

MEMORANDUM

Date: October 4, 2018
To: Members of the SRTC Board of Directors
From: Commissioner Al French, Chair
Subject: Meeting Notification and Transmittal of Meeting Agenda

Meeting Date: October 11, 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@src.org at least 48 hours in advance.



Board of Directors Meeting Agenda

Date: October 11, 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) September 13, 2018 Meeting Minutes Page 3
 - b) September 2018 Vouchers Page 8
 - c) 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) October Amendment Page 9
6. **Action – 2019-2022 TIP** (*Anna Ragaza-Bourassa*) Page 12
7. **Information & Discussion**
 - a) 2019-2022 TIP: New Project Selection – Discussion & Input on Programming (*Anna Ragaza-Bourassa*) Page 16
 - b) Performance Target Setting Update (*Eve Nelson & Sabrina Minshall*) Page 30
8. **Information**
 - a) FY 2018 3Q Budget Update (*Greg Griffin*) Page 34
 - b) Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan (*Jason Lien*) Page 39
9. **SRTC Board Comments**
10. **Adjournment**

Attachments

- Future SRTC Board of Directors Meeting Agenda Items Page 41
- Transportation Advisory Committee – August summary Page 43
- Transportation Technical Committee – August minutes & September summary Page 44

MEETING MINUTES

Agenda Item 5a

Spokane Regional Transportation Council Board
Thursday, September 13, 2018
SRTC Office, 421 W Riverside Ave, Ste 504, Spokane WA

1. **Call to Order** - Chair Al French brought the meeting to order at 1:02 pm.

2. **Roll Call/Record of Attendance – Excused Absences**

Board Members Present:

Al French, Spokane County Commissioner	Mayor Steve Peterson, City of Liberty Lake
Kate Burke, City of Spokane Council Member	Larry Stone, Major Employer Representative
Dee Cragun, Small Cities/Towns Representative	Joe Tortorelli, WA State Transportation Commission
Mike Gribner, WSDOT-Eastern Region	Kennet Bertelsen, TAC Chair
Lori Kinnear, City of Spokane Council Member	Matt Ewers, Freight/Rail Representative
Larry Krauter, Spokane Airports	Arne Woodard, City of Spokane Valley Council Member
E. Susan Meyer, Spokane Transit Authority	Mike Tedesco, TTC Chair
Dave Malet, City of Airway Heights Council Member	Josh Kerns, Spokane County Commissioner
Paul Schmidt, City of Cheney Council Member	

Guests Present:

Stanley Schwartz, Legal Counsel	Paul Parker, WA State Transportation Commission
Chad Coles, Spokane County	Karl Otterstrom, Spokane Transit Authority
Char Kay, WSDOT-Eastern Region	Larry Larson, WSDOT-Eastern Region
Brandon Blankenagel, City of Spokane	Adam Jackson, City of Spokane Valley
Paul Kropp, Citizen	Mayor Rod Higgins, City of Spokane Valley
Diana Wilhite, Citizen	

SRTC Staff Present:

Sabrina Minshall Executive Director	Anna Ragaza-Bourassa, Senior Transportation Planner
Staci Lehman, Communications Coordinator	Mike Ulrich, Senior Transportation Planner
Jason Lien, Senior Transportation Planner	Tristan De Alwis, Data Scientist
Greg Griffin, Administrative Services Manager	Julie Meyers-Lehman, Administrative Assistant

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

4. **Executive Director's Report**

Ms. Minshall spoke about:

- WSDOT development of the 2019 rail system plan.
- WSDOT update to the Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO) funding formula.
- Local agencies and jurisdictions obligated just over \$10M, exceeding the target of \$8.2M
- The latest speaker in the Education Series, Joe Minicozzi, will present at a public meeting later today and a technical session tomorrow.
- In sponsorship with APA Washington, former Governor of Maryland Parris Glendening will be the next speaker in the Education Series on October 3.
- SRTC is hosting a Business After School event in coordination with Greater Spokane Incorporated on October 17 to present information about the work done by Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to middle and high school students.
- October 17 & 18 most SRTC staff will be participating in an in-house Project and Program Management training led by EWU. Staff from member agencies are also welcome to attend.
- She will be attending the Association of MPOs (AMPO) conference later this month.

5. Consent Agenda – (5a) Minutes of the August 9, 2018 Board Meeting, (5b) August 2018 Vouchers, and (5c) 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) September Amendment #1

Ms. Meyer made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Mr. Peterson seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Recap for August, 2018:			
Vouchers: V120692 to V120717			52,449.91
Salaries/Benefits Warrant Nos.	460563-460574, 463112-463123 & 465606-465617		122,880.03
Interfund, other expenses, and reimbursements processed directly by the City of Spokane			284.50
			175,614.44

6. 2018-2021 TIP September Amendment #2: SRTC Studies

Ms. Minshall explained this item was on the agenda separately to ensure full understanding of the projects. She outlined the two studies (the US 195/I-90 Study and the Division Street Corridor Study), noted that the Board took action in March to set aside STBG funds for the studies, and stated that scope and schedule information were presented to the Board in July and August. She described the work done with stakeholders.

She spoke about project funding, both projects include funding from WSDOT and the City of Spokane is also contributing funding for the US 195/I-90 Study. Ms. Minshall explained that the Division Street study will be done jointly with STA. She said incorporating the studies into the TIP will permit the consulting request for qualifications (RFQ) process; contracts with consultants will be brought to the Board for approval. Ms. Kinnear asked for confirmation that SRTC is coordinating with City of Spokane Planning Department and Ms. Minshall replied affirmatively.

Mr. Stone made a motion to approve 2018-2021 TIP September Amendment #2: SRTC Studies; Mr. Peterson seconded.

Mr. Kerns inquired about the goals of the Division Street study and what can be expected from the final report. Ms. Minshall provided details about what will be examined and projected outcomes. Mr. Kerns expressed concern about accurate traffic count projections as it not known yet how completion of the NSC will affect other north-south arterials. Ms. Minshall replied that no model is perfect, but with WSDOT data and improvements done to parallel roadways, the traffic projection model will be as accurate as possible to the year 2040.

Mr. Gribner said it would be a mistake to wait until hard data becomes available after completion of the NSC before beginning the planning process for Division; opportunities to plan ahead for change would be missed and we would end up being reactive instead of proactive. He stated he has enough confidence in the model data to begin making decisions about where the corridor is headed.

Motion carried unanimously.

7a. Washington Transportation Plan Update

Mr. Parker, Deputy Director of the Washington State Transportation Commission (WTSC), provided information about WTSC’s purpose and responsibilities, and spoke about the road usage charge pilot program. He said the statewide transportation plan is updated every four years. In this update they are focusing on regional differences and how they affect the needs for types of funding and projects. He described the statewide transportation system, the WTSC long-range planning role, and six policy goals.

Mr. Parker outlined the statewide transportation planning process and how the statewide plan interacts with the WSDOT long-range plan and those of other agencies throughout the state. He explained what the draft plan is based upon, spoke about the stakeholder engagement process. He said the final plan will be primarily in a web-based format and spoke about the focus on three topics as they affect the six transportation policy goals: Technology & Innovation, System Resiliency, and Paying for Transportation.

He described the goals and draft recommendations of the plan and important issues identified as part of the update. He said the next steps include public outreach, gathering public input, plan revision, then approval by the WTSC and submittal to the Governor. There were no questions or comments.

7b. Performance Target Setting Update

Ms. Nelson stated that federal mandates require MPO's to have performance measures and performance targets. She explained that after WSDOT set their statewide performance targets on May 20, 2018, MPO's have 180 days to either support WSDOT targets or develop their own quantitative regional targets; that is the issue before the Board today. Ms. Nelson provided an illustration of the performance management cycle and described the reasons why performance management regulations were created.

She reminded the Board that Safety performance targets were approved in December and Public Transit Asset Management targets in June. The areas under consideration now are: (1) Pavement & Bridge Condition (2) Congestion (3) Air Quality. She provided information about the current performance, conditions, locations, and WSDOT targets for: Spokane County bridges, pavement on and off the NHS, congestion, and air quality/emissions reduction. She noted that there are no penalties to MPO's for not meeting targets and the State does not have the refined data to give staff an idea of what the four-year trendline would be for this region.

Ms. Nelson reported that a working group of Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) members convened twice to discuss these targets in-depth, and they were in favor of supporting the WSDOT targets. She remarked that WSDOT is in favor of SRTC supporting the state targets; Puget Sound Regional Council and Benton Franklin Council of Governments are also supporting the WSDOT targets.

Chair French gave a historical perspective of air quality non-attainment in Spokane County and the group further discussed air quality. Mr. Gribner stated that it is unlikely that the federal government would put so much energy into creating a national performance matrix if it was not eventually going to be tied into federal funding. He stated that it is his belief that at some point states will be required to monitor the performance of their transportation systems and address capital investments related to that performance and the results will have an impact on funding. The group discussed prioritization initiatives.

Ms. Minshall noted that she has become aware that many MPOs in small/medium urban areas which have another large urban area in another part of the state (such as eastern/western Washington) are setting their own targets because of the significant differences in conditions and of regional priorities. She feels that SRTC should not set their own targets because the state has not provided enough data about anticipated future conditions; she believes it may be premature to set separate targets that we may not want to live by.

Mr. Ewers explained how freight reliability and decreased freight efficiency impacts the costs of goods for the whole community. He said the cost of transportation for raw materials for some shippers in the area has gone from 6% to 18% and that affects the prices to the consumers.

Mr. Krauter said there is a significant difference between what the state has set versus our baseline and in many instances the difference is negative versus our situation. He asked if the TTC discussed that the terms of what we are considering accepting are at a far lower standard in many of these categories than those we currently have. Mr. Tedesco said the conversation at the TTC resulted in an agreement to follow the recommendation of the working group.

Ms. Nelson said the target setting process is highly technical and without having data to make a trendline or projection line, it would be very hard for the TTC to set realistic targets. She said the recommendation to support WSDOT targets is not an agreement that the State target should be our target as well; it means to agree that SRTC supports the work that the WSDOT is doing. She confirmed that the federal regulation states that MPOs may “accept” or “support” state targets. Mr. Krauter stated his concern about making a statement to support or adopt anything when some of the state targets are at levels below the conditions in the region now.

Ms. Nelson reviewed the pavement performance measurement grid again; the group discussed how MPOs work towards the state and local targets and the ability to adjust targets and requirements being built into the system for DOT oversight over target setting. Ms. Nelson said although there are state reporting requirements, there are no penalties to the MPO for failing to make progress to the target. Mr. Krauter said he does not feel we should make any change from the baseline until additional conversations about the target are held. The group continued to discuss. Mr. Gribner stated that he agrees with SRTC supporting state targets.

After continued discussion the Board asked staff to populate as many of the remaining data sets as possible then bring it back for the October meeting in order to make a more informed decision.

7c. 2019-2022 TIP: Overview

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 TIP contains 98 projects, of which seven are new, and totals \$818M over four years and \$1.1B over six years. She presented a graphic that broke out the 98 projects by type, reviewed the determinations for inclusion into the TIP, and described the public involvement process. The Board will be asked to approve the 2019-2022 TIP at the October meeting. There were no questions or comments.

7d. 2019-2022 TIP: New Project Programming

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa recapped the 2018 Call for Projects process to date, the steps in making priority-driven resource decisions and explained programming. She said the two policy questions before the Board were:

- (1) Should SRTC fully fund fewer projects or partially fund more projects?
- (2) Direction for legacy projects historically partially SRTC funded, but not ranking high in this round.

