

MEETING MINUTES

Spokane Regional Transportation Council Board
Thursday, September 10, 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 Vice-Chair, Ms. Diana Wilhite, at 1:03 pm.

2. Roll Call/Record of Attendance

Board Members in Attendance:

Diana Wilhite, City of Spokane Valley (Vice-Chair)
Latisha Hill, Washington State Transportation Commission
Mark Richard, Spokane County Commissioner
Todd Mielke, Spokane County Commissioner
Joe Shogan, City of Spokane Council Member
Nancy McLaughlin, City of Spokane Council Member
Keith Metcalf, WSDOT – Eastern Region

Board Members Not in Attendance:

Micki Harnois, Small Towns Representative (Chair)
Jim Williams, Private Sector Transportation Provider
Wendy Van Orman, Spokane Transit Authority

Guests Present:

Susan Meyer, CEO STA
Karl Otterstrom, STA
Neil Kersten, City of Spokane Valley
David Condon, Congresswoman McMorris
Rodgers Office
Paul Kropp, Neighborhood Alliance
Bill Gothmann, Transportation
Improvement Board (TIB), City of Spokane
Valley
Nick Lawshead, Desautel Hege
Communications

Staff Present:

Glenn Miles, Transportation Manager
Jeff Selle, Transportation Relations Mgr.
Ryan Stewart, Senior Transportation Planner
Anna Ragaza-Bourassa, Transportation
Planning Supervisor
Eve Nelson, Senior Transportation Planner
Bonnie Gow, Transportation Planner II

Donna Lively, Administrative Secretary

3. Board Action Items.

a) August 2009 SRTC Board Minutes

Mr. Todd Mielke asked whether a quorum was available of those Board members who attended last month's Board meeting in order to approve the minutes. Mr. Mark Richard stated that a report from legal staff at the Regional Health Department reiterated that those who were not present at a Board meeting can still vote to approve the minutes of that meeting, not necessarily the contents of the minutes. Abstaining from voting does not affect the quorum, and the minutes can still be approved as presented. Mr. Mielke chose to abstain since he felt he could not speak to the accuracy of the minutes.

Ms. Nancy McLaughlin made a motion to approve the August 13, 2009 meeting minutes. Ms. Latisha Hill seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved, except for Mr. Todd Mielke who abstained.

b) Approval of August Vouchers

Mr. Glenn Miles noted that Enduris is the insurance provider and the insurance is paid in an annual amount. Ms. Nancy McLaughlin asked whether HDR Engineering, Inc. was providing services other than what has normally been provided. Mr. Miles responded that HDR provided training and staff support during April and May. Ms. Diana Wilhite asked whether this detail should be added to the voucher. Mr. Miles stated that "on-call services" covers "training and staff support." Ms. McLaughlin asked whether the HDR contract is a yearly contract to which Mr. Miles responded that it is a 3 year contract broken into 1 year increments that is billed monthly.

Mr. Mark Richard made a motion to approve the payment of the August 2009 voucher list in the amount of \$180,577.66. Mr. Todd Mielke seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Recap for August 2009:	
Vouchers: V118849 - V118877	90,916.59
Salaries/Benefits: Warrant Nos: 1409525 - 1409540 and 1413690 - 1413704	89,110.80
Interfund and other expenses processed directly by the City of Spokane	550.27
	<hr/>
	180,577.66

4. Public Comments.

Mr. Mark Richard asked City of Spokane Valley Council member, Mr. Bill Gothmann, to share what he has learned of his appointment to the Board. Mr. Gothmann stated he has recently been appointed to the Transportation Improvement Board and has met with Director Steve Gorcester for an orientation. He noted that there are still several active projects in the County, one on the Director's watch list that he has spoken with Neil Kersten about.

A Board meeting is scheduled for September 24-25th in Yakima, WA. One of the agenda items addresses the "Executive Watch Projects," which are projects that are delayed beyond expectations. The Valley's Park Bridge project is included and has been delayed due to insufficient funds.

