

MEETING MINUTES

Spokane Regional Transportation Council Board
Thursday, May 14, 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 1:02 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
Mark Richard, Spokane County Commissioner
Nancy McLaughlin, City of Spokane Council Member
Wendy Van Orman, Spokane Transit Authority

Board Members Not in Attendance:

Todd Mielke, Spokane County Commissioner
Jim Williams, Private Sector Transportation Provider

Guests Present:

Senator Lisa Brown
Kimm Hill, Assistant to Senator Lisa Brown
Representative John Driscoll
Jim Robinson for Representative Matt Shea
Mike Hilborn, Aging & LTC of Eastern WA
Susan Meyer, CEO STA
Karl Otterstrom, STA
Gordon Howell, STA
Laura McAloon, STA
Neil Kersten, City of Spokane Valley
Bob Brueggeman, Spokane County
Margie Hall, City of Spokane
Paul Kropp, Neighborhood Alliance
Richard Schoen, City of Millwood

Staff Present:

Anna Ragaza-Bourassa, Transportation
Planning Supervisor
Jeff Selle, Transportation Relations Mgr.
Staci Lehman, Pub. Info/Ed Coordinator
Ryan Stewart, Sr. Transportation Planner
Sue Arnesen, Accountant
Donna Lively, Administrative Secretary

Todd Ableman, City of Cheney
Ross Kelley, HDR

3. Approval of Minutes.

a) Approval of April 9, 2009 Regular Board Meeting Minutes

Mr. Diana Wilhite made a motion to approve the April 9, 2009 meeting minutes. Ms. Latisha Hill seconded the motion, which was approved by all present with the exception of Ms. Nancy McLaughlin and Mr. Mark Richard who abstained.

4. Committee Reports.

a) Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) Report

Mr. Gordon Howell reported that the Technical Committee met on April 15th and discussed the call for projects criteria for STP and CMAQ funding and provided updates on regional stimulus projects.

The Technical Committee reviewed the Spokane Transit Authority (STA) American Recovery and Reinvestment Act ARRA projects that were out for public comment/review and the 2010 FY Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). The Committee recommended Board approval/adoption of both the STA ARRA projects into the TIP and the 2010 FY UPWP

The Committee also reviewed a draft copy of the 2009 Spokane Regional Bicycle Map. SRTC staff collaborated with local jurisdictions to ensure that correct roads and inventory were listed.

5. Administrative Matters.

a) Approval of April Vouchers

Per the Board's request at the April 9, 2009 SRTC Board meeting, KMPO and SRTC expenditures were placed into two separate columns. The Board agreed that this format was beneficial and easier to read and thanked Board staff, Sue Arnesen.

Mr. Mark Richard made a motion to approve the payment of the April 2009 voucher list in the amount of \$216,975.75. Ms. Diana Wilhite seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Recap for April 2009:	
Vouchers: V118743, V118763 - V118782, V118784 - V118791	127,618.56
Salaries/Benefits: Warrant Nos: 1379537 - 1379552 and 1382155 - 1382170	87,109.48
Interfund and other expenses processed directly by the City of Spokane	2,247.71
	<hr/>
	216,975.75

b) 2009 UPWP Amendment No. 1

Ms. Sue Arnesen explained that the amendment to the 2009 UPWP adjusts for FY 2008 carryover funds, increased FHWA PL, FTA, and RTPO funds, and reduced WTP funds. It also reallocates funds based on actual usage and the expected workload during the remainder of the fiscal year.

Ms. Arnesen noted that the major adjustment occurred in Task 44406, Interlocal Coordination. She stated that when the UPWP was created in 2007, the task was underfunded in error. She outlined the adjusted budgets for this task by year, adding that the funding increase in 2009 was due to Congressional and Legislative activity, the ARRA funding process, work on the Inland Pacific Hub, Big Tent support, and unanticipated public outreach efforts.

Ms. Arnesen provided a handout which reflected changes by task and funding source, as well as a revised Tables of Expenditures and Revenues. Ms. Diana Wilhite noted that the Revenue Forecast and Expenditure Tables were revised to reflect funding sources and task descriptions. She stated that she reviewed the underfunding issue with Ms. Arnesen earlier and expressed confidence that the error was effectively addressed and resolved. She expressed appreciation for the work Ms. Arnesen provides, noting that there are unique reporting requirements for each of the various funding sources in addition to having to deal with different fiscal cycles.

