

DATE: May 16, 2018  
TO: Members of the Transportation Technical Committee  
FROM: Mike Tedesco, Spokane Tribe, Chair  
SUBJECT: Agenda for TTC Meeting  
Wednesday, May 23, 2018 – **11:45 pm (Please note change in time!)**  
SRTC, 421 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 504 (The Paulsen Building)

### AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call / Record of Attendance
3. Public Comments
4. **Action - Consent Agenda**
  - a) Approval of April 25, 2018 Meeting Minutes
  - b) Recommend Board approval of the 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) June Amendment
  - c) Recommend Board approval of Spokane Transit Authority, Asset Management Performance Targets
5. **Action** – Draft State Fiscal Year 2019 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)
6. Adjournment **12:20pm**

**Special Training: Walkability Workshop 12:30pm – 5:00pm**

**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

## MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 16, 2018

TO: Members of the Transportation Technical Committee

FROM: Anna Ragaza-Bourassa, Senior Transportation Planner

SUBJECT: 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program June Amendment

### Summary

One member agency has requested an amendment to the 2018-2021 TIP (see **Attachment**). The changes necessitating an amendment are:

- **WSDOT – I-90/Barker to Harvard Rd** (*new project*) – This project will improve Barker Rd and Harvard Rd Interchanges and connect local road network north and south at Henry Rd. Only the preliminary engineering phase of this project is included in the 2018 TIP.
- **WSDOT – US 395/NSC I-90 to Sprague Ave** – Add preliminary engineering (\$7,445,100) and right-of-way (\$14,472,000) phases and decreased the construction phase from \$276,000,000 to \$260,833,550 (programmed in 2023). The total project cost increased from \$276,000,000 to \$282,750,650.
- **WSDOT – US 395/NSC Sprague Ave to Spokane River** – Add preliminary engineering (\$10,500,000) and right-of-way (\$45,342,000) phases and increased the construction phase from \$224,000,000 to \$293,908,500. The total project cost increased from \$224,000,000 to \$349,750,500.

### ***TIP Overview***

The TIP is a programming document that identifies specific projects and programs to be implemented during the upcoming four years. Any project with federal funds from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) or Federal Transit Administration (FTA), as well as any regionally significant projects, must be included in the TIP. After a TIP has been incorporated into the Washington State TIP (STIP), project changes can be requested by local agencies. Minor changes can be made administratively by SRTC staff. Significant changes must be made through the amendment process, which requires a 10-day public comment period and action by the SRTC Board of Directors.

### **Public Involvement**

Pursuant to SRTC's Public Participation Plan, this amendment will be published for a 10-day public review and comment period from May 23 through June 1 at 4:00 p.m. Notice of the amendment will be published in the Spokesman Review and on the SRTC website ([www.srtc.org](http://www.srtc.org)) May 23. Public comments received during the public comment period will be addressed by SRTC staff and presented to the SRTC Board of Directors in their June meeting packet.

**Policy Implications**

The TIP serves as an important tool in implementing the goals, policies, and strategies identified in Horizon 2040, SRTC's long-range plan. As such, any projects included in the TIP, including projects added through monthly amendments, must be consistent with Horizon 2040. Consistency with Horizon 2040 includes a demonstration of financial constraint and conformity with regional air quality plans. The June amendment has been reviewed by SRTC staff for compliance with federal and state requirements and consistency with Horizon 2040.

**Technical Implications**

TIP amendments must be approved by the SRTC Board in order to be incorporated into the Washington State TIP (STIP). Projects receiving federal funds must be in both the TIP and the STIP to access those funds.

Pending approval by the SRTC Board, the June amendment will be incorporated into the STIP on or around July 13.

**Prior Committee Actions**

This item is being presented to the TTC for the first time.

**Requested Action**

Recommendation for SRTC Board approval of the June amendment to the 2018-2021 TIP, as shown in the **Attachment**.



