

DATE: October 17, 2018  
TO: Members of the Transportation Technical Committee  
FROM: Mike Tedesco, Spokane Tribe, Chair  
SUBJECT: Agenda for TTC Meeting Wednesday, October 24, 2018 – 1:30pm  
SRTC, 421 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 504 (The Paulsen Building)

## **AGENDA**

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call / Record of Attendance
3. **Action** – Approval of September 24, 2018 and October 10, 2018 meeting minutes Page 2
4. Public Comments
5. Technical Member Comments
6. **Action** – 2018 Call for Projects: New Project Programming (*Anna Ragaza-Bourassa*) Page 10
7. **Action** – Coordinated Public Transportation-Human Services Transportation Plan Update (*Jason Lien*) Page 13
8. **Information & Discussion** –
  - a) Travel Demand Model / Land Use Model Discussion (*Mike Ulrich/Ryan Stewart*) Page 15
  - b) City of Spokane Bikeshare (and Scooter) Pilot Program (*Brandon Blankenagel*) n/a
9. Adjournment Next Meeting: November 28

**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

**MEETING MINUTES**

Spokane Regional Transportation Council Transportation Technical Committee  
 October 10, 2018 Special Meeting  
 421 W Riverside Ave Suite 504, Spokane, Washington

**1. Call to Order**

Mr. Mike Tedesco, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.

**2. Roll Call**

**Committee Members Present**

Mike Tedesco	Spokane Tribe of Indians	Brandon Blankenagel	City of Spokane
Sean Messner	Spokane County	Heleen Dewey	Spokane Regional Health Dist
Brandi Colyar	Spokane County	Gordon Howell	Spokane Transit Authority
Barry Greene	Spokane County	Mike Tressider	Spokane Transit Authority
Mark Bergam	City of Airway Heights	Larry Larson	WSDOT- Eastern Region
Todd Ableman	City of Cheney	Louis Meuler	City of Spokane
Roger Krieger	City of Deer Park		

**Committee Alternates Present**

Char Kay	WSDOT-Eastern Region	Adam Jackson	City of Spokane Valley
----------	----------------------	--------------	------------------------

**Guests**

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	Staci Lehman	Communications Coord.

**4. Public Comments - There were no public comments**

**5. Information & Discussion**

**(a) Review the Draft Program of Projects in light of any new information received (eligibility on CTR, plan for Riverside project) since 09/19/18 meeting**

Anna Ragaza-Bourassa said there was no update on the eligibility of the CTR program which is why a draft number is still included on the spreadsheet at this point, but a meeting is scheduled for this afternoon to discuss the issue.

There are also still questions about the eligibility of the Riverside project. Executive Director Sabrina Minshall said, based on the language in the long-range transportation plan, Horizon 2040, it is staff's assumption that the project is not regionally significant. The Board could take action to say otherwise though. Ms. Minshall said it will not be on the agenda to be discussed. The issue with this project is a difference in language between Horizon 2040 and the TIP guide book.

**(b) Review methodology documentation & all documentation received from project sponsors**

Ms. Minshall said Riverside was included as tentative on the sheets handed out to TTC members.

As for the CTR program, she said she is working with WSDOT headquarters on the eligibility issue. Directly funding operations after the first grant award isn't allowed by the Congestion Mitigation Air Quality program. Ms. Minshall said there is a fine line between incentives, operations and staffing. The amount of staffing in CTR's application is hard to tie to implementation of one project. She said she thinks the request for \$700,000 is higher than what CTR will receive.

Ms. Minshall said the two handouts went out in the Board packet on Friday, with notes added from email or verbal conversations with TTC members about the program of projects process. She said there hasn't been much change in the spreadsheets since the last TTC meeting, but she documented what has changed. She said staff has also been looking at ways to spread out the funding distribution over three or four years. After the Board approves the program of projects, staff will talk to project sponsors about funding of project phases by advancing or swapping around projects to help with delivery of all projects.

Ms. Minshall pointed out changes made to the program. Project #5, Riverside- Monroe to Wall was listed as tentative until the regional significance question is answered. By adding in \$850,000 for this project, that amount had to be taken from somewhere else in the program.

The funding amount for Phase 6 of the Bigelow Gulch project was reduced by \$268,000 but will completely fund the design and right-of-way phases. The Thor-Freya project was reduced by \$405,000 leaving it at 75% of the amount requested. And the Walk Bike Bus program had CMAQ as the funding source instead of STBG Set Aside. It is correct on the color-coded sheet though.

