn't participate and he also asked why RTC didn't, at some point, pass a resolution to kick off some of these planning both north and south of the river?

Lynda David said there are several issues. First of all, the primary motivation for the Corridor Visioning Study was to look at corridors within Clark County. That was the first priority. It then becomes a secondary question. Would any of the new corridors within Clark County be able to be extended across the river? It was very much a Clark County oriented study to begin with. Oregon didn't participate as part of the Steering Committee for the Corridor Visioning part of the process, but they were represented on the RTC Board and represented at RTAC meetings. They were kept up to date on what was being addressed in the Corridor Visioning Study.

The study concluded, again, with key findings and basically the next steps in the process would be to look at scenario planning and really turn focus to land use to ask the citizens of Clark County what they wanted their community to look like in the future. Did they want growth to extend well beyond the current urban growth areas? Ms. David said as noted in the presentation, they met with Federal Highway Administration; they came to Clark County, and presented to them a way to take the next steps. Again, the focus shifted to they should be looking at land use. The purview of the RTC Board and the Regional Transportation Council is transportation oriented. So they were looking at local jurisdictions to take up the land use piece, and if they wanted to pursue a future transportation corridor, it would have to be then incorporated into the Comprehensive Plans. Then, it was unfortunate timing, because the recession hit the Pacific Northwest late in the great recession. Unfortunately, a lot of the local jurisdictions lost a lot of their planning staff at that time. Unfortunately, the next step was not taken.

Mike Dalesandro said he too, wanted to thank RTC staff for putting this together and bringing it back. It is something that has been out there for a while. He said he first saw this ten years ago

when he got on the Planning Commission for Battle Ground. The recession hit and things slowed down when it came to planning. Mayor Dalesandro said the important thing here is when they start talking about bridges and corridors everyone turns into an engineer or cartographer or expert planner. The key is something they did in Battle Ground, and other jurisdictions have done this as well. They ask the community what they would like their community to look like. Mayor Dalesandro said for us to move forward with anything, it's important that first of all, not just the County, but the other jurisdictions all have to get aligned on this as well. Getting on the same page all requires resources, requires time. He said it would be irresponsible to say this should be here, this should be there, and as well as partnership with the State of Oregon and whoever else we need at the table. The Mayor said it is great to have the discussion, but it's not something he sees them moving forward with like that. It takes time. He said they should continue the discussion, and jurisdictions should step up and have their own discussions amongst themselves to see what they are willing to do and how they are willing to contribute to work on this. He did not think this necessarily should fall on the lap of this organization; it falls on the jurisdictions.

Paul Greenlee had a couple of observations. He said trying to do transportation planning before land use planning is definitely putting the cart before the horse, especially in Washington State with the Growth Management Act. He said in California you could make a freeway and build it and they will come. That's not the way they do it in Washington. Under the Growth Management act, all of the planning authority exists with the municipalities, counties, cities, and towns. The RTC doesn't have any planning authority. What they can do is convene a planning process, but they don't actually have the authority to make and set down a plan. That exists with the county, cities, and towns.

Councilor Greenlee said the other thing that is touched on in the Visioning Study and for people who want to know where Oregon is coming from on this; there is the Oregon Encyclopedia. It's Oregonencyclopedia.org. It began with the Mount Hood freeway, and there you will find the history of the transformation of Oregon that begins with Governor Tom McCall and the transition from Mayor Strunk to the mayor's race between Neil Goldschmidt and Frank Ivancie. Oregon made a huge change in their visioning for the future. Councilor Greenlee said it is important for us to understand that if you look at any third or fourth bridge project, at least 75% of the footprint is in Oregon, not in Washington. So unless or until Oregon starts champing at the bit to get a corridor, talking about new crossings from this side of the river is frankly a waste of time. He said we need to think more about our own internal corridors in Clark County. As an economic developer in Clark County, he said he is not sure it is not in our interest for it to be difficult to cross the river. That actually tends to push economic development here, not over there.

