

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council  
Board of Directors  
November 5, 2019, Meeting Minutes**

**I. Call to Order and Roll Call of Members**

The Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council Board of Directors Meeting was called to order by Chair Anne McEnerny-Ogle on Tuesday, November 5, 2019, at 4:00 p.m. at the Vancouver City Hall Aspen Meeting Room, 415 West 6th Street, Vancouver, Washington. The meeting was televised and recorded by CVTV. Attendance follows.

Voting Board Members Present:

Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor  
Shawn Donaghy, C-TRAN Chief Executive Officer  
Carley Francis, WSDOT Regional Administrator  
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Councilmember (Alt.)  
Bart Hansen, Vancouver Councilmember  
Scott Hughes, Port of Ridgefield Commissioner  
Temple Lentz, Clark County Councilor  
Anne McEnerny-Ogle, Vancouver Mayor  
Gary Medvigy, Clark County Councilor  
Ron Onslow, Ridgefield Councilmember (Alt.)  
Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1 Manager

Voting Board Members Absent:

Mike Dalesandro, Battle Ground Mayor  
Jim Herman, Port of Klickitat Commissioner  
Tom Lannen, Skamania County Commissioner  
Eileen Quiring, Clark County Councilor  
Melissa Smith, Camas Councilmember

Nonvoting Board Members Present:

Paul Harris, Representative 17<sup>th</sup> District

Nonvoting Board Members Absent:

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

Guests Present:

David Bennett, Citizen  
Monica Fowler, C-TRAN  
Sorin Garber, SGA  
Jim Hagar, Port of Vancouver  
Scott Langer, WSDOT SW Region  
Jeffrey Mize, The Columbian  
Sharon Nasset, Economic Transportation Alliance  
Scott Patterson, C-TRAN  
Sean Philbrook, Identity Clark County  
Bryan Stebbins, Senator Murray's Office  
Ron Swaren, Citizen

Staff Present:

Matt Ransom, Executive Director  
Ted Gathe, Legal Counsel  
Lynda David, Senior Transportation Planner  
Bob Hart, Transportation Section Supervisor  
Dale Robins, Senior Transportation Planner  
Diane Workman, Administrative Assistant

## **II. Approval of the Board Agenda**

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2019, MEETING AGENDA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY TEMPLE LENTZ AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

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

Sharon Nasset is from Portland, Oregon, with the Economic Transportation Alliance. She spoke about the Clark County Transportation Alliance Policy Statement.

Shirley Craddick entered the meeting at 4:05 p.m. Ron Onslow and Carley Francis entered the meeting at 4:06 p.m.

Ron Swaren is from Portland, Oregon, and spoke about the I-5 Bridge replacement and some of the needs and options.

## **IV. Approval of October 1, 2019, Minutes**

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 1, 2019, MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY RON ONSLOW AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

## **V. Consent Agenda**

### **A. November Claims**

### **B. Regional Active Transportation Plan: Professional Services Consulting Agreement, Resolution 11-19-26**

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA NOVEMBER CLAIMS AND RESOLUTION 11-19-26. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SCOTT HUGHES AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

## **VI. Resolution Supporting Acceleration of Connecting Washington Projects, Resolution 11-19-27**

Matt Ransom said the conversation around this resolution began in August. At the September meeting, Mr. Ransom provided a report to the Board giving some history about Connecting Washington projects that had moved around some. Connecting Washington was the big statewide Transportation Bill passed in 2015. After the September discussion, they had further dialogue at the October meeting. At that meeting the Board consented to see the resolution that he has provided. It is presented for the Board's adoption, and would support the project that should be accelerated to the extent there is capacity to do so.

Gary Medvigy said he certainly supports this.

Temple Lentz said in speaking on behalf of Clark County, they are making this a part of their Legislative agenda as well. They appreciate this Board considering it. It helps to keep the project moving forward, and she said they would appreciate the consideration.

SCOTT HUGHES MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 11-19-27. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY PAUL GREENLEE, AND CARLEY FRANCIS, WSDOT ABSTAINED. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED.

## **VII. Bylaws of the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council: Proposed Amendments**

Mr. Ransom said they have been discussing this matter for many months. What triggered this proposal for a draft review was the State Legislature amended a law to require that organizations like RTC invite Tribal Nations who have reservation lands as designated by the Federal Government within the service area of an MPO/RTPO, to be participants on the governing body of RTC, in this case. In August of this year, they sent a letter of invitation to both the Yakama Nation and the Cowlitz Indian Tribe, and they have heard responses from both. Just this last month, they did receive a response from Yakama Nation. What is proposed is for the Bylaws to be amended.

The Yakama Nation, whose lands are primarily within Klickitat County, responded this last month. They said they are interested in RTC and engaging in this process, but at this juncture, that they would defer participation on the governing body, but they would rather begin to participate, to the extent they have the time and ability, on the Klickitat Transportation Policy Committee. That is the committee that RTC convenes every other month in Klickitat County to discuss these matters of regional coordination, transportation planning, etc. Dale Robins on RTC staff manages that committee and has for many years. After that conversation, they had both a written correspondence and a telephone conversation with one of their directors. They will meet with them, perhaps some time in November or December, to talk about that committee. They expect that they will start to participate, given their availability.

The Cowlitz Indian Tribe responded to say that they are interested in joining RTC as a full member and being a participant on the governing board. They adopted a resolution of their board on September 7, 2019. Their governing Board of Cowlitz Indian Tribe adopted a resolution saying they wished to join RTC as a full participant and as part of that resolution they delegated who their principle participants would be, the member of the Board and an alternate. Mr. Ransom met with the Cowlitz Indian Tribe at their corporate offices in Longview. They discussed their participation and described how they would be admitted to become a full member of the RTC Board.

That is where they turned to the Bylaws discussion. In order to admit them to be full members, they must amend the Bylaws. The nature of many of the bylaws requires that a committee of the Board be convened. That committee was convened, and it met on one occasion. Attached to the Staff Report is a summary of the meeting on October 22, 2019, along with a list of the participants. Those participants included Vice Chair Scott Hughes (Committee Chair), Anne McEnerly-Ogle, Temple Lentz, Melissa Smith, and Carley Francis. All members participated in the discussion, and they voted unanimously to propose to this Board the amendments that are before them this evening.

