



Spokane Regional Transportation Council

Transportation Advisory Committee Meeting

Wednesday, September 23, 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.



Time	Item #		Page #
------	--------	--	--------

3:00	1	Call to Order/Record of Attendance	
------	---	---	--

3:05	2	Public Comments/TAC Member Comments/Chair Report on September Board of Directors Meeting	
------	---	---	--

FOR ACTION

3:15	3	Consent Agenda	
		a) August TAC Meeting Minutes	3

3:20	4	CY 2027 Unified List: Projects for State & Federal Versions – Final <i>(David Fletcher)</i>	8
------	---	---	---

3:35	5	City of Liberty Lake Comprehensive Plan Certification <i>(Ryan Stewart)</i>	10
------	---	--	----

3:40	6	City of Medical Lake Comprehensive Plan Certification <i>(Angela Paparazzo)</i>	19
------	---	--	----

3:45	7	City of Airway Heights Comprehensive Plan Certification <i>(Angela Paparazzo)</i>	28
------	---	--	----

3:50	8	CY 2027-2030 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Recommendation <i>(Ben Kloskey)</i>	37
------	---	--	----

INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

3:55	9	CY 2027 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Guidebook – Draft <i>(Ben Kloskey)</i>	38
------	---	--	----

4:05	10	WSDOT Consolidated Grant Project Rankings <i>(Angela Paparazzo)</i>	39
------	----	--	----

INFORMATION: No Presentation

4:15	11	Agency Update and Future Information Items <i>(Ben Kloskey)</i>	
------	----	--	--

4:20	12	Adjournment <i>(Chair)</i>	
------	----	-----------------------------------	--



Transportation Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, August 26, 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: Jared Aranda, John Griffin, Derrick Braaten

In attendance were:

Committee Members:

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

Guests:

Daniel Wells
STA
Don Skillingstad
STA
Alex Rempe
KPFF

Staff:

Lois Bollenabck
Executive Director
Bailee Petersen
Comms. & PR Coor.
Anadia Grier
Admin-Executive Coor.
Jason Lien
Transp. Planning Manager
David Fletcher
Principal Transp. Planner
Ryan Stewart
Principal Transp. Planner
Michael Redlinger
Associate Transp. Planner 3
Ben Kloskey
Associate Transp. Planner 2
Angela Paparazzo
Associate Transp. Planner 2

Absent Members:



2 Public Comments

Mr. Kloskey reported that SRTC received two written public comments regarding the September TIP amendment. Both comments expressed concerns about proposed changes to Spokane Falls Boulevard.

The first opposed narrowing Spokane Falls Boulevard or adding a concrete divider, citing its historic character and use for events such as parades and Hoopfest.

The second, submitted by nearby property owners, businesses, venues, and organizations, expressed concerns that the proposed changes could reduce roadway capacity, worsen congestion, and limit access to downtown destinations and events. The commenters requested further evaluation and greater consideration of stakeholder feedback before selecting a design.

No public comments were provided online or in person.

Ms. Zentz asked whether the written comments had been shared with the TTC and SRTC Board. Mr. Kloskey confirmed that they had been presented to the TTC and would be included in the Board's meeting materials.

Ms. Winkler agreed that the concerns raised were valid. Committee members also discussed the project's purpose and whether a final design had been selected. Mr. Kloskey explained that the City of Spokane was still considering design options and that the public input would help inform its decision. Based on information submitted for the TIP amendment, he understood that the project was primarily intended to improve safety and accommodate active transportation users.

Member Comments

There were no member comments.

Chair Report on SRTC Board Meeting

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

ACTION ITEMS

3 Consent Agenda

- a. June TAC Meeting Minutes
- b. CY 2026-2029 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment – August & September 2026

Mr. Ankney asked whether the two consent agenda items should be considered separately, and committee members indicated agreement.

Mr. Kloskey clarified that a TIP amendment programs project funding but does not approve a project's design. Mr. Barber asked whether a specific project could be separated from the TIP amendment for individual consideration or whether the committee had to act on the entire package. Mr. Kloskey confirmed that the Spokane Falls Boulevard project could be removed and



considered separately.

Mr. Ankney asked whether additional public input would occur before the project was ready for construction. Mr. Kloskey explained that design is scheduled for 2027 and construction funding for 2028 and 2029. Ms. Winkler questioned whether there would be enough time for public input before design begins and suggested inviting City staff to present the project. Mr. Kloskey agreed to contact the City.

Chair Ankney made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Mr. Hansen seconded the motion. Ms. Zentz abstained from voting. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Barber made a motion to approve the CY 2026-2029 TIP Amendment – August & September 2026 as presented. Mr. Hansen seconded the motion. Ms. Winkler voted no. The motion passed 11-1.

INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

4 Guest Presentation: Division Street Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)

Mr. Dan Wells, STA Director of Capital Development, and Mr. Don Skillingstad, STA Senior Project Manager, presented an update on the Division Street Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project. In response to a question from Mr. Ankney, Mr. Wells explained that BRT stands for Bus Rapid Transit.

Mr. Wells said the project resulted from the four-year Division Connects study and is intended to provide an affordable transportation option, improve access, and create a safer corridor. The preferred alternative would extend approximately 10 miles from downtown Spokane to Mead, use 60-foot zero-emission buses, and eventually provide service every 10 minutes or less.

Mr. Skillingstad reviewed the first phase, known as the Minimum Operable Segment. It would include 38 new stations, improvements at the STA Plaza and Hastings Park and Ride, transit signal priority, and business access and transit (BAT) lanes through the Division-Ruby couplet. Service would initially operate every 15 minutes, with approximately 1.4 million boardings projected during the first year.

The project is supported by local, state, and federal funding, including \$38.5 million committed by the STA Board, \$45 million in state funding, a \$1 million federal grant, and a requested \$82 million Federal Transit Administration Small Starts grant. Design is nearing 60 percent completion, construction is expected to begin in 2028, and passenger service is anticipated to begin in May 2031.

Future phases would extend BRT to a planned Mead Transit Center, add four stations, extend BAT lanes north of the couplet, construct a Ruby Street bicycle facility, and increase service frequency. STA has purchased property for the transit center and set aside \$10 million for the bicycle facility.



Ms. Harwood Duncan asked how the project is being coordinated with WSDOT's Complete Streets work and the planned bicycle improvements. Mr. Wells explained that bicycle access has been incorporated into the couplet design, including shared use of the southbound BAT lane and the future Ruby Street bicycle facility. Design details for the middle portion of the corridor are still being developed. Mr. Skillingstad added that STA has coordinated with WSDOT on the Wye to Wandermere project and is designing stations to accommodate bicycle lanes, including island stations where bicycle lanes would pass behind the platform and widened platforms where bicycles would travel through the station area.

5 CY 2027 Unified List: Projects for State & Federal Versions – Draft

Mr. Fletcher presented the draft list of project for the state and federal versions of the CY 2027 Unified List. He explained that the list communicates the region's transportation priorities to legislators and is updated annually. Projects are organized into initiation, development, and implementation categories based on their progress toward funding and construction.

The project evaluation criteria were updated to reflect Horizon 2050, with greater emphasis on operations, maintenance, and preservation and on safety and security. SRTC received 28 project submissions requesting approximately \$530 million in federal funding and \$370 million in state funding.

Staff recommended retaining all projects in the implementation and development categories. For the initiation category, Mr. Fletcher presented three possible cutoff options based on project scores and consistency with the previous year's list. One option would retain the higher-scoring projects, another would also include all projects appearing on last year's list, and a third would use the higher cutoff while retaining STA's Clean Energy Campus Acquisition project.

Ms. Winkler asked why some projects listed the same request amounts for state and federal funding and why those amounts did not equal the total project cost. Mr. Fletcher explained that each agency identifies the funding sources it intends to pursue, so requests vary by project and may cover only part of the total unfunded amount for some projects.

Ms. Gyure Havlek asked whether project scores are reevaluated annually. Mr. Fletcher confirmed that projects are rescored each year to reflect updated information and evaluation criteria. Ms. Gyure Havlek noted that recent wildfire evacuations and resulting traffic congestion could affect the score for Project 7. Mr. Fletcher agreed that such events could be considered during a future evaluation.

Mr. Fletcher will return in September with the final list for the committee's recommendation. Board adoption of the state list is planned for October, followed by the federal list in November.

6 2027-2030 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) – Draft



Mr. Kloskey presented the draft 2027–2030 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). He explained that SRTC prepares the four-year TIP each fall to identify regional transportation projects receiving federal funding or considered regionally significant. The document is developed with local agencies and WSDOT, aligns with Horizon 2050, and includes project costs, schedules, funding sources, and performance targets.

The draft TIP includes 58 projects and programs, one of which is new, and approximately \$660 million in secured funding. Mr. Kloskey explained that the program is fiscally constrained, meaning sufficient funding is available for all included projects. The North Spokane Corridor accounts for approximately \$285 million, or 43 percent, of the program's roughly \$664 million total.

The draft TIP and interactive project map will be available for public comment from September 1 through October 1. The map will provide project details and allow comments to be submitted directly. SRTC will also hold an open house on September 24 from 4:30 to 6:00 p.m. in the downstairs event room at the Spokane Central Library. No questions followed the presentation.

INFORMATION (NO PRESENTATION)

7 Agency Update

Mr. Kloskey announced that WSDOT's Wheatland Express ribbon-cutting ceremony scheduled for August 28 was canceled due to recent wildfires. He also shared that the fourth annual Spokane Regional Transportation Summit will be held October 15, with tickets and early-bird pricing available through Greater Spokane Inc.

