



Spokane Regional Transportation Council

Transportation Advisory Committee Meeting

Wednesday, April 22, 2026 at 3:00 PM

Hybrid In Person/Virtual Meeting

- **In Person: 421 W Riverside Ave, Suite 504, Spokane WA 99201**
- **Online via Zoom:**

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82360883378?pwd=VcLjTKsLWwph4jxVLrYR4CnWMQLFVA.1>

Meeting ID: 823 6088 3378 | Passcode: 674742

By Phone 1-253-215-8782

Meeting ID: 880 1169 5265 | Passcode: 807716

Or find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82360883378?pwd=VcLjTKsLWwph4jxVLrYR4CnWMQLFVA.1>

SRTC welcomes public comments at the Transportation Advisory Committee meetings.

The deadline for submitting written comments is 10:00 am on the day of the meeting and can be submitted:

- By email: contact.srtc@srtc.org
- By mail: 421 W Riverside Ave Suite 500, Spokane WA 99201
- By phone: 509.343.6370

Verbal comments may also be provided during the comment period at the beginning of the meeting.

SRTC is committed to nondiscrimination in accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 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.



Transportation Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, February 25, 2025- 3:00 pm

1 Call to Order/ Excused Absences

Mr. Ankney called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm, and attendance was taken.

Excused Absence:

In attendance were:

Committee Members:

Mike Ankney (Chair)
Jared Aranda
John Barber (Vice Chair)
Derrick Braaten
Raychel Callary
David Eash
John Griffin
Anna Gyure Havlek
Monica Harwood Duncan
Charles Hansen
Carlie Hoffman
Katie Melby
Paul Vose
Ann Winkler
Kim Zentz

Staff:

Lois Bollenback
Executive Director
Eve McMenemy
Deputy Executive Director
Savannah Creasey
Comm. & PR Coor.
Anadia Grier
Admin-Executive Coor.
David Fletcher
Principal Transp. Planner
Jason Lien
Principal Transp. Planner
Ryan Stewart
Principal Transp. Planner
Michael Redlinger
Associate Transp. Planner 3
Angela Paparazzo
Associate Transp. Planner 1

Guests:

Glenn Wagemann
WSDOT-ER



2 Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Member Comments

There were no member comments.

Chair Report on SRTC Board Meeting

Mr. Ankney gave a brief overview of February's SRTC Board meeting.

ACTION ITEMS

3 Consent Agenda

- a. January TAC Meeting Minutes
- b. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment - March

Ms. Zentz made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Mr. Braaten seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

4 Guest Presentation: Managing I-90 Corridor Transportation Operations

Mr. Wagemann provided a high-level update on how I-90 is operating from the SR-904/Cheney area to the Idaho state line, as background for SRTC's upcoming work to study I-90 operations and possible parallel routes. He explained that freeway performance is commonly described using "level of service," which is a way to describe how traffic conditions range from free-flowing to stop-and-go as the number of vehicles increases and drivers have less room to merge and maneuver.

Mr. Wagemann reported that I-90 generally operates well on the west end near SR-904/Geiger, with lower traffic volumes, but conditions become more challenging where major ramps and lane changes increase merging activity. He noted that the most consistent afternoon congestion occurs in the central portion of the corridor, particularly where older freeway design and closely spaced entrances and exits create heavy weaving and recurring backups. Farther east, operations generally improve where interchanges are spaced farther apart, but slowdowns return between Sullivan and the Harvard/Liberty Lake area due to a lane drop at Barker, heavy exiting demand, and added merging from the Appleway/Greenacres on-ramp. Near the state line, traffic typically returns to near posted-speed conditions as volumes decrease.

He described WSDOT's approach as prioritizing safety and making practical operational improvements before pursuing major capacity expansion. He summarized findings from a prior corridor study that led to tools such as ramp metering and expanded incident response. He stated that ramp meters have reduced the length of recurring peak-period backups and improved travel times through the most congested segment, while also reducing crashes at key merge locations. He emphasized that incident response is critical because many major



delays come from unexpected events such as collisions, and clearing incidents quickly helps restore traffic flow and reduces secondary crashes in queues.

Looking ahead, Mr. Wagemann outlined several strategies under consideration, including additional ramp meters at key westbound entrances, more electronic message signs to warn drivers sooner of congestion or incidents, and traffic management tools to help manage speeds and guide drivers during disruptions. He also emphasized the importance of operating I-90 as part of a broader system by encouraging very short trips to use local streets when feasible, improving local connections, and expanding transit options that reduce pressure on the freeway. He noted continued coordination with Spokane Transit Authority on concepts such as potential flyer stops near Argonne and Liberty Lake to support transit use along the corridor.

During discussion, members emphasized the value of studying I-90 alongside local routes and travel alternatives to improve reliability during peak congestion and major incidents. Mr. Wagemann reinforced that the goal is a coordinated, systemwide approach involving multiple agencies and strategies, rather than relying solely on adding lanes.

