Spokane Regional Transportation Council

Board of Directors Meeting

Thursday, 11/12/2026 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/82990423233?pwd=umAtOb7zXGZhQgRIqtByx14vkG0IBU.1

Meeting ID: 829 9042 3233 | Passcode: 100681

By Phone: +125 320 50468
Meeting ID: 829 9042 3233 | Passcode: 100681
Or find your local number: https://us02web.zoom.us/u/kcau3PfqF0

SRTC welcomes public comments at Board 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

Board of Directors Meeting Agenda

Thursday, November 12, 2026– 1:00 pm

Time	Item #		Page #
1:00	1	**Call to Order/Record of Attendance/Excused Absences**	
1:10	2	**Public Comments**	

FOR ACTION

1:15	3	**Consent Agenda**	
		a. October Board Meeting Minutes	3
		b. Vouchers Paid for the Month of October	12
1:20	4	**Executive Director Performance Review and Salary Adjustment – Approval** *(Greg Griffin)*	13

EXECUTIVE SESSION for the purpose of discussion of the performance of a public employee under [RCW 42.30.110(1)(g)]

1:40	5	**Recognition and Appreciation Policy – Approval** *(Bailee Petersen)*	16
1:45	6	**Meals and Refreshments Policy – Approval** *(Bailee Petersen)*	21

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING – Public Records Fee Schedule: The SRTC Board will hold a public hearing to receive comments on the proposed public records fee schedule.

1:50	7	**Public Records Fee Schedule – Approval** *(Lois Bollenback)*	26
1:55	8	**Public Records Request and Records Management Policy – Approval** *(Bailee Petersen)*	30
2:00	9	**CY 2027 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Guidebook – Approval** *(Ben Kloskey)*	41
2:05	10	**Town of Fairfield Comprehensive Plan Certification** *(Ryan Stewart)*	43
2:10	11	**Town of Latah Comprehensive Plan Certification** *(Ryan Stewart)*	53
2:15	12	**Town of Rockford Comprehensive Plan Certification** *(Ryan Stewart)*	63
2:20	13	**Town of Waverly Comprehensive Plan Certification** *(Ryan Stewart)*	73

INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

2:25	14	**CY 2027 Unified List Legislative Priority Statements (Federal Version) – Draft** *(Eve McMenamy)*	83
2:35	15	**Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Plan Update – Conditions & Needs** *(Jason Lien)*	88
2:40	16	**WSDOT Consolidated Grant Project Rankings Process** *(Angela Paparazzo)*	89

INFORMATION: No Action or Discussion *(Written reports)*

2:45	17	**Executive Director's Monthly Report** *(Lois Bollenback)*	90
		• Administrative Committee Meeting Summary	
	18	**Transportation Technical Committee & Transportation Advisory Committee Meeting Summaries**	91

DISCUSSION

2:50	19	**Board Member Comments** *(Chair)*
2:55	20	**Chair Comments**
3:00	21	**Adjournment** *(Chair)*

Board of Directors Meeting Minutes - Draft

Thursday, October 8, 2026 – 1:00 pm

1 Call to Order/ Excused Absences

Vice Chair Klitzke called the meeting to order at 1:02 pm, and attendance was taken.

Excused Absences:

Mayor Cris Kaminskas (Chair)
City of Liberty Lake

Council Member Micki Harnois
Small Towns Rep.

Commissioner Josh Kerns
Spokane County

Char Kay
WSDOT-ER

Council Member Haley made a motion to approve excused absences. Deputy Mayor Hattenburg seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

In attendance were:

Board Members:

Council Member Vincent Barthels
City of Cheney
Council Member Don Kennedy
City of Medical Lake
Council Member Kate Telis
City of Spokane
Council Member Kitty Klitzke
City of Spokane (Vice Chair)
Council Member Pam Haley
City of Spokane Valley
Deputy Mayor Tim Hattenburg
City of Spokane Valley
Daniel Clark
Kalispel Tribe
Doug Yost
Major Employer Rep.
Matt Ewers
Rail/Freight Rep.
Karl Otterstrom (CEO)
STA
Ernie Rasmussen
Spokane Tribe

Absent Members:

Council Member Jennifer Morton
City of Airway Heights
Council Member Dianne Pfaeffle
City of Deer Park
Mayor Shawna Beese
City of Millwood
Commissioner Al French
Spokane County

Ex-Officio Members:

Tara Limon
STA
(TTC Chair)
Mike Ankney
(TAC Chair)

Guests:

Paul Kropp

Staff:

Lois Bollenback
Executive Director
Eve McMenamy
Deputy Executive Director
Greg Griffin
Admin Services Manager
Bailee Petersen
PR & Comms Coor.
Anadia Grier
Admin-Executive Coor.
Hayley Harrison
Temp. Admin-Exec Coor.
Jason Lien
Transp. Planning Manager
Ryan Stewart
Principal Transp. Planner
Michael Redlinger
Assoc. Transp. Planner 3
Ben Kloskey
Assoc. Transp. Planner 2
Angela Paparazzo
Assoc. Transp. Planner 2
Patrick Keefe
Legal Counsel

DRAFT

 # 2 Public Comments
There were no public comments.

ACTION ITEMS

 # 3 Consent Agenda
Vice Chair Klitzke listed items comprising the Consent Agenda, including:

a. September Board Meeting Minutes
b. Vouchers Paid for the Month of September
c. Calendar Year (CY) 2026 Q3 Budget Update

Deputy Mayor Hattenburg made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Council Member Telis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

 # 4 CY 2027 Budget and Indirect Cost Plan – Approval
Mr. Griffin presented Resolution 26-24 to adopt SRTC's 2027 Budget and Indirect Cost Plan. He reported that the proposed budget remained unchanged from the Board Administrative Committee's June 26 review and the September Board presentation. The overall budget would decrease by 0.2% compared with 2026, with changes largely reflecting the timing and scope of consultant-led projects. The first six months of the budget would overlap with the final six months of SRTC's current two-year work plan, the UPWP.

Mr. Griffin highlighted ongoing work on the Safety Education Campaign and I-90 study, with proposed consultant budgets of $140,000 and $600,000, respectively. Most continuing consultant projects would receive increased funding as work expands in 2027, while the state-funded charging station project had been completed. The Consolidated Planning Grant, SRTC's largest annual federal grant, was expected to increase by just over 1%.

Total personnel expenses would increase by 1.7%, while overall wage expenses would increase by 5.4%. Proposed compensation included a 4% cost-of-living adjustment and a 3% merit pool based on 2026 employee performance evaluations. Consultant and professional services expenses would decrease by 2.8% overall, while including $22,000 for translation services to support accessibility requirements. Materials and services expenses would decrease slightly, while travel, training, and staff development would increase by 3.7%. Technology expenses would increase by 3.4%, primarily reflecting software costs and Washington's new sales tax on those purchases.

Mr. Griffin explained that the indirect cost plan allows SRTC to recover eligible overhead expenses through transportation grants. The proposed 2027 rate was 49%, compared with the current rate of 52% and an average of 53% since 2021. The rate is calculated using grant-eligible staff wages and budgeted overhead expenses, adjusted based on actual costs recovered in 2025. The plan follows federal guidelines and requires approval by the Washington State Department of Transportation.

Mr. Ewers made a motion to approve Resolution R-26-24, Adopting the CY 2027 Budget and Indirect Cost Plan as presented. Mr. Otterstrom seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

DRAFT

 # 5 CY 2027-2030 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) – Approval

Mr. Kloskey presented Resolution R-26-25 to adopt the 2027–2030 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). He explained that SRTC updates the four-year program annually, removing the outgoing year and adding a new fourth year. The TIP identifies transportation projects receiving federal funding or considered regionally significant. Developed in coordination with local agencies and the Washington State Department of Transportation, it outlines project costs, schedules, and funding sources and supports the region's long-range transportation plan, Horizon 2050.

Mr. Kloskey reported approximately $665 million in programmed funding across the six years reflected in the TIP funding information, covering 58 projects and programs. This included one new project scheduled for addition in January 2027. A substantial portion of the funding would support completion of the North-South Corridor. He also presented the investment breakdown without that project to help illustrate other regional investments. The program demonstrated sufficient anticipated revenue to cover the listed projects and included information showing how each project would support regional transportation performance targets.

The public comment period ran from September 1 through October 1, with no comments received. SRTC also held an open house on September 24, where participating agencies presented their projects. The meeting recording is available on SRTC's website. Mr. Kloskey highlighted an interactive online map that allowed the public to view project details and submit comments directly from individual project listings. The map would remain available year-round and reflect project updates and funding changes.

Council Member Haley made a motion to approve Resolution R-26-25 adopting the 2027-2030 Transportation Improvement Program as presented. Deputy Mayor Hattenburg seconded the motion.

Mr. Otterstrom questioned whether the Division Street Bus Rapid Transit project accurately reflected federal funding already appropriated and allocated. He noted that page 21 of the draft listed no federal expenditures for the project between 2027 and 2030. Mr. Kloskey stated that the project had substantial federal funding and agreed to verify and correct the information.

Mr. Otterstrom then proposed an amendment to correct any clerical errors in the Division Street Bus Rapid Transit funding information so the final publication would accurately reflect the federal share. Vice Chair Klitzke confirmed that Council Member Haley made the original motion, and Council Member Haley expressly accepted the amendment.

Mr. Otterstrom moved to amend the motion to approve Resolution R-26-25, adopting the 2027–2030 Transportation Improvement Program, to correct any clerical errors in the Division Street Bus Rapid Transit funding information to accurately reflect the federal share. Council Member Telis seconded the amendment. The amendment passed unanimously.

Members then voted on the amended motion. The motion passed unanimously.

DRAFT

 # 6 City of Liberty Lake Comprehensive Plan Certification

Mr. Stewart reviewed SRTC's responsibility under Washington's Growth Management Act to certify the transportation-related elements of local comprehensive plans. Certification evaluates consistency with the regional transportation plan, Horizon 2050, and applicable state requirements. He explained that the Board approved an updated certification process in January, including a checklist developed in coordination with other regional transportation planning organizations.

Vice Chair Klitzke suggested using the certification process to strengthen regional coordination on issues that cross jurisdictional boundaries, including growth, joint planning areas, and wildfire evacuation in areas where development meets wildland vegetation. She identified the five-year comprehensive plan review as a potential opportunity for this work. Mr. Stewart agreed that the midpoint review would provide an opportunity to revisit these issues.

Ms. Bollenback emphasized that SRTC could support broader regional planning discussions at the Board's direction. Although changing the certification approach would be challenging this late in the process, she welcomed further discussion once it was complete. She encouraged members to share recommendations for the upcoming debrief, both to improve future efforts and preserve lessons for future Board members and staff. She also identified development of the next two-year work plan early the following year as an opportunity to incorporate regional priorities and welcomed ideas for improving SRTC's services, information sharing, and role as a forum for regional coordination.

Mr. Stewart then presented the City of Liberty Lake's 2026–2046 Comprehensive Plan update. He recognized city staff for their early and ongoing coordination with SRTC, neighboring jurisdictions, and the Washington State Department of Transportation. SRTC participated in the city's transportation network analysis and received an early draft of the plan in June.

