

MEETING MINUTES

Spokane Regional Transportation Council
 Board of Directors Meeting – Thursday December 12, 2019
 SRTC Office, 421 W Riverside Ave, Ste 504, Spokane WA

1. Call to Order – Chair Al French brought the meeting to order at 1:04 pm.

2. Roll Call/Record of Attendance/Excused Absences

Board Members Present:

Al French, Spokane County Commissioner (Chair)	Arne Woodard, Council Member, City of Spokane Valley
Steve Peterson, Mayor, City of Liberty Lake (Vice-Chair)	Larry Stone, Major Employer Representative
Paul Schmidt, Council Member, City of Cheney	Susan Meyer, Spokane Transit Authority
Matt Ewers, Rail Freight Representative	Karl Otterstrom, TTC Chair
Josh Kerns, Spokane County Commissioner	Joe Tortorelli, WA State Transportation Commission
David Condon, Mayor, City of Spokane	Larry Krauter, Spokane Airports

Board Members Not Present:

Lori Kinnear, Council Member, City of Spokane	Steve Lawrence, Council Member, City of Airway Heights
Dee Cragun, Council Member, City of Deer Park, Small Towns Representative	Kennet Bertelsen, TAC Chair

Board Alternates Present

Larry Larson, WSDOT-Eastern Region

Guests Present:

Katherine Miller, City of Spokane	Paul Kropp
Micki Harnois, Councilmember, Town of Rockford	Shelly O'Quinn, Innova
Adam Jackson, City of Spokane Valley	Anna Ragaza-Bourassa, WSDOT-Eastern Region
Char Kay, WSDOT-Eastern Region	Nina Stocker, WSDOT-Eastern Region
Alex Pantagotacos, Census 2020 Spokane Complete Count Committee	

SRTC Staff Present:

Sabrina Minshall, Executive Director	Eve Nelson, Senior Transportation Planner
Mike Ulrich, Senior Transportation Planner	Jason Lien, Senior Transportation Planner
Ryan Stewart, Senior Transportation Planner	Shauna Harshman, Assoc. Transportation Planner
David Fletcher, Assoc. Transportation Planner	Michael Redlinger, Assoc. Transportation Planner II
Julie Meyers-Lehman, Administrative Assistant	Greg Griffin, Administrative Services Manager

Chair French read the names of the Board members requesting excused absences: Dee Cragun, Lori Kinnear, Steve Lawrence and Kennet Bertelsen.

Mr. Peterson made a motion to excuse the absences. Mr. Woodard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

3. Public Comments – There were no public comments.

4. Executive Director's Report – Ms. Minshall reported on;

- Thanking outgoing Board members Dee Cragun, Steve Peterson, and David Condon. There may be several other Board members departing, but that will not be known until jurisdictions select their representatives in January. She also thanked Mr. French for serving two years as Chair.
- She announced that Ryan Stewart recently received his AICP designation
- The Spokane region was selected to receive seven bike/pedestrian counters. They have been installed in various locations and SRTC will provide data to the Board as it becomes available

- Reminder that there is no January Board meeting. A workshop titled “SRTC-101” will be held on January 30 at 9:00 am. This workshop is ideal for new members; however, returning members will find it informative as well.

4. Special Report: 2020 Spokane Census Complete Count Committee – Ms. O’Quinn thanked the SRTC Board for partnering with Innova Foundation to hire Ms. Pantagotacos to coordinate the Complete Count Committee. Ms. Pantagotacos provided an update on the committee’s recent activities as the Census prepares to launch in early spring. She requested that any municipality or organization that had not yet identified a census contact person to please do so as soon as possible.

ACTION ITEMS

6. Consent Agenda – (a) Minutes of the November 14, 2019 Board Meeting, (b) November 2019 Vouchers (c) Resolution 19-04: Approval of Check Signing Authority to SRTC Executive Director and Administrative Services Manager (d) Resolution 19-05: Support of SRTC Employee Wellness Program (e) 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) January Amendment

There were no questions or discussion.

Mr. Woodard made a motion to approve items Consent Agenda as presented. Mr. Kerns seconded the motion. All votes were in favor.

Recap for November 2019:		
	Vouchers:	52,169.47
	Salaries/Benefits Warrant Nos. 538762-538772 & 541078-541088	69,870.14
	Interfund, other expenses, and reimbursements processed directly by the City of Spokane	265.00
		122,304.61

7. DATA (Data Application for Transportation Analysis) Project Contract Award – Mr. Ulrich outlined the requested action before the Board and briefly summarized the DATA project, which is a holistic evaluation of data acquisition and data use by SRTC in the following planning processes: Travel Demand Model, Congestion Management Process, Freight Strategy, Land Use Forecasting and Performance Measures.