5 CY 2027 Unified List Process & Criteria – Draft

Mr. Fletcher provided an overview of the CY 2027 Unified List process and proposed updates to the project evaluation criteria. He explained that the Unified List is SRTC's main tool for communicating regional transportation priorities to state and federal legislators and is updated annually. Projects typically begin in the long-range plan, Horizon 2050, move into the Unified List when they are ready to seek funding, and then advance to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) once fully funded and ready for construction.

He described the structure of the Unified List, which organizes projects into three stages: initiation (early planning), development (more defined with some funding or design work), and implementation (close to construction). He also outlined the timeline for this year's update, noting that project submissions will occur from May to June, followed by staff review and development of a draft list in August. The draft and final versions will be reviewed by committees and the Board in the fall, with separate versions prepared for state and federal audiences.

Mr. Fletcher reviewed the current evaluation criteria, which are based on seven guiding principles from Horizon 2050, including economic vitality, safety, and equity. Each category is currently weighted equally, but he noted that updates are proposed this year to better reflect recent planning work and community priorities.

He highlighted proposed changes to the economic vitality category, which update how projects are scored based on their connection to regional activity centers, such as major employment areas or smaller neighborhood hubs. The revisions introduce more detailed scoring based on the type of center and how well a project supports the surrounding area, including transit, walking, or freight needs.



He then explained the proposed updates to the operations, maintenance, and preservation category. This category would receive a higher weighting based on feedback that maintaining and improving the existing system is a top priority. New criteria would reward projects that improve travel reliability on congested corridors and align with strategies identified in the region's congestion management process, with an emphasis on lower-cost, practical solutions.

Similarly, the safety and security category would also receive increased weighting. New criteria would prioritize projects that address safety issues on the region's high-injury network and consider overall crash patterns—not just severe crashes—by factoring in areas with high collision rates.

During discussion, Mr. Fletcher clarified that safety improvements could still be recognized even if a project is not directly located on a high-injury corridor, as long as it helps address safety issues in that area.

He concluded by noting that the proposed criteria will be presented to the SRTC Board next month, and staff will return to the committee in April for a final recommendation.

6 Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan (CPT-HSTP) – Update

Ms. Paparazzo presented an overview of the update to the Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan (HSTP) for the 2026–2030 cycle. She explained that the HSTP is a required plan that coordinates transit funding and resources and must be updated every 4 years for the region to remain eligible for state and federal transportation grants. The plan is developed in partnership with Spokane Transit Authority (STA), which uses it to help guide funding decisions, particularly for programs that support specialized transportation services.

She explained that the purpose of the HSTP is to improve mobility by helping people better access existing transit services, with a focus on those who rely on transit the most, including seniors, youth, people with disabilities, and individuals experiencing poverty. The plan also identifies gaps in current transportation services and helps local providers pursue funding to address those gaps and improve connections across the community.

Ms. Paparazzo emphasized that community outreach is central to the planning process. Efforts include stakeholder meetings, public events across both urban and rural areas, a public survey, coordination with local service providers, and data collection and mapping to better understand travel needs. She noted that SRTC is leading the plan development, with support from STA staff, who are assisting with service inventory and outreach coordination.

She shared that the plan is currently in the early stages of development and outreach, with adoption anticipated in July. Once completed, the plan will provide a clearer understanding of regional transportation needs and ensure continued access to state and federal funding.

During discussion, Ms. Gyure Havlek suggested including neighborhood councils as part of the outreach strategy to capture more localized perspectives. Ms. Paparazzo agreed and noted



that outreach to neighborhood groups is being considered as part of ongoing efforts to expand engagement and better understand community-specific needs.

7 Public Participation Plan (PPP) Workshop

Ms. Creasey facilitated a workshop to gather input on updates to SRTC's Public Participation Plan (PPP), which outlines how the agency engages the public and communicates opportunities to get involved. She shared that the plan is currently being drafted and that outreach is already underway, including an online survey, participation in community events such as Lunar New Year, and upcoming outreach at El Mercadito and the Equity Working Group. She also noted ongoing coordination with stakeholders and communications staff from partner agencies.

Ms. Creasey explained that feedback from the workshop would help determine which outreach methods SRTC should prioritize, how to best coordinate outreach with the TAC, and possibly spark new ideas to incorporate into the plan. Participants were asked a series of questions about how people prefer to receive information, what works well, and what challenges exist in public outreach.

Participants shared that no single outreach method works for everyone. While email was seen as a reliable way to reach people, social media was noted as important for reaching broader and younger audiences. Others emphasized that outreach methods often work best when combined, such as using events or social media to direct people to surveys. There was also interest in shorter, more convenient engagement options, such as quick surveys or text-based outreach.

When discussing the clarity of SRTC's work, participants generally felt the information was understandable but noted that technical language and acronyms can be barriers. Members also raised concerns about "outreach fatigue," in which community members receive requests from multiple agencies and may not understand the differences among them, highlighting the need for better coordination.

