



Spokane Regional Transportation Council

Transportation Technical Committee Meeting

Wednesday, April 22, 2026 at 1:00 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/81656202452?pwd=ko00IK05dn3lnHnTeoD5VRTtBLLqA6.1>

Meeting ID: 816 5620 2452 | Passcode: 547271

By Phone 1-253-215-8782

Meeting ID: 816 5620 2452 | Passcode: 547271

Or find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/u/kbB00xwxF>

SRTC welcomes public comments at the Transportation Technical 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.



Time	Item #	Page #
1:00	1 Call to Order/Record of Attendance	
1:05	2 Public Comments/TTC Member Comments/Chair Report on March Board of Directors Meeting	

FOR ACTION

1:15	3 Consent Agenda a) February TTC Meeting Minutes	3
1:20	4 CY 2027 Unified List Process & Criteria – Final <i>(David Fletcher)</i>	11
1:35	5 Request to Shift Funding: Contingency List Process and CY 2026 TIP April Amendment Recommendation <i>(Ryan Stewart)</i>	15
1:45	6 Scope Change: City of Spokane – Sunset Highway Bike Path <i>(Ryan Stewart)</i>	19
1:50	7 Scope Change: City of Cheney – Purchase of Electric Vehicles and Charging Station for Maintenance Fleet <i>(Ryan Stewart)</i>	20
1:55	8 Scope Change: City of Spokane Valley – Sullivan Rd Preservation Projects <i>(Ryan Stewart)</i>	21
2:00	9 CY 2026-2029 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment – May 2026 <i>(Ryan Stewart)</i>	22
2:05	10 City of Millwood Comprehensive Plan Certification <i>(Ryan Stewart)</i>	26

INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

2:15	11 Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) Grant Application For FFY 2026 <i>(Jason Lien)</i>	31
------	--	----

INFORMATION: No Presentation

2:25	12 Agency Update and Future Information Items <i>(David Fletcher)</i>	
2:30	13 Adjournment <i>(Chair)</i>	



Transportation Technical Committee Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, February 25, 2026- 1:00 pm

1 Call to Order/ Excused Absences

Ms. Limon called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm, and attendance was taken.

In attendance were:

Committee Members:

- Pete Fisch
City of Airway Heights
- Luke Michaels
City of Liberty Lake
- Inga Note
City of Spokane
- Colin Quinn-Hurst
City of Spokane
- Kevin Picanco
City of Spokane
- Adam Jackson
City of Spokane Valley
- Jeremy Clark (Vice Chair)
City of Spokane Valley
- Sonny Weathers
Small Cities/Towns Rep
- Brandi Colyar
Spokane County
- Barry Greene
Spokane County
- Jami Hayes
Spokane County
- Margee Chambers
Spokane Clean Air
- Samantha Hennessy
SRHD
- Brian Jennings
STA
- Tara Limon (Chair)
STA
- Mike Pea
WSDOT-ER
- Glenn Wagemann
WSDOT-ER

Absent Members:

- Dan Ferguson
City of Cheney
- Julia Whitford
Kalispel Tribe
- Maria Cullooyah
Spokane Tribe
- Shauna Harshman
WSDOT-ER

Guests:

- Tyler Kimbrell
City of Spokane
- Sean Messner
CivTech
- Katherine Miller
City of Airway Heights
- Kristen Armstrong
City of Spokane Valley
- Matt Zarecor
Spokane County
- Dan Pratt
City of Deer Park
- Stu Barton
J-U-B Engineers
- Riannon Zender
J-U-B Engineers
- Shoisington*

Staff:

- Lois Bollenback
Executive Director
- Eve McMenamy
Deputy Executive Director
- Savannah Creasey
Comm. & PR Coord.
- Anadia Grier
Admin-Exec Coord.
- 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



2 Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Member Comments

Members shared updates on current projects within their agencies and regions, as well as general staffing updates, including introductions to new alternate representatives.

Chair Report on SRTC Board Meeting

Ms. Limon gave a brief overview of February's SRTC Board meeting.

