

DATE: July 18, 2018
TO: Members of the Transportation Technical Committee
FROM: Mike Tedesco, Spokane Tribe, Chair
SUBJECT: Agenda for TTC Meeting – Wednesday, July 25, 2018 - 1:30 pm
SRTC, 421 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 504 (The Paulsen Building)

AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call / Record of Attendance
3. **Action** - Approval of June 27 and July 12 2018 Meeting Minutes
4. Public Comments
5. Technical Member Comments
6. **Action** – 2018 SRTC Call for Projects: Project Prioritization Recommendation
7. **Information & Discussion**
 - a) US 195 / I-90 Study (*Ryan Stewart*)
8. TIP Working Group Update (*Sabrina Minshall*)
9. Target Setting Working Group Update (*Eve Nelson*)
10. Agency Update
11. Future Agenda Items
12. Adjournment

Next Meeting: August 22

TTC WORKSHOP SUMMARY

Spokane Regional Transportation Council Transportation Technical Committee
 Call for Projects Workshop
 June 27, 2018
 421 W Riverside Ave Suite 504, Spokane, Washington

Committee Members Present

Todd Ableman	City of Cheney	Gordon Howell	Spokane Transit Authority
Mike Basinger	City of Spokane Valley	Roger Krieger	City of Deer Park
Brandon Blankenagel	City of Spokane	Sean Messner	Spokane County
Derrick Braaten	City of Airway Heights	Louis Meuler	City of Spokane
Brandi Colyar	Spokane County	Inga Note	City of Spokane
Lisa Corcoran	Spokane Airports	Mike Tedesco	Spokane Tribe of Indians
Heleen Dewey	Spokane Regional Health Dist.	Glenn Wagemann	WSDOT-Eastern Region

Committee Alternates Present

Mark Bergam	City of Airway Heights	Adam Jackson	City of Spokane Valley
Scott Englehard	Spokane County	Keith Martin	WSDOT-Eastern Region
Barry Greene	Spokane County	Mike Tressider	Spokane Transit Authority

Other Attendees

Debbie Lyons	Kalispel Tribe of Indians	Katherine Miller	City of Spokane
--------------	---------------------------	------------------	-----------------

Staff

Anna Ragaza-Bourassa	Senior Transportation Planner	Jason Lien	Senior Transportation Planner
Mike Ulrich	Senior Transportation Planner		

A workshop was held to discuss the 2018 call for projects.

MEETING MINUTES

Spokane Regional Transportation Council Transportation Technical Committee
June 27, 2018
421 W Riverside Ave Suite 504, Spokane, Washington

1. Call to Order

Mr. Mike Tedesco, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Committee Members Present

Mike Tedesco	Spokane Tribe of Indians	Brandi Colyar	Spokane County
Sean Messner	Spokane County	Lisa Corcoran	Spokane Airports
Derrick Braaten	City of Airway Heights	April Westby	Spokane Regional Clean Air
Todd Ableman	City of Cheney	Heleen Dewey	Spokane Regional Health Dist
Roger Krieger	City of Deer Park	Gordon Howell	Spokane Transit Authority
Louis Meuler	City of Spokane	Karl Otterstrom	Spokane Transit Authority
Inga Note	City of Spokane	Larry Larson	WSDOT-Eastern Region
Brandon Blankenagel	City of Spokane	Glenn Wagemann	WSDOT-Eastern Region
Mike Basinger	City of Spokane Valley		

Committee Alternates Present

Adam Jackson	City of Spokane Valley	Keith Martin	WSDOT-Eastern Region
--------------	------------------------	--------------	----------------------

Guests

Robyn Lashbrook	T-O Engineers	Paul Kropp	Community Assembly
Mike Bjordahl	WSDOT-Eastern Region	Mark Bergam	City of Airway Heights

Staff

Anna Ragaza-Bourassa	Senior Transportation Planner	Staci Lehman	Communications Coordinator
Mike Ulrich	Senior Transportation Planner	Tristan De Alwis	Data Scientist
Jason Lien	Senior Transportation Planner	Julie Meyers-Lehman	Administrative Assistant

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa introduced new SRTC Data Scientist, Tristan De Alwis. Mr. De Alwis spoke about the type of work he will be doing at SRTC.

3. Approval of May 23, 2018 Minutes

Mr. Messner made a motion to approve the May 23, 2018 minutes as presented. Mr. Larson seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

4. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

5. Technical Member Comments

Mr. Messner reported that Spokane County received a \$2.3 million Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board (FMSIB) grant for Bigelow Gulch Project 3.

Ms. Note said the City coordinated with the railroad to close a section of railway for four hours to allow for University District Pedestrian Bridge construction.

Mr. Jackson stated FMSIB awarded \$1.7 million to Spokane Valley for the Barker Road Corridor Project.

Mr. Ableman said Cheney is starting up on annual preservation projects.

