

**MPO/RTPO/WSDOT COORDINATING COMMITTEE  
MEETING SUMMARY  
Clarion Hotel, SeaTac, WA  
August 25, 2009**

**1. INTRODUCTIONS**

- Chairman Jeff Wilkens opened the meeting and asked for introductions. The attendance sheet is attached.
- Mr. Wilkens then recognized and thanked Paula Hammond (Washington State Secretary of Transportation) for attending.

**2. CHAIR'S REPORT – Jeff Wilkens**

Mr. Wilkens asked if there were any suggested changes to the May 19, 2009 summary notes and thanked the Transportation Planning Office for a thorough job. No suggestions for change were made.

Mr. Wilkens then reviewed the meeting agenda and explained the focus for the meeting was on understanding how on-going transportation planning processes relate and how the MPO/RTPOs fit.

Mr. Wilkens informed members of the [National Association of Development Organizations \(NADO\)](#) and the [Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations \(AMPO\)](#) annual conferences being held in Savannah, GA, on October 27-30. He explained that both conference agendas have a strong focus on transportation authorization, finance, and climate change and that while the conferences are scheduled at two separate locations, NADO and AMPO are offering several joint sessions, plenaries, and networking opportunities. Mr. Wyrick (TRPC), Mr. Howard (PSRC), and Mr. Wilkens are attending.

It was announced that Mr. Wyrick was nominated for (and has since been elected to be) President of AMPO. Mr. Wilkens congratulated him and thanked him for his service and contributions.

Mr. Wyrick then mentioned that AMPO is very busy working on reauthorization.

Mr. Wyrick mentioned that Kathleen Davis (WSDOT Highways and Local Programs) has requested from each MPO and RTPO federal Recovery Act project stories for the purpose of compiling a brochure on Washington State economic stimulus projects. The brochure is intended to provide legislators with concise non-technical summaries of projects and progress.

**ACTION: Follow up with Ms. Davis. Result: There is no brochure with up-to-date information. Ms. Davis suggested providing the link to the WSDOT's weekly newsletter, [Stimulus News You Can Use](#)." Organizations can sign-up for weekly e-mail updates.**

Mr. Wilkens informed the group that Rosemary Siipola (CWCOG) is representing the Coordinating Committee on the workgroup for the WSDOT Scenic Byway update. The next meeting is on September 24 and Amy Asher (CWCOG) will be serving as Rosemary's alternate at that meeting.

Mr. Wilkens then discussed the status of the effort to form a Washington Association of MPOs and RTPOs, a gradually evolving concept. The group recognizes a need to confer with other statewide associations to determine if there would be any duplication. The Directors will continue to meet every 2-3 months. The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, August 31, 2009, at PSRC. Dean Lookingbill (RTC) suggested sharing their draft white paper with other members for comment before the meeting.

**ACTION: Mr. Wilkens will email the white paper to members before Monday, August 31, 2009. Not available.**

Mr. Wilkens turned the floor over to Ms. Hammond.

### **Secretary of Transportation – Paula Hammond**

Ms. Hammond indicated that there are many state and national challenges right now. She wanted to share her perspective and discuss how best to work together with the MPOs and RTPOs on the big issues such as federal funding authorization and climate change. Highlights from Ms. Hammond's talk include:

#### *WSDOT Program*

What keeps her awake at night is the agency is delivering the largest construction program in its history. Of the 391 projects from the 2003 and 2005 funding packages;

- 194 projects are complete.
- 298 projects are under construction or will be completed within the next 6 months
- Less than 100 funded projects will be left of the 2003 and 2005 legislative funding packages.
- WSDOT is facing a steep "funding cliff" taking us back to pre-2003 funding levels four years from now which necessitates downsizing while still trying to deliver all the basic services and programs.
- The biggest remaining projects are left for next biennium, e.g., Alaskan Way Viaduct, I405, SR520, SR16 Nalley Valley.
- We need to now start a collective conversation about the need for further investment—highways, local roads, etc.

### *Funding*

- The legislature may not be quite ready to discuss new funding in the 2010 session, but we need to start getting ready now with good information.
- Gas tax revenues are not keeping pace with inflation and as the vehicle fleet transitions to higher mileage vehicles, the revenue stream is further reduced.
- Discussions on tolling need to continue and the Joint Transportation Committee alternative funding study now underway will be important to understanding options and transitioning to them.
- We are attempting to balance climate goals, e.g., VMT reduction with the need for a transportation system and economic goals.