Ms. Minshall pointed out that the bottom of page 2 and top of page 3 summarizes the methodology used and projects included. There are 21 projects in the program, including Riverside. Twelve are fully funded, nine have SRTC funding with match money, three have money from other sources, and eight are partially funded. Of the requested, 13 received full funding while eight did not.

**(c) Outline any concerns that differ from those expressed at the 09/19/18 meeting**

Mr. Adam Jackson said he provided comments on the Sprague/Barker intersection project but the sheet doesn't reflect that. He said Spokane Valley prefers funding early in the program for the design phase.

Ms. Char Kay asked how the 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue and Craig Road project emerged as a priority but wasn't included on the list of projects recommended for funding. Ms. Minshall said it was only eligible for STBG Urban funding and there wasn't enough of those funds to cover it. Ms. Kay asked, if a project is not on the recommended list, should an explanation of why be included?

Mr. Louis Meuler asked about the benefits of partially funding projects. Ms. Minshall said other funding agencies are more interested in projects that already have some phases funded as very few agencies now can completely fund projects on their own. She also said it makes us more competitive with other parts of the state. She said it is being done throughout the state like this and that FMSIB, TIB, and Washington State want to see projects have multiple funding sources in order to leverage more money into the region in general and ensure sponsoring agencies have a personal stake in their projects.

Mr. Brandon Blankenagel asked how SRTC plans to justify that a full project isn't being delivered despite the full project being ranked and scored in the application process. Ms. Minshall said she will talk to the Board about that but SRTC is still committed to funding all phases of a project over time. Those that aren't fully funded will have to reapply for the next call for projects. Mr. Blankenagel asked what happens if a project doesn't score as well in the future? Ms. Minshall said



this process has been used in the past with projects that were partially funded.

Mr. Messner asked if, in the federal view, partially funding a project and not delivering on application is a risk for the region? Ms. Minshall said it will be on a case by case basis. Mr. Meuler asked if, by partially funding projects, the pool of projects will shrink in the future as other funding sources become hard to find. Ms. Minshall said there is a need to figure out how to grow the funding "pie." Mr. Meuler said transparency to the public is his concern.

## **11. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:05 a.m.

---

Staci Lehman  
Recording Secretary

## MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 17, 2018

TO: Members of the Transportation Technical Committee

FROM: Anna Ragaza-Bourassa, Senior Transportation Planner

SUBJECT: Call for Projects – Program of Projects Recommendation

### Summary

After receiving policy guidance from the Board of Directors and input from the TTC and TAC, SRTC staff worked with applicants on technical requirements, phasing, timing, leveraging other funding sources, etc. to develop a draft “Program of Projects” (**Attachment One**). The draft “Program of Projects” includes all projects sorted by Board priority, funding eligibility, geography and includes the funding award amounts for those projects that are recommended for funding.

This draft “Program of Projects” was presented to the Board at their October meeting. They were asked to provide input and direct any changes they would like to see to the draft. No changes were directed, and the comments were in support of the draft as presented.

### Background

At the September meeting the Board of Directors provided the following policy guidance to SRTC staff on the programming methodology: Develop a program of projects that maximizes the region’s transportation investments. There was discussion about how the approach would need to be flexible to accommodate all the programming nuances and responsive to the unique financial and project delivery situations surrounding each project.

The TTC reviewed the draft “Program of Projects” at their September and a special October meeting and shared ongoing concerns related to partially funding projects. Those concerns center around a project sponsor’s ability to deliver a project if other funding sources need to be secured because the project was not fully funded through this call. The TAC however liked the idea of partial funding, but not at the expense of project delivery. Both committees recognized the value and the risk of leveraging other funding sources.

Remaining Call for Projects Schedule	
October 22	TAC makes recommendation regarding “Program of Projects”
October 24	TTC makes recommendation regarding “Program of Projects”
November 8	SRTC Board – approve “Program of Projects” (will be added to 2019 TIP via the January TIP amendment)
December 19	TTC – recommend January TIP amendment approval
January 13	SRTC Board – approval of January TIP amendment

### **Public Involvement**

The call for projects process has been discussed at multiple committee and Board meetings, all open to the public. A 30-day public comment period on the prioritized list of projects ran from August 10 to September 9. Seven comments were received and provided to the TTC in the September packet. Once approved, the “Program of Projects” will go out for a public comment period in late December as part of the January TIP amendment 10-day public comment period.

