

MEETING MINUTES

Spokane Regional Transportation Council Board
Thursday, November 12, 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 1:04 pm.

2. Roll Call/Record of Attendance

Board Members in Attendance:

Micki Harnois, Small Towns Representative (Chair)
Latisha Hill, Washington State Transportation Commission
Mark Richard, Spokane County Commissioner
Todd Mielke, Spokane County Commissioner
Joe Shogan, City of Spokane Council Member
Wendy Van Orman, Spokane Transit Authority
Keith Metcalf, WSDOT – Eastern Region
Jim Williams, Private Sector Transportation Provider

Board Members Not in Attendance:

Nancy McLaughlin, City of Spokane Council Member
Diana Wilhite, City of Spokane Valley (Vice-Chair)

Guests Present:

Jon Snyder, Spokane City Council Elect
Susan Meyer, CEO STA
Karl Otterstrom, STA
Grant Wencel, City of Spokane Bicycle Coordinator
Neil Kersten, City of Spokane Valley
Paul Kropp, Neighborhood Alliance
Bob Brueggeman, Spokane County
Katherine Miller, City of Spokane
Joe Tortorelli, Good Roads Association
Doug Floyd, Spokesman Review
Kevin Picanco, David Evans & Associates

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
Staci Lehman, Pub. Info/Ed Coordinator
Donna Lively, Administrative Secretary

3. Board Action Items.

a) October 2009 SRTC Board Minutes

Mr. Joe Shogan made a motion to approve the October 8, 2009 meeting minutes with corrections. Mr. Todd Mielke seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

b) Approval of November Vouchers

Mr. Todd Mielke made a motion to approve the payment of the October 2009 voucher list in the amount of \$107,193.02. Mr. Joe Shogan seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Recap for November 2009:	
Vouchers: V118927 to V118951	51,492.83
Salaries/Benefits: Warrant Nos: 1429700-1429714 and 1432260-1432274	82,151.90
	<hr/>
	133,644.73

Mr. Miles stated that there was a question from Bear Creek Lodge as to whether or not the location worked for last month's Board Retreat. Board members responded that it did.

Mr. Mark Richards inquired about the listing for the Spokane Regional Health District. Mr. Miles responded that it was for the Mark Fenton Workshop held on September 29.

c) Executive Director and Transportation Manager Job Description Approval – Micki Harnois

Ms. Micki Harnois stated that the Executive Director and Transportation Manager Job Descriptions were provided to Board Members earlier for review. She noted that these are new positions and asked for feedback from the Board.

Ms. Van Orman requested that a revision be made to page one, bullet point one of the Executive Director's job description where it reads, "manages personnel to implement" to read, "provides administrative direction for." The purpose is to distinguish between the Executive Director and the Transportation Manager position. Mr. Mark Richard asked that this be appropriately spelled out in detail so that both individuals can understand their roles. He asked Mr. Miles whether it created any level of ambiguity between the two positions. Mr. Miles responded that he didn't think so since one deals with the day to day aspects of what the roles and responsibilities of individuals are, and the other is looking at the bigger picture in terms of how it all fits. He added that operating policies can be provided if needed. Mr. Joe Shogan concurred.

Ms. Latisha Hill made a motion to accept the Executive Director and Transportation Manager Job Descriptions as corrected. Mr. Joe Shogan seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

4. Public Comments.

Ms. Susan Meyer reported that the Washington State Transit Association has hired a new Executive Director, Geri Beardsley, currently with the Office of Financial Management as the Transportation Budget Assistant to the Governor. Her position is effective December 14, 2009.

5. Committee Reports and Recommendations.

a) Transportation Technical Committee Report

Ms. Katherine Miller briefed the Board on last month's TTC meeting, since neither the TTC Chair nor Vice Chair was able to attend the Board meeting. She reported that the West Plains subcommittee is waiting for the release of the SRTC 2030 model in order to determine the deficiencies in the West Plains. Also, the City of Spokane is the only jurisdiction that has one more stimulus project to release; all other jurisdictions are either finished or close to finishing their projects.

The TTC reviewed the scoring of the \$10 million STP call for projects and the subcommittee that revised the applications reconvened to determine how the process went and will report their findings to the TTC later this month. The subcommittee determined that the scoring process was legitimate, that SRTC staff did an excellent job in scoring the projects, and that uncertainties in available funding will affect how/which projects will be selected. Projects selected will require Board approval.