Staff found the plan generally consistent with Horizon 2050 and recommended certification. Mr. Stewart explained that staff marked some checklist items "no" because requirements do not apply in every circumstance or because newer requirements need further development. In particular, staff would continue working with the city on level of service standards and forecasts that evaluate how well the transportation system serves people using different modes of travel, beyond vehicle traffic. Although the plan did not explicitly reference SRTC's regional freight and bicycle priority networks, its policies supported freight movement and bicycle, pedestrian, and golf cart travel.

Council Member Haley made a motion to approve Resolution R-26-26 certifying the City of Liberty Lake 2026-2046 Comprehensive Plan as presented. Council Member Kennedy seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

In response to Mr. Otterstrom, he clarified that the Board's action would certify consistency with regional planning and applicable requirements, rather than approve the city's comprehensive plan itself.

DRAFT

 # 7 City of Medical Lake Comprehensive Plan Certification

Ms. Paparazzo presented staff's recommendation to certify the City of Medical Lake's comprehensive plan. She recognized city staff for providing a clear, accessible transportation element that included historical context and explained the city's role in the regional transportation system, particularly its relationship to State Route 902. She also thanked staff for completing the certification checklist thoroughly.

Staff found the plan generally consistent with the regional transportation plan and recommended Board approval of certification.

Council Member Kennedy made a motion to approve Resolution R-26-27 certifying the City of Medical Lake 2046 Comprehensive Plan as presented. Mr. Otterstrom seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

 # 8 City of Airway Heights Comprehensive Plan Certification

Ms. Paparazzo presented the City of Airway Heights' comprehensive plan update and commended city staff for their exceptional regional coordination throughout its development. Keeping SRTC involved helped staff understand the plan and review it more efficiently. She also recognized its visually appealing, easy-to-follow format.

Ms. Paparazzo explained that the city initially intended to seek an infill housing exemption under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). The submitted certification checklist indicated both that the city was seeking the exemption and that the required coordination with the Washington State Department of Transportation had occurred. However, during the Transportation Technical Committee meeting, WSDOT reported that consultation specifically related to the exemption had not taken place. That consultation subsequently occurred, and the city decided the previous week not to pursue the exemption. Ms. Paparazzo requested Board action using a revised checklist, changing Question 15 and the two related questions that followed from "yes" to "no."

Mr. Rasmussen identified an error in the resolution that listed the Mayor of Liberty Lake on the resolution indicating certification of Airway Heights' plan. Ms. McMenamy confirmed that a substitute resolution listed Vice Chair Klitzke's name *(resolutions are signed by the SRTC Chair or Vice Chair*). Vice Chair Klitzke acknowledged the correction and thanked Mr. Rasmussen for identifying the error.

Council Member Kennedy made a motion to approve Resolution R-26-28 certifying the City of Airway Heights' 2026–2046 Comprehensive Plan, with checklist Question 15 and the two related questions changed from "yes" to "no." Council Member Haley seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

 # 9 Spokane Regional Transportation Management Center (SRTMC) Funding Support Letter

Ms. Bollenback presented a request for SRTC to join regional partners in signing a letter seeking ongoing state funding for the Spokane Regional Transportation Management Center (TMC). She noted that the Board helped establish the TMC and has remained a strong supporter. WSDOT staff

DRAFT

operate the TMC, which is jointly supported through an interlocal agreement among WSDOT, SRTC, the cities of Spokane and Spokane Valley, Spokane County, and Spokane Transit Authority.

The TMC's annual budget is approximately $1.6 million. Ms. Bollenback reported that SRTC and local partners provide just over $1 million, describing their share as nearly 75%. SRTC's contribution previously used federal air quality funding but now relies on Surface Transportation Block Grant funds. She explained that these funds are particularly valuable to local partners because they can support a broad range of transportation preservation and capital projects.

The TMC Executive Board's member agencies supported requesting full state funding, consistent with the state's approach to all other transportation management centers across Washington. WSDOT's Eastern Region had also sought this funding for several years. The state provided a one-time allocation following the previous year's request, and the proposed letter sought ongoing funding to be pursued during the next legislative session. All other participating agencies had signed on, and Ms. Bollenback requested authorization for SRTC to join them.

Vice Chair Klitzke expressed support for the request on the basis of fairness and encouraged members to include ongoing TMC funding among the priorities they discuss with legislators during the upcoming budget session in Olympia.

Mr. Ewers made a motion to approve the joint letter of support seeking ongoing state funding for the Spokane Regional Transportation Management Center (SRTMC). Council Member Haley seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

 # 10 CY 2027 Unified List and Legislative Priority Statements (State Version) – Approval

McMenamy presented the proposed 2027 Unified List and Legislative Priority Statements for Board approval. She explained that the annual list is a communication tool for sharing regional transportation priorities with legislators and other stakeholders. It combines policy statements with priority projects and helps align SRTC's advocacy with that of local governments, statewide associations, and transportation partners.

The policy statements remained largely unchanged from the previous presentation, with one new priority focused on maintaining and expanding reliable, long-term funding for local transportation infrastructure. This priority included increasing the maximum vehicle weight subject to transportation benefit district vehicle license fees from 6,000 to 9,000 pounds, an approach some member agencies were pursuing to generate additional revenue. It also called for renewing statutory funding provisions for the Transportation Improvement Board and County Road Administration Board before their expiration in 2031, with consideration of the Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board in that renewal.

The new priority also supported funding, expanding, or making permanent the Federal Fund Exchange Program. Ms. McMenamy explained that the current pilot allows rural counties to exchange federal transportation funds for state funds, reducing the administrative burden of delivering projects while the state redirects the federal funds to other projects. SRTC does not

currently participate in the pilot, but staff saw potential benefits in extending it beyond rural counties. The final component supported full state funding for the Spokane Regional Transportation Management Center, consistent with other centers statewide and the Board's preceding action.

Ms. McMenamy then reviewed the priority project list, developed using evaluation criteria the Board approved earlier in the year. Agencies submitted 28 projects, including seven new submissions. The list groups projects by their stage of development and lists them based on the scoring to help legislators and congressional offices understand regional funding needs and project readiness. She noted that congressional offices had begun requesting the list directly.

Staff recommended retaining five projects in the implementation category, which includes projects ready for construction with substantial funding and approvals in place. The development category includes projects with preliminary engineering completed or right-of-way acquisition underway. Since last month's presentation, one element of the US-195 project was separated from the other US-195 projects at WSDOT's request and placed in the development category to reflect its progress. Ms. McMenamy thanked city staff for providing updated information.

The initiation category includes projects in earlier stages, such as those identified through studies or preparing to begin preliminary engineering. Ms. McMenamy explained that federal partners had encouraged a concise list, while SRTC also needed to represent the region and a range of funding opportunities. Both advisory committees recommended advancing the projects above the cutoff line shown in the presentation.

At the Board's request, the presentation also showed how projects scored against SRTC's guiding principles, including economic vitality, cooperation and leadership, stewardship, maintenance and preservation, safety, quality of life, and equity. Staff reviewed the legislative statements against Horizon 2050 strategies and found them aligned with the region's planning priorities.

Deputy Mayor Hattenburg made a motion to approve Resolution R-26-29 approving the CY 2027 Unified List and Legislative Priority Statements (State Version) as presented. Mr. Otterstrom seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION

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

Mr. Kloskey presented the draft 2027 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Guidebook for information and discussion. Updated annually since its development in 2013, the guidebook outlines the TIP's goals, programming policies, procedures for making changes, and key deadlines. It serves as a resource for member agencies, the Board, and advisory committees.

Aside from the annual schedule updates, the only significant proposed change was to Policy 6.8, which addresses contingency funding. The change would clarify that the existing retroactive approval process also applies to funding projects on the contingency list when a Board meeting is canceled or the Board is on its August break. Mr. Kloskey explained that this option would be used

when the next eligible project is clear and timely action is needed to meet the region's target for committing federal transportation funds to projects.

Mr. Kloskey cited an example from April, when the Board meeting was canceled, and the City of Spokane received National Highway System asset management funding for projects that already had SRTC funding. Reassigning the SRTC funds promptly helped move funding to other projects and support the regional funding target. The proposed change would put this existing practice in writing. He emphasized that the Board would still review the action afterward and could provide input, stop the process, or make changes.

There were no questions or comments.

 # 12 Administrative Policy Review – Draft (3)
Ms. Petersen presented three draft administrative policies for discussion and feedback: Recognition and Appreciation, Meals and Refreshments, and Public Records Requests and Records Management. The Administrative Committee reviewed all three policies at its September meeting, and they will return to the Board next month for approval. The policies would formalize existing practices, provide consistent guidance, and support compliance with state requirements. The first two were developed in response to recommendations from SRTC's most recent audit.

The Recognition and Appreciation Policy would establish guidelines for service awards, commemorative items, and other recognition of contributions to SRTC's mission. Ms. Petersen explained that state law allows employee recognition awards of up to $200, but SRTC intended to keep awards modest, with most not exceeding $50. The Administrative Committee recommended retaining the higher limit to allow flexibility in extraordinary circumstances while maintaining responsible use of public resources.

The Meals and Refreshments Policy would clarify when agency funds may be used for food and beverages, including stakeholder meetings and approved recognition activities. Ms. Petersen noted that modest refreshments or meals can help encourage participation during long meetings and public outreach activities. The policy would identify appropriate expenses, prohibited purchases, and required documentation.

Ms. Bollenback presented the Public Records Requests and Records Management Policy, which would establish local procedures for responding to public records requests and retaining and managing agency records. She explained that SRTC already follows Washington's Public Records Act and statutory records retention requirements; the policy would clarify how the agency carries out those requirements. Legal counsel Megan Clark provided input and reviewed the draft. Ms. Bollenback also recognized Anadia Grier for developing the policy and noted that she serves as SRTC's designated public records officer. Board members were invited to review the drafts and provide questions or feedback before the policies returned for approval.

There were no questions or comments.

DRAFT

INFORMATION

 # 13 Executive Director's Monthly Report

Ms. Bollenback highlighted SRTC's upcoming transportation summit, scheduled for the following week, and encouraged members who had not yet registered to do so. She noted that the event would feature both familiar and new speakers. Members interested in joining the SRTC table were asked to contact her or Ms. Petersen to be added to the list. She also invited attendees to take apples provided by a neighboring fifth-floor office as an annual gesture.

 # 14 Transportation Technical Committee & Transportation Advisory Committee Meeting Summaries

No questions or comments.

 # 15 Board Member Comments

Mr. Otterstrom reported that Spokane Transit Authority had launched STA Link, an on-demand transportation pilot, a couple of weeks earlier. The service connects residents in northern Spokane Valley, including incorporated and unincorporated areas, and Latah Valley to the transit system. STA posted information on their website. He noted that STA would report ridership to its Board, although the pilot did not carry the same federal ridership reporting expectations.

Ms. Bollenback asked whether the service operated throughout the same hours as fixed-route transit. Mr. Otterstrom explained that hours varied by location, with Spokane Valley service available seven days a week from approximately 6 a.m. to 7 p.m. and Latah Valley service operating on weekdays only. Service schedules reflected demand analysis, and early data showed greater demand in northern Spokane Valley than in Latah Valley.

