Spokane Regional Transportation Council

Transportation Advisory Committee Meeting

Wednesday, October 28, 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/u/kbZ7aSS5Z

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.

Spokane Regional Transportation Council

Transportation Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, October 28, 2026 – 3:00 pm

Time	Item #		Page #
3:00	1	**Call to Order/Record of Attendance**	
3:05	2	**Public Comments/TAC Member Comments/Chair Report on October Board of Directors Meeting**	
		FOR ACTION	
3:15	3	**Consent Agenda** a) September TAC Meeting Minutes	3
3:20	4	**CY 2027 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Guidebook – Approval** *(Ben Kloskey)*	12
3:35	5	**Town of Fairfield Comprehensive Plan Certification** *(Ryan Stewart)*	13
3:40	6	**Town of Latah Comprehensive Plan Certification** *(Ryan Stewart)*	22
3:45	7	**Town of Rockford Comprehensive Plan Certification** *(Ryan Stewart)*	31
3:50	8	**Town of Waverly Comprehensive Plan Certification** *(Ryan Stewart)*	40
		INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS	
3:55	9	**Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) Update Results – Draft** *(Angela Paparazzo)*	49
4:05	10	**Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Plan Update – Conditions & Needs** *(Jason Lien)*	50
		INFORMATION: No Presentation	
4:15	11	**Agency Update and Future Information Items** *(Ben Kloskey)*	
4:20	12	**Adjournment** *(Chair)*	

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

Absent Members:

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

DRAFT

 # 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

DRAFT

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.

DRAFT

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.

DRAFT

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

DRAFT

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

DRAFT

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

Requested Action:

Recommend Board approval of the CY 2027 TIP Guidebook.

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:

The committees discussed the 2027 TIP Guidebook at their September 2026 meetings. The Board discussed it at their October 2026 meeting.

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: Ryan Stewart, Principal Transportation Planner
Topic: Town of Fairfield Comprehensive Plan Certification

Requested Action:

Recommend SRTC Board certification of the Town of Fairfield's Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update.

Key Points:

- The SRTC Board adopted the Comprehensive Plan Certification Process update on 01/08/26.
- The consultant for the Town of Fairfield provided their Draft 2026 Comprehensive Plan Update for review by SRTC on 09/15/26.
- SRTC staff have reviewed the Town's Comprehensive Plan transportation chapter and other related elements. The consultant filled out the certification checklist and SRTC staff completed the SRTC portion as part of this review.
- SRTC staff find that the Town's transportation chapter and other related elements are consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan, Horizon 2050.
- SRTC staff find that the Town'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 Town of Fairfield'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: Town of Fairfield

Type of Review:
Comprehensive Plan
- ☑ Periodic Update
- ☐ Amendment

Date of Submission:
September 4, 2026
Anticipated Date of Plan Adoption:
November 17, 2026

Contact Person: Jared Howard
Email: townclerk@fairfieldwa.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? *RCW 36.70A.100*	☑ Yes ☐ No If yes, check all the apply: ☑ WSDOT ☐ STA ☐ Kalispel Tribe of Indians ☐ Spokane Tribe of Indians ☑ Spokane County ☑ SRTC	If no, please provide explanation:	54-55

SRTC Comments:

Coordination referenced.

2. Is the plan consistent with relevant countywide planning policies? *RCW 36.70A.100*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	57

SRTC Comments:

Topics 1, 3, 5, and 10.

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:	55
SRTC Comments:			
Guiding Principles are referenced and plan generally supports.			
4. Does the transportation element include an inventory of air, water, and ground transportation facilities and services, including state-owned transportation facilities? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(A)* *WAC 365-196-430*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	49-51
SRTC Comments:			
SR 27 (1st Street) primary route, Table 14.			
5. Is the transportation element consistent with the land use element including land use assumptions, population forecasts and planning periods? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)* *WAC 365-196-430 (1) (a)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	3-4
SRTC Comments:			
Consistent, Transportation Goal No. 3: "Ensure that the transportation system is adequate to serve all existing and future land uses contemplated in the Land Use Element"			