Councilor Medvigy said this really explains why there have been no further steps in the last ten years. He said what he sees that they can do and should do is a study on what it is costing us today. He said we don't need to envision what the county is going to look like. We know what it looks like today; what is the cost in commerce? Councilor Medvigy said constituents are

asking why anything isn't being done. We need to look at what the impact to health is, the impact to commerce and to lost man hours in traffic. He said we should have a study, pay some money and maybe Oregon wants to join in. They can take it to the County Council and put it toward land development and say let's plan some corridors, but he said that would be a futile effort if we don't know where it's going to connect on the southern side. It has to be a regional item. We need to take the next step forward, and if we can't bring Oregon along, this body can go directly to the federal transportation highway system. Councilor Medvigy said we have a navigable river and a strategic National Defense Corridor, so maybe the national government would join in. We need to plan rights-of-way and have a future plan; let's just do our bit to put it to the federal government and say help us out here.

Chair McEnery-Ogle said she and Mayor Dalesandro meet monthly with the Mayors of Clark County. They will ask them if they would like to work on a land use for new corridors and they can check back in September.

Representative Vicki Kraft said she appreciated the meeting today. She said as she has come and talked about a third bridge they have all been gracious to entertain that dialogue at a high level. She said she thinks this is really strategic. She has introduced legislation in the last three sessions to take a look west of I-5 with the intent of reducing congestion on the I-5. She said she wanted to address the Councilor's comment about not being able to bring Oregon to the table. She reminded them all that they all, the county and the City, as well as the majority of state delegates, Legislators in putting together resolutions passing those and prioritizing the I-5 bridge replacement. That is what restarted the conversation. So she believes that if they show the will power and dedication to a third corridor and focus on getting what we need here in Washington, we have to have more crossings. Now is the time to do it. She encouraged this body to get a west third bridge. She also said public input is critical, but we need to help the public consider some of the potential objectives in getting that feedback.

Temple Lentz said some of the comments they have heard from staff and the reports and some of the speakers today talk about the intersection of land use and transportation. She said she knows that is actually coming up on the agenda. Councilor Lentz said she thought that insisting that we need a corridor without also insisting that we look at our land use is failing to take into account the full picture. As has been referenced in this study, the framework for their Comprehensive Plan and for all of their Land Use Planning in Clark County was set through a community process 25 years ago. She did say that she thinks that 25 years is a good point in time to take another look at the framework. If they are half way through their 50-year point, maybe it is a good time to take a look and see what has changed, what assumptions have changed and where they might be able to go from there. Councilor Lentz said since that does fall under Clark County to lead the land use planning for Clark County, if her colleague on the Council wanted to discuss with the Council, and they are coming up. They are beginning the work for the next update of the Comprehensive Plan; that may be a very good time to take a look at the framework and the underpinnings of all the assumptions. If the look that they talk about is a community process to discover what we need, what the community wants, and how

the different jurisdictions want to work together to achieve this vision and these goals. Councilor Lentz said that would be a very worthwhile conversation to have and she said she hoped that the Mayors at their gathering would talk about that. This would be a process that no jurisdiction could undertake alone; they would have to have the conversation together.

Bart Hansen said he thought Mayor Dalesandro hit it on the head when he said this is something we need to take a step back and look at land use and where Clark County stands on this. He said he would be interested to see where others and their council are on this. Councilor Hansen said he would also be interested to hear some of the connecting communities, cities, and the municipalities are going to fit on this. To take it back another level: Where does each district sit on this? How do they feel about something like this coming through at that magnitude? Moving from there are the different east-west connections. Councilor Hansen said it is nothing new to hear that he is a fan of replacing the I-5 Bridge. In looking at some of the options on the map, it is definitely worth a discussion, but we need to start the discussion where it needs to start.

