



Spokane Regional Transportation Council

Transportation Technical Committee Meeting

Wednesday, September 23, 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/j/81656202452?pwd=ko00IK05dn3lnHnTeoD5VRTtBLLqA6.1>

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 September Board of Directors Meeting	
------	---	---	--

FOR ACTION

1:15	3	Consent Agenda	
		a) August TTC Meeting Minutes	3

1:20	4	CY 2027 Unified List: Projects for State & Federal Versions – Final	9
		<i>(David Fletcher)</i>	

1:35	5	City of Liberty Lake Comprehensive Plan Certification <i>(Ryan Stewart)</i>	11
------	---	--	----

1:40	6	City of Medical Lake Comprehensive Plan Certification <i>(Angela Paparazzo)</i>	20
------	---	--	----

1:45	7	City of Airway Heights Comprehensive Plan Certification <i>(Angela Paparazzo)</i>	29
------	---	--	----

1:50	8	CY 2027-2030 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Recommendation <i>(Ben Kloskey)</i>	38
------	---	--	----

INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

1:55	9	CY 2027 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Guidebook – Draft <i>(Ben Kloskey)</i>	39
------	---	--	----

2:05	10	WSDOT Consolidated Grant Project Rankings <i>(Angela Paparazzo)</i>	40
------	----	--	----

INFORMATION: No Presentation

2:15	11	Agency Update and Future Information Items <i>(David Fletcher)</i>	
------	----	---	--

2:20	12	Adjournment <i>(Chair)</i>	
------	----	-----------------------------------	--



Transportation Technical Committee Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, August 26, 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
Dan Ferguson
City of Cheney
Lance Mueller (Alt)
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
Kristen Armstrong (Alt)
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
Shauna Harshman
WSDOT-ER
Glenn Wagemann
WSDOT-ER

Absent Members:

Julia Whitford
Kalispel Tribe
Maria Cullooyah
Spokane Tribe
Mike Pea
WSDOT-ER

Guests:
Daniel Wells
STA
Don Skillingstad
STA
Tyler Kimbrell
City of Spokane
Dan Pratt
City of Deer Park
Katherine Miller
City of Airway Heights
Stu Barton
J-U-B Engineers
Wende Wilber
Kittleson & Assoc.
Paul Kropp

Staff:

Lois Bollenback
Executive Director
Bailee Petersen
Comm. & PR Coord.
Anadia Grier
Admin-Exec Coord.
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



2 Public Comments

Mr. Fletcher 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 final design.

No in-person public comments were provided, and no questions, comments, or discussion followed.

Member Comments

Members shared updates on current projects within their agencies and regions, as well as general staffing updates.

Chair Report on SRTC Board Meeting

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

ACTION ITEMS

3 Consent Agenda

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

At Mr. Weathers' request, the Chair called for a motion to amend the minutes to correct his attendance. Mr. Jennings made a motion to approve the amendment. Mr. Greene seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

Ms. Note made a motion to approve the CY 2026-2029 TIP August & September Amendment as presented. Mr. Weathers seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

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 Capital Project Manager, provided an update on the Division Street Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project. The project emerged from the four-year Division Connects study and is intended to provide an affordable transportation option, improve access along the Division Street



corridor, and enhance safety through additional pedestrian crossings and transportation choices. 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. Wells explained that Division Street BRT has long been identified as the public transportation alternative associated with the North Spokane Corridor. Planning began in 2008, and the project has since been incorporated into regional and local transportation plans. The Division Connects study evaluated BRT, active transportation improvements, land use and zoning changes, and ongoing coordination among partner agencies.

Mr. Skillingstad reviewed the first phase, known as the Minimum Operable Segment. This phase would construct 38 new stations and improve the STA Plaza and Hastings Park and Ride. The stations would resemble City Line stations and include shelters, seating, lighting, real-time information displays, security cameras, and other amenities. Service would initially operate every 15 minutes, with first-year ridership estimated at 1.4 million trips, approximately 52 percent higher than 2024 ridership.

The first phase would also include transit signal priority and business access and transit (BAT) lanes. Transit signal priority could shorten opposing green-light cycles, so buses receive a green light sooner, but unlike the system used by emergency vehicles, it would not override traffic signals. STA is coordinating with the City of Spokane, Spokane County, and WSDOT to determine where and under what conditions this priority would be used and to ensure it does not negatively affect traffic.

BAT lanes would be added along portions of Division and Ruby streets between approximately Cataldo Avenue and Buckeye Avenue/North Foothills Drive. These lanes would be available to buses and vehicles turning into or out of businesses and driveways. Ms. Harshman asked whether the project would slow traffic on Division Street. Mr. Wells clarified that the project does not propose reducing the speed limit, although additional pedestrian crossings may cause traffic to stop more frequently.

