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To: Members of the SRTC Board of Directors
From: Sabrina Minshall, AICP, Executive Director
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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@srtc.org at least 48 hours in advance.
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To: SRTC Board of Directors  
From: Sabrina Minshall, AICP, Executive Director  
Topic: Election of 2020 Board Officers

**Requested Action:**
Election of the SRTC Board of Directors Chair and Vice-Chair. Term may be up to two years (2020-2021).

**Key Points:**
- The SRTC Interlocal Agreement (*excerpt below*) establishes a Board Chair and Vice-Chair to be elected by majority vote of the Board.
- SRTC Rules of Procedures (*excerpt below*) establishes the process for selection, terms, and duties.
- Chair and Vice-Chair must be elected officials and voting members.
- Board members must have served at least one year to be eligible for leadership positions.
- Terms may be up to two years.

**Board/Committee Discussions:**
In February 2018 Spokane County Commissioner Al French was elected to be Board Chair and City of Spokane Valley Councilman Ben Wick was elected to be Vice-Chair. In July of 2018 the City of Spokane Valley changed their Board membership, resulting in the Vice-Chair position becoming vacant. City of Liberty Lake Mayor Steve Person was elected to fill the remaining term for Vice-Chair; with the Chair and Vice-Chair positions extended through the end of 2019.

Historically, there has been an information rotation for the Board Chair position. Since 2010, the members filling the Chair role have been as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019 Spokane County</th>
<th>2014 Spokane County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018 Spokane County</td>
<td>2013 City of Liberty Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 City of Cheney</td>
<td>2012 City of Spokane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 City of Spokane</td>
<td>2011 City of Spokane Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 City of Spokane Valley</td>
<td>2010 Spokane County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Public Involvement:**
Election of the Chair and Vice Chair occur at a public Board meeting.

**Supporting Information/Implications**

* SRTC 2013 Interlocal Agreement:

“The Board shall elect a Chair and Vice-Chair ("Officers") by majority vote of the Board. Only representatives who are elected officials may be Officers. To be eligible for the Chair position, the Board Member shall have served on the Board for at least one (1) year. The term for Officers may be up to two (2) years in each office. Ex officio members may not serve as Officers.”

* SRTC Rules of Procedure:

Selecting the Chair and Vice-Chair

“Nomination: The Chair will be selected by the voting Board members. Board members may each nominate one person for Chair. Nominations require a second. Each Board member shall be given the opportunity to submit a nomination for Chair. After all nominations are made, the Chair will call for a vote on the nominations in the order they were made. Voting will be a recorded vote as determined by the Chair. As soon as one nominee receives a majority vote, that Board member will be declared the Chair. No votes will be taken on the remaining nominees. The same process shall be followed for Vice Chair.

Term: The term of Chair may not exceed two (2) years from the date of election. If no term is stated, the term for the Chair or Vice-Chair shall be for one (1) year.

Vice Chair Succession: The Vice Chair is the presumptive incoming Chair.

Removal of Chair: The Chair may be removed from office upon a majority vote of the Board members.

Chair and Duties:
The Chair presides at all meetings of the Board. In the absence of the Chair, the Vice Chair shall preside. In the absence of the Chair and Vice Chair, the Board shall elect a temporary chair.

Only Board members who are elected officials may serve as the Chair or Vice-Chair. To be eligible for the Chair position, the Board member shall have served on the Board for at least one (1) year.”

**More Information:**

- For detailed information contact: Sabrina Minshall at (509) 343-6370 or sminshall@srtc.org
Requested Action:
For information and discussion.

Background and Summary:
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) are required to review, evaluate and certify the transportation planning processes for each Transportation Management Area (TMA) at least every four years. The certification review determines whether SRTC, as a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and as a TMA, meets the federal requirements of Section 23 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CRF), Part 450, Subpart C, and 49 CFR part 613. The review also suggests opportunities to enhance the quality of planning processes and ensure federal projects can advance without delay. As Spokane County is also designated as a “maintenance area” for certain air pollutants, the review also evaluates SRTC’s planning process to ensure it meets U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA’s) air quality requirements.

The TMA Certification review process included a desk review of key documents and materials, two on-site visits and legal discussions with federal, state and SRTC staff, and the formal Certification Report.

The 2020 federal TMA Certification review of SRTC resulted in no corrective actions but contains commendations and recommendations. While the entire report is attached for your review, a summary of the comments is highlighted below:

- The federal team commended SRTC for its proactive approach to transportation performance management. The federal team recommended as part of the next MTP update that SRTC establish and reference regional targets and objectives for performance measures and outline how investments and strategies support achieving those goals.

- The federal team recommended that SRTC provide more detailed citations and cross references in the UPWP to reflect timelines of projects.

- The federal team also recommended, as part of the MTP update, an analysis of how investments results in benefits/ or burdens to environmental justice populations, and the inclusion of additional information about transit services identified in the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Public Transportation Plan that was adopted in November of 2018.
The federal team recommends that the MTP’s financial plan update clarifies where additional funding will come from and to develop a clear distinction between current and new revenue assumptions that are assumed.

The review commended SRTC for the education series, public participation, and public outreach efforts.

The review recommends SRTC document and evaluate interactions with tribal governments.

The review commended the Board of Directors for leadership in improvements in areas of Title VI, environmental justice, and ADA, as well as outreach to persons with disabilities.

**More Information:**

For detailed information contact: Sabrina Minshall at (509) 343-6370 or at sminshall@srtc.org
January 10, 2020

HPT-WA/730.4

Ms. Sabrina Minshall
Executive Director
Spokane Regional Transportation Council
421 W. Riverside Ave., #500
Spokane, Washington 99201

Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) 2020 Federal Certification Report

Dear Ms. Minshall:

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) are pleased to provide you with the 2020 Transportation Management Area (TMA) Certification Review Report for the Spokane Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA). This report contains the findings, comments and recommendations that document the basis for our recertification of the TMA. FHWA and FTA staff conducted a file review and held two on-site meetings with SRTC.

This letter certifies that SRTC’s actions substantially meet the applicable program and regulatory requirements of 23 CFR 450.

We congratulate you, your staff, the Policy Board, and Technical Transportation Committee, on your accomplishments of the past four years, continuing to build a robust and proactive planning process that will serve the Spokane region well into the future. Although the enclosed report includes specific recommendations for improvements, our impression of the area’s transportation planning process is positive.

We appreciate the time and assistance that your staff provided during this review. Please convey our thanks for their excellent support.
Please contact Sharleen Bakeman or Matt Kunic of the FHWA Washington Division Office (360) 753-9418/753-9487, or Ned Conroy of FTA Region 10 at (206) 220-4318, if you have any questions regarding this review or any follow up actions.

Sincerely,

Daniel M. Mathis
Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration

LINDA M GEHRKE
Digitally signed by
LINDA M GEHRKE
Date: 2020.01.09
13:11:00 -08'00'

Linda M. Gehrke
Regional Administrator
Federal Transit Administration

cc:
SRTC: Al French, Chair, SRTC Board of Directors
FTA: Ned Conroy, Region 10
FHWA: Sharleen Bakeman, Washington Division
      Matt Kunic, Washington Division
WSDOT: Kerri Woehler, Multimodal Planning Division
      Gabe Phillips, Tribal and Regional Coordination Planning Office
      Charlene Kay, Eastern Region
Transportation Planning Certification Review

Spokane Regional Transportation Council

January 2020
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**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) are required to review, evaluate, and certify—at least every four years—the transportation planning processes for each Transportation Management Area (TMA). This report focuses on the certification review conducted on the Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC).

This certification review determines whether the Spokane Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) meets the Federal requirements of Section 23 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 450 (23 CFR 450), Subpart C and 49 CFR 613 - Metropolitan Transportation Planning and Programming. The review may also suggest opportunities to enhance the quality of the planning process and ensure that Federal projects can advance without delay.

In addition, as a TMA designated as a “maintenance” area for certain air pollutants, the certification review must evaluate SRTC’s planning processes to ensure it meets the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA’s) air quality conformity requirements contained in 40 CFR 51—Requirements for Preparation, Adoption, and Submittal of Implementation Plans.

The TMA certification review process used by FHWA and FTA includes three parts:

1. conduct a desk review of key documents and materials that demonstrate compliance with Federal planning laws and guidance;
2. conduct a site visit and lead discussions with TMA staff to clarify and understand how the MPO approaches its obligations under 23 U.S.C. and 49 U.S.C.; and,
3. transmit the TMA Certification Review Report.

This report documents the major findings and recommendations of the review. These certification reviews can result in “corrective actions,” “recommendations,” or “comments.” Corrective actions describe conditions that lead to a failure to meet Federal planning regulations and maintain USDOT certification, and provide tasks for the TMA to undertake to rectify these conditions. Recommendations should be addressed to enhance existing processes and more fully comply with Federal planning requirements. Comments are opportunities for FHWA and FTA to provide observations or commendations for the work accomplished.

On August 28, 2019, FHWA and FTA conducted a work session with SRTC staff, and on October 22, 2019, the Federal team held an on-site review that included discussions with MPO staff, Spokane Transit Authority, state and local government staff, and MPO policy board members. In lieu of a formal public meeting, a 30-day public comment period was available, requesting comments from the public on SRTC’s planning process. The public comment period was open October 15 through November 15, 2019. See Appendix B for more details on the certification review process.

The Federal TMA certification review of SRTC resulted in no corrective actions for the TMA certification review, but contains recommendations and commendations.

*FHWA and FTA find SRTC to be compliant with all applicable Federal transportation planning requirements, and therefore, jointly certify the transportation planning process in the Spokane Transportation Management Area.*
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) review, evaluate, and certify—at least every four years—the transportation planning processes for each Transportation Management Area (TMA). This report focuses on the certification review conducted on the Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC).

This certification review determines whether the Spokane Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) meets the Federal requirements of Section 23 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 450 (23 CFR 450), Subpart C and 49 CFR 613 - Metropolitan Transportation Planning and Programming. The review may also suggest opportunities to enhance the quality of the planning process and ensure that Federal projects can advance without delay.

The previous SRTC Certification Review, completed in January 2016, resulted in no corrective actions, but did include recommendations and commendations. Appendix A summarizes the resolutions to the recommendations in the 2016 Certification Review. The current 2020 SRTC Certification Review also did not identify any corrective actions. The review did identify seven recommendations and four commendations. The table below provides a summary of the review.

### Summary of 2020 SRTC TMA Certification Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic #</th>
<th>Topic Area</th>
<th>Recommendations and Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Area Boundaries</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Transportation Planning Process</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unified Planning Work Program</td>
<td>The Federal Team recommends that SRTC provide citations, dates, or links to cross-reference documents in the UPWP's to reflect timelines, milestones, and deliverables, indicating the start and completion of projects or goals being met as applicable, rather than listing these efforts and associated expenditures of Federal dollars only as “ongoing” or “in process.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Performance-Based Planning and Programming/Transportation</td>
<td>The Federal Team commends SRTC for its proactive approach to transportation performance management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic #</td>
<td>Topic Area</td>
<td>Recommendations and Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Management</td>
<td>The Federal Team recommends that, as part of the next Horizon 2040 update, SRTC establish and reference regional targets for all respective performance measures, and include a narrative that describes how transportation investments and strategies in the MTP will support achievement of the regional performance targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transportation Plan Development</td>
<td>The Federal Team recommends that, as part of the next Horizon 2040 update, SRTC include an analysis for how transportation investments in the MTP will result in benefits and/or burdens to environmental justice populations. The Federal Team recommends that, as part of the update of Horizon 2040, the financial plan make clear where additional funding -- sources and amounts -- will come from, to support long-term operations, maintenance, and preservation of transportation investments. The financial plan should also clearly distinguish between current revenue sources of funds and new revenue sources that are assumed to support identified investments in the MTP. The Federal Team recommends that, as part of the update of Horizon 2040, SRTC include additional information on non-urban transit providers and unmet needs for public transit services connecting urban and rural areas as identified in the coordinated Human Service Public Transit Plan (HSTP) (adopted November 2018).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Congestion Management Process and Data Management</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Air Quality Conformity</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Public Participation and Outreach</td>
<td>The Federal Team commends SRTC for a robust series of approaches in public participation and outreach, including addressing barriers in working with LEP, EJ, Title VI, and ADA populations, and for documenting these processes well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic #</td>
<td>Topic Area</td>
<td>Recommendations and Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10     | Title VI, Environmental Justice, and Related Requirements | The Federal Team commends the SRTC Policy Board for its leadership in making improvements in the areas of Title VI, Environmental Justice, ADA, and related areas.  

The Federal Team recommends adding more Spanish options on the main SRTC web site to better reach the Spanish-speaking population.  

The Federal Team commends SRTC for making more significant efforts to reach out to its population of persons with disabilities, and in turn making efforts to determine how best to serve that population. |
| 11     | MPO Self-Certification                          | None                                                                                                                                                    |
1. Metropolitan Planning Area Boundaries

**Regulatory Basis**
The metropolitan planning area boundary (MPA) refers to the geographic area in which the metropolitan transportation planning process must be carried out. The MPA shall, at a minimum, cover the Census-defined, urbanized area (UZA) and the contiguous geographic area likely to become urbanized within the 20-year forecast period covered by the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Adjustments to the UZA because of the transportation planning process are typically referred to by FHWA as the urbanized area boundary (UAB). In accordance with 23 U.S.C. 134 (e), the boundary should foster an effective planning process that ensures connectivity between modes and promotes overall efficiency. The MPA boundary should include U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)-defined air quality nonattainment and/or maintenance areas, if applicable, in accordance with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for ozone or carbon monoxide.

**Findings**
SRTC will incorporate demographic data from the 2020 U.S. Census using Study Map and other GIS tools after the next MTP update, which is due in 2021.

The Data Applications for Transportation Analysis (D.A.T.A.) project beginning in early 2020, will inform GIS applications and more clearly illustrate demographic data to be used in project prioritization decisions.

SRTC has created new maps and included additional demographic data that is available in the revised Public Participation Plan.

**Corrective Actions**
None

**Recommendations and Comments**
None

2. Transportation Planning Process

**Regulatory Basis**
In urbanized areas with a population of 50,000 or more, Federal planning law (23 U.S.C. 134 and 49 U.S.C. 5303 and 23 CFR 450) calls upon local officials to cooperate with states and public transportation providers in undertaking a continuing, comprehensive, and cooperative (3C) multimodal transportation planning process.
In metropolitan areas, Federal planning law (23 U.S.C. 134 and 49 U.S.C. 5304) requires each MPO to cooperate with the state and local officials, to develop a long-range metropolitan transportation plan, transportation improvement program, and unified planning work program (UPWP). These planning and programming documents are developed through a 3C process carried out on a statewide basis, but coordinated with the metropolitan planning processes of the MPO. Funding is available from FHWA and FTA to support metropolitan transportation planning. Planning programs are jointly administered by FHWA and FTA.

**Findings**
SRTC completes required transportation planning activities, and ensures that all member jurisdictions are included in planning and project level decisions made by the SRTC policy board.

SRTC has established a strong leadership role and developed effective partnerships with member agencies. Its organizational structure supports a positive framework for conducting a continuing, comprehensive, and cooperative (3C) planning process.

The SRTC Policy Board supports strategic leadership for enhancing the role of the MPO using the Management Review Committee and Technical Advisory Committee to guide the direction of the MPO.

SRTC has made significant enhancements to its data management system by developing and maintaining appropriate data sets used in its regional GIS mapping system.

The collaborative planning activities completed by SRTC and explained in the UPWP contributes to the successful execution of the 3C planning process.

**Corrective Actions**
None

**Recommendations and Comments**
None

### 3. Unified Planning Work Program

**Regulatory Basis**
MPOs are required to develop Unified Planning Work Programs (UPWPs) in Transportation Management Areas (TMAs) to govern work programs for the expenditure of FHWA and FTA planning and research funds (23 CFR 450.308). The UPWP must be developed in cooperation with the State and public transit agencies and include the required elements, such as a discussion of planning priorities, work proposed for the next 1- or 2-year period by major activity and tasks in sufficient detail to indicate who will perform the work, the schedule for completing the work, the resulting products, the proposed funding by activity/task, and a summary of the total amounts and sources of Federal and matching funds.
Findings
SRTC staff prepares for their annual UPWP review, providing finance and project data and updates as appropriate, and engaging USDOT in conversations about plans. FHWA/FTA and SRTC use the UPWP meetings to discuss TMA certification-related topics, as well as other updates.

SRTC identifies Title VI, Environmental Justice (EJ), Section 504 and the Americans with Disabilities Act planning priorities and activities as part of its annual UPWP.

Documents prepared by SRTC are sometimes lacking in clear documentation, such as technical citations, dates for activities, meetings, past or planned deliverables or updates, etc.

Corrective Actions
None

Recommendations and Comments
The Federal Team recommends that SRTC provide citations, dates, or links to cross-reference documents in the UPWPs to reflect timelines, milestones, and deliverables, indicating the start and completion of projects or goals being met as applicable, rather than listing these efforts and associated expenditures of Federal dollars only as “ongoing” or “in process.”

4. Performance-Based Planning Process

Regulatory Basis
States and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) are required to take a performance-based approach to planning and programming. 23 USC 150 Performance-based planning and programming regulations establish requirements for metropolitan planning organizations to coordinate with the State DOT to set performance targets, and integrate those performance targets and performance plans into their planning documents by certain dates, per 23 CFR § 450.306. MPOs are also required to reference performance targets and performance based plans into their TIPs and Metropolitan Transportation Plans, per 23 CFR § 450.324 and 23 CFR § 450.326. The planning products must include a description of the performance measures and performance targets used in assessing the performance of the transportation system and should include, to the maximum extent practicable, a description of the anticipated effect toward achieving the performance targets identified in the metropolitan transportation plan and TIP, linking investment priorities to performance targets.

MPOs must initiate discussions with transit agencies, state DOTs and planning partners to update Metropolitan Planning Agreements, per 23 CFR § 450.314. This presents an opportunity for MPOs and planning partners to clarify roles and responsibilities for developing and sharing performance data, setting performance targets, reporting of targets, and tracking progress towards meeting targets, through a formal agreement.