Tom Lannen said all of this is new to him. He moved to Stevenson back when the first round of building the bridge was going on. He said they have their own bridge problems in their area. Commissioner Lannen said in looking at this Corridor Visioning, what is interesting for him, kind of looking at it with a different set of eyes, is the struggle that he sees between Portland and the north side of the river. There doesn't seem to be the level of cooperation that you would like to see. Some of the work that he has seen suggest that the bypasses on the east and west side would let them do what they want to do, but still meet the needs of interstate transportation and local. One of the things that caught his attention was when logistics was brought up. He was at a presentation of a cherry grower who was talking about the number of hours they have to get produce to Seattle to get on flights out of here. When things back up on I-5 and they can't get to Seattle and miss a flight, it's not just the local area. It really has a far reaching implication. Commissioner Lannen said he is hearing that they are looking at what the roles of the individual groups are. He said this group should be a catalyst for going forward, because transportation is our job.

VII. Integrated Transportation and Land Use Planning

Matt Ransom said this item would be covered by both Lynda David and Mark Harrington. Mr. Ransom said in reading the Summary that was attached to the Visioning memo, you will see time and again, develop the vision, synchronize it with land use, land use vision, and as Lynda pointed in her report, there was the convening of a conversation about the tool of scenario planning. That is a tool that the Federal Highway Administration was recommending as a worthwhile endeavor for local communities to go through. The tool itself is where you look at a different range of potential outcomes. As Lynda pointed out, the Vision Study was one potential outcome; but didn't account for investments in infrastructure and sewer systems, and water systems, all those things. The corridor is a transportation corridor and one community piece of infrastructure. Is all the other infrastructure the outcome that the community wanted to pursue? The study was very limited in its ability to say any of those items were good ideas.

It recommended in that report summary, a single page, develop the land use vision and to probably do that from a long-term standpoint. Mr. Ransom said what they wanted to do in today's report is to give them the benefit of that conversation that was held in 2011 and frame for them the dialogue that was had. Then that leaves the Board in a place where they are now, which is to pick up a question of what are the growth parameters. He said as Lynda will report, in Washington and the same in Oregon, they do plan under strict guidelines. They have sideboards in terms of planning that they can do. It begins at the local level, at the Comprehensive Plan level.

Lynda David referred to the memo included in the meeting packet. She said the presentation is going to focus on the state's Growth Management Act to provide a planning context for locals and RTC as the Regional Transportation Planning Organization for the region. Mark will talk about integration of land use and transportation planning.

Washington State's 1990 Growth Management Act (GMA) codified in RCW36.70A was adopted to address the management of growth, protection of critical areas and natural resource lands, designation of Urban Growth Areas, preparation of Comprehensive Plan, and implementation of capital investments. The statewide interest in growth management is expressed through 14 explicit GMA goals and requirements, but the focus is on local control and decision making, because local jurisdictions determine how to meet the goals and requirements through the local planning process. Given its population of over 50,000 and fast growth rate of more than 10% of growth in the ten years preceding May 16, 1995, Clark County is required to fully plan under the GMA.

Ms. David addressed the duties and functions under GMA. The County, cities, and RTC, as Regional Transportation Planning Organization for the region, have duties and functions required under the GMA. As part of the Growth Management planning process, Clark County adopted a Framework Plan in 1993. Its adoption came after extensive public outreach and participation to set the vision and reflect community values for Clark County's future. Under the GMA, the County is tasked with developing a set of county-wide planning policies in collaboration with the cities in the county. These policies are described in Clark County's 20-Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan to guide comprehensive plan development and to ensure consistency between comprehensive plans of the County and cities. Clark County and the cities in the county have a transportation element as part of their Comprehensive Plan and have a Transportation Capital Facilities Plan to report Growth Management planning objectives. Some jurisdictions opt to develop Transportation Systems Plans which further informs and supports the Growth Management planning process. As Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO) for the region, RTC's duties under GMA include: developing a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) consistent with county-wide planning policies; must review and certify that the transportation elements of local comprehensive plans are complete and are consistent with the RTP; and must develop a Regional Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The duties of the RTPO, which is RTC, primarily focus on consistency between plans.

The GMA establishes the pre-eminence of the Comprehensive Plan as the centerpiece of local planning. The Comp Plan has mandatory component elements. All elements are significant, but it is the land use element that should reflect the community's vision and direct future growth. It is the county and cities that control land use and have the authority to maintain consistency with their comprehensive plans through zoning and platting. Both Clark County and cities in the county have a transportation element as part of their comprehensive plans and also develop a capital facilities plan to support the growth management planning objectives.

