Below are the minutes for the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council Board of Directors Meeting, held on **Tuesday, July 22, 2008,** at 4:00 p.m. at the Clark County Public Service Center, 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington. The agenda for this meeting is also available.

Minutes

I. Call to Order and Roll Call of Members

The Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council Board of Directors Meeting was called to order by Chair Royce Pollard on Tuesday, July 22, 2008, at 4:08 p.m. at the Clark County Public Service Center Sixth Floor Hearing Room, Vancouver, Washington. Attendance follows.

Board Members Present
Nancy Baker, Port of Vancouver Commissioner Marc Boldt, Clark County Commissioner Rex Burkholder, Metro Councilor Molly Coston, Washougal Council Member Bill Ganley, Battle Ground Council Member Jeff Hamm, C-TRAN Executive Director Pat McDonnell, Vancouver City Manager Betty Sue Morris, Clark County Commissioner Paul Pearce, Skamania County Commissioner Royce Pollard, Vancouver Mayor Steve Stuart, Clark County Commissioner Jason Tell, ODOT Region One Manager Don Wagner, WSDOT Regional Administrator Don Benton, Senator 17th District Bill Fromhold, Representative 49th District Jaime Herrera, Representative 18th District Jim Moeller, Representative 49th District Joe Zarelli, Senator18th District
Board Members Absent
Brian Prigel, Bingen Mayor Jim Honeyford, Senator 15th District: Bruce Chandler, Representative 15th District: Dan Newhouse, Representative 15th District Jim Dunn, Representative 17th District Deb Wallace, Representative 17th District Ed Orcutt, Representative 18th District Craig Pridemore, Senator 49th District
Staff Present

Lynda David, Senior Transportation Planner Mark Harrington, Transportation Analyst Bob Hart, Transportation Section Supervisor Dean Lookingbill, Transportation Director Sandi Roberts, Office Assistant Diane Workman, Administrative Assistant
Guests Present
Sam Adams, Berger/Abam Engineering Michael Andersen, The Columbian Ron Anderson, Columbia River Crossing Ed Barnes, Labor Round Table Ossie Bladine, Citizen Katy Brooks, Port of Vancouver Rob Charles, City of Battle Ground Justin Clary, City of Ridgefield KC Cooper, Berger/Abam Engineering John Cullerton, URS Myrna Curzon, ODOT Salem Amanda Dotson, Congressman Baird's Office Paul Edgar, Citizen Doug Ficco, Columbia River Crossing Kevin Gray, Clark County Jeanne Harris, Vancouver Council Member Schuyler Hoss, Governor Gregoire's Office Addison Jacobs, Port of Vancouver Tom Jurhs, Citizen David Johnston, Citizen Sharon Kelly, URS Michael Kepcha, Citizen Mary Legry, WSDOT Dick Malin, Central Park NHA Jeffrey Mize, The Columbian Sharon Nasset, ETA Robert Nichols, Citizen Philip Parker, WA Transportation Commissioner Terry Parker, Citizen Debbie Peterson, Citizen Matt Ransom, City of Vancouver Troy Rayburn, Clark County Dylan Rivera, The Oregonian Thayer Rorabaugh, City of Vancouver Rick Rush, Citizen Ron Swaren, Citizen Mark Turpel, Metro Theresa Wagner, Senator Murray's Office Rex Wong, Columbia River Crossing Curt Wyrick, Clark County

Chair Pollard thanked everyone for coming to the meeting. He welcomed Nancy Baker, Port of Vancouver Commissioner. She will be replacing Port of Ridgefield Commissioner Roy Randel.

II. Approval of June 3, 2008, Minutes

STEVE STUART MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 3, 2008, MEETING MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY DON WAGNER AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

III. Citizen Communications

Chair Pollard said there were several people wishing to comment and requested that they keep their remarks to three minutes or less.

Terry Parker, a NE Portland resident, said the purpose of the bridge is to bring the two sides of the Columbia River closer together, not further apart. A bridge needs an equitable cost sharing financing plan. If tolling in any form is implemented for any kind of motor vehicle, then the users of all modes of vehicular traffic must be required to pay a toll or a user charge, transit users and bicyclists as well. He said by limiting the number of traffic lanes, the people targeted to pay the most will receive the least amount of service. Mr. Parker noted that about 80 percent of the trips in the region are made by car or truck and said it would be cost prohibitive to develop a mass transit system to meet all those travel needs. By restricting vehicle capacity on the CRC will only lead to more congestion. Mr. Parker said he thinks a better alternative would be to retain the existing bridges for local and interchange traffic and build a new bridge for I-5 through-traffic with more lanes to increase capacity.

Rick Rush, a Ridgefield resident, said he favors the Lincoln terminus for the light rail because of increased projected ridership and a favorable location for future expansion. He said he favors light rail as more cost effective than bus transit. He is not in favor of tolls, but where the funding comes from needs to be firmed up. We need to get Federal funding and the funding for light rail should come from the Federal Transit Administration. He proposes that the federal government pay for 90 percent of the bridge construction with Washington paying 5 percent and Oregon paying 5 percent. He said this is a federal interstate and not a state route, and it should be paid for by a majority of federal funds. Light rail should be put to a vote of the people of Portland and Vancouver as to whether or not they want light rail, and if so, how operations and maintenance will be financed (sales tax, bonding, or some other means). Funding and a vote on light rail are crucial to how this project design moves forward. He said the question of light rail should be on the November ballot for the citizens of Vancouver and Portland to decide. In order for this to pass, the information needs to be put out there for the citizens to make a good informed decision. Mr. Rush said we need to get Senators Murray and Cantwell and Representative Baird to get commitments from the federal government and Oregon Senators and Representatives need to do the same. The number of bridges and the number of lanes needs to be determined.

Edward Barnes, a Vancouver resident, said he supported a new bridge across the Columbia River with light rail. The reason he said was for safety, congestion relief, freight mobility, and more jobs on the Washington side of the river. Mr. Barnes said the vote today should be what the people want and not what individual political people want. This project needs to be negotiated between the two states and the Transportation Commissions and the Federal Government. That will determine how this bridge will be built. He would like to see a positive vote, and for all to work hard to get the money necessary to build the bridge so the tolls will be at the minimum. He said it is important for everyone to work together to make it happen.

Sharon Nasset, a Portland resident, had a display map and a handout with a west arterial option. She said she had not seen a supplemental bridge design that is equal to the replacement bridge required by NEPA and said there are other options. She said you cannot have an LPA with only one issue and not several options. The display and handouts that she provided were for a third bridge option and said there was not a thorough study process. She said the west arterial option would provide heavy rail instead of light rail. The option would make a viaduct overhead from I-5 at Mill Plain and take the freight and commuter traffic out of downtown Vancouver to the Port of Vancouver. The route follows the BN rail to Jantzen Beach, Marine Drive, and to Columbia Blvd.

and across to Highway 30. She said this option would take traffic out of neighborhoods. She said this option needs to be studied now and not go forward with the replacement bridge.

Paul Edgar, an Oregon City resident, noted a paper he had written on the I-5 corridor. He said in talking with ODOT staff, he was told an important thing to remember is balance. You need to maintain balance in the corridor, and he felt this project would only cause more congestion. Mr. Edgar said he thought the I-5 corridor was not a viable corridor to build a big new bridge. He does not think all the information and facts are there and that now is not the time to approve the proposed bridge.

David Johnston, a Vancouver resident, said he supported the replacement bridge with light rail. He said he liked the idea of open tolls on the bridge until the bridge is paid for and then end. He said he thought the project would provide living wage jobs for the area and thinks it will improve the quality of living and the economic development of the area.

Robert Nichols, a Vancouver resident, said he was going to speak of the congestion that is going to be increased if this goes forward, as was expressed by earlier comment. He noted the testimony by Dr. Citron on how this replacement bridge will in fact significantly increase congestion in the corridor. He said it may lighten it at the bridge, but the total corridor will have significant increased congestion with commute times more than they are with the no build option. He said we simply do not know what the totals will be on this bridge. The reason is because we don't know what the state funding and the federal contribution is going to be. He said this should be a federal project, because it is an interstate highway. He said Clark County should not have to fund construction of an interstate highway. They have plenty to do inside Clark County. He said until those facts are known, he did not think a decision could be made.

Tom Jurhs, a Vancouver resident, said he is not in favor of tolls. He said he lives near the I-205 bridge and uses it often. He said it may be a small fee, but it adds up. He said if a toll is put in place it will affect everybody. Mr. Juhrs noted a neighbor that has cancer and travels to the Kaiser clinic twice a week when undergoing treatment. A toll would be difficult on them as well.

Debbie Peterson, a Vancouver resident, distributed copies of her comments. She said she was anticipating from the RTC a no vote on the CRC recommended LPA and listed her reasons. She believes it is more cost effective to retrofit the existing bridges than to build a new bridge. She feels the citizens of Vancouver and Clark County will have a triple hit financially with the tolls, the increased taxes, and the loss of revenue base. She does not believe the new bridge means less congestion. Ms. Peterson said she does not think the CRC Task Force research followed the NEPA process, and that the research is flawed.

