

**Bi-State Coordination Committee
Meeting Minutes
July 30, 2015**

1. Welcome and Introductions

The meeting of the Bi-State Coordination Committee was called to order by Co-Chair Jack Burkman at 9:00 a.m. at the Vancouver Community Library, 901 C Street, Vancouver, WA 98660. He asked everyone to introduce them self and note which jurisdiction or organization they represented. Those in attendance follow.

Committee Members

Nancy Baker, Port of Vancouver Commissioner
Jack Burkman, City of Vancouver Council Member, Co-Chair
Shirley Craddick, Metro Councilor
Jeff Hamm, C-TRAN Executive Director/CEO
Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland Alternate
Alan Lehto, TriMet Alternate
Steve Novick, City of Portland Commissioner
Jeanne Stewart, Clark County Councilor
Kris Strickler, WSDOT SW Region Administrator

Staff and Interested Guests

Mike Bomar, CREDC
Andy Cotugno, Metro
Lynda David, Regional Transportation Council
Kim Ellis, Metro
Timur Ender, City of Portland
Bob Hart, Regional Transportation Council
David Hodges, U.S. Senator Patty Murray's Office
Dena Horton, U.S. Senator Maria Cantwell's Office
Emily Lieb, Metro
John McKibbin, Identity Clark County
Chris Myers, Metro
Andrew Plambeck, ODOT
Matt Ransom, Regional Transportation Council
Peggy Sheehan, City of Vancouver
Jeff Swanson, Clark County
Patrick Sweeney, City of Vancouver
Joanna Valencia, Multnomah County
Diane Workman, Regional Transportation Council

2. Review of Minutes for March 19, 2015 Meeting

JEFF HAMM MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 19, 2015 MEETING MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SHIRLEY CRADDICK AND APPROVED.

3. Regional View: Affordable & Equitable Housing Studies

Chair Burkman introduced Peggy Sheehan with the City of Vancouver and Emily Lieb with Metro. Matt Ransom thanked Peggy and Emily for attending, and said he contacted them about this conversation of housing as it relates to transportation from both MPOs. He said this is just a tip of the iceberg about the relationship between housing and transportation; the cost implications for where you locate, both your ability to pay for housing as well as your ability to pay for transportation. He said some of the policy implications for an MPO would be where we put our resources, regional flexible funds, where people are making investments in the transportation system, and how that makes a place more affordable or less affordable, or should we invest regionally in places that are maybe disadvantaged transportation wise to make that more

affordable. Mr. Ransom said they see the intersection of all these types of policy questions. He said both Peggy and Emily are both leading initiatives in their respective communities. They are in different states of progression in terms of a study of equity and affordability on the housing front.

Mr. Ransom provided a [website](#) that you can put in your address and see how affordable the current housing and transportation is. This provides a tool to have a more comprehensive understanding of the affordability of place. This perhaps may be a tool to use to help make important financial decisions when it comes to locating a residence.

Andy Cotugno said this started with the question of why we were giving housing to an MPO oriented committee. Mr. Cotugno reminded people that about 10 years ago the organization of this group changed. What was originally founded as a sub-committee of the Regional Transportation Council and JPACT changed to be formed by all 10 governments. This group is really the two cities, two counties, two transit districts, two port districts, two DOTs, and the two MPOs specifically to broaden the conversation about bi-state issues that impact one another in a way that is broader than transportation. He said housing fits nicely into that. There was specific reference in the charter for this committee to economic development, so there may be other things we need to explore in the future as well.

Peggy Sheehan said the City of Vancouver has taken on the issue of affordable housing in Vancouver. This started when Courtyard Village was bought by a private investor and converted from subsidized affordable housing to market rate housing, and it had close to 200 units. All the people were asked to leave and were given a 20 day notice around Christmas time. It caused a lot of problems in the community and in the social service arena along with the homeless arena and the housing arena. They are at a 2% vacancy rate, so the people could not find any other place to go. The City Council asked staff to look at what they could do to protect those renters and to look at long-term affordable housing. Ms. Sheehan provided a handout and noted the City's affordable housing website.

Ms. Sheehan said the Affordable Housing Task force will be presenting the three potential policy changes that will protect vulnerable renters: increasing the notice to vacate, increasing the notice of rent increase, and also looking at finding a Section 8 as part of income and it would be discriminatory to not let folks rent just because they have a Section 8 certificate.

Ms. Sheehan provided data on Vancouver's vacancy rate and average rent. This was current data from the Census, the Department of Commerce, and Norris Beggs & Simpson who do a lot of work in this region on multi-family and vacancy rates. Clark County currently has a 2% vacancy rate or lower. Rent in Vancouver went up almost 30% in one year (2013 – 2014). Also addressed was the income needed to afford average rent in Vancouver.

Ms. Sheehan said the Task Force will present a Work Plan to the City Council that will have potential policies to look at over the next year to help increase affordable housing. The City has a multi-family tax abatement program, where if you build in certain areas there is a requirement that some of those units will be affordable. They are also looking at what they can do for incentives for affordable housing.

Jack Burkman clarified that there are two steps by the City Council. One that is short term and the one that was just mentioned that is longer term that goes well into next year.

In Vancouver, about 50% of renter households are cost-burdened. This means that they pay more than 30% of their gross monthly income on housing expenses. The rent-burdened people in Clark County are almost as high as they are in King County. Ms. Sheehan said there are websites as Mr. Ransom noted earlier that will show you how much money you need to make in order to live in a unit in a particular area.

Vancouver Housing Authority has the responsibility of managing the Section 8 Program, which is a long term rental assistance subsidy for people that are at or below 60% of the area's median

income. Currently, there are 750 households on the wait list. The wait list has been closed for about five years. They have about 2,500 vouchers in the community.

The number of multi-family projects, units under construction or in proposal/review process, was provided for each city in Clark County along with unincorporated Clark County.

Shirley Craddick asked if there was any thought being put into the relationship of housing and transit so that as you look at where future housing goes there will be fairly easy access to transit.