Findings
SRTC has engaged its member jurisdictions and policy board effectively, and worked closely with the state to ensure that active collaboration and coordination related to performance measures occur.

Horizon 2040 includes references to Federal performance-based planning requirements and outlines regional targets established at the time of plan adoption. Deadlines for regional targets for transit asset management (June 2017) and transit safety (January 2021) have since been established.

WSDOT uses a tiered approach in collaborating with MPOs – a framework group, working group, and technical teams (for each performance measure). This information is also available on the WSDOT performance measures website. SRTC is an active participant in these meetings, and often pushes the state to deliver on deadlines and consider MPO challenges when going through the target-setting process for each performance measure.

**Corrective Actions**
None

**Recommendations and Comments**
The Federal Team commends SRTC for its proactive approach to transportation performance management.

The Federal Team recommends that, as part of the next Horizon 2040 update, SRTC establish and reference regional targets for all respective performance measures, and include a narrative that describes how transportation investments and strategies in the MTP will support achievement of the regional performance targets.

5. Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Development

**Regulatory Basis**
In accordance with 23 CFR 450.322 (a) “The metropolitan transportation planning process shall include the development of a transportation plan addressing no less than a 20-year planning horizon…the transportation plan shall include both long-range and short-range strategies/actions that lead to the development of a multi-modal transportation system to facilitate the safe and efficient movement of people and goods in addressing current and future transportation demand.”

**Findings**
Online documents such as the MTP, while generally thorough, lacked some citations, links to support material, important dates (e.g., using “recently” instead of the date of a previous update), potentially jeopardizing the ability to explain, track, or defend decisions made in these documents.

Horizon 2040 (adopted December 2017) includes references to barriers to low-income, minority and transportation disadvantaged populations and discusses SRTC Title VI plan/ ADA policy. The ability to better analyze how transportation investments will result in benefits and/or burdens to environmental justice populations is anticipated to be one of many uses of the D.A.T.A. project scheduled to begin in early 2020.
The coordinated Human Service Public Transit Plan (HSTP), adopted November 2018, includes useful information on non-urban transit providers and identifies numerous unmet needs for public transit services connecting urban and rural areas.

The Horizon 2040 (2017 edition) stated that there is a lack of adequate funding for operations, maintenance, and preservation. Specifically, the plan states that existing funding levels are inadequate and references the need for “additional local options that will be required” for roadway maintenance and that “some public transit providers are unable to fund needed services”. The financial plan does not clearly identify the new revenue sources that are needed to support these potential unmet needs.

Horizon 2040 includes demographics of typically underserved populations, such as minority populations, persons at or below the poverty level, elderly persons with disabilities, zero-car households, and persons with limited English proficiency.

**Corrective Actions**
None

**Recommendations and Comments**
The Federal Team recommends that, as part of the next Horizon 2040 update, SRTC include an analysis for how transportation investments in the MTP will result in benefits and/or burdens to environmental justice populations.

The Federal Team recommends that, as part of the update of Horizon 2040, the financial plan make clear where additional funding -- sources and amounts -- will come from, to support long-term operations, maintenance, and preservation of transportation investments. The financial plan should also clearly distinguish between current revenue sources of funds and new revenue sources that are assumed to support identified investments in the MTP.

The Federal Team recommends that, as part of the update of Horizon 2040, SRTC include additional information on non-urban transit providers and unmet needs for public transit services connecting urban and rural areas as identified in the coordinated Human Service Public Transit Plan (HSTP) (adopted November 2018).

### 6. Congestion Management Process (CMP) and Data Management

**Regulatory Basis**
A congestion management process (CMP) applies to transportation management areas (TMAs) and is a systematic approach for managing congestion through a process that “provides for safe and effective integrated management and operation of the multimodal transportation system, based on a cooperatively developed and implemented metropolitan-wide strategy, of new and existing transportation facilities eligible for funding under title 23 U.S.C., and title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 through the use of travel demand reduction and operational management strategies.” (23 CFR 450.320(a))

**Findings**
The Data Applications for Transportation Analysis (D.A.T.A.) project, a $1.2 million project that SRTC is beginning in early 2020, is anticipated to aid in collecting and using data more efficiently toward products such as the TIP, MTP, CMP, project prioritize and selection.

SRTC has developed a CMP appropriate to the needs of the region, including the development of the CMP Toolkit, CMP/TIP Compliance Process, Roadway Capacity Justification Report, and CMP Journal that provides for innovative and effective implementation of the CMP.

**Corrective Actions**
None

**Recommendations and Comments**
None

## 7. Air Quality Conformity

**Regulatory Basis**
For MPOs classified by EPA as areas of air quality nonattainment or maintenance, special requirements apply to the metropolitan planning process. Section 176 (c)(1) of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (CAAA) states: “No metropolitan planning organization designated under Section 134 of title 23, United States Code, shall give its approval to any project, program, or plan which does not conform to an implementation plan approved or promulgated under section 110.” The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) includes provisions in response to the CAAA mandates.

Section 176(c)(1) of the Clean Air Act (CAA) Amendments of 1990 states: “No metropolitan planning organization designated under section 134 of title 23, United States Code, shall give its approval to any project, program, or plan which does not conform to an implementation plan approved or promulgated under section 110.” Provisions governing air-quality-related transportation planning are incorporated in several metropolitan planning regulations, including: 23 CFR 450.314, 23 CFR 450.322, 23 CFR 450.320, 23 CFR 450.324, 23 CFR 450.326, and 23 CFR 450.334.

**Findings**
SRTC complies with air quality conformity requirements, and participates fully in the air quality conformity analysis and review each year, in keeping with its status as a “maintenance” area for carbon monoxide (CO) and particulate matter of 10 micrometers in diameter or less (PM10).

SRTC’s Air Quality Interagency Consultation MOU is reviewed regularly by SRTC and WA Department of Ecology to ensure that current interagency relationships are reflected.

**Corrective Actions**
None

**Recommendations and Comments**
8. Transportation Improvement Program

**Regulatory Basis**
23 CFR 450.324 requires the MPO to develop a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) in cooperation with state and public transit operators. Specific requirements and conditions, as specified in the regulations, include, but are not limited to:

- An updated TIP, covering a period of at least four years, that is compatible with the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) development and approval process [23 CFR 450.324 (a)];
- The TIP should identify all eligible Transportation Control Measures (TCMs) included in the State Implementation Plan (SIP), and give priority to eligible TCM’s and projects included for the first two years which have funds available and committed; [23 CFR 450.324 (i)];
- The TIP should include capital and non-capital surface transportation projects, bicycle and pedestrian facilities and other transportation enhancements; Federal Lands Highway projects; and safety projects included in the State’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan. The TIP and STIP must include all regionally significant projects for which an FHWA or the FTA approval is required whether the projects are to be funded with Title 23 or Title 49 funds. In addition, all Federally and non-Federally funded, regionally significant projects must be included in the TIP and STIP and consistent with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) for information purposes and air quality analysis in nonattainment and maintenance areas; [23 CFR 450.324 (c)(d)]

**Findings**
SRTC programs projects in accordance with transportation performance management.

SRTC demonstrates that the TIP projects are fully funded by phases, and meets fiscal constraint requirements in programming projects that have funds that are reasonably expected to be available.

SRTC has developed clear guidance for MPO member agencies and other stakeholders through the development of the Horizon 2040 MTP Toolkit and the TIP Guidebook.

SRTC includes a notice of its Section 504/ADA nondiscrimination commitment (i.e., ADA Non-discrimination Statement) and the Title VI Nondiscrimination Statement in the TIP document.

**Corrective Actions**
None

**Recommendations and Comments**
None
9. Public Participation

**Regulatory Basis**
The MPO is required, under 23 CFR 450.316, to engage in a metropolitan planning process that creates opportunities for public involvement, participation and consultation throughout the development of the MTP and the TIP and is also included in 23 CFR 450.322 (f) (7) and (g) (1) (2), (i) and 23 CFR 450.324 (b). The MPO is also required to ensure that its public participation process is inclusive and nondiscriminatory under Title VI (49 CFR 20.5), Section 504 (49 CFR 27.7) and the ADA (28 CFR 35.130).

**Findings**
SRTC has added substantially to its tools to expand its outreach to marginalized populations, captured in SRTC’s 2018 Title VI Plan (which also compiles approaches to work with its ADA, LEP, and other communities).

The broader outreach for public participation is captured well in the Public Participation Plan (PPP) adopted December 2017. The PPP identifies outreach barriers, as well as a clear reference to the sections that describe how SRTC addresses these barriers. SRTC outlines its PPP principles and the procedures it uses to implement these principles. See resources in Appendix C.

SRTC demonstrates outreach to all populations, conducts multi-stage analyses to determine results of outreach, assures enhanced public participation, and has developed and evaluated the use of various outreach efforts.

SRTC determines appropriate meeting locations according to accessibility, EJ, Title VI and ADA requirements, and offer translation services.

SRTC provides a link on its website in other languages (as appropriate) that directs individuals to contact SRTC staff to request translation of meetings/materials, to more effectively reach persons who are limited in English proficiency.

SRTC has enhanced their efforts to fully implement the public outreach efforts identified in the PPP. SRTC has established personal contacts with organizations serving the needs of the traditionally underserved populations, translating brochures/flyers and posting at locations where LEP populations reside, and evaluating the effectiveness of outreach efforts and modifying as needed.

**Corrective Actions**
None

**Recommendations and Comments**
The Federal Team commends SRTC for a robust series of approaches in public participation and outreach, including addressing barriers in working with LEP, EJ, Title VI, and ADA populations, and for documenting these processes well.
The Federal Team recommends that SRTC document and evaluate all interactions with tribal governments as part of the effort to grow and continue to improve their tribal consultation program.

10. Title VI, Environmental Justice, and Related Requirements

**Regulatory Basis**
USDOT ensures nondiscrimination under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (and other nondiscrimination statutes). Title VI states “no person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.” Title VI bars intentional discrimination as well as disparate-impact discrimination (that stemming from neutral policy or practice that has the effect of a disparate impact on protected groups).

Planning regulations [23 CFR 450.334(a)(3)] require FHWA and FTA to certify that “the planning process . . . is being conducted in accordance with all applicable requirements of . . . Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Title VI assurance executed by each State under 23 U.S.C. 324 and 29 U.S.C. 794.” The Title VI assurance adds sex (gender) and disability to characteristics protected against discrimination.

The Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Executive Order 13166 ensures that, consistent with Title VI, persons with LEP have meaningful access to Federally conducted and funded programs and activities. The Order requires all agencies that provide Federal financial assistance to issue guidance on how Title VI applies to recipients of that assistance in their contact with persons who have LEP.

Title VI Executive Order 12898 (1994), provides that “each Federal agency shall make achieving Environmental Justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high or adverse human health and environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income population ...”. In compliance with this Executive Order, the USDOT Order on Environmental Justice was issued in 1997. Planning regulations (23 CFR 450.316(a)(1)(vii)) require that the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems, such as low-income and minority households that may face challenges accessing employment and other services, be sought out and considered.

**Findings**
SRTC provided examples of past, current, and planned changes to more fully meet the requirements of regulations related to LEP, EJ, Title VI, ADA populations. Title VI is posted in SRTC documents, and SRTC has put into action new LEP outreach efforts, including reaching new communities. SRTC is working with its local agencies on continued ADA compliance requirements.

SRTC has developed clear documentation for stakeholders to understand its approach to engage and provide opportunities for public input.
SRTC has provided limited Spanish instruction to users of its web pages concerning how to obtain information (and therefore more knowledge about the planning process) in Spanish. The Hispanic population currently must dial the main number and ask for a Spanish-speaking person.

SRTC’s approach to comply with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act includes funding several locally submitted ADA accessibility projects.

Appendices A and E of USDOT’s Title VI Assurances have been incorporated in all agreements and contracts developed by SRTC.

SRTC considers the condition of the region’s pedestrian access routes in conjunction with the mobility needs of persons with disabilities as part of Horizon 2040, and is documented in a Pedestrian Inventory.

SRTC reviews its planning processes and activities periodically (MTP, TIP, public participation, etc.) to ensure that they address Title VI effectively (and other nondiscrimination requirements).

**Corrective Actions**
None

**Recommendations and Comments**
The Federal Team commends the SRTC Policy Board for its leadership in making improvements in the areas of Title VI, Environmental Justice, ADA, and related areas.

The Federal Team recommends adding more Spanish options on the main SRTC web site to better reach the Spanish-speaking population.

The Federal Team commends SRTC for making more significant efforts to reach out to its population of persons with disabilities, and in turn making efforts to determine how best to serve that population.

**11. MPO Self-Certification**

**Regulatory Basis**
Self-certification of the metropolitan planning process, at least once every four years, is required under 23 CFR 450.334. The State and the MPO shall certify to FHWA and FTA that the planning process is addressing the major issues facing the area and is conducted in accordance with all applicable requirements of 23 CFR 450.300 and:

- 23 U.S.C. 134 and 49 U.S.C. 5303 and Sections 174 and 176(c) and (d) of the Clean Air Act (if applicable)
- Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Title VI assurance executed by each State
- 49 U.S.C. 5332, prohibiting discrimination based on race, color, creed, national origin, sex, or age in employment or business opportunity
• Section 1101(b) of SAFETEA-LU and 49 CFR Part 26, regarding involvement of DBE in U.S. DOT-funded planning projects
• 23 CFR Part 230, regarding the implementation of an equal employment opportunity program on Federal and Federal-aid highway construction contracts
• ADA and U.S. DOT regulations governing transportation for people with disabilities [49 CFR Parts 27, 37, and 38]
• Older Americans Act as amended, prohibiting discrimination based on age
• 23 USC 324, regarding the prohibition of discrimination based on gender
• Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and 49 CFR 27, regarding discrimination against individuals with disabilities
• All other applicable provisions of Federal law (e.g., while no longer specifically noted in a self-certification, prohibition of use of Federal funds for “lobbying” still applies and should be covered in all grant agreement documents (see 23 CFR 630.112).
• A certification review by FTA and FHWA of the planning process in TMAs is required at least once every four years, in addition to the required annual self-certification by the MPO and State.

Findings
SRTC adequately certifies that all Federal regulations and requirements are being followed with the annual submittal of the four-year TIP. SRTC submits the self-certification on schedule each year.

SRTC adheres to Federal regulations and requirements to develop the TIP, and is on schedule with this required self-certification of the transportation planning process.

