Spokane Regional Transportation Council

Transportation Technical Committee Meeting

Wednesday, November 18, 2026 at 1:00 PM
Hybrid In Person/Virtual Meeting

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

https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81656202452?pwd=ko00IK05dn3InHnTeoD5VRTtBLLqA6.1
Meeting ID: 816 5620 2452 | Passcode: 547271

By Phone 1-253-215-8782
Meeting ID: 816 5620 2452 | Passcode: 547271
Or find your local number: https://us02web.zoom.us/u/kbB00xwxF

SRTC welcomes public comments at the Transportation Technical Committee meetings.
The deadline for submitting written comments is 10:00 am on the day of the meeting and can be submitted:

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

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

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

Spokane Regional Transportation Council

Transportation Technical Committee Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, November 18, 2026 – 1:00 pm

Time	Item #		Page #
1:00	1	**Call to Order/Record of Attendance**	
1:05	2	**Public Comments/TTC Member Comments/Chair Report on November Board of Directors Meeting**	

FOR ACTION

1:10	3	**Consent Agenda** a) October TTC Meeting Minutes	3
1:15	4	**City of Spokane Valley Comprehensive Plan Certification** *(Ryan Stewart)*	10
1:20	5	**City of Deer Park Comprehensive Plan Certification** *(Ryan Stewart)*	19
1:25	6	**City of Spokane Comprehensive Plan Certification** *(Ryan Stewart)*	28
1:30	7	**WSDOT Consolidated Grant Project Ranking** *(Angela Paparazzo)*	37

INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

1:35	8	**Updating SRTC Land Use to Reflect Local Comprehensive Plans** *(David Fletcher)*	38
1:50	9	**2027 Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) Officers Election** *(David Fletcher)*	39

INFORMATION: No Presentation

1:55	10	**Agency Update and Future Information Items** *(David Fletcher)*	
2:00	11	**Adjournment** *(Chair)*	

Transportation Technical Committee Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, October 28, 2026– 1:00 pm

1 Call to Order/ Excused Absences

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

In attendance were:

Committee Members:

Pete Fisch
City of Airway Heights
Dan Ferguson
City of Cheney
Luke Michaels
City of Liberty Lake
Inga Note
City of Spokane
Colin Quinn-Hurst
City of Spokane
Kevin Picanco
City of Spokane
Adam Jackson
City of Spokane Valley
Jerremy Clark (Vice Chair)
City of Spokane Valley
Sonny Weathers
Small Cities/Towns Rep
Jami Hayes
Spokane County
Matt Zarecor (Alt Brandi Colyar)
Spokane County
Samantha Hennessy
SRHD
Brian Jennings
STA
Tara Limon (Chair)
STA
Shauna Harshman
WSDOT-ER
Glenn Wagemann
WSDOT-ER

Absent Members:

Julia Whitford
Kalispel Tribe

Barry Greene
Spokane County
Margee Chambers
Spokane Clean Air
Maria Cullooyah
Spokane Tribe
Mike Pea
WSDOT-ER

Guests:

Tyler Kimbrell
City of Spokane
Kristen Armstrong
City of Spokane Valley
Dan Pratt
City of Deer Park
LeAnn Yamamoto
CommuteSmart NW
Riannon Zender
J-U-B Engineers
Stu Barton
J-U-B Engineers
Monica Harwood Duncan
Citizen Engineers
Paul Kropp

Staff:

Eve McMenamy
Deputy Executive Director
Bailee Petersen
Comm. & PR Coor.
Anadia Grier
Admin-Exec Coor.
Hayley Harrison
Interim Admin-Exec Coor.
Jason Lien
Transp. Planning Manager
David Fletcher
Principal Transp. Planner
Ryan Stewart
Principal Transp. Planner
Michael Redlinger
Associate Transp. Planner 3
Ben Kloskey
Associate Transp. Planner 2
Angela Paparazzo
Associate Transp. Planner 2

DRAFT

 # 2 Public Comments
There were no public comments.

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

Chair Report on SRTC Board Meeting
Chair Limon gave a brief overview of October's SRTC Board meeting.

ACTION ITEMS

 # 3 Consent Agenda

a. September TTC Meeting Minutes

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

 # 4 CY 2027 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Guidebook – Approval
Mr. Kloskey presented the draft 2027 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Guidebook and requested a recommendation for Board approval. He noted that he had introduced the proposed changes at the previous month's meeting.

The guidebook establishes annual TIP goals and objectives, the policies for scheduling and allocating project funding to achieve those goals, and key deadlines. It serves as a resource for member agencies, the Board of Directors, and advisory committee members. First developed in 2013, the guidebook is updated annually to reflect revised schedules, procedures, and funding policies.

Mr. Kloskey explained that the principal policy change added to the contingency funding process in Policy 6.8, clarifying how Policy 3.6 applies. The addition documents the ability to approve the contingency list retroactively when timely funding transfers are needed to meet the region's obligation target—the target for formally committing federal funds to projects.

He cited an example from April of the current year involving two City of Spokane projects funded through National Highway System (NHS) Asset Management. Preservation funds needed to be reallocated to another project promptly so they could be committed toward the regional obligation target. The revised language clarifies that this process is available while preserving the Board's authority to reject or modify the action at its next meeting.

Other revisions updated the 2028–2031 TIP development schedule, schedules and submission deadlines for administrative modifications and amendments by local member agencies, and the anticipated timing of the next call for projects in late spring 2028.

DRAFT

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.

 # 5 Town of Fairfield Comprehensive Plan Certification

Mr. Stewart presented the Town of Fairfield's 2026 Comprehensive Plan Update for certification. Fairfield was one of four Palouse small towns scheduled for certification review at the meeting. He thanked town clerks, staff, and consultant teams for their communication and completed certification checklists, recognizing the towns' limited staff and resources.

