Transportation Advisory Committee Meeting

Monday, December 20, 2021 • 3:00 PM

Virtual Meeting via Teleconference

PUBLIC NOTICE:
Due to COVID-19 all public meetings will be held until further notice.

Join Zoom Meeting:
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81083877349?pwd=SURaZ2RsT09wSVArRVhlUG14OXg2UT09
Meeting ID: 810 8387 7349| Passcode: 759231

Join by phone 1-253-215-8782
Meeting ID: 810 8387 7349| Passcode: 759231

Or find your local number: https://us02web.zoom.us/u/kdnynvyaP8

SRTC is committed to nondiscrimination in accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and 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.

SRTC
SPOKANE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

Transportation Advisory Committee Meeting

Monday, December 20, 2021 - 3:00 PM

AGENDA

Time	Item		Page
3:00	1	Call to Order / Record of Attendance	
		FOR ACTION	
3:02	2	Approval of November 2021 Meeting Minutes	3
3:05	3	2022-2025 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) January Amendment *(Kylee Jones)*	5
3:10	4	TIP: Additional Obligation Authority *(Eve McMenamy)*	8
		FOR INFORMATION & DISCUSSION	
3:25	5	Spokane Transit Authority Near Term Investments *(Kathleen Weinand, STA)*	n/a
3:45	6	2024-2026 Call for Projects Overview *(Kylee Jones)*	23
3:55	7	Critical Urban/Critical Rural Freight Corridors *(David Fletcher)*	26
4:05	8	DivisionConnects Update *(Jason Lien)*	48
4:15	9	Chair Report on SRTC Board of Directors Meeting *(Chair)*	n/a
4:20	10	Agency Update	n/a
4:25	11	TAC member comments	n/a
4:30	12	Adjournment	

MEETING MINUTES

Spokane Regional Transportation Council
11/22/2021 Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting
Zoom Video Conference

#1 Call to Order/Roll Call – Chair Todd Coleman brought the meeting to order at 3:03 pm.

Members Present:
Todd Coleman, ***Chair***
Melanie Rose, ***Vice Chair***
Kennet Bertelsen
Raychel Callary
Mark Haberman
Liz Hall
Carlie Hoffman
Dave Richardson
Rhonda Young

SRTC Staff Present:
Kylee Jones, Associate Transportation Planner II
Lois Bollenback, Executive Director
Eve McMenamy, Deputy Executive Director
David Fletcher, Associate Transportation Planner III
Michael Redlinger, Associate Transportation Planner II
Julie Meyers-Lehman, Admin-Exec Coordinator

Guests Present
Tom Sahlberg
Karl Otterstrom, *Spokane Transit Authority*
Kristine Williams, *Spokane Transit Authority*
Brandon Rapez-Betty, *Spokane Transit Authority*
Joe Totorelli, *Spokane Good Roads Association*

ACTION ITEMS

2 Approval of October 2021 TAC Meeting Minutes

Ms. Rose made a motion to approve the minutes as presented; Ms. Callary seconded. Motion carried with all votes in favor.

3 2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Guidebook

Ms. Jones reminded members that the TIP is a list of projects to be advanced throughout the upcoming four-year period and she outlined the purposes of the TIP Guidebook. She explained there were very few edits from the 2021 Guidebook, primarily updates to the monthly schedules for TIP amendments and administrative modifications.

There was a question about it the guidebook is updated annually because it is applied to a four-year plan. Ms. Jones said it is updated every year to reflect policy changes, calendar changes, and intermittent programs, such as a call for projects.

Ms. Young made a motion to recommend Board approval of the 2022 TIP Guidebook; Ms. Rose seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

INFORMATION & DISCUSSION ITEMS

4 Spokane Transit Authority: Fare Policy Update

Brandon Rapez-Betty, STA's Director of Communications and Customer Service, outlined the proposed changes to STA fare policies which are designed to provide more access and better

value for customers. He explained the concept of fare capping, spoke about the public survey currently open, and addressed the multiple types of fare discount options being proposed.

A member commented saying that as so many people in our area are still struggling financially, fare capping will be a helpful tool to for low-income residents who use transit daily.

5 Critical Urban/Rural Freight Corridors Update

Mr. Fletcher provided an overview of the critical urban and rural freight corridors and described how WSDOT's Rail, Freight, Ports Division has created a working group to work coordinate with state MPOs for this 2022 plan update. He spoke about the number of National Highway Freight Network miles in Spokane County by type and shared details about the amount of funding that will be available from the National Highway Freight Program and INFRA.

6 Agency Update

Ms. Jones reported on the 2022-2024 TAC membership recruitment process thus far. She said the Nominating Committee met to discuss TAC bylaws and membership and the group wanted feedback from existing TAC members about (1) alternate members and (2) how to address chronic unexcused absences.

The group discussed and agreed that having alternate members would not be helpful; instead, they recommended keeping a reserve list of applicants after the initial selection of the 13 members. These individuals can be contacted for membership in the event that a seat becomes open.

Members discussed excused vs. unexcused absences; they agreed that the definition of unexcused was failing to be present at a meeting without providing advance notice. The specific reason for the absence need not be provided, however members should let the chair or staff know of their absence at least 24 hours in advance, if possible, with the understanding that sometimes there are unexpected circumstances that prevent early notice.