 # 16 Chair Comments

There were no Chair comments.

With there being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1:54 p.m.

_____

Anadia Grier, Clerk of the Board

DRAFT

VOUCHERS PAID FOR THE MONTH OF OCTOBER 2026

Date	Voucher	Vendor	Description	Amount
10/2/26	V123075	WA State Dept of Retirement	Employee DCP payroll contributions: October PP20 2026	3,200.00
	V123076	Rehn & Associates	Staff Payroll Deduction Health Ins Contributions: Pay Period 2026-20	710.00
	V123077	Vision Municipal Solutions	Registration GG Vision Trng in Deer Park, WA 10.2.26	225.00
	V123078	Rehn & Associates	Q-3 2026 Agency H.S.A. contributions LB,GG,AG,MR,JL,BK	3,000.00
	V123079	WA State Dept of Retirement	Employee and Employer Contributions: September 2026	11,956.41
	V123080	Cycrest Systems	Managed IT Services - Mnthly October; SaaS Security	1,426.76
10/9/26	V123081	Washington Trust Bank	Software Subscrptns; Office supplies/equpt.; Virtual Mtg Subscrptn; Staff travel/regs	3,038.14
	V123082	Gonzaga University	Strategic Planning - Custom Org Dev Program - 50% billing	11,000.00
	V123083	Diamond Parking Services	Acct parking for Board, Cmte, Staff mtg parking - September 2026	97.19
	V123084	Pacific Office Automation	Copier Lease/Usage September 2026	232.37
	V123085	Intermax Networks	VOIP telecom October 2026	253.23
	V123086	The Woodshop LLC	Website Hosting & Maintenance for January-August 2026	3,918.88
	V123087	Kittelson & Associates	Funding Strategies Study thru 8/31/26 - Tasks 1, 2, 3	12,074.52
	V123088	Rehn & Associates	Admin fee September '26	75.00
10/16/26	V123089	WA State Dept of Retirement	Employee DCP payroll contributions: October PP21 2026	3,700.00
	V123090	Angela Paparazzo	Travel Reimburse AP AMPO Conf, Sacramento, CA 9/14-17/26	214.00
	V123091	Rehn & Associates	Staff Payroll Deduction Health Ins Contributions: Pay Period 2026-21	710.00
	V123092	AWC Employee Benefit Trust	November '26 Benefit Insurance Premiums	11,760.00
	V123093	Spokesman Review	Public Notice TIP Amendment	109.55
	V123094	Dell Technologies	Replace BP laptop per replacement cycle	2,932.27
	V123095	Michael Redlinger	Travel Reimburse MR-WSDOT Asset Mgmt Workshop, Lacey, WA 9/28-29/26	598.93
	V123096	WA State Dept of Retirement	Employee DCP payroll contributions: October PP22 2026	3,700.00
	V123097	Rehn & Associates	Staff Payroll Deduction Health Ins Contributions: Pay Period 2026-22	710.00
	V123098	EMLVO P.C.	September legal svcs: Revise PRR policy; Closing ltr policy; Staff email exchange	500.00
	V123099	Kittelson & Associates	Planning & Update of Regional ITS Architecture thru 8/31/26 - Tasks 1, 2, 3	3,933.58
	V123100	Comcast	Fiber Services, Oct 2026; Onsite repair modem	381.75
	V123101	Mercedes Kissnger-Smith	Photograpy Services at 2026 Summit	300.00
10/20/26	V123102	Manpower	Temp services for 10.5.26 to 10.11.26	613.03
	V123103	Eve McMenamy	EM mileage reimburse for 4.14.26 to 10.14.26	70.64
10/29/26	V123104	Joshua Schank	Travel reimbursement for 2026 Keynot speaker	920.79
	V123105	Dell Technologies	Replace AG laptop per replacement cycle	2,917.77
	V123106	Manpower	Temp services for 10.11.26 to 10.18.26	852.49
	V123107	Diamond Plaza LLC	Paulsen Center Suite 500/504 Lease for November 2026	6,268.30
	V123108	Kittelson & Associates	Planning & Update of Regional ITS Architecture thru 9/30/26 - Tasks 1, 2, 3	10,473.96
	V123109	WA Employment Sec Dept - UI Tax	Unemployment Reimburseable Employer for Q3 2026	4,197.70

Vouchers:	V123075 - V123109	107,072.26
Reimbursement(s)		
Salaries/Benefits	Pay Periods Ending: 9/26/26, 10/10/26 & 10/24/26	145,924.43
Spokane County Treasury	Monthly SCIP fee - September 2026	24.76
		253,021.45

As of 11/12/26, the Spokane Regional Transportation Council Board of Directors approves the payment of the October 2026 vouchers included in the list in the amount of: **$253,021.45**

SRTC Board of Directors Chair, Mayor Cris Kaminskas, City of Liberty Lake

To: SRTC Board of Directors
From: Greg Griffin, Administrative Services Manager
Topic: Executive Director Performance Review and Salary Adjustment - Approval

Requested Action:

Adopt Resolution R-26-30 to approve the Executive Director annual review and compensation adjustment.

Key Points:

- Resolution R-22-19 established an Administrative Committee as a standing committee of the SRTC Board. Among the duties of the Administrative Committee is the responsibility to annually complete a performance appraisal of the Executive Director and recommend a compensation adjustment as deemed appropriate.
- The SRTC Board Chair made an announcement to the SRTC Board at the September Board meeting that the review was underway and input from Board members could be provided prior to 09/30/26.
- On 10/28/26, members of the Administrative Committee met to review the annual work plans and performance of Executive Director Lois Bollenback during calendar year 2026.
- A copy of the proposed CY 2027 Work Plan for the Executive Director is provided for review.
- During Executive Session, members of the Administrative Committee will report their findings and recommendations to the full board and seek consensus on a recommendation.
- The final action will be memorialized in a resolution of the SRTC Board.

Board/Committee Discussions:

The SRTC Chair announced the beginning of the review process at the 9/10/2026 Board meeting. The Executive Director presented work plans to the Administrative Committee on 10/28/2026. At that meeting, the Committee reviewed the Director's performance in an Executive Session. Updates of this process were provided to the full Board as part of the Executive Director's October and November reports.

Public Involvement:

All Board and committee meetings are open to the public.

Staff Contact: Greg Griffin, SRTC | ggriffin@srtc.org | 509.343.6370

Year 6 Work Plan

January 1, 2027 – December 31, 2027

As I begin my sixth year with SRTC, I will continue to prioritize staff development, strengthen organizational capacity, and ensure critical functions have appropriate cross-training and backup to improve continuity and efficiency. Building on our organizational development efforts, I will work to establish clear staff goals that align with organizational priorities and support the Board's development of a strategic plan and 2-year work plan.

Year-6 Goals & Activities

State & Regional Leadership	Organizational Focus	Program Development
In CY 2027, I'll continue to provide leadership on state & national transpo. policy & planning issues. With Congress working on a transpo. reauthorization bill, monitoring legislative activity, providing input, and preparing SRTC for program and funding changes will be a key priority. I will also renew my focus on staff engagement w/ SRTC partners and stakeholders to strengthen relationships & improve coordination	In recent years, I've implemented several initiatives to strengthen SRTC's internal operations, including updates to guiding documents, policies, and org structure. In CY 2027, I will continue to focus on SRTC's effectiveness by implementing recommendations from the ongoing organizational development activity. The goal is to build a strong, resilient, and effective organization w/ clear priorities, well-defined responsibilities, and the capacity to deliver on SRTC's mission.	SRTC supports a thriving region through planning, project and agency support, and regional coordination. These activities are defined in the UPWP, which will be updated in early 2027. I'll provide executive oversight of these efforts, ensuring senior staff have the direction needed to develop UPWP activities. I will also focus on securing sustainable funding, strengthening public engagement, & advancing strategic planning initiatives.
Strengthen stakeholder engagement • Maintain state & federal engagement (nat'l associations, Congressional Rep's & staff, State Legislators & staff) • Support regional Leadership (Tribal Govt., Business Leaders, Chambers, WSDOT, U-District) • Engage in policy & funding discussions (participate in MPO Coordinating Committee Activity, attend local council meetings) **Promote Unified List** of regional priorities to strengthen coordination and advocacy across jurisdictions and partner organizations **Monitor & prepare for federal reauthorization** activities - assess potential implications for SRTC and the region and position the agency to respond to emerging opportunities and requirements.. **Convene regional leaders** by planning and hosting the 5th Annual Transportation Summit to build consensus and advance shared priorities. **Increase Leveraging of AI Technology**	**Organizational Structure & Staff Development** • **Strengthen SRTC resilience:** Ensure critical functions & responsibilities have appropriate backup and cross-training to maintain op's continuity • **Align work plans & outcomes:** Incorporate recommendations from the org. development activity into staff work plans, w/ an emphasis on value, accountability, and delivery. • **Build team capacity and cohesion:** Continue developing a collaborative, high-performing team that supports retention, & organizational success. • **Recognize contributions:** Establish a member recognition program to reinforce a culture of service. • **Promote staff well-being:** Increase staff participation in wellness initiatives that support a healthy, productive workplace. **Strategic Planning & Accessibility** • **Advance strategic planning:** Complete a strategic plng exercise w/ the SRTC Board & advisory committees, to est. clear org priorities & direction. • **Strengthen ADA compliance:** Ensure staff receive training and internal procedures are updated to support ADA/WCAG requirements.	**Financial Sustainability & Program Administration** • **Pursue sustainable funding:** Advocate for adequate RTPO operating funding. • **Increase project competitiveness:** Continue developing econ analyses of prioritized transpo. projects. • **Evaluate legislative advocacy support:** Explore lobbyist support to advance SRTC's legislative and funding priorities. • **Maintain strong fiscal practices:** Oversee budgeting, audits, and related functions to ensure sound fiscal management & accountability. **Advance a comprehensive public engagement program:** Refine the overall program and develop a plan to strengthen public engagement, community relations, and stakeholder outreach w/ measurable outcomes. **Develop the next UPWP:** Develop planning activities reflecting regional needs &emerging priorities & successfully complete a TMA Review. **Support regional efforts such as:** the SRTMC, WSDOT planning, STA plan development and other opportunities to leverage regional partnerships. **Advance the E-W Mobility study effort:** complete scoping, issue an RFP & begin this important regional effort.

RESOLUTION

of the BOARD OF DIRECTORS of the

SPOKANE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

R-26-30

APPROVING EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ANNUAL REVIEW AND COMPENSATION ADJUSTMENT

WHEREAS, the Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) serves as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Spokane Metropolitan Planning Area and the Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO) for Spokane County; and

WHEREAS, SRTC is established through an Interlocal Agreement of the members that forms a Board of Directors and empowers the board with a variety of duties, among which is to determine the positions, duties, and working conditions of employees, including the duties and authority of an Executive Director; and

WHEREAS, on 10/13/22 the SRTC Board approved Resolution R-22-19 establishing an Administrative Committee with a responsibility to annually complete a performance appraisal of the Executive Director and recommend a compensation adjustment; and

WHEREAS, the SRTC Chair announced the review process at the board meeting on 9/10/2026 and invited comments from SRTC Board members to be considered in completing the performance review; and

WHEREAS, members of the Administrative Committee met on 10/28/2026 to review the annual work plans of Executive Director Lois Bollenback to assess her performance during calendar year 2026.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the SRTC Board of Directors approves the Administrative Committee proposal that the SRTC Executive Director's base salary be adjusted for the budget approved cost of living increase of 4 percent, effective January 1, 2027.

