



Spokane Regional Transportation Council

TTC MEETING 08/27/2025
CONSENT AGENDA

AGENDA ITEM 3a

Transportation Technical Committee Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, June 25, 2025– 1:00 pm

1 Call to Order/ Excused Absences

Mr. Greene called the meeting to order at 1:01 pm and attendance was taken.

In attendance were:

Committee Members:

Heather Trautman
City of Airway Heights
Dan Ferguson
City of Cheney
Luke Michaels
City of Liberty Lake
Inga Note
City of Spokane
Colin Quinn-Hurst
City of Spokane
Kevin Picanco
City of Spokane
Erica Amsden
City of Spokane Valley
Jeremy Clark
City of Spokane Valley
Sonny Weathers
Small Cities/Towns Rep
Brandi Colyar
Spokane County

Barry Greene
Spokane County (Chair)
Jami Hayes
Spokane County
Margee Chambers
SRCAA
Samantha Hennessy
SRHD
Brian Jennings
STA
Tara Limon
STA (Vice Chair)
Mike Pea
WSDOT-ER
Glenn Wagemann
WSDOT-ER

Absent Members:

Sonny Weathers
Small Cities/Towns Rep
Julia Whitford
Kalispel Tribe
Maria Cullooyah
Spokane Tribe
Shauna Harshman
WSDOT-ER

Staff:

Lois Bollenback
Executive Director
Eve McMenamy
Deputy Executive Director
Savannah Creasey
Comm. & PR Coord.
Anadia Grier
Admin-Executive Coord.
Jason Lien
Principal Transp. Planner
Ryan Stewart
Principal Transp. Planner
Michael Redlinger
Associate Transp. Planner 3
Ben Kloskey
Associate Transp. Planner 2
Angela Paparazzo
Associate Transp. Planner 1

Guests:

Tyler Kimbrell
City of Spokane
Paul Kropp
Sean Messner
CivTech
LeAnn Yamamoto
Commute Smart NW
David Istrate



2 Public Comments

There were no public comments.

3 Member Comments

Members provided updates to current projects within their agency/region.

#4 Chair Report on SRTC Board Meeting

Mr. Greene gave a brief overview of June's SRTC Board meeting.

ACTION ITEMS

3 Consent Agenda

- a. Minutes of the May TTC Meeting
- b. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment - July

Mr. Quinn-Hurst motioned to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Ms. Limon seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

4 2027-2029 Call for Projects – Approval of Final Awards and Contingency Lists

Mr. Stewart requested that the TTC recommend Board approval of the final project awards and contingency lists for the 2027–2029 call for projects. He began with a brief recap of what had been shared in previous meetings, noting that funding estimates had slightly increased based on final allocations, bringing the total available to approximately \$40 million. As a reminder, the Board approved the principles of investment in February, which included specific set-asides for the SRTMC, SRTC's planning activities, small town projects, and preservation-only efforts.

With support from TTC and TAC members, staff reviewed and scored all applications using the established criteria. While project rankings were based on these scores, several other factors were also considered during the programming process. These included eligibility for different funding sources, a balanced spread of project delivery years between 2027 and 2029 to help meet annual obligation targets, and equitable geographic distribution to ensure the funding wasn't concentrated in just one or two jurisdictions.

The meeting materials included simplified lists of recommended projects, which were also shared on screen. These showed full and partial awards, with partials highlighted in light purple. Mr. Stewart then walked through the preservation-specific project list, again indicating which projects received full or partial funding and confirming that agencies could still move forward with delivery even in cases of partial awards.

Next, he presented the contingency lists—one for general projects and one for preservation. These are a required element in SRTC's TIP guidebook and serve as a backup in the event additional funding becomes available. Projects on these lists are also ranked, and any surplus funding could be assigned at the Board's discretion to partially funded or currently unfunded projects.