Ms. Wendy Van Orman and Representative John Driscoll arrived at 1:15 p.m.

Ms. Diana Wilhite made a motion to adopt Amendment No. 1 to the 2009 UPWP. Mr. Keith Metcalf seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

c) SRTC Policy Sub-committee Update – Latisha Hill

Ms. Latisha Hill provided the Board with hard copies of her PowerPoint presentation entitled, Draft Comparison of Existing & Future Transportation Functions – Report to Regional Executive Transportation Team. She also provided a document regarding the Discussion on Governance Regional Executive Team Meeting, which was held on May 11, 2009. Ms. Hill briefed the Board on the history of the Executive Team and their interest in making the transportation system work better. She stated that the Executive Team, comprised mostly of elected officials, was charged with two tasks: 1) looking at governance (in general) for the transportation system; and 2) evaluating the Transportation Benefit District (TBD) concept. Given the enormity of the task, the SRTC Board created a policy subcommittee to prepare draft concepts for the Executive Team to review.

Mr. Joe Shogan arrived at 1:25 p.m.

Ms. Hill reviewed the presentation, which outlined existing challenges, regional transportation responsibilities, SRTC structure, SRTC “light” vs. SRTC “comprehensive,” agreed-upon functions, action items and next steps. She explained

that SRTC “light” is the existing SRTC structure, while SRTC “comprehensive” would take on a unified regional transportation governance system similar to that outlined in SB 6064*. Ms. Hill stated that the Executive Team agreed not to have an SRTC “light,” but settled on a mid-point concept that included the existence of SRTC & STA Ex-Officio positions, a Transportation Advisory Board with voting powers, a priority project review council, and adjusted Board representation.

Mr. Mark Richard requested that since the SRTC Board has Ex-Officio positions they should be listed in the SRTC structure chart; Ms. Hill agreed. He added that if connectivity with STA is contemplated, connectivity with all other modes of transportation, e.g., airport, rail, etc., must be contemplated also. Senator Lisa Brown pointed out that SB 6064 originated from a Washington business community roundtable to keep the discussion moving forward regarding what regional transportation models would work for the Puget Sound area. Roundtable representatives were frustrated with the fragmentation of transportation and planning agencies and their lack of ability to carry off regional transportation priorities. She noted that part of the reason why the big tent meetings were initiated came from the need for Vancouver and Spokane to talk about their own model should decisions be made at a regional level that would require some state authority.

Ms. Hill stated that last fall, the big tent attendees discussed what they wanted SRTC to provide. They established the following agreed-upon functions:

- Development of a regional vision
- Development of a regional transportation plan
- Establish regional transportation priorities
- Facilitate the timing, funding and development of regionally significant transportation projects
- Provide environmental screening during the planning process
- Receive and direct regionally collected transportation revenues based on adopted plans, programs and projects
- Monitor whether selected programs/projects for public funding are on schedule for completion and within budget
- Provide for regular consistent communications for all transportation stakeholders

Those functions not agreed upon were land use, funding, and binding authority.

Ms. Hill stated that the SRTC Board is expected to work on developing and implementing the community visioning process, which Mr. Todd Mielke first introduced to the Board at last year’s Board retreat. Ms. Hill noted that there is the need to further

* SB 6064 was intended to 1) improve regional transportation infrastructure for the benefit of citizens, the economy, and the environment by reducing fossil fuel use and carbon emissions and increasing transportation efficiency; 2) consolidate several governmental functions related to transportation planning and funding into a single governmental entity to coordinate and prioritize transportation planning and funding decisions; and 3) increase accountability to citizens by requiring direct election of transportation decision makers and voter approval for transportation taxes and fees.

develop a stronger public outreach component and what that governance structure should look like.