He noted this contract is for the Task 1 (design phase) only and reviewed the DATA project development to date, starting in with the adoption of the strategic plan in December 2017. He stated that project updates have been presented to the Board and Transportation Technical Committee on multiple occasions and a multi-jurisdictional project team made up of member agency staff have been very involved in the project development process.

Mr. Ulrich announced that consultant assistance for the DATA project was solicited through a Request for Qualifications process and RSG was the consultant team selected. He explained the proposed contract is a standard WSDOT local agency consultant agreement and an outline of work/study scope was included in the packet. He spoke about recently completed steps and the project budget. He said Task 1 findings are scheduled to be brought to the Board in June.

Mr. Stone made a motion to authorize the Executive Director to execute the contract for consultant services with RSG for the DATA Project. Mr. Peterson seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

8. Comprehensive Plan Certifications for Palouse Towns – Ms. Minshall distributed a letter from WSDOT-Eastern Region outlining their concerns about the transportation elements in the Town of Spangle’s comprehensive plan. She reminded the group that earlier this year SRTC legal counsel provided information regarding MPO responsibilities and requirements for certifying comprehensive plans. She noted that in September 2015 the Board approved the SRTC Plan Review and Certification Process Instruction Manual and this document outlines the process by which staff reviews jurisdictions comprehensive plans and specifies what elements SRTC certifies. She said the Manual does not give authority to SRTC to review individual real estate developments, particular intersections, or individual roadway segments; SRTC reviews the transportation elements of comprehensive plans at the regional level. Ms. Minshall stated that the Board always has the opportunity to re-evaluate the certification process, but as it stands now it is a regional review.

Ms. Harshman presented a chart showing which jurisdictions plans have been certified to date and which are pending certification. She described the elements required for certification and highlighted the RCW 36.70A. 070(6)(a) requirements, emphasizing land use assumptions. Ms. Harshman said that currently SRTC's travel demand forecasting is dependent on jurisdiction provided land use assumptions; the DATA project just discussed is re-evaluating data collection methods for the future. She read the requested action before the Board.

Mr. Larson explained that WSDOT has concerns about the accuracy of the analysis done for Spangle. He discussed discrepancies in the level of service grades and spoke about the existing traffic volume problems on US 195 at I-90 and the proposed development at Spangle will only compound the problem.

The group discussed at length; some comments included

- A lot of financial resources have been dedicated to looking into the congestion problems along this corridor (the US 195/I-90 Corridor Study)
- Mr. Peterson questioned what WSDOT would like staff to do differently. Mr. Larson said an in-depth analysis and additional data. He said the existing report does not have enough information.
- Ms. Kay reported that WSDOT has been working with Spangle representatives and they have provided comments on the development's impact analysis.
- What is before the Board today is a comprehensive plan certification, not a development approval. Standard procedure for municipalities is to have a comprehensive plan done first, then address traffic mitigation
- Out of fairness to the rest of the other plans that have been certified already, the same procedure should be applied to these plans. Addressing Spangle's plan differently would be applying a different standard
- Ms. Minshall provided details about traffic count data collection
- Ms. Harnois explained that she sub-division has not been approved yet. She said Spangle has an Interlocal Agreement with Spokane County to help them with land use assumptions because the town does not have staff to do so on their own.

Mr. Stone made a motion to certify that the comprehensive plans of Latah, Spangle, Rockford, and Waverly as generally consistent with the required elements of Horizon 2040 and the RCW guidelines and principles related to regional transportation planning, including the GMA. Mr. Peterson seconded. Mr. Larson voted against the motion; all over votes were in favor. Motion carried.

9. Calendar Year 2020 Budget/Indirect Cost Plan – Chair French noted that Board members received the draft budget and indirect cost plan documents last month; he said the Board Administrative Committee reviewed the documents in depth and recommend Board approval the budget and indirect cost plan as presented.

Mr. Griffin noted the only change from the draft version of the budget presented last month was a slight adjustment to personnel expenditures. There were no questions or discussion.

Mr. Stone made a motion to approve the CY 2020 Budget and CY 2020 Indirect Cost Plan. Ms. Meyer seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

10. SRTC Advisory Committees Bylaws Revision – Chair French said this item was discussed last month and Mr. Larson had concerns about a particular section. He invited Mr. Larson to address the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) membership section.

