



Spokane Regional Transportation Council

Transportation Technical Committee Meeting

Wednesday, October 28, 2026 at 1:00 PM

Hybrid In Person/Virtual Meeting

- **In Person: 421 W Riverside Ave, Suite 504, Spokane WA 99201**
- **Online via Zoom:**

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81656202452?pwd=ko00IK05dn3lnHnTeoD5VRTtBLLqA6.1>

Meeting ID: 816 5620 2452 | Passcode: 547271

By Phone 1-253-215-8782

Meeting ID: 816 5620 2452 | Passcode: 547271

Or find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/u/kbB00xwxF>

SRTC welcomes public comments at the Transportation Technical Committee meetings.

The deadline for submitting written comments is 10:00 am on the day of the meeting and can be submitted:

- By email: contact.srtc@srtc.org
- By mail: 421 W Riverside Ave Suite 500, Spokane WA 99201
- By phone: 509.343.6370

Verbal comments may also be provided during the comment period at the beginning of the meeting.

SRTC is committed to nondiscrimination in accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987 (P.O. 100.259) and the Americans with Disabilities Act. Reasonable accommodations can be requested by contacting the SRTC office by telephone at 509-343-6370 or by email at contact.srtc@srtc.org at least 48 hours in advance.



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

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

1:05	2	Public Comments/TTC Member Comments/Chair Report on October Board of Directors Meeting	
------	---	---	--

FOR ACTION

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

1:20	4	CY 2027 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Guidebook – Approval <i>(Ben Kloskey)</i>	10
------	---	---	----

1:35	5	Town of Fairfield Comprehensive Plan Certification <i>(Ryan Stewart)</i>	11
------	---	---	----

1:40	6	Town of Latah Comprehensive Plan Certification <i>(Ryan Stewart)</i>	20
------	---	---	----

1:45	7	Town of Rockford Comprehensive Plan Certification <i>(Ryan Stewart)</i>	29
------	---	--	----

1:50	8	Town of Waverly Comprehensive Plan Certification <i>(Ryan Stewart)</i>	38
------	---	---	----

INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

1:55	9	Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) Update Results – Draft	47
		<i>(Angela Paparazzo)</i>	

2:05	10	Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Plan Update – Conditions & Needs <i>(Jason Lien)</i>	48
------	----	--	----

INFORMATION: No Presentation

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

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



Spokane Regional Transportation Council

TTC MEETING 10/28/2026
CONSENT AGENDA

AGENDA ITEM 3a

Transportation Technical Committee Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, September 23, 2026– 1:00 pm

1 Call to Order/ Excused Absences

Ms. Limon called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm, and attendance was taken.

In attendance were:

Committee Members:

Pete Fisch

City of Airway Heights

Luke Michaels

City of Liberty Lake

Inga Note

City of Spokane

Colin Quinn-Hurst

City of Spokane

Kevin Picanco

City of Spokane

Adam Jackson

City of Spokane Valley

Jerremy Clark (Vice Chair)

City of Spokane Valley

Sonny Weathers

Small Cities/Towns Rep

Brandi Colyar

Spokane County

Barry Greene

Spokane County

Jami Hayes

Spokane County

Margee Chambers

Spokane Clean Air

Brian Jennings

STA

Tara Limon (Chair)

STA

Sauna Harshman

WSDOT-ER

Mike Pea

WSDOT-ER

Absent Members:

Dan Ferguson

City of Cheney

Julia Whitford

Kalispel Tribe

Samantha Hennessy

SRHD

Maria Cullooyah

Spokane Tribe

Glenn Wagemann

WSDOT-ER

Guests:

Kristen Armstrong

City of Spokane Valley

LeAnn Yamamoto

CommuteSmart NW

Stu Barton

J-U-B Engineers

Paul Kropp

Staff:

Lois Bollenback

Executive Director

Eve McMenamy

Deputy Executive Director

Bailee Petersen

Comm. & PR Coord.