Ms. Hill referred to the May 11, 2009 Meeting handout and reviewed the discussion topics regarding SRTC improvement needs. Mr. Mark Richard asked who attended this meeting; Ms. Hill responded stating that Senators Marr and Brown were there along with Mayors Munson, Verner, and Van Orman, Frank Tombari, Betsy Coles, Judy Cole, Margaret Shepherd, Dave Mandyke and most of the Public Works Directors; Todd Mielke and Ms. Hill also attended.

Ms. Diana Wilhite thanked Ms. Hill for her work in putting together the presentation. Ms. Nancy McLaughlin stated that there is a need to have a deeper more honest discussion on what SRTC has done well and what they have not done well. Ms. Hill noted that the complaints she's heard are that SRTC lacks the visioning piece and partnering with the stakeholders outside the transportation arena. Senator Brown added that in light of the financial climate, the feds are not going to provide as much money as in the past and states will require more local matches. Regionally, we must be better prepared in our vision and have a better connection with the public in order to take advantage of opportunities to leverage federal and state participation in developing the bigger vision of what we look like in terms of moving people and freight 20-30 years from now. She added that in order to take on such projects as light rail or other major innovations, this region will need to have the best possible structure for communication, public outreach, and leveraging for state and federal funding.

Mr. Joe Shogan stated that the debate lies in how much power should be given to the SRTC without a jurisdiction giving up their sovereignty (e.g., land use) He added that an effective, all powerful SRTC would need the participation of Senators Brown, Murray and Cantwell, and Representatives Parker and Driscoll. He added that SRTC needs the ability to dictate to its members and have an impact on the legislature. Ms. Hill argued that it is not a legality issue, it is already outlined in the SRTC charter; however, it is just the nature of our current culture. Ms. Diana Wilhite stated the Metropolitan Transportation Plan addresses these issues but must be taken in parts to the public with presentations made to the various councils with regard to what is needed from them in order to facilitate the plan.

Mr. Mark Richard stated the need for Board members to integrate what is discussed at the Board meetings into their own jurisdictions. He noted the need to have PR built into the process by having SRTC staff visit jurisdictions to obtain their input and buy-in. Mr. Keith Metcalf stated that an all-powerful agency, as is being discussed, would include a regionally developed funding plan (i.e., gas tax, etc.) that can be controlled. Senator Brown added that a commitment to local preservation and maintenance of the system as well as to the bigger picture capital projects is needed for local official buy-in and public support.

Ms. Hill stated that the policy sub-committee will continue to meet and ascertain what the next steps will be. They will keep the Board apprised of their ongoing efforts.

6. SRTC Board Member Comments.

Ms. Diana Wilhite stated that she and Mr. Glenn Miles attended the Joint Chambers meeting in Washington D.C. last month to talk to federal officials about the stimulus package and funding issues. They met individually with the Transportation Legislative Aides of Senators Cantwell and Murray and Congresswoman McMorris-Rogers. At Congresswoman McMorris-Rogers' suggestion, they met with Congressman Micca's Chief of Staff who is on the House Transportation Committee and who was shown the North South Corridor (NSC) on a visit to Spokane last year. They discussed the advantages of naming this project on a transportation bill for federal funding. Mr. Keith Metcalf distributed copies of materials he prepared on the NSC to present to various legislative staff. Ms. Wilhite noted that they also met with a member of the Transportation Commission, a Senator from Minnesota, and a staff member to express their desire in obtaining project funding. It was noted that reauthorization funding is still uncertain at this time. Mr. Jeff Selle added that there were three Bridging the Valley (BTV) projects submitted (Park, Pines and Barker), and two BTV projects for Idaho along with the Highway 95 project.

Mr. Keith Metcalf reviewed the NSC documentation he had prepared and added that a ribbon-cutting progress celebration is scheduled for August 22, 2009 in which the Governor may be attending. He was pleased to report that an additional \$28 million in funding for the Francis to Spokane River portion had been obtained; \$4 million will be applied toward design and environmental activities and \$24 million toward right-of-way acquisition. Current funding opportunities include: \$1.5 billion in federal stimulus funds available to be allocated to projects that are a minimum \$20 million with no more than \$300 million to be distributed to any given state; and a \$200 million earmark request. Mr. Joe Shogan asked Senator Brown whether she foresees any increased funding for shovel-ready projects in the next biennium. Senator Brown responded that the Governor just signed the 2009-2011 transportation budget and they were able to obtain the \$28 million that Mr. Metcalf mentioned, in addition to a \$10 million flexibility provision for the three high priority projects in the state, which includes the NSC. Also, Representative John Driscoll was able to secure \$250,000 towards the separate right turn lane for the Spokane/Cheney interchange on I-95. With construction costs falling; however, they hope to complete more of the NSC than what was originally anticipated. Also, with the City of Spokane funding commitment toward the interchange and available Intersection Safety Improvement funds, they hope to more adequately address the needs at the Spokane/Cheney interchange.

