

## **2009 SRTC BOARD RETREAT MINUTES**

Spokane Regional Transportation Council Board  
Thursday October 8, 2009  
Bear Creek Lodge  
24817 N Mt. Spokane Park Dr.  
Mead, WA 99021-9740  
9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

### **Opening Remarks and Schedule of the Day**

#### **SRTC Board Regular Business Items**

##### **a. Call to Order for Regular October Board Meeting**

The meeting of the Spokane Regional Transportation Council was called to order by Chair, Ms. Micki Harnois, at 9:32 am.

##### **b. Roll Call**

###### Board Members in Attendance:

Micki Harnois, Small Towns Representative (Chair)  
Diana Wilhite, City of Spokane Valley (Vice-Chair)  
Mark Richard, Spokane County Commissioner  
Todd Mielke, Spokane County Commissioner  
Nancy McLaughlin, City of Spokane Council Member  
Wendy Van Orman, Spokane Transit Authority  
Latisha Hill, Washington State Transportation Commission  
Keith Metcalf, WSDOT – Eastern Region  
Stan Schwartz, SRTC Legal Counsel

###### Board Members Not in Attendance:

Joe Shogan, City of Spokane Council Member  
Jim Williams, Private Sector Transportation Provider

###### Guests Present:

Susan Meyer, CEO STA  
Katherine Miller, City of Spokane  
Richard Rush, City of Spokane Council  
Member  
Larry Ehl, WSDOT Federal Relations  
Manager  
Kim Zentz, Inland Pacific Hub Co-Chair  
Paul Kropp, Neighborhood Alliance

###### Staff Present:

Glenn Miles, Transportation Manager  
Jeff Selle, Transportation Relations Mgr.  
Staci Lehman, Public Education/Information  
Coordinator  
Anna Ragaza-Bourassa, Transportation  
Planning Supervisor

**c. Minutes of the September 10, 2009 SRTC Board Meeting**

Diana Wilhite noted a misspelling of the word ‘ferry’ in the third paragraph under SRTC Board Member Comments.

**Ms. Diana Wilhite made a motion to approve the September 10, 2009 meeting minutes as corrected. Ms. Nancy McLaughlin seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved, except for Ms. Wendy Van Orman and Ms. Micki Harnois who abstained.**

Todd Mielke arrived at 9:36 a.m.

**d. Approval of September Vouchers**

**Mr. Mark Richard made a motion to approve the payment of the September 2009 voucher list in the amount of \$117,312.10. Ms. Diana Wilhite seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.**

Recap for September 2009:	
Vouchers: V118878 to V118906	35,953.09
Salaries/Benefits: Warrant Nos: 1416443 - 1416457 and 1419174 -1419188	80,685.06
Interfund, other expenses, and reimbursements processed directly by the City of Spokane	673.95
	<hr/>
	117,312.10

**e. SRTC Employee Handbook (action)**

Mr. Miles noted that based on Board member comments at the September Board meeting, employee exit interviews was added to the SRTC Employee Handbook. Mr. Miles will conduct the interviews but employees also have the option of requesting a meeting with Board members.

Ms. Wilhite had a question about item 27 on page 7 under ‘General Rules of Conduct.’ The item mentions ‘failure to comply with SRTC procedures or rules.’ Ms. Wilhite asked what rules this refers to. Mr. Miles stated that the handbook is considered to be those rules.

Latisha Hill asked why the punishment for violating the rules on page 9 under ‘Nondisclosure and Confidential Use of Information’ is a monetary fine instead of disciplinary action. Mr. Miles explained that SRTC staff work with highly confidential data from the Employment Security Department and are required to sign a release agreeing to pay a fine if the information is divulged. Ms. Hill suggested a provision stating that in addition to disciplinary action, a monetary fine could result from divulging that information.

Ms. Van Orman suggested adding ‘Spokane Transit’ to the list of agencies on page 1 of the handbook that make up SRTC and asked if the handbook is going to reflect what the amended Interlocal Agreement will say about SRTC’s structure. Mr. Miles stated

that the handbook will be amended later to reflect any changes made to the interlocal agreement.

**Mr. Mark Richard made a motion to approve the SRTC Employee Handbook with changes as noted. Mr. Todd Mielke seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.**

**f. SRTC/KMPO Contract Renewal (action)**

Mr. Miles noted that the contract recently awarded to SRTC to conduct transportation planning duties for Kootenai Metropolitan Planning Organization's (KMPO) is ready for Board review/consideration.

Mr. Keith Metcalf reminded the Board that earlier this year there was talk of the need for better coordination between the two boards and was wondering if steps have been taken to start that process. Ms. Harnois said she contacted KMPO Chair, Jimmie Dorsey, but never received a reply. Mr. Miles suggested that she try again after the first of the year.

Mr. Todd Mielke noted that the termination clause included in the contract states only that KMPO can terminate the contract but doesn't offer an out for SRTC to do the same, or that the termination clause doesn't include a 30-day notice period. Ms. Wendy Van Orman made a motion that attorney Stan Schwartz review the contract. Mr. Miles said he would have Mr. Schwartz work with Attorney Pat Dalton at the City of Spokane on this.