Mr. Lookingbill remarked that local governments, too, are looking at a revenue cliff. He expressed the need to include local governments in revenue discussions.

Ms. Hammond agreed.

Mr. Miles commented that some local governments are demonstrating they can raise revenue, especially for maintenance and operations, so they are ready to match state investment.

Mr. Mastin raised a question on the expectations for VMT reduction in urban vs. rural parts of the state.

Ms. Hammond acknowledged the complexity of this, and asked, for example will our largest urban areas need to bear the greatest reductions? She hopes for more honest conversations about this.

Ms. Hammond remarked that with the Transportation Commission's policy plan can help prepare the way for policy recommendations on needed investments, especially since they are a politically neutral agency tasked with the role.

Ms. Hammond indicated that WSDOT is preparing in anticipation of discussions with the Legislature and emphasized the need for WSDOT and the MPO/RTPOs agreement on clear priorities at the state level. She recognized the TransNow work in Yakima as an example of consensus building and clear communications with legislators on investment priorities. Walla Walla is another example.

### *Climate Change*

- Regarding the recently published Cambridge Systematic report [\*Moving Cooler\*](#), Ms. Hammond offered that AASHTO is concerned with the lack of transparency, lack of science, and that the bundles of recommended strategies are severe and not particularly politically feasible.

- AASHTO recently released a publication that offers more realistic strategies for transportation related to climate change.

Mr. Wyrick commented that “you can’t get there from here” if VMT reduction is the only tool.

- There is general agreement that climate change goals cannot be achieved through VMT reduction alone. There is some question of whether the Legislature intended only VMT reduction as a focus and there may be further discussion on a broader range of strategies such as vehicle technologies and fuels.

Mr. Miles commented that at the state level there needs to be clarity in public policy on what is to be achieved: reduction of green house gas emissions or reduction of travel, offering that clarity will build public trust.

Mr. Morton raised a question regarding scenic byway designations.

Ms. Hammond assured members that she has no plans to decertify any Scenic Byways – they were too hard to get.

#### *Next Step*

The secretary asked for more ideas and emphasized that with more agreement there is a much better chance of success. Ms. Hammond then offered to form and convene a group with MPO/RTPOs.

**ACTION: Jeff will poll the group for suggestions.**

### **3. MEETING DATES/LOCATION - All**

**The group agreed that the Clarion Hotel, SeaTac, is a suitable place to continue our meetings.**

**The next meeting dates are:**

**February 23, 2010**

**May 18, 2010**

**August 24, 2010**

**November 30, 2010**

### **4. FEDERAL LEGISLATION – WHAT THE NATIONAL GROUPS (AASHTO, AMPO, NARC) ARE SAYING ABOUT THE BILLS – Gordon Rogers, Page Scott, Lon Wyrick, Larry Ehl**

Mr. Wyrick: AMPO’s concerns included that the Oberstar bill is top down and creates new departments to review accountability. Climate change is presented in the bill as if the

states are failing and need federal oversight. But a lot of work is already underway in some states. We need to send the message that we are working hard locally and offer a few recommendations. Also, we need to send the message that we are 100% behind performance measures and we are already doing it. Any specific performance measures should be defined in detail at the state level. Regarding reorganizing metropolitan organizations and direct allocations to MPOs with over one million in population, only about 15 TMAs would be affected nationwide. AMPO's MPO reorganization policy recommendation was based on new funding allocations, not reallocation of existing funds.

Mr. Rogers: NARC seems to have parked the Oberstar bill and released a [Livability Framework](#), which includes recommendations for positioning regional planning organizations and local governments at the center of a federal livability initiative to promote comprehensive, cross-linked regional planning. Seems consistent with Oberstar's draft bill and the Framework appears to be top-down.

Ms. Scott: NARC is tracking the HUD/DOT/EPA relationship and the [Livable Communities Act](#) introduced in the Senate. Creating rural transportation planning organizations may be problematic because, in the bill, they may be punished for not meeting performance measures, even when funding is unavailable to address the needs. She also expressed frustration with the bill language which dictates the voting membership of MPO and RTPO boards and asked if anyone knew what problem it is attempting to fix

Mr. Miles: Funding should be based on good performance. Because of the shortage of available funds, historically, local governments let maintenance and preservation slide until the facilities scored high enough to qualify for funding. ARRA funding helped fill some of the needs, but it is just the beginning.