Participants identified several common barriers to public participation, including limited time, lack of awareness, language barriers, and competing priorities. They emphasized the importance of meeting people where they are, rather than expecting them to seek out opportunities to engage.

The group also discussed which communities should be better represented in outreach efforts, including transit-dependent populations, people with disabilities, and underserved groups. Members noted that many of these groups overlap and that partnerships with trusted community organizations can help improve engagement.

In discussing effective outreach, participants emphasized the importance of not only collecting input but also clearly communicating how that feedback is used. Demonstrating that public input leads to real decisions was seen as critical to building trust and reducing



engagement fatigue. The SRTC website was identified as a strong tool, with feedback that it is user-friendly and contains valuable resources, though awareness of those resources could be improved.

Participants suggested several ways SRTC could improve outreach, including increasing coordination with partner agencies, expanding neighborhood-level engagement, improving visibility, and sharing successful strategies across agencies. There was also interest in SRTC playing a stronger role as a central hub for information and outreach coordination.

The discussion concluded with ideas for how committee members can support outreach efforts, including sharing information within their networks, helping connect SRTC to community groups, and being active in the community to promote engagement opportunities. Ms. Creasey thanked participants and noted that their input will directly inform the development of the updated Public Participation Plan.

INFORMATION (NO PRESENTATION)

8 Agency Update

Mr. Fletcher provided a brief agency update, noting that the March committee meeting has been canceled and that the next meeting will take place in April.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:43 PM

Anadia Grier, Clerk of the Board



To: Transportation Advisory Committee
From: Ben Kloskey, Associate Transportation Planner II
Topic: CY 2026-2029 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment
- April 2026

Requested Action:

Recommend Board approval of the Contingency List process and the April amendment to the CY 2026-2029 Transportation Improvement Program.

Key Points:

- There is 1 project included in the April amendment to the CY 2026-2029 TIP. See the **Attachment** and **Supporting Information** for more details.
- Per TIP Guidebook Policy 6.8, this was the next highest ranked project to receive funds via the 2025 Call for Projects – Preservation contingency list following the returning of funds from several City of Spokane projects which received external grant awards.
- Per TIP Guidebook Policy 3.6, SRTC staff are seeking retroactive approval for this April amendment due to the cancellation of the April 2026 Board of Directors meeting.

AGENCY

City of Spokane

PROJECT

Crestline St. Chip Seal - Illinois to Francis

Board/Committee Discussions:

This is the first committee discussion of the April 2026 TIP Amendment.

Public Involvement:

The proposed April amendment was published for a public review and comment period from 03/16/26 through 03/25/26. On 03/16/2026, notice of the amendment was published in the Spokesman Review and posted on the SRTC website (www.srtc.org) and on social media platforms. There were no comments received for this cycle.

Staff Contact: Ben Kloskey, SRTC | bkloskey@srtc.org | 509.343.6370

2026-2029 Transportation Improvement Program

April Amendment (26-04)

Agency WA STIP ID#	Project Title Amendment Description	Funding Adjustment	
City of Spokane WA-16959	Crestline St. Chip Seal - Illinois to Francis (NEW) New project being added to the TIP from the contingency list. Two other City of Spokane projects received funds through the NHS Asset Management Program and the remaining SRTC awarded funds were transferred to this project, which was next on SRTC's contingency list. Pavement chip seal including pavement crack seal and limited full depth pavement repair.	Federal (STBG)	\$1,350,000
		State	\$0
		Local	\$1,332,000
		Total	\$2,682,000

STBG-Surface Transportation Block Grant



Topic: CY 2026-2029 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment – April

Key Points:

- 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.
- After a TIP has been incorporated into the Washington State TIP (STIP), project changes can be requested by local agencies. Minor changes can be made administratively by SRTC staff. Significant changes must be made through the amendment process, which requires a 10-day public comment period and action by the SRTC Board of Directors.
- The TIP serves as an important tool in implementing the goals, policies, and strategies identified in Horizon 2050, SRTC's long-range plan. As such, any projects included in the TIP, including projects added through monthly amendments, must be consistent with Horizon 2050.
- Consistency with Horizon 2050 includes a demonstration of financial constraint, the congestion management process, and the complete streets policy. The proposed April amendment has been reviewed by SRTC staff for compliance with federal and state requirements and consistency with Horizon 2050.
- TIP amendments must be approved by the SRTC Board to be incorporated into the Washington State TIP (STIP). Projects receiving federal funds must be in both the TIP and the STIP to access those funds.
- Pending approval by the SRTC Board, the April amendment will be incorporated into the STIP on or around 05/15/2026.



To: Transportation Advisory Committee
From: Ben Kloskey, Associate Transportation Planner II
Topic: CY 2026-2029 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment
– May 2026

Requested Action:

Recommend Board approval of the May Amendment to the 2026-2029 Transportation Improvement Program.