### **Prior Board Actions**

The SRTC Board of Director’s took the following principles of investment action at their March 8, 2018 meeting:

1. Funding of the following set-asides were approved by the Board:
  - *SRTC planning operations* – An additional \$50K in 2018 (\$250K total); additional \$150K in 2019 for a total of \$350K per year through 2023.
  - *SRTC data acquisition* - \$150K per year 2018-2023; additional \$100K in 2019.
  - *I-90/US 195 Study* - \$150K
  - *Division Street Corridor Study* - \$400K
  - *SRTMC Operations & Maintenance* - \$1,834,000
2. Hold \$3M each year of STBG funds in 2022 and 2023 for capital maintenance projects with project selection to occur in next call for projects (2020).
3. Allocate a minimum of 5% of the STBG (\$1.35M) and STBG Set-Aside funds (\$100K) for small town projects.
4. Require project sponsors to certify that they will use all project delivery tools available, including eminent domain to acquire right-of-way, if necessary, to meet project obligation schedules.

At the August 9, 2018 meeting the Board approved a prioritized list of projects, which can be found at the following link: <https://www.srtc.org/prioritized-list-of-transportation-projects/>

### **Policy Implications**

Funding projects consistent with performance objectives in Horizon 2040 is important to meet federal requirements of MPO’s and for long-range planning. Prioritizing based on quantitative criteria and vetted with local policy objectives ensures projects align with regional goals and values. Applying funding strategically and leveraging other funds helps the region to be competitive and encourages commitment to the projects by partner agencies.

### **Technical Implications**

The prioritized list was used as the first step in the development of the draft “Program of Projects” for Board consideration. In addition to public comments, funding criteria, timing, phases, and availability of other funds were considered.

### **Requested Action**

Recommendation for Board approval of the Program of Projects.