ADOPTED: 11/12/2026

ATTEST

Anadia Grier SRTC Clerk of the Board	Mayor Cris Kaminskas City of Liberty Lake Chair, SRTC Board of Directors

To: SRTC Board of Directors
From: Bailee Petersen, Communications and Public Relations Coordinator
Topic: Recognition and Appreciation Policy

Requested Action:

Approve resolution R-26-31 to adopt the Recognition and Appreciation Policy.

Key Points:

- The proposed Recognition and Appreciation Policy establishes guidelines for recognizing employees, Board members, committee members, volunteers, and others who support SRTC's mission.
- The policy provides clear administrative guidance for recognition activities, awards, commemorative items, and related expenditures while supporting responsible stewardship of public resources.
- RCW 41.60.150 authorizes employee recognition awards of up to $200; however, SRTC intends to keep recognition awards modest, with most awards not exceeding $50.
- Staff will provide an overview of the proposed policy and answer questions from the Board.
- The proposed policy is provided as an attachment for Board review and consideration.

Board/Committee Discussions:

The Administrative Committee reviewed the policies during their 09/10/2026 meeting, and the SRTC Board of Directors reviewed a draft of this policy at their 10/08/2026 meeting.

Public Involvement:

All Board meetings at which this policy is presented are open to the public.

Staff Contact: Bailee Petersen, SRTC | bpetersen@srtc.org | 509.343.6370

Spokane Regional Transportation Council

Recognition and Appreciation Policy (Draft)

Adopted by the SRTC Board of Directors
Month, Date 2026

SECTION 1: PURPOSE AND AUTHORITY

1.1 Purpose

The Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) values the contributions of employees, Board members, elected officials, committee members, citizen representatives, volunteers, and others who support the agency's mission. Recognizing service, achievement, leadership, volunteerism, and dedication helps foster a positive organizational culture, strengthens relationships, and acknowledges the individuals who make additional efforts that contribute to SRTC's success.

This policy explains how SRTC may provide recognition, service awards, and appreciation activities. It is intended to provide clear and practical guidance while ensuring recognition activities are reasonable, consistent, and supported by a legitimate public purpose.

1.2 Authority

This policy is adopted pursuant to RCW 41.60.150, applicable federal tax requirements, and established principles governing the expenditure of public funds by governmental agencies. RCW 41.60.150 authorizes public agencies to recognize employees for accomplishments including outstanding achievement, safety performance, longevity, and public service; with recognition awards not to exceed two hundred dollars in value per award. Although awards may be provided up to the statutory limit, SRTC generally intends to keep recognition awards modest, with most awards not to exceed $50.

SECTION 2: POLICY

2.1 General Requirements

SRTC may provide recognition awards or appreciation activities when:

a) The recognition serves a legitimate public purpose;
b) The contribution, achievement, service, or milestone being recognized is related to SRTC operations or governance;
c) The expenditure is reasonable, consistent with past practice and appropriate to the achievement;
d) The recognition is approved by the Executive Director or designee;
e) Adequate supporting documentation is maintained; and
f) Funding is available within an approved budget.

Nothing in this policy obligates SRTC to provide recognition under any circumstance.

2.2 Eligible Recognition

Recognition may be provided to employees, Board members, elected officials, committee members, citizen representatives, and volunteers for:

a) Outstanding achievement;
b) Exceptional public service;
c) Innovation or process improvements;
d) Completion of a term of service;

e) Successful completion of major projects;
f) Length of service; or
g) Other significant contributions to the agency.

Recognition provided to Board members, elected officials, or volunteers shall not constitute compensation, honoraria, or other personal benefit.

2.3 Recognition Events

SRTC may hold events or presentations as part of its recognition and appreciation activities. Costs associated with these activities, such as refreshments, may be covered if they follow applicable SRTC policies and are within the approved budget.

SECTION 3: GIFTS AND PROHIBITED EXPENDITURES

3.1 General Rule

Public funds shall not be expended for gifts that primarily provide a personal benefit to an individual rather than advancing a legitimate public purpose.

Recognition items shall be modest in nature and directly connected to service, achievement, participation, or contributions to SRTC.

3.2 Prohibited Recognition Items

SRTC funds shall not be used for:

a) Cash gifts;
b) Personal gifts unrelated to official service;
c) Wedding or baby shower gifts;
d) Alcoholic beverages;
e) Personal entertainment;
f) Political or campaign-related activities; or
g) Any expenditure that would constitute an impermissible gift of public funds.

Gift cards or cash-equivalent awards may be provided only for employee recognition, subject to Executive Director approval and applicable payroll and tax requirements. Such awards shall not be provided to Board members, elected officials, committee members, citizen representatives, or volunteers.

SECTION 4: APPROVAL AND DOCUMENTATION

Recognition expenditures shall receive prior approval from the Executive Director or designee. Documentation shall identify the recipient, reason for recognition, estimated cost, funding source, and supporting receipts or invoices.

SECTION 5: EFFECTIVE DATE

This policy is effective on the date adopted by the SRTC Board on mm/dd/yyyy.

DRAFT

RESOLUTION

of the BOARD OF DIRECTORS of the

SPOKANE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

R-26-31

ADOPTING THE RECOGNITION AND APPRECIATION POLICY

WHEREAS, the Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) serves as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Spokane Metropolitan Planning Area and the Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO) for Spokane County; and

WHEREAS, SRTC values the contributions of employees, Board members, committee members, volunteers, and others who support the agency's mission and regional transportation planning responsibilities; and

WHEREAS, SRTC desires to establish a formal policy governing recognition and appreciation activities to ensure recognition is administered consistently and reflects responsible stewardship of public resources; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Recognition and Appreciation Policy establishes guidelines for recognition activities, approval requirements, eligible forms of recognition, and related expenditures consistent with RCW 41.60.150 and applicable requirements governing the expenditure of public funds.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the SRTC Board adopts the Recognition and Appreciation Policy.

ADOPTED: 11/12/2026

ATTEST

Anadia Grier SRTC Clerk of the Board	Mayor Cris Kaminskas City of Liberty Lake Chair, SRTC Board of Directors

To: SRTC Board of Directors
From: Bailee Petersen, Communications and Public Relations Coordinator
Topic: Meals and Refreshments Policy

Requested Action:

Approve resolution R-26-32 to adopt the Meals and Refreshments Policy.

Key Points:

- The proposed Meals and Refreshments Policy establishes standards for the purchase and reimbursement of meals and refreshments associated with official agency activities.
- The policy provides clear administrative guidance regarding when meals and refreshments may be provided, including agency meetings, training events, public involvement activities, stakeholder meetings, and authorized recognition events.
- The policy identifies allowable and prohibited expenditures and establishes documentation requirements to support responsible use of public resources.
- Staff will provide an overview of the proposed policy and answer questions from the Board.
- The proposed policy is provided as an attachment for Board review and consideration.

Board/Committee Discussions:

The Administrative Committee reviewed the policies during their 09/10/2026 meeting, and the SRTC Board of Directors reviewed a draft of this policy at their 10/08/2026 meeting.

Public Involvement:

All Board meetings at which this policy is presented are open to the public.

Staff Contact: Bailee Petersen, SRTC | bpetersen@srtc.org | 509.343.6370

Spokane Regional Transportation Council

Meals and Refreshments Policy (Draft)

Adopted by the SRTC Board of Directors
Month, Date 2026

SECTION 1: PURPOSE AND AUTHORITY

1. 1 Purpose

The Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) is committed to being a responsible steward of public resources while creating opportunities for meaningful participation, collaboration, and engagement. In some circumstances, providing meals or refreshments can help support agency business by creating a welcoming environment, encouraging participation, and allowing attendees to remain engaged during meetings, trainings, workshops, and public involvement activities.

This policy explains when SRTC may purchase or reimburse meals and refreshments as part of official agency activities. It is intended to provide clear and practical guidance for staff while ensuring expenditures are reasonable, appropriately documented, and consistent with applicable state and federal requirements.

1. 2 Authority

This policy is adopted pursuant to Article VIII, Section 7 of the Washington Constitution, RCW 43.03.050, Washington State Administrative and Accounting Manual (SAAM) Sections 70.10 and 70.15. Meals and refreshments purchased with SRTC funds must serve a legitimate public purpose and comply with all applicable legal, financial, and grant funding requirements. With the exception of authorized travel expenses, meals and refreshments are not allowable expenses for federal planning funds allocated to SRTC.

SECTION 2: POLICY

2.1 General Requirements

SRTC may provide meals or refreshments when all the following conditions are met:

a) The event serves an official SRTC business purpose.
b) The expenditure is reasonable.
c) The expenditure is approved in advance by the Executive Director or designee.
d) Adequate supporting documentation is maintained.

Meals and Refreshments may also be provided in connection with awards and recognition events when those events are consistent with SRTC policy.

Nothing in this policy obligates SRTC to provide meals or refreshments under any circumstance.

2.2 Light Refreshments

SRTC may provide coffee, beverages, and light refreshments when:

a) The purpose of the meeting is to conduct official agency business or provide training;
b) The refreshments contribute to the effectiveness of the meeting or event; and
c) The costs are reasonable and consistent within available budgeted funds.

2.3 Meals

SRTC may provide meals when:

a) The meeting, training, workshop, conference, public involvement activity, or emergency response activity extends through a normal meal period;
b) Participants are expected to remain engaged during the meal period;
c) Providing a meal contributes to accomplishing the business purpose of the event; and
d) The costs are reasonable and consistent within available budgeted funds.

DRAFT

Meals included as part of an approved conference, training, seminar, or registration fee are permitted when associated with official agency business.

2.4 Business Meetings with Stakeholders

SRTC may also provide coffee, light refreshments, or a meal during small-group or one-on-one meetings with Board members, agency partners, community stakeholders, or other individuals when the meeting serves an official agency business purpose and the expenditure is reasonable and approved by the Executive Director or designee.

2.5 Grant-Funded Activities

When grant funds are used for meals or refreshments, expenditures must comply with the applicable requirements and restrictions of the funding source. Costs that are not allowable under a particular grant or funding source shall not be charged to or reimbursed from that funding source.

SECTION 3: PROHIBITED EXPENDITURES

SRTC funds shall not be used for:

a) Alcoholic beverages;
b) Employee birthday celebrations;
c) Employee recognition events primarily social in nature;
d) Entertainment activities;
e) Routine staff meetings where food is provided primarily for convenience;
f) Political, lobbying, or campaign-related activities; or
g) Any event that is primarily social rather than governmental in purpose.