Michael Kepcha, a Washougal resident, said he is in favor of the bridge because it is one of the major bottlenecks on the I-5 corridor from Canada to the Mexican border. The current bridges will cost too much to fix to what they need to be, and they are 100 years old. Mr. Kepcha said the bottleneck on this corridor needs to be fixed for commercial transportation of goods and services. He said he has been following this process, and that it has been totally fair. It has been going at a snail's pace, and taken forever to get the money approved by the federal government. He said if we lose this opportunity, we will not have the money coming back into the community if this project goes away and that it is long overdue. He hopes to hear a yes vote, because it is good for the whole region.

IV. Consent Agenda

A. Ratification of July Claims

STEVE STUART MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA RATIFICATION OF JULY CLAIMS. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

V. 2030 Clark County HCT System Plan: Early Findings

Dean Lookingbill referred to the memo included in the meeting packet. He said the Clark County High Capacity Transit System Study was initiated about 18 months ago with the goal of providing a framework for a long-term investment in a regional HCT system. The key partners in the project have been C-TRAN, Clark County, City of Vancouver, the small cities, the Ports, and WSDOT. Since the study began in the fall of 2006, the study team has collaborated with the study's Task Force, Steering Committee, the RTC Board of Directors, and other partner agencies to reach a number of different milestones. To date, the process has narrowed the list of the most promising HCT corridors from 15 down to 4. Those corridors are I-5/Highway 99, Fourth Plain, I-205, and Mill Plain.

The memo describes the draft findings for the 2030 Clark County High Capacity Transit System Plan along with a map. It includes descriptions of the key elements in each of the four HCT corridors, implementation issues, an aspirational long-range vision for HCT in Clark County, and policy issues related to implementing the corridors. The draft findings reflect the discussion and direction provided by the Clark County HCT Task Force and Steering Committee.

The study assumptions remained constant for analysis purposes to ensure that concepts are comparable. The HCT System Plan analysis is based on the adopted 2030 Growth Management Plan population and employment forecast. The supporting transit service is based on the Columbia River Crossing transit assumptions including light rail to Clark College. One of the goals of the study is to be successful in receiving federal transit funds to implement one of the HCT corridors. He said it is important to recognize that Federal Transit Administration has a New Starts program. It is a competitive, discretionary funding program that provided grants for major transit capital improvements in a corridor. There are three classes: Very Small Starts, Small Starts, and New Starts.

Based on the analysis of the modes and corridors in Clark County, the following are key points to consider regarding the ability of Clark County to compete for Small Starts or New Starts funding:

- High Capacity Transit needs to be designed and implemented in a way that it can serve trips with a level of transit service that is faster than the base bus system.
- The Clark County HCT corridors currently do not have adequate existing population density or employment to meet one of the FTA thresholds; however, showing a strong commitment to transit-supportive development in the corridors could help make a better case.
- Downtown Vancouver is the major local transit destination in Clark County. While it serves as a hub for transit connections, local government, etc., it does not have enough existing or planned employment to serve as the single major destination for a New Starts or Small Starts corridor per the FTA criteria. It will be important to demonstrate a strong connection to the CRC HCT extension and into Portland.
- High Capacity Transit will need to serve both intra-Clark County and bi-state trips in order to maximize ridership and to qualify for New Starts or Small Starts funding.

Mr. Lookingbill displayed the map of the 2030 HCT System Plan. He highlighted the most significant findings for guiding a set of recommendations for a 2030 Clark County HCT System Plan. Those include:

- High Capacity Transit improvements (both capital and operations) in the four most promising corridors can improve mobility for Clark County residents and provide a long-term foundation for increasing transit mode share within the county.
- Light rail is too expensive to consider in any of the corridors at this time. This largely has to do with how FTA rates the cost effectiveness in the corridors. Choices on HCT implementation in those corridors should be made so as to not preclude developing light rail at some point in the future.
- The cities of Camas, Washougal, Battle Ground, Ridgefield, La Center, and Yacolt should be connected to the HCT system with feeder bus service to benefit county-wide transit usage.
- The I-5/Highway 99 Corridor is a critical travel corridor, which serves both bi-state commuter trips and intra-Clark County trips. The HCT Plan should focus on Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) – Hybrid operating on Highway 99 between Salmon Creek and downtown Vancouver to serve intra-county trips and support redevelopment plans along Highway 99. Some level of express bus service should be maintained to provide for commuters to Portland.
- The Fourth Plain Corridor predominantly serves intra-county trips with most bi-state trips using I-205 or SR-500 to I-5. The HCT Plan should focus on Bus Rapid Transit – Hybrid on Fourth Plain to 162nd.
- The I-205 Corridor predominantly serves bi-state and longer-distance trips within Clark County. The HCT Plan should focus on incremental improvements to bus service, park and ride facilities, and other capital BRT treatments in this corridor moving towards a Bus Rapid Transit concept. Additional analysis should be done to determine which bus service improvements would be most appropriate at this time. The bus service improvements should attempt to balance the qualities of express buses (high speed, one-seat ride) with the convenience and accessibility of multi-destination service.
- The Mill Plain Corridor serves predominately intra-Clark County trips, connecting neighborhoods with a variety of commercial uses, the SW Washington Medical Center and the downtown Vancouver business district. The HCT Plan should focus on Bus Rapid Transit – Lite on Mill Plain connecting to both 192nd (new Clark College satellite campus) and to Fishers Landing park and ride with a transit-only lane to improve transit travel time in the vicinity of I-205 and Chkalov.

Mr. Lookingbill said early this fall they will reconvene with the Task Force and Steering Committee to share the results of the additional analysis and provide an update on continuing public outreach and jurisdiction and agency briefings. The intent is to select a "priority corridor" for the possible implementation of an HCT corridor. The HCT System Study will also refine the HCT design and operating plan, recommend land use policies, and identify potential financing strategies for the priority corridor.

Jim Moeller asked if the bus rapid transit was a dedicated lane that was separate from the rest of traffic. Mr. Lookingbill said yes that was correct, but expanded on the answer. He said the buses would be branded, a bus rapid transit vehicle, a larger vehicle with low floors. The stations would be somewhat like light rail stations. In some cases, it would be in mixed traffic (BRT lite), and other cases it would be in its own guideway, but it would have the BRT branding. Representative

Moeller asked when it was in mixed traffic how it could be called bus rapid transit. Mr. Lookingbill said other types of treatments would be done such as a queue jump at a signal, or a priority so the bus would operate faster.

Betty Sue Morris complemented Dean and his staff on this work. She said they have done a marvelous job and thinks there is a good look at the possibilities for the future. Chair Pollard agreed staff and all involved have done a great job on this.

VI. 2008 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Amendment: Columbia River Crossing Locally Preferred Alternative, Resolution 07-08-10

Chair Pollard said action on this item is needed to move the CRC project forward and to apply for Federal Transit Administration New Starts funding. The RTC decision needs to include a CRC project definition (Replacement Bridge, LRT, and Clark College terminus) and an understanding that there is a reasonable expectation that revenues will be available to fund the project. Given these two components; the Columbia River Crossing project's LPA will be amended into the "fiscally constrained" MTP

Dean Lookingbill referred to the resolution included in the meeting packet along with the MTP component pieces and resolution passed by C-TRAN, City of Vancouver, and Metro. Also distributed were copies of a summary of the public comment meeting the RTC sponsored on July 9. Copies of the resolution and considerations that the CRC Task Force passed were also available along with three letters that RTC received referring to the project.

Mr. Lookingbill said the action requested of the RTC Board is to adopt a Locally Preferred Alternative Project Definition and amend that LPA into the Metropolitan Transportation Plan with a recognition that there is a reasonable expectation that revenues will be available to fund the project. The MTP is the long-range, regional transportation plan and is based on the Growth Management Plan and identifies the future travel needs, policies, and projects for the County.

The Columbia River Crossing is a proposed multimodal bridge, transit, highway, bicycle, and pedestrian improvement project. The project is designed to improve passenger and freight mobility, and address safety problems along a five-mile corridor between SR-500 in Vancouver, and approximately Columbia Boulevard in Portland. The capital costs of the project would be funded by a combination of Federal Transit Administration New Starts funding for the transit component, Federal Highway Administration funding for highway, freight, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements, with additional funds provided by the states of Oregon and Washington along with tolls.

The Regional Transportation Advisory Committee, RTAC, the advisory committee to RTC, met on July 18 and made a technical recommendation for the Locally Preferred Alternative and amending it into the MTP as stated in the resolution. To date, the LPA has been recommended by the Columbia River Crossing Task Force, City of Vancouver, C-TRAN Board of Directors, TriMet Board of Directors, Portland City Council, JPACT and Metro. Action on this resolution would meet the federally required MTP amendment and complete the adoption of the LPA.

A Locally Preferred Alternative is an action that describes the project to be advanced into further analysis, engineering, financing, and impact mitigation. The final project to be proposed for construction would not be fully defined until the final EIS and the Record of Decision is complete. The Locally Preferred Alternative includes the following:

- I-5 replacement bridge with three through lanes in each direction. The number of auxiliary lanes (two or three) is to be determined through further analysis. The project also includes reconstructed interchanges within the bridge influence area.
- Light rail transit as the high capacity transit mode.
- Clark College terminus with a Vancouver alignment that travels south/north on the Washington-Broadway couplet, then turns east on McLoughlin with a terminus at the Clark College vicinity.

