

**Bi-State Coordination Committee
Meeting Minutes
December 9, 2014**

1. Welcome and Introductions

The meeting of the Bi-State Coordination Committee was called to order by Chair Jack Burkman at 8:35 a.m. at the Vancouver Community Library, 901 C Street, Vancouver, WA 98660. He asked each member to introduce them self and note which jurisdiction or organization they represented. Those in attendance follow.

Committee Members

Katy Brooks, Port of Vancouver Alternate
Jack Burkman, City of Vancouver Councilmember, Chair
Jeff Hamm, C-TRAN Executive Director/CEO
Tom Hughes, Metro President, Chair
Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland Alternate
Alan Lehto, TriMet Alternate
Jeanne Stewart, Clark County Commissioner
Don Wagner, WSDOT SW Region Administrator
Rian Windsheimer, ODOT Region One Manager

Staff and Interested Guests

Kelly Brooks, ODOT
Andy Cotugno, Metro
Bart Gernhart, WSDOT
Bob Hart, Regional Transportation Council
David Hodges, U.S. Senator Patty Murray's Office
Carolyn Long, Washington State University Vancouver
Sheila Martin, Portland State University
Matt Ransom, Regional Transportation Council
Karen Schilling, Multnomah County
Patrick Sweeney, City of Vancouver
Sandra Towne, City of Vancouver
Steve Tubbs, Citizen
Walter Valenta, Citizen
Shann Weishaar, Regional Transportation Council
Diane Workman, Regional Transportation Council

Chair Burkman welcomed everyone to the Vancouver Library which opened in 2011. He encouraged all to walk through the facility after the meeting. He noted that the third floor is the youth floor, and it has the largest early learning center of any library in the United States. The library system covers about 4,500 square miles from Woodland to Goldendale, with 13 branches. The Columbia Room that they are using is available for community use, and it has a CVTV control room so they can broadcast and record.

2. Review of Minutes for July 10, 2014 Meeting

JEFF HAMM MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF THE JULY 10, 2014 MEETING MINUTES. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SUSIE LAHSENE AND APPROVED. JEANNE STEWART ABSTAINED.

3. SW Washington Values & Beliefs (500K Voices) Survey Results

Chair Burkman invited Carolyn Long and Sheila Martin to present results from a survey that was taken over the last several months. It is similar to one that has occurred in Oregon. This is the first time they have had the opportunity to get this kind of information. Chair Burkman said this has not yet been rolled out robustly to the community. This is early information.

Carolyn Long provided a handout with some of the presentation slides. She said it will be released publically, and it is available on the Web currently at www.500kvoices.org as noted on the last page of the handout. She said this is the start of a larger project that WSU Vancouver is going to be involved with a couple of other partners. She said there was an article in the Columbian about it, as well as a news report on OPB a couple of weeks ago.

Ms. Long said for a number of years DHM Research has been conducting a survey of the beliefs and values of Portland, NW Oregon, and Oregon and they have been able to do it over time so they are able to measure how community values and beliefs have changed. This is the first time they have done it for SW Washington. In order to construct the survey, they selected a small number of questions that appeared on the Oregon survey and they duplicated it. They only used a small number because of cost. They hope to get money in the future to maybe make a larger survey and draw more comparison between the two communities. This is the first one. The questions were identical to those that were in the Oregon survey with one addition, which is whether or not people commute to Portland to work.

Ms. Long said WSU Vancouver has been working closely with Portland State University. She worked with Sheila Martin on a Bi-State Report a couple years ago, and they anticipate doing some work with this data. This is the collective voice of a region. She said this is the first time they have done this survey. They are trying to find out what people feel about a variety of issues in SW Washington. She said they are very excited about it. More than 2,000 residents were contacted. There were two stages to the research. The first stage was this scientific study that was conducted by phone and also online. The second stage of work done by DHM was when they made the website open for comment from individuals in the community. That information was not statistically relevant, so they do not refer to that in the data analysis. However, they did get a lot of responses from open ended questions about how people feel about these issues, and that will be a nice source of finding out about people's thoughts.

Ms. Long provided a slide of what was referred to in the Columbian article. It talked about how people feel about living in this community. She said the friendliness and neighborliness of individuals ranked the most high followed by public safety, to beauty/scenery, and small community. This will be addressed more thoroughly when Sheila Martin talks about the comparison between the northwest Oregon region.

