



## Transportation Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, November 19, 2025- 3:00 pm

### # 1 Call to Order/ Excused Absences

Mr. Vose called the meeting to order at 3:04 pm, and attendance was taken.

### Excused Absence:

In attendance were:

#### Committee Members:

Michael Ankney (Vice Chair)  
John Barber  
Raychel Callary  
David Eash  
Charles Hansen  
Carlie Hoffman  
Katie Melby  
Paul Vose (Chair)  
Ann Winkler  
Kim Zentz

#### Staff:

Eve McMenemy  
*Deputy Executive Director*  
Savannah Creasey  
*Comm. & PR Coor.*  
David Fletcher  
*Principal Transp. Planner*  
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*

#### Absent Members:

Mark Johnson

#### Guests:

Courtney Hamilton  
Derrick Braaten  
*J-U-B Engineers*



## # 2 Public Comments

There were no public comments.

## # 3 Member Comments

Mr. Barber expressed his appreciation to SRTC for the TAC celebration, and Mr. Kloskey thanked him for attending.

## #4 Chair Report on SRTC Board Meeting

Mr. Vose gave a brief overview of November's SRTC Board meeting.

## ACTION ITEMS

### # 3 Consent Agenda

- a. October TAC Meeting Minutes

***Mr. Barber moved to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Ms. Zentz seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.***

### # 4 Horizon 2050 – Approval

Mr. Lien presented the requested action for committee recommendation on Horizon 2050, SRTC's Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Regional Transportation Plan. He explained that the plan fulfills both federal MPO and state RTPO functions. He noted that draft versions have been available in packets since September and that the version linked in the meeting materials reflects recent updates.

He highlighted key updates incorporated throughout Horizon 2050. These include refreshed guiding principles, updated regional activity centers, and a revised financial forecast through the planning horizon year of 2050. He noted that the updated revenue projections influenced program funding targets. The regionally significant project list was also revised, with many projects carried over from Horizon 2045, some removed, and some newly added. Additional updates were completed across all chapters—including updated text, data, and appendices. He specifically pointed to the updated system performance report, which documents performance measures and system performance outcomes.

The draft plan was released for a 30-day public comment period beginning after the October board meeting and closing on November 10. An open house was held on October 21 as part of that outreach. The comments received during this period informed several minor adjustments, which are reflected in the current draft.

He then provided an overview of the feedback submitted. Washington State DOT, STA staff, Community Smart Northwest, and State Parks submitted comments that largely resulted in minor edits or clarifications. A citizen comment encouraged greater investment in intelligent transportation technologies and better signal coordination across jurisdictions. Approximately 20 of the roughly 90 total comments expressed opposition to light rail to North Idaho; Mr. Lien clarified that such a project is not included in Horizon 2050 and appears to stem from a



misunderstanding of the plan's contents. Three project-specific comments were also noted: STA requested a revised western terminus for the Appleway Bus Rapid Transit line based on updated planning; one citizen objected to the Barker Road capacity projects near the I-90 interchange and recommended redirecting funds to other improvements; and WSDOT clarified that Spokane Valley—not WSDOT—should be identified as the sole responsible agency for the Barker Road I-90 interchange project.

All comments and SRTC's responses are documented in Appendix A of the plan. Mr. Lien concluded by stating that the committee's recommendation would advance to the Board of Directors for action at its December 11 meeting.

Members expressed appreciation for both the plan's outcomes and the work that supported its development. Ms. Callary noted her enthusiasm for several of the final projects, observing that they will strengthen walkability and create new connections between neighborhoods and nearby businesses. Ms. Zentz commended the public outreach process, stating that it reached communities and locations that had not typically been engaged in past cycles and thanked staff for the breadth of effort. Mr. Lien added that he was pleased with how the plan came together, acknowledging the substantial work contributed by SRTC staff, partner agencies, and the public engagement team. He highlighted that committee and board input played an important role and expressed appreciation for the collective effort that supported the plan's completion.

***Ms. Zentz made a motion to recommend the approval of Horizon 2050 as presented. Mr. Hansen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.***

## INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

### **# 5 2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Guidebook – Draft**

Mr. Stewart opened the discussion by clarifying that the 2026 TIP Guidebook was on the agenda for information and discussion, rather than action, to allow for additional conversations with committees and the TIP working group. He noted that the draft document had been linked in the meeting packet and encouraged members to review it in detail. He reminded the committee that the TIP Guidebook serves as the overarching programming guidance for the region, providing direction to committees and the board on project inclusion, amendments, and administrative modifications, and emphasized its importance for local TIP managers in meeting critical deadlines.