ACTION ITEMS

3 Consent Agenda

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

Mr. Clark made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Mr. Picanco seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

4 Managing I-90 Corridor Transportation Operations

Mr. Wagemann presented an overview of current operations along the I-90 corridor, spanning from Four Lakes to the state line, to support SRTC's upcoming study of freeway operations and parallel routes. He began by defining Level of Service (LOS), explaining that it measures roadway performance based on speed, density, and flow. He noted that LOS A through C reflect stable conditions, while LOS D through F indicate increasing congestion and breakdown flow.

He described how conditions vary across the corridor. The segment from Four Lakes to US-195 generally operates under free-flow conditions, while the segment from US-195 to Arthur Street approaches unstable flow as volumes increase. The most constrained segment is between Arthur Street and Custer, where closely spaced interchanges and older design features lead to persistent stop-and-go conditions. East of this area, traffic conditions improve through Spokane Valley, though congestion reemerges between Sullivan and Liberty Lake due to lane drops and merging, particularly near the Appleway/Greenacres interchange. Conditions improve again, approaching the state line as volumes decrease.

Mr. Wagemann highlighted that short trips on I-90, such as entering and exiting within a few interchanges, contribute to congestion and reduce overall system efficiency. He emphasized that some of these trips could be accommodated on the local street network.

He then discussed operational improvements implemented by WSDOT, particularly ramp metering, which was introduced primarily to improve safety and reduce collisions. Since implementation began in 2019, ramp meters have significantly reduced congestion queues



and improved travel times. He noted that eastbound peak queues have been reduced by roughly half, and travel times through key segments have become more consistent. Collision data also shows notable reductions at locations where ramp meters have been installed.

Mr. Wagemann explained that WSDOT's approach to managing I-90 focuses on safety, preservation, and system operations rather than expanding capacity. He noted that a significant portion of congestion is caused by incidents, underscoring the importance of rapid response and operational strategies to restore traffic flow.

Looking ahead, he described several ongoing and future strategies, including additional ramp meters, expanded use of variable message signs, and active traffic management systems to better inform drivers and manage conditions in real time. He also highlighted coordination with Spokane Transit Authority to expand transit access along the corridor, including potential flyer stop locations.

He emphasized the importance of managing the entire transportation network as a system, encouraging better use of local streets for shorter trips and improved connectivity between local and regional routes. He noted that coordinated planning efforts among regional partners are critical to addressing long-term mobility needs.

In closing, Mr. Wagemann stated that while potential capacity improvements are being monitored, they are not currently prioritized due to cost and physical constraints. Instead, ongoing efforts are focused on maximizing the performance of the existing system through operational and multimodal strategies.

5 CY 2027 Unified List Process & Criteria – Draft

Mr. Fletcher presented an overview of the draft process and criteria for the CY 2027 Unified List and proposed updates to the evaluation criteria. He explained that the Unified List serves as SRTC's strategic tool for communicating regional transportation priorities to legislators and is updated annually. Within the broader planning framework, projects originate in the long-range Metropolitan Transportation Plan (Horizon 2050), transition into the Unified List as medium-range priorities when seeking funding, and ultimately move into the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) once fully funded.

He described the structure of the Unified List, which includes three categories—initiation, development, and implementation—reflecting a project's progression from early planning through readiness for construction. He also outlined the development schedule for the upcoming cycle, noting that the project submittal period will run from mid-May to mid-June, followed by staff review and draft list development through the summer. The draft list is expected to be presented to committees in August and to the Board in September, with final adoption anticipated in October and the federal version completed in November.

Mr. Fletcher reviewed the current evaluation framework, which consists of seven criteria categories aligned with SRTC's guiding principles, including economic vitality, stewardship,



safety, and equity. Each category is currently weighted equally; however, he noted that updates are being proposed this year to better reflect recent planning work, particularly Horizon 2050.

He highlighted proposed revisions to the economic vitality criteria, which incorporate an updated regional activity centers framework. The revised approach introduces tiered scoring based on the type and significance of activity centers and places greater emphasis on aligning projects with appropriate land-use and transportation functions, including both transit-supportive and freight-oriented improvements. To maintain the overall point total for the category, scoring for other components, such as employment growth and freight systems, would be slightly reduced.

He then discussed updates to the operations, maintenance, and preservation category, noting that its overall weighting is proposed to increase in response to feedback received during Horizon 2050. Two new criteria are proposed: one addressing mobility and travel time reliability, and another aligning projects with strategies identified in the Congestion Management Process. These additions are intended to better capture system performance and prioritize cost-effective operational improvements.