Corrective Actions
None

Recommendations and Comments
None

Appendix A

SUMMARY OF RESOLUTIONS TO 2016 SRTC TMA CERTIFICATION REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Area</th>
<th>Recommendations / Comments</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure of Study Area</td>
<td>FHWA and FTA recognize that SRTC has established a strong leadership role and developed effective partnerships with member agencies. Its or-</td>
<td>No resolution required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic Area</td>
<td>Recommendations / Comments</td>
<td>Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational structure supports a positive framework for conducting a continuing, comprehensive, and cooperative (3C) planning process.</td>
<td>No resolution required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA and FTA recognize the Policy Board for its strategic leadership and for enhancing the role of the MPO using the Management Review Committee and Technical Advisory Committee to guide the direction of the MPO.</td>
<td>No resolution required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA and FTA recognize that SRTC has enhanced their leadership structure by establishing Board member training related to the decision making necessary for regional transportation planning.</td>
<td>No resolution required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreements and Contracts</td>
<td>The MOA among SRTC, WSDOT and STA is recognized as the pilot for an update of all MPO MOAs in the State of Washington. FHWA and FTA recognizes SRTC’s leadership role in this process.</td>
<td>No resolution required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A and E of USDOT’s Title VI Assurances should be incorporated verbatim in all agreements/contracts developed by SRTC.</td>
<td>SRTC has incorporated this language.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified Planning Work Program</td>
<td>FHWA and FTA recommend that SRTC specifically identify major Title VI, Environmental Justice (EJ), Section 504 and the Americans with Disabilities Act planning priorities and activities as part of its annual UPWP.</td>
<td>SRTC has added the necessary language to documents, with numerous initiatives in place and more in process to address these issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Planning Process</td>
<td>FHWA and FTA recognize SRTC for developing clear guidance to MPO member agencies and other stakeholders through the development of the Horizon 2040 MTP Toolkit and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Guidebook.</td>
<td>No resolution required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transportation Plan Development</td>
<td>Consistent with Title VI requirements, SRTC must include a notice of its Title VI and Americans with Disabilities nondiscrimination in their documents.</td>
<td>SRTC incorporates the use of the required language for Title VI and ADA nondiscrimination in their documents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Area</th>
<th>Recommendations / Comments</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Act (ADA)</td>
<td>FHWA and FTA recommend that the next update to Horizon 2040 should include more detailed demographics of typically underserved populations, persons at or below the poverty level, elderly persons with disabilities, zero-car households, and persons with limited English proficiency.</td>
<td>SRTC has developed detailed demographic data GIS and tabular formats. They will update Horizon 2040 in 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FHWA and FTA recommend that the next update to Horizon 2040 include an Environmental Justice analysis that clearly identifies the benefits and burdens on EJ populations because of plan implementation.</td>
<td>This information has been provided in the Horizon 2040 update. SRTC has mapped this information; it’s provided on the SRTC web page.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FHWA and FTA recommend that SRTC more specifically consider the condition of the region’s pedestrian access routes in conjunction with the mobility needs of persons with disabilities when updating Horizon 2040.</td>
<td>The Pedestrian Inventory includes the data collection toward this effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FHWA and FTA recognize that SRTC has made significant enhancements to its data management system by developing and maintaining appropriate data sets used in its regional GIS mapping system.</td>
<td>No resolution required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>FHWA and FTA recommend that an update of SRTC's Air Quality Interagency Consultation MOU be considered to better reflect current interagency relationships, as well as the Federal emphasis on streamlining environmental processes.</td>
<td>SRTC conferred with WA Department of Ecology; they agreed the MOU is appropriate as is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIP and Project Selection</td>
<td>FHWA and FTA recommend that SRTC include a notice of its Section 504/ADA nondiscrimination commitment (i.e., ADA Nondiscrimination Statement) on the same page as the Title VI Nondiscrimination Statement.</td>
<td>This effort has been completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic Area</td>
<td>Recommendations / Comments</td>
<td>Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTC Certification Review</td>
<td>FHWA and FTA recommend that the next TIP include an analysis of Environmental Justice populations that documents how these populations are considered in project selection and the relative impact of planned TIP projects and programs.</td>
<td>SRTC demonstrates outreach to populations, including tribes, conducts multi-stage analyses to determine results of outreach, assures enhanced public participation, and has developed and evaluated the use of ArcGIS-based maps to understand locations of populations in terms of ethnic minority, national origin, LEP, economic levels, older and younger populations, including disability and veterans where available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FHWA and FTA recommend that SRTC enhance its outreach efforts to persons who are limited in English proficiency (LEP) by providing a link on the SRTC website that directs individuals to contact SRTC staff to request translation.</td>
<td>SRTC determines appropriate meeting locations according to accessibility, EJ, Title VI and ADA requirements, and offer translation services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FHWA and FTA recommend that the TIP Program Summary for pedestrian projects clearly identify the projects that specifically address ADA accessibility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Participation</td>
<td>FHWA and FTA recognize the substantial effort by SRTC to update its Public Participation Plan (PPP) in 2013.</td>
<td>No resolution required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FHWA and FTA recommend that SRTC provide a link on its website in other languages (as appropriate) that directs individuals to contact SRTC staff to request translation of meetings/materials, to more effectively reach persons who are limited in English proficiency.</td>
<td>The last page of this 2020 TMA Certification Review report offers a list of examples where SRTC’s outreach includes those of limited English proficiency among others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FHWA and FTA recommend that SRTC enhance their efforts to fully implement the public outreach efforts identified in the PPP. Specifically, more personal contacts with organizations serving the needs of the traditionally underserved populations, translating brochures/flyers and posting at locations where LEP populations reside, and evaluating the effectiveness of outreach efforts and modifying as needed.</td>
<td>SRTC has enhanced its public outreach efforts over the last four years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic Area</td>
<td>Recommendations / Comments</td>
<td>Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Certification</td>
<td>FHWA and FTA recommend that SRTC can confirm, through documentation, that its method of communication is effective and reaches traditionally underserved populations. SRTC engage, document, and reflect needs of traditionally underserved populations.</td>
<td>SRTC engage, document, and reflect needs of traditionally underserved populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FHWA and FTA recognize SRTC innovative approach to comply with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act, by funding several locally submitted ADA accessibility projects.</td>
<td>No resolution required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FHWA recommends SRTC work with its local jurisdictions to identify/inventory accessibility barriers associated with the Region’s pedestrian access routes, and develop strategies/projects to address those features found to be inaccessible. SRTC (and with its partner STA and others) has put into place efforts to develop strategies and gauge the value and focus of projects toward the goal of removing accessibility barriers.</td>
<td>No resolution required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title VI and Related Requirements</td>
<td>SRTC should work with WSDOT to develop a firm schedule for submitting the Title VI Annual Report.</td>
<td>SRTC provides an annual Title VI report to WSDOT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FHWA and FTA recommend that SRTC periodically review all its planning processes/activities (MTP, TIP, public participation, etc.) to ensure that they effectively address Title VI (and other nondiscrimination requirements).</td>
<td>SRTC provides update, information and presentations on its current planning processes and activities (MTP, TIP, public participation, etc.) annually during annual UPWP reviews, and will continue to do so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Management Process</td>
<td>FHWA and FTA recognize SRTC’s efforts toward developing a well-designed CMP appropriate to the needs of the region, including SRTC’s development of the CMP Toolkit, CMP/Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Compliance Process, Roadway Capacity Justification Report, and CMP Journal that provides for innovative and effective implementation of the CMP.</td>
<td>No resolution required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FHWA and FTA recommend that SRTC continue to expand their performance monitoring efforts beyond congestion management so that they will</td>
<td>Horizon 2040 addresses initial performance-based planning requirements; the TIP is developed following a performance-measures-based approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic Area</td>
<td>Recommendations / Comments</td>
<td>Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be in a good position to address Federal requirements on performance-based planning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

SRTC 2020 TMA Certification Review Timeline

August 28, 2019: Pre-TMA Certification Review Work Session

October 22, 2019: TMA Certification Review Meeting

Both meetings held at:
Spokane Regional Transportation Council Office
421 West Riverside Ave., Suite 500, Spokane, WA

Both meetings had phone-in capability available.

October 22, 2019 Meeting Attendee List:

- Ned Conroy, Federal Transit Administration (FTA)
- Sharleen Bakeman, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
- Matt Kunic, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
- Sabrina Minshall, Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC)
- Charlene Kay, Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) Eastern Region
- Anna Ragaza-Bourassa, WSDOT Eastern Region
- Susan Meyer, Spokane Transit Agency (STA)
- Mike Tresidder, Spokane Transit Agency (STA)
- Mayor Steve Peterson, Liberty Lake, WA
- Gordon Howell, Spokane Transit Agency (STA)
- Karl Otterstrom, Spokane Transit Agency (STA)
- Gabriel Phillips, WSDOT Headquarters
- Patrick Pittenger, Benton-Franklin Council of Governments (BFCG) - Observer

In lieu of holding a formal public meeting, SRTC placed the following notice on its web page on behalf of USDOT.

*(Posted October 15-November 15, 2019)*

*The Department of Transportation (USDOT) is required by Federal law to review and evaluate the transportation planning processes of Transportation Management Areas (TMAs) every four years. Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) is the Federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Spokane area, and is also designated as a TMA.*

*USDOT is soliciting public feedback on SRTC’s work in transportation. Examples may include the areas below or any area of specific interest to you: Working with SRTC’s member agencies / Transportation Data / Transportation Planning / Travel forecasting / Traffic Management / Transportation improvement programs / Pedestrian, bicycle and transit.*
More information about SRTC’s work is available on SRTC’s web pages in the headings at the top of this page. The public comment period is open from October 15 to November 15.

Comments may be submitted by any of the following methods:

Email: contact.srtc@srtc.org  
Phone: (509)343-6370  
Mail: SRTC, 421 W. Riverside Ave., Suite 500, Spokane, WA 99201

Comments can also be sent to:

Sharleen Bakeman
FHWA Washington Division  
711 Capitol Way South, Suite 501  
Olympia, WA 98501

Or email to: Sharleen.Bakeman@dot.gov

Ned Conroy  
Region 10 Office  
Federal Transit Administration  
915 Second Avenue, Suite 3142

Or email to: Ned.Conroy@dot.gov

(The page, under the “News” header, also links to “Title VI, Environmental Justice, ADA and Accessibility” and “Snow Removal Information” pages.)

No comments were received from the public regarding this review.
Appendix C

Public Participation and Outreach Resources

Below are examples provided by SRTC that illustrated their outreach in the context of ADA, Title VI, environmental justice, minority and low-income populations, etc. Links to these examples are provided below.

- Horizon 2040 has a Title VI Statement – https://www.srtc.org/horizon-2040/
- Title VI information is on page 5 of the Public Participation Plan -- https://www.srtc.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/PPP-11-7-17-FINAL.pdf
- Title VI, Environmental Justice, and ADA page: https://www.srtc.org/about-srtc/title-vi-ej-ada/
Spokane County Complete Count Committee

Update to SRTC
Alex Panagotacos
2-6-20

The following is a brief overview highlighting key elements of Census work to date:

- Collaborate with Census Bureau partnership representatives to ensure accuracy and consistency
- Support local and grassroots organizations doing trusted messenger work
- Messaging Marketing Plan finalized
- Provided public forum in Spokane Valley, featuring Sen. Mike Padden
- Public forum in Spokane 2-6-20 recorded and live streamed by KSPS
- Upcoming public forums tentatively planned for March in Airway Heights and Deer Park
- Expanded spokanecensus.org to include an assistance tab which will provide local support locations
- Created social media pages: facebook.com/spokanecensus2020 and Instagram.com/spokanecensus
- Recruitment of community partners to leverage messaging with their constituents:
  - Medical: CHAS, Providence, MultiCare
  - All post-secondary institutions (SFCC, Gonzaga, Whitworth, WSU, EWU)
  - Empire Health
  - 211
- Design of custom, local marketing campaigns:
  - Billboards
  - Poster expansion to include Russian, Ukrainian, Marshallese and Native American
  - Local photography to enhance impact
  - PSA’s on KSPS, Community Minded Enterprises, and KYRS
- Provided 75+ presentations to community stakeholders and general public
- Aligned State Office of Financial Management funding to support outreach efforts in Spokane County.

Learn more: www.spokanecensus.org
### Spokane County Complete Count Committee

**Innovia Foundation**

**Census 2020 Budget**

**As of February 10, 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>As of 10/10/2019</th>
<th>As of 2/10/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salary/Wage</strong></td>
<td>$54,900</td>
<td>$10,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Payroll Taxes</strong></td>
<td>$4,667</td>
<td>$878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$59,567</td>
<td>$11,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medical</strong></td>
<td>$8,450</td>
<td>$1,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>403(b)</strong></td>
<td>$5,130</td>
<td>$442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
<td>$1,050</td>
<td>$225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cell Phone</strong></td>
<td>$1,050</td>
<td>$225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>$28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$15,790</td>
<td>$2,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Payroll Fees</strong></td>
<td>$168</td>
<td>$48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment</strong></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$1,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mileage</strong></td>
<td>$4,200</td>
<td>$29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$6,368</td>
<td>$1,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$121,725</td>
<td>$16,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contributions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City/County</strong></td>
<td>$61,199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Agencies</strong></td>
<td>38,801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovia Foundation</strong></td>
<td>21,725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$121,725</strong></td>
<td><strong>$73,705</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Amounts for general office overhead and program support not included in this figure (i.e. Office rent, supplies and other Innovia staff time to support effort).*

Learn more: [www.spokanecensus.org](http://www.spokanecensus.org)
To: SRTC Board of Directors
From: Sabrina Minshall, AICP, Executive Director

Top: Electrification and Transportation

Requested Action:
For information and discussion.

Key Points:
• Rendall Farley, Avista Manager of Electric Transportation, will be presenting key insights from Avista’s recently completed EV Pilot which ran for three years, installing several hundred EV chargers in customer homes and businesses in the region.
• Based on this experience and lessons learned, this sets the stage for a comprehensive Transportation Electrification Plan (“TE Plan”), which Avista hopes to gain support for and launch new programs in 2020, in its service territories of eastern Washington and northern Idaho.
• The TE Plan aims to benefit all customers and communities in the region, for the long term. Broad stakeholder engagement, support and partnerships with groups including the SRTC will be critical to success.

More Information:
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)
   - Steve Peterson, Mayor, City of Liberty Lake (Vice-Chair)
   - Paul Schmidt, Council Member, City of Cheney
   - Matt Ewers, Rail Freight Representative
   - Josh Kerns, Spokane County Commissioner
   - David Condon, Mayor, City of Spokane
   - Larry Stone, Major Employer Representative
   - Larry Krauter, Spokane Airports
   - Brian Shutt, Kootenai County Commissioner
   - starts to read the names of those requesting excused absences

   **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

   **Board Alternates Present**
   - Larry Larson, WSDOT-Eastern Region

   **Guests Present:**
   - Katherine Miller, City of Spokane
   - Micki Harnois, Council Member, Town of Rockford
   - Adam Jackson, City of Spokane Valley
   - Char Kay, WSDOT-Eastern Region
   - Alex Pantagotacos, Census 2020 Spokane Complete Count Committee
   - Paul Kropp
   - Shelly O’Quinn, Innovia
   - Anna Ragaza-Bourassa, WSDOT-Eastern Region
   - Nina Stocker, WSDOT-Eastern Region

   **SRTC Staff Present:**
   - Sabrina Minshall, Executive Director
   - Mike Ulrich, Senior Transportation Planner
   - Ryan Stewart, Senior Transportation Planner
   - David Fletcher, Assoc. Transportation Planner
   - Julie Meyers-Lehman, Administrative Assistant
   - Eve Nelson, Senior Transportation Planner
   - Jason Lien, Senior Transportation Planner
   - Shauna Harshman, Assoc. Transportation Planner
   - Michael Redlinger, Assoc. Transportation Planner II
   - 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 Innovia 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.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recap for November 2019:</th>
<th>Vouchers: V121096-V121113</th>
<th>52,169.47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salaries/Benefits Warrant Nos. 538762-538772 &amp; 541078-541088</td>
<td>69,870.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interfund, other expenses, and reimbursements processed directly by the City of Spokane</td>
<td>265.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>122,304.61</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 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 its 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:
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 Governor's office; 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 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
## Vouchers Paid for the Month of December 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Voucher</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/18/19</td>
<td>V121115</td>
<td>American Planning Association</td>
<td>APA/AICP annual dues for JL for 1/1/20-1/31/20</td>
<td>575.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121116</td>
<td>OKARC Inc</td>
<td>Service two (2) SRTC fire extinguishers</td>
<td>217.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121117</td>
<td>Rehn &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Staff Payroll Deduction Health Ins Contributions: Pay Period 2019-24</td>
<td>420.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121118</td>
<td>Rehn &amp; Associates</td>
<td>H.S.A. Dep for MR</td>
<td>125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/26/19</td>
<td>V121119</td>
<td>Diamond Plaza LLC</td>
<td>Paulsen Center Suite 500/504 Rent for December 2019</td>
<td>6,468.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121220</td>
<td>Washington Trust Bank</td>
<td>Office splys; staff regst; Edu Series materials; Transp for trngs/conf; Conf Calls</td>
<td>4,462.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121221</td>
<td>AWC Employee Benefit Trust</td>
<td>SRTC Staff additional Life Insurance Premiums from payroll deductions - Nov '19</td>
<td>186.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121222</td>
<td>Rehn &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Staff Payroll Deduction Health Ins Contributions: Pay Period 2019-26</td>
<td>420.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121223</td>
<td>Verizon Wireless</td>
<td>IT Svcs; Wireless Svcs E.D. Phone &amp; Public Outreach Tablets, 11/24/19-12/23/19</td>
<td>87.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121224</td>
<td>Julie Meyers-Lehman</td>
<td>JML mileage reimburse for 8/20/19 to 11/1/19</td>
<td>43.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121225</td>
<td>WA State Dept of Retirement</td>
<td>Employee and Employer Contributions: November 2019</td>
<td>13,876.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/19</td>
<td>V121226</td>
<td>Intronium</td>
<td>Workstation setup fee</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121227</td>
<td>Parametricx</td>
<td>North Division Corridor Study</td>
<td>628.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121228</td>
<td>Spokesman Review</td>
<td>Public Notices: January 2020 TIP amendment</td>
<td>72.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121229</td>
<td>Rehn &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Admin fee November '19</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121330</td>
<td>Visionary Communications, Inc.</td>
<td>Fiber Services, December 2019</td>
<td>984.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121331</td>
<td>Intronium</td>
<td>Managed IT Services - December 2019</td>
<td>1,920.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121332</td>
<td>AWC Employee Benefit Trust</td>
<td>January '20 Benefit Insurance Premiums</td>
<td>11,118.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/10/19</td>
<td>V121333</td>
<td>Pacific Office Automation</td>
<td>Copier lease October 2019 - copy charges</td>
<td>65.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121334</td>
<td>Spokane County Treasurer</td>
<td>ESRI Software Support - October 2019</td>
<td>763.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121335</td>
<td>NewEgg Business Inc</td>
<td>MS Surface Pro 7 - 12.3&quot; touchscreen for SM</td>
<td>1,314.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121336</td>
<td>NewEgg Business Inc</td>
<td>MS Surface Pro 7 accessories - dock, pen, converter</td>
<td>427.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121337</td>
<td>Rehn &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Staff Payroll Deduction Health Ins Contributions: Pay Period 2019-26</td>
<td>450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121338</td>
<td>Pacific Office Automation</td>
<td>Copier usage October 2019</td>
<td>142.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121339</td>
<td>NewEgg Business Inc</td>
<td>Surface Pro 7 Case and Screen protector</td>
<td>45.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121340</td>
<td>Integra</td>
<td>Telephone: Lines to 12/7/19 and Long Distance for October 2019</td>
<td>515.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121341</td>
<td>Witherspoon Kelley Attnys</td>
<td>Legal Services for November 2019 - Admin</td>
<td>1,198.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121342</td>
<td>Intronium</td>
<td>Windows Pro 10 Software for MS Surface Pro 7</td>
<td>216.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121343</td>
<td>Jason Lien</td>
<td>JL Mileage reimburse for 10/10-12/11/19</td>
<td>17.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121344</td>
<td>Intronium</td>
<td>Set up fee for new MS Surface Pro 7</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/18/19</td>
<td>V121345</td>
<td>NewEgg Business Inc</td>
<td>ZOTAC video card for MR desktop upgrade</td>
<td>217.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121346</td>
<td>Associated Industries</td>
<td>Compensation Project</td>
<td>10,125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121347</td>
<td>ATRI</td>
<td>8 weeks GPS data for Spokane Region truck travel time patterns</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121348</td>
<td>Intronium</td>
<td>Work on Server for SQL server install</td>
<td>1,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121349</td>
<td>Rehn &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Staff Payroll Deduction Health Ins Contributions: Pay Period 2020-01</td>
<td>570.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/23/19</td>
<td>V121350</td>
<td>Dell</td>
<td>Precision 7540 Laptop for DF workstation</td>
<td>3,436.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121351</td>
<td>Diamond Plaza LLC</td>
<td>Paulsen Center Suite 500/504 Rent for January 2020</td>
<td>7,501.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121352</td>
<td>AWC Employee Benefit Trust</td>
<td>2020 AWC Benefit Trust Annual Assessment Fee</td>
<td>1,023.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121353</td>
<td>AWC Employee Benefit Trust</td>
<td>SRTC Staff additional Life Insurance Premiums from payroll deductions - Jan '19</td>
<td>130.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/30/19</td>
<td>V121354</td>
<td>Vision MS</td>
<td>Financial &amp; Payroll Software &amp; Install/Tmg</td>
<td>12,222.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Recap for December 2019:

- **Vouchers:** V121115-V121154
- **Salaries/Benefits Warrant Nos.:** 54373-543383 & 545658-545667
- **Interfund, other expenses, and reimbursements processed directly by the City of Spokane:**