**2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program  
June Amendment (18-06)**

Agency	Project Title Amendment Description	Funding Adjustment		Amendment	
				New Project	Existing Project
1 WSDOT	<b>I-90/Barker to Harvard - Improve Interchanges &amp; Local Roads</b> New project. This project will improve Barker Rd and Harvard Rd Interchanges and connect local road network north and south at Henry Rd. Only the preliminary engineering phase of this project is included in the 2018 TIP.	State	\$500,000	✓	
		Total	\$500,000		
2 WSDOT	<b>US 395/NSC I-90 to Sprague Ave</b> Add preliminary engineering (\$7,445,100) and right-of-way (\$14,472,000) phases and decreased the construction phase from \$276,000,000 to \$260,833,550 (programmed in 2023). The total project cost increased from \$276,000,000 to \$282,750,650.	CWA	\$6,750,650		✓
		Total	\$6,750,650		
3 WSDOT	<b>US 395/NSC Sprague Ave to Spokane River</b> Add preliminary engineering (\$10,500,000) and right-of-way (\$45,342,000) phases and increased the construction phase from \$224,000,000 to \$293,908,500. The total project cost increased from \$224,000,000 to \$349,750,500.	CWA	\$125,750,500		✓
		Total	\$125,750,500		

CWA Connecting Washington Funding Package

**MEMORANDUM**

DATE: May 16, 2018

TO: Members of the Transportation Technical Committee

FROM: Eve Nelson, Senior Transportation Planner  
Karl Otterstrom, Director of Planning and Development (STA)

SUBJECT: Spokane Transit Authority, Asset Management Performance Targets

**Summary**

SRTC is continuing the process of setting performance targets for the region’s transportation system. Spokane Transit Authority (STA), under Transit Asset Management (TAM) requirements, must set State of Good Repair performance targets for their assets. SRTC and STA are required to coordinate on these targets and target-setting processes.

Spokane Transit, in accordance with 49 CFR Part 625 and 630, reported the following State of Good Repair Asset Management Targets to SRTC. STA is the only public transportation provider required to report these targets to SRTC at this time.

*Spokane Transit Authority, State of Good Repair Targets*

Asset Category	Asset Class	Current Performance	STA Target & Proposed Regional Target
Rolling Stock	Buses	100%	Maintain the bus fleet that 90% or greater of the vehicles meet STA's State of Good Repair Standards
	Paratransit Vans	100%	Maintain the paratransit van fleet that 90% or greater of the vehicles meet STA's State of Good Repair Standards
	Rideshare Vans	100%	Maintain the rideshare van fleet that 90% or greater of the vehicles meet STA's State of Good Repair Standards
	Special Use Vans	100%	Maintain the special use van fleet that 90% or greater of the vehicles meet STA's State of Good Repair Standards
Equipment	Support of Non-Revenue Vehicles	95%	Maintain the support or non-revenue fleet that 90% or greater of the vehicles meet STA's State of Good Repair Standards
Facilities	Administration, Maintenance, passenger and parking facilities	100%	Maintain all facilities equal to or greater than 90% have a TERM condition rating of 3(adequate) or better

Per federal requirements, anytime a public transit provider adopts new TAM targets, SRTC has 180 days to review and adopt TAM performance targets and bring them into the regional performance management efforts. Staff from both agencies have agreed to keep in regular contact regarding these performance targets so that consistency can be maintained between the two organizations.

### **Public Involvement**

Stakeholder workshops, surveys and meetings including members of the public have been ongoing since 2015 regarding performance measure development at the regional level. The targets have been reviewed with a committee of the STA Board of Directors at an open public meeting and will be incorporated as an appendix to STA's 2018 Transit Development Plan (TDP).

### **Policy Implications**

Establishing a performance management process intends to provide more objectivity in developing, implementing, and measuring the effectiveness of future transportation projects and programs.