Providing context for the four reviews, Mr. Stewart explained that most of the towns are located along State Route 27, with Waverly nearby. He noted the route's association with the 208-mile Palouse Scenic Byway, designated in 2011. The towns share small populations, limited infrastructure, transportation systems primarily serving vehicle traffic, and no transit service. Their transportation work focuses largely on maintenance and preservation in coordination with the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and Spokane County. He also explained that certain Growth Management Act requirements concerning greenhouse gas reduction and reductions in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per person do not apply to these towns.

Mr. Stewart reviewed SRTC's responsibility as a Regional Transportation Planning Organization to evaluate comprehensive plans for consistency with Horizon 2050, the Regional Transportation Plan. The review considers applicable transportation requirements, guidelines, and recommended practices.

Fairfield's consultant team submitted the completed certification checklist in September. Following his review, Mr. Stewart found the plan generally consistent with Horizon 2050 and reflective of most applicable guidelines, with good practices in several areas. He highlighted the plan's consideration of resilience and climate impacts despite the town's population of approximately 600 and no forecasted population growth.

The plan anticipates maintaining existing transportation service levels and identifies coordination with WSDOT and Spokane County on traffic counts, maintenance, and preservation activities.

Mr. Stewart also noted that Fairfield was incorporated on March 3, 1905, and had been recognized in 2010 as the only town in the United States to celebrate Flag Day for 100 consecutive years.

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.

DRAFT

 # 6 Town of Latah Comprehensive Plan Certification

Mr. Stewart reported that the Town of Latah's consultant staff submitted its completed certification checklist in late September. He reviewed the checklist and found it complete, determining that the comprehensive plan update was consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan and reflected most mandatory elements and applicable guidelines.

Latah has a population of 185, with no population growth forecast over the 20-year planning period. Mr. Stewart noted that the town is not required to meet requirements for reducing greenhouse gas emissions or vehicle miles traveled per person. The plan forecasts maintaining transportation level of service A, indicating generally free-flowing traffic with minimal delay, throughout the planning period. It also identifies coordination with the Washington State Department of Transportation and Spokane County on traffic counts and other information.

Mr. Stewart shared a historical point of interest, stating that the Copelan brothers discovered prehistoric remains near Latah in 1980, which he described as the largest Columbian mammoth skeletons known at the time.

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.

 # 7 Town of Rockford Comprehensive Plan Certification

Mr. Stewart presented the Town of Rockford's comprehensive plan for certification, referring members to his memorandum beginning on page 29 of the meeting packet and the accompanying checklist. The town's consultant staff submitted the checklist in early September. After reviewing the checklist and the plan's transportation-related elements, he found them consistent with Horizon 2050, the Regional Transportation Plan, and reflective of most applicable guidelines.

Although Rockford is not required to include strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions or vehicle miles traveled per person, Mr. Stewart noted that its plan includes a robust climate element. The town has a current population of 570 and forecasts an increase of 66 residents over the planning period.

Rockford has low traffic volumes and transportation level of service A, indicating generally free-flowing traffic with minimal delay. It currently has no transit service. The plan identifies coordination with the Washington State Department of Transportation and Spokane County on traffic counts and maintenance activities.

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.

 # 8 Town of Waverly Comprehensive Plan Certification

DRAFT

Mr. Stewart presented the Town of Waverly's 2026 Comprehensive Plan as the final comprehensive plan certification review for the month. After reviewing the submitted checklist and comprehensive plan, he found the plan generally consistent with the guiding principles and policies of Horizon 2050, the Regional Transportation Plan. It also reflected most applicable guidelines and recommended planning practices.

Waverly currently has a population of 120 and forecasts an increase of 11 residents over the next 20 years. The plan identifies low traffic volumes and transportation level of service A, indicating generally free-flowing traffic with minimal delay, which is expected to continue throughout the planning period. The town currently has no transit service.

Mr. Stewart highlighted the town's close coordination with the Washington State Department of Transportation and Spokane County. Although Waverly is a few miles from State Route 27, the plan recognizes the highway's importance to the town and the potential for traffic passing through the community.

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

9 Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) Update Results – Draft

Ms. Paparazzo presented draft results of the bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) analysis for the Horizon 2050 Bicycle Priority Network. She explained that the analysis shows how the network functions and identifies barriers jurisdictions could address to improve bicycling conditions.

LTS ranks bicycling conditions according to how safe and comfortable they feel. A rating of 1 represents comfortable conditions, while ratings of 3 and 4 indicate stressful conditions that many people cannot or will not use. Ratings consider factors including the number of through traffic lanes, vehicle speeds, lane widths, and average daily traffic volumes.

Ms. Paparazzo asked committee members to review the draft results in the AGOL Data Hub map titled "Draft Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress Horizon 2050 Bicycle Priority Network." Links were provided in the packet. Members were asked to email feedback to her before November 30, particularly regarding whether the results matched their understanding of the bicycle network.

She plans to return to the committees in December with final results for a recommendation to the SRTC Board, followed by presentation to the Board in January for acceptance.

Vice Chair Clark asked whether an analysis document was available in addition to the map. Ms. Paparazzo clarified that no separate analysis document existed and that the documentation was included in the geographic information system (GIS) map.

DRAFT

Vice Chair Clark also questioned how buffered bicycle lanes were treated in the ratings. He stated that the Department of Transportation's metrics did not assign a benefit to buffered bicycle lanes and asked whether the analysis followed the department's design manual tables or another method. Ms. Paparazzo responded that the analysis did not consider whether a bicycle lane was separated, but instead considered bicycle lane width and the distance between the designated bicycle lane and vehicle traffic. Vice Chair Clark indicated that the response did not fully resolve his question and said he would follow up.