Mark Harrington will touch briefly on integrated land use and transportation planning and provide a quick summary of the 2011 Scenario Planning Workshop that was hosted by RTC and presented by Federal Highway Administration as well as the Volpe Institute. To begin with, in Washington State, the Growth Management Act is what provides the basis for integrated transportation and land use planning. Each Comprehensive Plan has a land use element and a transportation element, and it works to develop a Capital Facilities Plan that identifies transportation system infrastructure and investment needs to support the Plans land use and growth. These plans acknowledge fiscal constraints, wetlands, topography, development, legal requirements such as GMA itself as well as federal and state environmental policies. There are market considerations, as well as fiscal constraints that the plans must address, such as have funding for investment transportation infrastructure, as well as water, sewer, power, public safety, as well as schools.

So while Comprehensive Plans and the Regional Transportation Plan look out 20 years in the future, they're updated more frequently, about every 5 to 7 years. These Plans look at where we are at present, and they focus on the next steps to take in moving forward to accommodate growth and change in the community. They look at locations for new urban lands, both their density and type, locations for the redevelopment of urban lands. They look at identifying infrastructure needs for those new lands, as well as vision for the funding for that infrastructure, and the planning needs for those. This type of planning is best done when there is some longer range guidance to provide a destination to which those next steps are taking. Back in 1993, the County and the community adopted the Framework Plan. This was done prior to the adoption of the County's first Comprehensive Plans under the state's Growth Management Act in the early 1990s. It was a 50-year vision; it went from 1990 to 2040. It contained county-wide planning policies to support that vision. It included things like land use, housing, policies on resource lands, rural lands, transportation facilities, Capital Facilities Plans, parks, open space, economic development, community design, and preservation all in support of that future vision. Our current plans are now looking at 2040, that same horizon. So we no longer have that long-range vision toward which where our next steps are pointing towards. It is not saying that we are pointing in the wrong direction; we just don't necessarily have a direction at which we're walking towards. That is very critical in making these long-term plans that we have. The Comp Plans move us in a direction that we all consider to be the direction we would like to be in.

So, back in 2011, RTC hosted this Scenario Planning Workshop to look at developing a long-range community vision and integrated land use and transportation planning. Scenario planning provides the tools and processes to define a community vision. It's to develop flexible and strategic strategies that can adapt to future uncertainties, and it supports a vision that is owned by the community and supported by community values. It is very much a community driven process.

Scenario planning has its long standing history in military strategic planning. What they really acknowledged in war planning was that plans need to be flexible to accommodate an ever changing and uncertain environment that they would find in any type of conflict or battle. When we move that into community planning, a long-range strategic planning method used to make flexible long-term plans or visions. It is a guide for a more immediate plan. It creates some plausible stories about the future, what we know, and then to incorporate trends that they may go in places that we don't expect or can't anticipate. It analyzes these interactions across multiple factors and trends and asks certain what if questions. Not just a single what if, but multiple what ifs. From there, it's most successful when it's built upon a community values and a process within the community. Mr. Harrington said he is now nearly 50 years old. When he thinks about what's happened during his lifetime, there's been a lot of change. He said a 50 year vision is kind of beyond his lifetime horizon.