She presented a list of the pros/cons of partial funding, related TTC/TAC input and concerns about partial funding, and a series of graphs showing, theoretically, the number of projects that could be funded with full funding and with partial funding.

Mr. Krauter said the goal is to advance as many projects as possible and is concerned this approach is overly rigid and oversimplifying a complex process; a one-size-fits all approach could be limiting to funding projects. He questioned what problem was trying to be solved. He stated that any approach should allow the greatest amount of flexibility possible.

Ms. Minshall spoke to historical funding practices, explained the two alternative programming methods, and said the request for policy guidance is in which way does the Board want to the program to be presented; top-down full-funding based upon ranking of fewer projects or a program that partially funds more project and leverages other funding sources? Mr. Krauter said he would like staff to create a program that maximizes the region’s transportation investments; Mr. Gribner agreed.

Mr. Woodard said staff should review funding with agencies on a project by project basis and remarked that smaller agencies do not have the same resources to obtain additional funding as larger agencies. He said flexibility is key to maximizing infrastructure. He explained how receiving partial funding on a project

encourage other agencies to want to participate in the project. He commented that projects now are being completed by collaborative efforts, rather than receiving 100% of funding from one outside source.

Chair French remarked that it would helpful to receive information about other sources of funding available to jurisdictions that are not included on the chart and not under SRTC authority, for example FMSIB, TIB, etc. He said if a program of projects is being assembled that relies on other funding sources, information about the other funding sources should be made available so the Board can make a more informed decision.

Ms. Kinnear is concerned about the plan for the Board to provide feedback on the program of projects as there is so much that is not known at the Board level; the list is a snapshot, but nuances of projects, outside funding sources, etc. is unknown. She said the Board has to rely on staff to inform them. Mr. Tedesco commented that TTC members have committed to do strategic analysis of the program.

Mr. Schmidt said he likes the idea of trying to fuse more resources, although it can be very complicated and he doesn't want to oversimplify the impact to smaller jurisdictions; sometimes if they don't receive 100% funding on a project, it will not go forward. Chair French spoke to the Board's historical practice of setting aside funding for smaller cities and towns.

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa asked about question 2. The group discussed but did not reach a conclusion. Chair French said that staff should come back with a recommendation on how to maximize resources.

8. SRTC Board Comments

Mr. Schmidt said, in his experience, Performance Measurement is always someone else's idea and it can get political, so best to enter into it with open eyes.

Mr. Peterson spoke about upcoming community events in Liberty Lake.

Mr. Krauter announced new non-stop service to San Diego on Alaska Airlines begins October 2.

Ms. Meyer furnished details about the West Plains Transit Center ribbon cutting ceremony.

Mr. Stone spoke about the recent Transportation Research Board conference he attended.

Mr. Tortorelli said the annual Good Roads Conference is in Spokane on September 19.

9. Adjournment - There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:12 pm.

Julie Meyers-Lehman
Recording Secretary

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

As of October 11, 2018, the Spokane Regional Transportation Council approves the payment of the September 2018 vouchers included in the list in the amount of: \$ 134,272.14

Chair

<u>Date</u>	<u>Voucher</u>	<u>Vendor</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>
8/28/18	V120718	Diamond Plaza LLC	Paulsen Center Suite 500/504 Rent for September 2018	6,910.02
	V120719	Tristan DeAlwis	Per Diem for TRB Conference in Kansas City MO 8/21-24	144.00
	V120720	Mike Ulrich	Per Diem for MPO meetings in Yakima 8/27-28	58.00
	V120721	Mike Ulrich	MU Mileage Reimburse 6/6/18 to 8/28/18	254.90
	V120722	Washington Trust Bank	Office splys; Staff Reg's/airfares Conf's; mtg snacks; prkg validations; Postage	4,548.98
8/30/18	V120723	Visionary Comm, Inc.	Fiber Services, September 2018	953.31
	V120724	Standard Printworks	August Monthly Messaging	47.87
	V120725	Standard Printworks	Materials for Dr. Clay presentation	17.52
9/7/18	V120726	WA State Dept of Retirement	Employee and Employer Contributions: July 2018	15,770.17
	V120727	Verizon Wireless	IT Svcs: Wireless Svcs E.D. Phone & Public Outreach Tablets, 8/24/18-9/23/18	87.78
	V120728	Anna Ragaza-Bourassa	ARB per diem for AAMPO Conf, San Antonio, TX 9/25-28	144.00
	V120729	Eve Nelson	EN per diem for AAMPO Conf, San Antonio, TX 9/25-28	144.00
	V120730	Sabrina Minshall	SM per diem for AAMPO Conf, San Antonio, TX 9/24-27	159.00
	V120731	Spokesman Review	Public Notices for TIP, TTC mtgs, Title VI public comment	433.19
	V120732	Intrinium	Network Remediation Work: Project Meetings & Switch Configuration	1,180.00
	V120733	Konica Minolta Business Solutions	Lease - Copier: September 2018; Usage August 2018	293.96
	V120734	Intrinium	Managed IT Services - August 2018	1,845.00
9/11/18	V120735	Spokane County Treasurer	ESRI Software Support - July 2018	800.07
	V120736	Integra	Telephone: Lines to 10/7/18 and Long Distance for August 2018	510.45
9/18/18	V120737	WA State Univ.-Spokane	Room Rental for Edu Series speaker Glendening 10-3-18	315.00
	V120738	APA-WA	Conf Reg's for SM & MU for 10-3-18 in Spokane	590.00
	V120739	Witherspoon Kelley Attnys	Legal Services for September 2018 - Admin	1,035.00
	V120740	WA St Good Roads Assoc.	EN Registration for Annual Conf Sept 18-19 in Spokane	80.00
	V120741	Tristan DeAlwis	Travel & Per Diem for PTV Trng in Portland, OR Sept 4-7	381.60
	V120742	Standard Printworks	September Monthly Messaging	17.95
	V120743	West Plains Chamber	JL & MU Registration for Sept Membersip Breakfast Mtg	50.00
	V120744	Urban Planning Intl. LLC	Dr. Clay Consulting & Presentation on Land-Use Forecasting	8,000.00
	V120745	Intrinium	Remediation work Replacing Firewall on SRTC Network	1,629.00
		Spokane, City of - Salaries/Benefits Pay Periods Ending: 7/28/18, 8/11/18 and 8/25/18		87,586.87
		Spokane, City of - MIS	IF DP Services: August 2018	284.50

TOTAL SEPTEMBER 2018 134,272.14

Recap for September, 2018:

Vouchers: V120718 to V120745		46,400.77
Salaries/Benefits Warrant Nos.	467987-467998, 470361-470372	87,586.87
Interfund, other expenses, and reimbursements processed directly by the City of Spokane		284.50
		<u>134,272.14</u>

MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 4, 2018
TO: Members of the SRTC Board of Directors
FROM: Anna Ragaza-Bourassa, Senior Transportation Planner
SUBJECT: 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program October Amendment

Summary

Two member agencies have requested an amendment to the 2018-2021 TIP (see Attachment). The change necessitating an amendment are:

- **City of Spokane Valley – Barker Rd/BNSF Grade Separation:** Update the total estimated project cost from \$36,035,000 to \$26,170,000. Decrease the right-of-way phase from \$3,086,000 to \$3,000,000. Add TIGER funds and reduce the local dollars accordingly.
- **WSDOT – Eastern Region High Friction Surface Treatment 2017-2019:** Delete project from 2018-2021 TIP.
- **WSDOT – Eastern Region High Friction Surface Treatment 2019-2021:** Delete project from 2018-2021 TIP.

TIP Overview

The TIP is a programming document that identifies specific projects and programs to be implemented during the upcoming four years. Any project with federal funds from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) or Federal Transit Administration (FTA), as well as any regionally significant projects, must be included in the TIP. Regionally significant for this purpose is defined as projects that have the potential to adversely impact air quality. This is typically a project that changes vehicular capacity on a facility that serves regional transportation needs. After a TIP has been incorporated into the Washington State TIP (STIP), project changes can be requested by local agencies. Minor changes can be made administratively by SRTC staff. Significant changes must be made through the amendment process, which requires a 10-day public comment period and action by the SRTC Board of Directors.

Public Involvement

Pursuant to SRTC's Public Participation Plan, this amendment was published for a 10-day public review and comment period from September 19 through September 28 at 4:00 p.m. Notice of the amendment was published in the Spokesman Review and on the SRTC website (www.srtc.org) September 19. No public comments were received.

Policy Implications

The TIP serves as an important tool in implementing the goals, policies, and strategies identified in Horizon 2040, SRTC's long-range plan. As such, any projects included in the TIP,

including projects added through monthly amendments, must be consistent with Horizon 2040. Consistency with Horizon 2040 includes a demonstration of financial constraint and conformity with regional air quality plans. The October amendment has been reviewed by SRTC staff for compliance with federal and state requirements and consistency with Horizon 2040.

Technical Implications

TIP amendments must be approved by the SRTC Board in order to be incorporated into the Washington State TIP (STIP). Projects receiving federal funds must be in both the TIP and the STIP to access those funds.

Pending approval by the SRTC Board, the October amendment will be incorporated into the STIP on or around November 16.

Prior Committee Actions

At their September meeting, the TTC unanimously recommended SRTC Board approval of the October amendment to the 2018-2021 TIP.

Requested Action

Approval of the October amendment to the 2018-2021 TIP, as shown in the **Attachment**.

2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program
October Amendment (18-10)

Agency	Project Title	Amendment Description	Funding Adjustment		Amendment		
					New Project	Existing Project	
1	Spokane Valley	Barker Rd/BNSF Grade Separation Update the total estimated project cost from \$36,035,000 to \$26,170,000. Decrease the right-of-way phase from \$3,086,000 to \$3,000,000. Add TIGER funds and reduce the local dollars accordingly.	TIGER	\$1,850,000			
				Local	-\$2,436,000		
				Total	-\$586,000		
2	WSDOT	Eastern Region High Friction Surface Treatment 2017-2019 Delete project from the 2018-2021 TIP.	HSIP	-\$122,000			
				State	-\$3,000		
				Total	-\$125,000		
3	WSDOT	Eastern Region High Friction Surface Treatment 2019-2021 Delete project from the 2018-2021 TIP.	HSIP	-\$122,000			
				State	-\$3,000		
				Total	-\$125,000		

HSIP Highway Safety Improvement Program
TIGER Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery Federal grant program

MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 4, 2018
 TO: Members of the SRTC Board of Directors
 FROM: Anna Ragaza-Bourassa, Senior Transportation Planner
 SUBJECT: 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Project (TIP) Approval

Summary

A link to the final draft 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) document is available SRTC’s website at <https://www.srtc.org/transportation-improvement-program/>. Minor administrative edits and updates have been made to the draft TIP based on recent funding obligations and comments received from the public and the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) Local Programs headquarters staff. SRTC staff will summarize these changes at the Board meeting.

There are 96 projects programmed in the 2019 TIP totaling \$1.1 billion in local, state and federal funds to be spent over the next four years. SRTC is required to develop a TIP that includes a list of projects and programs to be carried out in the Spokane Metropolitan Planning Area (SMPA) over a four-year period, with two additional development years, 2023 and 2024. The TIP must be updated, at minimum, every two years. Per new federal regulations, the TIP now includes a new section dedicated to federal performance measures. Project selections from the 2018 call for projects are not currently in this TIP but will be amended into it via the January TIP amendment.

