

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
- (3) Review areas of consensus or differences

August 22 – Programming

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