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response		Plan Page #
6. Are travel demand management (TDM) strategies included? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vi)* *WAC 365-196-430(2)(i)(i)*	☐ Yes ☑ No	If no, please provide explanation: Small town, no strategies	59
SRTC Comments:			
While TDM strategies are not explicitly stated, Transportation Goal No. 2, Policy 2-7 is: "Encourage the development of ride share programs for Fairfield residents."			
7. Is there an active transportation component that addresses and encourages mode choice and alternatives to driving alone? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vii)* *WAC 365-196-430(2)(j)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	59
SRTC Comments:			
Transportation Goal No. 2 is: "Promote increased opportunities for non-motorized travel."			
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:	58
SRTC Comments:			
Does not specifically address SRTC's regional priority network but several policies under Goal No. 2 support bicycle and pedestrian improvements.			
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:	60
SRTC Comments:			
Does not specifically address SRTC's regional priority network but Goal No. 5 supports freight improvements.			

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:	10
SRTC Comments:			
Small town with low density character. "Higher-density residential development is subject to a Conditional Use Permit."			
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? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(G)*	☐ Yes ☑ No	If no, please provide explanation: Small town with limited infrastructure.	
SRTC Comments:			
ADA transition plan not addressed.			
12. Does the transportation element address how transportation investments are equitably made? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(i) and (iii)(E)* *WAC 365-196-430(2)(f)*	☐ Yes ☑ No	If no, please provide explanation: Small town with limited infrastructure.	54
SRTC Comments:			
Small town with planned investments (Table 13), does not address how they are equitably made.			
13. Does the transportation element demonstrate how system investments will reduce the number of traffic fatalities and serious injuries? *WAC 365-196-430 (2)(b)(i)*	☐ Yes ☑ No	If no, please provide explanation: Not explicitly demonstrated.	59
SRTC Comments:			
Not demonstrated but Transportation Goal No. 3 Policy 3-3: "ensure that programmed improvements to the existing transportation system enhance the safety of pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists."			

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response		Plan Page #
14. Does the plan include a forecast of multimodal transportation needs for a minimum of 10 years? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(i) and (iii)(E) WAC 365-196-430(2)(f)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	53
SRTC Comments:			
Table 12. Vehicular only.			
SEPA Infill and Housing Development Categorical Exemption			
15. Is an Infill and Housing Development Categorical Exemption is being requested per RCW43.12C.229?	☐ Yes, see questions 16 and 17 ☑ No		
SRTC Comments:			
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? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(B) and (C), WAC 365-196-430*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	53
SRTC Comments:			
Small town, vehicular only, no transit service.			
19. Does the plan reference WSDOT MMLOS standards for the HSS and SRTC's MMLOS standards for the Non-HSS state highways? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(B) and (C), WAC 365-196-430*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	53
SRTC Comments:			
WSDOT LOS for SR 27.			
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? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(D) WAC 365-196-430*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	53
SRTC Comments:			
Vehicular only, forecasted to remain LOS A.			

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)? *RCW 36.70A.070(9)*	☐ Yes ☑ No	If no, please provide explanation: Fairfield does not meet the population threshold for this requirement.	
SRTC Comments:			
N/A			
22. Does the resiliency element include goals and policies to improve climate preparedness, response and recovery efforts? *RCW 36.70A.070(9)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	64-67
SRTC Comments:			
Several Goals and Policies.			
Finance Plan			
23. Does the plan include an analysis of the capability to fund identified need? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vi)* *WAC 365-196-430(2)(i)(i)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	54, 56
SRTC Comments:			
Also addressed in Capital Facilities element.			

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response		Plan Page #
24. Does the plan include a multi-year financing plan based on the identified needs identified? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(B)* *RCW 35.77.010* *WAC 365-196-430(2)(k)(ii)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	54
SRTC Comments:			
Table 13.			
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? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(A)* *WAC 365.196-430(2)(k)(iv)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	56
SRTC Comments:			
Short falls are not discussed but limited funding available to small towns. Other funding options are also in Capital Facilities element.			

Additional Explanation	
Question:	Comment:

To: Transportation Advisory Committee
From: Ryan Stewart, Principal Transportation Planner
Topic: Town of Latah Comprehensive Plan Certification

Requested Action:

Recommend SRTC Board certification of the Town of Latah's Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update.

