SRTC SPOKANE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL
421 W. RIVERSIDE AVE. SUITE 500 • SPOKANE WA 99201 • 509.343.6370 • WWW.SRTC.ORG

MEMORANDUM

Date: August 2, 2018

To: Members of the SRTC Board of Directors

From: Commissioner Al French, Chair

Subject: Meeting Notification and Transmittal of Meeting Agenda

Meeting Date: August 9, 2018

Time: 1:00 p.m.

Location: SRTC Office, The Paulsen Center Building
421 W Riverside Ave Suite 504, Spokane WA 99201

The next SRTC Board meeting will be held at the SRTC office at the time and place noted above. The agenda and supporting information are enclosed for your review.

The SRTC offices are located in the Paulsen Center building on east side of the fifth floor. Paid parking is available in many surface parking lots in the surrounding area. Please contact Julie Meyers-Lehman at the SRTC office if you have questions about parking.

The Paulsen Center Building is two blocks east of the STA Plaza and served by all Spokane Transit routes. Please refer to STA's website for routes to the Paulsen Center building here: https://www.spokanetransit.com/

SRTC is committed to nondiscrimination in accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987 (P.O. 100.259) and the Americans with Disabilities Act. Reasonable accommodations can be requested by contacting the SRTC office by telephone at (509) 343-6370 or by email at contact.srtc@srtc.org at least 48 hours in advance.

SRTC
SPOKANE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

Board of Directors Meeting Agenda

Date:	August 9, 2018	Time:	1:00 pm
Location:	SRTC, 421 W Riverside Ave (The Paulsen Building) Suite 504, Spokane WA		

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call / Record of Attendance / Excused Absences
3. Public Comments
4. Executive Director's Report *(Sabrina Minshall)*
5. **Action – Consent Agenda**
   a) July 12, 2018 Meeting Minutes — Page 3
   b) July 2018 Vouchers — Page 9
6. **Action – Election of Vice-Chair** *(Sabrina Minshall)* — Page 10
7. **Action – 2019 Member Dues** *(Greg Griffin)* — Page 12
8. **Action – 2018 SRTC Call for Projects: Approval of Prioritized Project List** *(Sabrina Minshall)* — Page 15
9. **Information & Discussion**
   a) Title VI Plan Update: Comments Received *(Staci Lehman)* — Page 22
   b) Education Series: Board Comments and Input *(Staci Lehman)* — n/a
   c) Division Street Reimagined Study Update *(Jason Lien)* — Page 25
   d) Spokane Tribe & Kalispel Tribe Requests for SRTC Membership *(Sabrina Minshall)* — Page 27
   e) Calendar Year 2017 Audit *(Greg Griffin)* — Page 49
10. **SRTC Board Comments**
11. **Adjournment**

Attachments

- Future SRTC Board of Directors Meeting Agenda Items — Page 67
- Transportation Advisory Committee - June minutes & July summary — Page 69
- Transportation Technical Committee - June minutes, July 12 minutes & July 25 summary — Page 73

MEETING MINUTES

Agenda Item 5a

Spokane Regional Transportation Council Board
Thursday, July 12, 2018
SRTC Office, 421 W Riverside Ave, Ste 504, Spokane WA

1. Call to Order - Chair Al French brought the meeting to order at 1:04 pm.

2. Roll Call/Record of Attendance – Excused Absences

Board Members Present:

Al French, Spokane County Commissioner
Paul Schmidt, City of Cheney
Mayor Steve Peterson, City of Liberty Lake
Lori Kinnear, Council Member, City of Spokane
Kate Burke, Council Member, City of Spokane
Arne Woodard, Council Member, City of Spokane Valley
Larry Stone, Mayor Employer Representative
Matt Ewers, Freight Representative
Dee Cragun, Small Towns Representative
Josh Kerns, Spokane County Commissioner
E. Susan Meyer, Spokane Transit Authority
Kennet Bertelsen, TAC Chair
Mike Tedesco, TTC Chair
Joe Tortorelli, WA State Transportation Commission

Board Members Not in Attendance:

Larry Krauter, Spokane Airports
Dave Malet, City of Airway Heights

Guests Present:

Stanley Schwartz, Legal Counsel
Chad Coles, Spokane County
Mayor Rod Higgins, City of Spokane Valley
Brandi Colyar, Spokane County
Peter Higgins, Citizen
Paul Kropp, Citizen
Karl Otterstrom, Spokane Transit Authority
Lisa Corcoran, Spokane Airports
Inga Note, City of Spokane
Ben Wick, Council Member, City of Spokane Valley

SRTC Staff Present:

Sabrina Minshall Executive Director
Eve Nelson, Senior Transportation Planner
Ryan Stewart, Senior Transportation Planner
Greg Griffin, Administrative Services Manager
Staci Lehman, Communications Coordinator
Mike Ulrich, Senior Transportation Planner
Anna Ragaza-Bourassa, Senior Transportation Planner
Jason Lien, Senior Transportation Planner
Julie Meyers-Lehman, Administrative Assistant

Chair French read the names of the following members who have requested an excused absence from this meeting: Dave Malet and Larry Krauter.

Mr. Schmidt made a motion to excuse the absences. Mr. Stone seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair French reminded the group that SRTC Board positions held by elected officials must have elected officials as their alternate; similarly, if the position is an appointed position, then the alternate must be an appointed position as well.

3. Public Comments

Mr. Peter Higgins spoke about the need for an additional ramp from Division Street onto eastbound I-90; this will save traffic from the Southeast Boulevard, Rockwood Clinic and downtown hospital areas from having to drive 1.5 miles on downtown streets to loop back around onto the existing on-ramp.

4. Executive Director's Report

Ms. Minshall reported on the following topics:

- Introduction of new SRTC Data Scientist Tristan De Alwis
- Completion of 2017 audit; there were no findings and the exit conference will be July 26 at 1:00pm
- The region has met 87.5% of the federal obligation target; the deadline is August 1
- A recap of the last two events in the SRTC Education Series; a debrief of the series will be presented at the next meeting and again at the end of 2018
- An update on projects that SRTC staff is working on with other agencies, such as the Downtown Spokane plan, WSDOT US-2 Corridor Study, City of Spokane Valley corridor studies, and a peer exchange about multimodal decision making and prioritization for MPOs
- Dr. Michael Clay, Professor of Urban Planning at Brigham Young University, will be presenting an evaluation of the regional land use allocation and SRTC processes on August 1
- Puget Sound Regional Council requested a letter of intent for a planning grant related to innovative approaches to coordination in discussions about automated vehicles

5. Consent Agenda – (5a) Minutes of the June 14, 2018 Board Meeting, (5b) June 2018 Vouchers, (5c) 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) July Amendment

Chair French announced that 5a would be voted on separately.

Ms. Meyer made a motion to approve items 5b and 5c; Mr. Tortorelli seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Recap for June, 2018:		
Vouchers: V120646 to V120668		43,713.39
Salaries/Benefits Warrant Nos.	450616-450626 and 453021-453030, 549514	79,005.35
Interfund, other expenses, and reimbursements processed directly by the City of Spokane		(1,751.27)
		120,967.47

Chair French read the following requests to amend item 5a, Minutes of the June 14, 2018 minutes:

- Request to correct to the attendance section of the minutes – Mike Gribner and Matt Ewers were in attendance at the June 14 meeting and Larry Krauter was not in attendance.
- Request to include the recommendation from Matt Ewers that SRTC investigate and possibly provide guidance on the concept of planting native wildflowers along highways in lieu of grass to help insect pollinators thrive in our communities, also saving on operating costs because perennial wildflowers do not need to be mowed until end of the season.

Ms. Cragun made a motion to approve the changes to the minutes and Mr. Tortorelli seconded; the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Meyer made a motion to approve the July 14, 2018 minutes as amended; Mr. Bertelsen seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

6. Approve Contract for Information Technology Services

Mr. Minshall provided a background of the change from in-house IT management to the current use of contracted services, which began January 1, 2018. She stated that the current provider, Intrinium, has been providing service on a temporary six-month contract. On May 17 SRTC released a request for proposals for a three-year contract; several SRTC staff, the SRTMC IT manager and a Board member reviewed the bids received and recommended accepting the proposal from Intrinium.

The requested action before the Board was to approve the provisions of the Intrinium proposal and the Ultimate Service Plan as presented, subject to final review of the contract by SRTC legal counsel and upon final review by legal counsel, authorize the Executive Director to execute the lease agreement with Intrinium.

Mr. Stone made a motion to approve; Mr. Peterson seconded and all votes were in favor.

7. Resolution 18-01: Authorization to Board Chair and/or Executive Director for Procurement of SRTC Employee Benefits

Ms. Minshall stated this item is part of the ongoing conversation regarding obtaining SRTC employee benefits from a source other than the City of Spokane. She stated that although work continues to determine potential changes in payroll services and fiscal agent, applying for employee benefits through the Association of Washington Cities (AWC) must be done in August for an effective date January 1, 2019. She said the City of Spokane Valley has agreed to sponsor SRTC for membership in AWC.

Ms. Minshall said that the Board Administrative Committee will review and discuss benefit plan specifics; she noted it will likely cost more, however purchasing benefits from AWC creates more independence for SRTC. She read the requested action.

Ms. Meyer asked for clarification as to what types of benefits are under consideration for change. Ms. Minshall replied medical, dental, long-term disability, employee assistance program; basically everything that is not retirement. She said the retirement plan through the State of Washington will not change.

Mr. Stone made a motion to approve Resolution 18-01; Mr. Schmidt seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

8. Build Grant: Requests for SRTC Letters of Support

Chair French explained that the U.S. Dept. of Transportation BUILD (*Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development*) program (formerly known as TIGER) is accepting applications for grants and described the goals of this grant cycle, noting the emphasis will be for rural based projects. He said four local agencies are submitting applications and have requested that SRTC write letters of support.

Ms. Minshall provided additional context and asked the Board how they would like SRTC to proceed; to support all four projects, none of the projects, or some of the projects.

Mr. Woodard said there was a correction to the City of Spokane Valley project because the decision to build a roundabout at Pines Road is not final. Ms. Minshall replied that all the information about this project came from City of Spokane Valley staff.

The group discussed at length the funding split between rural and urban projects, local versus federal funding types of merit criteria, and timing. Chair French read descriptions of each project:

- Spokane County – Geiger Boulevard
- Spokane International Airport – Spotted Rd
- Spokane Tribe of Indians – US 2 Roundabouts
- Spokane Valley – Pines Road Grade Separation

There was a discussion about project costs, the amounts being requested from the grant, and funding received from other sources. Members provided additional details about the projects and there was a general agreement to vote to approve the requests for letters one project at a time.

Mr. Peterson made a motion to approve a support letter for the Spokane County-Geiger Boulevard project. Mr. Tortorelli seconded the motion.

Mr. Stone suggested that the motion be withdrawn and another motion put forward to approve letters for all four projects. The group discussed the pros and cons of endorsing all the projects and what supporting all four would say about regional prioritization or lack thereof. There was further conversation about prioritization at the MPO level and federal level, the importance of each project in different categories (freight, safety, etc.), project ranking processes, merit criteria in scoring, and the need for regional project prioritization. It was noted that letters of support can be sent after the grant applications are submitted and agencies can submit applications without a support letter, although if a project is selected for funding it will need to be incorporated into the TIP.

Chair French stated that it appears the group is unable to come to a consensus at this meeting and will require additional information and a better understanding about the ranking before making a decision; he suggested this item be deferred until the August meeting. Mr. Tedesco recommended that the requests be vetted through the TTC. Mr. Ewers said it would be very difficult to make a prioritization decision in one meeting and recommended at this point in time to vote to support all four.

Mr. Peterson withdrew his motion to approve a support letter for the Spokane County-Geiger Boulevard project and Mr. Tortorelli withdrew his second.

The group continued discussion about the timing of support letters and the merits of all four projects.

Mr. Peterson made a motion to approve the submission of support letters from SRTC for all four projects. Mr. Schmidt seconded the motion.

Mr. Gribner stated for the record that a strategy of supporting all projects will not be a winning strategy going forward; he said the pressure being put on the system for allocating funds will require prioritization. Mr. Ewers agreed but felt there is not enough time to prioritize the list before letters must be sent.

A vote was taken and the motion carried with Ms. Kinnear, Mr. Tortorelli, Mr. French and Mr. Gribner voting against.

9a. Title VI Plan Update

Ms. Lehman provided a background on the Title VI Act, stated that SRTC is updating its Title VI plan, and the document is currently open for public comment. She said any comments received on the plan will be presented to the Board in August. She spoke about planned outreach activities and after the public comment period the plan will be submitted to the WSDOT Office of Equal Opportunity. She called for questions and there were none.

9b. Quarterly Budget Update

Mr. Griffin said from January through June all categories are in line with the budget, excepting three line items that are slightly over budget for this point in the year, but are expected to end the year in line. He noted that a copy of the quarterly report from the prior year's budget has been added into in the packet for comparison. There were no questions or comments.

9c. 2019 Budget and Proposed Member Dues

Mr. Griffin reported that SRTC received new population figures from the Office of Financial Management and due to population increases in Spokane County it is anticipated that with a population only increase, dues received will be approximately $1600 more than last year. He said the Board Administrative Committee will meet later this year for budget planning and to discuss the possibility of increasing dues by 15%. Ms. Minshall provided more information about the dues for agencies that are not population based. She said dues make up approximately 11.7% of the budget; at other MPO's in the state dues make up 30-40% of the budget. There were

no questions or comments. In August, the Board will make a decision on the final dues amount and whether to only increase the dues by the population factor or apply a15% increase.

9d. US 195/I-90 Study

Mr. Stewart stated the proposed study was discussed at Board strategic planning meetings and the Board authorized set-aside funds for the study from the Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) funding in the recent Call for Projects. He said the project team consists of staff from WSDOT, STA, City of Spokane, Spokane County, and SRTC and emphasized that study is in a planning and scoping phase right now.

He said the study will utilize a systems approach and consider all modes of transportation. He stated that the primary issues of the study are safety, operations (congestion and reliability issues) and infrastructure (such as bridge conditions) along the US 195 and I-90 corridors; additionally, local network needs, infrastructure constraints and plans for additional local infrastructure will be examined. Mr. Stewart spoke about how land use and development can influence safety and operations along corridors and addressed the proposed funding for the study from SRTC, WSDOT and City of Spokane. He presented a tentative schedule and spoke about the next steps. Mr. Stewart called for questions and stated that staff is seeking feedback on how soon SRTC should proceed in funding the study.

Chair French asked if the schedule was in the packet; Mr. Stewart replied it was not but it will be included in the August packet.

