Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Board of Directors
October 1, 2019, Meeting Minutes

I. Call to Order and Roll Call of Members

The Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council Board of Directors Meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Scott Hughes on Tuesday, October 1, 2019, at 4:00 p.m. at the Clark County Public Service Center Sixth Floor Training Room, 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington. The meeting was televised and recorded by CVTV. Attendance follows.

Voting Board Members Present:
Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor
Carley Francis, WSDOT Regional Administrator
Bart Hansen, Vancouver Councilmember
Scott Hughes, Port of Ridgefield Commissioner
Temple Lentz, Clark County Councilor
Gary Medvigy, Clark County Councilor
Ron Onslow, Ridgefield Councilmember (Alt.)
Scott Patterson, C-TRAN (Alternate)
Mandy Putney, ODOT (Alternate)
Eileen Quiring, Clark County Councilor
Melissa Smith, Camas Councilmember
Ty Stober, Vancouver Councilmember (Alt.)

Voting Board Members Absent:
Mike Dalesandro, Battle Ground Mayor
Shawn Donaghy, C-TRAN Chief Executive Officer
Jim Herman, Port of Klickitat Commissioner
Tom Lannen, Skamania County Commissioner
Anne McEnerny-Ogle, Vancouver Mayor
Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1 Manager

Nonvoting Board Members Present:
Larry Hoff, Representative 18th 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
Vicki Kraft, Representative 17th District
Ann Rivers, Senator 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
Ed Barnes, Citizen
Vincent Carpenter, WSU
Monica Fowler, C-TRAN
Sorin Garber, SGA Consulting
Richard Gill, Citizen
Jim Hagar, Port of Vancouver
Rob Klug, Clark County
Dale R. Lewis, Congresswoman Herrera Beutler's Office
Larry Keister, Port of Camas-Washougal Commissioner
Jeffrey Mize, The Columbian
Sharon Nasset, Third Bridge Now/ETA
Gabe Philips, WSDOT
Ahmad Qayoumi, Clark County
Ron Swaren, Citizen
Walter Valenta, Citizen

Staff Present:
Matt Ransom, Executive Director
Ted Gathe, Legal Counsel
Lynda David, Senior Transportation Planner
Mark Harrington, Senior Transportation Planner
Dale Robins, Senior Transportation Planner
Diane Workman, Administrative Assistant

II. Approval of the Board Agenda

MELISSA SMITH MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2019, MEETING AGENDA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY RON ONSLOW AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

III. Call for Public Comments

Vice Chair Hughes said this is the call for public comment. He said as part of that, RTC will be inviting comments on the 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program, and this will conclude the public comment period of the 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program.

Sharon Nasset from Portland is with the Third Bridge Now Economic Alliance. She spoke about the I-5 Transportation and Trade Partnership Study and the I-5 Transportation and Trade Task Force. Ms. Nasset also referred to the Clark County Transportation Alliance Policy Statement.

Temple Lentz entered the meeting at 4:04 p.m.

Ed Barnes from Vancouver said several years ago every jurisdiction in Clark County passed resolutions in support of moving forward with the I-5 Bridge. He said he is unaware of any of those being rescinded. Mr. Barnes said no one has put forth any money for study of another corridor for another crossing on the east or the west side, so they need to move forward and build the I-5 Bridge.

Ron Swaren from Portland spoke about seismic upgrading, and he doesn't think the I-5 Bridge is seriously challenged. He spoke of completing a west side section of a ring road and the need for more bridges across the Columbia River.

There were no further comments on the Transportation Improvement Program.

IV. Approval of September 3, 2019, Minutes

BART HANSEN MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2019 MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY CARLEY FRANCIS AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

V. Consent Agenda

A. October Claims

B. Agreement Relating to Mutual Responsibilities in Carrying Out the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process in the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council Metropolitan Planning Area: GCB 1935 Amendment, Resolution 10-19-21

C. Smart Communities Assessment: Professional Services Consulting Agreement, Resolution 10-19-22

D. Transportation Programming Guidebook: Project Delivery and Obligation Policy, Resolution 10-19-23

MELISSA SMITH MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA OCTOBER CLAIMS AND RESOLUTIONS 10-19-21, 10-19-22, AND 10-19-23. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY TEMPLE LENTZ AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VI. 2019 Regional Competitive Grant Awards, Resolution 10-19-24

Dale Robins referred to the resolution included in the meeting packet. He said RTC is responsible for selection of regional allocated Federal Highway Funds. This includes a number of programs: STBG, CMAQ, HIP, and TA. Those they are talking about today are the Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) program, the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program, and the Highway Improvement Program (HIP). The goal of the regional grant selection process is to implement the Regional Transportation Plan. It is important that people identify the needs in the Regional Transportation Plan, and the TIP is the programming of funds to implement that Plan. It's a competitive process. Last month the Board was presented the regional evaluation process. They use a three-step process: 1) Project Screening, 2) Evaluation and Ranking by Criteria, and 3) Project Selection and Programming.

They are proposing that 15 projects be awarded a total of $14.2 million. There are 17 projects total, because two projects have two funding sources and are double counted under individual funding programs. In comparison, last year they awarded $8.6 million, so it is a much bigger program than last year. As part of this year's process, they had a one-time bonus, which allowed projects that were already programmed in the TIP to exceed their $4 million grant award limit that they have set. It addresses a short-term obligation shortfall in 2020 and helps them to meet their obligation targets. As part of the condition for receiving that money, projects have to guarantee that they can obligate that phase by August 1, 2020. It was $1 million for construction and $500,000 for right-of-way.