Let's look back at the past 50 years, from 1968 to 2018; that was a good 50 years' worth of time. Consider what's changed, and it might give us some perspective about when we think about a 50 year planning horizon, we can't plan it. It's not the same type of planning that we do when we look at the next steps we take. It's much more uncertain. So yes, Clark County grew; it grew a lot. That wasn't the only thing that changed. We see those 18 years and under used to represent a third of the population. Now it's not even a quarter. In the future, it's trending to be considerably less. In fact, we're looking at a future where maybe the 18 and under population is less than the 65 and older population. These are social and demographic changes that are occurring. Minority population was at 1% in 1968. We're now at 20% and growing. Manufacturing affects the demographics. On the economic side, manufacturing used to be 25% of the jobs in Clark County; it is now at 7%. We see social change, participation of women in the work force. It used to be about half of what the men's participation ratio was in 1968. Now, they're reaching close to parity. We look at political change. In 1968, there were 12 women serving in congress. There are now 10 times as many; 127 now serve in Congress. Political change, in 1968 we're still in the midst of the Cold War. Just six years prior, was the Cuban Missile Crisis. People were on the edge of their seats expecting global nuclear war. No one thought 50 years from then, there would be no Soviet Union, there would be reunified Germany. Back in 1968, China was the seventh largest economy in the world, 1/13th of the annual GDP of the United States. Right now, China is chomping at our heels. Technology change: we are sending men into space with a slide rule to make calculations. There was not even a desk top calculator. Now we carry more computing power in our pocket than all of NASA did when they sent someone to the moon. Technology has changed rapidly. We take what's happening in the past 50 years and say, what is going to happen in the next 50? Who

made these types of prediction in 1968? They were just possibilities. So what will the future be? We humans tend to look at the future and say there's my most likely future. We do that because we look just to the past, and say that is likely to continue. We get more sophisticated, and say plus or minus few error points, and we have a prediction of our future. The question is we have all these big possible changes, new laws that add constraints, new technology, geopolitical change, economic change, and new social attitudes. All of these happen over that long 50-year time frame. Disruptions we really have a hard time predicting. So, those trends from 1968 didn't necessarily continue for 50 years; so what does the future look like?

We've seen predictions of hurricane paths. It starts from the hurricane and broadens out. It says in four to five days it will hit somewhere between northern Florida and North Carolina. So we have this cone of uncertainty. The further it gets out, it gets broader and broader. So when we are looking 50 years out, we're not just looking at two dimensions or even three dimensions. Our forecasts are multi-dimensional of what the future is going to look like. We have an increasing range of possibility. We look at this and throw up our hands and say we don't know the future so why look at it?

Governments and businesses have been looking at scenario planning as a way to deal with strategic planning for really long range future, and under tremendously uncertain circumstances. Within community planning, we look at four major questions to that. First starting with who are we, and where are we now? Who do we want to be, and where do we want to go? How do we get there given uncertainties of the future? What could this possibly look like? The one question, who are we? That often starts with a community values assessment. What are the common values of the community? These help under pin the basis for which the community vision is developed based off the community's values. Where are we now? This is answered by a collection of information and data that paints a picture of the community, not just the community but the systems, how they work and function within the community. So who lives in our community? Where do they live? Who are they? Where do they work? Where do they play? These systems, it's not just water or sewer, transportation or public safety, but our economic systems, education systems, health systems, and our natural systems within the region. Then we ask, who do we want to be and where do we want to go? Maybe where we're at is not where we want to stay. So this is answered by a visioning process using community values to help identify goals and desired outcomes. Many desired outcomes across a range of potential quality of life concerns. There are often many paths to a particular outcome, but it's those path choices that have impacts on data outcome as well as often the outcome of other particular desires that we have. Understanding common community values will help inform tradeoffs and compromise, and better yet, by starting with the values and desired out comes for the community provides the opportunity to explore new ideas and strategies that can support multiple outcomes that are valued by the community. How do we get there given uncertainties about the future?

We can't look at every possible future. So within scenario planning methods, they tend to look at four to five very different scenarios of possibilities of the future, a wide range. Then to