Similarly, Mr. Fletcher presented proposed updates to the safety and security category, which would also receive an increased weighting. In addition to the existing criteria, two new measures are proposed: one focused on projects located on the regional high-injury network, and another evaluating overall crash rates using a severity-weighted methodology. These changes aim to broaden the evaluation of safety beyond fatal and serious injury crashes to include locations with high overall crash risk.

During discussion, Mr. Clark asked whether the proposed crash-rate criterion would apply only to projects on the high-injury network. Mr. Fletcher clarified that the intent is for this criterion to apply independently to any project that demonstrates safety improvements based on crash data.

Mr. Fletcher concluded by outlining next steps, stating that staff will refine the criteria based on feedback and return to the committee in April with a final proposal. He encouraged members to provide comments and suggestions in the interim.

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

Ms. Papparazzo presented an overview of the update to the Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan (CPT-HSTP) for the 2026–2030 cycle. She explained that the plan, referred to as the HSTP for simplicity, is a required document for receiving state and federal transportation funding and must be updated every four years. The plan serves as a regional framework for coordinating transit funding resources and prioritizing investments, particularly in partnership with Spokane Transit Authority (STA), which uses the plan to guide Section 5310 funding decisions.



She noted that the primary purpose of the HSTP is to improve mobility by enhancing access to existing transit services, with a focus on populations that rely most on public transportation. These include individuals experiencing poverty, people with disabilities, youth, and seniors. The plan also identifies gaps in current services and highlights opportunities for local providers to pursue funding to address those needs and improve overall service delivery.

Ms. Paparazzo outlined the key components of the planning process, emphasizing that community outreach is central to the effort. The process includes gathering public input, analyzing geographic and demographic data, and assessing existing transportation services to identify unmet needs. The plan will also establish strategies to address service gaps and define regional priorities, with input from stakeholders, SRTC committees, and the Board.

She described the outreach approach, which is designed to reach diverse communities across Spokane County. Engagement efforts include stakeholder meetings, public events in both urban and rural areas, a public survey, coordination with local service providers, and data collection and mapping to better understand travel patterns and needs.

Ms. Paparazzo also highlighted the collaborative partnership with STA in developing the plan. While SRTC is leading the plan development and certification, STA staff are supporting the effort through service inventory development and coordination of outreach and stakeholder engagement.

She stated that the plan is currently in the early stages of drafting and public outreach, with adoption anticipated in July. Upon completion, the plan will provide a comprehensive understanding of regional transportation needs and ensure continued eligibility for federal and state funding. She noted that staff will return to future committee meetings to provide updates as the process moves forward.

There were no questions or comments.

7 Public Participation Plan (PPP) Workshop

Ms. Creasey facilitated a workshop discussion to gather committee input on updates to SRTC's Public Participation Plan (PPP), a federally required document that outlines how SRTC engages the public and communicates opportunities to participate in the agency's work. She noted that since her prior presentation, staff have begun drafting the updated plan and have already initiated outreach activities, including an active online survey, participation in public events, and planned outreach at El Mercado in late March and the March Equity Working Group. She also shared that staff are continuing to gather stakeholder input and are meeting with communications staff from partner agencies to better understand and coordinate outreach strategies.

Ms. Creasey explained that feedback from the workshop would directly inform which outreach strategies SRTC prioritizes, how SRTC can better support partner agencies' outreach efforts,



and what additional perspectives should be incorporated into the plan. Participants were asked to respond to interactive questions about community interest in transportation, the effectiveness of different engagement tools, and challenges faced in public involvement.

In discussing community interest, Mr. Weathers shared that transportation consistently draws strong opinions because most residents rely on the system daily, but meaningful engagement can be difficult when people feel changes appear “out of nowhere” or are not connected back to a broader plan. He emphasized the importance of engagement methods that help residents understand why decisions are made and how input is used.

When the group discussed which outreach tools are most important, Mr. Jennings described open houses as a “mixed bag,” noting that traditional formats and timing can be difficult for residents to attend and may not fit modern schedules. Mr. Weathers added that communities often require multiple engagement approaches depending on audience needs, emphasizing the value of a “menu” of outreach options that includes both digital tools, such as online surveys, and more traditional methods for those who prefer paper materials or in-person interaction.