They had two projects that received that funding. Northeast 99th Street received $500,000 for right-of-way, and the City of Vancouver would be proposed to receive $1 million for the Southeast First Street, which has two funding source to meet the $1 million. Additional information on all of the projects can be found in the resolution that provides a brief project description along with the funding that is to be proposed.

Under the Highway Infrastructure Program, they only had an additional $1 million to allocate and that went to Northeast 10th Avenue, a Clark County project. That is a project that was ready to go and the funding actually has a time line on it. The money has to be obligated by 2021 or the funds will be lost, so they want to get that out the door as quickly as possible.

Under the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program, CMAQ, they have $3.7 million and have a WSDOT project to do a Regional Signal System Coordination. This would link all of the signal systems in the region with the cities and county and WSDOT on one system. They also received $2.5 million for southbound ramps on I-205, from Padden Parkway to Mill Plain. The County received money for the Salmon Creek / Hazel Dell Adaptive Traffic Signal System.

Under the Surface Transportation Block Grant program, they awarded an additional $8 million. This included RTC planning projects; $2 million to the SR-502/SR-503 Intersection improvement by the City of Battle Ground; 18th Street received $637,500 in funds for right-of-way for the City of Vancouver; Clark County received $500,000 for Northeast 15th Avenue; and the City of Camas received $813,000 for NW 38th Avenue; Clark County's Salmon Creek/Hazel Dell Adaptive

project received CMAQ funds and would also receive $500,000 in STBG funds; Clark County's I-5/NE 179th Street project will receive $750,000; and Vancouver's Jefferson-Kauffman Realignment project will receive $1,840,000.

The Regional Transportation Advisory Committee, RTAC, reviewed this at their September meeting and recommended adoption of the projects as shown in Resolution 10-19-24, which includes the selection of 15 projects for approximately $14.2 million in regional allocated federal funds.

Shirley Craddick said she was not aware that there was a limit of $4 million for any one project. She asked how long that has been in place.

Mr. Robins said that has been an RTC policy. They only have so much money, and what they have done is put a limit of $4 million on every project that they fund. This is to help them provide to as many agencies as they can rather than have all of the money go to one project. If that one project is delayed, that could put them in a very bad spot in not hitting their obligation targets.

Councilor Craddick asked if that was reevaluated over time.

Mr. Robins said yes, they have a subcommittee that meets about every two to four years to review that. The limit used to be $3 million a number of years ago, and they bumped it up to $4 million; it could be bumped up every few years.

EILEEN QUIRING MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 10-19-24 THE 2019 REGIONAL COMPETITIVE GRANT AWARDS. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY GARY MEDVIGY AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Mandy Putney entered the meeting at 4:22 p.m.

VII. 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program, Resolution 10-19-25

Dale Robins referred to the resolution included in the meeting packet and also noted that at the table was a list of the public comments that were received regarding the 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program. The Transportation Improvement Program is a federal and state requirement. It is a four-year program of regionally significant projects. Projects are drawn from the Regional Transportation Plan, and the TIP must be adopted by the MPO by October 15 in order to make it into the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). It shows a commitment for funding over the next four years for transportation. Unlike the last process, where funds were allocated to RTC and projects are selected; projects are selected for funding through multiple sources. C-TRAN selects projects under the FTA program; WSDOT selects projects, and there are other sources of how projects are selected, but all projects are reviewed for consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan.

In this year's TIP, they have $343.8 million programmed over four years. There are 79 projects, and Mr. Robins showed the percentage of projects by type. In looking at the percentage of funding, there is a much different picture. The road projects are fairly significant in numbers; they also have a significant number of dollars. One of the big ones that show a difference on is

bridges. Bridges are very expensive, so thus they eat up a lot more money even though they have fewer projects associated with bridges.

Some of the major projects that they might see in the TIP include the I-5 Columbia River Interstate Bridge project programmed for $19 million in design money. They see $63 million programmed for I-5 East Fork Lewis River Northbound Bridge Replacement; $11 million for SE First Street; $3.6 million for bus replacements; and many other projects programmed over the four years.

Projects must be programmed in the Transportation Improvement Program as a condition to receive federal funds in particular, but the program really includes all regionally significant projects.

Mr. Robins said he does have actual physical copies of the TIP document if anyone would like a hard copy. The document was also provided as a link in the Board packet in order to review the projects listed. Please contact Mr. Robins if you want a hard copy. The action before the Board is for authorizing the first two years as being selected, meaning those projects programmed in 2020 and 2021 are eligible to move forward for obligation. The projects in the outer two years are more for planning. They are programming $343.8 million dollars / $126.1 million of that is federal funding, and $37.2 million of that is federal funds that were selected by RTC Board. Mr. Robins said this also states that RTC as the MPO is following the planning process which the projects are consistent with the RTP, the projects are financially constrained, and that they have followed the public participation process. The public participation process was opened over 30 days ago; they received a number of comments; the public comments distributed are comments received by the end of the day on Monday. No further comments have been received. A lot of the comments received were not even concerning a project listed in the TIP. Staff is looking for adoption. The RTAC committee reviewed the document at their September meeting and has recommended adoption of Resolution 10-19-25 which includes adoption of the 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Vice Chair Hughes asked if this was time sensitive and needed to be acted on. Mr. Robins said action needs to take place by October 15 in order to make it in the State TIP. It can be amended in in January, but that means it would not be in the STIP until February and no one could move their projects forward in January if they miss the October 15 deadline.