evaluate: one is not deemed to be more likely than the other. The idea that they can pick the one that is the most likely, they all are most likely. The goals develop a set of strategies that best navigate a wide range of possible futures leading to the outcomes that are desired by the community. In the end here, that community vision, we end with a community vision, but it is not a vision that is a forecast. It's not some detailed picture of the future, but it is a set of flexible strategies that preserve the best options for reaching out to the community values despite the uncertainties of the future. So it's a vision that's focused, centered, and balanced desires across a wide range of interests and issues. While scenario planning provides one way, and there's many ways to go about it, there are other ways to do that. But each one is going to comprise these things: there is going to be an extensive community engagement process. The community has to be involved in this in a deep way. They need to generate and own that vision. It's not going to be a vision that planners or government is going to try to sell to a skeptical public. It's going to involve close participation of multiple jurisdictions and agencies and stakeholders across the region. It's our multimodal transportation system is only one part of that future. There are a whole host of parts of competing interests across that future that compete for the funding and the impacts there are in that future. It's challenging, but it's worth the endeavor. Mr. Harrington tried to summarize six hours of information in a few minutes here. For those interested this is the link for the archive for that 2011 Scenario Planning workshop. It includes the materials, discussions, and the CTV coverage of the workshop. It lasted a day. <https://www.rtc.wa.gov/events/spw/>

VIII. Regional Studies Update

Mr. Ransom said the purpose of this item is to share with the Board many studies that RTC staff is tracking and he referred to the memo included in the meeting packet. RTC is doing studies, local agencies are working on Transportation System Plans, and the State Joint Transportation Committee just initiated a request for consultant proposals on a statewide priority study they are working on. RTC will be engaged in that. Mr. Ransom said he thinks that is where the Joint Transportation Committee and the legislature is looking at developing a 10-year priority list to inform their new funding proposal that we discussed this last year that was heard in the Senate. There may be reconsideration of that based on this discussion.

There are many studies that are going on down in Metro and the Portland region. Specific to topics that are of mutual interest to RTC are studies that were just launched. One study is a technical evaluation, sort of a bigger picture of congestion pricing within the Portland metropolitan area. It is something that this organization is interested in, and they will continue to track that. Mr. Ransom said they may want to look at it in terms of its applicability here. They're doing a level of service evaluation setting policy for levels of service on the freeway. It is called The Regional Mobility Policy. That work has just begun.

Thirdly, very germane to this conversation today, the Metro Council has authorized the reevaluation and a refresh of their 2040 Growth Concept Plan. That's the Metro region's 50-Year Comprehensive Land Use and Community Strategy. They have authorized a review of that to take a look at three key policy areas. 1) What does the new economy look like and are they

creating a land framework that supports the new economy? 2) What are the status and the continued need for preserving open space? 3) How are our infrastructure resilient and our communities resilient perhaps to issues such as climate change, change in weather patterns? Mr. Ransom said in the memo they will find links to materials. This is provided for members benefit and their staffs benefit. Their staff will hear it at the technical meeting next week. He encouraged members if they have direct interest or direct their staff to dig into the details. It is provided as information only.

The last sort of appendix to the memo is a gray sheet of paper. Mr. Ransom said there was a study, very similar, coincidentally, to RTC's Corridor Visioning Study, and has been referred to at a couple prior Board meetings. It was out of Washington County (OR), and they provided a link to that study. He said to take a look at the folio summary. It almost paraphrased exactly what the conclusions of RTC's study were which is: more work to be done; not a plan; and a study requires the community to figure out what they want to do. That's out of Washington County from this last year.

IX. Other Business

From the Board

Chair McEnery-Ogle said that moves them into the final piece of information from the board. She asked CEO from C-TRAN, Shawn Donaghy, if he had something for the Board.

Mr. Donaghy said they did; they actually have two announcements today. He said if you haven't seen their website or any of their social media feeds, they are actually involved in training a guide dog for the blind. His name is Jamboree. Mr. Donaghy said it's a neat program. Essentially, they get to keep the puppy for a year. They help some of their folks on the bus. They get acclimated with how transportation works for the blind community, and then they pass that dog along to someone in our community who needs it. They are very excited about the program. The second announcement, which the Mayor alluded to, is they are excited to be in their third straight year of increasing ridership, and as such they were awarded the North American Transportation System of the Year. It is not an easy feat to achieve. They only pick three transit systems in North America every year. C-TRAN falls into the category of 4 million to 20 million passengers in a mid-size, which is a large, large category. Mr. Donaghy said C-TRAN obviously did not accomplish this feat on its own. He said they have an amazing community that has an amazing group of elected officials that help push our community forward that they are proud to partner with. They have got a lot of private agencies that they partner with, and a lot of government agencies that they partner with. Mr. Donaghy said to say that this is a group effort is probably a little bit understated. He said everybody in this room had a piece of that, and they were glad to have everybody out to celebrate with them. He also said they appreciate their partnership with TriMet across the river. They help them with a lot of stuff, and so they're able to have that partnership both locally and regionally to solidify where they are. Mr. Donaghy had a bunch of award pins for anyone who didn't get one when they came to the event. He said these are limited edition. Mr. Donaghy wanted to take an opportunity to say