Any project with federal funds from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) or Federal Transit Administration (FTA), as well as any regionally significant projects regardless of funding source, must be included in the TIP. Regionally significant for this purpose is defined as projects that have the potential to adversely impact air quality. This is typically a project that changes vehicular capacity on a facility that serves regional transportation needs. Projects cannot obligate federal funding unless they are both in the STIP and TIP. Per federal regulations, to be in the TIP and STIP projects also must be consistent with the long-range transportation plan of the region, Horizon 2040. Once approved by the SRTC Board, the TIP is incorporated into the Washington State TIP (STIP) which is reviewed and approved by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

Below is the schedule for the development and approval of the 2019-2022 TIP:

2019-2022 TIP Development Schedule	
August 1	Agencies must submit the required information for all regionally significant and/or federally funded projects to SRTC in Secure Access Washington (SAW)

August 1	Complete Streets Checklists due to SRTC for projects that are not exempt from the Safe & Complete Streets policy or were not previously submitted with an SRTC call for projects.
July-August	TIP Development – review project information in SAW, finalize project list, fiscal constraint analysis, air quality conformity determination.
August 22, 27	TTC, TAC meetings – TIP Overview
August 31 -September 1	30-day public comment period
September 13	Board meeting – TIP Overview
September 19	Public meeting to review draft TIP
September 19	TTC meeting – Recommend approval of draft TIP
October 11	SRTC Board Approval
October 19	WSDOT STIP Due Date
~ January 1	FHWA/FTA STIP Approval

Public Involvement

Pursuant to the SRTC Public Involvement Policy, the development and approval of the TIP included a 30-day public comment period (August 31 – September 30), a public meeting hosted by SRTC at the STA Plaza on September 19, and presentation of the TIP document at Transportation Technical Committee (TTC), Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) and SRTC Board meetings. Additionally, individual agencies have developed and adopted their six-year programs in accordance with their own public involvement procedures. Public comments are compiled in the **Attachment**.

Policy Implications

The TIP is an important tool for implementing the goals and policies of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). Projects that are programmed in the TIP must be consistent with the MTP.

Technical Implications

SRTC is required to update the TIP at least every two years and it must be consistent with the approved MTP, Horizon 2040.

Prior Committee Actions

The TTC, TAC and SRTC Board of Directors were briefed on the 2019-2022 TIP at their August and September meetings, respectively. At the September 19 meeting the TTC voted unanimously to recommend Board approval.

Requested Action

Approval of the 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program through Resolutions 18-02 and 18-03.

2019-2020 TIP
PUBLIC COMMENTS

Submitted by: Bill Johns
Date Received: 09-17-2018
Method: Email
Regarding Project: various
Comment:

1. Table of contents. There are no appendices included.
2. page 5, last paragraph. Wash States's target zero must have been created by hippies in a dorm room as it is not possible. A reasonable goal should be set.
3. page 13, 2nd paragraph. The table referance should be 5 not 2.
4. page 14, table 6. Including the NSC with it's 76.2% diguises the 22% spent on transit. The 5.2% figure is very misleading. Almost 1/4 of the money available and being spent represents the least trips and should not be hidden. As time goes by it is becoming ever more obvious that the \$840,055.928 will never make it to Spokane. This aboration fouls up the whole planning process.
5. page 4, last paragraph. There is no Appendix E and WSDOT'S web site does not have their 2019-2022 STIP with the promised more detail. The "project summary" pages are much too vague for the public to review. For the DRAFT this paragraph makes no sense as the info is not "more accessible to the public"
6. page 15, SPO53. Thank you listing that this project removes capacity.
7. page 20, WS 135, 108,109,112,111 and 136. The funding is not secure as the NSC is not a guarenteed project from the gas tax. The other state projects are listed and will take the money first. SRTC and WSDOT need to at some point come to grips with not enough money being available especially as you have programmed it in this document.
8. Bill Johns, 1208 s scribner road, cheney, washington 99004

Agency Response: Forwarded to WSDOT
Jurisdiction: In response to Item 4.
Response:

- Regarding Table 6 –Your comments will be taken into consideration.

In response to Item 7

- The 2015 session of the Washington Legislature took action on the transportation revenue package, called Connecting Washington. This \$16 billion package is a critical investment in our transportation system that enables us to better fulfill this mission and enhance our multimodal transportation system for the people we serve. This 16 year package includes \$9.7 billion on state and local road projects. Current legislation passed through “Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 6106”, Effective date March 27, 2018, states: “...the entire connecting Washington account – state appropriation and the entire transportation partnership account – state appropriations are provided solely for the projects and activities as listed by fund, project, and amount in

LEAP Transportation Document 2018-1 as developed March 5, 2018 Program – Highway Improvements Program (I). Page 17 of 34 of the LEAP document specifically lists Project US 395 North Spokane Corridor including appropriations totaling \$878.9 million. The next schedule project to advertise for construction will occur in 2019.

Submitted by: Paul Kropp
Date Received: 09-19-2018
Method: Email
Regarding Project: None specified
Comment: About acronyms: those two-, three-, or four-letter abbreviations in the world of transportation planning and funding. There are many of these, and recently it seems there are even a few new ones.

So if our regional planning agency wishes to engage as broad a spectrum of interests and populations as possible, wouldn't it make sense for the main body of the TIP document to include a key for all those acronyms that technical folk read without difficulty but would puzzle the casual but interested reader and dampen both their understanding of the import of the document but also lessen, if not foreclose, their interest in commenting on its contents?

Where is a table of acronyms in the documents posted on the SRTC web site for public comment on the 2019-2022 TIP? The main document? The appendices?

Agency Response: Comments noted.
Jurisdiction Response: SRTC added a new appendix (Appendix E) of acronyms and their definitions.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 4, 2018
TO: Members of the SRTC Board of Directors
FROM: Anna Ragaza-Bourassa, Senior Transportation Planner
SUBJECT: 2019-2022 TIP: New Project Selection – Discussion & Input on Programming

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” for Board consideration. At the October Board meeting SRTC staff will present the programming methodology and overall program strategy and the projects recommended for funding.

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 meeting and applicants shared ongoing concerns related to partially funding projects and the project sponsor’s ability to deliver the project if other funding sources needed to be secured. 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.

SRTC staff developed a draft “Program of Projects” (**Attachment One**). This document only lists those projects that are recommended for funding. It lists the priority rank approved by the Board at the August meeting, the project number and agency rank, the requested amount, recommended funding award, whether it is full or partial funding, funding sources utilized for the recommendation, and a notes section with comments on proposed match and rationale for funding. After the funding table, there is a detailed description of the methodology used for the programming and summary of the recommendation. Also included is the notes of any discussions with project sponsors, either from verbal conversations or emails for each project.

For reference, **Attachment Two** is the project programming spreadsheet distributed during the last meeting that includes all projects sorted by board priority, funding eligibility, and geography.

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 (**Attachment Three**). 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 that were received through the 2018 SRTC Call for Projects.

Policy Implications

Funding projects consistent with performance objectives in Horizon 2040 is important to meet federal requirements for MPO’s and 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

For information, discussion and input on the draft “Program of Projects”. The Board will be asked to approve the finalized “Program of Projects” at the November meeting.

Remaining Call for Projects Schedule	
October 11	SRTC Board – Provide input and direct changes on draft “Program of Projects”
October 22	TAC makes recommendation to Board on “Program of Projects”
October 24	TTC makes recommendation to Board on “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 – recommendation on January TIP amendment approval
January 13	SRTC Board – approval of January TIP amendment

Priority Rank	Proj. # /Agency Rank	Project Name	Request	Recommended Award	Full (F) or Partial (P)	Source of Funding	Proposed match from Application/Rationale and Notes
1	SC1	Bigelow Gulch 5	\$1,568,000	\$1,568,000	F	RURAL/HIP	76% match; Has all other \$ in other sources; last in project fully funded, freight, safety, phase of bigger project
2	COS3	Thor-Freya	\$8,119,105	\$5,684,000	P	URBAN	10% local, 23.5% prog; Large project, phasing not possible (city info), Reconstruction/signal upgrades/ADA; PCI 41; 70% of ask
3	SRHD1	SR2S Walking School Bus	\$611,181	\$600,000	F	STBG-SA	Match wasn't sufficient as required by program so adjusted to 13.5%. Programmatic safety project for walking and biking
4	SV1	Pines Grade Separation- ROW phase	\$3,795,000	\$1,890,000	P	URBAN	20% local match; 50% of ask to leverage additional funds; after design will have better numbers; city committed to DS, grants out for DS and ROW as well; aligned with regional Bridging the Valley, keep momentum
5	COS1	Riverside-Monroe to Wall	\$5,003,141	\$850,000 Tent.	P	Urban	23.5% prog. 10% local match; City indicated DS and ROW is priority. Project length is .23 miles. Clarification and decision needed around regional significance to proceed.
6.	SRHD2	WBB Downtown Spokane	\$304,202	\$304,000	F	STBG-SA	13.5% match; Programmatic safety project for walking and biking; downtown Spokane area of high safety issues.
7.	SC12	Commute Trip Reduction	\$898,157	\$700,000	P	CMAQ	23.5% match; Program for reduction of trips; reduction based on eligibility issues and a percentage of requested funding for staffing direct to program
8.	STA1	Purchase 6 electric buses	\$2,670,000	\$2,670,000	F	CMAQ	60% match; Transit project
10.	MW1	Argonne Cong. Relief	\$1,270,000	\$1,270,000	F	CMAQ	13.5% match; CN only, DS and ROW prev. funded through CMAQ
11.	SC2	Bigelow 6	\$4,085,000	\$2,814,000	P	Urban/HIP	51% match; Sources committed: \$2.2M FMSIB, \$2.2M County; County staff requested focus on DS and ROW phases to leverage, timing crucial with Sullivan & Wellesely intersection project. Funds DS and partial ROW with remaining funds
12	SV2	Barker Corridor	\$6,331,800	\$2,050,000	P	Urban	30% match; Aligned with grade separation in freight corridor; opening industrial lands. City began design/ FMSIB \$\$; Conf. with city staff focus on fund CN fully on phase 1, right of way phase 2 to leverage additional funding to finish full project
15	DP1	Crawford/Colville RAB	\$1,943,514	\$1,944,000	F	Rural	13.5% match TIB; rural safety project; small town minimum
18	COS7	Maple/Wellesley	\$761,822	\$762,000	F	CMAQ	33.5% match; match proposed to be programmatic, must be local instead. TSMO project, congestion and safety
21	SV4	Pines/Mission	\$1,211,000	\$509,000	P	CMAQ	13.5% match; fully funds phase 1 indicated in application – practical solution approach

Projects SRTC staff recommends for funding

25	COS5	Centennial Trail Summit Gap	\$2,532,198	\$2,532,000	F	CMAQ	13.5% match, missing gap in Centennial Trail in City of Spokane jurisdiction; regional trail system spans many jurisdictions
26	SC6	57 th /Freya RAB	\$728,300	\$728,000	F	CMAQ	13.5% match
27	COS6	Ben Burr Crossing Improvements	\$746,099	\$746,000	F	STBG-SA	33.5% match; match proposed to be programmatic, must be local instead. Active trans. project.
29	COS8	Driscoll/Alberta/Cochran Sidewalk Infill	\$1,060,452	\$530,000	P	STBG-SA	33.5% match; match proposed to be programmatic, must be local instead. remaining funds in STBG-SA; 50% of ask; infill active transportation project; can leverage remaining funds needed
34	SV3	Sprague/Barker Intersection	\$1,159,979	\$349,000	P	CMAQ	23.5% match; leverage applications for CN by funding DS and ROW
37	CH1	Washington St. (Cheney)	\$730,691	\$731,000	F	STBG-US/HIP	23.5% match; rehabilitation project in downtown, only eligible small urban project
46	FF2	First St. Sidewalk Phase 2	\$272,034	\$315,000	F	STBG-SA Rural	Programmed at full funding; application indicated match through TIB. Hold match (\$41,000) in reserve) if not a good fit for TIB match to ensure project is delivered. Only rural STBG-SA project eligible. On state highway. If \$41K is not needed, move funds to contingency list.