### Spokane, City of - Salaries/Benefits Pay Periods Ending: 11/30 and 12/14/19
- $70,215.45

### Spokane, City of - MIS MIS charges for November/December 2019
- $530.00

### Total December 2019
- $174,859.26

As of 2/13/20, the Spokane Regional Transportation Council Board of Directors approves the payment of the DECEMBER 2019 vouchers included in the list in the amount of:
- **$174,859.26**
### Vouchers Paid for the Month of January 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Voucher</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/2/20</td>
<td>V121155</td>
<td>Verizon Wireless</td>
<td>IT Svcs: Wireless Svcs E.D. Phone &amp; Public Outreach Tablets, 12/24/19-1/23/20</td>
<td>88.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121156</td>
<td>Washington Trust Bank</td>
<td>Office supplies; staff regis/trnsprtn trngs; coffee maker; Parking &amp; STA passes; IT hrdwr</td>
<td>1,690.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121157</td>
<td>Intrinium</td>
<td>Workstation setup fees for MR &amp; SM</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121158</td>
<td>WA State Dept of Retirement</td>
<td>Employee and Employer Contributions: December 2019</td>
<td>14,376.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121159</td>
<td>Intrinium</td>
<td>Office 365 subscription for 2020; January Stability Ultimate Mnthly Svc</td>
<td>5,295.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/7/20</td>
<td>V121160</td>
<td>Rehn &amp; Associates</td>
<td>SRTC H.S.A. contribution for HDHP enrollees SH, SM, GG, JL, MR, MU</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121161</td>
<td>Associated Industries</td>
<td>Q1 2020 Membership dues</td>
<td>377.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121162</td>
<td>Pacific Office Automation</td>
<td>Copier lease November 2019 - copy charges</td>
<td>173.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121163</td>
<td>Visionary Communications, Inc.</td>
<td>Fiber Services, January 2020</td>
<td>963.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121164</td>
<td>Rehn &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Admin fee December '19</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/12/20</td>
<td>V121165</td>
<td>Allstream</td>
<td>Telephone: Lines to 2/7/20 and Long Distance for December 2019</td>
<td>513.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121166</td>
<td>Spokane County Treasurer</td>
<td>ESRI Software Support - December 2019</td>
<td>763.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121167</td>
<td>Rehn &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Staff Payroll Deduction Health Ins Contributions: Pay Period 2020-02</td>
<td>570.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/21/20</td>
<td>V121168</td>
<td>Witherspoon Kelley Attnys</td>
<td>Legal Services for December 2019 - Admin</td>
<td>987.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121169</td>
<td>Fehr &amp; Peers</td>
<td>US-1954-90 Study for 10/23/19 - 11/29/19 Phases 1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>17,042.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121170</td>
<td>Pacific Office Automation</td>
<td>Copier lease December 2019</td>
<td>142.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121171</td>
<td>AWC Employee Benefit Trust</td>
<td>SRTC Staff additional Life Insurance Premiums from payroll deductions- Feb '20</td>
<td>130.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121172</td>
<td>AWC Employee Benefit Trust</td>
<td>February '20 Benefit Insurance Premiums</td>
<td>11,116.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/20</td>
<td>V121173</td>
<td>Pacific Office Automation</td>
<td>Copier lease December 2019</td>
<td>41.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121174</td>
<td>Ryan Stewart</td>
<td>RS per diem for Transportation Conformity Conf, San Diego CA Jan 6-8</td>
<td>199.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121175</td>
<td>Rehn &amp; Associates</td>
<td>Staff Payroll Deduction Health Ins Contributions: Pay Period 2020-03</td>
<td>570.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V121176</td>
<td>WA Dept of Labor &amp; Industries</td>
<td>Q-4 Industrial Insurance</td>
<td>1,074.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spokane, City of - Salaries/Benefits Pay Periods Ending: 12/28/19; 1/11/20 and 1/25/20**

| Vouchers: | V121155-V121176 | 68,280.95 |
| Salaries/Benefits Warrant Nos. | Pay Periods Ending: 12/28/19; 1/11/20 and 1/25/20 | 102,553.04 |

**TOTAL JANUARY 2020**

170,833.99

---

Recap for January 2020:

Vouchers: V121155-V121176


| Vouchers: | V121155-V121176 | 68,280.95 |
| Salaries/Benefits Warrant Nos. | Pay Periods Ending: 12/28/19; 1/11/20 and 1/25/20 | 102,553.04 |

**TOTAL JANUARY 2020**

170,833.99

As of 2/13/20, the Spokane Regional Transportation Council Board of Directors approves the payment of the JANUARY 2020 vouchers included in the list in the amount of: $170,833.99

Chair
To: SRTC Board of Directors  
From: Eve Nelson, Principal Transportation Planner  

Topic: Funding Opportunities for SRTC Priority List Projects

Requested Action

On December 12, 2019, a board motion to approve Regional Priority Projects in Table 2 for SRTC contingency funds was deferred for action to the February 13, 2020 SRTC Board of Director’s meeting.

The SRTC Board of Director’s has the following options:

1. Award contingency funds as recommended by the TTC in Table 2.
2. Award contingency funds as proposed in Table 3.

Key Points:

- In 2018, the SRTC Board of Director’s conducted a Call for Projects and developed a Regional Priority Project List and partially funded many projects, see Attachment 1.

- In the 2018 Call for Projects, the SRTC Board’s intent of awarding partial funding to projects, was so the region could leverage other funding sources and thus project sponsors would commit to utilize their resources to seek additional funding or commit to the remaining funding of the project.

- At the time of the 2018 award, all jurisdictions receiving grants signed acknowledgement that projects would be delivered with the same scope as their application and they would commit to securing the additional funding.

- The Call for Projects prioritization differs from the intent of the contingency funding process, see Attachment 2. This contingency funding process focuses on project delivery commitments to meet SRTC’s obligation target of $11.37 M each year. Timing of project delivery by year becomes a paramount factor in awarding contingency funds.

- Total available SRTC funds over the next four years are estimated at $10.6M; these contingency funds have been made available through project de- obligations, project closures and increased allocations to SRTC (see Table 1.) This is an increase from the target reported available in the December Board memo due to SRTC receiving a higher than anticipated funding allocation. Not all projects are eligible for all the funding sources.

- SRTC must award contingency funds to projects in 2021 & 2022 by this March to meet our future regional obligation targets. Generally, project applicants need at least one year of lead time to prepare projects for delivery.
• If obligation targets are met, SRTC positions the agency gain additional funding. Conversely if obligation targets are not met, SRTC risks losing federal funding to other Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs).

• At the December 2019 Board meeting a motion to approve the Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) recommendation in Table 2 was deferred to the February Board meeting for two reasons:
  o Concern that I-976 has caused uncertainty for state-funded projects in our region and if those state funding awards are in fact secure. This gave rise to the possibility of supplanting SRTC-managed federal funds to state-funded projects potentially at risk.
  o The City of Spokane requested the Board alternatively consider awarding the remaining funding request for the Thor/Freya Couplet, see Attachment 3. The TTC recommendation originally intended to provide enough funding in 2023 to complete the Thor/Freya project. However, the City of Spokane newly reported the project could now be delivered much sooner, in 2021.

• The Board Chair requested SRTC Staff provide another funding option which has been provided in Table 3. Table 3 includes the new information regarding delivery schedule for Thor-Freya provided by the City of Spokane, contingency funding at the new higher of available funding and a maintained focus on delivering projects to meet our obligation targets each year.

• The benefit of awarding projects listed below in Table 2 or Table 3 is that applicants will have ample time to prepare for FY2021 and SRTC is better prepared to meet obligation targets.

• The risk of awarding projects listed below in Table 2 or 3 is that all the agencies are not clear on funding shortages they may encounter for projects, particularly state-funded projects. However, I-976 is under pause from the courts as they evaluate its constitutionality and there is no information on when that might be resolved.

• Addressing I-976 concern, the State Legislature holds the authority to reapportion state funding and there is no information available indicating how they will assign funding to meet state transportation funding gaps and when that might occur.

• If projects are not awarded by March 2020, there is a very high risk that SRTC will not meet its obligation target for 2021.

**Board/Committee Discussions**
On November 13, the TTC provided a recommendation for the Board to approve awarding contingency funds to the priority projects outlined in this memo. Preliminary discussions were also held at the October SRTC Board meeting. At the November SRTC Board meeting, the Board was made aware of the funding available and the TTC recommended priority projects. At the December 12 Board meeting a motion to approve the Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) recommendation was deferred to the February Board meeting for two reasons as stated above: Concern that I-976 has caused uncertainty for projects in our region and if those state
funds are not secure, should the Board use SRTC-managed funds to replace state funds. The Board also discussed the timeline for the review of I-976 could be months to over a year away.

As an alternative to the recommendation, the City of Spokane requested the Board consider awarding the remaining funding request for the Thor/Freya Couplet, the number two ranked project on the Regional Priority Project List. The City of Spokane indicated they had a change in circumstances from the time of the TTC recommendation and they can now deliver the project in 2021, which was critical funding factor.

Public Involvement:
Projects in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) have been through a formal public comment process. New projects will be subject to an additional public comment process.

Supporting Information/Implications
TIP Guidebook Policy 6.5.1 directs SRTC staff to provide a recommendation to the SRTC Board on how to best utilize leftover SRTC regional funds. This recommendation when time allows, will be reviewed and discussed with the TTC prior to going to the Board. This includes using the approved Priority Project list and contingency fund process as approved by the Board, see Attachments 1 and 2 respectively. The amount of funding projected to be available is based on best available information; see Table 1. Note that some funding sources are flexible, and some are limited in their use.

Table 1 Projected Contingency Funds Available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate Amount</th>
<th>Type of Funding</th>
<th>Obligation Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$5,600,000</td>
<td>Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) (Flexible Use)</td>
<td>2021-2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>Surface Transportation Block Grant-Set Aside (STBG-SA) (Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian Use)</td>
<td>2022-2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) (Must Provide Quantifiable Air Quality Benefits)</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,470,000</td>
<td>Highway Infrastructure Program (HIP) (Highways and Bridges)</td>
<td>by July 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through requests from and in coordination with local jurisdictions in October 2019, the following list of projects in Table 2 were recommended by the TTC for STBG, STBG-SA, HIP and CMAQ funding opportunities. Per policy, projects are being considered based on project delivery timing and funding needs. Project locations are illustrated in Attachment 4.
Table 2 Regional Priority Projects, TTC Recommendation for Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Project List Rank</th>
<th>Project Title, Year of Funding</th>
<th>Funding Partners</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>SRTC 2018 Funding Awards</th>
<th>TTC Recommended Funding Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*2</td>
<td>Thor/ Freya Couplet Reconstruction: Hartson to Sprague, 2022 &amp; 2023</td>
<td>City of Spokane, SRTC</td>
<td>$9,021,228</td>
<td>$5,684,000</td>
<td>$955,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bigelow/Forker Project 6: New Roadway Alignment, 2021-2022</td>
<td>Spokane County, SRTC, TIB, FMSIB</td>
<td>$8,731,439</td>
<td>$2,814,000</td>
<td>$1,271,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Five Mile Park and Ride Study-Mobility Hub, 2021</td>
<td>Spokane Transit</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Argonne Road Reconstruction, 2021</td>
<td>City of Spokane Valley, TIB</td>
<td>$5,800,000</td>
<td>$2,508,500</td>
<td>$2,469,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Greta to Whitworth Bike Route, 2022</td>
<td>Spokane County</td>
<td>$346,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$299,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Wilbur Sidewalk, 2022</td>
<td>City of Spokane Valley</td>
<td>$643,987</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Under this alternative all above projects would be fully funded based on the agencies request except the number 2 project.

The following Table 3 fulfills the request of the Board to bring another contingency funding alternative for consideration. Table 3 also recommends utilizing funding from STBG, STBG-SA, HIP and CMAQ funding opportunities and uses an approach to fully fund the highest priority project first in balance with delivery schedules.

Table 3 differs from Table 2 in that it awards full funding request to the Thor/Freya project that can now be delivered earlier in 2021. Table 3 includes more contingency funding (i.e., $2.1M) that has recently become available in our January 2020 allocation letter from WSDOT. Two additional projects are included; the Pines Grade Separation (right of way phase), ranked fourth and Bigelow Project 2, ranked 9th. The Argonne Road project ranked 17th is not recommended in Table 2. It was no longer ranked high enough for an award in which funding was available. Projects 44 and 48 are different from the higher ranked projects because they utilize Congestion Mitigation Air Quality or STBG-Set Aside funding which have very specific criteria.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Project List Rank</th>
<th>Project Title, Year of Funding</th>
<th>Funding Partners</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>SRTC 2018 Funding Awards</th>
<th>Alternative Funding Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Thor/ Freya Couplet Reconstruction: Hartson to Sprague, 2021 &amp; 2022</td>
<td>City of Spokane, SRTC</td>
<td>$9,021,228</td>
<td>$5,684,000</td>
<td>$2,435,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,119,105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*4</td>
<td>Pines Grade Separation Right of Way Phase, 2022 &amp; 2023</td>
<td>Spokane Valley, SRTC, Federal Railroad Administration, (Deferred FMSIB)</td>
<td>$27,497,110 Full Project</td>
<td>$1,890,000</td>
<td>$1,905,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,795,000 ROW Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*9</td>
<td>Bigelow/Forker Project 2, Right of Way Phase, 2023</td>
<td>Spokane County, SRTC, CRAB, HSIP, (Deferred FMSIB)</td>
<td>$15,256,654</td>
<td>$1,033,0870 (Prior SRTC Funding)</td>
<td>$1,450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,601,000</td>
<td>$0 in 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bigelow/Forker Project 6: New Roadway Alignment, 2021-2022</td>
<td>Spokane County, SRTC, TIB, FMSIB</td>
<td>$8,731,439</td>
<td>$2,814,000</td>
<td>$1,271,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,085,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Five Mile Park and Ride Study-Mobility Hub, 2021</td>
<td>Spokane Transit</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Greta to Whitworth Bike Route, 2022</td>
<td>Spokane County</td>
<td>$346,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$299,300</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$299,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Wilbur Sidewalk, 2022</td>
<td>City of Spokane Valley</td>
<td>$643,987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$557,060</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Under this alternative all above projects would be fully funded based on the agencies request except number 4 and 9 which complete a project phase.

The year of funding represents the year that the program will be in the TIP. However, projects can be advanced in the TIP Amendment process and have opportunity to deliver in earlier years.

**More Information:**
- Attachment 1: SRTC Regional Project Priority List
- Attachment 2: SRTC Contingency List Process
- Attachment 3: Letters from the City of Spokane
- Attachment 4: Regional Priority Project Locations
- For detailed information contact: Eve Nelson at enelson@srtc.org or at (509)343-6370.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Requested</th>
<th>Dotted=partially funded, Strikethrough=removed by juris for consideration, Shaded=Funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Supplement to Henry Road Overpass ROW Preservation-Opportunity Project</td>
<td>$12,670,000</td>
<td>$530,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bigelow Gulch Project 5</td>
<td>$1,568,000</td>
<td>$1,403,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Thor-Freya Couplet</td>
<td>$6,619,105</td>
<td>$6,684,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Safe Routes to School Walking School Bus</td>
<td>$611,181</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pines Grade Separation (RW only)</td>
<td>$3,795,000</td>
<td>$1,890,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Riverside-Monroe to Wall</td>
<td>$5,003,141</td>
<td>$580,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bike Bikes Downtown Spokane</td>
<td>$304,202</td>
<td>$304,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Commute Trip Reduction</td>
<td>$898,157</td>
<td>$881,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Upgrade 5 diesel buses to electric</td>
<td>$611,181</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bigelow Gulch Project 2</td>
<td>$2,601,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Argonne Rd, Frederick to Liberty congestion relief</td>
<td>$1,270,000</td>
<td>$1,270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pines and Mission intersection improvement (can be split into 2 segments)</td>
<td>$1,211,000</td>
<td>$509,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>River Corridor reconstruction &amp; widening (can be split into 3 segments)</td>
<td>$6,331,800</td>
<td>$2,050,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Argonne Rd Reconstruction</td>
<td>$2,508,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Crawford &amp; Colville Roundabout/N Colville reconstructions</td>
<td>$1,943,514</td>
<td>$1,943,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5-Mile Park &amp; Ride Study</td>
<td>$89,545</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Havana St-Sprague to Broadway</td>
<td>$5,836,971</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Crawford &amp; Colville Roundabout/N Colville reconstructions</td>
<td>$2,021,738</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5-Mile Park &amp; Ride Study</td>
<td>$2,126,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21st Ave Craig Rd to Deer Heights Rd (Property Survey)</td>
<td>$89,545</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Spokane Falls Blvd-Lincoln to Division</td>
<td>$7,305,931</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Colville Reconstruction Third St to North City Limits</td>
<td>$3,795,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Centennial Trail Summit Gap</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Centennial Trail at Argonne</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Centennial Trail at Argonne</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Centennial Trail at Argonne</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Centennial Trail at Argonne</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Centennial Trail at Argonne</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Centennial Trail at Argonne</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Centennial Trail at Argonne</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Centennial Trail at Argonne</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Centennial Trail at Argonne</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Centennial Trail at Argonne</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Centennial Trail at Argonne</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Centennial Trail at Argonne</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Centennial Trail at Argonne</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Centennial Trail at Argonne</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Centennial Trail at Argonne</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Centennial Trail at Argonne</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Centennial Trail at Argonne</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Centennial Trail at Argonne</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Centennial Trail at Argonne</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Centennial Trail at Argonne</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Centennial Trail at Argonne</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Centennial Trail at Argonne</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Centennial Trail at Argonne</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Centennial Trail at Argonne</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Centennial Trail at Argonne</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Centennial Trail at Argonne</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Centennial Trail at Argonne</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
<td>$2,532,198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Award:** $29,727,327
2019 SRTC Contingency Process and List

At the November 2018 Board meeting, the SRTC Board selected a 2018 Prioritized List of projects to fund with 2020-2023 regional allocations of the Surface Transportation Program Block Grant (STBG) and 2021-2023 Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds. As the prioritized list includes all funding sources and many partially funded projects, SRTC Staff and the TTC discussed ways to establish a contingency list process using the new 2018 Prioritized List (see Attachment) to establish a predicable process yet maintain responsiveness to project changes. The recommended process was to seek to balance regional priority with the need to be nimble in utilizing funding quickly. The 2018 Prioritized list is now the 2019 Contingency List.