Key Points:

- The SRTC Board adopted the Comprehensive Plan Certification Process update on 01/08/26.
- The consultant for the Town of Latah provided their Draft 2026 Comprehensive Plan Update for review by SRTC on 09/22/26.
- SRTC staff have reviewed the Town's Comprehensive Plan transportation chapter and other related elements. The consultant filled out the certification checklist, and SRTC staff completed the SRTC portion as part of this review.
- SRTC staff find that the Town's transportation chapter and other related elements are consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan, Horizon 2050.
- SRTC staff find that the Town'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 Town of Latah'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: The Town of Latah

Type of Review:
Comprehensive Plan
- ☑ Periodic Update
- ☐ Amendment

Date of Submission:
September 18, 2026
Anticipated Date of Plan Adoption:
December 8, 2026

Contact Person: Corrina Rittgarn
Email: latahmayorc@gmail.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? *RCW 36.70A.100*	☑ Yes ☐ No If yes, check all the apply: ☑ WSDOT ☐ STA ☐ Kalispel Tribe of Indians ☐ Spokane Tribe of Indians ☑ Spokane County ☐ _____	If no, please provide explanation:	48

SRTC Comments:

Coordination with relevant agencies documented.

2. Is the plan consistent with relevant countywide planning policies? *RCW 36.70A.100*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	52

SRTC Comments:

Topics 1, 3, 5, and 10.

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:	49
SRTC Comments:			
Guiding principles referenced, generally consistent with Horizon 2050.			
4. Does the transportation element include an inventory of air, water, and ground transportation facilities and services, including state-owned transportation facilities? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(A)* *WAC 365-196-430*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	45
SRTC Comments:			
Vehicular, including SR 27.			
5. Is the transportation element consistent with the land use element including land use assumptions, population forecasts and planning periods? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)* *WAC 365-196-430 (1) (a)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	23, 53
SRTC Comments:			
Consistent, Policy T G-3.			

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response		Plan Page #
6. Are travel demand management (TDM) strategies included? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vi)* *WAC 365-196-430(2)(i)(i)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	44-45
SRTC Comments: Policies under T G-2.			
7. Is there an active transportation component that addresses and encourages mode choice and alternatives to driving alone? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vii)* *WAC 365-196-430(2)(j)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	45, 53, 55
SRTC Comments: Policies T G-2 and T G-7.			
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:	53
SRTC Comments: SRTC regional priority network not referenced but policies under T G-2 support bicycle improvements.			
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:	54
SRTC Comments: SRTC regional priority network not referenced but policies under T G-5 support the movement of goods.			

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:	9, 15
SRTC Comments:			
Small town with low density character but Goal No. 5 (5-2) encourages density where feasible. Also Land Use Policies LU G-2 and G-4.			
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? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(G)*	☐ Yes ☑ No	If no, please provide explanation: Small town with limited infrastructure.	
SRTC Comments:			
12. Does the transportation element address how transportation investments are equitably made? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(i) and (iii)(E)* *WAC 365-196-430(2)(f)*	☐ Yes ☑ No	If no, please provide explanation: No transportation improvements planned for	48
SRTC Comments:			
"Given Latah's small size and rural setting, existing state and county roadway and right-of-way standards are expected to adequately support the community's present and future transportation needs."			
13. Does the transportation element demonstrate how system investments will reduce the number of traffic fatalities and serious injuries? *WAC 365-196-430 (2)(b)(i)*	☐ Yes ☑ No	If no, please provide explanation: Small town with little to no safety issues.	48
SRTC Comments:			
"State Route 27 (SR-27) passes through the Town of Latah and serves as a primary regional connection. Latah will coordinate with WSDOT on matters related to safety, mobility, maintenance, and planned improvements along this state highway."			

