

MEETING MINUTES

Spokane Regional Transportation Council Transportation Technical Committee
September 19, 2018
421 W Riverside Ave Suite 504, Spokane, Washington

1. Call to Order

Mr. Mike Tedesco, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

2. Roll Call

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	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	Darrell McCallum	WSDOT-Eastern Region
Brandon Blankenagel	City of Spokane	Larry Larson	WSDOT-Eastern Region

Committee Alternates Present

Keith Martin WSDOT-Eastern Region

Guests

Adam Jackson	City of Spokane Valley	Char Kay	WSDOT-Eastern Region
Paul Kropp	Citizen	Katherine Miller	City of Spokane

Staff

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

Chair Tedesco noted that a revised agenda was emailed to the TTC yesterday and is at each person's place.

Mr. Martin made a motion to accept the revised agenda. Mr. Messner seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

3. Approval of August 22, 2018 Minutes

Mr. Otterstrom made a motion to approve the August 22, 2018 minutes as presented. Mr. Martin seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

4. Public Comments - There were no public comments

5. Technical Member Comments

Ms. Dewey spoke about the Walking School Bus program launched at three elementary schools.

Ms. Colyar noted that the bridge on Bigelow Gulch was now open.

Mr. Otterstrom spoke about the West Plains Transit Center grand opening, sidewalk projects in Cheney and provided status of Small Starts program funding in the Legislature.

Mr. Bergam said crews are laying down base on the Phase II Project and City of Airway Heights is getting a bike counter for the bike path on the north side of Highway 2.

Mr. Krieger stated that the WSDOT roundabouts on US 395 are done and Deer Park citizens seem to be happy with the results.

Mr. Blankenagel spoke about the City of Spokane's Bike Share pilot program that began September 4.

Mr. Basinger announced that Valleyfest is this weekend.

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

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa described the three projects in the amendment; two WSDOT projects to be deleted out of the four-year window and adding TIGER funds to City of Spokane Valley Barker Road/BNSF Grade Separation project. There were no questions or comments.

Mr. Larson made a motion to recommend Board approval of the October Amendment as presented; the motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

7. 2019-2022 TIP Recommendation

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa provided an overview of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and explained how it fits into the regional transportation planning process. She reported that the new draft TIP contains 98 projects, including seven new ones, and totals \$818M over a four-year window and \$1.1B over a six-year window. She presented a graphic that outlined the 98 projects by type and spoke about several changes that will be made to the final version based on project obligations that have occurred since the draft document went out for public comment. Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa reviewed the various determinations required for the TIP and described the public involvement process. She explained that the Board will be asked to approve the 2019-2022 TIP at their October meeting. There were no questions or comments.

Mr. McCallum made a motion to recommend Board approval of the 2019-2022 TIP; Ms. Colyar seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

8a. North Spokane Corridor / Children of the Sun Placemaking Process

Mr. Meuler presented the public NSC placemaking website which features a prototype in-depth story map which also documents the entire process of public engagement. He spoke about the maps on the site and deliverables scheduled for placement of the trail. He spoke about the public involvement process, community input charrettes, and design of the transition areas.

Ms. Kay spoke about how the process developed data-driven outcomes, described the partnership with EWU for collecting and organizing public comments, and how visual and graphic elements of the website and outreach materials help to tell the message in an easily understandable way. She spoke about the collaboration team made up of 30 – 40 volunteers and staff and the success the project has experienced due to the community truly engaging. The group discussed placemaking and place-keeping, multi-use facilities, public/private partnerships and funding mechanisms.

8b. Performance Measures Target Setting

Chair Tedesco noted that significant discussion had occurred on this topic at the last Board meeting, which was somewhat unexpected. A workgroup of TTC members reviewed the issue and made a recommendation to accept State targets; however, the Board could not come to agreement about accepting the recommendation and requested that staff gather additional information.

Ms. Nelson stated it is federally required that the Board decide whether SRTC will support the State targets or develop their own. She provided names of the technical work group members and described their tasks. She said the group concluded that there was insufficient data for staff to create targets and also noted that most MPOs are supporting State targets. Ms. Nelson presented the information that was given to the Board about regional performance management targets for conditions in Pavement & Bridge, Congestion, and Air Quality and said direction from the Board was to populate the SRTC portion of State 4-year targets.

She has been in touch with WSDOT regarding data on pavement and bridge condition targets and she would like the Target Setting Working Group to reconvene, along with agency pavement specialists, to re-evaluate pavement condition targets. She said the new information will be presented to the Board and TTC in October.

Ms. Nelson said staff has been told that at this time there are no funding implications if regional targets are higher or lower than those of the State, but it is possible that could change in the future. The group discussed performance management, funding, and opportunities to update projected performance targets.

8c. 2019-2022 TIP: New Projects Programming

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa spoke about the programming policy guidance given to staff by the Board at their last meeting, which was to *“Develop a program of projects that maximizes the region’s transportation investments”*. She presented the call for projects timeline and said staff is requesting TTC input about the draft program. The Board will receive the draft program in October and the committees will be making a formal recommendation in October as well.