Mr. Ransom referred to page 2 of the Bylaws with the proposed amendments. They call out by name the Cowlitz Indian Tribe. They do that because it specifies which tribe they are referring to. They call out that the Cowlitz Indian Tribe is to become a party to the Bylaws, and they describe the nature which they are invited to be, which is the statute of the State of Washington. They amend the number of voting members. They leave unchanged the number of members required for a quorum. They characterize on page 3 that it would be one member of the Cowlitz Indian Tribe. The Cowlitz Indian Tribe also wishes to participate on the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC), and there is an amendment on page 7 that reflects that participation. That discussion will take place following this discussion. The requirements of the Bylaws stipulate that this amendment be published 30 days in advance of full consideration or voting on. It was published the previous Tuesday, so that provides sufficient 30-day notice. This will be advertised again for Board final consideration and adoption at the December meeting.

Mr. Ransom said in his conversations with the Chairman of the Cowlitz Indian Tribe, Mr. Bill Iyall, he intends to attend the December meeting. Mr. Ransom said he invited him to attend and to introduce himself and to the extent he wants to introduce the Cowlitz Indian Tribe and their interests.

Shawn Donaghy said the way the current Bylaws are written that they will approve next month essentially say they will bump the number of voting members from 14 to 15 with the Cowlitz Tribe. Mr. Donaghy said with the Yakama Nation, should they decide they want to be a voting member, would they not have to go through the Bylaws again.

General Counsel Ted Gathe said they would need to go through the Bylaws again. He said the reason they chose the Bylaws is that it is a very cumbersome process to go back and open up the original Interlocal Agreement from 1992. It would take months to get that even approved administratively. Because the state law mandates that a tribe can join an RTPO, there is really no discretion. They have assumed that based on that, they can simply amend the Bylaws. There is a secondary clause that says when it is describing the membership makeup, any federally recognized Tribal Nation or representation on the RTC Board as provided for by state law. That opens the door for the Yakama Nation, but we would have to go back and specifically name them, as they did with the Cowlitz.

Mr. Donaghy asked if there was a time frame on that, so if they come tomorrow and say they would like to be in this, we would be good.

Mr. Ransom said his understanding of the guidance out of the State of Washington Attorney General's office is that we would be compelled to either re-extend the invitation or for those tribes in the case of the Yakama Nation who didn't except the invitation originally, that on a two-year cycle, we are to re-engage. Mr. Ransom said he believed the intent is that the law mandates participation so it is the prerogative of the agency like RTC to continue to ask. It is not just a one time of either in or out, but there is a repeated request. The purpose of this is for collaboration and engagement.

Mr. Donaghy said if somebody were to come to the table before the two years and said they would like to join, we would entertain that. Mr. Ransom said yes, that is correct.

Shirley Craddick asked if it was considered to just add the Yakama to this group and allow them to choose to attend or not and from the start have them be a member of this Committee.

Mr. Ransom said from a staff standpoint and confirming with General Counsel in developing the proposal, because they didn't choose to participate, that we shouldn't presuppose that they do, and that we respect that autonomy that they have in their sovereign rights to choose how they wish to participate. It was more the practicality of not trying to assume anything, but then also respecting where they choose to be, which is they want to participate and engage but more at the staff level, technical level. Given their interest, and because so little of their tribal lands actually encroach into Klickitat County. Their main interest and their main region of interest is Yakima. Out of respect of their time and their interest, they deferred at this point. Action on this item will take place at the December meeting.

#### **VIII. Bylaws of the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee: Proposed Amendments**

Mr. Ransom said this addresses the Bylaws for the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC). The RTC Board Bylaws reflect a reference to these. The first reason for the amendments is the need to incorporate the Cowlitz Indian Tribe as a participant to RTAC. In their resolution to RTC, they did name a delegate to participate. Mr. Ransom said his team has said that the Cowlitz Tribe in their coordination and planning at large, such as coordination with Clark County under Growth Management issues and other intergovernmental coordination, that they have seen the Cowlitz Indian Tribe's technical staff person participate at a high level. He said he has no reason to believe that they would not do the same for RTC. Mr. Ransom said many of the participants to RTAC probably were unaware that the Bylaws even existed. He said so when he brought the amendments to the committee, he made a couple other suggestions.

He referred to pages 2 and 3 under Membership. Mr. Ransom said when the agency was formed in 1992 Bylaws for RTAC did not exist. At some point, Bylaws were introduced and adopted by the Board. They were most recently amended in January 2007. The issue that is substantive is the membership had some naming conventions that are proposed to be changed. It grouped members to the RTC as a coalition. As shown on page 3 the coalitions were for example City of Washougal/Port of Washougal and another was City of Battle Ground/Town of Yacolt. The presumptions in the actual Bylaws and the participation in the RTAC meetings was that there was this grouping of participation. Mr. Ransom described what actually happens at RTAC.

The point of RTAC is to first take up matters and provide recommendations to the Board, but the secondary point, and possibly the primary point is to collaborate and coordinate and to provide a forum for staff, including planners, county engineers, public works directors, etc. It is a forum for information sharing, collaboration, presentations and guest presentations. Mr. Ransom said what is described in the Bylaws is not exactly what takes place. To the extent that staff have the capacity and availability, they will attend and vote on matters and participate

fully. He said when he introduced this and said that some were sharing a seat with someone else, it was a surprise to some people. The recommendation is to break up the sharing of seats and provide that every member of RTC named in the Interlocal has a seat on RTAC. In doing so, it creates this continued participation; they want everyone to participate with no sharing of seats. The third change that is proposed, and discussed at RTAC, is to add a delegate in this instance they are proposing the Columbia River Economic Development Council (CREDC) to be added to RTAC. Mr. Ransom said in statute, RCW 4780, it lays out some implied parameters for who would be around the table. That could include both the governing body, this Board, but also participant committees. The reference in statute is that a major business or a major employer is an eligible entity to participate on an RTPO Board. They could begin with participation on RTAC and at a future time the Board could consider that if they so choose. The reason for delegating that to the CREDC is that they are similar to RTC in the sense they are formed through a cooperative association. They serve under state statute and have government mandates that they fulfill. The CREDC could choose among their membership how they wish to fill the seat.