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response		Plan Page #
14. Does the plan include a forecast of multimodal transportation needs for a minimum of 10 years? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(i) and (iii)(E) WAC 365-196-430(2)(f)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	47
SRTC Comments:			
Table 9. "As Latah grows, traffic volumes are not expected to reach levels requiring major capacity improvements, such as additional travel lanes, turn lanes, or parking restrictions."			
SEPA Infill and Housing Development Categorical Exemption			
15. Is an Infill and Housing Development Categorical Exemption is being requested per RCW43.12C.229?	☐ Yes, see questions 16 and 17 ☑ No		
SRTC Comments:			
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? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(B) and (C), WAC 365-196-430*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: Vehicular only.	47
SRTC Comments:			
Small town with vehicular traffic primarily, no transit service.			
19. Does the plan reference WSDOT MMLOS standards for the HSS and SRTC's MMLOS standards for the Non-HSS state highways? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(B) and (C), WAC 365-196-430*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	47
SRTC Comments:			
Vehicular only. WSDOT for SR 27.			
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? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(D) WAC 365-196-430*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	
SRTC Comments:			
Vehicular only, low volumes so projected to remain LOS A.			

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)? *RCW 36.70A.070(9)*	☐ Yes ☑ No	If no, please provide explanation: The Town of Latah does not meet the population threshold for this requirement.	
SRTC Comments:			
N/A			
22. Does the resiliency element include goals and policies to improve climate preparedness, response and recovery efforts? *RCW 36.70A.070(9)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	51, 56-59
SRTC Comments:			
Climate Element, Resilience Goals and Policies (several) primarily CE G-3.			
Finance Plan			
23. Does the plan include an analysis of the capability to fund identified need? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vi)* *WAC 365-196-430(2)(i)(i)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	49-51
SRTC Comments:			
Federal, state and local funding sources identified.			

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response		Plan Page #
24. Does the plan include a multi-year financing plan based on the identified needs identified? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(B)* *RCW 35.77.010* *WAC 365-196-430(2)(k)(ii)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	36-37
SRTC Comments:			
Six-year capital improvement program, Policy CF 3-6.			
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? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(A)* *WAC 365.196-430(2)(k)(iv)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	40, 48
SRTC Comments:			
LOS forecasted to remain A due to low volumes. Policy CF 3-6			

Additional Explanation	
Question:	Comment:

To: Transportation Advisory Committee
From: Ryan Stewart, Principal Transportation Planner
Topic: Town of Rockford Comprehensive Plan Certification

Requested Action:

Recommend SRTC Board certification of the Town of Rockford's Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update.

Key Points:

- The SRTC Board adopted the Comprehensive Plan Certification Process update on 01/08/26.
- The consultant for the Town of Rockford provided their Draft 2026 Comprehensive Plan Update for review by SRTC on 09/04/26.
- SRTC staff have reviewed the Town's Comprehensive Plan transportation chapter and other related elements. The consultant filled out the certification checklist, and SRTC staff completed the SRTC portion as part of this review.
- SRTC staff find that the Town's transportation chapter and other related elements are consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan, Horizon 2050.
- SRTC staff find that the Town'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 Town of Rockford'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: The Town of Rockford

Type of Review:
Comprehensive Plan
- ☑ Periodic Update
- ☐ Amendment

Date of Submission:
September 4, 2026
Anticipated Date of Plan Adoption:
November 18, 2026

Contact Person: Heidi Johnson
Email: townclerk@rockfordwa.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? *RCW 36.70A.100*	☑ Yes ☐ No If yes, check all the apply: ☑ WSDOT ☐ STA ☐ Kalispel Tribe of Indians ☐ Spokane Tribe of Indians ☑ Spokane County ☑ SRTC	If no, please provide explanation:	50, 52

SRTC Comments:

Coordination referenced.

2. Is the plan consistent with relevant countywide planning policies? *RCW 36.70A.100*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	11, 41, 51

SRTC Comments:

Topics 1, 3, 5, and 10. Siting of Essential Public Facilities as well.

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:	51-53
SRTC Comments:			
Generally supports Horizon 2050 through transportation goals and policies.			
4. Does the transportation element include an inventory of air, water, and ground transportation facilities and services, including state-owned transportation facilities? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(A)* *WAC 365-196-430*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	44-47
SRTC Comments:			
Described and inventoried for each mode.			
5. Is the transportation element consistent with the land use element including land use assumptions, population forecasts and planning periods? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)* *WAC 365-196-430 (1) (a)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	16-23, 82
SRTC Comments:			
Consistent. Transportation Goals and Policy T-G3.			