Mr. Gothmann stated that he intends to meet and talk with the various transportation contacts in each of the jurisdictions. He encouraged Board members to contact him if there is anything he can do to help them. Ms. Nancy McLaughlin asked Mr. Gothmann for his cell phone number since she sits on the National League of Cities' Transportation Steering Committee.

Ms. Diana Wilhite noted that Mr. Gothmann has been a City Councilmember for almost 4 years and is an Engineer by trade who has built his own airplane and house. She noted that Mr. Gothmann has been invited to attend SRTC committee meetings when available. Mr. Gothmann stated that he has already visited with Mr. Miles to get a better understanding of the SRTC Board.

5. Committee Reports and Recommendations.

a) Transportation Technical Committee Report – No Meeting in August

Mr. Glenn Miles stated that there was nothing to report on behalf of the Transportation Technical Committee; however, he will soon be involved in the STP application scoring process.

b) Inland Pacific Hub (IPH) Update – Ryan Stewart

Mr. Ryan Stewart noted that due to staffing changes, his role will be to provide coordination of the Advisory Board and the Executive Committee. Mr. Jeff Selle will continue to provide support from a legislative and policy perspective.

The revised Technical Memo One has been received and the comments submitted, the consensus of the reviewing members being that the quality is vastly improved. The summary of comments was sent to the consultants on September 3, 2009. Also, the County profile document is currently being reviewed and the deadline for comments is September 15th.

An Executive Committee meeting is scheduled for September 15th at 8:00 am at the Liberty Lake Library and the next Advisory Board meeting is scheduled for October 8th at 7:00 am at Center Place. An agenda and meeting packet is forthcoming, along with a website: www.inlandpacifichub.org.

6. Administrative Matters.

a) SRTC Board Change Discussion – Diana Wilhite

Ms. Diana Wilhite reported that at the last SRTC Board Meeting, the Board approved the SRTC proposed Board changes as presented by the Policy Subcommittee. However, since both County representatives were absent, she wanted to bring it back up for discussion to reconfirm what the Board had agreed upon. She has also been tasked by the City of Spokane Valley City Council to make a suggestion. She asked for comments from the Board regarding the vote on the make up of the Board.

Mr. Mark Richard responded that it was not identified on the agenda, and that the Board had agreed to a two-touch process. Ms. Wilhite stated that the Board discussed voting on the changes in September and that the Board was perhaps over zealous in their decision. Mr. Richard stated that although jurisdictions will have the opportunity to weigh in on the changes when presented with the final interlocal agreement, it is an owner's task that should first be addressed by the Board. Mr. Mielke stated that he did not disagree with Mr. Richard's comments regarding the process; however, he opined that what was adopted was not inconsistent to what had been discussed along the way.

Ms. Latisha Hill reported that she received a request by Ms. Beth Thew who attended the Big Tent Meeting to have an STA union representative sit on the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC). Numerous requests/suggestions have been received regarding the composition of the TAC; consequently, the policy sub-committee needs to meet again and solicit Board member feedback with regard to this issue. She encouraged Board members to provide feedback for sub-committee consideration. Mr. Mielke stated that should the Board consider labor/union representation, some nexus of transportation must be included. Ms. Susan Meyer noted that STA's Union, Amalgamated Transit Union, has getting a position on the Board of Transit and the Board of MPOs as one of their objectives.

Ms. Wilhite reported that the Spokane Valley City Council has asked her to inquire whether or not the Board would entertain the idea of revising the Board composition population criteria from 50,000 – 100,000 to 50,000 – 85,000 so that the City of Spokane Valley could have 2 Board representatives. Mr. Todd Mielke expressed concern with regard to the appearance of manipulating the formula for one, or a limited number of jurisdictions. The purpose of addressing small town representation was due to the fact that towns with populations less than 5,000 people do not have the resources to engage more complex transportation staff; it is typically contracted out. The Board has attempted to make strategic adjustments to its composition. With regard to population, the City of Spokane Valley is well on its way to hitting the next step and has faired well with transportation allocations over the past year. Therefore, he does not see that there is a problem.

