

## MEETING MINUTES

Spokane Regional Transportation Council Board  
Thursday, January 21, 2010  
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, Mr. Mark Richard, at 1:03 pm.

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

#### Board Members in Attendance:

Mark Richard, Spokane County Commissioner (Chair)  
Latisha Hill, Washington State Transportation Commission  
Micki Harnois, Small Towns Representative  
Todd Mielke, Spokane County Commissioner  
Jon Snyder, City of Spokane Council Member  
Gary Schimmels, City of Spokane Valley  
Wendy Van Orman, Spokane Transit Authority  
Keith Metcalf, WSDOT – Eastern Region  
Stan Schwartz, Legal Council

#### Board Members Not in Attendance:

Mary Verner, Mayor, City of Spokane

#### Guests Present:

Howard Delaney, City of Spokane Attorney  
Susan Meyer, CEO STA  
Laura McAloon, STA Legal Council  
Karl Otterstrom, STA  
Ron Edgar, Spokane Clear Air Agency  
Doug Smith, City of Liberty Lake  
Diana Wilhite, Citizen  
Neil Kersten, City of Spokane Valley  
Paul Kropp, Neighborhood Alliance  
Bob Brueggeman, Spokane County  
Katherine Miller, City of Spokane  
Richard Rush, City of Spokane Council  
Member

#### 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

David Condon, Representing  
Congresswoman Cathy McMorris Rodgers  
Joe Tortorelli, Good Roads Association  
Kevin Picanco, David Evans & Associates  
Ross Kelley, HDR  
Dale Smith, Citizen

Mr. Howard Delaney, Mayor Verner's designee, extended the Mayor's apologies for being unable to attend the Board meeting due to a prescheduled meeting in Washington D.C. Although she had hoped she could participate via telephone conference, she is unable due to phone restrictions at the White House.

### **3. Board Action Items.**

#### **a) December 2009 SRTC Board Minutes**

**Ms. Wendy Van Orman made a motion to approve the December 10, 2009 meeting minutes. Ms. Latisha Hill seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.**

Mr. Todd Mielke arrived at 1:05 p.m.

#### **b) Approval of December Vouchers**

**Mr. Howard Delaney made a motion to approve the payment of the December 2009 voucher list in the amount of \$41,248.31. Mr. Keith Metcalf seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.**

Recap for December 2009: Vouchers: V118952 - V118978	41,248.31
---	-----------

#### **c) Election of Vice Chair**

**Mr. Jon Snyder made a motion requesting that the SRTC Board reaffirm the Chair selection for the purposes of new members being seated. Ms. Latisha Hill seconded the motion for discussion purposes.**

Mr. Richard asked Mr. Schwartz for clarification to proceed. Mr. Schwartz stated that a majority vote of the council is all that is needed. Mr. Mielke stated that the by-laws or inter-local agreement specify when the election of officers is to occur and expressed concern with regard to violating the by-laws or interlocal agreement unless the Board wishes to amend this provision. Mr. Schwartz stated that the SRTC Board is governed by an interlocal agreement and not by-laws and that Section 5 of the interlocal agreement presently in effect does not stipulate when the election of officers is to occur. However, past practice indicates that officer elections have occurred in December.

Mr. Snyder stated that he supports Mr. Richard as Chair but would like the opportunity to vote on the selection along with the other new Board members who were not present at the December 2009 meeting. Mr. Miles was asked what the past practice has been. He responded that for the past 21 years, officer elections occurred in December. Mr. Mielke added that the reason has been that it coincides with the terms of office that members are elected to. Terms of office typically end December 31 of the calendar year. In addition, in the best interest of the organization, officers are typically those that have had a history in serving the organization to be effective in its interaction with state and federal agencies.

Mr. Snyder stated that the issue is not so much allowing a new, inexperienced member to become Chair, but that all members of the council are given the opportunity to voice their Board Chair selection.

Mr. Richard stated that a Call for Question was made and that a vote was needed on the Call for Question. Mr. Schwartz noted that unless an objection was made to the Call for Question, a vote on the motion can be made.