Mr. Richard asked if the Board is comfortable with the for-cause termination clause. Mr. Miles noted that part of the reasoning behind it being "for-cause" is to encourage the agencies involved to work out problems that arise rather than immediately cancel the contract. There is also a recoup clause saying that SRTC will be reimbursed for expenses incurred up to the date of termination. Mr. Metcalf suggested either making the last sentence of the first paragraph under 'Termination' more unilateral so that both KMPO and SRTC have a 'walk away' clause or eliminate it altogether so neither party has an easy way out of the contract.

Mr. Miles said edits will be taken back to the KMPO Board, as the current contract is valid until Oct. 31. Mr. Miles said this item will be brought back to the Board in November.

**g. Regional Transportation Project Priorities (status report)**

Jeff Selle handed out a spreadsheet of regional priority projects compiled as a result of a call for projects to update last years' list. The list will be updated annually with new projects.

The projects were scored by a non-jurisdictional team, including Barb Chamberlain of WSU Spokane, Judy Cole of Avista, Joe Torterelli of the Good Roads Association,

citizen Paul Kropp, Frank Tombari of the Joint Transportation Committee, and Matt Ewers of Inland Empire Distribution Systems. The process was vetted by Greater Spokane Incorporated.

The scoring team was asked to identify their top three capital projects, top two non-motorized projects, and top three studies. Ms. Hill asked for the list in Excel format with a note saying where money is coming from for each project so Board members can thank the people responsible for securing funding.

The list of projects will be taken to the TTC for a motion for the Board to approve it and Greater Spokane Incorporated has agreed to add it to their legislative packet.

Mr. Richard suggested that some sort of outside peer review group look over the future scoring of priority projects. Mr. Metcalf asked about the scoring process as some projects didn't rank as high as he would have expected. Mr. Selle said the individual scores were averaged for each project.

There was discussion on how to weigh 'connector' projects in the future, such as packaging together projects like Farwell, NSC, Bigelow Gulch and the Sullivan/Bridging The Valley project to present as 'mega projects,' which would be weighted heavier.

Ms. Hill asked what education scoring committee members receive prior to ranking the projects. Mr. Selle said scorers are given a week to read through the projects, then jurisdictions that submitted projects are asked to answer any questions from the committee.

Mr. Schwartz suggested that the Board approve the scoring process in the future. Mr. Richard asked to have it noted in the Board meeting minutes that everyone involved anticipates the scoring process will be changed for next year.

### **New Agenda Item:**

Mr. Miles handed out results of the Surface Transportation Program (STP) call for projects. 75 applications were submitted for approximately \$10 million in funding that will be available for STP projects. The projects were scored by SRTC planners. The list presented is *not* in rank order.

Ms. Nancy McLaughlin asked what criteria was used to score the projects. Mr. Miles said that the projects were ranked using criteria developed by a subcommittee of all the area jurisdictions. Ms. Susan Meyer suggested including the project sponsor next to each project name so that it will be obvious who is behind which project and whether a project has been included in the House Infrastructure Bill.

Mr. Richard noted a typographical error on the Bigelow Gulch project; a zero was missing in the price.

The STP projects list will go to the TTC later this month for a recommendation for Board approval.

Ms. Harnois asked for any public comment then adjourned the Board meeting portion of the meeting at 10:50 a.m.

#### **h. Public Comments**

There were no public comments.

#### **i. Adjournment of the Regular SRTC Board Meeting**

There being no further business before the Spokane Regional Transportation Council Board, the Regular Business meeting was adjourned at 10:50 a.m.

### **SRTC BOARD RETREAT**

The SRTC Board Retreat was called to order at 11:10 a.m.

#### **New Agenda Item:**

Ms. Kim Zentz, Co-Chair for the Inland Pacific Hub (IPH), reported on the IPH project stating that the project is behind schedule because the IPH group will not accept anything less than a quality product. She thanked SRTC for their work on technical reviews, as well as Ms. Char Kay with WSDOT and her counterparts in Idaho.

Ms. Zentz stated that the next step is public outreach and education/communication. The consultant hired for the IPH project will talk about their initial findings in November/December. Public workshops will be used to get reactions from business leaders and the general public and all input will be incorporated into a final report that will help define Phase 2 of the IPH project.

### **Session I – MPO/RPTO Responsibilities**

#### **a. Legal/Statutory Requirements Presentation**

Mr. Miles gave a power point presentation on the legal/statutory requirements of MPOs. He anticipates a big change in the role of MPOs in the near future, especially if Spokane and Kootenai County are made a consolidated statistical area following the 2010 census. If this happens, it will be up to the two MPOs to decide whether or not to merge. Such a merger would be beneficial to KMPO since they stand to gain greater funding than if they were to remain their own entity. Airway Heights will also most likely be considered part of the urbanized area following the 2010 census.

Mr. Miles reviewed the five core functions of an MPO:

- Prepare and maintain a Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP).
- Establish and manage a fair and impartial setting for regional decision-making.

