

Appendix C: Stakeholder and Public Comments and RTC Response

Stakeholders and Public Outreach Processes

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for Clark County is the region's long-range regional transportation plan. The RTP is a part of the required federal transportation planning process and represents the collective strategy for guiding the development of a regional transportation system to provide mobility and accessibility for person trips, as well as freight and goods movement. The transportation plan is based on the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan for Clark County and supports local land uses and the region's economic development. The RTP identifies future travel needs, recommends policies and transportation strategies, and identifies implementation programs to meet future transportation needs.

The stakeholder and public outreach and participation process is an integral part of the RTP's development. Through this planning process, stakeholders and the public have been encouraged to participate in the draft RTP by commenting on its elements via the RTP [StoryMap](#) on the RTC's web page, via an online feedback form, via email and US mail, and in person at RTC Board meetings. All public meetings relating to the RTP's development were held at locations served by public transportation and in accessible meeting rooms. RTC makes translation services available at public meetings through contract with Telelanguage.com and translation of website materials through Google translate. Involvement of the public in regional transportation planning builds from local efforts with public meetings held by WSDOT, C-TRAN, and local jurisdictions to seek public input on local transportation plans and projects.

A SEPA checklist and Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) was issued for the Regional Transportation Plan for Clark County update in late November 2023. The SEPA documentation was circulated and made available on Washington Department of Ecology's SEPA Register and directly mailed to local, regional, and statewide stakeholders allowing consultation resource agencies, tribes and interested parties to access the draft RTP.

RTC Board and RTAC RTP Discussions

Draft RTP elements and information have been made available via the [RTC website](#), a joint RTAC and RTC Board workshop, RTAC meetings, and RTC Board meetings. Monthly meetings of the RTC Board of Directors allow the public to comment on regional transportation issues in a formal setting. All

comments at these meetings become part of the meeting record. The RTP update has been a regular agenda item at many of the RTC Board meetings during the latter part of 2022, throughout 2023, and during early 2024. A cumulative discussion was held by RTC staff and the RTC Board during the following meetings:

Table 1: Summary of RTC Board RTP Discussions

Date	RTP Topic	Meeting Link
9/6/2022	RTP scoping	9/2022 Board of Directors Meeting
12/6/2022	RTP schedule	12/2022 Board of Directors Meeting
1/3/2023	State and Federal requirements	1/2023 Board of Directors Meeting
2/7/2023	Trends and policies influencing RTP, transportation performance measures and targets	2/2023 Board of Directors Meeting
3/7/2023	Policy framework, demographic Profile, 2045 growth projections	3/2023 Board of Directors Meeting
4/4/2023	Process update	4/2023 Board of Directors Meeting
6/6/2023	Congestion management process	6/2023 Board of Directors Meeting
9/5/2023	Reformatting the RTP and draft goals, objectives, and actions	9/2023 Board of Directors Meeting
10/3/2023	RTP Action Strategies, 6-Year Project List, and 20-Year Project list; equity considerations and framework	10/2023 Board of Directors Meeting
11/17/2023	RTP Workshop–StoryMap, policy framework, and action strategies	11/2023 Board/RTAC Workshop
1/2/2024	Draft RTP	1/2024 Board of Directors Meeting
2/6/2024	RTP adoption	2/2024 Board of Directors Meeting

On November 17, 2023, the RTC Board and RTAC held a joint workshop to review the draft RTP. Overall, comments received were in favor of the draft RTP and its elements. A handful of recommendations for improving the StoryMap and draft RTP were considered and incorporated.

The various components of the draft RTP were also discussed during the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC) monthly meetings. RTAC is comprised of local jurisdictions and transportation planning agencies and is the advisory committee to the RTC Board. RTC staff and RTAC held RTP discussion during the following meetings:

Table 2: Summary of RTAC RTP Discussions

Date	RTP Topic	Meeting Link
11/18/2022	RTP schedule	11/2022 RTAC Meeting
12/16/2022	State and Federal requirements	12/2022 RTAC Meeting
1/20/2023	Trends and policies influencing RTP, transportation performance management measures and targets	1/2023 RTAC Meeting
2/17/2023	Policy framework, demographic profile, 2045 growth projections	2/2023 RTAC Meeting
3/17/2023	Status report	3/2023 RTAC Meeting
7/21/2023	6-Year Project List and 20-Year Project List	7/2023 RTAC Meeting
8/18/2023	RTP policy framework – vision, goals, objectives, & actions	8/2023 RTAC Meeting
9/15/2023	RTP policy framework and RTP project lists	9/2023 RTAC Meeting
10/20/2023	RTP financial and action plan; equity planning considerations and framework	10/2023 RTAC Meeting
11/17/2023	RTP workshop – StoryMap, policy framework, and action strategies	11/2023 Board/RTAC Workshop
12/15/2023	Draft RTP	12/2023 RTAC Meeting
1/19/2024	Motion to RTC Board to adopt RTP	1/2024 RTAC Meeting

Consultation with Planning Partners

In addition, consultation meetings were held with planning partners. On December 12, 2023, RTC and Metro staff met to discuss the Clark County RTP and other bistate topics. On January 9, 2024, RTC staff met with FHWA, FTA, WSDOT, and C-TRAN to discuss the RTP and its elements. Planning partners took the opportunity to discuss their concerns and provide accolades.

Public and Stakeholders Comments on RTP

The draft RTP was made available for a formal public comment period beginning on November 22, 2023, and extending through January 11, 2024. An online open house (StoryMap) was created to provide an

opportunity to learn about the RTP and let RTC staff know what the public and stakeholders think about the draft plan. The StoryMap used for the online open house may be found [here](#). Comments received from the public and RTC's responses are documented in this Appendix of the RTP. Table 3 presents public comments received by RTC and RTC's response to the comments.

Table 3: Summary of Public Comment on RTP

#	Date	Agency/ Name	Comments	RTC Response
1	12/5/2023	Vancouver/ Mayor Pro Tem Ty Stober	<i>Edits to Figure 2-3 Replace 0.9% with 5.8% on last column</i>	Edits made as suggested
2	12/15/2023	Clark County/ Christopher Carle	<i>Edits to Table 5-1 Regional Transportation Plan Completed projects. Updated total project costs to 5 projects.</i>	Edits made as suggested
3	12/15/2023	Clark County/ Christopher Carle	<i>Edits to Table 6-2 Regional Transportation Plan 6-Year RTP Project List. Updated project description, estimated year of completion and/or total project costs to 11 projects.</i>	Edits made as suggested
4	12/15/2023	Clark County/ Christopher Carle	<i>Edits to Table 6-2 Regional Transportation Plan 6-Year RTP Project List. Add 5 projects.</i>	Added 5 projects as suggested. Did not include 5 HMA and scour projects
5	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>Southwest Regional Transportation Council Transportation Council [Add missing space between words.]</i>	Edits made as suggested
6	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>Appendix A – Statutory Regulations Regulations Appendix Appendix C – Public Comments and RTC Response</i>	Edits made as suggested
7	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Kate Tollefson	<i>RTC also serves as the regional transportation planning organization (RTPO) for the three-county area of Clark, Skamania, and Klickitat counties, as required authorized by the State Growth Management Act (GMA).</i>	Edits made as suggested
8	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Kate Tollefson	<i>Omit reference to air quality for clarity. E.g., change to: “Under the Federal Transportation Act, this RTP must be updated every 5 years.”</i>	Edits made as suggested
9	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>...through the neighbourhood online news and neighbourhood liaisons and was and</i>	Edits made as suggested

#	Date	Agency/ Name	Comments	RTC Response
			<i>was posted on RTC's website. [Add missing space between words.]</i>	
10	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Kate Tollefson	<i>Move sentence "The current RTP meets federal requirements...and was posted on RTC's website" to the following section 2024 Regional Transportation Plan – Public Participation.</i>	Edits made as suggested
11	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>Clark County's Comprehensive Plan land uses are mapped in Figure 2-1 Figure 2-1. For additional information, see Appendix D. The GMA requires... [Add missing spaces between words, sentences.]</i>	Edits made as suggested
12	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>Multnomah Multnomah County, OR Snohomish Snohomish County, WA</i>	Edits made as suggested
13	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>The description of SR 500 as carrying traffic to and from the mall oversimplifies the highway's regional significance and might better be expanded to "The facility carries traffic to and from the Clark County regional shopping mall as well as other significant commercial areas and residential communities."</i>	Edits made as suggested
14	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>SR 502 extends from the I-5/NE 219 219th Street interchange to an intersection with SR 503 in Battle Ground.</i>	Edits made as suggested
15	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>The reference to I-5 as Clark County's only STRAHNET highway facility appears to be incorrect. I-205 is also a STRAHNET facility.</i>	Edits made as suggested
16	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>Federal functional classifications of the RTP regional transportation system are shown in Figure 2-7 2-6.</i>	Edits made as suggested
17	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>"Washington is a gateway state, connecting:" A list of some sort should follow the colon, but is absent.</i>	Edits made as suggested
18	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>Figure 2-9 2-8 shows WSDOT's Freight and Goods Transportation System.</i>	Edits made as suggested
19	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>...is home to 50+ businesses employing approximately 1,000 employees, with an annual payroll and an annual payroll exceeding \$35 million.</i>	Edits made as suggested