General Methodology notes:

1. Started in order of priority. Considered funding source criteria, required programmatic geography (urban, rural, urban small), timing of funding/obligation and phases, ability to leverage other funds and any eligibility issues.
2. Applied rural programmatic minimum; funded project to complete and leverage other funds
3. Applied small town minimum complete project and leverage other funds
4. Applied STBG set aside to small towns programmatic minimum
5. Applied STBG Set aside to Urban large eligible project
6. Applied Urban small STBG project
7. Balanced above actions to new total to STBG urban and CMAQ
8. Applied priority to CMAQ considering match, phasing in applications, possible phases for leveraging (DS, ROW, CN)
9. STBG Urban, reviewed projects to either funding or possible phases to leverage funds. Discussed with applicants' opportunities with obligation balance. Discussed priority of phases to applicants in partial funding. Projects under consideration with this approach left were Thor- Freya.Riverside, Pines Grade Sep. Row, Bigelow 6, Barker Corridor.; Outstanding issue re: Riverside and MTP. Bigelow 2 would have shifted more urban funds to rural, and some \$\$ had shifted already to complete funding of rural and small town projects.
10. In most cases, did not partially fund a phase unless there was a separate rationale noted.

Projects SRTC staff recommends for funding

11. Rounded awards to nearest 1,000 to clean up and simplify balancing.

Summary:

- 20 projects funded
- 1 project *tentatively* partial funding at DS and ROW (Riverside) pending decision on Regional Significance. If regionally significant, recommending set-aside of \$850,000 to not program now until decision on inclusion on MTP is made; then funding decision on Riverside, or \$850,000 into other projects.
- 12 projects full funding of the request (after match);
 - 3 Projects SRTC is “last in money” - significantly leveraging funding already committed
 - Bigelow 5 and electric buses have significant other funding sources already committed
 - Argonne congestion relief had previous SRTC grant for DS and ROW.
 - 9 projects SRTC funding all but match;
 - 2 programs through SRHD
 - 2 small cities; Deer Park and Fairfield (proposed match through TIB)
 - 1 small urban project, Cheney (confirm source of match)
 - 2 intersection safety/congestion relief projects; 1 signal modification, turn lanes with 33% match; 1 RAB with 13.5% match
 - 2 active transportation/trails projects; 1 with 33% match (STBG-SA only source); 1 with 13.5% match, large regional trail project (CMAQ)
- 8 projects have partial funding
 - 1 due to eligibility (CTR- CMAQ funding)
 - 1 partial STBG-SA with funds remaining- infill sidewalk, next priority in line, 50% of ask to leverage remaining funds
 - Within very limited funding pool of STBG-Urban:
 - 4 projects with phases funded- (Bigelow 6, Barker corridor, Pines/Mission, Sprague/Barker)
 - 1 project we are funding ½ of the funding requested on a phase (Pines Grade separation ROW)
 - 1 very large/expensive project; reported to not have phases to fund, or project segments, funded proportion of request (Thor/Freya)

Projects SRTC staff recommends for funding

Agency Input on Projects

Applicants had 2 opportunities to provide comments on phasing (both within projects and physical phasing) as well as delivery concerns if partial funding. Also requested and received if any specific projects there were other funding sources received or applied for; if with partial funding there were phases of focus to leverage other funds and realistic timelines of delivery (important for programming of the years and HIP funds.) Eligibility in some cases was also discussed in terms of project components.

Summary of Comments received:

Spokane Valley-

Barker Corridor- per email; due to price tag, unrealistic to expect one agency to fund all in one cycle. FMSIB funding awarded for all phases of overall project, available for construction. Outlined and connected SRTC with WSDOT contact on another grant submitted for specific safety components. Discussed options of how to leverage SRTC funds with partial funding; timing of applicant to get started on design with the city funds sooner than the grants would be available, thus best way to leverage was to complete segment 1 CN; fund ROW segment 2 if available, setting up additional funding requests for CN segment 2; ROW and CN segment 3. At SRTC request, applicant provided cost break out of ROW on phases, escalated costs and contingency on ROW to estimated year of expenditure.

The ROW phase shows in the line item as \$120,000. However, this value is omitting any consideration to inflation. To capture inflation, the total ROW phase cost for Priority 2 needs to be \$130,000.

See attached excel list that serves *conceptually* as our estimate of which parcels will be impacted by our Barker Rd improvements. The priority segment of the project has the fewest parcels impacted by the improvements. (exhibit was attached)

FMSIB awarded Spokane Valley its requested \$1,680,000 for the 2019-2021 biennium for the Barker Road Corridor Project (Spokane River to Trent).

Pines/Mission information: Phase 1 of project was taken from application; confirmation of phase one made in phone call with applicant

Sprague/Barker is last project able to be funded and funds DS and ROW only (never received any comments back – email out to confirm ability to deliver)

Pines Grade Separation: In the September Board meeting when discussing partial funding, SRTC Board member from SV indicated that understanding not all projects could get full funding due to limited funds and even if project was able to receive half of the request that would help receive other grants and get the project going. Staff inquired in phone conversation possible creative solution to split into two projects in TIP to be able to obligate and spend if full funds not received later. Also noted that good estimate on ROW not available until DS is decided on alternative.

City of Spokane:

Provided information on projects they felt would be HIP eligible due to targeted obligation dates.

Thor/Freya The Thor-Freya Couplet project is one of the city's high priorities and largest funding request. In conversation with WSDOT to find if partnering options to reduce cost, but based on footprint and timeframe, any cost reduction would be minimal at best. For that reason, maintain our request for that project at this point.

Projects SRTC staff recommends for funding

Riverside Avenue will require an extended period of design, and additional attention to construction easements as we work through necessary details of vaulted sidewalks. Would be satisfied to receive a DS/ROW grant for \$850,000 to prepare that project for a future construction grant.

Other projects fall lower in the rankings, and do not have ready phasing strategies.

The City would be willing to accept partial on Driscoll-Alberta-Cochran, there are certainly other good sources available to get the last dollar in.

Spokane County:

Email sent regarding CTR eligibility and information forthcoming to clarify questions

Reiteration that Bigelow 6 is equal priority to Bigelow 5 and concerned about timing of construction due to alignment with SV intersection project

Bigelow Gulch Project 5

1. Availability to phase: No. This request is to bridge the gap in funding of project. All phases are expected to obligate by fall of 2019/spring of 2020. Construction is scheduled to occur in 2020.
2. Project is eligible for HIP rural funding, and the obligation target date is well within our current schedule.

Commute Trip Reduction

1. Availability to phase: No. There is no phasing as part of this project. If funds are reduced, services are also reduced.
2. Project is NOT eligible for HIP funding.

Bigelow Gulch Project 2

1. Availability to phase: Yes. We would be looking for DS and ROW funds. ROW funds total \$987,500. Project 2 has FMSIB funds recently awarded, as well as previous STP funds and RAP funds. DS + ROW are about \$850,000 less than the ask.
2. Project is eligible for HIP rural funding, and the County can meet the obligation deadline for DS and ROW obligations by 9/30/2021.

Bigelow Gulch Project 6

All three phases in the application request for Project 6: DS, ROW, and CN.

Already started PE with County funding. DS is/would be currently obligated and any DS funds we received would just be programmed with the STIP amendment. ROW will begin later this year. Schedule at this point is to have the ROW phase obligated in November 2018. The ROW plans are being developed as we move forward with the design.

CN is scheduled to tie in with the Valley's Wellesley/Sullivan project, tentatively to be constructed spring/summer of 2020. We would plan to go to add in fall of 2019, so CN would be obligated October/November 2019.

1. Availability to phase: Yes. We would be looking for DS and ROW funds. OW funds total \$2,100,000. Project 6 has FMSIB funding (construction only). We will be looking to apply for TIB funding in 2019 (use for 2020 construction). The project is scheduled to be in construction the summer of 2020, the same as Bigelow Project 5. The project will also tie in with the Spokane Valley

Projects SRTC staff recommends for funding

Wellesley/Sullivan project, I believe anticipated to be in construction the same year. Coordination between the City and County is continuing, and conversations revolving around the transfer of CMAQ (and associated City match funds) are occurring from the City of Spokane Valley to the County for construction activities..

2. Project is eligible for HIP urban funding, and the County can meet the obligation target date for DS and ROW funding.

57th Avenue

1. Availability to phase: Yes. The corridor project could be split up into segments. If this is available, we would entertain the notion of receiving funding for the segment between Regal and Palouse Highway, and include the 57th/Freya roundabout as well. If this were an option, we can develop numbers, but we would NOT want to accept DS, ROW, or CN “only” dollars at this time. The project would be eligible for future pavement preservation funding. There are really no other funding sources for this project. If this is not an option, then we respectfully decline phasing.
2. Project is eligible for HIP urban funding.

57th Avenue & Freya Street Roundabout

1. Availability to phase: Yes. However, only if there is a guarantee for future construction funding. If not, then we would NOT want the liability of phasing. The project does not lend itself to many other funding sources, only CMAQ and Safety (barely). If no guarantee, then we respectfully decline phasing. Let us talk more about this as we’re open to possibilities.
2. Project is eligible for HIP urban funding.

Harvard Road

1. Availability to phase: No. We would not want to accept additional funding until all phases could be fully funded.
2. Project is NOT eligible for HIP rural funding. This is mostly due to schedule and the lack of funding for all phases.

Centennial Trail at Argonne

1. Availability to phase: No. We would not want to start DS until construction funding was imminent.
2. Project is NOT eligible for HIP funding due to type of project.

Craig Road

1. Availability to phase: No. We would not want to start DS or ROW until construction funding was imminent. WSDOT is undertaking a sub-area study in the West Plains area, which could ultimately change the usage of Craig Road. We recommend waiting on this project until further planning has been completed.
2. Project is NOT eligible for HIP funding due to schedule.

Cascade Way

1. Availability to phase: No. We have stormwater funding available for the project, however without construction dollars for the resurfacing we would not want to accept federal dollars on the DS only phase.
2. Project is NOT eligible for HIP funding due to lack of total project funding.

Brooks Road Phase 1

1. Availability to phase: No. We have received partial funding from the 2017-2019 STP call for project in the amount of \$728,000. The current request is for construction funding.
2. Project is eligible for HIP rural funding, so long as the entire project is funded.

Greta to Whitworth Bike Route

1. Availability to phase: No. We would not want to start DS until construction funding was imminent.

Projects SRTC staff recommends for funding

2. Project is NOT eligible for HIP funding due to type of project.

Columbia Dr

1. Availability to phase: No. We would not want to start DS until construction funding was imminent.
2. Project is NOT eligible for HIP funding due to roadway type.

Cheney-Spokane Rd

1. Availability to phase: No. We would not want to start DS until construction funding was imminent.
2. Project is NOT eligible for HIP funding due to lack of total project funding.

STA-

Indicated in September TTC meeting that partial funding on 5 -Mile park and ride study was not a preferred strategy for them.

