

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Board of Directors
September 3, 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, September 3, 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
Carley Francis, WSDOT Regional Administrator
Bart Hansen, Vancouver Councilmember
Jim Herman, Port of Klickitat Commissioner
Scott Hughes, Port of Ridgefield Commissioner
Tom Lannen, Skamania County Commissioner
Temple Lentz, Clark County Councilor
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver Mayor
Gary Medvigy, Clark County Councilor
Scott Patterson, C-TRAN (Alternate
Eileen Quiring, Clark County Councilor
Melissa Smith, Camas Councilmember
Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1 Manager

Voting Board Members Absent:

Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor
Shawn Donaghy, C-TRAN Chief Executive Officer

Nonvoting Board Members Present:

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
Vicki Kraft, 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:

Ron Arp, Identity Clark County
Rian Davis, Clark County Assoc. of Realtors
Ray Delahanty, WSP USA
Kathy Fitzpatrick, MCEDD
Monica Fowler, C-TRAN
Sorin Garber, SGA Consulting
Chuck Green, Otak
Jim Hagar, Port of Vancouver
Jason Irving, MacKay Sposito
Terry Kearns, AECOM
Rob Klug, Clark County
John Ley, Citizen
Jessica Metta, MCEDD
Jeffrey Mize, The Columbian
Sharon Nasset, ETA/Third Bridge Now
Bryan Stebbins, Senator Murray's Office

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

MELISSA SMITH MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2019, MEETING AGENDA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY CARLEY FRANCIS AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

III. Call for Public Comments

John Ley from Camas thanked RTC for reviewing the 2008 Corridor Visioning Study last month. He spoke about new corridors crossing the Columbia River.

Temple Lentz and Gary Medvigy entered the meeting at 4:04 p.m. Rian Windsheimer entered the meeting at 4:05 p.m.

Ron Arp with Identity Clark County thanked Matt Ransom and Carley Francis for their good job of updating them on the various projects underway, current projects that are planned, and where they are headed in the future at the Business Leaders Roundtable and Transportation Summit they held on August 22, 2019. He also noted that the Oregon Transportation Commission has stepped up with a \$9 million commitment and an intention of another \$9 million next year getting them to a total of \$50 some million.

IV. Approval of August 6, 2019, Minutes

TOM LANNEN MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 6, 2019 MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MIKE DALESANDRO AND APPROVED. MELISSA SMITH ABSTAINED.

V. Consent Agenda

A. September Claims

TEMPLE LENTZ MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA SEPTEMBER CLAIMS. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BART HANSEN AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VI. 2019 Regional Grants – Project Evaluation and Prioritization

Dale Robins referred to the memorandum included in the meeting packet. He said RTC conducts a three-step grant process. First, they screen projects to make sure they're eligible. Second, they evaluate against the adopted criteria, and third, they select. Today, they are seeking acceptance of the first two steps in the evaluation, the screening and the evaluation steps.

Mr. Robins gave an overall introduction of the Federal funds that come to the state. Federal funds come to Washington State, and 62% of the funds go to Washington State Department of Transportation and 38% goes to local agencies. Those local agency funds are then allocated through lead agencies such as RTC as the MPO in the region. RTC uses their funds to implement the Regional Transportation Plan, the long-range plan; really, it is local agencies applying for funds. They also allow WSDOT to seek funding for operational improvements, such as traffic signals, ramp meters, and travel time signs. They also allow local agencies to promote state highway projects that are of significance to them, such as will be seen today, SR-502 / SR-503

intersection in Battle Ground. They use a competitive process as required by federal regulations. There is no direct allocation to any agency as also required by federal regulations. Also important is that they do program according to their Guide Book, which has been adopted by the Board, and which they have updated numerous times in front of the Board and they have adopted RTC criteria they use adopted last in April of 2019. It is also important to note that any year an agency's success varies from year to year due to competition. Some years agencies walk away with a lot of money, other years they might not get a lot. That is just the way things happen sometimes.

As part of this year's process, they have a one-time exception. Mr. Robins reminded that they had a bit of an issue hitting their obligation targets this last year. So what they did was they had a higher allocation than normal and a lower delivery of projects so they came up with this one-time cost exception that allows agencies to go beyond the \$4 million cap. This is for \$500,000 for right-of-way or \$1 million for construction, and the projects must be delivered by August 1, 2020 or they lose both their existing funds and the bonus funds. They had to put that caveat otherwise everyone would have applied. They only had two projects submitted: the City of Vancouver SE 1st Street for construction and Clark County NE 99th Street for right-of-way.

Mr. Robins provided a graphic that displayed their grant and TIP adoption process. It is important to note that local agencies really submit their priority projects to RTC. It is not RTC saying which projects should be funded. They had a total of 21 projects submitted for consideration this year. That is the most projects they have had in a single year. They did have more money than usual. Pages 2 and 3 of the memo provide a brief description of every project. Projects are reviewed for consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). In particular, if a project adds capacity, it needs to be listed in the RTP or it cannot be funded. Also, they have to be consistent with the policies of the Plan. In their review, all of the projects were qualified and eligible for funding. Projects are then evaluated by the RTC Board adopted criteria and placed in ranked order by scores. Page 4 of the memo has a table that shows how that is ranked as far as the scores. The criteria are multi-modal and are designed to address existing regional concerns. Air quality points are triple for CMAQ, which are Congestion Mitigation Air Quality type eligible projects. There was a separate table for those projects.

Member agencies were allowed to review their evaluations to make sure their scores were accurate. They then take those to the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC) who recommended approval at their last meeting, August 16. There is approximately \$14.2 million available which is the highest amount that they have had in previous years. This allows them to go quite far down the list. The shaded projects in the tables are below the cut line for funding for this year's projects. The full draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is available for a 30-day public review/comment period and available on RTC's website. Next month they will return with the funding scenario and the adoption of the Transportation Improvement Program. Mr. Robins provided a summery slide of the projects that are within the funding window. These are generally projects that would receive STBG funds. As can be seen, they go

quite a way down the list on projects being funded. Also provided was the table listing the CMAQ evaluation with the projects above the cut line in the funding window. Mr. Robins said if Board Members had specific questions on a project, he would try to answer those. Their next steps are to return to the September RTAC meeting and ask them to make a recommendation on the final funding. They have already had a discussion about that, and they'll make the final recommendation to adopt the TIP. They will return next month on October 1 for Board adoption of the awarding of grants. They will also look for adoption of the Transportation Improvement Program. One other thing they plan on bringing back is this last year RTAC has been working on a project delay policy since they had issues with obligation. They have been working on a new policy for the Board to consider on how they think they can avoid the issue they ran into this time last year. They are looking for action by the Board today to include the acceptance on the evaluation of the projects as recommended by RTAC.

Chair McEnerny-Ogle referred to page 4 of the memo with the two tables of project prioritization. She noted the scoring totals were in order but a couple of the ranking numbers were not.

Mr. Robins said that was a miss on his part. The projects were in the correct order, but the rank number just should have been updated. The shaded projects were still those under the cut line. The memo listed on the website would be updated with the corrected numbering.