Ms. Sheehan said that would be a good task to add to their look for next year. She said on the website, there are also links to the maps of all the subsidized housing in the County by each city. It can be overlaid with the buses.

Shirley Craddick asked if they have looked at where people work, their location of employment. Ms. Sheehan said they had not collected any of that analysis.

Jack Burkman said this is an ongoing topic at the City as it relates to transportation costs on top of housing costs. He said they are hearing more examples of people who are living quite a ways away from their minimum wage job. It all plays together, but as our communities grow, this is going to be a bigger topic.

Jeanne Stewart said the vacancy rate of 2% or less is extremely low. When it is like that it puts a squeeze on rent for everyone. People who previously were able to marginally make their rent, as these rents go higher and higher, a lot of people are squeezed. She said there are ways to ensure that our policies can perhaps provide some incentives for construction, not necessarily just low income. Councilor Stewart said if we relieve that pinch in the market, rents will stop going up so fast and with more housing available, people will have more options. She said she was shocked to hear from Council for the Homeless that Vancouver had a very active program of subsidizing both market rate and low income housing. However, in spite of a 12 year tax abatement for that lowest cost housing, the lowest cost was still higher than many of the people that are low income could afford. Tax abatements have a big impact. If anything is going to be tax abated in any of Clark County, we need to be sure that we are not giving up something for nothing. She said transit and how people seek work and get to work is important whether they are low income or not. She said she thought we were on the right track with the discussion. Councilor Stewart added that there are folks at the County that are also concerned about this. She said if we can change some of the incentives and find some of that for multi-family, we can have a big impact because there is a need for it.

Jack Burkman said that is very much a conversation that the City Council is doing in stage two. The City has done tax abatements predominantly in the downtown area, though they are also authorized to do them in the Fourth Plain area. One of the goals was to get more feet on the ground in downtown, but they also realize that the standards that were used in terms of income didn't come anywhere near addressing the income that these people are making. To clarify, Council Member Burkman said the Courtyard Village was renting at the very bottom end. It had many issues, safety and otherwise. The owners decided to vacate everyone and rebuild, but that very likely comes with a higher rent when they are done.

Councilor Stewart thanked Council Member Burkman for the clarification. She said those were the facts about that. It was not just an irresponsible landlord. There were serious safety issues.

Emily Lieb with Metro distributed a handout "Living there with equitable housing choices." She said they are not as far along as the City of Vancouver in terms of how they gathered their data on the current state and the pinch that they are seeing in the market now. She has been tasked with developing Metro's capacity to provide technical assistance, support, and data and help build a shared understanding of the challenge that every elected official across the region is hearing about pretty regularly now. Ms. Lieb said our region is not alone in tackling this challenge. She said they have a lot to learn from other cities, particularly from Seattle and the Bay area.

Ms. Lieb said they are in the early stages of developing a new initiative. The Equitable Housing Initiative 2015-16: Promoting equitable housing means ensuring diverse, quality, affordable housing choices with access to jobs, schools and transportation options. They are trying to be as broad as possible, and really claim a comprehensive conversation about what the regulatory tools are, what the market based approaches are, what the financing opportunities are, and where new opportunities for partnership are around this issue.

Ms. Lieb said at this stage, they would like to hear from this group what they think could be opportunities for collaboration, where they would like to learn more from a data perspective, and how they think Metro could help support local efforts like what is happening in Clark County. She said Metro has had similar conversations about housing in the past. They had a Task Force that come together in 2006 and developed a set of implementation recommendations that were accepted by the Metro Council. They then applied for a HUD Sustainable Communities Grant, which they did not get, and things fizzled out because there were no resources or capacity to carry those forward. Last year, the Metro Council created a budget for this project, so they will be picking up those recommendations from 2006.

They are going through an engagement process in partnership with an organization called the Oregon Opportunity Network. This is an umbrella organization for housing authorities and nonprofits in Oregon. They have been working together to develop a series of roundtable discussions. They have two conversations in Washington County, one in partnership with the Portland Housing Bureau and one in Gresham an east Multnomah County jurisdiction. They have one coming up in Clackamas County. They are talking with jurisdictions about the challenges they are experiencing and the opportunities they see for local policy changes, local new partnership, and strategies that might be able to move forward with a little technical assistance. They are trying to take a bottom up approach to understanding what the needs are in terms of data research, convening and then develop a program based on that.

The goals and objectives of the Equity Housing Initiative include the following: 1) develop a shared understanding among elected officials, jurisdiction staff, developers, funders and other stakeholders regarding best practices, needs, and opportunities for collaboration; 2) develop and provide technical assistance to support local implementation of best practices to overcome barriers to equitable housing development; 3) evaluate the feasibility of collaborative funding models and identify opportunities for partnerships between Metro, foundations, and other public and private funders to fill the financing gap for equitable housing development and preservation; and 4) pursue opportunities for Metro and local partners to support equitable housing development and preservation through capacity building, technical assistance, policy development, and funding partnerships.

Ms. Lieb said they are currently in the opportunity assessment phase. They have several researches going on in parallel. They will be working with economic consultant Jerry Johnson on a scope of work for a market analysis to take a snapshot of current state of vacancy rates, rents, home sales, and construction that is happening across the region.

Metro convened local jurisdictions to develop a comprehensive inventory of regulated affordable housing, and they are in the process of updating that. Vancouver is also at the table for that conversation. They are including Clark County in all the data analysis.

They have a small technical work group, and they are helping synthesize a lot of information into a framework that will be presented back to all at a regional summit in February, 2016. Ms. Lieb said they are trying to understand what the tools are that are appropriate in different market contexts and how they can provide a larger framework that helps Vancouver talk to Tigard and to Hillsboro bringing all those conversations together. This will help to see opportunities for coordination. Ms. Lieb asked the group for input on what they would like to see addressed or any local best practices that should be highlighted, especially from a data standpoint. Ms. Lieb said as part of the market analysis, they will also be looking at access to jobs, access to transit, and looking at housing and

transportation combined cost burden. She said they hope to have this good data in about six months.