Key Points:

There are 5 projects included in the May amendment to the CY 2026-2029 TIP. See the **Attachment** and the **Supporting Information** for more details.

AGENCY

City of Spokane
Airway Heights
City of Spokane Valley
City of Spokane Valley
City of Spokane Valley
WSDOT East

PROJECT

Sunset Hwy Bike Path
US 2 Phase I Pedestrian and Multimodal Enhancements
Appleway Trail & Stormwater (Farr Rd Dishman Mica)
Sullivan Preservation – UPRR to Kiernan
Sullivan Preservation – Spokane River to UPRR **(NEW)**
I-90/Division/Custer/Arthur/ Hamilton - ITS Cabinet Rebuilds

Board/Committee Discussions:

This is the first committee discussion of the May 2026 TIP Amendment.

Public Involvement:

The proposed May amendment was published for a public review and comment period from 04/13/26 through 04/22/26. On 04/13/2026, notice of the amendment was published in the Spokesman Review and posted on the SRTC website (www.srtc.org) and on social media platforms. There were no comments received for this cycle.

Staff Contact: Ben Kloskey, SRTC | bkloskey@srtc.org | 509.343.6370

2026-2029 Transportation Improvement Program

May Amendment (26-05)

Agency WA STIP ID#	Project Title Amendment Description	Funding Adjustment	
City of Spokane Valley WA-15428	Sullivan Preservation – UPRR to Kiernan Project being broken into two separate phases to accommodate the construction of a new ice arena. Project termini shifting to UPRR to Kiernan Ave., from original limits of Spokane River to Kiernan Ave.	Federal (STBG)	\$1,383,009
		State	\$0
		Local	\$1,486,491
		Total	\$2,869,000
City of Spokane Valley TBD	Sullivan Preservation – Spokane River to UPRR (NEW) Phase 2 of the Sullivan Preservation project listed above. Grind and inlay along listed termini after the ice arena is constructed. Engineering phase conducted under project WA-15428.	Federal (N/A)	\$0
		State	\$0
		Local	\$1,430,000
		Total	\$1,430,000
City of Spokane Valley WA-16697	Appleway Trail & Stormwater (Farr Rd Dishman Mica) Moved funding forward for design in 2026 and construction in 2027. Originally scheduled for 2027 and 2028.	Federal (STBG)	\$1,210,467
		State	\$0
		Local	\$188,917
		Total	\$1,399,384
City of Airway Heights WA-16801	US 2 Phase I Pedestrian & Multimodal Enhancements Project added a \$2,000,000 award from the Sandy Williams Connecting Communities program.	Federal (STBG)	\$387,637
		State (CCP)	\$2,417,798
		Local	\$0
		Total	\$2,805,435
City of Spokane WA-16257	Sunset Hwy Bike Path Adding STBG and CMAQ funds from project WA-08171. Rolling eligible leftover funds from that phase of the Sunset Highway shared use path project into this project. Total addition of \$2,247,000.	Federal (STBG,CMAQ)	\$2,247,000
		State	\$1,800,000
		Local	\$500,000
		Total	\$4,547,000

WSDOT EAST 609068C32	I-90/Division/Custer/Arthur/ Hamilton - ITS Cabinet Rebuilds Corrected project record to reflect PE obligation in 2022 and delayed construction due to workforce complications.	Federal (NHPP)	\$231,884
		State	\$4,732
		Local	\$0
		Total	\$236,616

STBG-Surface Transportation Block Grant | CMAQ-Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality program | NHPP-National Highway Preservation Program | CCP-Sandy Williams Connecting Communities Program



Topic: CY 2026-2029 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment – May

Key Points:

- 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.
- After a TIP has been incorporated into the Washington State TIP (STIP), project changes can be requested by local agencies. Minor changes can be made administratively by SRTC staff. Significant changes must be made through the amendment process, which requires a 10-day public comment period and action by the SRTC Board of Directors.
- The TIP serves as an important tool in implementing the goals, policies, and strategies identified in Horizon 2050, SRTC's long-range plan. As such, any projects included in the TIP, including projects added through monthly amendments, must be consistent with Horizon 2050.
- Consistency with Horizon 2050 includes a demonstration of financial constraint, the congestion management process, and the complete streets policy. The proposed May amendment has been reviewed by SRTC staff for compliance with federal and state requirements and consistency with Horizon 2050.
- TIP amendments must be approved by the SRTC Board to be incorporated into the Washington State TIP (STIP). Projects receiving federal funds must be in both the TIP and the STIP to access those funds.
- Pending approval by the SRTC Board, the May amendment will be incorporated into the STIP on or around 06/19/2026.



To: Transportation Advisory Committee
From: David Fletcher, Principal Transportation Planner
Topic: CY 2027 Unified List Process & Criteria – Final

Requested Action:

Recommend SRTC Board approval of the CY 2027 Unified List Project Evaluation Criteria, as shown in the **Attachment**.

