

**Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Board of Directors
September 6, 2016, Meeting Minutes**

I. Call to Order and Roll Call of Members

The Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council Board of Directors Meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Jeanne Stewart on Tuesday, September 6, 2016, at 4:05 p.m. at the Clark County Public Service Center Sixth Floor Training Room, 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington. The meeting was recorded by CVTV. Attendance follows.

Voting Board Members Present:

Marc Boldt, Clark County Councilor
Kelly Brooks, ODOT (Alternate)
Jack Burkman, Vancouver Councilmember
Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor
Paul Greenlee, Washougal Councilmember
Jeff Hamm, C-TRAN Executive Director/CEO
Anne McEnery-Ogle, Vancouver Council
Jerry Oliver, Port of Vancouver Commissioner
Julie Olson, Clark County Councilor
Ron Onslow, Ridgefield Mayor
Jeanne Stewart, Clark County Councilor
Kris Strickler, WSDOT Regional Administrator

Voting Board Members Absent:

Jim Herman, Port of Klickitat Commissioner
Doug McKenzie, Skamania Co. Commissioner
Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region 1 Manager

Nonvoting Board Members Present:

Nonvoting Board Members Absent:

Curtis King, Senator 14th District
Norm Johnson, Representative 14th District
Gina McCabe, Representative 14th District
Don Benton, Senator 17th District
Paul Harris, Representative 17th District
Lynda Wilson, Representative 17th District
Ann Rivers, Senator 18th District
Liz Pike, Representative 18th District
Brandon Vick, Representative 18th District
John Braun, Senator 20th District
Richard DeBolt, Representative 20th District
Ed Orcutt, Representative 20th District
Annette Cleveland, Senator 49th District
Jim Moeller, Representative 49th District
Sharon Wylie, Representative 49th District

Guests Present:

Ron Arp, Identity Clark County
Ed Barnes, Citizen
Madison Chambers, WSDOT
Lori Figone, WSDOT
Jim Hagar, Port of Vancouver
Scott Hughes, Port of Ridgefield Commissioner
Dale Lewis, Congresswoman Herrera Beutler's Office
Steve Lovejoy, ODOT
Scott Patterson, C-TRAN
Scott Sawyer, City of Battle Ground
Marc Thornsbury, Port of Klickitat
Susan Wilson, Clark County

Staff Present:

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

II. Approval of the Board Agenda

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 6, 2016, MEETING AGENDA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MARC BOLDT AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

III. Call for Public Comments

Ed Barnes from Vancouver said he would again like to ask the RTC Board to create a resolution to encourage the Legislators of SW Washington to put together a package for the 2017 Legislature for funding to start the replacement of the I-5 Bridge. He noted the extreme congestion that everyone is witnessing on the bridge weekdays and weekends. Mr. Barnes said they are trying to get something happening here in Clark County to prove to the State of Oregon that people are onboard this time to get a package passed to replace the I-5 Bridge.

IV. Approval of August 2, 2016, Minutes

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 2, 2016, MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MARC BOLDT AND APPROVED. SHIRLEY CRADDICK AND KELLY BROOKS ABSTAINED.

V. Consent Agenda

A. September Claims

ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA SEPTEMBER CLAIMS. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY PAUL GREENLEE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

VI. YR 2020 Regional Grants

- **Project Evaluation and Prioritization**
- **TIP Programming Guidebook – Project Obligation Policy Revisions**

Dale Robins referred to the memos in the meeting packet. He reminded the Board that RTC has selection authority for federally allocated regional grants. He said this year they are selecting funds for anticipated year 2020 regional allocation of federal funds including the STP Urban and Rural grants and the CMAQ (Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality) grant.

The overall regional grant process includes three steps: 1) all projects are screened for eligibility, 2) projects are evaluated and ranked based on approved criteria, and 3) projects are selected for funding and programmed in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The grant process began in June with the RTC Board approval of the grant process and a call for projects. The process will end next month with the RTC Board grant selection and adoption of the 2017 – 2020 TIP.

This year they received a total of 18 grants requesting \$15.4 million, which is higher than the 15 grants requesting \$11.2 million received last year. This means overall, they have funding for about 57% of the total dollar requests.

Mr. Robins highlighted the scores and ranking of projects, and he said the evaluation has been reviewed by jurisdictions' staff at RTAC, who are recommending RTC Board acceptance. He

showed the overall score of the 11 projects competing for the STP Urban funding. A similar table can be found in the memo. This included the Urban Freeway Operations Study requested by the Board. The Urban Freeway Operations Study will analyze the I-5 corridor to allow the region to identify operational improvements to get the most out of the existing I-5 corridor.

Another slide showed the overall scores for the STP Rural and CMAQ projects. The region received only one project for the STP Rural program. There are six CMAQ projects. CMAQ projects are evaluated using the same criteria, but the air quality points are tripled. These tables are also in the memo.

Mr. Robins said the draft TIP document is currently out for public review. This process will end October 4 at the RTC Board meeting where the RTC Board will be asked to make the final 2020 grant selection and approve the 2017 – 2020 Transportation Improvement Program.

The action being asked on this item includes RTC Board acceptance of the evaluation and ranking of year 2020 grants as recommended by RTAC.

Paul Greenlee asked what UPWP and CMP stood for. Mr. Robins said the UPWP is the Unified Planning Work Program which is the planning process that RTC goes through each year. The CMP is the Congestion Management Process which has most recently been discussed.

Jeff Hamm asked if the ranking shown as N/A meant the funds were taken off the top for those projects. Mr. Robins said those projects can't really be evaluated with the criteria, usually being a planning process that can't be evaluated so they are placed at the top.

Jeanne Stewart said she had a question about the process. She said RTAC indicates priority and advises the Board. She asked what they base their priority on and how early in the process the elected folks are involved. She said they may have a different set of priorities.