When asked which issue is most important for government to tackle, 12% chose economy/jobs (which they see that reflected both regionally and nationally), followed closely by road infrastructure at 10%. That shows the community's need or interest in addressing as a policy issue. Next is government spending/taxation at 8%. Ms. Long said one of the things that they will see later on in the comparison was one of the differences between northwest Oregon and southwest Washington was how people feel about taxes.

Attitudes vary on growth and public transportation. While almost half support elevating southwest Washington's economic role in the state and across the nation, 38% expressed concern about too much development increasing their pace of life. Almost half of those surveyed say they favor investing more tax revenue in public transit over spending more on roads for cars, and 45% believe shifting tax dollars from road and highway construction to public transportation is desirable.

Respondents strongly believe that higher education should be made more affordable. They favor building and communicating a pro-business attitude in local and state government. More than half of respondents say protecting our region's green spaces is desirable, and that they would choose policies to help preserve environmental quality over economic growth. When it comes to their careers, residents say they are more inspired by doing good things and working with good people than by having others admire their accomplishments or climbing the corporate ladder. The survey found 68% of respondents would like to see insurers discourage unhealthy behaviors and create incentives to encourage healthy choices, in order to help control insurance costs. Most southwest

Washington residents believe the issue of climate change will require changes in our way of life, versus 40% who say they would rather deal with the problem of climate change later.

Ms. Long said this is their first attempt of evaluating people's beliefs and values; however, they are very much in favor of looking at the data in a lot more detail. She said there are a quite a few questions that are asked. They looked at Clark, Cowlitz, and Skamania Counties. There is an opportunity to look at these results and divide them by county and by age group in order to find out what the differences are among the various populations, which is what they will do in the next steps.

At WSU Vancouver, they will be convening a series of community conversations about some of these results. They have not announced it yet; they will announce it in January. They would like to, instead of just looking at the statistical data, actually listen to what the community feels about these issues by having large conversations broken up in small groups where they gather additional data to find out how people feel about these issues. Ms. Long said they are looking forward to that next step.

4. Comparative Review of OR and SW WA Values

Sheila Martin said as Carolyn had mentioned, one of the things that they wanted to do with the survey results was to be able to compare the Values and Beliefs between the Oregon side of the metropolitan region (northwest Oregon) and southwest Washington. She said since this committee was reconvened and over the summer, they have been spending time thinking and talking about what the basis are for promoting stronger collaboration between our two states. She said the results of the survey will allow them to test their assertions or assumptions about the shared values that we may or may not have. Ms. Martin said she would provide a few highlights that they think are most relevant to the Bi-State coordination Committee. She said to keep in mind a couple of things for northwest Oregon, which includes Washington, Multnomah, and Clackamas Counties. When comparing, she said the margin of error around the survey is about 3.8%.

Ms. Martin began with the Washington survey question of "What do you value most about living in your community?" The Oregon survey question was "What do you value about living in Oregon?" Results showed that people in northwest Oregon also value friendliness and neighborliness. They are not so concerned about safety or public safety. There was a stronger value for nature in general, beauty and scenery, and being close to the mountains and ocean from Oregonians, but not as much for southwest Washington folks. The weather and climate was more appreciated by Oregonians. The comments on "proximity to bigger cities" were interesting. Ms. Martin said statements were either "they like being next to Portland" or "they are glad they are not in Portland". Those two comments often went together. Being in a quiet peaceful community were things that came up among the Washingtonians but not the Oregonians.

The next question addressed asked "when you think about your community ten years from now, do you think it will be a better place to live, about the same as it is today, or worse than today?" Given the margin of error, it was hard to draw a conclusion, but generally, it looks like Oregonians think it is more likely to be a better place, but it does show that Oregonians think it will change, more so than Washingtonians.

The question on priorities was "What is the most important issue that you want your local government officials to do something about?" Both were equally concerned with the economy and jobs and believed that the public sector should take a role in that. Oregonians were much more concerned about government spending and taxation.

Jeff Hamm asked if the presumption that the interest in government spending and taxation is to reduce spending and reduce taxation. Ms. Martin said there is a question about that later on. She said she thinks it is about wanting more spending in Oregon but not in Washington. She would add to this later in the presentation.