Key Points:

- The SRTC Unified List serves as a strategic tool for communicating current regional transportation priorities to state and federal legislators for potential funding opportunities. The list is updated annually.
- The SRTC Board of Directors approved the CY 2026 Unified List at its 10/09/2025 ([State Version](#)) and 11/13/2025 ([Federal Version](#)) meetings.
- On an annual basis, SRTC applies the [Unified List Project Evaluation Criteria](#) to assess candidate projects for potential inclusion. The criteria are designed to identify projects that align with [SRTC's Guiding Principles and Policies](#).
- As part of the CY 2027 Unified List development process, SRTC reviewed and updated the Project Evaluation Criteria to incorporate recent planning work completed through the Horizon 2050 metropolitan transportation plan update. The proposed CY 2027 Unified List Project Evaluation Criteria is included as an **Attachment**.

Board/Committee Discussions:

The draft CY 2027 Unified List process and criteria were presented to the TAC and TTC at their 02/25/2026 meetings, and to the SRTC Board at their 03/12/2026 meeting.

Public Involvement:

All SRTC Board and committee meetings are open to the public.

Staff Contact: David Fletcher, SRTC | dfletcher@srtc.org | 509.343.6370



SRTC Unified List Project Evaluation Criteria

The SRTC Unified List of Regional Transportation Priorities outlines critical investments to improve the performance of the regional transportation system. The Unified List includes a variety of project types supported collectively by members of SRTC with consideration for equity, economic vitality, and safety among other screening criteria that indicate beneficial outcomes to both the state and the region.

250
Total Points
Possible



30
Points

Economic Vitality

Targets transportation investments aimed at the development of a multi-modal system that enhances accessibility and connections among the region's activity centers.

Question 1 **10 points**

- ▶ Does the project improve access to/from or within an **activity center**?
 - » Metropolitan Center or Regional Industrial, Retail, Employment, or Multi-sector Center.....10 points
 - » Neighborhood or Rural Center, or Special Use Area5 points

Question 2 **5 points**

- ▶ Does the project contain active transportation or transit-supportive elements and improve access to/from or within one of the activity center types listed below?
 - » Metropolitan Center
 - » Regional Retail, Employment, or Multi-sector Center
 - » Neighborhood or Rural Center
 - » Special Use Area

Question 3 **5 points**

- ▶ Does the project contain freight-supportive elements and improve access to/from or within one of the activity center types listed below?
 - » Metropolitan Center
 - » Regional Industrial, Retail, or Multi-sector Center

Question 4 **5 points**

- ▶ What is the **forecasted 2050 employment density** of transportation analysis zones (TAZ) within a 0.25-mile buffer of the project?

Question 5 **5 points**

- ▶ Is the project located on the **Freight and Goods Transportation System (FGTS)**?

* Points scaled based on FGTS classification.



**30
Points**

Cooperation and Leadership

Relates to SRTC's role as a regional forum to identify regional transportation needs, establish priorities, and develop strategies to acquire funding in accordance with federal and state planning requirements.

Question 1 **15 points**

- ▶ Is the project identified in the local Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Transit Development Plan, and/or Comprehensive Plan?

Question 2 **15 points**

- ▶ Is the project identified in other agency plans; has it gone through a documented public outreach process?



**30
Points**

Stewardship

Emphasizes transportation investments that maximize positive impacts on the human environment while minimizing negative impacts to the natural environment.

Question 1 **10 points**

- ▶ Does the project incorporate electrification or other clean fuel strategies?

Question 2 **10 points**

- ▶ Does the project increase resilience by adding or preserving redundancy in areas of limited connectivity* or to facilities identified as most critical† in the SRTC System Resiliency Assessment?

* Areas of limited connectivity are defined as those lacking the necessary infrastructure to support federal functional classification (FFC) spacing guidelines and/or transit in areas currently lacking service. More information on FFC spacing guidelines is available in WSDOT's [Guidelines for Amending Functional Classification in Washington State](#) manual.

† The [SRTC System Resiliency Assessment](#) lists the following infrastructure as the region's most critical facilities: I-90 Latah Creek Bridge, viaduct structures downtown, US 2 West overcrossing at US 2 and I-90, US 195 overcrossing at I-90, and the Hwy 290 Spur bridge.

Question 3 **10 points**

- ▶ Does the project reduce air quality emissions or Vehicles Hours Traveled (VHT)/Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?*

* Relates to SRTC's [Regional Vehicle Miles Traveled Reduction Framework Plan](#).



**50
Points**

Operations, Maintenance, and Preservation

Involves strategically investing limited resources to maximize the operations and physical condition of the transportation network.

Question 1 **10 points**

- ▶ Does the project incorporate Transportation Demand Management (TDM) or Transportation Systems Management and Operations (TSMO) solutions or improve capacity without adding travel lanes or roadways?*

* Criteria relates to federal transportation performance management (TPM) requirements.