9e. Call for Projects Preliminary Results

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa explained that prioritization and programming are different processes. She also described how the raw scores are a first step and that various filters can be applied to establish regional priorities. She summarized the amount of estimated funding available and explained how the 2018 call for projects process differed than those in the past.

Ms. Minshall presented a diagram that outlined the steps to be taken in order to arrive at priority driven decisions and she described the updates to the call for projects schedule.

Mr. Lien stated that SRTC received applications for 49 projects from eleven jurisdictions and a brief description of each was in the packet. He summarized the scoring process and the jurisdictions which participated in scoring.

Mr. Ulrich described how projects with a similar raw score can rank very differently in Guiding Principles (GP) categories and demonstrated this with a hypothetical situation. He recapped the exercises completed by the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) to rank the GP and presented the results.

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa stated the Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) met on July 12 to review policy considerations such as GP standouts, project cost, geography, or project types that could be used to adjust the list beyond the raw score. She described the next steps in the prioritization process for the Board, TAC and TTC and provided details, reiterated that that programming will be done separately from prioritization, and spoke about the upcoming public comment period specific to the call for projects. She called for questions.

Chair French spoke about his experience on another committee using filters to prioritize a list of projects and reminded the group that the Board must consider what is best for the region, not individual communities.

Mr. Woodard said in the past the process was to have staff review the grant funding available and then submit projects based upon that; this process has agencies submit projects and their funding depends on how much support from the Board can be obtained, not dependent on if a project fits well into a grant fund category.

Chair French responded that if there are not clearly defined parameters to define priorities, then project selection becomes a political process driven more by emotion than by fact. However, if there is a fundamental

understanding about things that are important to the community then projects can be ranked based upon that priority. He said it is for the Board as a group to decide what is most important for the region; for example, if it is determined that public safety is the most important regional priority then that filter is applied and the project ranking changes.

They discussed concerns about selecting and changing regional priorities and the challenges associated with the fact that federal funding agencies are seeking greater clarity about priorities.

10. SRTC Board Comments

Ms. Burke reported that the Bike Town Hall meeting held last evening was very successful.

Mr. Peterson spoke about the Liberty Lake farmer's market.

Mr. Woodard thanked the Board for the all the grants given to City of Spokane Valley in the past.

11. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:59 pm.

_____

Julie Meyers-Lehman
Recording Secretary

SRTC
SPOKANE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

Agenda Item 5b

VOUCHERS PAID FOR THE MONTH OF **JULY 2018**

As of August 9, 2018, the Spokane Regional Transportation Council approves the payment of the July 2018 vouchers included in the list in the amount of: $ 125,804.33

Chair

Date	Voucher	Vendor	Description	Amount
6/28/18	V120669	Diamond Plaza LLC	Paulsen Center Suite 500/504 Rent for July 2018	6,643.77
7/2/18	V120670	Visionary Communications, Inc.	Telephone: Fiber Services, July 2018	953.31
	V120671	Black Box	PBX Software Maintenance Renewal thru 6-24-19	326.40
	V120672	Standard Printworks	TAC Mtg print document	26.11
	V120673	Washington Trust Bank	Office splys; RS Conf hotel/meals; mtg food/bevrgs/snacks; IT Equip;staff bus	1,754.73
	V120674	Verizon Wireless	IT Svcs: Wireless Svcs E.D. Phone & Public Outreach Tablets, 6/24/18-7/23/18	87.82
	V120675	WA State Dept of Retirement	Employee and Employer Contributions: June 2018	13,068.18
7/5/18	V120676	Anna Ragaza-Bourassa	Mileage Reimburse 5-30-18 to 6-26-18	94.29
	V120677	Gonzaga University	Jepson GU Rental for Edu Series Speaker M Cornett	175.00
7/10/18	V120678	Konica Minolta Business Solution	Lease - Copier: July 2018; Usage June 2018	314.93
	V120679	Integra	Telephone: Lines to 8/7/18 and Long Distance for June 2018	510.40
	V120680	Spokesman Review	SRTC May 2018 TIP amendment; Public Mtg Notice; Roundabout Trng; IT RFI	177.13
	V120681	Spokane County Treasurer	ESRI Software Support - May 2018	800.07
	V120682	Intrinium	Managed IT Services - July 2018	1,765.00
	V120683	Intrinium	Set up Fee for 2 new laptops (MU & JL)	100.00
	V120684	Dell	2 Docking Stations for new laptops (MU & JL)	421.03
	V120685	Standard Printworks	Tax on June inv# 120056 pd 6-29-18	3.48
	V120686	Standard Printworks	MAP printed for	65.28
	V120687	Standard Printworks	July Monthly Messaging	71.81
7/18/18	V120688	DKS Associates	Travel Expenses for Roundabout Workshop Panelist	914.81
	V120689	WA State Auditors Office	CY 2017 Accountability, Federal & Financial Audit	8,131.05
	V120690	Ryan Stewart	Per Diem for Travel Modeling Conf, Atlanta GA	192.00
	V120691	Sabrina Minshall	Mileage reimburse 4-25-18 to 6-20-18	205.63
		Spokane, City of - Salaries/Bene	Pay Periods Ending: 6/02/18 and 6/16/18	87,351.73
		Spokane, City of - MIS	IF DP Services: June 2018	284.50
		Spokane, City of - Accounting	IF Accounting Services Q-3 2018	1,805.87
		Reimbursement	APA-WA double payment for local APA conference	(440.00)
			TOTAL JULY 2018	125,804.33

Recap for July, 2018:

Vouchers: V120669 to V120691		36,802.23
Salaries/Benefits Warrant Nos.	455513-455523, 458030-458041	87,351.73
Interfund, other expenses, and reimbursements processed directly by the City of Spokane		1,650.37
		125,804.33

SRTC SPOKANE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL
421 W. RIVERSIDE AVE. SUITE 500 • SPOKANE WA 99201 • 509.343.6370 • WWW.SRTC.ORG

Agenda Item 6

MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 2, 2018

TO: Members of the SRTC Board of Directors

FROM: Sabrina C. Minshall, AICP, Executive Director

SUBJECT: Election of SRTC Vice-Chair

Summary

In late July of this year, the City of Spokane Valley notified SRTC of a change in their SRTC Board Representation. The prior Spokane Valley Board representative was elected Vice-Chairman of SRTC in February 2018. **Election of a new Vice-Chair is necessary for the effective and efficient operations of SRTC.**

The process and requirements outlined in the SRTC 2013 Interlocal Agreement (ILA) is as follows:

2013 ILA
The Board shall elect a Chair and Vice-Chair ("Officers") by majority vote of the Board. Only representatives who are elected officials may be Officers. To be eligible for the Chair position, the Board Member shall have served on the Board for at least one (1) year. The term for Officers may be up to two (2) years in each office. Ex-officio members may not serve as Officers.

The selection process, terms and succession provisions, and duties of Chair and Vice Chair for SRTC Board leadership is outlined in the SRTC "Rules of Procedure" (adopted 2015.)

2015 Rules of Procedure
SELECTING THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

3.1 **Nomination:** The Chair will be selected by the voting Board members. Board members may each nominate one person for Chair. Nominations require a second. Each Board member shall be given the opportunity to submit a nomination for Chair. After all nominations are made, the Chair will call for a vote on the nominations in the order they were made. Voting will be by a recorded vote as determined by the Chair. As soon as one nominee receives a majority vote, that Board member will be declared the Chair. No votes will be taken on the remaining nominees***. The same process shall be followed for the Vice Chair.***

3.1.1 Term. The term for Chair may not exceed two (2) years from the date of election. If no term is stated, the term for the Chair or Vice Chair shall be for one (1) year.

3.2 **Vice Chair Succession.** The Vice Chair is the presumptive incoming Chair.

CHAIR AND DUTIES

4.1 **Chair**: The Chair presides at all meetings of the Board. **In the absence of the Chair, the Vice Chair shall preside**. In the absence of the Chair and Vice Chair, the Board shall elect a temporary Chair.

4.1.1 Only Board members who are elected officials may serve as the Chair or Vice Chair. To be eligible for the Chair position, the Board member shall have served on the Board for at least one (1) year.

4.2 **Call to Order**: The meetings of the Board shall be called to order by the Chair. In the absence of both the Chair and Vice Chair, the meeting shall be called to order by the Administrative Secretary for the election of a temporary Chair.

4.3 **Points of Order**: The Chair with the assistance of the Board Attorney shall determine all points of order, subject to the right of any member to appeal to the Board.

4.4 **Questions to Be Stated**: Prior to a vote, the Chair shall state the motion, call the question and announce the result.

4.5 **Presiding Officer - Powers**: The Chair may move, second, debate and vote subject only to such limitations of debate as are by these rules imposed on all members, and shall not be deprived of any of the rights and privileges of a Board member by reason of acting as the Chair.

421 W. RIVERSIDE AVE. SUITE 500 • SPOKANE WA 99201 • 509.343.6370 • WWW.SRTC.ORG

MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 2, 2018

TO: Members of the SRTC Board of Directors

FROM: Greg Griffin, Administrative Services Manager

SUBJECT: Calendar Year (CY) 2019 Budget and Proposed Member Dues

Summary

Each year, SRTC develops a Unified Plan and Work Program (adopted by the SRTC Board in June), and a subsequent annual calendar year budget outlining anticipated revenues and expenditures. At the July 2018 SRTC Board meeting, staff presented two options for dues for FY2019; one using the historical population only based increase, and as second utilizing an across the board, 15% increase. The dues for Spokane International Airport, Spokane Transit Authority, and Washington State Department of Transportation are a fixed figure do not have an automatic, population-based increase provision.

SRTC's budget is disproportionately funded by federal and state grants. In Fiscal Year 2018, only 12% of our revenue is from membership dues. Board discussions over the past few years have been to seek a better balance of funding sources.

An increase of up to 15% is allowed by the SRTC Interlocal agreement as part of the normal budget calendar. Dues increases above 15% require a one-year notice to members. Due to escalating operational costs, match requirements, and anticipated budget shortfalls in the future, staff recommends a 15% increase yearly. **A Board decision is needed as to which dues structure to distribute to members and use as the basis for the rest of the budget process. (Attachment A- Dues Scenarios)**

- Based on the preliminary estimates released by OFM, without the 15% increase allowed by the SRTC ILA, the total dues for CY 2019 will increase by $1,618.
- With a 15% increase to all members, the total dues increase for CY 2019 compared CY2018 would be $30,070 (16%.)

Next Steps

- Staffing levels, position classifications, and anticipated work requirements are being reviewed.
- Work tasks for the FY2019 calendar year, operational requirements, cost estimates and opportunities for costs savings are being identified. Activities in the CY2019 budget follow the adopted SRTC Strategic Plan and the adopted 2019 FY UPWP.
- Employer contribution costs for medical insurance are being evaluated. As anticipated, benefit costs will be substantially higher than past years.

The schedule for preparing the Calendar Year (CY) 2019 Budget is:

Calendar Year 2019 Budget Schedule	
August 9, 2018	Board decision on CY 2019 dues
August 10, 2018	Distribution of Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) (*adopted June 14, 2018*) and 2019 member dues
October 11, 2018	Board Administrative Committee budget workshop
October 11, 2018	Board - first review of CY 2019 Budget and five-year projections
November 8, 2018	Board- second review CY2019 Budget
December 13, 2018	Board action on the CY 2019 Budget

Public Involvement

The CY 2019 Budget was discussed at the July 12, 2018 meeting of the SRTC Board.

Policy Implications

A draft CY 2019 Budget will be prepared within the framework of the Board's priorities for the agency. The budget focuses available resources on core planning activities, as outlined in the adopted Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).

Technical Implications

The annual budget establishes revenue and expenditure estimates for SRTC. The budget categories are used to track actual revenues and expenditures during the year. Quarterly reports are provided to the Board to report on financial matters in relation to the approved budget. The 2013 Interlocal Agreement calls for the SRTC Board to provide a proposed work program and total budget to the member agencies by September 30 of the preceding year. Approval or rejection of such budget by each member shall be submitted to SRTC by November 1 of each year.

Requested Action

Approval of 15% increase in SRTC member dues for the CY 2019 Budget. The Draft CY 2019 Budget will be presented to the Board for information in October and November, and action in December.

Agenda Item 7 Attachment

Agency	April 1, 2017 OFM Population Estimate	2018 Dues	April 1, 2018 OFM Population Estimate [2]	% of Total	2019 Dues @ .20 per cap	Dues % Increase 2018 to 2019	Proposed 15% increase: $ amount of increase	Proposed 15% increase: Total amount
Airway Heights	8,460	1,692	9,085	1.79%	1,817	7.4%	273	2,090
Cheney	11,880	2,376	12,200	2.40%	2,440	2.7%	366	2,806
Deer Park	4,105	821	4,240	0.83%	848	3.3%	127	975
Fairfield	620	124	620	0.12%	124	0.0%	19	143
Latah	195	39	195	0.04%	39	0.0%	6	45
Liberty Lake	9,910	1,982	10,390	2.05%	2,078	4.8%	312	2,390
Medical Lake	4,990	998	4,990	0.98%	998	0.0%	150	1,148
Millwood	1,790	358	1,790	0.35%	358	0.0%	54	412
Rockford	480	96	480	0.09%	96	0.0%	14	110
Spangle	275	55	275	0.05%	55	0.0%	8	63
Spokane	217,300	43,460	220,100	43.33%	44,020	1.3%	6,603	50,623
Spokane County (Unincorp)	144,788	43,460	147,650	29.07%	44,020	1.3%	6,603	50,623
Spokane Valley	94,890	18,978	95,810	18.86%	19,162	1.0%	2,874	22,036
Waverly	117	23	125	0.02%	25	6.8%	4	29
City and County Subtotal	**499,800**	**114,462**	**507,950**	**100%**	**116,080**	**1.4%**	**17,412**	**133,492**
Spokane International Airport		15,000			15,000	0.0%	2,250	17,250
Spokane Transit		38,600			38,600	0.0%	5,790	44,390
WSDOT		20,000			20,000	0.0%	3,000	23,000
Transportation Agency Subtotal		**73,600**			**73,600**	**0.0%**	**11,040**	**84,640**
GRAND TOTAL		**188,062**			**189,680**	**0.9%**	**28,452**	**218,132**

[1] The SRTC Board policy is for Spokane County dues to match the City of Spokane dues each year.

[2] Based on the State of Washington's Office of Financial Management's April 1, 2018 preliminary estimates.