As the project moves forward through the EIS process and to a Record of Decision, Mr. Lookingbill said there are a number of policy issues that need to be addressed. Those were included in the resolution.

Mr. Lookingbill said the current MTP adopted in 2007 includes the CRC project in the Strategic Plan section of illustrative projects. The CRC project is not currently in the "fiscally-constrained" portion of the MTP. Approval of the resolution would amend the fiscally constrained MTP to include the project. The CRC project meets the federal and state process requirements for MTP amendment. The CRC project has been developed with extensive public participation opportunities. Resource agencies and tribes have also been consulted.

A Federal Transit Administration New Starts application for the transit portion of the CRC project will be submitted in mid-August. One of the required elements for the New Starts submittal is for the project to be in the region's approved Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

Mr. Lookingbill noted the chapters and pages of the MTP that have changes given the amendment. Included was an attachment page listing the MTP List of "Fiscally Constrained" Projects 2007-2030 which would be updated to include the CRC project. Also attached was a map with the LRT alignment and the page listing the CRC Funding Assumptions.

He said the project is recognized as a national priority. It was designated as a "Corridor of the Future" by the Federal Highway Administration. FHWA has indicated that it is a high priority to address the safety and congestion issues related to the segment of I-5 between Columbia Boulevard in Portland, Oregon to SR-500 in Vancouver, Washington. Federal Transit Administration has also recognized the project. This region has been fairly successful in securing FTA funds and therefore considered reasonable that this component of the CRC project would be able to secure federal transit funds. In addition both the Governors of Washington and Oregon have stated their commitment to work with their respective state legislatures to provide state funds. Tolling is also considered as another funding element of the project. Total project costs for highway and transit were listed for low and high along with the revenues.

Mr. Lookingbill refereed back to the resolution on page 4. He said affirmative action on the resolution amends the locally preferred alternative for the Columbia River Crossing Project into RTC's Metropolitan Transportation plan. Based on analysis of potential revenues and cost estimates the CRC project meets the federal requirement for "fiscal constraint".

Senator Zarelli said the total project cost numbers listed in the funding assumptions are the lowest numbers that he has seen. He said he has heard $4.5 to 6 billion and this lists $3.7 billion as a high. He asked if that is based on a construction date 10 years out or why the difference. Mr. Lookingbill said the numbers listed in the DEIS were not specific to a transit terminus. The numbers listed in the MTP use the methodology and same year of construction assumptions etc., and look at the cost for the LPA decision which is the Clark College terminus. That is why there is a range of $3.5 billion to $3.7 billion. Don Wagner said this is a construction start date of 2012 and completion in 2017.

STEVE STUART MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 07-08-10, 2008 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AMENDMENT: COLUMBIA RIVER CROSSING LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE. DON WAGNER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Paul Pearce said in comparing the other resolutions with RTC's resolution he was having difficulty seeing a resolution and just paragraphs. Mr. Lookingbill said the entire memorandum was the resolution. He said RTC's general format has not included the "Whereas" and "Now Therefore" listed. The "Whereas" have been listed under the Background paragraph headings, and the "Now Therefore" is listed in the three bullets under the Locally Preferred Alternative paragraph heading. He said in terms of amendment to the plan, the key pages list the project description and the funding assumption. The key for the RTC Board is to place the LPA project in the MTP. Mr. Pearce said he was looking for what was included for "Therefore".

Senator Benton said it seems that this is all premised on this action, that this needs to be passed so it can be included in the Plan and then be eligible for FTA grants. You are not eligible for the grant if it is not in the Plan. He said it appears that the primary purpose for today is to be able to move forward with an FTA grant for the $750 million portion, and asked if that was correct. Mr. Lookingbill said that was partially correct. As he said in discussing the Locally Preferred Alternative, at this stage in the DEIS process, they identify an LPA so they can move forward in seeking other funding sources as well. He said part of this is seeking Federal Highway funding as well as Federal Transit funding. A project needs to be defined in order to move forward. Senator Benton asked if it was possible to move forward with transit grant applications without using the term light rail. He said high capacity transit can mean light rail or bus rapid transit. Mr. Lookingbill said yes, that Federal Transit identifies high capacity transit as a variety of forms including street cars and other types. Senator Benton said we would be equally eligible for the grant whether this product said light rail or bus rapid transit. Mr. Lookingbill said that was not correct; we are seeking a funding application for a project, and if we cannot say what the project is (LRT or BRT), it would not be eligible.

Jeff Hamm said for the New Starts application, FTA needs a mode and a terminus. We could not be successful in the New Starts application if it said light rail or bus rapid transit. Senator Benton said if it said bus rapid transit it would be just as acceptable as light rail. It could say one or the other. He said bus rapid transit achieves the same goal and end in terms of the application process as light rail does. Mr. Hamm that is assuming that the analysis backs up bus rapid transit.

Betty Sue Morris said she thought they were having difficulty with the issue at this point because they were trying to do two separate things in a single document, single motion, and a single resolution. She said this body is responsible for voicing its position on a Locally Preferred Alternative. It is also responsible for amending the Metropolitan Transportation Plan for the purpose of being eligible for grant money. The two are more properly considered in different documents, and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan amendment should reference a resolution. The point that Senator Benton is making is entirely for the purpose of language which makes us eligible to submit grant applications, but it not the only issue in front us today. Ms. Morris said if we were dealing with a separate document that did have all the "whereas" and the "therefore' in it, it would be much easier for us to have this discussion point by point. She did not know if it was possible to segregate them. She said they could just pull out that particular section of the language and work with it, or they could ask staff to take a few minutes to draft a resolution that is much more similar to the format of the other signatory agencies. She said she was trying to separate the difference between amending a Plan and passing a resolution. She said it would be difficult for her to suggest that this is a financially constrained plan. She might be able to vote on parts of it, but she would have trouble saying that it is a financially constrained plan. She said the format of all the other signatory agencies has been a separate resolution.

Rex Burkholder said their effort at JPACT/Metro as the MPO is what RTC is doing today as the MPO. The resolution that was adopted by their MPO for the LPA and the changes to their Regional Transportation Plan is the same type of action here. They put the two together in one resolution as this acting as the same type of body. He said the cities and transit agencies are a little different, but the Metropolitan Planning Organizations on the Oregon side did combine the two actions in one piece. He agreed that they use a little different format, but this is the format that we have always used and was familiar with here at RTC. He said it is the same action for them to amend the RTP and adopt the LPA in the same resolution.

Steve Stuart said he did not know if the will of the body is to follow more of the format of what we have seen. He said that Commissioner Pearce and Commissioner Morris have raised good points about the readability and the separate ability of the two things that we are doing. He said he has read through Metro's document. He said he is used to the format that Dean has put together, but he said it is relatively easy to part this off. He said he would certainly amend his motion, but not at this point. He said it looked as though we agree that the "therefore" is where the Locally Preferred Alternative is listed under the three bullets. He said THEREFORE could be added in front of the first sentence of the paragraph "the approval of a locally approved alternative…." After the three bullets, add the word FURTHERMORE, in front of the paragraph "as the project moves forward through the EIS process…." and the list of issues that need to be addressed as they move forward. He said on page one under Background of the MTP and Background of the CRC Project, those sentences can easily become the WHEREAS. He said he would trust Dean and staff to make those changes in format adding Whereas, Therefore, and Furthermore.

STEVE STUART AMENDED HIS MOTION TO RESOLUTION 07-08-10 TO MODIFY THE MEMORANDUM INTO A RESOLUTION FORMAT AS FOLLOWS: ADD WHEREAS ON PAGE ONE FOR EACH ITEM UNDER BACKGROUND. ON PAGE 2 UNDER LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE ADD THEREFORE, IN FRONT OF "BASED ON THE INFORMATION, FINDINGS,…". ADD FURTHERMORE, IN FRONT OF "AS THE PROJECT MOVES FORWARD THROUGH THE EIS PROCESS….." AND LIST THE BULLETS. THIS WOULD BE FOR THE APPROVAL OF A LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE. THE AMENDED MOTION WAS SECONDED BY DON WAGNER AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Steve Stuart distributed a copy of suggested amendments to the resolution with each of the items to be considered individually as motions. Chair Pollard asked if there was any other way to address these other than changes to the resolution itself. Mr. Stuart said he did not believe so. He had looked at other ways to capture it, but he wanted to amend the document in a way that it becomes more comprehensive of the thoughts that C-TRAN, Clark County, the City of Vancouver, and other bodies recognizing that this is a continuing process. Chair Pollard said in looking at the Metro's resolution as a model, they added the section which listed project issues that require local oversight during planning, design, and engineering. These were other considerations. Steve Stuart said he could address that. He said the language that he is suggesting would be listed as a bullet under "FURTHERMORE, as the project moves forward through the EIS process and to a Record of Decision, the following policy issues need to be addressed."

Betty Sue Morris asked if he was talking about the formation of an oversight committee and suggesting that that is a policy discussion that needs to be addressed, who will address it? Chair Pollard said he was not suggesting that. He was just looking for where our recommendations would be listed. Ms. Morris asked where Mr. Stuart was proposing to list the amendments.