Jack Burkman said he was surprised about the higher level of “don’t know” answers in Washington. Carolyn Long said she thought that since this was the first time this survey was conducted, it may have something to do with that. Sheila Martin said it also may be that people don’t know just what it is that local government has the power to influence. Jack Burkman said for the government spending and taxation both in northwest Oregon and southwest Washington, he asked if there was a large variation among the Counties? They have not looked into that at this point. Carolyn Long said local government can mean different levels of local government, so that might have an influence as well.

Rian Windsheimer said it is sometimes difficult to tell when you have two studies like this. He referred to the two items of road infrastructure and traffic/traffic congestion where Oregonians answered to the road infrastructure but nothing to the traffic/traffic congestion. Ms. Martin noted that the Oregon Values and Beliefs survey was conducted in 2013, so there is a lag with respect to when the Washingtonians responded to the survey. Things that are in the public consciousness change, so the responses can change as well.

Ms. Martin said a question of priorities of environment or economy was asked. Responders were asked to evaluate two statements: Statement A was “Economic growth should be given priority even if the environment suffers to some extent”; Statement B was “Protection of the environment should be given more priority even at the risk of slowing economic growth”. The results showed in both cases (statements) stronger concern for the environment, more likely to say they think we should protect the environment even if it means we might sacrifice some economic growth and not a big difference between SW Washington and NW Oregon.

Don Wagner asked when the survey was taken. Ms. Martin said for SW Washington it was the summer of 2014, and in Oregon it was in 2013.

For the priority of roads or transit, the two statements were: Statement A “We should invest more in roads for cars” and Statement B “We should invest more in public transit.” There was not a strong conclusion, but in both cases Statement B was preferred. This was a bit of a surprise to members.

Regarding public services and taxes, there were three statements and respondents were asked which comes closest to how they felt. The three statements were 1) We spend too much on public services and taxes should be reduced. 2) We spend about the right amount on public services and taxes should remain the same. 3) We don’t spend enough on public services and we should increase some taxes. The strongest result was that Oregonians feel more strongly that we should increase some taxes and that we should be spending more public money on some things. The other statements were within the margin of error.

The statement “Shift some funding for road and highway construction toward public transportation such as better bus service and high speed rail projects. There was not a lot of statistical difference between Washingtonians and Oregonians with respect to where they lean, but 45% in SW Washington and 46% in NW Oregon saying we should shift some funding. It was noted that this percent would not be enough to support a ballot measure.

Economic development actions were also addressed. Two statements were given: 1) Build and communicate a pro-business attitude in local and state government, and 2) build and communicate a pro-environment attitude in local and state government. There was not a big difference. Katy Brooks said she has seen some surveys in the State of Washington Association of Businesses on quantifying measurable results that correlate to the permits. In other words, if you support the environment to what degree do you want to see measurable results of regulation to actual results the permit required. She said it would be interesting to dig into to this to understand, because she said she thought that people in this area want it all, clean environment to live in and attract new businesses. Ms. Brooks said it would be interesting to see to what degree they would go either way. Ms. Martin asked if she meant what you are getting for the environmental regulation. Ms. Brooks said in part, and there are checks and balances. She said that sliding scale is relevant to policy makers and regulatory laws.

Sheila Martin said more of these results will be rolled out and presented over the next few months. She said they will be digging into the data further, and said it is interesting for them to hear what members response to this is.

Katy Brooks said in the northwest Oregon survey, it would be interesting to look at the downtown Portland residents as opposed to the outlying areas to see how that compares to the southwest Washington community as a satellite around the downtown core to see if there were similarities, such as urban versus suburban versus satellite service.

Jack Burkman said there is a theory that there is some commonality between results that you would get out of Clackamas County and Clark County. He said whether or not it is true, he did not know. It would be interesting to know.

Jack Burkman asked when they planned to do the next step into comparison. He asked if they would have that information by the next meeting in March. It was felt they would have that information by then. Mr. Burkman said that could be something for the March meeting.

Carolyn Long said they know what they would like to look at in terms of dividing up the data, but if members have suggestions about what they would like to see, it would be helpful to them. They want to provide data that will be useful for members planning. She said to e-mail her or Sheila, and they would take that into consideration.