**There being no objection, the Board unanimously reaffirmed Mr. Mark Richard as the SRTC Board Chair for 2010.**

Mr. Mark Richard then opened the floor for Vice Chair nominations. Mr. Todd Mielke nominated Mr. Gary Schimmels to serve as Vice Chair of SRTC. Mr. Jon Snyder nominated Mayor Mary Verner to serve as Vice Chair of SRTC. There being no further nominations, Mr. Richard closed the floor for nominations.

Mr. Richard asked legal counsel for procedural clarification with regard to multiple nominations. Mr. Schwartz responded that a majority candidate vote is preferred. Ms. Hill requested discussion on Vice Chair nominations. Ms. Harnois stated that Mr. Schimmels has served on the SRTC Board in the past, thus having the desired history and familiarity with the Board. Mr. Snyder commented that with all deference to all other elected officials present, he would like to see Mayor Verner as Vice Chair, since she is one of the highest profile elected officials in the region and has strong ties with area lawmakers and would be a very powerful advocate for the SRTC.

Mr. Metcalf noted that in the new interlocal agreement, officer elections are not tied to a rotation. Mr. Mielke stated that Mr. Schimmels has served on the SRTC Board over the past five years, including in an officer capacity. He noted that his philosophy is that the SRTC is created by interlocal agreement to represent the best interests of the region and of partner jurisdictions and that there is a process of immersing oneself in the process and in the organization and understanding the dynamics as well as state and federal requirements. He added that he was apprehensive in allowing someone to serve as an officer who has never served in the organization before.

**Mr. Richard asked for a show of hands in favor of electing Mr. Gary Schimmels as Vice Chair of SRTC. There being a majority of votes cast, Mr. Gary Schimmels was selected as the SRTC Vice Chair for 2010.**

Mr. Richard noted that he failed to ask for audience introductions earlier and requested that they be provided at this time.

#### **d) SRTC Policy Subcommittee – Latisha Hill**

##### **1. TAC Update**

Ms. Hill stated that the deadline to submit Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) member applications is February 19. Six applicants have been received to date. She requested that Board members forward the information to interested parties for consideration.

Mr. Miles noted that the TAC Charter and electronic application are located on the SRTC website. He stated that an inquiry has been made as to whether or not the Board would entertain outside representation on the TAC since the Charter is silent on this issue. Ms. Hill responded that she favors representation from jurisdictions outside the area and that it presents an opportunity to partner with KMPO; however, she questioned whether or not the candidate should be an elected official.

Mr. Metcalf stated that if the Board decides to allow outside representation on the TAC, there should be a stipulation that these members not be allowed to serve as Chair, since this position also serves on the SRTC Board. Mr. Mielke stated that another stipulation would be to require that though the applicant who resides outside of Spokane County must reside within the service area e.g., Kootenai County vs. Naples, Florida, or have some nexus to SRTC, i.e., business.

**Mr. Metcalf made a motion to prevent citizens who do not reside in Spokane County from serving on the Transportation Advisory Committee. Mr. Jim Williams seconded the motion.**

Mr. Metcalf stated that more people in the Spokane area should be encouraged to participate on the committee and that those outside the area are not hindered from participating in the open meeting process. Mr. Miles was asked to define the service area or area of influence, to which he responded that SRTC provides the same metropolitan planning services for all of Spokane and Kootenai Counties. In the past, a representative from the Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) routinely attended the TTC meetings as an ex-officio member while an ITD Board member attended the SRTC Board meetings as an ex-officio member.

Ms. Hill stated that SRTC has always encouraged an open partnership and dialogue with KMPO. Ms. Van Orman concurred. Mr. Mielke clarified that the two scenarios in question are 1) allow TAC membership from residents outside of Spokane County but within the service area to serve as ex-officio members only; or 2) allow TAC membership from residents outside of Spokane County but within the service area with the exception that they cannot serve as the TAC Chair. Mr. Snyder concurred with the later scenario noting that the member could have a vote on the TAC, but not serve as an SRTC Board member.