Mr. Martin reminded the group to get complete funding packages to his office by July 11.

Mr. Meuler reported the North Spokane Corridor placemaking project and Children of the Sun Trail alignment process with the public is ramping back up and will continue until November. He said a collaboration team has been created to vet information gathered from the public charrettes held earlier this year.

Mr. Braaten spoke about continuing street projects in Airway Heights and updates to ADA ramps in various locations throughout the city.

Mr. Otterstrom noted that construction of the West Plains Transit Center is still on track to be completed in September. He said STA is in partnership with City of Spokane for design engineering on the Central City Line.

Mr. Blankenagel talked about the upcoming Riverside Avenue from Division to Monroe project and said the City of Spokane is setting up the next level of public comment and outreach for this project.

Ms. Corcoran reported that construction of phase two of the convenience store project was underway as well as a new 12-acre parking lot, a new hotel near the airport, and a \$18 million investment of improvements to the airfield.

Ms. Dewey announced that the City of Spokane Parking Advisory Committee has committed \$25,000 towards design of the Spokane Urban Cultural Trail project.

Mr. Larson stated that WSDOT is wrapping up the Division/Ruby paving projects and beginning two roundabouts in Deer Park.

Ms. Westby reported that SRCAA received notice from the EPA that the official particulate matter monitors currently located on the SRCAA building at Augusta and Mission must be moved before the NSC is completed, as it will no longer meet the EPA siting criteria. SCRAA is trying to find a new location and secure funding to move the monitors.

6. 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) July Amendment

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

- City of Spokane – Spokane Street Preservation North (*scope change*)
- Spokane County – Geiger Boulevard (*new project*)
- Spokane International Airport – Airport/Spotted Rd Interchange & Realignment (*new project*)
- Spokane Regional Health District – Walk Bike Bus Millwood (*new project*)

Mr. Larson made a motion to recommend Board approval of the 2018-2021 TIP July Amendment. Mr. Greene seconded the motion.

Mr. Otterstrom asked if alternatives for the preliminary engineering on Airport/Spotted Rd interchange will be considered, such as a roundabout in lieu of an interchange. Ms. Corcoran replied that many alternatives had been evaluated, but in looking at the purpose of the road improvements it was decided that an interchange was the desired option to separate freight and passenger traffic.

A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

7a. 2018 SRTC Call for Projects – Preliminary Results

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa stated she will talk about updates to the final funding allocations, safety scoring methodology and the schedule, Mr. Lien will present the preliminary results, and then receive input from the group on how to package an investment strategy based on performance areas for both review by the TTC; ultimately make a recommendation in July to the Board.

She summarized the number and types of project applications received for funding consideration and the total amount available would be \$1.8M less now that the final federal fiscal year (FFY) 2018 allocations. She noted the updated estimated funding available is:

- \$16M for Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG)
- \$8.4M for Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ)
- \$1.8 M for STBG Set-Aside

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa provided information about the updated scoring methodology used in the safety section of the application, described the proposed schedule changes for the remainder of the Call for Projects process, and getting projects into the TIP. Mr. Otterstrom commented that anytime the TIP process can be moved along more quickly is better because then there is more certainty when it comes to pursuing other grants and opportunities.

She stated that the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) has been asked to review and weight the Guiding Principles and the TTC is being asked to provide input on Performance Areas; not performance *measures* because staff recognizes that some of the final performance measure metrics have not yet been released and also the criteria in the application might not completely align with the federal performance measures. Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa outlined, briefly described each of the five Performance Areas and asked for input on two questions (1) How can staff use performance areas to develop a prioritized list of projects and (2) How should staff handle capital maintenance projects.

The group then discussed the item at length. TTC Member comments included:

- There have been conversations by this group predicting this would be challenging, there is no framework for creating value points, and asked if there is a planned approach to arrive at a consensus;
- The applications already were submitted into different categories at the beginning; it was thought a decision had been made to not slice-and-dice up front; not sure if we can go back and weight after the fact;
- The earlier direction of the process said all the projects would be put in to the ring to see how they measured up for priority. Suggestion that a sampling of only 50 projects may not be enough to determine regional priorities;
- Confusion about what the group is supposed to be trying to do with the performance areas, asking to choose which to emphasize is nebulous without direction or correlation to the Guiding Principles;
- Mr. Otterstrom read from the February 2018 TTC minutes where it was announced that the TAC would be asked to weight the Guiding Principles which is the reason the application did not weight them and the TTC will be asked to assist in grouping and packaging of the applications for presentation to the Board;
- A lot of effort had gone into the development of the application and overlaying performance areas would skew the raw scores. It would be helpful to see which projects are eligible for the different funding buckets. To put another weighting on top after the scoring doesn't seem right. The raw scores should be sufficient;
- Deciding to prioritize performance areas before the list of scored projects is seen is a shift of the whole method of evaluation; makes more sense to see the scores first;
- Suggestion to see how each project ranked based on each performance area.