Eileen Quiring asked if the list of public comments distributed was the complete list. Mr. Robins said the list provided was all of the comments submitted regarding the 2020-2023 TIP; a summary of each of the comments.

Gary Medvigy asked process wise, how they start talking about, evaluating, and studying additional corridors. In starting to look at Comprehensive Plan update for the County, he is already hearing from staff that when looking at corridors this is really an issue for RTC. He said he hopes that Metro will step up and Clark County will step up and they can start moving the conversation to form a process to fund the appropriate studies.

Dale Robins said the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is a program, not a plan. The TIP lists projects that they reasonably expect funding for over the next four years that are regionally significant. If a project, such as studying a corridor, was funded, it had a project sponsor who was funding it, they could add it to the TIP document. If the project has funding, they can add it to the document if it is consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Bart Hansen told Councilor Medvigy that he thought a good way to start the process would be for him to get together with Councilor Julie Olson and have some listening stations in their districts, because that third bridge or corridor would probably go through his and Councilor Olson's districts, and it would be good to hear what their constituency thinks about a corridor going through that community. Councilor Medvigy said he didn't realize he was being addressed.

Councilor Hansen said the reason he was saying these districts was it would most likely be in these areas of Ridgefield or Battle Ground or Washougal. He said he would join them at the listening stations; he would love to hear what the constituencies would say. He said he would also like to hear from the cities that would have the direct impact, and then hear from the County Council as a whole. Councilor Hansen said he is not particularly interested in having a third bridge going through downtown Vancouver. He said this would be a good place to start that conversation and a low-cost way to start that conversation.

TEMPLE LENTZ MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 10-19-25. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BART HANSEN AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VIII. Legislative Affairs Update

Matt Ransom referred to the memorandum included in the meeting packet with a couple attachments. He said following the September Board meeting, the Board had requested additional information in the form of an update on the Connecting Washington Statewide Transportation Package, the status of projects and if they have not proceeded, where they are staged for programming and current law. Mr. Ransom distributed a memo to the Board on September 10, and a copy of that letter was attached. He provided a summary. When the Bill was enacted by the Legislature and signed into law July 2015, it set out a broad programming which is a schedule of when the projects would be funded according to when the bonds and taxes and income would accrue to the state. The department with the legislature laid out a schedule and that was published into law. There was an understanding that schedule or programming would have to be reevaluated periodically. The mechanism for reevaluation is the annual legislative session.

Mr. Ransom said he presented three instances where there had been changes to the project list since it was adopted into law in July 2015, and he enumerated a couple of examples. One example was where a piece of money, a $1 million for Mill Plain Interchange, was moved up to an earlier year to try and do better coordination with a project that was funded for construction earlier, which is the Port Access Improvement Project on the Mill Plain Couplet. There was another example where the project scope was essentially money moved from the Camas

Washougal Bridge to the segment of SR-14 just east of I-205. The second referred to I-205-164th. That was a reprogramming on the same corridor, but it was determined regionally that that was a more priority segment to be constructed earlier. The third example is additional funds to be programmed, new revenue that was identified and programmed then for the I-5/179th Interchange. In summary, changes to law can occur, but that occurs through the annual legislative process with the Transportation House and Senate Transportation Committees.

The last page of the memo enumerates, this was provided from the Department of Transportation, where projects are in their status and also in current law where the projects are programmed for funding.

Mr. Ransom said there was Board interest in continued conversation about the question of supporting acceleration of the I-5/179th Interchange and what form that might take, if any. He said he understood that the Board wished to discuss this again.

Gary Medvigy asked if the list that was provided was the list for Southwest Washington.

Mr. Ransom said yes, it was the current law list adopted in 2015 and where it exists today in terms of project status.

Councilor Medvigy asked if they were to pass a resolution asking the state to elevate us on their list, would it in any way negatively impact any of Oregon's interest or Southwest Washington's interest on other projects.

Mr. Ransom said he didn't know; he couldn't answer that question.

Carley Francis noted for clarification, that the request of asking goes to the Legislature to make that change, because the Legislative project list: they own the scope; they own the amount of money; and they own timing. It is theirs to delineate. It is not actually state priority, but it is the Legislative priority.

Vice Chair Hughes said as far as the Ports are concerned, they have lobbied for that in the past. It is in the Port of Ridgefield's southern district. He said they have done it in the past and will probably continue to do it.

Melissa Smith said for clarification, you want to move this up. She said she just wants to make sure that since Camas and Washougal did donate some funds to the 164th/162nd Interchange to help widen SR-14, that they don't lose their place for the remaining funding for the Slough Bridge. She said she would fight to keep that in line over getting it bumped for something else.

Mr. Ransom said the Camas Washougal Slough Bridge project was reprogrammed, and it is noted in the memo. It is one example where the scope was moved from the bridge to the part of SR-14. There is no programmed or identified replacement to recover the Camas Washougal Slough Bridge. What would need to occur is a new project identified in a future Legislative Session or future law, to the extent there is a future statewide transportation package. That project would need to be identified, a project cost identified, and then it would have to go

through the Legislative process for appropriations signing it into law. In summary, there is no bumping, because the project doesn't exist in current law.

Vice Chair Hughes said that project is listed on the Transportation Alliance Statement.