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response		Plan Page #
6. Are travel demand management (TDM) strategies included? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vi)* *WAC 365-196-430(2)(i)(i)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	51-53
SRTC Comments:			
Code Section 13.24.090, Transportation Goals and Policies T-G1, G2, G7.			
7. Is there an active transportation component that addresses and encourages mode choice and alternatives to driving alone? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vii)* *WAC 365-196-430(2)(j)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	46, 52-53
SRTC Comments:			
Transportation Goals and Policies T-G2, G7.			
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:	53
SRTC Comments:			
Transportation Goal and Policies T-G7, does not directly reference SRTC's priority networks.			
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:	46
SRTC Comments:			
Freight mobility described, no direct reference to SRTC's regional priority network.			

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: Not applicable, Small town with low density	Page 6 of LCA,
SRTC Comments:			
Small town with low density development.			
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? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(G)*	☐ Yes ☑ No	If no, please provide explanation: No ADA transition plan	
SRTC Comments:			
12. Does the transportation element address how transportation investments are equitably made? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(i) and (iii)(E)* *WAC 365-196-430(2)(f)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	41
SRTC Comments:			
Policy CF 4-4 for siting of EFPs.			
13. Does the transportation element demonstrate how system investments will reduce the number of traffic fatalities and serious injuries? *WAC 365-196-430 (2)(b)(i)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	6
SRTC Comments:			
Goal #3 and objectives (signage improvements and pursuing funding for additional sidewalks).			

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response		Plan Page #
14. Does the plan include a forecast of multimodal transportation needs for a minimum of 10 years? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(i) and (iii)(E) WAC 365-196-430(2)(f)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	48
SRTC Comments:			
Forecasted impact to future vehicular LOS only.			
SEPA Infill and Housing Development Categorical Exemption			
15. Is an Infill and Housing Development Categorical Exemption is being requested per RCW43.12C.229?	☐ Yes, see questions 16 and 17 ☑ No		
SRTC Comments:			
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? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(B) and (C), WAC 365-196-430*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	48
SRTC Comments:			
Vehicular traffic only.			
19. Does the plan reference WSDOT MMLOS standards for the HSS and SRTC's MMLOS standards for the Non-HSS state highways? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(B) and (C), WAC 365-196-430*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	50-51
SRTC Comments:			
Both referenced.			
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? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(D) WAC 365-196-430*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	48
SRTC Comments:			
Vehicular only. LOS remains A through the forecasted period. "There are no roadway improvements that are required to meet established Level of Service Standards for future forecasted traffic."			

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)? *RCW 36.70A.070(9)*	☐ Yes ☑ No	If no, please provide explanation: The Town of Rockford does not meet the population threshold for this requirement.	
SRTC Comments:			
22. Does the resiliency element include goals and policies to improve climate preparedness, response and recovery efforts? *RCW 36.70A.070(9)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	51-52, 54-57
SRTC Comments:			
Consistent with CPP Topic 10, Policies T-G6 and G7. Several policies in Climate Element and analysis in Appendix C.			
Finance Plan			
23. Does the plan include an analysis of the capability to fund identified need? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vi)* *WAC 365-196-430(2)(i)(i)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	49
SRTC Comments:			
Table 5.5			

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response		Plan Page #
24. Does the plan include a multi-year financing plan based on the identified needs identified? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(B)* *RCW 35.77.010* *WAC 365-196-430(2)(k)(ii)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	
SRTC Comments:			
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? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(A)* *WAC 365.196-430(2)(k)(iv)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	49
SRTC Comments:			
"the Town has few or no resources of its own to apply to these improvements and will rely on annual grant applications and awards to accomplish its goals." References TIB and SRTC small towns set-aside.			

Additional Explanation	
Question:	Comment:

To: Transportation Advisory Committee
From: Ryan Stewart, Principal Transportation Planner
Topic: Town of Waverly Comprehensive Plan Certification

Requested Action:

Recommend SRTC Board certification of the Town of Waverly's Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update.

