

## **MEETING MINUTES**

Spokane Regional Transportation Council Board  
Thursday, April 9, 2009  
SRTC Office - Intermodal Center – Third Floor  
Spokane, Washington

### **1. Call to Order**

The meeting of the Spokane Regional Transportation Council was called to order by Chair, Ms. Micki Harnois, at 1:18 pm.

### **2. Roll Call/Record of Attendance**

#### Board Members in Attendance:

Micki Harnois, Small Towns Representative (Chair)  
Keith Metcalf, WSDOT – Eastern Region  
Latisha Hill, Washington State Transportation Commission  
Diana Wilhite, City of Spokane Valley (Vice-Chair)  
Joe Shogan, City of Spokane Council Member  
Todd Mielke, Spokane County Commissioner  
Wendy Van Orman, Spokane Transit Authority

#### Board Members Not in Attendance:

Jim Williams, Private Sector Transportation Provider  
Mark Richard, Spokane County Commissioner  
Nancy McLaughlin, City of Spokane Council Member

#### Guests Present:

Dale Smith, concerned taxpayer  
Karl Otterstrom, STA  
Gordon Howell, STA  
Neil Kersten, City of Spokane Valley  
Bob Brueggeman, Spokane County  
Margie Hall, City of Spokane  
Paul Kropp, Neighborhood Alliance

#### Staff Present:

Glenn Miles, Transportation Manager  
Jeff Selle, Transportation Relations Mgr.  
Staci Lehman, Pub. Info/Ed Coordinator  
Donna Lively, Administrative Secretary

### **3. Approval of Minutes.**

#### **a) Approval of March 12, 2009 Regular Board Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Keith Metcalf noted a correction on page 7, second paragraph, last sentence under "SRTC Board Member Comments." The phrase "...high on their study list" should read, "...high on the GSI priority list."

**Ms. Wendy Van Orman made a motion to approve the March 12, 2009 Regular Board Meeting Minutes as corrected, and the March 19, 2009 Special Board Meeting Minutes. Mr. Joe Shogan seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.**

### **4. Committee Reports.**

#### **a) Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) Report**

Mr. Gordon Howell reported that based on the recent receipt of several local transportation funding requests, the TTC recommends that a new call for projects be issued for future STP, CMAQ or additional stimulus funding. The TTC also recommends approval of the Project Selection and Re-allocation Procedures, which were presented at last month's Board meeting, and the City of Spokane Valley's federal functional classification amendment requests.

Ms. Diana Wilhite asked whether one list of projects would be created from the call for projects, since each funding type has separate requirements. Mr. Glenn Miles responded that the intention is to provide jurisdictions with another opportunity to submit projects, supported by the selection criteria, for two programming years of STP and CMAQ funding; the additional shovel-ready criteria would apply to projects eligible for stimulus funding. He stated that what has worked well in the past is to get projects into a state of readiness by funding the preliminary engineering and right-of-way phases up front, especially for capital improvement projects. Mr. Miles added that the TTC is currently working on updating the various funding criteria and hopes to have a draft list ready for Board review/approval in May.

### **5. Administrative Matters.**

#### **a) Approval of March Vouchers**

Per the Board's request at the March 12, 2009 SRTC Board meeting, direct expenses for the Kootenai County Metropolitan Planning Organization (KMPO) were identified on the March vouchers. Ms. Wendy Van Orman requested that the format be changed on future vouchers by separating KMPO and SRTC expenditures into two separate columns. The Board concurred with this recommendation.

**Ms. Wendy Van Orman made a motion to approve the payment of the March 2009 voucher list in the amount of \$142,320.95. Ms. Latisha Hill seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.**

Recap for March 2009:	
Vouchers: V118733-V118742 and V118744-V118762	44,629.60
Salaries/Benefits: Warrant Nos: 1373050-1373066 and 1376954-1376970	97,249.35
Interfund and other expenses processed directly by the City of Spokane	442.00
	142,320.95

**6. SRTC Board Member Comments.**

Ms. Latisha Hill reported that the Washington Transportation Plan (WTP) kick-off took place in Olympia last Friday and there were fifteen people on their advisory group. The focus is specifically on policy, not projects, the idea being that with stakeholder input on policy, there will be better prioritization of projects. The group is drafting a vision statement which Ms. Hill will forward to the Board when completed. They are also in the process of drafting a blog policy and communication strategy to obtain feedback both from experts and those utilizing the system. An outline of the plan will be presented to the public this fall.

Mr. Todd Mielke arrived at 1:26 pm.