2018 SRTC Call for Projects - Draft Programming

Priority	Project #	Project Name	Match	Requested	STBG			CMAQ	STBG Set-Aside		HIP			Small Towns
					Urban	Urban Small	Rural	inside AQ boundaries	Urban Large	Rural	Urban Large	Urban Small	Rural	
					\$12,670,000	\$530,000 (min)	\$3.1M (min)	\$9.8M	\$1.8M	\$208,000 (min)	\$1,040,000	\$28,000	\$165,000	\$1.5M (min)
1	SC-1	Bigelow Gulch Project 5	76.0%	\$1,568,000			\$1,403,000						\$165,000	
2	COS-3	Thor-Freya Couplet	prog. 23.5%, 10% local	\$8,119,105	\$5,684,000									
3	SRHD-1	Safe Routes to School Walking School Bus	13.5%	\$611,181					\$600,000					
4	SV-1	Pines Grade Separation (RW only)	19.5%	\$3,795,000	\$1,890,000									
5	COS-1	Riverside-Monroe to Wall	prog. 23.5%, 10% local	\$5,003,141	\$850,000									
6	SRHD-2	Walk Bike Bus Downtown Spokane	13.5%	\$304,202				\$304,000						
7	SC-12	Commute Trip Reduction	23.5%	\$898,157				\$700,000						
8	STA-1	Upgrade 6 diesel buses to electric	60.0%	\$2,670,000				\$2,670,000						
9	SC-3	Bigelow Gulch Project 2	75.9%	\$2,601,000										
10	MW-1	Argonne Rd, Frederick to Liberty congestion relief	13.5%	\$1,270,000				\$1,270,000						
11	SC-2	Bigelow Gulch Project 6	50.7%	\$4,085,000	\$1,774,000						\$1,040,000			
12	SV-2	Barker Corridor reconstruction & widening (can be split into 3 segments)	30.0%	\$6,331,800	\$2,050,000									
13	STA-2	5-Mile Park & Ride Study	20.0%	\$200,000										
14	COS-12	Havana St-Sprague to Broadway	prog. 23.5%, 10% local	\$5,836,971										
15	DP-1	Crawford & Colville Roundabout/N Colville reconstructions	13.5%	\$1,943,514			\$1,944,000							\$1,944,000
16	SV-6	Argonne Rd preservation (PE + RW only option)	13.5%	\$2,508,500										
17	WSDOT-1	US 2 Garfield Rd intersection improvement	13.5%	\$2,220,000										
18	COS-7	Maple-Wellesley Intersection	33.0%	\$761,822				\$762,000						
19	SC-5	57th Avenue	prog. 0.9%; 41.7 local	\$2,126,000										
20	AH-2	21st Ave Craig Rd to Deer Heights Rd (Property Survey)	13.5%	\$89,545										
21	SV-4	Pines and Mission intersection improvement (can be split into 2 segments)	13.5%	\$1,211,000				\$509,000						
22	COS-10	Spokane Falls Blvd-Lincoln to Division	prog. 23.5%, 10% local	\$7,305,931										
23	DP-3	Colville Reconstruction Third St to north City Limits	13.5%	\$2,021,738										
24	SV-7	Park Road reconstruction (RW only)	13.5%	\$268,150										
25	COS-5	Centennial Trail Summit Gap	13.5%	\$2,532,198				\$2,532,000						
26	SC-6	57th Avenue & Freya St Roundabout	13.5%	\$728,300				\$728,000						
27	COS-6	Ben Burr Crossing Improvements	33.0%	\$746,099					\$746,000					
28	SC-14	Harvard Rd	13.5%	\$4,827,000										
29	COS-8	Driscoll-Alberta-Cochran Sidewalk Infill	33.5%	\$1,060,452					\$530,000					
30	COS-4	Washington-Stevens, Spokane Falls to Boone	prog. 23.5%, 10% local	\$2,014,581										
31	SC-13	Centennial Trail at Argonne	13.5%	\$719,000										
32	COS-2	Freya St - Wellesley to Decatur	prog. 23.5%, 10% local	\$3,658,690										
33	COS-13	North Bank Trail Study	33.5%	\$166,250										
34	SV-3	Sprague & Barker intersection improvement	23.6%	\$1,159,979				\$349,000						
35	COS-9	Napa-2nd Ave to Sprague	prog. 23.5%, 10% local	\$1,508,697										
36	SC-9	Craig Rd	13.5%	\$962,700										
37	CH-1	Washington St (Cheney)	23.5%	\$730,691		\$703,000						\$28,000		
38	AH-1	10th Ave Garfield Rd to Hayford Rd	13.5%	\$3,203,000										
39	DP-2	E Crawford Preservation	13.5%	\$575,650										
40	COS-11	37th Ave Sidewalk	33.5%	\$726,183										
41	SC-11	Cascade Way	60.9%	\$601,200										
42	SC-4	Brooks Rd Phase 1	13.5%	\$1,608,000										
43	SV-5	Mullan Road preservation	13.5%	\$1,211,000										
44	SC-8	Greta to Whitworth Bike Route	13.5%	\$299,300										
45	SC-10	Columbia Dr	42.8%	\$1,536,000										
46	FF-2	First St Sidewalk Phase 2	0.0%	\$272,034						\$315,000				\$315,000
47	SV-8	Wilbur Rd sidewalk	13.5%	\$557,060										
48	FF-1	Rattler Run Road reconstruction	13.5%	\$799,433										
49	SC-7	Cheney-Spokane Rd	13.5%	\$2,132,000										
					\$12,668,000	\$703,000	\$3,347,000	\$9,824,000	\$1,983,000	\$315,000	\$1,040,000	\$28,000	\$165,000	\$2,259,000

## **MEMORANDUM**

DATE: October 15, 2018

TO: Members of the Transportation Technical Committee

FROM: Jason Lien, Senior Transportation Planner

SUBJECT: Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan Update

### **Summary**

Over the past several months, Spokane Regional Transportation Council, in cooperation with Spokane Transit Authority, has been working on an update to the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan (CPT-HSTP). The plan addresses public transportation in Spokane County with emphasis on programs that serve persons with disabilities, older adults, and individuals with lower incomes. The goal is to enhance transportation access, identify unmet needs, minimize duplication of services, and facilitate the most appropriate cost-effective transportation services with available resources. The plan was last updated in 2014, and this update complies with state and federal requirements for human services transportation coordination.

The CPT-HSTP review draft was completed in September and is posted on the SRTC website: <https://www.srtc.org/human-services-transportation-plan/>. The review draft went through an initial comment period and adjustments have been made based on feedback received. These adjustments are reflected in the second review draft that is posted at the provided link.

The plan is the guiding document for human services transportation project programming. For example, organizations participating in WSDOT's 2019-2021 Consolidated Grant Program must cite the need they are addressing in the CPT-HSTP. WSDOT uses a single process (one application) to evaluate public transportation projects and distribute funds from both state and federal program sources.

### **Public Involvement**

Throughout the planning process, input has been gathered from service providers, employers, and the public to ascertain special transportation needs. In particular, the planning effort was focused on populations that depend on human services transportation—disabled, low-income, and elderly populations, as well as veterans, rural populations, and youth. This feedback is reflected in the plan document. The draft CPT-HSTP document has been available for public comment since early September. A formal 10-day public review and comment period is underway with legal notice appearing on October 16, 2018.