Mr. Kloskey confirmed that committee members were interested in a presentation on the Spokane Falls Boulevard project and agreed to contact the City of Spokane.

Mr. Barber asked whether SRTC's transportation resiliency study should be revisited following the recent wildfire. Mr. Lien said an update is not currently included in SRTC's work plan but could be considered during development of the next two-year work plan beginning in early 2027. He noted that the previous study considered wildfire risks and that Spokane Emergency Management is currently updating its plan. Mr. Barber added that feedback from those affected by the recent evacuation could provide valuable insight.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:09 PM.

Anadia Grier, Clerk of the Board



To: Transportation Advisory Committee
From: David Fletcher, Principal Transportation Planner
Topic: CY 2027 Unified List: Projects for State & Federal Versions — Final

Requested Action:

Recommend SRTC Board approval of the CY 2027 Unified List projects for inclusion in the state and federal versions of the list, 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.
- Earlier this year the SRTC Board approved Resolution 26-13, establishing the [CY 2027 Unified List Project Evaluation Criteria](#) for evaluating candidate projects for potential inclusion. The criteria are designed to identify projects that align with [SRTC's Guiding Principles and Policies](#).
- In total, agencies submitted 28 projects for potential inclusion in the CY 2027 Unified List, including seven new projects. Additional information on each project is available through the interactive [Unified List Project Submittals Map](#).
- The proposed CY 2027 Unified List projects for inclusion in the state and federal versions of the list is provided as an **attachment**.

Board/Committee Discussions:

The draft CY 2027 Unified List was presented to the SRTC Board at their 09/10/2026 meeting. It was presented to the TAC and TTC at their 08/26/2026 meetings. The SRTC Board approved Resolution 26-13, establishing the CY 2027 Unified List process and criteria, at their 05/14/2026 meeting. The process and criteria were recommended by the TAC and TTC at their 04/22/2026 meetings.

Public Involvement:

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

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

CY 2027 Unified List: Projects for Inclusion in State and Federal Lists

Date: 09/16/2026

#	Title	Lead Agency	Project Status	Total Cost	2026 State Request	2026 Federal Request	Total Score	Econ Score	C&L Score	Stwrdr Score	OMP Score	Safety Score	QoL Score	Equity Score
1	I-90/Valley High Performance Transit (HPT)	STA	Implementation	\$ 31.9 million	\$ -	\$ -	217	30	30	30	50	27	20	30
2	US 2 Multimodal Improvements Project, Phase I	Airway Heights	Implementation	\$ 21.0 million	\$ 11.8 million	\$ 11.8 million	213	26	30	20	30	47	30	30
3	Sullivan/Trent Interchange	Spokane Valley	Implementation	\$ 50.7 million	\$ 9.1 million	\$ -	196	28	30	20	50	43	10	15
4	Fish Lake Trail Connection Phase 2-3	Spokane	Implementation	\$ 18.0 million	\$ 11.1 million	\$ 11.1 million	162	20	30	10	18	29	30	25
5	STA Fleet Electrification Infrastructure	STA	Implementation	\$ 15.4 million	\$ -	\$ -	95	16	28	20	10	1	10	10
6	Division Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)	STA	Development	\$ 166.5 million	\$ -	\$ 82.0 million	225	28	30	30	50	32	25	30
7	Argonne Bridge at I-90	Spokane Valley	Development	\$ 27.5 million	\$ 10.0 million	\$ 3.0 million	216	29	28	20	50	39	20	30
8	US 2 Multimodal Improvements Project, Phase II	Airway Heights	Development	\$ 26.7 million	\$ 22.8 million	\$ 22.8 million	214	27	30	20	30	47	30	30
9	Wellesley High Performance Transit (HPT)	STA	Development	\$ 9.7 million	\$ 4.6 million	\$ -	200	29	30	10	50	31	20	30
10	Division St Active Transportation Access Improvements	Spokane	Development	\$ 26.1 million	\$ 23.7 million	\$ 23.7 million	198	23	30	20	30	45	20	30
11	Spokane Falls Blvd	Spokane	Development	\$ 14.5 million	\$ 13.7 million	\$ 13.7 million	192	28	30	10	30	39	25	30
12	Latah Bridge Rehabilitation	Spokane	Development	\$ 65.1 million	\$ 59.8 million	\$ 59.8 million	189	26	30	20	38	20	25	30
13	Argonne Rd Freight, Active Transportation & Safety Improvements: Argonne Rd/Upriver Dr Intersection	Spokane County	Development	\$ 6.5 million	\$ 0.9 million	\$ 6.5 million	186	26	30	10	50	45	20	5
14	Craig Rd & I-90 Four Lakes Connection	Spokane County	Development	\$ 66.9 million	\$ -	\$ 61.3 million	172	26	30	20	26	30	10	30
15	Craig Rd Complete Street Project	Airway Heights	Development	\$ 11.2 million	\$ 10.0 million	\$ 10.0 million	163	17	26	20	10	35	25	30
16	West Plains Connection - Spokane Phase	Spokane	Development	\$ 6.3 million	\$ 5.8 million	\$ 5.8 million	155	25	30	20	20	20	20	20
17	Wall St Safety and Capital Improvement Project	Spokane County	Development	\$ 17.5 million	\$ -	\$ 16.9 million	150	27	28	10	36	34	10	5
18	Barker/I-90 Interchange (Mission to Appleway)	Spokane Valley	Initiation	\$ 71.8 million	\$ 10.0 million	\$ 2.0 million	217	28	28	20	50	46	25	20
19	Freya - Wellesley to Francis	Spokane	Initiation	\$ 14.5 million	\$ 12.5 million	\$ 12.5 million	172	27	30	20	20	35	10	30
20	21st Ave Improvements Phase I	Airway Heights	Initiation	\$ 8.3 million	\$ 8.3 million	\$ 8.3 million	165	24	28	20	20	38	10	25
21	US 195 Corridor Projects	Spokane	Initiation	\$ 142.7 million	\$ 138.7 million	\$ 138.7 million	163	26	30	20	30	17	15	25
22	Paratransit & Rideshare Operations Base	STA	Initiation	\$ 30.0 million	\$ 5.6 million	\$ 1.1 million	159	20	23	20	30	26	10	30
23	Thorpe Rd/Fairchild 2nd Gate Entrance	Spokane County	Initiation	\$ 3.1 million	\$ -	\$ 3.1 million	138	12	28	20	20	28	10	20
24	Francis (SR 291)/Assembly/Driscoll Intersection	Spokane	Initiation	\$ 9.0 million	\$ 7.6 million	\$ 7.6 million	131	18	30	10	40	23	10	0