 # 10 Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Plan Update – Conditions & Needs

Mr. Lien provided an update on the regional Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Plan, which began over the summer. SRTC is managing the project with consultant support from Citizen Engineers. Consultant lead Monica Harwood Duncan was available on the call to answer questions. Mr. Lien explained that ITS uses computing, sensors, and communications to connect vehicles, transportation infrastructure, and travelers, with the goals of reducing congestion, improving safety, and making travel across transportation modes more efficient.

The project is nearing completion of Task 2, a review of existing plans and conditions. A draft existing conditions memorandum was available through a link in the meeting packet for stakeholder review. Task 3, stakeholder engagement and identification of regional ITS needs, is continuing. Staff and consultant have completed four joint stakeholder interviews and held the first workshop with the Spokane Regional Transportation Management Center (SRTMC) Operations Board the previous week. Mr. Lien presented preliminary themes from that work and asked members whether they reflected their experiences or whether additional needs should be included.

For regional traveler information, stakeholders recognized the SRTMC's value as a central source for roadway conditions and disruptions. Partner agencies can enter roadway impacts directly into its website, but participation and consistency vary. No standard operating procedure for agency reporting was apparent. Planned platform upgrades would provide additional capacity for reporting future events and detours. Stakeholders also expressed interest in adding Spokane County snowplow or winter operations information. Transit information is not currently integrated into the website; stakeholders preferred a clearer link to Spokane Transit Authority information, recognizing STA's expertise in transit operations.

Needs related to communications infrastructure and equipment included gaps in regional camera coverage, aging equipment, and older or unreliable technologies that limit the transmission of larger amounts of data. The use of different vendors, technologies, and sensors within and across agencies creates compatibility and information-sharing challenges. Stakeholders expressed interest in expanding fiber-optic connections and sharing infrastructure, while addressing security concerns and establishing formal agreements. The planning process will seek to clarify sharing procedures and constraints on how systems can work together.

DRAFT

For major events and disruptions, stakeholders described interagency coordination as generally positive but noted that processes can seem improvised during region-wide incidents. Identified needs included stronger regional preparedness, established routes for diverting traffic, expanded incident response coverage, and Traffic Incident Management training for all responders. Mr. Lien noted that WSDOT's Incident Response Team has only three people covering the region. Stakeholders also identified a need to clarify transportation agencies' roles when a centralized emergency operations center is activated.

The project will examine the ability to adjust traffic signals remotely during major events, disruptions, and reroutes. Mr. Lien noted that the number of evacuees during the complex fires overwhelmed the transportation system regardless of signal timing, although adjustments could potentially help people leave an affected area more quickly. He also described WSDOT's Virtual Coordination Center as a shared digital workspace and dashboard for multiagency incident response. Established in the Puget Sound region, it could offer a platform for improving coordination in this region.

Mr. Lien explained that the plan update also includes an ITS architecture—a technical framework documenting how transportation technologies connect, exchange information, and function together. The framework uses RAD-IT, a nationally developed software tool, to inventory existing systems and devices, document services, data exchanges, and agency responsibilities.. This technical work complements the broader planning effort, which may produce operational recommendations or policy changes.

Next steps include incorporating stakeholder feedback and finalizing the existing conditions memorandum, updating the ITS architecture, and developing strategies and the plan over the next several months. The team will continue coordinating with stakeholder agencies through group discussions and individual follow-up. The final plan and SRTC Board acceptance are scheduled for spring 2027.

In response to Chair Limon's question about the memo review deadline, Mr. Lien confirmed that feedback was requested by Friday, October 30. He asked stakeholders needing additional time to contact him. Members were invited to send further observations or questions to Mr. Lien or Ms. Harwood Duncan.

INFORMATION (NO PRESENTATION)

 # 11 Agency Update

Mr. Fletcher reminded members that the November and December committee meetings would each be held one week earlier to accommodate the holidays. He identified the anticipated meeting dates as November 18 and December 16.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:34 PM.

_____

Anadia Grier, Clerk of the Board

DRAFT

To: Transportation Technical Committee
From: Ryan Stewart, Principal Transportation Planner
Topic: City of Spokane Valley Comprehensive Plan Certification

Requested Action:

Recommend SRTC Board certification of the City of Spokane Valley's 2046 Comprehensive Plan Update.

Key Points:

- The SRTC Board adopted the Comprehensive Plan Certification Process update on 01/08/26.
- The City of Spokane Valley staff provided an early draft of their Draft 2046 Comprehensive Plan Update (titled "Valley 2046 Planning Our Future Together") for review by SRTC on 08/12/26. Additional materials were received on 10/29/26.
- SRTC staff have reviewed the city's Comprehensive Plan transportation chapter and other related elements.
- SRTC staff completed the checklist as part of this review and provided it to city staff. City staff responded with clarifications and additional information.
- SRTC staff find that the city's transportation chapter and other related elements are consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan, Horizon 2050.
- SRTC staff find that the city's transportation element meets the other requirements as detailed in the SRTC Comprehensive Plan Certification Process.
- Please see the **Attachment** for the checklist details.

Board/Committee Discussions:

This is the first discussion of the City of Spokane Valley's Comprehensive Plan certification with the TTC.

Public Involvement:

All SRTC Board and Committee meetings are open to the public. The city had an extensive public engagement effort, which is detailed in a summary document on their website.

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

Review Checklist

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

Applicant/Agency: City of Spokane Valley

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

Date of Submission:
8/12/2026 (draft)
Anticipated Date of Plan Adoption:
December 15, 2026

Contact Person: Steve Roberge
Email: sroberge@spokanevalleywa.gov

Regional Consistency and GMA Conformity
The checklist will be used to assess and document for conformity with the GMA transportation element content requirements and consistency with the adopted regional transportation plan (RTP).