SECTION 4: DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENTS

The following documentation shall be maintained for all expenditures made under this policy:

a) A completed purchase request form;
b) Attendee list or participating organizations, when practical;
c) Itemized receipts showing actual expenditures; and
d) Funding source documentation.

SECTION 5: EXCEPTIONS

The Executive Director may approve exceptions when extraordinary circumstances exist and a documented public purpose is demonstrated.

SECTION 6: EFFECTIVE DATE

This policy is effective on the date adopted by the SRTC Board on mm/dd/yyyy.

DRAFT

RESOLUTION

of the BOARD OF DIRECTORS of the

SPOKANE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

R-26-32

ADOPTING THE MEALS AND REFRESHMENTS POLICY

WHEREAS, the Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) serves as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Spokane Metropolitan Planning Area and the Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO) for Spokane County; and

WHEREAS, SRTC periodically conducts meetings, trainings, workshops, conferences, public involvement activities, stakeholder meetings, and other official agency functions that may require the provision of meals or refreshments in support of agency business; and

WHEREAS, SRTC desires to establish a formal policy governing the purchase and reimbursement of meals and refreshments to ensure expenditures are properly documented and comply with applicable legal, financial, and grant funding requirements; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Meals and Refreshments Policy establishes standards for allowable expenditures, documentation requirements, and prohibited uses of agency funds.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the SRTC Board adopts the Meals and Refreshments Policy.

ADOPTED: 11/12/2026

ATTEST

Anadia Grier SRTC Clerk of the Board	Mayor Cris Kaminskas City of Liberty Lake Chair, SRTC Board of Directors

To: SRTC Board of Directors
From: Lois Bollenback, Executive Director
Topic: Public Records Fee Schedule – Approval

Requested Action:

Approve resolution R-26-33 to adopt the Public Records Fee Schedule.

Key Points:

- The proposed fee schedule establishes charges for providing copies of public records using the state's default fees under RCW 42.56.120.
- The fee schedule outlines applicable copying and delivery charges while maintaining free access to inspect public records.
- Staff will provide an overview of the proposed fee schedule and the public hearing process and answer questions from the Board.
- The proposed fee schedule is provided as an attachment for Board review and consideration.

Board/Committee Discussions:

This is the first time the proposed Public Records Fee Schedule has been brought before the Board.

Public Involvement:

All Board meetings at which this topic is presented are open to the public.

Staff Contact: Lois Bollenback, SRTC | lbollenback@srtc.org | 509.343.6370

SRTC does not charge for locating public records or making records available for inspection. Under state law, SRTC may charge certain fees for providing copies of public records. These fees may include paper or electronic copies, scanning paper records into electronic format, electronic delivery, digital storage media, postage or delivery, mailing supplies, and copies made by an outside vendor when necessary. If an outside vendor is used, the requestor is responsible for the actual cost charged to SRTC. For small requests, SRTC may charge a flat fee of up to $2 instead of itemizing costs and may waive fees when appropriate. A deposit may be required. The fees listed below are authorized by RCW 42.56.120.

Spokane Regional Transportation Council Public Record Act Fee Schedule	
Inspection	
Inspection of agency records on the agency's public website or by scheduled appointment at the agency office.	No fee
Accessing or downloading records the agency routinely posts on its public website, unless the requestor asks that the records be provided by another method (the copy charges below then apply).	No fee
Copies	
Paper copies (photocopies or printing electronic records), B & W or color. 8x11; 8x14; 11x17	15 cents per page
Scanned records (converting a paper record to an electronic format).	10 cents per page
Records uploaded to email, a cloud-based data storage service, or other electronic delivery method.	5 cents per four electronic files or attachments
Electronic transmission of records, including the use of agency equipment to send records electronically.	10 cents per gigabyte for transmission of records in an electronic format
Digital storage media or device used for delivery of records: • CD • DVD • Thumb Drive • Other	Actual cost
Label, case, and/or sleeve for CD/DVD	Actual cost
Postage or delivery charges (based on the actual postage or delivery cost for the specific mailing or delivery used)	Actual cost
Copy charges listed above may be combined if more than one type of charge applies to a records request.	
Records Copied by Outside Source(s)	
If requested records must be copied by an outside vendor, the requestor will pay the actual amount invoiced to SRTC.	Actual cost
Customized Service Charge	
Customized electronic records services requiring specialized IT expertise. The requestor will be notified of the estimated cost before the work begins and may revise the request to reduce or avoid the charge.	Actual cost

Examples:

Installment contains	200 scanned pages x 10 cents per page	$20.00	
	40 electronic files / 4 = 10 x 5 cents	$0.50	
	50 MB		$0.00
	USPS Flat Rate Envelope		$12.90 +
		Total:	**$33.40**
Installment contains	80 scanned pages x 10 cents per page	$8.00	
	16 electronic files / 4 = 4 x 5 cents		$0.20
	1.2 GB transmitted electronically x 10 cents per GB		$0.12
	No postage (records delivered electronically)		$0.00 +
		Total:	**$8.32**
Small request containing	8 electronic files / 4 = 2 x 5 cents		$0.10
	15 scanned pages x 10 cents per page		$1.50 +
		~~**Total:**~~	~~**$1.60**~~
	SRTC to charge optional flat fee		**$2.00**
Customized Service Charge	IT services required to prepare a customized electronic compilation (per written estimate)		$85.00
	40 electronic files / 4 = 10 x 5 cents		$0.50 +
		Total:	**$85.50**

Example only. A customized service charge may be assessed only when SRTC determines that responding to a request requires the use of information technology expertise to prepare or provide electronic records in a customized manner that is not used for other agency purposes, consistent with RCW 42.56.120.

RESOLUTION

of the BOARD OF DIRECTORS of the

SPOKANE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

R-26-33

ADOPTING A PUBLIC RECORDS FEE SCHEDULE

WHEREAS, the Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) serves as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Spokane Metropolitan Planning Area and the Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO) for Spokane County; and

WHEREAS, the Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) does not charge for locating public records or making records available for inspection and desires to establish a fee schedule for providing copies of public records using the default fees authorized under RCW 42.56.120; and

WHEREAS, the fee schedule will identify applicable charges for copying and delivering public records and provide for deposits, a flat fee for small requests, and fee waivers when appropriate, promoting transparency and consistency in the administration of public records requests.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the SRTC Board adopts the proposed fee schedule.

ADOPTED: 11/12/2026

ATTEST

Anadia Grier
SRTC
Clerk of the Board

Mayor Cris Kaminskas
City of Liberty Lake
Chair, SRTC Board of Directors

To: SRTC Board of Directors
From: Lois Bollenback, Executive Director
Topic: Public Records Request and Records Management Policy

Requested Action:

Approve resolution R-26-34 to adopt the Public Records Request and Records Management Policy.

Key Points:

- The proposed Public Records Request and Records Management Policy establishes a framework for responding to public records requests and managing agency records.
- The policy provides clear administrative guidance to support consistent practices, promote transparency, and meet applicable state requirements.
- Staff will provide an overview of the proposed policy and answer questions from the Board.
- The proposed policy is provided as an attachment for Board review and consideration.

Board/Committee Discussions:

The Administrative Committee reviewed the policies during their 09/10/2026 meeting, and the SRTC Board of Directors reviewed a draft of this policy at their 10/08/2026 meeting.

Public Involvement:

All Board meetings at which this policy is presented are open to the public.

Staff Contact: Lois Bollenback, SRTC | lbollenback@srtc.org | 509.343.6370

Spokane Regional Transportation Council

Public Records Request and Records Management Policy (Draft)

Adopted by the SRTC Board of Directors
Month, Date 2026

Regional Transportation Decisions Start Here

The Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) is the lead agency for coordinating transportation planning activities in the Spokane region. SRTC serves as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the region and is responsible for ensuring compliance with federal transportation planning requirements. Since the Spokane Metropolitan Planning Area has a population of over 200,000, SRTC is also designated as a Transportation Management Area (TMA), which entails additional responsibilities and discretion in allocating certain federal transportation funds within the urbanized area. Finally, SRTC serves as the state-designated Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO) for Spokane County. RTPOs are voluntary associations of local governments, authorized under the 1990 Washington State Growth Management Act, to coordinate transportation plans at the local and regional levels.

As both the MPO and RTPO, SRTC is subject to the Washington State Public Records Act (Chapter 42.56 RCW), state records retention requirements under Chapter 40.14 RCW, and applicable federal recordkeeping and disclosure requirements associated with federal awards. SRTC shall manage, retain, and disclose public records in accordance with these laws and adopted agency policy.

DRAFT

SECTION 1: PURPOSE 4
1.1 Purpose 4
1.2 Public Records Officer Contact Information 4
SECTION 2: PROCEDURES 4
2.1 Requesting Public Records 4
2.2 Responding to Public Records Requests 5
2.3 Redactions and Denials 5
2.4 Access and Delivery of Records 5
2.5 Fees 6
2.6 Closing Requests 6
2.7 Records Holds 7
2.8 Review of Denials 7
SECTION 3: RECORDS MANAGEMENT 7
3.1 Purpose 7
3.2 Retention and Destruction 7
3.3 Transferring to the WA Archives 8
APPENDIX A 8

DRAFT

SECTION 1: PURPOSE

1.1 Purpose

The Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) is committed to transparency, accountability, and responsible records management. Public records are essential to maintaining public trust, and SRTC strives to provide timely and reasonable access to those records while protecting information exempt from disclosure.

This policy explains how SRTC responds to public records requests and how records are created, maintained, retained, and disposed. It is intended to be practical, easy to follow, and useful for both staff and the public. This policy is not intended to supersede or replace any provision of Ch. 42.56 RCW.

1.2 Public Records Officer Contact Information

SRTC designates a Public Records Officer (PRO) to serve as the primary point of contact for all public records requests. The PRO is responsible for coordinating responses, communicating with requestors, and ensuring compliance with applicable requirements.

While the PRO manages the process, all staff share responsibility for identifying and providing records that may be responsive to a request.

The Public Records Officer for the Spokane Regional Transportation Council can be contacted at:

Public Records Officer
421 W Riverside Ave, Suite 500
Spokane, WA 99201-3613
Phone: 509-343-6370

SECTION 2: PROCEDURES

2.1 Requesting Public Records

Members of the public may request records in writing, by email, in person, or by phone.

To help SRTC respond efficiently, requests should include:

- The requestor's name and contact information (a name is not required)
- A description of the records being requested
- Whether the requestor would like to view the records or receive copies

If a request is unclear, SRTC may ask for clarification before proceeding.

A Public Records Request form (**Appendix A**) is available from the Public Records Officer or may be obtained directly at SRTC's website at **www.srtc.org**. While use of the form is encouraged, it is not required. Submitting a written request helps SRTC ensure that the requestor receives the records sought, that any exemptions are properly

DRAFT

applied, and that any applicable copying charges are accurately calculated. SRTC staff are available to help document your request. Refusal to submit a written request may delay processing if additional clarification is needed.

2.2 Responding to Public Records Requests

SRTC will acknowledge receipt of the request within five business days.

