

MEETING MINUTES

Spokane Regional Transportation Council Transportation Technical Committee
May 22, 2019
421 W Riverside Ave Suite 504, Spokane, Washington

1. **Call to Order** - Mr. Sean Messner, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m.

2. **Roll Call**

Committee Members Present

Sean Messner	Spokane County	Adam Jackson	City of Spokane Valley
Mark Bergam	City of Airway Heights	Brandi Colyar	Spokane County
Roger Krieger	City of Deer Park	Heleen Dewey	Spokane Regional Health Dist.
Inga Note	City of Spokane	April Westby	Spokane Regional Clean Air
Louis Meuler	City of Spokane	Gordon Howell	Spokane Transit Authority
Brandon Blankenagel	City of Spokane	Mike Tedesco	Spokane Tribe
Gloria Mantz	City of Spokane Valley		

Committee Alternates Present

Barry Greene	Spokane County	Keith Martin	WSDOT-Eastern Region
Mike Tressider	Spokane Transit Authority	Char Kay	WSDOT-Eastern Region

Guests

Gloria Bennet	Transportation Improvement Board
---------------	----------------------------------

Staff

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

3. **Approval of March 27, 2019 Minutes**

Mr. Blankenagel made a motion to approve the March 27, 2019 meeting minutes as presented. Mr. Tedesco seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Chair Messner announced there would be a change in the agenda; item 9A - Roles and Requirements for MPOs, will be rescheduled to June as Stan Schwartz was unable to make today's meeting.

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

5. **Chair Report on SRTC Board of Directors Meeting** – Chair Messner provided a synopsis of major topics and discussions at the most recent Board meeting.

6. **Survey: TTC Input for establishing trends, assisting in creation of agenda/content for SRTC Board of Directors Retreat** - Ms. Minshall distributed a survey for members to complete and turn in by the end of the meeting. She noted it is the same survey that the Board completed, and it will be informative to see where there is alignment and where there are differences. She explained the survey will help determine the focus of the Board retreat.

7. **TIP Working Group Update** – Ms. Nelson stated that the group last met on May 8 and is focused on meeting the federal obligation target of \$10.07 million by August 1, 2019. She said the region is \$200,000 over

target right now, which is good news, but it is vitally important that all agencies and jurisdictions follow through on their project obligations. Ms. Nelson said she and the group will continue monitoring progress.

The group discussed the statewide obligation target, the project obligation process, federal obligation authority, and avoiding inactivity on a project.

ACTION ITEMS

8a. 2020-2021 Unified Planning Work Program – Ms. Minshall provided a history of the document development. She said an on-site document review meeting was held yesterday with Federal Highway Administration, WSDOT, Spokane Transit Authority and Federal Transit Authority; they had very few substantive comments and suggested minor narrative and language changes. Ms. Minshall stated that the TTC's motion to recommend Board approval will include those suggested revisions to the document. Ms. Kay noted that at the on-site meeting, WSDOT had positive comments about the collaborative efforts on the upcoming corridor studies. Ms. Minshall called for questions or additional comments and there were none.

Mr. Krieger made a motion to recommend Board approval of the 2020-2021 UPWP. Mr. Tedesco seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

8b. 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) June Amendment – Ms. Nelson explained the proposed amendment is a housekeeping type item; deleting two City of Spokane Valley projects from the TIP as they were both incorporated into a single larger project.

Mr. Tedesco made a motion to recommend Board approval of the 2019-2022 TIP June amendment and Mr. Krieger seconded. All votes were in favor.

The second part of the June amendment is inclusion of performance measure language into the TIP, which is an administrative modification which does not need a recommendation. The language refers to performance management targets for: Safety, Pavement & Bridge, System Performance, Freight, and CMAQ. Ms. Nelson said there were no changes to the language for transit targets. The group discussed the ambiguity of performance management, particularly for safety measures.

INFORMATION & DISCUSSION ITEMS

9b. Analytic Tool/Dad Acquisition Project Update – Mr. Ulrich noted the title of this project has been changed from “Data Acquisition and Technical Tool Development” to “Update, Develop and Implement Regional Planning Tools”. He presented milestones to date, highlighted when the SRTC Board has received project updates, spoke about the multi-jurisdictional project team, and said the RFQ will hopefully be released next month.

Mr. Ulrich discussed the adjustments made to the project and the procurement strategy based on feedback at the October 2018 TTC meeting; the procurement structure is now of a design/build type. He discussed the re-evaluation of project goals to ensure there is no predetermined outcome. He said the draft RFQ is currently with the project team for final edits and can be made available to anyone who would like to see it. He provided the definition several terms being used in this project.