**There being no further discussion, a vote was taken on the motion on the floor that those residing outside of Spokane County may not serve on the Transportation Advisory Committee. There were 9 members voting nay, and one member, Jim Williams, voting aye.**

**Ms. Hill made a motion to allow membership on the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) to include those living within the transportation service area but outside of Spokane County with the condition that they cannot serve as the TAC Chair. Mr. Todd Mielke seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved with the exception of Mr. Jim Williams who voted nay.**

Mr. Glenn Miles asked whether TAC membership could include an elected official who resides outside of Spokane County, but serves within the service area so long as they do not serve as Chair of the TAC. There was Board consensus to allow an elected official serving within the service area, but residing outside of Spokane County to serve on the TAC, but not as Chair.

Mr. Metcalf asked whether the Board will be voting on the TAC membership. Ms. Hill responded that the applications will be reviewed by the subcommittee first before coming to the Board for review/approval. Mr. Snyder asked how many slots per transportation category/background will be allowed on the TAC. Ms. Hill welcomed Mr. Snyder to participate on the subcommittee; Mr. Snyder volunteered. She stated that the intent is to comprehensively evaluate each applicant based on their own merit and qualifications. She added that there are 13 membership slots and only six applications have been received to date. Mr. Richard asked that staff forward the TAC website application link to Board members to distribute to interested parties.

#### **e) Authorization for Board Member Travel**

Mr. Miles reported that on February 9-11, 2010 the Coalition of America's Gateways and Trade Corridors (CAGTC) will be hosting their Annual Meeting in Washington D.C. Each year since joining the CAGTC, the SRTC has sent at least one SRTC Board member to the annual meeting. With the upcoming Jobs Bill, Climate Change, and Transportation Authorization Bill under consideration, Mr. Miles stated that it would be important to ensure that SRTC is engaged in these important discussions. Mr. Miles requested that the SRTC Board consider authorizing travel for the SRTC Board Chair or his designee to attend the CAGTC meeting in Washington D.C.

Mr. Miles was asked how many Board members were authorized to attend in the past. He responded that up to two Board members had been authorized to attend past conferences. Mr. Mielke noted that unless prohibited by the budget, for consistency with past practice and because there are new Board members, he recommended that the Board authorize travel for up to two Board members.

**Mr. Todd Mielke made a motion authorizing up to two SRTC Board members to attend the Coalition of America's Gateways and Trade Corridors (CAGTC)**

**Annual Meeting in Washington D.C on February 9-11, 2010. Ms. Latisha Hill seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.**

Mr. Richard directed those members interested in attending to contact Mr. Miles. If more than one member (other than the Chair) is interested in attending, he will notify the Board via email for direction.

**4. Public Comments.**

Mr. Paul Kropp reported that he would assure that the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) application would be distributed to the various Neighborhood Councils.

Ms. Diana Wilhite recommended that the TAC application also be forwarded to the Chair of the Transportation Committee for the Joint Chambers.

Mr. David Condon representing Congresswoman Cathy McMorris Rodgers' Office introduced himself.

Ms. Susan Meyer reported that Spokane City Councilwoman Amber Waldref was elected Vice Chair of the STA Board and Mayor Wendy Van Orman was ratified as Chair for 2010. Councilwoman Waldref will also Chair STA's Operations and Customer Service Committee. Mr. Richard added that Ms. Van Orman was also selected to continue as the STA representative on the SRTC Board for 2010.

**5. Committee Reports and Recommendations.**

**a) Transportation Technical Committee Report**

Mr. Ron Edgar with the Spokane Regional Clear Air Agency introduced himself, noting that he was elected as the 2010 Chair for the Transportation Technical Committee (TTC). He stated that Ms. Katherine Miller from the City of Spokane was elected as the TTC Vice Chair for 2010.

Mr. Edgar gave a brief summary of their meeting on January 20, 2010. He noted that Mr. Miles briefed the committee on enhancement and job stimulus funds that might become available and recommended combining the existing Tier II stimulus project list and the STP project list in developing a prioritized list of projects that can be obligated within a 120 day period. Local Programs requested that this list be submitted to them by March 1st. There was committee consensus to do this and it was noted that the results of the combined list would be forwarded to the jurisdictions to confirm whether or not their project could be ready within the specified time constraints. The list would then be brought before the Board for approval.