As part of the acknowledgement SRTC will respond with one or more of the following:

- Provide the requested records or a link to the records
- Request additional clarification
- Denying the request in whole or in part
- Provide the time frame required to respond to the request

Some requests require additional time due to volume, complexity, and/or the need to review records for exemptions. In those cases, SRTC will communicate updates and may provide records in installments.

If a requestor does not respond to requests for clarification, fails to claim or submit payment for records, or fails to inspect available records within thirty days of a request or notification by SRTC, SRTC is entitled to close the request.

2.3 Redactions and Denials

SRTC will disclose public records unless a specific exemption applies. When a record contains both exempt and nonexempt information, only the exempt portion will be redacted.

If a request is denied, in whole or in part, SRTC will provide a written response that includes the legal basis for withholding the record and/or denying the request.

2.4 Access and Delivery of Records

Public records are available for inspection during normal business hours or may be provided electronically when feasible. Records are generally provided in the format in which they are maintained.

To protect the integrity of records:

- Original records will not be removed from SRTC custody
- Inspection will occur at the SRTC office or through approved electronic access

SRTC will provide reasonable accommodations for individuals with disabilities and will take reasonable steps to assist individuals with limited English proficiency.

DRAFT

2.5 Fees

SRTC may charge fees for the cost of providing copies of records, as set forth in the fee schedule below. Whenever possible, records will be provided electronically to reduce costs. The full fee schedule is available on the SRTC website.

If fees are charged, SRTC will use the rates established in the Washington Public Records Act (RCW 42.56.120, as amended), which apply when an agency does not calculate its own actual costs. At the time of approval of this policy, the rates are:

- $0.15 per page for paper copies
- $0.10 per page for scanned documents
- $0.05 for every 4 electronic files or attachments uploaded
- $0.10 per gigabyte for electronic transmission of records
- Actual cost of any digital storage device (e.g., USB drive)
- Actual cost of postage or shipping

Should fees allowed pursuant to RCW 42.56.120 be modified, this policy shall adopt the fees set forth in that provision and that provision shall supersede any fee set forth herein.

SRTC will use the most cost-efficient method available and does not charge for records already available on its website unless copies are specifically requested. SRTC also does not charge for inspecting public records or for the time spent searching for, reviewing, or redacting records.

For larger requests, SRTC may provide a cost estimate, require a deposit of up to 10%, and provide records in installments with payment due before each release.

As an alternative to the fee schedule herein, SRTC may charge a flat fee of up to $2 for small requests, rather than itemized costs, and may waive fees when appropriate.

In limited cases, SRTC may apply a customized service charge for requests requiring advanced data compilation or specialized electronic formatting. If so, SRTC will notify the requestor in advance, explain the charge, and provide an estimate.

2.6 Closing Requests

A request is considered complete when SRTC has provided all responsive, nonexempt records and notified the requestor.

A request may also be closed if:

- The requestor withdraws the request
- The requestor does not respond to clarification request within 30 days
- Required payment or inspection does not occur within the time specified by SRTC

SRTC will send the requestor a closing letter, which will identify the basis for SRTC's closure of the request, and notify the requestor of the applicable statute of limitations, and provide the requestor with a reasonable time to ask follow up questions, as applicable.

2.7 Records Holds

When SRTC becomes aware of a public records request, litigation, audit, or investigation, any related records must be preserved.

During a records hold:

- Relevant records must not be deleted or altered
- Staff will be notified by the PRO when the hold is in place and when it is lifted

2.8 Review of Denials

A requestor may seek review of a denial or redaction by submitting a written request to the Public Records Officer.

The Executive Director, or Public Records Officer, will review the denial or redaction and provide a written determination within a reasonable timeframe. This process does not limit the requestor's right to seek judicial review.

SECTION 3: RECORDS MANAGEMENT

3.1 Purpose

SRTC maintains records in accordance with state and federal requirements.

All staff are responsible for properly storing and retaining records they create or receive.

Records may exist in many formats, including email, documents, databases, maps, and audio or video recordings, and must be managed consistently.

Staff are expected to:

- Save records in approved SRTC systems, not on personal devices or accounts
- Maintain records in an organized and accessible manner
- Follow applicable retention schedules
- Avoid deleting records unless authorized
- Respond and provide records within a reasonable time to requests made by the PRO

3.2 Retention and Destruction

Records must be retained in accordance with the applicable retention schedules issued by the Washington State Archives and any applicable federal requirements.

DRAFT

Records may only be destroyed when:

- The required retention period has been met, and
- The records are not subject to a public records request, audit, litigation, or other hold

Destruction must be conducted securely and documented as required.

3.3 Transferring to the WA Archives

Certain records may be designated as archival and required to be transferred to the Washington State Archives after their retention period has been met.

The Public Records Officer is responsible for coordinating the transfer of records that have met their archival designation. This includes working with the Archives to ensure records are prepared, documented, and transferred in accordance with applicable requirements.

Staff may be asked to assist in identifying and preparing records for transfer. Records identified for archival transfer must not be destroyed.

DRAFT

APPENDIX A

Spokane Regional Transportation Council

Request for Inspection/Copying of Public Records
(Revised Code of Washington 42.56)

Date:	_____	**Time:**	_____
Name:	_____	**Company/Agency:**	_____
Address:	_____	**City:**	_____
State:	_____	**Zip Code:**	_____
Email:	_____	**Phone:**	_____

Identification/Description of Record(s) Sought:
Please be as specific as possible. We will be able to process your request faster if you clearly identify the records you are requesting to review. Note that pursuant to RCW 42.56.520 we have five (5) business days to respond to your request. (Copy fee is $.15 per page)

_____

_____

_____

If the record(s) sought is/are in the form of a list of named individuals, I certify, covenant, and warrant that such list will not be used for commercial purposes pursuant to RCW 42.56.070(9).

_____
Signature

For Department Use Only:

Request Received By: _____ **If requested granted, copy fee (if any):** _____

If request denied, wholly or partially, reasons are stated as follows:

_____

_____

Request for Review of Denial of Inspection:

Requester's Signature: _____

Received by Staff Member: _____

Signature of Dept. Head: _____

Denial Overturned: _____
Denial Modified: _____
***Denial Upheld** _____
**result if no action taken by end of second business day*

RESOLUTION

of the BOARD OF DIRECTORS of the

SPOKANE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

R-26-34

ADOPTING THE PUBLIC RECORDS REQUEST AND RECORDS MANAGEMENT POLICY

WHEREAS, the Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) serves as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Spokane Metropolitan Planning Area and the Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO) for Spokane County; and

WHEREAS, SRTC is committed to transparency, public access to records, and responsible records management; and

WHEREAS, SRTC is subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, state records retention requirements under Chapter 40.14 RCW, and applicable federal recordkeeping requirements; and

WHEREAS, the SRTC Board of Directors desires to adopt the Public Records Request and Records Management Policy to establish consistent procedures for responding to public records requests and managing agency records.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the SRTC Board adopts the Public Records Request and Records Management Policy.

ADOPTED: 11/12/2026

ATTEST

Anadia Grier SRTC Clerk of the Board	Mayor Cris Kaminskas City of Liberty Lake Chair, SRTC Board of Directors

To: SRTC Board of Directors
From: Benjamin Kloskey, Associate Transportation Planner II
Topic: CY 2027 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Guidebook – Approval

Requested Action:

Approve Resolution R-26-35 approving 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 in 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 and October 2026 meetings, unanimously recommending approval in October. The Board discussed the 2027 TIP Guidebook 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

RESOLUTION

of the BOARD OF DIRECTORS of the

SPOKANE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

R-26-35

ADOPTING THE CY 2027 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM GUIDEBOOK

WHEREAS, the Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) Board of Directors serves as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Spokane Metropolitan Planning Area (SMPA) and as the Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO) for Spokane County; and

WHEREAS, SRTC is responsible for developing a 4-year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); and

WHEREAS, the Calendar Year (CY) 2027 TIP Guidebook has been developed under the direction of the SRTC Board in consultation with local government staff, Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), and Spokane Transit Authority (STA).

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the SRTC Board adopts the Calendar Year 2027 Transportation Improvement Program Guidebook.

ADOPTED: 11/12/2026

ATTEST

Anadia Grier SRTC Clerk of the Board	Mayor Cris Kaminskas City of Liberty Lake Chair, SRTC Board of Directors

To: SRTC Board of Directors
From: Ryan Stewart, Principal Transportation Planner
Topic: Town of Fairfield Comprehensive Plan Certification

Requested Action:

Approve Resolution R-26-36 certifying the Town of Fairfield's 2026 Comprehensive Plan 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:

Both the TAC and TTC at their 10/28/26 meetings unanimously recommended Board certification of the Town of Fairfield's 2026 Comprehensive Plan Update.

Public Involvement:

All SRTC Board and Committee meetings are open to the public. The Town's public engagement is detailed in the comprehensive plan document on page 1 and in Appendix A (separate document).

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:

RESOLUTION

of the BOARD OF DIRECTORS of the

SPOKANE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

R-26-36

CERTIFYING THE TOWN OF FAIRFIELD 2026 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

WHEREAS, the Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) Board of Directors serves as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Spokane Metropolitan Planning Area (SMPA) and as the Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO) for Spokane County; and

WHEREAS, the Washington State Growth Management Act requires that RTPOs certify that the transportation elements of jurisdictions' comprehensive plans and the countywide planning policies are consistent with the regional transportation plan, Horizon 2050; and

WHEREAS, the Washington State Growth Management Act requires that RTPOs certify that the comprehensive plans and countywide planning policies meet the requirements of RCW 36.70A.070; and

WHEREAS, the SRTC Comprehensive Plan Certification Process Update was developed under the direction of the SRTC Board of Directors in consultation with local government staff, Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), and Spokane Transit Authority (STA), and with opportunity for input from members of the public; and

WHEREAS, the SRTC Comprehensive Plan Certification Process Update was adopted by Resolution R-26-03 by the SRTC Board of Directors on 01/08/26.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the SRTC Board of Directors certifies the Town of Fairfield 2026 Comprehensive Plan Update.

ADOPTED: 11/12/2026

ATTEST

Anadia Grier SRTC Clerk of the Board	Mayor Cris Kaminskas City of Liberty Lake Chair, SRTC Board of Directors

To: SRTC Board of Directors
From: Ryan Stewart, Principal Transportation Planner
Topic: Town of Latah Comprehensive Plan Certification

Requested Action:

Approve Resolution R-26-37 certifying the Town of Latah's 2026 Comprehensive Plan.

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:

Both the TAC and TTC at their 10/28/26 meetings unanimously recommended Board certification of the Town of Latah's 2026 Comprehensive Plan. The Town's public participation efforts are detailed in the comprehensive plan document on page 4 and in Appendix A.