SRTC SPOKANE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL
421 W. RIVERSIDE AVE. SUITE 500 • SPOKANE WA 99201 • 509.343.6370 • WWW.SRTC.ORG

Agenda Item 8

MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 2, 2018

TO: Members of the SRTC Board of Directors

FROM: Sabrina C. Minshall, AICP, Executive Director

SUBJECT: **2018 SRTC Call for Projects: Approval of Project Prioritization List**

The 2018 Call for Projects began in February and culminates this fall with the Board selection of a "Program of Projects." **The action requested from the SRTC Board in August is to adopt a "Prioritized List of Projects".** The Board approved prioritized list will be used to apply criteria from the available funding sources and prepare a draft program of projects for the Board's subsequent review and approval. **The strategic application of funding sources and consideration of grant program requirements will occur after the priority list is adopted.**

The Project Priority List is an expression of SRTC's values. While grounded in the technical merit and application criteria, the SRTC Board must provide the policy perspective and guidance to ensure it is reflective of the region's priorities. The ***technical review*** of the applications is complete and both committees have made separate recommendations. SRTC staff synthesized certain elements from both committee's recommendations to arrive at a **MODIFIED** priority list as a starting point for the Board's August deliberation. See **Attachment One** for that methodology (A) and the prioritized list (B).

Key questions to consider include:

- Is the MODIFIED proposed priority list reflective of the region's priorities?
- Did the technical work place the projects in the relative rank they should be in?
- Are there any factors missing from the technical review that would merit projects being moved in the priority listing?
- Did the TAC address some of these policy issues? Did they miss any?

History and Background

SRTC has been working on performance-based planning and prioritization since 2014 as part of the *Horizon 2040 Toolkit*. Goals and strategies were established as part of the Toolkit effort, and subsequently in the 2017 SRTC Strategic Plan, to align the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) policies with project funding. The 2018 application consolidated all funding sources into one application, improved the application to be more quantitative, included areas required for federal performance management, and requested agency's rank their projects.

Historically, programming targets were established prior to receipt of applications and were based on past expenditures of all funding types in the region. Using past expenditures as an indicator of need, program targets drove funding. In this call, the categories of programming were not predetermined. Instead, the applications (number, type, value, member agency ranking) are being used as an indicator of short term need.

Projects were scored in six unweighted sections which align with the guiding principles in the MTP, consistent with the previous application process. Points were added to the consolidated raw score based upon the agencies priorities (1-10.) The resulting score was the projects final technical score and raw priority ranking.

Committees' Work and Recommendations

After a series of workshops, the *Transportation Technical Committee (TTC)* voted to recommend the raw score priority ranking to the Board for adoption (**Attachment Two**.) The TTC charge is to provide the Board with a technical perspective. The TTC felt that any modifications to the raw score ranking in terms of weighting of guiding principles or other post application adjustments should not occur after project submittal. The TTC also voiced concern that weighting of the guiding principles, prior to the call, could have influenced the applications submitted by the agencies. Some members stated the 49 projects received were not an indicator of regional need.

The *Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC)* voted to recommend a modified prioritized list to the Board for adoption. The charge to the TAC is to provide the SRTC Board with recommendations reflecting the public perspective related to policy. The TAC began with the raw score ranking of projects, and considered what, if any, guiding principles should have a higher weight than others. They placed a higher value on *Quality of Life* (16.6% to 25%), and *Safety and Security* (16.6% to 19%) relative to the other four Guiding Principles and the list was adjusted based upon the new weighting. The TAC took a second review step and considered whether any projects did not appear to be accurately placed in the priority list given the revised weighted list. They also considered whether the application sufficiently captured the value of the project through the score. The TAC recommended additional shifting of seven projects for their final recommendation. The TAC final recommended priority list is (**Attachment Three**)

Public Involvement

The call for projects process has been discussed at multiple committee and Board meetings, all open to the public. A public comment period will be held on the new, prioritized project list after the Board action. The traditional public comment period will be held as part of the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) amendment when the new projects are added into the TIP in December 2018.

Policy Implications

A project priority list is an expression of the values of SRTC. While the MTP has long-term projects that qualify as regionally significant for air quality conformity, a shorter-term list of projects for which the region is actively committed to seeking funding does not exist. Until the next update of the MTP which will include project lists in 5-year increments, this list will not be all inclusive or exhaustive. Additionally, this prioritized list does not exclude member agencies from seeking other funding sources for other projects.

Technical Implications

The prioritized list will be used as the first step in the development of a Program of Projects for Board consideration. In addition to public comments, funding criteria, timing, phases, and availability of other funds will be considered and presented to the committees for recommendations, and ultimately to the Board for action.

Requested Action

Board approval of a Priority Project list.

Agenda Item 8
Attachment One A

SRTC Staff revised list

1. The base list (TTC List) is the list of projects sorted by raw score + member agency priority points (without TAC recommended weighting applied).
2. Those projects that moved significantly upward (more than 3 positions) in the Guiding Principles weighted “TAC List” were identified.
3. There were five such projects as follows:
    a. COS-13 North Bank Trail Study
    b. COS-11 37th Ave Sidewalk
    c. SC-6 57th Avenue & Freya St Roundabout
    d. SC-9 Craig Rd
    e. SC-13 Centennial Trail at Argonne
4. Each project was moved up in the list the number of positions called for in the “TAC List”. Projects were not moved “down”.
5. The list was then renumbered to account for the ties that were created.
6. The “shift” column reflects where the project is relative to the TTC List.
7. Considered the additional movements recommended by TAC; 3 active transportation projects and 4 capital projects.
    a. The rationale for moving additional active transportation projects was addressed by the weighting shift and looking for significant project movement (step 2).
    b. Of the four capital projects the TAC recommended moving, switching MW-1 and SV-1 did not seem to be supported by technical information or cost considerations. Switching SC-1 and SC-2 is supported by policy given the priority provided by the member agencies.

Agenda Item 8
Attachment One B

New Rank w/o ties	Project Number	Project Description	Final Shift
1	SC-1	Bigelow Gulch Project 5	▲ 10
2	COS-3	Thor-Freya Couplet	▬ 0
3	SRHD-1	Safe Routes to School Walking School Bus	▬ 0
4	SV-1	Pines Grade Separation (RW only)	▬ 0
5	COS-1	Riverside-Monroe to Wall	▬ 0
6	SRHD-2	Walk Bike Bus Downtown Spokane	▬ 0
7	SC-12	Commute Trip Reduction	▬ 0
8	STA-1	Upgrate diesel buses to electric	▬ 0
9	SC-3	Bigelow Gulch Project 2	▬ 0
10	MW-1	Argonne Rd, Frederick to Liberty congestion relief	▬ 0
11	SC-2	Bigelow Gulch Project 6	▼ -10
12	SV-2	Barker Corridor reconstruction & widening (can be split into 3 segments)	▬ 0
13	STA-2	5-Mile Park & Ride Study	▬ 0
14	COS-12	Havana St-Sprague to Broadway	▬ 0
15	DP-1	Crawford & Colville Roundabout/N Colville reconstructions	▬ 0
16	SV-6	Argonne Rd preservation (PE + RW only option)	▬ 0
17	WSDOT-1	US 2 Garfield Rd intersection improvement	▬ 0
18	COS-7	Maple-Wellesley Intersection	▬ 0
19	SC-5	57th Avenue	▬ 0
20	AH-2	21st Ave Craig Rd to Deer Heights Rd (Property Survey)	▬ 0
21	SV-4	Pines and Mission intersection improvement (can be split into 2 segments)	▬ 0
22	COS-10	Spokane Falls Blvd-Lincoln to Division	▬ 0
23	DP-3	Colville Reconstruction Third St to north City Limits	▬ 0
24	SV-7	Park Road reconstruction (RW only)	▬ 0
25	COS-5	Centennial Trail Summit Gap	▬ 0
26	SC-6	57th Avenue & Freya St Roundabout	▲ 3
27	COS-6	Ben Burr Crossing Improvements	▼ -1
28	SC-14	Harvard Rd	▼ -1
29	COS-8	Driscoll-Alberta-Cochran Sidewalk Infill	▼ -1
30	COS-4	Washington-Stevens, Spokane Falls to Boone	▬ 0
31	SC-13	Centennial Trail at Argonne	▲ 6
32	COS-2	Freya St - Wellesley to Decatur	▼ -1
33	COS-13	North Bank Trail Study	▲ 1
34	SV-3	Sprague & Barker intersection improvement	▼ -2
35	COS-9	Napa-2nd Ave to Sprague	▼ -2
36	SC-9	Craig Rd	▲ 2
37	CH-1	Washington St	▼ -2
38	AH-1	10th Ave Garfield Rd to Hayford Rd	▼ -2
39	DP-2	E Crawford Preservation	▬ 0
40	COS-11	37th Ave Sidewalk	▲ 2
41	SC-11	Cascade Way	▼ -1
42	SC-4	Brooks Rd Phase 1	▼ -1
43	SV-5	Mullan Road preservation	▬ 0
44	SC-8	Greta to Whitworth Bike Route	▬ 0
45	SC-10	Columbia Dr	▬ 0
46	FF-2	First St Sidewalk Phase 2	▬ 0
47	SV-8	Wilbur Rd sidewalk	▬ 0
48	FF-1	Rattler Run Road reconstruction	▬ 0
49	SC-7	Cheney-Spokane Rd	▬ 0

Agenda Item 8
Attachment Two

2018 SRTC Call for Projects - Sorted by Average Raw Score with Priority Points

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	Upgrate 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 segme	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 segn	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

Final No.	Project #	Project Name	Economic Vitality	C&L	Stewardship	Systems	Safety	QoL	Score
1	**SC-1**	**Bigelow Gulch Project 5**	○	●	●	◑	◕	○	155.9
2	COS-3	Thor-Freya Couplet	●	◑	●	●	◑	●	207.0
3	COS-1	Riverside-Monroe to Wall	●	◕	◕	◕	◕	●	201.3
4	**MW-1**	**Argonne Rd, Frederick to Liberty congestion relief**	◕	◕	◔	●	◕	◑	166.4
5	SRHD-1	Safe Routes to School Walking School Bus	◕	◕	◕	●	●	◔	199.2
6	SRHD-2	Walk Bike Bus Downtown Spokane	●	◑	◕	●	◕	◑	183.7
7	SC-12	Commute Trip Reduction	●	●	●	●	○	◔	174.3
8	STA-1	Upgrate diesel buses to electric	●	●	●	◕	○	◑	173.5
9	SC-3	Bigelow Gulch Project 2	○	●	●	◑	●	○	171.0
10	**SV-1**	**Pines Grade Separation (RW only)**	◕	●	◔	●	●	◑	199.4
11	SV-2	Barker Corridor reconstruction & widening (can be split into 3 segs.)	◑	◕	◕	◕	◑	●	157.6
12	**SC-2**	**Bigelow Gulch Project 6**	◕	●	●	◔	●	●	216.8
13	COS-12	Havana St-Sprague to Broadway	◕	◕	◑	◑	●	◕	155.5
14	DP-1	Crawford & Colville Roundabout/N Colville reconstructions	◑	◕	◑	◕	◔	●	153.0
15	STA-2	5-Mile Park & Ride Study	◕	◕	●	●	○	◔	149.3
16	WSDOT-1	US 2 Garfield Rd intersection improvement	◑	◔	○	●	◕	◔	144.3
17	SV-6	Argonne Rd preservation (PE + RW only option)	●	◑	○	●	◕	○	143.0
18	COS-7	Maple-Wellesley Intersection	◕	○	◑	◕	◕	◔	140.0
19	SC-5	57th Avenue	◕	◔	●	◑	○	●	136.2
20	**COS-5**	**Centennial Trail Summit Gap**	◔	●	◔	◔	○	●	128.8
21	**COS-6**	**Ben Burr Crossing Improvements**	◑	◔	●	◔	○	◕	123.3
22	COS-10	Spokane Falls Blvd-Lincoln to Division	◕	○	◑	◑	◑	◕	132.3
23	AH-2	21st Ave Craig Rd to Deer Heights Rd (Property Survey)	○	●	◔	●	○	◕	130.9
24	SV-7	Park Road reconstruction (RW only)	◔	◔	◑	◔	◕	◕	130.7
25	DP-3	Colville Reconstruction Third St to north City Limits	◔	◑	◑	○	◑	◕	128.3
26	SC-6	57th Avenue & Freya St Roundabout	◕	◔	○	◑	◔	●	126.6
27	SV-4	Pines and Mission intersection improvement (can be split into 2 segs.)	●	◑	○	◕	◕	○	126.3
28	COS-8	Driscoll-Alberta-Cochran Sidewalk Infill	◔	◕	◑	◔	◑	◑	123.5
29	SC-14	Harvard Rd	◔	○	◕	◕	◑	◑	123.4
30	SC-13	Centennial Trail at Argonne	◑	○	◔	◔	◑	●	115.5
31	COS-13	North Bank Trail Study	●	◑	◔	○	○	◕	115.5
32	COS-9	Napa-2nd Ave to Sprague	◔	◑	●	○	◑	◔	115.2
33	CH-1	Washington St	◔	◕	◔	○	◔	◕	114.9
34	SC-9	Craig Rd	◔	◔	○	◑	◑	◑	114.5
35	SV-3	Sprague & Barker intersection improvement	○	◕	◑	◕	○	◔	114.5
36	COS-4	Washington-Stevens, Spokane Falls to Boone	●	○	◕	◕	○	○	112.3
37	AH-1	10th Ave Garfield Rd to Hayford Rd	○	●	◔	◑	◔	◑	110.8
38	COS-2	Freya St - Wellesley to Decatur	◑	●	◕	◑	○	○	110.7
39	COS-11	37th Ave Sidewalk	◔	○	◕	○	◑	◕	107.4
40	**SC-8**	**Greta to Whitworth Bike Route**	◑	○	◔	◔	○	●	101.1
41	DP-2	E Crawford Preservation	◔	◑	◕	○	○	◔	104.0
42	SC-11	Cascade Way	◑	◔	◕	◔	○	◔	102.2
43	SC-4	Brooks Rd Phase 1	○	◔	◑	◔	◑	○	100.6
44	SV-5	Mullan Road preservation	●	◑	○	◕	○	○	92.9
45	SC-10	Columbia Dr	○	○	◔	○	◑	◕	90.3
46	SV-8	Wilbur Rd sidewalk	○	◔	○	◔	○	◑	80.5
47	FF-2	First St Sidewalk Phase 2	◑	○	○	○	◔	◔	80.3
48	FF-1	Rattler Run Road reconstruction	○	◔	○	○	○	○	55.0
49	SC-7	Cheney-Spokane Rd	○	○	○	○	○	○	35.3

Bigelow Gulch Project 5 and 6

- Prioritized Project 5 over Project 6 because it is geographically contiguous with the currently under construction Project 4a.
- TAC Prioritization aligns with local priority.