Question 2 **10 points**

- ▶ Does the project improve mobility on a corridor with a Level of Travel Time Reliability greater than 1.5?*

* Criteria relates to federal TPM requirements.

Question 3 **10 points**

- ▶ Does the project incorporate any strategies from the [CMP Toolkit of Strategies](#) on a Tier 1 or Tier 2 Corridor on the [CMP Network](#)?

- » Specific strategies identified for Tier 1 CMP Corridors in the [CMP Strategies Matrix](#) 10 points

- » Other TDM or operational strategies identified in the CMP Toolkit on a Tier 1 CMP Corridor 8 points

- » Other TDM or operational strategies identified in the CMP Toolkit on a Tier 2 CMP Corridor 6 points

- » Other capacity strategies identified in the CMP Toolkit on a Tier 1 CMP Corridor 4 points

- » Other capacity strategies identified in the CMP Toolkit on a Tier 2 CMP Corridor 2 points

Question 4 **10 points**

- ▶ Does the project improve pavement or bridge condition on the National Highway System (NHS), or contribute to STA's adopted public transit asset management targets?*

* Criteria relates to federal TPM requirements.

Question 5 **10 points**

- ▶ Does the project address a need identified in the [SRTMC ITS Architecture Plan](#), SRTMC Implementation Plan, or local technology plan?



50
Points

Safety and Security

Focuses on designing a safe and secure system for all transportation modes through best-practice design, operational improvements, education and outreach, and technological strategies.

Question 1 15 points

- ▶ Is the project identified in a state, regional, or local safety plan, or an approved prioritized list of safety projects?

Question 2 15 points

- ▶ What **countermeasures** or strategies* does the project incorporate to address crashes that result in serious or fatal injury? If the project is a transit project, how does it contribute to STA safety targets?

* Please provide supporting documentation (e.g., studies, modeling results, or similar evidence) demonstrating the effectiveness of any identified strategies.

Question 3 10 points

- ▶ Does the project address safety issues on the High Injury Network?

Question 4 10 points

- ▶ If the project addresses safety issues, what is the severity-weighted crash rate* of the project area?

* The severity-weighted crash rate represents equivalent property-damage-only (EPDO) crashes per 1 million vehicle miles traveled. It applies weights of 76.8 to fatal and serious injury crashes, and 8.4 to evident or possible injury crashes.



30
Points

Quality of Life

Aims to improve choice and mobility by providing safe and convenient transportation options for people of all abilities.

Question 1 10 points

- ▶ Is the project on the Regional Bicycle Priority Network and does it have a active transportation element(s); or does the project add a new pedestrian connection or feature beyond what is required for ADA compliance?

Question 2 10 points

- ▶ Is the project on the Regional Transit Priority Network and does it have a transit-supportive element(s)?*

* Examples include new/enhanced transit, bus stops, active transportation facilities, pavement work, signal improvements, and TSMO improvements.

Question 3 10 points

- ▶ Does the project extend or fill gap in one of the regional trails, or provide new active transportation connectivity to one of the regional trails?*

* Regional trails: Centennial, Children of the Sun, Ben Burr, Fish Lake, Millwood, Sunset, and Appleway.



30
Points

Equity*

Addresses protecting disadvantaged communities from disproportionately high adverse impacts, while equitably distributing the benefits of transportation investments.

* Equity is a statewide priority and is applied as a criterion only in SRTC's project evaluation and prioritization in it's role as a state-designated Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO).

Question 1 10 points

- ▶ Does the project directly benefit residents in an area of potential disadvantage?

Question 2 5 points

- ▶ If yes to question one, has the project gone through a documented public outreach process, or has targeted engagement been conducted, with communities of potential disadvantage?

Question 3 10 points

- ▶ Does the project incorporate appropriate countermeasures to address safety issues, or contribute to STA safety targets, in an area of potential disadvantage?

Question 4 5 points

- ▶ Does the project provide access or increase transit frequency to/from or within an activity center?



To: Transportation Advisory Committee
From: Ryan Stewart, Principal Transportation Planner
Topic: City of Millwood Comprehensive Plan Certification

Requested Action:

Recommend SRTC Board certification of the City of Millwood's Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update.

Key Points:

- The City of Millwood adopted its 2025 Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update on 11/12/25.
- The SRTC Board adopted the Comprehensive Plan Certification Process update on 01/08/26.
- The City of Millwood provided a complete comprehensive plan certification checklist on 01/21/26.
- SRTC staff have reviewed the City's Comprehensive Plan transportation element and the complete checklist.
- SRTC staff find that the City's transportation chapter and other related elements are consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan, Horizon 2050.
- SRTC staff find that the City's transportation element meets the other requirements as detailed in the SRTC Comprehensive Plan Certification Process.
- Please see the **Attachment** for more details.

Board/Committee Discussions:

This is the first discussion of the City of Millwood's Comprehensive Plan certification with the TAC.

Public Involvement:

All SRTC Board and Committee meetings are open to the public.