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 st			
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:

RESOLUTION

of the BOARD OF DIRECTORS of the

SPOKANE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

R-26-37

CERTIFYING THE TOWN OF LATAH 2026 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

WHEREAS, the Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) Board of Directors serves as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Spokane Metropolitan Planning Area (SMPA) and as the Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO) for Spokane County; and

WHEREAS, the Washington State Growth Management Act requires that RTPOs certify that the transportation elements of jurisdictions' comprehensive plans and the countywide planning policies are consistent with the regional transportation plan, Horizon 2050; and

WHEREAS, the Washington State Growth Management Act requires that RTPOs certify that the comprehensive plans and countywide planning policies meet the requirements of RCW 36.70A.070; and

WHEREAS, the SRTC Comprehensive Plan Certification Process Update was developed under the direction of the SRTC Board of Directors in consultation with local government staff, Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), and Spokane Transit Authority (STA), and with opportunity for input from members of the public; and

WHEREAS, the SRTC Comprehensive Plan Certification Process Update was adopted by Resolution R-26-03 by the SRTC Board of Directors on 01/08/26.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the SRTC Board of Directors certifies the Town of Latah 2026 Comprehensive Plan.

ADOPTED: 11/12/2026

ATTEST

Anadia Grier SRTC Clerk of the Board	Mayor Cris Kaminskas City of Liberty Lake Chair, SRTC Board of Directors

To: SRTC Board of Directors
From: Ryan Stewart, Principal Transportation Planner
Topic: Town of Rockford Comprehensive Plan Certification

Requested Action:

Approve Resolution R-26-38 certifying the Town of Rockford's 2026 Comprehensive Plan.

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:

Both the TAC and TTC at their 10/28/26 meetings unanimously recommended Board certification of the Town of Rockford's 2026 Comprehensive Plan.

Public Involvement:

All SRTC Board and Committee meetings are open to the public. The Town's public involvement is detailed in the comprehensive plan document in Appendix D.

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:

RESOLUTION

of the BOARD OF DIRECTORS of the

SPOKANE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

R-26-38

CERTIFYING THE TOWN OF ROCKFORD 2026 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

WHEREAS, the Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) Board of Directors serves as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Spokane Metropolitan Planning Area (SMPA) and as the Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO) for Spokane County; and

WHEREAS, the Washington State Growth Management Act requires that RTPOs certify that the transportation elements of jurisdictions' comprehensive plans and the countywide planning policies are consistent with the regional transportation plan, Horizon 2050; and

WHEREAS, the Washington State Growth Management Act requires that RTPOs certify that the comprehensive plans and countywide planning policies meet the requirements of RCW 36.70A.070; and

WHEREAS, the SRTC Comprehensive Plan Certification Process Update was developed under the direction of the SRTC Board of Directors in consultation with local government staff, Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), and Spokane Transit Authority (STA), and with opportunity for input from members of the public; and

WHEREAS, the SRTC Comprehensive Plan Certification Process Update was adopted by Resolution R-26-03 by the SRTC Board of Directors on 01/08/26.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the SRTC Board of Directors certifies the Town of Rockford 2026 Comprehensive Plan.

ADOPTED: 11/12/2026

ATTEST

Anadia Grier
SRTC
Clerk of the Board

Mayor Cris Kaminskas
City of Liberty Lake
Chair, SRTC Board of Directors

To: SRTC Board of Directors
From: Ryan Stewart, Principal Transportation Planner
Topic: Town of Waverly Comprehensive Plan Certification

Requested Action:

Approve Resolution R-26-39 certifying the Town of Waverly's 2026 Comprehensive Plan.

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:

Both the TAC and TTC at their 10/28/26 meetings unanimously recommended Board certification of the Town of Waverly's 2026 Comprehensive Plan.

Public Involvement:

All SRTC Board and Committee meetings are open to the public. The Town's public engagement is detailed in the comprehensive plan document on page 13 and Appendix A.

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:

RESOLUTION

of the BOARD OF DIRECTORS of the

SPOKANE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

R-26-39

CERTIFYING THE TOWN OF WAVERLY 2026 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

WHEREAS, the Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) Board of Directors serves as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Spokane Metropolitan Planning Area (SMPA) and as the Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO) for Spokane County; and

WHEREAS, the Washington State Growth Management Act requires that RTPOs certify that the transportation elements of jurisdictions' comprehensive plans and the countywide planning policies are consistent with the regional transportation plan, Horizon 2050; a9nd

WHEREAS, the Washington State Growth Management Act requires that RTPOs certify that the comprehensive plans and countywide planning policies meet the requirements of RCW 36.70A.070; and

WHEREAS, the SRTC Comprehensive Plan Certification Process Update was developed under the direction of the SRTC Board of Directors in consultation with local government staff, Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), and Spokane Transit Authority (STA), and with opportunity for input from members of the public; and

WHEREAS, the SRTC Comprehensive Plan Certification Process Update was adopted by Resolution R-26-03 by the SRTC Board of Directors on 01/08/26.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the SRTC Board of Directors certifies the Town of Waverly 2026 Comprehensive Plan.

ADOPTED: 11/12/2026

ATTEST

Anadia Grier SRTC Clerk of the Board	Mayor Cris Kaminskas City of Liberty Lake Chair, SRTC Board of Directors

To: SRTC Board of Directors
From: Eve McMenamy, Deputy Executive Director
Topic: CY 2027 Unified List Priority Statements (Federal Version) – Draft

Requested Action:

None. For information and discussion.

Key Points:

- The SRTC Unified List serves as a strategic tool for communicating current regional transportation priorities to state and federal legislators for potential funding opportunities. SRTC updates a state and federal version of the list annually.
- Last month, the SRTC Board approved Resolution R-26-29, establishing the CY 2027 Unified List of Project Priorities for both the state and federal versions of the list.
- The Unified List package also includes legislative priority statements as well as the approved regional project priorities. Staff will review updates to the 2027 Draft Federal Priority Statements, see **Attachment**.

Board/Committee Discussions:

The SRTC Board approved Resolution R-26-13, establishing the CY 2027 Unified List process and criteria, on 05/14/2026. The CY 2027 Unified List of Projects and Priority Statements were presented to the TTC and TAC on 08/26/2026 and to the SRTC Board on 09/10/2026. The TTC and TAC recommended approval of the projects included in the Unified List on 09/23/2026. On 10/08/26, the SRTC Board approved Resolution R-26-29, establishing the State Version of the Unified List and the Federal Project Priorities.

Public Involvement:

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

Staff Contact:

Eve McMenamy, SRTC | evemc@srtc.org | 509.343.6370

Legislative Priority Statements

FEDERAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BILL REAUTHORIZATION PRIORITIES

Enact a Robust, Multi-Year Transportation Reauthorization Act

- Pass a comprehensive reauthorization that provides long-term funding certainty and stability for transportation infrastructure investments.
- Ensure funding levels are sufficient to maintain and strengthen critical transportation programs, including the Bridge Investment Program (BIP).
- Provide certainty beyond Continuing Resolutions, short-term funding measures, and establish predictable federal investment that allows states and local communities to plan, prioritize, and deliver critical infrastructure projects.

SRTC urges our federal partners to prioritize a strong, long-term commitment to transportation infrastructure through timely reauthorization.





Renew funding for critical programs that improve transportation safety

- Nearly 95% of people who die using our Nation's transportation networks are killed on our streets, roads, and highways.
- U.S. Roadway fatalities declined consistently for 30 years, but progress has stalled. An estimated 39,345 lives lost on US roads in 2024—down slightly from 43,230 in 2021 which was the largest number of fatalities since 2005.[1]
- The Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and Safe Streets for All (SS4A) provide critical funding to reduce traffic fatalities and serious injuries.
- Continued SS4A funding is especially important as location agencies transition from safety planning to implementing projects that deliver measurable improvements.

SRTC encourages our federal partners to continue funding HSIP and SS4A programs into the next transportation reauthorization to support safety efforts and save lives.

DRAFT

1 USDOT. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Early Estimate of Motor Vehicle Traffic Fatalities in 2024. Traffic Safety Facts Crash Stats Brief Statistical Summary. DOT HS 813 710. Washington, DC: NHTSA, April 2025. https://crashstats.nhtsa.dot.gov/Api/Public/ViewPublication/813710.

Expand funding for transportation system maintenance and preservation

- The nation's highways, roads, and bridges connect people to jobs and schools, support communities, and support our existing economy by moving goods to market.
- FHWA estimated a $1 trillion backlog in repairs and maintenance needed to improve the condition of more than 619,000 bridges and 4 million miles of public roads.[2]
- Federal infrastructure funding has helped address aging transportation infrastructure, but sustained investment is needed beyond the current authorization to maintain and preserve the existing system.
- Long-term, predictable funding allows state and local agencies to plan preservation projects, maintain adequate staffing, and deliver needed repairs efficiently.

SRTC supports a long-term, balanced approach to transportation funding that provides stable, predictable resources for system maintenance and preservation.



Strengthen core formula funding and preserve local access to federal resources

- Core federal formula programs provide predictable funding for states, metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs), and local governments to address transportation needs.
- Increased investment in Metropolitan Planning (PL) funds and the Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) program is needed to support regional planning, project delivery, and growing transportation demands. Proposed PL funding increases are welcome, but inflation limits their impact.
- Local funding set-asides within the Bridge Investment Program (BIP) and the proposed Surface Transportation Assistance Grant (STAG) program help ensure communities can access resources to address regional priorities.
- Predictable funding for core formula and public transportation programs, including through advanced appropriations, supports long-term capital planning, timely project delivery, and continued transit services.

SRTC encourages Congress to strengthen core federal funding programs, preserve local access to federal resources, and ensure funding distributions remain transparent, predictable, and equitable.

Modernize the federal funding formula to ensure funding equitably supports population centers

- The federal highway funding formula relies on outdated data that may not adequately reflect current population and transportation needs.
- Washington's population grew by more than 30% between 2000 and 2020, compared with just under 19% nationally, increasing demands on transportation infrastructure. (footnote)
- A sustainable federal transportation program also requires a long-term solution to the Highway Trust Fund's structural funding challenges.

SRTC encourages modernization of the federal highway funding formulas using current data that better reflects population growth, transportation demand, and infrastructure needs, while pursuing sustainable revenue sources to support predictable, long-term federal transportation investment.

DRAFT

2 USDOT, Federal Highway Administration, FHWA Budget Estimates FY 2023, submitted to the Committees on Appropriations (Washington, DC: U.S. DOT, March 2022), accessed September 29, 2025, https://www.transportation.gov/sites/dot.gov/files/2022-03/FHWA_Budget_Estimates_FY23.pdf.

Expand direct recipient status for certain federal funding programs

- MPOs often rely on state DOTs to pass through federal funding, which can create administrative delays and limit flexibility in addressing regional transportation needs.
- Direct recipient status for select federal programs could streamline funding, expedite project delivery, and strengthen accountability by allowing MPOs to align investments with adopted regional plans and local priorities.
- Direct access should complement existing coordination among states, MPOs, and local governments while preserving collaborative transportation planning.

SRTC supports direct recipient eligibility for select federal funding programs to improve funding flexibility, reduce administrative delays, and accelerate delivery of regional transportation priorities.

Continue federal investments in public transportation

- Public transportation is essential to regional mobility, connecting people to jobs, education, services, and communities. In Spokane County, Spokane Transit provides urban service, while intercity, tribal, & specialized transportation services connect rural communities & smaller cities.
- Federal funding supports transit operations, capital improvements, and regional connectivity.
- The Capital Investment Grant (CIG) program helped fund Spokane Transit's City Line, the region's first Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project. Spokane Transit plans to seek CIG funding for Division Street BRT, a regional priority consistent with Horizon 2050.