Mr. Ransom said there is regional consent to support that. There is a statement of that in the 2019-2020 Legislative Statement published by the Clark County Transportation Alliance that supports that, calls out that project specifically. The question in front of the Board may be if there is interest or desire to doing more than that in the form of a specific resolution and or could be a letter if not a resolution.

Ron Onslow said he was part of that, and that year, the amount of projects voted on and backed up with their information, for example 179th, there are several questions here. Basically, if you move one project up, somebody on the bottom is going to be moved out. He said there was quite a bit of discussion at that time on where different projects should move to and where they should be listed. If one is moved up, someone is going to be moved off or down. Councilor Onslow said he was surprised. He thought when Camas/Washougal said they realize the problems they have on SR-14 and 164th, that they will take the money for the Slough Bridge and put it towards SR-14, 164th to I-205. He thought at the time that they were at the top of the list for any consideration for when we awarded money because of the actions they took.

Mr. Ransom said he wanted to clarify this as he has listened to the comments. He said as pointed out, the Connecting Washington law is somewhat zero sum, in that if a new project is added, something has to be deleted or funding has to be arranged because it is a fixed pot of funds. He understood that revenues as it accrues to the state each year, they project out like everyone does in their budgets, and each year there is a reevaluation in terms of collection of fees, taxes, etc. and their projections. The legislative committees are consistently with the office of financial management evaluating the program. There has been some intent to say, let's try to keep the programming somewhat consistent while still allowing for new things to be slid back and forth. One slides up, something else slides back, unless there is a deluge of funds or if there would be a lack of funds, everything would have to be reprogrammed. That is the annual process with the Department Office of Financial Management and Legislative Committees. Specific to the Camas-Washougal Bridge, that was a defined scope for a project and what the region decided to do was to redefine the project scope. So that project, was reconceived in a new scope and a new description, which is what is currently proceeding to construction: the improvement on SR-14 between I-205 and 164th. This means a whole new project would have to be identified in a new bill.

Vice Chair Hughes said so that means the Slough Bridge died.

Mr. Ransom said yes, in a sense. It is on the list, but it is low down. It is on the regional priority. It is certainly a priority of this region. It is expressed as such on the Transportation Alliance Statement. There is a specific call out: SR-14 Camas Slough Bridge $35 million. That is this region's attempt to say don't forget us; we redefined the scope and moved money from this

location to that location. Now we need to come back at the appropriate time and replace, because we still have that need to be addressed.

Ron Onslow said he didn't recall that it was dropped off. He said an example might be that the county says their project needs to go on SR-14, but they still want to stay on that list and they are told sorry, they will be dropped off, what would they then say?

Gary Medvigy said he is not hearing that this 179th project funding is competing with the Camas Bridge; it's that new legislation or rekindling the old bill and getting that moving. He said he didn't know if they were necessarily dropping someone off somewhere in the state by asking them to move our project up. He said this is funding going out to 2023. Councilor Medvigy said they are already having forecast for increased revenue in the state over the projected conservative forecast; they could be adding money over the year to transportation projects. We don't know. Councilor Medvigy said he brought that question up to get the conversation going in the beginning hoping in case someone here knew specifically if we raised our hand and said let's move 179th up or asked the Legislature to do that, are we somehow shooting ourselves in the foot. He said he didn't think we have identified any other priority that we would be pushing down. He didn't think it would impact Oregon's priority for funding whatsoever. He said he is hoping that they can move a resolution forward to advance the money.

Ty Stober said he thought there was confusion about if they would go to the Legislature and asked for a reprioritization, is that a zero sum game within Clark County or would the Legislature be looking at the full list of projects around the state in that potentially us moving up 179th actually affects a project in Wenatchee, for example. He asked if this was a contained box for Clark County or the bigger box of the state?

Mr. Ransom said he didn't know the answer, because he doesn't serve on the Legislative Committee, but he offered an impression. He said his impression is it is not Clark County; it is the entirety of the Connecting Washington bill, and it has to do with the accrual of revenues and the expenditures as programmed by the Department of Transportation. The intent in law was each year that is to be reevaluated just because of the changes that occur; projects can be accelerated and projects have to be delayed, and so the process in the House and Senate Transportation Committees is they receive a report from the Department of OFM. They also elicit from their members' jurisdictions inputs. What is being proposed would be an input into that process. By any measure, it would be an appropriate input should it be the desire of the Board. It is statewide and just a mechanism of who makes the strongest case and is there capacity within the big pot of Connecting Washington.

Councilor Stober said as he looks at the list, he sees that all but two projects have some activity going on. He asked what the chances of injuring another project if the funding streams are already moving forward in our list. Is there a potential, because of all of these other projects that we have in Connecting Washington are moving right now, if we go to the Legislature and

say we really need this money, would it put in jeopardy a project that is already receiving a flow of money.

Mr. Ransom asked Carley Francis if she wanted to provide comments from the Department's perspective.

Carley Francis said one thing to mention as a clarifying comment. She said there has been some discussion around the table that represents Connecting Washington as a cash basis program. It is a borrowed program, so that gas tax increase is supporting the repayment of debts that are let over time. One, it further constrains the amount of funds they have from any gas tax to manage with. It is just a point of clarification. It is then balancing things across a borrowed revenue stream as opposed to cash only. She said the Legislature gets to do what the Legislature gets to do. She added that Representative Hoff may have some comments to add.