Anadia Grier

Admin-Exec Coord.

Jason Lien

Transp. Planning Manager

David Fletcher

Principal Transp. Planner

Ryan Stewart

Principal Transp. Planner

Michael Redlinger

Associate Transp. Planner 3

Ben Kloskey

Associate Transp. Planner 2

Angela Paparazzo

Associate Transp. Planner 2



2 Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Member Comments

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

Chair Report on SRTC Board Meeting

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

ACTION ITEMS

3 Consent Agenda

- a. August TTC Meeting Minutes

At Vice Chair Clark's request, the Chair called for a motion to amend the minutes to correct his attendance. Mr. Picanco made a motion to approve the amendment. Mr. Greene seconded the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved as amended.

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 of the projects for inclusion in the state and federal versions of the list. He explained that the Unified List is updated annually to communicate the region's current transportation priorities to legislators and support funding requests. Projects are generally added as they become ready to seek funding and removed once they are fully funded and moving toward construction.

This year, SRTC received 28 project submissions, including seven new projects. Staff also updated the project evaluation criteria to better reflect recent planning work completed through Horizon 2050. Changes focused primarily on economic vitality, operations and maintenance, preservation, and safety and security. Mr. Fletcher explained that staff considered project scores, consistency with previous Unified Lists, and the need to keep the list focused while maintaining enough flexibility to respond to different funding opportunities.

All five projects in the implementation category were recommended for inclusion. Staff also recommended retaining all projects in the development category. After discussions with the City of Spokane, staff separated the Inland Empire Way connection from the larger U.S. 195 corridor project and moved it into the development category because it is further along. The remaining U.S. 195 corridor projects remain in the initiation category.

For initiation projects, staff recommended using the natural break in project scores as the cutoff, resulting in seven initiation projects being included and four excluded. Mr. Fletcher noted that projects in the initiation stage may move on or off the Unified List from year to year as priorities and funding needs change.



Committee members discussed several adjustments to the proposed list. Mr. Jackson requested that the funding amount for the Sullivan/Trent project be verified and updated before finalizing the list. Mr. Fletcher confirmed that project request amounts can be adjusted as funding needs change. Mr. Greene also reported that Project No. 23, the Thorpe/Fairchild Second Gate Entrance, has been funded and should be removed from the list.

Mr. Jackson asked how funding requests are distributed among agencies and whether inclusion on the Unified List affects scoring in future SRTC calls for projects. Mr. Fletcher explained that funding requests by agency are available through the interactive map linked in the staff memo. He also clarified that inclusion on the Unified List is not currently a scoring criterion in SRTC calls for projects, although some of the evaluation criteria address similar considerations.

In response to a follow-up question from Ms. Harshman, Mr. Fletcher clarified that the Inland Empire Way connection is listed separately in the development category at \$11.5 million. He also identified a correction to the remaining U.S. 195 corridor project amount, which should be shown as \$141 million.

Mr. Jackson made a motion to recommend SRTC Board approval of the CY 2027 Unified List for inclusion in the state and federal versions, with modifications to remove the funded Thorpe/Fairchild Second Gate Entrance project and update the Sullivan/Trent funding amount. Mr. Picanco seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously as amended.

5 City of Liberty Lake Comprehensive Plan Certification

Mr. Stewart provided an overview of SRTC's comprehensive plan certification process, which was updated by the Board in January to reflect changes in state requirements. As the region's Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO), SRTC reviews transportation-related elements of comprehensive plan updates for consistency with Horizon 2050, applicable state transportation planning guidelines, and mandatory elements under the Growth Management Act.

Mr. Stewart explained that staff reviews the comprehensive plan materials and other available documentation related to coordination and outreach. The review checklist is intended to identify both required elements and opportunities for improvement; not every item must apply to every jurisdiction or be fully addressed for a plan to receive certification. Staff provides the completed checklist and feedback to jurisdictions for consideration in the current or future periodic update process.