Steve Stuart said the first proposed amendment would replace bullet 2 under "Furthermore, as the project moves forward…" The current bullet 2 speaks to the formation of a Project Sponsors Council. His amended language would replace that entire bullet with the language that was from both the Task Force recommendation and the RTC language. It also adds in language to address both of the DOTs and working as equal partners.

STEVE STUART MOVED TO AMEND THE RESOLUTION TO REPLACE BULLET 2 UNDER "THEREFORE, AS THE PROJECT MOVES FORWARD" WITH THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE: Creation of a formal oversight committee that works as equal partners, striving for consensus and providing for a public process of review, deliberation and decision-making for outstanding major project issues and decisions. The Governors of Washington and Oregon issued a joint letter on June 19, 2008, calling for the committee to include representatives of WSDOT and ODOT, RTC, and Metro, C-TRAN and TriMet, and Vancouver and Portland. The Governors' letter also called for the Council to be chaired by two citizens, one from each state. BETTY SUE MORRIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Don Wagner asked if the language was a quote from the Governor' letter. Steve Stuart said it was not. It was the exact language from the original draft RTC resolution. Don Wagner asked what the main change was between the RTC resolution and what was in the Governors' letter. Mr. Stuart said it was two pieces, the first sentence, which was pulled from the CRC Task Force recommendation, and he added the words "as equal partners". He said this was to give more specificity to the Oversight Committee and the public nature of the Oversight Committee and that the public would continue to be involved. It would also call out that we would be moving forward as equal partners. Don Wagner said that he would be abstaining on this motion, because with the Governor as his direct boss, a vote on this issue would not be proper.

THE MOTION WAS APPROVED WITH TWO ABSTAINING, DON WAGNER AND JASON TELL.

STEVE STUART MADE A MOTION TO ADD A NEW BULLET UNDER THE PREVIOUSLY AMENDED BULLET THAT WOULD SAY: "EVALUATE OTHER BOTTLENECKS WITHIN THE SYSTEM (E.G., I-405/I-5 LOOP, ROSE QUARTER, ETC.)." Mr. Stuart said this would be guidance for further discussion. The language is directly from the CRC Task Force recommendations, and he said there has been a lot of discussion within our own jurisdictions about making sure this is the beginning of a multi-stage process that deals with congestion along the corridor and not just in the BIA. PAUL PEARCE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Rex Burkholder said this is included in a different section in the Task Force recommendations. It is saying that this needs to be an issue on the table as we do our update of our transportation plans versus this being a part of the project. The question is whether or not we want another piece of language in there that says this needs to be dealt with, but not the charge of this project to deal with it. It is a recommendation that needs to be addressed, but outside the project.

Steve Stuart said he understood what Mr. Burkholder was saying. The Task Force Recommendations had an additional section, For Regional Consideration. He said the oversight committee is a regional body that will be discussing issues. This doesn't say that it is part of the LPA, it states a policy issue to be considered. It is something that from this side of the river that is important to continue that conversation.

Royce Pollard said it is an issue, but doesn't feel that it fits in that part of the resolution. He said in the Project Sponsors Council this may be an appropriate item for discussion. Steve Stuart said the statement says "evaluate." It does not say "fix other bottlenecks." It says "evaluate other bottlenecks within the system." He said it is not establishing an action necessary to move forward; it is simply moving forward with the evaluation of other issues.

Paul Pearce said he needed some clarification as a policy moves forward through the EIS process to a Record of Decision, the following policy issues need to be addressed: 1) Who issues the final Record of Decision? and 2) Do all of these issues disappear for consideration once the ROD is issued? He said he would read it to say that they do.

Don Wagner said the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration issue the Record of Decision. That is the federal action that takes place near the end of 2009. He said the issues do not go away, but noted a technical issue. He said the DEIS has a defined scope limit. It is the 5 mile section. He said what is being asked here could be interpreted as expanding the limits of the DEIS, which would be problematic for the project. He said he supported what the motion was trying to achieve, which says there needs to be a group that keeps this on the radar screen. He said he was not opposed to that being the Project Sponsors Council, but he was worried about the technicality.

Paul Pearce said it appears that after the Record of Decision, the Project Sponsors Council ceases to exist. Don Wagner said the intent that he understood from the Governor's office is the Project Sponsors Council itself would be here through the duration of the project, not just the Record of Decision. Mr. Pearce said there is the Project Sponsors Council, and asked if they were creating a second oversight committee.

Jason Tell suggested that it could be directed to a body. He said there is already the Bi-State Coordination Committee which is made up of the two MPOs. He said in looking for a body that is lasting and here beyond the EIS process, one option is that this could be directed towards that Bi-State Committee to do that evaluation so it is outside the EIS of this project, and it includes this body and the two MPOs.

Senator Zarelli said regardless of the fact that it may be out of the scope, it is too bad that it is. He said probably the thing that is the most problematic about this potential corridor and potential bridge is outside of the Delta Park issue. He said that one would expect that ten years or so down the road when this project may be completed, this becomes the point of confluence in which we have the second greatest problem; it may be there before the bridge is ever built. He said for us to ignore what happens in and around the I-405 split from I-5 and the Rose Garden would be leaving out a huge part of this whole discussion to make the type of investment that we are talking about only to be faced with the same level of congestion at that bottleneck once it is complete we would have not done ourselves and this process justice.

Jason Tell said at Metro and JPACT, he has identified a short list of corridors to be looked at in the region. One of the corridors is the section that is being discussed. It is how I-84, I-5, and I-405 work in that whole area. It is in the adopted list on the short list of corridors. In the five to ten year timeframe, it is one of the corridors to be addressed. He said although it is outside the EIS and this project, it is on their list of things they have to deal with. He said it is not that it is not on the radar screen at all; it is just not in the EIS.

Betty Sue Morris said they did not have a copy of the resolution that the City of Portland passed, and she asked staff to get copies of it. She said she understood that the Portland resolution did address areas outside of the Bridge Influence Area in this EIS, because they suggested that the tolls from the bridge should be used to make those improvements as well. She said there is precedence for that.

Rex Burkholder said the procedural issues is how to say this, and what is the charge of giving this committee versus what are other issues of concern. That is why the Task Force broke it into three parts. They said yes there are a lot of other issues out there identified, but not as part of the EIS process.

Steve Stuart said given the discussion, and that the language actually speaks to the timeframe of the EIS process, but not saying as part of the EIS process, that helps. He said the Bi-State Coordination Committee is an advisory committee. STEVE STUART AMENDED HIS MOTION TO ADD THE FOLLOWING AT THE BEGINNING OF THE BULLET: "DIRECT THE BI-STATE

COORDINATION COMMITTEE TO EVALUATE OTHER BOTTLENECKS IN THE SYSTEM….". PAUL PEARCE AGREED TO THE AMENDMENT.

STEVE STUART MOVED TO APPROVE ADDING A NEW BULLET UNDER THE PREVIOUSLY AMENDED BULLET THAT WOULD SAY: "DIRECT THE BI-STATE COORDINATION COMMITTEE TO EVALUATE OTHER BOTTLENECKS WITHIN THE SYSTEM (E.G., I-405/I-5 LOOP, ROSE QUARTER, ETC.)" THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY PAUL PEARCE AND UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

STEVE STUART MOVED TO ADD ANOTHER NEW BULLET UNDER THE PREVIOUS NEW BULLET TO STATE: "REFLECTING PRIOR AGREEMENTS BETWEEN OREGON AND WASHINGTON, CRC PROJECT CONSTRUCTION, OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE COSTS NOT COVERED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD BE DIVIDED EQUALLY BETWEEN THE TWO STATES." He said this is to reflect the agreements that have already been talked about a lot between Oregon and Washington and the equity that is being sought beyond the Federal money. BILL GANLEY SECONDED THE MOTION.

Don Wagner asked if this was specifically the bridge or the entire project. Steve Stuart said he had looked at separating it out by project components but ended up doing the entire project being that all three intersect, the interchange, bridge, highway, and transit as well. He put that in there for the reason that the equity provision for the transit component had been dealt with by the C-TRAN Board for the Washington side to assure that there would be equity between the states on the transit portion. Don Wagner explained why he was concerned. He said he has concern that the Oregon part of the land based project is going to be significantly more expensive than the Washington land based part of the project. Chair Pollard said we need to be careful. There is a lot of work that is going to take place just south of the bridge. This makes him nervous.

Betty Sue Morris asked Don Wagner if he had language that would address his point, and if not, she suggested the language that C-TRAN adopted in their resolution. Ms. Morris said that it refers to the state line. Don Wagner said the basic concept that they're after is one that the bridge is a joint piece and the land base is each states responsibility, but over fairness they would be equal partners as the project moved forward in funding. He said the intent is fairness and equity on the common elements. He said in looking at Hayden Island and Marine Drive, equal would mean that Washington residents would be paying a bigger percentage of the capital costs. Steve Stuart said that was not his intent.

Betty Sue Morris referred to the language in C-TRAN's resolution which states: CRC Project construction, operation and maintenance costs should be divided between Washington and Oregon according to the proportion of the project within each state. For HCT capital, operation, and maintenance costs the proportions shall be calculated by dividing the length of the HCT corridor in Washington and the length of the HCT corridor in Oregon, as determined by the State DOT's acknowledged state line in the Columbia River, by the total length of the HCT corridor from the Expo Center Station to the terminus in Clark County.