### **Policy Implications**

Locally developed, coordinated public transit-human services transportation plans are a required element of the federal reauthorization program for surface transportation, known as

FAST Act, and an eligibility requirement for FTA's Section 5310 funding (Enhanced Mobility for Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities). It is also a required element for WSDOT's Consolidated Grant Program.

**Technical Implications**

None.

**Prior Committee Actions**

This item was previously presented to the TAC and the TTC at their respective March 2018 meetings in the early stages of the planning process. More recently, an update was given to the TTC at the September 2018 meeting and to the SRTC Board at their October 11 meeting this month. No action has been taken to date.

**Requested Action**

Recommendation for Board Approval of the 2018 Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan. SRTC Board action is targeted for the November 8, 2018 meeting.

## MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 17, 2018

TO: Members of the Transportation Technical Committee

FROM: Mike Ulrich, Senior Transportation Planner  
Ryan Stewart, Senior Transportation Planner

SUBJECT: Travel Demand Model Update and Land Use Model Development

### **Summary**

The SRTC strategic plan, adopted by the Board in December 2017, calls for SRTC to broaden its technical expertise. Confidence in core data products is critical for the Board to make recommendations and decisions in the best interest of the region. The region's primary data product is the Travel Demand Model (TDM). The TDM, which is maintained by SRTC, was last updated in 2012. One of the primary inputs of the model, the household travel survey (HTS), was last conducted in 2005. A peer review of the TDM was also completed in 2016 resulting in several recommendations for improving the model and land use processes. Changing land use patterns, the proliferation of "big data", and other related factors have prompted SRTC to evaluate its regional "toolbox."

In January of 2018 SRTC asked a consultant team to investigate the suitability of passive data (e.g. – StreetLight) to inform an update to the model. Their findings aligned with staff's conclusions that passive data is not yet suitable for a full model update. A traditional HTS or trip generation and mode choice studies are still necessary to update the foundational elements of the TDM. That team also analyzed the demographics changes (using ACS and other data sources) in Spokane County since the 2005 HTS to develop a recommended sample size for a survey.

In August SRTC brought in Dr. Michael Clay, Director of Urban Planning at Brigham Young University, to evaluate the region's current practice of projecting land use. His recommendation was to pursue a land use model to produce quantitatively supported horizon year projections. These land use projections are an important input into the TDM and significantly impact the accuracy of the outputs. The first step in the model update process is to sit down with our stakeholders to understand their needs.

Dr. Clay and his consulting team will be back in Spokane sometime between November 5-16. He and his team will be facilitating a "listening sessions" with member jurisdictions. These meetings will be used to determine the following:

- i. if an integrated model and/or TDM improvements would benefit various agency missions
- ii. if they would be willing to partner in the adoption, development, improvement and implementation of the land use model and/or TDM improvements
- iii. what specific needs/requirements/abilities agencies desire the model to meet/have
- iv. stakeholder and jurisdictional buy-in

After the meetings SRTC will have a set of goals the integrated model development process will be required to meet. SRTC has contracted with Dr. Clay to build a scope of work based on this input that will be used as the basis for an Request For Proposals (RFP) to achieve the established goals. For this effort to be successful, we need complete participation from all our member jurisdictions. Otherwise, the effort will fall short.

Expect to receive a Doodle poll in the next week or so gauging schedules to find dates that maximize participation. We will schedule two meetings, likely on consecutive days, to provide as much flexibility as possible. Please have a representative attend from your agency that most closely works with the TDM and is familiar with the land use allocation process.

### **Public Involvement**

None. These are staff level technical tools.

### **Policy Implications**

In March 2018 the SRTC Board set aside \$1M of STBG-Urban funding plus a local match for data acquisition and technical tool development. This project will be funded with those set aside funds.

### **Technical Implications**

The regional model is one tool used by SRTC and regional partners for technical analysis of current and forecasted multimodal travel conditions. For example, the model was employed extensively during the development of Horizon 2040. The model was used for scenario evaluation, forecasting of future conditions and informing the air quality transportation conformity analysis. The regional model is used to support ongoing transportation planning and operational evaluation including interchange justification reports, subarea plans, corridor studies, and level of service analysis to support comprehensive plan certification.

### **Prior Committee Actions**

None.

### **Requested Action**

None. This is an informational item.