Senator Brown reported that at the state level, the budget is tapped out and not much is expected to occur in 2010. She anticipates, however, that 2011 will be a big year for state level transportation decisions, especially if a funding/revenue package is lacking. She added that this is another good reason for the region to come to the table.

Ms. Nancy McLaughlin reported that earlier this year, she was selected by the National League of Cities (NLC) to sit on the Transportation Infrastructure Steering Committee. She will be attending a Committee meeting in Florida May 26th through May 30th and asked Board members to contact her if there was any information they wanted her to

bring back or to communicate at the NLC level, particularly with regard to the reauthorization or new authorization of transportation funding.

Ms. Latisha Hill reported that the Washington Transportation Commission (WTC) will be meeting in Spokane Valley on June 16th. They hope to have representatives from various modes of transportation present; Greater Spokane Incorporated (GSI) will host a reception for the Commission following the event. The Commission will take part in field trips prior to the event to see various regional transportation projects, such as the NSC. She stated that once an agenda is available it will be forwarded to all the Board members. WTC received \$350,000 to complete their Plan. Ms. Hill requested Board members to forward information to the Commissioners for their public policy draft so that Eastern Washington receives adequate representation.

Mr. Keith Metcalf briefed the Board as to the status of various Eastern Washington WSDOT projects. Construction bids on many of these projects are coming in below estimates allowing WSDOT to begin funding some of their Tier 2 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) projects.

7. Transportation Manager's Report.

Ms. Micki Harnois noted that Mr. Glenn Miles was absent due to medical reasons and had asked Ms. Anna Ragaza-Bourassa to provide the Transportation Manager's Report.

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa provided an update on the West Plains-Spokane International Airport Study, stating that they are still gathering future development data from jurisdictions to accurately portray the 2030 transportation network and resolve any foreseeable problems.

She added that the Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) Street Standards subcommittee has reconvened and will soon review a list of existing street standards being compiled by each jurisdiction. Also, a TTC subcommittee reviewing STP and CMAQ funding criteria in order to incorporate non-motorized and transit elements hopes to have a draft of the STP applications ready for review at next week's TTC meeting.

Calibration efforts for the 2006 SRTC model are continuing; jurisdictions are to reply with comments by May 21st. Mr. Ryan Stewart will be incorporating the transit element into the 2008 SRTC model update. Ms. Nancy McLaughlin asked whether the model required calibration every year. Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa responded that it does not, but that the next calibration effort will occur after the 2010 Census data has been incorporated.

Ms. Latisha Hill asked Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa to introduce herself. Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa stated that she has worked for SRTC for six years. She was initially hired as an Air Quality Planner, but has newly promoted to Planning Supervisor to oversee and

coordinate the planning work performed by staff. She grew up in Rathdrum, Idaho, and attended WSU obtaining a degree in chemical engineering.

Mr. Jeff Selle briefed the Board on the recent state legislative process. He stated that the Greenhouse Gas Cap and Trade Bill died, but came close to passing. The bill would've required jurisdictions to implement a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) reduction program in their comprehensive plans. All comp plans and comp plan amendments would be required to document how VMT would be reduced. Mr. Selle stated that staff discussed with legislative representatives how VMT was not the right tool given current vehicle emission systems and alternatively fueled vehicles. He added that vehicles manufactured in 2009 will not longer require emission testing in the State of Washington and by 2019 the emission testing program will be eliminated. Mr. Keith Metcalf noted that with projects such as the NSC, emissions can be reduced by reducing the amount of vehicles sitting at intersections. Mr. Selle stated that staff will continue to work with legislative representatives in providing alternatives to reducing VMT.