In the conversation with RTAC, they opened the question to others; should there be others around this table, because if the intent is to have an advisory committee to the Board, should there be people who are not named in the Bylaws. The RTAC was interested in that discussion, but they couldn't determine who or what the purpose would be so they tabled it for the time being with the intent that if they could come to some place and identify who an organization would be that would make sense to participate that they would bring that back and the Board could considerate at that time. For that purpose, that discussion was put aside, but not forgotten.

Mr. Ransom said the Bylaws Committee did consider the amendments at their October 22 meeting. They did also recommend, although it is not required by process, the Bylaws Committee did recommend that the amendments for RTAC made sense, and that they should be considered. The next process step for these would be that they would be placed on the November RTAC agenda for their endorsement and recommendation to the Board. Assuming they make a recommendation, they will bring it back for the Board's consideration at their December meeting.

#### **IX. RTC Member Contributions (Dues) for YR 2020: Proposed Amendment**

Mr. Ransom said this agenda item is in regard to RTC member contributions or dues for 2020. This Board in April of this year adopted a dues schedule for the coming year, and as part of that, they established the table which is attached to the staff report included in the meeting materials. In consideration of adding the Cowlitz Indian Tribe to RTC, one of the provisions of the Bylaws states that "and agrees to fund the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council pursuant to the Interlocal Agreement and these Bylaws." That phrase would suggest to be a participant in RTC's business and to be a member of this governing Board that you also be a willing partner to pay dues to help support the operations of the agency. Mr. Ransom said he has shared this in his conversations with the Cowlitz Indian Tribe. He has made them aware of

the recommendation, which is as proposed here that they get the assessed dues beginning January 2020, of \$1,500. That would fulfill their obligations under that provision of the Bylaws. By verbal representation, they said that seemed fine and made sense to them. This will be brought back for Board consideration at their December meeting.

Gary Medvigy said he saw that this amount was consistent with some others and Clark County pays a lot and Vancouver pays a lot. He asked how they arrived at the amount and if there was a formula.

Mr. Ransom said there is a formula for agency members. This formula was established by the Board, most recently amended in 2016. The land area and population, which is part of the criteria in the current formula, doesn't fit for the Cowlitz Indian Tribe within the formula structure. The proposal here for them is an entry assessment of \$1,500 as a flat rate. They do apply flat rates in the Gorge area for all those rural communities. The Skamania and Klickitat Counties pay \$1,000 each, and the cities of the Gorge region pay \$800. That is a flat fee, to be reviewed every five years; whereas the fees within Clark County for member agencies are reviewed annually. The basis for that is that most of RTC's work and technical work and support take place in Clark County, which is why the fees are reviewed annually. They do less work and provide less support in the Gorge region, which is why they are reviewed on a five-year cycle. Mr. Ransom said he looked at the City of Ridgefield, which in 2020 will pay \$1,700 and the Port of Ridgefield \$900 and the recommended \$1,500 was between those two and a good starting point. If that doesn't work, they can revisit it in March when they take up reconsideration for the 2021 fee period. That was the recommendation of the Committee.

Shirley Craddick said that Metro and RTC have an agreement that neither pays dues to the other. She asked if they had considered acknowledging that in some fashion to show that Metro is a member even though they do not contribute. WSDOT and ODOT don't pay as well.

Mr. Ransom said he hadn't thought about that issue.

Chair McEnery-Ogle said they could note that with an asterisk at the bottom.

Mr. Ransom said for those who have not read the Interlocal or the Bylaws, in both of those governing documents they prescribe the exception to Metro, ODOT, and WSDOT. That was established in 1992.

## **X. YR 2020 RTC Work Program and Budget**

Mr. Ransom said the 2020 Work Program and Budget item is for discussion, and it will be brought back in December for action. Each year, he presents to the Board a proposed operating budget for a calendar year. As the staff report lays out, RTC's work program is established months earlier on a state and federal fiscal year basis. The reason for that is that most of the money that they operate with is derived from federal funds and also state funds. They mandate that we produce a work program on their schedule. That work program is called the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). The Board adopted that in May of this year, and it was amended most recently in August to add a new project activity.

Mr. Ransom provided a report on the budget to date. Because 90 percent of RTC's operating revenues are grant funds, they work on a grant reimbursement basis. If they don't do the work, they don't reimburse the grants and therefore, they don't use the money. Their budget is really a planning document; it is less a case of X amount of money to spend, because they have already spent it before they can ask for reimbursement. The work program is never established to reimburse more money than they have available. As shown in the memo, they are going to spend about \$500,000 less than they had programmed or planned for this year. What this means is the activities that they had proposed didn't occur or they didn't incur the grant billings, so they will not bill for them or incur the expense. The deviation in expenditures is under Professional Services, where they didn't incur expenses. The reason for that you may ask if we performed on the work program. Most of RTC's activities are coalition activities. Very little work that they do is solely directed by them. They do plans and projects and collaboration and coordination with agencies, so their schedules are often set by the group and the pace of activities. In some cases, the group or the pace is not as fast as they had planned or anticipated, so the expenses just don't occur. They over shot a bit on their estimate of benefit costs, and also, there was an anomaly in that they were charged for benefits that they actually didn't use, so they had to go through this elaborate process to have them be refunded, which is why it shows less expense. Under other expenses, where there is deviation is where they anticipated expenses that they reimbursed this year and given the calendar year that the expenses occurred, that amount was less. In summary, for this year's budget performance, they didn't use the money, so they won't bill for them so they are not reimbursed.

Chair McEnery-Ogle said it should be noted that RTC passed their state audit beautifully, so there is no question there.

Gary Medvigy said on the Consent Agenda they passed earlier, they had a consulting agreement for about \$80,000 and it also accounts for \$32,000 in overhead to RTC. He asked how that fits in a budget when charging overhead on a consulting contract.