Mr. Robins said the process begins with the RTC Board adopting the process including the criteria used to rank projects at the June meeting when they did the call for projects. Next, in July, grant applications are submitted to RTC. This is each jurisdiction's staff submitting what they consider the priority projects. This would hopefully be communication between your staff and the elected officials about what the priority projects would be that they submit. Those projects are submitted. They are evaluated by RTC staff with the approved criteria that were adopted and scored. Technical staff from each agency reviews the evaluations and scores. They are then taken to the RTAC committee where they approve the scores and make a recommendation to the RTC Board. The projects are ranked based on the score of the evaluation criteria.

Councilor Stewart said the staff priorities are indications from their elected bodies with the priority of that jurisdiction. Mr. Robins said that was correct.

Julie Olson said in looking at the projects, there is no dollar figure for the projects. She asked if that was known and just how many of the projects can be funded before funds run out. Mr. Robins said they have an idea. They know, but right now they are just doing an evaluation. Next month they will bring back and show what can actually be funded. Mr. Robins said when

they get to the funding, there is some give and take as to which projects get funded. When they have a project that is in the middle of when they run out of funding, the question becomes if they can fund it half way or can the previous project give up a little money to make the project whole. Some of that goes on to make the final recommendation.

Paul Greenlee asked what STEVE stood for. Mr. Robins said it is Signal Timing Evaluation Verification Enhancement, basically a signal timing project in Clark County.

Vice Chair Stewart said the action before the Board is to accept the evaluation and the ranking for the federal project grants as recommended by RTAC. She said the question is how far we can get with the money that is available.

Mr. Robins said they know that they have overall about \$8.8 million in the different programs, roughly \$4 million in STP Urban, \$3 million CMAQ, and \$1 million Rural STP.

Jeanne Stewart said jurisdictions might give a different indication of priorities if they knew how much money there was and whatever they send forward to advocate for might change. She asked if there was a possibility of changing the priority once they are accepted depending on when the money is available. Mr. Robins said these projects are requesting money for the year 2020, so they should all know that is when the funds would be available.

Jeff Hamm said there are projects that have the same score, and he asked how that was dealt with. Mr. Robins said if they are tied, they should have the same rank. If they are running out of funds where the rank is, they generally split the money proportionally between the two projects.

ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE MOVED TO ACCEPT THE EVALUATION AND RANKING OF THE PROJECTS AS RECOMMENDED BY RTAC. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY PAUL GREENLEE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Dale Robins provided discussion on the project obligation policy revision. He said as discussed at previous RTC Board meetings, as a region we have an issue with doing too good of a job of obligating projects. If we do not make changes to our policies, it could result in the inability of the region to obligate critical projects. The purpose of the memo included in the meeting materials is to introduce potential obligation policy changes which can be brought into the Transportation Programming Guidebook. Final action will be requested at the October RTC Board meeting.

There are a number of reasons that they need to revise the obligation policies. It is important to note that although previously RTC's policy allowed for the early obligation of projects on a first come basis, this was never a guarantee. RTC's process has always selected projects based on anticipated funding that would be available for the fourth year of the TIP. They are always selecting projects four years in advance.

Mr. Robins said they must meet both federal and state policies. The memo outlines these policies. Because of the regional advancement in obligation, they are approaching the two-year obligation limit. This could result in the inability to obligate critical projects.

The proposed policies do not remove funding from any existing projects but will impact when funds will be available based on the actual selection year. The revised policies are:

- 1) Two Years TIP Selection. This means only projects listed in the first two years can proceed to implementation. For the upcoming TIP, only projects programmed in 2017 and 2018 could proceed. This limits projects to being obligated no more than one year in advance.
- 2) Obligation Date is Tied to Selection Year. Projects will be programmed in the 4th year of the TIP when selected for funding. This will cause improved planning for projects seeking federal funds. The last minute request will be a thing of the past.
- 3) Annual Request Limit of \$2.5 million. Any project is eligible for \$4 million total; annually they would limit it to \$2.5 M. This year, they had several projects that requested the majority of funding. This would limit it to one project per grant. With a limit of \$2.5 million per year, additional projects will be able to proceed towards implementation rather than only fund a couple projects.

Mr. Robins said this is an informational item, and this issue will be brought back at next month's RTC Board for action. Final language will go to RTAC this month for review and a recommendation for the Board in October.

Paul Greenlee said he did not understand the state policy listed in the memo of "Transfer Policy limited to projects in first year of TIP." Mr. Robins said federal funds can be moved between programs. The most common example they see is C-TRAN with Federal Highway funding (for example a CMAQ grant) transfers these funds to a Federal Transit Administration program. This transfer can now only take place in the first year of the TIP.

Mr. Robins said that now that they have obligated almost two years in advance, they would not be able to transfer projects because the first year has already been spent. In the upcoming TIP, they have one small project that they can list in 2017 (first year), because all the other money in 2017 has been spent. All the other projects are in 2018, 2019, or 2020.

Shirley Craddick asked how this compared to the policies that Metro uses in allocating their funds. Mr. Robins said we have a different process than what they do. Metro is much further in advance. We do a four year in advance selection; Metro might do an eight year in advance selection of projects. Generally, most agencies have an annual process. Mr. Robins said Metro is behind on obligation of projects. There is always project delay, which can push a project back on obligation. With RTC's process, it allows the second year of projects to come forward so they should never be behind and just slightly ahead.

Councilor Craddick said with the new policies, it will help stay in check and not over spend. Mr. Robins said they are currently way over, almost two years in advance. These should help keep them in line.

Jeff Hamm said the reason that we are over is that projects in the future obligate their funds before projects which closer to us have obligated their funds; they have basically locked up

those federal dollars. Mr. Robins said that was correct. He said everyone has done it. This year in the TIP 2016-2019, they had a lot of 2019 projects come forward, over half of the projects. This caused the 2016 projects to not have funds to obligate and have to delay, which was unfair to them.

Mr. Hamm asked to have an explanation of what obligation means. Mr. Robins said obligation is a federal term that basically says that you have entered into an agreement with Federal Highways to expend funds, and they agree to reimburse you when you submit a bill. All these federal grants are reimbursement grants. You have a contract with the Feds that says when I send you a bill, they will pay me. Mr. Hamm asked if this was even if the project itself was not under construction and may not be for a couple years. Mr. Robins said generally, they want to see money being expended immediately upon obligation, up to a 60 day period to see billings. Federal Transit Administration is a little different. They allow several years. Federal Highway does not; they expect to see monthly billings within two months.