Ron Edgar reported that EPA proposed new ozone standards, which were published on January 19. The proposed standard would be between 0.060 to 0.070 parts per million (ppm). In 2008, Spokane measured 0.064 ppm and 0.062 in 2009. If the

standard is set at 0.060, Spokane will not be in attainment for ozone; however, if the standard is set at 0.065 Spokane will be in attainment. EPA will utilize 2010 data, which may or may not place Spokane in ozone attainment levels. EPA will make the designations in 2011 and those that are not in attainment will need to submit a plan to achieve attainment by December 2013. Ms. Hill asked whether Spokane currently has an attainment plan. Mr. Edgar responded that there is not a plan since Spokane has been in attainment; ozone levels have been on a downward trend, perhaps due to the economy or weather, and engine design has reduced many precursors.

Ms. Harnois commented that there has been recent Board discussions regarding ensuring that land use planners are on the TTC. She asked whether the planners have to specifically represent a jurisdiction or whether they can be a 'member at large'. Mr. Miles stated that the TTC by-laws are currently being revised but that the planner positions are typically by jurisdiction and are usually the Planning Director (or designee), or from Public Works or Traffic Engineering.

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

Mr. Ryan Stewart introduced himself as a Senior Transportation Planner with SRTC and that he serves as the Project Manager for the Inland Pacific Hub and is working closely with WSDOT, which is the lead for Phase I of the Study. He invited new Board members to contact him in order to update them on the mission and goals of the IPH project.

He reported that three public forums were held in December and that the materials are available on the IPH website, [www.inlandpacifichub.org](http://www.inlandpacifichub.org). Much to the frustration of the Executive Committee, the consultant has requested a no-cost time extension through the end of the month.

Mr. Stewart noted that an IPH Board meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 11th at 7 am at Center Place in Spokane Valley. Mr. Condon asked whether the IPH Study proposed to have any recommendations down to the project level prior to the reauthorization of the current transportation bill. Mr. Stewart responded that there will only be general recommendations that will serve as a springboard for more specific proposals. Mr. Metcalf added that Phase I of the Study is geared toward opportunities and corridors. The only specific recommendation was for a cross link between Idaho and Washington using Hwy 2 as a connection to 395 and the North/South Corridor (NSC).

Mr. Condon asked whether an SRTC rating system will include weighing projects based on the corridors proposed by the IPH. Mr. Miles noted that regional significance will be a key factor when scoring projects. Mr. Condon asked whether the SRTC group heading to Washington D.C. will report on any initial findings of the IPH Study since appropriation requests are due as early as February 7th. Mr. Metcalf noted that one of the major improvement recommendations of regional significance is the NSC.

Mr. Richard noted the importance of interweaving the analysis and prioritization of IPH projects with the scoring of local projects. Mr. Miles stated that the SRTC group that will be in Washington D.C. has already made appointments with the regional congressional delegates and will be meeting with the Transportation & Infrastructure Committee as well.

Ms. Harnois noted that in previous Board discussions it was noted that an alternate needed to be identified for the Board Chair who is also a member of the IPH Board. It was unanimously agreed that the Vice Chair, Mr. Gary Schimmels, would serve as the SRTC IPH Board member alternate.

## **6. Old Business.**

### **a) SRTC Interlocal Agreement Update – Stan Schwartz**

Mr. Stan Schwartz reported that on January 20th he received a copy of the comments to the SRTC Interlocal Agreement from the County Commissioners' office. Consequently, the copy provided in the Board packets is not the most current; however, there are still four issues that can be reviewed and discussed.

Mr. Schwartz provided a brief history and timeline of the revision process. He stated that the latest revisions have been forwarded to the various representative legal councils for review. Once all comments have been received and noted, the final draft will be presented to the Board for final action and then forwarded to all jurisdictions for consideration. Mr. Mielke recommended that a return date to submit comments be identified in order to expedite the review process in hopes of having a final draft review by legal counsel at next month's Board meeting. He noted that since jurisdictions have varying processes for considering and adopting the document, thresholds are needed to prevent further delays.

