Spokane Regional Transportation Council

TAC MEETING 10/28/2026
CONSENT AGENDA

AGENDA ITEM 3a

Transportation Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, September 23, 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 Absences: David Eash, Carlie Hoffman, Ann Winkler

In attendance were:

Committee Members:

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

Guests:

Daniel Wells
STA
Don Skillingstad
STA
Alex Rempe
KPFF

Staff:

Lois Bollenabck
Executive Director
Eve McMenamy
Deputy 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
There were no public comments.

Member Comments
There were no member comments.

Chair Report on SRTC Board Meeting
Mr. Ankney gave a brief overview of September's SRTC Board meeting.

ACTION ITEMS

 # 3 Consent Agenda

a. August TAC Meeting Minutes

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.

 # 4 CY 2027 Unified List: Projects for State & Federal Versions – Final
Mr. Fletcher presented the final CY 2027 Unified List of Projects and requested a recommendation for SRTC Board approval to include the projects in the state and federal versions of the list. He noted that minor modifications had been made since the version included in the meeting packet based on feedback received from the TTC and SRTC Board.

Mr. Fletcher explained that the Unified List is updated annually to communicate the region's current transportation priorities to state and federal legislators and help position projects for potential funding opportunities. The state and federal versions contain the same projects, although funding request amounts may differ depending on the anticipated funding source. Projects are categorized by stage of advancement: initiation, development, or implementation.

For the 2027 update, agencies submitted projects for consideration from May through June. SRTC staff reviewed the submissions for completeness and consistent scoring before developing the draft list presented to the committee in August. Mr. Fletcher noted that the project evaluation criteria were also updated this year to reflect priorities identified through the Horizon 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) update. Changes included updates related to regional activity centers and greater emphasis on operations, maintenance and preservation, and safety and security. Additional evaluation questions were also added in these areas to better reflect identified regional needs.

SRTC received 28 project submissions, including seven projects that had not been submitted previously. Mr. Fletcher explained that staff considered project scores and consistency with previous years when determining which projects to include. At the same time, legislators have consistently encouraged SRTC to keep the Unified List focused and concise. Staff also sought to maintain a diverse range of project types so the region can respond to different funding opportunities, including safety and freight programs.

Mr. Fletcher reviewed the proposed projects by status category. All five projects in the implementation category are recommended for inclusion, with no changes from the draft list. These projects are further along, have generally received significant prior investment, and are positioned for implementation sooner than projects in the other categories.

Staff also recommended including all projects in the development category because they scored highly and were included on the previous year's list. One modification was made following feedback on the draft list. A component of the larger US-195 suite of projects was separated from the initiation category and moved into the development category because that particular improvement is further along than the remainder of the US-195 projects. Mr. Fletcher said staff discussed the change with the City and agreed that the development category more accurately reflects the project's current status.

For projects in the initiation category, staff considered two potential cutoff points. One followed a natural break in project scores between projects 7 and 8. A second would have extended the list through project 9, the STA Clean Energy Campus acquisition, because that project was included on the previous year's Unified List. Mr. Fletcher explained that staff ultimately recommended ending the list at project 7. Because initiation projects are still early in development, their funding needs and readiness can change more significantly from year to year than projects in the development or implementation categories. Staff also received feedback that some projects below the proposed cutoff are not currently seeking funding. The shorter list therefore provides a more focused set of current regional priorities.

Mr. Aranda asked whether staff considered funding that agencies or projects had already received through other awards when determining the cutoff. Mr. Fletcher confirmed that existing funding is a consideration and that projects receiving significant funding from other sources are generally included on the Unified List. Based on discussions with the sponsoring agencies and staff's review, however, none of the projects below the proposed cutoff currently have a significant amount of committed funding.

Mr. Fletcher concluded by requesting that the committee recommend SRTC Board approval of the CY 2027 Unified List projects for inclusion in the state and federal versions of the list, incorporating the modifications presented.