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa turned the floor over to Mr. Lien who presented the scoring spreadsheet, 49 projects from eleven jurisdictions and the sum total of amount requested is \$98M and there is approximately \$26M to disburse. He outlined the agencies and jurisdictions that participated in the scoring process. Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa spoke about pavement condition scoring. Mr. Lien described the categories, scoring criteria, and ranking values. He said as a comparative metric, staff applied different methods of scoring to see if the results changed much from simple raw scores and said it changed an insignificant amount. Chair Tedesco said the goal for this conversation is to give feedback to SRTC staff about how the group would like to go about pursuing a formal recommendation to the Board next month.

Discussion by the group ensued. TTC member comments included:

- Questions on how and why final scoring would deviate from raw scores;
- The need for additional information if the group is being asked to move beyond the raw score and look at projects through a filter;
- The desire to avoid adding another filter to the process;
- Request to see the scored project list divided by existing filters (CMAQ, TAP, small town minimums, urban/rural minimums);
- Question about if projects could accept funding less than was requested on the application to make distribution more equitable;
- Difficulties with receiving partial funding for projects because the lead agency is then committed to finishing the project or paying back the federal funds;
- Desire to maximize federal dollars for regional benefits.

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa said the Board will be presented with this list at the July meeting. Chair Tedesco asked Ms. Note to reiterate her earlier recommendation for clarity. She said it would be helpful to see a similar list that shows the raw scores priority points and overall rank, but summarized by whether its eligible to be funded by a certain funding category; so essentially three separate lists, showing which projects are eligible for STBG, CMAQ and STBG Set-Aside, and indication as to which projects qualify for rural funding and the rural funding targets.

The group discussed the upcoming additional TTC meeting on July 12, receiving the modified list prior to that meeting, and how and when a debrief on the process may occur.

Chair Tedesco noted that item #9 had been removed from the agenda. He had to leave the meeting at 3:02 pm and turned the meeting over to Vice Chair Sean Messner.

7b. I-90 Operations Study Update

Mr. Bjordahl reported that the study has been completed and the final report includes:

- Existing conditions report;
- Needs, goals and objectives memorandum;
- Implementation plan;
- Operational Concept Report;
- Washington State Patrol Wrong Way Driver Incidents.

He spoke about a retrofit ramp meter planned for the US-195/I-90 interchange and the consideration of five additional ramp meters in 2019. He provided details about wrong way driver notification technology on I-90 ramps; he said in 2017 there were 21 known incidents and one fatality as a result of wrong way vehicles.

Mr. Bjordahl described the next steps of the study:

- Short-term - reviewing need for additional ramp meter locations on the West Plains;
- Mid-term - closer study of the Walnut ramp closure and a study of the US 195/I-90 area;
- Long-term – Active Traffic Management System elements and a further study of downtown on/off ramp reconfigurations.

The group discussed high occupancy vehicle lanes.

8. TIP Working Group Update

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa said 87.5% of the target, or \$7.2M, has been obligated.

9. Agency Update

Ms. Lehman spoke about the next event in the Education Series, former Oklahoma City Mayor Mick Cornett coming to Spokane for three different sessions on July 10 and 11.

11. Future Agenda Items

There were no suggestions for future agenda items.

13. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:15pm.

Julie Meyers-Lehman
Recording Secretary

MEETING MINUTES

Spokane Regional Transportation Council Transportation Technical Committee
 July 12, 2018 – Additional Meeting
 421 W Riverside Ave Suite 504, Spokane, Washington

1. Call to Order & Roll Call

Mr. Mike Tedesco, Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

Committee Members Present

Mike Tedesco	Spokane Tribe of Indians	Gloria Mantz	City of Spokane Valley
Sean Messner	Spokane County	Mike Basinger	City of Spokane Valley
Mark Bergam	City of Airway Heights	Lisa Corcoran	Spokane Airports
Roger Krieger	City of Deer Park	Brandi Colyar	Spokane County
Inga Note	City of Spokane	Darrel McCallum	WSDOT-Eastern Region

Committee Alternates Present

Cindy Greene	Spokane Regional Health Dist.	Barry Greene	Spokane County
Mike Tressider	Spokane Transit Authority	Keith Martin	WSDOT-Eastern Region

Guests

Adam Jackson	City of Spokane Valley	Colin Quin-Hurst	City of Spokane Valley
--------------	------------------------	------------------	------------------------

Staff

Sabrina Minshall	Executive Director	Anna Ragaza-Bourassa	Senior Transportation Planner
Mike Ulrich	Senior Transportation Planner	Tristan De Alwis	Data Scientist
Jason Lien	Senior Transportation Planner	Julie Meyers-Lehman	Administrative Assistant

2a. Summary of TAC Prioritization Efforts to Date

Mr. Ulrich explained that the TAC has been tasked with weighting the Guiding Principles (GPs) as part of the Call for Projects process. He outlined the weighting exercises completed at the June 25 meeting; the group was asked to weight the GPs individually based on their own opinions and their interpretation of public perception, then the group reviewed their answers and explained the reasoning behind their choices. The second part was to weight the GPs as a group. Mr. Ulrich noted that the results from individual and group exercises were surprisingly similar with Quality of Life receiving the most weight in both cases.