Ms. Wilhite stated that the vote that was passed by the Board is what will be used to craft changes to the interlocal agreement, with the exception of what has yet to be decided for the City of Spokane. Mr. Miles reported that Mayor Mary Verner with the City of Spokane has expressed an interest in occupying one of the seats on the SRTC Board. Ms. Nancy McLaughlin was asked whether or not the City has had the discussion as to whether or not the interlocal agreement should be changed to reflect

the change in representation. Ms. McLaughlin stated that she would check and get back to the Board on this issue prior to the October Board meeting. With regard to the Board composition, Mr. Todd Mielke reiterated that the Board is comprised primarily of elected officials and not their representatives.

Mr. Joe Shogan arrived at 1:27 p.m.

b) SRTC Fall Board Retreat – Bear Creek Lodge, Mt. Spokane

Ms. Wilhite stated that the SRTC Fall Board Retreat will be held on October 8, 2009 at Bear Creek Lodge at Mount Spokane from 9 am to 3 pm. Mr. Miles stated that included on the agenda will be discussions on governance, visioning, and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). Ms. Wilhite requested that Board members review the introduction through the first map in the MTP in preparation for revising the MTP to incorporate events that occurred in 2008, visioning, and missing transportation elements. Mr. Miles stated that the final draft interlocal agreement will also be addressed; any other agenda items should be forwarded to Board Chair, Ms. Micki Harnois.

The address was noted as 24817 North Mt. Spokane Park Drive and is located prior to the park entrance. Cell phone service is unavailable at this location.

c) SRTC/TMC Office Remodel Recommendation – Bonnie Gow

Ms. Bonnie Gow provided the Board with an update of the SRTC/TMC Office Remodel. She stated that SRTC has been leasing the additional space since August of 2008. A floor plan was formulated based on staff input and includes a small, medium, and large conference room; the large one to accommodate up to 40 people at the table.

Ms. Gow added that there will be 17 office spaces for the 15 employees with room for growth, and approximately 500 square feet will be allocated to the TMC. Ms. Gow and Ms. Sue Arnesen met with the architect who felt that the remodel could be done design built, depending on whether or not the contract was \$50,000 or less to avoid the formal bid process. Several contractors estimated the remodel costs to be between \$75,000 to \$85,000, not including architect fees. The cost automatically increases for being a government agency due to prevailing wage requirements. It was suggested that Kiemle & Hagood would manage the construction, since the remodel becomes an asset to building, and the lease with the City of Spokane would be amended to recoup the improvement costs over the 15 year lease. Mr. Joe Shogan asked who staff was coordinating with at the City level; staff noted that they are working with Kay Bachman.

Staff recommends the Board authorize the Executive Director to negotiate and execute the SRTC/TMC office addition/remodel construction contract and amended the lease with Kiemle & Hagood Company, in an amount not to exceed \$85,000. SRTC is anticipating the total cost to be anywhere from \$60,000 to \$85,000.

Ms. Nancy McLaughlin asked how the remodel will be paid for. Mr. Miles responded that the cost becomes part of the indirect cost rate reimbursable through the federal grant process. The lease could also be recapitalized through the use of CMAQ funds. In addition, competition should keep costs down. It was recommended to obtain as many bids as possible. Mr. Shogan reported that the City has had bids submitted 30-40% less than estimated on some of their contracts.

Mr. Todd Mielke made a motion to authorize staff to negotiate and contract for the SRTC office improvements as described by staff in an amount not to exceed \$85,000. Mr. Joe Shogan seconded the motion, which was unanimously carried.

d) 2009 Employee Handbook (sent to Board via email)

Mr. Glenn Miles outlined the recent changes (indicated in red) made to the handbook based on legal council review. He stated that the progressive discipline language was put back into the document on page 29. Also, even though employment is “at will,” an appeals process has been added for demotions or terminations, which is currently in the personnel policy. The appeals would be directed to the Board Chair within ten days of filing.