The TTC also reviewed the recent regional call for projects. Mr. Jeff Selle briefed the Board on the regional transportation priority projects and the process used in determining and prioritizing the list. Mr. Miles emphasized that these are projects that require regional advocacy. Mr. Selle stated that he will request narratives from each jurisdiction describing what portions of the project can be completed given various funding amounts available in order to add another level of accountability when addressed next year. Mr. Miles stated that the list will be presented at the Big Tent meeting on November 18, with the Board's endorsement.

Mr. Shogan asked Mr. Metcalf what the total funding requests were for the NSC and what the odds were of obtaining the funds. Mr. Metcalf noted that when considering which projects will receive funding it is important to evaluate the project based on its benefit to the region as a whole. Mr. Richard reminded the Board that with regard to the strategic planning process, the goal was for consistency in how the projects are ranked. He also emphasized the need for Board members to advocate the list as prioritized and not promote their own jurisdictional project during funding opportunities. He noted that during this improvement process, the outcome could be different next year and that tools are needed for implementation into Board policy. Ms. Hill

suggested having brown bag sessions to educate Board members on each of the priority projects so that they know what they're advocating.

The question was asked whether the list is consistent with the Governor's Climate Change Order. Mr. Selle stated that the scoring criteria includes greenhouse gas reduction and foreshadows the climate change legislation. Mr. Richard Rush asked whether the projects will meet criteria at the federal level. Mr. Miles noted that the Tiger Grant criteria addressed issues such as regional significance, access mobility, livability, and sustainability of the investment, etc., and that the legislative response has been that we are a lot closer in meeting the federal criteria than other projects submitted.

Mr. Shogan asked what the funding level was for Havana and Thor/Freya regarding the Bridging the Valley project. It was noted that Thor/Freya is out for construction and that Havana will go out for bid soon. It was also noted that the City of Spokane Valley has requested that the Barker Road portion be addressed next due to high accident rates and area development.

Mr. Rush asked what the total possible points were for each project; the response was 150.

Mr. Shogan made a motion to approve the STP Project List as presented and address the project selection discussion at a later date when funding availability is known. Ms. Latisha Hill seconded the motion, which was unanimously carried.

Mr. Joe Shogan made a motion to approve the Regional Transportation Prioritized Project list for Board advocacy as presented. Ms. Latisha Hill seconded the motion, which was unanimously carried.

Mr. Miles noted that the Regional Transportation Prioritized Project list is for the advocates in the greater Spokane area to go out and seek additional funding to support these projects through legislative actions either at the state or federal level. The STP projects are based on the expectation that federal aid funds will be received through the STP program. The Board will select projects from the STP project list for funding, depending on the amount of funds that become available.

Ms. Hill asked for clarification with regard to what the next steps are involving the Executive Director and Transportation Manager positions. Ms. Micki Harnois suggested establishing a subcommittee to discuss recruitment for the two new positions. Mr. Mielke asked whether a buy off from the other jurisdictions was needed if an additional position requires the recalculation of partner jurisdiction contributions. Mr. Metcalf stated that earlier subcommittee discussions described a shifting of salaries and not an added position, but a replacement and focus on the job description itself. Mr. Mielke stated that the Board has received comments from outside organizations and individuals advocating that a position be added, which would require a cost whether by reorganizing existing revenues or increasing them. Mr. Shogan

concluded with Mr. Metcalf stating that the Board should look in house first. He asked for an assessment from Glenn as to whether the existing personnel structure can accommodate the position without adding additional staff and whether some of the duties are currently being done or whether it would require an additional person. Ms. Hill concurred with Ms. Harnois that a subcommittee address these issues. She asked whether the management committee could serve as the new subcommittee. Ms. Harnois stated that Ms. Wilhite was on that committee and that it should be a different committee altogether. Due to Board member schedules it was suggested to postpone the new subcommittee until after the first of the year.

Mr. Richard asked who the incoming Chair will be since the Vice Chair, Ms. Wilhite, did not win her re-election and will no longer be on the Board. Ms. Harnois stated that the informal rotation would have a City of Spokane Valley representative as Chair; however, Ms. Wilhite has requested that the incoming Valley Board member be either exempt for a year or be put back in the informal rotation. Mr. Mielke noted that the new interlocal agreement has attempted to clarify the Board officer selection process regardless of whether or not a Board member is re-elected. Ms. Harnois stated that in the past, the informal rotation was the City of Spokane, Spokane County, Small Cities, and the City of Spokane Valley. Mr. Mielke stated that if the new interlocal agreement goes out within the next 60 days it will change how the officers are selected.