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response		Plan Page #
1. Was the update coordinated with neighboring jurisdictions and tribes (if applicable) and regional transportation agencies? *RCW 36.70A.100*	☑ Yes ☐ No If yes, check all the apply: ☑ WSDOT ☑ STA ☐ Kalispel Tribe of Indians ☐ Spokane Tribe of Indians ☑ Spokane County ☑ Liberty Lake, Millwo	If no, please provide explanation:	1-9

SRTC Comments:

SRTC coordination mentioned on page LU-70 and T-93.

2. Is the plan consistent with relevant countywide planning policies? *RCW 36.70A.100*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	LU-69, 70, 77, H-125, and T-93

SRTC Comments:

Consistency with regional population and employment allocations, Ensuring land use plans support and are consistent with regional transportation planning by the Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) and Spokane Transit Authority (STA). Consistent with CPP's affordable housing policies and UGA process.

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:	LU-70, T-94, T-122, P-226, NR-240 and 252, 24-25
SRTC Comments:			
Support for Horizon 2050 acknowledged in Exhibit 74, on page T-94, T-111 and T-112. Transportation Safety, Connectivity and Multimodal Investment page 1-10. Part of Community Values page 1-13. In Transportations Goals T-P2 and identified in transportation costs Exhibit 86.			
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:	T-93, T-100 through T-111, CF-171,
SRTC Comments:			
Detailed on pages T-100 through T-111. Exhibit 32. Multimodal facilties in Exhibits 33 and 34, framework in Exhibits 35 and 36. Referenced in Capital Facilities element page CF-170 and Exhibit 74.			
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:	LU-70, T-93, T-112 and 113.
SRTC Comments:			
Modeling of land use alternatives to project forecasted volumes (no statistically significant differences between alternatives). Also, consistency with CPP, regional allocations, as well as SRTC and STA planning.			

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:	T-106, 112 T-103
SRTC Comments:			
MMLOS framework encourages non-SOV travel. "Due to the planned expansion of the multimodal infrastructure, Spokane Valley anticipates higher growth rates for active transportation modes compared to auto traffic, which is consistent with the expectations of Horizon 2050, SRTC's long range transportation and land use vision."			
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:	T-103 through 108
SRTC Comments:			
City has a recent (2026) Active Transportation Plan and results are incorporated into Transportation element. MMLOS framework encourages non-SOV travel. Increasing bike and pedestrian facilities/networks. Policy CR-P17.			
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:	T-105 through 107
SRTC Comments:			
Comp plan doesn't directly reference SRTC's regional bicycle network but City uses Level of Traffic Stress that is consistent and leads to supportive policies and planning. Exhibit 35 MMLOS framework.			
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:	T-110 and 111, T-122 and 123
SRTC Comments:			
"Spokane Valley has street design standards that support freight movement and are consistent with SRTC's regional freight ne development." Policies LU-P8, T-G4, T-P10.			

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:	T-122
SRTC Comments:			
References "higher density development supported by a strong multimodal transportation network that includes high-performance transit, better bicycle/pedestrian connections, and convenient auto access to new infill 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:	Separate document dated 2024.
SRTC Comments:			
The City of Spokane Valley ADA Self Evaluation and Transition Plan 2024 was provided by city staff.			
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: While not addressed in the transportation element,	NR-252, CR-257 264-5, H-140
SRTC Comments:			
Reference: "City can guide development that is environmentally responsible, economically competitive, and socially equitable." "climate resilience and GHG emissions reduction that prioritizes equitable outcomes for all residents." "ensure equitable access to resources."			
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:	T-94, 103, 121
SRTC Comments:			
References CMP strategies to improve safety. Developing Active Transportation Plan to improve safety, accessibility, and connectivity for people walking, biking, and rolling. Policy T-G3 Continually improve roadway design and engineering standards to maximize traffic safety. Policy T-P7 Support local, regional, state, and federal transportation safety programs. "providing buffers between sidewalks and lanes of traffic, such as landscaping or on-street parking, can also increase safety and comfort for pedestrians, particularly on arterial streets." Complete Streets Policy.			

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:	T-113 and 114, 118
SRTC Comments:			
2050 forecasted volumes and LOS.			
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:			
Not being requested.			
16. Does the environmental analysis address the proposed use or density and intensity of use and analyze multimodal transportation impacts, including impacts to neighboring jurisdictions, transit facilities, and the state transportation system?	☐ Yes ☐ No	N/A	
SRTC Comments:			
N/A			
17. Is consultation with WSDOT on impacts to state-owned transportation facilities clearly documented, including any necessary mitigation?	☐ Yes ☐ No	N/A	
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:	2-24, 2-25, T-94, T-105 and 106.
SRTC Comments:			
Policies T-G7 and T-P21. The City uses Level of Traffic Stress, will also be included in Active Transportation Plan. Exhibit 35 MMLOS Framework. Refers to STA's transit LOS standards.			
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:	T-105
SRTC Comments:			
"The City uses the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) MMLOS measure of Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) as an interim measure for bicycle and pedestrian facilities and planning, pending future official action." WSDOT MMLOS standards not final yet. Does not reference SRTC's standards but uses SRTC model data for forecasted LOS.			
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:	T-118 through 123. CF-187
SRTC Comments:			
"Spokane Valley recognizes that implementing MMLOS measures in practice for specific developments may require more work than is outlined in this plan, especially in terms of balancing roadway LOS, Transit MMLOS, and bicycle and pedestrian LOS measures. Therefore, the City identifies further work is needed for MMLOS implementation in its street standards." State MMLOS standards under development, not final yet.			

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:	2-36 and 38. CR-262 and 263,
SRTC Comments:			
GHG emissions reduction sub-element of Climate and Resiliency Element. "Key local actions include reducing passenger vehicle travel, reducing energy use in existing buildings, decarbonizing new and existing buildings, facilitating the transition to electric vehicles, and diverting waste from landfills." Policies CR-G6 and P16.			
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:	2-36 through 2-38. CR-263 through CR-266
SRTC Comments:			
Policies CR-G1, G3, P2, P6, P7, P8.			
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:	CF-188 and 189
SRTC Comments:			
References to Capital Improvement Plan and transportation impact fees. Exhibit 86.			