Mr. Joe Shogan asked for clarification of “unacceptable behavior.” Mr. Miles responded that general rules of conduct are included on page 7. Ms. Latisha Hill asked whether a section on “exit interviews” was included. Mr. Miles stated that there was not, but that one will be added. Mr. Todd Mielke stated that there was a small typographical error on page 30; “Please note” was misspelled as “Please not.”

It was noted that these revisions are to an existing employee handbook and that legal staff and City Human Resource Department staff have reviewed the document and provided comments/edits. Staff also reviewed the proposed revisions and provided valuable feedback on updates. Ms. Wilhite stated that the Board will take action on the final version of the 2009 Employee Handbook at its retreat in October.

Mr. Mielke asked for clarification regarding #27 of the general rules of conduct on page 7, which states: Failure to comply with SRTC or departmental procedures or rules, and whether these “procedures or rules” are spelled out somewhere in another document. Mr. Miles responded that there are written protocols for various positions. It was noted that the SRTC structure would need to be changed once finalized.

7. Old Business.

a) Regional Transportation Priorities (Status Report) – Jeff Selle

Mr. Jeff Selle provided handouts regarding the recent regional transportation priorities call for projects, including the criteria used to score projects from the last call for projects, a timeline, and a list of existing regional transportation priority projects. The documents were based on last year’s legislative request that a regional priority list be compiled.

Mr. Selle stated that this year, the Chamber is requesting a prioritized list for the state and federal legislative process; the goal being to have one regional agenda for state and federal funding purposes or other available funding programs.

Mr. Selle stated that prior to the July 20th Big Tent meeting, Mr. Miles sent out an email regarding funding for three types of calls for projects: TIGER grant, regional priorities, and STP. A timeline for the TIGER grant was set for September 17th; the STP deadline was extended from August 7th to September 14th, and the regional priority project deadline is also September 14th. Only one project for regional priorities was submitted by STA.

Mr. Selle stated that rather than hold hard to that deadline, he would call jurisdictions to discuss and update last year's list of regional projects. He stated that some of the projects on the list received funding last year and that some are farther along in progress (e.g., Fish Lake Trail). The projects will need to be rescored and reprioritized and new projects added. Mr. Joe Shogan asked whether the Post Street Bridge was still a viable project. Mr. Selle replied that he would check with Kathryn Miller. Mr. Shogan asked whether the lists were all for federal funding, to which Mr. Selle replied that they are not. Mr. Selle stated that the existing list was not used for federal funding last year, but that a separate list was used.

The deadline for the TIGER grant funding has passed; STP applications are due by Monday, September 14th and will be scored the following week. Mr. Selle stated that he has compiled a committee to review the regional priority projects, many of whom participated in the process last year. Mr. Glenn Miles stated that the final list will serve as the advocacy wing of Spokane; a unified voice for the region in soliciting state, federal and alternate forms of funding.

Ms. McLaughlin asked whether the scoring criteria were the same for all three call for projects. Mr. Miles responded that they are not. Ms. Susan Meyer asked when the criteria for the regional projects were approved. Mr. Selle stated that it was last year under a tight deadline. Ms. Wilhite suggested that the Board consider whether or not the criteria should be revised. Mr. Miles stated that if the criteria were to be changed, all existing projects would need to be rescored and re-ranked. Mr. Selle stated that the criteria were based on the Senate Transportation Committee's priorities for ranking projects. Ms. McLaughlin asked how projects get initial funding to get on the list. Mr. Miles responded that for the STP projects, specifically allocated funds are available for preliminary engineering and design. This allows projects to be scored better for when TIB funds or a regional mobility grant becomes available.