Tom Hughes said there have been several editions of the survey done in Oregon. He said it would be interesting to see that data compiled to show some trends.

Jack Burkman said SW Washington is pretty diverse. He asked if there was an urban – rural split in Clark County. That was discussed in the context of Oregon versus Washington in comparison, but not within Clark County. Carolyn Long said they do have that information. She said there are some interesting findings with the demographic data as well. She said SW Washington is changing.

Jack Burkman asked if there was enough data to pull out ethnicity results. Ms. Long said that could be a bit tricky for both Oregon and Washington, because they are so small and they are likely to choose to not answer that question. They can get age and gender and where they live, such as urban core City of Vancouver versus Clark County. She was not sure they could do that yet and that she did not think they received zip codes.

Alan Lehto anything on the transportation and land use related issues are important to TriMet along with economic development.

Jeff Hamm said in the appendix page of the 2014 survey, looking at the demographics, he said it looks like the ethnic group percentages don't add up. Carolyn Long said they don't. She mentioned earlier that at one point they decided to do the second gathering of data with online responses because they were low in numbers of races and also age. They did get responses, but it was self-selected so people could have gone multiple times. Sheila Martin added that noted in the table listing the ethnic groups was a footnote. Hispanic or Latino is an ethnicity that can be combined with any race, so some percentages do not equal 100%. She also noted that the Hispanic/Latino folks were much underrepresented in the scientific survey and the public engagement survey.

Tom Hughes asked about the number of respondents. The scientific survey had 673 respondents and the public engagement survey had 1,364 respondents. He referred to their online opt-in which has about 19,000 for the Portland metropolitan area. He said they occasionally put questions to them and what they have done with that is that they have identified people with ethnicity and age. They have tested it and generally it tests pretty accurately.

Jack Burkman asked if they had access to the actual questions. Ms. Long said she could get those to him. Sheila Martin said they are trying to do a better job at gaging how many people they are reaching and how well they are reaching them. She said they have started doing evaluations for all presentations and distributed copies for members to fill out with feedback.

Jeanne Stewart asked for a copy of the PowerPoint of the shared values and beliefs presented. That would be provided to Commissioner Stewart.

5. Columbia River Bridges – Issues / News Updates

Matt Ransom said they understand based on the meeting so far this year that the committee would like to see updates as they are appropriate on issues of bi-state significance to help keep the dialog going and information sharing. They understood the task to be project specific, policy specific, and oriented toward I-5 and I-205 corridors where there is direct connections but there may be larger initiatives that should be addressed.

The RTC Board unanimously approved the Regional Transportation Plan Update for Clark County at their December 2 meeting. Knowing that Metro adopted their RTP this last summer, Mr. Ransom had a few observations about RTC's RTP update. He said it was largely policy and programmatic focused. In that they need to upgrade their population forecast to calibrate to a couple policies established by FHWA. The Board emphasis in terms of policy interest was on issues of economic development, how to refine their project selection criteria for regional flexible funds to focus more on economic development. He said they will be looking at their project review criteria to see if there may be a way to get more points for those purposes. Another issue is the interest in funding or the lack thereof, and how to start to move as a region around pushing for funding and maybe even a regional initiative.

In terms of consistency as an MPO, the federal mandate is that a two state, bi-state MPO region have consistency within their Plans. The Regional Transportation Plan that RTC adopted did include as a project, the I-5 Bridge replacement. That is representative of the component parts of the former Columbia River Crossing. The RTC and Metro's RTPs are consistent in terms of that project, with a lot of policy consistency as well. The population forecasts are similar. They include, as most RTPs include, a strategic element that is not on the project list, but they are issues of strategy or a horizon that they need to continue to develop. There are three of those that showed up in the RTC Plan. First is to continue to develop our high capacity transit corridors. In 2008, RTC adopted a policy plan that laid out some high capacity transit corridors. Each of those corridors as they go toward project development and implementation will need to be refined further. Strategy wise, there was a call to continue to refine those corridors. C-TRAN is moving forward and anticipating a full funding grant agreement for BRT on Fourth Plain. Mr. Ransom said the next question is what is next? - A Highway 99 corridor, or something on I-205 just to continue to seek opportunity. That is one of the strategic elements.