Ms. Hammond: WSDOT and others are concerned that the performance measures could become punitive especially if there is already a good record of performance.

Mr. Miles expressed concern that the Waxman/Markey draft bill puts EPA in the lead on setting planning regulations. USDOT is the appropriate lead for transportation air quality conformity, not EPA.

Ms. Hammond: The Governor is recommending changing the lead agency back to USDOT for planning.

Mr. Harvey: The bill is trying to make up for 30-40 years of wrong direction in relation to density, etc.

Larry Ehl spoke about the prospects for transportation legislation given the other significant issues that the Congress is wrestling with presently and likely into the Fall. Still pending is the potential elimination of the upcoming rescission by September 30, 2009. Congress seems likely to extend our current federal authorization for and

undetermined period and not take up full authorization until early in 2010. Mr. Ehl commented that there is some agreement between the Administration and Representative Oberstar, particularly on issues like performance measures, transit, and livability. He completed his remarks by thanking the MPO and RTPO directors for their input as WSDOT tries to understand the perspectives of organizations and associations, not just AASHTO.

### **5. Report from Washington State Transportation Commission Statewide Transportation Policy – Paul Parker, Gordon Rogers**

Mr. Parker handed out the latest timeline for the Commission's process to update its policy plan to be called the Washington Transportation Plan 2011- 2030.

Mr. Parker then asked Mr. Rogers, who is representing the MPO/RTPOs on the Commission's advisory group (Charlie Howard is representing the larger organizations), and asked him to report first.

Mr. Rogers reported that the process is timely and includes representatives from business, cities, counties, Departments of Ecology, Commerce, and Transportation, other agencies and associations, and MPO/RTPOs.

Mr. Rogers reported on significant issues affecting this update:

- Washington population growth and changing demographics.
- Large city annexations are creating higher costs to meet required standards for urban transportation facilities.
- A vision statement is being developed by drafting a statement that will evolve throughout the process.
- Mr. Rogers participated on the working group that selected a consultant.
- The Commission indicates a strong commitment to working with MPO/RTPOs.
- The timeline is to adopt an updated policy by the end of 2010.
- How other planning efforts interact with the policy plan.

#### **ACTION: Keep this as a standing agenda item**

**Mr. Parker** referred the members to the current [WTP Workplan and Timeline](#) handout.

Mr. Parker reported that the Commission is on schedule to adopt in the update by December 2010. He had hoped to have a draft outline available in September, but that was delayed because it is dependent on hiring the consultant. He now expects to sign the contract with Berk & Associates this week (Aug 25-28, 2009) and be back on track soon thereafter.

Mr. Parker reported the following progress:

- The website is up and running for The Washington Transportation Plan, 2011-2030 update.
- A blog will soon follow.
- Feedback will start this fall.
- In addition to the Advisory Group meetings the Commission will use other opportunities for outreach on this update, such as:
  - Cowlitz Wahkiakum Council of Governments, September 1.
  - The Association Washington Business, August 28.
  - The Washington State Association of Counties on November 18
  - Washington Public Ports Association in November .
- The Commission is very open to visits to all MPOs and RTPOs if they are invited.
- The Commission will be available for outreach throughout the schedule.
- Early 2010 we will start to develop the draft.
- Will present a draft for comments in August 2010.

Mr. Lookingbill, asked if the Commission is collaborating with legislative transportation chairs and staff? Mr. Parker responded that they invited staff to the advisory committee and after the consultant is contracted he anticipates visiting the chairs and ranking members to discuss the update of the policy plan.

Mr. Wyrick asked how other plans that WSDOT produces fit into the policy plan. Mr. Parker responded that the next agenda item will address that question, but that the Commission has spent a fair amount of time discussing with WSDOT the respective roles and responsibilities of the mandated plans

## **6. Other Statewide Transportation Planning Activities Elizabeth Robbins / Jay Alexander**

Ms. Robbins presented the [Fact Sheet: Selected Statewide Transportation Plans](#), an [Altitude Chart](#), and a large time chart to illustrate the complexity of the various statewide plans and related efforts.

- In addition to the Transportation Commission's policy plan which is due to be completed in December 2010, there are several statewide transportation planning efforts underway at this time or very recently completed. Several of the MPOs and RTPOs are also in the process of updating regional transportation plans.
- Many of these planning efforts are conducted by WSDOT. WSDOT is responsible to prepare a statewide multimodal transportation plan which is legislatively directed to be focused on state-interest and state-owned facilities and services. The Transportation Planning Office is currently in the process of gathering data and analyses to update our

*Trends Report* (see below)—the groundwork for later work on the multimodal plan itself.