As the discussion shifted to engagement levels and the balance between informing versus involving the public, Mr. Clark noted that even when agencies use consultative or involved outreach early in a process, it is often followed by multiple rounds of outreach focused on informing the public about what was heard and how decisions were made. This, he explained, can make “inform” the most frequent engagement mode, even when earlier phases are more interactive.

Participants then identified common challenges in public engagement, including translation needs, timeliness, and achieving meaningful input. Mr. Wagemann emphasized that a recurring challenge is the complexity of transportation funding and decision-making, noting that the public can understandably oversimplify issues and may attribute decisions to taxes or agencies without understanding legal requirements, funding restrictions, or design standards. Mr. Weathers observed that small attendance at a single meeting can create unrealistic expectations, where a few aligned voices may assume they represent the broader public; when outcomes differ, people may conclude the process was meaningless. Ms. Bollenback noted a perceived contradiction: transportation is often rated as highly important by communities, yet agencies still struggle to obtain meaningful feedback and sustained participation. Mr. Wagemann responded that this often comes down to managing expectations and clearly communicating which elements the public can influence versus those constrained by laws, standards, or funding limitations.

In discussing how to measure outreach success, Mr. Weathers emphasized the value of participation levels in identifying trends, while also noting the importance of feedback quality and of being transparent about how public input influences decisions. Mr. Jennings described how his agency began documenting every outreach touchpoint—such as emails, social media posts, open house attendance, and community-based organization outreach—to demonstrate



the breadth of engagement, address skepticism about outreach quality, and create a baseline for improving future efforts. Mr. Quinn-Hurst noted that success can also be measured by whether all key stakeholder groups had an opportunity to comment, even if they ultimately chose not to.

When asked what SRTC could improve, Mr. Quinn-Hurst highlighted translation services at community events as an effective practice and encouraged expanding similar partnerships. Mr. Clark suggested that establishing a central, consistent forum for public input—where residents know they can find information and provide comments regardless of which agency is leading a project—could strengthen participation and reduce fragmentation across multiple agencies conducting outreach separately. Ms. Creasey acknowledged the value of this suggestion and shared that staff is developing an SRTC e-newsletter platform and exploring the concept of a regional transportation event to help centralize information-sharing and engagement opportunities.

The workshop also surfaced interest in stronger coordination among agencies, including sharing what outreach methods are working, cross-promoting public involvement opportunities, maintaining or improving a shared catalog of community groups and engagement resources, and coordinating joint booths or events so agencies can direct the public to the appropriate partner. Ms. Creasey described current support practices, including monitoring and resharing partner outreach through SRTC communication channels, using the website to share information, attending partner events when possible, and coordinating staff presence to avoid missing key opportunities.

Ms. Creasey closed by thanking participants for their input and noted that the workshop feedback will inform both the content of the updated Public Participation Plan and how SRTC implements outreach and coordination moving forward.

8 Local Agency Comprehensive Plan Updates Check-In

Mr. Stewart provided an update on SRTC's Comprehensive Plan Certification Review, which is required under the Growth Management Act. He explained that SRTC, as the regional transportation planning organization for Spokane County, is responsible for certifying that local comprehensive plan transportation elements are consistent with the region's long-range plan, Horizon 2050, and meet applicable state requirements. He noted that the certification process was recently updated and approved by the SRTC Board in January, and staff are now actively implementing the revised process.

Mr. Stewart shared that SRTC has begun reviewing submitted materials, including transportation elements from the City of Deer Park and the City of Millwood. He noted that Millwood's plan was received after adoption due to earlier communication challenges, but SRTC is proceeding with certification in accordance with state requirements.

He then provided a status update on coordination with local jurisdictions and anticipated timelines for draft plan submittals. The City of Spokane is expected to submit its draft in the



third quarter of the year, while the City of Airway Heights anticipates providing a draft around mid-April. The City of Liberty Lake is also targeting April for its draft submittal.