The current project cost estimate is approximately \$166 million. Funding includes more than \$38 million approved by the STA Board, \$50 million from the state, a \$1 million federal grant, and a requested \$82 million Federal Transit Administration Small Starts grant. Design is approaching 60 percent completion and is expected to advance to final design in October. Federal environmental approval was anticipated in September, followed by state environmental review and property acquisition. STA expects to seek construction bids in January 2028, begin construction in spring 2028, complete construction around May 2030, and begin passenger service in May 2031 following system testing.

STA continues to coordinate with agency partners, utility providers, neighborhood councils, property and business owners, and community members. Outreach has included mailings, open houses, project updates, leadership events, and a project website. Artists have also been



selected to develop neighborhood-based artwork for the stations, similar to the City Line project.

Future phases, as funding becomes available, would include a Mead Transit Center, four additional stations between Hastings Park and Ride and the new transit center, an extension of BAT lanes to the Division Street Y, a bicycle facility on Ruby Street, and more frequent transit service. STA has purchased the property for the Mead Transit Center and has set aside \$10 million for the Ruby Street bicycle facility.

Ms. Harshman also asked whether bicycles would share the BAT lanes. Staff explained that the southbound BAT lane through the Division-Ruby couplet is being designed as a wider shared lane for buses, bicycles, and right-turning vehicles. The northbound bicycle connection would eventually be replaced by the planned Ruby Street bicycle facility. Dedicated bicycle facilities are not currently proposed for the main portion of Division Street during the first phase, although the project may remove the existing bicycle restriction. Additional discussions with WSDOT and the City of Spokane will be needed as future BAT lanes and bicycle improvements are developed.

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

Mr. Fletcher presented the draft list of projects for the state and federal versions of the CY 2027 Unified List. He explained that the Unified List is updated annually to communicate the region's current transportation priorities to legislators and support potential funding opportunities. Projects are organized into three stages: initiation, development, and implementation.

The project evaluation criteria were updated this year to reflect Horizon 2050 and align with SRTC's guiding principles. The most significant updates were made to the economic vitality; operations, maintenance, and preservation; and safety and security categories. Greater weight was also given to operations, maintenance, and preservation and to safety and security. The SRTC Board approved the updated criteria in May.

SRTC received 28 project submissions this year, including eight projects that are not on the current Unified List. Together, the projects requested approximately \$530 million in federal funding and \$370 million in state funding. Mr. Fletcher explained that staff considered project scores, consistency with previous lists, regional needs, and the importance of maintaining a focused list that can respond to different funding opportunities.

Staff recommended retaining all projects in the implementation and development categories. Several projects advanced from development to implementation, including I-90 Valley High Performance Transit, US 2 Multimodal Improvements Phase I, and the Sullivan/Trent Interchange. The STA Fleet Electrification Infrastructure project was newly added to the implementation category because it can be completed more quickly than a typical infrastructure project.



Mr. Fletcher explained that the primary decision involves where to establish the cutoff within the initiation category. He presented three options: ending the list at a natural break in project scores, extending the cutoff to include the Clean Energy Campus Acquisition project because it appeared on the previous year's list, or using the higher cutoff while retaining the Clean Energy Campus project as an exception.

Mr. Jackson asked whether staff could provide the number of projects and total funding requested by each submitting agency. He noted that this information could help the committee assess geographic balance and determine whether including additional projects might dilute the region's highest priorities. Mr. Fletcher agreed to provide the information and suggested adding it to the online project map.

In response to a question from Ms. Note, Mr. Fletcher confirmed that staff did not propose a cutoff within the development category because those projects were on last year's list and received relatively strong scores.

Ms. Limon asked when the committee would review the list again. Mr. Fletcher said he would return in September with a final list for the committee's recommendation. Committee members were encouraged to contact him with comments or questions before the next meeting.

Mr. Jackson also asked which cutoff option staff was most likely to recommend. Mr. Fletcher said that, although staff will defer a recommendation until the TAC and TTC have had an opportunity to provide input, the option most consistent with past practice would be to use the natural break in project scores while retaining the Clean Energy Campus Acquisition project because it was included on the previous year's list. This approach would remove the three other projects below the initial cutoff.

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 that will receive federal funding or are otherwise considered regionally significant. The TIP is developed in coordination with local agencies and WSDOT and is consistent with Horizon 2050, the region's long-range metropolitan transportation plan. It includes information about project costs, schedules, funding sources, and regional performance targets.

The draft TIP includes 58 projects and approximately \$660 million in programmed and secured funding, including one new project beginning in 2027. Mr. Kloskey explained that the program is fiscally constrained, meaning sufficient funding is reasonably available to cover all projects and programs included during the four-year period.