Mr. Ransom said that is all listed under professional services, and there is an expense that is anticipated to be paid to a third party, a consulting company that is going to run the study for RTC. This went through their procurement process, which is about \$83,000. There is about \$30,000 which is RTC, so RTC will pay itself. If the federal funds that they have committed are \$100,000, they will pay themselves for their time, reimbursing their work effort. They also have to provide local match, so dues that members pay are local money, about 10 percent of RTC's operating revenues or less, this is used to match. Any time you use state or federal grants, you have to match that.

Mr. Ransom referred to the 2020 budget revenues shown on page 4 of the memo. It lists all the different funding sources: Federal FHWA, FTA, and STBG funds; and State RTPD funds; and also Match needed from local dues reserve and local MPO dues. Partner Match is listed, and this is when RTC works with other organizations and they also put up money. An example of this is last month a study was approved that was partnered by five agencies, RTC and four other agencies all put in equal shares to initiate the study. That would be an example of the coalition

process and what Partner Match is. Mr. Ransom said all of the revenues are committed currently or to be committed. They do not have any reason to believe that the revenue projection wouldn't materialize. If it didn't, they would come back to the Board and make an adjustment.

On the planned expense side, most of the activities are laid out in the Unified Planning Work Program. Of substantive interest, one of the major expenses of this agency is staff. He said they are a professional services agency, and the staffing recommendation is to remain unchanged at 9.75 FTE. One area Mr. Ransom wanted to raise for the Board's interest is in recommending a set aside. He said RTC has a phenomenal team, and part of that team is because they have been employees at RTC for 25 – 30 plus years. With that amount of tenure, you get extremely efficient services, a high level of skill, etc. But, based on that tenure, what he anticipates is that they may start to see some retirements. Because RTC is such a small agency, there is not any duplication. People have a job assignment, and they do that job. There is a little bit of cross training on the planning, project management side, but there are functions such as IT, GIS, some other activities that there is no backup. So, Mr. Ransom said he doesn't want to find himself in a lurch or members find the agency in a lurch where they are down a person and don't have the skill to back it up. Given what he anticipates, he is suggesting that they set aside some to procure a temporary staff or a limited term staff to provide backfill, that they have the capacity to do that. He said that is a basic operating need that he anticipates. Whether it materializes this next year, it is unknown. He can't predict it, but he thinks it to be prudent to set that up, and if they need to tap it for that purpose, they do that. Mr. Ransom referred to page 5 listing the expenses and highlighted those items. He said there are no significant changes except the one he noted about the potential turnover of staff due to retirement.

Paul Greenlee said he wanted to thank Matt for thinking about that sustainability problem. He said when you have very experienced staff, and they start to retire, you have holes that you have to fill. In many cases, it makes sense to start filling them before they are there. He commended Matt on that.

#### **XI. Vancouver Eastside Highway Operations Study: Project Update**

Scott Langer, Assistant Regional Administrator for Operations and Planning at WSDOT SW Region, thanked the Board for inviting him to provide a presentation on a study that they completed this past year specifically related to I-205 / SR-14 to Padden Parkway Operations. He thanked Judith Perez and Jason Gibbons who put the presentation together. Mr. Langer said he would provide a wrap up of not only this study, but of several other ones and where they are planning on going with them in the future.

Mr. Langer said when they looked at this corridor, they were trying to find a list of cost effective strategies to help alleviate some of the congestion that they are seeing on the I-205 corridor. Some history of this, they had a Plan in 2002 for the I-205 corridor. At that time, that was estimated at \$540 million. That was expected to be a 20-year plan, so by the year 2022, which

we are real close to. In the 2012-2014 timeframe, it became real obvious that they were not actually going to be able to fund that plan, and certainly not completed by the time that the vision year was. At that point, there was a decision made, another study was run, and that \$540 million was reduced to \$138 million. That was still very aspirational. During that timeframe, a couple things have happened. They have actually completed the 18<sup>th</sup> Street /Mill Plain section of the I-205 Plan. The SR-14 widening was also in that Plan from 2014, which will be completed in the next few years. They are starting to move on some of the operational improvements that were put in that Plan. That is where they are going.

Mr. Langer provided output from the models that they ran on the I-205 corridor down to the river. The first graph was Northbound PM – 2035 modeled congestion with no build (what is there today), no build plus Padden, and 6 other scenarios. The graph showed the speeds that the traffic was traveling. Adding the auxiliary lane, extending the onramp from Mill Plain and meeting the off ramp at SR-500 showed some benefit. There was also the same for the southbound AM direction. To do both directions of that are listed in the RTP for \$25 million. He said they have to ask themselves if it is worth that investment to get that benefit. Mr. Langer said they had a Technical Advisory Committee that was made up of members from WSDOT, C-TRAN, RTC, Clark County, and City of Vancouver. That committee selected the strategy.

Ron Onslow said he had no idea of the three-lane on ramp back up on SR-500 to I-205 northbound. Mr. Langer said that is the addition of the ramp meter. They added the ramp meter there, and they have seen significant improvements on I-205 in both operational speed as well as the throughput on I-205. When they get to the point of ramp metering, they are at the point of saying that the roadway no longer has the capacity to handle what is coming at it. In order to limit the severity of congestion, they have to start managing the system. They are managing what can get on there, to limit the impacts to the highway.

Councilor Onslow said he understood that for I-205, but the on ramps from SR-500 are extremely backed up. Mr. Langer said that is the kind of tradeoffs that they are having to make. Councilor Onslow said it can only get worse.