The group discussed the program of projects and methodology at length. Questions and comments were:

- Were data points and funding rationale shared or discussed with agencies outside the TIP Working Group?
- Were project assumptions made with or without input from project sponsors?
- Conversation about the rationale in requiring differing percentages of matching funds
- Concern about inconsistent policy or practice of applying funds to projects
- If an agency/jurisdictions agreed to partial funding, where is that decision documented?
- Why was the Riverside project included in the last six months of evaluation only to be notified now that it is ineligible?
- Based on the notes, it is difficult to understand a consistent rationale outside of the scoring criteria

Ms. Minshall responded that the Board held conversations about full funding, leveraging funding, first-in/last-in, etc. and came to the conclusion that they desired staff to come back with a program along with a rationale of how it was achieved. She said this is a strategy conversation, staff used their judgement, and it was not consistent by intent.

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa explained that because the Riverside project is regionally significant it must be incorporated into the MTP by amendment before it can be eligible; which is the reason it was not recommended for funding at this time. The group discussed the Riverside project specifics.

Discussion continued. Points raised were:

- This funding strategy is problematic in that “slicing and dicing” changes the effectiveness for the region and would probably change the scoring technique that was used to prioritize projects
- Funding phases rather than entire projects jeopardizes delivery

- Partial funding that results in dialing back project scope is a flaw in the process
- If the MTP amendment issued for the Riverside project is the reason it is not being recommended for funding, that should have been made clear to City of Spokane at the beginning of the call for projects process; not brought up at the last minute
- Staff and the TTC went through a great deal of time and effort to create a priority list which is now not being utilized
- Differing interpretations of the programming strategy guidance requested by the Board
- Concern that the Board did not discuss the risk that partial funding of projects could have on meeting the federal obligation target

Ms. Minshall said that the Board understands that jurisdictions accepting partial funding are committing to either funding the other portion locally or that this is seed money and will be finding other funding sources. Many Board members feel that projects should be leveraging SRTC funds. Ms. Minshall spoke about partial funding strategies.

Discussion continued. Points raised were:

- Future calls for projects should have a cap if there will be a requirement to match funds so it is clear from the beginning
- It may not be accurate to assume that the draft program represents the Board's guidance; reiterated that the Board guidance could be interpreted alternatively. Did not hear the Board say not to fund in a method other than from top priority down
- Segmenting projects results in under-funding, risks obligation authority targets, and changes the scoring methodology

Ms. Minshall said there are many ways that a project list can be programmed and staff looked at many of them. She said the draft list assumes that all agencies that receive funding will be able to deliver projects; most of the projects that have been segmented and phased were already phased in their project applications. She stated that the Board very clearly said they weren't interested in funding from the top down but wanted the program to be strategic, so if there are specific strategic examples now is the time to provide that feedback.

Mr. Blankenagel distributed a programming recommendation spreadsheet he created which he said reflects fully funding from the top down and provided details about the methodology. He said his recommendation is to avoid the risk of failing to meet federal obligation authority by segmenting projects and negating the prioritization that came out of the application process.

Discussion continued. Points raised were:

- Minutes from the last TTC meeting reflect many of the same concerns being raised today
- Several members stated they would like to see documentation of agencies/jurisdictions' discussions or agreement to accept partial funding
- Recommendation that partial funding agreements should be done in writing with authorization from the executive level
- Suggestion to offer several programming lists to the Board which differ by the degree of risk for delivery
- The draft list before the TTC today is not the same list that was presented to the TIP working group three days ago and a request for information about conversations with agencies that resulted in the changes.
- Project sponsors generally already know at the time of application about other funding opportunities and therefore are already leveraging funds
- There is no one method that will work for all projects; reviewing on a case by case basis and looking at delivery risk is key.
- Suggestion that members take the list back to discuss with their staff and review the plan from a strategic perspective

Ms. Minshall spoke about the changes that occurred as a result of conversations with Spokane County and Ms. Mantz addressed the Barker Corridor project. Ms. Minshall stated that the list created by staff and the one created

by Mr. Blankenagel only differ on four projects and she noted that staff held discussions with both those agencies. She said the changes were not done in isolation.

Discussion continued. Points raised were:

- Would like to see the decision-making rationale in writing; the process should be transparent
- Would like further discussion about Riverside project
- What would happen if the TTC recommends that the Board not approve the list

Ms. Minshall said documentation of the conversations will be provided and agreed to further review of the Riverside project. The group and staff agreed that the TTC will convene again prior to the October 11 Board meeting, ideally the first week of October, to continue this discussion.

8d. Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan Update

Mr. Lien explained the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan (CPT-HSTP), which focuses on coordinating transportation services for those with special transportation needs such as the elderly, disabled, low income or rural populations. He described the planning area and coordination partners.

Mr. Lien listed the plan objectives:

- Identify transportation service needs
- Create strategies to meet those needs
- Optimize use of limited resources

He spoke about the public outreach events and feedback received from the community. He said Consolidated Grant applications were due September 14 and the CPT-HSTP plan update to go to the Board and committees in October for review and to the Board in November for adoption. There were no questions or comments.

9. Agency Update

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa provided details about the last speaker for the 2018 SRTC Education Series and an open house later today for the 2019-2022 TIP.

10. Future Agenda Items

There were no suggestions for future agenda items, but it was requested that future meetings adjourn on time.

11. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:54 pm.

Julie Meyers-Lehman
Recording Secretary