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

Requested Action:

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

Key Points:

- The SRTC Board adopted the Comprehensive Plan Certification Process update on 01/08/26.
- The City of Liberty Lake staff provided their Draft 2026–2046 Comprehensive Plan for review by SRTC on 06/15/26.
- SRTC staff have reviewed the City's Comprehensive Plan transportation chapter and other related elements. Staff filled out the certification checklist as part of this review.
- 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 Liberty Lake'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 Liberty Lake			
Type of Review: Comprehensive Plan ☒ Periodic Update ☐ Amendment		Date of Submission: 6/15/2026 Anticipated Date of Plan Adoption:	
Contact Person: Lance Mueller Email: lmueller@libertylakewa.gov			
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 #
1. Was the update coordinated with neighboring jurisdictions and tribes (if applicable) and regional transportation agencies? <u>RCW 36.70A.100</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No If yes, check all the apply: ☒ WSDOT ☐ STA ☐ Kalispel Tribe of Indians ☐ Spokane Tribe of Indians ☒ <u>SRTC</u> ☒ <u>Spokane County</u>	If no, please provide explanation:	136
SRTC Comments:			
Coordination well documented. Also, coordinated with City of Spokane Valley. Held separate coordination calls/meetings to discuss modeling and other analysis. Transportation Policy 1.3			
2. Is the plan consistent with relevant countywide planning policies? <u>RCW 36.70A.100</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	97, 112
SRTC Comments:			
Transportation Goals & Policies are generally consistent with Countywide Planning Policies. Intersection LOS standard is consistent with CPP.			

12

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response	Plan Page #
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 129
SRTC Comments:		
Active transportation and transit options, participates in Commute Trip Reduction.		
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 98, 106
SRTC Comments:		
Policies 1.8 and 1.30. Robust AT network, working on Sidewalk Master Plan.		
8. Do bicycle and pedestrian-supportive policies, programs, and projects address SRTC's Regional Bicycle Route Priority Network?	☐ Yes ☒ No	If no, please provide explanation: Not specifically referenced.
SRTC Comments:		
While SRTC regional priority network is not specifically referenced, the AT section and maps show network within city and connection to regional facilities.		
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?	☐ Yes ☒ No	If no, please provide explanation: Not specifically referenced. 110
SRTC Comments:		
While SRTC regional network is not specifically referenced, freight transport and routes are acknowledged.		