Mr. Vose made a motion to recommend SRTC Board approval of the CY 2027 Unified List for inclusion in the state and federal versions as presented. Ms. Zentz seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

 # 5 City of Liberty Lake Comprehensive Plan Certification

Mr. Stewart presented the City of Liberty Lake Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update for certification and provided an overview of SRTC's role in the comprehensive plan review process. As the state-designated Regional Transportation Planning Organization, SRTC is responsible for reviewing local comprehensive plans for consistency with the regional

transportation plan, Horizon 2050, and applicable state transportation planning requirements. Mr. Stewart explained that staff reviews the best available information when completing the certification checklist, including draft comprehensive plans, transportation and related elements, meeting records, and documentation of coordination with jurisdictions and partner agencies. He emphasized that not every checklist item must receive a "yes" for SRTC to recommend certification. Some requirements may not apply to every jurisdiction, while others involve newer state requirements for which guidance is still developing. In those cases, staff may identify opportunities for future improvements or work with jurisdictions to address outstanding items.

Mr. Stewart said the City of Liberty Lake began its periodic update process early and coordinated extensively with SRTC, WSDOT, Spokane County, the City of Spokane Valley, and other partners. The City also conducted a network analysis and significant community outreach and provided draft materials to SRTC early in the process. Staff found the update, including the transportation element and related elements, consistent with the intent of Horizon 2050. The update also addresses most applicable state requirements, although some newer requirements related to forecasting multimodal level of service will be addressed through future planning updates. Staff requested that the committee recommend SRTC Board certification of the City of Liberty Lake Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update.

Ms. Callary asked whether committee members could access the City's actual draft comprehensive plan materials when reviewing certification requests. Mr. Stewart acknowledged that the memo did not include a link and offered to provide one to the committee upon request. He added that future certification memos would include links to the applicable comprehensive plan materials.

Ms. Callary also asked about jurisdictions that do not yet have an ADA Transition Plan and whether SRTC certification of their comprehensive plans could relieve them of the responsibility to develop one. Mr. Stewart clarified that certification does not remove that requirement. While SRTC does not directly oversee development of ADA Transition Plans through this certification process, jurisdictions remain responsible for meeting applicable state requirements. He noted that the timing and approach for addressing those requirements may vary by jurisdiction, particularly as guidance continues to develop.

Ms. Zentz asked about the checklist indicating that consultation with Spokane Transit Authority (STA) had not been verified for Liberty Lake. Mr. Stewart said STA representatives clarified during the earlier TTC meeting that coordination with Liberty Lake had occurred, but SRTC did not have documentation of that consultation when the checklist was originally completed. To improve the process going forward, STA will copy SRTC on correspondence documenting consultation and coordination with jurisdictions. Mr. Stewart said staff would incorporate the updated information when the certification is presented to the SRTC Board in October.

Mr. Braaten made a motion to recommend SRTC Board certification of the City of Liberty Lake's Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update as presented. Mr. Aranda seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

 # 6 City of Medical Lake Comprehensive Plan Certification

Ms. Paparazzo presented the City of Medical Lake Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update for certification. She noted that Medical Lake staff completed SRTC's certification checklist. While jurisdictions are not required to complete the checklist themselves, it provides guidance on the information SRTC considers during its review, and Ms. Paparazzo thanked City staff for providing the additional information.

Ms. Paparazzo explained that SRTC's review considered information documented in the Comprehensive Plan as well as information gathered through ongoing coordination and discussions with City staff. Based on that review, SRTC staff determined that the City of Medical Lake Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update is consistent with Horizon 2050.

Mr. Vose made a motion to recommend SRTC Board certification of the City of Medical Lake's Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update as presented. Mr. Hansen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

 # 7 City of Airway Heights Comprehensive Plan Certification

Ms. Paparazzo presented the City of Airway Heights Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update for certification. She noted that City staff coordinated closely with SRTC throughout the update process and also worked with Kalispel Tribe-related representatives, addressing a question raised during the previous agenda item regarding tribal coordination.

Ms. Paparazzo said Airway Heights staff completed SRTC's certification checklist, although jurisdictions are not required to do so. SRTC staff reviewed the City's responses along with other available documentation and information gathered through coordination with the City. With some adjustments identified through the review process, staff determined that the Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update is consistent with Horizon 2050 and recommended that the SRTC Board certify the update.