He presented a list of all the projects and how each scored in each GP and if that moved the project up or down in relation to the raw score.

2b. TTC Prioritization Next Steps

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa summarized the 2018 Call for Projects process which is different than past years' calls. She reviewed the upcoming schedule and stated that the emphasis in July and August is regional prioritization and project programming will be done in September and October. \

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa provided details about what the TTC will be asked to do at the meeting today and at the following three meetings:

July 12 – Prioritization

- (1) Determine policy considerations
- (2) Consider adjustments for projects

August 22 – Programming

- (1) Review Board priority list and public comment
- (2) Discuss and provide feedback on draft "Program

(3) Review areas of consensus or differences

of Projects”

July 25 – Prioritization

- (1) Review guidance from July 12 meeting
- (2) SRTC staff presents draft priority list with adjustments
- (3) Modify/accept/recommend priority list

September 26 – Programming

- (1) Review Board feedback on first draft of “Program of Projects: and public comment from Board priority list
- (2) Recommend “Program of Projects” to Board

Mr. Ulrich highlighted the limitations of using only raw scores for prioritization. He presented three hypothetical projects which had very close raw scores but had very different results in terms of GP scoring.

Ms. Minshall elaborated on the TTC’s next steps in the coming months. She explained the first exercise today will be a break out into small groups to consider if there should be adjustments of the prioritization score based on:

- Guiding Principles Standouts
- Cost
- Geography (projects outside the urbanized area)
- Types of Projects (pavement preservation, active transportation, studies & programs)

The group discussed the cost category and Transportation Improvement Board matching rules. Ms. Minshall pointed out that the priority list of projects is going to be used for more things than applying funds from SRTC’s call for projects; this list will be able to be used for contingency funding, for conversations with the Board about the projects that did not receive funding, and for continued assistance with finding funding from other sources.

Ms. Minshall distributed a worksheet and divided the members into small groups and they worked on the activity for twenty minutes. Ms. Minshall then went over the questions on the worksheet one at a time and asked each team for their response, which were tallied on a whiteboard.

She then explained the second part of the exercise a distribution of the scored projects list and then the small groups will reconsider the questions to see if their answers change and if so, to discuss upon what prompted the change. The teams worked on the activity for twenty minutes then the meeting reconvened. Ms. Minshall said a summary of the results of the activities will be presented at the next TTC meeting. Each team provided responses to each question which were again tallied.

Some TTC comments included:

- Doesn’t feel there is a need for prioritization; feels like the scoring does that on its own
- There are project types and policy issues, but the first cut should be by regional priority, however the reality is that the group needs to see the subsets
- At the time of the application it was understood that all policies were weighted equally.
- Because of there being a single application for all funding sources, preservation projects will not have high scores
- Desire to see a sub-list of small town projects

3. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:59 am.

Julie Meyers-Lehman
Recording Secretary

MEMORANDUM

DATE: July 18, 2018
TO: Members of the Transportation Technical Committee
FROM: Anna Ragaza-Bourassa, Senior Transportation Planner
SUBJECT: 2018 Call for Project: Project Prioritization Recommendation

Summary

SRTC released a call for projects on March 9, 2018. After the Board approved “off the top” programs and the two years of reserve for capital maintenance, the total estimated amount made available through this call is \$26.2 million; comprised of \$16 million in Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) program funds, \$8.4 million in Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ) program funds and \$1.8 million in STBG Set-Aside funds. Please note that these numbers have decreased from the initial estimates based on the federal fiscal year (FFY) 2018 final allocations, which went down for some programs. SRTC received 49 project applications totaling just over **\$98 million**.

In previous years, calls for projects have been released separately, based on funding source. This year SRTC released a single call for projects with the allocation of resources occurring after regional priorities are established. After Board priorities have been established, staff will recommend programming to maximize the number of projects that can be awarded. This updated process allows for tighter linkage between Horizon 2040 guiding principles, goals, and strategies and project selection.

Status

The call for projects schedule reflects a measured, two-step process and has many positive benefits:

1. This allows the SRTC Board to establish regional priorities **first**, without the sideboards of complicated grant programs and funding limitations.
2. The public comment benefit is better realized. This differs from past process where the Board made project and programming preliminary decisions simultaneously and *then* accepted public comment when projects were being included in the TIP. Although TIP approval is the final step in the process, the public likely considers the programming decisions foregone once a list of projects has been adopted by the Board.
3. SRTC staff is responsible for recommending programming options to the Board in order to maximize resources and comply with grant requirements and complexities.
4. This more deliberate process will allow for more collaboration, transparency, and policy level discussion that should realize greater benefit.