The group agreed that after 3 excused absences within a rolling 12-month period (as opposed to calendar year), the person's membership should be reviewed, and 3 unexcused absences should result in membership termination. Several members commented that continuing to have an option to attend meetings virtually is very important.

Ms. Jones provided a report on the near completion of the 18-month process to update the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, Horizon 2045.

7 TAC Member Comments

The group discussed the City of Spokane traffic calming projects funded from the red light violation program.

8 Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:25 pm.

_____

Julie Meyers-Lehman, Recording Secretary

SRTC SPOKANE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL
421 W. RIVERSIDE AVE. SUITE 500 • SPOKANE WA 99201 • 509.343.6370 • WWW.SRTC.ORG

To: Transportation Advisory Committee 12/13/2021

From: Kylee Jones, Associate Transportation Planner II

Topic: 2022-2025 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) January Amendment

Requested Action:

Recommend SRTC Board of Directors approval of the January amendment to the 2022-2025 TIP as shown in the **Attachment.**

Key Points:

Four agencies have requested amendments to the 2022-2025 TIP for the following nine projects. See **Attachment** for more details.

- Spokane County
  - 2021 Horizontal Curve Signing and Area Delineation
  - 2021 NE County Rumble Strips and Delineation
  - Wellesley Ave and Appleway Ave Roundabout
  - Wellesley Ave Railway – Highway Crossings Program (Section 130)
  - Guardrail Safety 2019 County Safety Program
- WSDOT
  - 2021-2023 SRTMC Operations and Maintenance
  - US 2/Colbert Rd Intersection Revision
- Spokane Transit Authority
  - Central City Line
- City of Spokane
  - Hatch Road – Latah Creek Bridge Deck Repair

TIP Overview

The TIP is a programming document that identifies specific projects and programs to be implemented during the upcoming four years. Any project with federal funds from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) or Federal Transit Administration (FTA), as well as any regionally significant projects, must be included in the TIP. After a TIP has been incorporated into the Washington State TIP (STIP), project changes can be requested by local agencies. Minor changes can be made administratively by SRTC staff. Significant changes must be made through the amendment process, which requires a 10-day public comment period and action by the SRTC Board of Directors.

Board/Committee Discussions:

This is the first time the 2022-2025 TIP January amendment has been discussed by the TAC. The Transportation Technical Committee will review this topic on 12/15/21.

Public Involvement:

Pursuant to SRTC's Public Participation Plan, this amendment will be published for a public review and comment period from 12/15/2021 through 12/24/2021 at 4:00 p.m. Notice of the amendment will be published in the Spokesman Review and posted to the SRTC website (www.srtc.org) and social media platforms on 12/15/2021. Public comments received during the public comment period will be addressed by SRTC staff and presented to the Board in their January 2022 meeting packet.

Supporting Information/Implications:

The TIP serves as an important tool in implementing the goals, policies, and strategies identified in Horizon 2045, SRTC's long-range plan. As such, any projects included in the TIP, including projects added through monthly amendments, must be consistent with Horizon 2045. Consistency with Horizon 2045 includes a demonstration of financial constraint and conformity with regional air quality plans. The September amendment has been reviewed by SRTC staff for compliance with federal and state requirements and consistency with Horizon 2045.

TIP amendments must be approved by the SRTC Board to be incorporated into the Washington State TIP (STIP). Projects receiving federal funds must be in both the TIP and the STIP to access those funds.

Pending approval by the SRTC Board, the January amendment will be incorporated into the STIP on or around 2/15/2022.

More Information:

- See Attachment: 2022-2025 TIP January Amendment
- For detailed information contact: Kylee Jones at kjones@srtc.org or 509.343.6370

January Amendment (22-01)

Agency	Project Title / Amendment Description	Funding Adjustment		Amendment: New Project	Amendment: Existing Project
Spokane County	**2021 Horizontal Curve Signing and Area Delineation** Add/upgrade horizontal curve signing and flexible guideposts countywide.	Federal (HSIP) Local Total	$420,200 $4,800 $425,000	✔	
WSDOT	**2021-2023 SRTMC Operations and Maintenance** Project to be removed from the TIP. Funds have been obligated.	No Funding Adjustment			✔
Spokane County	**2021 NE County Rumble Strips and Delineation** Add mixed treatments of centerline rumble strips, flexible guideposts, and guardrail reflectors at Argonne (MP 1.35-5.04), Bruce (MP 0.00-2.20), Moffat (MP 1.50-3.83), Forker (MP 3.50-6.94)	Federal (HSIP) Local Total	$168,500 $2,500 $171,000	✔	
WSDOT	**US 2/Colbert Rd - Intersection Revision** Convert 4-leg stop controlled intersection to restricted access u-turn intersection to reduce crash severity and improve intersection operation.	Federal (HSIP) Local Total	$2,032,520 $41,480 $2,074,000	✔	
Spokane County	**Wellesley Ave and Appleway Ave Roundabout** The project will construct a single lane roundabout at the intersection of Wellesley Ave. Extension, Appleway Ave., and at the WA / Idaho State Line.	Federal (HSIP) Local Total	$1,258,200 $139,800 $1,398,000	✔	
Spokane County	**Wellesley Avenue Railway – Highway Crossings Program (Section 130):** Project to be removed from the TIP. Funds have been obligated.	No Funding Adjustment			✔
Spokane County	**Guardrail Safety 2019 County Safety Program** Project to be removed from the TIP. Funds have been obligated.	No Funding Adjustment			✔
City of Spokane	**Hatch Road – Latah Creek bridge Deck Repair** Project to be removed from the TIP. Funds have been obligated.	No Funding Adjustment			✔
Spokane Tranist	**Central City Line** Project to be removed from the TIP. Funds have been obligated.	No Funding Adjustment			✔