- Other WSDOT-prepared plans include, for example, the highway system plan, the freight rail plan, and the recently completed *Long-term Aviation Transportation Study*.
- The scope of the content for these plans is outlined in state law, federal statute, and in some cases both.
- Most of these planning efforts have active websites accessible from the main WSDOT website. The Transportation Planning Office is currently designing a one-stop plan update page that will link to each of these pages. Our hope is that this will provide stakeholders and the public a central location for learning about statewide planning activities underway.

**ACTION: Inform MPO/RTPOs when the THE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING OFFICE plan webpage is live.**

Discussion:

Mr. Wilkens commented that the policy direction is a bit vague on the chart, adding that there are scattered and conflicting policies and investment priorities. His impression is the 17,500 foot, HSP level, is in the wrong sequence.

Mr. Wyrick commented that the WTP should be above legislative actions on the chart.

Mr. Wilkens observed that programming is above planning, which is backwards.

Bob Jones (WSDOT Olympic Region) informed the group that the altitude chart was developed for a legislative staff briefing (October 2008) to explain what planning does and how it interrelates to programming and budgeting decisions. A number of MPOs also participated in this legislative staff briefing.

Mr. Harvey commented that, with public understanding in mind, that he would find it difficult to explain the complexity of planning efforts.

Mr. Wyrick expressed his hope that this could lead to change and better coordination.

Mr. Miles observed how the time chart clearly demonstrates that planning efforts are out of synch. He suggested showing the chart to the legislature and asking them to work on legislation and fix this gross inefficiency.

Mr. Miles suggested separating the planning process from the issue development process.

Mr. Wyrick suggested creating another version of the chart by reorganizing it.

### **Statewide Transportation Condition and Needs Analysis – 2009 Trends Report – Elizabeth Robbins**

- The Transportation Planning Office is currently working with the various modal divisions and others to update our data-driven analytical basis for planning.
- The *Trends Report* will update available information about the current conditions and 20-year demands for these statewide systems (state-owned and state-interest).
- We are also summarizing key information on performance, emerging issues, challenges facing each mode, and the statewide system as a whole.
- This information will be electronically published through the WSDOT Planning webpage: Transportation Data Library.
- As part of this effort we desire to gather key issues and data at the regional level.

### **Survey Tool – Collaborative Review of MTPs and RTPs – Elizabeth Robbins**

Ms. Robbins referred the group to the draft [MTP & RTP Survey](#) and explained that WSDOT is proposing a collaborative process with each of the MPOs and RTPOs to yield some key perspectives that will become part of the core content of the *2009 Trends Report*. She informed members that the Transportation Planning Office developed the proposal and survey with the help of Page Scott, Dean Lookingbill, Jeff Wilkens, and the WSDOT Region Planning Managers.

Ms. Robbins outlined that the proposal crafted with the above people is to have the WSDOT Region planning staff and MPO/RTPO staff to jointly

prepare responses to the survey question. She then asked for input on how to make it successful.

#### Discussion:

Dean Lookingbill asked for clarification on the survey question about whether a regional plan was adopted before or after 2008. The answer is that it identifies plans that were developed before and after the legislature passed RCW 47.04.280 (SB 5412) establishing the five policy goals: Preservation, Safety, Mobility, Environment, and Stewardship.

Mr. Rogers asked how the survey data will be used. Ms. Robbins explained that we hope to identify your regional trends and key needs and perspectives and how they might integrate with statewide multimodal planning.

Mr. Wilkens asked how WSDOT anticipates using the data in the plan and recommended keeping a dialog with the MPO/RTPOs throughout the process.

Ms. Lorenzo asked the organizations to think about how WSDOT should use the data and advise us on how to incorporate it. She informed the group that this process is derived from a recommendation that Dean Lookingbill has made, which was to first look at the regional plans as a primary source of information.

Mr. Miles emphasized that the first step is for THE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING OFFICE staff review and summarize the MTP/RTPs and then supply the summaries to MPOs for feedback.

Mr. Lookingbill disagreed, commenting that the profound knowledge is in the organizations and with the WSDOT region planners.

Mr. Wyrick agreed that it was good for the WSDOT staff to review and understand the plans, but commented that this is a good opportunity for MPO/RTPOs to be included in the process and influence the final product.