### **Technical Implications**

The SRTC Board of Directors has three key responsibilities under federal surface transportation regulations that are directly related to the Horizon 2040 Implementation Toolkit. First, the Board is responsible for selecting projects for Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) Regional funds, STBG set-aside funds and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds. Second, the Board is responsible for ensuring that all federally funded transportation projects are consistent with Horizon 2040. Third, the Board is responsible for determining that all regionally significant transportation projects meet air quality conformity requirements.

### **Prior Committee Actions**

The SRTC Board approved Horizon 2040 and the safety performance targets on December 14, 2017.

### **Requested Action**

Recommend the SRTC Board of Directors approve to Spokane Transit TAM targets to include in the SRTC performance management planning efforts.

**MEMORANDUM**

DATE: May 16, 2018  
 TO: Members of the Transportation Technical Committee  
 FROM: Greg Griffin, Administrative Services Manager  
 SUBJECT: SFY 2019 SRTC Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

**Summary**

**Staff is asking the TTC to recommend approval of the draft SFY 2019 UPWP (see Attachment 1) to the SRTC Board.**

The Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) contains information about the transportation planning projects to be undertaken by Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) during the 2019 state fiscal year (SFY): July 1, 2018 – June 2019. The UPWP also includes major planning activities identified by Spokane Transit Authority (STA) and Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) Eastern Region in a separate appendix. It is a fundamental document that spells out the core functions, planning studies, technical support and ongoing planning activities being conducted by the agency, as well as the federal, state, and/or local funding sources for this work. The SFY 2019 UPWP addresses SRTC’s core programs and functions as well as emerging transportation planning needs identified in Horizon 2040.

**The attached version contains additional language throughout added after the on-site review on May 16, 2018 with FHWA, FTA, and WSDOT. The language is not substantive; the intent is to provide additional detail and focus on federal emphasis areas and clarification given that the SRTC certification review will be at the end of SFY 2019/early SFY 2020. The certification process is on a four-year cycle. It was recommended that the accomplishments and work proposed be as specific as possible to aid in the desk audit process. Please refer to the SFY 2019 UPWP development schedule below for an overview of important dates associated with this process.**

SRTC SFY 2019 UPWP Development Schedule	
Key Due Dates	Key Action Due
May 16, 2018	On-site review meeting with WSDOT, Public Transportation Division, FHWA and FTA
May 23, 2018	TAC and TTC requested to recommend of Board approval of SFY2019 UPWP
June 7, 2018	Board action on SFY 2019 UPWP
June 15, 2018	Approved SFY 2019 UPWP submitted to WSDOT
June 21, 2018	WSDOT submits approved SFY 2019 UPWP to FHWA/FTA
June 30, 2018	FHWA/FTA UPWP approval date
July 1, 2018	SFY 2019 UPWP takes effect

**Public Involvement**

The draft SFY 2019 SRTC UPWP was discussed at the March TTC meeting, the April TAC meeting, as well as the March and May SRTC Board of Directors meetings, all of which were open to the public.

**Policy Implications**

The purpose of the UPWP is to meet the federal MPO unified planning work program requirements as well as the state RTPPO work program requirements. The UPWP also fosters regional coordination and collaboration on proposed planning activities over the next SFY (July 1 – June 30).

**Technical Implications**

On May 16, 2018, the WSDOT Transportation Planning Office, Public Transportation Division, and Eastern Region Planning Office, along with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), conducted an on-site review of the SFY 2019 UPWP.

After Board approval on June 14, 2018 the UPWP will be submitted to WSDOT who will in turn submit it to FHWA and FTA for approval by the end of June. The FY 2019 UPWP will be in effect beginning July 1, 2018.

**Prior Committee Actions**

The draft SFY 2019 UPWP was discussed at the March TTC meeting and at the April TAC meeting. The draft document was posted on the SRTC website and a link emailed to members of both committees on April 13 for review and comments. The deadline to submit comments was May 1. The comments received were discussed at the May SRTC Board meeting and are summarized in Attachment 2.