Mr. Selle reported that House Bill 1825 passed requiring that as part of the Growth Management Act (GMA) planning process, cities and counties must plan for the inclusion of areas sufficient to accommodate specific types of urban growth, including, but not limited to, medical, governmental, institutional, commercial, service, retail, and other nonresidential uses. It also requires that in planning for county-wide economic development and employment under the GMA, counties must include consideration of the future development of commercial and industrial facilities. Mr. Selle emphasized the importance that this be considered in all regional governance discussions, adding that if this does not get interpreted and implemented correctly, the state will dictate how it will be done.

Mr. Selle reported that at the federal level, three Bridging the Valley (BTV) requests were submitted by the City of Spokane Valley and two requests were submitted by WSDOT, one for the NSC and one for US 195. He stated that significant progress is being made toward funding these projects. Ms. Diana Wilhite added that BTV is pushed as a joint state project making it more likely to receive funding.

Mr. Mark Richards noted that there were other projects submitted to the group, such as Bigelow Gulch, and asked whether SRTC advocated these in these legislative meetings. Mr. Selle stated that letters of support were submitted for every project submitted within the time limits. He added that he did not attend the recent trip to Washington D.C. and deferred the question to Ms. Wilhite who did. Ms. Wilhite stated that Bigelow Gulch was not discussed and explained that the other projects were easy sells; i.e., BTV involved two states, the NSC addresses freight-mobility issues, and the US 195 project addresses a highly publicized safety issue. She added that Bigelow Gulch needs to have a higher profile as to what the project provides for the region. Mr. Selle stated that from a Chamber perspective, a joint regional agenda was needed. Mr. Richard stated that this speaks to this issue on governance in that Bigelow Gulch was a project that was approved by the SRTC Board, is on the funding list, is a high priority, connects I-90 with US-395, has federal funding, and is shovel ready. He

stated that this was a mega project that was to be taken to Washington D.C. and that he was unaware that it had been taken off the list. Mr. Keith Metcalf stated that in defense of SRTC, this was a Chamber trip. When the GSI had their big tent meeting and identified priorities, Bigelow Gulch was not considered to be a high priority project. Ms. Wilhite noted that Mr. Todd Mielke also attended the Washington D.C. trip and was uncertain why he did not advocate the project. Ms. Hill noted that SRTC is a regional board and Bigelow Gulch is a regional project, therefore, it should be equally represented.

8. Old Business.

a) STA Request for SRTC Board Representation

Ms. Susan Meyer, Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Spokane Transit Authority (STA), introduced herself and thanked the Board for having twice rescheduled this presentation. She thanked STA Board members, Mayor Van Orman, Commissioner Richard, and Councilwoman McLaughlin.

Ms. Meyer handed out copies of the 2003 SRTC interlocal agreement, noting that the copy posted on the website is not the most recent version, and copies of her PowerPoint presentation. She noted that for the purposes of the presentation, she reminded those in attendance that SRTC is an organization that was created by WSDOT, STA, the City, and the County, and has membership involving 16 partners. She stated that SRTC is not a government, nor a government agency.

She previewed Section 2 of the interlocal agreement outlining the purpose, and it identifies the partners and the need for coordinated transportation among the County, City, WSDOT, and other members, which is an official category in the agreement that includes all of the other cities.

Ms. Meyer then referenced the STA proposal, approved in February 2009, which proposes to increase STA SRTC Board representation from 1 to 2. Their request specifies that one of the Board representatives be chosen by the STA Board, without the requirement that it be a small cities representative, and the other representative be the STA CEO. She reviewed in detail the basis for their proposal: 1) Legislative Intent, 2) Interlocal Agreement Representation Model, and 3) Share of SRTC Budget. Ms. Meyer concluded her presentation by outlining what the next steps would be, which included amending the interlocal agreement (requiring unanimous approval by all affected parties), and options for presentment: SRTC Board Members to take the STA proposal to their respective jurisdictions for action, and/or STA to take their proposal to respective parties for action.