Carley Francis said they are collecting data on that and will bring that back. She said that they are looking at ramp metering on I-5 and also on I-205, in part because a comment that Scott made earlier, which is how do you get best throughput on I-5 or I-205. That is maintaining speeds at 30-40 miles an hour. Those ramp meters allow them to delay when congestion breaks down to the 10-20 miles per hour zone where you get less people through. So even if you have those ramps backed up, the later that that congestion can start, the earlier that it can end means you get more throughput. Yes, the ramps do have a service degradation, but you are also able to make the main line move so that ultimately you are able to get more traffic through and you do have reasonable service on those ramps, and people end up making different choices. Ms. Francis said their office is close to that ramp. There are many staff that were regularly getting on at the ramp and getting off at Padden, and they have decided that the best thing for them is to be on local streets. Part of this whole recognition, and the discussion

around this table, is to recognize how we create a system that has this hierarchy that serves different needs. So to some degree, some of those folks that were getting on at 500 and getting off at Padden, it makes sense to be on local streets. It is a choice that people will make, and it does mean that there are a new sort of circumstances that they're reacting to, which they may not like, but partly it is to make sure that that function of the roadway comes back as soon as possible so that they can really maximize the value of the pavement that they have.

Mr. Langer showed the Southbound AM – 2035 modeled congestion and a couple things jump out. At the top is towards the I-205/I-5 conversion and the bottom is the river. In the morning you are driving south towards the river. One thing that jumps out is the red northerly section of the corridor. In the no build strategy, that section between Padden and SR-500 doesn't have the auxiliary lanes. The rest of the scenarios do. It was clear that was a big part of the answer to some of the issues they are having on the southbound corridor. Some of that is really looking out at the future years. The southern half of the corridor was a different story. Scenarios 1 through 6 look at different treatments that they could do in the southern corridor, and how it impacts congestion. When they came down to it, and it is not surprising, this is one thing they have learned since the 2014 study. When the 2014 study happened, the congestion wasn't there yet southbound. You're making a guess at where the congestion was going to start. The model is predicting where the bottleneck is. Since that point, they now have the congestion there, and they actually know where it starts, and they can calibrate the model to reflect that. So not surprisingly, they actually have to get out on the bridge to have any impact in that section between SR-500 and the river. The reason for that is the turbulence on the I-205 bridge is the start of the bottleneck point. Scenarios 3 and 4 tended to have the best impact. What they are modeling is a peak-use shoulder lane on the Glenn Jackson I-205 Bridge. This is using an existing shoulder, and they put up electronic signs on it. They are making the balance between they need this to be an emergency stopping location most of the day and need maintenance to do maintenance from that location. However, during those couple hour periods when they have really bad congestion, maybe that space can be used to actually alleviate it. The difference between scenario 3 and 4 is not a lot of difference there. The only difference between those two scenarios is adding the southbound auxiliary lane or extending the SR-500 on ramp southbound to the Mill Plain exit. Northbound and southbound is a \$25 million project in the RTP, and that is one of those questions when they come back later that they will have to think about priorities and ask if the benefit is worth it. Mr. Langer said he would get into that when he shows the travel time difference. A big caveat on this point though, this was done at a 30,000 foot planning level. They don't know if this is even a feasible, technical solution at this point. There are a lot of questions with the bridge when you're talking about adding signed gantries to it and when talking about how it impacts downstream at Airport Way. How does it impact once they get to that point? Do they just move something and not actually fix it? That is what they do not want to do. What they are doing in this biennium is setting aside some money to engage with their partners at ODOT and say from a technical standpoint, is this a feasible solution and really understanding that there is a whole other level of conversation after it becomes technically feasible. Mr. Langer said this looks

good in a model, but there are a lot of other steps that have to happen before it is a feasible solution.

Mr. Langer provided a look at what the Committee recommended on the I-205 northbound corridor looking at the afternoon peak period. No build travel time at Airport Way to I-5 in the afternoon is estimated at 42.5 minutes from the model. With the proposal from the committee, the travel time is estimated at 15 minutes from the model. So this is substantial travel time savings with the investment. The southbound corridor is not as impressive. The no build to the peak-use shoulder is 30 minutes to 16 minutes. It is a decent benefit, but a lot of that benefit is actually coming from the auxiliary lanes at Padden. All of these things have to factor in as they go forward.

Looking at travel times in the northbound PM corridor, the no build is estimated at 43 minutes. They move to scenario 3 and 4 with travel time estimating at 15 minutes. In the southbound AM corridor, estimates go from 30 minutes to 16 minutes with the auxiliary lanes and peak use shoulder benefit use.

Mr. Langer said the reason that he wanted to present to tonight is that they have brought several studies to the Board looking at some of the things that are currently in the RTP. Some of this is that they are able to model it a little better now, because the congestion is starting to show itself, and they are able to calibrate the models better. They also have better data available to them. They had a joint partnership with RTC where they went out and got origin/destination data from a company called Moonshadow. Some of that has been presented to this Board. That has gone a long way in telling them where people are going to and from, and that is not data they had five years ago. It was very hard to collect. It has really opened up their ability to actually understand the models a little better and be a little more accurate and look at the impacts.

Carley Francis said in that same concert of trying to help inform things, this is really trying to provide this body and ourselves good information about what the benefit is that we can expect to get out of a certain level of investment; especially in light of constrained transportation funding and trying to set themselves up for those really targeted investments that are both financially targeted, but also location targeted. That is in the lens of recognizing that maybe the future is not continued freeway expansion on all the roadways that currently don't look like limited access facilities. That has long been a baked in assumption within DOT, and it may not be popular to everybody around the table, but the funding doesn't look to support that in the long term. So with them just recognizing how do they pay attention to really being targeted about money and investment and how to help folks around the table have that information to help make decisions on what is a good investment.

Gary Medvigy asked if they had been doing modeling or looking forward to doing the modeling for the bi-state committee on what another corridor would look like.

Carley Francis said with respect to the Interstate-5 Bridge work, there is a program office that will be established over time. It isn't complete yet. Obviously, the Bi-State Legislative

Committee principles include discussing other corridors and value of those things. They anticipate that work. It is not really until a program office is established, which one is about getting the parties to have a “how do we work together”, getting a program administrator, and getting staff. They are not going to delve into the “what” questions until they have that bench of folks to help support that. That will be run in coordination with regional entities like SW Region, like ODOT Region 1 in that context, but will also be sort of a separable set of folks who are dedicated to that effort.

Ron Onslow asked if the information provided by WSDOT was on RTC’s website.