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response	Plan Page #
10. Does the land use element support increased urban densities and transportation-efficient development and redevelopment?	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 28, 57, 88
SRTC Comments:		
GHG element also has Sub-goal 3.1, Housing element policies as well.		
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 134
SRTC Comments:		
Complete inventory not yet conducted but upgrading ADA features during roadway reconstruction.		
12. Does the transportation element address how transportation investments are equitably made? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(i) and (ii)(E)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(f)</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 106, 135, App. F
SRTC Comments:		
Prioritization of active transportation improvements partially based on equity. Transportation Finance Priorities, "Investments and improvements that enhance the safety of all transportation network users"		
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 135
SRTC Comments:		
Prioritize "Investments and improvements that enhance the safety of all transportation network users"		

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response		Plan Page #
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>	☐ Yes ☒ No	If no, please provide explanation:	
SRTC Comments:			
Only forecast for vehicular impact to LOS and short to long term mitigations.			
SEPA Infill and Housing Development Categorical Exemption			
15. Is an Infill and Housing Development Categorical Exemption is being requested per <u>RCW43.12C.229</u> ?	☐ Yes, see questions 16 and 17 ☒ No		
SRTC Comments:			
Not requested.			
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?	☐ Yes ☐ No		
SRTC Comments:			
N/A			
17. Is consultation with WSDOT on impacts to state-owned transportation facilities clearly documented, including any necessary mitigation?	☐ Yes ☐ No		
SRTC Comments:			
N/A			

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response	Plan Page #
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 112, 113
SRTC Comments:		
Requirement is sidewalks and bike lanes on both sides of the street, while allowing a multimodal pathway to be provided in lieu of bike lanes and sidewalks on the same side of the street.		
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 112
SRTC Comments:		
"WSDOT has not adopted one (as of the time of this writing)." "The Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) has published example level of service performance metrics for a variety of modes, including pedestrian, bicycle, and transit. The city may evaluate the use of these metrics when looking at ways to better describe levels of service for facilities within the city."		
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 112
SRTC Comments:		
See comments above for 18.		

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response	Plan Page #
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 26-32, 129, App. D
SRTC Comments:		
GHG reduction goals and policies, Transportation resiliency, Appendix D.		
22. Does the resiliency element include goals and policies to improve climate preparedness, response and recovery efforts? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(9)</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 32-36, App. K,
SRTC Comments:		
Resiliency goals and policies, Appendix K – Transportation Resiliency Plan		
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> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(i)(i)</u>	☐ Yes ☒ No	If no, please provide explanation: 136
SRTC Comments:		
Potential future funding sources mentioned but not analysis of need.		

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response	Plan Page #
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>	☐ Yes ☒ No	If no, please provide explanation: 157
SRTC Comments: Policy 1.9, reference to 6-year TIP (periodic update checklist page 20), impact fees (periodic update checklist page 42)		
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>	☐ Yes ☒ No	If no, please provide explanation:
SRTC Comments: Reference to 6-year TIP and Capital Facilities Plan to be updated to 20-year comp plan period.		

Additional Explanation	
Question:	Comment:



To: Transportation Advisory Committee
From: Angela Paparazzo, Associate Transportation Planner II
Topic: City of Medical Lake Comprehensive Plan Certification

Requested Action:

Recommend SRTC Board certification of the City of Medical Lake Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update.

Key Points:

- The SRTC Board adopted the Comprehensive Plan Certification Process update on 01/08/26.
- The City of Medical Lake staff provided their Draft 2026–2046 Comprehensive Plan for review by SRTC on 6/16/2026.
- SRTC staff have reviewed the City’s Comprehensive Plan transportation chapter and other related elements. Staff filled out the certification checklist as part of this review.
- 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 Medical Lake Comprehensive Plan certification with the TAC.

Public Involvement:

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

Staff Contact: Angela Paparazzo, SRTC | apaparazzo@srtc.org | 509.343.6376

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 Medical Lake			
Type of Review: Comprehensive Plan ☒ Periodic Update ☐ Amendment		Date of Submission: 6/16/2026 Anticipated Date of Plan Adoption: 8/18/2026	
Contact Person: Elisa Rodriquez; Medical Lake, Senior Planner Email: ERodriquez@medical-lake.org			
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 #
1. Was the update coordinated with neighboring jurisdictions and tribes (if applicable) and regional transportation agencies? <u>RCW 36.70A.100</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No If yes, check all the apply: ☒ WSDOT ☐ STA ☐ Kalispel Tribe of Indians ☐ Spokane Tribe of Indians ☐ _____ ☐ _____		If no, please provide explanation: 7-9, 32
SRTC Comments:			
Referenced the County Wide Planning Policies, and included SRTC's Metropolitan Transportation Plan within the transportation chapter.			
2. Is the plan consistent with relevant countywide planning policies? <u>RCW 36.70A.100</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No		If no, please provide explanation: 30-32, 45-46
SRTC Comments:			
References County Wide Planning Policies within land use and transportation chapters.			