Staff Contact: Ryan Stewart, SRTC | rstewart@srtc.org 509.343.6370

Review Checklist

The checklist will be used to conduct and document the certification of comprehensive plan related to 1) conformity with the GMA transportation element content requirements and 2) consistency with the adopted RTP. If “no” is checked for any criterion, additional coordination with the applicant/agency will occur to document and resolve any outstanding issues.

Applicant/Agency: City of Millwood				
Type of Review: Comprehensive Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Periodic Update Amendment		Millwood's Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update (minus the Climate Change & Resiliency Element) was adopted on November 12, 2025. The Climate Change & Resiliency Element is anticipated to be adopted in March 2026.		Date of Submission: 1/21/26 Anticipated Date of Plan Adoption: 11/12/25
Contact Person: Amanda Tainio, Contract City Planner - planner@millwoodwa.us Email:				
Regional Consistency and GMA Conformity The checklist will be used to assess and document for conformity with the GMA transportation element content requirements and consistency with the adopted regional transportation plan (RTP).				
Checklist Criteria	Agency Response	Plan Page #	SRTC Comments	
1. Was the update coordinated with neighboring jurisdictions and tribes (if applicable) and regional transportation agencies? <i>RCW 36.70A.100</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, check all the apply: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WSDOT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> STA <input type="checkbox"/> Kalispel Tribe of Indians <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Spokane Tribe of Indians & CdA Tribe <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SRTC & Adjacent Jurisdictions <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Felts Field, Utility & Service Providers	If no, please provide explanation: Page 185	11.2 GMA Requirements	
2. Is the plan consistent with relevant countywide planning policies? <i>RCW 36.70A.100</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	If no, please provide explanation: Page 92,	Chapter 8 Transportation Element, 8.2 GMA Requirements	
3. Does the plan (or plan update/amendment) support the SRTC RTP Guiding Principles and policies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic Vitality <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cooperation & Leadership <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stewardship System <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operations, Maintenance, & Preservation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Safety & Security <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Choice & Mobility <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quality of Life	If no, please provide explanation: Page 95	8.3 Transportation Studies, Horizon 2050	
4. Does the transportation element include an inventory of air, water, and ground transportation facilities and services, including state-owned transportation facilities? <i>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(A)</i> <i>WAC 365-196-430</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	If no, please provide explanation: Page 98	8.4 Transportation Choices and Modes	

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response		Plan Page #	SRTC Comments
5. Is the transportation element consistent with the land use element including land use assumptions, population forecasts and planning periods? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430 (1) (a)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	If no, please provide explanation:	Page 114	8.7 Transportation Forecast
6. Are travel demand management (TDM) strategies included? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vi)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(i)(i)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	If no, please provide explanation:	Page 115	8.7 Transportation Forecasts
7. Is there an active transportation component that addresses and encourages mode choice and alternatives to driving alone? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vii)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(j)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	If no, please provide explanation:	Page 112-113	8.6 Level of Service Standards
8. Do bicycle and pedestrian-supportive policies, programs, and projects address SRTC's Regional Bicycle Route Priority Network?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	If no, please provide explanation:	Page 100	8.4 Transportation Choices and Modes, Bicycle & Pedestrian Infrastructure (Active Transportation)
9. Do the land use and transportation elements address and plan for freight mobility and accessibility on the corridors within SRTC's Regional Freight Priority Network?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	If no, please provide explanation:	Page 93	8.3 Transportation Studies
10. Does the land use element support increased urban densities and transportation-efficient development and redevelopment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	If no, please provide explanation:	Page 49	Chapter 5 Land use Element
11. Does the plan address an ADA transition plan that includes a program to address deficiencies and obstacles that limit accessibility, methods to make facilities accessible, an implementation schedule, and identification of public officials responsible for plan? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(G)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	If no, please provide explanation:	Page 101-105	Table 8-1: City of Millwood Sidewalk Inventory
12. Does the transportation element address how transportation investments are equitably made? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(i) and (iii)(E)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(f)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	If no, please provide explanation:	Page 95 & 98	8.3 Transportation Studies, Horizon 2050; 8.4 Transportation Choices and Modes
13. Does the transportation element demonstrate how system investments will reduce the number of traffic fatalities and serious injuries? <u>WAC 365-196-430 (2)(b)(i)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	If no, please provide explanation:	Page 93	8.3 Transportation Studies
14. Does the plan include a forecast of multimodal transportation needs for a minimum of 10 years? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(i) and (iii)(E)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(f)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	If no, please provide explanation:	Page 98	8.4 Transportation Choices and Modes