SRTC received an early draft of Liberty Lake's update in June and coordinated with City staff throughout the review. Mr. Stewart thanked the City for its early and ongoing coordination with SRTC and regional partners. Staff determined that the transportation-related elements of the update are consistent with Horizon 2050, reflect most applicable guidelines, and generally conform to mandatory elements. He also highlighted the City's public outreach and



regional coordination, including work with Spokane County, the City of Spokane Valley, and Spokane Transit Authority (STA).

Mr. Stewart noted that while the plan does not specifically reference SRTC's regional bicycle and freight priority networks, it includes strategies to improve and further those types of networks. He also noted that SRTC provided feedback regarding the required forecast of multimodal transportation needs over a minimum 10-year period, as the draft primarily included forecasts for vehicular impacts and level of service, along with short- and long-term mitigation strategies.

Chair Limon clarified that STA coordinated with the City of Liberty Lake during development of the comprehensive plan and requested that the review checklist be updated to reflect that coordination. Mr. Stewart confirmed that he would include the information when the item is presented to the Board.

Vice Chair Clark made a motion to recommend SRTC Board certification of the City of Liberty Lake's Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update, with a modification to the review checklist to reflect STA's coordination with the City during development of the plan. Mr. Weathers seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously as amended.

6 City of Medical Lake Comprehensive Plan Certification

Ms. Paparazzo presented the City of Medical Lake Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update for certification. She reported that SRTC's review found the plan to be consistent with Horizon 2050 and thanked Medical Lake staff for completing the review checklist, noting that while not required, it helped streamline the review process.

Chair Limon clarified that STA also coordinated with the City of Medical Lake during development of the comprehensive plan and requested that the review checklist be updated to reflect STA's involvement.

Ms. Harshman made a motion to recommend SRTC Board certification of the City of Medical Lake's Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update, with a modification to the review checklist to reflect STA's coordination with the City during development of the plan. Vice Chair Clark seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously as amended.

7 City of Airway Heights Comprehensive Plan Certification

Ms. Paparazzo presented the City of Airway Heights Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update for certification. She thanked Airway Heights staff for completing the review checklist, noting that while not required, it helped streamline SRTC's review. She explained that one checklist item regarding multimodal level of service was originally marked "no," but SRTC's review determined that the requirement had been met and the response was changed to "yes."

Ms. Harshman requested a correction to the checklist item regarding consultation associated with the SEPA infill categorical exemption. She explained that the consultation had not yet



occurred and requested that the response be changed from “yes” to “no.” Ms. Paparazzo agreed to make the correction.

Ms. Bollenback asked whether a representative from Airway Heights could provide additional information about coordination or the anticipated consultation schedule. Mr. Fisch stated that he was not familiar with the City’s comprehensive plan process but would contact Airway Heights staff for additional information. Ms. Harshman noted that WSDOT works closely with Airway Heights on other projects, but clarified that the coordination on those projects is separate from the consultation referenced in the checklist.

Vice Chair Clark noted that several agencies have also been coordinating on transportation modeling and forecasts affecting WSDOT facilities. Ms. Harshman acknowledged that work but reiterated that it is separate from the consultation identified in the certification review. Mr. Stewart noted that SRTC would take another look at how this type of coordination is documented as part of its lessons learned from the certification process.

Mr. Weathers made a motion to recommend SRTC Board certification of the City of Medical Lake’s Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update, with a modification to the review checklist to change the response regarding consultation associated with the SEPA infill categorical exemption from “yes” to “no.” Mr. Quinn-Hurst seconded the motion. Ms. Harshman abstained from voting. The motion passed as amended.

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 transportation projects receiving federal funding or considered regionally significant. The TIP is developed in coordination with local agencies and WSDOT and is consistent with Horizon 2050. It also includes project costs, schedules, funding sources, and information on how projects contribute to regional performance management targets.