Mr. Richard asked whether additional review time is needed given the new composition of city leadership, particularly that of the City of Spokane and Spokane Valley. Mr. Snyder opined that the suggested timeline is sufficient. Mr. Schimmels stated that the Valley has their review scheduled for early February also opined that the timeline was sufficient. Mr. Metcalf reminded the Board that as previously discussed and agreed upon, comments are to be substantive and limited to the latest proposed revisions. After further discussion, it was agreed that Mr. Schwartz will send the latest version of the interlocal agreement to all jurisdictions with a memo outlining the specific issues for consideration and that comments would be due no later than 3 days prior to the February 11, 2010 SRTC Board meeting.

Mr. Schwartz proceeded to review the substantive issues of the interlocal agreement; the first pertaining to the nature of the organization, i.e., joint venture, voluntary association, non-profit, etc., as outlined in Section 1. After much discussion, it was agreed that Mr. Schwartz would revise the section to ensure consistency with Title 23 and Chapter 24.03 or 24.06 RCW, or Chapter 25.04 RCW. It was requested that Mr.

Schwartz also review the agreement with regard to identifying the participating members and address his findings in the follow-up memorandum.

Mr. Schwartz asked for assistance in clarifying the ex-officio members to be identified representing the Airports and Rail under Section 5. Ms. Hill suggested that the Airport Board nominate their SRTC ex-officio Board member; Mr. Miles suggested that Rail nominees be affirmed by the SRTC Board. Mr. Schwartz agreed to amend the agreement accordingly.

Mr. Schwartz then directed the Board to Section 8, Work Program and Annual Budget, of the draft interlocal agreement, stating that a question was raised as to how to address the levying of assessments on small cities if SRTC decides to do so in the future. Ms. Van Orman described the financial dilemma facing small cities while Mr. Schwartz provided alternatives to address this concern.

Mr. Miles was asked to describe current practice and the basis for it. He explained that when the agreement was revised in 2003, the County served in benevolence towards small towns. He stated that a year's advance due notice prior to termination would resolve the issue. A small town would risk losing federal transportation funding however if choosing to terminate participation in an interlocal agreement. Federal Highways emphasizes that to be eligible for federal funds, an entity must demonstrate its part in a continued, coordinated, conferencing planning process. Termination of an interlocal agreement implies that you are no longer part of this process. Moreover, WSDOT also risks losing funding for any project within that city boundary. Any town not wanting to participate in the interlocal agreement must understand this risk and be provided time to plan for it. Mr. Miles expressed concern that he did not want to see small towns lose their eligibility to receive stimulus funds or for the State to lose the ability to conduct an overlay project through that town.

Mr. Richard stated that it might be in the best interest of the organization to give the Board the opportunity to waive newly assessed dues of a small town if doing so would prevent compromising a project that would benefit the region. After much discussion, Mr. Schwartz agreed to revise the language to state that if an assessment is made against a city, notice shall be given a year in advance of the effective date of the assessment allowing the Board the opportunity to act if needed for the benefit of the region.

Mr. Schwartz directed the Board to Section 10, Real and Personal Property, of the interlocal agreement. Concerns have been expressed regarding how far SRTC would go with regard to acquiring property. Mr. Mielke noted that the County opines that SRTC should be able to acquire property; however, they added language prohibiting SRTC to operate a transportation system on any acquired property to prevent competition with other jurisdictions. He emphasized that there has been pressure from outside agencies, the legislature notwithstanding, for SRTC to be more creative, comprehensive, and take on a more aggressive transportation role provided it is not in competition with other jurisdictions.

Upon request, Mr. Miles provided several examples whereby SRTC might want to purchase property particularly for the purpose of protecting future corridor or other regional transportation plans. Mr. Mielke used the Old Milwaukee Corridor as an example. It was noted that should SRTC have the ability to acquire property, a cost to contributing members may need to be assessed in order to maintain that property.

Board consensus on the issue could not be reached, consequently, jurisdictions were asked to further consider the matter and provide comments to Mr. Schwartz. Mr. Schwartz stated that he would incorporate today's comments and recirculate the agreement with a memo outlining the issues, the process, and the timeline to return comments.