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:	CF-188 and 189
SRTC Comments:			
Exhibit 86			
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:	CF-187
SRTC Comments:			
"Should funding fall short to meet adopted levels of service, the City shall reassess the Land Use Element of the comprehensive plan to ensure new development may be adequately served." Exhibit 86.			

Additional Explanation	
Question:	Comment:

To: Transportation Technical Committee
From: Ryan Stewart, Principal Transportation Planner
Topic: City of Deer Park Comprehensive Plan Certification

Requested Action:

Recommend SRTC Board certification of the City of Deer Park Comprehensive Plan Update.

Key Points:

- The SRTC Board adopted the Comprehensive Plan Certification Process update on 01/08/26.
- The consultant for the City of Deer Park provided their Draft Comprehensive Plan update for review by SRTC on 10/21/2025.
- Adoption of the plan was delayed until December 2026. The city's consultant confirmed there are no changes to the transportation element on 11/03/2026.
- SRTC staff have reviewed the City's Comprehensive Plan transportation chapter and other related elements. Staff filled out the SRTC portion of the certification checklist as part of this review.
- SRTC staff find that the City's transportation chapter and other related elements are consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan, Horizon 2050.
- SRTC staff find that the City's transportation element meets the other requirements as detailed in the SRTC Comprehensive Plan Certification Process.
- Please see the **Attachment** for the completed certification checklist.

Board/Committee Discussions:

This is the first discussion of the City of Deer Park's Comprehensive Plan certification.

Public Involvement:

All SRTC Board and Committee meetings are open to the public. The city's comprehensive plan public participation is described on page 3 of the draft plan document.

Staff Contacts: Angela Paparazzo, SRTC | apaparazzo@srtc.org | 509.343.6376
Ryan Stewart, SRTC | rstewart@srtc.org

Review Checklist

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

Applicant/Agency: City of Deer Park

Type of Review: **Comprehensive Plan** ☑ Periodic Update ☐ Amendment	**Date of Submission:** 10/21/25 (original), 11/11/26 (SRTC up **Anticipated Date of Plan Adoption:** December 2026

Contact Person: Derrick Braaten
Email: dbraaten@jub.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 ☑ Fairchild AFB ☐ _____	If no, please provide explanation:	Pages 49 - 83
SRTC Comments: Mentioned throughout the plan			
2. Is the plan consistent with relevant countywide planning policies? *RCW 36.70A.100*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	Page 16
SRTC Comments: The introduction of the comp plan cites the relevant county wide planning policies. Included in 3.4 County-wide Planning 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:	Page 75 - 80

SRTC Comments:

RTP Guiding Principles and Policies are included in 10.6.3 Spokane Regional Transportation Council.

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:	Page 18, 69-73

SRTC Comments:

Included in the transportation chapter of the comprehensive plan.

10.4 Non-Motorized Modes includes rail, transit, airport (Page 69 - 73)

4.1.8 Inventories Accompanying the Steering Committee's Guidelines (Page 18)

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:	Pages 30-46

SRTC Comments:

5.1 County-wide Planning Policies, 1-11, Urban Growth Areas (page 30)

6.1 Land use Capacity Analysis (Page 37)

6.2 Population: Table 2 2023-2046 Population Forecasts for all Spokane County Jurisdictions (Page 35)

Chapter 7: Land Use includes citation of RCW 36.70A.070 (Page 46)

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:	Pages 82-86
SRTC Comments: Included in 10.8 Transportation Goals and Policies (Pages 82-86)			
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:	Page 55-57, 74
SRTC Comments: Included in 7.2 County-wide Planning Policies, Policy Topic No. 5 Transportation (Page 55) Included in LU 4-3 (Page 57) 10.4 Non-Motorized Modes (Page 74)			
8. Do bicycle and pedestrian-supportive policies, programs, and projects address SRTC's Regional Bicycle Route Priority Network?	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	Page 81
SRTC Comments: Included in Policy topic No.5 Transportation (Page 81)			
9. Do the land use and transportation elements address and plan for freight mobility and accessibility on the corridors within SRTC's Regional Freight Priority Network?	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	Page 50 and 76
SRTC Comments: freight priority network mentioned and cited in 10.7 in County wide planning policies and the land use chapter (Page 76) Policy Topic No. 3 Promotion of Contiguous and Orderly Development and Provisions of Urban Services (Page 49-50)			

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response		Plan Page #
10. Does the land use element support increased urban densities and transportation-efficient development and redevelopment?	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	Page 53
SRTC Comments:			
Included in the land use chapter: Goal No. 7 Policy LU 7-3 (Page 53)			
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:	Page 81
SRTC Comments:			
Included in the transportation chapter: Goal No 9, Policy T 9-1 (Page 81)			
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:	Page 81
SRTC Comments:			
Included in the transportation chapter: Goal No 9, Policy T 9-1 - T 9-6 (Page 81)			
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:	Page 54
SRTC Comments:			
Included in the land used chapter: Policy LU 7-6 (Page 54)			

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:	Page 80-81
SRTC Comments:			
T 6-6 (page 80) Goal No. 9 (Page 81)			
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	N/A	N/A
SRTC Comments:			
Not seeking exemption			
16. Does the environmental analysis address the proposed use or density and intensity of use and analyze multimodal transportation impacts, including impacts to neighboring jurisdictions, transit facilities, and the state transportation system?	☐ Yes ☐ No	N/A	N/A
SRTC Comments:			
N/A			
17. Is consultation with WSDOT on impacts to state-owned transportation facilities clearly documented, including any necessary mitigation?	☐ Yes ☐ No	N/A	N/A
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 LOS only.	Pages 71-72, 81
SRTC Comments:			
Vehicular (intersections and road segments) LOS only. No MMLOS standards set but Transportation Goal No. 9 supports a multimodal transportation system.			
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: WSDOT HSS MMLOS standards not established yet.	Page 73, 75
SRTC Comments:			
10.6 Coordination with other agencies, 10.6.1 Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT MMLOS standards are in progress and not finalized yet). 10.6.3 SRTC LOS does not apply, no regional mobility corridors besides US 395 which is a HSS (WSDOT LOS applies).			
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: Not MMLOS.	Page 73
SRTC Comments:			
Vehicular only, Table T-7.			