Cheney-

After review with WSDOT on budget, discussed with Cheney contingency and sufficiency. At SRTC request Cheney submitted new cost estimate

Other notes:

- Both WSDOT Local Programs and SRTC staff reviewed all cost estimates for reasonableness and adequate contingency.
- Met with City of Spokane/WSDOT staff regarding their estimates; no changes ultimately requested
- WSDOT local programs reviewed and provided feedback on CMAQ eligibility of projects
- Phone calls were made to Executive Director of TIB and FMSIB, regarding strategy of leveraging funds; applications and grant programs were reviewed

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			\$1,400,000						\$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	\$850,000				\$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										
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 6diesel 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				\$2,500,000						
26	SC-6	57th Avenue & Freya St Roundabout	13.5%	\$728,300				\$729,000						
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					\$530,300					
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										
					\$12,665,000	\$703,000	\$3,344,000	\$9,793,000	\$1,983,300	\$315,000	\$1,040,000	\$28,000	\$165,000	\$2,259,000

**SRTC 2018 CALL FOR PROJECTS
PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED**

Submitted by: Lisa Duncan

Date Received: 08/10/2018

Method: SRTC Facebook page

Regarding Project: Sunset Boulevard from Royal Street to Lindeke Street

Comment: I live just down the road from the incinerator on Geiger. I'm so thrilled that Sunset Blvd is getting a complete facelift! I hope the top of the hill will come soon after.

Agency Response: Responded via email that input had been received and would be forwarded to the jurisdiction sponsoring that project.

Jurisdiction Response: None required

Submitted by: Scott Haney

Date Received: 08/13/2018

Method: SRTC website

Regarding Project: None specified

Comment: What about improving Nevada and Lincoln Road, Division and Lincoln/Cascade way. Repair the intersection, with protected Left Turns.

Improving Hamilton St, Trent/Spokane Falls Blvd, Mission, Indiana, Illinois Ave, North Foothills Dr. Repair intersections, Protected Left Turn Lights.

29th and Ray Turn lights for Ray, Two left turn lanes 29th to NB Ray.

Agency Response: Responded via email that input had been received and would be forwarded to the jurisdictions that own each of those facilities.

Jurisdiction Response: None required

Submitted by: Lynn Adolphson

Date Received: 08/13/2018

Method: SRTC website

Regarding Project: None specified

Comment: Do you have any plans to pave this part of a critical commute for Air Force folks?

Those of us who travel from 9-mile area to Fairchild AirForce Base would certainly appreciate being able to travel over Carlson Road to Pine Bluff to 7-mile to take the Arterial into Fairchild Air Force Base would really appreciate it. Thank you so much for your consideration

Agency Response: Responded via email that input had been received and would be forwarded to the jurisdictions that own each of those facilities.

Jurisdiction Response: None required

Submitted by: Judy Kight

Date Received: 08/13/2018

Method: Email

Regarding Project: None specified

Comment: Dear Spokane Regional Transportation Council:
I'm responding to Nick D's article in the paper Monday, Aug. 13, "Getting There, What Projects Should Get Funding?"

We moved three years ago to a home just off of E.Stoneman Rd, between Bruce/Argonne roads and Market St. Stoneman is a narrow, curvy, bumpy, and unfortunately dangerous road with poor lighting. Yet, it is a main thoroughfare for people commuting from Spokane to the Valley via Bruce/Argonne road.

On a daily basis, I see at least one car coming my way that has crossed onto or over the double yellow line. Some corners are blind as cars come around. It's hazardous.

For safety's sake, the road needs to be widened and repaved, with added lighting and probably signage.

Please drive along the road, preferably during either the morning or late afternoon commute. But be careful!

Thanks

Agency Response: Responded via email that input had been received and would be forwarded to the jurisdictions that own each of those facilities.

Jurisdiction Response: None required

Submitted by: Tom Engdahl

Date Received: 08/15/2018

Method: Email

Regarding Project: None specified

Comment: I'm happy to see the repairs planned. I have some streets I'd like to see on your list:

1. The half block just south of the Monroe St. Bridge that somehow was missed in the paving process the past year.
2. Riverside Ave. from Monroe to Division. As a life-long citizen it is an embarrassment to have our main artery in such deplorable condition. What do visitor's think?!
3. The section of 4th Ave. from Maple to Sunset Blvd. It receives a lot of traffic and is in very bad condition.
4. 27th Ave. from Southeast Blvd. to Ray. Looks like the street has received mortar fire.

Please visit and then add these streets to SRTC's list.

Thank you.

Agency Response: Responded via email that input had been received and would be forwarded to the jurisdictions that own each of those facilities.

Jurisdiction Response: None required

Submitted by: Erik Nelson
Date Received: 08/21/2018
Method: SRTC Facebook Page
Regarding Project: None specified
Comment: Need curb protected bike lanes and Dutch Intersections for bikes, if we want the same bike traffic found on Centennial trail expanded throughout the city. (It is not safe, people won't bike on it)
Agency Response: Responded via Facebook that his comment was received and would be forwarded to City of Spokane staff for consideration.
Jurisdiction Response: None required.

Submitted by: Joanna Williams
Date Received: 08/30/2018
Method: Email
Regarding Project: None specified
Comment: I have never seen or used a roundabout until the one that was installed at Hwy 902 and Craig Road. I really do not know how they work, so I make sure I do the 15 mph when going through one. They are confusing to me.

I have seen on facebook a description of a two-lane roundabout and how to use it but nothing on a single-lane roundabout which is the Hwy. 2 - Craig Road one.

Please, please, please publish something in the Cheney Free Press, the Spokesman-Review, facebook, etc., with explanation of how to properly use one and what the law(s) is (are). I have been told only one car in a roundabout at a time but when I stop to yield to others already in it, the people behind me are laying on the horn. They also do not slow down to the posted 15 mph.

Thank you for giving me this opportunity to comment.

P.S. This is based on an article in the Cheney Free Press.
Agency Response: Responded via email that comment was received, that SRTC recently hosted a symposium on roundabouts but that further education efforts would be considered. Included a link to education materials on how to use a single-lane roundabout.
Jurisdiction Response: None required.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 4, 2018
TO: Members of the SRTC Board of Directors
FROM: Eve Nelson, Senior Transportation Planner
SUBJECT: Performance Measure Target Setting Update

Summary

Performance-based planning is a data-driven process to identify important transportation system measures (i.e., conditions) and develop strategies and investments to lead to a desired outcome. For each performance measure, performance targets show the projected condition or expectation of how the system will perform in the future based on strategies and investments over the next four years. This is a cyclical process is meant to make known how transportation conditions can be impacted by transportation investments. States and MPOs will be given opportunities to re-adjust targets at two and four-year intervals.

This opportunity to re-adjust targets highlights frustrations we are hearing from both States and MPOs across the country. As this new process unfolds, MPOs will have to re-adjust targets due to improved data sources and methods which complicates the process. It is a “learn by doing” exercise. Additionally, MPOs have little guidance on how to proceed with implementation throughout planning and programming and how compliance will be evaluated at our next federal certification.

States must establish annual targets for the performance measures listed below, as provided by 23 CFR 490.105(f)(3). Following the States, MPOs must establish 4-year targets by either: (i) Agreeing to plan and program projects so that they contribute toward the accomplishment of the relevant State DOT target for that performance measure; or (ii) Committing to a quantifiable target for that performance measure for their metropolitan planning area.

- Percentage of person-miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable [23 CFR 490.507(a)(1)]
- Percentage of person-miles traveled on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable [23 CFR 490.507(a)(2)]
- Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) Index [23 CFR 490.607]
- Total Emission Reductions for applicable criteria pollutants [23 CFR 490.807] and for those MPOs that do not meet the criteria under 23 CFR 490.105(f)(6)(iii).
- Percentage of pavements of the Interstate System in Good condition [23 CFR 490.307(a)(1)]
- Percentage of pavements of the Interstate System in Poor condition [23 CFR 490.307(a)(20)]
- Percentage of pavements of the non-Interstate NHS in Good condition [23 CFR 490.307(a)(30)]
- Percentage of pavements of the non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition [23 CFR 490.307(a)(4)]
- Percentage of NHS bridges classified as in Good condition [23 CFR 490.407(c)(10)]
- Percentage of NHS bridges classified as in Poor condition [23 CFR 490.407(c)(20)]

In both cases of supporting the state targets or setting our own targets, SRTC will be required to incorporate targets and progress towards achieving targets in a new System Performance

Report as part of Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). This would include information on how SRTC is including performance-based planning throughout our planning and programming and how this is impacting performance target progress.

At the September Board meeting the Board discussed WSDOT and SRTC performance targets at length. The Board requested that the Staff provide the region's portion of the State's targets since our conditions vary from state conditions. SRTC Staff did coordinate with WSDOT experts in providing SRTC's portion of the state targets found below in the Performance Target Table. The SRTC portion of the state targets is based on the actual facility of condition is Spokane Count only. in column D are based on *historical congestion trends* (lines 1-3) or *payment & bridge financial trends* (lines 6-11). The air quality targets are based on upcoming *emission reductions from our Congestion Mitigation Air Quality funded projects* in the Spokane Regions (lines 4 & 5).

Performance Target Table

	Performance Measure	(A) State Baseline	(B) State Target 4-year	(C) SRTC Baseline	(D) SRTC portion of State Target 4- year
1	Percent person miles traveled on the interstate system that are reliable	73%	68%	91%	84%
2	Percent of person miles traveled in the non-interstate system that are reliable	77%	61%	83%	71%
3	Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR Index)	1.63	1.75	1.42	1.55
4	Carbon Monoxide (CO)	313.16	309.1	347.94	306.856
5	Particulate Matter less than 10 microns (PM10)	435.69	224	0.029	0.029
6	Percent of lane miles of interstate pavements on the NHS-good condition	32.5%	30%	53.3%	53%
7	Percent of lane miles of interstate pavements on the NHS-poor condition	3.6%	4%	0%	1%
8	Percent of lane miles of non-interstate pavements on the NHS-good condition	18%	18%	13.7%	13%
9	Percent of lane miles of non-interstate pavements on NHS-poor condition	5%	5%	4.7%	4%
10	Percent of NHS bridges in good condition	32.8%	30%	38.8%	38%
11	Percent of NHS bridges in poor condition	7.8%	10%	12.4%	10%

Target Setting Guidance

Per federal guidance, targets should be reasonable, based on analysis of trends and projections of future efforts. Targets established in accordance with FHWA's performance measures rules should be considered as interim condition/performance levels that lead toward the accomplishment of longer-term performance expectations in State DOT and MPO transportation plans. State DOTs and MPOs may establish constant or declining targets. MAP-21 does not provide FHWA the authority to approve or reject State DOT or MPO established targets

Setting aspirational targets that are not data-driven, realistic, or achievable does not align with the performance management framework or the stated congressional policy to improve project decision-making through performance-based planning and programming. Setting data-driven targets will enable decision makers to utilize resources in ways that will result in

increased accountability and transparency by allowing the public to better understand expectations and expenditure results.