#	Date	Agency/ Name	Comments	RTC Response
20	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>It is unclear what the Asian trade flows graphic on page 34 is meant to communicate.</i>	Labels on chart have been edited as follows: primary caption as “Washington’s role in international and national freight” with the three sub-bullets/call-outs being <i>Asian Trade Flows to the US Economy, Alaska to the Lower 48, and Canada to the US West Coast</i>
21	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>Community in Motion: On Page 41 of the RTP, Community in Motion’s services are discussed. However, this portion of the Clark RTP appears to have been switched with similar sections in the Klickitat and Skamania RTPs; Community in Motion offers more services within Clark County than in either Klickitat or Skamania Counties. Also, the Transportation Brokerage information should state that it is specific to Medicaid clients only and is unavailable to non-Medicaid clients. Community in Motion has other programs which provide services for non-Medicaid clients.</i>	Descriptions on this section are high level, intended to provide a quick overview of existing transportation services in the region. Description matches the one used in the most recent HSTP. No edits will be made to this section
22	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>Figure 2-9 is redundant, presenting no information that is not also displayed in Figure 2-10.</i>	The RTP will retain both figures as they are relevant to information provided. Figure 2-9 was renamed 2-11 and moved between pages 40 and 41.
23	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>The discussion of Amtrak facilities on page 41 states there are 70 miles of passenger rail corridor within Cowlitz and Lewis Counties. Please include information relevant to Clark County instead.</i>	Edits to section have been made

#	Date	Agency/ Name	Comments	RTC Response
24	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>The TriMet section on page 41 incorrectly describes transit services into Vancouver. Please update the information to accurately reflect that TriMet does not provide fixed route service to Vancouver</i>	Edits to section have been made
25	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>For additional information, see Appendix E F.</i>	Edits made as suggested
26	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>Please amend the Safety paragraph on page 44 to read: "The frequency, severity, location, and type of crashes are assessed by WSDOT and local jurisdictions. The RTP supports regional system safety projects identified through Safety Management System (SMS) planning, in addition to local plans and programs to reduce serious and fatal injury crash potential on the regional transportation system."</i>	Edits made as suggested
27	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>Clark County's 2012 Aging Readiness Plan (ARP) is referenced in the Aging Readiness discussion on page 45. The county council adopted the 2023 ARP update in September, and the Clark RTP should instead reference this updated version.</i>	Edits to section have been made
28	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>For the system performance report, please provide an explanation for the use of state-wide safety performance data instead of data specific to RTC's metropolitan planning area to fulfil the requirement of reporting on MPO system performance per 23 CFR 450.324. (f)(4).</i>	Explanation can be found under the RTP Performance, Federal Performance section (second paragraph) on page 65. Safety performance targets have been updated to regional targets.
29	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>There are several LOS and GMA points on page 61 that should be considered and integrated into the Clark RTP: Please note that highways of state-wide significance are exempt from concurrency requirements. Please indicate the region's adopted standards for non-HHS state highways, E for urban areas and C for rural, in accordance with RCW 47.80.030(1)(c).</i>	Edits made as suggested and were incorporated into LOS and GMA section on page 61