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:	Page 81
SRTC Comments:			
Included in the transportation element. Goal No. 9: Policy T 9-2 - T 9-4. (Page 81)			
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:	Page 81
SRTC Comments:			
Included in transportation element. Goal No. 9: Policy T 9-2 (Page 81)			
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:	Page 6
SRTC Comments:			
Included in Capital Facilities plan and Utilities Element: 3.1 Six year capital improvement plan (Page 6)			

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:	Page 6, 84
SRTC Comments:			
Included in Capital Facilities plan and Utilities Element: 3.1 Six year capital improvement plan.			
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: No probable funding shortfalls.	Page 6, 84
SRTC Comments:			
No probable funding shortfalls.			

Additional Explanation	
Question:	Comment:

To: Transportation Technical Committee
From: Ryan Stewart, Principal Transportation Planner
Topic: City of Spokane Comprehensive Plan Certification

Requested Action:

Recommend SRTC Board certification of the City of Spokane's Comprehensive Plan Update.

Key Points:

- The SRTC Board adopted the Comprehensive Plan Certification Process update on 01/08/26.
- The City of Spokane staff provided their Draft 2046 Comprehensive Plan (titled "PlanSpokane") for review by SRTC on 8/31/2026.
- SRTC staff have reviewed the City's Comprehensive Plan transportation chapter and other related elements. Staff filled out the SRTC portion of the certification checklist as part of this review.
- SRTC staff find that the City's transportation chapter and other related elements are consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan, Horizon 2050.
- SRTC staff find that the City's transportation element meets the other requirements as detailed in the SRTC Comprehensive Plan Certification Process.
- Please see the **Attachment** for the completed certification checklist.
- Please see the following referenced materials for more details:
    - Draft 2046 Comprehensive Plan
    - Chapter 4: Transportation
    - Appendix 3: Transportation

Board/Committee Discussions:

This is the first discussion of the City of Spokane Comprehensive Plan certification.

Public Involvement:

All SRTC Board and Committee meetings are open to the public. The city's public involvement for the plan update is summarized in this community engagement summary.

Staff Contacts: Angela Paparazzo, SRTC | apaparazzo@srtc.org | 509.343.6370
Ryan Stewart, SRTC | rstewart@srtc.org

Review Checklist

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

Applicant/Agency: City of Spokane

Type of Review: **Comprehensive Plan** ☑ Periodic Update ☐ Amendment	**Date of Submission:** 8/31/2026 **Anticipated Date of Plan Adoption:** 12/2/2026

Contact Person: Colin Quinn-Hurst
Email: cquinnhurst@spokanecity.org

Regional Consistency and GMA Conformity
The checklist will be used to assess and document for conformity with the GMA transportation element content requirements and consistency with the adopted regional transportation plan (RTP).

Checklist Criteria	Agency Response		Plan Page #
1. Was the update coordinated with neighboring jurisdictions and tribes (if applicable) and regional transportation agencies? *RCW 36.70A.100*	☑ Yes ☐ No If yes, check all the apply: ☑ WSDOT ☑ STA ☑ Kalispel Tribe of Indians ☑ Spokane Tribe of Indians ☑ Airway Heights ☑ Spokane Valley	If no, please provide explanation:	Draft EIS: Pages 1-39, 3-287 Chapter 4: Page 2 Appendix 3: Page 332 - 333 and 335 - 337
SRTC Comments: Included in the Transportation Chapter 4 (Page 2), and in DEIS (Pages 1-39, 3-285, 3-287). Included in Appendix 3 (Table 2) and detailed in Berk Sept 1, 2026 memo included in Appendix 3 (Page 32-333 and 335-337)			
2. Is the plan consistent with relevant countywide planning policies? *RCW 36.70A.100*	☑ Yes ☐ No	If no, please provide explanation:	Draft EIS: Page 56, 57, 304
SRTC Comments: Draft EIS: 3.6, Relationship to Plans, Policies, and Regulations. Includes concurrency with Countywide Planning Policies (Page 307-345). Appendix 3 F&P memo (172-3), DEIS pages 1-30 and 3-191.			

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:	Ch. 7: Page 2; Ch. 4: Pages 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12
SRTC Comments:			
Economic Vitality: Chapter 4: Pages 4, 5, 12. Cooperation & Leadership: Chapter 4: Pages 1-6. Stewardship: Chapter 4: Pages 7, 8, 9. System Operations, Maintenance & Preservation: Chapter 4: Pages 5, 8, 10. Safety & Security: Chapter 4: Pages 3, 6, 7. Choice & Mobility: Chapter 4: Pages 4, 8, 9, 10, 11. Quality of Life: Chapter 4: Pages 3, 7.			
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:	Appendix 3, Part 1, Pages 9-22
SRTC Comments:			
Inventory included in "Appendix 3 - Transportation; Part 1, Transportation Facilities Plan: 2027-2046" (Pages 9-24).. Inventory Included in the Transportation Chapter; Maps TR-1 through TR-11 (Pages 18-33).			
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:	Draft EIS: Pages 74, 316, 324, 329, 346-400
SRTC Comments:			
Draft EIS: The EIS identified and analyzes a range of alternatives that describe different growth strategies. 2.1 Includes land use alternatives regarding employment and housing forecasts; Including infill housing development (SB 5412). (Page 74)			