Argonne Road (Millwood)

- Prioritized project higher because they thought the scale of the project was smaller than some larger ones but would go further in addressing congestion and reliability.
- Project cost was strongly considered.

Pines Grade Separation

- Prioritized project lower because they thought there were projects that were more shovel-ready and more deliverable at this stage.
- Had some concerns with funding a ROW only project.

Active Transportation

- Ben Burr Crossing Improvements
- Centennial Trail Summit Gap
- Greta to Whitworth Bike Route

Active transportations project's benefits not fully realized by the nature of the application.

SRTC SPOKANE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL
421 W. RIVERSIDE AVE. SUITE 500 • SPOKANE WA 99201 • 509.343.6370 • WWW.SRTC.ORG

Agenda Item 9a

MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 2, 2018

TO: Members of the SRTC Board of Directors

FROM: Staci Lehman, Communications Coordinator

SUBJECT: Title VI Plan Update: Comments Received

Summary
SRTC's Title VI Plan is being updated as required upon any substantial organizational changes. SRTC changes include the hiring of a new Executive Director in 2017 and new outreach methods and tools. All government agencies receiving federal funds are required to comply with nondiscrimination laws and regulations, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which prohibits discrimination based on race, color, and national origin in the provision of benefits and services. The Title VI Program includes a requirement to submit a plan specifying how agencies will implement their Title VI responsibilities.

The update to the plan was completed in June and released for a 30-day public comment period that ends August 8. To date, the only comment received is from the Spokane Tribe that points out that, on page 3 of the document, it reads "Member agencies and tribes include" rather than "Member agencies and *Participating* Tribes….", which would be consistent with the language in SRTC's Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).

The omission of the word "participating" was an oversight or a typographical error and was not intended.

A letter signed by Spokane Tribal Chairwoman Carol Evans says the statement "Member agencies and Tribes" is inaccurate as it suggests the Spokane Tribe is a member of SRTC. The letter goes on to suggest a revision of the statement or the list of member agencies that follows it.

In response, staff edited the document (see **Attachment**) and separated member agencies and participating Tribes into two separate bulleted lists.

The Board does not need to formally act on the Plan update but was informed at the July Board meeting that any comments received on it would be brought back for consideration.

Public Involvement
The updated Title VI Plan has been out for a 30-day public comment period that started July 9 and will conclude on August 8, 2018. The plan was posted on the agency's website, sent out via multiple press releases and social media posts and sent directly to stakeholders via email. In addition, staff published two legal notices and spent an evening at the Hillyard Farmer's Market talking to people about Title VI and the updated Title VI Plan.

Policy Implications

Local agencies are expected to comply with the U.S. Department of Transportation's (USDOT) Title VI regulations contained in 49 CFR Part 21, and the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) regulations contained in 23 CFR 200.

Prior Committee Actions

This item is being presented to the Board for the second time. It was also presented to the TTC.

Requested Action

This item is for information and discussion. Absent any other substantial comments, the Plan as is will be finalized.

INTRODUCTION

The Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) is designated the Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO) at the state level and a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for Spokane County at the Federal level. MPOs ensure transportation expenditures are based on a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive planning process. RTPOs cover both urban *and* rural areas and receive state funding for planning activities.

Funds for transportation projects and programs are channeled through SRTC and awarded to local agencies and jurisdictions that deal with transportation. Additionally, as a regional intergovernmental agency, SRTC encourages communication, coordination and collaboration between planning and transportation departments at member agencies to assure connectivity throughout Spokane County. A signatory~~n~~ Interlocal Agreement between the following~~se~~ agencies shows SRTC's commitment to working together to provide each other, and the public, with quality transportation planning services:

~~Member agencies and Tribes include:~~

- City of Spokane
- Spokane Valley
- Spokane County
- Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) Eastern Region
- Spokane Transit Authority (STA)
- Spokane Airport Board
- Small cities and towns
- Washington State Transportation Commission

Participating Tribes include:

Formatted: Left, Indent: Left: 0"

- Spokane Tribe of Indians
- Kalispel Tribe of Indians

~~An Interlocal Agreement between these agencies shows SRTC's commitment to working together to provide each other, and the public, with quality transportation planning services:~~

Operational Guidelines

Primary guidance to SRTC is provided by:

- The Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Regulations 23 CFR 450.
- RCW 47.80 Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO).
- SRTC's Interlocal Agreement
- Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act (Pub. L. No. 114-94)
- State and Federal Clean Air Acts and Amendments
- Washington State Growth Management Act
- SRTC's Public Participation Plan
- SRTC's Procurement Process Policy

SRTC SPOKANE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL
421 W. RIVERSIDE AVE. SUITE 500 • SPOKANE WA 99201 • 509.343.6370 • WWW.SRTC.ORG

Agenda Item 9c

MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 2, 2018

TO: Members of the SRTC Board of Directors

FROM: Jason Lien, Senior Transportation Planner

SUBJECT: Update on Division Street Corridor Study

Summary
The purpose of this agenda item is to update the SRTC Board of Directors on the status of the proposed Division Street Reimagined study. In March 2018, the SRTC Board of Directors set aside STBG funds in support of a coordinated study of the Division Street corridor.

Previously, Spokane Transit Authority had been awarded study funds through the 2017-2019 SRTC Call for Projects. STA's comprehensive plan, Connect Spokane, identifies Division Street as a High Performance Transit (HPT) corridor and a priority for implementation. STA was awarded $400,000 in STP funds, in addition to $100,000 secured local funds, to study the operation and alignment of HPT on Division Street extending north into unincorporated Spokane County.

To supplement the STA effort, a coordinated study approach would consider the implementation of HPT in the context of the broader transportation system within and surrounding the Division corridor. This systems approach includes the multimodal aspects of the corridor through the lenses of mobility, safety, access, and connectivity. Key issues are system opportunities after completion of the North Spokane Corridor project, policy decisions regarding parallel local and regional corridors, best configuration of Division right-of-way with HPT alignment, potential active transportation enhancements, and integration with adjacent land uses / neighborhoods.

At the March SRTC Board meeting, there were some concerns with a singular planning study for the corridor. Since then, meetings have been held with STA, WSDOT, City of Spokane, and Spokane County staff to further refine approach, scope, and schedule of the effort. While this is still an ongoing conversation, the respective agencies have been amenable to working out a study scope that makes the most sense for the corridor given timing and staffing constraints.

Approach
Staff is drafting a study approach that includes a task order list for placement under a consultant team master contract. The contract would encompass the core items of the HPT study as well as other tasks to fill out a holistic, multimodal scope. In this approach, STA would manage the HPT study process and other consultant tasks would be managed by SRTC and vetted through a project management team consisting of STA, City of Spokane, WSDOT, and Spokane County staff. A singular RFQ would be issued to identify a consultant

team with strong qualifications in the areas of transit, traffic modeling, active transportation, public involvement, and land use.

The detailed schedule is under development, but it is expected that a consultant team will be under contract in early 2019. The study structure and management responsibilities would be established in a project charter and executed through an interlocal agreement that is acceptable to all involved parties.

Public Involvement

Public involvement will be a collaborative effort between the partner agencies and will include various public outreach techniques to engage community members, including residents and businesses in the corridor, affected agencies, and transportation and community interest groups. Identifying and cultivating champions for this effort is crucial.

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. The Metropolitan Transportation Plan, Horizon 2040, has policies to improve multimodal choice and mobility on the transportation network (Guiding Principle 6: Quality of Life). As a key work item, the study is in the SRTC Board approved 2019 Unified Planning and Work Program (UPWP).

Technical Implications

The study will include extensive technical analysis by consultant experts to examine potential alternatives for the Division corridor. Outcomes will focus on identification of capital projects that can be phased over time to implement the preferred corridor strategies.

Prior Committee Actions

In March 2018, the Board voted to set aside $400,000 of STBG funds for the study as part of the 2018 Call for Projects “off-the-top” funding action item. Programming of that funding was subject to further agency coordination. The need for the study was previously mentioned during development of the SRTC Strategic Plan.

Requested Action

Item is for information and discussion; no action requested at this time. If the Board is comfortable with the outlined approach, the programming of STBG funding for the study could occur through an amendment to the 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) or through an amendment to the next TIP in January. The amendment will include any additional funding sources from partner agencies. This will be brought back for Board action at the September meeting.

SRTC SPOKANE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL
421 W. RIVERSIDE AVE. SUITE 500 • SPOKANE WA 99201 • 509.343.6370 • WWW.SRTC.ORG

Agenda Item 9d

MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 2, 2018

TO: Members of the SRTC Board of Directors

FROM: Sabrina C. Minshall, AICP, Executive Director

SUBJECT: Spokane Tribe and Kalispel Tribe Requests for SRTC Membership

Summary

SRTC received requests from the Spokane Tribe and the Kalispel Tribe requesting membership in the Council (**Attachments One and Two**). This item is presented for information and discussion only. Relevant provisions from the 2013 SRTC Interlocal Agreement (ILA) are provided as well as background on prior discussion of amendment of the ILA

At the time of the Spokane Tribe request, SRTC was exploring the necessity of amending the ILA to address operational issues stemming from how benefits, accounting services, and fiscal agency were being procured from the City of Spokane. These operational issues are now being resolved without the need to amend the ILA; Per the Board action in July, benefits are being procured through the Association of Washington Cities, and SRTC will be adopting a new employee policy manual with independent policy provisions.

The ILA (**Attachment Three**) lists membership agencies and Board representation by population thresholds, as well as special members. A voting structure is also established to reflect this membership, as well as a weighted voting process to reflect population. Section 13 provides that the new members may be added to the Council (Board) "upon the majority consent of the voting Members." The same section also provides that the ILA may be amended by unanimous consent of the Members governing bodies. It is the opinion of legal counsel that while the Council may add new members, those members may not be voting members unless there is unanimous consent by the ILA Members governing bodies.

Another issue is presented to the Board because at least two agencies are likely to be in different population thresholds with the release of census populations numbers from 2020. With this additional need to look at membership within the ILA, it is my recommendation that potential changes be addressed all at once for a singular amendment to be in effect when Census 2020 official population numbers are released. Factors such as overall board size, weighted voting, and types of members will be issues the Board will want to consider as part of that potential amendment, which will be sent to the Members governing bodies for consideration.

Requested Action

This item is for information and discussion only.

Agenda Item 9d
Attachment One

Spokane Tribe of Indians

P.O. Box 100 Wellpinit, WA 99040 (509) 458-6500 Fax: 509-458-6500

RECEIVED
MAR 13 2018
SRTC

March 9, 2018

Al French
SRTC Board Chair
Spokane County Commissioner
Re: Spokane Tribal Representation Part II

Dear Mr. Chairman,

I am writing you on behalf of the Spokane Tribe of Indians in your capacity as Board Chair of the Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC). The purpose of this letter is to reaffirm a request made by my predecessor, Rudy Peone, that the SRTC Board of Directors consider accepting the Spokane Tribe to a formal voting position on SRTC's governing body. As a reminder, the original request, dated April 9, 2015, is attached.

I understand that member agencies will soon individually consider revisions to the *Interlocal Agreement* that establishes SRTC and its governing body. It is also my understanding that the primary reason the Spokane Tribe has not yet received formal consideration of our request for voting privileges is because of the practical challenges associated with amending the *Interlocal Agreement.*

Today, three years after Chairman Peone sent a letter requesting Spokane Tribal representation, it appears SRTC's Board of Directors is poised to open the *Interlocal Agreement* to advance other business objectives. Thus, the practical obstacles that precluded formal consideration of Spokane Tribal representation are no longer relevant. While revisions are being considered to the *Interlocal Agreement*, I respectfully request incorporation of language that allows for full voting representation of the Spokane Tribe of Indians on SRTC's governing body. After all, it is the Spokane Tribe that puts the 'S' in SRTC.

At the convenience of the SRTC Board of Directors, either myself or one of my colleagues on Tribal Business Council will be happy to communicate our perspective to the full board during a regularly scheduled meeting.

Thank you for the consideration.

Sincerely,

Carol Evans

Carol Evans
Chairwoman
Spokane Tribal Business Council

CC: Mike Tedesco
Sabrina Minshall
SRTC Board of Directors

Kalispel Tribe of Indians
P.O. Box 39
Usk, WA 99180

(509) 445-1147
(509) 445-1705 *fax*
www.kalispeltribe.com

RECEIVED
APR 19 2018
SRTC

April 12, 2018

Al French
SRTC Board Chair
Spokane County Commissioner

Re: Request for Kalispel Tribe Representation on Spokane Regional Transportation Council

Dear Chairman French,

The Kalispel Tribe of Indians holds great value in community collaboration. It is with this in mind that we request a formal position on the Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC).

As you know, Kalispel Tribe has reservation land in Airway Heights. As such, regional transportation issues are important to the Kalispel Tribe and its Tribal Council. Our tribal government and business enterprises rely on the region's transportation infrastructure and smart planning efforts.

We are aware that SRTC is actively reviewing the Interlocal agreement that establishes its governing board. As such, the Kalispel Tribe believes this would be an ideal time to request representation on your board. The Tribe has enjoyed positive relations with many of the municipal and government agencies represented on your board and we have a strong tradition of being an active collaborator on issues of importance in the Spokane region. As a sovereign nation, we believe a seat on the SRTC would be another appropriate place for collaboration.

We thank you for your consideration and look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

Curt Holmes

Curt Holmes
Executive Director of Public & Governmental Affairs
Kalispel Tribe of Indians

CC: SRTC Board of Directors

Return To:

Spokane Regional Transportation Council
221 W. First Avenue, Suite 310
Spokane, WA 99201

AN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT AMONG SPOKANE COUNTY, CITY OF SPOKANE, CITY OF SPOKANE VALLEY, WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, SPOKANE TRANSIT AUTHORITY, SPOKANE AIRPORT BOARD AND OTHER CITIES AND TOWNS WITHIN SPOKANE COUNTY, TO FORM THE SPOKANE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL, DEFINE ITS ORGANIZATION AND POWERS, AND ITS JURISDICTIONAL AREA.

THIS AGREEMENT, is made and entered into among the County of Spokane, a political subdivision of the State of Washington, hereinafter referred to as the "County," the City of Spokane, a municipal corporation of the State of Washington, the City of Spokane Valley, a non-charter code city of the State of Washington, the Washington State Department of Transportation, an agency of the State of Washington, hereinafter referred to as "WSDOT," the Washington State Transportation Commission, hereinafter referred to as "WSTC", the Spokane Transit Authority, a municipal corporation of the State of Washington, hereinafter referred to as "STA," Spokane Airport Board, a joint operation of the County and City of Spokane, hereinafter referred to as "SAB" and other incorporated towns and cities located within Spokane County, hereinafter referred to as "Other Members," jointly, along with the County, City of Spokane, STA and WSDOT are collectively referred to as the "Members."