21

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response	Plan Page #
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 32, 45
SRTC Comments:		
Chapter 6: Transportation and Mobility, Page 32, Chapter 6: Transportation and Mobility, Page 45; consists of goals and strategies related to travel demand management		
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 35-38, 45-46
SRTC Comments:		
Chapter 6: Transportation and Mobility, Page 35-38; Active Transportation Network Chapter 6: Transportation and Mobility, Page 45; consists of goals and strategies related to active transportation		
8. Do bicycle and pedestrian-supportive policies, programs, and projects address SRTC's Regional Bicycle Route Priority Network?	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 35-38, 45-46
SRTC Comments:		
Chapter 6: Transportation and Mobility, Page 35-38; Chapter 6: Transportation and Mobility, Page 45-46; consists of goals and strategies related to 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?	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 34-35
SRTC Comments:		
Chapter 6: Transportation and Mobility, Page 34-35;		

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response	Plan Page #
10. Does the land use element support increased urban densities and transportation-efficient development and redevelopment?	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 27-32
SRTC Comments:		
Chapter 5: Land Use, Page 27-31;		
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>	☒ Yes ☒ No	If no, please provide explanation: Need to clarify. 34, 45
SRTC Comments:		
Chapter 6: Transportation and Mobility; included in "Traffic Operations and Capacity" on page 34 and in "Transit Overview" on page 35. Mentions the need to make updates that are ADA-compliant. Improving ADA connections to bus stops is listed as priority action on page 46. Chapter 7: Capital Facilities; Noted in priority actions under transportation system needs to implement sidewalk connectivity that is ADA compliant. Methods and implementation schedule are unclear.		
12. Does the transportation element address how transportation investments are equitably made? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(i) and (ii)(E)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(f)</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 39, 45, 65
SRTC Comments:		
Chapter 6: Transportation and Mobility; Included in page 39; Included in the Financing Strategy on page 44 & 45		
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 34-35, 45
SRTC Comments:		
Chapter 6: Transportation and Mobility; Included in Traffic Operations and Capacity and Key Safety and System Issues sections on page 34 and 35; Included in the financing strategy on page 44 & 45		

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response	Plan Page #
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 39-42
SRTC Comments:		
Chapter 6: Transportation and Mobility; included in Future Traffic Forecasts and Intersection Needs on page 39; Maps on pages 40-42		
SEPA Infill and Housing Development Categorical Exemption		
15. Is an Infill and Housing Development Categorical Exemption is being requested per <u>RCW43.12C.229</u> ?	☐ Yes, see questions 16 and 17 ☒ No	N/A
SRTC Comments:		
Opted Out		
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?	☐ Yes ☐ No	N/A
SRTC Comments:		
Opted Out		
17. Is consultation with WSDOT on impacts to state-owned transportation facilities clearly documented, including any necessary mitigation?	☐ Yes ☐ No	N/A
SRTC Comments:		
Opted Out		

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response	Plan Page #
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 34, 43-44
SRTC Comments:		
Chapter 6: Transportation and Mobility; Included in Traffic Operations and Capacity on page 34; Included in Level of Service on page 43 and the Financing Strategy on page 44		
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 43
SRTC Comments:		
Chapter 6: Transportation and Mobility; Included in Level of Service on page 43.		
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 45-46
SRTC Comments:		
Chapter 6: Transportation and Mobility; Included in the goals and strategies on page 45-46.		

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response	Plan Page #
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 32, 64-66
SRTC Comments:		
Chapter 6: Transportation and Mobility; Included on Page 32; Chapter 10: Climate Resiliency; Included on pages 64-66;		
22. Does the resiliency element include goals and policies to improve climate preparedness, response and recovery efforts? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(9)</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 64-66
SRTC Comments:		
Chapter 10: Climate Resiliency; Included on pages 64-66;		
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> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(i)(i)</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 44-45, 53-55
SRTC Comments:		
Chapter 6: Transportation and Mobility; Included in the Financing Strategy and Goals and Strategies, Page 44-45 Chapter 7: Capital Facilities; included in the Financing Strategy and Goals and Strategies, Page 53-55		

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response	Plan Page #
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 44-45, 54
SRTC Comments: Chapter 6: Transportation and Mobility; Included in the Financing Strategy and Goals and Strategies, Page 44-45 Chapter 7: Capital Facilities; included in the Financing Strategy and Goals and Strategies, Page 54		
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 44-45
SRTC Comments: Chapter 6: Transportation and Mobility; Included in the Financing Strategy and Goals and Strategies, Page 44-45		

Additional Explanation	
Question:	Comment:



To: Transportation Advisory Committee
From: Angela Paparazzo, Associate Transportation Planner II
Topic: City of Airway Heights Comprehensive Plan Certification

Requested Action:

Recommend SRTC Board certification of the City of Airway Heights Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update.

Key Points:

- The SRTC Board adopted the Comprehensive Plan Certification Process update on 01/08/26.
- The City of Airway Heights staff provided their Draft 2026–2046 Comprehensive Plan for review by SRTC on 7/30/2026.
- SRTC staff have reviewed the City’s Comprehensive Plan transportation chapter and other related elements. Staff filled out the certification checklist as part of this review.
- 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 Airway Heights Comprehensive Plan certification with the TAC.