SRTC SPOKANE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL
421 W. RIVERSIDE AVE. SUITE 500 • SPOKANE WA 99201 • 509.343.6370 • WWW.SRTC.ORG

To: Transportation Advisory Committee 12/13/2021

From: Eve McMenamy, Deputy Executive Director

Topic: **Transportation Improvement Program (TIP): Additional Obligation Authority**

Requested Action:

Recommend the SRTC Board award projects in Table 1 to meet member agency requests and to assist SRTC in meeting 2022 Federal Funding Obligation Target.

Key Points:

- SRTC will be awarded an additional $4.26M in Federal Obligation Authority (OA) in January 2022. This amount will be added to the 2022 federal obligation target.
- The award was due to successfully meeting and exceeding our federal obligation target for 2021. The TIP Working Group did an excellent job adjusting to the new internal Board deadline to obligate projects by June 1.
- The new funding awarded by WSDOT Local Programs will be Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) funding or the equivalent in the new federal transportation bill.
- SRTC is required to meet federal OA targets within our Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). WSDOT's Local Agency Federal Obligation Authority (OA) Policy establishes the obligation targets for each Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO).
- In October and November, SRTC received two cost overrun requests: one from Airway Heights regarding Highway 2 Shared-use Path project and one from Millwood for the Argonne Road Congestion Relief project. SRTC received a request from Spokane County for a two-year extension to continue to seek funding for a Brooks Road project. (See **Attachment 1** for all requests).
- In addition to $4.26M in STBG, SRTC also has $984,000 in Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funding available and $600,000 of STBG-Set Aside funds for alternative transportation projects from project deobligations. SRTC also has $357,000 of Highway Infrastructure Program funds available, however these funds do not contribute to meeting the SRTC OA target.
- TIP Guidebook policies that are relevant to this matter can found in the supplemental information of this memo.
- In 2018 SRTC conducted a Call for Projects, and the Board developed a Regional Priority Project List to utilize for contingency funding opportunities. In 2021 SRTC conducted a Preservation Call for projects and maintains a list of preservation projects for potential funding opportunities (see **Attachment 2)**.

- Using the TIP Guidebook Polices as guidance, the TIP Working Group met on November 9 and December 10 to discuss options to quickly obligate funding by June 1, which is the target obligation policy date at SRTC. The TIP Working Group recommendation for additional awards to meet our 2022 obligation target is shown below in Table 1.

Table 1, TIP Working Group Recommendation for Awards

Agency	Project	Recommended Award	Fund Type
Airway Heights	SR 2-Path Gap Project	$145,761	STBG-Set Aside
Spokane County	Little Spokane Connection Rd Separated Path	$375,000	STBG-Set Aside
Spokane Valley	Wilbur Sidewalk	$57,000	STBG-Set Aside
Millwood	Argonne Rd Congestion Relief	$1,000,000	CMAQ/HIP
Spokane	Thor/Freya Couplet Reconstruction	$1,250,000	STBG
Spokane	Spokane Falls Blvd (PE Phase)	$500,000	STBG
Spokane County	Brooks Rd	$1,684,000	STBG
Spokane Valley	Evergreen Preservation	$824,519	STBG

- On December 9 the Board was asked to provide guidance on awarding the following: member's project requests, partially funded projects in the TIP, cost overruns and /or awarding a new project as reported in Tables 2 and 3 below. The Board expressed support for these opportunities.

- Successfully meeting our obligation target will again position the region to receive additional OA from WSDOT.

Board/Committee Discussions:

The Board was notified of the additional funding in the Director's report at the November 11 board meeting and on December 9 were presented the projects that could fulfill additional available funding.

The TAC is being asked to make a recommendation to the Board based on the TIP Working Group's recommendation at their December meeting.

Public Involvement:

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

Supporting Information/Implications

Three agencies submitted letters to SRTC in October and November. Airway Heights and Millwood submitted cost overruns and Spokane County submitted a request for a two-year extension to seek more funding to complete their project, see Table 1 below.

Table 2: Project requests from member agencies

Agency	Project	Need	Fund Type	Project Award History
Airway Heights	SR 2-Path Gap Project	$145,761	STBG-Set Aside	$346,777
Millwood	Argonne Road Congestion Relief Project	$1,000,000	CMAQ	$1,650,000 (2018 & 2020)
Spokane County	Brooks Road	$1,800,000	STBG	Partial Award 2014 $727,665

Additionally, the TIP Working Group identified other projects that could potentially obligate funding by June 1, 2022. Details regarding these projects in Table 2 below are still being verified.