The second relates to developing a regional long-term population / growth forecast and a travel demand forecast. This is an opportunity area within the two MPOs to look beyond the state mandated 20-year horizons that we both operate under.

The third relates to new corridors. Mr. Ransom distributed a handout. He said there seems a lot of interest in SW Washington around new corridors, and specifics of maybe crossing the Columbia River. There have been four instances as shown in the handout where the Clark County Commission placed on the public ballot sheet in 2013 and 2014 advisory votes. The caveat is that those votes were advisory only to the Clark County Commission in terms of policy. As shown, it asks the broad question of interest of bridges east, west, or other. The November 4, 2014, Advisory Vote where the question was asked should the County Commission support or advocate for a new east county bridge crossing the Columbia River. A slight majority is interested in that topic, and nearly half the people are not so interested in that topic. The RTC has agreed to place on a future agenda discussion for the Board this matter, possibly February or March of 2015. RTC staff needs to go back and refresh where they studied the issue back in 2008. The RTC Board developed some ideas about corridors that crisscross Clark County. The study was the Future Corridor Visioning Study. As part of that, the question was prompted if there was a need long term if we have a huge population for an additional river crossing. Mr. Ransom said the recent ballot

measure pivoted off of that Visioning Study concluding that we do need one. With the RTC Board, they intend to go back and refresh and look at that study and the scope and start to narrow in on the question of the need short term versus strategy for long term and distinguish between the two. They will start to talk about corridors and whether that moves forward to river crossing discussion is uncertain.

Tom Hughes asked for clarification of what a west county bridge location refers to. Matt Ransom said the RTC Visioning Study published in 2008 had some very broad generalizations about a west side corridor, which the idea goes back decades. This could perhaps be a major arterial or a limited access roadway from Ridgefield down the west side adjacent to the Columbia River down into the Port of Vancouver lowland area. Whether it crossed the river the study said what if you crossed here. The study conclusion suggested that it would not draw a lot of traffic, and it would be extremely expensive if not prohibited to build. Mr. Ransom said it is a broad look and a proposal to look at crossing the river at more locations.

Tom Hughes referred to the advisory vote and said a toll free bridge was a pretty good deal. Jack Burkman said all four of the advisory votes had that in common. They are all toll free. The west side was communicated as west of the current I-5 bridge, nothing more specific. The east county bridge became more specific at 192nd Avenue. Mr. Burkman said now that they have this advisory vote on the east side, it seems to push off the previous years with a new look. That one passed by just under 6%. The results for the toll free I-5 bridge, the results showed it passed with about 11.5%. The west side location was at .06%. The Transportation Corridors Visioning that was done in 2008 was wrapped around what happens when Clark County reached 1 million people. The results said we don't have sufficient transportation infrastructure to drain out of the expansion areas to the north and the north east. There needs to be some kind of corridor set up through there. That invites the question of how to cross the river on the east side of Clark County. The other part was from a land use perspective at the time, it was built out up to the 800 ft. level with people. That was where the study discussion stopped. Currently, RTC is in a position of getting everyone back to a common level of knowledge of what that visioning was and was not and what the next steps would be. Mr. Burkman said they would start working on this in 2015.

Rian Windsheimer said he had a hard time taking anything from this. He said for the many years he has attended the TMAC meetings he has heard that they want more bridges, more roads, and more transit, but when asked to put in 5 cents to get all of them, the answer is no. The Values and Beliefs survey is similar. There are a lot more unknowns than knowns in this conversation. He said he questioned that the surveys show us the answers.

Tom Hughes said it is very difficult to advocate in favor of a concept of a project through a vote of the people, because sooner or later somebody has to put some real specific things on the table about what they thought the public had in mind when they were doing it, and they are usually wrong. Mr. Hughes said particularly if you only have a 5 or 6 percent margin of error in the advisory votes, you're never going to get support for the finished product.

Jack Burkman said in many circles, there is good recognition that there is a lot of confusion created by these advisories starting with "no toll". The question then is what the funding mechanism is and what does that mean? Mr. Burkman said he hoped this new survey would be beneficial along with the follow-up conversations with the residents so they can start broaching this topic a bit. He said he did not know how to restart transportation investments. He said if anything, his biggest concern is that these advisory votes might have set in place a perception that there are ways of getting major transportation projects without paying for them. That is a tough starting point.