Next Steps:

- To help inform the Board’s action, the TAC and TTC will be asked to recommend a prioritized list of projects at their July meetings. A summary of the activities that took place at the July

12 special TTC meeting have been attached to this memo, **Attachment 1**. There wasn't consensus on moving projects either up or down on the raw score ranked list and therefore the original results ranked by raw score and three additional sub lists for small town projects, active transportation projects and capital maintenance projects are attached (**Attachment 2**).

- SRTC staff will then work to provide a draft “Program of Projects” - applying the grant sources and available funds to as many of the identified priorities as possible. SRTC staff will work with the applicants on technical requirements, phasing, etc., to develop recommendations and options. This information will be brought back to the TAC and TTC for review in August.

Remaining Call for Projects Schedule (updated)	
July 12	SRTC Board - review preliminary results
July 23, 25	TAC, TTC - recommend prioritized list of projects
August 9	SRTC Board – approve a prioritized list of projects
August 10- Sept 8	30-day Public comment period on prioritized list of projects
August 23, 27	TAC, TTC – review draft “Program of Projects”
September 13	SRTC Board – review public comments on prioritized list. Information and discussion on draft “Program of Projects”
September 24	TTC review of policy considerations as input on the draft “Program of Projects”
September 26	TTC review of technical requirements as input on the draft “Program of Projects”
October 11	SRTC Board – approve “Program of Projects” (will be added to 2019 TIP via the January TIP amendment)
December 19	TTC – recommend January TIP amendment approval
January 13	SRTC Board – approval of January TIP amendment

Public Involvement

The call for projects and application scoring was presented at multiple committees, TTC, TAC and SRTC Board of Directors meetings, which were open to the public. A sub-committee of the TTC helped to develop the application. The Board prioritized list of projects will go out for a 30-day public comment period after the August Board meeting, and the feedback will be available before approving the new “Program of Projects.” The new “Program of Projects” will go out for a public comment period again in late December as part of the January TIP amendment public comment period.

Requested Action

The TTC will be asked to recommend a prioritized list of projects for Board consideration.

Description of Activity 1: Priorities can be based on projects that are “well rounded” and perform well in all Guiding Principles (GP), on stand out, more singular purpose projects scoring very high in one or two GP’s, or projects that may not score well in all GP but are strong compared to others in same project type. Other considerations may be overall project costs as the application does not incorporate a benefit/cost analysis, or geography of project outside the UZA, which are challenged by the scoring methodology. Break into teams and please indicate Yes or No that adjustments to the overall priority could be made in the following areas.

Summary of Results:

1. Guiding Principles:

- a. Should adjustments based on stand out projects with high scores in one or two GP but don’t prioritize high overall – ***only one team (25%) said yes***
- b. Or in reverse, adjust if score high overall, but are not standouts in any GP – ***two teams (50%) said yes***

2. Project Cost – the application and raw prioritization scores do not include a benefit cost analysis. Should project cost adjust the overall priority? – *only one team (25%) said yes*****

3. Small Towns outside urbanized areas. Generally, projects don’t prioritize well due to density considerations in application.

- a. Should there be an adjustment in priority score for small towns projects? – ***only one team (25%) said yes***
- b. Should small town projects be sub-prioritized (separate list in addition to overall priority list) – ***two teams (50%) said yes***

4. Project types:

- a. Active transportation projects generally didn’t score well in application; as some points in GP not applicable. Should there be an adjustment in overall priority for “best” active transportation projects when compared to each other? – ***two teams (50%) said yes***
- b. Some points in the GP not applicable to studies or programs. Should there be an adjustment in overall priority for studies/programs? – ***all teams said no***
- c. Should there be an adjustment in overall priority for top preservation projects? Some points in the GP not applicable/ plus supplement to compare pavement preservation projects to each other? – ***two teams (50%) said yes***

Description of Activity 2: Break into the same teams as activity 1 and look at lists of top projects based on the six GP’s, small towns, Active transportation projects, Studies and Programs, Pavement Preservation and Reconstruction. Indicate by circling the “thumbs up” or “thumbs down” icon whether or not a project’s overall raw score ranking should be adjusted.