Mr. Larson said WSDOT understands the goal of having TAC membership based on various community representatives, but they feel the inclusion of transportation users, even perhaps individuals who may have a singular focus, is important and value making those voices heard. He said WSDOT created modifications to the proposed language ([see page 7](#)) changes which ensures that all users of the transportation system are invited to take part on the TAC, because this group is an opportunity for advocacy groups to let us know how transportation decisions affect them. He read from the WSDOT suggested guidance: “The SRTC shall invite application for membership to the TAC from the general public and groups including, but not limited to, people

with disabilities, senior citizens, youth, the business and freight moving communities, rural communities, traditional automobile users and advocates for non-motorized transportation or public transit. TAC members should be willing to represent the issues and concerns of the groups they represent as well as be willing to consider transportation needs and solutions from the broader community perspective. The TAC members shall not be elected officials or members of the SRTC Board".

Ms. Minshall noted that the red-line version of the bylaws modified the language to read "Members shall be chosen to represent *users of the transportation system and community/industry areas...*" but intentionally does not list out specific groups. She said the discussions last month revolved around (1) how specific or non-specific to make the list of prospective members and (2) to focus membership on community/industry perspectives and system users or to primarily focus on system users;

The group discussed at length; some comments included

- Mr. Woodard said the wording in the red-line version does not preclude advocacy or special interest groups from participating; all meetings are open, so their voices can be heard. He feels that outlining groups on a list means that only that type of person will apply. Mr. Larson said the goal is to be deliberate in inviting and reaching out to special interest groups or system users to apply, not just announce that it's an open meeting and anyone can attend.
- Chair French pointed out that deliberately inviting certain groups, no matter how good your intentions, means that other groups have been deliberately left out, which is the unintended message
- Mr. Kratuer spoke about the importance of keeping the policy non-specific and flexible, otherwise the bylaws will need to be changed every time the proposed membership list is updated. He said WSDOT's suggested language may be too specific to be a policy, but is great screening criteria for outreach efforts and for staff to use when processing TAC membership applications

Mr. Stone made a motion approve the revision to the SRTC Advisory Committee Bylaws as presented in Attachment 2 and to direct SRTC staff to conduct recruitment of new members for the TAC. Mr. Peterson seconded the motion.

Discussion continued; some comments included;

- Mr. Larson said the previous selection process wasn't broken; he emphasized that the language reads "*not limited to*", so it provides inclusion for community/industry groups as well.
- Mr. Tortorelli said the TAC Working Group discussed which groups could provide valuable input, not that that it was going to be an exclusive membership, but to ensure that there are representatives from those particular groups and assigning them responsibility to report back to the groups they are representing.
- Ms. Minshall said the Interlocal Agreement states that TAC membership cannot exceed 13 individuals; discussions of the TAC Work Group and the Board Administrative Committee resulted in more vague language so that membership could be kept to 13 without being exclusive. The language in Attachment 2 is meant to be a middle ground of listing out groups and having no parameters at all.

Chair French called for a vote. Motion carried with Mr. Larson voting against and all other votes in favor. Motion carried.

11. SRTC Funding Allocation for Priority Projects – Ms. Nelson stated this item will be for action or information, depending on the will of the Board. It would normally be an action item due to the recommendation for approval by the TTC, however there is a great deal of uncertainty about state transportation funding due to the passage of Initiative 976.

She reviewed the amount and types of contingency funding available; each category has its own technical requirements. She spoke about the importance of meeting the federal obligation targets each year, which means paying attention to the timing of project obligations. Ms. Nelson explained that the TIP Working Group and the TTC review the funding needs of each project, opportunity for outside funding and the amount the region needs to obligate each year to meet the federal target. Based on all those considerations, staff and the TTC recommend the following package of projects:

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Funding Type</u>
City of Spokane	Thor/Freya Couplet Reconstruction: Hartson-Sprague	\$955,000	STBG
Spokane County	Bigelow/Forker Project 6: New Roadway Alignment	\$1.27 M	STBG
Spokane Transit Authority	Five Mile Park & Ride Study	\$200,000	STBG
City of Spokane Valley	Argonne Road Reconstruction	\$2.47 M	STBG & HIP
Spokane County	Greta to Whitworth Bike Route & Path	\$299,300	CMAQ
City of Spokane Valley	Wilbur Sidewalk	\$500,000	STBG-SA

Ms. Nelson commented that because of I-976, WSDOT has a list of projects on hold and she spoke about other agencies' State-funded projects potentially being at risk. This included projects awarded by Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board (FMSIB) funding. Mr. Ewers said the FMSIB also lost \$15 M of their funding last year as a result of action by the **Washington State Legislature**; he spoke about concerns about FMSIB typically being "first money in" and there are projects that have millions of FMSIB dollars allocated to them that don't begin construction right away so the money appears to legislators to be just sitting there, which puts it at risk.