A question was asked of the November 2014 advisory vote regarding what was meant by "a community embraced projects policy." Mr. Burkman said that is from a series of statements by the Board of County Commissioners.

Katy Brooks said this goes back to Tom Hughes point, when you do public surveys like this, you can't expect folks to deeply understand what it all means. She said that is the challenge of being

someone who is supposed to advocate for what folks want and make it happen. It is working on the principles that aren't necessarily doable in the real world. Ms. Brooks said it goes back to the education piece. Part of it could be the educational piece we as a group or we as a region over the color of money, the types of money that is actually available and the feasibility of funding any bridge. She said maybe this is a piece of the educational process that needs to be front and center, not only where we put a new bridge, what type of a bridge, and what types of modes of traffic that move across the bridge. It is understanding how anybody gets anything paid for in today's world.

Rian Windsheimer said the point about modes is interesting when you consider if someone supports a bridge, but for light rail some are maybe or a very strong yes. Portland just built a bridge that is transit and bike/pedestrian only, so there is a wide range.

Jack Burkman said in Clark County in looking at the results, it may surprise you. The voters were not asked if they approved light rail, they were asked if they wanted to vote on it. The downtown Vancouver core area group said they did not even want to vote on it. When you look at the rural areas, real high percentages want a vote. He said those are not surprises. He said his biggest concern in this finance part is how to have a conversation with people around the concept of one generation builds a bridge for the next. It is the future investment as to the immediate pay. He said he is fearful that people have adopted a philosophy that we see in our school system, sometimes referred to as fail first, fund second. When there are so many portables, when kids can't attend and they are bused to another school, the level of pain causes people to finally agree to pay the bill and you get a new one. That is the cycle. He said he hoped that is not true with large infrastructure.

Jeff Hamm said there is a lot of heat and smoke on this side of the river about a new bridge crossing or the I-5. He said what they don't have is a sense of where Metro is and the Oregon elected officials. He said his sense is that they have shifted to other priorities, and this really doesn't stack up to put any investment into. He said it would be good on the north side of the river to get a sense of where Oregon is on it. He said unfortunately, the Clark County representative had to leave early. Chair Burkman said it is important for the County to hear this conversation and participate. They are an important player.

Tom Hughes said it is fair to say that in the RTP that Metro just passed, the bridge continues to hold a prominent place. It is their intension on the south side of the metro area that the bridge is a key feature to their future transportation. He said the reality of it is that they won't get money for it. In the interim, they are going to fund the projects that they can fund and continue to keep that top on their priority list. He said there is frustration on the majority party on the south of the river that they couldn't get any of the Republicans to cross over and vote to support a one-state only funding of the bridge. There is general frustration down there that they couldn't get the Washington Legislature to fund anything at all. Mr. Hughes said there is some comparison between Washington State and Clackamas County who refused to fund the bridge that everybody was going across in the case of the Selwood Bridge. He said it is realistic to understand that we have got to replace the bridge, and it is realistic to understand that there is no money available to do that right now. He said they are not going to put everything else on hold while they get the money to do it.

Jeff Hamm asked if their priority is still to replace the bridge and a third crossing would not supplant that. Tom Hughes said a third crossing would have to go all the way back and start our process all over again.

Jack Burkman said in the update that Mr. Hughes just gave, 90% of that is the same on the Washington side of the river. Mr. Burkman said their RTP does not contain "CRC". The description of the project does not say CRC, because it is not, but the actual purpose listed in there is the same and has not changed. When talking about how to fund, they are still along that path. He said they know where Washington is in respect to funding. Mr. Burkman asked what was happening on the legislative side of this.

Andy Cotugno said he thought he heard the Governor say "we tried; it's in your court." Mr. Cotugno said he thought he said we are not doing anything on the CRC funding; it is your move next,

meaning the Washington Legislature. Mr. Cotugno said as far as the Oregon Legislature goes, they haven't done anything yet, but there has been a major initiative among an organization called the Oregon Transportation Forum to develop a comprehensive funding package. They have done that; they have voted on it, and it is going to be introduced to the 2015 Legislature. It is up to the Legislature to decide what to do with it. It has road funds, Cascade Amtrak funds, lottery funds for non-roads purposes, and more. In the last Legislature they approved \$450 million for CRC, but they didn't approve a funding source to pay for the debt service on the \$450 million. If it had gone according to plan, Mr. Cotugno said he thought the package that would be in front of us today would have included a penny and a half gas tax increase for debt retirement on CRC and then something for the rest of the system. Funding for CRC isn't even in the discussion. It is everything else for the rest of the system statewide, transit, freight, and roads; nothing mentioned about the debt service on the CRC project in the package that has been adopted by the Oregon Transportation Forum to go to the Legislature.