Mr. Weathers indicated that the City of Medical Lake is currently developing its comprehensive plan in multiple phases, with a full draft anticipated around June. He noted that their transportation element is being informed by a consultant-led transportation plan currently under review. Representatives from Spokane County shared that they are awaiting additional consultant data before finalizing their draft, with a tentative timeline of approximately June. Mr. Clark stated that the City of Spokane Valley expects to complete most of its analysis by May, with a draft available in June and adoption anticipated later in the third quarter.

Mr. Stewart noted that SRTC staff will continue coordinating with jurisdictions, including following up with the City of Cheney and working with consultants supporting smaller jurisdictions. He added that staff will return to the committee with updates as reviews progress and will bring certification recommendations forward to the Board as required.

INFORMATION (NO PRESENTATION)

10 Agency Update

Mr. Fletcher provided a brief agency update, noting that the March committee meetings have been canceled and regular meetings will resume in April. He also reminded members of the upcoming FMSIB freight funding opportunity deadline, with project submissions due on March 5 at 5:00 p.m., and invited agencies to share whether they plan to submit applications to support regional coordination.

Ms. Hayes stated that Spokane County intends to submit two projects, including a grade separation project and improvements on the north portion of Argonne Road. A representative from the City of Spokane shared that the City will be submitting three projects: Latah Bridge, Inland Empire Way, and Freya Street between Francis and Wellesley. Mr. Fisch noted that the City of Airway Heights plans to submit two projects, including US-2 Multimodal Phase 1 and improvements along 21st Avenue from Hayford to Garfield. Mr. Jackson added that Spokane Valley will be submitting projects from its legislative agenda, including the Sullivan-Trent Interchange, the Barker I-90 Interchange, and the Argonne I-90 Interchange Bridge.

Mr. Fletcher acknowledged the updates and thanked agencies for sharing their anticipated submissions.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:36 PM

Anadia Grier, Clerk of the Board



To: Transportation Technical 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: SRTC Board of Directors
From: Ryan Stewart, Principal Transportation Planner
Topic: Request to Shift Funding: Contingency List Process and CY 2026 TIP April Amendment Recommendation

Requested Action:

Recommend retroactive SRTC Board approval of the April TIP Amendment and the approval of the Contingency List process moving funding to the Crestline St. Chip Seal project.

Key Points:

There is 1 project included in the April amendment to the CY 2026-2029 TIP. See **Attachment 1** and the **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. Please see **Attachment 2** to view the full 2025 Call for Projects - Preservation Contingency List.

- The project, Ray St. - 18th Ave. to 29th Ave. Grind & Overlay, scored higher on the Preservation Contingency List but, the City of Spokane identified Crestline St. as the preferred funding recipient.

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	PROJECT
City of Spokane	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, posted to the SRTC website (www.srtc.org) and 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.



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

SRTC 2027-2029 Program of Projects - Preservation (Contingency List)

Agency	Project Name	Final Score as %	Amount Requested	Project Phase(s)	Total Award for 2027-2029
Spokane	Ray St. - 18th Ave. to 29th Ave. Grind & Overlay	92%	\$1,219,474	CN	\$0
Spokane	Monroe St. - Maxwell Ave. to Indiana Ave. Grind & Overlay	90%	\$955,591	CN	\$534,794
Spokane	Sprague Ave. - Stone St. to Freya St. Grind & Overlay	89%	\$1,350,000	CN	\$0
Spokane	29th Ave. - High Dr. to Grand Blvd. Grind & Overlay	86%	\$1,350,000	CN	\$0
Spokane	Crestline St. Illinois Ave. to Francis Ave. Chip Seal	84%	\$1,350,000	CN	\$0
Spokane Valley	32nd Preservation (Pines to SR27)	75%	\$1,350,000	CN	\$0
Cheney	Salnave Road Preservation Project	54%	\$1,241,100	CN	\$716,009

Legend:

	Funded by external grant awards
	Requested project to fund



To: Transportation Technical Committee
From: Ryan Stewart, Principal Transportation Planner
Topic: Scope Change: City of Spokane – Sunset Highway Bike Path

Requested Action:

Concur with the City of Spokane TIP project scope change.