W I T N E S S E T H:

WHEREAS, pursuant to the provisions of chapter 39.34 RCW, two or more public entities may jointly cooperate to perform functions which each may individually perform; and

WHEREAS, on July 6, 2012, the President of the United States signed the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21), which provided authorization for highways, highway safety, and mass transportation and enunciated a policy "[t]o develop a National Intermodal Transportation System that is economically efficient, environmentally sound, provide the

foundation for the nation to compete in the global economy and will move people and goods in an energy efficient manner;" and

WHEREAS, in 1962, Federal transportation legislation required the establishment, by agreement between the Governor of the State of Washington and units of general purpose local government, of a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), which in cooperation with the State of Washington, shall develop transportation plans and programs for urbanized areas of Washington State; and

WHEREAS, Chapter 47.80 RCW authorizes the formation of a Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO) by voluntary association of local governments within a county; provided each RTPO shall have as members the county and at least sixty percent of the cities and towns within the RTPO's boundaries, representing a minimum of seventy-five percent of the cities' and towns' population; and

WHEREAS, each RTPO formed by local governments shall create a transportation policy board to provide policy advice to the RTPO and shall allow representatives of major employers within the region, the department of transportation, transit districts, port districts, and member cities, towns, and counties within the region to participate in policy making; and

WHEREAS, among other duties, each RTPO shall: (i) develop and periodically update a regional transportation plan in cooperation with the State Department of Transportation, providers of public transportation and high capacity transportation, ports, and local governments within the region and shall (ii) designate a lead planning agency to coordinate preparation of said regional transportation plan and carry out the other responsibilities of the organization; and

WHEREAS, RCW 47.80.020 provides that the RTPO in an urbanized area shall be the same as the MPO designated for federal transportation planning purposes; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the above referenced state and federal laws, the Members are desirous of establishing a regional transportation council ("Council") to carry out the responsibilities of the MPO as provided in Federal Transportation legislation as well as other responsibilities determined by the Council.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the following terms and conditions, to include the above recitals, which are incorporated herein as a part of this Agreement, it is agreed among the Members:

Section 1: **NAME/ORGANIZATION**

A voluntary association and joint board, comprising representatives of the County, City of Spokane, City of Spokane Valley, Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), Washington State Transportation Commission (WSTC), Spokane Transit Authority (STA), Spokane Airport Board (SAB) and Other Members is hereby created and shall be known as the Spokane Regional Transportation Council, referred to hereinafter as the "Council."

Section 2: **PURPOSE**

Recognizing that coordinated transportation planning of the County, Cities and Towns, WSDOT, WSTC, STA, SAB and Other Members are necessarily interwoven and interdependent and that the interests of all citizens will best be served by coordinated, cooperative, and comprehensive transportation planning, this Council is established to facilitate such appropriate coordination and cooperation and provide for continuing area wide transportation planning in accordance with Section 3, herein.

The Council is not authorized to in any way supersede the authority vested in the County, Cities and Towns, WSDOT, WSTC, STA, SAB or Other Members, but is intended to meet the prerequisites of United States Code Titles 23 and 49, and RCW Chapter 47.80.

Section 3: **POWERS AND FUNCTIONS**

The functions, responsibilities, and powers of Council shall be as follows:

(a) To perform the functions of a Transportation Management Area (TMA) for the metropolitan area, which includes those functions set forth in the MAP-21 legislation of July 6, 2012, and related rules, as amended to implement MAP-21 as well as those functions, which may be required hereinafter by subsequent Federal Transportation legislation.

(b) To perform the functions of a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) as set forth in Title 23 United States Code and Title 49 United States Code as currently adopted or as amended, and 23 CFR Parts 450 and 500 and 40 CFR Part 613, as currently adopted or as amended.

(c) To perform the functions of a Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO) as set forth in Ch. 47.80 RCW and Ch. 468-86 WAC, as currently adopted or as amended.

(d) To prepare and update a Metropolitan Transportation Plan pursuant to 23 CFR Parts 450 and 500 and 49 CFR Part 613.

(e) To engage in regional transportation planning.

(f) To administer regional transportation funding programs and consider those projects which have been approved by the governing bodies of the Members and which are incorporated within the adopted Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

(g) To participate in the development and maintenance of transportation related information necessary to support the functions and responsibilities of the Council.

(h) To promote the regional transportation interests, plans and projects to local, state and federal public and private entities.

(i) To contract with the WSDOT or other appropriate entities in order to meet requirements of State and/or Federal Transportation legislation.

(j) To create committees as necessary, to advise the Board on regional transportation related matters. At a minimum this shall include:

a. the Transportation Advisory Council (TAC) whose composition and responsibilities shall be defined by the Board.
b. the Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) whose composition and responsibilities shall be defined by the Board.

(k) To comply with the Transportation Planning requirements set forth in the Washington State Growth Management Act, and Ch. 47.80 RCW, consistent with Spokane County County-wide Planning Policies.

(l) To perform such other transportation planning and program related functions as the Board may hereinafter determine to be in the best interests of the Council and the members thereof, which are consistent with the terms of this Agreement and related federal and state law.

Section 4: **JURISDICTIONAL AND METROPOLITAN AREA DEFINED**

The Council's jurisdictional area shall consist of all incorporated and unincorporated areas of Spokane County, Washington, and may include contiguous areas across county or state boundaries as deemed appropriate and which meet the criteria of State and/or Federal Transportation legislation.

Section 5: **GOVERNING BODY AND OFFICERS**

The governing body (the "Board") of the Council, presently consisting of fourteen (14) voting persons, shall be established by the following thresholds:

(a) Jurisdictions under 5,000 people - One (1) person jointly selected by jurisdictions with populations fewer than 5,000 people. The person selected shall be an elected official from a small town/city;

(b) Jurisdictions between 5,001 and 50,000 people – Three (3) persons separately selected by the City of Airway Heights, City of Cheney and City of Liberty Lake. The persons selected shall be elected officials;

(c) Jurisdictions between 50,001 to 100,000 people – one (1) person appointed by each respective governing body, who shall be an elected official;

(d) Jurisdictions over 100,001 people – two (2) persons appointed by each respective governing body, who shall be elected officials; (The population of Spokane County includes the population of its cities and towns);

(e) One (1) person from STA, who shall be the STA Chief Executive Officer or his or her designee;

(f) Two (2) State Transportation representatives, one (1) from the Washington State Department of Transportation and appointed by the Secretary of Transportation, and one (1) from the Washington State Transportation Commission appointed by the Chair of the Commission;

(g) One (1) person who represents a major employer, with preference for a provider of private sector transportation services within the region who shall be appointed by a majority vote of the Board; and

(h) One (1) person representing SAB, who shall be the Chief Executive Officer or his or her designee.

(i) There shall be three (3) ex officio, non-voting members serving on the Board representing different modes of transportation, which shall include:

(1) One (1) person representing Rail; who shall be appointed by the Members; and

(2) The Chair of the TTC

(3) The Chair of the TAC

(j) Pursuant to RCW 47.80.040, all legislators whose districts are wholly or partially within the designated boundaries of the Council, are considered ex officio (non-voting) members of the Board.

(k) All Board appointments shall be for a term of three (3) years or the tenure of office of the representative in his/her respective jurisdiction, whichever is the lesser time. Alternate Board representatives may serve in the absence of the designated representative so long as the alternate representative is an elected or appointed official of the appointing Member's parent agency (or governing body, as appropriate) and whose name has been placed on record with the Council. All alternate Board representatives must serve in the same capacity as the regularly designated representative as defined hereinabove.

(l) The Board shall elect a Chair and Vice-Chair ("Officers") by majority vote of the Board. Only representatives who are elected officials may be Officers. To be eligible for the Chair position, the Board Member shall have served on the Board for at least one (1) year. The term for Officers may be up to two (2) years in each office. Ex officio members may not serve as Officers.

(m) A Board Member who, during a calendar year, has three (3) unexcused absences from regular Board meetings shall be automatically removed from the Board, without further action.

Section 6: **MEETINGS AND VOTING**

The Council shall hold regular monthly Board meetings. The Chair may call a special meeting or executive session or shall call a special meeting at the request of a majority of the Board. All meetings of the Board shall be open to the public as required by chapter 42.30 RCW. A quorum for the purpose of transacting business shall consist of a simple majority of the Board.

The Board shall adopt rules for the conduct of its business consistent with this Agreement and such rules shall prescribe the place of meetings, the method of providing reasonable notice to Members, the form of the agenda, the regular meeting date and such other matters that relate to the conduct of the

Council's business. Such rules shall be adopted and may be amended by a seventy-five percent (75%) positive vote of the Board, or by amendment to this Agreement as provided herein.

All recommendations, motions, or other actions of the Board shall be adopted by a favorable vote of a majority of those present. Voting Board members shall be entitled to one vote. Provided, however, that the following enumerated actions shall take an affirmative vote of a majority of the voting membership of the Board:

(a) Approval of the annual budget expenditure division among the Members;
(b) Purchase, sale or disposition of real property; and
(c) Addition of new members.

The appointment or discharge of the Executive Director shall require the affirmative vote of ten (10) Board members.

To provide for a measure of proportionate representation within a jurisdiction, the Council adopts a weighted voting process.

A weighted vote may be requested by any two Board members. A weighted vote shall be requested either prior to the vote on the proposed motion or after the vote but prior to the Board taking action on a subsequent agenda item. Following the request for weighted voting, the Chair shall thereafter conduct a weighted vote on the matter with the weight of each vote calculated according to the percentages set forth in Table 1 on the following page. If the weighted vote achieves greater than fifty percent (50%) of the vote, the weighted vote shall take precedence over a prior non-weighted vote. A weighted vote may not be requested for items (a)-(c) above.

Section 7: **STAFF AND SUPPORT**

The Board shall determine the positions, duties and working conditions of employees as necessary to conduct the work programs of the Council consistent with this Agreement. An Executive Director shall be appointed by and serve solely at the pleasure of the Board. The Board shall adopt policies and procedures to establish the duties and authority of the Executive Director, including authority to make financial expenditures on behalf of the Board. The Board shall approve application(s) for or acceptance of any grants to carry out those functions set forth in Section 3 hereinabove. Provided, however, in instances where a grant application must be submitted prior to the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Board so that timely Board approval cannot

Table 1
SRTC Board Majority Vote and Weighted Vote Calculations

Jurisdiction	Majority Vote	% of Vote	Weighted Vote (1.286)[2]	% of Weighted Vote
Airway Heights	1	7.14%	1.000	6.48%
Cheney	1	7.14%	1.000	6.48%
Cities and towns under 5,000 [1]	1	7.14%	1.000	6.48%
Liberty Lake	1	7.14%	1.000	6.48%
Private Sector Transportation	1	7.14%	1.000	6.48%
Spokane - Member 1	1	7.14%	1.286	8.33%
Spokane - Member 2	1	7.14%	1.286	8.33%
Spokane County - Member 1	1	7.14%	1.286	8.33%
Spokane County - Member 2	1	7.14%	1.286	8.33%
Spokane Airport Board	1	7.14%	1.000	6.48%
Spokane Transit Authority	1	7.14%	1.000	6.48%
Spokane Valley	1	7.14%	1.286	8.33%
State Transportation Board	1	7.14%	1.000	6.48%
WSDOT	1	7.14%	1.000	6.48%
	14	**100.00%**	**15.430**	**100.00%**

[1] Small cities and towns under 5,000 in population share a single vote on the SRTC Board. These jurisdictions include Deer Park, Fairfield, Latah, Medical Lake, Millwood, Rockford, Spangle, and Waverly.

[2] When a weighted vote is called, each vote for representatives from the City of Spokane, the City of Spokane Valley, and Spokane County are weighted by 1.286. This weighted vote formula was established to preserve the voting weight for these three agencies from the 2010 Interlocal Agreement.

be obtained, the grant application may still be submitted with mutual approval of the Chair and Vice-Chair.

Unless otherwise determined by the Board, employees are at-will and shall be hired and discharged by, and work under the direction of, the Executive Director.

The Board may arrange for support services such as requisitioning and purchasing, payment of expenditures, accounting, payroll, computer processing, legal counsel, and others as deemed necessary.

Pay schedules shall be set by the Board consistent with responsibilities performed and the demand for such personnel in public and private industry, with due consideration to pay schedules for like positions in Member agencies.

Section 8: **WORK PROGRAM AND ANNUAL BUDGET**

The Board shall prepare and adopt a proposed work program and budget for each calendar year. The detailed annual work program shall list specific work projects to be undertaken by the Council. The Executive Director or designee shall confer with and inform Members concerning the preparation of and progress on the technical areas of work programs and projects. The proposed annual budget shall set forth the methodology for determining the allocation of costs, appropriations and expenditures to each member.

The Board shall submit the proposed work program and budget to the Members by September 30 of the preceding year. Approval or rejection of such budget by each Member shall be submitted to the Council by November 1 of each year. Members from jurisdictions identified in Section 5(a) that have not previously been required to contribute funds toward the annual budget and Members who have annual assessments increased by more than fifteen percent (15%) shall be given written notice one (1) year in advance of a proposed budget assessment.

Following a request from a Member to perform services on a specific project, not identified in the work program, the Board may impose a special assessment on the requesting Member. The special assessment shall be: (a) reasonably determined by the Board and (b) reimburse the costs and expenses associated with the specific project.

The annual budget and/or work program of the Council may be amended by vote of the Board, provided such amendment does not require additional budget appropriation in excess of the amounts established in the second

paragraph of this Section 8, by the Members. After approval of the Council budget, no Member may terminate or withhold its share during the year for which it was allocated.

Section 9: **ALLOCATION OF COSTS, APPROPRIATIONS, EXPENDITURES**

It is anticipated that most projects and programs of the Council will involve mutual benefit to its Members. Costs of the annual budget expenditures shall be divided among the Members as recommended by the Board and approved by the Members in the budget approval process. Any additional agency joining the Council as a Member, shall contribute as agreed with the Board. Additional contributions to the Council budget may be made to accomplish projects and programs deemed to be of particular pertinence or benefit to one or more of the Member agencies.

Each funding Member after approval of the proposed Council budget shall submit its payment on or before January 20 of the budget year. The funds of such joint operation shall be deposited in the public treasury of the City of Spokane or the public treasury of any other Member as so agreed upon by the Members; and such deposit shall be subject to the same audit and fiscal controls as the public treasury where the funds are so deposited. The funds shall be used in accordance with the adopted budget and work plan.