The Commission will meet in Spokane Valley on June 16th. Ms. Hill is working with Commission staff and Mr. Miles to draft an agenda and has asked the Commission if they can hold a night meeting for greater public involvement. Ms. Hill stated that Board Members may be asked to sit on a subcommittee to ensure accuracy. She noted that agenda items can be submitted within the next week or so. A similar event will be held in Kent, WA, where Boeing and Microsoft will be represented, and one in Yakima. Ms. Hill stated the Commission would like to invite the Idaho Transportation Board to lunch to discuss shared similarities such as I-90.

Mr. Joe Shogan reported that he saw Post Falls Mayor Clay Larkin on televised news expressing disappointment with, and possible secession from, the Idaho Transportation Department because of promised projects that were never delivered. Mr. Glenn Miles elaborated on the situation stating that the City of Post Falls has put up a substantial amount of money to do the environmental impact statement and interchange justification report with what was anticipated to be a \$20 - \$30 million interchange at Greensferry Road. However, once the project gets through the federal highway process, it could be \$100 million interchange due to the need to have a collector distributor similar to the one at Sullivan, Evergreen and Pines. Also, Post Falls received a letter from ITD, the Chair of the ITD Board and the Governor that they were going to expedite the construction of the Beck Road interchange. Since then; however, Idaho has a new Governor, a new ITD Director and ITD Board. The frustration and disappointment lies in Post Falls' expectation that these projects were going to happen.

Mr. Shogan also noted that he will be attending the Chamber meeting in Washington DC at the end of the month and expressed concern with regard to the state funding of the North/South freeway.

Ms. Wendy Van Orman reported that the Executive Transportation Committee (a.k.a. "little tent meeting" or "Judy Cole's group") is looking for any available grants for education and staffing. Mr. Todd Mielke elaborated, stating that there were two questions posed by the Committee. One deals with assembling data that the Committee is trying to obtain, i.e., current vs. needed maintenance and operation (M&O) expenditures as well as deferred maintenance. Regionally, the region has \$44 million, but another \$44 million is needed to complete deferred maintenance and M&O shortfall. The question is: How much is needed for deferred maintenance and how much for M&O shortfall? SRTC staff was asked to assist in analyzing this.

The second question is whether stimulus money is available for transportation planning assistance. Mr. Miles is researching the availability of funds. Ms. Latisha Hill asked whether the SRTC Board should be involved in this discussion and provide recommendations. Todd stated that Executive Transportation Committee (Committee) updates should be made part of the regular SRTC Board meetings. He added that if SRTC is to be redefined, it needs to be determined why and how. Between local government, state legislatures and outside stakeholders, there has been a variety of interest expressed, especially for capital projects that are regional in nature. Consequently, there should be a regional entity that can figure out how to raise and expend money on projects of regional significance. Municipalities state that it is difficult to talk about building new projects when maintaining or paying for current projects is problematic; M&O must be addressed before they are will commit. The Committee concluded that SRTC exists by mandate—the question then becomes, do jurisdictions want a "light" or comprehensive SRTC.

Mr. Mielke noted that the Committee discussed whether jurisdictions were willing to formally commit to a comprehensive transportation planning organization and forming a Transportation Benefit District (TBD) for the purpose of funding transportation needs. Also, whether jurisdictions can agree to a funding mechanism that allocates 80% of the revenues to M&O and 20% to projects of regional significance. The Committee also considered whether they should look at a funding mechanism where both the M&O needs and capital contributions are addressed.

Ms. Hill stated that the group answered these questions. The majority wanted a comprehensive SRTC and a TBD and wanted to do them together. Moreover, they are interested in a funding mechanism where both the M&O needs and capital contributions are addressed, but are not comfortable with the numbers. She requested that a subcommittee of SRTC Board members convene to review House Bill 6064 and compare it to the SRTC Bylaws. Mr. Mielke stated that the question that keeps getting asked is whether the SRTC Board is open to change, or will resist it. Todd responded that Yes, the SRTC Board is open to change, but not for the sake of change. Objectives must be defined and the organization must be designed to meet these objectives. He added that the existing organization should be given the opportunity to

meet these objectives before redesigning it. Mr. Mielke asked Board members whether this was an appropriate Board response/reflection. Board members were in agreement and Ms. Hill stated that an SRTC Board subcommittee should stay apprised of Executive Transportation Committee discussions, keep the Board informed and be ready to respond.