Mr. Ransom said Representative Hoff serves on the Appropriations Committee so he knows how this works. Mr. Ransom said he doesn't work for the OFM or the Department or the Committee. There are hundreds of projects in the bill, moving pieces and moving parts. The Department with the Legislative Committees would have almost like a public and fiduciary obligation to make sure things flow as they program them. It was noted bonds are sold and revenues are accruing and expenses. Programmatically, the Department would say they can't delay, because it will cost more and there is oversight there. To the extent there is capacity to do this within law, and there is support from this region to say please do this, he can't see it is a bad thing. He said he didn't think there is any harm to come to this region as a result. Mr. Ransom said since he is not a Legislator, he doesn't know what happens behind the scenes, and he would defer to one that does.

Representative Hoff said there is absolutely a statewide emphasis on the available funds, and there are certainly revenue forecasts that change regularly, so that all adds into the mix. He said Matt talked about the solutions or the direction properly. It is a matter of priorities. He noted that different Legislators have different size sticks. He said if this group wants to come, he is excited to do everything He can, but he said to make sure that you get to the Transportation Committee Chairs and things like that. It is a matter of contacts there in Olympia. If there is a change in priorities or a shift in direction, you need not be timid in suggesting that, because they get all kinds of requests and suggestions of direction. If indeed they get more of the same from this group, it will certainly help the efforts. He said he appreciated that.

Ty Stober said philosophically, he doesn't have a problem with this group going to the Legislature and asking for one of our projects to move up the list. He said personal commentary is the more thought through the reasons for making that request are, he thinks, the more likely that the Legislature would respond to a request. So, if there was a complete Subarea Plan for the area around 179th Street, he thinks that would make a stronger impression with the Legislature than just hey, we think there is development opportunities here.

Eileen Quiring said there is a Subarea Plan, and they just made a decision to fund some of the other roads that connect with 179th. Councilor Quiring said if RTC is not willing at this point in time to stick their neck out and do a resolution, one way the county can handle it is to speak to their Legislative delegation, make it a priority, and convince them that it really does help the entire region; it is a regional project. She said then, if it is on somebody else's priority list, and the county comes back and says look at all the various things on the list. This helps our region because of these things, and the Legislature is willing to make it one of their priorities, perhaps then RTC can come behind and pass a resolution.

Mr. Ransom said this is the Board's decision. He is happy to prepare some comments, a letter or resolution, defer, or wait.

Vice Chair Hughes asked if anyone had any opposition to this.

Carley Francis said she would abstain from this as she noted last month, because typically, they don't engage in this type of set of suggestions to legislators.

Mandy Putney said likewise for ODOT.

Vice Chair Hughes said he didn't hear any opposition.

Mr. Ransom said he would return with a draft proposal to look at the next meeting.

Next on the legislative report, Mr. Ransom said he wanted to let the Board know that he is currently working with Identity Clark County on the update to the 2019-2020 Transportation Alliance Policy Statement. His role is primarily to reach out to member agencies and re-verify projects as they are stated on the current Policy Statement or accept amendments. He said he has reached out to many of members around the table's senior staff that would know numbers and factoids that would then become part of the statement update. Identity Clark County has announced through invitation to partners to the Alliance, as well as a broader group that they convene each year, that on October 15, this group will convene to review the draft statement and release it for member agency ratification and other groups and associations ratifications. This becomes then sort of a Legislative Statement of this body, and they have the opportunity to see it and have an opportunity to endorse it again by December/January meeting, most likely the December meeting.

Mr. Ransom said probably the most pressing issue when it comes to the early work of 2020, and possibly throughout 2020, this will be a primary item that is new to our work program which is to engage in the Joint Transportation Committee Statewide Transportation Needs Assessment. This is a study funded by the Legislature, sponsored by the House and Senate Transportation Committees, called the Joint Transportation Committee. It is to identify all the needs across the state in development of what may become future statewide transportation package to be considered by the legislature maybe in a future session. Those who were around the table earlier this year may recall that the Senate Transportation Committee did propose and held hearings on a statewide transportation package. Those hearings concluded with the Senate Transportation Committee actually voting on and pushing out of their specific

committee a proposal. The proposal didn't go to the Senate floor, but it sits out there as the first attempt to initiate the statewide conversation. Out of that attempt, the Senate's attempt, the legislature convened this committee. What we need to do or what Mr. Ransom will be proposing to do in the 2020 work program is to update what this Board did in advance of the Connecting Washington package.

Back in 2012, as a quick history lesson, the Washington Transportation Commission went out statewide and said every region, tell us what your priority projects are, and they were starting the developmental process in what then became Connecting Washington. You can see between 2012 and 2015, it took a couple years and a couple legislative sessions to get it done. Mr. Ransom said he anticipates it may be, and we saw a first attempt this last session, and there may be one or two others that they work on this over the course of that period of time. For the activity of RTC, we need to produce, for the purposes of discussion, a 10-year or a top-10 priority list. Since the Board adopted the 20-Year Regional Plan in March of this year, we have a good platform to then do a technical review and an agency review for the identification of this region's top projects. What the Board approved and developed and approved in 2012 is a 10-Year Transportation Project Priorities Report. It developed rationale and projects to be funded in a new transportation bill.