Jeff Hamm asked if either the City of Vancouver or Metro has engaged in conversation with the development community as we have come out of the recession and as the pressure is building for housing are they seeing the market differently than over the last 15 years in Clark County where the pressure was to do the suburban single family tract building.

Peggy Sheehan said the Affordable Housing Task Force includes developers both private and nonprofit. What they are seeing is developers that traditionally developed in Portland are now coming to Vancouver. Some of the things that they are saying are that the cost of operation here is about 50% less than the cost of operating in a similar type of project in Portland. One is because of the tax structure. They are also talking about how it takes two years to permit a multi-family project in Portland, where in Vancouver it is 90 days and Clark County is close to the same. Developers are moving over here to develop more housing.

Mr. Hamm asked if that was both single family and multi-family. Ms. Sheehan said there are a lot more permits for multi-family than for single family.

Emily Lieb said they will be doing an analysis of recent construction, but one of the things that they have heard is that development is still happening in very concentrated parts of inner Portland. She said one thing that she has heard that is that there is a lot more money coming in from other places, so where it used to be all local companies, they are seeing developers come in from all over the country. That is changing the market.

Susie Lahsene said she wanted to follow on with Councilor Stewart's comments. One aspect of all of this is having the right job mix and understanding where those jobs are. She asked how this work would take into account the job diversity that exists, or doesn't exist.

Peggy Sheehan said in Clark County it is rumored that 60,000 people cross the bridge every day to work. What the staff is going to propose as a result of the Task Force will be that sort of discussion. What we can do to support more jobs. Vancouver has been the affordable housing area for Portland for many years, just like Washington County is. They will be looking at this as part of the second phase.

Emily Lieb said they have Greater Portland Inc. on their work group, and they have also been talking with PBA who have come out with a report on jobs and the connection to housing. The question is now that they have all that data, what they want to do with it. That will be a part of this effort as well.

Alan Lehto said we already discussed the importance of considering both housing and transportation costs in helping keep things affordable for households. He said one of the key things that transit can do is help provide a better transit option to help drive down the cost of transportation. He explained one of the things he is very interested in understanding in the future. He said we can do a pretty good job of convincing the providers of affordable housing to put them in places where they can be served efficiently by transit and provide good service for those that choose to live there. Mr. Lehto said Section 8 housing is only one part of the affordable housing market and for those who cannot even get a Section 8 voucher, a collection of unintentionally affordable housing because of its condition. He said it seems the location of that is probably predictable, but he said he doesn't know of anyone who has tried to understand where it is and what the forces are that drive them that way and whether we can know enough about them to actually think about how we create or adjust our service in order to serve those locations. In terms of understanding additional information for them as a transit agency to address the transportation side of the housing transportation cost, that additional information might be helpful.

Shirley Craddick spoke to Mr. Hamm's comment regarding multi-family versus single family housing. She said his comment is a good introduction to why the Metro Chief Operating Officer is recommending to the Metro Council that we not expand the urban growth boundary, because most

of the new development is going to be in the City of Portland, particularly multi-family housing. She said there are multiple reasons for that, and one is that the millennials don't want or need single family housing to the degree that us older people do. The other side is that we older people are also downsizing. So the trend is the expectation, and they see it by the number of multi-family housing being built in the Portland Metro region particularly in the City of Portland. Metro's COO is also recommending to the Metro Council that we relook at this in three years to see if that trend continues, and open up the discussion about the UGB earlier than they would traditionally.

Jeff Hamm suggested one concept that should be investigated is location efficient mortgages. This concept developed in the banking community over the last 15 years in certain metropolitan areas that if you are located on a transit line, your transportation costs go down, so therefore, a bank is willing to lend you more to get into a home than they would otherwise when they do their calculation of your finances. That might be something to look at, especially on the lower end of the housing market. You might be able to get more folks into home ownership if it is combined with location efficient mortgages.

Steve Novick said a concern that he has about housing affordability in Portland is that they are seeing an increasing backlash against growth. A lot of people would be very upset if there is a new apartment going up in their neighborhood. So far, he said he didn't think City Council is about to reverse four years of policy and decide to crack down on growth. He said that movement is building, but it is not intuitive for a lot of people that increasing supply reduces price. He said a lot of people have the impression that a lot is being built so prices will be going up, and if you stop building things, prices would go down. The fact is that it is the opposite.

Commissioner Novick also said an important piece of urban density and having an urban growth boundary is that it reduces greenhouse gas emissions. That also is not intuitively obvious. He said growth is good. Commissioner Novick said he was curious as to whether Vancouver is seeing the same kind of backlash.

Jack Burkman said yes for many years. One challenge he sees in Clark County is a wide variation of views depending upon jurisdiction. The City of Vancouver has been very resistant to moving urban growth boundaries for the very reason as mentioned. The current County policies seem to be more aimed at a suburban kind of mix, more single family housing. Jurisdictions like Camas that have recruited a number of employers, but are not providing lower income housing. They are relying on other jurisdictions. As our region on this side of the river grows, we're trying to figure out how to blend those different designers together. Battle Ground for quite a while was growing quickly. They had low cost single family housing. Today, they have a bit of a tax problem. There is learning occurring, and it is very dynamic. Council Member Burkman said that is why this forum is a unique opportunity, because we can learn from each other what is or isn't working. It is going to take some persuasion to convince some of the jurisdictions to look at it a little differently. Some very good points were brought up about that.

Jeanne Stewart clarified that jurisdictions within Clark County have their own GMA planning, and they plan and can make requests for expansion of their urban growth boundary. Unless there is a highly legitimate reason to refuse, the County basically serves those communities. Councilor Stewart said as a County Councilor it does not go without notice that some cohesion about policy is probably necessary, but at the present time, it is sort of inter specific jurisdictional. Councilor Stewart said some of them do see a need for having some overall policy.