Table 3: Projects that can potentially obligate by June 1, 2022

Agency	Project	Award Opportunity	Fund Type	Project Award History
Spokane County	Elk-Chattaroy	$80,431	STBG	Partial award 2021 $615,569
Spokane County	Little Spokane Connection Rd Separated Path	$375,000	STBG-Set Aside	Partial Award 2015 $93,933
Spokane Valley	Wilbur Sidewalk	$57,000	STBG-Set Aside	Partial award 2018 $500,000
Spokane Valley	Barker at UPRR	$300,000	STBG	Partial award 2018 $2,050,000
Spokane	Thor/Freya Couplet Reconstruction	$1,250,000	STBG	$8,119,105 (2018 & 2020) due to cost escalation/cost overrun
Spokane	Havana or Spokane Falls Blvd-PE Phase	$756,000	STBG	No award granted in 2018
Spokane Valley	Evergreen Preservation	$824,519	STBG	No award granted in 2021

The following is a summary of 2021 TIP Guidebook policies relevant to making funding decisions.

Policy 4.5 – If a project sponsor is unable to meet a targeted obligation date after the one-time grace period, the project sponsor may request an extension from the SRTC Policy Board. The Board may grant the extension or may act to remove the project from the TIP. If the agency is permitted an extension, it must submit a revised schedule to SRTC within 30 calendar days of the Board action. If the Board acts to remove the project from the TIP, any regional federal funds awarded to the project shall be returned to SRTC for reallocation. If the project is eligible to receive regionally selected federal funds, it may be placed on the contingency list of projects for that fund source at the discretion of the Board.

Policy 4.7 - SRTC will maintain a Regional Project Priority List selected through a regional process and approved by the SRTC Board of Directors. Projects on the Regional Priority List may be selected for future funds available through the contingency funding process (see Policy 6.8). The most recently approved Regional Priority List replaces and supersedes any previously approved priority list.

Policy 4.8 - SRTC will consider the following strategies to meet an obligation target when shortfalls are anticipated:

- Advancing projects from future years
- Exchange federal funds for local funds between phases or stages of a single project or between projects in the same agency
- Advancing contingency list projects
- Increase the federal share of awarded projects (no more than maximum federal share can be awarded)

Policy 6.8 –Contingency funds become available if previously selected projects from that fund source are removed from the TIP by Board action, funds are voluntarily returned by the sponsoring agency, or additional funds become available for some other reason (for example: annual allocations higher than anticipated). The SRTC is responsible to reassign those funds.

As stated in Policy 4.7 SRTC maintains a Regional Project Priority List which will be used as the basis for this contingency funding process for available STBG, STBG-SA, CMAQ or other SRTC-awarded funds. The following criteria guide the contingency funding process:

- Evaluate the eligibility of Regional Project Priority List projects that meet the technical requirements of the available funding sources;
- Review project readiness from the above identified projects to maximize project delivery;
- Review the capability of available funding to complete a project or phase;
- Analyze obligation authority targets and schedules to ensure the programming of SRTC managed federal funds meet project obligations targets; and
- Provide a recommendation for the use of continency funds.

The TTC and the SRTC staff will make separate or joint recommendations to the Board for funding consideration.

More Information:

- See Attachment 1: Request letters from Airway Heights, Millwood, and Spokane County
- See Attachment 2: 2018 Contingency List and 2021 Preservation Call for Projects List
- For detailed information contact: Eve McMenamy at evemc@srtc.org or 509.381.9466.

October 20, 2021

Spokane Regional Transportation Council
421 W. Riverside Ave.
Suite 500
Spokane, WA 99201

Attention: Lois Bollenback, Director

Regarding: Airway Heights
SR-2 Path Gap Project – Funding Increase Request

Dear Lois;

The City of Airway Heights has been working through the design and ROW for the SR-2 Path Gap Project funded with federal TAP funds from SRTC. Over the course of this past year. The City has encountered significant challenges in wrapping up the Design and Right-of-way (ROW) to obtain approval to bid the project. These are summarized below:

O'Reilly's

O'Reilly's Auto Parts was required to construct the segment of shared use path directly in front of their store when it was constructed in 2012, prior to the City annexing this area, as part of the terms of their development agreement approval. However, WSDOT, who had jurisdiction at the time, did not enforce the requirement for the path to be constructed. The City was made aware of the lapse during a subsequent development review of a nearby parcel.

To address the situation, the City re-established discussions with O'Reilly's regarding the section of shared use pathway in front of their store at the time that the TAP grant application was submitted in 2017. The City worked out an informal agreement with O'Reilly's to honor the original development agreement and pay for the cost of the path in front of their parcel.

Subsequently, there have been several staff changes at O'Reilly's corporate office, and the knowledge of the original agreement and earlier City discussions have been lost. While trying to re-establish contact with O'Reilly's corporate office this past year, the City was passed around to several different contacts. Our ROW agent was finally able to re-establish a contact and dialog with O'Reilly's. However, to-date, they have not shown a willingness to honor the original cost sharing agreement.