Don Wagner said that works well for the transit piece, but not for the highway piece from the standpoint of proportionate. He said if proportionate is talking about mileage, the mileage is not going to hit us; it is going to be the interchanges. He said the interchanges on the Washington side will be fairly cheap.

Betty Sue Morris asked if the following language would work: Oregon shall be responsible for interchange improvements on the Oregon side of the river and Washington shall be responsible for interchange improvements on the Washington side of the river. Mr. Wagner said he was more comfortable with that. Steve Stuart suggested changing the word "equally" in his motion to "proportionately."

Paul Pearce said it appears there are three different things, the bridge, which we said should be equal; the roadway, which each state should cover; and the transit. He asked if there was an issue that this is needed. Senator Benton said yes there is. He said there has been some controversy in the State Legislature and Transportation Committees who have met jointly with the Oregon Legislature as well over the expenditures so far. He said it is about $60 million for Washington and $12 million for Oregon. Don Wagner said for clarity those are the dollars that are available, not what has been expended. He said Washington has allocated five times than what Oregon has. He said that is why some language like this is necessary. Jason Tell noted that the Delta Park Lombard project is currently under construction in this corridor. The project is costing about $80 million to construct.

Bill Ganley said he supported what Paul Pearce said with the bridge shared equally, the roadway to be each state's cost, and the transit to be what C-TRAN stated. Steve Stuart said he felt that was getting at what they were trying to achieve. STEVE STUART WITHDREW HIS MOTION AS DID THE SECOND.

PAUL PEARCE MOVED TO REFLECT THE COSTS FOR THE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE I-5 REPLACEMENT BRIDGE SHOULD BE EQUALLY SHARED BETWEEN OREGON AND WASHINGTON. THE COSTS OF THE ROADWAY AND INTERCHANGES IN EACH STATE WOULD BE COVERED BY THE RESPECTIVE STATE. FOR THE HCT CAPITAL, OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE COSTS, THE PROPORTIONS SHALL BE CALCULATED BY DIVIDING THE LENGTH OF THE HCT CORRIDOR IN WASHINGTON AND THE LENGTH OF THE HCT CORRIDOR IN OREGON, AS DETERMINED BY THE STATE DOTS ACKNOWLEDGED STATE LINE IN THE COLUMBIA RIVER, BY THE TOTAL LENGTH OF THE HCT CORRIDOR FROM THE EXPO CENTER STATION TO THE TERMINUS IN CLARK COUNTY. BETTY SUE MORRIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Don Wagner clarified that this is cost not construction. He said it is still one project so we are talking about being responsible for the costs. Betty Sue Morris asked Mr. Wagner if he understood the language stated about the land portions of the construction as he had earlier referred to that the interchanges are not a part of the bridge. Mr. Wagner said yes, that his understanding is that the interchanges would be the land base. Paul Pearce said his intent is not to separate this project into three pieces, just to simply talk about the costs of the land at the state level and certainly go together for the federal money. Chair Pollard said it is one project with area components.

Rex Burkholder expressed some concern. He understood the issue of equity, but he said we also have to make a project happen, which means a lot of negotiations at federal, state, and local level to make it happen. He said he hopes that we see this as guidance as to what we hope to get to. This cannot be built halfway. He said this will provide guidance to the project team, which are the DOTs who have to make this happen in partnership with the Federal Government. He said he is committed to try and deliver a project in the end.

Jaime Herrera said the heart of what we are saying is that we want this to be equitable. Regardless of whether it is messy or there are negotiations, etc., we are saying that we want to be equitable.

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Steve Stuart suggested an amendment to add a sub-bullet under the bullet that was just created. He said regarding finance issues, they had talked about working together to go to the Federal Government to get funding and equitable distribution at the State level. One of the other primary components that has been discussed is tolling.

STEVE STUART MOVED TO HAVE THE AMENDMENT READ "GIVEN THE PROJECTED INEQUITY BETWEEN STATES IN FUNDING DERIVED FROM TOLLS, WE ASK THAT THE OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE CONSIDER ALTERNATIVE METHODS TO ACHIEVE GREATER FUNDING EQUITY, SUCH AS PROVIDING WASHINGTON RESIDENTS WORKING IN OREGON A DEDUCTION ON THEIR OREGON INCOME TAXES FOR TOLLS PAID." Mr. Stuart said this is an item that came forward from Vancouver Council Member Tim Leavitt among others. He said it is something that when their constituents are paying into the income tax of Oregon and realizing that if they are going to have to pay tolls, it will add to their burden. This is looking at some relief, some sort of equity. BILL GANLEY SECONDED THE MOTION.

Don Benton said he was in favor of the motion. He thanked Council Member Leavitt for presenting the concept, and Commissioner Stuart for bring it forward. He said there should be some opportunity to address that inequity in the future in the toll setting process.

Bill Ganley said he totally supported this. He said a lot of residents in Battle Ground already pay income tax to Oregon, and a toll is a tax. He said he thought it was fair. With the new electronic methods, they should be able to document the costs.

Don Wagner said he would have to abstain from the motion, because it references the oversight committee. He said he did not believe any member of the oversight committee has any authority over income taxes, although he said he does support the concept.

Royce Pollard said the word "consider" is used in the statement. He said this is a good thing and wish it would happen. He said we certainly can ask Oregon to consider that.

THE MOTION WAS APPROVED WITH TWO ABSTAINED, DON WAGNER AND JASON TELL.

Steve Stuart said his last proposed amendment is under 'Furthermore, as the project moves forward….' And after the bullet that states 'A detailed financing plan…' STEVE STUART MOVED TO ADD A NEW BULLET UNDER IT THAT READS "WITH REGARDS TO POSSIBLE TOLLING AS A REVENUE SOURCE FOR THE CRC PROJECT, WE GIVE THE FOLLOWING DIRECTION: 1) FIRST, SET UP A PROCESS THAT WORKS WITH AND EDUCATES THE PUBLIC ON POTENTIAL TOLLS, MODELED AFTER (AND LEARNING FROM) THE TOLLING IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE CREATED BY THE LEGISLATURE AND GOVERNOR IN HOUSE BILL 3096 (CREATING THE SAME FOR TOLLING THE SR-520 BRIDGE AND REPORTING TO THE GOVERNOR AND LEGISLATURE BY JANUARY 2009). 2) SECOND, LIMIT THE COSTS OF TOLLS TO FUNDING FOR THE CRC PROJECT WITHIN THE BRIDGE INFLUENCE AREA, AND ONLY AFTER ALL OTHER SOURCES OF FEDERAL AND STATE REVENUE ARE EXHAUSTED." BETTY SUE MORRIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Steve Stuart said that sub-bullet 1 is speaking to a process that Governor Gregoire spoke to as a possible way for us to involve the public in a funding methodology that has not been used in this region for quite some time, since the last I-5 Bridge was built. He said for SR-520 it will produce a lot of good ideas for how to involve the public, how to educate, involve, and inform the public on tolling as a resource and as a potential funding necessity for this project. Governor Gregoire spoke of us being able to learn from it and potentially apply that process. Steve Stuart said the sub-bullet 2 deals with conversations that any tolls should be to cover the difference between need and what the Feds/State provide, not cover future projects or be the first money laid our for the CRC.

Bill Ganley said there are no other tolls on the I-5 corridor. He said he hoped that they limit the fees for the tolls to as small as they can. He asked if there would be a sunset so the tolls do not go on forever. Steve Stuart said this says that the tolls would be used specifically for this project. The implication is that when the project is funded, it goes away. Betty Sue Morris asked if Mr.

Stuart would amend his motion to say that the tolls would be used to pay for construction only and sunset when the bonds are retired. Steve Stuart said he wanted to leave it as it was for now.

Paul Pearce said he was concerned by the statement only for this project because if the toll works well and starts bringing in a lot of money, when the state or Federal partners step up and say they want us to repay what they put in, it goes on forever. He said it isn't just a piece of the pie, it becomes the pie. He said in looking at the total dollars projected in toll collection, and asked why would the Federal Government not say you did that in ten years, leave it on another ten and pay us back the $1.4 billion that we put in.

Don Benton said he thought the issue needed to be addressed. SENATOR BENTON MOVED TO AMEND THE AMENDMENT MOTION TO ADD THE WORDS "CONSTRUCTION OF" AFTER THE WORD 'THE' AND BEFORE THE WORD 'CRC'. Jim Moeller asked if a nonvoting member could make a motion. Dean Lookingbill clarified that yes, they could make a motion. The RTC Bylaws recognize the Senators and Representatives as full ex-official members with all the rights of a member except voting. BETTY SUE MORRIS MOVED TO AMEND SENATOR BENTON'S MOTION TO READ "LOCAL SHARE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF". She said that would make it clear that the tolls are only to pay for the local share of the construction of the project. Senator Benton said he was fine with that.

