

MEETING MINUTES

Spokane Regional Transportation Council Transportation Technical Committee
April 25, 2018
421 W Riverside Ave Suite 504, Spokane, Washington

1. Call to Order

Mr. Mike Tedesco, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:30 pm.

2. Roll Call

Committee Members Present

Mike Tedesco	Spokane Tribe of Indians	Brandi Colyar	Spokane County
Derrick Braaten	City of Airway Heights	Lisa Corcoran	Spokane International Airport
Roger Krieger	City of Deer Park	Heleen Dewey	Spokane Regional Health Dist.
Inga Note	City of Spokane	Gordon Howell	Spokane Transit Authority
Brandon Blankenagel	City of Spokane	Karl Otterstrom	Spokane Transit Authority
Gloria Mantz	City of Spokane Valley	Larry Larson	WSDOT-Eastern Region
Mike Basinger	City of Spokane Valley	Darrel McCallum	WSDOT-Eastern Region

Committee Alternates Present

Keith Martin	WSDOT-Eastern Region	Joe Southwell	Spokane Regional Clean Air
Barry Greene	Spokane County		

Guests

Ryan Brodwater	Spokane Transit Authority
----------------	---------------------------

Staff

Anna Ragaza-Bourassa	Senior Transportation Planner	Staci Lehman	Communications Coordinator
Sabrina Minshall	Executive Director	Mike Ulrich	Assoc. Transportation Planner
Eve Nelson	Senior Transportation Planner	Julie Meyers-Lehman	Administrative Assistant

3. Approval of March 28, 2018 Minutes

Mr. Otterstrom made a motion to approve the March 28, 2018 minutes as presented. Mr. Martin seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

4. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

5. Technical Member Comments

Ms. Dewey announced that on June 13 SRHD is hosting a health impact assessment training session.

Mr. Otterstrom said the STA website now has an opt-in page for project newsletters and other STA news.

Mr. Martin spoke about a STIP training opportunity on May 8 at the WSDOT office.

Chair Tedesco announced that due to unexpected heavy traffic congestion on I-90, Mr. Braaten is running late; he suggested moving agenda items 6 and 7 to after agenda items 8a through 8d. There were no objections.

8a. Monroe High Performance Transit (HPT) Update

Mr. Otterstrom gave a background of the Monroe Regal Corridor as part of STA's long range comprehensive plan, Connect Spokane, and STA's 10-year plan, Moving Forward. He showed a map that identified corridors for potential future HPT route networks throughout the service area. He said this corridor brings several different STA routes together which have very high ridership and are relevant because of the locations that they serve.

Mr. Brodwater stated the Monroe Regal Corridor consolidates Route 24 (Monroe), Route 44 (Grand) and Route 45 (Regal) and it will touch 12 out of 29 City of Spokane neighborhoods, making it very accessible. He outlined the budget for corridor design/construction, the budget for the Moran Station Park & Ride design/construction, reviewed the 2017 timeline and described the next steps and public outreach for 2018/2019.

Mr. Brodwater described proposed station design and amenities and explained not all stations along the route will have the same set of amenities. He said STA was able to get a jump on corridor development by working in coordination with City of Spokane on their Monroe Street Project, which will have six HPT stops between Montgomery and Alice. He explained the collaboration effort and station design elements will be similar to the City's Sprague Avenue project which was completed last year.

He noted an important piece of the project is the Moran Station Park & Ride. He said STA has coordinated station planning with Moran Prairie Elementary School, which is very close to the site, and with Spokane County, in order to tie in the station to the Ben Burr Trail. He outlined the timeline for the creation of the Park & Ride which is scheduled to begin operation in September 2019.

Mr. Otterstrom explained that during peak times this corridor will have an express route and he described the ways in which HPT differs from traditional bus service.