The amount of O'Reilly's share identified at the time of application was approximately $51,037. The City is currently evaluating its options for pursing recourse against O'Reilly's for failure to honor the development agreement. However, the time and cost for resolving this issue through legal means is unknown and TIB, a funding partner for the project, is very concerned about the project delays and the City is at risk of losing that funding if it doesn't proceed to bidding and construction in the next couple months.

Further complicating the process, existing stormwater facilities within the Right-of-way (ROW) serving Highway US-2 in front of O'Reilly's parcel require that the shared use path extension be constructed partially outside of ROW along the frontage of O'Reilly's parcel. Without O'Reilly's cooperation, the

project will incur significant additional cost to revise the grading and drainage facilities for Highway US-2 to keep the path inside of ROW.

Right-of-Way (ROW)
During the preparation of project ROW Plan, it was discovered that almost every connection to the existing sidewalk and path along both the north and south sides of US-2 was located outside of ROW. The original application had anticipated one or two potential construction easements with the entirety of the improvements located within ROW. In total, the City actually needed to secure easements affecting six (6) parcels and four (4) property owners. Furthermore, with O'Reilly's not being cooperative, it is anticipated that the City will have to purchase property rights needed to construct the path in front O'Reilly's parcel instead of those rights being provided as required in the development agreement.

The City also incurred some additional ROW agent costs to accommodate the Sadaqa Group's new Hazelwood Square development. However, this was a net benefit to the project. During preliminary coordination discussions with Sadaqa about the upcoming Path Gap project, they invited us to locate the sidewalk outside of ROW along their frontage to better complement their new improvements. Earthwork needed to construct the project in front of their parcels would instead be completed as part of Sadaqa's frontage improvements. Sadaqa also donated the property rights for the permanent easement. This effort was ongoing during the ROW phase this summer and did not affect the project timeline.

Summary
Based on the most recent cost estimate for the project, the City is expected to incur approximately $55,000 in additional ROW costs and $51,000 in additional construction costs for the O'Reilly segment alone. Overall ROW costs increased by approximately $50,700 for the other parcels affected by the project. The City is also incurring additional engineering and construction costs related to these challenges and current bidding climate conditions due to supply chain issues.

Project Costs & Funding Summary

Phase	Original Budget	Cost Changes	Updated Costs	Proposed Fed. Increase
PE	$35,478	$12,296	$47,774	$9,795
ROW	$4,000	$105,700	$109,700	$0
CN	$307,299	$45,633	$352,932	$135,966
Total	$346,777	$163,629	$510,406	**$145,761**
				Proposed
Funding				**Funding**
Fed. Funds	$198,471	$0	$198,471	$344,232
TIB	$97,269	$0	$97,269	$97,269
O'Reilly	$51,037	($51,037)	$0	$0
City:	$0	$214,666	$214,666	$68,905
Total	$346,777	$163,629	$510,406	$510,406

Overall, the net increase in project cost is approximately $163,629 after taking into account construction cost savings from the Sadaqa Development improvements and earthwork that complimented our project from the recent US-2/Deer Heights Roundabout project. This is an increase of 47% over the original project budget and an extremely large hit to the City's transportation budget. Without additional funding, the City's share will jump to approximately $214,700 (42%). A detailed project cost estimate is provided for additional information.

The City of Airway Heights is proposing to increase their matching ratio to $68,905 (13.5%) and agree to cover any future potential costs overruns beyond the current request. We respectfully submit a request for an increase in Federal funding of $145,761 to cover a portion of the project cost increase. This would increase the federal share from 57.2% to 67.4%.

Please feel free to contact us if you have any questions.

Sincerely

CITY OF AIRWAY HEIGHTS

Mark J Bergam, P.E.

Mark Bergam, P.E.
City Engineer

Enclosure

CC: Eve McMenamy, SRTC
Keith Martin, WSDOT

CITY OF
MILLWOOD

November 15, 2021

Lois Bollenback, Executive Director
Spokane Regional Transportation Council
421 W Riverside Avenue, Suite 504
Spokane WA 99201

Re: Request for Additional Funds
Argonne Road Widening Project
CMAQ-4041(016)

Dear Ms. Bollenback:

The City of Millwood ("Millwood" or "the City") presents to Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) this request for additional funding for the Millwood Congestion Relief – Argonne Road Widening Project; CMAQ-4041(016), referred to within as "the Project". The City has been working diligently on this Project for several years but has experienced multiple delays related the COVID-19 pandemic, coordination and negotiation with Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) regarding the UPRR Argonne Road crossing, and Right-of-Way (ROW) acquisition. These circumstances (COVID, UPRR, ROW) resulted in general project cost increases for engineering and consulting fees, but also unforeseen increases attributed to inflation of property values and construction (labor and material) costs, and cost increases related to UPRR, chiefly (1) their protracted engineering review process that adds multiple review/comment cycles to the design (of which the Project is responsible for both the Project engineer costs and UPRR engineering costs) and (2) UPRR's demand for advanced signal preemption equipment as part of the Project .