The North Spokane Corridor represents approximately \$285 million of the TIP's roughly \$664 million in total programmed funding. The remaining funds support transit programs, high-performance transit, preservation, and other transportation improvements. Mr. Kloskey noted



that the totals may change slightly as agencies finalize their project information.

The TIP also includes details about the federal funds managed and distributed by SRTC. Projected year-end balances remain positive, demonstrating that the program is fiscally constrained. The document also contains regional performance-management measures, public transit asset-management targets, and other transit targets provided by STA.

The draft TIP and an interactive online project map will be available for public review from September 1 through October 1. The map will allow users to view detailed information and submit comments on individual projects. SRTC will also hold a public open house on September 24 from 4:30 to 6:00 p.m. in Event Room A at the Spokane Central Library.

INFORMATION (NO PRESENTATION)

7 Agency Update

Mr. Fletcher announced that WSDOT's Travel Washington Wheatland Express intercity bus ribbon-cutting ceremony scheduled for August 28 had been canceled due to the impacts of regional wildfires. He also shared that the fourth annual Spokane Regional Transportation Summit will be held on October 15. Tickets are available through the Greater Spokane Inc. website, with discounted early-bird pricing offered.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:03 PM.

Anadia Grier, Clerk of the Board



To: Transportation Technical 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 Technical 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 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 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.			

13

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 Technical 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 TTC.

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.			

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response	Plan Page #
3. Does the plan (or plan update/amendment) support the SRTC RTP Guiding Principles and policies?	☒ Economic Vitality ☒ Cooperation & Leadership ☒ Stewardship ☒ System Operations, Maintenance, & Preservation ☒ Safety & Security ☒ Choice & Mobility ☒ Quality of Life	If no, please provide explanation: 5-6, 32-45, 68-70
SRTC Comments: Economic Vitality: Chapter 5: Land Use; Chapter 11: "Placemaking"; Chapter 12: Zoning and Development Standards; Cooperation & Leadership: Stewardship: Chapter 7: Capital Facilities; System Operations, Maintenance, & Preservation: Chapter 3: Public Services; Chapter 6: Transportation Safety & Security: Chapter 3: Public Services; Chapter 8: Transportation and Mobility; Chapter 9: Natural Environment; Chapter 10: Climate Resiliency; Chapter 13: Urban Growth Area Choice & Mobility: Chapter 6: Transportation & Mobility; Chapter 7: Capital Facilities; Chapter 8: Parks; Chapter 10: Climate Resiliency Quality of Life: Chapter 5: Land use; Chapter 7: Capital Facilities; Chapter 8: Parks; Chapter 9: Natural Environment; Chapter 11: "Placemaking"; Chapter 12: Zoning and Development Standards		
4. Does the transportation element include an inventory of air, water, and ground transportation facilities and services, including state-owned transportation facilities? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(A)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 32-36, 47-50
SRTC Comments: Chapter 6: Transportation and Mobility, pages 32-36. Chapter 7: Capital Facilities, pages 47-50.		
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 27-46
SRTC Comments: Chapter 5: Land Use, beginning on page 27. Chapter 6: Transportation and Mobility, beginning on page 32. The Transportation and Mobility chapter supports housing and land use strategies for "compact, connected growth by planning for a multi-modal system."		

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 Technical 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 TTC.

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.			

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response	Plan Page #
3. Does the plan (or plan update/amendment) support the SRTC RTP Guiding Principles and policies?	☒ Economic Vitality ☒ Cooperation & Leadership ☒ Stewardship ☒ System Operations, Maintenance, & Preservation ☒ Safety & Security ☒ Choice & Mobility ☒ Quality of Life	If no, please provide explanation: Pages 69-99
SRTC Comments: Provides and overview of SRTC Guiding Principals and the relation of City projects to the regional guidelines.		
4. Does the transportation element include an inventory of air, water, and ground transportation facilities and services, including state-owned transportation facilities? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(A)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: Page 44-47, 99-133
SRTC Comments: Much analysis and recommendation is dedicated to U.S. 2 as a National and regional highway of significance. See pages 23 – 24 (pdf) Air and Water, and 50 – 67 (pdf) Existing Conditions and Future Conditions.		
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>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: Pages 49-63
SRTC Comments: "Future Land Use" discuss Transportation Element land uses assumption correlation to the Land Use Element.		

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 Technical Committee
From: Benjamin Kloskey, Associate Transportation Planner II
Topic: 2027-2030 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) – Draft

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 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 Technical 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@strtc.org | 509.343.6370



To: Transportation Technical 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 TTC to review project applications using a set of scoring criteria. The group will be combined with volunteers from the TAC.
- 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