Susie Lahsene asked Rian Windsheimer if he could give them a sense of what kind of maintenance issues are related to the I-5 Bridge.

Mr. Windsheimer distributed a letter that he prepared for the RTC Board of Directors which provided I-5 Interstate Bridges Maintenance and Rehabilitation Needs. It included some background and the basic needs of each bridge. This was at the request of some of the RTC members. Since that time, they have also produced a Seismic Plus Report. He read the language regarding the I-5 Bridge replacement. The Interstate Bridge I-5 connects Portland to Vancouver. To identify the significance of seismic vulnerability, it would collapse or be rendered unusable in an earthquake. Oregon and Washington have developed a project to replace the bridges with a seismically resilient structure and address other transportation deficiencies, but the project has not moved forward. Replacement of the Interstate Bridges is not included in their Seismic Plus Report with a cost of addressing that it is too high. ODOT assumes that the bridges deficiencies will be addressed through a specific project around that Columbia River Crossing project. The handout lists the cost of regular maintenance.

Don Wagner said to keep in mind that WSDOT pays 50% of the maintenance costs. It is a 50/50 share in the costs.

It was asked if the Seismic Report speaks to I-205. If I-5 fails, is I-205 standing? Mr. Windsheimer said it does talk a little about that. He said the I-205 bridge would do much better; it has a higher seismic standard.

Jeff Hamm said he sees RTC marching off this next year to dive into the corridors visioning and start talking about a third bridge crossing. He said he felt there would be pressure to do that, and he was asking if Oregon would be participating in that.

Jack Burkman said he had a different perspective on that. He said he thought there would be pressure to look at that, but with the Corridors Visioning he thought they would talk about what is needed to address cross river transportation over time. He said what they arrived at last time this was done was that it did not pull the priority off of I-5. It said that is a critical need, and as time marches on there is greater need elsewhere. Mr. Burkman said he would be surprised to see the outcome to be another crossing in lieu of. Mr. Hamm said what he sees to help bring that eventuality about is some empirical data that says that these third crossings are not going to solve the I-5 Bridge issues. Chair Burkman said that is exactly what they got into with the Corridor Visioning. He said the west side corridor would only off load I-5 by about 8% of the load, and something very similar on the east side. It was not addressing a core problem, unless some other needs came up. Mr. Burkman said they plan to start by getting everyone on the same page with what was said and not said in the original study. He said there is also belief that the original study called for a crossing at 192nd, which it did not.

Tom Hughes said the only issue on the Oregon side of the river, which might prove complicating, is that there is a group of local jurisdictions on the west side of Portland that have resurrected the

west side bi-pass idea. He said if the two ever get connected, there may be some synergy there. Although, he said the advocate for that program in the Oregon Legislature was just defeated in the last elections.

Jack Burkman said there is a small group on the Washington side that is advocating a west side crossing. He said they have struggled at describing how to get traffic off of I-5 to that, because they proposed an overpass flyover over Vancouver, but there is the wildlife refuge to deal with as well.

Chair Burkman asked Don Wagner to discuss the Governor's budget.

Don Wagner said he would go back to the Columbia River Bridge project and give the status. He said it is Washington's view that there is a ready to go project there in search of funding. The needs that we addressed in the original Columbia River Crossing project still exist. The bridges are not getting any newer, not any more stable, and traffic congestion is getting worse. To address the problems that exist that we are trying to solve with the Columbia River Crossing, they believe they need to address the bridges themselves. They are in a position that says it is a project that is ready to go into the next phase in search of funding. That being said, he said he does not know what the Governor's Transportation Budget is going to be. That will be made public within the next 30 days. There may be a funding package, or there may not. It is not known at this point. Mr. Wagner said they are sticking pretty strongly to the use of the project.