Mr. Stewart summarized key revisions to the guidebook, including updates to the definition of regionally significant projects, removal of the requirement for regional air quality transportation conformity determinations, updates to project selection to reflect the 2025 call for projects, and inclusion of the schedule for developing the next TIP covering 2027–2030. He also highlighted updates to the congestion management process and emphasized the schedules for submitting amendments and administrative modifications. He explained that Policy 4.4, which allows for an automatic two-year extension if a project phase is delayed, was under review because the two-year extension could jeopardize the region's ability to meet



annual obligation targets, which impacts potential additional funding. He noted that staff had discussed narrowing the extension to a one-time, one-year extension for right-of-way and construction phases, with a March 1 deadline for requests, while allowing flexibility if a sponsor can advance another project or phase to maintain the obligation target.

Mr. Stewart responded to questions from committee members to clarify these revisions. In response to Mr. Barber, he confirmed that if a sponsor misses the March 1 deadline for an extension, notification is critical, and staff would work to balance the program as possible, but projects that fail to meet the deadline could risk not receiving an extension. Ms. Zentz asked whether everyone understood the parameters for successfully obligating another project under the open-ended language, and Mr. Stewart acknowledged that while the language allows some flexibility, TIP managers generally understand the requirements and value of this approach. Ms. Hoffman asked about legal implications if the language remained vague without a hard deadline, and Mr. Stewart indicated that there are no known legal requirements prohibiting flexible language, although any board-adopted policy could be subject to legal interpretation if challenged.

Mr. Stewart concluded by noting that Policy 4.5 allows for additional board-approved extensions, with funding returning to the region if the board does not grant the request. He emphasized that the intent of these policies is not punitive but to maintain flexibility while ensuring the region meets its obligation targets. He outlined next steps, including further discussion at the December TIP working group, refinement of the guidebook language, updates to the board, and returning to the committee next month to seek a recommendation for board approval in January.

## **# 6 Transportation Performance Management (TPM): PM1 – Safety Targets**

Mr. Kloskey provided an update on Spokane Regional Transportation Council's (SRTC) Transportation Performance Management (TPM) efforts, focusing on Performance Measure 1 (safety). TPM, established under MAP-21 and the FAST Act, uses a data-driven, performance-based approach to improve accountability and align resources with measurable targets for safety, reliability, and efficiency. In Washington, safety targets align with Target Zero, the state's goal to eliminate traffic fatalities and serious injuries by 2030. Programs such as the Highway Safety Improvement Program fund projects proven to reduce crash risks. States set annual safety targets for five measures: fatalities, fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (VMT), serious injuries, serious injuries per 100 million VMT, and non-motorist fatalities and serious injuries. MPOs may support the state's targets or adopt separate regional targets, which requires additional reporting.

Mr. Kloskey presented recent data showing that the statewide 2026 targets include fewer than 471 fatalities, a fatality rate of 0.8 per 100 million VMT, fewer than 2,023 serious injuries, a serious injury rate of 3.476 per 100 million VMT, and fewer than 467 non-motorist fatalities and serious injuries. Regionally, SRTC's portion of the 2026 targets includes fewer than 36 fatalities, 0.9 fatalities per 100 million VMT, fewer than 142 serious injuries, 3.769 serious injuries per 100 million VMT, and 42.7 non-motorist fatalities and serious injuries. While statewide measures



have trended upward over the past decade, 2024 showed slight improvements in most categories.

During discussion, Mr. Barber asked whether specific factors are driving the increase in safety incidents. Mr. Kloskey noted that speed, substance use, and distraction are the primary contributors, varying by age group. Ms. Callary raised concerns that enhanced pedestrian crossings may unintentionally reduce awareness that pedestrians can legally cross at any marked or unmarked crosswalk. Ms. Zentz asked about barriers to additional lighting, noting potential financial or jurisdictional constraints, and also questioned the impact of declining driver education programs, particularly in Idaho. Mr. Kloskey noted that behavior change is central to improving safety and that ongoing efforts include education campaigns targeting pedestrians and drivers.

Mr. Kloskey concluded by highlighting the Regional Safety Action Plan, adopted in 2024, which aims for a 50% reduction in fatal and serious injury crashes by 2030 on the high-injury network and zero fatal and serious injury crashes in the planning area by 2042. Data and targets will be reassessed every four to five years. Historically, SRTC has recommended aligning regional planning with the state's targets, though this may be reconsidered as the 2030 Target Zero deadline approaches. A December board discussion will seek a recommendation on whether to adopt regional targets or continue supporting state targets, with board action expected in early 2026.

## **# 7 2026 Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) Officers Election**

Mr. Vose and Mr. Kloskey provided an overview of the upcoming Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) officer elections for 2026. They noted that the TAC, established under the 2021 interlocal agreement as a standing committee of the SRTC Board, follows bylaws requiring annual election of a chair and vice chair. The chair may serve no more than two consecutive one-year terms, and the vice chair may succeed the chair upon completion of their term or a vacancy. Any vacancies are filled through nomination and a majority vote of TAC members.