8b. Title VI Plan and Update

Ms. Lehman provided a history of Title VI, stated that because SRTC receives federal funding it is required to maintain a Title VI plan, and said staff is currently working on an update to the existing plan from 2014. She described the times at which plan updates must be made and noted a copy of the existing plan was included in the packet. She asked the group to review the document and submit comments to her by email. Ms. Lehman outlined the next steps in the process, including a 30-day public comment period. Ms. Dewey suggested that a simple one-page summary of Title VI and its requirements would be a helpful addition to the document.

8c. Freight Working Group

Mr. Ulrich noted at its last meeting the Board gave an informal go-ahead to SRTC staff to convene a Freight Working Group for the purpose of designing a scope for a Regional Freight Mobility Plan, which will align with local freight needs. He provided a history of three prior freight planning studies; Bridging the Valley, Inland Pacific Hub and the Joint Transportation Commission (JTC) Road/Rail Study Phase I and Phase II.

He explained that information contained in freight project applications is currently the only source of regional freight needs data. He presented a map which showed:

- Major jurisdictions in Spokane County
- Then overlaid the regional freight network
- Then highlighted which corridors have applied for National Highway Freight Program Formula Funds
- Then highlighted corridors which have applied for funds through the recent Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board call for projects
- Then highlighted JTC road/rail crossings

Mr. Ulrich stated that the Regional Freight Mobility Plan will not be SRTC directed; the working group will be organized by SRTC, but will be working group participants aggregating local needs into a regional plan. He noted that the SRTC Strategic Plan approved by the Board in December 2017 includes a freight needs assessment.

He noted it may be more helpful to think of the Working Group as creating a strategy, instead of a plan, which will allow local agencies and jurisdictions to be more competitive in freight project application processes. He described several recent freight project successes: Bigelow Gulch, Barker Road grade separation, Havana Street Bridge and the North Spokane Corridor.

Mr. Ulrich described potential working group members: member jurisdictions freight planning, land-use staff, and capital improvement staff along with private sector freight stakeholders. He said having the group be sufficiently representative, a manageable size and fully supportive of the strategy will be key. He asked the group for recommendations and input as to who needs to be included in the working group.

Members discussed the ideal size of the working group, private sector outreach and the availability of rail data. Suggestions were made to contact the US-395 group and to reach out to other nearby RTPs about their freight plans. They also discussed the strategy's intent and deliverables. Mr. Ulrich discussed the timeline and said he would like to get the working group set as soon as possible. He noted the group's initial conversations will drive the process and it will be the group that determines the type of plan to be created. Mr. Ulrich said to contact him if anyone would like to participate in the working group or if there were additional suggestions.

8d. TTC Formal Opinions to SRTC Board of Directors

Chair Tedesco reported that he, Mr. Messner, and Mr. Blankenagel met with Ms. Minshall last week to discuss the role of the TTC and how the TTC group formalizes opinions in a way which the Chair can communicate to the Board, with the premise being it is the TTC Chair's responsibility, which he agrees with. He said two recommendations came out of the meeting last week:

- (1) Requesting of the SRTC Board Chair to include a Board meeting agenda item for a generalized TTC update; the TTC Chair will provide a brief summary of the most recent TTC meeting.
- (2) Making distinctions between individual agency opinions and the formal opinion of the TTC body as a whole.

He said in the event that a TTC information and discussion agenda item evolves into something that the Board needs to be informed about, it can be designated as an item for action at the following month's TTC meeting. If time is of the essence, the TTC could make a motion to develop an opinion at the time of the conversation to be relayed to the Board at their next meeting.

Mr. Blankenagel spoke about the requirement to advertise action items on an agenda ahead of time and he discussed the challenge in informing the Board in a situation where there was discussion on a topic, but opinion was divided. He said part of the recent discussion was in regard to how to identify if TTC opinions were from one or two members or representative of a larger portion of the group.

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa said another option discussed was having a memo in the Board packet summarizing items that were discussed by the TTC and any other information that may require the Board's attention. She said they also discussed SRTC staff doing a better job of engaging the TTC earlier on in the process; maybe more than two touches on an item to allow for input throughout the process. Ms. Minshall said SRTC staff will strive to engage the TTC earlier in the process on larger planning or strategy type efforts as well, not just technical project discussions.