Andy Cotugno asked how long he could make that statement relative to bridge permits and record of decisions. He said they have a permitted project on the shelf today, and asked when those sorts of things expire.

Don Wagner said there are many, many permits. He said there are a lot of these really big complicated projects out there and people understand that you have to be able to not start over on everything simply because of the time period on a permit. He said almost every permit will need to be refreshed that they have in line between both states as they move forward. Mr. Wagner said to keep in mind the work that they did in the past, the \$180 million are things that are not going to change such as the Troutdale formation underneath the Columbia River that has been there for a few million years. Mr. Wagner said they have a lot of data that is still very, very valid. As long as we're talking about replacing the bridges, he thinks that we will not be starting over again, but they may have to refresh almost every permit.

Chair Burkman asked Mr. Wagner about the financial issues before our Legislature this year. Mr. Wagner said there are several major issues that the Legislature will have to address. There is an educational issue decision where they are under orders to improve our education system and state support for that. That will be a huge conversation in the General Fund. On the transportation side, there is also a court decision a few years ago related to Puget Sound specifically and barriers to salmon migration. The courts ordered the state to speed up their repairs and replacement of barriers with a specific deadline to have it fixed. They have just this year looked at the progress, and said that somebody is in contempt of court for not moving fast enough. They left that open to whether that somebody was WSDOT that doesn't fund projects, the Legislature that does, or the Governor. It is open, they are watching, but they made it clear that they expect to see some progress towards funding out of this coming Legislature or they may come back and do something that the Supreme Court in the state has never done before, which is to find an elected official in contempt of court for not taking them seriously.

Chair Burkman asked what was meant by barriers. Mr. Wagner said it is basically culverts. It did not relate to anything outside the Puget Sound, because it was brought to DOT by the tribes that have treaty rights in the Puget Sound. Mr. Wagner said in the SW Region, there are a few of the barriers in the north. He said this may gain some ground with the Columbia River treaty tribes, and they will see something move forward. Mr. Wagner said it's a few billion dollars of transportation funding. This is a big hit in transportation. Mr. Wagner said there is also the aging infrastructure. He said we have the distinction of being the last state with a major Interstate bridge collapsing into a river. Luckily it was not the one here in Vancouver, but it did point out that there are a lot of

bridges that may not be in a position of seismic vulnerability, but are fracture critical as was seen. Mr. Wagner said there is a good possibility that transportation improvements will be on the Legislatures agenda. What is in that is not clear.

Jack Burkman said relative to the education issue facing the Legislature is acting on two parts. There is a classroom size initiative, but it did not have any funding associated with it.

6. Bi-State Coordination Committee – Chartering a Year 2015 Work Program

Chair Burkman referred to the handout with Agenda topic ideas. He asked that members take a look at that and send Chair Hughes or him any thoughts or ideas. He proposed the next meeting be in March. He said they could begin with a follow up from the Survey that was presented and spend some time in the comparison of both the urban and rural areas in Southwest Washington and the portion of Oregon that was surveyed. By then they should have some information of what is going on with the Legislature. Mr. Burkman said there may possibly be some update with the Corridor Visioning. He also said he would like to see something to address the I-5 corridor.

Susie Lahsene said the Port of Portland has just completed the update to the cost of congestion. She said this might be a good study for Clark County to think about as a foundation piece for looking at improvements to certain corridors, including I-5. She had copies of an Executive Summary and a PowerPoint presentation that she distributed and said they could go through it in March. Ms. Lahsene said as you are looking at things for the Washington side of the river to undertake, matching this effort might be a good thing. Chair Burkman said that would be a good item for March. He said from his perspective, the conversation around our transportation system in SW Washington moved a long way off the freight issue. It would be beneficial to move us back to that economic and business side.

Rian Windsheimer said the Seismic Plus Report is also a conversation they are starting to have in their Legislature and the Oregon Transportation Commission, around a \$5 million program to retrofit certain bridges, address landslides, and other issues. It has the potential to save \$84 billion in economic recovery by addressing those bridges. These are issues that both states are looking at.

Jeff Hamm asked if all members have appointed their representatives for the Bi-State Committee and wish to participate. It was noted that it will take an effort to get more participation. Chair Burkman said the March agenda topics may spark some interest in participation.

7. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 a.m.