Mr. Todd Mielke stated that the Board may want to check whether or not the legislature intends to use the same criteria it used last year, since it appears that the federal government is transitioning their criteria. Mr. David Condon commented that there are two pieces to the transportation appropriation process: the formula currently used and the add-ons. He concurred that there should be a unified regional message; however, there will be opportunities throughout the process to do the smaller projects. Mr. Mielke asked whether the projects currently on the list will be rescored. Mr. Selle

responded that they would. He added that in July, the Big Tent group asked SRTC to utilize the existing list for a regional agenda. He noted that flexibility will be required due to legislative priorities and agendas.

Mr. Shogan asked whether there are any particular state funds that can be identified. Mr. Miles stated that the approach has been that it doesn't matter what the color of the money is as long as it is money.

Ms. McLaughlin commented that the Board has been working hard to restore its authority and reiterated the fact that the Big Tent group may advise the Board on matters, but the Board is the decision making body on transportation issues. She requested that the transportation information be brought to the Board for decision making purposes. Also, Ms. McLaughlin asked whether the Board should approve the scoring committee. Ms. Wilhite concurred stating that this should be discussed. Ms. Susan Meyer requested that STA be allowed to appoint a member to the scoring committee. Mr. Selle stated that in his defense, he was tasked to put the committee together from last year. Ms. Wilhite stated that this should then be brought to the Board as a recommendation for approval. Mr. Miles noted that staff is attempting to maintain consistency so that it cannot be construed that SRTC is reinventing the wheel every year. Staff wanted to update the Board on the process to ensure they were comfortable with the approach being taken.

Mr. Shogan concurred with Ms. McLaughlin noting that there seems to be a tug of war between SRTC and the Big Tent body. He stated that the question is: who is charged with transportation planning for the region? Mr. Miles emphasized that on July 14th, the Board authorized staff to commence the process of engaging the community through the Big Tent Meeting to look at STP, TIGER and regional priority projects. He then reviewed the process timeline. Ms. Wilhite noted that what is missing is the September 10th Board meeting date specifying Board authorization for staff to contact the various jurisdictions to update the project list and that the Board will appoint the scoring committee. Mr. Miles continued, noting that the prioritized regional project list would be sent to the Board and the TTC. The Board will review the list at their retreat in October and set project priorities at its November meeting, after being reviewed by the TTC in October.

Mr. Mark Richard asked whether it would make sense, given the tight time line, to have a community dialogue. Mr. Miles stated that staff can put the list out for a public comment period and on the SRTC website in order to solicit public comments. The Board concurred with the suggestion. Mr. Shogan clarified that the notice should be clear in specifying that it is public comments that are needed, not their approval. Mr. Miles stated that for the community support criteria, the more local jurisdiction, business, advocacy, regional organization and legislative support a project has, the more points it will receive. Mr. Miles noted that with regard to the criteria issue, the TIGER grant process had similar requirements, i.e., is the project regionally significant, is it ready, does it provide access and mobility using multi-model means, does it have community support, reduce green house gas emissions, does it have financial support and a financial strategy. He added that from a federal and state level, the criteria used

to score the local SRTC projects was ahead of its time. Mr. Mielke concurred, but questioned whether the headings are called out in such a way as to get attention.

Ms. Susan Meyer asked how a multi-year project strategy would be reflected, i.e., funding needed for the current year vs. the entire project. Mr. Karl Otterstrom added that the challenge is in how the Board policy will be applied to each project, whether it is in phases or towards the entire project. Mr. Miles noted that what worked well during his last Washington D.C. trip was to talk about the entire project, but then lay out a strategy for funding dependent upon available funding sources. Mr. Richard commented that it brings up a good point in that it needs to be in the context of a long range strategy. The Board needs to address how the projects are scored and there is an advantage of scoring them in phases.

Mr. Mielke stated that one of the items for discussion at the Board retreat should be how regional projects on the refined list are marketed at the legislative level based on the comprehensive list that is continually being worked on. Mr. Selle concurred stating that there must be a comprehensive list along with the flexibility to draw from the list whenever funding opportunities arise. Mr. Mark Richard stated that this issue needs to be hammered out in order to have a policy that Board members advocating for SRTC, its policy and projects, at a congressional level will adhere to.