- Identify and evaluate alternative transportation options via various planning methods.
- Develop a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) – a four-year program of transportation improvements based on the long-range transportation plan.
- Involve the general public in the four essential functions listed above.

Mr. Miles explained the documents SRTC is responsible for developing, including the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), MTP, and the TIP. Mr. Mielke asked for clarification on how the UPWP fits with the TIP and MTP. Mr. Miles explained that the UPWP lists exactly what projects will be tackled in the upcoming year, such as studies, modeling, etc. and sets out tasks and activities that need to be completed in order to complete the MTP and TIP. All activity leading up to having a project included in the MTP goes into the UPWP.

Mr. Miles stated that every jurisdiction is required to use the same process to get their projects in the MTP, although some try to get around doing this, due mostly to political pressure. The criteria are outlined in each local agency guideline manual.

Mr. Schwartz encouraged Board members to read .030, .026, .023, 47.80, .030, and .040 of the Revised Code of Washington as these sections clarify what the SRTC Board is about.

Mr. Miles discussed Comprehensive Plan amendments and the struggle to get jurisdictions to use the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Checklist that SRTC developed since SRTC is an advisory agency and can not enforce adherence to it.

**Lunch – Guest Speaker, Larry Ehl (WSDOT)**

Mr. Larry Ehl of the Washington State Department of Transportation presented a lunchtime PowerPoint presentation on Federal Funding 101. His presentation covered items such as how much transportation funding Washington State receives, TEA project funding by region, the earmark process, technical assistance for local agencies, 2010-2011 Federal Transportation funding opportunities, and the typical budget process timetable. Mr. Ehl said that he would send his PowerPoint presentation to Mr. Miles to distribute to retreat attendees.

**b. Draft Interlocal Agreement Review and Recommendations**

SRTC Legal Counsel, Mr. Stan Schwartz, reviewed SRTC’s draft Interlocal Agreement. He noted that page 2 lists the different types of entities that SRTC could be. He stated that currently, SRTC is legally a joint venture but may eventually want to become a non-profit organization. A handout was provided regarding the development of a future transportation advisory committee.

Attendees provided the following suggested revisions to the Interlocal Agreement:

- Page 5, Section 5: Use “STA” instead of the generic term ‘public transportation.’

- Page 4, Section 5: Use wording to reflect that geographic population will be used instead of jurisdictional populations; otherwise the County could have to drop a Board seat should its population drop due to annexation.
- State in writing the agreed-upon rotation of Board Chair and Vice Chair. Mr. Miles suggested adding wording to the effect that, 'Officers shall be elected annually,' or 'Each term is not to exceed two years' to leave Board members the option of choosing a Chair or Co-Chair in the event that a new Board member is immediately rotated into a Chair position upon joining the Board.
- Section 6: Mr. Schwartz stated that he would send draft rules to Mr. Miles for review and the wording in this section changed from: 'Such rules shall be adopted and may be amended by a majority vote (75% ratification of the Member bodies which are signatory to this inter-local agreement), to: 'Rules are adopted by this council and will take a 75% vote to amend.' One of these rules will be that SRTC Board members who fail to represent the policies, interests, and adopted project list of SRTC, while they are representing SRTC, are subject to removal from the Board.
- Section 10: Strike the phrase "identify herein' in the last line."
- Section 14: Update wording to recognize the incorporation of Spokane Valley.
- Page 6: Amend wording that says "all council representatives, including officers, will be entitled to one vote" to reflect that ex-officio members do not get a vote.
- Section 13: Use the word "unanimous" instead of the phrase "mutual agreement."

Other items discussed regarding the Interlocal Agreement:

- Section 11 has no changes at this time but could end up changing as a result of federal and state legislation. This section will likely be revisited within the next six to eight months.
- Ms. Susan Meyer asked for a clarification as to whether or not the term "recognized" on page 5 in the sentence, "There shall be three ex-officio, non-voting members recognized by the Board..." meant that they will be Board members. Mr. Schwartz responded that they will be Board members.
- Mr. Schwartz noted that Section 7 has been significantly rewritten to reflect that the Board will determine the positions, duties, and working conditions of employees. The change was made to broaden the language to allow the Board discretion to make these determinations.
- Ms. Anna Ragaza-Bourassa stated that she would send out the original redlined Interlocal Agreement to be sure that the versions are consistent.

Ms. Nancy McLaughlin left at 2:45 to attend another meeting.

Ms. Micki Harnois announced that there were five minutes left in the retreat. Mr. Mielke suggested starting the November Board meeting at noon instead of 1 p.m. in order to discuss some of the items on the retreat agenda that didn't get discussed.

Mr. Metcalf suggested that in the future, Board members be provided further education on projects prior to normally scheduled Board meetings, such as from noon to 1 p.m., so that those who are interested could attend.

Mr. Jeff Selle provided a handout outlining new MPO requirements being proposed in a Senate Bill.

#### **11. Adjournment.**

There being no further business before the Spokane Regional Transportation Council Board, the meeting was adjourned at 3: 05 pm.

---

Staci Lehman  
Recording Staff