Summary of Results: ***Team 1, 2 and 4 did not recommend any adjustments. Team 3 recommended adjustments both up and down from each list mentioned above, but since the other teams didn’t recommend similar adjustments, none were made.***

SRTC 2018 Call for Projects - Preliminary Results - Sorted by Average Raw Score

Project #	Project Name	Location	Program Eligibility	Priority Points	Pavement	Amount	Avg Raw Score	Raw Score w/ Priority Points	Overall Rank	1) Economic Vitality Pts.	1) EV Rank	2) Cooperation & Leadership Pts.	2) C&L Rank	3) Stewardship Pts.	3) Stew. Rank	4) Systems Pts.	4) Systems Rank	5) Safety Pts.	5) Safety Rank	6) Quality of Life Pts.	6) QoL Rank
SC-2	Bigelow Gulch Project 6	UA	STBG	9		\$4,085,000	206	215	1	27	15	47	3	48	1	8	31	37	3	39	5
COS-3	Thor-Freya Couplet	UA	STBG	8	35	\$8,119,105	199	207	2	36	6	32	22	30	8	50	1	15	12	36	7
SRHD-1	Safe Routes to School Walking School Bus	UA	STBG, TAP	10		\$611,181	186	196	3	26	17	34	16	25	13	28	8	50	1	24	32
SV-1	Pines Grade Separation (RW only)	UA	STBG	10		\$3,795,000	186	196	4	30	11	48	2	9	38	30	6	40	2	30	22
COS-1	Riverside-Monroe to Wall	UA	STBG, TAP	10	35	\$5,003,141	185	195	5	34	8	33	19	23	15	24	12	29	5	42	1
SRHD-2	Walk Bike Bus Downtown Spokane	UA	STBG, CMAQ	9		\$304,202	175	184	6	38	4	32	23	22	17	33	4	25	7	26	27
SC-12	Commute Trip Reduction	UA	STBG, CMAQ	0		\$898,157	183	183	7	41	1	40	7	39	4	39	2	0	20	25	30
STA-1	Upgrade diesel buses to electric	UA	STBG, CMAQ	10		\$2,670,000	171	181	8	40	2	47	5	34	6	24	13	0	20	27	26
SC-3	Bigelow Gulch Project 2	Rural	STBG	8		\$2,601,000	168	176	9	12	40	47	4	45	2	8	27	40	2	15	42
MW-1	Argonne Rd, Frederick to Liberty congestion relief	UA	STBG, CMAQ	10		\$1,270,000	153	163	10	24	18	36	13	12	34	27	9	25	7	29	23
SC-1	Bigelow Gulch Project 5	Rural	STBG	10		\$1,568,000	153	163	11	12	41	48	1	43	3	8	29	26	6	15	41
STA-2	5-Mile Park & Ride Study	UA	STBG	9		\$200,000	146	155	12	26	16	34	15	34	5	29	7	0	20	23	35
SV-2	Barker Corridor reconstruction & widening (can be split into 3 segments)	UA	STBG	9		\$6,331,800	146	155	13	21	21	36	12	23	16	18	16	15	12	33	10
COS-12	Havana St-Sprague to Broadway	UA	STBG	0	65	\$5,836,971	151	151	14	29	13	33	20	19	24	8	28	30	4	32	15
DP-1	Crawford & Colville Roundabout/N Colville reconstructions	Rural	STBG	10		\$1,943,514	137	147	15	16	29	34	17	20	21	14	20	12	13	41	2
SV-6	Argonne Rd preservation (PE + RW only option)	UA	STBG	5	100	\$2,508,500	140	145	16	34	7	30	26	4	44	36	3	25	7	12	45
WSDOT-1	US 2 Garfield Rd intersection improvement	UA	STBG	10		\$2,200,000	130	140	17	21	22	26	35	6	43	31	5	24	8	24	34
COS-7	Maple-Wellesley Intersection	UA	STBG, CMAQ	4		\$761,822	134	138	18	28	14	18	44	17	26	26	11	25	7	21	37
SC-5	57th Avenue	UA	STBG	6	65	\$2,126,000	127	133	19	21	20	27	32	28	10	14	21	1	19	37	6
AH-2	21st Ave Craig Rd to Deer Heights Rd (Property Survey)	UA	STBG	9		\$89,545	120	129	20	11	43	42	6	10	36	26	10	0	20	32	17
SV-4	Pines and Mission intersection improvement (can be split into 2 segments)	UA	STBG, CMAQ	7		\$1,211,000	121	128	21	31	9	30	25	7	42	16	17	25	7	12	46