Chair McEnerny-Ogle said the action they're looking for tonight is to accept the evaluation and the ranking, and then they will use those results and apply them to the final selection on October 1, 2019, Board meeting. They will use that information next month.

Eileen Quiring said number 9 in the Overall Evaluation project list, Clark County's NE 68th Street Sidewalk project is in the shaded area meaning that it did not get funded.

Mr. Robins said the funding did not go that far.

Councilor Quiring said it is really about funding at this point. It is one of their priorities. She said staff had input as well as RTC.

CARLEY FRANCIS MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE SCORING AS RECOMMENDED BY RTAC. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY TEMPLE LENTZ AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VII. Gorge Region Economic Development Strategy and Regional Transit Investments (Guest presentation from the Mid-Columbia Economic Development District)

Dale Robins introduced the Mid-Columbia Economic Development District or MCEDD staff and said he has been able to work with them over the years. MCEDD is a well-respected bi-state agency serving Skamania and Klickitat Counties, as well as the three counties in Oregon to the south of the area. They support economic growth within the region and have been working with local transit providers to develop a bi-state transit system. RTC has specifically worked with MCEDD in the development of the Human Services Transportation Plan and to obtain funding for their mobility manager over the years. MCEDD staff participates in Skamania and Klickitat Counties' Transportation Policy Committees, and RTC staff has regularly participated

with the Gorge Transit which talks about the transit service that they have in the Gorge. Mr. Robins said one thing they need to understand about the Mid-Columbia area is that the people really do see themselves as a region, despite the state line being the barrier in between. Jessica Metta is the Deputy Director of MCEDD and Kathy Fitzpatrick is the Mobility Manager who would share more about their work.

Jessica Metta thanked the Board for inviting them and especially thanked Dale for the invitation. Ms. Metta said she and Kathy Fitzpatrick were happy to come and share a bit about what they do in the region and the services that they provide especially for the transportation services. Ms. Metta said MCEDD is celebrating their 50th anniversary this year. In 1969, Skamania and Klickitat Counties on the Washington side and Hood River, WASCO, and Sherman Counties on the Oregon side, recognized the strong ties that connected them all. The economies of those five counties are closely linked and identified that they wanted to work together for the benefit of all. They came together to create a unique public-private governance model where they have elected officials from all of the counties and from the cities. They have private representatives from industry, from higher education, the ports, and the chambers. It is a large board that directs MCEDD, and they provide: regional coordination, business assistance, and technical assistance. They have about 20 employees now, and their office is in The Dalles, Oregon.

Ms. Metta said one of the unique services they bring to the region every five years is they have development of an Economic Development Strategy for the region. They see this as something that the community creates itself, and they are the facilitators of it. They have strong outreach, a multi-month process to involve all the varied stake holders in those five counties to talk about their strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats; where they see the Gorge going as an economy over the next five years; and what they need to do to get there. The plan is a very data-focused plan, and it is on their website www.mcedd.org. It's a great source for demographics, economic data for the region. From that they develop their vision statements. The focus really is helping to create jobs, raise wages, helping to diversify the economy, often improving the quality of life and maintaining the environment and protecting the environment. From the community pulling together, they identify their goals and objectives and action plans from there. On a five-year level, that is what they do. Every year they also develop an up to date project list that is larger infrastructure projects. Public works kind of projects that really help having that focus list they can identify grants and target funding opportunities to increase the amount of funding coming to the region. Some of the transportation projects that often show up on that list would be the White Salmon / Hood River Bridge. It is a key issue in the region. Also, the Columbia Gorge Regional Airport is very important to the region and often on the list for improving the runway at that site.

The action plan is based on a community system's premise that all elements are interconnected and must be vibrant and healthy to ensure a functioning economy for them to succeed. The innovation capacity and social/natural amenities elements both scored well in terms of existing efforts. The strategy focuses on the remaining elements: housing,

entrepreneurial environment, workforce, infrastructure, and regulatory environment. Klickitat County is home to their largest regional employer Insitu, a Boeing subsidiary, that is an international leader in unmanned aerial vehicles, or drones, for intelligence and surveillance. The drone industry in the Gorge as a whole is a national hub of innovation with over 20 companies in the supply chain. Klickitat County is also home to some of the largest wine grape production in Washington and is a leader in renewable energy production with wind farms and plans for a hydropower pump storage facility. Skamania County is important in the region particularly for timber and innovative forest products as well as manufacturing and tourism.

The focusing on transportation is actually under the infrastructure goal. Their motto is: Provide a safe and efficient regional transportation system to enhance the livability and vitality of the region. Their top three transportation priorities: 1) Coordinate transportation investments. A lot of the large projects they discussed, including the bridges and the Columbia Gorge Regional airport; 2) Enhance the safety of the transportation network; and 3) Provide a coordinated regional public transportation network to serve the needs of a mobile workforce.

MCEDD developed the transportation part of the plan, the economic development strategy, through Connect Mid-Columbia, which is something that Dale Robins participated in. It was a regional initiative to better inform and elevate their transportation priorities. They had stakeholders including Dale, their State departments of transportation, their regional transportation partners, city, county, and port officials, and representatives from private businesses to talk about their transportation issues in the Gorge. From those meetings and that process, that is what formed the transportation part of the plan as just discussed.

One of the transportation elements that MCEDD helps with in the region, as of February 2018, is they operate The LINK, the public transportation provider for Wasco County, Oregon. MCEDD also provides a regional Mobility Manager that focuses on the transportation planning and coordination issues. That is the position that Dale mentioned that is partially funded by the Washington State Consolidated Transit Grant. The Mobility Manager convenes the Gorge TransLink, which is an alliance of rural providers offering public transportation services in their five counties. So each one of their counties has its own rural transportation providers, and they benefit from having Kathy Fitzpatrick as their Mobility Manager.

Kathy Fitzpatrick said she would give some updates on the regional public transportation system, which in the last year and a half has significantly increased. They have got more buses on the road serving a fixed route. They are providing fixed route services for the community including the work force. That has been a real difference, especially with Klickitat County providing multiple round trips from White Salmon to Hood River and return and Goldendale to The Dalles and return. That is crossing over state lines and bridges connecting those communities on the western side and the eastern side of Klickitat County. That has been significant, not just for the people they're serving, but for the regional transportation system as a whole. Because as Klickitat County has been expanding their fixed route services, The LINK in Wasco County and CAT in Hood River County have also been expanding their services. This makes it possible for somebody to go from Goldendale to Portland now with only one

connection a few times a day and soon that will be just one connection, one transfer, multiple times a day, Monday through Sunday in November. That is a significant difference in real transportation for public transit in the Gorge.