Mr. Ransom said the presentation would be posted with today’s meeting materials on RTC’s website after the meeting.

Councilor Onslow said a lot of the study shows SR-500 is where there are the big backups, but he asked if it wasn’t all starting at Padden in the southbound.

Mr. Langer said it is the section between Padden and SR-500, and it is the interaction between people getting on at Padden and people getting off at SR-500. That is essentially what the no build model is showing. The queue length varies from day to day. What the model is looking at is an average day. If there is an incident, if it rains, whatever happens that is an abnormal day, it will queue up back to Padden. There are a lot of days though where there is a gap currently between the queue that is coming from the bridge and the congestion that is starting to build at Padden from the interaction of people getting on there and the through traffic. They start to merge.

Councilor Onslow said he hears about it every day. His wife is on an open-heart surgery team at PeaceHealth. She has to know where she can get through, because if it is backed up, she can’t get through on I-205, and they’ve got somebody on the table that needs open heart surgery.

Mr. Langer said if they have a crash on I-5, I-205 is much worse. It is all interrelated and works together, and the littlest things can impact it.

Shawn Donaghy said in talking about trying to drive down the cost of these types of projects and talk about it being in the \$140 million range, what additional cost is going to be associated with the Glenn Jackson Bridge? He said because when you talk about deferred bridge maintenance, we are able to move lanes, essentially restripe a bridge, in order to defer maintenance into the future. If one or both shoulders are opened up to an auxiliary lane, do you know what unintended consequence that is going to have to bridge maintenance on I-205 and the cost of such bridge maintenance.

Mr. Langer said that is part of the technical stuff they will answer. At this point of the study, it is simply putting every idea they can into a model and see what happens. He said there will be a plethora of questions like that. What they are charged to do is look at how they can use every piece of the existing system that they have out there to get every last drop out of it. That is what they are looking to do. There are certainly trade-offs to any of this.

Paul Greenlee said the piece that he drives with some regularity is from SR-14 south on the Glenn Jackson Bridge or from Mill Plain south. He said it really does point out to him the turbulence problem from Mill Plain to the bridge and once SR-14 comes on and the turbulence problem is solved, traffic moves until you get to Airport Way and then it backs up, and then it moves until it backs up from I-84 eastbound, and then it moves until I-84 westbound. He said for this kind of modeling to be effective, you will really have to get those Oregon pieces included.

Mr. Langer said they did go down into that area. They incorporated the Glenn Jackson Bridge and Airport Way. He said the congestion is there and the turbulence issues are showing themselves and they can see it and then calibrate the model. They can then better understand where their impact really is.

Rian Windsheimer said he is kind of excited that everybody here has taken such an interest in this kind of work and asking such educated questions. He said because this is really important work. Particularly, the idea that you are doing all this modeling and looking hard at not just solving a problem, but the next thing down the line. Mr. Windsheimer said they are talking about that. In Oregon they are also doing a congestion study. They are looking at where the bottlenecks are, where the queueing is, and they start thinking about where their next lines are. They start talking about if that actually makes a difference. It might make a big difference, but the next one is right there, so you are really not solving a problem in thinking about how all those things work together. Mr. Windsheimer said the idea of should you run cars there, what does that mean for maintenance, what does it mean from a trade-off of potentially running bus on shoulder and if that has an advantage. He asked how they think of that from a policy perspective in terms of where those trade-offs are and what the real benefits are, and what the destinations are for both. If you have a lot of folks who are using that shoulder lane, that are then going to just try to get back into the main line to go further, that may not be a benefit; whereas, if they are actually destined for Airport Way and the jobs at the airport and the port and other places, that might make more sense. There are a lot of considerations that move into this. Mr. Windsheimer said he appreciated that WSDOT is taking the time to come down and talk with them about how they are thinking about things and coordinating it. He said they have more work to do, but the good news is that they have two DOTs who are all thinking about how they can make the best bang for the buck in trying to resolve some of those issues.

Carley Francis said it is kind of a different idea, and it is definitely a point of potential coordination if it is technically feasible between the states that is unique and a little different. She said she appreciated the first conversation that they had with ODOT. They had a lot of really good questions and identification of all these different kind of nest of issues that are there. She said she also really appreciates entering the conversation and explore it to see whether or not it is something that actually has legs or not. At this point, they don't know, and that is very plain. It has this promise of green, but it is also untested from a feasibility perspective. Ms. Francis said specific to the idea of the balance between bus on shoulder and that priority value versus peak use shoulder. She said on SR-14 that looks like transit gets the

same reliability out of a peak use shoulder lane, and that type of sense of what they are valuing and how they are valuing it is also important to layer in. Ms. Francis said she appreciates the conversation with ODOT so far and looking forward to seeing whether or not it is actually something that could work.

## **XII. Vancouver Area Smart Trek (VAST) Program Report**

Bob Hart said this is part of a regular update to the Board that they do about every year about the VAST program. VAST stands for the Vancouver Area Smart Trek. It links intelligent transportation systems (ITS) technology with a system and communications infrastructure to improve traffic operations through agency collaboration. A copy of the VAST 2019 Annual Program Report is attached to the memo included in the meeting packet. Mr. Hart would provide highlights of the report.

Mr. Hart said VAST is a partnership. RTC works with the VAST agency partners. They have been working together since 2001 on project development, planning, funding, and sharing resources for ITS and operations. The chart on page 2 of the report gives a more detailed overview of the program and responsibilities. Besides the overall benefits of the program that are there, they also do this because they have to. It fulfills federal requirements to develop and maintain a regional ITS architecture and the Congestion Management Process requirements to collaborate on operational strategies before you can add roadway capacity. Mr. Hart said Scott Langer alluded to that in his presentation, the fact that we need to think about these things besides new roadway capacity all the time.

Mr. Hart said a big effort this next year will be to update their ITS architecture. What this means is that they have to update the definitions to their data flows, information functions, physical communications connections that they need to have in place to make sure that technologies are integrated and work together between systems, as well as accounting for new technologies like connected vehicles.