Jack Burkman said the clear advantage that Metro has is the talk among those lines. He said he does have a concern, and asked if they have any information or any direction to provide from any other region like ours, given the river, the states boundaries, where we operate under very different clauses and cases. Mr. Burkman said he does not know how many of the 60,000 commuters a day are driving to minimum wage jobs. He was not aware of any policy instituted on either side of the river that might push or pull people to or from a jurisdiction.

Jeanne Stewart said she was not sure who did it, but a study was conducted that tracked license plate numbers that crossed the bridge and counted occupants. They actually called people, and they were not very happy about it. They asked their primary purpose for crossing the bridge, how long they were across the bridge, and many other questions. It was extensive. That was done before the recession. She believed that a lot of that is for commerce, not necessarily a fixed job. The question was who had undertaken the study.

Kris Strickler said ODOT and WSDOT actually performed some of that as part of the CRC project. That was done pre-recession. It was typically focused on origin destination patterns irrespective of income. Jack Burkman said that could be helpful information to look at.

Andy Cotugno said along those lines, he had a request of Emily and Peggy. He said it is generally hard to tease out the cross river effect from their information and he suggested that when they were 70-80% done, at the five month marker, take advantage of the staff that attend these meetings, because they have been trying to understand cross river effects, and there are some perspectives to be shared to analyze the information. Mr. Cotugno added that Sheila Martin from the Institute of Metropolitan Studies has done a fair amount of work and presented it here, and Carolyn Young from Washington State University has done that kind of research as well. This group is not just about what each are doing in Portland and Vancouver but how that impacts one another. Jack Burkman said the Bi-State is the only group that is doing that; it's an important forum.

Alan Lehto said he had an article in his email a few days ago about the conversation that is going on around this same issue in the San Francisco area which is far worse off than we are in many ways, and a place we want to learn from before we get anywhere close to it. All the high tech folks are working in the Silicon Valley, but they want to live in San Francisco. The rents are not only unaffordable for low income, but unaffordable for a lot of medium income people as well. The article was basically pointing the finger back at land use policies in San Francisco that had downzoned most of the city and did not allow the kind of development that was needed to keep up with the demand. So they were pointing out that while Seattle is building 5,000-6,000 units every year, San Francisco is maybe managing 1,500 in multi-family. For a big city like that with the kind of growth that they have seen, that was another piece that greatly impacted rents.

Jack Burkman asked that he share that article or any that he finds. He recommended that anyone in the group to do the same. Please send it to Matt or Andy to distribute to all in the group.

Emily Lieb asked if the article was by Kim Cutler. Mr. Lehto was not sure. Ms. Lieb said they are going to be partnering with GPI to bring a San Francisco tech reporter who has written about the housing crisis there to town sometime in September. They are finalizing the date, possibly Friday, September 18, but she would share that with Andy when confirmed.

Jack Burkman said that would be very good information. Any research that shows the pros and cons would be helpful.

Matt Ransom displayed the website that he had referred to and said they can share this with the group as well. He said Andy had mentioned another site that is better and more customized that HUD has taken and advanced the schematic. When you put in your zip code, it takes you to your block group and gives you the affordability index from a housing standpoint and from a transportation standpoint. The links are: H&T Index: <http://htaindex.cnt.org/map/> and, Location Affordability Index: <http://www.locationaffordability.info/>

4. RTC Bus on Shoulder Feasibility Study: DRAFT Scope and Process Update

Bob Hart of RTC said this is a follow up on the presentation that was provided at the March 19 Bi-State Committee meeting. The study came out of the recommendations that were discussed in March. Since that time, RTC developed a draft scope of work and met with agency staff including the two DOTs, two transit districts, and Metro, and they helped review the scope within the overall study.

The purpose of the Feasibility study is to identify engineering, technical, operational, and policy considerations for Bus on Shoulder in the I-205 corridor. Phase one will recommend whether the region should proceed with a comprehensive phase two BOS study. If stakeholders agree to advance phase two, they would adopt regional BOS policies to guide how and when to consider BOS in other freeway corridors.

The reliability on I-205 is highly variable. In the morning peak, speeds range between 15 to 35 mph at SR-14. In the evening peak, they range from 25 and 40 mph at Airport Way. Congestion on I-205 affects reliability and on-time performance for commuter service in the corridor.

Bus on Shoulder is when transit vehicles can use the shoulder when the mainline speeds fall below a predetermined speed or dynamic, not all the time and only as needed. Traffic speed threshold is generally 35 mph, with buses allowed 15 to 20 mph faster than the adjacent traffic. Mr. Hart said Bus on Shoulder is different than hard shoulder running which can carry general purpose traffic and carpools with much higher vehicle volumes. There are about 15 BOS systems in place in 2012 in the US.

Mr. Hart highlighted four Bus on Shoulder systems: Minneapolis-St. Paul, Miami, Atlanta, and Chicago. The Minneapolis-St. Paul system is known as the gold standard for Bus on Shoulder. They are the region that most regions look to when considering Bus on Shoulder. Others will take what they have done and customize and refine it to work for their own particular needs. Some systems require buses to stay in regular traffic lanes between exit and entrance ramps, while others allow buses to continue giving priority to on and off traffic. Priority is always given for emergency and law enforcement. Most systems use the outside shoulder lane, with only a few using the inside shoulder. Mr. Hart emphasized the fact that each Bus on Shoulder system is designed to fit the individual needs and conditions of that area. He showed a couple animations of how Bus on Shoulder works, and also provided some video clips of actual buses using the Bus on Shoulder system.

Jeff Hamm said the Minneapolis 300 mile Bus on Shoulder system averages 2 crashed per year. Mr. Hart said safety is a main concern that many people have. They have found that safety has not really been an issue with Bus on Shoulder.

Shirley Craddick said that she attended Rail-volution when it was in Minneapolis, and got to see their system. She said it was fascinating. She also said it was her first experience with lane pricing and how it varied according to the traffic.