Complete Regional Performance Planning

The federal requirements are limited to national values and not necessarily all MPO priorities. Looking ahead to the next update to the MTP, SRTC will add performance measures of regional value to assist the agency in taking a more complete approach to performance. During Horizon 2040 development, stakeholders developed a more complete list of measures that encompass regional values. For example, measuring economic impact at activity centers and measuring multi-modal performance for transit and active transportation through levels of service

Stakeholder Identified Performance Measures

Guiding Principle	Performance Measure	Federal Requirement	Regional Importance
Economic Vitality	Reliable Truck Travel Times	X	
	Economic Impact on Activity Centers		X
	Jobs within 30 min Commute by Mode		X
Stewardship	CO ₂ Emissions Reductions	X	
	% Investments in Activity Centers		X
	Reduction in VMT		X
Quality of Life	Commute by Mode		X
	Transit Ridership		X
	Cost of Housing/Transportation		X
	Multi-Modal Level of Service		X
	% of Population Access to Trails, Parks & Recreation		X
System Operations, Maintenance & Performance	% of Interstate Pavement in Good/Poor Condition	X	
	% of NHS roads in Good/Poor condition	X	
	% Bridges on the NHS is Good/Poor Condition	X	
	Interstate % Person-hours Delay	X	
	NHS % Person-hours Delay (not final)	X	
	% of Expenditures on Preservation & Maintenance		X
Safety and Security	Total Fatalities and Serious Injuries	X	
	Fatality & Serious Injury Rates	X	
	Bicycle and Pedestrian Fatalities & Serious Injuries	X	

Board Recommendation Options

The Board may choose to adopt the quantifiable targets as outlined in the above in the Performance Target Table, column D. This will educate the Board and the public on how the data trends over time and this will provide more experience on how to move the needle for these measures. The reporting requirement would be to author a System Performance Report for the MTP and TIP explaining how SRTC plans and programs in relationship to the regional goals.

There are concerns for the Board to consider in their decision-making. One concern is how much money does it really take to impact performance at a regional level and are we willing to limit the scope of performance to these federal measures. Also, as the data becomes more robust, such as pavement management, will the old data translate and communicate repeatable and reliable information. There is some concern amongst experts that this may be a challenge as data collection progresses. Also, much of the information is limited to the NHS and is this the regional value that should be expressed.

The Board may choose to support the State targets instead. The reporting requirement would be to author a System Performance Report for the MTP and TIP on how SRTC plans and programs in relationship to the state goals. With this option SRTC would continue to track and monitor our performance trends at a regional level. Most MPOs across the country are proceeding with this option.

Public Involvement

Stakeholder workshops, surveys and meetings include members of the public have been ongoing since 2015 regarding performance measure development at the regional level.

Policy Implications

Establishing a performance management process intends to provide more objectivity in developing, implementing, and measuring the effectiveness of future transportation projects and programs. Federal requirements set clear expectations that our regional performance management system must link transportation performance to funding decisions and annually evaluate & report progress to inform the next performance cycle.

Technical Implications

SRTC must report our performance management process and targets in the in the next Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). The MTP must include a systems performance report describing how current planning efforts, program investment priorities and policies contribute to regional and/or state performance targets. SRTC is also required to include similar discussion in the 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Prior Committee Actions

The SRTC Board Approved Horizon 2040 and the safety performance targets on December 14, 2017 and agreed to Public Transit Asset Management (TAM) Targets on June 14, 2018.

Key Steps

TTC Recommendation by October 24, 2018 and SRTC Board decision on November 8, 2018.

Requested Action

For information and discussion.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 4, 2018

TO: Members of the SRTC Board

FROM: Greg Griffin, Administrative Services Manager

SUBJECT: CY 2018 Quarterly Budget Update (Quarter 3: July through September)

Summary

Each year, SRTC develops an annual budget outlining the anticipated revenues and expenditures for the upcoming year. SRTC reports on a cash basis, which provides a snapshot in time of the agency's revenues and expenditures. The Revenues portion includes funds received in Calendar Year (CY) 2018 that were for CY 2017 expenditures. Additionally, there is a total expense of \$2,170 for 2017 expenses (supplies, printing, audit) that were paid in 2018 rather than 2017 as anticipated. The attached spreadsheet provides a summary for the Third Quarter of CY 2018 budget, actual revenues received in 2018 and actual CY 2018 expenditures. A column for prior (2017) year to date revenues and expenses has been added for comparative purposes. The following is a summary of specific issues related to revenues and expenditures:

Revenues:

Through the Third Quarter (75% of Calendar Year) of CY 2018 (January – September), SRTC collected 64% of anticipated revenues for the year. All but one SRTC members have paid their 2018 dues.

Expenditures:

Through the Third Quarter of CY 2018 (January – September), SRTC spent 60% of total anticipated expenditures.

- **Personnel Expenditures:** Total personnel expenditures were \$900,573 through Third Quarter, or 71% of the CY 2018 budget amount.
- **Contractual and Professional Services:** Total services expenditures were \$70,559 year-to-date, or 19% of the total budget amount.
 1. Audit for 2017 was completed in August and paid in Third Quarter.
 2. Property & Liability Insurance was billed and paid in Third Quarter.
 3. Only 6% expensed thus far on budgeted Travel Model Data & I-90 Study.
- **Materials and Services:** Total materials and services expenditures were \$93,544 for the year 2018, or 78% of the total budget amount.
 1. Operating Supplies include \$1,010 for SRTC logo shirts/jackets for events that carried over from 2017.
 2. Advertising for the Data Scientist position was higher than anticipated.

3. Printing includes expense (\$743) of Horizon 2040 update not anticipated in 2018 budget.
- Travel, Training, and Staff Development: Total expenditures were \$35,880 thru Quarter Three, or 50% of the total budgeted amount. Activities during the Third Quarter included:
 1. Executive Director: Meetings with local leaders, agency officials and stakeholders; TRB Tools of the Trade Conference in Kansas City MO; AMPO Conference in San Antonio TX; AASHTO Peer Exchange; Plan Alignment Work Group (PAWG) Meetings; Good Roads Association Meeting.
 2. Senior Planners: Quarterly MPO/RTPO/WSDOT Coordinating Committee meeting in Yakima, WA; AMPO Conference in San Antonio TX; AASHTO Peer Exchange & 2018 Joint Policy Conference; Collaboration Meetings: Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan Working Group, Downtown Plan Update Technical Committee, STA-DT Plaza Operational Analysis, West Plains PDA, WSDOT Land Use Reconciliation, US 2 West Plains Study Workshop, Land Use Allocation- Medical Lake Interchange, NSSC Corridor Executive Committee, US 195/I90 Project Team, Road Map to Washington's Future. Webinars include: Critical Urban and Critical Rural Freight Corridors Guidance and Designation Process Discussion; Cooperative Automated Transportation (CAT) webinar.
 3. Data Scientist: TRB Tools of the Trade Conference in Kansas City MO; PTV Training in Portland OR; AASHTO's 2018 Joint Policy Conference; AWS Innovate Online Conference; WSDOT Blyncsy Meeting; SRTMC Board Meeting; Annual WSDC Meeting; StreetLight User Training webinar; NPMRDS Quarterly Webinar.
 4. GIS Analyst: NMPRDS Quarterly webinar; WSDOT Target Zero meeting; WSDOT Blyncsy Meeting; MAP-21 Technical Team Meeting; Cooperative Automated Transportation (CAT) webinar.
 5. Communications Coordinator: Education Series Events featuring guest speakers: Mick Cornett, Joe Minicozzi; GSI Annual Meeting; *Public Outreach*: Hillyard Farmers Market for Title VI Plan; Monthly Messaging various locations.
 6. Administrative Assistant: Top 10 Public Records Tips webinar.
 7. Administrative Services Manager: Webinars: MRSC Services, 2018 Compensation Best Practices, Navigating Onboarding, Faster Recruiting=Better Hires; INSHRM HR Legal Update.
 - IT Operations: Total expenditures were \$35,086 thru Quarter Three, or 61% of the total budgeted amount. Estimated savings thru the third quarter from decision to move IT management to a contracted vendor was approximately \$59,500.

Public Involvement

The original CY 2018 Budget was approved by the SRTC Board on December 14, 2017.

Policy Implications

SRTC operated within the Board approved budget for CY 2018. All major revenue and expenditure categories are in line with anticipated revenues and expenditures for the completed year.

Technical Implications

The budget recap provides a summary of revenues by source and expenditures by program area. No budget changes to accommodate unanticipated expenditures are needed at this time.

Prior Committee Actions

On December 14, 2017 the SRTC Board approved the CY 2018 Budget.

Requested Action

This item is presented for information and discussion.

SRTC CY 2018, Report through September 30, 2018

	CY 2018	CY 2018					Prior Year-to- Date	CY 2018 % of Budget
	Approved	1st Qtr	2nd Qtr	3rd Qtr	4th Qtr	Year-to- Date		
REVENUES								
SRTC Cash Balance 12/31/17						423,883		
FHWA PL (Federal Public Law Funds)	730,845	215,610	212,820	142,231		570,661	386,767	78%
FTA (Federal Section 5303 Funds)	291,000	64,809	66,344	52,417		183,570	144,733	63%
STBG Planning Funds	250,000	-	36,829	148,911		185,740	200,000	74%
STBG Data & Study Funds	250,000	-	-	-		-	-	0%
RTPO (State Planning Funds)	140,438	18,737	30,840	37,727		87,305	94,887	62%
Local Dues	188,062	188,023	-	-		188,023	186,605	100%
Other Local Study Funds	50,000	-	-	-		-	-	
TOTAL REVENUES (Received in 2018)	1,900,345	487,179	346,833	381,286	-	1,215,299	1,012,991	64%
EXPENDITURES								
Personnel								
Salaries	859,515	212,643	180,448	231,313		624,404	601,183	73%
Accrued Leave Payouts (includes unemployment)	55,198	19,793	-	-		19,793	13,207	36%
FICA	68,446	17,387	13,454	17,615		48,456	46,598	71%
WA State Retirement System	108,369	25,205	25,198	27,098		77,501	66,616	72%
Insurance	179,349	41,871	42,158	46,391		130,419	112,893	73%
Total Personnel	1,270,877	316,898	261,258	322,417	-	900,573	840,497	71%
Contractual and Professional Services								
Legal Services	15,000	3,271	4,115	3,669		11,055	6,848	74%
Travel Model Data & I-90 Study	305,000	7,200	5,400	5,500		18,100	37,970	6%
State Audit Charges	9,785	419	-	9,510		9,929	8,259	101%
Misc. Professional Services	50,600	10,546	10,065	10,864		31,475	23,307	62%
Total Contractual and Professional Services	380,385	21,436	19,580	29,543	-	70,559	76,384	19%
Materials and Services								
Publications	500	-	63	-		63	80	13%
Postage	225	106	4	50		160	150	71%
Operating Supplies	1,500	1,293	141	447		1,880	609	125%
Minor Furniture	2,200	642	-	-		642	1,859	29%
Telephone	8,585	1,673	1,675	1,731		5,079	5,354	59%
Advertising	2,090	2,256	741	1,100		4,098	1,690	196%
Rent - Office Space	75,455	19,560	19,154	20,252		58,966	49,931	78%
Rent - Meeting Rooms	400	-	-	-		-	-	0%
Lease - Copier	4,300	861	843	891		2,595	2,579	60%
Property and Liability Insurance	10,700	-	-	10,975		10,975	10,427	103%
Printing	1,000	1,083	111	274		1,468	321	147%
IF Charges	12,500	2,300	2,659	2,659		7,619	8,550	61%
Total Materials and Services	119,455	29,774	25,391	38,380	-	93,544	81,548	78%
Travel, Training, and Staff Development								
Mileage & Parking	3,600	371	1,297	1,332		3,000	1,827	83%
Travel / Training (Staff)	35,000	4,748	6,983	9,883		21,614	9,049	62%
Travel / Training (Board)	10,000	-	-	-		-	-	0%
Educational Speaker Series	16,000	-	4,932	3,956		8,888	-	56%
Dues, Subscriptions, and Memberships	7,875	2,621	1,280	2,432		6,333	5,235	80%
Total Travel, Training, and Staff Development	72,475	7,740	14,493	17,603	-	39,835	16,111	55%
IT Operations								
Software	26,000	6,200	6,381	2,727		15,307	10,246	59%
Hardware - New and Replacement	13,500	866	6,043	2,271		9,180	16,807	68%
Hardware - Repairs, Maintenance, and Upgrades	5,125	302	972	-		1,274	556	25%
Online Services	12,528	2,980	2,980	3,365		9,325	10,142	74%
Total IT Services	57,153	10,348	16,376	8,363	-	35,086	37,751	61%
TOTAL EXPENDITURES (Paid in 2018)	1,900,345	386,196	337,097	416,305	-	1,139,597	1,052,291	60%
CASH BALANCE 9/30/18						499,584	404,886	