Mr. Hart said this collaboration has been pretty successful over the years. Partner agencies secured \$34 million in federal funding over the last 17 years have been programmed for VAST TSMO types of projects. The reality is it is a very small part of the overall program. If you look at roughly of all the projects from the currently adopted TIP, it is about 3% of all the projects that are programmed in the TIP. It is a very small amount of money for a good value. Projects that TSMO and VAST will fund include: central system upgrades; arterial and freeway detection; cameras; variable message signs; transit signal priority; and things of that nature, including the fiber and network infrastructure they need to make sure they operate well.

One of the things that they have in the TIP that was adopted by the Board last month is something that is called a Regional Signal System Project. Mr. Hart said it represents good collaboration on the part of the VAST partners. In 2016, Clark County, WSDOT, and City of Vancouver all had central signal systems to help operate their system, but they were separate and could not talk to each other. The small cities couldn't even look at their signals remotely or how they were performing. That has been changing over the last few years through the

collaboration process that they have. In 2016, they had grant money to connect Clark County and WSDOT into a single ATMS system so they could talk to each other and share information across their signal systems. In 2020, also a federal grant that will bring in the small cities, Battle Ground, Camas, and Washougal, to be part of a single shared system. In the new TIP in 2022, they have programmed additional funds to bring in the City of Vancouver. With the completion of that project, they will have a single integrated ATMS system for the region for improved corridor management across jurisdictions and between facilities. This took a lot of conversation on the part of the VAST group to get everyone to work toward having this together. Also, over time they can work toward a transportation management center where they can possibly have co-located operation. They will have rules in place for what happens during the off hours, when city or county staff are not there to address issues like an accident that may come up in the corridor.

Mr. Hart said they have a list of emerging issues and trends. These are things that are coming up or recently happened that represent a different way of thinking about transportation operations and making better use of what they have on the ground already. They have the bus on shoulder project on SR-14 that has been there for a couple years. C-TRAN, WSDOT, and ODOT are planning on doing bus on shoulder on the Glenn Jackson Bridge to Airport Way during the I-5 Bridge trunnion repair project in September 2020. There is the SR-14 expansion project with auxiliary lanes between 164<sup>th</sup> Ave. to I-205 and a westbound peak shoulder running. I-5 south will have ramp metering and variable speed signs that will open the summer of 2020 before the trunnion project begins in September. In addition, WSDOT and C-TRAN are going to construct bus on shoulder on I-5 southbound as well to open summer of 2020 prior to the I-5 trunnion project in September.

Mr. Hart referred to a flier introducing the Smart Communities Assessment included in the meeting materials. RTC is hosting a Smart Communities Assessment for transportation and stakeholder engagement workshop, or SCA Workshop early next year. It is being jointly funded by all the VAST partners, Vancouver, WSDOT, Clark County, C-TRAN, and RTC. It builds on previous VAST projects and initiatives. They had a workshop in late 2017 that provided the general overview of the whole idea of smart cities, what it means, and how they can benefit communities. As a follow up, the VAST agencies are cooperating on this on the next logical step with the SCA project. There will be a broad outreach with transportation agencies and departments, and elected officials and policy makers. It will evaluate current practices and how they do things now on technology and smart communities. It will compare our region with other regions in the country. It will provide a benchmark as well as a model for implementation of emerging technologies for mobility and transportation by reducing silos and furthering integrations between systems. The project will have two main tasks. The first task is an all-day workshop broken into three parts: a two-hour session with elected officials and stakeholders; a longer session with planning, technical, and IT staff with different departments and different agencies all together; and a debrief to the RTC Board as a discussion of the day and key takeaways from what happened that day. The second task is a broad online survey of agency staff to look at current practices again, processes that provide information on smart

communities with benchmarks on strengths, weaknesses, areas for improvement, and things to do better to advance the concept. Those findings will also be presented to the Board when it is done. They are still developing the schedule, but the workshop will take place early next year, and they are tentatively set for February 4, the February Board meeting. He said to expect to spend about an hour of the meeting with the workshop results. There will be invitations to also attend the morning session for the stakeholder workshop portion as well. They will talk more about this as they get closer to the forum.

Shirley Craddick said he had mentioned that there are plans for bus on shoulder on both bridges. She asked how that fit with the presentation that they just had where WSDOT is considering using the shoulders for additional lanes for autos.

Mr. Hart said for I-205, it is just a temporary bus on shoulder. It will be during the I-5 Bridge Trunion Repair project. What happens after that will be part of that discussion WSDOT talked about regarding using the shoulder for hard shoulder running during peak period use and how buses may or may not fit into that. In the short term, next September they will be doing bus on shoulder as mitigation for the trunion project.

Councilor Craddick said that bus on shoulder comes first.

Mr. Hart said yes, but although the bus on shoulder project on I-5 south from the park and ride at 99<sup>th</sup> Street down I-5 to the I-5 Bridge will be a permanent improvement on I-5 south.

### **XIII. Other Business**

#### From the Board

Chair McEnerny-Ogle said just as a reminder, Diane sent out the survey on Matt's annual performance review on the 1<sup>st</sup> of November. If any member did not get that, she asked that they contact Diane to have it resent or for any assistance regarding the survey. She asked members to try to get that done before Wednesday, November 20. The Executive Committee will review the collected information during the last week of November, and they will report that to the Board on December 3 and have that discussion in Executive Session with Matt.