He reported that one project had been removed since the previous presentation, bringing the TIP to 58 projects and programs with approximately \$665 million programmed. One project is new from the 2026 TIP. He also confirmed that the program is fiscally constrained, meaning sufficient resources have been identified to complete the projects and programs included in the TIP.

Mr. Kloskey reviewed the breakdown of projects and funding within the TIP, noting that the North Spokane Corridor accounts for nearly half of the overall program. He also highlighted the project overview reports included in the document, which provide financial information, recent funding changes, maps where applicable, and other project information.

He also shared that an interactive web map has been available during the public comment period, which allows the public to view individual projects and submit comments directly



through the map. The draft TIP is available for public comment from September 1 through October 1, with a public open house scheduled for September 24 from 4:30–6:00 p.m. at the Spokane Central Library.

Mr. Greene made a motion to recommend SRTC Board approval of the 2027-2030 Transportation Improvement Program as presented. Mr. Picanco 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 TIP Guidebook as an information item. He explained that the Guidebook is updated annually and provides guidance for developing the TIP, including annual goals and objectives, programming policies, development timelines, and amendment and administrative modification schedules.

Mr. Kloskey reported that the 2027 Guidebook includes one policy change related to the contingency funding process under Policy 6.8. He referenced a situation earlier this year when two City of Spokane projects received NHS Asset Management funding, freeing up funding for projects on SRTC's contingency list. Because there was no Board meeting in April, the funding transferred to the next highest-scoring project, and the Board later approved the action.

Mr. Kloskey explained that the proposed change puts that process in writing. When funding becomes available and a clear next highest-scoring project is on the contingency list, SRTC may begin moving the funding and processing the TIP amendment before Board approval if no Board meeting is scheduled. He noted that TIP amendments can take approximately two and a half to three months to fully process, making it important to begin the process in a timely manner.

Mr. Kloskey also noted that the 2028–2031 TIP development schedule and the amendment and administrative modification schedules have been updated for the upcoming year.

10 WSDOT Consolidated Grant Project Rankings

Ms. Paparazzo provided an overview of the WSDOT Consolidated Grant Program and requested volunteers to participate in the project evaluation process. She explained that the program combines multiple funding sources into a single grant program supporting public transportation between cities and rural communities, as well as transportation services for seniors and persons with disabilities. Eligible projects must be identified in the Coordinated Public Transit–Human Services Transportation Plan (CPT-HSTP).

Ms. Paparazzo explained that SRTC, as the MPO/RTPO, is responsible for scoring submitted projects before forwarding the rankings to WSDOT for review. The evaluation committee will consist of six members, with three representatives from TTC and three from TAC. Volunteers will participate in a virtual kickoff meeting and independently score the projects. Scores are due November 9 and will be averaged using WSDOT's established ranking process.



The final project rankings will return to TTC and TAC at their November meetings for a recommendation, followed by SRTC Board approval in December.

Chair Limon and Ms. Hayes volunteered to serve on the evaluation committee. Chair Limon noted that one additional TTC volunteer was still needed and encouraged members to review their schedules and contact Ms. Paparazzo if interested.

INFORMATION (NO PRESENTATION)

11 Agency Update

Mr. Fletcher reminded members that the TIP Open House will be held September 25 from 4:30–6:00 p.m. at the Spokane Central Library.

Ms. Petersen announced that registration is open for the 4th Annual Transportation Summit on October 15, with early bird pricing ending September 25. She explained that the Summit will bring together speakers and panelists to discuss transportation funding challenges and opportunities for the region. The event will focus on identifying solutions and priorities and building alignment around regional transportation advocacy.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:54 PM.

Anadia Grier, Clerk of the Board



To: Transportation Technical 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 Technical 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 TTC.