Jeff Hamm asked with the \$2.5 million limit, if they buy \$5 million for new buses and pay for those buses, would they only get \$2.5 million for them. Mr. Robins said no. What that would mean is that with this year's grant process the maximum you could ask for this year is \$2.5 million; the following year you could ask for \$1.5 million to reach the \$4 million cap. Mr. Hamm said he had already paid the \$5 million. Mr. Robins said that would be in 2020 and 2021, which if you obligate in 2020, you could obligate both years; you can obligate the \$4 million at one time; you just have to program it in different calendar years. This allows us to have multiple projects going forward rather than all money tied up in one project.

Kelly Brooks referred to the obligation ahead and the leveraging of projects. She asked if that was factored in when projects were scored accordingly. Mr. Robins said this issue was identified last year, and they warned RTAC about it. They were notified about this before the grant process and that year 2020 projects would not be able to get to for a couple years. This did affect some agencies. Mr. Robins said agencies are adjusting their schedules. For the most part there is only one project that he has heard feedback from.

VII. Federal Compliance Plan Updates

- **Public Participation Plan: RTC's Draft PPP Release for Public Comment Review**
- **Title VI Plan**
- **Limited English Proficiency Plan**

Matt Ransom said that in running the federal program here in the region, RTC needs to put in place various plans. Three of those will be presented today. Staff is currently in a mid-term update. They will be audited by the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration later this year. They look at all of our plans and compliance documents to make sure that we are running a good program. The intent is to get these updates in process in order to share them with the Feds during the program review.

Lynda David referred to the memo included in the meeting packet along with the Draft Public Participation Plan update. She said public participation is an important part of the regional transportation decision-making process carried out by RTC. At the March meeting, background information on the public participation process was provided. Today, the Board has an opportunity to review a draft updated Public Participation Plan document and approve its release for a mandatory 45-day public comment period.

The Public Participation Process is a key component of the metropolitan transportation planning process, and the Public Participation Plan has to be reviewed periodically and updates made accordingly. Required initially by the 1991 federal transportation act ISTEA, RTC first adopted a Public Involvement Plan in 1994 with updates in 2001 and 2007. The last update in 2014 provided a comprehensive Plan update, so in 2016 they are looking to make minor modifications.

There are both federal and state laws that require a Public Participation Process and Plan. There are some consistent general requirements of the Public Participation Process included in the federal regulations. They include providing adequate and timely public notice of outreach activities, use of visualization techniques to help understanding of transportation planning information, use of the Word Wide Web to help reach a larger audience, holding public meetings at convenient times and places in accessible buildings, and consider the needs of the traditionally underserved (for example, minorities and low income populations).

There are specific requirements for public participation and outreach relating to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). For example, there needs to be additional opportunity for public input if significant edits are made to the documents as a result of public comment before Plan and Program adoption. The effectiveness of the Process and its component Plan has to be evaluated periodically. If significant written and oral comments are received, they should be documented. When an updated Plan is drafted, there needs to be a minimum 45-day public comment period offered before its adoption, and there has to be consultation and coordination with other planning activities including state and local agencies, tribal governments, and resource agencies.

Ms. David provided an outline of the Plan, unchanged from the 2014 Plan. There are seven major sections that include information on RTC's organization and the transportation Plans and Programs RTC publishes. The Appendices include federal and state laws pertaining to public participation and a menu of public participation techniques. The 2016 update is minor with no change to the framework for the Plan. Some of the changes include reference to the current federal transportation act is now updated to the FAST Act, passed in 2015 and electronic hyperlinks to related information have been updated where appropriate.

The most significant change is on page 43 with the addition of a section describing C-TRAN's reliance on RTC's Public Participation Process associated with RTC's regional Transportation Improvement Program to publicize C-TRAN's Program of Projects that are included in RTC's TIP. RTC already makes this clear in media releases and in information provided on the TIP. At the

most recent C-TRAN triennial review, it was recommended this should be explicitly stated in RTC's Public Participation Plan.

Chair Jack Burkman entered the meeting at 4:40 p.m.

Ms. David noted that while updating the Public Participation Plan (PPP), they also took the opportunity to review two other related documents: RTC's Title VI Plan and the Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Plan. Both were last updated in 2014. To support the PPP, the Title VI, and the LEP Plans, RTC relies on understanding the demographics of the region. RTC compiles a supplemental Environmental Justice (EJ) Demographic Profile with details of relevant demographics, such as minority populations, low-income populations and other Title VI protected populations. The demographic profile on which the Plans rely is now updated from 2010 Census data to 2010-2014 American Community Survey data. On pages 29 and 30 of the Public Participation Plan are maps showing the location of 2014 minority populations and low-income populations in Clark County.

Ms. David highlighted some of the updated demographics. As anticipated, the percentage of minority population is increasing with 18.2% in the 2010 Census and 20.5% in 2014. The most rapid growth has been in Hispanic communities and those that report as being of two or more races.

In the Human Services Transportation Plan, a growth in the percentage population aged over 65 is forecast. Updated Census Bureau American Community Survey data confirms this forecast with 13.8% now aged over 65 in Clark County compared with 11.5% in the 2010 Census.

Poverty rates have decreased now that the recession is over. Back in 2010, 12.6% of Clark County's population was below the poverty level. This has now decreased to 9.33%.

There has been little change in the percentage of Clark County's population that speaks English less than "very well". The percentage remains around 6%. Spanish is the largest of the non-English language speakers at 2.1% followed by Russian at about 1.46% and Vietnamese at about .5%. RTC now makes Title VI forms available in Spanish and Russian, and Telelanguage interpretive service is available to help the Limited English Proficiency community.

Staff sought RTC Board and RTAC comments at the outset of the update process back in March. The Board is asked for any comments and is also asked for approval to release the Public Participation Plan for public comment for a minimum 45-day public comment period. There will be notices and publicity of the public opportunity to review and comment on the Public Participation Plan update and the plan is to seek Board adoption at the November 1 Board meeting.