Ms. Fitzpatrick said they have been relying a lot on technology to provide some of the services that riders need to get on the bus. She said they have the buses out there; the rubber hitting the road, so how do riders get on the bus; how do they use it? They have a mobile app that the providers, one by one are adopting. So far the Mount Adams Transportation Service (MATS) in Klickitat County, Hood River's CAT, and The LINK in Wasco County have adopted this mobile app. From your phone you can purchase a ticket, make a transfer; it makes it very easy. It also makes a very easy mobile app to provide employer programs. Last year they launched the Gorge Commuter Pass that was a partnership between CAT and MATS and ODOT's Columbia Gorge Express. That allows employers to buy into the program to provide each one of their employees with a pass that gives them unlimited access to transit for a year. Insitu has bought that pass. There is a very simple mobile app called HopThru that the three providers have adopted. All the rider has to do is click the app and the pass starts blinking. The driver just looks at the phone and waves the rider on through. They not only get all that data from the riders, where they are getting on and who is getting on, but is very easy for the riders as well. They can transfer from one to the other easily. For Insitu, for instance, who has campuses in both Hood River County and Klickitat County, it makes it very easy for them to ride the Mount Adams Transportation Services to get from one campus to the other or to get from Portland in the Vancouver area to Hood River and across the river to Klickitat County to get to their campuses. It has been a great success. They have other employers looking into purchasing the pass. They're working on the next agreement with Insitu. They are bundling this pass program with their employee benefit program, and so they are looking at launching kind of a newly shaped program for them this coming year.

They have a new website that they redeveloped. They have gone from 1992 to 2020 very quickly as far as websites are concerned. They have been using cutting edge technology tools to provide an interactive map for providers to provide GTFS data, the kind of data that all transit systems use and what Google maps uses, and Apple maps and Microsoft maps, important data. It is what they are using to show riders all the schedules side-by-side in a similar format so they are not having to go to different websites to download a schedule that looks different from another schedule and trying to figure out how to transfer from there. The website highlights all five of the transportation providers, their services individually, but really focuses on the regional connectivity and the information that the riders need to know. Because they have all this great service, slowly people find out about this service in their own region and in their local area. So, they launched an "Everybody Rides!" campaign, which was basically public awareness to let the community know the bus is for everyone. People are still figuring that out. It has been a couple years now since some of the fixed route systems have been on the road. It has been an incredible success. They focused on videos that they created with each one of the counties. For instance in Skamania County, they worked with the Sheriff's

Posse, the high school cheer leading squad, and Sasquatch for the video, and the video was shown. The website is www.gorgetranslink.com.

Kathy Fitzpatrick highlighted what was ahead for the Gorge Regional Transportation Strategy. She said they have lots of transportation plans in the Gorge; Rian Windsheimer has been a part of a lot of them on the Oregon side. They have Coordinated Transportation Plans; thanks to Dale for updating just recently Clark, Skamania, and Klickitat Counties' Human Services Plans. Each one of those counties has their own Coordinated Transportation Plan. They have the Columbia Gorge Transit Study, the Columbia Gorge Congestion and Safety Mitigation Study, and some of the counties have their own Transit Development or Master Plans. They have lots of Plans, but they don't have a regional plan. A regional plan looking at both corridors, SR-14 and I-84, and looking at all the communities that connect to those corridors.

So, ODOT granted MCEDD funding in the Special Transportation Improvement Plan. The grant, a new grant program they put together for funding to do a Regional Plan. Ms. Fitzpatrick said they will be inviting all of those around the table to help them to be a stakeholder and to partner and engage in this plan. They will be looking at ODOT, WSDOT, and RTC. They will be asking US Forest Service and others like State Parks who are property management, those property owners and management providers along the Gorge for significant tracks of land. They will be looking to the counties and cities and all sorts of stakeholders and those who are transit dependent and those who want to use transit for the work force. They will be looking at mitigating housing challenges and more connected transit services. Ms. Fitzpatrick said they are excited about this new project. She said she is reaching out to all the partners now and finding out how each partner wishes to engage and how much they can participate. It will be an important study. They will put all the studies together; they are not going to create anything new. They will put all the studies together and move forward from that point, not starting over again. She provided their contact information, and said folks could email them if they wanted to sign up.

Rian Windsheimer said he just wanted to say how excited he was about this. He said they have invested heavily in the Columbia River Gorge Express. He is excited to see what it can do for recreation in connecting their transit system into the Gorge and what that is growing into the community service allowing people access to jobs and other things and by pulling all this together and making transit a real alternative in the Gorge and across both bi-states is an exciting thing. He is looking forward to see how it comes together and working with them and trying to develop that into a sustainable future funding model that they can obtain. A lot of what they are doing is short-term grant funded and other things, and what they really need to do is figure out how they are going to be able to continue to expand something that the community is coming to expect. It makes a need to be successful; he said they are there to help it be successful.

Tom Lannen said he has worked with the MCEDD folks and the other Commissioners for a time now. He applauds their effort. He said he looks forward, as Rian said, to where they eventually take it. He said he thinks the weak link right now is the Skamania County link. When looking at

how things have progressed, you have the Oregon side from Portland to The Dalles. He said he was curious when they made the arrangements with Insitu how many employees live and benefit from the Washington side of the river. Ms. Fitzpatrick said it is significant.

Commissioner Lannen said every morning 5,400 people in their county get up to get ready to go to work; 3,400, 65% leave the county. They go to White Salmon, Hood River, and a majority of them come to Vancouver and Portland. He said long term, there is a huge potential for what could happen if they could get a sustainable link through Skamania County.

Jim Herman asked if Bingen still had their bus running or if they had deferred to this system.

Ms. Fitzpatrick said they discontinued Eagle One, and they are very interested in connecting the dot between Carson and Bingen using public transit. They really want to support the community public service instead of just plowing money into their own private bus that doesn't serve the community. They are very community minded in that way, and MCEDD is very happy that they are. They would like the services expanded.

Chair McEnery-Ogle said 50 years of bi-state collaboration is wonderful and offered congratulations. She said they met about 20 pedestrian coming and going across the Bridge of the Gods on that Pacific Crest Trail daily. She said she is amazed at how many people cross that bridge on foot and was sure they could benefit from a strong transit piece.

Mr. Ransom provided some context. He thanked Jessica and Kathy for making the trip, and also thanked them for the partnership. He said a lot of what was heard today is behind the scenes. He said Members know at their own local agencies and organizations so much of the work happens and nobody hears about it. At times he said we need to share with people what's being done and the attempts at service. Mr. Ransom said he thinks their partnership, RTC's partnership, with MCEDD is long standing. A lot of that is personal relations, and also just the commitment to try to make the Gorge a better place. That's the Gorge in the inclusive, like one region kind of statement. Mr. Ransom thanked them for their leadership and the work they do. He said he wanted to create a link also to what they're doing here in Clark County. One of the reasons he wanted MCEDD to participant today is to showcase what by any definition they may be modest saying. He said Dale Robins told him this earlier today. MCEDD is almost a national model, in some respect, for bi-state collaboration. Mr. Ransom said we shouldn't be modest in recognizing that.