Mr. Hart said there is a lot of variability in the types of systems. Each region looks at their own specific infrastructure and their own needs and builds it to work for them.

Jack Burkman asked how long these systems have been in operation. Mr. Hart said Twin Cities was the first 20 years ago, and they just expanded year by year. Most Bus on Shoulder systems have come in the last 15 years.

Shirley Craddick asked if the Washington and Oregon shoulders are able to accommodate these buses or would there have to be construction to occur. Mr. Hart said that is part of the Feasibility Study, to look at the infrastructure, shoulder width, and pavement depth and constraints. They will also assess their high volume interchanges and how a bus would travel through that area. Councilor Craddick said she assumed that Washington had more space than Oregon. Mr. Hart said on I-205 between the river and I-84, Oregon has pretty good shoulder widths in many places. South of 18th Street on I-205 to the Bridge does have some constraints. Those will need to be addressed.

Jeff Hamm said he has been a passionate advocate for this for many years. He said he had worked with Don Wagner and Bart Gernhart about seven years ago looking at I-5 south between Main Street and SR-500 and the bridge on the inside lane. They did a lot of really good work. It was about \$1 million to move some of the Jersey barriers on I-5 south and rebuild the shoulder in order to do that. It didn't go anywhere for a host of reasons. This is a much better way to take a

step back and look at it. He said he thinks the Bus on Shoulder has huge potential for the region for the suburb to suburb commute and transit efficiency and ridership. Mr. Hamm said the PACE system in Chicago added a couple more sections over the last couple years on the outside shoulder. They go inside for 15 miles, then it is discontinuous and they go outside for a few miles, and they have seen a 30% increase in ridership once they implemented the new segment of Bus on Shoulder.

Kris Strickler said it is more than just width that they need to be concerned with. For many years they had a history of constructing the shoulders at a much slimmer depth than the rest of the roadway service, so the depth is not there to accommodate the weight. He said with that said, where we sit now is a great place to be. We know we are constrained all over the region, and looking at options like this is perfect.

Alan Lehto said he thought there used to be some Bus on Shoulder in the Seattle area and asked if Mr. Hart ran across that. Mr. Hart said on I-405 in Seattle, they are looking at developing a Bus on Shoulder segment. It was noted that there used to be a system on the approach to the Evergreen Point Floating Bridge on SR 520.

Susie Lahsene said because they have recently had some real challenges at the airport, actually getting out of the airport going northbound, the airport is very focused on the rest of I-205. She asked that as this study proceeds, she would like to have the Port be involved periodically on the technical side. She recommended Mike Coleman as the contact person and would talk with Mr. Hart about participating.

Mr. Hart said the study corridor encompasses the I-205 corridor from 18th Street, where they are currently constructing an interchange, south to I-84 and on SR-14 from I-205 to 164th Avenue. SR-14 is included because of the high congestion levels and the number of commuter buses using SR-14 that travel between Fisher's Landing Park and Ride facility. Although the detailed analysis will focus on I-205 and SR-14, the transit influence area may extend as far north as the Salmon Creek interchange in order to understand the technical issues and physical characteristics of the corridor associated with a BOS system if and when C-TRAN expands transit service north of 18th Street.

Mr. Hart displayed the 8 study tasks. He noted that task 3 is a Technical Workshop with agency stakeholders. They will get a consultant on board that has expertise in Bus on Shoulder systems, and they also want to invite public agency experts that have experience with Bus on Shoulder systems. Mr. Hart said Minnesota has what they call a Traffic Team of people that provide that kind of support. He said he sees the Workshop as being part educational in getting people up to speed as to how these systems work, what they have experienced, and also help inform some of their tasks in terms of developing a bus service operating concept of what we want to consider in the region.

Jeanne Stewart said she is interested in the timeframe going forward. Mr. Hart said they will develop the scope of work further. They met with agency staff earlier to review the scope and had discussion of ways to refine it, and they will finalize the scope. They anticipate over the next few months to have a Request for Qualifications go out for the study. They will also finalize funding and a budget for the study. They anticipate by the end of the year to have an RFQ and hire a consultant for assistance in the study.

Jeanne Stewart said she is interested to know if there has ever been a comprehensive safety study of Bus on Shoulder. She said Mr. Hamm said that Minneapolis averages about two accidents a year. She is interested in overall safety, noting that he used four or five examples.

Mr. Hart said he provided four examples, but he has data on the 15 that are in place now in the US. He said that initially when it started, it was thought safety would be an issue, but it has turned out that safety is not an issue. Part of the Feasibility Study, will address what the safety issues may be and how to deal with incidents and emergency access and the interface with buses.

Jeanne Stewart asked if there would be a standard width of a shoulder for the bus. Mr. Hart said the general rule is a minimum of 10 feet and 12 feet is recommended for the shoulder width. The pavement depth in some cases with low volume use can be used for a while, but in the longer term, the shoulder will need to be rebuilt to the standard depth to accommodate buses. Mr. Hart said in looking at the different systems, it is variable in terms of how they do it. In some cases when they don't have the shoulder width, the bus goes back into the regular travel lane until it gets to a wider shoulder segment to move back onto. These are the things that will be addressed in the study.

Jeanne Stewart asked if there was any intention of taking out any existing lanes for the bus to use the shoulder. Mr. Hart said they don't have that answer at this time. He said they wouldn't take any general purpose lanes away, but how they might fit a bus on the shoulder with the right standards along the corridor is part of the study.

Jeanne Stewart said she thought currently the I-205 shoulder looked narrower than a standard lane. She said that serves as an emergency lane, and would no longer be available if the bus was using the shoulder. Mr. Hart said if there was a disabled vehicle on the shoulder, the bus would not travel on the shoulder. It would move over to the regular travel lane to go around the disabled vehicle. The priority is for the vehicle on the shoulder. Those issues will be handled with the bus operating rules that will be developed.