COS-10	Spokane Falls Blvd-Lincoln to Division	UA	STBG	1	35	\$7,305,931	126	127	22	29	12	18	45	19	23	13	23	15	12	33	11
DP-3	Colville Reconstruction Third St to north City Limits	Rural	STBG	8		\$2,021,738	116	124	23	16	30	31	24	20	22	2	42	15	12	32	16
SV-7	Park Road reconstruction (RW only)	UA	STBG	4		\$268,150	120	124	24	15	32	25	36	15	28	8	33	25	7	32	18
COS-5	Centennial Trail Summit Gap	UA	STBG, CMAQ, TAP	6		\$2,532,198	117	123	25	15	33	39	9	12	35	5	37	5	17	40	3
COS-6	Ben Burr Crossing Improvements	UA	STBG, CMAQ, TAP	5		\$746,099	117	122	26	21	23	23	38	32	7	8	30	1	19	32	12
SC-14	Harvard Rd	UA	STBG	0	65	\$4,827,000	121	121	27	13	39	21	42	24	14	19	15	18	10	25	28
COS-8	Driscoll-Alberta-Cochran Sidewalk Infill	UA	STBG, TAP	3		\$1,060,452	117	120	28	15	31	35	14	15	29	7	35	15	12	30	21
SC-6	57th Avenue & Freya St Roundabout	UA	STBG, CMAQ	5		\$728,300	114	119	29	22	19	27	33	8	40	12	24	6	16	40	4
COS-4	Washington-Stevens, Spokane Falls to Boone	UA	STBG	7	65	\$2,014,581	110	117	30	36	5	22	41	20	20	14	19	5	17	13	44
COS-2	Freya St - Wellesley to Decatur	UA	STBG	9	35	\$3,658,690	107	116	31	18	27	39	8	21	19	9	25	2	18	18	40
SV-3	Sprague & Barker intersection improvement	UA	STBG, CMAQ	8		\$1,159,979	107	115	32	10	46	36	11	16	27	20	14	2	18	24	33
COS-9	Napa-2nd Ave to Sprague	UA	STBG	2	100	\$1,508,697	113	115	33	13	38	30	27	30	9	0	49	15	12	25	31
COS-13	North Bank Trail Study	UA	STBG	0		\$166,250	114	114	34	31	10	30	28	15	30	2	43	5	17	30	20
CH-1	Washington St	Urban Small	STBG, TAP	10	100	\$675,335	101	111	35	15	34	34	18	15	31	0	48	7	15	31	19
AH-1	10th Ave Garfield Rd to Hayford Rd	UA	STBG	10		\$3,203,000	100	110	36	11	44	39	10	10	37	9	26	6	16	25	29
SC-13	Centennial Trail at Argonne	UA	STBG, CMAQ, TAP	0		\$719,000	108	108	37	19	26	21	43	13	32	6	36	15	12	34	9
SC-9	Craig Rd	UA	STBG	2	100	\$962,700	106	108	38	14	35	26	34	4	45	13	22	21	9	28	24
DP-2	E Crawford Preservation	Rural	STBG	9	100	\$575,650	98	107	39	14	36	33	21	26	12	3	40	5	17	18	39
SC-11	Cascade Way	UA	STBG	0	65	\$601,200	104	104	40	16	28	28	30	26	11	8	32	5	17	21	36
SC-4	Brooks Rd Phase 1	Rural	STBG	7	100	\$1,608,000	94	101	41	9	47	27	31	19	25	7	34	17	11	15	43
COS-11	37th Ave Sidewalk	UA	STBG, TAP	0		\$726,183	101	101	42	13	37	17	46	22	18	1	45	15	12	32	13
SV-5	Mullan Road preservation	UA	STBG	6	65	\$1,211,000	93	99	43	39	3	28	29	2	46	15	18	0	20	9	47
SC-8	Greta to Whitworth Bike Route	UA	STBG, CMAQ, TAP	3		\$299,300	92	95	44	19	25	22	40	9	39	5	39	1	19	35	8
SC-10	Columbia Dr	UA	STBG	1	100	\$1,536,000	80	81	45	3	49	15	48	13	33	2	44	15	12	32	14
FF-2	First St Sidewalk Phase 2	Rural	STBG, TAP	9		\$272,034	67	76	46	20	24	16	47	0	49	1	46	10	14	20	38
SV-8	Wilbur Rd sidewalk	UA	STBG, TAP	3		\$557,060	72	75	47	11	45	24	37	0	48	5	38	5	17	27	25
FF-1	Rattler Run Road reconstruction	Rural	STBG	10		\$799,433	48	58	48	7	48	22	39	8	41	1	47	5	17	5	48
SC-7	Cheney-Spokane Rd	Rural	STBG	4	100	\$2,132,000	33	37	49	12	42	13	49	2	47	2	41	0	20	4	49