Ms. Nelson outlined the benefits and risks of approving the TTC's recommendation and emphasized that if the Board approves the project, the jurisdictions will be able to start spending as soon as March 2020. She read the requested action and but also noted this item could be brought back to the Board in March to allow for more time to see what happens with state funding status, although this would delay spending until May or June.

Chair French said he recently was told by a state legislator that the Legislature would not work on a transportation bill in the 2020 session. Mr. Kerns spoke about alternative transportation funding plans being discussed by state legislators. The group discussed the uncertainties of state transportation funding going forward, the SRTC funding that goes to WSDOT via the Spokane Regional Transportation Management Center, and reservations about the accuracy of statements from legislators about the funding impacts to local projects.

Mr. Woodard made a motion award contingency funds to the priority projects as presented. Mr. Schmidt seconded the motion.

Mr. Condon suggested that action be postponed. He discussed how the Thor/Freya project will be scaled back because it's not being fully funded and addressed the regional importance and metropolitan impact of the Thor/Freya corridor. He said this city facility is utilized by many vehicles coming from outside the city limits; serving a very large number of commuters and as such the reduction in scope could be limiting. He indicated the project could be delivered in 2021, which is two years earlier than originally anticipated.

Mr. Condon made a motion to defer this item until February and to request to staff to inform the Board in February about the possibility of an amendment to the motion on the floor or to approve it. Mr. Peterson seconded the motion.

Mr. Woodard stated his concerns that several months delay in starting projects will mean a higher bidding climate and higher costs. Mr. Krauter said delaying the award of funding until February may not solve anything because the constitutionality of I-976 could be tied up in court for many months and projects are under deadline to obligate federal funds. Mr. Otterstrom addressed the analysis of the project prioritization and funding done by the TIP Working Group; he noted that all jurisdictions with projects on the priority list agreed to accept the funding as listed. The group continued discussion.

Chair French stated that a motion for deferral supersedes a prior motion for action, so it would be voted on first.

The motion to defer the item passed with 6 votes in favor and 5 votes opposed.

INFORMATION & DISCUSSION ITEMS

12. Board Member Comments – Members shared comments about projects and events happening in their jurisdictions.

13. Adjournment - There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:48 pm.

Julie Meyers-Lehman, Clerk of the Board



**Washington State
Department of Transportation**

Eastern Region
2714 N. Mayfair Street
Spokane, WA 99207-2090
509-324-6000 / FAX: 509-324-6005
TTY: 1-800-833-6388
www.wsdot.wa.gov

December 11, 2019

Attn: SRTC Policy Board Members
Spokane Regional Transportation Council
421 W Riverside Ave.; Suite 500
Spokane, WA 99201

Re: SRTC Review of Spangle Comprehensive Plan Update

Dear Board Members;

During the past few months, the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) has been reviewing the Town of Spangle's Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan. The WSDOT review revealed that the proposed plan does not adequately address the transportation system, particularly US 195 and Interstate 90 (I-90).

While mainline US 195 may be functioning at an acceptable level of service (LOS), some intersections of US 195 within the City of Spokane are functioning at an unacceptable LOS. For example, a recent study conducted for a new plat in Spangle shows the Meadowlane/US 195 and 16th Ave/US 195 intersections to be functioning a LOS "F" in the PM peak hour. Regarding I-90, the SRTC Regional Model presents I-90 from the Geiger Interchange to the Sprague Ave. Interchange as functioning at LOS "C" in the PM peak hour. I-90 in the peak hour is typically stop and go traffic for a significant section of the interstate in this vicinity. This actual condition would be more closely reflective of LOS "F" in the peak hour.

Additionally, WSDOT is concerned that the transportation analysis does not address the potential for further development of the undeveloped Urban Growth Area. The plan should analyze and present some projection of growth for the Spangle UGA.

Providing concurrence with the transportation element of this Comprehensive Plan without a discussion of intersection operations, realistic LOS projections, and growth within Spangle's UGA does not present a realistic assessment. I am recommending to the Board that further discussions/collaboration occur on this matter between SRTC, WSDOT and the Town of Spangle prior to providing concurrence.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you should have any questions regarding the above comments.

Sincerely,



Michael Gribner
Regional Administrator

cc: Charlene Kay, WSDOT Planning and Strategic Community Partnerships Director
Greg Figg, WSDOT Development Services