Mr. Keith Metcalf reported that the Regional Boundary Bill died and that their focus is on the budget. He noted that there are discrepancies between the House and Senate surrounding Eastern Washington, especially with regard to the North/South Corridor (NSC) and I-95. He added that the stimulus projects will go out for advertising later this month or the first of May. By mid-May, they will advertise for the completion of the drivable link of the NSC up to Wandermere. On August 22<sup>nd</sup> there will be a NSC progress celebration, noting that it has been nine years since groundbreaking.

Ms. Diana Wilhite reported that she will also be attending the Chamber meeting in Washington DC later this month.

Mr. Todd Mielke added that the Executive Transportation Committee needs preliminary direction from the SRTC Board. Mr. Metcalf said that one of the catalysts for pulling this group together was for a unified voice for transportation; SRTC provides this minimal function, but lacks visioning. Mr. Mielke stated that SRTC is as effective at being a voice as our member jurisdictions are willing to allow this organization. Ms. Diana Wilhite stated that SRTC does not need another entity to define its mission and goals. SRTC should be comprised of elected officials, especially an entity that is going to have regular money or taxing power; there needs to be accountability. Mr. Metcalf noted how local businesses were involved in the meetings. Ms. Wilhite stated that they are not excluded from SRTC meetings. Mr. Mielke noted that stakeholder interest is expressed when it pertains to a project that impacts them or involves taxes.

Ms. Micki Harnois asked for subcommittee volunteers. Mr. Mielke, Ms. Hill, Ms. Van Orman, and Ms. Wilhite agreed to staff the Interim Policy Subcommittee as recommended by Ms. Hill. Ms. Hill suggested that the SRTC Board prepare policies and an organizational chart and provide it to Committee. Mr. Miles added that at last year's SRTC Board retreat it was decided that a Transportation Policy Board be created for the purpose of getting advocacy and interest groups' input on matters coming before the SRTC Board, thus maintaining the integrity of the Board as elected officials.

Mr. Joe Shogan departed at 2:00 pm.

Ms. Micki Harnois asked for introductions from non-SRTC Board members.

## **7. Transportation Manager's Report.**

Due to time constraints and the need to keep a quorum for the scheduled Executive Session, Mr. Glenn Miles was asked to forward the Transportation Manager's Report to Board members via email following the meeting.

## **8. Old Business.**

### **a) Project Selection and Re-allocation Procedures—Technical Committee Recommendation**

Mr. Glenn Miles reviewed the handout that was provided at the March 12, 2009 Board meeting which outlined the Transportation Technical Committee's recommendations regarding project selection and funding re-allocation procedures. This agenda item had been deferred at a Board Member's request to allow time to review the recommendations in detail. Mr. Glenn Miles provided additional clarification on project over-runs and under-runs. He stated that the most notable change is that after the call for projects is made, each jurisdiction is provided additional time (2 weeks) to confirm project time tables to ensure that their projects are deliverable.

**Mr. Todd Mielke made a motion to approve the Project Selection and Re-allocation Procedures as presented to the Board. Ms. Latisha Hill seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.**

### **b) STA Request for SRTC Board Representation**

On Wednesday April 8, 2009, SRTC staff was notified by SRTC Board Member, Mayor Wendy Van Orman, that STA Representative Susan Meyer would be unable to attend the April 9th Board Meeting to provide the STA request for SRTC Board Representation. Consequently, this agenda item is deferred to the May 14, 2009 SRTC Board Meeting.

## **9. New Business.**

### **a) ARRA Transportation Improvement Program Amendments**

- i. WSDOT Proposed Projects (ARRA):**
- ii. Spokane Transit Authority—multiple projects (ARRA)**
- iii. I-90/Geiger I/C to WSP District Office ITS, SRTC06-28**

Mr. Glenn Miles reviewed the proposed American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) amendments. He noted that the Spokane Transit Authority (STA) projects are currently in the public comment period as for information purposes only in order to satisfy the Board's two-touch document/information request. The SRTC06-28 project did not go out for ad last year as expected and consequently, needs to be added back into the TIP.

**Ms. Diana Wilhite made a motion to approve the WSDOT Proposed Projects (ARRA) and the I-90/Geiger I/C to WSP District Office ITS, SRTC06-28 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments as presented. Ms. Latisha Hill seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.**

## **b) City of Spokane Valley Scope Change Request—44<sup>th</sup> Avenue Pathway**

Mr. Glenn Miles reviewed the 44<sup>th</sup> Avenue Scope Change request submitted by the City of Spokane Valley and stated that the TTC recommends Board approval.

