



Transportation Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, April 22, 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:

Eve McMenemy
Deputy Executive Director
Anadia Grier
Admin-Executive Coor.
David Fletcher
Principal Transp. Planner
Jason Lien
Transp. Planning Manager
Ryan Stewart
Principal Transp. Planner
Michael Redlinger
Associate Transp. Planner 3
Angela Paparazzo
Associate Transp. Planner 1

Guests:



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 March's SRTC Board meeting.

ACTION ITEMS

3 Consent Agenda

- a. February TAC Meeting Minutes
- b. CY 2026-2029 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment - April & May 2026

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

4 CY 2027 Unified List Process & Criteria – Final

Mr. Fletcher presented the 2027 Unified List Project Evaluation Criteria and requested a recommendation for SRTC Board approval. He explained that the Unified List serves as a strategic tool to communicate regional transportation priorities to state and federal legislators and bridges the gap between the long-range Metropolitan Transportation Plan (Horizon 2050) and the short-range Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Projects move through three stages—initiation, development, and implementation—depending on their readiness and funding. The list is updated annually, with separate state and federal versions that generally include the same projects but may differ in funding requests and legislative emphasis. Key dates include a project submittal period from May 15 to June 12, development of a draft list for committee review in August, and final Board consideration in September.

Mr. Fletcher outlined updates to the evaluation criteria, which are based on SRTC's seven guiding principles. This year's revisions focus primarily on economic vitality, operations maintenance and preservation, and safety and security to better align with recent planning work. Changes to economic vitality reflect updated regional activity center designations. For operations maintenance and preservation, staff proposed increasing the category weight from 30 to 50 points and adding new questions to improve mobility on unreliable corridors and to incorporate strategies from the Congestion Management Process. Similarly, the safety and security category is proposed to increase to 50 points, with new questions addressing projects on the high injury network and evaluating severity-weighted crash rates. Additional refinements were made based on Board feedback to broaden how safety benefits are captured, including strategies such as shifting trips to safer modes like transit.

During discussion, committee members asked several clarifying questions about how the criteria would be applied. One member inquired whether projects could receive safety-related



points for benefits occurring on adjacent or parallel corridors rather than strictly within the project limits. Mr. Fletcher confirmed that applicants can justify these connections in their project narratives and remain eligible for scoring if they clearly demonstrate safety improvements for nearby facilities. Another question focused on the treatment of equity in the evaluation criteria, noting that it appeared to be treated differently from other categories. Mr. Fletcher explained that equity remains a guiding principle and scoring criterion for the state version of the Unified List due to state priorities, but is not applied in the same way for the federal version because of differing federal requirements. Follow-up discussion acknowledged the complexity of projects that may receive both state and federal funding, with staff noting that while the same projects will likely appear on both lists, scoring and application of criteria may differ. Blended funding is a common and expected reality.

Mr. Fletcher concluded by outlining next steps, including seeking Board approval in May, opening the project submittal period shortly thereafter, and returning to the committee with a draft list in August.

Mr. Braaten made a motion to recommend Board approval of CY 2027 Unified List Process & Criteria as presented. Mr. Vose seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

5 City of Millwood Comprehensive Plan Certification

Mr. Stewart presented the City of Millwood's Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update for certification and requested a recommendation for SRTC Board approval. He explained that, as the region's designated regional transportation planning organization under the Growth Management Act, SRTC is responsible for reviewing and certifying the transportation and related elements of local comprehensive plans. Jurisdictions are required to complete their updates by December 31, 2026 following a legislative extension. He noted that SRTC recently updated its certification process to align with new state requirements, including considerations for resiliency, climate, and potential SEPA exemptions. Although Millwood completed its plan update prior to the new process, the city submitted the required checklist afterward, and staff found the transportation and land-use elements consistent with Horizon 2050 and state requirements. Staff recommended certification of the plan.

During discussion, committee members asked clarifying questions about the certification process and scope. One member asked whether the checklist was a state-provided form or developed locally; Mr. Stewart explained that SRTC created the checklist, adapting it from the Southwest Regional Transportation Council to simplify the process for jurisdictions while still meeting requirements. Another question focused on what exactly the committee was being asked to approve. Mr. Stewart clarified that the request is to recommend certification of the transportation and related elements of the comprehensive plan—not the full plan—based on consistency with the regional transportation plan and applicable requirements.

Questions were also raised about the level of public input reflected in Millwood's plan. Mr. Stewart acknowledged that while SRTC's review primarily focuses on technical consistency, he



understood that the city conducted open houses and workshops, with additional public processes ongoing as implementation details, such as development codes, continue to be refined. He offered to follow up with more information if needed. Committee discussion noted that while Millwood is a small community with limited transportation changes, it must still account for regional impacts and coordinate with neighboring jurisdictions, which staff found were adequately addressed. Mr. Ankney added that opportunities for public participation were provided. However, attendance can be limited due to the city's small population, and the city has spent several years developing the plan with input from local boards and staff.