Ms. Harnois stated that the management committee needs a replacement for Ms. Wilhite and that the role is to review and communicate with the Transportation Manager and staff. Mr. Shogan volunteered to participate in the management committee.

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

Mr. Ryan Stewart introduced himself as a Senior Transportation Planner for SRTC and serves as the Project Manager for the Inland Pacific Hub (IPH). He works in close coordination with Charlene Kay at WSDOT who is the Project Manager for Phase I of the Study. Mr. Stewart stated that Phase I of the Study is approximately 75% complete, with an anticipated completion date of December 31, 2009. He noted that several technical members of the committee are reviewing a number of working papers and reports, including an economic base analysis and freight profile of the region. Pending reports to be completed include one on technology assets, a regional competitiveness paper, and a modal issues report.

Mr. Stewart handed out a brochure on the IPH, which will also be posted on the website. The brochure advertises a series of stakeholder and public forums scheduled for December 1-3 to review Phase I results to date. It will include interviews with stakeholders and the analysis derived from the working papers that will eventually be in a report recommending implementation strategies for the IPH.

The IPH website: www.inlandpacifichub.org, is out for technical review by the Board and committee members. It is anticipated that the website will be released to the public formally next week after the Executive Committee has provided their comments.

The next Executive Committee meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, November 17, 2009, at 8 am in the Liberty Lake Library. The IPH Advisory Board is scheduled to meet on December 10.

Mr. Shogan asked what the funding status was for the IPH. Mr. Ryan stated that Idaho committed a portion of the GEM community grant to finish Phase I. Mr. Shogan asked whether the federal government provided their contribution. Mr. Stewart stated that they had; Mr. Metcalf noted that the federal government secured another \$200,000 from appropriation funding from Senator Murray to commence Phase II. Mr. Miles added that Phase II also has a \$150,000 commitment from the State of Idaho to fulfill.

c) SRTC Policy Subcommittee – Latisha Hill

Ms. Hill provided a copy of the revised Draft Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) Charter, stating that it was for Board review and that it will be presented at the Big Tent meeting scheduled for November 18. She requested that Board members review the document in detail and provide her with comments via email. The goal is to have the TAC functioning by the first of next year.

Ms. Hill stated that the Board is on the agenda for the Big Tent meeting and will address the TAC Charter, the revised Interlocal Agreement, and the restructuring of the Board. Ms. Harnois asked how many Board members plan to attend the Big Tent meeting next week. Mr. Shogan, Mr. Rush, Mr. Metcalf, Ms. Van Orman, and Ms. Hill all indicated that they plan to attend the meeting. Mr. Mielke stated that the Counties have their annual meeting in Seattle at that time and that he and Mr. Richard would not be able to attend the Big Tent meeting.

6. Administrative Matters.

a) SRTC/KMPO Contract Renewal (action) – Stan Schwartz

Mr. Miles stated that the Board and KMPO attorneys have worked out the contract termination concerns and that the KMPO Board unanimously approved the contract at their meeting last week.

Mr. Schwartz reviewed the service contract changes with the Board. He noted that pages 4 through 15 were added by the KMPO attorney and are a recitation of the various federal laws applicable to a contract this size. Mr. Mark Richard asked whether Mr. Schwartz has reviewed these pages as well. Mr. Schwartz responded that he has not reviewed the detailed federal laws that were referenced due to their length but has reviewed online publications that summarize these provisions. SRTC is merely providing that it will impose these contractual requirements on its contracting entities. He stated that he is satisfied and comfortable with the changes, noting that originally it was written so that SRTC would provide assurances or guarantees that our contractors would comply with the laws. Mr. Schwartz stated that SRTC cannot do that since it cannot know what contractors do in their businesses or shops, but can only impose the requirements on them.

Mr. Joe Shogan made a motion to approve the renewal of the SRTC/KMPO Contract as presented. Ms. Latisha Hill seconded the motion.

Mr. Mark Richard apologized, stating that he did not have time to review the contract and would abstain from the motion with reference to the added pages unless he was allowed more time to review the changes. It was clarified that the added pages are merely what is stated in federal law, and that the Board reviewed the document at last month's Board retreat and that it was the Board that provided the requested modifications.

Mr. Schwartz further clarified that he modified the contract to ensure the Board would not be guaranteeing third party requirements.