#### From the Director

Mr. Ransom said he listed the Clark County Transportation Alliance 2020 Policy Statement on the agenda to bring it forward, and it will be presented to the Board to consider fully and endorse it at the December meeting. The year 2020 Clark County Transportation Alliance Policy Statement was attached to the memo included in the meeting packet. The tradition of RTC is they participate in the Clark County Transportation Alliance in two ways. One, RTC staff provides technical assistance to the staff at Identity Clark County and others that convene the coordinating process to develop the statement. They review the projects and the ideas in relation to the Regional Transportation Plan. They review those for relevancy in terms of current projects that member agencies are pursuing. As part of that process, Mr. Ransom reaches out to each agency to elicit their endorsement and clarification or re-stating as the case might be in any circumstance of the projects that are listed. As can be seen, these are a subset and probably the most important projects that agencies are both individually pursuing and that

it makes sense for the region to pursue as a collective. That is the origin of the Alliance Statement. The process in terms of development is there is a coordinating committee. It is called Clark County Governmental Affairs Roundtable. The CCTA is a subcommittee of that. They convene an annual meeting where the legislative affairs staffs from various entities convene around the table, generally in October, to share what they're collectively pursuing and individually pursuing in Olympia. The intent of the Roundtable and the intent of the Alliance Statement is to speak with one voice, not to usurp individual voices, but where there is an opportunity to make a collective statement that that is done. This would be the transportation collective statement. That committee met on October 15 and recommended for release of the statement that is before the Board. The RTC's process is to look at the statement from a legislative standpoint. The RTC Board is to review the statement and then offer endorsement. It is at that point, after the Board has endorsed it, that then the logo would be associated with the Statement. This will return for the Board's final consideration at the December meeting should the Board chooses to endorse it as a statement of collective interest. This doesn't usurp individual interests. It is just a collective statement. Mr. Ransom would then notify Identity Clark County and RTC's logo would be attached to it. In prior years, the same process has taken place. The last time the Board saw this statement and offered formal endorsement was December 4 of last year. The schedule would be then to have this, as many agencies as choose to endorse it, it would then be presented to the Legislative members as part of their annual legislative breakfast. Mr. Ransom said he thought that was scheduled for December 13. That is where they, as regional stakeholders, have an opportunity to hear from our state delegates to both interact and share with them our priorities, the transportation list. Sometime during the Legislative Session they have an Alliance Day where anybody that is available and has an interest in transportation issues convenes in Olympia for a half-day session with our Legislative Members. They feed them lunch. They convene around the table to talk about priorities, and after that morning session, they have an opportunity in the afternoon to pay individual visits to advocate for projects that are represented in the statement. RTC typically participates. The Legislative day has not been scheduled. Mr. Ransom said if there are questions about this, individual agencies might see this for their own purpose, but this presentation is for RTC's benefit.

Chair McEnery-Ogle asked Carley Francis for any updates on the I-5 Bridge replacement.

Carley Francis said with respect to the I-5 Bridge replacement, as mentioned earlier, there was the first Bi-State meeting of Oregon and Washington Legislators engaged in that process. It was a full meeting, all 16 members, 1 participating by phone. It was a great showing of support. It is good that that conversation has started. The states are coordinating to get this conversation around "how do we work together with the local agency partners", so that is ODOT and WSDOT convening that conversation with Metro, RTC, the Cities of Portland and Vancouver, C-TRAN and TriMet to really map that out before they get into the sticky business of "the what." That work is ongoing. It is good progress. There is another meeting coming up on November 13. She did not yet have an official location for the meeting. The meeting is open to the public. On both Oregon and Washington Legislature websites have information about the committee. A

search for I-5 Bridge on both states will find the committee information. Ms. Francis said that she believed that they are having public testimony at each meeting. They had a half hour this last time, and she believed that they are anticipating a half hour each time.

Shawn Donaghy said they continue to move forward on Mill Plain BRT. A few months back, they submitted their 30% design to the Federal Government so they will hopefully get in the queue for funding. They hope to know something by 2020. They are probably a lot closer to 60%, which will be at the beginning of the year, which means they will get out and start having some conversations about what that means for where the stop locations are going to be and what construction may take place as they continue to get a lot closer to the appropriation of those funds and what they are going to do with the project. That corridor continues to grow. It is really a prime location for a bus rapid transit.

Mr. Donaghy said a couple weeks ago they had an opportunity to go to New York City and finally receive their award for Public Transit System of the Year. He said they received a lot of cards from a lot of communities and transit agencies talking about how awesome our community is. That is a big deal. It really resonated with a lot of the folks they talked to when they were there, a lot of other public transit systems, and they brought a lot of their Board members who serve their communities. They asked them a lot of questions about the makeup of our city governments and county government and how they interact with each other and how we are able to see such amazing progress within the county, and what that means not just from a public transit standpoint, but what it means for citizens that live within the county. He said it was really nice to be able to represent Clark County in that and see people really take a lot of interest in how our bi-state DOTs work together, how our governments are working together to solve problems. He said they don't always agree on everything, but at the end of the day, they are always trying to do the right thing for the citizens. Mr. Donaghy said it was really nice to hear from peer agencies when they were there. He said he just wanted to bring that message back to the home crowd and say thanks for everybody's support on that.

Mr. Donaghy also said two things they have done over the past couple weeks. They were able to go to Ridgefield and Washougal and drop off their new City Series buses for those communities. They look fantastic. They are up to five now, and they all look amazing. Eric Florip who works in their communications department and Dean Horn who is their graphic designer get the credit for that work. They go out and try to capture the essence of every single community. They do an amazing job, by taking pictures and finding things that are really unique to each individual city in the communities in Clark County. When they put that on a bus, it is fantastic. He gave a shout out to those two guys.

Paul Greenlee said they had their ribbon cutting for the two roundabouts on SR-14 on the 30<sup>th</sup> of October. He thanked Carley Francis and all of her staff and the contractors. He said it is a great project, and it looks wonderful.

Carley Francis said they appreciate the partnership, and it has been great. As a point of note, that is one of those situations where they had an amount of funding from Connecting

Washington. It wasn't enough necessarily to meet all of the community desires and needs, but through effective work together, they found a really good starting point for the community, which she said she really values the opportunity to have these good constructive conversations when they have a balance of needs and budget to navigate together. They have brought three roundabouts to SR-14 this year. They have the third one at Wind River Road. The opportunity keeps moving; Ridgefield is a fan obviously. This also helped the Port of Camas Washougal have good access to SR-14 for their large trucks. It was a significant safety improvement.

Paul Greenlee thanked Shawn Donaghy for the Washougal bus. He said they did a great job.

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, December 3, 2019, at 4 p.m. back at the regular location in the Clark County Public Service Center.

#### **XIV. Adjourn**

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

---

Anne McEnery-Ogle, Board of Directors Chair