## **b) Community Visioning and Improvement Strategy for a Unified Regional Transportation System RFP Scoring and Interviews**

Mr. Miles reported that 8 proposals for the Community Visioning and Improvement Strategy for a Unified Regional Transportation System project were received and scored. Mr. Miles identified those that scored the proposals as Wayne Brokaw, Executive Director, Inland Northwest Associated General Contractors of America (AGC), Marty Dickinson, President, Downtown Spokane Partnerships, E. Susan Meyer, Chief Executive Officer, STA, Rich Hadley, President & CEO, Greater Spokane Incorporated (GSI), Neal Sealock, Director, Spokane Airport Board, Lunell Haught, Chair, Inland Northwest Trails and Smart Routes.

Mr. Miles noted that the scoring committee recommended interviewing two firms, MIG and Glatting-Jackson, on February 5<sup>th</sup>. It is hoped to have a recommendation for Board consideration to negotiate a contract in an amount not to exceed at the February Board meeting in order for an approval to proceed in March.

Ms. Hill asked whether these firms employed subcontractors, to which Mr. Miles replied that they do. He noted that there was concern that the proposals didn't address all modes of transportation. The two selected firms will be asked to augment their original presentations to address those modes of transportation that they are materially weak on.

Ms. Hill asked whether local subcontractors will be used, to which Mr. Miles responded affirming that local subcontractors will be used. Mr. Miles stated that the proposals are available to Board members to review if so inclined.

## **7. New Business.**

### **a) Jobs Bill Status and Possible Preparation Strategy**

Mr. Miles reported that several stimulus projects remain, including the City's Havana Street Bridge project (bids will open next Thursday), and the project in Rockford, which is expected to go to bid during the first week in February. He stated that \$106,000 in

stimulus funds remain and will be applied to the Cheney/Spangle Road project for completion. The obligation date for stimulus funding is February 22<sup>nd</sup>.

Mr. Miles reported that with regard to the Jobs Bill, WSDOT Highways and Local Programs has asked each MPO to submit one project for funding by March 1. It is estimated that approximately \$14 million will be available statewide and allocations will not be given out to each region. Mr. Miles stated that TTC was asked to confirm whether they had any enhancement projects where the PSE is or can be completed in 120 days in order to qualify for the enhancement funds.

Mr. Miles stated that WSDOT Highways and Local Programs is also requesting a prioritized list of local projects for the Jobs Bill by March 1. It is anticipated that \$10 million of funding will be made available with a 120 day obligation period. There was general consensus at the TTC meeting to utilize the Tier II and STP project lists to select and submit projects to Local Programs. The results of the combined lists will be forwarded to the TTC to confirm whether or not the projects will be ready within the time constraints. A TIP amendment at the February Board meeting is anticipated.

#### **b) Unified Planning Work Program Amendment to Support the Unified Regional Transportation Vision Process**

Mr. Miles reported that the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) will require amending to add the specific visioning work item and program \$350,000 in Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding to the program to cover the expenses related to the scope of work from the selected consultant team to support the Unified Regional Transportation Vision Process. Approving the amendment will allow sufficient time to process the funding request through WSDOT and FHWA in order to meet the February Board meeting date.

**Ms. Latisha Hill made a motion to approve amending the 2010 UPWP to include the scope of work as outlined in the Regional Transportation Visioning request for proposals, and authorize up to \$350,000 in STP funds to support the work effort. Mr. Todd Mielke seconded the motion, which was unanimously carried.**

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

Mr. Miles reported on his trip with Greater Spokane Incorporated to Washington D.C. last week noting that it was primarily for policy discussion since funding was not available. Mr. Mielke testified on the Transportation Benefit (TBD) Bill and as of Monday, the Street Utility Bill has been dropped.

Mr. Miles reported that he has been working on the scoring committee for the Downtown Transit Alternatives Analysis project for STA and noted that quality proposals have been submitted.

## **9. SRTC Board Member Comments.**

Mr. Todd Mielke asked for Board concurrence to send a letter to partner jurisdictions reminding them that SRTC Board appointments are for 3 years or until such time that the member appointment no longer holds the elected seat. He emphasized that the jurisdictions agree to this stipulation when signing the interlocal agreement, regardless of the appointment schedules of each jurisdiction. Ms. Hill recommended sending out this letter after the proposed revisions to the existing interlocal agreement is resolved so as to avoid confusion.