Approved Process, March 14, 2019 Board meeting:

- Use the 2018 Prioritized List as the 2019 Contingency List.
- SRTC Staff will bring a draft recommendation for TTC consideration based on the criteria below.
- The TTC will make a recommendation to the Board using the same criteria below.

Criteria:

- Evaluate the technical requirements of the funding source for the project on 2019 Contingency List and amount of funding that is available;
- Identify from the 2019 Contingency List projects that meet such requirements;
- Review project readiness from the above identified projects to maximize project delivery;
- Review the capability of available funding to complete a project or phase; and
- Recommend a project or projects for Board approval.
December 24, 2019

Commissioner Al French  
Chair  
Spokane Regional Transportation Council  
421 W. Riverside Ave., Ste. 504  
Spokane, WA 99201

Dear SRTC Board Members,

My time at the City of Spokane is coming to a close. I wanted to take a moment to thank the Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) staff and Board members for their commitment to our regional transportation process and to share some final thoughts about our discussion earlier this month.

During our December 12th meeting, we began a discussion about the Board’s process of prioritizing projects for funding. Basically, the City is seeking clarification on whether stretching dollars to meet the community’s most pressing needs remains the Board’s goal as it allocates funds, or if the Board has changed to prioritize timing of projects above all other considerations.

Let’s review what has happened.

- During the initial call for projects, the Board determined that it should fund as many projects as possible by partially funding projects. The highest-scoring projects were to receive funding first. The parties seeking funding signed on to the application understanding that by accepting partial funding the Local Agencies were also committing to coming up with the remaining funds needed. The City agreed to this approach.

- More recently, SRTC has worked to allocate unspent funds from past projects. The Board’s approach appears to have shifted, focusing on construction timing rather than on the projects that received highest scores. Additionally, the four new projects that were selected for funding received 100 percent funding, rather than continuing the partial funding practice to spread across additional projects. The current recommendation also added money to fully fund a higher scored project and added some money to the other remaining high-scoring project.

- The result of this process is that the highly ranked Thor-Freya project remains the only project that was not fully funded. This project received high scores because of its importance to the regional transportation system, tying into the new North Spokane Corridor (NSC) and Interstate 90. And, as we did point out, we could move construction to 2021, if timing truly is the new priority.

The City of Choice  
808 W. Spokane Falls Blvd. • Spokane, Washington 99201-3335  
Phone: 509.625.6250  FAX: 509.625.6563
Here is the City’s ask:

1. Since Thor-Freya is the only project that remains in the partially funded category and received the highest scores among the funded projects, we respectfully request a reassessment. Again, this work is planned on significant regional roadway that must be addressed before the NSC is connected.

2. We request clarification by the Board to its priorities for funding. We request this be added as an agenda item prior to any additional allocation of funds.

As I have served as the City’s Mayor over the last eight years, I believe that transparency of our actions to the public is one of the most important values of government agencies. I encourage SRTC to continue to strive to provide clear and understandable direction for the benefit of the region’s transportation system.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

David A. Condon
Mayor

CC  Councilwoman Lori Kinnear
    Sabrina Minshall
January 6, 2020

SRTC Board Members
421 W Riverside Ave, Suite #504
Spokane, WA 99201

Dear SRTC Board Members:

It has come to my attention that during our December 12th meeting, which I was unable to attend, there was a discussion about the Board’s process for prioritizing projects for funding. I want to echo Mayor Condon’s December 24th letter to SRTC Board Members in which he asks for clarification on whether stretching dollars to meet the community’s most pressing needs remains the Board’s goal when allocating funds, or if the Board now prioritizes project timing above all other considerations.

I believe that the Board’s original determination was that it should fund projects by utilizing our scoring tool. The projects were then partially funded to extend the dollars over as many projects as possible. The recent practice of focusing on construction timing, rather than fully funding the projects that initially received partial funding the highest scores, does not best serve the region.

My requests are the same as Mayor Condon’s:

1. With the recent TIB project call not awarding another City project that was slated for 2021, as the Mayor shared, the City has full capacity to deliver Thor/Freya in 2021.
2. Since Thor/Freya is the only highest scoring project that remains in the partially funded category, I respectfully request a reassessment. This work is planned on a significant regional roadway that must be addressed before the NSC is connected.
3. Clarification by the Board regarding its priorities for funding. I, too, request that this be added as an agenda item prior to any additional allocation of funds.

Thank you for listening to my concerns and requests. For the benefit of the region’s transportation system, I encourage SRTC to continue to provide clear and understandable direction regarding funding priorities.

Sincerely,

Lori Kinnear
Spokane City Council Member, District 2
Rank 4- Pines Grade Separation Right-of-way Only
Rank 9-Bigelow Gulch Project 2

Rank 12-Bigelow/Forker Project 6, Spokane County
Rank 13-Five Mile Park & Ride (Mobility Hub) Study Area-Vicinity Map, STA in the City of Spokane

Rank 17-Argonne Project Location, Spokane Valley
Rank 47-Wlbur Road Sidewalk Segment, Spokane Valley

Rank 44-Greta Ave, Spokane County
To: SRTC Board of Directors  
From: Sabrina Minshall, AICP, Executive Director  

Requested Action:  
Direct SRTC staff to prepare a letter of support for the Spokane Valley/Spokane County Bigelow-Sullivan Corridor project for the INFRA grant program request.

Key Points:  
- The FAST Act establishes the Nationally Significant Freight and Highway Projects (NSFHP) program to provide financial assistance—competitive grants, known as INFRA grants, or credit assistance—to nationally and regionally significant freight and highway projects that align with the federal program goals.
- The FAST Act requires DOT to reserve at least 25% of each fiscal year’s INFRA grants for projects – either large or small projects – in rural areas, defined as an area outside of a U.S. Census Bureau designated urbanized area with a population of over 200,000. [23 U.S.C. 117(i)]
- An INFRA grant may not exceed 60% of the total eligible project costs. An additional 20% of project costs may be funded with other Federal assistance, bringing total Federal participation in the project to a maximum of 80%.
- Grant applications must include certification that the projects are consistent with the Regional Long-Range Transportation Plans and that they are included in local, regional and state planning processes.
- SRTC reached out to member agencies in January 2020 outlining the process to obtain letters of support and the timeline to submit for the February Board discussion.
- The only project submitted is the Spokane Valley/Spokane County Bigelow-Sullivan Corridor Project (information sheet attached). The request to INFRA for this project is estimated to be $29.9M.

Board/Committee Discussions:  
This is the first time the Board of Directors has discussed a letter of support for this round of INFRA grant funding. At the Board’s direction, SRTC has prepared letters of support in the past for member agency projects.
Public Involvement:
This discussion will be at the SRTC Board of Directors meeting in February. All SRTC Board meetings are open to the public.

Supporting Information/Implications
The FAST Act establishes the Nationally Significant Freight and Highway Projects (NSFHP) program to provide financial assistance—competitive grants, known as INFRA grants, or credit assistance—to nationally and regionally significant freight and highway projects that align with the program goals to:

- improve the safety, efficiency, and reliability of the movement of freight and people;
- generate national or regional economic benefits and an increase in global economic competitiveness of the U.S.;
- reduce highway congestion and bottlenecks;
- improve connectivity between modes of freight transportation;
- enhance the resiliency of critical highway infrastructure and help protect the environment;
- improve roadways vital to national energy security; and
- address the impact of population growth on the movement of people and freight.

Eligible projects are:

- A highway freight project on the National Highway Freight Network;
- A highway or bridge project on the National Highway System, including:
  - A project to add capacity to the Interstate System to improve mobility; or
  - A project in a national scenic area;
- A freight project that is:
  - A freight intermodal or freight rail project; or
  - A project within the boundaries of a public or private freight rail, water (including ports), or intermodal facility and that is a surface transportation infrastructure project necessary to facilitate direct intermodal interchange, transfer, or access into or out of the facility,
  - Provided that the project will make a significant improvement to freight movements on the National Highway Freight Network, that the Federal share of non-highway portions of the project funds only elements of the project that provide public benefits, and that the total of Federal INFRA grants for non-highway portions of these projects does not exceed $500 million for fiscal years 2016 through 2020; or
- A railway-highway grade crossing or grade separation project. [23 U.S.C. 117(d)]

Eligible Project Costs
Financial assistance received for a project under this program may be used for:

- Development phase activities, including planning, feasibility analysis, revenue forecasting, environmental review, preliminary engineering and design work, and other preconstruction activities; and
- Construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, acquisition of real property (including land related to the project and improvements to the land), environmental mitigation, construction contingencies, acquisition of equipment, and operational improvements directly related to improving system performance. [23 U.S.C. 117(f)]
**Eligible Applicants**

- A State or group of States;
- A metropolitan planning organization serving an urbanized area with a population above 200,000;
- A unit of local government or a group of local governments;
- A political subdivision of a State or local government;
- A special purpose district or public authority with a transportation function, including a port authority;
- A Federal land management agency that applies jointly with a State or group of States;
- A tribal government or a consortium of tribal governments; and

**Large Projects**

**Project Cost Thresholds**

Each fiscal year, 90% of INFRA grants are reserved for projects with costs that must be reasonably anticipated to equal or exceed the lesser of:

- $100 million; or
- In the case of a project—
  - Located in one State, 30% of the State’s Federal-aid highway apportionment in the most recently completed fiscal year; or
  - Located in more than one State, 50% of the amount apportioned to the participating State with the largest Federal-aid highway apportionment in the most recently completed fiscal year. [23 U.S.C. 117(d)]
- A multistate or multijurisdictional group of entities described above. [23 U.S.C. 117(c)]

**Small Projects**

**Project Cost Threshold**

Each fiscal year, 10% of INFRA grants are reserved for projects that do not satisfy the minimum project cost thresholds described above. These are referred to as “small projects.”

**Grant Award Amounts**

A grant for a small project must be at least $5 million.

**More Information:**

- Attachment: Map and estimated cost summary
- For detailed information contact: Sabrina Minshall at (509) 343-6370 or sminshall@srtc.org.
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Project Cost Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$ (in Millions)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previously Completed Projects</td>
<td>$52.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously Incurred Costs</td>
<td>$12.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Eligible Costs</td>
<td>$62.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Federal Funds*</td>
<td>$24.9</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Federal Funds</td>
<td>$7.8</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFRA Funds</td>
<td>$29.9</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$127.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Assumes $4.0 million in non-Federal funds required for PE and ROW for SR 290 interchange.
To: SRTC Board of Directors
From: Shauna Harshman, Associate Transportation Planner III

Topic: Comprehensive Plan Certification: Spokane County

Requested Action:
The Spokane Regional Transportation Council certifies the transportation related provisions in the Spokane County Comprehensive Plan for the 2017 Update are generally consistent with the specified transportation planning requirements of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW), including the Growth Management Act (GMA), and with SRTC’s Regional Transportation Plan (RTP): Horizon 2040.

Key Points:
- Spokane County has satisfied the minimum certification criteria found in Appendix D (Counties and UZA Cities and Towns) of the Plan Review and Certification Process Instruction Manual.
- Spokane County is not planning for land use changes that would affect the regional transportation network.
- The next required update of local comprehensive plans must be by June 30, 2025. Revisions to the Plan Review and Certification Process Instruction Manual will be necessary to align with the yet to be developed MTP.

Board/Committee Discussions:
On September 10, 2015, the SRTC Board approved the Plan Review and Certification Process Instruction Manual.

On July 10, 2014, the SRTC Board approved Resolution 14-02, which authorized the following as it relates to updating the comprehensive plan review and certification process:
- Establishment of a process for the SRTC Board to certify local comprehensive plan amendments and updates based on GMA requirements, Horizon 2040, and regional transportation levels of service;
- Authorization of the Executive Director to develop methodologies for review and certification of comprehensive plans; and approval of updated regional travel time level of service standards.

Public Involvement:
Each jurisdiction has their own public involvement process for the development of their Comprehensive Plan updates.
Supporting Information/Implications:
As per the RCW, to be certified by SRTC, plans must demonstrate that their transportation chapters are consistent with SRTC’s Regional Transportation Plan (RTP): Horizon 2040, reflect the specified guidelines and principles under the RCW\(^1\), and satisfy the requirements of the GMA\(^2\).

More Information:
- For detailed information contact: Shauna Harshman at (509)343-6388 or sharshman@srtc.org.

---

\(^1\) RCW 47.80.026
\(^2\) RCW 36.70A.070(6)
To: SRTC Board of Directors
From: Eve Nelson, Principal Transportation Planner

Topic: 2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Guidebook

Requested Action:
For information and discussion

Key Points:
- The SRTC 2020 TIP Guidebook establishes goals and objectives for the TIP, specific programming policies, and provides timelines and information for various processes.
- The Draft 2020 TIP Guidebook is a programming resource for SRTC’s member agencies, the Board of Directors, and advisory committee members, see Attachment.
- The Guidebook was first established in 2013 and is updated annually to incorporate new programming policies, procedures, and schedules.
- The only major policy change in this year’s Guidebook includes new language from the Board adopted contingency list process approved during the April 11, 2019 Board meeting.
- Proposed changes to the SRTC obligation policy for future program years will be brought back to the Board in early summer once the statewide obligation policy is changed.

Board/Committee Discussions:
This item is being presented to the Board of Directors for the first time. The 2020 TIP Guidebook will be proposed to the Board for approval at February 13, 2020 meeting. The TTC approved a motion requesting the Board approve the 2020 TIP Guidebook at their December 18th meeting.

Public Involvement:
Updating of the Guidebook was discussed as part of the Contingency List Process which the SRTC Board of Directors approved April 11, 2019 meeting. All SRTC Committee and Board meetings are open to the public.

Supporting Information/Implications:
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. The 2020 TIP Guidebook provides funding policies and critical TIP timelines to provide clarity and transparency to implement and deliver regional transportation program.

More Information:
- Attachment: Draft 2020 TIP Guidebook
- For detailed information contact Eve Nelson at enelson@srtc.org or (509) 343-6370.
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INTRODUCTION

Purpose

The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Policies and Procedures Guidebook is a transportation programming resource for SRTC’s member agencies. The purpose of the document is to: (1) outline the goals and objectives of SRTC’s program and to (2) identify the policies and procedures necessary to implement the program.

About SRTC

The Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) is the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Spokane region. SRTC is the lead agency for transportation planning and decision-making for the Spokane Metropolitan Planning Area (SMPA), which includes all of Spokane County.

SRTC is governed by a Board of Directors composed of elected officials from member agencies and representatives from the following: Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), Washington State Transportation Commission, Spokane Transit Authority (STA), Spokane International Airport, transportation private sector, a freight representative and SRTC’s Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) and Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC). Member agencies include all local jurisdictions within Spokane County, as well as WSDOT and STA.

For more information on SRTC's member agencies, committees, and SRTC's planning area boundary map, please see Appendix A.

Effective Date

Goals and Objectives

The goals and objectives of the program and development process are defined below. For the purposes of this document, goals describe the long-term desired outcome for the program and objectives describe specific actions that will be taken to achieve these goals.

**Goal 1 | SRTC’s Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) will provide for the efficient use of federal, state and local funds for regionally significant projects that advance the long-term transportation goals of the Spokane region.**

- **1.1 |** Projects in the TIP will implement the strategies and projects of the current Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), Horizon 2040.
- **1.2 |** SRTC will fully obligate annual allocations of Federal funds (STBG, CMAQ, and STBG Set-Aside).
- **1.3 |** Projects in the TIP will be completed on budget and schedule.

**Goal 2 | SRTC’s TIP will provide an open and transparent process that is accessible to stakeholders and the public.**

- **2.1 |** The TIP will comply with applicable federal and state regulations and requirements.
- **2.2 |** Information on federal and state regulations will be made readily available to all local agencies and the public.
- **2.3 |** TIP documents will be presented in clear and accessible language and formatting.
- **2.4 |** Programming decisions will be made in a public forum and will be consistent with the goals, objectives and policies of the Guidebook.
- **2.5 |** Timelines for the TIP development process will be made available to stakeholders and the public well in advance.
SECTION 1 - REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMMING

Transportation Planning and Programming

At least once every four years, SRTC prepares a Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) that establishes the long-range goals for the region and identifies projects and strategies that will be necessary to implement them.

The current MTP, Horizon 2040, was approved by the SRTC Board on December 14, 2017. For more information on Horizon 2040, please refer to SRTC’s website, www.srtc.org, or click here.

With a long-range plan in place, the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) serves as a short-range programming document for projects that are planned over the next four years. The purpose of the TIP is to ensure that projects planned for implementation in the near future are consistent with the projects and strategies identified in the MTP.

The 2020-2023 TIP was approved by the SRTC Board October 10, 2019 and will go into effect at the beginning of the 2020 program year (approximately January 1, 2020). For more information about the 2020-2023 TIP, the document can be accessed at: https://www.srtc.org/transportation-improvement-program/.

For the purposes of SRTC’s TIP, years one and two of the TIP constitute an agreed to list as defined by CFR 45.330. This means that once a project has been programmed into year one or two of the approved TIP, the project’s sponsor(s) can begin implementation of the project by accessing funds to start preliminary engineering, right-of-way acquisition, or construction. Projects that are programmed in years three and four of the TIP are not part of the agreed to list and are not eligible for obligation without prior approval by the SRTC Board.

Projects Included in the TIP
Projects in the TIP are required to be consistent with the MTP. In order to be considered consistent, a project in the TIP must be listed in the MTP as a planned regionally significant project (i.e. a new or expanded roadway) or otherwise captured in a program of projects (i.e. preservation program or bicycle/pedestrian program).

The TIP must include all projects that are federally funded through U.S. Code Title 23 (Federal Highway Administration) and Title 49 (Federal Transit Administration), and all regionally significant projects regardless of source of funds.