EXPLANATION OF COST INCREASES

Union Pacific Railroad Cost Unknowns

The City has dedicated significant time and effort coordinating with UPRR staff and their subconsultants to accommodate their demands for an "advanced" preemptive crossing signal/traffic signal interconnect system as part of the Project. The City agrees that the Project must provide a safe and efficient crossing for the traveling public. UPRR has policies in place that, while understandable, are not advantageous to a local jurisdiction or agency. One of those policies is the refusal to provide an opinion of cost for construction work required for a project until the design work is complete. Due to the protracted coordination and design process, Millwood is still without accurate budgetary numbers for the Project. The City originally estimated UPRR's work at $250,000. However, based on a recent cost estimate for a similar project completed in the area, the City anticipates that UPRR's cost estimate for their required work will total approximately $730,000.

Property Values

The project was approved and funded for design and construction in 2016. Since then, property values in the Inland Northwest have increased significantly. The City originally estimated ROW acquisition at approximately $85,000. Based on the recently completed appraisals, the City anticipates the ROW acquisition will cost approximately $260,000.

Additional Signal Costs

Spokane County administers, maintains, and controls the Argonne Road traffic signals within the City of Millwood. As the requested interconnection of UPRR and traffic signal design expanded, the cost of the required signal modifications increased. The original estimate for modifying the existing Empire/Euclid Avenue signal was approximately $150,000; the anticipated final cost based on current design requirements is expected to be approximately $350,000.

Additional Design Costs

Additional design costs were incurred after multiple delays and review iterations in railroad coordination and the ROW phase. Additionally, ROW appraisal fees increased dramatically due to high demand in the Inland Northwest. The appraisal fees amounted to approximately $90,000.

ADDITIONAL FUNDING REQUEST

The table below shows a summary of the current project funding and costs. **The City of Millwood is requesting an additional $1,000,000 in CMAQ funds, or other SRTC funding sources, for completion of the Project.**

FUNDING SUMMARY	**AMOUNT**
PE - CMAQ	$ 121,619
PE - City	$ 18,981
ROW - CMAQ	$ 83,473
ROW - City	$ 13,027
CN - CMAQ	$ 1,650,000
CN - City	$ 200,000
CN - City REET Funding	$ 82,992
Total Funding Received	**$ 2,170,092**
CURRENT TOTAL PROJECT COST ESTIMATE	**$ 3,168,186**
Funding Shortfall (Estimate less Received)	**$ (998,094)**
Additional City Funds Required (Assuming 13.5% match)	**$ (134,743)**

CITY OF MILLWOOD

We respectfully ask that you grant our additional funding request. Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Kevin M. Freeman, Mayor
City of Millwood, Washington

Attachments:

Copies:

Spokane County
Public Works Department
Spokane County, Washington
Chad W. Coles, P.E. – Director / County Engineer

October 19, 2021

To: Lois Bollenback
SRTC Board of Directors
421 W. Riverside Ave Suite 500
Spokane, WA 99201

From: Spokane County Public Works Department
1026 W Broadway Ave
Spokane, WA 99208

RE: WA-06998 Brooks Road

Dear Lois,

In 2014 SRTC awarded $727,665 in STBG grant dollars to partially fund the Spokane County Brooks Road project, from beginning mile post 0.00 to ending mile post 1.87. The project was scheduled for a road reconstruction with the intent to not only reconstruct a failing road but to widen the roadway from 11' drive lanes with 2' shoulders to 12' drive lanes with 6' shoulders. The purpose of the project was to improve the surface driving conditions, provide shoulders for improved bicycle access, add additional room for maneuverability, and allow for emergency parking access. Brooks Road is important to our region as a rural major collector in the West Plains and the only major collector that goes from Medical Lake to Fairchild Air Force Base. It is also commonly used to get to US-2, the City of Airway Heights, the City of Spokane, as well as access western Spokane County.

The Brooks Road project was not able to meet the required construction phase targeted obligation date and was granted a one-time extension of two years in 2019. This extension was primarily due to the project not being able to obtain the remaining construction funding necessary for project completion. The extension secured the project funding through December of 2021. Spokane County is grateful for the extension and has utilized the time to complete the project right of way and prepare a construction ready PS&E Package with the allocated STBG funding.

Spokane County has been committed to the completion of this project and is working diligently to make efforts that guarantee this project makes forward progress. Fully completed phases include the preliminary engineering phase and securing right of way. Both phases utilized the STBG awarded grant funding for a total of $313,861 spent to date and are a substantial part of completing the project in its entirety. This project can be considered "shovel ready" and is only waiting on additional construction funding to see this project through to completion. The federal balance remaining from the original SRTC STBG grant is $413,804, but this is not enough money to obligate construction funds and complete the project.

Spokane County has received an updated local programs agreement with WSDOT allowing for the obligation of Construction funding by 2024, and have been actively pursuing grant funding opportunities in a good faith effort to get this project completed. In 2018 Spokane County applied for the SRTC STBG call for grants but did not receive funding in that grant cycle. In 2020 Spokane County applied for funding to complete the project with the County Road Administration Board (CRAB). The project fell short of CRAB's funding capacity, coming in second in line to be funded if additional state funding were to be made available, please see the attached North-East Priority Array issued by CRAB 11-2-2020. It should be noted that this Brooks Road Project was the second highest scoring reconstruction project that was not selected due to funding constraints in the CRAB 2020 project array. Spokane County will continue to petition funding through any available grant opportunities including the SRTC 2022 spring call for projects for the remaining construction funding needed to break ground on this project.