With no questions from the committee, Mr. Stewart concluded by outlining the next steps. The Board will consider the TTC's recommendation at its July 10 meeting. If approved, these projects will be incorporated into the 2026–2029 TIP. That development process will take place in August and September and will include a public comment period, giving the community an opportunity to provide input on both these projects and others that may carry over or receive funding through different sources.

Mr. Clark motioned to recommend the approval of the 2027-2029 Call for Projects – Approval of Final Awards and Contingency Lists as presented. Mr. Picanco seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

5 Draft CY 2026 Unified List

Ms. McMenamy presented an update on behalf of Mr. Fletcher, who was away at a conference. She introduced the annual update to the unified list, which serves as the region's main tool for communicating transportation priorities to Congressional representatives, state legislators, and other funding partners. The list is also supported by local Chambers of Commerce, who incorporate it into their own advocacy materials. Member agencies are encouraged to ensure their submitted projects also align with their legislative agendas, with the goal of presenting a unified regional message.

This year's update followed an expedited process due to the ongoing development of Horizon 2050. The evaluation criteria remained unchanged, and agencies were only asked to submit updates if they had new projects or changes to existing ones they wished to have rescored. Staff reviewed the submissions, with the scoring process wrapping up in mid-June.

For the 2024 update to the state version of the unified list, one new project was submitted by STA—the Clean Energy Campus—and three previously submitted projects were reevaluated after not being included last year. Seven projects already on the list were also resubmitted with updated information. Feedback from past outreach efforts has emphasized the value of maintaining both a federal and state version of the list, submitting it early to aid in legislative planning, and keeping the list focused and succinct rather than continuing to expand its length. Ms. McMenamy then reviewed the updated project phases. The implementation phase includes projects that are construction-ready, with no changes proposed at this time. In the development phase, some projects were resubmitted but maintained their previous scores (marked in green), while others received slight scoring increases (marked in blue). No new additions were made to this phase. On the initiation side, there was one new addition: STA's Clean Energy Campus Phase One project, which scored well and is being recommended for inclusion. That project was marked in purple. STA representatives shared a brief overview, noting the agency's growing space needs and its work toward a zero-emission fleet and long-term facilities planning.

Projects shaded in gray were not recommended to move forward at this time, but may be



reconsidered during future updates. The unified list will be presented to the Board in the coming weeks, with final approval expected in September. Agencies with questions about project scoring were encouraged to reach out directly to Mr. Fletcher later in the week.

During discussion, Mr. Quinn-Hurst asked about the pros and cons of narrowing the list. Ms. McMenamy explained that legislators often request a more prioritized list to make decision-making easier, sometimes asking whether the list is ranked numerically. However, the Board has preferred to keep the list broad and regionally representative, without assigning strict rankings. The emphasis has remained on communicating regional priorities collectively rather than advocating for any single project as the top priority.

6 Horizon 2050 – Chapters 3-4 & Future Projects Overview

Mr. Lien continued the conversation around Horizon 2050, focusing on chapters 3 and 4 of the long-range transportation plan. These chapters look ahead to the region's future conditions and outline how transportation investments will be prioritized through 2050.

He began by stepping back to reflect on the many efforts that have fed into the plan over the past few years, including the Smart Mobility Plan, resiliency work, ongoing public outreach, the Unified List, the Congestion Management Process, the Regional Safety Action Plan, and the CTR Plan. These have all been integrated into a broader needs assessment developed with consultant support.

Chapters 1 and 2, which were reviewed last month, focused on existing conditions. Chapters 3 and 4 look forward: forecasting traffic and population growth, tracking performance measures, defining priority networks for various travel modes, projecting financial resources, and exploring implementation strategies and future scenarios that might affect transportation in the region.

Key to Chapter 4 are the categories of need: regionally significant projects, program areas, operations and maintenance, and preservation. These categories are balanced against an estimated \$14 billion in total funding through 2050. Similar to Horizon 2045, most of that funding is expected to go toward preservation and maintenance, with smaller allocations to new capital investments. Lien noted that any increase in one area would mean reductions elsewhere, emphasizing the importance of weighing trade-offs.