**ACTION: The Transportation Planning Office will review and summarize plans and make these summaries available to those organizations that want these in advance of collaboratively responding to the survey.**

Note: Some WSDOT Regions and Organizations felt they were ready to proceed without the Transportation Planning Office summaries, e.g., SWRTC.

**The Highway System Plan – Jay Alexander**

Mr. Alexander (WSDOT Capital Program Development & Management Office) shared the current process and on-going efforts to update the Highway System Plan.

Mr. Alexander commented that he was intrigued by the comments on the timing and linking of plans. He imparted that he is new to this role and that this is his first Highway System Plan update so he is seeking input and collective understanding from MPO/RTPOs. He also offered an observation, in relation to earlier comments about the Altitude Chart, that the legislature is not just involved at the top but at the bottom too and throughout.

In relation to the timeframe for developing and adopting the Highway System Plan, the legislative policy discussions occur early in each legislative session (January and February) with budget development occurring later in the legislative session. WSDOT is aiming for a draft document in July 2010 and the final updated plan in December 2010. The Highway System Plan and the Commission's Washington Transportation Plan update are on similar schedules. In response to the question of waiting until the Commission's policy plan is adopted, Mr. Alexander responded that it would make sense, but to accommodate legislative discussions the two efforts must be occur concurrently.

WSDOT is interested in focusing on economic vitality in this update, although there doesn't appear to be a clear way to measure the investment benefits so we are doing more research and trying to better understand this. We intend to include sections on bike/pedestrian, Information Technology Systems, and scenic byways.. We want to be able to demonstrate the benefits for any investments we propose.

Mr. Alexander acknowledged that it is especially difficult to balance needs with policy plans when the legislature funds specific projects versus programs. WSDOT is working hard to make certain the Highways System Plan resembles the policy priorities.

Ms. Scott: The fact that you are looking for help beyond WSDOT on economic vitality is positive and encouraging. If there is data that regional organizations need to be collecting let us know.

Mr. Harvey noted that the new director of the Dept. of Commerce, Rogers Weed, is conducting meetings/listening sessions around the state and that the information might be useful to the update of the Highway System Plan.

Ms. Scott also commented, regarding mobility and capacity, that most MPOs have and use models to demonstrate air quality conformity for TIPs and plans which include WSDOT projects. If WSDOT would use the existing models and data, MPOs could anticipate upcoming projects rather than responding to emergency TIP amendment requests from WSDOT. Ms. Scott cautioned WSDOT not to lose sight of the Federal modeling requirements in metropolitan areas. Mr. Alexander responded that he is learning about the regional travel demand models and that WSDOT needs to understand the differences in assumptions among the models. It is important for him to ensure that any proposals WSDOT puts forward have a statewide perspective.

Mr. Wyrick recommended forming an advisory group that includes MPOs and RTPOs. Mr. Alexander responded that he is open to forming an advisory group. Mr. Wilkens suggested forming a sub-committee. He then shared his observation that in the past several updates have been primarily of a technical nature, but this time the plan may be ready for a policy screen. He suggested using the SB 5412 goals to assist in this.

Ms. Robbins suggested the SB 5412 sub-committee could be reconvened and recapped the bill requirements and sub-committee recommendations for follow-up tasks and reporting to the full Coordinating Committee.

**ACTION: Explore resuming and possibly expanding the SB 5412 sub-committee.**

Mr. Rogers was still unclear about the timing of the Commission Washington Transportation Plan update and the Highway System Plan update, and asked, if the Commission's adoption is scheduled for December 2010 and the Highway System Plan draft is scheduled for July 2010 – following the 2010 legislative session, why not move the Highway System Plan adoption schedule out to the end of 2010 to synchronize with the recommendations from the Commission's policy plan. Mr. Alexander replied that WSDOT budget proposals are submitted to the Governor each September for the following legislative session. To use the updated Highway System Plan for a budget proposal for the 2011 legislative session, WSDOT must submit the budget proposal in September 2010, prior to the Commission's policy plan adoption.

Ms. Lorenzo reminded the group that the current *Washington Transportation Plan (2007-2026)* is still valid and relevant so the Highway System Plan can and will be synchronized with the existing policy plan.

Ms. Robin Mayhew (PSRC) indicated that the PSRC is updating its long range plan to address congestion and mobility, climate change, funding for the system. They're trying to decide if previously generated lists of "grandfathered projects" must stay in the recommended plan even though funding may be insufficient for those plus newer priorities.