Mr. Stewart provided additional clarification regarding two consultation items on the certification checklist. First, staff will follow up with the City to ensure its coordination with the Kalispel Tribe is properly documented and will update the checklist before presenting it to the Board.

Mr. Stewart also noted that the checklist indicated consultation with WSDOT had occurred regarding use of a SEPA categorical exemption for infill development. During the earlier TTC meeting, however, WSDOT staff clarified that the consultation had not yet occurred. SRTC staff will revise the checklist to reflect that information before presenting the certification to the Board. Mr. Stewart emphasized that these consultations are consistent with Horizon 2050 expectations and should be completed and documented.

Mr. Braaten made a motion to recommend SRTC Board certification of the City of Airway Heights' Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update as presented. Mr. Barber seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

 # 8 CY 2027-2030 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Recommendation

Mr. Kloskey presented the draft CY 2027-2030 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and requested a recommendation for SRTC Board approval. He explained that the TIP is a four-year planning document updated annually that identifies federally funded and regionally significant transportation projects throughout the region. The TIP is developed in coordination with local agencies and WSDOT and must be consistent with Horizon 2050, SRTC's Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). It includes project costs, schedules, funding sources, performance management targets, and information on how individual projects support those targets.

Mr. Kloskey reported that the draft TIP includes approximately $665 million for 58 projects and programs, including one new project for 2027. The total had decreased slightly since the previous presentation after removing one project. He noted that the TIP is fiscally constrained, meaning sufficient anticipated revenues have been identified to cover the projects and programs included in the plan.

Mr. Kloskey reviewed the distribution of TIP funding by project type. Because the North Spokane Corridor (NSC) accounts for approximately 43% of the overall program, staff also presented funding percentages excluding the NSC to provide a clearer picture of other transportation investments throughout the region.

Mr. Kloskey also highlighted the TIP's project overview reports, which include project funding, recent funding changes, and project limits. The reports are generated through SRTC's Project Tracker platform. He also reviewed the interactive TIP web application, which allows members of the public to view projects geographically and submit comments directly through the platform.

The draft TIP has been available for public comment since September 1, with the comment period continuing through October 1. Mr. Kloskey also reminded the committee of the TIP Open House scheduled for September 24 from 4:30–6:00 p.m. at the Spokane Central Library. Spokane County, WSDOT, the City of Spokane, the City of Spokane Valley, and the City of Airway Heights were scheduled to present information on transportation projects underway in the region.

Ms. Zentz asked for additional context regarding the percentage of TIP funding attributed to transit and how that distribution relates to regional survey results emphasizing additional investment in safety and preservation.

Mr. Kloskey explained that the transit funding shown in the TIP largely consists of Federal

Transit Administration (FTA) funding allocated directly to Spokane Transit Authority (STA), rather than funding allocated by SRTC. The transit figures also forecast multiple years of federal allocations, extending through 2032. He estimated that only approximately $1–2 million of the roughly $213.5 million shown for STA had been awarded through SRTC, primarily for planning projects.

Mr. Kloskey added that SRTC-managed funding awarded through its Call for Projects is directed much more heavily toward preservation, along with other regional transportation priorities. He agreed that STA funding, like the NSC, is a substantial and distinct funding source that can affect how the overall TIP percentages appear. He offered to provide a separate breakdown showing only SRTC-managed funding. Ms. Zentz said a separate table was not necessary and clarified that she wanted the distinction reflected in the record.

Mr. Vose made a motion to recommend SRTC Board approval of the 2027-2030 Transportation Improvement Program as presented. Mr. Barber seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

9 CY 2027 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Guidebook – Draft

Mr. Kloskey presented the draft CY 2027 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Guidebook. He explained that the Guidebook establishes the TIP's goals and objectives, outlines policies for programming projects, and sets key timelines and deadlines for TIP amendments and other activities. It serves as a programming resource for SRTC member agencies, the Board of Directors, and advisory committees. Originally developed in 2013, the Guidebook is updated annually to reflect current schedules, procedures, and programming policies.