He walked through the updated list of regionally significant projects—those with systemwide impact and assigned costs. Some have been completed and are proposed for removal. Others, like the final segment of the North Spokane Corridor, are moving to the short-term list based on anticipated completion timelines. Some projects are being reclassified; for example, Whistlarks Way Improvements is recommended to shift from the regionally significant list to the road capital program area due to changes in scope. A few new projects were proposed for inclusion, including STA's I-90 Valley High Performance Transit, Harvard Road Reconstruction, and Sprague Avenue Reconstruction. One project—Park Road/BNSF Grade Separation—is recommended for reclassification as an unfunded need based on updated priorities.

Program areas—such as active transportation, safety, transit, and TSMO—are expected to



receive about \$1.8 billion. Mr. Lien shared illustrative projects within each category to help paint a clearer picture of what those investments could look like. He noted that safety has emerged as a public and Board priority, and suggested increasing the safety funding target by slightly reducing other allocations, such as bridge-related projects, which are already accounted for by larger bridge projects in the regionally significant list. There was also interest in reclassifying some active transportation projects as safety-related when appropriate.

Mr. Quinn-Hurst asked whether regional planning efforts like Division Connects would fall under the planning category. Mr. Lien confirmed they would and noted that the current planning allocation is closer to half a percent. He suggested that rounding up to a full one percent—roughly \$18 million—might better reflect the value of planning efforts and align with recent feedback.

The region's financial outlook remains relatively flat compared to the previous plan. While a new gas tax increase may bring in some additional state-level funding, and some STA forecasts may show increases for transit-related categories, the overall pie remains similar to Horizon 2045. A federal revenue reduction scenario was also modeled, showing the impact of potential cuts in 2027 if federal funding drops by 10 to 20 percent. These exercises help illustrate potential future trade-offs.

The full draft of Horizon 2050 is expected to be ready for review in August, with a proposed release for public comment in September and final Board approval in November. A public survey that has been open throughout the year will close at the end of June and will help guide final adjustments to the plan.

Mr. Lien invited members to reach out if they wanted to explore specific topics in more detail and offered to schedule further discussions if needed over the summer.

INFORMATION (NO PRESENTATION)

7 Agency Update

Ms. McMenamy shared a few updates, starting with a reminder that the MTP survey closes on June 30. She encouraged members to take the survey if they haven't already—it's available on the SRTC website. She also noted that outreach staff have been actively promoting the survey at community events like Summer Parkways and appreciated seeing many committee members engaging with the public.

She announced that recruitment is underway for SRTC's equity working group and invited members to suggest individuals or communities who may be interested in participating. Anyone with recommendations can reach out to her, Michael Redlinger, or Savannah Creasy. On the funding side, she mentioned the potential for redistributed obligation authority at the end of the year. This opportunity arises if other states don't fully spend their federal funds, and it could help cover cost overruns for eligible SRTC-funded projects currently in the TIP. She's already reached out to most agencies but flagged that she would be following up with Luke about a preservation project that may qualify. She also noted that Airway Heights



doesn't have any currently active SRTC-funded TIP projects, but asked members to let her know if she missed anything.

Regarding the July meeting, she said the date would remain on calendars for now, pending final direction from the Board. Once confirmed, staff will make sure attendees are notified if the meeting is canceled.

Ms. McMenemy welcomed Angela Paparazzo as SRTC's new Associate Transportation Planner. Ms. Paparazzo gave a brief introduction, and Ms. McMenemy added that she recently graduated from Eastern Washington University's planning program and previously completed an internship with STA. She shared that the team is excited to have Ms. Paparazzo on board.

Lastly, she shared that staff liaison assignments for the committee will shift in July, with David Fletcher stepping in to support Mr. Greene for the remainder of the year.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:59 PM

Anadia Grier, Clerk of the Board