In summary, we need to reprise this document. We need to be prepared as part of the Joint Transportation Committee Study to engage properly and directly to say what this region's priorities are. Mr. Ransom suggested to the Board, that it is not only going to be improvement projects, but we also need to perhaps describe more clearly the deferred maintenance, preservation, and safety needs that we have. Often times, they are not discussed enough. The things that are identified in statewide transportation bills, as it is a prerogative of legislature to fund new things, but Connecting Washington sort of started to fund more so than they had in the past for maintenance and preservation. At the local city, county level, there was not enough money that came from that package to flow to the local level. It may be in the interest of this Board and the region to ask for more of that direct distribution to cities and counties. But also, the State Department of Transportation needs more money to maintain these critical assets as well. In addition to the project list, we probably need to work with each member and their senior staff through the RTAC Committee to have a stronger statement about maintenance and preservation. Mr. Ransom said these are thoughts, but he is proposing that they earnestly get into this work, that we are prepared as a region to transmit our priorities to this Joint Transportation Committee Study. It's going to be a quick sprint. According to the schedule he has seen published, they intend to have their work and reports to the legislature by the end of 2020. You can imagine if they are looking statewide, it is going to be a quick effort to have us have a strong statement. Mr. Ransom said he thinks we are well positioned with our plans and some priorities, a good example may be the Camas Washougal Bridge, obviously that is a priority for this region, and that certainly should be considered as a part of this.

IX. RTC Travel Demand Model Program Update: 2020 Clark County Household Travel Behavior Survey, Scope, and Funding

Mark Harrington referred to the memo included in the meeting packet. He will be covering the purpose and scope of our upcoming 2020 Household Travel Behavior Survey and present a local matching formula for an STBG grant that has funding identified for that work in the TIP. Before doing that, Mr. Harrington would provide the Board with a brief overview of RTC's "Travel Demand Modeling Program to provide some context for where that survey effort fits within RTC's broader work as well as all the work that rests upon the RTC's Regional Travel Demand Model.

It's important to understand that RTC works in partnership with Portland Metro in developing the region's transportation modeling tools. As the MPOs for the Vancouver-Portland Metropolitan area, RTC and Metro are responsible for the development and application of the original travel demand forecast model. The model is actually a set of models that are multi modal and they cover the entire region. The model excels at comparisons, comparing a base year of today, or our recent past, to a future year or comparing across various scenarios in the future. Today's base year is 2015. The base year is updated every five years. The base year for the model is calibrated and validated across a number of dimensions to observe data from that year. The current forecast year is 2040. Typically, the forecast year is the 20-year forecast year for RTC's Regional Transportation Plan.

Mr. Harrington provided a graphic that was included in the memo, starting with the Regional Travel Demand Forecast Model and to look at inputs into that model. He gave some categories of what feeds into that and how they work and how the travel survey data fits within that, and what the outputs or the uses of that model are. They are broad and deep across the region. First, they have land use that feeds into the model; their base land use; something that is observed. They have locations of people, households, employment, activity locations within the region and where it is in the future. This provides what they call the demand side of transportation. It creates the demand for transportation; people going to work, going to school; going shopping; that creates the demand for travel. The next big input is transportation systems. This includes roads, transit systems, sidewalks, bike lanes, parking; everything that is associated with the physical side as well as the system side of transportation. This provides what they call the supply side of that equation. They have the demand and the supply for transportation, the ability to provide it.

The next piece that is important is the travel behavior data. They use this data to make statistical representations, mathematical models of the decision making of people to travel. For instance, make a choice to travel; the origin of that trip; the destination of that trip; the mode of that trip; the purpose of that trip; when does it occur; and what route does it take. It is a lot of complex decision making in there, and they do it on an individual level, but they are also responding to the environment and the transportation supply as well as the land use arrangement on the ground. It influences all of that decision making. That is where the data comes into. They also use their existing traffic counts or transportation data that includes

counts, ridership data, and information about parking. They use this data to validate and calibrate an existing base year model, something from the recent past. Everything is observed, and they run it through the mathematical models and calibrate it to outcomes they see on the ground. They say this works for now, and they are going to use that to do modeling for something in the future.

They use that in a whole host of context here. They will use it regionally looking at various policy analyses for the Regional Transportation Plan and system performance for that Plan. It also leads into the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), the evaluation for projects for TIP selection. The regional travel model plays a role there. It is used in major investment studies such as the bridges, interchange improvements, various impact studies and traffic studies like the Urban Corridor Freeway Operations Study. It is also used for the smaller studies such as projects for applications to jurisdictions' planning departments that do traffic impact studies for site development. They utilize regional travel demand model information to do those traffic impact studies for the site development in those applications to local jurisdictions. All types of project development, from looking at gaps along NE 99th Street in the County to improvements to the west side of Vancouver, running the gamut regionally as well from big picture down to micro level. The Regional Travel Demand Model is the tool that sits at the center of all that work.

Mr. Harrington said they have an upcoming Regional Household Travel Survey in 2020, and it provides data as the basis for estimating these travel behaviors that they use within their regional model. They try to get new data every ten years. Travel behavior changes, sometimes rapidly, sometimes less so. They try to do it every ten years to get a new pulse on what is happening. They see new technology emerging and new travel options. Ten years ago, if you talked about Uber and Lyft, people would have no idea. There are all these new things that come on line, like in downtown Portland they have little electric scooters. People have new things that they can respond to, different choices that they can make, and we are trying to understand what is happening in that choice making behavior. This helps them develop models, but it also helps them as they look at how behavior is changing so policy makers can understand what are new and emerging trends, how rapidly those are changing, and things that we may need to start looking at and addressing in the future that hadn't been around before. It is helpful to the technicians, but it is also helpful to policy makers.