The Board briefly discussed the make-up of the scoring committee. Mr. Selle stated that the committee will need to meet prior to his presentation to the Chamber on September 30th. Ms. Wilhite asked the Board whether they were in agreement in allowing Ms. Meyer to select a transit advocate (not a staff member) for the scoring committee and provide the name to Mr. Selle. The Board was in agreement.

Mr. Joe Shogan made a motion to approve the Regional Priority Scoring Committee as amended. Ms. Latisha Hill seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

b) STP Project Applications – Anna Ragaza-Bourassa

Ms. Anna Ragaza-Bourassa directed Board members to the STP Project Application memo contained in their Board packet, which included a timeline. She noted that what was not included in the timeline was that the criteria was adopted by the Board at its July 9th meeting.

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa stated that the STP applications are due on Monday, September 14, 2009, and that this deadline was an extension based on feedback at the July 29th workshop. Scoring the applications is tentatively scheduled for September 24th and 25th. A prioritized list is expected to be presented to the TTC at their October 21, 2009 meeting.

Mr. Mielke asked for a reminder as to what categories of projects are eligible for STP funding. Mr. Miles responded that there are four categories of projects, whether urban or rural, eligible for STP funding: capital, rehabilitation, and preliminary engineering and design. Mr. Mark Richard asked why SRTC planners would score the STP

applications, even though it is past practice, when a citizen's advisory group is scoring the regional priority projects. Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa asked for Board feedback based on the discussion from the last agenda item. Mr. Selle stated that the Big Tent meeting group selected the regional priority scoring committee due to the legislative agenda and tight time frame at the time. Mr. Richard responded that he is more interested in the quality of the outcome. Mr. Miles noted that staff typically scores the projects since they do not have a project to be scored. Mr. Richard argued that everyone has their filters and bias and projects that they believe in. Mr. Miles noted that the scored projects are then brought to the TTC for vetting. SRTC staff, Ms. Eve Nelson, added that in the past, jurisdictions who have not submitted projects have assisted staff in scoring the projects.

Mr. David Condon suggested that it is a qualified vs. most qualified issue. The TTC is qualified to prioritize projects while the Board (most qualified) does the selection of projects eligible for funding.

Mr. Keith Metcalf asked how much STP funding is available; Mr. Miles responded: \$10 million. Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa noted that the TTC took great effort into removing subjectivity from the scoring process.

Ms. Nancy McLaughlin made a motion to approve the STP timeline as presented. Mr. Joe Shogan seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Ms. Wilhite suggested addressing the make-up of the STP scoring committee at the Board Retreat.

8. New Business.

a) Mark Fenton Walkable Communities Workshop, September 29th – Eve Nelson

Ms. Eve Nelson stated that she hoped all Board members received an invitation to attend a civic leader's breakfast scheduled for September 29th and is sponsored by SRTC, the Spokane Health District, the YMCA, and the City of Spokane. The event will host foremost pedestrian advocate, Mr. Mark Fenton. Originally he planned to talk with planners and engineers, however, he stressed the need to talk to civic leaders as well regarding the core elements of multi-modal transportation and the need for strong policies and solutions. Ms. Nelson then outlined Mr. Fenton's qualifications.

Ms. Nelson noted that the format of the breakfast with engineers and civic leaders included a walk through downtown. She encouraged Board members to send their engineers and staff to the event, since when drafting the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan the complaint was that a shortage in training exists. Later in the afternoon, Mr. Fenton will meet with School District officials and in the evening, will engage advocates at a town hall meeting to discuss how they can take multi-modal transportation to the next level.

Ms. Nelson noted that an R.S.V.P. is requested for the Health District, which was also included in the email that they received. Mr. Shogan stated that he would notify Mr. Richard Rush who has been the City's point man on this topic.