So the question then turns to Clark County; which is what is the model we're using for a national model for bi-state collaboration? Specific to the MPO, we have had a Bi-State Committee that existed for a number of years, but in recent years has been somewhat dormant, in part, searching for a mission, maybe also searching for clarity of focus and purpose. A study, in lieu of the Committee meeting and having another meeting, they are now launching, and they've seen on their prior board agendas we've talked a couple of instances about this study they're doing with Metro called Columbia Connects. In part, the discovery process they're intending to undertake is how do we coordinate better? Mr. Ransom said he thinks it is, as Kathy pointed out, not creating new plans, not starting from scratch, but taking what we

have here, which is a lot of great work in a Portland - Vancouver metro area, carving out an area or circling an area, close in Vancouver, north side Portland area and asking these broader questions. Can we be coordinating better? What are the systems that we have? What is the economy that exists? Create a micro-chasm to then start to maybe become a bi-state conversation from a little different perspective. So often they're dominated from the infrastructure standpoint, which is obvious. You have a piece of infrastructure that exists that needs to be maintained. There is a larger exchange question that MCEDD gets into. It's not just about infrastructure. There are the priorities: housing, economic development, innovation, entrepreneurship. They have a lot of people doing great work in all these counties and all these regions, CREDC and others. But the larger questions are many of which they continue to tackle over the course of 50 years, which is how do we do this together across state lines? We have every structural reason to not talk to each other; two different Legislatures, two different Governors, two governing systems, that we have every reason to talk to each other, because we have one region. Those are the challenges. Mr. Ransom thanked them for their presentation and the work that they do. It is a model, and maybe they will be looking at that model for this Portland – Vancouver metro region, and what are some opportunities we can take from the work that you've done, and the established resume that you've put out for the people that you serve. We look forward to the continued partnership.

VIII. Legislative Affairs Update

Mr. Ransom said this discussion is in part prompted by a question raised last month. It was asking the board's interest in pushing forward like a policy resolution concerning the I-5, 179th interchange. Mr. Ransom said he figured since we don't often frame the conversation of legislative affairs as how RTC gets involved; he would sort of take one or two steps back, and frame for the directors and the public what we do as an organization when it comes to those concerns and provide some examples of how we engage legislatively. There are three topics that are worthy of further board dialogue. They will talk through each one of those. Some may invoke that they should weigh in on this; others may fall into the category of information sharing. Whether weighing in or information sharing, that's part of the larger umbrella, the legislative affairs.

Mr. Ransom referred to the memo included in the meeting packet. He said because we are a voluntary association of governments, which is the organizing statute in state law, and under federal law, Title 23, the Metropolitan Planning Organization. We are here as an ex officio board, not a legislatively elected, but here to represent different interests. The different interests that then create the consensus to then become the regional interest. Mr. Ransom said the reason why he framed it like that is that each entity around this table is going to have their interest and their specific interests. They may be project specific or policy interests. When we convene at this table, those come forward, but then also there's the collective interest. What we try to do as a basic premise of parameters is to advocate for the collective interest, recognizing that individual entities certainly pursue their self-interest and as is manifested at their local legislative level. When you look historically through RTC's

engagement a lot of our legislative affairs are about what he framed in the table in the memo, they set policy. The policies manifest in plans, in the Transportation Improvement Program, which is the list of projects. All of those create the collective interest of these are the priority projects or priority policies. That's one way we frame legislative affairs. Specific to his role as director, or staff's roll, or officials of RTC, the chair, and the vice chair, et cetera; if they speak on behalf of RTC, they're speaking on behalf, most often to share information. So they share information at their council meetings if he or his staff were to be invited. They share information with state or federal legislators. They do that within the context of largely, here are the priorities, here is what the board has done to establish what those priorities are, and we think somebody should do something about them may be one of the takeaways. The third way they get involve in legislative affairs is they support implementation. How they do that often would be, they will consult to your agencies or others looking to implement projects. They might help with grant applications. They might actually pursue conversations with state or federal officials about details of grant applications. Anything they can do in terms of helping agencies to implement their projects. That might be over the shoulder advice as Mr. Ransom or his staff has experience here in local government over the course of years. They might be a sounding board for your staffs to say here's a thought how you might get this fund or have you thought about this or that. A lot of that is behind the scenes to say how do we get the projects implemented. Those are the three primary categories. There's a lot of nuance in between each of those. As a framing of how we are involved, that's what we do. The paragraph listed below the table is what we don't do. What we don't do is necessarily specifically lobby for X, Y, and Z. However, in instances where we do, so that might be Matt talks to somebody and says, we need X million dollars for this project. That might be an example of lobbying. So under federal law, you're trying to advocate for a certain outcome with an elected official. Mr. Ransom said they are not prohibited from doing that. Whenever that is done, it's done within the frame work of the Board's approved a project list, the Board's approved a TIP, or the Board's approved a policy statement or a resolution, and then he speaks to that, or staff at RTC might speak to that. If it ever ran into that type of category, what they do need to do is bill his time differently or staff's time differently. So, the case would be, he can't use state funding or federal funding and lobby an official at the state or federal level using those monies. That is the dilemma there. We need to exclude those. Local dues that members pay help support and cross leverage our grants so that we can have local match, but also, if he were to be involved in those types of activities, they exclude his time. He would track his time separately to say this is the kind of conversation that may be interpreted as such and prohibit that from ever being billed from a grant. This keeps us within the parameters of the law. Again, if people were to ask, do you lobby, I think the general answer is we try to really advocate for implementation of projects, share information about implementation of projects, and do it at the collective sense. What he thinks is not in the interest of RTC is to necessarily advocate for one agency's project other another agency's project. So where viewpoints or issues are opposing, we try to stay out of those issues for obvious reasons.

Mr. Ransom provided a couple of examples of recent activities. One of the most notable things we do in terms of creating a policy frame work for our region's priority projects is the Board typically sees as part of the Clark County Transportation Alliance will see the policy statement annually. This last year, we adopted a two-year cycle, so they will not see it this coming year. That was attached to the memo for reference. This would cover priority transportation projects that are of interest and policy issues. This was most recently adopted by the RTC Board within the last several months for the 2019 - 2020 legislative sessions. The activity is led by the Identity Clark County. RTC provides technical support in terms of validating projects, coordinating some of the review of projects, talking with member staffs, et cetera. The lead sponsor would be Identity Clark County. RTC is also a participant in their annual legislative days up in Olympia where they present to the state delegation. We talk often with members of the public and members of the legislature about this statement. This would be a good example of a collective statement. At times they do adopt policy resolutions. These would be specific resolutions pertaining to a project of regional interest. Within the last three years, the Board's adopted a couple of resolutions related to replacement of the I-5 Bridge. This Board did advocate, as a specific example, for the creation of a new state process whereby the I-5 Bridge could be designated a project of statewide significance. The Board took a resolution forward, as well as many other local agencies, that supported the change in state law. Even where we adopt resolutions that are specific to a project, most often it is done within the context of, this is really regionally supported. Other agencies might be doing it individually, and so RTC weighs in as a matter of consensus as a Regional Transportation Planning Organization. Then the third example is Mr. Ransom is often contacted by state or federal officials, their staffs most specifically, more often with state legislators. Federal legislators, Members of Congress, he doesn't meet with per se, but their staffs consult with him about what the issues here regionally are and the project priorities. That falls within the information sharing category. Mr. Ransom paused at this juncture before they get into the three issues before the Board. He asked if there were any questions about the general activities and how the organization gets involved in legislative affairs.

