

MEETING MINUTES

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

1. **Call to Order** - Mr. Mike Tedesco, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:34 pm.

2. **Roll Call**

Committee Members Present

Mike Tedesco	Spokane Tribe	Inga Note	City of Spokane
Sean Messner	Spokane County	Gloria Mantz	City of Spokane Valley
Mark Bergam	City of Airway Heights	Adam Jackson	City of Spokane Valley
Todd Ableman	City of Cheney	Brandi Colyar	Spokane County
Scott Bernhard	City of Liberty Lake	April Westby	Spokane Regional Clean Air
Brandon Blankenagel	City of Spokane	Heleen Dewey	Spokane Regional Health Dist
Louis Meuler	City of Spokane	Karl Otterstrom	Spokane Transit Authority

Committee Alternates Present

Keith Martin	WSDOT-Eastern Region	Scott Englehard	Spokane County
--------------	----------------------	-----------------	----------------

Guests

Paul Kropp	Citizen	Tara Ziegler	Spokane Transit Authority
------------	---------	--------------	---------------------------

Staff

Eve Nelson	Senior Transportation Planner	Mike Ulrich	Senior Transportation Planner
Sabrina Minshall	Executive Director	Julie Meyers-Lehman	Administrative Assistant

3. **Approval of October 24, 2018 meeting minutes**

Mr. Blankenagel made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Mr. Martin seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

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

5. **Technical Member Comments** – Members shared information about current projects or programs in their jurisdiction or agency.

6. **TTC Officer Elections**

Ms. Nelson summarized the annual officer election procedure, duties of officers, and recapped the historical rotation of the chair position by jurisdiction.

Mr. Otterstrom nominated Mr. Messner for 2019 TTC Chair. Mr. Blankenagel seconded the motion. There were no other nominations or discussion. Motion carried unanimously.

- ***Ms. Note nominated Mr. Otterstrom for 2019 Vice Chair. Ms. Messner seconded the motion.***
- ***Ms. Mantz nominated Mr. Jackson for 2019 Vice Chair. Mr. Englehard seconded the motion.***
- ***A vote was taken on Mr. Otterstrom's nomination. 10 votes were in favor.***
- ***A vote was taken on Mr. Jackson's nomination; 2 votes were in favor.***

The TTC recommends Board approval of as Mr. Messner as Chair and Mr. Otterstrom as Vice Chair for 2019.

7. 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) January Amendment

Ms. Nelson explained there were 38 projects in the amendment; 27 are new, 11 are modifications of existing projects. She said full details of projects were provided in the packet.

Mr. Otterstrom made a motion to recommend Board approval of the January TIP amendment as presented. Mr. Krieger seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Englehard asked when 2018 Call for Projects Award letters would be distributed to project sponsors. Ms. Nelson replied they would be sent out no later than year end.

Chair Tedesco announced that the order in which agenda items 8a and 8b are presented will be reversed.

8b. 2019 SRTC Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Guidebook

Ms. Minshall said the TTC previously recommended that policies in the Guidebook, especially those in regards to partial funding, be reviewed; the TIP Working Group met last week to review and discuss. She said staff took the comments and created draft changes; additionally, she would like entire TTC to comment on any additional policies they feel need to be revised. Ms. Minshall said policies are striving to keep flexibility to ensure obligation but also provide reasonable expectations for projects. The concerns heard from the TIP Working Group was primarily about having a clear understanding of cost overruns vs. partial funding.

She discussed conversations held around the contingency list section of policy 6.5. She read the suggested change for policy 6.6 (partial funding) and a copy was distributed to all present; she said this is a separate policy from that covering cost over-runs. She provided additional detail about policy 6.6. She stated that she would like to hear from the group about anything else that the Guidebook is missing.

Ms. Dewey asked if a formal discussion is held between SRTC and jurisdictions receiving partial funding; she also asked about SRTC's process in partial funding decisions. Ms. Minshall replied that the Board reviewed all funding sources prior to holding partial funding discussions and SRTC reached out to all jurisdictions to make them aware that a partial funding program was being considered. They talked about the difference in the Call for Projects process and the project obligation process, which is what the Guidebook addresses. Ms. Minshall said the language in the award letters matches the specific language of the Board about SRTC partial funding, fund leveraging, and the responsibility of project sponsors to seek additional funding.

Mr. Blankenagel stated he feels the revised language for policy 6.6 is a good start to the definition of partial funding but suggested possible additional clarifications. He also said he thinks the group should discuss policy 6.7; he feels this policy should remain as is and not be changed to include the parentheticals.

The group discussed programming by phases and geographic location, consistency of language in the Guidebook, transfer of funds between project phases.

Ms. Minshall agreed there is additional clarification need for policy 6.7 and also suggested a change in language to match policy 6.6. She said staff will work on the wording and bring back before the TTC in January.

The group discussed the correlation between policy 6.6 and 6.8 in terms of contingency dollars and funding of the contingency list. Ms. Minshall said her assumption is that the partially funded projects would be part of the contingency list, therefore the list will be brought before the TTC for development and prioritization. She said projects with cost over-runs will also brought to the TTC for review. Creation of the contingency list by funding source eligibility, contingency list funding strategies, and funding project segments were discussed.

Mr. Blankenagel said the group should discuss the definition of cost overruns in policy 6.1 and 6.2, what is an overrun eligible for requesting additional funds, and method of additional funding. He said 6.3 outlines what type

of overrun may be eligible for fund increase, but still does not truly define the term “overrun”. He stated that he thinks it could be defined as “costs that exceed the project budget determined at the time of application”.