SRTC CY 2017, Report through September 30, 2017

	CY 2017 Approved	CY 2017				CY 2017 % of Budget
		1st Qtr	2nd Qtr	3rd Qtr	Year-to-Date	
REVENUES						
SRTC Cash Balance 12/31/16					444,185	
SRTC Cash Balance Budgeted	60,000				-	0%
FHWA PL (Federal Public Law Funds)	683,189	155,568	90,868	140,331	386,767	57%
FTA (Federal Section 5303 Funds)	221,428	55,874	31,480	57,379	144,733	65%
STP (Federal Discretionary - Metropolitan Planning)	200,000	38,853	132,945	28,202	200,000	100%
RTPO (State Planning Funds)	141,139	33,054	6,121	55,712	94,887	67%
Local Dues	186,597	186,558	39	-	186,597	100%
SRTMC-Reimbursement for Network Manager	-	8	-	-	8	
TOTAL REVENUES (Received in 2017)	1,492,353	469,915	261,453	281,623	1,012,991	68%
EXPENDITURES						
Personnel						
Salaries	846,748	218,302	176,037	220,051	614,390	73%
FICA	64,776	16,214	14,117	16,267	46,598	72%
WA State Retirement System	97,464	21,296	21,041	24,280	66,616	68%
Insurance	170,802	36,898	38,417	37,578	112,893	66%
Cell Phone Allowance	600	-	-	148	148	25%
Total Personnel	1,180,390	292,710	249,612	298,324	840,645	71%
Contractual and Professional Services						
Legal Services	15,000	3,045	2,637	1,166	6,848	46%
Planning Consultant Services/Peer Review/Data	52,000	11,918	23,247	2,805	37,970	73%
State Audit Charges	8,800	-	-	8,259	8,259	94%
Misc. Professional Services	12,100	-	20,406	2,902	23,307	193%
Total Contractual and Professional Services	87,900	14,963	46,289	15,132	76,384	87%
Materials and Services						
Publications	500	80	-	-	80	16%
Postage	180	101	-	49	150	83%
Operating Supplies	1,500	181	276	151	609	41%
Minor Furniture	4,500	543	283	1,033	1,859	41%
Telephone	7,980	1,622	2,053	1,531	5,206	65%
Advertising	2,090	273	320	1,097	1,690	81%
Rent - Office Space	67,277	14,560	16,908	18,463	49,931	74%
Rent - Meeting Rooms	400	-	-	-	-	0%
Lease - Copier	4,900	843	885	851	2,579	53%
Property and Liability Insurance	10,500	-	-	10,427	10,427	99%
Printing	500	-	-	321	321	64%
IF Charges	12,900	2,667	2,942	2,942	8,550	66%
Total Materials and Services	113,227	20,869	23,666	36,865	81,400	72%
Travel, Training, and Staff Development						
Mileage & Parking	1,600	218	751	857	1,827	114%
Travel / Training	26,000	1,120	2,924	2,195	6,239	24%
Registration	7,500	140	600	2,070	2,810	37%
Dues, Subscriptions, and Memberships	2,305	370	755	4,110	5,235	227%
Total Travel, Training, and Staff Development	37,405	1,849	5,031	9,231	16,111	43%
IT Operations						
Software	25,740	1,949	6,235	2,062	10,246	40%
Hardware - New and Replacement	25,750	-	13,205	3,603	16,807	65%
Hardware - Repairs, Maintenance, and Upgrades	5,125	510	41	5	556	11%
Online Services	16,816	3,392	3,406	3,344	10,142	60%
Total IT Services	73,431	5,851	22,887	9,013	37,751	51%
TOTAL EXPENDITURES (Paid in 2017)	1,492,353	336,242	347,484	368,565	1,052,291	71%
CASH BALANCE 9/30/17					404,886	

MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 4, 2018
TO: Members of the SRTC Board of Directors
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 coordination with Spokane Transit Authority, has been working on an update to the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan (CPT-HSTP). The plan addresses human services transportation 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 plan has gone through an initial comment period and will be updated as a second review draft for final public comment. The plan is the guiding document for human services transportation project programming. 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. With release of the CPT-HSTP draft, the plan will be available for a formal public review and comment period.

Policy Implications

Locally developed, coordinated public transit-human services transportation plans are a required element of FAST Act and an eligibility requirement for FTA's Section 5310 funding. 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. Most recently, an update was given to the TTC at their September 2018 meeting.

This item will be presented and recommendations for the SRTC Board will be sought at the October 22 TAC meeting and the October 24 TTC meeting. SRTC Board action is targeted for the November 8 meeting.

Requested Action

For information and discussion.

SRTC BOARD AGENDA WORKSHEET							
	<u>TITLE / DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>POLICY IMPLICATIONS/ REQUIREMENTS</u>	<u>AGENDA TYPE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>PRESENTER</u>	<u>PROPOSED AGENDA</u>	<u>TTC AND/OR TAC AGENDA</u>
•	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
•	FY2019 Budget	Financial projections, tasks, timelines, dues	Info & Disc	30	Sabrina/ Greg	November	N/A
•	Coordinated Public Transit- Human Services Transportation Plan	Joint plan between SRTC and STA- required	Action	10	Jason	November	October
•	Riverside Ave. Determination of Regional Significance	Needed for MTP compliance regulations	Action	15	Sabrina	November	October
•	Selection of new projects for SRTC funding for 2018 Call for projects	Distribution of federal funds through SRTC TMA status	Action	20	Sabrina/Anna	November	August/Sept/October
•	Performance Measure Target Setting	Required-Bridge, Pavement, Congestion & CMAQ	Action	20	Eve	November	October
•	FY2019 Budget / Indirect Cost Plan FY 2019	Draft FY2019 for review and comment	Info & Disc	15	Sabrina/ Greg	November	N/A
•	Re-appointment of Business and Freight Board members	Bylaws	Action	10	Chair	November	N/A
•	Discussion on TTC/TAC Committee (s)	Required by bylaws	Info & Disc	15	Chair	December	N/A
•	Land use/travel model strategy	Update on data strategy and schedule	Info & Disc	20	Mike/Ryan	December	November
•	FY2019 Budget / Indirect Cost Plan FY 2019	Final draft	Action	15	Sabrina/ Greg	December	N/A

SRTC BOARD AGENDA WORKSHEET

	<u>TITLE / DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>POLICY IMPLICATIONS/ REQUIREMENTS</u>	<u>AGENDA TYPE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>PRESENTER</u>	<u>PROPOSED AGENDA</u>	<u>TTC AND/OR TAC AGENDA</u>
•	Executive Director's Review	Feedback and review	Executive Session/ then Action	30	Chair	December	N/A
•	Freight Mobility Draft Scope	First Touch	Info & Disc	30	Mike	February	January
•	2019 education series	Discuss education series	Info & Disc	15	Sabrina/ Staci	February	January
•	Input into multi-year action plan/check in on strategic plan	Continued discussion on organizational work and action planning	Info & Disc	60 (workshop)	Sabrina	February	N/A
•	TTC/TAC Committee(s)	Required by Bylaws	Action	20	Chair	February	N/A
•	Quarterly Budget Update	For 4 th quarter 2018	Info & Disc	10	Greg	Jan/Feb	N/A
•							
•							
•							
•							
•							
•							
•							
•							

Spokane Regional Transportation Council
Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting
August 27, 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 August 9 Board meeting to the group.

Ride to Care & Other Transportation Programs:

The Spokane Neighborhood Action Programs (SNAP) outlined the transportation programs used to serve the community. She provided details about the Ride to Care program which has been operating for 19 months in the City of Spokane and City of Spokane Valley; she said it has saved approximately \$77,000 in transportation costs for non-emergent medical transportation. She said SNAP hopes to expand the program to all of Spokane County by the end of 2019.

Performance Measures Update:

SRTC staff provided an update on performance management, the target setting framework team, and the performance management cycle. It was reported that the Board already adopted Safety and Transit Asset Management targets, but for the remaining target areas (Pavement & Bridge Condition, Congestion Measures & Air Quality Measures) SRTC has the choice to set quantitative regional targets or support the WSDOT statewide targets. The working group decided to recommend accepting WSDOT targets.

2019 Education Series Topics

SRTC staff recapped the Education Series events held so far this year and described two upcoming events. She called for input on topics or speakers for next year. Suggestions included emergency evacuation plans for people with no personal vehicles, autonomous vehicles, ride sharing and work zone safety.

2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Overview

The TTC was given an overview of the 2019-2022 TIP, development schedule, upcoming public comment period and public meeting.

2019-2022 TIP Overview

The TTC was given an overview of the TIP development schedule, upcoming public comment period and public meeting.

Call for Projects: Programming

The TAC members were given the Board approved Prioritized list of projects and a funding eligibility spreadsheet. Staff described how the recommended project priority lists from the TTC and TAC were synthesized into one hybrid list; the Board was presented with all three lists on August 9 and ultimately approved the hybrid list. He spoke about the movement of projects up and down the priority list as a result of the synthesizing.

SRTC staff also explained the funding eligibility spreadsheet and how projects are eligible for different funding sources. She said the programming process was just beginning; staff has asked project sponsors to provide additional information about project phasing, leveraging additional funding sources, etc.

She said the input sought from the TAC today whether or not it is better to fully fund fewer projects or partially fund more projects. The group discussed additional funding source strategies, project delivery, review of project cost estimates by WSDOT Local Programs, and the Highway Infrastructure Program.

The group consensus was that partial funding could be advantageous but would not want to see it done at the expense of complete project delivery.

MEETING MINUTES

Spokane Regional Transportation Council Transportation Technical Committee
August 22, 2018
421 W Riverside Ave Suite 504, Spokane, Washington

1. Call to Order

Mr. Mike Tedesco, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Committee Members Present

Mike Tedesco	Spokane Tribe of Indians	Lisa Corcoran	Spokane International Airport
Sean Messner	Spokane County	April Westby	Spokane Regional Clean Air
Mark Bergam	City of Airway Heights	Heleen Dewey	Spokane Regional Health Dist
Todd Ableman	City of Cheney	Gordon Howell	Spokane Transit Authority
Louis Meuler	City of Spokane	Karl Otterstrom	Spokane Transit Authority
Inga Note	City of Spokane	Darrel McCallum	WSDOT-Eastern Region
Brandon Blankenagel	City of Spokane	Larry Larson	WSDOT-Eastern Region
Gloria Mantz	City of Spokane Valley		

Committee Alternates Present

Scott Engelhard	Spokane County	Adam Jackson	City of Spokane Valley
Barry Greene	Spokane County	Keith Martin	WSDOT-Eastern Region

Guests

Chris Mansfield	T-O Engineers	Mike Lopez	Spokane Fire Dept
Cameryn Flynn	Spokane Neighborhood Action Partners		

Staff

Anna Ragaza-Bourassa	Senior Transportation Planner	Mike Ulrich	Senior Transportation Planner
Eve Nelson	Senior Transportation Planner	Julie Meyers-Lehman	Administrative Assistant
Staci Lehman	Communications Coordinator		

3. Approval of July 25, 2018 Minutes

Mr. Blankenagel made a motion to approve the July 25, 2018 minutes as presented. Mr. Otterstrom seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

4. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

5. Technical Member Comments

Mr. Bergam spoke about completion of complete streets/ADA projects in Airway Heights.