During discussion, members were invited to express interest in the chair and vice chair positions. Mr. Vose shared personal reflections on serving as chair, emphasizing the supportive role of SRTC staff and encouraging members to consider stepping into leadership roles. Mr. Kloskey confirmed that the current vice chair, Mr. Ankney, is interested in serving as chair. Members were reminded that formal elections will occur in December and were encouraged to reach out to staff or current officers with questions.

The discussion also highlighted ongoing efforts to expand committee membership and increase diversity. In response to a question about technical recruitment, Mr. Kloskey noted that the recruitment period continues until November 28 and encouraged members to share the opportunity to broaden participation.

## **# 8 Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Reduction Framework and Comprehensive Plan**



## **Certification Final Report**

Mr. Stewart provided an update on the VMT Reduction Framework and related comprehensive plan certification work, noting this effort began in May–June and has since involved extensive coordination with member jurisdictions, consultants, and advisory committees. He explained that the state legislature tasked WSDOT with developing strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, recognizing that lowering vehicle miles traveled is a major component of that work. After producing an initial statewide report, the legislature allocated additional funding to regions, acknowledging that needs vary significantly between areas like central Puget Sound, Spokane, Tri-Cities, and southwest Washington. SRTC used its allocation to advance a regional VMT framework and update its comprehensive plan certification process.

Mr. Stewart recapped the project’s scope: establishing a VMT reduction framework for the Spokane region and aligning it with new Growth Management Act requirements that local jurisdictions must address in their 2026 comprehensive plan updates. He described the working group meetings, technical presentations to SRTC committees, and one-on-one meetings with local staff. Feedback from the Planning Technical Advisory Committee helped shape the May draft into a refined September version.

He summarized findings from the state-of-practice review conducted with Kittelson & Associates, which examined approaches in Washington and in states with more established GHG-reduction programs. While statewide legislation outlines expectations, he noted that regions are not yet required to set specific VMT targets. Many peer MPOs are improving their data and modeling tools while awaiting further state guidance. SRTC uses a blend of regional travel model data, HPMS data, and passive mobility datasets, though each comes with limitations. Until consistent, high-quality data is available, the recommendation is to provide jurisdictions with monitoring information, support their plan updates, and wait for clearer state direction before establishing regional targets.

Mr. Stewart briefly revisited the scenario analysis presented in May. Aligning directly with statewide targets would imply nearly a 50% reduction in per-capita VMT—an unrealistic outcome for a region with lower density and different transit conditions. Forecasting based on Horizon 2050 land use instead shows per-capita VMT increasing to around 20 daily miles. Based on this, the team recommends continuing monitoring rather than setting targets prematurely.

He then outlined updates to the comprehensive plan certification process. Under the Growth Management Act, SRTC must certify that local transportation elements—and related components such as land use—are consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan and mandatory GMA elements. New requirements include climate change and resiliency strategies, per-capita VMT monitoring, ADA transition planning, equity and multimodal provisions, and locally developed multimodal level of service standards. SRTC reviews these elements for inclusion but does not prescribe specific methodologies.

Mr. Stewart also reviewed changes under SB 5412, which allow certain housing types—such as



infill and middle housing—to bypass SEPA review at the development proposal stage if analyses are addressed at the comprehensive plan level. This shifts impact evaluation to a more conceptual level, requiring modeling assumptions rather than project-specific details. He clarified that while SRTC receives SEPA checklists for information, cities and counties remain responsible for SEPA enforcement and coordination with WSDOT.

During the discussion, Ms. Zentz asked how SRTC determines vehicle occupancy in its calculations and whether age cohorts affect the per-capita methodology. Mr. Stewart explained that the model accounts for person throughput rather than relying solely on vehicle counts, and age cohorts can be considered in the demographic inputs. He added that the model remains under refinement as new datasets become available.

Mr. Barber asked whether the emphasis on reducing VMT is primarily tied to air quality benefits, and whether increasing adoption of electric and hybrid vehicles changes that relationship. Mr. Stewart clarified that while reductions in tailpipe emissions remain a major factor, VMT reductions are also linked to broader environmental considerations, including particulate pollution from tire wear, heavier vehicle weight, and other non-tailpipe sources. He emphasized that VMT is only one strategy among many, and that the largest long-term influence on emissions and travel behavior comes from land-use patterns that support shorter trips, walking, transit access, and overall reduced reliance on personal vehicles.

## **# 9 FFY 2027-2032 National Highway Freight Program (NHFP) Project Solicitation and Selection Process**

Mr. Fletcher provided an overview of the recently announced FFY 2027–2032 National Highway Freight Program (NHFP) project solicitation by WSDOT, outlining funding levels, project eligibility, and the evaluation and selection process. He explained that the NHFP provides federal funding to improve freight efficiency on the National Highway Freight Network (NHFN), with an estimated \$11 million per year available for local projects, totaling roughly \$55 million over the program period. He noted that funding is contingent on continued reauthorization of the IIJA, which expires next year, but anticipated that reauthorization will occur in a similar form.