He outlined the proposed project scope, which is a two-phased approach:

Task 1a (Design):

- Synthesize previous evaluations and prioritize recommendations
- Conduct facilitated listening sessions with SRTC members to determine members' current and future use of technical tools
- Compare SRTC's data application to the current state of the practice
- Consider other relevant tools
- Evaluate SRTC internal (existing and needed future) capacity

Task 1b (Build):

- Develop improvement plan which, at a minimum, incorporates the elements detailed in Task 1a. The plan should also include budget, schedule, necessary data, and a best practices inventory. It should consider the cost-benefit of each recommended improvement in relation to the current and future planning needs of the region.

Task 2:

- Execute improvement plan (including data purchase and application)

He explained that the tasks incorporate the recommendations SRTC has received from previous project plan evaluations (FHWA's Travel Model Improvement Program Final Report, Executive Report from Dr. Michael Clay, an expert in land use forecasting) and emphasized that the program will not go forward to Phase 2 until after TTC and Board evaluation.

Mr. Ulrich explained how forecasting transportation and land use conditions and trends are federal requirements for MPO's (23 CFR 450.324). He further explained that emerging transportation technologies, decoupling of VMT and GDP, market-based employment trends, etc. are the reasons behind the need to update the suite of tools and travel demand model used by SRTC. He summarized the tasks in each phase and noted there will be both an integrated technical path and policy path with the Board working to develop a refined shared vision for the region as part of the MTP update. He described how the TTC will engage in the process, shared the preliminary cost estimates, and the remaining steps in the consultant selection process.

The group discussed at length. Some comments included.

- Inquiring about deliverables, expected outcomes, wanting more details for Task 2, concerns about vagueness
- The project feels disconnected from the UPWP
- Elaboration on the design/build process for a planning project and its intent to create efficiencies
- The intentional high-level scope of the project
- Nebulousness may be because it's a design/build process on a planning project
- SRTC may be leaving the path for deliverables up to the consultant
- FHWA reviewed the project at the on-site UPWP meeting on May 21 and were comfortable with the language
- New methods of analyzing transportation and land use
- Suggestion of having one consultant for Phase 1 and another for Phase 2, decreasing the conflict of interest
- Existing SRTC policy prohibiting hiring two contractors for a single project
- Concern that a consultant may recommend something only they can provide; importance of avoiding conflict of interest
- Discussion of checks and balances in a one contractor scenario
- Clarification that the RFQ is to qualify consultants, not a proposed scope of work. Confirmation that the members from the multi-agency project team will participate in consultant selection
- Several members said they would be more comfortable with definable outcomes and closer alignment with the UPWP

Chair Messner suggested obtaining the project team comments on the RFQ, tying the project back to the UPWP and incorporating comments from today's meeting into the RFQ.

9c. Tribes and Regional Transportation Planning - Mr. Tedesco addressed Bill 1584, recently passed by the Washington State Legislature and signed into law by the Governor, revising the RCW to provide for reasonable opportunity for Tribes to sit in a voting capacity on RTPO's decision making body. He noted the Spokane Tribe plans to participate at SRTC and said the Kalispel Tribe and Coeur d'Alene Tribe may plan to as well. He noted he would be educating the group today about what Tribes bring to the table in regional transportation planning.

Mr. Tedesco presented a map of the RTPOs in Washington and showed which currently have Tribal voting representation and the two that do not, Spokane Regional Transportation Council and Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council. He explained the legislation was specific to Spokane County.

He spoke about the Tribal trust land process, Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) Transportation Plan, and BIA roadway inventory. He explained that adding existing roads to the BIA inventory list opens a lot of doors for additional funding resources; he said it's most helpful to think about tribal governments as having their own "bucket" of funding resources. He showed a map of the current Spokane Tribe's roadway inventory and explained a road does not need to be owned by the Tribe or on the reservation to be included in the inventory; the more roadway miles a tribe has on their inventory, the more money the tribe will receive. He said the Spokane Tribe partners with WSDOT frequently to put roads on the tribal inventory. He discussed rural transportation providers and discussed the collaboration with jurisdictions as part of Tribal real estate development.

He reported that the Kalispel Tribe is the 3rd largest jurisdictional entity in Spokane County in terms of budget and employment and the Spokane Tribe is in the top five, illustrating the positive impacts that Tribes have on the regional economy.

10. Technical Member Comments - Members shared information about current projects or programs in their jurisdiction or agency.

11. Agency Update – Ms. Nelson stated that the deadline for Division Street Corridor RFQ submissions is today and May 30 is the deadline for the US 195 / I-90 RFQ. The North Spokane Corridor PM10 evaluation is being opened up at the project level. She asked any agency or jurisdiction submitting a BUILD grant application to notify SRTC. She said eight bike/ped counters are arriving this summer for the region.

12. Adjournment - There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:26 pm.

Julie Meyers-Lehman
Recording Secretary