Shirley Craddick said this is a wonderful opportunity where this is a project that the two regions might consider. She hoped that fellow elected at the table might begin to discuss this as we learn more about this. She said this may be a project that we could both add to our Regional Transportation Plans in the future to seriously consider.

Jack Burkman said right now this is being done under the auspices of the Regional Transportation Council. This has not yet come before the C-TRAN Board.

Mr. Hart said RTC will be supported by a Technical Advisory Committee made up of representatives from the WSDOT, C-TRAN, ODOT, TriMet, Metro, and RTC. In addition, RTC will engage with the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration when necessary to inform them of study progress and ensure coordination on transit use of interstate facilities and regulatory or other requirements.

5. Metro 2018 Regional Transportation Plan Update

Kim Ellis of Metro provided two handouts, a 2018 RTP Update fact sheet along with a more detailed background document that they have been using to brief their elected officials and others partners that will be involved in the update process. Ms. Ellis said her purpose is to hear from this group about the work being done to support the bi-state coordination effort.

Ms. Ellis said one of the things about the Regional Transportation Plan update is that they are really trying to better link the work that they are doing at a regional policy level with the experiences that people and businesses have on the ground. She displayed a tree as an example. The roots of the tree serve as the policies that are guiding all the work that they are doing (trunk and limbs): making investments to improve access to jobs, improve access to schools, new freight and goods within the region, to then create great places across the community (leaves). The Regional Transportation Plan is really the primary tool that helps them create great places across the region. It is a tool about how they are coordinating their investments to support all the community and business needs that they have across the region.

The RTP establishes a vision with goals, objectives, and performance targets that have been adopted previously and more work will be done on this in response to Map-21 and federal laws that are currently in the works. The RTP will have a financial plan about how they will pay for priority investments. The plan reflects a shared investment strategy of local, regional, and state priorities for how they are making investments in the transportation system to support jobs, the economy, and getting people to where they need to go. It also includes an action plan for all parts of the

transportation system. So it is not just the investments, but the actions that they need to do to make that vision a reality. It is also a tool to coordinate investments across all the transportation providers. There is no one agency responsible for the entire transportation system, so the long-range transportation plans that are developed at the regional level are really a way to coordinate all of those different investments aimed at achieving a common vision. It also establishes priorities for what is eligible for state and federal transportation dollars.

Ms. Ellis said they updated their RTP last year to keep it current, but at the same time they were working on the region's Climate Smart Strategy that was adopted in December and developing an Active Transportation Plan. This next update, which is due by the end of 2018, is an opportunity to further implement those two plans, but also address some of the issues that they were not able to deal with because of the limited nature of the last update.

As listed on page 2 of the 2-page fact sheet, there are several components that they will work toward updating. They are the last significant updates to some of the pieces back in 2010. Things have changed a lot in the region. There are a lot of new issues to address.

Metro's 2040 Growth Concept is a regional strategy built with community plans and visions. They are nearly halfway to that 50 year vision. They are also doing this current RTP update that will look at how they are doing with that vision, what's working, what has changed, and what the region can do better. To think ahead on where they want to go the next 25 years, and doing so in a way that is looking at not transportation as a single means to an end, but how transportation investments can really help the region advance and make progress toward six desired outcomes that have been adopted.

Ms. Ellis said in developing their scope of work, they have a four-phase approach, and she highlighted these phases. They are on the fore front of this and just getting started. She asked the group for ideas of what is important to them for the RTP update to look at. By the end of this year, they will be looking to the Metro Council and JPACT to adopt the 2018 RTP Work Plan that will guide the remaining phases of the process for adoption in 2018.

Ms. Ellis said partnerships and collaboration are important, and the Bi-State Coordination Committee is an important forum for sharing information throughout the process. She said there will be topics that they will want to weigh in on as a group as they move forward. She said we all have a shared responsibility for making our transportation system in the region.

In speaking to the list of components to be updated, Ms. Ellis said they will begin developing a regional transit strategy. In the past, they had a High Capacity Transit Plan, which is really focused on the capital side. She said TriMet has been doing a lot of work over the last two years to develop Service Enhancement Plans for expanding service going into the future. The idea is that they will build on that High Capacity Transit Plan to bring all of the service related increases that they have been mapping out with communities on the Oregon side of the river, as well as SMART, who serves transit in the Wilsonville area. She explained that SMART is also embarking on updating their Master Plan for service in that part of the region. This would bring all those pieces together with the High Capacity Transit Plan including the transit support of the investment including sidewalks and bike connections to transit and transit centers, along with signal timing for buses.

They will be updating the Regional Freight Plan, which is an important part of both sides of the river. They will be working with both Ports as well as other partners as they move forward. The following will also be updated: Transportation System Management and Operations Plan; Atlas of Regional Mobility Corridors (serves as their Congestion Management Plan); and Regional Transportation Safety Plan.

Ms. Ellis said she will be continuing to develop a more detailed work plan that they will be taking to their policy and technical advisory committees starting in September and asking JPACT and Metro Council to adopt the Work Plan in November and December, respectively.

Potential areas for future discussion and collaboration with the Bi-State Coordination Committee include: Atlas of Regional Mobility Corridors, particularly in the I-5 and I-205 corridors; Regional Transit Strategy; Regional Freight Strategy; Shared investment strategy for I-5 and I-205 corridors; and funding.

Shirley Craddick said this follows up on the last discussion of a project that she hopes will be included in the RTP, the possibility of the Bus on Shoulder project. She asked how much coordination they do with RTC, given the two states and two sides of the river. Ms. Ellis said they really rely on the technical committees, with TPAC and RTAC, and that policy coordination occurs through JPACT and RTC. She said at the last major update in 2010 they had a fairly significant amount of sharing of information and discussions at the staff level. They did come to the Bi-State Coordination Committee, because they did need to coordinate on modeling assumptions for the analysis that they do in terms of the land use but also reflecting the transportation plans that had been adopted on the Washington side of the river. At the staff level they do bring things forward for discussion and sharing of information to ensure there is an understanding of where they are headed and opportunities to raise concerns or comments or to add to what is being discussed and recommended through the process.