Mr. Shogan reaffirmed his earlier motion as follows, stating that as an attorney himself, he is differing judgment to Mr. Schwartz who oversees the Board's legal issues.

Mr. Joe Shogan made a motion to approve the renewal of the SRTC/KMPO Contract as presented. Ms. Latisha Hill seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

b) SRTC Interlocal Agreement (action) – Stan Schwartz

Mr. Schwartz stated that the Board's changes requested at last month's meeting have been incorporated into the interlocal agreement copy that was included in their Board packet. He proceeded to review the changes as follows:

Section 1, second paragraph: modified to allow the Council to determine its precise organization as either a separate legal or administrative entity to include a joint venture or non-profit corporation.

Section 3, subsection (e): added to clarify that not only will the Board participate in the development and maintenance of transportation related information, but that it will promote it as well.

Section 3, subsection (g): clarifications respective to subcommittees.

Section 4, Governing Body, second paragraph: clarifications on thresholds and members.

Section 5, last paragraph: clarification on representatives and terms.

Mr. Schwartz noted an inconsistency in the last sentence in Section 5, last paragraph, which states: "The Chair shall alternate among elected and voting representatives of the Board." He asked the Board how they wanted this clarified. Mr. Miles stated that the point made earlier by the Board is that an ex-officio member cannot be a Chair, e.g., local legislators. The Board agreed to modify the paragraph to read, "The Board

shall elect a Chair and Vice-Chair ("Officers") by majority vote of the Board. Only representatives who are elected officials may be Officers. The term for Officers *may* be up to two (2) years in each office. ***Ex-officio members may not be Officers.***"

Mr. Metcalf noted that in Section 3, subsection (g), it had been agreed that the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) would serve at the discretion of the TAC as needed, and that there is no mention of the TTC. It was agreed to strike the reference to the CAC and replace it with, ***"A Transportation Technical Committee shall be defined by the Council."***

Mr. Rush noted that the first sentence in the second paragraph in Section 5 needs clarification regarding defining jurisdictions under 50,000. It was agreed to revise the sentence to read, "Jurisdictions under 50,000 people - One (1) person jointly selected by jurisdictions with populations between ***50,000 and*** 5,000 people and one (1) person jointly selected by jurisdictions with populations fewer than 5,000 people."

Ms. Hill asked for clarification as to what the Board is being asked to do. Mr. Miles responded that the Board is asked to approve the draft prior to distribution to the other jurisdictions for approval.

Ms. Susan Meyer asked for clarification with regard to the TTC Chair as a Board member position. It was noted that the TTC Chair should be added as an ex-officio member of the Board in Section 5, paragraph 10.

Ms. Meyer also requested clarification regarding the last sentence of the last paragraph in Section 6, which states, "All Council representatives including officers shall be entitled to one vote." She noted that all Board members are not entitled to vote. Consequently, it was agreed to revise the sentence to read, ***"Voting Board members*** shall be entitled to one vote."

Ms. Meyer pointed out that the work program and annual budget in Section 8 raises the question of funding by partners who are not contributors and asked the Board if they have had any discussion on this or plan to discuss it at a later date. She stated that currently, some of the largest members are contributors. Mr. Miles responded noting that the second sentence in the first paragraph of Section 9 states that the "Costs of the annual budget expenditures shall be divided among the Members as determined by the Board." Thus, it is the Board's discretion as to how they want to address membership in the organization.

Mr. Schwartz continued his review of the modifications, noting that the first and second sentences in the first paragraph under Section 7 were modified consistent with the Board's request and the second paragraph modified to read, ***"Unless otherwise determined by the Board,*** employees shall be hired and discharged by and work under the direction of the Executive Director."

Mr. Schwartz noted that Section 10, Real and Personal Property, gives the Council the right to acquire, hold, or dispose of real or personal property. He explained that this

provision arose when SRTC relocated from the City Hall to its current facility. Also, a property and liability insurance requirement was added under Section 11, which is present practice.

Mr. Schwartz stated that a revised version of the interlocal agreement can be provided at the next Board meeting, or the Board can incorporate the changes in a motion today.

Mr. Keith Metcalf made a motion to approve the Draft Interlocal Agreement with revisions. Mr. Joe Shogan seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Mr. Todd Mielke made a motion requiring Board members to take the approved Draft Interlocal Agreement with revisions to their respective jurisdictions and for SRTC staff to take it to all other jurisdictions for consideration and action as soon as possible. Ms. Latisha Hill seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Mr. Shogan noted that the City of Spokane requires Council approval prior to the Mayor's signature. It was noted that the approval process may vary in each jurisdiction, but that the onus is on the Board member to obtain the required signature of approval.