Public Involvement:

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

Staff Contact: Ryan Stewart, SRTC | rstewart@srtc.org 509.343.6370

Review Checklist

The checklist will be used to conduct and document the certification of comprehensive plan related to 1) conformity with the GMA transportation element content requirements and 2) consistency with the adopted RTP. If "no" is checked for any criterion, additional coordination with the applicant/agency will occur to document and resolve any outstanding issues.

Applicant/Agency: 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.100</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No If yes, check all the apply: ☒ WSDOT ☐ STA ☐ Kalispel Tribe of Indians ☐ Spokane Tribe of Indians ☒ <u>Spokane County</u> ☒ <u>SRTC</u>	If no, please provide explanation:	54-55
SRTC Comments:			
Coordination referenced.			
2. Is the plan consistent with relevant countywide planning policies? <u>RCW 36.70A.100</u>	☒ 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(A)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430</u>	☒ 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430 (1) (a)</u>	☒ 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vi)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(i)(i)</u>	☐ Yes ☒ No	If no, please provide explanation: Small town, no strategies * * * *
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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vii)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(j)</u>	☒ 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(G)</u>	☐ 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(i) and (ii)(E)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(f)</u>	☐ Yes ☒ No	If no, please provide explanation: Small town with limited infrastructure.
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? <u>WAC 365-196-430 (2)(b)(i)</u>	☐ Yes ☒ No	If no, please provide explanation: Not explicitly demonstrated.
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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(i) and (iii)(E)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(f)</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 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 <u>RCW43.12C.229</u> ?	☐ 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(B) and (C).</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(B) and (C).</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(D)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430</u>	☒ 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)? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(9)</u>	☐ 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(9)</u>	☒ 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vi)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(i)(i)</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(B)</u> <u>RCW 35.77.010</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(k)(ii)</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(A)</u> <u>WAC 365.196-430(2)(k)(iv)</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 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 Technical 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 TTC.

Public Involvement:

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

Staff Contact: Ryan Stewart, SRTC | rstewart@srtc.org 509.343.6370

Review Checklist

The checklist will be used to conduct and document the certification of comprehensive plan related to 1) conformity with the GMA transportation element content requirements and 2) consistency with the adopted RTP. If "no" is checked for any criterion, additional coordination with the applicant/agency will occur to document and resolve any outstanding issues.

Applicant/Agency: 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.100</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No If yes, check all the apply: ☒ WSDOT ☐ STA ☐ Kalispel Tribe of Indians ☐ Spokane Tribe of Indians ☒ <u>Spokane County</u> ☐ _____	If no, please provide explanation:	48
SRTC Comments:			
Coordination with relevant agencies documented.			
2. Is the plan consistent with relevant countywide planning policies? <u>RCW 36.70A.100</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	52
SRTC Comments:			
Topics 1, 3, 5, and 10.			

22

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response	Plan Page #
6. Are travel demand management (TDM) strategies included? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vi)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(i)(i)</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vii)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(j)</u>	☒ 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(G)</u>	☐ 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(i) and (ii)(E)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(f)</u>	☐ Yes ☒ No	If no, please provide explanation: No transportation improvements planned for
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? <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(b)(i)</u>	☐ Yes ☒ No	If no, please provide explanation: Small town with little to no safety issues.
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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(i) and (iii)(E)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(f)</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 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 <u>RCW43.12C.229</u> ?	☐ 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(B) and (C).</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: Vehicular only.
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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(B) and (C).</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(D)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 47
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)? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(9)</u>	☐ 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(9)</u>	☒ 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vi)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(i)(i)</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(B)</u> <u>RCW 35.77.010</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(k)(ii)</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(A)</u> <u>WAC 365.196-430(2)(k)(iv)</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 40, 48
SRTC Comments: LOS forecasted to remain A due to low volumes. Policy CF 3-6		

Additional Explanation	
Question:	Comment:



To: Transportation Technical 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 TTC.