Steve Stuart said he would clear out those two layers and consider that as part of his amendment. STEVE STUART AMENDED HIS AMENDMENT TO READ "SECOND, LIMIT THE COSTS OF TOLLS TO FUNDING THE LOCAL SHARE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE CRC PROJECT WITHIN THE BRIDGE INFLUENCE AREA, AND ONLY AFTER ALL OTHER SOURCES OF FEDERAL AND STATE REVENUE ARE EXHAUSTED." SENATOR BENTON AND BETTY SUE MORRIS WITHDREW THEIR MOTIONS.

Jason Tell asked if the intent is that this is to build a bridge, but the ongoing maintenance and operations will be up to the two DOTs to take care of. That was the intent.

Don Wagner said the collection of tolls, as it is done on the one project in Washington, the tolls themselves pay for the operations of the collection of the tolls. He asked if that was included in the motion. Yes, that was included.

Rex Burkholder said he would vote no on this, because he said he would have supported the first motion, but limiting this is contrary to the motions passed by the Task Force and the Metro Council as well. He said they see the tolls as a responsible funding mechanism for ongoing operations and maintenance and replacement eventually of the structure. He said we are in a tough spot today because we let the tolls go off in the 60's instead of collecting the dollars to rebuild the bridges in the future. He said we are stuck with it because our predecessors thought it was the cheap and easy thing to do. He said he thought it irresponsible and contrary to the actions that were taken by the Task Force and his Council.

Jeff Hamm clarified that "local share" means the portion of the project that is not covered by the maximum amount of state and federal revenue support. That was correct.

Royce Pollard said he was prepared to support the original motion, but not with the changes.

THE MOTION PASSES WITH BAKER, BOLDT, COASTON, GANLEY, MORRIS, PEARCE, STUART (7) YES; BURKHOLDER, MCDONNELL, POLLARD, TELL, WAGNER (5) NO; AND HAMM (1) ABSTAIN. (Mr. Hamm noted that the C-TRAN Board has not had this discussion.)

BETTY SUE MORRIS MOVED TO ADD LANGUAGE SPECIFYING THAT THE TOLL REVENUE SHALL PAY FOR NO MORE THAN 1/6 OF THE COST OF THE PROJECT. Commissioner Morris said this is because she is alarmed by recent discussion about financing. She said from the beginning they had discussed 1/3 state, 1/3 federal, and 1/3 local, and that seemed like a fair and equitable share. She said what they are seeing now is toll revenues, in looking at the projected financing, that are double the amount of the federal discretionary highway money. She said tolls that are 50 percent higher than the state funds contribution. She said since most of the tolls will be paid by the Washington commuters across the bridge, it means that if we have 2/3 share of this project to carry at the local level, that would fall to the commuters. She said she thinks it is imperative that we limit right now the cost of those tolls. Given the price tag and the cost allocation that we have here, she could not for this project under these circumstances. She said we started 1/3, 1/3, 1/3, and she said she is not uncomfortable with tolls. She is uncomfortable with tolls that require citizens of Clark County to pay an undue burden for the construction of this project. PAUL PEARCE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Pollard asked that the motion be restated.

BETTY SUE MORRIS MOVED TO ADD A THIRD SUB-BULLET THAT STATES TOLL REVENUES SHALL UNDERWRITE NO MORE THAN 1/6 OF THE COST OF THE PROJECT. PAUL PEARCE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Clarification was asked of Commissioner Morris regarding the 1/3 and 1/6 cost. Commissioner Morris said originally, discussions were 1/3, 1/3, 1/3. She said if we had that, it would mean that the Oregon side would have 1/6 as their share and the Washington side would have 1/6 as their share. She said that seemed appropriate. Now, she said she is hearing that 2/3 of the cost is very likely to be borne by the local people. She said given the fact that if there is no limit set on tolls that would mean that you could count on 66 percent of the project being paid for primarily by tolls from Washington commuters to the other side of the river. She said she is trying to protect Washington commuters.

Jason Tell said he is trying to understand what message this might send to our congressional delegation and our state legislature on both sides of the river. He said currently the plan is a draft. He said it is one of the specific things that the Governors is charging the Project Sponsors Council with. He said if we are saying, if the Federal Government or State Governments come up with 2/3 of the project costs, we won't come up with the 1/3 through tolling, which means we won't do a project. Ms. Morris said no, that it means that we would expect the other part of that to be made up by the state or other revenue streams. It would mean that State and Federal are supposed to be paying the bulk of this.

Steve Stuart said he agreed with the sentiment of making that tolls are limited as far as how much people are being asked to pay, and this does not become the majority share of the project costs. He said he couldn't support the motion. He said setting the proportionate, the 1/6, 1/3, takes away the option of having a lower cost alternative come forward. He said if we end up with a project with only so much Federal or State money, and we decide we are going to create a more bare bones project, or we are going to phase, tolling may end up being a larger proportion but a lower actual dollar amount. He said instead of $1.35 billion, it may end up being $1 billion, but the overall project ends up being $2.5 billion, so the proportion would be much larger that 1/6 and larger than 1/3. Setting it as a proportion as opposed to a dollar amount limits us. He said it is his hope that it is clear that tolls are seen as the last alternative that we work for, that the States and the Feds are first, and that tolls need to be limited to the project. Betty Sue Morris asked if Mr. Stuart had alternative language that might work. He had no more comment.

Senator Zarelli said Commissioner Stuart's point is well taken, but he said the body is being asked for a specific plan. If we find that the resources are not there to follow through on this

plan, we will be back to doing this again. He said he thought Commissioner Morris' motion is very workable within the guidelines that we are establishing for this preferred Alternative. He said if we have to go a different route, we will go back through this resolution process. He said he thinks it applies specifically to what is being asked to be adopted. He said he thinks it is reasonable. He said in these numbers we're counting on the Feds for about 12 percent of this project. He said that is ridiculous. If they can't do 50 or 60 percent of this project, it is not going to get done. He said he knows that the State of Washington is not going to put up $1.5 billion, and the state of Oregon is not going to put up $1.5 billion. Senator Benton agreed. Senator Zarelli said if the Feds don't step up in a big way, this isn't getting done. He said he thought this was a reasonable consideration.

Royce Pollard said he agreed with most of what Senator Zarelli said. He said his concern is that all of us want the toll to be al low as possible. All of us want the Federal Government to step up to the plate in as big a way as possible. He said this is not Portland and Vancouver's bridge. It is the Federal Government's bridge, and we expect them. He said in spite of things, he said this project is bigger than we have the capacity to handle, and they need to step up. He said this corridor connects three countries; the main artery of the West Coast of the United States of America. He said it is a strategic highway, but not to put this kind of restriction. He said he is still asking why they are not considering tolling on I-205 as well. He said he cannot support this, that we need to keep trying for as much as we can get from the Federal Government, but when the push comes to shove at the end, we will need to make a decision. If we cannot afford that much tolls, then we say we're sorry and we back away from it. He said we all agree we have our limits.

Dean Lookingbill said regarding financial feasibility of this, he asked for clarification. He referred to the table that was listed in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. He said it calls out a percentage share of various revenue sources for the project. Based on those assumptions, this action was set up to amend this project into the fiscally constrained Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Mr. Lookingbill asked if the action on the motion changes the line for the tolls and/or are there other changes in the rest of the Federal sources that need to be recognized.

Paul Pearce said he thought Commissioner Morris' motion is about restricting expectations and if 1/6 doesn't do it then perhaps a dollar amount does, but he said he thought the point was well taken. He said having spent a lot of time in Washington, D.C. the last 18 months, he said they have no money. He said he thinks this process is good, but that they have no money.

Jaime Herrera said she thinks we all understand that the Feds don't have the dollars, the state is looking at a deficit, which in her mind, brings her back to the Commissioner motion and how important it is to say it is not going to come off the backs of the people here in Clark County. She said more than anything we need to send that message whether it is a dollar amount or a percentage. She said as already stated, they will exhaust their budget limits really quickly. That's what the previous motion said. Then they will come back for the toll, and we do need to put a cap out there, some sort of limit so it is not the Clark County residents who meet the shortfall of the Feds and the State.

Steve Stuart said that Commissioner Morris had asked if he had any other language. He said the only thing that he can come up with would be to specify the projected dollar amount in the funding assumptions under the MTP and reference those which is between $1 billion and $1.35 billion. This would establish an upper cap at $1.35 billion. Ms. Morris said we could do that too, but she did not want to pay that much in tolls on this project. She said the Feds say they don't have any money, and the State says they don't have any money, and she said neither do the people of this county. She said she is not going to make the people make up the difference between what the State and Feds have. She said she doesn't want this bridge at any cost, and if the Feds and the State don't have any money, she is not willing to pick up the tab locally. She said it has been an issue with her for years in this discussion and the amount of money the we

are putting into this project that can be used equally well for bettering other parts of the County and even the State. Commissioner will hold her position on the motion.

THE MOTION FAILS WITH BOLDT, COSTON, GANLEY, MORRIS, AND PEARCE (5) YES; BURKHOLDER, MCDONNELL, POLLARD, STUART, TELL, AND WAGNER (6) NO; BAKER AND HAMM (2) ABSTAIN. Commissioner Baker and Mr. Hamm said this discussion had not taken place by their Commission or Board.