To see the project completed, Spokane County Public Works department would like to propose that an additional two-year extension on the Brooks Road project be granted providing time to secure the construction funding required for project completion. If an additional two-year extension cannot be granted, Spokane County respectfully offers to de-obligate the remaining funding for the Brooks Road project. Spokane County asks to have this project placed on the SRTC contingency list, and be given future consideration for any available funding as this is a "shovel ready" project benefitting our region and may be used to fill programming gaps.

Considering that Spokane County has made every reasonable attempt to apply for grants to secure construction funds and has completed the preliminary engineering and acquired the right of way needed, we request that if asked to de-obligate this project that Spokane County is not required to pay back the $313,861 obligated to date. Spokane County would like to thank you for this consideration and values the ongoing and collaborative relationship with SRTC.

Sincerely,

Chad Coles P.E.
County Engineer

2019 SRTC Priority List - Board Approved 9/12/19
(From 2018 Call for Projects Prioritization) Updated 3/12/21

Priority	Project #	Project Name	Requested	AWARD Total Award
1	Board -1	Supplement to Henry Road Overpass ROW Preservation		
2	SC-1	Bigelow Gulch Project 5	$1,568,000	$1,568,000
3	COS-3	Thor-Freya Couplet (rec'd funding in 2018 and 2020)	$8,119,105	$8,119,105
4	SRHD-1	Safe Routes to School Walking School Bus	$611,181	$600,000
5	SV-1	Pines Grade Separation (RW only) (funding in 2018 and 2020)	$3,795,000	$3,795,100
6	COS-1	Riverside-Monroe to Wall	$5,003,141	$850,000
7	SRHD-2	Walk Bike Bus Downtown Spokane	$304,202	$304,000
8	SC-12	Commute Trip Reduction	$898,157	$881,327
9	STA-1	Upgrate 6 diesel buses to electric	$2,670,000	$2,670,000
10	SC-3	Bigelow Gulch Project 2 ($1.45M in 2020)	$2,601,000	$1,450,000
11	MW-1	Argonne Rd, Frederick-Liberty congestion relief (1.27M in 2018 & $380,000-201	$1,270,000	$1,650,000
12	SC-2	Bigelow Gulch Project 6 ($2.814 in 2018, $1.27M in 2019 & $429,689 in 2021)	$4,085,000	$4,514,680
13	SV-2	Barker Corridor reconstruction & widening (can be split into 3 segments)	$6,331,800	$2,050,000
14	STA-2	5-Mile Park & Ride Study (funded in 2019)	$200,000	$200,000
15	COS-12	Havana St-Sprague to Broadway	$5,836,971	$0
16	DP-1	Crawford & Colville Roundabout/N Colville reconstructions	$1,943,514	$1,944,000
17	SV-6	Argonne Rd Reconstruction	$2,508,500	$0
18	WSDOT-1	US 2 Garfield Rd intersection improvement	$2,220,000	$0
19	COS-7	Maple-Wellesley Intersection	$761,822	$762,000
20	SC-5	57th Avenue	$2,126,000	$0
21	AH-2	21st Ave Craig Rd to Deer Heights Rd (Property Survey)	$89,545	$0
22	SV-4	Pines & Mission intersection imp. ($450,500 in 2018 & $1,418,600 in 2021)	$1,211,000	$1,869,100
23	COS-10	Spokane Falls Blvd-Lincoln to Division	$7,305,931	$0
24	DP-3	Colville Reconstruction Third St to north City Limits-Rural	$2,021,738	$0
~~25~~	SV-7	~~Park Road reconstruction (RW only)~~	~~$268,150~~	$0
26	COS-5	Centennial Trail Summit Gap	$2,532,198	$2,532,000
27	SC-6	57th Avenue & Freya St Roundabout	$728,300	$728,000
28	COS-6	Ben Burr Crossing Improvements	$746,099	$746,000
29	SC-14	Harvard Rd	$4,827,000	$0
30	COS-8	Driscoll-Alberta-Cochran Sidewalk Infill (530,000 in 2018, $175,200 2019 & 33	$1,060,452	$1,040,725
31	COS-4	Washington-Stevens, Spokane Falls to Boone	$2,014,581	$0
32	SC-13	Centennial Trail at Argonne	719000	$0
33	COS-2	Freya St - Wellesley to Decatur	$3,658,690	$0
34	COS-13	North Bank Trail Study	$166,250	$0
35	SV-3	Sprague & Barker intersection improvement	$1,159,979	$349,000
36	COS-9	Napa-2nd Ave to Sprague	$1,508,697	$0
37	SC-9	Craig Rd	$962,700	$0
38	CH-1	Washington St (Cheney)	$730,691	$731,000
39	AH-1	10th Ave Garfield Rd to Hayford Rd	$3,203,000	$0
40	DP-2	E Crawford Preservation-Rural	$575,650	$0
41	COS-11	37th Ave Sidewalk	$726,183	$0
42	SC-11	Cascade Way	$601,200	$0
43	SC-4	Brooks Rd Phase 1-Rural	$1,608,000	$0
44	SV-5	Mullan Road preservation	$1,211,000	$0
45	SC-8	Greta to Whitworth Bike Route (funded 2020)	$299,300	$299,300
46	SC-10	Columbia Dr	$1,536,000	$0
47	FF-2	First St Sidewalk Phase 2	$272,034	$315,000
48	SV-8	Wilbur Rd sidewalk (funded in 2020)	$557,060	$500,000
49	FF-1	Rattler Run Road reconstruction-Rural	$799,433	$0
50	SC-7	Cheney-Spokane Rd-Rural	$2,132,000	$0