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:	Draft EIS: pg. 399 Appendix 3 pg. 230
SRTC Comments:			
Appendix 3 - Transportation, Part 7: Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Memo. (Page 230-247) Transportation Demand Strategies (TDM) included in the Draft EIS (Page 399). Chapter 4, beginning on page 8, Goal TR-3 and associated policies., Policies TR-9.2 and TR-9.3			
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:	Appendix 3, pgs. 133-166, and pgs. 51-131
SRTC Comments:			
Appendix 3 - Transportation includes the Spokane Bicycle Master Plan (133-167) Appendix 3 - Transportation includes the Spokane Pedestrian Master Plan (50-132) Chapter 4, Goal TR-1, Goal TR-3 Policy TR-3.5			
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:	Appndx 3, pgs. 36-37
SRTC Comments:			
Included in Appendix 3 - Transportation Part 2: Planning Documents Reviewed. Includes SRTC's Regional Bicycle Priority Network (Pages. 36-37) . Appendix 3, Transportation Part 10, Bicycle Priority Network Documentation (Pages 319-332).			
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:	Ch. 4 Page 12; Appendix 3 Page 16
SRTC Comments:			
Included in Transportation Chapter, (Page 12); Map TR-7: Freight & Goods Tonnage (Pages 26, 27); and Map TR-8: Heavy Haul Network (Page 28, 29). Included in Appendix 3 - Transportation, Freight Network (Page 16).			

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:	Draft EIS Page. 7-8, 98, 104-112
SRTC Comments:			
Proposed urban density alternatives are introduced in the draft EIS (Pages 7-8). Exhibit 2.4-1. Alternatives Overview included in the draft EIS (Page 98). Included in the draft EIS in 2.4.3 Alternative 2: Distributed and Balanced (Page 104-112). Chapter 4, Policy TR-4.1.			
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:	Appendix 3 Page 10; Ch. 4 Pg 7
SRTC Comments:			
Included in Appendix 3 - Transportation (Page 10) Included in Chapter 4; Policy TR-1.5 (Page 7) ADA Transition plan can be found on the City of Spokane Website: https://my.spokanecity.org/accessibility/			
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:	Ch. 4 pg. 9 Appendix 3 pgs. 32, 248
SRTC Comments:			
Included in Chapter 4; Policy TR-3.1 (Page 9) Included in Appendix 3 (Pages 32 & 248)			
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:	Ch. 4 pg. 6 Draft EIS pg. 378, 381, 387, 390, 394, 396
SRTC Comments:			
Included in Chapter 4; Policy 1.1 - 1.7 (Page 6) Included in draft EIS; (Pages 378, 381, 387, 390, 394, 396)			

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:	Appendix 3, page 36 Draft EIS pgs. 397-400
SRTC Comments:			
Included in Appendix 3: Table TR-6 (Page 36) Included in draft EIS (Page 397-400)			
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		Draft EIS pg. 610
SRTC Comments:			
Included in Draft EIS 5.4 Potential Infill Exemption Location (Page 610). FEIS references Chapter 6, Appendix E. Fact Sheet page iii: "the Preferred Alternative facilitates growth through an infill exemption (RCW 43.21c.229) along frequent transit routes, particularly bus rapid transit. The City may also raise SEPA thresholds citywide (WAC 197-11-800) or in targeted areas in the city."			
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		Draft EIS pg. 614
SRTC Comments:			
Map included in draft EIS: Exhibit 7: Phased SEPA Proposed Infill / Categorical Exemption Area. (Page 614)			
17. Is consultation with WSDOT on impacts to state-owned transportation facilities clearly documented, including any necessary mitigation?	☑ Yes ☐ No		DEIS pg.11, 365 Appendix 3: page 335
SRTC Comments:			
Documentation Includes: - Draft EIS: Distribution list of those notified of the availability of the Draft EIS was published is included (Page 11); Exhibit 3.7-10. Existing State Facility Performance (v/c Ratio) (Page 365, 366) - Appendix 3: Meetings with WSDOT specific to SEPA infill housing exemption included (Page 335) - SRTC staff received an email on 9/23/2026 from WSDOT that staff has coordinated with the City.			

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:	Appendix 3 pgs. 26, 214
SRTC Comments:			
Included in Appendix 3 - Transportation (Pages 26, 214)			
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:	Appendix 3, pages 171-180
SRTC Comments:			
Included in Appendix 3 - Transportation (Pages 171-180)			
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:	Appendix 3, pgs. 26, 212, 213
SRTC Comments:			
Included in Appendix 3 - Transportation (Pages 26, 212, 213)			

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:	Chapter 4, page 14.
SRTC Comments:			
Included in Chapter 4: Goal TR-9, Policies TR-9.1 - TR-9.9 (Page 14)			
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:	Chapter 4, Page 15
SRTC Comments:			
Included in Chapter 4, Goal TR-10, Policies TR-10.1 - TR 10.4 (Page 15)			
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:	Appendix 3: Page 30
SRTC Comments:			
Financial Tables (TR 3, TR 4) included in Appendix 3 - Transportation - identify the projected high and low ends of expected revenue (TR 3) and projected project costs (TR 4). (Page 30)			

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:	Appendix 3, Pages 30
SRTC Comments:			
Financial Tables (TR 3, TR 4) included in Appendix 3 - Transportation - identify the projected high and low ends of expected revenue (TR 3) and projected project costs (TR 4). (Page 30)			
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:	Appendix 3, Pages 30
SRTC Comments:			
Financial Tables (TR 3, TR 4) included in Appendix 3 - Transportation - identify the projected high and low ends of expected revenue (TR 3) and projected project costs (TR 4). (Page 30)			

Additional Explanation	
Question:	Comment:

To: Transportation Technical Committee
From: Angela Paparazzo, Associate Transportation Planner II
Topic: WSDOT Consolidated Grant Project Ranking

Requested Action:

Recommend SRTC Board approval of the final project rankings.