**Mr. Keith Metcalf made a motion to approve the City of Spokane Valley's Scope Change Request for the 44<sup>th</sup> Avenue Pathway. Ms. Latisha Hill seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.**

## **c) City of Spokane Valley Federal Functional Classification Amendment Requests**

### **i. Extension of Indiana East of Sullivan to Flora as a Minor Arterial**

Glenn Miles reported that the City of Spokane Valley submitted several federal functional classification amendments; one for Indiana Avenue and the other for Conklin Road.

Indiana Avenue east of Sullivan Road is currently unclassified, since it is a dead-end at the old railroad right-of-way. The City of Spokane Valley has acquired Transportation Improvement Board (TIB) grant funding and developer participation to extend the road to Flora at Mission, making it an important connector (minor arterial) between the north Greenacres area, Millwood, and out to the commercial center of the Spokane Valley Mall.

Mr. Todd Mielke asked whether the percentages of roads in certain categories are by entire region or jurisdiction under the federal guidelines. Mr. Miles responded that it is for the whole urbanized area. Mr. Mielke asked whether the area is close to their caps in terms of percentages of roads in specific categories. Mr. Miles stated that the area is capped with regard to principal arterials and is actually over the guideline by 3%. Mr. Mielke asked how competing applications from jurisdictions is rectified. Mr. Miles stated that in the past 20 years, the Board has asked jurisdictions what they are giving up in return. The only time this would change is if the population and area grow moving a jurisdiction from a rural to an urbanized area, then the number of road miles will increase. He noted that the primary reason we've exceeded our principal arterial guideline is that each segment of a one way street is counted as a road.

Mr. Metcalf suggested looking at the bigger picture in terms of the effects of reclassification requests. Mr. Miles stated that this process is already an integral part of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Ms. Diana Wilhite suggested that as a future agenda item, jurisdictions be shown what their major/minor arterials are. Mr. Miles added that it would make for a good study item.

**Ms. Latisha Hill made a motion to approve the federal functional classification amendment to extend Indiana East of Sullivan to Flora as a Minor Arterial. Ms. Diana Wilhite seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.**

## **ii. Designation of Conklin to a Collector from Broadway to Sprague**

The second request is for Conklin Road, currently an unclassified road between Sprague Avenue and Broadway. The City of Spokane Valley is in the process of installing a signal at Sprague and Conklin due to the recent opening of Kohl's and Lowe's, making Conklin an urban collector.

**Mr. Keith Metcalf made a motion to approve the federal functional classification amendment designating Conklin as a Collector from Broadway to Sprague. Mr. Todd Mielke seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.**

## **10. Public Comments.**

Mr. Paul Kropp reported that Spokane's Smart Routes Campaign received quite a bit of attention at the annual Rails-to-Trails meeting in Washington D.C. last month. The purpose of the Smart Routes project was to designate regionally significant bike and pedestrian projects to substitute vehicular trips. The case statement, prepared from findings supplied by SRTC, was the best one shown at the Rails-to-Trails summit. He reminded the Board that Mr. Miles signed up the SRTC to be in the control program. The back-up data allowed the case statement to refer to that data, which quantified the outcomes, which apparently no one else thought or tried to do. The Board thanked Mr. Kropp for his compliments.

Mr. Stan Schwartz, SRTC Legal Counsel, arrived at 2:16 pm.

Mr. Dale Smith stated that he was curious why law enforcement is not represented on either the SRTC Board or the Executive Transportation Committee. He added that they probably travel the roads more than anyone in the room. Mr. Todd Mielke stated that it begs the issue whether there is the interaction of accident data to traffic planning. Mr. Glenn Miles stated that accident data is collected and geo-coded from the Spokane Regional Transportation Management Center (SRTMC) and can be related to where some of the capacity deficiencies are located. The data collected is from the city, county and state. The Transportation Technical Committee reviews this info and it is also considered when a call to projects is issued. Mr. Mielke stated the most important thing is that the data is collected and used to evaluate future projects.

## **11. Executive Session—Personnel Matters.**

Ms. Micki Harnois, convened the Executive Session at 2:20 pm. Everyone except the Board Members was asked to leave the room. It was anticipated that the Executive Session would last until approximately 2:40 pm.

Ms. Wendy Van Orman departed at 2:47 pm.

At 3:05 pm, the Board announced a five minute extension. At 3:14 pm the meeting was reconvened into public session.

## **12. Adjournment.**

There being no further business before the Spokane Regional Transportation Council Board, the meeting was adjourned at 3:15 pm.

---

Donna Lively  
Recording Secretary