This is not the first time that RTC has done this. Two previous efforts were done in 1994 and in 2009. Both efforts were partnered not only with Metro, but Oregon has statewide a very integrated and robust travel modeling approach. RTC has worked with them as they have a joint modeling area with Metro, and it provides great consistency between the data they collect. RTC collects data for Clark County, but it becomes very consistent with all the data that is collected in the Portland Metro area, as well as economies of scale. RTC, Metro, MPOs both in Salem down to Medford and the Oregon Department of Transportation across all their regions are soliciting survey data. With that, RTC collected 1,650 surveys the last time. This is a very scientific, stratified sample for Clark County. Across the whole effort, there were over

10,000 surveys collected, so we get to get into a larger pool for buying that survey data. The last time they collected 1,650 households; that represented 4,000 people. They did a one-day travel diary that recorded over 15,000 trips. They had the details of when, who, what parking costs were involved, what the transit fare was, what car they took, automobile operating costs, all of this factors into that data and helps them understand the travel making behavior of not just a person, but different types of people of different ages, different economic categories, where they're located, the number of cars available in the household, if they were working, if they were retired, and if they were doing volunteer work. All this information they take into account when they do the travel model.

RTC's next steps include them continuing in that partnership with the Oregon Household Activity Survey. They will continue that coordination with Metro and other Oregon partners in this effort. They are in the process of releasing a Request for Proposal (RFP) this fall. They anticipate that over the next six months, November to April timeframe the first two phases of the RFP will be accomplished. 1) The review of current survey methods, design, and implementation. This is an area that is rapidly changing, and they will be looking at what is most current. 2) Scope survey, design survey instrument and field testing. They will also be looking at the opportunities to leverage potentially, big data sources that are out there that haven't existed before. Also, look at getting a program in place that tracks changes so they can be ahead of new trends that are merging that are going to more rapidly coming on in the future. The final will be the data collection piece. This will be in 2020-2021. There are two big things happening in 2020 that they need to consider. In April of 2020 is the US Census. That is not the best time to ask for more data from people. The next big thing for the public is the Presidential Election in 2020. That involves lots of calls, lots of surveys, and recruiting, and there is participation fatigue with people. With the consultants, they will be looking at these issues as well as how best to put this in the field that is the most efficient for us and is the least costly in terms of getting return surveys and information back.

Before collecting data, RTC will be seeking to secure $78,500 in local matching funds for the $500,000 STBG Urban grant that is identified in the TIP for this survey work. In 2009, RTC members contributed $64,500 in local matching funds to support that survey effort. The formula table listed in the memo would meet the needs for the local matching funds totaling $78,500 for this survey effort. If they pursue this path, those local matching contributions will be billed for payment as the grant is being billed over the course of the project time in 2020 and 2021.

Gary Medvigy asked if the survey would get into issues for those who may not use mass transit to get into the questions as to why, such as transaction time and having limited transfers. He asked if the survey would look at mass transit in that vein.

Mr. Harrington said typically, this survey is what they consider to be a revealed preference survey. They are looking at what choices people are making. They do have information about their location, so you could look at the difference between the walk distance to transit and how that may impact people's choice making behavior or the distance to a park and ride. Those

types of things they could get. The question of why not using transit is more of a stated preference survey. That is something that someone like C-TRAN would be interested in fielding to see how they could improve operations. The efforts here are not to say how to address barriers or what are the choices they are making given the environment that they are in.

Eileen Quiring asked how they select the people who participate.

Mark Harrington said this is a scientific sample, so it is not us asking them if they want to participate. It goes through what they call a sampling frame. They randomize the sample, and at the same time want to ensure that across that sample that we are not over sampling, say for example older retired folks who are happy to talk to someone on the phone. They quickly get enough of those samples, so it is maybe harder to recruit a single person household. There is that random sampling frame, but they also as they are collecting those samples, once certain target bins are filled up, they try to continue to sample other places where they might get some. They have targets among demographic data, but the sampling is completely random, not self-selecting.

Carley Francis said that she assumes that the Trunnion Project will also be taken into consideration with respect to time constraints or timing considerations of selected sampling.

Mr. Harrington said yes, that they try to give as much consideration to big projects that are going on, but to try and find a time when C-TRAN is not reorganizing a transit line or TriMet's not doing something, or ODOT or WSDOT are not doing something in the region, it gets difficult. They try to think about all of the other surveys or interests that are going on in the field. They will give a lot of consideration to all these things as they make a decision about timing, but timing is also related to when RTC has aligned funding to make this happen.

X. Other Business

From the Board

Shirley Craddick distributed a letter from a consortium of the City of Portland, TriMet, Multnomah County, Port of Portland, and Metro. This is a letter that they sent to Oregon Governor Kate Brown and Washington Governor Jay Inslee regarding their thoughts and comments regarding the I-5 Bridge project. They are pleased that the project is now moving forward and the two states are working together, but they have made some statements in the letter of what they would like to see occur as those plans move forward. Councilor Craddick said there should be enough copies for the audience as well.

Mandy Putney said likely the news has spread that ODOT has named a new Director who has participated around the RTC table and is expected to be confirmed in November. Kris Strickler has been selected by the Oregon Transportation Commission pending confirmation from the Senate.

Carley Francis said in keeping with the Chair not here today, she had an update on the Interstate Bridge. A federal extension repayment was granted by the federal government. The timeframe for Notice of Intent, Proceeding with Right-of-Way, and Proceeding with

Construction, those dates were specifically provided, because there are federal policy requirements to provide those types of dates when requesting repayment extension. They were given with two specific caveats, which is pending legislative funding and pending bi-state partner agreements on how to move forward. Those are the best information and awareness of how projects move forward and an understanding that there is some history that may be informative, but there is also some significant caveats on those timeframes.