Outside Urbanized Area (Small Towns)

Jurisdiction	Project Name	Avg Raw Score w/ Priority Points	Overall Rank
Deer Park	Crawford & Colville Roundabout/N Colville reconstructions	147	15
Deer Park	Colville Reconstruction Third St to north City Limits	124	23
Cheney	Washington St	111	35
Deer Park	E Crawford Preservation	107	39
Fairfield	First St Sidewalk Phase 2	76	46
Fairfield	Rattler Run Road reconstruction	58	48

Active Transportation Projects

Jurisdiction	Project Name	Avg Raw Score w/ Priority Points	Overall Rank
Spokane	Centennial Trail Summit Gap	123	25
Spokane	Ben Burr Crossing Improvements	122	26
Spokane	Driscoll-Alberta-Cochran Sidewalk Infill	120	28
Spokane County	Centennial Trail at Argonne	108	37
Spokane	37th Ave Sidewalk	101	42
Spokane County	Greta to Whitworth Bike Route	95	44
Fairfield	First St Sidewalk Phase 2	76	46
Spokane Valley	Wilbur Rd sidewalk	75	47

Pavement Preservation Projects

Jurisdiction	Project Name	Pavement Score	Avg Raw Score w/ Priority Points	Overall Rank
Spokane County	57th Avenue	65	133	19
Spokane	Washington-Stevens, Spokane Falls to Boone	65	117	30
Cheney	Washington St	100	111	35
Spokane County	Craig Rd	100	108	38
Deer Park	E Crawford Preservation	100	107	39
Spokane Valley	Mullan Road preservation	65	99	43
Spokane County	Cheney-Spokane Rd	100	37	49

Pavement Reconstruction Projects

Jurisdiction	Project Name	Pavement Score	Avg Raw Score w/ Priority Points	Overall Rank
Spokane	Thor-Freya Couplet	35	207	2
Spokane	Riverside-Monroe to Wall	35	195	5
Spokane	Havana St-Sprague to Broadway	65	151	14
Spokane Valley	Argonne Rd preservation (PE + RW only option)	100	145	16
Spokane	Spokane Falls Blvd-Lincoln to Division	35	127	22
Spokane County	Harvard Rd	65	121	27
Spokane	Freya St - Wellesley to Decatur	35	116	31
Spokane	Napa-2nd Ave to Sprague	100	115	33
Spokane County	Cascade Way	65	104	40
Spokane County	Brooks Rd Phase 1	100	101	41
Spokane County	Columbia Dr	100	81	45

MEMORANDUM

DATE: July 18, 2018

TO: Members of the Transportation Technical Committee

FROM: Ryan Stewart, Senior Transportation Planner

SUBJECT: US 195/Interstate 90 Study

Summary

The US 195 corridor has experienced increasing operational and safety issues, particularly at the interchange with Interstate 90 and at local access points. The issues are a result of a combination of factors including infrastructure design and increasing traffic volumes due to residential growth in the corridor. The interchange ramps do not meet current design standards. The eastbound on ramp to I-90 has a difficult merge due to the short length of the acceleration lane. While WSDOT is actively addressing some of these issues, there is an identified regional need to balance the function of US 195 as a state highway with local access.

Interstate 90 is also facing increased safety issues and decreasing reliability. Traffic volumes have increased due to growth in areas such as the West Plains. WSDOT recently completed the I-90 Operations Study which focused on safety concerns. The study evaluated and prioritized transportation system management and operations (TSMO) solutions to improve safety on I-90 between Four Lakes and the Idaho Stateline. That study as well as other important analysis conducted near these corridors will be incorporated in this project.

The proposed US 195/I-90 project is a multimodal study to address safety, operational, and infrastructure issues in the US 195/I-90 corridors. The purpose is to develop a holistic plan for addressing these issues while considering the need for more coordinated land use planning and access management between agencies. The study is a collaborative, multiagency effort including the City of Spokane, Washington State Department of Transportation Eastern Region, Spokane County, Spokane Transit Authority, and SRTC.

The proposed US 195/I-90 Study will be undertaken using a systems approach. The study will examine the interface of all modal systems including local, regional and state facilities, functions and services. All modes of travel will be considered such as public transportation, private vehicles, pedestrian, biking, and freight. The study will consider the needs of all users. Solutions identified will be developed with an explicit understanding that the resulting projects will need collaborative and innovative approaches from all funding sources for success. A consultant will be contracted to assist with the study.

Public Involvement

Public involvement will adhere to SRTC's Public Participation Plan. Outreach will be a collaborative effort between the partner agencies. Outreach to the public and stakeholders

will include representatives from neighborhoods, the business community, Spokane Public Schools, emergency services, freight, and recreation interests.

Policy Implications

This study is consistent with the SRTC Strategic Plan, specifically under Core Requirements & Data Collection/Analysis: Strategy 2: Bolster Needs Assessment - Move to corridor/network-level and systems thinking; and, Strategy 5: Lead pilot studies to bring together stakeholders for system approaches - I90/195 Connection improvements. This study is in the SRTC Board approved 2019 Unified Planning and Work Program (UPWP).

Technical Implications

The study will include extensive technical analysis of the operational characteristics of US 195 and Interstate 90 as well as the role of local infrastructure, nonmotorized access, and transit service.

Prior Committee Actions

None, this is the first briefing for the TTC. The SRTC Board discussed the study as part of the 2018 Call for Projects off the top funding in March. The need for the study was previously mentioned during the development of the SRTC Strategic Plan.

Requested Action

For information and discussion.