Public Involvement:

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

Staff Contact: Angela Paparazzo, SRTC | apaparazzo@srtc.org | 509.343.6376

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 Airway Heights			
Type of Review: Comprehensive Plan ☒ Periodic Update ☐ Amendment		Date of Submission: June 30th, 2026 Anticipated Date of Plan Adoption:	
Contact Person: Heather Trautman or Bill White Email: htrautman@cawh.org or bwhite@civtech.com			
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 #
1. Was the update coordinated with neighboring jurisdictions and tribes (if applicable) and regional transportation agencies? <u>RCW 36.70A.100</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No If yes, check all the apply: ☒ WSDOT ☒ STA ☐ Kalispel Tribe of Indians ☒ Spokane Tribe of Indians ☐ _____ ☐ _____	If no, please provide explanation:	Pages 76-89
SRTC Comments: Policies consider the needs of neighboring jurisdictions, tribes, and regional transportation agencies, including, Fairchild Air Force Base, STA, Spokane County, WSDOT, Spokane International Airport and SRTC. plan discusses the partner project initiatives of the Spokane and Kalispel Tribes.			
2. Is the plan consistent with relevant countywide planning policies? <u>RCW 36.70A.100</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	Page 77, 183, 190
SRTC Comments: Plan is consistent with CWPP.			

30

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response	Plan Page #
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: Pages 25-27, 138-144
SRTC Comments:		
Section II, Policies and Actions, and Section VII, Transportation Climate, include TDM strategies.		
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: Page 98-137
SRTC Comments:		
Section VI, Active Transportation is dedicated to mode choice and targeted active mobility and transit projects.		
8. Do bicycle and pedestrian-supportive policies, programs, and projects address SRTC's Regional Bicycle Route Priority Network?	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: Page 23, 98-129
SRTC Comments:		
Section II Goals presents several multimodal goals and policies that compliment SRTC objectives. Section VI, Active Transportation, identifies pedestrian and bicycle network priority projects that support regional connectivity.		
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?	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: Page 44, 72-89
SRTC Comments:		
Objectives and projects for moving people and goods are highlighted for U.S. 2 & Hayford Road, many of these projects are identified with the regional TP.		

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response	Plan Page #
10. Does the land use element support increased urban densities and transportation-efficient development and redevelopment?	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: Page 44-63, 98-129
SRTC Comments:		
Notes the diversification of residential land uses to address urban density variations. Multimodal strategies for efficient movements are discussed with Section VI (page 50-65).		
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: Page 133-137
SRTC Comments:		
Discuss the relation of the Element to the City ADA Transition Plan and later incorporates projects into short and long range TIP's.		
12. Does the transportation element address how transportation investments are equitably made? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(i) and (ii)(E)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(f)</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: Page 23-33, 108-121
SRTC Comments:		
Section II Goals highlights equity actions, note the demographics that supports objectives for residents below equitable means. Highlights multimodal solutions for marginalized neighborhoods.		
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: Page 34-45, 72-89
SRTC Comments:		
Highlight an extensive safety analysis. Section V presents extensive improvements recommended to improve safety and mobility for Airway Heights citizens.		

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response		Plan Page #
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	Page 146-173
SRTC Comments:			
Section VIII presents multimodal solutions for 6-Year, 20-year, and longer term horizons.			
SEPA Infill and Housing Development Categorical Exemption			
15. Is an Infill and Housing Development Categorical Exemption is being requested per <u>RCW43.12C.229?</u>	☒ Yes, see questions 16 and 17 ☐ No		Page 66, 87, 124, 159
SRTC Comments:			
The proposed code update requests the residential development categorical exemption authorized by SB 5412 and RCW 43.21C.229 (3) for qualifying housing development within the incorporated UGA.			
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?	☒ Yes ☐ No		Page 66
SRTC Comments:			
The Transportation Element analyzes forecast land use intensity and multimodal impacts, including effects on regional and state facilities. Additional analysis will be addressed through the Comprehensive Plan SEPA review.			
17. Is consultation with WSDOT on impacts to state-owned transportation facilities clearly documented, including any necessary mitigation?	☒ Yes ☐ No		Page 87
SRTC Comments:			
This will be addressed through the Comprehensive Plan public review and engagement process and SEPA review.			

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response	Plan Page #
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: Page 128-129
SRTC Comments: Highlights the multimodal LOS developed for the Element, Page 65-66 presents the application of this standard to active mobility projects.		
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: Solutions for U.S. 2 were adapted from WSDOT and SRTC regional plans which present Regional MM Performances. The City objective related to these projects. Page 100-104
SRTC Comments: Element solutions for U.S. 2 were adapted from WSDOT and SRTC regional Plans which already present regional MM performances. The City objective related to these projects.		
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: Element solutions for U.S. 2 were adapted from WSDOT and SRTC regional Plans which present regional MM performances. The City objective related to these projects. Page 100-104
SRTC Comments: Element solutions for U.S. 2 were adapted from WSDOT and SRTC regional Plans which already present regional MM performances. The City objective related to these projects.		