Mr. Larson said WSDOT has finished the major portion of placemaking for the Children of the Sun trail alignment and further information can be found on the website www.nscplace.com.

Mr. Otterstrom announced the ribbon cutting ceremony for the West Plains Transit Center will be September 18. He said STA is seeking public comment on bus stops and station locations for the Monroe Regal Line, which is scheduled to begin service next year. The survey can be accessed from the STA website. He said STA sent out over 10,000 postcards to residents living within a quarter mile of the route and a public open house will be later this fall.

Chair Tedesco reported that the Spokane Tribe is in process of adopting a new long-range transportation plan. He noted that part of the plan will incorporate roadways on the West Plains into the BIA (Bureau of Indians Affairs) Roadway Inventory, which can open up additional funding opportunities. He spoke about the roundabout on Highway 2; he noted that a Spokane Tribal member artist has been commissioned to create a piece of artwork for the center of the roundabout; landscaping on the roundabout will be planted after the artwork is installed.

Mr. Ableman said preservation work in Cheney was done end of July.

Mr. Martin congratulated SRTC members for reaching the obligation authority target.

Ms. Westby noted the region is in its tenth day of air quality exceedance for PM2.5 due to wildfires. She said they are working with Dept. of Ecology to get those days excused under the natural events policy.

6. 2018-2021 TIP September Amendment

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa described the three projects contained in the amendment:

- SRTC – US 195/I-90 Study
- SRTC – Division Street Corridor Study
- STA – Fixed Route Bus Replacement

Ms. Corcoran made a motion to recommend approval of the 2018-2021 TIP September Amendment; Mr. Martin seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

7a. 2019-2022 TIP: Overview

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa highlighted the TIP development schedule and stated that all agencies' project information has been received. She announced that a public meeting will be held in September to review the draft document and it will be presented to the TTC at the September 19 meeting. There were no questions or comments.

7b. 2019-2022 TIP: New Project Programming

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa brought attention to the Board approved prioritized list of projects and the programming funding eligibility spreadsheets at each place. She said staff is requesting TTC input today on the following questions:

- Does it make sense to partially fund projects?
- Pros/Cons to partially funding projects?
- Have any projects secured, or are actively seeking, additional funding sources?

The group discussed at length; some questions and comments included:

- If a project receives partial funding in this call, does that mean priority funding in the next call?
- Does a willingness to accept partial funding allow for a change or reduction in project scope? And how might that affect scoring?
- How would the partial funding decisions be made?
- Would partial funding be awarded to a project that prefers full funding?
- Concerns about partial funding and the "ten-year clock" that starts ticking after acceptance of federal funds.
- Partially funding many projects, versus fully funding fewer, can be risky in terms of not getting any full projects off the ground.

- A partial funding approach should be done very cautiously because of implications with project delivery.
- If a project receives partial funding and then applies for additional funding during the next call, it's possible that future call parameters may change, decreasing the chance of a fully funded project.
- A suggestion for researching additional funding sources.
- The public wants to see real things get done so having fully funded projects that can be delivered is a better option.

Mr. Ulrich described how the TTC and TAC project priority lists were synthesized and which projects the TAC recommended to be moved up in priority.

The group continued discussion; some comments included

- Details about Highway Improvement Program (HIP) funding requirements.
- The programming spreadsheet is helpful for strategic planning, however it is not very clear. Projects listed in multiple places makes it appear there are more than 49 projects and eligibility in more than one categories is hard to follow. Several members suggested revisions to the spreadsheet.
- Timing of when the draft programming list to the TTC and the Board.
- The Board has only seen the priority list; they should be provided this programming list as well. Then as the TTC has an opportunity to make adjustments to the list, the Board can start programming discussions from there.
- Unease at giving a blanket TTC statement regarding partial funding. It would be most appropriate on a project specific basis and suggested staff meet with agencies one-on-one for in-depth discussions.
- There is not enough time or information before the committee today to provide guidance on the issue of partial funding.
- Suggestion that a more in-depth discussion about funding should be done in a smaller group setting, such as one representative from each agency and SRTC staff, before the next TTC meeting.
- Agencies will not voluntarily agree to receive partial funding if they do not already have additional funding lined up.
- A draft program of projects should not be presented to the Board before it has been reviewed by the TTC
- Members need adequate time to take the programming eligibility back to their agency to discuss strategies to make this work for the region.
- Partial funding doesn't always work very well; a lot of pressure comes from having underfunded projects
- The amounts requested on the original applications were accurate representations of the amount needed for the project.
- Discussion about the project contingency list.

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa said detailed project programming by the TTC was not expected; programming information will be brought back to the TTC by staff at the next meeting. The input sought from this discussion was in regards to partial funding and additional funding sources.

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa asked if **(1) Reformating the programming spreadsheet for clarity (2) Seeking approval for the TIP Working Group (or another small group) to convene for further more in-depth partial funding and or additional funding source discussions and those conversations brought to the next TTC meeting and (3) Determination (and notification to the TTC) of what programming information will be presented to the Board** is what the committee desired as a result of this discussion; the group agreed.

7c. Performance Measures Update

Ms. Nelson described the purpose of performance management, the target setting framework team, and the performance management cycle. She reported that the Board already adopted Safety and Transit Asset Management targets, but for the remaining target areas (Pavement & Bridge Condition, Congestion Measures & Air Quality Measures) SRTC has the choice to set quantitative regional targets or support the WSDOT statewide targets.

She named the five TTC members that make up the Target Setting Working Group and said they have met twice for in-depth evaluation of which option would be best. Ms. Nelson said the working group advised that the TTC recommend support of the WSDOT targets and she outlined their reasons. Ms. Nelson provided information about bridge performance targets and the locations of regional NHS bridges classified as in poor condition. She also described pavement performance targets and showed a map of regional NHS roadways in poor condition. Ms. Nelson spoke about travel time reliability indexes for trucks/freight and person-miles and presented details about statewide emission reduction targets.

Mr. Larson provided additional details about why the working group decided to recommend accepting WSDOT targets. The TTC discussed making a recommendation to the Board next month to support the state targets, unless through Board feedback, additional issues should be considered and discussed.

7d. Title VI Plan Update and Comments Received

Ms. Lehman outlined Title VI, explained the SRTC Title VI plan was being updated and the 30-day public comment period ended August 8. She said only one public comment had been received, which was the Spokane Tribe noting that on page 3 of the document it reads “Member agencies and Tribes include” rather than “Member agencies and *Participating* Tribes”, which is how the phrase reads in the SRTC Unified Planning Work Program. Ms. Lehman explained that the omission of the word “participating” was unintentional and has been corrected. She noted the final document will be forwarded to WSDOT. There were no questions or comments.

7e. 2019 Education Series Topics

Ms. Lehman recapped the Education Series events held so far this year and described two upcoming events. She called for input on topics or speakers for next year. Mr. Otterstrom noted that state legislative session recaps are done very well by Greater Spokane Incorporated and he provided names of several potential guest speakers.

7f. Ride to Care & Other Transportation Programs

Ms. Flynn from Spokane Neighborhood Action Programs (SNAP) outlined the transportation programs used to serve the community. She provided details about the Ride to Care program which has been in place for 19 months in the City of Spokane and City of Spokane Valley and has saved approximately \$77,000 in transportation costs. She said SNAP hopes to expand the program to all of Spokane County by the end of 2019.

8. TIP Working Group Update

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa reported that the region exceeded the federal obligation target by 21%.

9. Agency Update

Ms. Ragaza-Bourassa reported that Paul Parker from the Washington State Transportation Commission will make a presentation about the Washington Transportation Plan update at the September 13 SRTC Board meeting. She pointed out that the next TTC meeting will be one week early next month; it will be held on Wednesday September 19 at 1:30.

10. Future Agenda Items

Mr. Meuler suggested a presentation on the NSC Placemaking process.

11. Adjournment -

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:06 pm.

Julie Meyers-Lehman
Recording Secretary

MEETING SUMMARY

SRTC Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) Meeting – September 19, 2018 1:30pm 421 W Riverside Ave Suite 504, Spokane, Washington

2018-2021 TIP October Amendment - The TTC unanimously recommended SRTC Board approval of the October amendment to the 2018-2021 TIP.

2019-2022 TIP - The TTC unanimously recommended SRTC Board approval of the 2019-2022 TIP.

North Spokane Corridor/Children of the Sun Trail Placemaking Process – staff from City of Spokane and WSDOT presented information about the public outreach and community participation in the trail alignment and placemaking process.

Performance Measures Update – SRTC staff spoke about the federal performance measure target setting requirements, and the extensive discussion held at the recent Board meeting about which option to endorse. Staff said the Target Setting Working Group will reconvene to continue evaluation, discussions with jurisdictions pavement specialists will be held, and information will be presented to the Board in October.

2019-2022 TIP: New Projects Programming – Staff 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*”. A draft program of projects was distributed, and staff requested input.

The group discussed at length some questions and comments, including the following:

- Concerns about inconsistent policy or practice of applying funds to projects. Based on the notes, it is difficult to understand a consistent rationale outside of the scoring criteria.
- Were project assumptions made with or without input from project sponsors? If an agency/jurisdiction agreed to partial funding, where is that decision documented?
- Staff and the TTC went through a great deal of time and effort to create a priority list which is now not being utilized.
- This funding strategy is problematic in that “slicing and dicing” changes the effectiveness for the region and would probably change the scoring that was used to prioritize projects. Partial funding that results in dialing back project scope is a flaw in the process.
- If the MTP amendment issue 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.
- Differing interpretations of the programming strategy guidance requested by the Board. It may not be accurate to assume that the draft program represents that Board’s guidance; reiterated that the Board guidance could be interpreted alternatively. Some 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
- Funding phases rather than entire projects jeopardizes project delivery
- 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
- 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
- Would like to see the decision-making rationale in writing; the process should be transparent

Ms. Minshall described the Board conversation, noted this is a strategy conversation, required judgement, , and it was not consistent by intent. She said the Board understands that jurisdictions accepting partial funding are committed to either funding the other portion locally finding other funding sources. Many Board members feel

that projects should be leveraging SRTC funds. Ms. Minshall spoke about partial funding strategies. Ms. Minshall said staff reviewed many programming methods. She said the draft list assumes all agencies receiving funding are able to deliver projects; most projects that segmented and phased were already phased as such in the application. 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. Ms. Minshall agreed to provide conversation documentation and further review of the Riverside project. The group and staff agreed to re-convene prior to the October 11 Board meeting to continue this discussion.

Ms. Minshall clarified that there were only four differences in projects resulting from SRTC staff conversations with applicants including phasing represented in the applications. She said notes documenting conversations with jurisdictions and emails will be included in the Board packet and distributed at the next TTC. She reminded the TTC that at the last Board meeting specific comments that it would not be a one-size-fits-all programming method; it would need to be project specific. She also stated the role of the TTC is to provide input into programming, not do the programming as the majority of the committee are project applicants. She also responded that it is premature to have authorization from applicants for partial funding as there is not yet grant agreements; the Board has not made any decisions for offers or awards, which will occur as part of a grant agreement.

Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan (CPT-HSTP) Update – SRTC staff explained the CPT-HSTP, the planning area and coordination partners. The plan is on the website for review and comment and the Board will be asked to approve the plan in November.