Ms. Hill noted that tolling has been a major topic of discussion for the State Transportation Commission and that these discussions are expected to reach Eastern Washington in the near future. The Washington Transportation Plan is nearing completion and the Commission intends to hold public meetings throughout the State to unveil the Plan. With the Board's permission, she advocated that SRTC take the lead in hosting the event locally, which will complement and coincide with the current visioning process. For the record, Ms. Hill emphasized the Board's commitment in developing a strategic plan.

Ms. Micki Harnois inquired as to whether the Board has received any inquiries from small cities interested in serving on the SRTC Board. Mr. Miles responded that there has been none. She noted that the transition for small cities to work with WSDOT rather than the Transportation Improvement Board (TIB) has been difficult, due to structure and process differences. She noted that the Governor would like to put the TIB within WSDOT due to inconsistencies within the two organizations. Mr. Miles and others responded that there is no longer any effort or intent for this to occur.

Mr. Gary Schimmels thanked the Board for their support.

In response to Ms. Hill's report on tolling, Mr. Jim Williams stated that in his opinion, it is not the best solution.

Ms. Wendy Van Orman reported that STA is going through their Capital Development Plan and anticipate approving it in February. They are also following draft legislation on providing flexible funding for public transportation.

Mr. Keith Metcalf reported that WSDOT Eastern Region is working with GSI in moving the NSC forward and have scheduled an impromptu media event to announce being the TIGER Grant recipient (if awarded). He noted that other projects have been identified to receive funding if the NSC fails to receive the TIGER funding.

Mr. Miles noted that at the legislative meetings last week, legislators were heard concurring that tolling will not work in Spokane due to the opportunities for people to make several choices in the routes they can travel.

Mr. Richard reported that there are 2 items up for hearing before the Board of County Commissioners: 1) the adoption of revised road standards and 2) connectivity

regulations. Both are relative to the annexation agreement with the City of Spokane and public and private party input is welcomed. Mr. Richard also emphasized that the Board will be addressing a strategic plan within the next several months and brown bag sessions will be hosted to help it along. He noted that the County is also addressing issues with regard to weight limit violations on County and City roadways.

Mr. Todd Mielke reported that there are several efforts moving forward in Olympia to amend the laws pertaining to Transportation Benefit Districts (TBD), including extending the lifespan of a TBD from 10 to up to 40 years for bond accommodation, and addressing issues regarding governance. Mr. Mielke testified on the bill last week. Currently, TBD laws require that a new TBD Board be established to distribute funding and evaluate projects. However, since there is no connection to the local MPO, the modeling and planning organization, he proposed that by local agreement, the parties can agree to substitute the governing Board of the MPO as the governing Board of the TBD. This would maintain the needed connection between modeling, planning, and funding allocation functions.

Ms. Van Orman and Mr. Richard reported on a bill that would allow transit authorities to initiate a \$20 car tab for public transportation that would be subtracted from the total TBD capacity within the jurisdiction. If the transit authority established the TBD for public transportation, the \$20 would flow to the transit authority; other jurisdictions could charge a maximum \$80 not to exceed the \$100 taxing authority. STA Board consensus was to not weigh in on the bill but rather to monitor it. Mr. Mielke noted that last year similar legislation that would have given transit authorities the ability to impose a car tab fee was vetoed by the Governor at the request of the Association of Cities and the Association of Counties who expressed concern that maintenance and operation of the current infrastructure is already at risk. Without a healthy infrastructure in place there cannot be a successful public transit system. He cautioned that the same battle may arise unless the maintenance and operation issue is addressed.

#### **10. Executive Session—to review the performance of a public employee.**

Mr. Richard announced that the purpose of the executive session is to review the performance of a public employee. The meeting is anticipated to last until approximately 4:00 p.m. Board Chair, Mr. Richard, convened the Executive Session at 3:34 p.m.

At 4:00 p.m. Mr. Stan Schwartz announced that the executive session would be continuing for another 5 to 10 minutes.

At 4:08 p.m. the Executive Session adjourned with no action taken and the regular meeting reconvened.

## **11. Adjournment.**

There being no further business before the Spokane Regional Transportation Council Board, the meeting was adjourned at 4:08 pm.

---

Donna Lively  
Recording Secretary