Key Points:

- The City of Spokane Valley has requested a project scope change to the following project:
 - Sunset Hwy Bike Path
- Per the SRTC 2025 TIP Guidebook, Policy 3.1: *All scope changes must be approved by the Executive Director, with TTC concurrence. SRTC Board approval of a scope change is processed as a TIP amendment.*
 - This scope change has been approved by the SRTC Executive Director.
- The change is being requested due to a change in available funds. The City of Spokane had two projects on Sunset Highway, Sunset Hwy Bike Path and Sunset Highway (US2) Bicycle Facilities/Shared Use Path. The latter project, Sunset Highway (US2) Bicycle Facilities/Shared Use Path, has closed out with a remaining \$2,247,000 in SRTC awarded funds, and the City is requesting the funds be moved to the other phase of the Sunset Highway project. The original application for these SRTC funds identified the whole extent of the Sunset Highway improvements, and thus the award is eligible for both phases.
- SRTC staff and the Executive Director have reviewed the request and found that the changed project scope still accomplishes the project's original goals and the requirements of the funding award.

Board/Committee Discussions:

This is the first discussion of this scope change with the TTC.

Public Involvement:

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

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



To: Transportation Technical Committee
From: Ryan Stewart, Principal Transportation Planner
Topic: Scope Change: City of Cheney – Purchase of Electric Vehicles and Charging Station for Maintenance Fleet

Requested Action:

Concur with the City of Cheney TIP project scope change.

Key Points:

- The City of Cheney has requested a project scope change to the following project:
 - Purchase of Electric Vehicles and Charging Station for Maintenance Fleet
- Per the SRTC 2025 TIP Guidebook, Policy 3.1: *All scope changes must be approved by the Executive Director, with TTC concurrence. SRTC Board approval of a scope change is processed as a TIP amendment.*
 - This scope change has been approved by the SRTC Executive Director.
 - This project’s funding was fully obligated on 8/12/2025 and is no longer in the TIP, but SRTC policy still requires a formal scope change and TTC concurrence.
- The change is being requested due to unforeseen circumstances. The original project scope outlined the purchase of several types of electric vehicles, one of which was the Ford half-ton EV pickup truck, which is no longer in production. Cheney has changed the scope to purchase more Polaris UTV EVs.
- SRTC staff and the Executive Director have reviewed the request and find that the changed project scope still accomplishes the project’s original goals and the requirements of the CRP funding award.

Board/Committee Discussions:

This is the first discussion of this scope change with the TTC.

Public Involvement:

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

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



To: Transportation Technical Committee
From: Ryan Stewart, Principal Transportation Planner
Topic: Scope Change: City of Spokane Valley – Sullivan Rd Preservation Projects

Requested Action:

Concur with the City of Spokane Valley TIP project scope change.

Key Points:

- The City of Spokane Valley has requested a project scope change to the following project:
 - Sullivan Preservation – Spokane River to Kiernan
- Per the SRTC 2025 TIP Guidebook, Policy 3.1: *All scope changes must be approved by the Executive Director, with TTC concurrence. SRTC Board approval of a scope change is processed as a TIP amendment.*
 - This scope change has been approved by the SRTC Executive Director.
- The change is being requested due to the construction of a new ice arena on the South end of the project limits. The city is splitting the project into two phases to accommodate the ice arena construction. Phase 1, which will be UPRR to Kiernan Ave., will obligate all SRTC funds in 2026 to stay on schedule with SRTC's expected delivery. Phase 2, which will be Spokane River to UPRR, is expected to be constructed in 2027 or 2028 following the completion of the ice arena and will use only local funds to complete the phase.
- SRTC staff and the Executive Director have reviewed the request and found that the changed project scope still accomplishes the project's original goals and the requirements of the funding award.

Board/Committee Discussions:

This is the first discussion of this scope change with the TTC.

Public Involvement:

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

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



To: Transportation Technical Committee
From: Ryan Stewart, Principal Transportation Planner
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

PROJECT

City of Spokane	Sunset Hwy Bike Path
Airway Heights	US 2 Phase I Pedestrian and Multimodal Enhancements
City of Spokane Valley	Appleway Trail & Stormwater (Farr Rd Dishman Mica)
City of Spokane Valley	Sullivan Preservation - UPRR to Kiernan
City of Spokane Valley	Sullivan Preservation - Spokane River to UPRR (NEW)
WSDOT East	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 Technical 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 TTC.

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)</u> , <u>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)</u> , <u>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)</u> <u>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 Technical 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