Mr. Kloskey reported that most of the proposed 2027 changes are routine updates to schedules and timelines. The only substantive policy change relates to Policy 6.8, the contingency funding process, which was revised to clarify how Policy 3.6 applies to projects on the contingency list.

Mr. Kloskey explained that the change resulted from a situation earlier in 2026 involving two City of Spokane projects that received funding through the NHS Asset Management Program. Because that funding overlapped with preservation funding previously awarded through SRTC's Call for Projects, the City returned the SRTC-managed funds so SRTC could redistribute them.

To avoid delaying the redistribution of those funds and help the region meet its annual obligation target, SRTC reassigned the funding to the next highest-scoring project on the contingency list. Because no Board meeting was available within the necessary timeframe and TIP amendments can take several months to complete, staff proceeded with the redistribution and sought retroactive Board approval.

Mr. Kloskey explained that staff already understood this approach to be allowable under

existing policies but wanted the Guidebook to state the process more clearly. The proposed language clarifies that when funding becomes available and timely redistribution is necessary, it may be assigned to the next highest-scoring project on the contingency list in accordance with Policy 3.6. If a Board meeting is not available because a meeting was not scheduled or was canceled, the action may be brought to the Board for retroactive approval at the next available meeting. This allows funding to move forward without unnecessary delays while supporting regional obligation targets and project delivery.

Mr. Kloskey also noted that the Guidebook includes updated schedules for development of the 2028-2031 TIP, which will occur in 2027, as well as updated TIP amendment and administrative modification schedules.

 # 10 WSDOT Consolidated Grant Project Rankings

Ms. Paparazzo provided an overview of the WSDOT Consolidated Grant Program and requested three committee volunteers to participate in the project evaluation and ranking process. She explained that MPOs and RTPOs must provide representatives to evaluate projects submitted within their regions.

The Consolidated Grant Program combines multiple funding sources into a single application process, allowing eligible applicants to seek funding without completing separate applications for each funding source. Eligible applicants include nonprofit organizations, tribes, public transit agencies, and local agencies in Washington. The program supports public transportation improvements, including intercity transportation and services for seniors and persons with disabilities.

Ms. Paparazzo explained that the grant process is directly connected to the Coordinated Public Transit–Human Services Transportation Plan (CPT-HSTP). Regional transportation needs are identified through the CPT-HSTP, and projects seeking Consolidated Grant funding must address needs identified in the plan. Following project submission, the MPO/RTPO evaluation committee scores the projects and forwards the results to WSDOT for review. WSDOT may adjust scores before making funding decisions.

Ms. Paparazzo requested three volunteers from the committee to serve on the evaluation committee. She explained that the commitment includes one virtual kickoff meeting, followed by independent project scoring, which evaluators can complete on their own time. In response to Mr. Aranda's question about the time commitment, Ms. Paparazzo estimated that scoring would take about two hours and confirmed that scores are due by November 9.

Ms. Harwood Duncan, Mr. Aranda, and Mr. Braaten volunteered to participate in the evaluation process. Ms. Paparazzo said she would coordinate with the volunteers to schedule the virtual kickoff meeting.

Ms. Paparazzo explained that the individual scores will be averaged and used to determine the A, B, and C project rankings established by WSDOT. After completing the evaluation

process, the team will present recommendations for the final rankings to the TTC and TAC at their November meetings and present them to the SRTC Board in December.

INFORMATION (NO PRESENTATION)

 # 11 Agency Update

Mr. Kloskey reminded committee members that the TIP Open House would be held the following evening. The event will feature presentations from several agencies on transportation projects and other transportation-related information relevant to the Spokane region.

Ms. Petersen reminded members that registration is open for the 4th Annual Transportation Summit, with early-bird pricing ending September 25. She said this year's Summit will focus on the region's transportation funding challenges, including where the current system falls short and opportunities for the region to make a difference. The discussion will focus on moving beyond identifying the funding gap toward developing shared solutions, establishing priorities, and identifying issues the region can collectively advocate for.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:51 PM.

_____

Anadia Grier, Clerk of the Board