PAUL PEARCE MOVED TO SET A CAP ON TOLLS AT $850 MILLION. BETTY SUE MORRIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Pollard asked Commissioner Pearce how he came up with that amount. Commissioner Pearce said that $1.3 billion is 1/3 and we said we don't want to be 1/3, so he picked a number. He said the point is that it sets a cap saying we are not going to tax our counties' (Clark, Skamania, Cowlitz, etc.) citizens for 70 percent of this. He said he is comfortable with $900 million, something under $1 billion.

PAUL PEARCE MOVED TO SET A CAP ON TOLLS AT $900 MILLION. BETTY SUE MORRIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Rex Burkholder said a lot of this is based on the assumption that we know what the incidents of the tolls are. He said he doesn't know that. He has been on the Task Force for three years, and the traffic that goes across both the bridges has commuters that go in both directions, but there is also twice as much traffic that is much of freight movement. He said to him this is saying let's not even take advantage of that. He said an earlier motion talked about compensating Washington commuters, but there is a lot of other traffic that uses I-5 that causes impact on I-5, and you are saying let's not collect tolls from them above a certain level. He said if he had a chart that said who was going to pay based on the assumptions, he said he would be more comfortable doing this. He said there is an assumption here that it is all Clark County commuters paying the tolls, and he said that is not accurate. Mr. Burkholder said that is saying let's leave a bunch of money on the table by ignoring all the international trade, trucks, and others by limiting the tolls to a certain amount. He said he would need more information to make an intelligent choice, and he said we don't have that information. He said it is acting without knowledge. Chair Pollard said the purpose of what they are doing and what the other five agencies have already voted to move this forward, is to get this project into a point that we can do in-depth studies and actually determine what the costs are going to be. He said at that point in time, we may look at this and say that is far too much. We don't have that information yet.

PAUL PEARCE WITHDREW HIS MOTION.

Betty Sue Morris said they do know who crosses the bridge. It is in the DEIS, and they do know that about 2/3 of the people who will be paying that are commuters from Clark County. She said it is under any circumstances a disproportionate share. Commissioner Morris said what Mr. Burkholder was speaking of was price per type of car or per location. Commissioner Pearce's motion was a total cap on the amount, which wouldn't mean that you might be able to charge more on an out of state license or for someone who did not have an auto pay than for someone who did have an auto pay or instate license. She said there are an infinite number of ways to address.

Commissioner Baker said they have not discussed tolls at the Port meetings; however, she said one of the things that really concerns her about tolls is the affect that it will have on freight mobility. She said the Port of Vancouver and the Port of Portland are not the only ports on the West Coast. She said she has some concerns about high tolls that would affect freight mobility that would be going elsewhere, Seattle, Tacoma, etc.

SENATOR BENTON MOVED TO REMOVE THE WORD 'LIGHT RAIL' FROM THE FIRST BULLET ON PAGE 2 OF THE RESOLUTION AND REPLACE IT WITH "BUS RAPID TRANSIT" AS THE PREFERRED HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT MODE. FOR THE LPA, THE WORD 'LIGHT RAIL' SHOULD BE REPLACED WITH "BUS RAPID TRANSIT." BETTY SUE MORRIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Senator Benton said the ability to secure a high capacity transit grant will not be hindered by this language. He said we are equally eligible for a high capacity transit grant whether you use the words light rail or the words bus rapid transit, and moving forward at this point with an LPA that uses that language he thinks alleviates a lot of concern on the part of his constituents and still allows the project to move forward.

Representative Moeller said he could not see any advantage to the amendment for the citizens and his constituents in the 49th District. He said he sees the light rail as an opportunity for his constituents to connect with an existing fully operational high capacity transit facility that they have been waiting for and watching expand for years. He strongly recommended the motion be turned down.

Jeff Hamm briefly summarized how C-TRAN arrived at its endorsement of light rail as the LPA. He said first it is acknowledged that the capital costs of light rail is certainly higher than the bus rapid transit, but the way that the financial plan is currently constructed by using Washington State toll credits, it is possible to get that higher cost of the HCT to light rail fully funded with federal dollars. The analysis also showed that forcing an additional transfer, everyone who would be on bus rapid transit would be forced to transfer to the Yellow Line at Expo. Under the light rail alternative, fewer than half of the passengers would be forced to transfer. That transfer imposes a penalty on ridership, about a 15 percent reduction in ridership by bus rapid transit. The second issue is getting the volume of passengers/riders a day. They can carry more passengers in a light rail vehicle, up to 300, than they can in a BRT vehicle, which is more like 100. So the operating costs would be 2½ times greater for the bus rapid transit. That was the analysis that led to C-TRAN's staff and the Board moving ahead with the light rail transit.

Senator Benton said he appreciated that, but he did not believe it. He said he could not be convinced that light rail is cheaper than buses. He said he thought bus rapid transit was much more visionary. It is not fixed and can be adjusted. He said he thinks bus rapid transit opens flexibility. He said there is a good bus system that takes people across currently, and it will run even better if there are dedicated bus lanes. Senator Benton said he did not think the citizens in Clark County want light rail in Clark County and knows they don't want to pay to get it. He said this gives us the options to move forward with the project, and not get mired in the light rail argument. Senator Benton said that more than 2/3 of the riders of any light rail system come from buses. They were already using public transit. Senator Benton said there has never been a light rail system built in this country that was built on budget or delivered ridership projections. He said MAX does not reach ridership projections and deliver the relief in congestion that is promised. He said no system in America ever has, and he said he did not believe this one will either. Senator Benton believes we should use bus rapid transit for the high capacity transit portion of the LPA and not light rail.

Chair Pollard said he and Senator Benton have had a lot of conversations over the years about this, and they do not agree on this at all. Chair Pollard said he cannot support it. He said there are five other government agencies that have supported and voted an LPA that included the mode of light rail.

Commissioner Morris told Senator Benton that she agreed with everything that he had said. She said it is known that she has been an opponent for light rail for many years, but she said even though she seconded the motion for the purpose of discussion, she will not be able to vote with him, because whatever we choose has to run on the other side of the river. She said they have

no inclination from any jurisdiction on the south side of the river that they would allow us to move bus rapid transit to the downtown area of Portland or any where else. She said we would be required to stop at the Yellow Line terminus. Commissioner Morris said she appreciated the motion, but would not be able to vote for it.

THE MOTION FAILED WITH 0 YES VOTES.

SENATOR BENTON MOVED TO ADD EVERYWHERE THE WORD 'LIGHT RAIL' APPEARS IN THE DOCUMENT TO READ "LIGHT RAIL, IF APPROVED BY THE VOTERS OF CLARK COUNTY," MARC BOLDT SECONDED THE MOTION.

Jeff Hamm asked for clarification. He asked if this meant all the voters in Clark County or those within C-TRAN's service area. Senator Benton said he meant all the voters in Clark County.

Representative Herrera said this is her first session, and some of the meetings are newer to her. She said one of the things that she has observed whether it is in meetings or editorials in the paper or people getting involved in the issue, she read it in the Columbian ways to get around the voters to get this project moved forward. She said one of her biggest concerns whether it is the agencies or these bodies as we move with this is the "we know best" elitism. She said this is one of the areas where she sees it manifesting in this project. She said she supports this going to a vote only because, not the agencies or us as a Board who are going to foot the bill for this, it is the people in Clark, Cowlitz Counties. She said this is about the people who are paying for this. She urged members to set aside what we think we know is best.

Bill Ganley said at C-TRAN they reduced the boundary. The first vote for light rail in 1995 was countywide, because the Public Transit Benefit Authority (PTBA) was throughout the county. Now the boundaries have been moved back. He said he believed the C-TRAN position was to support a public vote. That was why he continues to support a vote within the PTBA, not the entire county. This includes Vancouver, the Vancouver urban area and all the small incorporated cities. He said this is about 80 percent of the population.

Jeff Hamm said the resolution that was passed by the C-TRAN Board of Directors states under number 2. of HCT Financing "Any means chosen to finance operations of the HCT component of the CRC project shall be submitted to impacted C-TRAN voters for approval." This contemplates that C-TRAN is the entity that will be going to the voters for a sales tax increase for the operations and maintenance of the HCT project.

SENATOR BENTON AMENDED HIS MOTION TO SAY "LIGHT RAIL, IF APPROVED BY THE VOTERS OF THE PTBA." MARC BOLDT AGREED AND SECONDED THE MOTION.

Jeff Hamm said that is largely consistent with the resolution at C-TRAN although it said "shall be submitted to impacted C-TRAN voters". Mr. Hamm said in the last legislative session, the C-TRAN Board sought to have the authority to draw a sub-district within its current PTBA boundary for the purpose of better aligning the benefits and the costs of the HCT component of the CRC project. The C-TRAN Board is still interested in pursuing that in the next session

Senator Benton said that is why his motion doesn't use that language. His motion stands with the boundary of the PTBA. Senator Benton said he doesn't believe in gerrymandering districts. He said that is what that bill was before the legislature last year, and he was successful in stopping it. He said he would work to stop that bill again. He said all voters that are going to have to pay the tax should have the right to vote on the tax not just those within a little area. He said this is for any additional tax. Senator Benton said he would prefer to go for the whole county, but he said he thought it made some of the members of this Board more comfortable to

use the PTBA boundaries and he is willing to compromise on that in hopes of getting passage of this amendment.