Mr. Otterstrom said his understanding of Roberts Rules of Order are that a prohibition on unannounced action items is specific to special meetings; at a regularly scheduled meeting action items may be added if the group decides to do so and still be in compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act.

The group discussed the timing challenges of discussions on informational items at one meeting evolving into action items a month later.

Mr. Larson asked if these issues were covered by existing committee bylaws. Ms. Minshall said there are bylaws, but they are extremely broad. Mr. Larson said, as a fairly new member, he would like more information about the role and purpose of the TTC. Chair Tedesco agreed with that suggestion and also said receiving information

about MPO best practices would be helpful. Mr. McCallum also stated he would like an informational session about roles and responsibilities of the TTC.

Chair Tedesco said he feels it would be difficult to relay information to the Board without formal decision made by a vote. Mr. Blankenagel said if each discussion became a formal decision it may be difficult to have regular discussions and ask simple questions; he feels the informal nature of the TTC is great and allows members to remain open to receiving information.

The group discussed other options such as the; TTC Chair commenting on agenda items at the Board meeting, reading from prior meeting minutes, and TTC receiving prior notice of upcoming Board action items on their agenda.

The group did not come to any conclusions for action or make recommendations on specific procedural changes. Chair Tedesco stated this will continue to be a work in progress.

6. City of Airway Heights Highway 2 Shared Use Path Gap Scope Change Request

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa provided a background of the project and overview of the proposed scope change. She explained that this item is before the TTC because scope changes of projects with SRTC regional funds need to be approved by the SRTC Executive Director with TTC review and concurrence prior to approval. She noted no additional funds are being requested.

Mr. Braaten gave additional details about the scope change, noting that the City of Airway Heights agreed to cover the additional costs in exchange for a better project and he explained how the project would look if the scope change was not done.

Mr. Otterstrom made a motion to recommend SRTC Executive Director approval of the City of Airway Heights Scope Change Request as presented. Ms. Note seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

7. 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) May Amendment

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa reported that the May amendment consists of the following projects:

- City of Airway Heights – Hwy 2 Shared Use Path Gap
- SRTC – Metropolitan Transportation Planning
- SRTC – Data Acquisition
- Spokane County – Mill Rd
- Spokane County – Monroe Bridge
- Spokane County: Signal Safety

Mr. Otterstrom made a motion to recommend Board approval of the 2018-2021 TIP May Amendment and Mr. Martin seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

9. TIP Working Group Update

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa announced that the region has obligated \$3.2 million, or 38% of the target, and reminded the group that the obligation deadline is August 1.

10. Agency Update

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa noted that the May 23 meeting will be a combined TTC/TAC workshop from 12:00 – 5:00 and the topic is walkability. She said there will be a very brief TTC business session at the beginning of the workshop. She spoke about two additional TTC meetings on June 7 and July 11, both from 10:00 am to 12:00 pm and said the purpose of these meetings is to make sure there is plenty of time to discuss and gather input on the best way to present the results and investment strategies to the Board. She said SRTC received 50

eligibility worksheets and is looking for volunteers to score the applications; Mr. Howell, Mr. Blankenagel, Ms. Mantz, Mr. Braaten and Ms. Colyar volunteered.

She said the SRTC Unified Planning Work Program was out for comment and May 1 was the deadline to submit comments.

Ms. Lehman announced SRTC is presenting a roundabout symposium on June 6. She said there will be a technical presentation during the day and a more general presentation in the evening aimed at the public. She asked for volunteers to craft questions for the public session. Mr. Larson, Mr. Braaten and Ms. Dewey volunteered. Ms. Lehman provided a status update of the SRTC Monthly Messaging program.

11. Future Agenda Items

There were no suggestions for future agenda items.

12. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:02 pm.

Julie Meyers-Lehman
Recording Secretary