The Executive Director may make expenditures in accordance with the approved Council budget, work plan and approved policies and procedures, and shall maintain records of expenditures and report monthly to the Board on budget activity.

Payment of all claims shall be signed by the Executive Director or designee, and approved monthly by the Board. Such claims, with proper affidavits required by law, shall then be certified for payment by the City of Spokane or as arranged by the Board.

Section 10: **REAL AND PERSONAL PROPERTY**

The Council may, through gift, devise, purchase, lease or other form of conveyance, acquire, hold, manage, use and dispose of real and personal property necessary for the joint undertaking set forth herein with such property acquisition upon such terms and conditions as agreed by the Board. It is recognized that any public or private entity may appropriate funds and may sell, lease, give or otherwise supply real and personal property, personnel and services to the Council or other legal or administrative entity for the purpose of operating the joint or cooperative undertaking.

The Council may not acquire or use real property to operate a transportation system.

Section 11: **INSURANCE**

The Council shall obtain property and liability insurance for the matters set forth in this Agreement with coverages and limits reasonably determined by the Council, provided, insurance coverage for comprehensive general liability, auto liability, employment practices liability, public officials errors and omissions liability, shall not be less than $10,000,000 in the aggregate.

Section 12: **INTER-RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COUNCIL, CITIES AND COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSIONS**

Cities and County Planning Commissions shall continue their respective functions as provided by charter and/or State law, including preparation of Cities' and County Comprehensive Plans, to which the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Regional Transportation Improvement Plan shall be coordinated, and administering the zoning, subdivision and similar implementing controls as may be assigned them by their respective legislative bodies.

The successful execution of Council duties and responsibilities in preparing a Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Regional Transportation Improvement Plan, in coordination with state and local plans, requires comprehensive plans be prepared and kept up-to-date by the City, County, and Other Members for their respective jurisdictions.

Section 13: **AMENDMENTS AND NEW MEMBERS**

This Agreement may be amended by unanimous consent of the Members' governing bodies, except WSDOT may take action through its Secretary. Upon majority consent of the voting Members, new members may join the Council upon written acceptance of the terms of this Agreement.

Section 14: **TERMINATION OF MEMBERSHIP**

The Cities, County, STA, SAB, WSDOT, WSTC, or Other Members of the Council may terminate membership in the Council by giving written notice to the Council prior to August 1 of any year for the following year.

Section 15: **PRIOR WRITTEN AGREEMENTS**

This Agreement shall supersede the following Agreements:

Agreement creating the Spokane Regional Planning Conference, Spokane, Washington, dated December 15, 1966.

An Amended Agreement between Spokane County, Washington, and City of Spokane, Washington, to form a Spokane Regional Planning Conference, Define its Organization and Powers, and Establish its Regional Planning District, dated August 31, 1972.

An Amended Agreement between Spokane County, Washington, and the City of Spokane, Washington, and other municipalities, to form Spokane Regional Council, Define its Organization and Powers, and Establish Regional Council Jurisdiction Area, dated August 15, 1984.

An Interlocal Agreement among Spokane County, City of Spokane, Washington State Department of Transportation, Spokane Transit Authority, and Other Cities and Towns within Spokane County, to form a Regional Transportation Council, Define its Organization and Powers, and Establish a Regional Council Jurisdictional Area dated October 12, 1993.

An Interlocal Agreement among Spokane County, City of Spokane, Washington State Department of Transportation, Spokane Transit Authority, and other Cities and Towns within Spokane County to form a Spokane Regional Transportation Council, Define its Organization and Powers, and Establish a Regional Council Jurisdictional Area dated April 28, 2003.

An Interlocal Agreement among Spokane County, City of Spokane, City of Spokane Valley, Washington State Department of Transportation, Spokane Transit Authority and other Cities and Towns within Spokane County, to form the Spokane Regional Transportation Council, define its organization and powers, and its jurisdictional area last dated October 23, 2010.

Section 16: **EFFECTIVE DATE and Binding Agreement**

The effective date of this Agreement shall be upon ratification of this Agreement by the County and, at least, sixty percent (60%) of the cities and towns within the Council area that represent seventy-five percent (75%) of the cities' and towns' population. This Agreement shall be binding upon the Members who have executed this Agreement, their successors and assigns.

Section 17: **METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO) DESIGNATION**

The execution of this Agreement by the Members is not intended to act as a revocation of the MPO or constitute a substantial change in authority or responsibility of the MPO and shall not be interpreted to require the redesignation of the MPO under 23 CFR § 450.310.

Section 18: **SUCCESSOR IN INTEREST**

The Council, as provided for herein, shall be the successor in interest to all grants, contracts, and other documents entered into by the Council's predecessor, the Spokane Regional Council.

Section 19: **DEFAULT**

Failure by any Member to perform, observe or comply with the covenants, agreements or conditions on its part contained in this Agreement where that failure continues for a period of thirty (30) days after written notice from the Council to the defaulting Member shall constitute an "Event of Default."

Section 20: **REMEDIES**

In the event of any Event of Default, the Council may at any time, without waiving or limiting any other right or remedy, pursue any remedy allowed by law including, by way of example and without limitation, specific performance, declaratory judgment and other equitable remedies, and recovery of attorney's fees and other costs for such enforcement action.

Section 21: **GENERAL TERMS**

This Agreement contains terms and conditions agreed upon by the Members. The Members agree that there are not other understandings, oral or otherwise, regarding the subject matter of this Agreement.

In the event any portion of this Agreement should become invalid or unenforceable, the rest of the Agreement shall remain in full force and effect.

This Agreement shall be construed under the laws of Washington State. Any action at law, suit in equity or judicial proceeding regarding this Agreement or any provision hereto shall be instituted only in courts of competent jurisdiction within Spokane County, Washington.

This Agreement may be executed in any number of counterparts, each of which, when so executed and delivered, shall be an original, but such counterparts shall together constitute but one and the same.

Nothing in this Agreement is intended to give, or shall give, whether directly or indirectly, any benefit or right, greater than that enjoyed by the general public, to third persons.

The section headings in this Agreement have been inserted solely for the purpose of convenience and ready reference. In no way do they purport to and shall not be deemed to define, limit or extend the scope or intent of the sections to which they pertain.

Section 22: **RCW CHAPTER 39.34 REQUIRED CLAUSES**

A. PURPOSE

See Section No. 2 above.

B. DURATION

This Agreement is perpetual until the joint and comprehensive undertaking is either voluntarily dissolved or discontinued pursuant to RCW 47.80.020.

C. ORGANIZATION OF SEPARATE ENTITY AND ITS POWERS

The Board shall administer the joint and cooperative undertakings set forth herein.

D. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PARTIES

See provisions above.

E. AGREEMENT TO BE FILED

This Agreement may be filed with the County Auditor or published on the Members' websites, as available.

F. FINANCING

See Section Nos. 8 and 9 above. The Council, or any of the Members hereto, may receive grants-in-aid from the State or Federal Government or any other department or agency and may

accept gifts from public or private entities for the purposes authorized in this Agreement.

G. TERMINATION

See Section No. 14 above.

H. PROPERTY UPON TERMINATION

Any Member terminating its membership in the Council as provided for in Section 14 hereinabove shall forfeit any ownership interest in any personal or real property owned or held by the Council.

Personal property acquired by the Council in the performance of this Agreement shall be disposed of by the Council upon termination of the Agreement. Unless otherwise required by law or agreement, cash and cash proceeds from sale of personal property shall be disbursed to the Members according to the contribution made by the Member as set forth in this Agreement.

Real property shall be conveyed or disposed of as set forth in this Agreement in the same manner as personal property except where a separate instrument or deed reservation exists with regard to any real property in which instance it shall control.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Members hereto have entered into this Agreement on the day and year of their respective signature.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS SPOKANE COUNTY SEAL SPOKANE COUNTY, WA

ADOPTED by the Board of County Commissioners of Spokane County, Washington this 12th day of March, 2013.

Shelly O'Quinn, Chair

ATTEST:
DANIELA ERICKSON

Al French, Vice-Chair

CLERK OF THE BOARD

By: Daniela Erickson
Daniela Erickson
Clerk of the Board

Todd Mielke, Commissioner Absent

ATTEST:

City Clerk

CITY OF SPOKANE

By
Date: 02-27-2013

David A. Condon
Mayor
City of Spokane

Approved as to form:

Assistant City Attorney

WASHINGTON STATE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Secretary of Transportation
Date: 6/12/13

SPOKANE TRANSIT AUTHORITY

By
Date: 4/10/13

WASHINGTON STATE
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

By
Date: 6/12/13

CITY OF AIRWAY HTS.,
WASHINGTON

By
Date: 4-5-13

CITY OF CHENEY, WASHINGTON

By
Date: 3-14-13

CITY OF DEER PARK, WASHINGTON

By
Date: 4/15/13

CITY OF FAIRFIELD, WASHINGTON

Ed Huber
By
Date: 5-07-13

CITY OF LATAH, WASHINGTON

By
Date: 4-12-2013

CITY OF LIBERTY LK., WASHINGTON

By
Date: 3/28/13

CITY OF MEDICAL LAKE, WASHINGTON

By
Date: 3/21/13

CITY OF MILLWOOD, WASHINGTON

Dail N. Mak
By
Date: April 12, 2013

CITY OF ROCKFORD, WASHINGTON

Micki Harnois
By
Date: 3/14/13

CITY OF SPANGLE, WASHINGTON

By
Date: 5/13/13

CITY OF WAVERLY, WASHINGTON

By
Date:

CITY OF SPOKANE VALLEY, WASHINGTON

By
Date: 4/12/13

CITY OF DEER PARK, WASHINGTON

By
Date:

CITY OF FAIRFIELD, WASHINGTON

By
Date:

CITY OF LATAH, WASHINGTON

By
Date:

CITY OF LIBERTY LK., WASHINGTON

By
Date:

CITY OF MEDICAL LAKE, WASHINGTON

By
Date:

CITY OF MILLWOOD, WASHINGTON

By
Date:

CITY OF ROCKFORD, WASHINGTON

By
Date:

CITY OF SPANGLE, WASHINGTON

By
Date:

CITY OF WAVERLY, WASHINGTON

By
Date: March 11, 2013

CITY OF SPOKANE VALLEY, WASHINGTON

By
Date:

SPOKANE AIRPORT BOARD

Lawrence J. Krauter

By Lawrence J. Krauter

Date: 3/27/13

SRTC SPOKANE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL
421 W. RIVERSIDE AVE. SUITE 500 • SPOKANE WA 99201 • 509.343.6370 • WWW.SRTC.ORG

Agenda Item 9e

MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 2, 2018

TO: Members of the SRTC Board of Directors

FROM: Greg Griffin, Administrative Services Manager

SUBJECT: SRTC Calendar Year 2017 Audit

Summary

Each year the Washington State Auditor's Office performs Financial Statement, Accountability and Federal Single Audits for the prior calendar year financial activity. The Exit Conference for the 2017 audit was held on July 26, 2018. The auditor from the State Auditor's Office sent the final Exit Conference document to Board members following the completion of the Exit Conference. There were no findings, management letters, or exit items for the calendar year 2017 audit. The report from the Office of the Washington State Auditor follows this memo (see **Attachment**).

Public Involvement

None

Policy Implications

The exit conference provides an opportunity for Board Members to participate in the audit process.

Technical Implications

Recommendations identified through the audit process can be implemented into SRTC's financial management system. Recommendations are made in the form of findings, management letters, and exit items.

Prior Committee Actions

None

Requested Action

For information and discussion.

Office of the Washington State Auditor
Pat McCarthy

Exit Conference: Spokane Regional Transportation Council

The Office of the Washington State Auditor's vision is increased trust in government. Our mission is to provide citizens with independence and transparent examinations of how state and local governments use public funds, and develop strategies that make government more efficient and effective.

The purpose of this meeting is to share the results of your audit and our draft reporting. We value and appreciate your participation.

Audit Reports

We will publish the following reports:

- Accountability audit for January 1, 2017 through December 31, 2017 - see draft report.
- Financial statement and federal grant compliance audit for January 1, 2017 through December 31, 2017 - see draft report.

Audit Highlights

- There were no audit issues identified during the audit.
- The Council responded promptly our requests and provided all the documents necessary to complete the audit in a timely manner.

Communications required by audit standards

In relation to our financial statement audit report, we would like to bring to your attention:

- There were no uncorrected misstatements in the audited financial statements.
- There were no material misstatements in the financial statements corrected by management during the audit.

Finalizing Your Audit

Report Publication

Audit reports are published on our website and distributed via e-mail in an electronic .pdf file. We also offer a subscription service that allows you to be notified by email when audit reports are released or posted to our website. You can sign up for this convenient service at: https://portal.sao.wa.gov/saoportal/Login.aspx

Management Representation Letter

We have received a copy of representations requested of management.

Audit Cost

At the entrance conference, we estimated the cost of the audit to be $10,000, plus travel expenses, and actual audit costs will approximate that amount.

Your Next Scheduled Audit

Your next audit is scheduled to be conducted in 2019 and will cover the following general areas:

- Accountability for Public Resources
- Financial Statement
- Federal Programs

Working Together to Improve Government

Audit Survey

When your report is released you will receive an audit survey from us. We value your opinions on our audit services and hope you provide feedback.

Local Government Support Team

This team provides support services to local governments through technical assistance, comparative statistics, training, and tools to help prevent and detect a loss of public funds. Our website and client portal offers many resources, including a client Help Desk that answers auditing and accounting questions. Additionally this team assists with the online filing of your financial statements.

Performance Center

The Performance Center is a resource for local governments that need to solve problems, reduce costs, and improve the value of their services to citizens. The Center offers training and tools to help local governments improve performance and effectiveness.

Questions?

Please contact us with any questions about information in this document or related audit reports.

Kelly Collins, CPA, Director of Local Audit, (360) 902-0091, Kelly.Collins@sao.wa.gov

Sadie Armijo, CFE, Assistant Director of Local Audit, (360) 902-0362, Sadie.Armijo@sao.wa.gov

Alisha Shaw, Audit Manager, (509) 329-3701 ext. 102, Alisha.Shaw@sao.wa.gov

Matt Thompson, Assistant Audit Manager, (509) 329-3701 ext. 107, Matthew.Thompson@sao.wa.gov

Tara Alfano, Audit Lead, (509) 329-3701 ext. 119, Tara.Alfano@sao.wa.gov

PRELIMINARY DRAFT - Please do not duplicate, distribute or disclose

AUDIT RESULTS

This report describes the overall results and conclusions for the areas we examined. In those selected areas, Council operations complied with applicable state laws, regulations, and its own policies, and provided adequate controls over the safeguarding of public resources.