Gary Medvigy said he took it that most of this had to do with the request to look at the issue of whether they could have a resolution to advance the funding for the 179th I-5 interchange project. He asked if he was talking more broadly than that.

Mr. Ransom said he wanted to introduce for everybody's benefit how we get involved legislatively, and then next on the topic is that project specifically where the board can talk about that.

Chair McEnery-Ogle said seeing no further questions, go ahead.

Mr. Ransom said turning to that question, at the last board meeting the question arose, could the Board advocate in support of moving money forward for the I-5 179th interchange project. He took the question under advisement; he has written a quick summary in the memo, and the Board can certainly debate whether further input is warranted. A little bit of background context. That project, a priority regional project has been on the RTP for a number of years. It

has also been on the top 10 list within our region of priors to be funded. In the Connecting Washington Build, that project was funded at the tune of \$50 million. However, the issue he believes that has arisen regionally is the programming of the funds. So when the funds were committed to be available for expenditure was in the outer years of the Connecting Washington Build. As you can imagine, at the statewide level having a \$16 billion bill, they have to stagger when projects are completed. That is an issue here regionally, which is it is on the outer year. In recent legislative session, he said he believes some funds were moved forward or maybe not moved forward, but there was a special appropriation, \$500,000 to get some early planning work and those were committed in the 2017-2019 biennium. That's what has happened at the state level. Mr. Ransom said he understood through his conversations with WSDOT and Clark County staff that there's a lot of predevelopment work that's ongoing. That kind of work includes studies, conceptual engineering, and evaluation trying to get a sense of what the scope of the project is. Also, very aware, as many of you might be by reading the paper following the Clark County policy issues, that Clark County is then working with their public works director and a different consortium of private interests to see if they could create a funding plan for their portion of that project work. If you'll look at the total scope of the project, it is worth tens of millions of dollars. There's a County portion and a WSDOT portion. The WSDOT portion is funded in Connecting Washington, not sure if it's fully funded, but at least there's an award of \$50 million in the Connecting Washington Bill. The Clark County portion, as he understands it is in development. The County Council has taken preliminary steps to try to implement what that might look like from a multi-party funding formula standpoint.

So, legislative activity of this organization, most recently in the 2019-2020 legislative policy statement, you'll see that was identified as a regional priority to be moved forward. The way it's characterized here on page two under action two, the statements support acceleration of projects such as, economically vital interchange improvements at I-5 179th Street. It called that out specific to say, that's a regional priority, but you see the language there which is such as, meaning if there were other opportunities to accelerate other projects that might be in the region's interest as well. The attempt might be not to just single handedly point out one project, but to say if all these can be done sooner that's in the region's interest. That brings us to the question right now, which is he presumes, by assumption that acceleration of that project is still in the interest of the region. Mr. Ransom said his current intent would be to continue to support that. When he says that, RTC as the institution would continue to support that. He as Director would advocate whenever he is able to support that. The question then turns to whether additional advocacy is warranted by this Board in the form of a specific resolution. It is certainly within the purview of the Board to do that. This could be a policy type of resolution not unlike what it's done for the I-5 Bridge related matters or other matters. It doesn't run afoul of any legal frame work. It's within the bounds of this Board to offer that if that were to be additional inducement to move that project forward. As it stands, it's a priority of the region. How or when additional pushes are needed or necessary is subject to this group's impression or sense of need.

Chair McEnery-Ogle said in looking at the list from the Alliance, what other items are in the Connecting Washington package that are on this list?

Mr. Ransom said he would cite what he could recall off memory, and invite WSDOT Administrator Francis to fill in: I-5/179th Street; Battle Ground SR-502/SR-503 intersection; Vancouver Mill Plain Corridor Improvement I-5 to the Port of Vancouver; Mill Plain Interchange Improvement; SR-14 Washougal Intersection Roundabout Improvements.

Carley Francis said she thought that might be the list for this region. It is not all represented on the Policy Statement, because some of those things either had efficiency of time reflected and others folks are waiting until they come about, such as I-5 and Mill Plain isn't on here.

Chair McEnery-Ogle asked Ms. Francis on that Connecting Washington Package, the time line for each of those happens to be somewhere on some list of all the different projects. Vice Chair Hughes said it would be nice to get a list and when they are to receive the funding.

Carley Francis said most of the projects on the Alliance Statement are not Connecting Washington funded projects. The Connecting Washington information, when those are funded is available on the WSDOT website. This is an interactive map that you can pull the information regarding when it sits in the 16-year package. The 179th project is about half way through that package with funding. Many of the Alliance listed projects are unfunded, so there wouldn't be a time frame to associate because they're unfunded.

Chair McEnery-Ogle said so accelerated funding for one without evaluating the entire package for Southwest Washington might be premature tonight.

Eileen Quiring said she would like to ask to actually have a discussion about accelerating this and the possibility of a resolution. She said she would like to get a feel from the directors here what their feeling is on it. Since the council has taken action to lift the urban holding in that area. They have worked with developers to see to it that they're paying 19%, 20% of the cost that the county needs. So she would like to find out from the rest of the group whether it's something they would entertain, a resolution fairly quickly, or at least prior to the legislative session.

Chair McEnery-Ogle was looking for response from members.

Carley Francis said she appreciates their partnership with Clark County. She said she thinks in general they, with the space that they sit in within the legislature, they try to be very careful how and when they attach themselves to advocacy in that way. As a full disclosure, they probably have to abstain from a vote on that because it's not really their place, but she said she appreciated the spirit of the conversation.

Chair McEnery-Ogle asked if she could though, if they wanted in the future, give them a list of the Connecting Washington projects.

Carley Francis said she certainly could do that.

Chair McEnery-Ogle asked for a list from our region and their schedule of when they would be funded.

Ms. Francis said she could bring that to the next meeting.

Vice Chair Hughes asked if that list could be distributed prior to the next meeting.

Ms. Francis would provide that earlier and work with Matt to get that distributed to members.

Gary Medvigy said in listening to how this information was given in great detail, he thanked Matt for the presentation. He said it had a degree of negativity, and along with the Mayor's question for unfunded projects, he didn't see that the 179th project competes with it. Councilor Medvigy said it is an impact on the I-5 corridor; it's a regional impact, and it would greatly help alleviate that if they could get that funding earlier. He said if they have a resolution from this body saying, this is important to us legislature, why don't you move it up, it's not the exclusion of any other project. He added that perhaps they don't want to get in the business of doing this on every single project, but it seems like a monumental enough project that has been funded, although in out years, that they could make a simple statement to our legislature that they support them moving it up. He didn't think it commits them to anything beyond that. He didn't think it excludes any other project, and he didn't think it pushes anyone down on the funding priority list. He said he would be interested, as Councilor Quiring said, just to hear what others think about it.