Key Points:

- The SRTC Board adopted the Comprehensive Plan Certification Process update on 01/08/26.
- The consultant for the Town of Waverly provided their Draft 2026 Comprehensive Plan Update for review by SRTC on 09/14/26.
- SRTC staff have reviewed the Town's Comprehensive Plan transportation chapter and other related elements. The consultant filled out the certification checklist, and SRTC staff completed the SRTC portion as part of this review.
- SRTC staff find that the Town's transportation chapter and other related elements are consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan, Horizon 2050.
- SRTC staff find that the Town'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 Town of Waverly'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: The Town of Waverly

Type of Review:
Comprehensive Plan
- ☑ Periodic Update
- ☐ Amendment

Date of Submission:
September 14, 2026
Anticipated Date of Plan Adoption:
December 1, 2026

Contact Person: DonNell Ellsworth
Email: waverlytown@gmail.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? *RCW 36.70A.100*	☑ Yes ☐ No If yes, check all the apply: ☑ WSDOT ☐ STA ☐ Kalispel Tribe of Indians ☐ Spokane Tribe of Indians ☑ Spokane County ☑ SRTC	If no, please provide explanation:	58-59
SRTC Comments:			
Coordination referenced.			
2. Is the plan consistent with relevant countywide planning policies? *RCW 36.70A.100*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	4, 42, 49, 61, 66
SRTC Comments:			
Consistent with CPPs, reflected in Capital Facilities, Utility, Climate, and Transportation Goals and Policies.			

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:	59
SRTC Comments:			
Generally reflects Horizon 2050 Guiding Principles and Policies.			
4. Does the transportation element include an inventory of air, water, and ground transportation facilities and services, including state-owned transportation facilities? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(A)* *WAC 365-196-430*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	53-55
SRTC Comments:			
Inventory included.			
5. Is the transportation element consistent with the land use element including land use assumptions, population forecasts and planning periods? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)* *WAC 365-196-430 (1) (a)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	
SRTC Comments:			
Consistent.			

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response		Plan Page #
6. Are travel demand management (TDM) strategies included? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vi)* *WAC 365-196-430(2)(i)(i)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	61
SRTC Comments: Policy T 2-7.			
7. Is there an active transportation component that addresses and encourages mode choice and alternatives to driving alone? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vii)* *WAC 365-196-430(2)(j)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	62
SRTC Comments: Policies T 2-1, 2-2, and 2-3.			
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:	
SRTC Comments: SRTC regional priority network not mentioned but Policies T 2-1, 2-2, and 2-3.			
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:	
SRTC Comments: SRTC regional priority network not mentioned but Section 6.2.5 addresses frieght near or through this small town. Policy LU 6-6.			

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:	
SRTC Comments:			
Goal No. 4 and associated Policies.			
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? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(G)*	☐ Yes ☑ No	If no, please provide explanation: ADA transition plan not addressed.	
SRTC Comments:			
Small town with limited facilities.			
12. Does the transportation element address how transportation investments are equitably made? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(i) and (iii)(E)* *WAC 365-196-430(2)(f)*	☐ Yes ☑ No	If no, please provide explanation:	
SRTC Comments:			
Not in transportation element but mentioned in Policy LU 9-6			
13. Does the transportation element demonstrate how system investments will reduce the number of traffic fatalities and serious injuries? *WAC 365-196-430 (2)(b)(i)*	☐ Yes ☑ No	If no, please provide explanation:	
SRTC Comments:			
Not specific to fatalities and serious injuries but supported by Goal 3, Policy 3-3			

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response		Plan Page #
14. Does the plan include a forecast of multimodal transportation needs for a minimum of 10 years? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(i) and (iii)(E) WAC 365-196-430(2)(f)*	☐ Yes ☑ No	If no, please provide explanation: Vehicular only.	
SRTC Comments:			
LOS for vehicular traffic in this small town.			
SEPA Infill and Housing Development Categorical Exemption			
15. Is an Infill and Housing Development Categorical Exemption is being requested per RCW43.12C.229?	☐ Yes, see questions 16 and 17 ☑ No		
SRTC Comments:			
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? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(B) and (C), WAC 365-196-430*	☐ Yes ☑ No	If no, please provide explanation: Vehicular only.	
SRTC Comments:			
Vehicular LOS only for this small town.			
19. Does the plan reference WSDOT MMLOS standards for the HSS and SRTC's MMLOS standards for the Non-HSS state highways? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(B) and (C), WAC 365-196-430*	☐ Yes ☑ No	If no, please provide explanation: Does not apply to this small town off state and regional network.	
SRTC Comments:			
Does not apply.			
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? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(D) WAC 365-196-430*	☐ Yes ☑ No	If no, please provide explanation: Does not apply to this small town off state and regional network.	
SRTC Comments:			
Does not apply.			