Matt Ransom added that the list of activities for collaboration and discussion identified offer many shared opportunities, whether it is transit, freight, or system management. It shouldn't stop at the river. He said when projects emerge, or policies emerge, we would be better to have them be the same so they work well.

Shirley Craddick said as a member of the RTC Board representing Metro, she asked if this discussion had occurred at the RTC Board yet about what some shared projects are that the two regions would like to consider and look at together.

Jack Burkman said it is very early in the conversation. He said it was a topic at the last JPACT meeting. Mr. Burkman said this is a unique opportunity because your last update was 2010 and ours was 2014. He said for the first time, there is some significant time between these. The question is what we want to put in each other's RTPs referencing back and forth. He asked if there was a way to do this in a timeframe that has us march along together a little bit. He has not seen this opportunity before, and he said he wanted to make sure to preserve enough time to talk a little bit about state legislative updates, but at a very high level, he would not bet on the Washington State money going for Mega projects for a while. Mr. Burkman said they got committed to the projects that were there and asked what that meant with the constraints that we now see. What does that mean for both of our plans in addressing the issues? It is clearly both sides of the river.

Shirley Craddick requested that this topic be considered as an agenda item for the RTC Board. Mr. Burkman said they would relay that to Chair Melissa Smith.

Kim Ellis said she is scheduled to present this to the RTAC committee in September and after that would be able to present to the RTC Board.

Steve Novick said that if we are thinking about how we are going to raise money for example high capacity transit in the SW corridor, we need people who are close to that in order to get people to be devoted to such a thing. It won't matter to the people who don't live in the SW corridor. He wondered if there was a prospect of a cross-river bond measure or something. It could be that because they are all in the same media market, some kind of combined campaign where people in Washington are talking about fixing these problems and you can talk about fixing problems in Oregon that resonate to Washingtonians and vice versa. Commissioner Novick said it could be a pie in the sky idea, but maybe at some point in 2020, we do a coordinated plan for transportation improvements and come up with messages that resonate across the river.

Jack Burkman said he thought that was a wonderful idea if we don't have to wait that long. There is a lot of ongoing conversation in Clark County around, "we can't do anything until Portland does _____" and fill in the blank. He said he expects something similar coming across. He asked how

we inform at least what is going on and what the plans are. There is lack of information to start with.

Jeanne Stewart said any project that is done across the river has to be a joint project. She said she appreciated the notion of some kind of joint legislative action. Ms. Stewart said some of the jurisdictions on the Clark County side may be ready for that, adding that she thought it would be a little bit more time before we get more participation by Clark County Council. She said these are priorities, mutual priorities and we need to see them that way. Rather than focusing on how socially and culturally we might be different than downtown Portland, we need to start focusing on how we are the same and how our problems are the same. Councilor Stewart said some of them are making every effort to move in that direction, but they are still a ways away from a consensus. She did not think it would be too much longer.

6. RTC 2014 Congestion Management Process, Bi-State Corridor Observations

Matt Ransom said Dale Robins, the project manager for the Congestion Management Process, had planned to present this item but was unable to attend. Mr. Ransom distributed copies of the 2014 Congestion Management Process Summary Report and provided a brief presentation. He said RTC produces their Congestion Monitoring Report annually. It is primarily a traffic counting exercise, traffic counts and vehicle movements. They fully assess, under their mission as an MPO, the regional system and the conditions and feed that back into their RTP decision making process.

Mr. Ransom said the real take away in this year's report is bridge conditions. That is one of the highlights. The bi-state bridge traffic was shown from 1960 to 2014 showing the current highest recorded volumes across the two bridges in history totaling 284,300. He noted that the aberration in time was during the recession. At that time, the counts were going backwards, but since then the economy is resurgent, people are back to work, and traffic has picked up as shown in the numbers.

Mr. Ransom showed a comparison of 2013 to 2014 morning peak hour delay (7-8 a.m.) for the I-205 Bridge: 26% increase; SR-14, I-205 to 164th Ave.: 37% increase; and the I-5 Bridge: 57% increase in delay. For I-5 this translates to if your commute for the segment being measured was 10 minutes in 2013; in 2014 it was almost 16 minutes. This is a significant increase in delay.

Mr. Ransom displayed 2005 versus 2014 Northbound PM Peak Period Columbia River Crossings volumes from 2:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. When conditions are not congested, you can put more people through the corridor. What is happening on I-5 now is that the more that is put in all at once, the less efficient the system is. They are seeing a flattening and a widening of the congestion period. Mr. Ransom said mid-day traffic is getting worse, both northbound and southbound.

Key strategies identified for Clark County see that as they continue to build out major pieces of the system, such as I-5 north, they now need to shift to system management and operations strategies. There are selective capacity improvements on the regional system. These are more of the order of auxiliary lanes; no major new corridors have been identified in the Regional Transportation Plan. They need to focus on system management and demand management strategies overall. Possibly, the public along with the regional partners see the reemergence of the need to talk about these bridges.

Andy Cotugno asked if they had any data on the truck impact of the Port of Portland T-6 closure. Susie Lahsene said yes. To clarify, she said in the paper it was reported as 2,000 truck trips a day, but in fact it is a week. The impact is really an estimate on the Port's part. The implication, while it is 2,000 truck trips a week, is broader because of the delay on local streets accessing NW Container for example.

Jack Burkman asked what affects they were seeing now on freight, were they delaying their times or working at night, how are they dealing with this? Susie Lahsene said they completed the Cost of Congestion Study with a number of partners around this table. She said some of the conclusions from that work effort were that companies used to operate off peak; they are now operating in the

middle of the night. To the extent that they have to continue to do that has a big impact on jobs and quality of life. This means that you have to have people there to receive the product as well as move the product. That is a big concern. Ms. Lahsene said it also impacts companies thinking about expansion. If you are coming into a market with the assumption that you are going to be able to serve a certain area, and in fact that area shrinks, then it really impacts your ability to do what you had done with the original investment you started with. Ms. Lahsene said another implication is that once congestion occurs, companies then turn around and try to overcome it by putting more trucks on the road, and it creates more congestion. It becomes a big challenge to deal with making the integrated multi-modal freight network work well; the rail, waterways, as well as air freight in addition to the workhorse of the system, the trucks. They must also make sure that the chokepoints are addressed. Ms. Lahsene said to the extent that ITS or other operational improvements are helpful, we need to be as creative as we can be about it.