Key Points:

- The WSDOT Consolidated Grant Program released its application for the 2027-2029 biennium in June 2026. The application deadline was 09/09/26.
- The program supports public transportation-related projects, including service between cities and within rural areas, paratransit/special needs transportation, mobility management, and new/replacement vehicles.
- For the 2027-2029 cycle, WSDOT will award consolidated funding from six state and federal sources. Project guidance is from our local Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan.
- The state's application review process requires RTPOs to submit regional rankings for projects submitted to the Consolidated Grant Program. As the RTPO for Spokane County, SRTC facilitates the project ranking process. Rankings are based on A-B-C allocations from the state. The region was allocated 2 A grades, 3 B grades, and 3 C grades
- Recommended rankings are the result of the work of the 6 TTC/TAC volunteers that made up the Evaluation Committee for the 2027-2029 cycle. The evaluation committee ranked projects individually, which were then averaged to determine each project's final score.
- A recommendation for the final rankings is as follows:
    - Cancer Can't: A
    - SMS: A
    - SNAP: B
    - Project id: B
- The final scores and complete project applications/descriptions are available for review.

Board/Committee Discussions:

This item was presented to the TTC/TAC committees during the September meetings, during which volunteers were recruited to serve on the Evaluation Committee.

Public Involvement:

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

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

To: Transportation Technical Committee
From: David Fletcher, Principal Transportation Planner
Topic: Updating SRTC Land Use to Reflect Local Comprehensive Plans

Requested Action:

None. For information and discussion.

Key Points:

- SRTC tracks and forecasts land use for a variety of long-range planning functions. These include travel demand modeling, scenario development, capital investment prioritization, freight planning, subarea analysis, and comprehensive plan certification.
- At a minimum, SRTC updates its land use forecast with each Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) update. Additional information on SRTC's land use forecasting process and methodology is available in Appendix B of Horizon 2050.
- SRTC is proposing a two-phase approach to expedite incorporating the latest comprehensive plan updates into the regional land use forecast.
- Phase I will update the existing base year land use and regional land capacity analysis, while reallocating forecasted growth among transportation analysis zones (TAZ) to reflect changes in local comprehensive plan land use designations. Phase II will incorporate the Phase I work into a comprehensive regional land use forecast update in advance of the next MTP.

Board/Committee Discussions:

The committee has not previously discussed this item.

Public Involvement:

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

Staff Contact: David Fletcher, SRTC | dfletcher@srtc.org | 509.343.6370

To: Transportation Technical Committee
From: David Fletcher, Principal Transportation Planner
Topic: 2027 Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) Officers Election

Requested Action:

None. For information and discussion.

Key Points:

- The Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) Bylaws state that the TTC shall annually select and recommend to the Board of Directors a member to act as TTC Chair and a member to act as TTC Vice-Chair for a one-year term; the Chair and Vice-Chair cannot be from the same agency.
- A history of past years' chair and vice chair appointments going back to 2017 can be found in the following **Supporting Information**.
- Duties for the chair and vice chair are outlined in the SRTC Transportation Technical Committee Bylaws, adopted by the SRTC Board on 06/09/2022.

Board/Committee Discussions:

This is the first discussion of the 2027 TTC officers.

Public Involvement:

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

Staff Contact: David Fletcher, SRTC | dfletcher@srtc.org | 509.343.6370

Topic: 2027 Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) Officers Election

Key Points:

- The TTC chair will preside over TTC meetings and be responsible for communicating to the Board of Directors and SRTC staff on matters directed by the Board of Directors or TTC. The TTC vice chair will perform all duties of the chair during his or her absence.
- If the chair vacates his/her position, the vice chair fulfills the chair's duties. As an ex-officio member of the Board of Directors, the TTC chair or vice chair shall make every attempt to attend all SRTC Board meetings.
- When serving at the SRTC Board of Directors meeting, the TTC chair represents the TTC, not the agency of which they are employed.
- To align with the new SRTC Board of Directors appointments, once selected, the new officers will be immediately seated at the 12/16/2026 TTC meeting so they may represent the committee at the 01/14/2027 Board meeting.
- TTC Bylaws, adopted by the SRTC Board in June 2022, state that the officers of chair and vice chair shall rotate on a yearly basis among the following parties:
    - City of Spokane
    - City of Spokane Valley
    - Spokane County
    - Spokane Transit Authority
    - Washington State Department of Transportation
    - Cities of Airway Heights, Cheney, and Liberty Lake; Tribes; or Small Towns Representative
- The table on the following page shows the rotation of TTC chairs and vice chairs over the past 10 years.

SRTC Transportation Technical Committee Officers

2017–2026

Year	Chair	Agency	Vice Chair	Agency
2026	Tara Limon	Spokane Transit Authority	Jerremy Clark	City of Spokane Valley
2025	Barry Greene	Spokane County	Tara Limon	Spokane Transit Authority
2024	Heather Trautman	City of Airway Heights	Barry Greene	Spokane County
2023	Char Kay	WSDOT	Heather Trautman	City of Airway Heights
2022	Inga Note	City of Spokane	Char Kay	WSDOT
2021	Adam Jackson	City of Spokane Valley	Inga Note	City of Spokane
2020	Karl Otterstrom	Spokane Transit Authority	Adam Jackson	City of Spokane Valley
2019[1]	Karl Otterstrom	Spokane Transit Authority	Adam Jackson	City of Spokane Valley
2019[2]	Sean Messner	Spokane County	Karl Otterstrom	Spokane Transit Authority
2018	Mike Tedesco	Spokane Tribe of Indians	Sean Messner	Spokane County
2017	Brandon Blankenagel	City of Spokane	Mike Tedesco	Spokane Tribe of Indians

[1]September–December 2019

[2]January–August 2019