Mr. Schwartz stated that he will forward the corrected Interlocal Agreement to Mr. Miles for distribution.

c) Regional Transportation Vision (Direction & Decision) – Glenn Miles

Mr. Miles directed the Board to the draft Request for Proposal (RFP) for the Community Visioning and Improvement Strategy for a Unified Regional Transportation System contained in their Board packet. He stated that if the Board approves the RFP, it is intended to release it on November 20 with a December 18 deadline. The goal is to have a consultant selected for negotiation at the January 14, 2010 Board meeting.

Mr. Rush asked how this relates to what STA is doing. Mr. Miles stated that they act in tandem, but that this unified transportation vision process looks at rail, public transportation, non-motorized, streets, etc., with the intent that it all dovetails together so that the community and region has a unified vision for transportation for where we want to be in 20 to 50 years. He added that it would draw from what STA is doing and what jurisdictions are doing with regard to their comprehensive land use plans, etc., recognizing that climate changes are occurring, comprehensive plan changes are occurring, and the legislature is looking at governance and funding issues. The goal is to have one document reflecting how it all fits and works together.

Mr. Richard asked whether the task scheduling on page 4 would change. Mr. Miles responded stating that Task 1 would be moved from January 2010 to February 2010,

and Task 2 from February 2010 to March 2010. Mr. Miles stated that there are contractors waiting to submit proposals.

Ms. Hill asked how much money the Board has for this. Mr. Miles stated that staff would look at acquiring \$250,000 in CMAQ funds. STA graciously offered to consider additional funding, which could serve as a local match opportunity. Ms. Susan Meyer asked how much the total project would cost. Mr. Miles stated approximately \$350,000 to \$400,000; the premium being the acceleration of getting it done by November 2010. Ms. Meyer asked if there would be other funding partners, to which Mr. Miles stated that staff would look for some, but given the state of the economy he is not hopeful. Ms. Meyer responded that the difference is higher than STA's funding expectation. Mr. Miles noted that once there is authorization to negotiate, then the funding details will be evident.

Mr. Shogan asked whether any portion of the project is repetitive with the Inland Pacific Hub Study. Mr. Miles responded that it is not repetitive since the IPH is looked at as a strategy for making investments and does not focus on the overall regional vision, although there are work elements within the scope that the consultant will be able to draw from rather than reinvent. Ms. Hill added that the IPH reaches beyond the county to encompass 18 different counties.

Mr. Richard asked when the last time SRTC conducted this type of exercise. Mr. Miles answered that to his recollection, SRTC has never conducted this type of exercise on this scale.

Mr. Joe Shogan made a motion to approve the Request for Proposal for the Community Visioning and Improvement Strategy for a Unified Regional Transportation System as presented. Ms. Latisha Hill seconded the motion, which was unanimously carried.

d) Regional Transportation Benefit District (TBD) Concept – Glenn Miles

Mr. Glenn Miles stated that this was included on the agenda due to the upcoming Big Tent meeting on November 18. He noted that the Board has had many discussions regarding TBDs and has seen examples of some. He inquired as to whether the Board has a position on a TBD for presentation at next week's meeting.

Mr. Mielke updated the Board on a recent conference call that included Mayor Verner, Frank Tombari, Mark Shepherd, and himself to discuss how to move forward to meet the regional needs of maintenance and operations as well as transportation capital projects. The consensus has been to do this on a regional basis, although responses have been tentative depending on how it will be carried out.

Mr. Mielke stated that at the last Council of Government meeting, it was made clear that the County would not facilitate a TBD on its own, but would require some level of support from other jurisdictions. Mr. Mielke noted that there are various TBD funding mechanisms available for consideration. In order to move forward, boundaries would

need to be defined, a project list would need to be established (based on the 6-year street projects), and revenues defined. TBD statutes or an interlocal agreement would have to identify how revenues would be split for maintenance and operation needs and for capital projects. For maintenance and operations, the distribution would be based on a model that combines population with vehicle miles traveled. Funding sources would require a public vote.