#	Date	Agency/ Name	Comments	RTC Response
30	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>In the Chapter 5 funding discussion, please include the following statement: Note that the Washington State Legislature determines transportation project and program funding priorities. Multiple obligations, including mandates and prior legislative packages, also impact WSDOT's available resources for funding projects.</i>	Edits made as suggested to state wide funding section on page 82
31	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>On page 76, the inclusion of "2024" in the Table 5-1 title is confusing, as listed projects were completed in previous years.</i>	Table is part of <i>Accomplishments and Challenges</i> discussion. No edits required
32	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>Suggestions for Table 5-2 on page 79 include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>The table's title does not match its contents.</i> - <i>For both the Clark County and Cities and the C-TRAN rows, annual cost values are unrealistically large portions of 22-year cost values (42% each).</i> - <i>This table states the total annual cost for maintenance and preservation is \$158,315,175; Table 5-3 includes annual maintenance and preservation costs of \$164,647,782. The reason for the discrepancy is unclear.</i> - <i>The 22-year Cost total value (\$5,027,813,145) far exceeds the sum of the above three rows (\$775,194,109).</i> 	Table 5-2 was revised. Cost values included on this table were provided by agencies
33	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>On page 79, please include an explanation for the different inflation rates used for cost (3%) and revenue (1%).</i>	Explanation for the assumed average growth rate and percent of inflation used for the revenue forecast are included in page 81. These factors were

#	Date	Agency/ Name	Comments	RTC Response
				developed based on historical trends.
34	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<p><i>The second and third paragraphs should be amended to read:</i></p> <p><i>“The IBR program cost estimate reflects the components being analysed in the supplemental environmental impact statement. The cost estimate accounts for current market conditions, along with potential risks and cost saving opportunities, and includes all costs associated with constructing the replacement bridge and all other program components in the estimated 2025 – 2034-time frame. The program is expected to cost between \$5 and \$7.5 billion, with an estimated cost of \$6 billion.</i></p> <p><i>Revenue from a diverse range of sources is required, including federal funds, tolling, and state funds from both Oregon and Washington. Variable rate tolling will help generate revenue to fund construction and facility operations and maintenance through the duration of the construction loan, as well as manage demand and improve mobility through the corridor. Funding sources include:”</i></p>	Edits made as suggested
35	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<p><i>The funding sources graphic should be updated to reflect 100M of Existing Oregon and Washington state funding, rather than 1M, and 1B of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) New Starts CIG Funding, rather than 1M.</i></p>	Edits made as suggested

#	Date	Agency/ Name	Comments	RTC Response
36	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>Transportation allowance for commuters rather than free parkinG parking</i>	Edits made as suggested
37	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	Streetcar Streetcar [Second column]	Edits made as suggested to Table 4-7
38	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>A full description of current and potential revenue sources and funding programs available for transportation uses is available in Appendix N M.</i>	Edits made as suggested
39	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>Broken down by point of expenditure, this equates to about \$1.2 B billion in federal revenues, \$2.6 billion in WSDOT revenues, \$1.8 billion in local revenues, and \$2.4 billion in C-TRAN revenues.</i>	Edits made as suggested
40	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	Economies Economic Vitality & Quality of Life	Edits made as suggested
41	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	Economies Economic Vitality & Quality of Life <i>The pie chart should be shifted downward off of the title bar.</i>	Edits made as suggested
42	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>Suggestions for Figure 5-4 on page 84 include:</i> <i>The values and legend of the figure are incorrect given the costs shown in Table 5-4. Please modify the chart legend as follows:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Safety & Security should be light blue (8%)</i> - <i>Economic Vitality & Quality of Life should be lime green (2%)</i> - <i>Accessibility & Mobility should be dark blue (53%)</i> - <i>Sustainability & Resiliency should be orange (37%)</i> <i>The labeled values for the two smallest pie chart wedges are incorrect; they should be 8% and 2%.</i>	Figure 5-4 was modified given edits to 6-Year RTP Project List