Paul Greenlee said they have the updated demographic numbers for Clark County and asked if they have them for Skamania and Klickitat Counties as well.

Ms. David said the difficulty with updating numbers from the Census for those communities was that they have a smaller population, so they don't get the detail that they do for Clark

County. Councilmember Greenlee asked if the last data they have for Skamania and Klickitat is from 2010. Ms. David said that was correct.

Jeanne Stewart said she was interested in the change in C-TRAN's reliance on RTC's Public Participation Process for Federal Transit Administration's requirement. She asked what obligation C-TRAN had under the FAST Act or other federal, state, or local programs to have a public process of their own with regard to expanding/retracting service or the purchase of a vehicle. Councilor Stewart said she had concerns that this would get buried.

Ms. David said it has always been the case that C-TRAN has relied on RTC as it pertains to the Transportation Improvement Program. What this means is that C-TRAN comes up with a list of projects to be funded by the Federal Transit Administration, and they are incorporated into the regional Transportation Improvement Program for RTC.

Councilor Stewart asked if RTC requires C-TRAN to do their own outreach for public participation for the projects. Ms. David said C-TRAN relies on that they do outreach for public participation to come up with the projects that they want to fund, and also they rely on their citizens advisory committee and the C-TRAN Board to come up with the projects that will be moved forward to be incorporated into RTC's Transportation Improvement Program.

Councilor Stewart said if RTC has always done this for C-TRAN, what is the change or update. Ms. David said the change is that they are actually stating it in the Plan. In the past they have always stated that C-TRAN relies on RTC in any advertising or press releases, but it has not been specifically noted in the Public Participation Plan. With the last triennial review that C-TRAN had, one of the reviewers said that this needed to be specifically stated in RTC's Public Participation Plan. A paragraph has been inserted that describes this specific issue. Ms. David said many transit agencies do the same. For example, the Puget Sound Regional Council does this for their transit agency; they advertise or have a public participation process including the transit projects. This satisfies the Federal Transit Administration's circular of requirements that we do this.

Jeff Hamm said in their Plan and policies, they have a pretty expressed public participation process, and out of that filters the services and the projects they wish to have funded with federal dollars. It is the integration of the federal dollar public participation reference in the RTC with C-TRAN's work that needs to be referenced.

Shirley Craddick said for the public outreach, there is the 45-day public comment period; she asked how they reached out to the minority groups to get their involvement. Ms. David said they tend to rely a lot on agencies and neighborhood groups that serve such people. She said in particular, they have close links with the Healthy Living Collaborative and the Accessible Transportation Coalition. At these meetings, there tend to be people representing people of color or minority populations.

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR APPROVAL TO RELEASE THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN FOR PUBLIC COMMENT. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE.

Jeanne Stewart said this depends on demographics. She said one of the most significant deficiencies is capacity crossing the Columbia River. This impacts many people every day. Councilor Stewart said she thought these people are waiting for leadership in the community to improve that commute time in a number of ways. She asked if that was a demographic for the purposes of the federal standards.

Ms. David said it is probably one of the issues they should address in the update to the Regional Transportation Plan. When you are looking at accessibility in transportation, accessibility to jobs or homes, it is something that should be addressed in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). When they update the RTP that is when the Public Participation Plan comes into play; when they outreach to the community to get input or consider difficulties they might have or challenges in meeting their transportation needs.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

This will be brought back in November for Board adoption.

VIII. FAST Act Freight Provisions and Ongoing Activities

Matt Ransom said this item was skipped in July due to time constraints, so they are returning with it today. With the adoption of the FAST Act, there was a new increase in freight and freight planning across the nation. That resulted in the State Department of Transportation and also MPOs needing to go through a process of mapping and designating and a call for projects. Today, they would provide a status report. He said by working with agency staff they know that many are pursuing freight related projects.

Lynda David referred to the memo and attached list of projects included in the meeting packet. She would provide some background information on the federal FAST Act and its freight provisions along with policy, freight plans, freight transportation networks, new federal funding programs, freight projects, and FAST Act implementation.

The FAST Act was signed into law in December 2015. Among its provisions were those to improve the condition and performance of the national freight network as well as support investment in freight-related transportation projects. The FAST Act established a national policy for maintaining and improving condition and performance of the National Multimodal Freight Network. The Act specifies goals associated with the freight policy: condition, safety, security, efficiency, productivity, resiliency, and reliability of the freight network.

Ms. David said plans are to be developed to implement the goals of the new freight policy, both at National and State levels. To meet national mandates, the State Freight Plan must be comprehensive and must identify: critical rural and urban freight corridors, significant congestion or delay caused by freight movements, and mitigation strategies. It must include a list of priority projects and must be developed in consultation with the State Freight Advisory Committee. WSDOT will update its comprehensive Washington State Freight Mobility Plan, adopted in 2014 to comply with new federal requirements.

At the July meeting, the Board was made aware of the State's work to identify highway segments for designation as Critical Rural and Urban Freight Corridors. These critical corridors become part of the National Highway Freight Network that also includes interstate routes and some port connectors.

Statewide, only a limited number of miles are available for Critical Rural and Urban designation. The State DOT Primary Highway Freight System for Clark County includes I-5, I-205, and SR-501 to the Port of Vancouver. The limited mileage of Critical Urban Freight Corridors available allowed for the proposed designation of SR-14 between I-205 and 164th Avenue and SR-14 through Washougal; both segments of highway where projects are proposed, but not funded; both projects that would improve freight mobility. In addition, both Mill Plain and Fourth Plain routes to the Port of Vancouver are part of the National Highway Freight network.

In Skamania and Klickitat Counties, the four bi-state Columbia River Bridges: 1) the Bridge of the Gods, 2) the Hood River Bridge, 3) SR-197 on The Dalles Bridge, and 4) SR-97 over the Biggs Bridge are proposed as Critical Rural Freight Corridors. They are all important connectors from Washington State to I-84 on the Oregon side. In mid-August, WSDOT submitted the proposed designations of Critical Rural and Urban Freight Connector segments to the Federal Highway Administration for certification.