**Regionally Significant Projects**

Regionally significant projects must be included in the TIP, MTP and added to the transportation demand model for purposes of air quality conformity. SRTC classifies a transportation project as regionally significant\(^1\) if the project:

1. Cannot be grouped in the TIP and/or State TIP (STIP)\(^2\), and/or it is not listed as an exempt project type in the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA’s) regional transportation conformity regulation (40 C.F.R. part 93)\(^3\); and
2. Is on a facility which serves regional transportation needs (federally classified as a principal arterial, highway or freeway) and alters the number of through-lanes for motor vehicles for a length greater than a half mile, or impacts a freeway or freeway interchange (other than maintenance projects); or
3. Is a new or extended fixed guideway transit service (dedicated bus lanes, vehicle track or wires) or capital expenditures related to a new fixed-route transit service on a facility which serves regional transportation needs (federally classified as principal arterial or higher).
4. Is determined by the SRTC Policy Board to be regionally significant or have the potential for adverse emissions impacts for any reason.

SRTC is responsible for determining whether or not a project is regionally significant. Project sponsors are responsible for providing the necessary project information to SRTC in order to make the determination on regional significance.

It is important to note that although a project may not meet the definition of regionally significant, that does not impact the importance of the project to the region, nor does it impact the project’s

---

\(^1\) The federal definition for regionally significant is defined in 23 C.F.R. § 450.104.

\(^2\) U.S.C. 135(g)(4)(C)(ii) states that projects that are categorically excluded from the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process and are not regionally significant can either be identified individually or grouped with other projects of the same funding source in the STIP.

\(^3\) 40 CFR § 93.126 states that certain highway and transit projects are exempt from conformity requirements (highway safety, transit, bike and pedestrian facilities, travel demand management programs, and other activities that do not lead directly to construction of a project), unless it is determined by the Interagency Consultation group that the project it has potentially adverse emissions impacts for any reason. 40 CFR § 93.127 identifies several project types that are exempt from regional emissions analysis (intersection channelization or signalization, interchange reconfiguration, transit terminals, weigh stations, and changes in alignment), unless it is determined by the Interagency Consultation group that the project it has potentially adverse emissions impacts for any reason.
ability to receive future federal or state grants. The purpose of defining projects as regionally significant is to ensure that all projects that could impact transportation conformity are analyzed.

One example of a project that would not meet the definition of regionally significant, but is considered a regional priority project is the completion of the Fish Lake Trail. The project is a bicycle and pedestrian facility and is exempt from transportation conformity requirements. However, the project is an important project to the region; it was listed on the SRTC Policy Board’s 2012 Regional Project Priorities.

**Interagency Consultation Group and Process**

Interagency consultation is required as part of the conformity determination process as stated in 40 C.F.R. Part 93.105, which covers the requirements for determining conformity to State or Federal Implementation Plans; transportation plans or programs; or projects developed, funded, or approved under Title 23 or FTA transit laws. Currently, the agencies involved in SRTC’s interagency consultation group include the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), WSDOT, Washington State Department of Ecology, Spokane Regional Clean Air Agency and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

The interagency consultation group has many roles related to transportation conformity determinations. As it pertains to the TIP, this group assists SRTC in determining which transportation projects should be considered regionally significant for purposes of regional emissions analysis. In addition, this group has a role in evaluating whether projects that are otherwise exempt from meeting conformity (40 C.F.R. Part 93.126 and 93.127) should be treated as non-exempt in cases where potential adverse air quality impacts may exist.
SECTION 2 - TIP DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

The development of the TIP involves three separate but interrelated processes; SRTC project selection, STA project selection, and local agency six-year transportation programs.

SRRTC Project Selection

SRRTC, in consultation with WSDOT and STA, is responsible for selecting projects for regional allocations of federal highway funds – Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG), Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ), and STBG Set-Aside (formerly TAP) program. The next call for projects will be in 2018. In the event that regional funds are returned prior to the next call for projects, SRTC will follow policy 6.5.1 related to the utilization of leftover funds.

Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG):

The purpose of the STBG program is to provide a flexible source of funding that can be tailored to meet the specific needs of the region. STBG funds can be used for roadway construction, reconstruction or preservation; transit projects; bicycle and pedestrian facilities or programs; bridges; and planning efforts.

In November 2018, SRTC selected projects to fund using the estimated STBG allocations (formerly STP) for 2020-2021.

Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ):

The purpose of the CMAQ program is to implement transportation projects and programs that improve air quality by increasing the efficiency of existing transportation facilities or reducing travel demand. CMAQ-funded projects and programs must be capable of demonstrating a reduction of
either carbon monoxide (CO) or particulate matter (PM-10) within the Spokane CO and PM-10 boundaries.

In November 2018, SRTC selected projects to fund using the estimated CMAQ allocations for 2021-2023.

**STBG Set-Aside (formerly TAP):**

The purpose of the STBG Set-Aside program is to implement on- and off-road facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians and fund other enhancements to surface transportation. Eligible projects include sidewalks, bicycle facilities, signals, traffic calming projects, projects that bring a facility into compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), conversion of rail corridors for non-motorized users, scenic overlooks and viewpoints, historic preservation, environmental mitigations, Safe Routes to School projects, and recreational trails.

In November 2018, SRTC selected projects to fund using the estimated CMAQ allocations for 2021-2023.

**Other Federal, State Programs:** For projects funded with federal National Highway Performance Program (NHPP), Surface Transportation Program (STP), and Federal Lands Highway programs, and any projects on the National Highway System (NHS), WSDOT is responsible for selecting projects in cooperation with SRTC (23 C.F.R. §450.330(c)).

Other federal programs (various discretionary programs, Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board, Highway Safety Improvement Program, etc.) and state programs (Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety, Safe Routes to School, Transportation Improvement Board, etc.) may also award funds to projects within the Spokane region. Although the prioritization processes for these funding programs are conducted outside of SRTC, SRTC must cooperatively select all projects programmed in the TIP.

**STA Project Selection**

As the designated recipient of regional allocations of federal transit funds, STA is responsible for selecting projects for the Federal Transit Administration (FTA)’s Urbanized Area Formula Program (Section 5307), Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities (Section 5310), and Bus and Bus Facilities Formula Program (Section 5339). SRTC assists in soliciting and prioritizing projects for Section 5310 funds; however, the STA Board of Directors is responsible for selecting a program of projects for those funds.

**Six-Year Transportation Programs**

SRTC annually reviews the six-year transportation improvement programs adopted by local agencies. Projects that are consistent with the MTP, are regionally significant, and/or federally funded through U.S. Code Title 23 and Title 49 are incorporated into the TIP. These projects must be submitted to SRTC in the Washington STIP system, Secure Access Washington (https://secureaccess.wa.gov/myAccess/saw/select.do) no later than August 1.
The schedule for local agency’s six-year transportation programs is included below.

### Local Six-Year Transportation Programs Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jun 30</td>
<td>Cities and towns must have six-year transportation programs adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 5</td>
<td>Cities and towns, Spokane County⁴ and STA⁴ submit adopted six-year programs to SRTC for TIP review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 17</td>
<td>SRTC notifies agencies of all regionally significant and/or federally funded projects that will need to be included in the regional TIP. Some projects may also require a completed Safe &amp; Complete Streets checklist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 31</td>
<td>All agencies must submit the required information for all regionally significant and/or federally funded projects to SRTC via the Washington STIP system, Secure Access Washington (SAW). Safe and Complete Streets checklists are also due.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2020-2023 TIP Development

After SRTC has selected projects for regional allocations of federal funds and has selected projects from local six-year transportation programs for inclusion in the TIP, the projects are compiled into the 2020-2023 TIP.

The schedule for the 2020-2023 TIP development is included below

### 2020-2023 TIP Development Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul 31</td>
<td>Safe and Complete Streets checklists due to SRTC for projects that are not exempt from the Safe and Complete Streets policy or were not previously submitted with an SRTC call for projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 31</td>
<td>Agencies must submit the required information for all regionally significant and/or federally funded projects to SRTC via Secure Access Washington (SAW).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul - Aug</td>
<td>TIP development – review project information in SAW, finalize project list, fiscal constraint analysis, air quality conformity determination, maps, project pages, and appendices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 26</td>
<td>TTC meetings – Review TIP development timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 1 – 30</td>
<td>30-day public comment period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep (TBD)</td>
<td>Public meeting to review draft TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 10</td>
<td>Board meeting – Overview of draft TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 23</td>
<td>TTC meeting – Recommend approval of draft TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 8</td>
<td>SRTC Board Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 16</td>
<td>WSDOT STIP Due Date (estimated)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴ According to state regulation, counties must adopt a six-year transportation program by December 31st (RCW 36.81.121) and transit agencies must adopt a six-year transit plan by September 1st (RCW 35.58.2795). The deadlines for these two entities conflict with the TIP development schedule, which must be submitted to WSDOT in October. In developing the TIP, SRTC will review the most recently adopted six-year plan for incorporation into the TIP.
Safe and Complete Streets Policy

The SRTC Policy Board approved the SRTC Safe and Complete Streets Policy in September 2012, with the effective date of January 2013. The primary purpose of the policy is to ensure that the safety and convenience of all transportation system users (pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, motorists, freight providers, and emergency responders) are considered during the planning and programming of projects. The policy and checklist are provided in Appendix B.

The SRTC Safe and Complete Streets Policy shall apply to all roadway construction and roadway reconstruction projects (any phase) that are required to be included in SRTC’s TIP.

Several project types are exempt from the policy and are not required to submit a Safe and Complete Streets Checklist, including:

- Roadway preservation,
- Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS),
- Projects located on a facility that prohibits bicyclists or pedestrians AND transit does not operate on, nor is planned to, for the next 15 years,
- Non-motorized,
- Transit,
- Safety projects (funded with safety funds, for example Highway Safety Improvement Program or Safe Routes to School)
- Programs, and
- Planning studies.

Project sponsors will be required to complete the SRTC Safe and Complete Streets Checklist for all applicable projects (see above) submitted for inclusion in the SRTC TIP. This can occur: 1) as part of the annual TIP development process (due August 1), 2) through an amendment to add a new project to the TIP (monthly), or 3) during an SRTC Call for Projects (submitted with the application packet).

Congestion Management Process

The Congestion Management Process (CMP) is a systematic and regionally-accepted approach for managing congestion that provides accurate, up-to-date information on transportation system performance and assesses alternative strategies for congestion management that meet state and local needs. Since the Spokane Region is a Transportation Management Area (TMA), SRTC is required to develop, implement, and monitor a CMP. The Spokane Region is also classified as an EPA air quality maintenance area therefore, certain types of transportation projects may not receive Federal funding unless that project has been addressed through a congestion management process (23 Code of Federal Regulations 450.320 (d) & (e)).

To address compliance with the TIP a decision process was created, called the CMP/TIP Compliance Process. This process will ensure that any project, regardless of funding source, that...
appears in the SRTC TIP has gone through a least-cost planning process and a justification process, if the project increases Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) carrying capacity of roadways. This analysis ensures fair treatment of all projects in the TIP that address congestion.

This process will require that alternative strategies be analyzed and, in most instances, a Roadway Capacity Justification Report be conducted before significant SOV capacity-increasing projects are approved for funding or placed in the SRTC Regional TIP. The Roadway Capacity Justification Report would be reviewed by members of the CMP Working Group and approved by the SRTC Board before such a project could move forward. The CMP/TIP Compliance Process is as follows and is also depicted in Figure 1:

*SOVCAP (Single Occupancy Vehicle Capacity Adding Project) – a transportation project which significantly increases the carrying capacity of a roadway. In areas that are in non-attainment/maintenance zones for air quality, a SOVCAP may not receive federal funding unless consistency with the regional CMP has been demonstrated.

Exempt from this definition, are realignments which replace rather than supplement previous roadways for through traffic, turning lanes, acceleration/deceleration lanes, climbing lanes, bridge replacements, widening without adding new travel lanes, and facilities that are primarily for use by modes other than SOVs (such as bus lanes, HOV lanes, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities).

**Safety Projects: **There is a wide range of strategies and projects for improving safety on public roadways, which can include geometric improvements and intersection improvements that may result in adding roadway capacity,
though many small capital projects and policy programs are also used to improve safety on a corridor. Projects that are funded through a safety program are considered safety projects. If not funded through safety program, a project statement must demonstrate how the project will improve safety and be accepted by the CMP Working Group.

**Bottleneck Projects**: A bottleneck is a localized section of highway or principal arterial that experiences reduced speeds and inherent delays due to a recurring operational influence or a nonrecurring impacting event; a bottleneck is distinguished from "congestion" because it occurs on a subordinate segment of a parent facility, and not pervasively along the entire facility. Increasing capacity on a short section of roadway is one of many available methods for combating bottlenecks, along with a variety of operational and demand management strategies. A project statement must indicate the location of the bottleneck, how the project will improve the bottleneck and be accepted by the CMP Working Group.
SECTION 3 - PROJECT CHANGES

As a project gets underway, new information often results in project changes. This can include project cost adjustments, scope changes, newly secured funds, etc. In addition, federal funds may be awarded to new projects throughout the year. When a change is requested for an existing project in the TIP or a new project needs to be added to the TIP, it is classified as either an amendment or an administrative modification. The process for incorporating the change into the TIP is different for each classification.

From the initial request for an amendment or administrative modification to the final federal approval, the process typically takes 8-10 weeks. The process includes the following steps:

1) Project sponsor submits written request for an amendment or administrative modification to SRTC.

2) SRTC staff evaluates request for completeness, financial feasibility, air quality conformity, consistency with the MTP and State and Federal regulations, SRTC’s Safe and Complete Street Policy, etc.

3) If the project change is an amendment, a 10-day public comment period is held pursuant to the SRTC Public Participation Plan. Administrative modifications do not require a public comment period and are processed administratively by SRTC staff.

4) The TTC reviews the amendment and makes recommendation for approval to the SRTC Policy Board.

5) The Board takes action on the amendment.

6) If approved by the Board, the amendment is submitted to WSDOT for inclusion in the State TIP (STIP). Administrative modifications are submitted to the STIP at the same time as any approved amendments.

7) WSDOT reviews the project changes and forwards the amended STIP to FHWA and FTA for approval.

8) FHWA and FTA review the revised STIP for approval.

2020 Amendment and Administrative Modifications Schedules
The amendment and administrative modifications schedules, which is subject to change, is provided below. If a change occurs to the schedule, revised schedules will be published on SRTC’s website and member agencies will be notified.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amendment</th>
<th>Amendment Request Due Date</th>
<th>SRTC Staff Review &amp; Air Quality</th>
<th>Public Comment Period (10 day)</th>
<th>TTC Recommendation</th>
<th>SRTC Board Approval</th>
<th>WSDOT STIP Amendment Due Date</th>
<th>FHWA/FTA STIP Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January Amendment</td>
<td>December 6</td>
<td>December 9 – 13</td>
<td>December 18 – 27</td>
<td>December 18</td>
<td>January 9</td>
<td>January 17</td>
<td>~February 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February Amendment</td>
<td>January 3</td>
<td>January 6 – 10</td>
<td>January 15 – 24</td>
<td>January 22</td>
<td>February 13</td>
<td>February 21</td>
<td>~March 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March Amendment</td>
<td>February 7</td>
<td>February 10 – 14</td>
<td>February 19 – Mar 28</td>
<td>February 26</td>
<td>March 12</td>
<td>March 20</td>
<td>~April 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April Amendment</td>
<td>March 6</td>
<td>March 9 – 13</td>
<td>March 18 – 27</td>
<td>March 25</td>
<td>April 9</td>
<td>April 17</td>
<td>~May 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May Amendment</td>
<td>April 3</td>
<td>April 6 – 10</td>
<td>April 15 – 24</td>
<td>April 22</td>
<td>May 14</td>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>~June 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June Amendment</td>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>May 4 – 8</td>
<td>May 13 – 22</td>
<td>May 27</td>
<td>June 11</td>
<td>June 19</td>
<td>~July 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July Amendment</td>
<td>June 5</td>
<td>June 8 – 12</td>
<td>June 17 – 26</td>
<td>June 24</td>
<td>July 9</td>
<td>July 17</td>
<td>~August 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August Amendment Tentative (Board may not meet in August)</td>
<td>July 3</td>
<td>July 6 – 10</td>
<td>July 15 – 24</td>
<td>July 22</td>
<td>August 13</td>
<td>August 21</td>
<td>~September 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September Amendment</td>
<td>August 7</td>
<td>August 10 – 14</td>
<td>August 19 – 28</td>
<td>August 26</td>
<td>September 10</td>
<td>September 18</td>
<td>October 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October Amendment</td>
<td>September 4</td>
<td>September 7 – 11</td>
<td>September 16 – 25</td>
<td>September 23</td>
<td>October 8</td>
<td>October 16</td>
<td>November 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The SRTC Board will also be approving 2020-2023 TIP at this meeting.

No amendments will be processed by WSDOT in November or December; the amendment process for the 2020 TIP is closed after the October cycle.
### 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Administrative Modifications Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January Administrative Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin Mod Request Due Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTC Staff Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSDOT STIP Amendment Due Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA/FTA STIP Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>July Administrative Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin Mod Request Due Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTC Staff Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSDOT STIP Amendment Due Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA/FTA STIP Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>February Administrative Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin Mod Request Due Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTC Staff Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSDOT STIP Amendment Due Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA/FTA STIP Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>August Administrative Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin Mod Request Due Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTC Staff Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSDOT STIP Amendment Due Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA/FTA STIP Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>March Administrative Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin Mod Request Due Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTC Staff Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSDOT STIP Amendment Due Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA/FTA STIP Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>September Administrative Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin Mod Request Due Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTC Staff Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSDOT STIP Amendment Due Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA/FTA STIP Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April Administrative Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin Mod Request Due Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTC Staff Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSDOT STIP Amendment Due Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA/FTA STIP Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October Administrative Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin Mod Request Due Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTC Staff Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSDOT STIP Amendment Due Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA/FTA STIP Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>May Administrative Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin Mod Request Due Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTC Staff Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSDOT STIP Amendment Due Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA/FTA STIP Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>June Administrative Modifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin Mod Request Due Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTC Staff Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSDOT STIP Amendment Due Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA/FTA STIP Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No administrative modifications will be processed by WSDOT in November or December; the amendment and administrative modifications process for the 2020 STIP is closed after the October cycle.
Types of Project Changes

Project changes are classified as amendments or administrative modifications. SRTC is responsible for determining whether or not a project change is an amendment or administrative modification.