From the Executive Director

Mr. Ransom said in prior meetings he mentioned that they were having some project obligation issues where there were two projects in the region that were having difficulty wrapping up their right-of-way agreements and therefore getting the funds authorized for expenditure in their construction phase. He said that he is happy to report that since the last meeting, all of those projects have been authorized for construction, so we have met our obligation target. Congratulations to those agencies for getting those two activities under construction.

Matt Ransom highlighted four Project showcases and they will be posted to RTC's website as part of the project archive. WSDOT had three projects; the first project was a Clark County Area Centralized Signal System – Joint ATMS. This project provides the opportunity to have a uniform and consistent Central Signal System that will connect an entire multi-jurisdictional signalized corridor for optimal traffic management completed in October 2018. RTC funding was $149,000. The second project is SR-503, Fourth Plain to Main Street ITS Device Infill. This project finalizes WSDOT's three-stage ITS Plan for infilling of traffic flow data and ATIS devices through the SR-503 corridor between Fourth Plain BLVD. and NE 219th Street in Battle Ground completed in January 2019. RTC funding was $307,500. The third project is SR-14 ATIS Infill: I-5 to Evergreen Blvd. This project will complete the installation of fiber optic communication lines on SR-14 between I-5 and I-205 and includes the addition of traffic data stations and traffic cameras completed in June 2019. RTC Funding was $819,500. The fourth Project Showcase was the Port of Vancouver's Port Connector Bike/Ped Path. This project connects the already constructed segments 1 and 3 of the path together. It completes a 4.5 mile separated bike and pedestrian trail from the boundary of the Port's property out to Frenchman's Bar park. RTC funding was $560,800.

Mr. Ransom referred to the memo in the meeting packet regarding the RTC Bylaws Committee. He said he has informed the Board Chair that they need to convene the Bylaws Committee per the agency's Bylaws. Any time there is a need to amend the Bylaws, a governing rule is that it has to be reviewed by a committee, which is a sub-committee of the RTC Board. That committee makes a recommendation to the full Board. The need to amend the Bylaws is coming to us in the need to implement Tribal membership on the RTC Board. It is proposed and the chair has agreed to convene this committee per the Bylaws. The Committee itself will be chaired by the Vice Chair, Scott Hughes. Listed on the back of the memo was the Committee Roster. Mr. Ransom has reached out to each of the designated members to let them know they are to serve on the Committee to the extent that they can. Staff would be contacting the designees within the next week to set at least one meeting in October. This meeting will likely

be held the week of October 21, and it may be held by teleconference. They will try to get this scheduled for the end of October. The proposal of the Committee is to be published 30 days in advance of full consideration by the Board. That schedule will have them post the proposed amendment in October for the November meeting allowing 30 days in advance of the December meeting which is the Annual Meeting of the Board where they would expect the Board to take up full consideration of the Proposal.

Shirley Craddick asked if the Cowlitz Tribe was the only tribe that is recognized in this area.

Mr. Ransom said there are two Tribes, the Cowlitz Tribe and the Yakama Nation. Councilor Craddick asked if the Yakama Nation was invited. Mr. Ransom said they have been invited, and to date, they have not responded. They have received a response from the Cowlitz Tribe, and Mr. Ransom will be meeting with their Chairman and staff the following day to discuss the logistics and the schedule. There is also an expectation that they will be asked, as all members are, to pay dues to the agency to support the operations. That will also be a part of the discussion.

Shirley Craddick asked if the Yakama did respond, would they also get to sit on the Board, both would have a representative.

Mr. Ransom said that was correct. The law that was adopted and signed by the Governor provides that if they desire participation on the RTPO and MPO Board that they are given such. It is a mandate for RTC to accept their participation if they so express it. To date, the Cowlitz Tribe has expressed their desire to participate.

Related to that, the technical advisory group, the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee, RTAC will also need to have their Bylaws amended to allow the Cowlitz to have a senior staff person or technical person participate on the RTAC Committee. That will be another governing document that will come forward in December with a preview at the November meeting.

Mr. Ransom said that he has informed the Board throughout the annual audit process of the RTC. He is pleased to report, as he noted in his email the previous week, that the State Auditor has concluded their annual financial review; there were no comments, no letters, and no findings. It is what all would recognize as a clean audit. He said he would like to say publically and for those around the table a couple comments in the auditors exit comment report: the Council's staff was very helpful, friendly, and a pleasure to work with; very responsive to the audit requests and questions. They appreciate the Council's effort in maintaining well-organized, detailed supporting documentation that was easy to follow. Mr. Ransom said he mentioned this because he is not the one doing the work; it is the staff of the Council. He said their Administrative Team including Diane, who you see, and two others Shari and Shann who support the accounting, payroll, receivables, and all that process every day. Mr. Ransom said this year was a bit more challenging, because they had a full system financial management program conversion. He said he wanted to recognize his team publically to say great work. He said they, behind the scenes, have a great team supporting the agency, and he appreciates their efforts.

Vice Chair Hughes said he has been involved in a number of these kinds of audits, and he said you should be proud. That was an excellent audit, and he didn't think he had ever seen one so clean.

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, November 5, 2019, at 4 p.m. at the City of Vancouver Aspen Meeting Room.

XI. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

_____

Anne McEnerny-Ogle, Board of Directors Chair