Mr. Fletcher described the solicitation process, which requires MPOs to submit consolidated regional lists of freight investment priorities for consideration. He emphasized that this federal process is distinct from the state-funded Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board (FMSIB) call for projects, although both target freight projects and local agencies may consider leveraging funding from both sources. Unlike the FMSIB process, NHFP projects must be submitted through the MPO. Referring to the 2022 cycle, he noted that four of six previously submitted projects received nearly \$9 million in funding, exceeding the region's proportionate share based on both population and NHFN lane miles.

He reviewed project eligibility requirements, including clear benefits to freight transportation, readiness to obligate funds during 2027–2032, and eligible activities such as preliminary engineering, right-of-way acquisition, and construction, with a required 13.5% non-federal



match. Mr. Fletcher also discussed evaluation criteria, aligning with WSDOT's six statewide transportation goals: preservation, safety, stewardship, economic vitality, mobility, and the environment, noting that bonus points are available for projects providing truck parking benefits or network redundancy. He proposed using the same evaluation criteria as in 2022, given their prior success in securing funding, and invited input from the committee.

Projects will be identified through the SRTC Unified List and Horizon 2050, while local agencies may submit additional projects that meet the criteria. Mr. Fletcher reviewed the proposed schedule: criteria will be presented to committees later this month, a draft regional priorities list will be returned in December for committee review, the Board will receive the draft in January, and the final list will be presented for approval in February to meet WSDOT's February 27 submittal deadline.

Committee members asked clarifying questions regarding project benefits, process overlap, and timelines. Mr. Barber noted that many proposed projects could benefit multiple modes beyond freight, and Mr. Fletcher confirmed that the evaluation criteria allow projects that support other modes, such as active transportation, transit, or general vehicular traffic, to score competitively if they also advance freight efficiency. Ms. Zentz asked about the role of FHWA and the state's Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board (FMSIB), and Mr. Fletcher explained that the NHFP is federally funded and managed separately from state-funded FMSIB projects, though both programs support freight improvements. Ms. Zentz observed that some duplication exists between processes but agreed that the NHFP process is thorough. Mr. Vose commented that the solicitation timeline seems short, highlighting the need for careful coordination to meet deadlines.

## **# 10 Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) Application and Selection**

Mr. Kloskey provided an overview of the application and selection process for new members of the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC). He noted that the application period opened on October 13 and will close on November 28, with review and scoring of applications planned for mid to late December. Invitations to join the committee will be sent following that review. The committee is recruiting six new members, including four permanent members and additional alternates, as recently approved through a bylaw amendment.

The application consists of 14 questions covering standard information, including demographics, geographic representation, professional background, community involvement, and other regional considerations. Applications are available on the SRTC website and via staff email, with assistance provided for applicants who may need support, including individuals from the blind community.

The selection process involves a review by Mr. Kloskey and three colleagues. Rather than assigning numeric scores, they evaluate applications based on factors such as diversity of profession, geographic representation of residence and workplaces, and minimizing overlap with existing committee members. Once applicants providing the most benefit to the committee are identified, they will be notified, and the list of selected members will be



presented to the Board of Directors in January for approval of the roster for the following two years.

Mr. Kloskey noted that six applications have been received to date, with additional submissions expected, ensuring that all open positions will be filled and the committee will maintain a full roster of 16 members. He encouraged committee members to share the application opportunity with potential candidates and offered to answer any questions regarding the process.

There were no questions or comments.

## **INFORMATION (NO PRESENTATION)**

### **# 8 Agency Update**

Mr. Kloskey provided agency updates to the Technical Advisory Committee. He noted that Executive Director Lois Bollenback was unable to attend due to illness and expressed her appreciation for the committee members' time and commitment.

He highlighted the City of Airway Heights' draft ADA Transition Plan and encouraged committee members to participate in the public engagement process. The plan aims to identify physical barriers in public facilities, including sidewalks, curb ramps, shared-use paths, parks, and city buildings, and outlines methods to achieve ADA compliance and priority projects aligned with the 2023 Comprehensive Plan. Comments on the draft plan are being accepted through November 2025, and Mr. Kloskey offered to connect interested members with the city engineers leading the effort.

Mr. Kloskey also emphasized that the committee's work benefits both the region and its members. He invited members to suggest topics for presentations or discussions, either during member comments or via email, to ensure their interests are addressed in future meetings. He concluded by noting that members were welcome to stay for refreshments and socializing and reminded the committee that the next meeting is scheduled a week earlier than usual, on December 17.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:20 PM

---

Anadia Grier, Clerk of the Board