7. State Legislative Updates

Matt Ransom provided a handout with the proposed 2015 State Transportation Project List for Clark, Skamania, and Klickitat Counties along with a Clark County Transit Project. Also listed was a draft New-Law Transportation Balance Sheet. Mr. Ransom said the Washington State Legislature and ultimately then the Governor has signed a new transportation investment bill called Moving Washington. On the revenue side, it was a \$16 billion bill over the course of 16 years. The handout listed how the money would be raised, primarily funded through 11.9 cents gas tax increase phased-in in two phases. Also listed was a summary listing of the expenditure categories. Over \$8 billion are committed to projects that are earmarked in the law, so the DOT has a specific list of projects to implement. The majority of that is mega projects in the central Puget Sound and Spokane. Another nice attribute of this bill was funding and other regulatory revisions that enable enhanced transit funding or the capacity to raise more money for transit service.

Mr. Ransom said in the State of Washington, since the Legislature primarily is driving the process, they select the projects. It is an earmarking activity. The list to benefit SW Washington is listed totaling \$238 million. Mr. Ransom said in looking at the projects, most of the smaller projects such as in Battle Ground or Ridgefield are funded in the front end of the bill. Money starts to flow to those projects right after the bill is signed and into the next two biennium. The two largest projects, interchange improvement projects one at I-5 and Mill Plain and one at I-5 and 179th Street, are slated for funding at the back side of the bill, possibly into 2020 until money starts to flow to those projects.

Jack Burkman asked if that meant for the I-5/ 179th Street interchange, we shouldn't expect to see it operational for ten years. Mr. Ransom said he has a list of just exactly when those funds are available. He said what is important about how the money is programmed now is that is how the bill was enacted subject to revision, and as money comes in and money goes out, they will probably adjust as they did in the previous two funding bills' actual expenditure plan. Currently, in looking at how the spreadsheet is programmed, it is at least ten years plus. Mr. Burkman said our Legislature meets yearly, so there is an opportunity to compete in the conversation.

Chair Burkman asked about the "poison pill" that is related to transit. Jeff Hamm said it has been a high wire act the last week and a half. The legislation contained a "poison pill", as Mr. Burkman referred to. That is if the Governor were to implement a low carbon fuels standard, that all the money, over \$1 billion, for transit, bike and pedestrian, complete streets, and safe routes to school would be taken out and put into the highway fund. The Governor was seriously considering doing that. They had discussions with the Governor, and the day before yesterday, he decided not to do that and instead is pursuing the Department of Ecology implementing a carbon pollution limit or standard rule for major fuel producers, carbon producers in the state. The "poison pill" has not been administered.

Mr. Burkman said he understood that there is some controversy around the Department of Ecology's role and ability to do that. There is a lot of conversation occurring. Mr. Burkman said this is very important because it does describe very different terrain between Oregon and Washington.

Andy Cotugno said they swallowed the "poison pill" at the beginning of the Session meaning the Legislature adopted low carbon fuel standards early and then broke down and couldn't reach agreement on a transportation package. He said they went into the process with the Legislature after 18 months of work collaboration through the Oregon Transportation Forum, a large group of stakeholders with a pretty comprehensive proposal. Amongst the proposal, there were a couple small things that did pass. Connect Oregon passed at half of what they hoped for. They were seeking \$100 million for the biennium. Mr. Cotugno said that was a little better than the previous year, and the 6th consecutive biennium that that was provided for. Connect Oregon is strictly for non-highway multi modal type projects. There was an important need to continue funding for the passenger rail service between Eugene and Vancouver, B. C. or it would go away, and that did pass as well. Mr. Cotugno said those were the two small things that passed. Major funding for transit expansion and major funding for highway expansion died because of the tie with low carbon fuel standards.

Jack Burkman asked if this meant that no gas tax went through. Mr. Cotugno said that was correct. Mr. Burkman said that is the biggest difference with Washington. Washington ended with an 11.9 cent gas tax sequenced over two steps. He said it has been very challenging to have a conversation about a new gas tax on top of this one for many years. He said he is optimistic that maybe that door is still open for Oregon. Washington gas tax is currently at 45 cents going up to over 50 cents. Oregon is currently at 30 cents.

Andy Cotugno said one hopeful prospect out of the legislative process was that there were repeated statements about the need and the importance of doing something. He said they didn't do something, but that was not because there were doubts about the need. They didn't do something because of the double dip on the consumer. The low carbon fuel costs driving up gas prices crowding out the ability to tax gasoline higher.

8. Columbia River Bridges – Issues / News Updates

Chair Burkman asked Kris Strickler if any bridge maintenance would be taking place. Mr. Strickler said they are working together with ODOT on the maintenance plan for the biennium. He said there will be some maintenance of the greasing of the cables, checking the trunnion and such in the upcoming months.

Future Agendas:

Chair Burkman said the committee will meet again in three months so that may be a good topic for the agenda to hear what is going on. They also have the Greater Portland Inc. 2020 Plan Update and the update on the 500K Voices Results for SW Washington's Values and Beliefs Survey. Chair Burkman asked if there were other items to add to the future agenda.

Andy Cotugno said Greater Portland Inc. has been developing a strategy for the region, and that is a bi-state strategy. They have a draft out, and they want to come to the next meeting to talk about that. Mr. Burkman said they could make that their first priority.

9. Adjourn

JEANNE STEWART MOVED FOR ADJOURNMENT. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY JEFF HAMM AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED. The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.