Mr. Shogan asked whether anyone knew the status of the SmartRoutes program. Ms. Nelson responded that the committee will be meeting to determine their destiny; however, with regard to funding, the transportation bill is inconclusive but is unlikely to be favorable.

9. Transportation Manager's Report.

Ms. Wilhite asked Mr. Miles, Mr. Mielke, and Mr. Metcalf to brief the Board on their recent trip to Washington D.C. to promote the North Spokane Corridor (NSC). Mr. Miles reported that they met with Senator Murray at 9 a.m. over coffee and it was communicated that what was being requested was within the realm of possibility in the Authorization Bill. Mr. Miles stated that the focus of the trip was to educate the congressional delegation on the NSC. They met with the Associated General Contractors (AGC) regarding issues pertaining to Spokane as well as with Mr. Victor Mendez, Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration, and his staff. Mr. Mendez read everything provided to him in advance and asked pointed, articulate questions regarding Spokane and the NSC. He is the former Director of the Arizona Department of Transportation and understands the business very well.

Mr. Mielke complimented Mr. Miles and Mr. Metcalf on how well they represented the community and conveying technical expertise (demographics, environmental issues, etc.) at the legislative level. He noted that staff for Senator Murray and Congresswoman McMorris Rodgers was very engaged, although Senator Cantwell's staff was harder to read. Mr. Metcalf reported that all optimistic that the NSC is a good project, but cautioned regarding the competition.

Rich Hadley, Betsy Coles, Wayne Brokaw, and Tim Welsh (from Good Roads) also attended. Mr. Metcalf noted that diversity of the group all having a single focus and the broad community support given to the project were advantageous. Mr. Miles stated that Senator Cantwell holds seats on both the Science, Commerce and Transportation and the Finance committees. Although appropriations is important, it is not nearly as important as the authorization and Senator Cantwell is in a position to greatly help the project.

Mr. Shogan congratulated staff on the clean audit.

Mr. David Condon provided Mr. Keith Metcalf with a letter from Congresswoman McMorris Rodgers in support of the NSC to be included in the application, stating that she will also give it to Mr. Ray LaHood. He added that they heard that Governor Gregoire intends to endorse the SR 520, the NSC and the Columbia River Crossing only.

Mr. Miles reported that the KMPO Board met in executive session this morning and interviewed Wilbur Smith & Associates at 8 a.m. and Mr. Miles (SRTC) at 10 a.m. for the KMPO service contract. Upon adjourning the executive session, the Board voted to renew the KMPO service contract with SRTC for another three years.

10. SRTC Board Member Comments.

Mr. Mark Richard reminded the Board of tomorrow's Council of Government (COG) meeting starting at 10:00 a.m. until 12 noon. There will be an opening ceremony with the Base Commander for a 9/11 memorial and a ribbon cutting ceremony for the County Fair followed by the COG meeting. He stated that Mr. Rich Hadley and Mr. Wayne Brokaw are providing an update on the recent Washington DC trip and NSC support letters will be circulated for signature.

Mr. Todd Mielke reported that at the last Big Tent meeting, there was little (if any) opposition to the proposed Board composition changes. It was noted that the next meeting is tentatively scheduled for November 28th.

Ms. Latisha Hill reported that the Commission raised ferry fares this week by 2.5% and they dropped the Super Summer Surcharge. The next regional meeting will be held in Yakima on September 22nd.

Mr. Keith Metcalf reported that the NSC ribbon cutting ceremony was successful thanks to the community and regional support.

Mr. Mark Richard stated that Mr. Mielke and Mayor Mary Verner will be giving a presentation at the COG meeting on the transportation benefit district for area officials' consideration.

Ms. Susan Meyer asked whether jurisdictions have been notified on providing Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) annual updates. Mr. Miles responded that staff is behind schedule due to the 2030 model update, but that notifications will be sent out as soon as possible.

11. Adjournment.

There being no further business before the Spokane Regional Transportation Council Board, the meeting was adjourned at 3:30 pm.

Donna Lively
Recording Secretary