The FAST Act includes newly created Freight Funding Programs. The Nationally Significant Freight & Highway Projects Program, known as FASTLANE, is nationally competitive. The program is primarily for projects over \$100 million with 10% set aside for smaller projects. FASTLANE funds require a 40% match; however, 20% of the match can come from other federal funding sources. Congress oversees project selection for these funds. Approximately \$900 million per year is available nationwide. Projects must be on either the National Highway Freight Network or the National Highway System. In the first round of funding competition, the Federal Highway Administration received 212 applications, with 18 projects awarded funding. Two were from Washington State; a large project in Seattle and a small project in Tukwila, both involving grade separation between streets and rail.

The National Highway Freight Program funds are formula funds apportioned to states and are to be used for projects on the National Highway Freight Network (NHFN). About \$20 million per year is available to Washington State. To be eligible for the National Highway Freight Program, projects must be in the State Freight Plan.

Ms. David said earlier this year, WSDOT put out a call for projects eligible under the two new federal funding programs. The Board was made aware of this at the July meeting. RTC worked with local jurisdictions and WSDOT SW Region to identify prospective projects. These projects are listed as an attachment to the memo. These projects are candidates for including in an updated Washington State Freight Mobility Plan. WSDOT will review the project, discuss with the Washington State Freight Advisory Committee (WAFAC) and have a prioritized tiered list in October. The final project list will be provided to OFM and the Legislature by November 1, though all eligible projects will be carried into the 2017 State Freight Plan update.

The FAST Act also includes new authorities and requirements to improve project delivery and includes additional performance measures beyond those measures included in the previous federal act, MAP 21. The FAST Act requires the collection and annual reporting of total tonnage, containers, and dry bulk tonnage for the nation's top 25 ports. In 2014, Tacoma ranked 29th, Seattle 31st, and Vancouver around 74th in tonnage.

RTC staff will continue to work with WSDOT and member agencies on federal freight transportation requirements making sure that performance monitoring and updated freight provisions are included in the next Regional Transportation Plan update and that this region's freight transportation issues and needs are reflected in the updated Washington State Freight Mobility Plan. RTC staff will continue to provide grant consulting services to member agencies who want to pursue FASTLANE grant program funds for Regional Transportation Plan improvements.

Chair Burkman said he heard three key challenges: 1) there is a lot of need and limited money, 2) it has a pretty heavy match, and 3) it has to be in construction within 18 months.

Marc Boldt asked if this was just for roads or if it also included rail. Ms. David said the call for projects very much focused on highway; although, access to multimodal (from rail to highway) were part of the call, as was the grade separation from streets and rail.

Shirley Craddick said it was noted that Congress oversees project selection. She asked to what degree that was. Lynda David said she was not sure; with FASTLANE, the federal Highway Administration at the national level probably decides on which are the priority projects and then Congress decides which will be awarded. Councilor Craddick asked if there was a geographic tie to it. Ms. David said she was not sure. She said they have only seen one round of projects so far with 18 awarded; two in Washington State and one in Oregon in the Coos Bay area.

Chair Burkman said there is not a defined process for it just yet.

Paul Greenlee asked when the next deadline was for a municipal agency or Port to submit a request for any of the FAST Act funds. Ms. David said RTC submitted the list of projects as noted that were attached to the memo. WSDOT will be prioritizing the projects they receive from the state, statewide before November 1. The State Legislature would then decide on which have the most priority. Ms. David said as she understood it, the highest priority projects will be those that are ready to go to construction.

Paul Greenlee said this list of projects are the ones in the hopper asked if somebody had a new project when the next submission would be. Ms. David said she was not sure of that.

Matt Ransom said the next call for projects would probably be spring. He said what is important is that there are multiple pots of funds. He said what Lynda described as a formula pot that was allocated new money through the FAST Act and the State has discretion to choose. That is why the DOT reports to the Legislature to prioritize the list. That is the formula pot. The competitive process for the FASTLANE, where an agency would submit at the national

competitive level, there is the one cycle of projects that was funded this summer. They expect to see another call for projects next spring. Mr. Ransom said in the case of the Washougal project, he said in consulting with the City Administrator and staff on this that they should, and any agency wishing to pursue a FASTLANE nationally competitive grant, start to do their preparatory work, and consult with FHWA project office. He said if they do a lobby trip to DC early next year, meet with the Federal Highway Administration staff to talk about your project.

Councilmember Greenlee asked if they should plan a trip to DC in January or February. Mr. Ransom said many agencies do an annual trip to DC; if it happened to coincide with that it would be beneficial.

Jerry Oliver said there are multiple pots of funding for consideration. He asked for some elaboration on that; how much was going to come from where.

Ms. David said for the FASTLANE projects, there is about \$900 million per year available nationwide (5-year act). It is her understanding that the 18 projects of the first round of projects that were awarded was just under the \$900 million.

Ms. David said the National Highway Freight program is allocated to the states, with Washington receiving about \$20 million per year. To be eligible for these funds, projects must be listed in the State Freight Plan, and they must be on the National Highway Freight Network.

Commissioner Oliver said the state was authorized and encouraged to set up the Freight Mobility Plan which was beyond what is existing; he asked the status of that. Ms. David said she understood that the State would update the Freight Mobility Plan in 2017 to meet these federal requirements that were part of the FAST Act. They are going to a comprehensive update to the list of projects that are currently in the State Freight Plan that was adopted in 2014.

Commissioner Oliver asked about the issue of prioritization. He said it sounded like there were a couple of different tracks for getting projects prioritized for consideration and asked for more information in that regard.

Ms. David said she was not certain what criteria they will be using to prioritize the projects. She said her assumption is that they will be going to the State Freight Advisory Committee to review with them what they think the criteria should be and how they would be prioritized. She said high on the list would be bottleneck or congestion issues related to freight movement and to give high priority to those projects, as well as projects that are ready to go.