thanks to the community, because obviously that's just not an agency thing. It's a reflection of their customers, a reflection of their elected officials, a reflection of their community, and a reflection of the direction that Clark County wants to go and how they want transportation to be a piece of that. Mr. Donaghy said thanks to everyone in the room, and very thankful to everybody watching on TV.

C-TRAN and Mr. Donaghy were given a round of applause.

Chair McEnery-Ogle asked Carley Francis if she had some updates that she would like to give.

WSDOT SW Region Administrator Carley Francis said with respect to beginning work on the I-5 Bridge replacement, as she noted last month, there was funding provided by the Washington legislature in the 2019 session that is specific to restarting work on replacing the I-5 Bridges. The basis and the beginning of that work really is to reach out to partners and figure how to, in a collaborative way, with all of the entities, which is WSDOT, ODOT, C-TRAN, TriMet, the City of Vancouver, the City of Portland, as well as RTC and Metro., specifically, to figure out how to work together to build the project together, essentially. That work will take time, and ultimately, program work will, as is suggested in the legislation, it will reevaluate a purpose and need for replacement of those bridges. That means looking at the problem statements again, figuring out whether or not they are valid, figuring out what may be different now, and how to respond and bring forward a project that reflects both the issues that are at play today and any changes that have happened in context and how to address those issues going forward.

Shirley Craddick said she would like to add a couple comments to what Matt said regarding Metro's work on congestion pricing. She thanked Mr. Ransom for acknowledging that. Councilor Craddick said ODOT has been given direction by the State Legislature to focus on tolling on I-5 and I-205, but Metro's work on this is slightly different. It is looking at pricing strategies and their feasibility. It is a much broader look looking at corridor pricing, vehicles paying to enter or travel a corridor, vehicle miles traveled where there is a road user charge based on miles traveled, roadway pricing, a direct charge to use a specific roadway, and parking pricing, the impact that parking might have on specific areas of the region. It is strictly to see what they learn from this. Metro doesn't have the authority to implement in this. It is just to give them a perspective of if they were going to use congestion pricing as a way to influence driving behavior, which one would be the best choice. It would look at equity, making sure that no one group of people are more affected than another and look at safety. A significant impact from Metro is looking at the impact on climate, reducing their greenhouse gas emissions.

From the Executive Director

Chair McEnery-Ogle asked the Executive Director to present EHB 1584.

Mr. Ransom noted the memo included in the meeting packet and said this is a notice to the Board that after this meeting he is asking the Chair to sign letters to two Tribal Nations, the Cowlitz Tribe and Yakama Nation, to implement House Bill 1584. That Bill is where under law RTPOs in the State of Washington are required to invite Sovereign Tribal Nations to be participants in the RTPO process. It is a formal invitation. They are a Sovereign Nation. They

will receive our invitation request. Dependent upon their feedback, Mr. Ransom will engage and/or invite the Chair to participate with him, in any consultation or follow up conversation they may have. They will report back to the board when they hear a response. That will go out in the mail tomorrow.

Mr. Ransom had a second notice that was not listed on the agenda that he also wanted to notify the Board. He said in May, the Board adopted a resolution where by in order to keep RTC in alignment with state policy for getting their funds spent, the regional flexible funds, the Board authorized him, if necessary, to reallocate funds away from projects to other projects. It means taking monies out of a given project, and moving it over to another project in order to keep the money flowing and keep us concurrent with state policy. As of right now, the two projects that are waiting to secure and obligate their funds are still pending. Mr. Ransom was authorized by the Board as of August 15 to potentially make that change, if necessary. He said, of course, he is going to wait until the last minute and maybe then some. He just wanted to let the board know that he doesn't take this lightly. The Board did grant the authorization, but they will work with the partners to make sure that if their project is fundamentally delayed for another year, then they might have to take that step. However, if it's the 16th not the 15th, *Executive* discretion is required.