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response		Plan Page #	SRTC Comments
SEPA Infill and Housing Development Categorical Exemption				
15. Is an Infill and Housing Development Categorical Exemption is being requested per <u>RCW 43.12C.229</u> ?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, see questions 16 and 17 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		N/A	Question 15 marked as "No" +
16. Does the environmental analysis address the proposed use or density and intensity of use and analyze multimodal transportation impacts, including impacts to neighboring jurisdictions, transit facilities, and the state transportation system?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		N/A	Does not apply - Question 15 marked as "No"
17. Is consultation with WSDOT on impacts to state-owned transportation facilities clearly documented, including any necessary mitigation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		N/A	Does not apply - Question 15 marked as +
Multimodal Level of Service (See Attachment A for MMLOS Evaluation Methodology)				
18. Does the plan address multimodal levels of service (MMLOS) standards for all locally owned transportation facilities and transit routes? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(B) and (C), WAC 365-196-430</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	If no, please provide explanation:	Page 98	8.4 Transportation Choices and Modes
19. Does the plan reference WSDOT MMLOS standards for the HSS and SRTC's MMLOS standards for the Non-HSS state highways? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(B) and (C), WAC 365-196-430</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	If no, please provide explanation: WSDOT MM +	N/A	There are No Highways in Millwood
20. Does the transportation element describe the plan's ability to meet local, regional and state MMLOS standards? Does the plan identify specific actions to bring transportation facilities and services to the established MMLOS if they do not meet standards? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(D), WAC 365-196-430</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	If no, please provide explanation:	Page 98, 112	8.4 Transportation Choices and Modes; 8.6 Level of Service Standards
Climate				
21. Does the transportation element include goals and policies to support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and per capita vehicle miles traveled (VMT)? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(9)</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	If no, please provide explanation: N/A for City +	N/A	N/A Does not meet the population requirement +
22. Does the resiliency element include goals and policies to improve climate preparedness, response and recovery efforts? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(9)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <i>Included in Part 2</i>	If no, please provide explanation:	Page 225	Chapter 12 Climate Change & +
Finance Plan				
23. Does the plan include an analysis of the capability to fund identified need? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vi)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	If no, please provide explanation:	Page 119	8.9 Funding

<u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(i)(i)</u>				
24. Does the plan include a multi-year financing plan based on the identified needs identified? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(B)</u> <u>RCW 35.77.010</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(k)(ii)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	If no, please provide explanation:	Page 119	8.9 Funding
25. Does the plan discuss probable funding short falls in meeting identified needs and how additional funding will be secured, or how land use assumptions will be reassessed to meet MMLOS standards? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(A)</u> <u>WAC 365.196-430(2)(k)(iv)</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	If no, please provide explanation:	Page 119	8.9 Funding



To: Transportation Advisory Committee
From: Jason Lien, Transportation Planning Manager
Topic: Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) Grant Application for FFY 2026

Requested Action:

None. For information and discussion.

Key Points:

- SRTC is preparing to apply for the FFY 2026 round of funding for the Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) program.
- Applications for funding are due by May 26th, 2026.
- SRTC is anticipating applying for a Demonstration grant to implement a “**Quick Builds: Call for Projects**” at high crash locations on the High Injury Network (HIN) or as identified in other local safety plans. The details of the grant are still being scoped but key information includes:
 - **Anticipated funding request:** ~\$1 million per year.
 - **Timeframe:** Spring/Summer 2027/2028 to 2029/2030 (2-year frame).
 - **Pre-determined solutions:** SRTC and local agency staff would pre-select options for low cost, quick-build funding, focusing on key emphasis areas of safety identified by the current administration (speeding, impairment, and distracted driving).
 - **Implementation:** Agencies awarded funding would be required to conduct before-and-after analyses (more details to be determined), and once awarded funding, a ~6-month period will be determined to complete implementation of designated solutions.
 - **Agency Support:** To be eligible to apply for funding if this grant is awarded, local agencies will need to provide a letter of support for the application process to USDOT by **May 15th**.

Board/Committee Discussions:

This is the first discussion regarding the SS4A FFY 2026 application cycle with the committees.

Public Involvement:

All SRTC Board and Committee meetings are open to the public.

Staff Contact: Ben Kloskey, SRTC | bkloskey@srtc.org | 509.343.6370



To: Transportation Advisory Committee
From: Eve McMenemy, Deputy Executive Director
Topic: Legislative Activity (Federal)

Requested Action:

None. For information and discussion.

Key Points:

- The current transportation act was signed into law on November 15, 2021 as part of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA; P.L. 117-58).
- This act added several new programs and established funding to support transportation projects over the period of Federal Fiscal Years (FFY) 2022 through 2026.
- Activity has been underway to draft a reauthorization bill to be enacted when the IIJA expires on September 30, 2026.
- This discussion will include an overview of potential changes and topics important to the Spokane Region as well as general timelines of legislative activity.

Board/Committee Discussions:

This is the first discussion of federal transportation reauthorization with the Transportation Advisory Committee. The topic was previously discussed at the March 12, 2026 Board meeting. SRTC positions regarding federal reauthorization can be found in the [2026 Unified List- Federal version](#).

Public Involvement:

All SRTC Board and committee meetings are open to the public.

Staff Contact: Eve McMenemy, SRTC | evemc@srtc.org | 509.343.6370