Mr. Mielke addressed a question regarding TBD sunseting stating that the TBD is limited to 10 years but can expand to 20 years. Mr. Shogan emphasized that the TBD must have options to account for many unpredictable variables and asked whether it can be amended without going to vote. Mr. Mielke responded that it could, as long as it gets to the 6 year project list. He also noted that a street utility tax is unconstitutional unless it is revised.

Mr. Shogan expressed support for the TBD concept while Mr. Richard expressed concern that the projects promised to constituents could be modified. Additional discussion points included determining how 6 year projects would be selected; how to address maintenance and operation funding; educating constituents on what the regional projects are; and how to provide predictability to constituents when priorities change due to unforeseen circumstances.

Mr. Mielke noted that he anticipates that Mayor Verner and Mr. Tombari will present this discussion in his absence at next week's Big Tent meeting.

7. Old Business.

No old business items were noted.

8. New Business.

a) Draft Spokane Regional Pedestrian Plan – Eve Nelson

Ms. Staci Lehman noted that Ms. Nelson had to leave and introduced Ms. Heleen Dewey, Physical Activity and Nutrition Program Coordinator for the Spokane County Regional Health District who would be making the presentation. Ms. Lehman stated that Board action is not required at this time, but it is anticipated that Board approval will be solicited at next month's Board meeting.

A draft copy of the Spokane Regional Pedestrian Plan was distributed. Ms. Lehman stated that the public comment period has ended and the comments have been incorporated into the draft Plan, which is available on the SRTC website.

Ms. Dewey gave a PowerPoint Presentation outlining the goals, existing conditions, identified barriers/obstacles, and recommendations for providing a pedestrian-accessible environment. Ms. Dewey also outlined the need to provide education and encouragement to get members of the public out walking safely.

Ms. Susan Meyer noted that through Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) funding STA has inventoried sidewalks and pedestrian facilities and is committed to updating this information. She asked that page 15 of the draft Pedestrian Plan be corrected to reflect STA's commitment. Ms. Dewey stated that the Plan will be modified as requested.

There was a discussion regarding the Smart Routes to School program and the need for an advisory board or committee to involve schools in planning routes and applying for funding. Also noted was the need for enforcement to protect pedestrians and evaluations to identify successes and problems.

Ms. Hill asked whether the pedestrian survey responses can be broken down by zip codes. Ms. Dewey responded that they can. Ms. Lehman added that the survey results are posted on the SRTC website. Funding mechanisms were also discussed, including investigating more sustainable sources of funding. The presentation concluded with a reference to the regionally significant pedestrian projects.

Mr. Miles reminded the Board that the public comment period has ended and that the final draft will be presented to the Board for approval at next month's meeting and will include all comments received and the responses to those comments.

9. Transportation Manager's Report.

Mr. Miles stated that on Monday, November 16, SRTC will welcome a new Transportation Planner employee named Mallory Atkinson.

He reported that the Town of Rockford's stimulus project has been submitted for funding and will probably go out for bid in February at the estimated cost of \$480,000. Also, back in April or May, the City of Cheney amended their Cheney/Spangle Road stimulus project to stop short of the railroad tracks since they had not received the necessary agreements from the railroads, which would've jeopardized their ability to receive stimulus funding. Since then, the agreements have been received and the City is nearing completion of their project and is asking that the money be restored. Mr. Miles noted that since it was a stimulus funded project and no second phase was identified, additional stimulus funding cannot be provided and a letter will be forwarded to the City in response to their request.

One last stimulus project remains, which is the City of Spokane's Havana Street Overpass. The project is in its final approvals in order to go out to bid. All other Tier I projects are completed.

10. SRTC Board Member Comments.

Mr. Latisha Hill reported that on Monday through Wednesday of next week, the State Transportation Commission is holding their meeting in Everett, Washington. On Tuesday, the National Journal Magazine is hosting a panel discussion in Washington D.C. on Transportation and Climate Change via a web conference. Ms. Hill stated that she will be unable to listen, but will forward the link to the Board for those interested in listening.

Mr. Keith Metcalf reported that WSDOT Eastern Region has also completed 100% of their Tier I stimulus projects. One Tier II project (Dowel Bar retrofit on US 195) has been awarded but construction will not begin until next summer.

Mr. Miles reported that he will be in Boise, Idaho on December 2 representing the five MPOs in the State of Idaho before the Governor's Task Force on Transportation Funding.

11. Adjournment.

There being no further business before the Spokane Regional Transportation Council Board, the meeting was adjourned at 3:24 pm.

Donna Lively
Recording Secretary