About the audit

This report contains the results of our independent accountability audit of the Spokane Regional Transportation Council from January 1, 2017 through December 31, 2017.

Management is responsible for ensuring compliance and adequate safeguarding of public resources from fraud, loss or abuse. This includes the design, implementation and maintenance of internal controls relevant to these objectives.

This audit was conducted under the authority of RCW 43.09.260, which requires the Office of the State Auditor to examine the financial affairs of all local governments. Our audit involved performing procedures to obtain evidence about the Council's uses of public resources, compliance with state laws and regulations and its own policies and procedures, and internal controls over such matters.

In keeping with general auditing practices, we do not examine every transaction, activity or area. Instead, based on our risk assessment for the year ended December 31, 2017, the areas examined were those representing the highest risk of fraud, loss, abuse, or noncompliance. The following areas were examined during this audit period:

- Financial condition and fiscal sustainability
- General disbursements, credit card activity, travel expenditures and reimbursements

PRELIMINARY DRAFT - Please do not duplicate, distribute or disclose

RELATED REPORTS

Financial

Our opinion on the Council's financial statements and compliance with federal grant program requirements is provided in a separate report, which includes the Council's financial statements. That report is available on our website, http://portal.sao.wa.gov/ReportSearch.

Federal grant programs

We evaluated internal controls and tested compliance with the federal program requirements, as applicable, for the Council's major federal program, which is listed in the Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs section of the separate financial statement and single audit report. That report is available on our website, http://portal.sao.wa.gov/ReportSearch.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT - Please do not duplicate, distribute or disclose

INFORMATION ABOUT THE COUNCIL

The Spokane Regional Transportation Council is a Metropolitan Planning Organization formed by an interlocal agreement among several local governments. The Council is responsible for the development and endorsement of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, the Transportation Improvement Program and other regional transportation studies. This transportation planning process includes data collection and analysis, traffic projections, network evaluation, determining roadway and intersection requirements, and the conceptual development of regionally significant projects.

A Board of Directors with 14 voting members administers the Council. Participating entities appoint Board Members to the Council and serve undefined terms. The Council appoints an Executive Director to oversee the Council's daily operations as well as its 10 full-time employees and one part-time employee. The majority of the Council's funding comes from federal grants, state and local assistance, and interlocal agreements with area cities and other local governments. The Council's annual revenue fluctuates heavily from year-to-year due to the nature of its projects and associated grant funding. In fiscal year 2017, the Council operated on an annual budget of approximately $1.49 million.

Contact information related to this report	
Address:	Spokane Regional Transportation Council 421 W. Riverside Avenue Suite 500 Spokane, WA 99201
Contact:	Greg Griffin, Administrative Services Manager
Telephone:	(509) 343-6370
Website:	www.srtc.org

Information current as of report publish date.

Audit history

You can find current and past audit reports for the Spokane Regional Transportation Council at http://portal.sao.wa.gov/ReportSearch.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT - Please do not duplicate, distribute or disclose

SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS

Spokane Regional Transportation Council
Spokane County
January 1, 2017 through December 31, 2017

SECTION I – SUMMARY OF AUDITOR'S RESULTS

The results of our audit of the Spokane Regional Transportation Council are summarized below in accordance with Title 2 *U.S. Code of Federal Regulations* (CFR) Part 200, *Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards* (Uniform Guidance).

Financial Statements

We issued an unmodified opinion on the fair presentation of the Council's financial statements in accordance with its regulatory basis of accounting. Separately, we issued an adverse opinion on the fair presentation of all funds with regard to accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America (GAAP) because the financial statements are prepared using a basis of accounting other than GAAP.

Internal Control over Financial Reporting:

- *Significant Deficiencies:* We reported no deficiencies in the design or operation of internal control over financial reporting that we consider to be significant deficiencies.
- *Material Weaknesses:* We identified no deficiencies that we consider to be material weaknesses.

We noted no instances of noncompliance that were material to the financial statements of the Council.

Federal Awards

Internal Control over Major Programs:

- *Significant Deficiencies:* We reported no deficiencies in the design or operation of internal control over major federal programs that we consider to be significant deficiencies.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT - Please do not duplicate, distribute or disclose

- *Material Weaknesses:* We identified no deficiencies that we consider to be material weaknesses.

We issued an unmodified opinion on the Council's compliance with requirements applicable to its major federal program.

We reported no findings that are required to be disclosed in accordance with 2 CFR 200.516(a).

Identification of Major Federal Programs:

The following program was selected as a major program in our audit of compliance in accordance with the Uniform Guidance.

CFDA No.	Program or Cluster Title
20.205	Highway Planning and Construction

The dollar threshold used to distinguish between Type A and Type B programs, as prescribed by the Uniform Guidance, was $750,000.

The Council did not qualify as a low-risk auditee under the Uniform Guidance.

SECTION II – FINANCIAL STATEMENT FINDINGS

None reported.

SECTION III – FEDERAL AWARD FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS

None reported.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT - Please do not duplicate, distribute or disclose

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING AND ON COMPLIANCE AND OTHER MATTERS BASED ON AN AUDIT OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH *GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS*

Spokane Regional Transportation Council
Spokane County
January 1, 2017 through December 31, 2017

Board of Directors
Spokane Regional Transportation Council
Spokane, Washington

We have audited, in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, the financial statements of the Spokane Regional Transportation Council, Spokane County, Washington, as of and for the year ended December 31, 2017, and the related notes to the financial statements, which collectively comprise the Council's financial statements, and have issued our report thereon dated July 9, 2018.

We issued an unmodified opinion on the fair presentation of the Council's financial statements in accordance with its regulatory basis of accounting. We issued an adverse opinion on the fair presentation with regard to accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America (GAAP) because the financial statements are prepared by the Council using accounting practices prescribed by Washington State statutes and the State Auditor's *Budgeting, Accounting and Reporting System* (BARS) manual described in Note 1, which is a basis of accounting other than GAAP. The effects on the financial statements of the variances between the basis of accounting described in Note 1 and accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America, although not reasonably determinable, are presumed to be material.

INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING

In planning and performing our audit of the financial statements, we considered the Council's internal control over financial reporting (internal control) to determine the audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances for the purpose of expressing our opinion on the financial statements, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the Council's

PRELIMINARY DRAFT - Please do not duplicate, distribute or disclose

internal control. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the Council's internal control.

A *deficiency in internal control* exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and correct, misstatements on a timely basis. A *material weakness* is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control such that there is a reasonable possibility that a material misstatement of the Council's financial statements will not be prevented, or detected and corrected on a timely basis. A *significant deficiency* is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control that is less severe than a material weakness, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance.

Our consideration of internal control was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control that might be material weaknesses or significant deficiencies. Given these limitations, during our audit we did not identify any deficiencies in internal control that we consider to be material weaknesses. However, material weaknesses may exist that have not been identified.

COMPLIANCE AND OTHER MATTERS

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the Council's financial statements are free from material misstatement, we performed tests of the Council's compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts and grant agreements, noncompliance with which could have a direct and material effect on the determination of financial statement amounts. However, providing an opinion on compliance with those provisions was not an objective of our audit, and accordingly, we do not express such an opinion.

The results of our tests disclosed no instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under *Government Auditing Standards*.

PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

The purpose of this report is solely to describe the scope of our testing of internal control and compliance and the results of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on the effectiveness of the Council's internal control or on compliance. This report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* in considering the Council's internal control and compliance. Accordingly, this communication is not suitable for any other purpose. However,

PRELIMINARY DRAFT - Please do not duplicate, distribute or disclose

this report is a matter of public record and its distribution is not limited. It also serves to disseminate information to the public as a reporting tool to help citizens assess government operations.

Pat McCarthy

State Auditor

Olympia, WA

July 9, 2018

PRELIMINARY DRAFT - Please do not duplicate, distribute or disclose

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT ON COMPLIANCE FOR EACH MAJOR FEDERAL PROGRAM AND REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER COMPLIANCE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE UNIFORM GUIDANCE

Spokane Regional Transportation Council
Spokane County
January 1, 2017 through December 31, 2017

Board of Directors
Spokane Regional Transportation Council
Spokane, Washington

REPORT ON COMPLIANCE FOR EACH MAJOR FEDERAL PROGRAM

We have audited the compliance of the Spokane Regional Transportation Council, Spokane County, Washington, with the types of compliance requirements described in the U.S. *Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Compliance Supplement* that could have a direct and material effect on each of the Council's major federal programs for the year ended December 31, 2017. The Council's major federal programs are identified in the accompanying Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs.

Management's Responsibility

Management is responsible for compliance with federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of its federal awards applicable to its federal programs.

Auditor's Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on compliance for each of the Council's major federal programs based on our audit of the types of compliance requirements referred to above. We conducted our audit of compliance in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America; the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States; and the audit requirements of Title 2 *U.S. Code of Federal Regulations* Part 200, *Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards* (Uniform Guidance).

PRELIMINARY DRAFT - Please do not duplicate, distribute or disclose

Those standards and the Uniform Guidance require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether noncompliance with the types of compliance requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on a major federal program occurred. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence about the Council's compliance with those requirements and performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion on compliance for each major federal program. Our audit does not provide a legal determination on the Council's compliance.

Opinion on Each Major Federal Program

In our opinion, the Council complied, in all material respects, with the types of compliance requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on each of its major federal programs for the year ended December 31, 2017.

REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER COMPLIANCE

Management of the Council is responsible for establishing and maintaining effective internal control over compliance with the types of compliance requirements referred to above. In planning and performing our audit of compliance, we considered the Council's internal control over compliance with the types of requirements that could have a direct and material effect on each major federal program in order to determine the auditing procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances for the purpose of expressing an opinion on compliance for each major federal program and to test and report on internal control over compliance in accordance with the Uniform Guidance, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of internal control over compliance. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the Council's internal control over compliance.

A *deficiency in internal control over compliance* exists when the design or operation of a control over compliance does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and correct, noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement of a federal program on a timely basis. A *material weakness in internal control over compliance* is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control over compliance, such that there is a reasonable possibility that material noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement of a federal program will not be prevented, or detected and corrected, on a timely basis. A *significant deficiency in internal control over compliance* is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control over compliance with a type of compliance requirement of a federal program that is less severe than a material weakness in internal control over compliance, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT - Please do not duplicate, distribute or disclose

Our consideration of internal control over compliance was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control that might be material weaknesses or significant deficiencies. We did not identify any deficiencies in internal control over compliance that we consider to be material weaknesses. However, material weaknesses may exist that have not been identified.

Purpose of this Report

The purpose of this report on internal control over compliance is solely to describe the scope of our testing of internal control over compliance and the results of that testing based on the requirements of the Uniform Guidance. Accordingly, this report is not suitable for any other purpose. However, this report is a matter of public record and its distribution is not limited. It also serves to disseminate information to the public as a reporting tool to help citizens assess government operations.

Pat McCarthy

State Auditor

Olympia, WA

July 9, 2018

PRELIMINARY DRAFT - Please do not duplicate, distribute or disclose

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT ON FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Spokane Regional Transportation Council
Spokane County
January 1, 2017 through December 31, 2017

Board of Directors
Spokane Regional Transportation Council
Spokane, Washington

REPORT ON THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of the Spokane Regional Transportation Council, Spokane County, Washington, for the year ended December 31, 2017, and the related notes to the financial statements, which collectively comprise the Council's financial statements, as listed on page 16.

Management's Responsibility for the Financial Statements

Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of these financial statements in accordance with the financial reporting provisions of Washington State statutes and the *Budgeting, Accounting and Reporting System* (BARS) manual prescribed by the State Auditor described in Note 1. This includes determining that the basis of accounting is acceptable for the presentation of the financial statements in the circumstances. Management is also responsible for the design, implementation and maintenance of internal control relevant to the preparation and fair presentation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

Auditor's Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express opinions on these financial statements based on our audit. We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free from material misstatement.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT - Please do not duplicate, distribute or disclose

An audit involves performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. The procedures selected depend on the auditor's judgment, including the assessment of the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to fraud or error. In making those risk assessments, the auditor considers internal control relevant to the Council's preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the Council's internal control. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. An audit also includes evaluating the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of significant accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the financial statements.

We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our audit opinions.

Unmodified Opinion on Regulatory Basis of Accounting (BARS Manual)

As described in Note 1, the Spokane Regional Transportation Council has prepared these financial statements to meet the financial reporting requirements of Washington State statutes using accounting practices prescribed by the State Auditor's *Budgeting, Accounting and Reporting System* (BARS) manual. Those accounting practices differ from accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America (GAAP). The differences in these accounting practices are also described in Note 1.

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position and results of operations of the Spokane Regional Transportation Council, for the year ended December 31, 2017, on the basis of accounting described in Note 1.

Basis for Adverse Opinion on U.S. GAAP

Auditing standards issued by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) require auditors to formally acknowledge when governments do not prepare their financial statements, intended for general use, in accordance with GAAP. The effects on the financial statements of the variances between GAAP and the accounting practices the Council used, as described in Note 1, although not reasonably determinable, are presumed to be material. As a result, we are required to issue an adverse opinion on whether the financial statements are presented fairly, in all material respects, in accordance with GAAP.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT - Please do not duplicate, distribute or disclose

Adverse Opinion on U.S. GAAP

The financial statements referred to above were not intended to, and in our opinion they do not, present fairly, in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America, the financial position of the Spokane Regional Transportation Council, as of December 31, 2017, or the changes in financial position or cash flows for the year then ended, due to the significance of the matter discussed in the above "Basis for Adverse Opinion on U.S. GAAP" paragraph.

Other Matters

Supplementary and Other Information

Our audit was performed for the purpose of forming an opinion on the financial statements taken as a whole. The Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards is presented for purposes of additional analysis as required by Title 2 *U.S. Code of Federal Regulations* (CFR) Part 200, *Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards* (Uniform Guidance). The Schedule of Liabilities is presented for purposes of additional analysis, as required by the prescribed BARS manual. These schedules are not a required part of the financial statements. Such information is the responsibility of management and was derived from and relates directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the financial statements. The information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the financial statements and certain additional procedures, including comparing and reconciling such information directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the financial statements or to the financial statements themselves, and other additional procedures in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. In our opinion, the information is fairly stated, in all material respects, in relation to the financial statements taken as a whole.