**Amendments**
Amendments include adding a new project, deleting a project, major scope changes, changes to a project’s total programmed amount greater than 30% (or over $3 million), changes to a project that impact air quality conformity, adding a future phase of a project, and adding federal funds to a project currently programmed in the TIP without federal funds.

**Administrative Modifications**
Administrative modifications are project changes that are not considered amendments and typically include: revisions to lead agency, adding a prior phase of a project not previously authorized, changes to a project’s total programmed amount less than 30%, minor changes in scope, and minor changes or errors in project information (environmental type, right-of-way required, project limits, improvement type, typographical errors, etc.); changes in a project’s federal fund source, moving a project within the first four years of the TIP (as long as the project timing remains consistent with the MTP); authorization for any federal funds currently programmed in the TIP without consideration of the phase split, and adjustments in a project’s funding authorization for award of contract.

Administrative modifications requested by local agencies are reviewed by the jurisdiction and SRTC staff prior to being implemented. A list of modifications is maintained by SRTC as part of the TIP. Once a modification has been made, a revised TIP will be sent to WSDOT, FHWA, and FTA and will be linked on SRTC’s website.

For full definitions of amendments and administrative modifications please see Appendix C.
SECTION 4 - PROJECT DELIVERY

The final step in the programming process is project delivery; construction, procurement, or implementation. SRTC monitors project delivery by annually publishing a list of obligations from the preceding year and by presenting project status reports to the SRTC Policy Board twice annually.

Annual Listing of Federal Obligations

Every year, SRTC is required to complete a list of federal obligations that occurred in the preceding program year (23 C.F.R. § 450.332). For each project, the listing shall include the amount of federal funds that: were programmed in the TIP, obligated in the preceding year, and remaining for future years. The list is prepared cooperatively with WSDOT and STA, and must be published no later than 90 calendar days following the end of the program year.

The schedule for completing the Annual Listing of Federal Obligations is included below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Listing of Federal Obligations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>January</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTC compiles information on 2019 federal obligations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feb 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTC will notify agencies of any requested information necessary to complete the 2019 Annual Listing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feb 15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for local agencies to submit requested information to SRTC for compilation of the 2019 Annual Listing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mar 25</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC and TTC meetings – present the 2019 Annual Listing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mar 31</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 Annual Listing will be posted to the SRTC website and sent to WSDOT, FHWA, and FTA no later than March 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apr 9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTC Board – present the 2019 Annual Listing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Tracking

In addition to tracking annual obligations, SRTC also tracks the status of projects receiving regional funds. The purpose of tracking the status of these projects is to ensure that regional allocations of federal funds are being obligated efficiently and that projects are making continuous progress towards construction or implementation.
SECTION 5 - PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

SRTC’s Public Participation Plan includes the policies and procedures SRTC follows to ensure that the public is given adequate opportunity to participate in and comment on SRTC’s programming process. Participating agencies and the general public are provided an opportunity to comment on the TIP development through a variety of means. Throughout the year, the public is invited to attend SRTC advisory committee meetings to discuss project selection, TIP amendments, and the development of the next four-year TIP. Documentation from the meetings is also posted on the SRTC website.

In addition to the adopted policies and procedures for public involvement, SRTC strives to make the programming process as clear and accessible to the public as possible.

For more information on SRTC’s Public Participation Plan, please refer to SRTC’s website.

SECTION 6 - POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

1. Regional Transportation Programming

Policy 1.1 – For the purposes of SRTC’s TIP, years one and two of the TIP constitute an agreed to list as defined by CFR 45.330.

Policy 1.1.1 - Once a project has been programmed in year one or two of an approved TIP, the project sponsor(s) can begin project implementation by obligating funds.

Policy 1.1.2 - Projects that are programmed in years three and four of the TIP are not part of the agreed to list and are not eligible for obligation without prior approval by the SRTC Board.

Policy 1.2 – All projects in the TIP must be consistent with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). In order to be considered consistent with the MTP, a project in the TIP must be listed in the MTP as planned regionally significant project (i.e. a specific capital project that adds or impacts vehicular capacity) or program of projects (i.e. arterial preservation, sidewalk infill).

Policy 1.3 – SRTC shall determine consistency with the MTP. If it is unclear whether or not a project is consistent with the MTP, SRTC shall convene the Interagency Consultation group (WSDOT, STA, FTA, and FHWA) and/or the Air Quality Interagency Consultation Group (members of the Interagency Consultation group with the addition of Environmental Protection Agency and the Washington State Department of Ecology) pursuant to SRTC’s Interagency Consultation Procedures. The results of the consultation process are presented to the SRTC Policy Board for final determination on a project’s consistency with the MTP.
Policy 1.4 – **All projects receiving federal funds through U.S.C. Title 23 and Title 49 must be included in the TIP.** Projects receiving other federal funds do not need to be included in the TIP unless the project is regionally significant.

Policy 1.5 – **All regionally significant projects must be included in the TIP.** Regionally significant projects are defined on page 4.

Policy 1.6 – **SRTC shall determine whether or not a project is regionally significant.** If it is unclear whether or not a project is regionally significant, SRTC shall convene the Interagency Consultation group (WSDOT, STA, FTA, and FHWA) or the Air Quality Interagency Consultation Group (members of the Interagency Consultation group with the addition of Environmental Protection Agency and Washington State Department of Ecology) pursuant to SRTC’s Interagency Consultation Procedures. The results of the consultation process are presented to the SRTC Policy Board for final determination on a project’s regional significance.

Policy 1.7 – **Project sponsors shall provide the necessary project information to SRTC in order to make the determination on consistency with the MTP and regional significance.** This includes a description of the project, location, length, and planned year of completion.

2. TIP Development

Policy 2.1 – **Agencies must submit approved TIP to SRTC no later than July 1 each year.** The projects may be submitted in any format; however, agencies must provide sufficient detail in their TIP for SRTC to identify projects for inclusion in the TIP (including project name, length, description of work, total estimated cost, and amount of secured funds).

Policy 2.2 – **SRTC shall notify agencies no later than July 15 with a list of all regionally significant and/or federally funded projects that will need to be included in the regional TIP and that will require a completed Safe and Complete Streets checklist.**

Policy 2.3 – **Agencies must submit the required information for all regionally significant and/or federally funded projects to SRTC in the State’s STIP system, Secure Access Washington** (https://secureaccess.wa.gov/myAccess/saw/select.do), as well as a completed Safe and Complete Streets checklists no later than August 1.

Policy 2.4 – **SRTC shall publish the draft TIP during the first week of September for the required 30-day public comment period.** The timing of the public comment period must allow sufficient time for public comments to be incorporated into the draft TIP prior to the SRTC Policy Board approval.

Policy 2.5 – **The SRTC Safe and Complete Streets Policy stipulates that roadway construction and roadway reconstruction projects (any phase) that are required to be included in SRTC’s TIP must complete and submit a Safe and Complete Streets Checklist.** The timelines for submitting the checklists are detailed in Policy 2.2 and 2.3. Several project types are exempt from the policy and are not required to submit a Safe and Complete Streets Checklist, including: roadway preservation; Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS); projects located on a facility that prohibits bicyclists or pedestrians AND transit
does not operate on, nor is planned to, for the next 15 years; non-motorized; transit; safety (funded with safety funds); programs; and planning studies.

3. Project Changes

Policy 3.1 – All scope changes must be approved by the Executive Director, with TTC concurrence.

Policy 3.2 – SRTC is responsible for determining whether or not a project change is an amendment or administrative modification.

Policy 3.3 – Project sponsors shall submit a written request to SRTC to initiate a project change, whether it is an amendment or administrative modification. The request must provide sufficient detail for SRTC to make the determination on the type of project change that is required.

Policy 3.4 – SRTC shall maintain a full accounting of all amendments and administrative modifications made to the current TIP. The history of these project changes will be made available on SRTC’s website for the TIP.

Policy 3.5 – In the event that the TIP amendment/administrative modification schedule should be revised, SRTC shall notify all member agencies and post an updated schedule on SRTC’s website for the TIP.

4. Project Delivery

All Projects

Policy 4.1 – SRTC will track the status of all projects receiving regional federal funds in the TIP. Project sponsors shall provide sufficient information for tracking the status of projects upon request. This information will be provided to the Board of Directors and committees as it relates to the Region’s ability to meet the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2018 obligation target.

Policy 4.2 – SRTC will provide delivery status updates on all projects obligating or de-obligating regional federal funds during the FFY. SRTC shall present these updates to the SRTC Policy Board and committees periodically throughout the year.

Policy 4.3 – SRTC shall publish a listing of all annual federal obligations from the preceding program year no later than March 30. This policy is consistent with federal regulations for annual obligations reporting. The annual listing will be presented to the SRTC Board of Directors and advisory committees and will be posted to SRTC’s website for the TIP.
Policy 4.4 – If a project phase does not meet its targeted obligation date; SRTC may administratively grant the project sponsor a one-time extension of up to two (2) years. The project sponsor has 30 calendar days from the date it was notified of the administrative extension to submit a revised project delivery schedule for the project to SRTC. If a revised schedule has not been received within that time period, the project will be presented to the SRTC Policy Board for direction and possible removal from the TIP.

Policy 4.5 – If a project sponsor is unable to meet a targeted obligation date after the one-time grace period, the project sponsor may request an extension from the SRTC Policy Board. The Board may grant the extension or may act to remove the project from the TIP. If the agency is permitted an extension, it must submit a revised schedule to SRTC within 30 calendar days of the Board action. If the Board acts to remove the project from the TIP, any regional federal funds awarded to the project shall be returned to SRTC for reallocation. If the project is eligible to receive regionally selected federal funds, it may be placed on the contingency list of projects for that fund source at the discretion of the Board.

Policy 4.6 – Planning projects and preliminary engineering phases for all projects are not eligible for an administrative grace period for obligation of funds. If a planning project or preliminary engineering phase cannot meet its scheduled date for obligation, the project will be reviewed by the SRTC Policy Board. The Board may grant the agency a one-time grace period of up to one (1) year or may act to remove the project from the TIP. If the agency is permitted a grace period, a revised schedule must be received by SRTC within 30 calendar days of the Board action. If the Board acts to remove the project from the TIP, any regional federal funds awarded to the project shall be returned to SRTC for reallocation. If the project is eligible to receive regionally selected federal funds, it may be placed on the contingency list of projects for that fund source at the discretion of the Board.

Policy 4.7 – SRTC will maintain a contingency-Regional Project Priority List selected through a regional process and approved by the SRTC Board of Directors. Projects on the contingency-Regional Priority Lists may be selected for future funds available through the contingency funding process (see Policy 6.8) that become available if previously selected projects from that fund source are removed from the TIP by Board action, funds are voluntarily returned by the sponsoring agency, or additional funds become available for some other reason (for example: annual allocations higher than anticipated). The contingency list can include projects partially funded by the SRTC Policy Board. The most recently approved contingency–Regional Priority List replaces and supersedes any previously approved contingency-priority lists.

Policy 4.8 – SRTC will consider the following strategies to demonstrate fiscal constraint in the event that regional allocations are reduced because of failure to meet SRTC’s obligation target:

- Utilization of returned funds from project de-obligations and closeouts, if any.
- Accounting of obligations by agency to provide a quantitative methodology for delaying or removing regional funds from an agency’s projects.
5. Public Involvement

Policy 5.1 – SRTC will follow the policies and procedures for public involvement throughout the TIP development and amendment process outlined in SRTC’s Public Participation Plan, located on SRTC’s website, [here](#).

Policy 5.2 – SRTC will make all decisions related to transportation programming in a public forum. This includes meetings of the TTC, TAC, and/or SRTC Policy Board.

Policy 5.3 – SRTC will strive to make the programming process (including any documents) understandable and accessible to the public. This includes using plain language, as appropriate; including definitions for technical terms; providing lists of abbreviations; and including graphics to illustrate complex processes.

6. Funding Policies (STBG, CMAQ, STBG Set-Aside funds only)

**Cost Overruns**

Cost overruns are defined as costs that exceed the project budget as it was determined at the time of project application to SRTC.

Policy 6.1 - After a project has been selected by SRTC for regional allocations of federal funds, any cost overruns are the responsibility of the project sponsor. Project sponsors are required to sign SRTC’s Local Agency Project Endorsement Form, which states that any cost overruns are the responsibility of the project sponsor.

Policy 6.2 - Although cost overruns are the responsibility of the project sponsor, for eligible cost overruns (see Policy 6.3) on projects awarded on regional allocations of federal funds, the project sponsor may request additional funds through the SRTC Executive Director or the SRTC Board. The process for requesting a fund increase is described below.

Policy 6.2.1 - For a project with a total estimated project cost less than $1 million (as originally programmed in the TIP), the SRTC Executive Director may increase the project’s award amount up to 15% of the total estimate project cost. At the Executive Director’s discretion, the request may be brought to the TTC for discussion and input. Fund increase requests approved or denied by the Executive Director will be noted at an SRTC Board meeting.

Policy 6.2.2 - For a project with a total estimated project cost equal to or greater than $1 million (as originally programmed in the TIP), the SRTC Executive Director may
increase the project’s award amount up to 15% of the total project cost, not to exceed $300,000. At the Executive Director’s discretion, the request may be brought to the TTC for discussion and input. Fund increase requests approved or denied by the Executive Director will be noted at an SRTC Board meeting. Requests greater than 15% of the total project cost or greater than $300,000 would require SRTC Board action. Fund increase requests requiring SRTC Board action will be brought first to the TTC for discussion and input. Fund increase requests approved or denied by the SRTC Board will take place during an SRTC Board meeting, which are open to the public.

Policy 6.2.3 - It is the responsibility of the project sponsor to submit a written request to SRTC for the increase in the award amount. The request shall document the circumstances of the cost overrun and describe why the cost overrun should be considered eligible by SRTC and/or the SRTC Board for a fund increase.

Policy 6.2.4 - Fund increases that are considered by the SRTC Executive Director shall be limited to available funds. Available funds are allocated funds (this includes but is not limited to annual allocations, carryover funds, returned funds from projects that came in under budget) that have not been awarded or programmed for a specific project. If a fund source has been fully programmed in the current TIP (all available funds and forecasted funds are associated with planned projects), approving a fund increase request will impact currently programmed projects. These impacts could include delaying one or more projects out of the first four years of the TIP or reducing the award amount for one or more projects.

Policy 6.2.5 - If a fund increase request is denied by the SRTC Executive Director or the SRTC Board, the project sponsor may finance the cost increase through other funding sources, reduce the scope of the project to available funds (with SRTC concurrence on the scope change), or withdraw the project from the TIP and return any previously obligated funds to SRTC for redistribution. In addition, fund increase requests denied by the SRTC Executive Director may be appealed by the project sponsor; appeals may be considered by the SRTC Board, at their discretion.

Policy 6.3 - **Fund increase requests related to cost overruns will be considered on a case-by-case basis.** Policies 6.3.1 and 6.3.2 describe possible causes for eligible and ineligible cost overruns. The examples provided below are not exhaustive and do not imply the eligibility or ineligibility of any specific project. The SRTC Executive Director and/or SRTC Board shall make the determination on whether a project cost overrun is considered eligible or ineligible for a fund increase.

Policy 6.3.1 - A cost overrun may be eligible for a fund increase if it is considered outside of the control of the project sponsor. Examples of possible eligible cost overruns could include: unanticipated weather events, “Acts of God”, or other external events including war, labor strikes, or national security threats or events; new federal or state mandatory
requirements; significant unanticipated utility, environmental, cultural/historical issues; or significant unanticipated pavement condition.

Policy 6.3.2 - A cost overrun may be ineligible for additional funds through SRTC if the cost overrun is considered to be within the control of the project sponsor. Examples of possible ineligible cost overruns could include: a change in scope for owner betterment; omitted requirements that could have reasonably been anticipated; or poor judgment or inadequate planning, design, or implementation of the project.

Policy 6.4 - Approved fund increase requests related to cost overruns must maintain or increase the original local match commitment (i.e. percentages).

Leftover Funds

Policy 6.5 - After a project has been selected by SRTC for regional allocations of federal funds, any unspent funds from the project award must be returned to SRTC for redistribution. Project sponsors may not change the original scope or extend the length or duration of the project in order to utilize the remaining funds.

Policy 6.5.1 – SRTC staff will provide a recommendation to the SRTC Board on how to best utilize leftover SRTC regional funds. This recommendation will be reviewed and discussed with the TTC prior to going to the Board. The following methods will be utilized in order to develop this recommendation:

1. Applying funds to regional planning needs identified in the Task 9 “Unfunded Planning Activities” of the current Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) – Board approval required.
2. Advancing projects programmed in the out years of the current TIP – Administrative modification, does not require Board approval.
3. Select projects to fund from the most recently approved contingency list– TIP amendment requires Board approval.

Policy 6.5.2 – Active Projects (i.e. project that have not closed) that de-obligate SRTC regional funds may reapply for future regional funds through SRTC calls for projects; however, there is no guarantee, expressed or implied, that the project will be prioritized and selected for funding.

Partial Funding

Policy 6.6 - If a project has been selected for partial funding, whether by phases (PE, ROW, CN) or geographical segment (PE and/or RW only), it is the responsibility of the project sponsor to secure the remaining funds necessary to complete the project. The project sponsor may apply for additional funds through future SRTC calls for projects;
however, there is no guarantee, expressed or implied, that the project will be prioritized and selected for funding.

Policy 6.7 - Unless approved in advance by the SRTC Policy Board, projects selected for PE or RW only are permitted to transfer any remaining funds to a later phase of the project, if the project is programmed for construction within the first four years of the TIP. If the construction phase is not programmed within the first four years of the TIP, the project sponsor must return any remaining funds after the completion of the PE and RW phase.

**Contingency Funds Funding Process**

Policy 6.8 - Contingency funds become available if previously selected projects from that fund source are removed from the TIP by Board action, funds are voluntarily returned by the sponsoring agency, or additional funds become available for some other reason (for example: annual allocations higher than anticipated). The SRTC is responsible to reassign those funds.