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)? *RCW 36.70A.070(9)*	☐ Yes ☑ No	If no, please provide explanation: The Town of Waverly does not meet the population threshold for this requirement.	
SRTC Comments:			
Does not apply.			
22. Does the resiliency element include goals and policies to improve climate preparedness, response and recovery efforts? *RCW 36.70A.070(9)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	66, 69
SRTC Comments:			
Climate Element Goal 1 several policies, Goal 3 Policy CE 3.3			
Finance Plan			
23. Does the plan include an analysis of the capability to fund identified need? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vi)* *WAC 365-196-430(2)(i)(i)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	57-58
SRTC Comments:			
Six year TIP acknowledges limited available funding.			

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response		Plan Page #
24. Does the plan include a multi-year financing plan based on the identified needs identified? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(B)* *RCW 35.77.010* *WAC 365-196-430(2)(k)(ii)*	☐ Yes ☑ No	If no, please provide explanation: Acknowledges limited available funding.	59-60
SRTC Comments: References funding sources, dependent on grant awards.			
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? *RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(A)* *WAC 365.196-430(2)(k)(iv)*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	59-60
SRTC Comments: Acknowledges limited available funding and pursue grants, no reference to MMLOS for this small town.			

Additional Explanation	
Question:	Comment:

To: Transportation Advisory Committee
From: Angela Paparazzo, Associate Transportation Planner II
Topic: Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) Update Results – Draft

Requested Action:

None. For information and discussion.

Key Points:

- Conducting a Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) analysis is in the SRTC Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) concluding this fiscal year. The intent of analyzing LTS is to provide a useful data point in understanding the function of, and barriers on, the Regional Bicycle Priority Network in Horizon 2050.
- LTS utilizes several factors – thru-lanes, speeds, traffic volumes, bike facility width – to determine the level of stress a rider may experience while cycling along a particular route. Higher stress routes may discourage bicycle use absent adequate facilities that increase the user's sense of security. For example, separated trails (e.g. Centennial Trail) are defined as low stress or LTS 1.
- SRTC used the Horizon 2050 Regional Bicycle Priority Network as the input network layer and built a GIS database of relevant factors to calculate LTS in accordance with the LTS 1-4 grading system, following the methodology detailed in Chapter 15 of the WSDOT Design Manual.
- Staff have completed the analysis and assigned LTS values to the network, and the draft map is available for review. Staff are seeking agency feedback on the draft results.
- The final version of the LTS results will be presented to the committees in December for a recommendation and brought to the SRTC Board for acceptance in January.

Board/Committee Discussions:

The committees received an overview of this project in June followed by a Board update in July.

Public Involvement:

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

Staff Contact: Angela Paparazzo, SRTC | apaparazzo@srtc.org 509.343.6370

To: Transportation Advisory Committee
From: Jason Lien, Transportation Planning Manager
Topic: Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Plan Update – Conditions & Needs

Requested Action:

None. For information and discussion.

Key Points:

- SRTC is working on an update to the region's Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Plan with consultant assistance. Last updated in 2019 under the leadership of the SRTMC, the plan lays the groundwork for ITS technologies (cameras, communications, networked systems) to promote efficient transportation operations and safety. The ITS Plan and corresponding architecture is a guiding tool for interagency coordination and the planning, deployment, and integration of regional technology and services.
- As part of the plan update, interviews have been conducted over the past month with agency and service provider stakeholders. The interviews inform the project's understanding of existing ITS assets, operational practices, coordination needs, planned projects, and opportunities to improve regional transportation operations and emergency response.
- Existing ITS conditions and an initial understanding of needs have been documented in a draft Existing Conditions Memo. The memo is available here, and it has been shared with agency stakeholders to review as the project continues to move forward with fully capturing potential ITS needs at the regional level.
- The final plan deliverable is scheduled for completion in Spring 2027.

Board/Committee Discussions:

A project update was previously provided in May 2026 and a Board update in June.

Public Involvement:

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

Staff Contact: Jason Lien, SRTC | jlien@srtc.org | 509.343.6370