Commissioner Oliver said there are some 35 projects that RTC submitted. He asked who would be judging those for priorities. Ms. David said it depends on which funding pot they are going after. The first screening would be only WSDOT. Then if they go after the state allocated funds, it is the State, the Washington State Freight Advisory Committee which would be making the decision. If they are eligible for FASTLANE funds, they will be forwarded to the Federal Highway Administration and the USDOT Board for their decision, and then onto Congress for the final say.

Commissioner Oliver asked who the list has been submitted to. Ms. David said it has been submitted to WSDOT for consideration for project eligibility and for listing in the updated State Freight Plan.

Commissioner Oliver said there is a listing for \$3.3 billion for a new I-5 Bridge over the Columbia River and said it is not as much for a new road into the Port at \$100 million. He said he would appreciate that all projects will be considered.

Commissioner Oliver asked if it has been acknowledged that the submitted list will be considered with other projects from around the state since this is just our region. Ms. David said yes, every region in the state has submitted their list of projects. The Washington State DOT Freight staff will be going through the projects to see if they are eligible and whether they should be included in the updated State Freight Plan next year.

Commissioner Oliver asked if there was a deadline or a suggested time of decision for the ranking of the projects. Ms. David said for the National Highway Freight Program, that the state is looking to the Legislature that will be in session in 2017 who will be looking at how to expend that \$20 million per year. It will be up to the Legislature. The first cut project list will be by November 1, and it will be going to the Legislature in early 2017.

Chair Burkman said it sounds like it will be awhile before we hear anything conclusively, because the process ultimately ends up at the State Legislature and they have to make decisions before it can go to Congress for their decision to fund for the FASTLANE. For the National Highway Freight Program, it will be the decision of the Washington State Legislature.

Jeff Hamm said the list of projects looks like many of the projects have been pulled off the shelf, that are largely highway widening. He asked what the nexus to the improvement of freight movement that the analysis is going to show or is the intent to do that analysis to show that and fund those that are going to be the most cost effective for improvement in freight movement. He said for example, if you have a highway interchange upgrade for \$100 million could you perhaps do a different improvement to the interchange for example a freight bypass lane or a queue bypass if you could get the same effectiveness for \$15 million. Mr. Hamm asked if someone would be looking for that. Ms. David said she would assume that WSDOT would be. Many of the projects on the list are WSDOT projects. With practical design and other processes WSDOT are using, you would think they would be looking at every project as to how they could be more effective.

Kris Strickler said it is a context of timing, but he said these projects are all part of the Regional Plan.

IX. I-5 Trunnion Replacement Project - Update

Kelly Brooks Introduced Steve Lovejoy an ODOT Senior Bridge Engineer to provide an update on the I-5 trunnion replacement. He was a part of the first trunnion replacement in 1996. Mr. Lovejoy said he would provide a background on this and why they were doing it and what to expect. He would explain what was wrong with the trunnion, and what it would look like when

they go to replace it. He said with the first trunnion it was all new and unknown as what to expect. This time they know what to expect.

Mr. Lovejoy said there are three basic types of movable bridges: the most common is the bascule style; the vertical lift bridge is also common such as the I-5 Bridge; and the swing span bridge like the railroad bridge just downstream of the I-5.

For the lift span operation, the lift span is balanced by the counterweights in each tower that weigh half as much as the lift span. As the span goes up, the counterweight goes down. The lift span is attached to the counterweight by large wire ropes that go over essentially a pulley. When a pulley gets big enough, they call it a sheave. The sheave is attached to the trunnion that allows it to move. The trunnion supports the sheave in bearings on each of its ends to allow low friction rotation.

When the bridge was built in 1917, the most common type of bearing was used; a plain steel journal riding in a bronze bushing. Grease between the journal and bushing provides for relatively low friction. In 1958, they rehabilitated the existing bridge and built the southbound bridge structure. At this time, they upgraded the old structure to the more common rolling contact bearings due to extremely low friction compared to the old plain journal / bushing style bearings. They put in new sheaves and for whatever reason, they reused the old trunnion shafts. To reuse the old trunnion shafts, they had to modify it to get it to accommodate the new bearings. Unfortunately, they had to weld up some grease grooves in the trunnion. The grease grooves were there for the old bearings style and no longer needed for the new bearings. That is what doomed the trunnions to a short life. The welds were located in high stressed regions of the trunnion which eventually lead to fatigue cracking of the trunnion.

They found this by periodic testing of the trunnion shafts. An ultrasonic test is performed to allow them to see into the shaft while it is in service to look for defects. They found a defect that was of concern and began the 1996 trunnion replacement project. After that trunnion replacement project, they took the old trunnion apart to find out what was going on. Since they only replaced the trunnions and sheaves on the north tower, they still had two more identical assemblies on the south tower that they would have to replace.

The forensic analysis that was done allowed them to develop a testing procedure that was much more accurate than what they had before. Now they can very accurately monitor any cracks in the existing two shafts. They detected small cracks in 2011 and have been monitoring their growth. They have indeed grown. Currently, a crack is about 6 inches wide and about a quarter inch deep. When it reached a certain size, the level of risk becomes large enough that they need to act and start planning on this replacement project.

The 1996 replacement was an emergency project because they didn't know just what exactly was going on in the shaft. The replacement took 6 months with a 7 day shutdown of the bridge. This replacement project should go smoother, because they are much more knowledgeable about what is there and what to expect, and it is not an emergency. It is a planned project this time.

Once this replacement project has a contract the sequence of events includes the following: fabricate new sheaves, trunnions, bearings, and wire ropes to replace existing on the south tower; fabricate temporary counterweight support structure; install the support structure; shut bridge down and replace equipment on south tower; and open the bridge and remove temporary works.

Mr. Lovejoy provided slides of the fabrication of the new components from the last repair. This included a new trunnion being machined, machining sheave hub, welding the sheave rim, the sheave web, assembling the sheave, shrink fit of trunnion to sheave, installing roller bearings, and its ready for paint. Mr. Lovejoy said Glen Scroggins is the structural engineer that helped him on the project, and he works for the Washington DOT. Mr. Scroggins will also be working on this project as well.