#	Date	Agency/ Name	Comments	RTC Response
43	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<p><i>Suggestions for Table 5-5 on page 84 include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -<i>The right-most column appears to include mid-point year values. If so, the column title should be Regional Projects 2035.</i> -<i>Please double-check the values in the right-most column, as several entries vary slightly from expected mid-point year figures and that column's Total entry is not equal to the sum of the above four rows.</i> 	Figure 5-5 was modified given edits to 20-Year RTP Project List
44	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<p><i>Suggestions for Figure 5-5 on page 84 include:</i></p> <p><i>To be consistent with Figure 5-4, this figure's title should be Figure 5-5. 20-Year RTP List: Regional Projects</i></p> <p><i>The values and legend of the figure are incorrect given the costs shown in Table 5-5. Please modify the chart legend as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -<i>Safety & Security should be lime green (8%)</i> -<i>Economic Vitality & Quality of Life should be light blue (14%)</i> -<i>Accessibility & Mobility should be dark blue (50%)</i> -<i>Sustainability & Resiliency should be orange (28%)</i> <p><i>The labelled values for the light blue pie chart wedge should be 14%.</i></p>	Figure 5-5 was modified given edits to 20-Year RTP Project List
45	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<p><i>...followed by Sustainability and Resiliency (24 28 percent). [Assuming the Regional Projects values in Table 5-5 are correct.]</i></p>	Figure 5-5 was modified given edits to 20-Year RTP Project List
46	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<p><i>These regional projects for the next six years are listed in Table 6-1 6-2.</i></p>	Edits made as suggested
47	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<p><i>The plan includes many hyperlinks to external references and resources. These links did not function for some WSDOT staff while working appropriately for others, an issue which may limit accessibility for some members of the community.</i></p>	Hyperlinks have been checked and seemed to be working

#	Date	Agency/ Name	Comments	RTC Response
48	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>Edits to Table 5-1 Regional Transportation Plan Completed projects. Updated estimated year of completion and/or total project costs to 2 projects</i>	Edits made as suggested
49	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>Edits to Table 6-2 Regional Transportation Plan 6-Year RTP Project List. Updated estimated year of completion and/or total project costs to 5 projects</i>	Edits made as suggested
50	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>Edits to Table 6-2 Regional Transportation Plan 6-Year RTP Project List. Move 2 projects to 20-Year RTP project List.</i>	Edits made as suggested
51	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>Edits to Table 6-2 Regional Transportation Plan 6-Year RTP Project List. Added 7 new projects to list</i>	Edits made as suggested
52	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>Moved 3 projects from 6-Year RTP Project List to 20-Year RTP Project List on Appendix N</i>	Edits made as suggested
53	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>Edits to 9 projects on 20-Year RTP Project List on Appendix N.</i>	Edits made as suggested
54	12/15/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<i>Added 8 projects to 20-Year RTP Project List on Appendix N.</i>	Edits made as suggested
55	12/15/2023	COV/Mayor Anne McEnerny - Ogle	<i>Edit 20-Year RTP Project list on Appendix N. Change City of Vancouver 32nd Avenue project's name to "Fruit Valley Freight Access and Safety Improvements Project"</i>	Edits made as suggested
56	12/20/2023	Citizen/Chris Moen	<i>Regarding the section of 152nd Avenue from Padden Parkway to NE 99th Street: the proposal is to widen the road and add a turn lane, bike lanes and sidewalks. These are good improvements, HOWEVER; there is no mention of providing for a stop sign, traffic light, or some means to allow children and pedestrians to safely cross 152nd Avenue from York Elementary School. I cross there often and people are VERY careless and do not observe rules of a painted sidewalk.</i> <i>Regarding 162nd Avenue between NE 99TH Street and NE Ward Road; There is no mention of any improvements along this section of road. People use this road as a bypass and travel VERY FAST on this section</i>	Concern forwarded to Clark County Public Works staff. They provided follow up to address citizen comment.

#	Date	Agency/ Name	Comments	RTC Response
57	12/29/2023	WSDOT/Jason Gibbens	<p><i>of road. Again, children and pedestrians must be very cautious along this stretch of road. We need some sort of traffic-calming measures!!! We would very much appreciate speed bumps to slow the traffic so that children crossing the road are not in danger.</i></p> <p><i>This came in too late for inclusion in the earlier comments, but the Rail Division would like to include the below information about Cascadia high-speed rail in Chapter 2.</i></p> <p><i>“Cascadia High-Speed Rail</i> <i>A series of recent studies and analysis conducted between 2016 and 2020 (also known as the Ultra-High-Speed Ground Transportation study) lay out a vision for a new high-speed corridor connecting the Portland, OR, Seattle, WA, and Vancouver, B.C. metropolitan areas. This would be an entirely new transportation service with the potential to reduce travel times to under one hour between each city and Seattle. Previous studies estimated this system would have as much as \$355 billion in economic benefits and add 200,000 new jobs in the region, as well as other environmental and safety benefits.</i></p> <p><i>In fall 2021, the states of Washington and Oregon and the province of British Columbia signed a Memorandum of Understanding to continue to advance this work. In December 2023, Cascadia High-Speed Rail and Amtrak Cascades were accepted into the USDOT’s Corridor Identification and Development Program, bringing formal federal funding and participation. WSDOT, ODOT, and the B.C. Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure continue to collaborate with partners along the corridor to shape future planning and development activities.”</i></p>	<p>Suggested language was incorporated to the existing Cascadia High Speed Rail Study description on page 2 of Appendix N.</p> <p>Chapter 2 describes existing conditions; current and planned studies are included in Appendix N.</p>