Mr. Wilkens asked if Moving Washington came from the Washington Transportation Plan. Ms. Robbins responded affirmatively adding that the Washington Transportation Plan recommended investing in operational efficiencies first.

**7. Climate Change-Related Activities**  
**Elizabeth Robbins**

Ms. Robbins addressed the group: As you are probably aware there are a lot of activities around climate change. We see different pieces of legislation recently passed; the latest directive to WSDOT being the Governor's [Executive Order 09-05](#). Some of the key tasks

are for Departments of Ecology and Commerce to research benchmarks, baselines, and trends. WSDOT is tasked to:

1. [Executive Order Sec. 2(a)]  
“...in consultation with Ecology, Commerce, local governments, business, and environmental representatives to estimate current and future statewide levels of vehicle miles travelled, evaluate potential changes to RCW 47.01.440 VMT reduction benchmarks, develop additional strategies to reduce emissions from the transportation sector, and report to the Governor by December 31, 2010.”
2. [Executive Order Sec. 2(b)]  
Work with the Puget Sound Regional Council, Spokane Regional Transportation Council, Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council and Thurston Regional Planning Council to cooperatively develop and adopt regional transportation plans that will, when implemented, provide people with additional transportation alternatives and choices, reduce greenhouse gases and achieve the statutory benchmarks to reduce annual per capita vehicle miles traveled in those counties with populations greater than 245,000. By December 1, 2011, the Department will report to the Governor on which regional transportation planning organizations have developed, or are developing, plans with greenhouse gas strategies, which strategies appear to have the greatest potential to achieve the benchmarks, and what policy or funding issues need to be resolved to ensure implementation;

WSDOT has started working on these tasks internally, but the question is how should we involve the MPO/RTPOs? The logical question, since this will likely eventually affect all MPO/RTPOs, is how, to engage all organizations in the discussions.

Mr. Wyrick suggested focusing on the four MPOs as a Coordinating Committee sub-Committee and then reporting back to the full Committee.

**ACTION: PSRC, SRTC, SWRTC, and TRPC will work with WSDOT as the Coordinating Committee sub-committee and report back to the full Committee.**

**ACTION: Set as agenda item for December meeting.**

Ms. Robbins informed the members that an initial meeting or conference call will occur in early Fall 2009 with the four MPOs, and the first task at the next meeting is to develop a work plan.

Mr. Lookingbill commented that, as part of the four, he is still troubled by VMT reduction because it is not the answer to climate change. Mr. Lookingbill then recommended that all four RTPOs include this work in their work plans.

Mr. Miles expressed concern with the requirement for WSDOT to report what MPO/RTPOs have or have not adopted. Ms. Robbins replied that the executive order does not require adoption of any specified strategies, but rather to report which strategies have been adopted, if any, and which appear to have potential to achieve the benchmarks, if any, and which policy or funding issues may be obstacles to implementing the strategies.

## **8. Announcements: American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009**

Ms. Robbins announced that Scott Witt (WSDOT Rail and Marine Office) submitted the first track High Speed Intercity Passenger Rail applications to USDOT. The WSDOT [Summary of Track 1 Projects: High Speed Intercity Passenger Rail Program Funding Application](#) is now available.

The applications include:

1A - \$398 million for projects that are ready to construct

1B - \$37 million for projects to be completed within 3-7 year

Applications for a second track of longer term projects are due Oct 2, 2009.

Mr. Wyrick asked if the process was coordinated with the West Coast Corridor Coalition (WCCC). Ms. Robbins responded that she does not know, but will find out.

**ACTION: Find out if these project applications were coordinated with the West Coast Corridor Coalition and e-mail answer with project list.**

**Answer: The project applications were not coordinated with the West Coast Corridor Coalition, but they are aware of them.**

Ms. Robbins informed the group that the Governor's focus for TIGER Grants is on replacing the SR 520 Bridge, Columbia River Crossing (SR 500 Interchange), and the North Spokane Freeway.

Mr. Lookingbill mentioned that the MPO/RTPOs can submit applications directly and the SWRTC is submitting.

A clarification was made that any WSDOT TIGER grant applications will be submitted through the Governor. The Secretary has indicated that in order to maintain a clear statewide focus neither the Governor nor WSDOT would prepare letters of support for other proposals.

**9. Meeting Adjourned—Thank you! Next 2009 Meeting Date: December 8, 2009**