Once everything is built, they will start erecting the temporary counterweight support structure. With the last project they erected a tower crane to install the temporary counterweight support. The crane was used to take off the old stuff and put on the new stuff. They had incentives to finish the project early. Mr. Lovejoy noted that when they took off the existing sheave assembly, the tower grew four inches, but of course it shrunk back once the new was installed.

After the installation of the new machinery, the lift span is tested for proper function. Once accepted, the bridge can be opened to vehicular and marine traffic. The temporary counterweight support structure will be removed with minimal impacts on traffic.

Mr. Lovejoy said experience and lessons learned from the 1996 replacement will be incorporated into the 2019 project. Traffic volumes are much higher, but many of the unknowns of construction and traffic control have been eliminated. Since this is not an emergency contract, bid prices could be lower compared to the previous work. They have a schedule worked as to timelines. Mr. Lovejoy said it will take about a year to a year and a half to get the parts made. The shutdown will be on the order of what it was last time. The repair will be good until however long it takes to replace the bridge or whatever is decided.

Chair Burkman thanked Mr. Lovejoy for an outstanding summary that was very well done. He said about the last time, from much of the public's perspective it went really well. The communication and outreach was such that a lot of people changed their plans. The load that was on the freeway system at the time was lower than what was expected because people figured out how to fit it into their lives because they knew it was coming.

Jeanne Stewart asked how many total days the bridge would be closed, because it will be done in steps. Mr. Lovejoy said the vast majority of the work is fabrication and things that might slightly impact traffic, but mostly at night. The actual shutdown to vehicle and marine traffic last time they were given 21 days and they finished in 7 days. Numerous times it could have gone bad. This time they are looking at about two weeks.

Councilor Stewart asked what the diversion plan was for WSDOT. Chair Burkman said Mr. Lovejoy explained the engineering part of the project. Another group does the transportation part. At some point, they would like to get an update on that part of the project.

Anne McEnery-Ogle said she did want to compliment WSDOT 20 years ago for doing such a wonderful job, and people were able to plan their vacations so they were not involved in all of that. She said they used the BNSF lines for a commuter to cross the river that they found out that they actually didn't have to use. So if we can get an idea, people can make early arrangements to be gone at that time.

Chair Burkman asked if there would be incentives / disincentives for completing ahead of schedule like in 1996. Mr. Lovejoy said he would think so. He added that they are committed to do this project in the September to October timeline for low water. They will let the project whenever it gets let, but the actual bridge shutdown will be likely during low water to minimize the problems with the marine traffic. The project will occur at the same time of year as it did last time.

Kris Strickler said to address the question about traffic control. He said work is ongoing on that. The traffic engineer on the project will be from the SW Region. He said Glen Scroggins, as mentioned will again work on the project, and said that both ODOT and WSDOT are working together on the project. Mr. Strickler said there is no reason to believe that there won't be a significant outreach campaign that allows them the same type of success they had last time. He said they are developing a timeline application effort because it does help set the stage for what happens after an operation is in place.

Chair Burkman asked to have Lori introduced and share some of her experience to be a part of this project. Mr. Strickler said that Lori Figone is their Vancouver Area Engineer and will be the engineer on the trunnion project. Many of the projects that they have opened over the last several months in this area have been under the direction of Lori and her office. She has very capable and qualified staff that supports the projects. The 18th Street project is one of the recent projects opened that she was responsible for. Mr. Strickler said that Lori's background includes a lot of work outside the agency as well as inside the agency working in other area offices. He said she is a great area engineer for them and does a great job of keeping traffic moving. He said he has all the confidence in her work.

X. Other Business

From the Board

Jeanne Stewart said those members that are members on JPACT were notified that there were two federal rules that are in the process of being modified. One of the rules is to quantify and look at performance measurers for Federal Highways and Interstates including bridges. JPACT has a recommended letter that they wrote. Clark County has two letters that they wrote. One of the letters was regarding performance measurers. The other issue that came up is that the federal government has interest in changing the rule so MPOs, such as RTC and Metro, would potentially need to merge into one MPO for transportation planning. The rule goes further to

say that SW Washington would become the same region as Metro. The rule is still draft. She said in Clark County they would like to maintain some autonomy and have input and direction and not be overcome by the larger Metro. Councilor Stewart said Clark County wrote a letter in regard to this rule change as well. She said this is something that needs to be addressed with the many differences given we are in two different states. Councilor Stewart said they need to be mindful of this possible rule change and outcome.

Chair Burkman said the comment period for that closed the previous week. He said it would probably be awhile before they hear anything from the Federal Government.

Shirley Craddick said she appreciated Councilor Stewart bringing that issue up. She said possibly Matt could send out the letter that JPACT submitted. (Mr. Ransom would send the letters that were submitted to the Board Members) Councilor Craddick said there are other cities across the country that have similar circumstances where there is an MPO on both sides of a river and in two different states. She said they are also working with those states to lobby to not have this new rule put into place.

Chair Burkman said the letter that was written by the chair of JPACT and they all reviewed was very well done. It pointed out that there has been a history of successful collaboration across the river here and provided some ideas. It did not just say we don't like this. The ideas provided some options to make it work with the unusual circumstances; cross river and cross state split. Councilor Stewart said they identified how we already have relationships through the varied committees including the Bi-State Coordination Committee and would like to be an exception to the rule.

From the Director

RTC Procurement Policy: Mr. Ransom referred to the memo included in the meeting packet along with the draft Procurement Policy. He said in his tenure here at RTC, he has been reviewing policies and procedures, and best practice would have a director do that. In the process of reviewing RTC's procurement policies, he said he felt a need to fine tune and update it. In part, because policies whether they are the use of state, federal, or local funds continue to evolve, and the auditors periodically come up with new policies, etc. Mr. Ransom said he would appreciate any comments or feedback after this meeting that members may have.

There are three basic parts to the policy. It clarifies that the Executive Director carries out and staff carries out procurement on behalf of the Board. What they are trying to do with the Policy is to lay out some clear Policies, defined Guidelines, and Purchasing Thresholds. The Purchasing Thresholds delegates the Executive Director with certain responsibilities for purchasing and also vests the Board certain responsibilities in terms of purchasing, primarily related to the amount of money and who has the authority to spend it.