**Requested Action**

Recommend approval of the SFY 2019 UPWP to the SRTC Board of Directors.

**UPWP Comments  
Received May 1**

1. Page 15

Section 1 Transition from MAP-21 and FAST Act Implementation

Comment: *Would like to add to the first bullet “and will inform and aid local agencies of the notices and changes” or something similar.*

Done

2. Page 15

Section 3 – Ladders of Opportunity – second bullet point

Comment: *Please add “through coordination with local agencies”*

Done

3. Page 26 – Travel Demand Modeling Expected Outcomes –

Comment: *Can we tie these down to years? True that models should always evolve, but a line has to be drawn toward a “published model” versus a “working model”. For this row as the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> from the bottom of the table.*

Until a strategy is agreed upon for data acquisition, for both the travel demand model and for land use allocation a schedule is premature. Certain parts of the travel demand model must be updated at least 18 months prior to the long-range plan update to provide the inputs necessary for meaningful travel behavior and project selection.

4. Page 29 – TIP Development and Maintenance Expected Outcomes

Final Project Selection for STBG, STBG Set-Aside and CMAQ call for Projects – August 2019

Comment: *2018?*

Yes, Corrected

5. Page 29 – TIP Development and Maintenance Expected Outcomes

Develop and maintain a TIP database and reporting tool

Comment: *What is the TIP reporting tool?*

The intention of a TIP reporting tool, which can take many different formats, is to be able to provide electronic reports in different formats, specifically obligation, phase of project, and sponsor.

- Page 11 states as an accomplishment: “Started a liaison program to provide each member jurisdiction with a specific member point-of-contact.” I understand Jason Lien is the transit lead, but I didn’t realize each jurisdiction has a designated POC. Is this written somewhere or disseminated in some fashion uniformly at some point?

Yes, this information was sent to all member agencies in a letter on Jan 25, 2018. Board members and TTC members were cc’d on the letter.

- Page 27: I’m interested in learning more the schedule for the 2021 MTP update, as Task 4.1 indicates it will begin this fall and focus on the definition of regional significance. What will this entail?

Scoping will begin this month, and developing the schedule is part of that process. Defining “regional significance” is broader than the air quality definition, which is in the CFR. We have a variety of other examples from MPO’s to review. This will entail conversations with the TAC and TTC committees and ultimately a Board recommendation. This is only one portion of the MTP scope.

- Page 28, Task 4.5: Should there be an outcome related to the TTC or other workgroup on performance management?

This has been added for specificity on page 28

- Task 7 Planning Consultation and Studies: I agree this makes sense to keep broad to take advantage of opportunities; however, the fact this Task grows from \$75,000 in the current UPWP to nearly \$500,000 in the draft UPWP (including \$240,000 in personnel and indirect expenses) should require some additional explanation on how to accomplish a scaling up of that magnitude. Additional details are warranted to be able to accomplish that much work.

This has been addressed with the Board of Directors. Some activities historically that belonged in Task 7 have been recorded in Task 4, although they are eligible for the funding sources billed either way. In SFY 16-18, much of staff time was on development of the MTP, so task 4 was much higher. SFY2019 includes more time for member agency support, specifically WSDOT as well as time for two regional planning initiatives. We re-evaluated the time and have dropped the staffing and indirect, however the direct funds for consulting in the proposed version has now increased to reflect funding to be received by WSDOT and the City of Spokane for these planning initiatives. In consultant with WSDOT and FHWA, we show these funds as received and potentially expended. We do not anticipate they will be fully expended in SFY2019, and we will re-budget them into SFY2020 when the time comes.

- Task 7.2 (Division Street Reimagined) seems reasonable as a starting point for the collaborative work

We concur. See above response for financial implications. In on-site review FHWA and WSDOT HDQ concurred the collaborative work was an appropriate and standard activity for MPO’s of our size.