The group discussed this topic at length and some points raised were:

- Possible reasons to consider other cost overrun benchmarks besides costs that exceed project budget.
- New projects estimates/cost refinements should be updated yearly for the TIP
- As the Guidebook reads now, the funding gap of a partially funded project is not included in overrun and therefore ineligible for coming forward for a cost increase request
- Touchpoints within other Guidebook policies about delivery keep the progress before the group.
- The policies only apply to overruns, not funding gaps, which is why it is important to clearly define the term “overrun”.
- A possible definition that “overruns add to the remaining cost to be covered by the agency”

Ms. Minshall said staff will work on re-wording (1) 6.1 defining cost overruns (2) 6.7 to ensure that is consistent with 6.6 and (3) 4.7. and bring back to the TTC next month. Mr. Blankenagel said he would share his suggestions with the staff.

Mr. Blankenagel said the TIP Working Group also discussed that the TTC has been told that SRTC would advocate for partially funded projects in their quests for additional funding. He suggests that made in to a policy in the Guidebook including a mechanism for activating the advocacy on each agency’s behalf and in terms of keeping it an unbiased process.

The group discussed this topic at length and some points raised were:

- The need to define what “advocacy” means; is it letters of concurrency, assistance with applications, phone calls to funding agency, etc.
- Recent Board discussion about possibly having the Board vote on SRTC support letters
- Need for rules of engagement, transparency, and documentation of the advocacy process to be made available to the TTC
- Desire to have a process of engagement laid out in writing or creation of a reporting system to document assistance provided
- Question there is a priority process in place to select one project over another if more than once agency/jurisdiction is seeking additional funding from the same source or will all projects receive the equal level of support from SRTC
- How does this pertain to older projects that received partial funding outside of the 2018 SRTC Call for Projects

Mr. Blankenagel had sample policy language about for a suggested new policy “SRTC Project Promotion” and read it aloud: *“The SRTC Executive Director may promote funding applications for federal and state programs outside the purview of the SRTC Board. Such promotions may include letters expressing concurrence with regional plans, policies, or programs. Promotion may also include assistance, as desired, to prepare applications and communications on behalf of SRTC member agencies. SRTC promotion will be conducted at the request of a member agency only for projects that are consistent with the MTP. Promotions will be unbiased, and no project/agency will be prioritized above another project from this region. Any promotion will be reported to the Board and committees.”*

Discussion continued. Points raised were:

- Not sure this advocacy process belongs in the TIP. Letters of concurrency may be an issue between the Board and the Executive Director. The TIP is a project programming document
- Partial funding is creating gaps and how it is dealt with becomes a programming issue since it has been expressed that SRTC is willing to participate in helping agencies gather additional funds
- The desire to outline the expected level of engagement by SRTC in the funding assistance process to agencies/jurisdictions
- Project scoring and priority ranking from other funding agencies create different insertion points at which SRTC can step in to assist

- Need for discretion rather than too many rules, but transparency and a reporting mechanism is key
- There have been continuing conversations about the possibility of the Board to hold policy discussions about how the region as a whole can become more successful in obtaining funding; There are pros and cons of supporting all projects in a region
- Need for SRTC to provide technical assistance to smaller jurisdictions
- Most jurisdictions will likely have projects to submit in the upcoming TIB Call for Projects; how would SRTC provide assistance/guidance/help on those applications?
- We all have the same goal: more funding for the region via all the projects and how do we get there
- This discussion sounds more like a code of conduct conversation; while it is important, not sure it belongs in the TIP Guidebook
- The importance of letters of concurrency from SRTC, regardless of additional SRTC assistance with funding

Ms. Minshall re-stated that staff will work on re-wording the policies discussed and the document will be distributed to the TTC in the January meeting packet.

8a. City of Spokane Bike & Scooter Share Pilot Program

Mr. Blankenagel provided a background to the City's collaboration with Lime Bikes and a summary of the results of the 73-day bike/scooter share pilot program. He outlined the number of rides per vehicles per day, total number of rides to date, and total distance per vehicle per day for each of the three vehicles; pedal bikes, e-assist bikes and scooters. He displayed a map of trips taken in October and noted that within a 2.5-mile radius of downtown, every single street was used at least once.

Mr. Blankenagel spoke about the results of public survey held by the city which was completed by over 4200 people. He noted that this was not a profit sharing venture; Lime Bikes is solely responsible for running the program and keeps all profits. He spoke about the next steps and the likelihood of this becoming a permanent collaborative program with Lime Bikes. The group discussed user injuries, helmet use, lack of yield protocol on sidewalks, and possible vendor education requirements in the future.

9. Agency Update

Ms. Meyers-Lehman reported that after December 31 Diamond Parking will discontinue the code validated parking service that TTC members currently utilize and SRTC is still working with Diamond to come to an alternative agreement.

Ms. Nelson said that SRTC staff Mike Ulrich will be reaching out to stakeholders about data tool project to set up a meeting after the first of the year.

Ms. Nelson spoke about the WTS (Women in Transportation), the local chapter and its purpose, which is to retain and advance women in transportation field. The gala is January 31.

Ms. Nelson thanked Mr. Tedesco for serving as TTC Chair in 2018.

10. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:19 pm.

Julie Meyers-Lehman
Recording Secretary