SRTC encourages sustainable federal public transportation funding, including the CIG program, to support transit improvements, regional connectivity, and growing mobility needs.

Streamline project delivery while maintaining environmental stewardship

- Duplicative reviews, uncertain timelines, and administrative delays can increase project costs and slow implementation of regional transportation priorities.
- Improved coordination among federal, state, regional, and local agencies can reduce unnecessary delays, improve schedule predictability, and make more effective use of public resources.
- Project delivery reforms should maintain meaningful environmental review, public involvement, and consistency with adopted local and regional transportation plans.

SRTC encourages that the next transportation bill streamline federal project delivery and permitting processes to reduce delays, improve coordination, and accelerate transportation investments while maintaining environmental stewardship and public engagement.



DRAFT

Additional Policy Statements

Ensure access to transportation in support of affordable housing strategies

- Ensure access to affordable, reliable, and equitable transportation options which are an integral component of affordable housing strategies.
- Provide additional resources to local jurisdictions to plan, accelerate, and accommodate affordable housing.

Fund regionally critical projects of SRTC & MPOs

- Invest in projects collaboratively identified by the SRTC Board of Directors in the Unified List.
- Finish what we have started by prioritizing projects that already have significant investments.

Encourage development of alternative fuel technologies

- Support the development of electric charging infrastructure.
- Support and monitor the development of alternative fuels across the spectrum of vehicle types through pilot projects or other means.

Address funding gaps that are anticipated due to the loss of gas tax revenue

- Plan for long-term transportation funding needs as gas tax revenues become less sustainable over time.
- Support pilot projects that will assist in identifying transportation revenue strategies.

Enhance transportation investments supporting Fairchild Air Force Base

- Support transportation strategies that ensure air force personnel are able to access Fairchild Air Force Base (FAFB) safely and in accordance with military response times.

DRAFT








To: SRTC Board of Directors
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 project will build on this baseline information and move toward fully capturing potential ITS needs and strategies at the regional level.
- Routine stakeholder coordination will take place over the next few months. The final plan deliverable is scheduled for completion in Spring 2027.

Board/Committee Discussions:

A project update was previously provided to the Board in June. The TTC/TAC were updated last month.

Public Involvement:

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

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

To: SRTC Board of Directors
From: Angela Paparazzo, Associate Transportation Planner II
Topic: WSDOT Consolidated Grant Project Rankings Process

Requested Action:

None. For information and discussion.

Key Points:

- The WSDOT Consolidated Grant Program released its application for the 2027-2029 biennium in June 2026. The competitive program supports public transportation related projects, including service between cities and within rural areas, paratransit/special needs transportation, mobility management, and new/replacement vehicles.
- For the 2027-2029 cycle, WSDOT will award consolidated funding from six state and federal sources. Project guidance is from our local Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan.
- The state's application review process requires RTPOs to submit regional rankings for projects submitted to the Consolidated Grant Program. As the RTPO for Spokane County, SRTC facilitates the project ranking process for this region. Rankings are based on A-B-C allocations from the state. The RTPO rankings are used as an input in WSDOT's statewide evaluation of projects.
- An evaluation committee of 6 volunteers from the TTC and TAC was assembled to score and rank 4 locally submitted projects.
- A recommendation for the final rankings will come before the TTC and TAC at the respective November meetings, with Board action to approve the project rankings in December. The Board-approved rankings will then be submitted to the state.

Board/Committee Discussions:

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

Public Involvement:

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

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

To: SRTC Board of Directors
From: Lois Bollenback, Executive Director
Topic: Executive Director's Monthly Report

Requested Action:

None. For information only.

Key Points:

Ongoing/Upcoming Public Events & Activities

- SRTC staff hosted the 4th Annual Regional Transportation Summit in partnership with Greater Spokane Incorporated. Drawing an audience of ~160 participants, this year's program was titled "Bridging the Funding Gap: Building Momentum for Change."

Transportation Funding – Awards & Opportunities

Grant Program	Close Date	Available Funding	Agency
Wildlife Crossings Pilot Program (WCPP)	11/16/2026	$80 million	FHWA

- The City of Spokane received an award of $396,000 in state funding from the 2025-27 Sandy Williams Connecting Communities Pilot Program for pedestrian and bicycle improvements, and the creation of a largescale mural for the I-90/Perry Street underpass.

SRTC Administrative Committee Activity

- The SRTC Administrative Committee held a meeting on 10/28/2026 to complete the annual performance review of the Executive Director. Members in attendance received a presentation by the Director including an overview of the 2026 work plan and noteworthy accomplishments as well as a discussion regarding the financial position of SRTC. Members met in Executive Session to discuss their assessment of performance.

Staff Contact: Lois Bollenback, SRTC| lbollenback@srtc.org | 509.343.6370

Transportation Technical Committee 10/28/2026

ACTION ITEMS

CONSENT AGENDA

The consent agenda, which included the September TTC meeting minutes, was approved.

Vice Chair Clark made a motion to approve the consent agenda as presented. Ms. Note seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

CY 2027 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) GUIDEBOOK- APPROVAL

Mr. Kloskey presented the draft 2027 TIP Guidebook for Board recommendation. Updates clarify retroactive approval of the contingency list for timely funding transfers and revise TIP schedules and deadlines.

Mr. Weathers made a motion to recommend SRTC Board approval of the CY 2027 TIP Guidebook as presented. Vice Chair Clark seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

TOWN OF FAIRFIELD COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CERTIFICATION

Mr. Stewart presented Fairfield's 2026 Comprehensive Plan Update for certification and found it generally consistent with Horizon 2050. The plan emphasizes maintaining transportation service levels and coordinating maintenance and preservation with WSDOT and Spokane County.

Mr. Picanco made a motion to recommend SRTC Board certification of the Town of Fairfield's Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update as presented. Mr. Weathers seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

TOWN OF LATAH COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CERTIFICATION

Mr. Stewart presented Latah's comprehensive plan update for certification and found it consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan. The plan anticipates maintaining free-flowing traffic and coordinating with WSDOT and Spokane County on transportation data.

Mr. Jackson made a motion to recommend SRTC Board certification of the Town of Latah's Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update as presented. Mr. Wagemann seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

TOWN OF ROCKFORD COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CERTIFICATION

Mr. Stewart presented Rockford's comprehensive plan for certification and found it consistent with Horizon 2050. The plan includes a robust climate element and coordination with WSDOT and Spokane County on traffic counts and maintenance.

Mr. Weathers made a motion to recommend SRTC Board certification of the Town of Rockford's Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update as presented. Mr. Jackson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

TOWN OF WAVERLY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CERTIFICATION

Mr. Stewart presented Waverly's 2026 Comprehensive Plan for certification and found it generally consistent with Horizon 2050. The plan anticipates continued low traffic volumes and emphasizes coordination with WSDOT and Spokane County.

Vice Chair Clark made a motion to recommend SRTC Board certification of the Town of Waverly's Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update as presented. Mr. Picanco seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

BICYCLE LEVEL OF TRAFFIC STRESS (LTS) UPDATE RESULTS – DRAFT

Ms. Paparazzo presented draft bicycle Level of Traffic Stress results for the Horizon 2050 Bicycle Priority Network and requested member feedback by November 30. The committee is scheduled to review the final results in December, with Board approval in January.

INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS (ITS) PLAN UPDATE – CONDITIONS & NEEDS

Mr. Lien presented progress on the regional ITS Plan update, highlighting needs for improved traveler information, technology infrastructure, and incident coordination. Stakeholder feedback will guide strategies and recommendations, and the Board is expected to approve the plan in spring 2027.

AGENCY UPDATE AND FUTURE ITEMS

Mr. Fletcher reminded members that the November and December committee meetings would be held one week earlier, on November 18 and December 16, to accommodate the holidays.

Transportation Advisory Committee 10/28/2026

ACTION ITEMS

CONSENT AGENDA

The consent agenda, which included the September TAC meeting minutes, was approved.

Ms. Zentz made a motion to approve the consent agenda as presented. Mr. Aranda seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

CY 2027 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) GUIDEBOOK- APPROVAL

Mr. Kloskey presented the annual TIP Guidebook updates for Board recommendation, including a policy clarification allowing staff to reallocate contingency funds before Board approval when necessary. Other revisions update the TIP development timeline and programming schedules.

Mr. Braaten made a motion to recommend SRTC Board approval of the CY 2027 TIP Guidebook as presented. Mr. Hansen seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

TOWN OF FAIRFIELD COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CERTIFICATION

Mr. Stewart presented the Town of Fairfield's Comprehensive Plan Update and found it generally consistent with Horizon 2050 and applicable planning requirements. The plan anticipates stable population and low traffic volumes over the 20-year planning period.

Vice Chair Barber made a motion to recommend SRTC Board certification of the Town of Fairfield's Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update as presented. Ms. Winkler seconded the motion. Mr. Braaten abstained. The motion passed unanimously.

TOWN OF LATAH COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CERTIFICATION

Mr. Stewart presented the Town of Latah's Comprehensive Plan Update, noting its general consistency with Horizon 2050 and applicable planning requirements. The plan anticipates no population growth and minimal traffic congestion over the 20-year planning period.

Ms. Winkler made a motion to recommend SRTC Board certification of the Town of Latah's Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update as presented. Mr. Eash seconded the motion. Mr. Braaten abstained. The motion passed unanimously.

TOWN OF ROCKFORD COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CERTIFICATION

Mr. Stewart presented the Town of Rockford's Comprehensive Plan Update, noting its consistency with Horizon 2050 and applicable planning requirements. He commended the Town for including a climate element focused on community resiliency, despite not being required to do so.

Mr. Weathers made a motion to recommend SRTC Board certification of the Town of Rockford's Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update as presented. Mr. Jackson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

TOWN OF WAVERLY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CERTIFICATION

Mr. Stewart presented the Town of Waverly's Comprehensive Plan Update, noting its general consistency with Horizon 2050 and applicable planning requirements. The plan anticipates modest population growth and minimal traffic congestion, while emphasizing coordination on agricultural freight needs.

Ms. Zentz made a motion to recommend SRTC Board certification of the Town of Waverly's Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update as presented. Mr. Barber seconded the motion. Mr. Braaten abstained. The motion passed unanimously.

INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

BICYCLE LEVEL OF TRAFFIC STRESS (LTS) UPDATE RESULTS – DRAFT

Ms. Paparazzo presented the draft Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress analysis, which evaluates riding comfort and barriers along the region's Bike Priority Network. Members were asked to review the draft and submit comments or corrections by November 30, ahead of a final review in December and anticipated Board adoption in January.

INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS (ITS) PLAN UPDATE – CONDITIONS & NEEDS

Mr. Lien shared progress on the ITS Plan update, highlighting regional needs for better traveler information, technology connections, and emergency response coordination. Stakeholder feedback will guide strategies and improvements, with plan completion anticipated in spring 2027.

AGENCY UPDATE AND FUTURE ITEMS

Mr. Kloskey reminded members that the November and December TAC meetings will be held one week earlier due to the holidays. He also encouraged members to consider serving as Chair or Vice-Chair next year.