Mr. Joe Shogan noted that this issue was addressed before and that there was a reason for an STA small representative on the Board, but that unless that reason can be reasserted, he didn't have a problem with STA having Board representation. He expressed concern, however, with STA having a two member representation, stating that neither WSDOT nor WTC has two members. The bodies representing SRTC are

primarily elected officials, putting them in a separate category as a public agency. Although he doesn't mind STA having their own representation on the SRTC Board, he felt that small cities would need to respond, however, as to whether or not they want that condition to still apply. He clarified that he didn't mind whether STA selected a staff member or an elected official who was an STA Board member.

Ms. Wendy Van Orman noted that it would then come down to the discussion of small cities, including Liberty Lake, Airway Heights, and the Cities of Cheney and Rockford. They noted that the small city jurisdictions have different compositions and to have one small town representative sitting on the SRTC Board would not be in the best interest of small cities. Ms. Nancy McLaughlin stated that she felt Ms. Meyer made an exceptional case for STA representation and agreed with the proposed two-member STA representation as presented.

Ms. Latisha Hill asked whether SRTC has representation on the STA Board. Ms. Meyer replied that there is not and it would necessitate having SRTC representation on all the city councils, noting that SRTC is created by the local jurisdictions. Ms. Hill stated that while she did not disagree that there should be a change at some level, she was concerned about revising the interlocal agreement for this issue only, knowing that it may need to be revised for the governance issue discussed earlier. Ms. McLaughlin recommended that the agreement be changed for STA representation as the groundwork for future changes, noting that the other issues could take much longer to resolve. Ms. Hill stated that based on the May 11th meeting, she felt that this wouldn't be the case.

Mr. Shogan asked how many STA Board members were also members of SRTC. It was noted that there are three. He asked how difficult it was for these SRTC Board members to divorce themselves from STA when sitting on the SRTC Board. He argued that there could be a total of five advocates for STA on the SRTC Board if STA was granted their representation request. Ms. Van Orman pointed out that the SRTC Board has technical expertise in Ms. Hill, Mr. Metcalf and Mr. Williams, but that no technical expertise from STA is represented. Mr. Shogan responded stating that while he doesn't have a problem with STA providing their own representation, he does have a problem with five positions connected with or directly from STA.

Extensive Board discussion continued with differing opinions expressed. Ms. Hill asked that the Board consider this request further and comprehensively, noting that there are many individuals who would want to sit on the SRTC Board and change the Board's composition. Noting the time and the need to maintain a quorum for a scheduled Executive Session, Board Chair, Micki Harnois, asked that the discussion be continued at next month's Board meeting.

Mr. Mark Richard left at approximately 2:55 p.m.

b) 2010 FY Unified Planning Work Program Approval

Ms. Harnois noted that the 2010 FY Unified Planning Work Program requires Board approval by May 26, 2008 per WSDOT.

Mr. Joe Shogan made a motion to approve the 2010 FY Unified Planning Work Program as presented. Mr. Keith Metcalf seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

9. New Business.

a) ARRA Cheney Spangle Road Improvements Scope Change Request

Mr. Todd Ableman and Mr. Ross Kelley briefed the Board regarding the ARRA Cheney Spangle Road Improvements, noting that the request is not a scope change, but rather a staging issue due to railroad agreement delays. The City wants to proceed in building the road portion of the project and will have a transition across the tracks and safe means for students to cross the tracks until the railroads can complete their portion. The railroads have changed their design by placing the sidewalks behind the gates and signals; the railroads portion of the project will be stage II.

Mr. Joe Shogan asked whether this request requires Board approval. Ms. Harnois responded that it did.

Mr. Joe Shogan made a motion to approve the ARRA Cheney Spangle Road Improvements request. Ms. Diana Wilhite seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Mr. Metcalf asked for clarification on several conditions needing to be met for the project to proceed. He stated that the letter from the mayor must have certified the cities funding portion commitment toward the project and noted that a letter from the Utilities and Transportation Commissioner (UTC) was also requested. Mr. Ableman stated that they are working out the details of the crossing and will submit the designs to Union Pacific and Burlington Northern Santa Fe for their approval. Once approved by the railroads, the designs will be forwarded to the UTC. Funds will be released contingent on obtaining all necessary approvals. The SRTC Board can still approve Cheney's request, but funding is contingent on these approvals.

b) STA 2009-2012 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

Spokane Transit Authority requested the following projects be amended into the 2009-2012 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP): New Projects: hybrid coaches, diesel coaches, security surveillance system; Funding Changes: preventative maintenance, transit enhancements. These projects have received ARRA funds.