#	Date	Agency/ Name	Comments	RTC Response
58	1/4/2024	Citizen/John Ley	<p data-bbox="646 275 1182 590"><i>In 2008, the RTC completed a "Visioning Study" which identified transportation needs for Clark County, once the population reached 1 million people. Today in 2024, we are over half way to that 1 million population, and sadly, there has been ZERO planning for the needed TWO new transportation corridors and additional bridges over the Columbia River.</i></p> <p data-bbox="646 632 1182 1052"><i>It was recently revealed that Oregon, via ODOT's Westside Mobility Improvement Study (WMIS) is studying a Northern Connector, among other projects. The Northern Connector proposes to build a highway northeast from highway 26 in the Beaverton-Hillsboro area, proceeding through a tunnel under the West Hills, and connecting to US 30. Furthermore, they plan to build a new bridge over the Willamette River to connect with terminals 4, 5, and 6 at the Port of Portland.</i></p> <p data-bbox="646 1094 1182 1661"><i>This is of extreme interest of SW Washington residents because it offers a logical western bypass of I-5. It offers a direct connection between the Port of Vancouver to the Port of Portland. All that is needed, is for Washington to seek a bridge over the Columbia River connecting with the west side of the Port of Vancouver. Your own Visioning Study provided TWO "options" for a western bridge over the Columbia that connected the two ports. The early planning has already been accomplished! This would take a significant number of 18-wheel trucks OFF the Interstate Bridge and I-5. It would enhance freight mobility in the region. It would reduce traffic congestion on I-5.</i></p> <p data-bbox="646 1703 1182 1837"><i>Here is a recent article. Northern Connector to provide both a tunnel and a new bridge over the Willamette River ClarkCountyToday.com</i></p>	<p data-bbox="1195 275 1463 842">The "Visioning Study" is mentioned on Appendix N. It is also listed as an action strategy to implement the RTP. Action strategies can be found on Chapter 6. The scoping and programming of this study has not been added to our UPWP. This action is dependent on securing funding for the study.</p>

#	Date	Agency/ Name	Comments	RTC Response
			<p><i>and more:</i> https://www.portlandtribune.com/news/westside-transportation-study-proposes-tolls-for-u-s-26-highway-217/article_52f756e5-c4bc-5958-934e-cdface22c016.html</p> <p><i>Your Westside Corridor Options tied perfectly into what Oregon is considering for its Northern Connector! The RTC has sat on its hands doing nothing for over 15 years to begin planning and land acquisition for the TWO needed new transportation corridors over the Columbia River. You must begin now by putting TWO new transportation corridors in your 20-year RTP. One new bridge and corridor west of I-5 and one new bridge and corridor east of I-205.</i></p>	
59	1/9/2024	FHWA/ Kelly Dolan	<p><i>Table 4-3 mentions that GHG emissions reduction target is TBD by 2050, WA statewide GHG targets will be adopted by 2/1/2024. Metrics are different from this TBD target.</i></p>	<p>The TBD target was meant to reflect the Climate Element required as part of Clark County's Comprehensive Plan update. Which will be incorporated into the RTP by its 2026 amendment. The federal GHG performance measure will be adopted by the RTC Board after the RTP adoption therefore the federal GHG tailpipe CO2 emissions on the NHS target will also be incorporated in 2026 when the RTP is amended.</p>
60	1/9/2024	FHWA/Mathew Pahs	<p><i>How is the RTP addressing freight parking</i></p>	<p>The development of a freight plan is an action strategy identified in Chapter 6. This planning</p>

#	Date	Agency/ Name	Comments	RTC Response
				process will begin in early 2024 and it will include strategies and projects to address freight parking issues.