Mayor Dalesandro said they have multiple jurisdictions to consider here given the fact that his position is Battle Ground and includes Ridgefield, La Center, and Yacolt. He said he is hoping to have the conversation with his council and coming back with their recommendation and also conferring with the other jurisdictions to see where they're at. That would be similar to what they did with the other resolution regarding the project of significance. He said he wouldn't want to just rush into it at that point; he would have the conversation first and then come back.

Scott Hughes said he would have to second that, too. He said they know how the Port of Ridgefield feels, but they have two other ports to talk to.

Melissa Smith said she agreed with that, given that she also represented more than just Camas.

Eileen Quiring said she thought that this was great. All of the people sitting at this table actually represent a body, and she said she thinks it would be wonderful if they would bring it up to their body that they represent and come back to us. She said she thought this was a healthy discussion, and she asked everyone to check with their bodies to see how they feel about it. She thought it could be a good thing for Clark County if this Board did this. Councilor Quiring said they, the County Council, have worked on this for eight months.

Chair McEnery-Ogle asked Mayor Dalesandro and Councilor Smith if they would want the list of projects before they have that conversation with their colleagues.

Mayor Dalesandro said it is probably not a bad idea to have some information. Councilor Smith said it would be helpful to have.

Tom Lannen said basically, he will go with the majority of the discussion that he hears, because, again, although they are outlanders, the I-5 is a principle corridor for everything major. It does affect them even if it is a little in the distance.

Chair McEnery-Ogle said it looks like they have a bit of home work. She asked Carley Francis to prepare a list and time line on that list and send it to Matt. She asked Matt to send that out as soon as possible so folks have the opportunity to have discussions with their councils and ports and different groups. Chair McEnery-Ogle said they will put it on the agenda to have a discussion about accelerating projects in our legislative package.

Mr. Ransom said in looking at that and thinking about the crafting of the policy statement, he said the paragraph referred to in the CCTA Statement says: we support acceleration of projects, and we support project budget adjustments. Both of those are key parameters that could clearly be broad statements and help each entity individually as those legislative dialogue begins. He said he would proceed with that input.

Mr. Ransom said there is another issue that is in front of voters of the state of Washington. He was presenting this in an attempt to portray facts and bring detail regionally, which there's an initiative of the people that has been filed and approved for the ballot. It is referred to as Initiative 976. It is often referred to as the \$30 Tab Initiative. He has presented it in the memo, for disclosure purposes, how it will appear on the ballot. He said he wanted to give a little context regionally, and that is there will be impacts both potentially positive to individuals and or businesses that register vehicles within the state and specific to a couple municipalities within Clark County, but there is also potential negative impact to local agencies, state agencies, et cetera, that collect these funds. Mr. Ransom described that. As a general idea, I-976 would repeal authorizing legislation which enables both local and regional jurisdictions to assess additional car tab registration fees through authority called the Transportation Benefit District. There are two municipalities here in Clark County that have enacted a Transportation Benefit District, often referred to as a TBD. The two that have implemented the fee are the City of Vancouver and the City of Battle Ground. Two others have authorized the TBD but are not currently collecting revenue; that would be the City of Ridgefield and the City of Washougal. Mr. Ransom said he is not aware that anyone else has implemented that. Battle Ground's current assessment, which they use primarily for pavement and preservation purposes, is \$20 per vehicle registered. He is not sure of any of the exclusions, generally speaking, \$20 per vehicle. The City of Vancouver's current assessment is \$40 per vehicle. If I-976 passed, as understood, those fees would be rolled back to \$30 statewide, and local jurisdictions would be precluded; essentially, the TBD would be eliminated and local jurisdictions and regional agencies would no longer be able to assess those fees. Mr. Ransom said they have talked at this table and even in the Regional Transportation Plan discussions about there is under TBD authority the ability to assess a countywide levee in a couple different forms. You could do a countywide gas tax and countywide property tax voted of the people. He said gas tax might be councilmanic, and you can also do a countywide license tab fee. Those haven't been used, but as we look forward, having the ability to utilize that tool has been a value at some level, at the

local government level. In the Central Puget Sound region, the regional transit provider, Sound Transit has used that, and they have voted that in through special levees that they have assessed, and they use that for regional transit service.

As Mr. Ransom states in the memo, obviously if you're an individual or business that registers a vehicle, you might save money. The estimated local impact to Vancouver, Mr. Ransom said he believed they primarily use those monies for pavement and preservation, and to his understanding, some of those monies for safety improvements and matching local capital improvements, so they use it for the extent of their transportation program. Battle Ground primarily uses that for pavement preservation activities. WSDOT would potentially have a revenue loss, and the Office of Financial Management has provided a very detailed assessment year by year over the course of a six or seven year assessment of what the potential impacts would be to the state, and you can see how this might ripple forward. C-TRAN revenue loss, in talking to the C-TRAN CEO, Mr. Donaghy, Mr. Ransom didn't have an exact number. He characterized it more of an indirect effect to C-TRAN. They are funded through operations by local levees. So, the indirect impact would be state grant programs that they pursue. An example may be a Regional Mobility Grant, which they use for capital improvements and special projects, and that might be impacted by this initiative, so they may have less access to state grant funds.

Mr. Ransom offered an observation, which is there are a lot of efforts underway, both on the pro and the con side to inform the public. He said he is aware that Vancouver, as a legislative body, has enacted a resolution. In conferring with RTC's General Counsel, they are of the opinion that advocacy by this organization for an initiative of the people is really not within the purview of this type of agency. The reason for this is RTC is not a legislatively elected body; they are a volunteer association of governments. Typically, the way the statute is written, and the Counsel can add to this, is Ex-officio Boards like RTC need to defer from weighing in on citizen initiatives. Mr. Ransom had RTC General Counsel Ted Gathe provide other guidance on that matter.

Mr. Gathe said he thinks the statute is pretty clear. It says, he was referring to RCW's which is the general authorization for legislative activities of state agencies and other units of governments which applies to local government. It says in local government, an elected legislative body of the local government does have the ability to take a pro or con position on an Initiative through a resolution, but it requires an open public hearing and an opportunity for both the legislative body as well as citizens if they're allowed to comment at the legislative hearing to do so and then adopt a resolution following that. The key language though, is an elected legislative body. Mr. Gathe said their Executive Director has pointed out that they serve here in an ex-officio capacity even though a number of members are elected officials for their own local government entities. Mr. Gathe said it's his opinion that as a body, RTC does not have the authority to entertain such a resolution.

Mr. Ransom said they would conclude that by saying we'll see what happens, but there would be some loss of revenue here locally, and then individuals may receive some cost savings.