Councilor Medvigy said he liked the idea that Ed Barnes brought up regarding a resolution. He asked if they would consider putting it on the agenda to have a resolution to advance the money for the County's I-5, 179th Corridor. They failed to do that with the legislature last session, but hopeful they can in the future. Councilor Medvigy said it's important for their regional transportation to get that money advanced for 2023 now. He asked if they could get that on the agenda to discuss whether that's an appropriate position for the RTC to take.

Mr. Ransom asked if that was a question of him.

Councilor Medvigy said he was addressing the Chair, but...

Chair McEnery-Ogle said they don't have their lawyer in attendance today.

Mr. Ransom said he would take the question under advisement in terms of what is within their latitude. He said he thought, certainly a resolution is not policy; it's encouraging framing in of an issue. He wanted to make sure that they don't run afoul. He said he knows that Public Works staff is working on something, and he knows they and WSDOT are working jointly on things. Mr. Ransom would do some behind the scenes checking to see if it's in good form. If it is, he will report back and can consider something next month.

Councilor Hansen said to go back to what Councilor Craddick was saying as far as congestion pricing and implementation studies. He asked if RTC was going to have some sort of representation there, or even somebody there to see what is going on with their meetings as how it would integrate with C-TRAN, or how it would integrate with Clark County commuters, and how it would affect RTC or future projects that might have tolling involved.

Mr. Ransom said he wanted to distinguish between the ODOT work the RTC has been very directly engaged in, both at the technical level and this Board authorized him to submit comments to ODOT Transportation Commission last year, which he did. That is the technical study referred to in the memo. That is ongoing. Mr. Ransom said he is told by ODOT staff that is leading and managing that study that there's been a lot of the behind the scenes work and soon there may be more public work. He will keep the board apprised of that. The new study, as Councilor Craddick mentioned, is more regional in scope, exploratory. Mr. Ransom said he thought it would be his intent as the MPO that we should certainly follow. A strategic question for this community is we should probably follow, and perhaps ask the same questions. We know one thing as a point of most likely fact, new infrastructure, particularly major infrastructure, new corridors and new bridges will in part be funded by tolls as a user fee. So right there, we should be up to speed on these conversations. If we were in the Puget Sound, we would be 10 to 15 years ahead in this conversation. For our uniqueness, being a metro area of 2.4 million in population, we are sort of behind the curve. Most regions of this scale are both not only advanced in their conversations, perhaps using tolling when they do infrastructure updates. The long and short is yes, they will keep track of it. Mr. Ransom said he thinks they should bring that conversation back to this table and ask ourselves those broader questions. How that might apply here, and could in it the future?

Chair McEnery-Ogle said they did ask to participate.

Shawn Donaghy said to Councilor Hansen's point, outside of the RTC, he thinks there are agencies that need to be involved in that. He said he can only speak for C-TRAN, which is the fourth largest public transit agency in the State of Oregon, that they have reached to Metro and ODOT and have not heard anything about being a participant in the conversation about value pricing or tolling or whatever we're calling it. He wanted to make sure to that point they have the right people at the table. He said he was not suggesting that RTC as a body is not the right entity to be involved in those conversations, but there are individual government entities within Clark County that need to be at that table as well. He said they did advocate for that at the last JPACT meeting. He just wanted to make sure that was out there. C-TRAN has received letters from both entities saying they would be involved, and that has been months and they have not heard anything. Mr. Donaghy said he would like to move that forward if they could.

Chair McEnery-Ogle said they will be meeting back at their usual location next month on September 3rd, the Tuesday after Labor Day.

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, September 3, 2019, at 4 p.m.

X. Adjourn

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

Anne McEnergy-Ogle, Board of Directors Chair