As stated in Policy 4.7 SRTC maintains a Regional Project Priority List which will be used as the basis for this contingency funding process for available STBG, STBG-SA, CMAQ or other SRTC-awarded funds. The following criteria guide the contingency funding process:

- Evaluate the eligibility of Regional Project Priority List projects that meet the technical requirements of the available funding sources;
- Review project readiness from the above identified projects to maximize project delivery;
- Review the capability of available funding to complete a project or phase;
- Analyze obligation authority targets and schedules to ensure the programming of SRTC-managed federal funds meet project obligations targets; and
- Provide a recommendation for the use of contingency funds.

SRTC Staff working with the TIP Working Group will bring a draft recommendation to the TTC for consideration to recommend Board approval of funding based on the criteria above. The TTC and the SRTC Staff will make separate or joint recommendations to the SRTC Board of Directors for funding consideration.

**Eligible Phases and Project Types**

Policy 6.9 - The SRTC Policy Board shall define the eligible phases and types of projects for each Call for Projects process. For example, for each Call for Projects, the Board may choose to only fully fund projects, allow some partially funded projects, fund only the construction phase of projects, and/or fund regional or local planning studies. This policy
grants SRTC the flexibility to respond to the changing needs of individual agencies and the region as a whole.
February 6, 2020

To: SRTC Board of Directors
From: Mike Ulrich, Principal Transportation Planner
Topic: Metropolitan Transportation Plan Update

**Requested Action:**
For information and discussion.

**Key Points:**
- In order to comply with federal regulations, an update to SRTC’s Metropolitan Transportation plan must be adopted by the SRTC Board by December 9, 2021.
- To meet that deadline a scope and schedule is being developed and a high-level draft is included as Attachment One.
- For several critical reasons, a horizon year of 2045 has been selected.
- Critical policy decision points included in the draft scope:
  - Land use forecast assumptions
  - Regional significance definition
  - Financial plan assumptions
  - Performance objectives
  - Investment strategy
- Final outputs from the Data Applications for Transportation Analysis (DATA) project won’t be delivered until 2022. As such, SRTC anticipates an early adoption of the next MTP, after the 2021 Plan, to allow for the incorporation of those DATA project outputs.

**Board/Committee Discussions:**
The TTC will be briefed on the project scope and the committee’s relationship with the update at their February 26 meeting.

The TAC will be briefed at their first meeting of 2020.

**Public Involvement:**
A public participation plan for the project has been drafted and will be utilized to validate through public education and engagement that the MTP aligns with and implements the community vision.

**Supporting Information/Implications**
The MTP adopted in 2017 took important steps towards fulfilling the federal requirements of MAP-21 related to performance management. The “toolkit” project helped make a connection between capital investment and performance. This update will continue that progress and shift to an outcome-based approach that relies heavily on the principles of performance-based planning and programming.
Through the course of the update the Board will be asked to identify specific objectives derived from the six existing guiding principles. These objectives will then be linked with specific performance measures. This approach combined with other important updates to revenue forecasting and the method for determining which facilities are regionally significant will provide for a comprehensive regional plan.

While this update will make progress towards a data-driven planning process it is important to note that the already underway DATA Project is studying the region’s practices for data application. The benefits from the DATA project won’t be realized until after the MTP update is due. Therefore, SRTC intends to apply the outputs from the DATA project to an early adoption of the next MTP.

**More Information:**

- Attachment: MTP Update Schedule
- For detailed information contact: Mike Ulrich at (509) 343-6370 or mulrich@srtc.org.
February 4, 2020

To: Nadine Woodward, Mayor
    Breen Beggs, Council President
    Candace Mumm, Councilmember
    Karen Stratton, Councilmember
    Lori Kinnear, Councilmember
    Kate Burke, Councilmember
    Betsy Wilkerson, Councilmember
    Michael Cathcart, Councilmember

RE: *Spokane Comprehensive Land Use Plan History and Future*

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,

The City of Spokane is now approaching an historic landmark in the planning for its future, the 25th anniversary of the City’s Comprehensive Land Use Planning process. It was in 1995 that the City embarked on the creation of a Comprehensive Land Use Plan to comply with the Growth Management Act. This community effort was referred to as the Horizon Process. As an active participant in this process and the ultimate drafting and adoption of a Comprehensive Land Use Plan and then many of the implementation ordinances, I think I have a unique perspective on the goals that we were striving for and the results that ensued to get us to today. I share my views with you, not as a criticism, but more as an observation and opportunity to adjust the plan to reflect the community’s changing desires as they have been articulated in community meetings and the neighborhood planning processes. This re-evaluation is also underway at the County as we work to find new avenues to address a growing shortage of housing for our citizens.

Horizon’s was a visioning process to identify a growth strategy for the City. There were three strategies that emerged from the process (1) Current Patterns, (2) Focused Growth, Central City, and (3) Focused Growth, Centers and Corridors. The strategy adopted after years of community engagement was Focused Growth, Centers and Corridors. During this time, the Neighborhood Council Program was in its infancy with only 3 Neighborhood Councils created in 1995-96, mine being one of them, the Nevada-Lidgerwood Neighborhood Council. I was one of the original founding members and served as their President for several years. The Community Assembly was also formed at this time and again had very few members. This is important because there was no other recognized citywide organization to gather feedback on the three
strategies. This resulted in community meetings that were populated by those advocating for their vision and not a community vision.

In hindsight, I think that the selection of the Centers and Corridor strategy was driven more by the politics of the day and not a reasoned community-supported approach as to how we wanted to grow our city. Growth in the city was weak and there was an opinion that we needed to do something different to be able to turn things around. This drove a desire to change and move away from what was referred to as “Current Patterns”. Downtown interests were driving major investments in the core to revitalize the Central Business District (CBD) primarily around the River Park Square development. The Focused Growth, Central City was rejected because there was already activity underway and that the Central City could be included as a target area in the Centers and Corridors strategy. There was also interest outside of the CBD that did not want to be left out of a growth initiative. The other foundational element of this strategy was the inclusion of an “Infill Development Strategy” that would allow for increasing densities within existing neighborhoods.

While philosophically this strategy was selected, many in the neighborhoods did not understand that this plan relied upon increasing the density of housing and commercial uses in existing neighborhoods. Existing neighborhoods would be materially changed from the traditional suburban patterns to a much more urban and vertical growth pattern. Fundamentally, citizens believed in increasing densities but not in their back yards or somewhere else creating a “nimby” mentality. This reaction really surfaced when the City engaged the neighborhoods in the Neighborhood Planning process which I will address later in this letter.

Once the City Council adopted the Focused Growth, Center and Corridor strategy the Planning Commission was charged with developing a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (Plan) to reflect this directive and ultimate adoption by the City Council. During this time the Neighborhood Council program was still in a formative stage with only half of the neighborhoods organized and participating. I was elected as the Liaison to the Planning Commission from the Community Assembly and participated in the creation of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan. During drafting of the Plan, many of us on the Planning Commission were concerned that the full impacts of this growth strategy was not fully understood by the neighborhoods. This was addressed with the requirement that every neighborhood would undergo a Neighborhood Planning process. That would ensure that the neighborhoods had an opportunity to either embrace or reject the strategy.

The City Council adopted the Plan in May 2001. Once the Plan was adopted then the Planning Commission undertook the process of developing the zoning regulations that would implement the Plan. We started with the Industrial zones followed by the Commercial zones and Employment Centers. The goal was to facilitate the creation of more job opportunities within the City with the hope that while the Planning Commission was developing these regulations the neighborhoods would be undergoing their neighborhood planning process and we would see how the neighborhoods embraced the new growth strategy. Unfortunately, the City Council did not fund or staff the Planning Department with the resources necessary to undertake such a huge process. The City only funded 2-3 neighborhood plans per year and there were 26 neighborhoods that had been formed and required a Neighborhood Plan.
The early neighborhood planning efforts revealed what became a common theme throughout the process, neighborhoods supported increased density, but not in their neighborhood. Centers that were projected to accommodate an increase in population were rejected routinely. Infill development proposals were likewise rejected. The realization that the neighborhoods were not in support of the foundational elements of the Centers and Corridors growth strategy led the City to lower the projection of population that could be accommodated within the City Limits. The growth projections in housing associated with the Centers and Corridors and Infill Development have not been realized, thereby resulting in a housing shortage that is driving up prices. This has also negatively impacted our collective goal of housing affordability.

The City has experienced some isolated developments as a result of the Multi-Family Tax Exemption Program, but these projects were primarily on undeveloped land. The Multi-Family Tax Exemption tool has not spurred redevelopment in existing neighborhoods to increase density or to improve the quality of housing.

In addition to the lack of support from the neighborhoods for the implementation of the Centers and Corridors and Infill Development strategy, the City is also confronting concurrency issues in one of its main growth areas, that being the SR-195 corridor. While I was on the City Council, we worked with WSDOT to protect SR-195 as a freight corridor and not an urban collector. The plan was to build a frontage road system to parallel SR-195 and relieve the highway of local traffic. That frontage road system has not been built and traffic congestion has now resulted in J-Hook intersections and signalized access to I-90 to address safety issues. These are short term solutions and will not accommodate the growth that the City had planned for this area. Without a long-term solution agreed to, funded, and implemented between the City and WSDOT I would not be surprised to see WSDOT close this corridor to future development which again negatively impacts the ability of the City to achieve its growth projections and accommodate its share of population allocation.

So, after 25 years the City has a Comprehensive Land Use Plan predicated upon two strategies, Centers and Corridors and Infill Development that aren’t supported by the neighborhoods in their neighborhood. This challenges the City Council to address this situation. You either acknowledge that the current Plan is not reflective of the desires of your constituents and make the appropriate adjustments to bring the Plan and development regulations into compliance or adopt development regulations that will allow you to achieve the goals you have set out in terms of population projections and density. A lack of housing in the region can have a negative impact on our ability to grow our community and recruit good jobs for our citizens.

As I indicated earlier, the lack of buildable lands for the construction of affordable and workforce housing is challenging all of us to adjust to meet the demand. The County will be working to amend our regulations this year to increase our allowed density and expand our housing options. We continue to work with the legislature to amend condo development regulations at the state level to allow for that option of home ownership in the region but that is not an immediate solution.
The state has provided new funds for affordable housing projects through HB1406 but that challenges us to maximize the funds to insure the greatest number of units. We need to be diligent to ensure that regulations do not discourage housing in our jurisdictions.

I hope that you will join the County and other jurisdictions to find a regional solution to the immediate housing problem and then longer-term strategies that are sustainable for the provision of housing in all market sectors that will support continued growth for our community.

Sincerely,

Al French, Commissioner

Cc:  Mary Kuney, Spokane County
      Josh Kerns, Spokane County
      Gerry Gemmill, Spokane County
      John Pederson, Spokane County
      Mike Gribner, WSDOT
      Joel White, SHBA
      Rob Higgins, SRA
      Members of the GMA Steering Committee of Elected Officials
### 2020 FUTURE BOARD AGENDAS
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### GUEST
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MEETING SUMMARY
Spokane Regional Transportation Council
Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) Meeting
December 18, 2019 1:30 pm

Action Items

- **2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Guidebook** – Chair Otterstrom noted that this item was originally on the agenda for information and discussion, however staff has requested that the TTC consider taking action today. He said as today’s meeting was a regularly scheduled meeting, even though it is one week early, it was noticed as such earlier in the year. It is therefore not a special meeting and unscheduled action may be taken.

Ms. Nelson stated that the updated Guidebook includes language developed by the TTC in March 2019 and adopted by the Board in April 2019. She spoke about changes to the language in the contingency funding section and noted the updated TIP Amendment and TIP Administrative Modification schedule. The motion to recommend Board approval of the 2020 Guidebook, to include the correction of any typographical errors or other minor errors, passed unanimously.

Information and Discussion Items

- **Transportation Advisory Committee Update** – Ms. Minshall distributed a red-line version containing the revisions of the 2012 SRTC Advisory Committee Bylaws and Procedures. She said the revised document was approved by the Board on December 12. She drew attention to the minor language changes and emphasized the major changes to the section addressing Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) membership. She spoke about the steps taken by the Board and the TAC Working Group throughout 2019 to re-position the TAC and clarify its focus. The group discussed the removal of the

- **2020 SRTC Education Series** – Ms. Harshman re-capped the 2019 Education Series and asked the group for suggestions for the upcoming year. She said SRTC hopes to present three or four events in 2020. Members discussed and provided a list of possible topics. Ms. Harshman said any additional suggestions could be emailed to her.

- **Pines Rd Grade Separation Project Presentation** – Mr. Adam Jackson from City of Spokane Valley provided an update to the Pines Rd Grade Separation project.

- **Group Discussion: Initiative 976** – The group discussed recent actions taken by WSDOT to postpone or defer projects until the legislative impacts on the initiative are clarified. Ms. Mantz requested that staff make it clear to the Board the pressure to obligate projects and the potential risk of losing funding if projects are not obligated.
To: SRTC Board of Directors

From: Greg Griffin, Administrative Services Manager

Topic: CY 2019 Quarterly Budget Update (Quarter 4: October through December)

Requested Action:
For information.

Key Points:
- SRTC began 2019 with a cash balance of $484,978 and ended 2019 with a balance of $868,323. The increase was due primarily to receipt of $350,000 in local designated funds, of which $347,000 carried into 2020 for the US 195-I90 Study and the Division Street Study.
- SRTC collected 92% of anticipated revenues for the year.
- SRTC spent 87% of total anticipated expenditures.
- Estimated savings thru the fourth quarter from decision to move IT management to a contracted vendor was approximately $100,000.

Board/Committee Discussions:
On December 13, 2018 the SRTC Board approved the CY 2019 Budget. The CY 2019 budget was amended by the SRTC Board on September 12, 2019

Public Involvement:
The original CY 2019 Budget was approved by the SRTC Board on December 13, 2018. The 2019 budget was amended by the SRTC Board on September 12, 2019. Each quarter this report is provided to the Board of Directors.

Supporting Information/Implications
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. SRTC began 2019 with a cash balance of $484,978 and ended 2019 with a balance of $868,323. The increase was due primarily to receipt of $350,000 in local designated funds, of which $347,000 carried into 2020 for the US195-I90 Study and the Division Street Study. The revenues portion includes funds received in Calendar Year (CY) 2019 that were for CY 2018 expenditures. The attached spreadsheet provides a summary for the Fourth Quarter of CY 2019 budget, actual 2019 revenues and expenditures, and a column for prior (2018) 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 Fourth Quarter (100% of Calendar Year) of CY 2019 (January – December), SRTC collected 92% of anticipated revenues for the year. All but one SRTC member paid their 2019 dues. Approximately $147,000 STBG Data & Study Funds unspent in 2019 were rolled into 2020 budget.

Expenditures:
Through the Fourth Quarter of CY 2019 (January – December), SRTC spent 87% of total anticipated expenditures.

- **Personnel Expenditures:** Total personnel expenditures were $1,140,342 through Fourth Quarter, or 97% of the CY 2019 budget amount.

- **Contractual and Professional Services:** Total services expenditures were $147,906 year-to-date, or 43% of the total budget amount. The major contractual study efforts were re-budgeted into 2020.

- **Materials and Services:** Total materials and services expenditures were $121,806 for the year 2019, or 99% of the total budget amount.

**Travel, Training, and Staff Development (includes Education Speaker Series, Subscriptions & Memberships):** Total expenditures were $93,521 thru Quarter Four, or 111% of the total budgeted amount.

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

**More Information:**
- See Attachment
- For detailed information contact: Greg Griffin at (509)343-6370 or ggriffin@srtc.org.
## SRTC CY 2019, Report through December 31, 2019

### REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRTC Cash Balance 12/31/18</th>
<th>484,978</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FHWA PL (Federal Public Law Funds)</td>
<td>620,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYWA PL</td>
<td>244,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA (Federal Section 5303 Funds)</td>
<td>57,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STBG Planning Funds</td>
<td>39,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STBG Data &amp; Study Funds</td>
<td>1,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTPO (State Planning Funds)</td>
<td>55,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Dues</td>
<td>218,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants - Other</td>
<td>6,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Dues for Census 2020 'Complete Count'</td>
<td>73,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Local Study Funds</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,131,665</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENDITURES

| Personnel |
| Salaries | 793,112 |
| Accrued Leave Payouts (includes unemployment) | 41,800 |
| FICA | 60,673 |
| WA State Retirement System | 102,883 |
| Insurance | 172,590 |
| **Total Personnel** | **1,171,058** |

| Contractual and Professional Services |
| Legal Services | 29,000 |
| Consultants & Professional Svcs | 30,600 |
| Professional Svcs Census 2020 'Complete Count' | 73,705 |
| MTP Update | 25,000 |
| Consultant Svcs & Model Development | 25,000 |
| Consultant Svcs & I90/US 195 Systems Study | 75,000 |
| Consultant & Division St Study | 75,000 |
| State Audit Charges | 11,500 |
| **Total Contractual and Professional Services** | **344,805** |

| Materials and Services |
| Publications | 500 |
| Postage | 225 |
| Operating Supplies | 1,500 |
| Minor Furniture | 1,500 |
| Telephone | 8,585 |
| Advertising | 4,090 |
| Rent - Office Space | 77,800 |
| Rent - Meeting Rooms | 400 |
| Lease - Copier | 4,300 |
| Property and Liability Insurance | 10,700 |
| Printing | 2,000 |
| IF Charges | 10,900 |
| **Total Materials and Services** | **122,500** |

| Travel, Training, and Staff Development |
| Mileage & Parking | 4,800 |
| Travel / Training (Staff) | 53,700 |
| Educational Speaker Series | 15,000 |
| Board/Staff Retreats, Facilitators, Food | 2,800 |
| Dues, Subscriptions, and Memberships | 7,725 |
| **Total Travel, Training, and Staff Development** | **84,025** |

| IT Operations |
| IT Professional Svcs | 37,000 |
| Software | 26,365 |
| Hardware - New and Replacement; Repairs/Maint. | 8,000 |
| Online Services | 12,912 |
| **Total IT Services** | **84,277** |

| **TOTAL EXPENDITURES** (Paid in 2019) | 1,806,665 |
| **CASH BALANCE 12/31/19** | 868,323 |