OTHER REPORTING REQUIRED BY GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS

In accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*, we have also issued our report dated July 9, 2018 on our consideration of the Council's internal control over financial reporting and on our tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts and grant agreements and other matters. The purpose of that report is to describe the scope of our testing of internal control over financial reporting and compliance and the results of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on internal control over financial reporting or on compliance. That report is an integral

PRELIMINARY DRAFT - Please do not duplicate, distribute or disclose

part of an audit performed in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* in considering the Council's internal control over financial reporting and compliance.

Pat McCarthy

State Auditor

Olympia, WA

July 9, 2018

WORKSHEET FOR SRTC BOARD AGENDA

Item	*Title/Description*	*Policy Implications/ Requirements*	*Agenda Type*	*Time*	*Presenter*	*Proposed Agenda*	*TTC and/or TAC Agenda*
	Public Comment	Meets WA Code and various grant requirements	Regular	-	N/A	Monthly	N/A
	Executive Directors Report	Keep Board up to date of issues from the month	Regular	10	Sabrina	Monthly	N/A
	Approve Minutes from most recent Board Meeting	Meets WA Code and various grant requirements.	Consent Agenda	_	N/A	Monthly	N/A
	Approve Vouchers	Required	Consent Agenda	_	N/A	Monthly	N/A
	Approve TIP Amendment	Required	Consent Agenda	_	Anna	Monthly	Monthly
	Receive Future Meeting Agenda Worksheet	Aid in communication for future board topics	Attachment	n/a		Monthly	N/A
	Receive Inactive Project List from WSDOT	Ensure Board is aware of projects with delays in spending	Attachment	n/a	N/A	As Available	N/A
	Performance Measures- set targets	Required- Bridge, Pavement & Congestion	Info and Disc	20	Eve	September	August
	2019-2022 TIP	TIP overview – first touch	Info and Disc	15	Anna	September	August
	WTP from the WA Transportation Commission	Washington State Trans Plan Presentation	Info and Disc	20	Paul Parker (confirmed -Eve)	September	N/A
	Data purchase and travel survey	Update on recommendation for purchasing data subscription, land use model and conducting travel survey to update model	Info & Disc	20	Ryan	Sept	August

Item	Title/Description	Policy Implications/ Requirements	Agenda Type	Time	Presenter	Proposed Agenda	TTC and/or TAC Agenda
	Performance Measures Update	Required-Bridge, Pavement, Congestion & CMAQ	Action	15	Eve	October	September
	Data purchase strategy approval	Decision on data strategy	Action	15	Ryan	October	Sept
	2019-2022 TIP	TIP approval	Action	10	Anna	October	September
	Coordinated Public Transit- Human Services Transportation Plan	Joint plan between SRTC and STA- required	Info & Disc	15	Jason	October	September
	Quarterly budget update	For third quarter 2018	Info & Disc	10	Greg	October	N/A
	FY2019 Budget	Financial projections, tasks, timelines, dues	Info & Disc	30	Sabrina/ Greg	October	August/ Sept tasks
	Coordinated Public Transit- Human Services Transportation Plan	Joint plan between SRTC and STA- required	Action	15	Jason	November	October
	Input into multi-year action plan/check in on strategic plan	Continued discussion on organizational work and action planning	Info & Disc	45	Sabrina	November/ possible workshop	N/A
	FY2019 Budget / Indirect Cost Plan FY 2019	Draft FY2019 for review and comment	Info & Disc	20	Sabrina/ Greg	November	N/A
	Debrief education series	Discuss education series	Info & Disc	15	Sabrina/ Staci	November	October
	New TAC Committee Members	Required by bylaws	Action	15	Mike	December	N/A
	FY2019 Budget / Indirect Cost Plan FY 2019	Final draft	Action	15	Sabrina/ Greg	December	N/A
	Freight Mobility Draft Scope	First Touch	Information and Feedback	30	Mike	February	November?

Agenda Item 6

MEETING MINUTES

Spokane Regional Transportation Council Transportation Advisory Committee
June 25, 2018
421 W Riverside Ave Suite 504, Spokane, Washington

1. Call to Order

Chair Kennet Bertelsen brought the meeting to order at 3:02pm.

2. Roll Call

Committee Members Present

- Kennet Bertelsen
- Greg Francis
- Fred Beaulac
- Justin Botejue
- John Dietzman
- Carlie Hoffman
- Rosemarie Schmidt
- Jim Simon
- Greg Szabo

Committee Members Not Present

- Margaret Watson
- Donald Moore
- Robert Race Sr
- Tom Trulove

Guests

Paul Kropp

Staff

Mike Ulrich	Senior Transportation Planner	Tristan De Alwis	Data Scientist
Anna Ragaza-Bourasssa	Senior Transportation Planner	Julie Meyers-Lehman	Administrative Assistant

3. New Member Introductions

Ms. Hoffman and Mr. Botejue introduced themselves, talked about where they worked, the neighborhoods in which they live, and their transportation interest areas. Then existing members also introduced themselves and their transportation interest areas.

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

4. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

5. TAC Chair Report on SRTC Board of Directors Meeting

Chair Bertelsen commented on the great presentation by representatives from Fehr & Peers about the decoupling of Vehicle Miles Traveled from Gross National Products over the past 15 years. He noted the Board approved Mr. Botejue and Ms. Hoffman as new TAC Members, Eve Nelson provided an update on performance targets for transit, and the Board unanimously approved the 2019 Unified Planning Work Program.

6. Approval of April 23, 2018 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Simon made a motion to approve the April 23, 2018 minutes as presented and Mr. Francis seconded. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

7. Approval of May 23, 2018 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Francis made a motion to approve the minutes as presented and Mr. Szabo seconded.

Chair Bertelsen and Mr. Beaulac said they would abstain from the vote as they were not present at the May 23 meeting. This put the number of voting members for this item below quorum. Chair Bertelsen said approval of the May 23 minutes would be tabled indefinitely.

Ms. Schmidt joined the meeting at 3:14pm.

8. 2018 Call for Projects – Funding Recommendation Exercise

Mr. Ulrich said the purpose of the exercise is to have the TAC weight the Guiding Principles (GPs).

Mr. Ulrich asked each member to describe the last transportation related conversation they had with another person. He reminded the group that one of the core missions of the TAC is to provide guidance to the Board and SRTC on public perception and public perspective.

Mr. Ulrich provided regional information about regional trends in population and employment. He also described other transportation trends including commute times, percentage of trips by mode, factors in quality of life (GP), bicycle facility tracking, shared-use path use, transit ridership, crash history and countermeasures, bridge and pavement condition, and others.

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa spoke about the correlation between GPs and project selection criteria on the Call for Projects application; she mentioned that staff made sure the application questions were as quantitative as possible. She brought attention to the schedule of upcoming dates in this process and described how projects in the long-range plan (Horizon 2040) feed into the short-range (four-to-six year) plan (the Transportation Improvement Program).

She outlined the factors that apply to each of the six GPs and how those integrated into the application questions. She provided an overview of regional funding for Spokane County, noting that SRTC handles approximately 2% of the regional transportation dollars. She reported that after the final allocations the following approximate amounts are available in the Call for Projects:

- Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) Program - $6.9M/year
- Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality - $3M/year
- STBG Set-Aside - $530K/year

She reported that 50 project applications were received totaling $98M and we have $26M to distribute. She said SRTC is requesting the TAC to assist in the selection process by weighting the GP; they were intentionally weighted equally in the application.

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa stated that the Board approved an allocation of 5% to small town projects and a set-aside of $3M/year in 2022/2023 for capital maintenance projects. Additionally, $3.15M was allocated to SRTC for planning, data acquisition and two studies as well as $1.834M to the Spokane Regional Transportation Management Center (SRTMC).

Mr. Ulrich started the Guiding Principles weighting exercise, which consisted of each member being given a sheet with each GP and a corresponding scale of one to seven and stickers to apply onto the scale based on importance to each member based on their personal and public perspective.

Chair Bertelsen left at 4:00 due to a prior commitment; he turned the meeting over to Vice Chair Greg Francis.

The group worked on the exercise and then there was a short break while Mr. Ulrich complied the results.

Mr. Ulrich presented the weighted GPs from aggregated each member's scoring sheet and asked each member to expand on why they scored the way they did and their reasons for determining what was important and what was not as important. The group discussed at length.

After the discussion, the group completed the second part of the exercise, which was assigning points to each GP on a single large page. Mr. Ulrich said that at list of projects weighted as indicated this exercise will be brought before the TAC at the July meeting.

9. TAC Member Comments

Ms. Schmidt talked about the very nice bus shelters in Port Townsend, WA.

Mr. Dietzman commented on the recent Roundabout Symposium hosted by SRTC.

Mr. Botejue said he appreciated today's collaborative process.

Mr. Francis spoke about the uneasiness created when traffic counting.

10. Staff Report

There was no staff report.

11. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:55pm.

Julie Meyers-Lehman
Recording Secretary

Spokane Regional Transportation Council
Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting
July 23, 2018 3:00pm
421 W Riverside Ave Suite 504, Spokane, Washington

TAC Chair Report on SRTC Board of Directors Meeting: The TAC Chair provided highlights of the July 12 Board meeting to the group.

2018 SRTC Call for Projects: Recommend Prioritized Project List:

- Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa spoke about changes to the upcoming schedule and a public comment period for the new projects to be held separately from the TIP public comment period. She explained the benefits of the modified schedule and the separation of prioritization from programming.
- Mr. Ulrich re-capped the exercises from the June meeting, presented the results of the individual and group weighting of the Guiding Principles (GP), and explained how they were averaged together to arrive at the following weighting:

    - 25% - Quality of Life
    - 19% - Safety & Security
    - 15% - Systems Operations, Maintenance & Preservation
    - 15% - Economic Vitality
    - 14% - Cooperation & Leadership
    - 14% - Stewardship

- He remarked that ranking by weighted GP is not the only way to prioritize projects and before the group recommends a list of priority projects today, other methods of evaluation will be discussed.

- A list of scored and ranked projects weighted by GP was distributed and the committee broke into small groups to evaluate the project list. The instructions for the evaluation exercise were for each group to (1) either move three projects, either up or down in priority, or (2) give a more general observation about types of projects, for example, trail projects did not score as well as group feels that they should have and should be generally prioritized higher.

- The committee worked on the exercise for 30 minutes. The group reconvened, reported on their suggestions for moving projects on the priority list, and provided their reasons. In summary the changes were:

    - Bigelow Gulch Project 6 to #12 and Bigelow Gulch Project 5 to #1 (switching places)
    - Pines Grade Separation to #10 and Argonne Road Congestion Mitigation to #4 (switching places)
    - Centennial Trail Summit Gap change from #23 to #19
    - Ben Burr Crossing Improvements from #29 to #18
    - Greta to Whitworth Bike Route from #42 to #39

US 195 / I-90 Study:

- Mr. Stewart stated the proposed study was discussed at Board strategic planning meetings and the Board will consider committing set-aside funds for the study from the Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) funding in the recent Call for Projects. He emphasized that the study is in a planning and scoping phase right now.

- He said the study will utilize a systems approach and consider all modes of transportation. He stated that the primary issues of the study are safety, operations (congestion and reliability issues) and infrastructure (such as bridge conditions) along the US 195 and I-90 corridors; additionally, local network needs, infrastructure constraints and plans for additional local infrastructure will be examined.

- Mr. Stewart spoke about how land use and development can influence safety and operations along corridors and addressed the proposed funding for the study from SRTC, WSDOT and City of Spokane. He presented a tentative schedule and spoke about the next steps and emphasized that the study was still preliminary at this point.

Agenda Item 3

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

Agenda Item 3

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	September 26 – Programming
(1) Review guidance from July 12 meeting (2) SRTC staff presents draft priority list with adjustments (3) Modify/accept recommend priority list	(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

MEETING SUMMARY

Spokane Regional Transportation Council
Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) Meeting
July 25, 2018 1:30pm
421 W Riverside Ave Suite 504, Spokane, Washington

2018 SRTC Call for Projects: Project Prioritization Recommendation

SRTC staff gave a brief presentation regarding the TAC deliberation process to develop their recommended Prioritized Project List. The TAC recommended the movement of a couple of roadway projects, both up and down the prioritization list, and recommended the upward movement (ranking them higher on the priority list) of a high-ranking active transportation (pedestrian or bicyclist) projects. The TAC weighted Quality of Life and Safety guiding principles slightly higher than the other four guiding principles, applied that weighting, then considered a few additional projects they felt the application didn't reflect the priority accurately.

After the presentation there was discussion about how the TAC came to those results, and the prioritization process overall. Some of the topics of discussion included:

- Regional prioritization vs call for project prioritization and how this effort was to be used. Concern was expressed that the call for projects yielded a sampling of project that members felt were appropriate for funding requests, not a long-term reflection of need. Staff responded that the call does show a short-term snapshot of project needs, prioritized by members that can be used not only to allocate SRTC funding but provide support and pursue additional funding opportunities. This prioritized list does not replace, only supplements the project lists in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, but these projects are at a finer grain.
- Weighting of guiding principles, and the role of the committees, and when that is done in the process. TTC felt if emphasis was to be placed in certain guiding principles in the beginning of the process, the applications may have been submitted differently upfront. Discussion was held as to the role in the future of the MTP to establish better priorities and how a needs list can be prepared if emphasis is already established.
- Clarity in the application process by relying on the technical raw score versus prioritization of projects on more contextual filters after scoring. TTC strongly felt that the raw scores that are unweighted give the best picture of the regional priority projects.

SRTC staff reviewed the process of the TTC workshop previous in the month where members considered adjustments to the priority ranking of projects based on factors such as: stand out projects in one or more Guiding Principles, adjustment of priority ranking for standout active transportation projects (as a group scored low in the application process,) adjustment of priority ranking for standout pavement preservation projects (as a group scored low in the application process), adjustment of priority ranking to consider cost of projects, or adjustment of ranking of projects for programs or studies. After some discussion the TTC unanimously voted to recommend the raw score rankings as the priority list to the SRTC Policy Board. The TTC recommended the Vice-Chair Sean Messner fill in for the TTC Chair at the August Board meeting to provide the most input on the TTC's deliberations.

US-195/I-90 Study

Ryan gave a brief presentation; few questions came from the TTC members.

TIP Working Group Update

We are at about 93% of the obligation target.

Agency Updates

- There will be a public meeting at the Hillyard's Farmers Market on 7/30 related to the SRTC Title VI Plan.
- A keynote speaker on an economic land use model and allocations will be at SRTC (8/1), from 3-5 PM.
- SRTC is looking into project manager training for the region, through EWU. It would be a 2-day training and would cost about $500/person done jointly, rather than $1,500-$2,000 if purchased separately. Tentatively looking at late October/November for the training.