Mr. Ransom said the third matter that the Board may be interested in reviewing when it comes to legislative affairs would be our federal legislative agenda. He briefly described this. In December of 2015, the current Federal Transportation Act, called the FAST Act, was enacted into law. It runs through 2020. At the Congressional level, there is a lot of emergent discussion about the reauthorization of the FAST Act. As one can imagine maybe reading the paper conjecture about whether it be this huge transportation spending bill or just continuing resolutions, which is what Congress does to reauthorize current law at existing funding levels. Mr. Ransom said of course, we don't know where that might end up. Often MPOs weigh in with their thoughts or policy statements that they then share with their members of Congress. This organization by history has not generally done that. In talking with his colleagues across the state, others across the nation that he bumps into, as well as our peer MPO down south, many of them do weigh in with the federal legislative agenda. He gave a couple of examples in the memo that they could refer to. One is by the national Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (AMPO). They have started to prepare a bill analysis, because there are bills that have begun to be introduced at Senate and House Committees for policy evaluation of what might be in the next FAST Act. AMPO has a very extensive review of that. He also provided a link to our peer Metro, south of us, what their Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) weighed in with this spring. Each year they take a trip of their members to Washington, D.C. to share with members of Congress. They often meet with our members of the Congressional Delegation as well, as part of the Bi-State endeavor. Earlier this year, Metro weighed in prior to their trip to D.C. with a policy statement. Mr. Ransom provided a link in the memo for members to refer to. His thought is that they have a good basis for starting to think about whether this board wants to weigh in with some specific statements for our members of Congress. If this Board were to entertain that idea, Mr. Ransom might offer two ways to approach it. One would be the CCTA's policy statement represents really a project specific list. It's a shorter term, within the next six year priority list, and it is a good representation of projects. He didn't think there was a need necessarily to go back through and rehash the projects, because this is a good composite right now. What they might want to do is put a cover letter or cover memo or a policy statement resolution, whatever that might look like, on top of the CCTA Policy Statement that says in addition to these projects, because there's conversation about, if earmarking was going to come back or never come back, or are there going to be special grant programs for a significant piece of infrastructure, for example the I-5 Bridge, and maybe a special program that could be reauthorized to provide special bonding authority, and so on. Project wise, Mr. Ransom said he thought they have a good basis. They may want to, or may consider, adding on top of that some policy statements that we could then share with our Congressional Delegation. He offered the impression that he thought there is value in that. He didn't think there was a need to start from scratch, build on top of this, maybe look at the AMPO priorities that they've started to track, maybe look at our peer Metro and what they've articulated. Mr. Ransom said if members are interested in that kind of advocacy at the federal level for this next reauthorization, they can start that conversation now. He thinks timing wise there may be value, and they could dovetail that in even with this earlier

discussion about Connecting Washington projects to look at a policy statement for our federal delegation.

Chair McEnery-Ogle said she knows the City of Vancouver would appreciate that cover memo.

Vice Chair Scott Hughes asked if Fast Act funds were in addition to the gas taxes collected federally.

Mr. Ransom said it is largely how they allocate those funds. The feds have not increased the federal gas tax since 1993. So they have a fixed pot of funds, and every reauthorization of federal law in certain instances, they adopt new special programs. An example of this is this major capital funding program called TIFIA Loans (Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act). It is a special loan program where the debt of the loan is backed by the U.S. government, which means you can get them at a better rate. They then loan them to projects that might need a long-term debt structure. Back in the I-5 Bridge financing plan discussion, some five or six years ago, there was conversation about if that project could through WSDOT and ODOT secure a TIFIA loan. That would be a lower cost way to finance a long-term debt. Another example of what the FAST Act or the replacement may be is there has been a shift in federal policy to move away from earmarking, which has been dissolved as a congressional process, and the USDOT has turned more to competitive grant programs, some not unlike what we do here regionally and spoke to first on the agenda. They then now through the Tiger grant, which is what it's been referred as, or what's now named the Build grant, the local agencies submit applications to the feds each year under that call for projects. They award across the nation 20 or 30 projects of significance. Mr. Ransom said the City of Washougal has pursued Tiger grants in the past. The Port of Vancouver has pursued Tiger grants. Those are the kind of things that are more rehashed, because they don't want to deal with the funding. They try to create new little buckets of programs. He said we might want to weigh in and say these are priorities and we think that they ought to be reauthorized or something like that.

Chair McEnery-Ogle said she didn't see any harm in having him prepare a cover memo.

Chair McEnery-Ogle said before they leave this item, she asked Councilor Quiring and Councilors Medvigy and Lentz to prepare a memo on that northeast 179th interchange for the Board so they know the scope of the project and the funding that you've approved in that.

IX. Other Business

From the Board

Chair McEnery-Ogle said she was sure that members had heard about the loss of Nancy Baker recently. Nancy represented the Port of Vancouver as one of the Commissioners and served on the RTC Board of Directors for seven and a half years.

Scott Patterson said their Mill Plain BRT project reached its second or third milestone. They are at about 30% level of design. They have submitted the overall funding packet to the Federal Transit Administration. They should be getting a good indication early next year as to where they are going to fall in that funding line. Everything they're hearing is looking good. They are

very busy currently doing some door-to-door outreach with businesses and residences that are adjacent to the proposed station locations. They have had a lot of positive feedback. There are a couple of areas where they're trying to wrestle with some pretty significant traffic challenges. That work is advancing again, and they expect to have some more information at the C-TRAN Board level, and they will keep this group updated as best as they can. Things are moving along very quickly. In addition to that, they are in the process of moving their administrative function over next to their new neighbors, WSDOT and Carley Francis. They look to be hosting a nice event in the not too distant future as well.

Carley Francis said they have had all sorts of news happening. This past month, they had the dedication of the Oregon Transportation Commission to the I-5 Bridge replacement. So that's for all the folks wondering when Oregon is coming to the table with money. They have, just as another comment about how that money comes to the table between two states over time. It never comes dollar for dollar at the same point in time. That is not how these things work with different legislative cycles and the different passages of time. She said she just didn't want anyone to have that expectation of dollar for dollar. They also had the naming of the members to the Joint Legislative Action Committee by Oregon, so now they have a body of 16 legislative elected officials from both states. She said they are looking to find a time to meet and discuss initiating activities. They are continuing to work on trying to figure out a game plan and vetting that game plan for setting the foundation between the project partners. That is the DOT's transit organizations, City of Portland, City of Vancouver, as well as Metro and RTC. That is not to diminish the extensive work that is needed through other stakeholders who issue permits, who sit around this table, and the public at large. Those are also key components going forward. Additionally, Oregon and Washington jointly submitted a letter to the Federal Highway Administration formally requesting an extension on repaying the federal funds previously expended on work to replace the I-5 Bridge. That letter has been submitted. The deadline for that repayment is at the end of the federal fiscal year this year, so that is September 30th. They submitted that about six weeks in advance hoping they have time to respond and time to consider that request.

Chair McEnery-Ogle said the City of Vancouver would be honored to host them if they choose to meet here and take them on a field trip to the tower of the bridge so they can see the cables as they are working, so let them know.

Gary Medvigy said he wanted to put this in two questions. At last month's meeting, Chair McEnery-Ogle had brought up that perhaps you would take the question of another corridor to the council of mayors. He said he didn't know if they since had a meeting or if she had one planned in the future. He was wondering if she had got an answer.

Chair McEnery-Ogle said the meeting is Sunday at Chutneys.

The second area Councilor Medvigy told Matt he appreciated the context when they were talking about the Mid-Columbia Economic Development District and bi-state cooperation, every time talking about that bi-state cooperation and corridors. He kept hearing the word corridors.