Chair Pollard said they have been told that they could get up to $750 million to build a light rail system. He said that is an assumption, but if there is an operation and maintenance requirement for the light rail system, he has always said that should go to a vote. Mayor Pollard said if the light rail system goes to a vote that is where he differs and would not support.

Senator Benton said the explanation for that is that if it is built, there is clearly going to be operational costs, and those operational costs will continue to increase. The burden to tax payers will not be limited to $750 million. He said if we are fortunate enough to get $750 million grant, it will cost the tax payers way more than what the Federal Government will ever put into building it. Mayor Pollard said the operational and the maintenance should go to a vote of the citizens. Senator Benton said we should know that before we spend $750 million.

Jeff Hamm said that the Federal Transit Administration will not give us $750 million until we can demonstrate to them that we can operate C-TRAN's core bus system and the new high capacity transit portion of the CRC project for 20 years. Royce Pollard said that is what this is designed to do, to get us to the process where we can determine those costs.

Don Wagner asked for clarity on the language. He said it sounded like we were doing something different. It sounded like we were requiring a vote before we made the mode choice, which would in that case take us out of the opportunity to go for a New Starts grant until after the vote. He said the way state law currently reads is that there has to be a vote on any new high capacity line that goes into the State of Washington. The way that law is written, we are allowed to work through this initial phase, which to find out the costs and financing before the vote would have to happen to be able to be in the Federal program. He said the wording as he thought the Senator had stated would put the vote before we could move forward, which would put us behind for our application.

Senator Benton said the motion language would read as follows: WHERE 'LIGHT RAIL' APPEARS IN THE SECOND BULLET ON PAGE 2 IT WOULD SAY "LIGHT RAIL, IF APPROVED BY THE VOTERS WITHIN THE PTBA AS THE PREFERRED HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT MODE."

Senator Benton asked for a roll call vote.

Bill Ganley said he had a comment to the motion. He said he had a concern from the smaller cities to the north, and that is why he was supportive of what was done at C-TRAN. He said because this is a sales tax, and they are not like Portland. If they are able sometime in the future to support a benefit district that is in Vancouver and vote for the sales tax for the businesses in Battle Ground, Yacolt, La Center, and Ridgefield is why he would oppose the amendment. He said if it goes to a vote now for the sales tax to pay for the light rail, that will not apply. If it is a smaller sub-district, it would not apply to the smaller cities. Senator Benton said current law does not allow smaller sub-districts, so we are only dealing within the current law. If the Legislature successfully passes, then that would be allowed. Bill Ganley said that is what he would like, and in favor of, and that is what C-TRAN has discussed.

THE MOTION FAILED WITH BOLDT, MORRIS, AND PEARCE (3) YES; BAKER, BURKHOLDER, COSTON, GANLEY, HAMM, MCDONNELL, POLLARD, STUART, TELL, AND WAGNER (10) NO.

Steve Stuart said given the discussion and some of the confusion of where this language goes and who the voters are that will be impacted affected get to vote on this, the bottom line is that we all have said that the voters need to approve this. He said there are two questions: 1) Who, which voters; is it a sub-district, the PTBA, or the whole county? and 2) Is it a vote on whether

light rail comes in or a vote on a sales tax increase to fund a system? Mr. Stuart said 81104, the legislation that would be used to bring high capacity transit to Washington does require a vote on the system plan and financing. The system plan and financing in this case would primarily be associated with sales tax. He said he understands what Bill Ganley is speaking to, but the ultimate outcome of the discussion is he would like to see some of the language get in.

STEVE STUART MOVED TO AMEND THE RESOLUTION UNDER THE SECTION THAT SAYS 'FURTHERMORE AS THE PROJECT MOVES FORWARD…' AND ADD THE C-TRAN LANGUAGE THAT SAYS "ANY MEANS CHOSEN TO FINANCE OPERATIONS OF THE HCT COMPONENT OF THE CRC PROJECT SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO IMPACTED C-TRAN VOTERS FOR APPROVAL." PAUL PEARCE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION IS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

REX BURKHOLDER CALLED FOR THE QUESTION TO END DEBATE, AND STEVE STUART SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED.

Chair Pollard stated that Dean Lookingbill would reconstruct the resolution from meeting notes and the recording. He asked for final comment.

Betty Sue Morris said it is with regret that she will be voting no, if for no other reason than the fact that she holds Ed Barnes in such high regard, and he is such an advocate for this project. She said that she publicly wanted to say she was sorry. She said she supported the C-TRAN position, but the financing of the bridge has become extremely troubled. She said she has no assurance here that there is any limit on the amount that will be asked for local people to pay for the bridge for tolls. She said if this Board would have been willing to accept any kind of limit on tolling, she would have been happy to support it. She said it seems that this Board is fine with allowing the general toll paying public to carry as much of this cost as is necessary. She does not want this bridge at any cost. Without some kind of limit on the tolls, she will be voting no.

Marc Boldt said he regrets that he will also be voting no. He said the reason being that from day one it's been said this is a Federal project, everyone except the Federal players. He said it has been said 1/3, 1/3, 1/3, and we still do not have a good number from the Federal Government. He said he is disappointed in the Ports and freight associations that haven't really come forth with good proposals on their concerns on tolls for freight. Commissioner Boldt said this has always been a freight bridge, and a year ago it wasn't because of tolls. He said we will have every truck going on I-205. He said the I-5 Bridge is a port to port bridge, with tolls it will no longer be that. Commissioner Boldt said this next session he will be going to Olympia to ask for funding for projects like 139th and 179th and Highway 14, and he said if he were them, he would say you got your bridge money find your project money somewhere else. He said with the loss of gas tax, it will actually hurt us for many years to come out of it, even their current projects. Just to keep up the county roads is a challenge. Commissioner Boldt said he hopes the Federal Government steps up and gives us a dollar figure. He gave credit to Commissioner Stuart for all the work he has done on this project. He said regretfully he would be voting no.

Don Wagner said in speaking to the motion, he would be voting in favor of it even though he had to abstain from a couple specific issues. He did remind people that this is not an endorsement of building a project. He said this is an endorsement of allowing us to answer all of the questions that have been asked that they have not been able to answer yet because they haven't been able to do all the engineering and all the financial activities that are necessary to define these. He will be voting yes and urged others to do the same.

Paul Pearce said he will be voting no, and the reason being that the toll train is nearly out of control and will be out of control. He said Metro's resolution states "Implementation of tolls on

the existing I-5 Bridge should be undertaken as soon as legally and practically permissible. Consideration should be given to potential diversion of traffic to I-205 and potential tolling I-5 and I-205 with those revenues potentially used for projects on these two facilities in the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan area." He said he thinks this train is headed down a really bad path. He said being the first to toll I-5 is not a distinction that he is excited about. For those reasons he will be voting no.

Senator Benton said he doesn't get to vote on this. He said he'll have to see about changing that. He said before they vote he suggested that others join Commissioners Morris, Boldt, and Pearce. The reason is that Ms. Nasset spoke earlier about an alternative route, 85% publicly owned land; the light rail restriction that is not in the document that he hoped to get; the fact that light rail, as Mr. Edgar said, 20 years or more of transportation funding will be sucked up in that light rail system. Senator Benton said there will never be another road improvement if we sign on to this multi billion dollar light rail. He said it will never meet the density requirements to have any affect on congestion on the I-5 corridor. He said we were headed down the wrong path. He asked that they go back to the drawing board and come up with a solution that will solve congestion problems and will be reasonable in terms of the cost benefit ratio. He said this isn't it.

Chair Pollard said they have a motion and a second for approval of the LPA as modified multiple times.

THE MOTION PASSES WITH BAKER, BURKHOLDER, COSTON, GANLEY, HAMM, MCDONNELL, POLLARD, STUART, TELL, AND WAGNER (10) YES; AND BOLDT, MORRIS, AND PEARCE (3) NO.

Chair Pollard said the proposed action is that with the approved LPA, update and amend the MTP.

Betty Sue Morris said that since she did not support the LPA, she would not be supporting the amendment to the MTP.

STEVE STUART MOVED TO APPROVE AMENDING THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AS OUTLINED IN THE RESOLUTION BEFORE THEM. DON WAGNER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Don Benton said that in the LPA, they couldn't use the word "or", it had to be specifically bus rapid transit or light rail. He asked in the master plan, that it could simply be high capacity transit. Jeff Hamm said for the purposes of the New Starts application, again this (the MTP) is key to the New Starts application. Both MPOs have to amend their Metropolitan Transportation Plans to include the project. The matrix of that includes mode and terminus in the MTP.

THE MOTION PASSES WITH BAKER, BURKHOLDER, COSTON, GANLEY, HAMM, MCDONNELL, POLLARD, STUART, TELL, AND WAGNER (10) YES; AND BOLDT, MORRIS, AND PEARCE (3) NO.

VII. Other Business

From the Board

Chair Pollard noted that copies of the final resolution will be delivered to RTC Board Members.

From the Director

Mr. Lookingbill noted JPACT would meet August 14, 2008, at Metro at 7:15 a.m.

There will be no RTC Board meeting in August.

The next RTC Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, September 2, 2008, at 4 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.