Mr. Keith Metcalf made a motion to approve the STA 2009-2012 Transportation Improvement Program Amendments. Mr. Joe Shogan seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

c) Call for Projects for FTA Section 5316 and 5317 Funding

Mr. Ryan Stewart, reported that at the March 12, 2009 SRTC Board Meeting, the Board supported STA's request to be the designated recipient for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5316, Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC), and Section 5317, New Freedom, funding for the Spokane Urbanized Area (UZA). The Board also approved STA's request for SRTC's assistance in developing and administering a competitive grants process before funds are awarded.

Since the enactment of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) in 2005, the following apportionments have been made by FTA for fiscal years (FY) 2006 thru 2009 for the Spokane UZA:

	JARC	New Freedom
FY2006	\$178,704	\$88,628
FY2007	\$188,373	\$102,142
FY2008	\$204,071	\$110,338
FY2009*	\$87,770	\$47,456

* FY2009 is pro-rated approximately 5 months of FY2008 funding per a continuing resolution. Further funding is anticipated once the final FY2009 budget has been adopted.

Funding is available for obligation up to two years following the end of the fiscal year for which it was apportioned.

SRTC staff recommended Board approval for the release of the Call for Projects for Section 5316 and 5317 funds for the Spokane UZA.

Ms. Latisha Hill made a motion to release a Call for Projects for Section 5316 and 5317 funds for the Spokane UZA. Ms. Wendy Van Orman seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

d) City of Millwood Scope Revision Request of Argonne Road Rebuild

Mr. Keith Metcalf asked the Board what it had decided to do with leftover project money and what this scope revision would cost. Mr. Jeff Selle clarified that the City of Millwood scaled back the project last fall due to funding restrictions. Since then, however, construction cost estimates have come back lower than anticipated which allows for the entire original scope of the project to be funded. Funding for the project remains unchanged; no funds were ever returned to SRTC for reallocation. The City of Millwood is requesting only that the scope of the project be amended back to what was originally requested.

Mr. Metcalf asked what is set aside as contingencies in case these additional projects come in over budget. Mr. Shogan responded that he thought it comes back into a common pool for reallocation. Mr. Selle confirmed that this was the new policy approved by the Board. Mr. Metcalf asked how many projects have been advertised that are coming in under or over their estimated cost. Mr. Selle stated that this will be differed to Mr. Glenn Miles to address at next month's meeting.

Mr. Joe Shogan made a motion to approve the City of Millwood's Scope Revision Request of the Argonne Road Rebuild. Ms. Nancy McLaughlin seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

e) Spring 2009 Spokane Regional Bike Map

Ms. Anna Ragaza-Bourassa noted that the new 2009 Spokane Regional Bike Maps are available for distribution and copies were provided to Board members.

10. Public Comments.

Ms. Staci Lehman reported that SRTC is partnering with the Health District, the Lands Council, and a few other groups on the Commute Trip Reduction program and is hosting a webinar on Wednesday, May 20, 2009, from 12 noon to 1 pm, regarding carbon-free day. She noted that other communities have implemented this event, including Portland, Seattle and Bogota, Columbia, where certain streets or neighborhood areas are closed to vehicles and events are held encouraging the use of non-motorized modes of transportation. The purpose of the webinar is to consider how to start such an event here locally. Board members were invited to attend.

Mr. Paul Kropp stated that due to time constraints, he will hold his comments until the next Board meeting.

Ms. Micki Harnois thanked staff for participating in the Board meeting.

11. Executive Session—Personnel Matters.

Ms. Micki Harnois convened the Executive Session at 3:29 pm. Everyone except the Board Members was asked to leave the room. It was anticipated that the Executive Session would last until approximately 4:00 pm.

At 3:45 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 3:45 pm.

Donna Lively
Recording Secretary