Public Involvement:

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

Staff Contact: Ryan Stewart, SRTC | rstewart@srtc.org 509.343.6370

Review Checklist

The checklist will be used to conduct and document the certification of comprehensive plan related to 1) conformity with the GMA transportation element content requirements and 2) consistency with the adopted RTP. If "no" is checked for any criterion, additional coordination with the applicant/agency will occur to document and resolve any outstanding issues.

Applicant/Agency: 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.100</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No If yes, check all the apply: ☒ WSDOT ☐ STA ☐ Kalispel Tribe of Indians ☐ Spokane Tribe of Indians ☒ <u>Spokane County</u> ☒ <u>SRTC</u>	If no, please provide explanation:	50, 52
SRTC Comments:			
Coordination referenced.			
2. Is the plan consistent with relevant countywide planning policies? <u>RCW 36.70A.100</u>	☒ 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(A)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430</u>	☒ 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430 (1) (a)</u>	☒ 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vi)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(i)(i)</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vii)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(j)</u>	☒ 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
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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(G)</u>	☐ 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(i) and (ii)(E)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(f)</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 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? <u>WAC 365-196-430 (2)(b)(i)</u>	☒ 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(i) and (iii)(E)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(f)</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 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 <u>RCW 43.12C.229</u> ?	☐ 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(B) and (C).</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(B) and (C).</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(D)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430</u>	☒ 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)? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(9)</u>	☐ 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(9)</u>	☒ 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vi)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(i)(i)</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(B)</u> <u>RCW 35.77.010</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(k)(ii)</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:
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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(A)</u> <u>WAC 365.196-430(2)(k)(iv)</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:
SRTC Comments: "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 Technical 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 TTC.

Public Involvement:

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

Staff Contact: Ryan Stewart, SRTC | rstewart@srtc.org 509.343.6370

Review Checklist

The checklist will be used to conduct and document the certification of comprehensive plan related to 1) conformity with the GMA transportation element content requirements and 2) consistency with the adopted RTP. If "no" is checked for any criterion, additional coordination with the applicant/agency will occur to document and resolve any outstanding issues.

Applicant/Agency: 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.100</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No If yes, check all the apply: ☒ WSDOT ☐ STA ☐ Kalispel Tribe of Indians ☐ Spokane Tribe of Indians ☒ <u>Spokane County</u> ☒ <u>SRTC</u>	If no, please provide explanation:	58-59
SRTC Comments:			
Coordination referenced.			
2. Is the plan consistent with relevant countywide planning policies? <u>RCW 36.70A.100</u>	☒ 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.			

40

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response	Plan Page #
6. Are travel demand management (TDM) strategies included? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vi)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(i)(i)</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vii)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(j)</u>	☒ 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 freight 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(G)</u>	☐ 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(i) and (ii)(E)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(f)</u>	☐ Yes ☒ No	If no, please provide explanation:
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? <u>WAC 365-196-430 (2)(b)(i)</u>	☐ 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(i) and (iii)(E)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(f)</u>	☐ Yes ☒ No	If no, please provide explanation: 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 <u>RCW43.12C.229</u> ?	☐ 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(B) and (C).</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430</u>	☐ Yes ☒ No	If no, please provide explanation: 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(B) and (C).</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430</u>	☐ Yes ☒ No	If no, please provide explanation: 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iii)(D)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430</u>	☐ 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)? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(9)</u>	☐ 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(9)</u>	☒ 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(vi)</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(i)(i)</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(B)</u> <u>RCW 35.77.010</u> <u>WAC 365-196-430(2)(k)(ii)</u>	☐ Yes ☒ No	If no, please provide explanation: Acknowledges limited available funding.
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? <u>RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)(iv)(A)</u> <u>WAC 365.196-430(2)(k)(iv)</u>	☒ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation: 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 Technical 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; please return any comments to Angela Paparazzo by **11/30/2026**.
- 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 Technical 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 here for review](#), and the committee meeting will be used to confirm that ITS elements have been accurately noted 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