After that last meeting he said he watched the entire presentation by the engineering firm Fig on an eastern corridor, and he took Battle Ground's comments last time to heart. He said he has never stated a position on a tunnel, east-west corridor. He said that is for the engineers and land use planners in his opinion. But the presentation that was done in 2014, he said he thought Senator Rivers did the introduction, and a number of people in this room were present at it. He said it went into great detail in the benefits of an eastern corridor tying into 192nd Street and showed exactly where it can easily tie into I-84. This was an engineering company that's built magnificent bridges all over the country. He said that step of the Visioning Study wasn't mentioned at our last hearing. So it came up in the context of, now starting with County staff and look at our north-south corridors, our strategic road plan as we look towards planning. He said it's a ripe issue to talk about at this body. He said we can't do anything unless we talk in the context of where it is going to connect south of the river. His question to Matt was why that presentation and engineering work wasn't presented as having occurred in 2014.

Chair McEnerny-Ogle said before Matt responds, that was five years ago. She asked Councilor Medvigy if she had heard that the County Council is considering land use to develop corridors which would entail purchasing land using eminent domain on a new north-south corridor.

Councilor Medvigy said they were nowhere near that. He said there are a lot of preliminary steps that must occur. They are just starting the discussion to see what they have existing right now to see if any of these visioning plans, work that was done in 2014, if any of that is actually been solidified into the County's strategic planning. Councilor Medvigy said certainly, they need to talk to their constituents as to where these corridors could go. They are not anywhere near that stage yet.

Chair McEnerny-Ogle said so as we remember, because she was in this room for that discussion five years ago, absolutely, we want to move forward with additional bridges in the future, but she asked if the County was considering funding a new visioning plan that would entail all of us on a Comprehensive Plan timeline, because GMA would require that.

Councilor Medvigy said the simple answer is they haven't gotten to that point yet. They are not outside any normal processes for the Comprehensive Plan update, and they were looking at buildable lands. The answer is no; they have not gotten to that part.

Chair McEnerny-Ogle said we had that discussion five years ago; it was not part of a Comp Plan review.

Mr. Ransom said he would respond to the nature of the presentation last month. It was to primarily characterize for the Board work that this agency has done. His view and the decision that he made is to say, let's cover the studies that we did and then the follow up work, which was the scenario planning exercise also funded by this agency and co-funded by the Federal Highway Administration. The reason for that is to try to say this is what we did. Mr. Ransom said he is fully aware, as many of you might be, that there are other groups and or maybe respectively your agencies that have had conversations, but he tried to keep it more focused on that body of work to begin with.

From the Executive Director

Mr. Ransom said when Board Members' staff submits a showcase, they try to highlight them for the Board and then they become part of the permanent record. Those who are familiar with Evergreen Highway know that it is a two lane rural roadway, 20 feet of pavement, and there have been over the years increments of a walking path way or a sidewalk in different forms and widths that have been built. This showcase is a phase of the Evergreen Highway Trail that was built in recent years. The City of Vancouver submitted a showcase to document this work. The investment by this organization was about \$925,000. It built 2300 feet, and to be built, so preliminary plans have been developed for another 2300 feet of pedestrian walking improvement. It is a nice safety improvement that the City of Vancouver has been able to push forward for the community, a good use of RTC's federal funds.

The next matter is to inform Members of a business type of agreement called a Tri-party Agreement that is required under federal law. As an MPO, RTC must consult with WSDOT and C-TRAN as also co-recipients of federal funds to make sure that they are working together to fulfill the requirements of federal law and that they are coordinating properly. The last agreement that the Board adopted was five years ago. It is set to be renewed in October. A memorandum was included in the meeting packet. There is a track change version of the changes that are proposed to be made. There are a couple of additions where they characterize the work that RTC is doing on behalf of the agencies in the area of their VAST program, ITS regional signal system program. That's a component of federal law where they have to have a regional ITS plan, and that's something that RTC has had a long standing program management responsibility for. They are now documenting that. There are other track changes referring to updated citations to federal law. Mr. Ransom said to contact him if there are any questions about this. This will be brought back for the Board's approval. Mr. Ransom offered the observation that this isn't new policy; it is primarily just a procedural business type document. Reach out to him with any questions.

Mr. Ransom provided a quick update regarding House Bill 1584 implementation. This is RTC's requirement to invite Tribal Nations to participate on the RTC Board. He has sent the letters out, as he stated at the last meeting, and he received communication from Chairman Bill Iyall who is Chairman of the Cowlitz Indian tribe. He is interested in having conversations about joining RTC. Later this month, in September Mr. Ransom will likely sit down with him and other members of the tribe, as he sees necessary, to discuss more in-depth about RTC, what's required, and dues structure. Mr. Ransom said he does anticipate, as each member does, that all members of the Board pay operating dues to help support the agency. Mr. Ransom said they will talk through those things with him. He said they had a good conversation. He said by reference, and Chairman Iyall can say this when he joins the Board, he is very experienced in these matters. He used to work for the City of Tacoma as a project engineer and project manager. He used to pursue these types of funds and work on these issues as he was a participant in the Central Puget Sound Regional Council. He knows the process, and has a practical and operating basis for his participation and or others in the Indian tribe. Mr. Ransom

said he was very pleased with that interaction and look forward to future conversations with them.

Mr. Ransom said he wanted to get the Board up to speed on the message he made at the last meeting, which was they were almost at the cutting edge of not meeting their obligation projects whereby agencies have to commit the grant funds that RTC awards or they risk censure or sanctioning at the state level. He said he is pleased to report that maybe through the pressure or other that the two projects that were a little bit behind have both crossed the finish line. So they won't have to pursue any of those more extreme measures, which is great.

Mr. Ransom said it is not listed on the agenda, but there is a unique opportunity that Board Members may be interested in. The Transportation Commissions of Washington, Oregon, and California meet every other year or every three years and have a Joint Tri-State Meeting. It is going to be held at the Skamania Lodge Conference Center September 16th and 17th. Mr. Ransom has been invited to participant in a field tour on the 17th. He will be riding around on a bus with others as part of the Commission delegation. It is a good opportunity to talk about transportation bi-state and tri-state issues. Mr. Ransom said there is going to be quite a bit of discussion about new funding models, because both Oregon and Washington and he believed California have explored and are piloting this new system, the Road Usage Charge. This is a different way of trying to transition from the gas tax structure to more of a road usage fee structure. Mr. Ransom said he is sure they will talk about that issue, because it is a huge issue for them in the decades ahead.

The next meeting is on October 1st. Mr. Ransom will be sending out those issues that he is to follow up on within the next week.

Tom Lannen said on a positive note he told Carley Francis for many people in Skamania County, the Wind River Intersection roundabout, after much community wailing and gnashing of teeth, the project went forward. He said it has been flawless. It's a great job, on time, and they will get used to it. He said thank you for that. Ms. Francis said they have three new roundabouts on SR-14 this year.

X. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Anne McEnery-Ogle, Board of Directors Chair