Mr. Ransom said the Policy is high level, because one of the parameters of the policy is that the Board delegates to him the responsibility to ensure that they purchase according to the appropriate guidelines; essentially which funding source is being used. Page 2 of the Policy lists the Guidelines, which provide the funding source matrix. As an organization, they spend

potentially up to four types of funds: 1) general funds, revenues generated by RTC through consulting activities or dues; 2) state funds through WSDOT; 3) Federal Highway Administration funds through STPG, CMAQ, or TAP grants; and 4) Federal Transit Administration funds. The matrix says that the director will ensure when they make a purchase using a certain type of funds, they will follow those procedures and policies.

The Thresholds matrix on page 3 of the Policy is very similar to many of the agencies thresholds matrix. It breaks it down by the types of purchasing activity and dollar amount thresholds that the director would have the authority to purchase. An example would be to purchase a computer without having to bringing it to the Board; it would typically be listed on the claims list. It also breaks out professional services agreements; such as hiring an accountant to supplement their accounting review. If they had to hire an engineer or any type of special licensed professional, state statute lays out that those are different so they have different procurement thresholds to those. For intergovernmental purchasing, they have Intergovernmental contracts.

The Policy also lays out Change Orders. Typically, change orders could be administered with approved up to 10% of the budget amount and no more than \$50,000.

Mr. Ransom said this item will be brought back at the next meeting for the Board's final review and consideration.

Jeanne Stewart said she thought the thresholds looked reasonable for the Executive Director, and that would be for any specific project for one year. She asked what happens if a project is to the maximum and there are cost overruns and they want to expand the contract; would that be brought back to the Board?

Mr. Ransom said there are two safeguards. One would be the change Order policy; director can commit resources by no more than 10% of the contract never to exceed \$50,000 without returning to the Board for approval. The overlay to this is if they have the budget to do it. If they had the budget to do it, he would be granted administrative authority up to that threshold limit. What they can't do following best practices in procurement, the organization should never split a contract to avoid any of the thresholds. That is prohibited by both state and federal procurement procedures.

Chair Burkman said as a reminder to the Board, one of the things that they have asked the executive director do is to go through all of the processes that are used here, because this organization having had one executive director since the day it started has a lot of practices but not necessarily a lot of policies. Now, our director as the second one is charged with taking those practices and reducing those to paper and clarifying with the Board if that is what they want to happen. Chair Burkman said it is a very effective organization as long as the people stay here. If they have turnover, they lose that historical knowledge and need the documentation. They have a dedicated staff that has been there for quite a while.

FAST Act Funding: Statewide Formula: Mr. Ransom said earlier this spring he presented to the Board that there was a provision in the adoption of the FAST Act where the Governor through

his authority could decide how the flexible funds that come to the state can be allocated between the Department of Transportation and subsequently cities, counties, and etc. It was a part of the formula update. The Governor convened the Committee of Stakeholders this summer and held three meetings. The results are in a letter from the Governor's office. There are countervailing proposals that have been floated by the different interest groups, the Association of Washington Cities, Washington Association of Counties, Washington Transit Association, and possibly the Ports Association. Mr. Ransom said he wanted to make the Board aware of this and that the process has wrapped up. There are competing proposals on the table, and he said he has no idea where things go from here. He encouraged members to contact their associations if you intend to weigh in or learn more about this. Mr. Ransom said he wished he had materials on this, but his request for them were not forthcoming prior to the meeting.

I-5 Bridge Seismic Reports: Mr. Ransom referred to the memo that was emailed to members earlier in the day and also provided at the table. He said this is his response to the Board in relation to a request that the Board made at last October's meeting. He said he has been working on that request and wanted to provide a formal update. He said he does not see a lot to bring back to the Board. The Board had passed a motion at the last October meeting to have him bring back any relevant information or presentation that would present options for seismically upgrading the I-5 Bridge.

Along with the memo, an email was provided, and Mr. Ransom referred to the last two paragraphs of the e-mail. The email was prepared and distributed by Assistant Director of Transportation at ODOT to a constituent that inquired about this same issue around the same time of October 2015. Mr. Ransom said he found this email summary to encapsulate what he wanted to report to the Board. There is not a lot of information. All the analysis done to date by either Washington or Oregon Departments of Transportation has been conceptual and preliminary. There has not been a robust engineering study to consider all the different components that need to be done to evaluate seismic retrofit options. The takeaway summary is that he doesn't have anything to present to the Board, because there is really not good information out there of the current relevancy that would be of policy interest. There has been a lot of work done, back to the CRC days, but it was preliminary, investigatory, etc.

Mr. Ransom provided links to three reports. The reports document either preliminary assessments or current conditions and are close to 100 pages. If members wished to have paper copies, staff could provide that. Mr. Ransom said unless the Board had further direction on this inquiry, he would consider it closed.

Chair Burkman said he would work under the assumption that this meets the requirements of the requested motion to bring this to the Board.

Kris Strickler thanked Matt for bringing this update forward. He said as most know, many have been deeply involved in the investigation as it relates to the seismic upgrade or replacement bridge, etc. He concurred with Matt's most recent statement concluding that at this level of

dialogue for the search as it relates to the seismic element. The reason for that is for the amount of work that has gone into it at this point and the amount of relevant data that is available to us. What they are really talking about is a policy consideration that is very, very big. That policy consideration has an effect on the overall replacement status and everything else as it relates to bridge work that has been done for the better part of 15 years. He said he is not sure that there is more that RTC could inform on the topic.

Shirley Craddick asked if a motion was needed to close this issue or if it was the decision of the Chair. Chair Burkman said his understanding is that since the motion was made that the information was to be brought back to the Board, by the Executive Director presenting the information that completes the requirement of the motion unless someone feels differently. With no objections, the motion was considered fulfilled.

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, October 4, 2016, at 4 p.m.

XI. Adjourn

PAUL GREENLEE MOVED FOR ADJOURNMENT. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY ANNE MCENERNY-OGLE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:57 p.m.

Jack Burkman, Board of Directors Chair