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response	Plan Page #
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: Page 138-144
SRTC Comments:		
Section VII discusses GHG and VMT objectives and performance review.		
22. Does the resiliency element include goals and policies to improve climate preparedness, response and recovery efforts? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(9)</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: Page 23-27
SRTC Comments:		
Section II Goals presents goals for emergency preparedness		
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> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(i)(i)</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: Page 166-173
SRTC Comments:		
Discusses funding considerations and objectives.		

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response	Plan Page #
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: Page 160-173
SRTC Comments: Discusses project priorities based on priority, an annual funding plan is presented with the revised City 6-Year TIP.		
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: Page 166-173
SRTC Comments: Discusses funding considerations and objectives. Discussion is lacking on the land use side.		

Additional Explanation	
Question:	Comment:



To: Transportation Advisory Committee
From: Benjamin Kloskey, Associate Transportation Planner II
Topic: 2027-2030 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Requested Action:

Recommend Board approval of the 2027-2030 Transportation Improvement Program.

Key Points:

- SRTC is required to develop a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) that includes a list of projects and programs to be carried out in the Spokane Metropolitan Planning Area over a four-year period.
- The TIP must be updated at least every four years; SRTC updates the TIP annually.
- 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.
- Member jurisdictions and agencies have submitted their TIP project records into the SRTC ProjectTracker eTIP software. SRTC staff have reviewed the records as part of developing the TIP.
- Once approved by the SRTC Board, the TIP is incorporated into the Washington State TIP (STIP), which is reviewed and approved by FHWA and FTA.
- The draft 2027-2030 TIP document is available on the [SRTC website](#).

Board/Committee Discussions:

The committees discussed the draft 2027-2030 TIP at their August 2026 meetings, and the Board discussed the draft 2027-2030 TIP at their September 2026 meeting.

Public Involvement:

All SRTC Board and Committee meetings are open to the public. The draft 2027-2030 TIP is available for a 30-day public comment period from September 1 through October 1, 2026, with a public meeting to be held on September 24, 2026. All comments received during the public comment period will be provided to the SRTC Board before taking action.

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



To: Transportation Advisory Committee
From: Benjamin Kloskey, Associate Transportation Planner II
Topic: 2027 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Guidebook – Draft

Requested Action:

None. For information and discussion.

Key Points:

- The SRTC TIP Guidebook establishes goals and objectives for the TIP, outlines specific programming policies, provides critical TIP timelines, and details other TIP-related information.
- The TIP Guidebook is a programming resource for SRTC member agencies, the Board of Directors, and advisory committee members.
- The initial TIP Guidebook was developed in 2013 and is updated yearly to incorporate new schedules, procedures, and programming policies.
- Changes to the 2027 Guidebook include:
 - An update to Policy 6.8 outlining the applicability of Policy 3.6 to retroactively approve funding a Contingency List project if the funding is time sensitive.
 - Updates to the 2028-2031 TIP development schedule.
 - Updates to the amendment and administrative modification schedules.
- The draft 2027 TIP Guidebook document is available on the [SRTC website](#).

Board/Committee Discussions:

This is the first discussion of the draft 2027 TIP Guidebook.

Public Involvement:

All SRTC Board and Committee meetings at which the draft 2027 TIP Guidebook is discussed are open to the public.

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



To: Transportation Advisory Committee
From: Angela Paparazzo, Associate Transportation Planner II
Topic: WSDOT Consolidated Grant Ranking Process

Requested Action:

None. For information and discussion. Volunteers will be sought out to participate in the ranking process.

Key Points:

- The WSDOT Consolidated Grant Program released its application for the 2027-2029 biennium in June 2026. The application deadline was 09/09/26.
- The program supports public transportation related projects, including service between cities and within rural areas, paratransit/special needs transportation, mobility management, and new/replacement vehicles.
- For the 2027-2029 cycle, WSDOT will award consolidated funding from six state and federal sources. Project guidance is from our local Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan.
- The state's application review process requires RTPOs to submit regional rankings for projects submitted to the Consolidated Grant Program. As the RTPO for Spokane County, SRTC facilitates the project ranking process. Rankings are based on A-B-C allocations from the state.
- Staff will need a **minimum of 3 volunteers** from the TAC to review project applications using a set of scoring criteria. The group will be combined with volunteers from the TTC.
- The anticipated time commitment is a kick-off meeting followed by scoring (~10) applications on your own time. The group scoring will be averaged and used to determine A-B-C ranking results. Score submittals may be coordinated through email with a completion deadline of 11/09/26.
- A recommendation for the final rankings would come before the TTC and TAC at the respective November meetings, with Board action scheduled for December.

Board/Committee Discussions:

This is the first time this item is being discussed for the 2027-2029 biennium.

Public Involvement:

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

Staff Contact: Angela Paparazzo | apaparazzo@srtc.org | 509.343.6376