Mr. Ankney recused himself from voting on this matter due to his role as Chairman of the Planning Commission for the City of Millwood.

Ms. Winkler made a motion to recommend Board approval of the City of Millwood's Comprehensive Plan Certification as presented. Mr. Aranda seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

6 Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) Grant Application for FFY 2026

Mr. Lien provided an overview of the Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) program and current funding opportunity, noting that SRTC has previously secured funding to develop the Regional Safety Action Plan, adopted in 2024, and a safety education campaign grant that is expected to begin soon. He explained that the current round of funding, due in late May, offers approximately \$1 billion nationwide and includes two grant types: planning/demonstration and implementation. Since the region already has a safety action plan, staff are exploring options to either enhance the plan or fund implementation of identified safety strategies, particularly those addressing speeding, impaired and distracted driving, and safety for vulnerable users such as pedestrians and cyclists.

Mr. Lien outlined a potential concept involving "quick build" demonstration projects on high-injury network corridors. However, he noted that this idea raised concerns among technical staff about practicality, particularly on high-speed arterials, where permanent infrastructure improvements may be more appropriate and could trigger additional regulatory requirements. He emphasized that staff are seeking alternative ideas that are both feasible and competitive for funding, especially given that this may be the final year of the program under the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law.

During discussion, committee members asked questions and offered feedback on potential project approaches. Members sought clarification on how funding is allocated between planning and implementation, with Mr. Lien noting that a portion is set aside for planning but may be redistributed if not fully utilized. Questions were also raised about whether applications require specific project proposals or broader concepts; Mr. Lien indicated that more defined proposals with locations and strategies may be more competitive. Committee members expressed mixed views on the proposed ideas, noting that some concepts, such as



sidewalk inventories or data collection, may be redundant or already ongoing. In contrast, others emphasized the value of smaller, non-traditional safety strategies and pilot projects that can deliver meaningful improvements.

Additional discussion focused on alternative approaches, including bundling smaller safety improvements into a programmatic funding strategy, exploring non-camera methods for collecting safety-related data, and prioritizing projects with the greatest measurable safety impact. Members also highlighted the importance of aligning proposals with the program's scoring criteria, leveraging existing data, and demonstrating strong regional partnerships to improve competitiveness. Mr. Lien confirmed that SRTC would serve as the applicant with support from member agencies. He noted that staff will continue refining a proposal for Board consideration ahead of the application deadline.

7 Legislative Activity (Federal)

Ms. McMenamy provided a federal legislative update, emphasizing the importance of federal transportation funding to SRTC, as the majority of its planning funds and project funding passed through to member agencies come from federal sources. She explained that the current federal transportation bill, the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (IIJA), is set to expire on September 30, prompting ongoing reauthorization discussions in Congress. She also provided an overview of how federal transportation funding is generated—primarily through the Highway Trust Fund, which relies on gas taxes and other sources but is not financially solvent and requires supplementation from the federal general fund—and how funds are distributed through both formula funding and discretionary grants.

Ms. McMenamy reviewed the evolution of past federal transportation bills. She highlighted key features of the IIJA, including its historic funding levels, investments in transit, infrastructure repair, and new programs related to safety, bridges, and environmental initiatives. She noted that while the IIJA significantly increased funding, implementation of discretionary grants has been slow, with delays in project agreements and funding distribution. She also explained that reauthorization is underway, with the House leading development of the next bill and the Senate contributing on specific policy areas. However, it is unlikely a new bill will be passed before the current one expires, meaning a continuing resolution is expected.

She outlined several key policy topics under discussion, including the long-term solvency of the Highway Trust Fund, the balance between formula and discretionary funding, freight and supply chain considerations, transit funding levels, permitting reform, and continued emphasis on safety and bridge investment. She also highlighted the Basics Act as a current proposal aimed at increasing funding for both state and local governments, addressing disparities between local responsibility for roadways and the share of federal funding received, and supporting planning, safety, and rural transportation needs.

During discussion, committee members shared observations and asked questions about legislative engagement and funding uncertainties. Members acknowledged the complexity and unpredictability of the federal process and emphasized the importance of staying



informed and engaged through national organizations. Questions were raised about regional representation in Congress and lessons learned from recent funding delays. Ms. McMenamy noted that delays, such as those experienced with SS4A grants, require agencies to remain flexible and continue pursuing funding opportunities while adjusting work plans as needed. Committee members also emphasized the value of proactive communication with federal representatives, noting that direct outreach can help address funding issues and raise awareness of local project needs. Ms. McMenamy agreed, highlighting SRTC's ongoing coordination with congressional offices and encouraging continued engagement to support regional priorities.

INFORMATION (NO PRESENTATION)

8 Agency Update

Mr. Fletcher provided a brief agency update, noting that beginning in June, committee meetings will be held in the SRTC Office's Selkirk Room (Suite 500). He explained that the change is due to lease terms and that while the new space is smaller, it can still accommodate attendees. Board meetings will remain in the current room, and in-person attendance is still encouraged.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:19 PM.

Anadia Grier, Clerk of the Board