2021 SRTC Call for Preservation Projects
$6,000,000 Available - Recommended Awards

						STBG			
						Urbanized Area Award min	Urban Small Award min	Rural Award min	Flex funding
Scoring Rank	Agency/ Rank	Project Name	Match	Requested/ Eligible	Score	$4,346,950	$118,456	$685,891	$848,703
1	COS-2	Maple/Ash Chip Seal	25.0%	$718,500	84.6	*$718,500*			
2	SV-2	Sprague Avenue Preservation	49.9%	$1,000,000	81.0	*$1,000,000*			
3	SV-3	Evergreen Road Preservation	13.5%	$824,519	79.7				
4	SV-1	Broadway at I-90 Preservation	44.0%	$1,000,000	78.1	*$1,000,000*			
5	SC-1	Freya Street Preservation	25.0%	$745,500	72.9	*$745,500*			
6	COS-3	Washington/Stevens Grind & Overlay	25.0%	$867,750	71.1				
7	COS-1	Haven Street Grind & Overlay	28.5%	$1,000,000	70.7	*$882,950*			*$117,050*
8	COS-4	29th Avenue Grind & Overlay	25.0%	$561,750	67.4				
9	SC-4	Magnesium Road Preservation	25.0%	$529,500	67.3				
10	DP-1	E. Crawford Avenue Preservation	13.5%	$500,131	66.9			*$500,131*	
11	CH-1	Washington Street Preservation	20.0%	$420,300	64.7		*$118,456*		*$301,844*
12	SC-3	Elk-Chattaroy Preservation	25.0%	$696,000	63.7			*$185,760*	*$429,809*
13	SC-2	Starr Road Preservation	25.0%	$954,000	60.3				
14	AH-1	Lawson Street Grind & Overlay	13.5%	$494,702	44.4				
15	SPG-1	Old State Route 195 Grind & Overlay	0.0%	$432,740	30.3				
16	AH-2	Lundstrom Street Grind & Inlay	13.5%	$680,184	30.1				
17	FF-2	Fairfield Citywide Chip Seal	0.0%	$224,623	25.9				
18	FF-1	Bradshaw & Brewster Grind & Inlay	0.0%	$254,673	24.0				
					Remaining Balance	$0	$0	$0	$0

AH Airway Heights
CH Cheney
DP Deer Park
FF Fairfield
SPG Spangle
COS Spokane
SC Spokane County
SV Spokane Valley

To: Transportation Advisory Committee 12/13/2021

From: Kylee Jones, Associate Transportation Planner II

Topic: **2024-2026 SRTC Call for Projects Overview**

Requested Action:

For information and discussion.

Key Points:

- On 2/11/2022 SRTC will release a Call for Projects for the following funding types:
  - Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) program
  - Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ) program
  - STBG Set-Aside Funds
  - Highway Infrastructure Program (HIP) Funds
  - Highway Infrastructure Programs-Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act (HIP-CRRSAA) Funds
- STBG is the most flexible of all FHWA funding programs. Eligible STBG project types include; roadway and bridge construction, transit capital projects and repair, safety, active transportation, programs and studies.
- The purpose of the CMAQ program is to fund transportation projects that improve air quality in the Spokane region. CMAQ funding can be expended on projects that reduce carbon monoxide (CO) and/or coarse particulate matter (PM_{10}) emissions. Eligible CMAQ project types include transit improvements, travel demand management strategies, traffic flow improvements and pedestrian and bicycle facilities.
- STBG Set-Aside, introduced with the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, replaces the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). Examples of eligible projects include on- and off-road pedestrian and bicycle facilities, infrastructure projects for improving non-driver access to public transportation and safe routes to school projects.
- HIP provides federal funds for road, bridge, ferry, transit capital, and Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) capital projects for the elimination of hazards and the installation of protective devices at railway-highway crossing. Additionally, HIP funds can be used for charging infrastructure along alternative fuel corridors.
- HIP-CRRSAA may be used for activities that are eligible under the STBG funding program in addition to covering revenue losses, supplanting, or replacing funds, personnel salaries, operation and maintenance. There is no local match required with this funding type.
- There will be approximately $40 million in the 2024-2026 Call for Projects to be spent in the years 2024-2026, some limited funding will be available for use in 2023. The new

transportation infrastructure bill is anticipated to increase SRTC's annual allocations, we will have more clarity on available funding in early 2022.

- The Board will begin discussions about the principle of investments for the call for projects at their January meeting. This will include, but is not limited to, agency requests for "off-the-top" funding and a funding set aside for a preservation call for projects in 2023 or 2024.
- Historically, the "Principles of Investment" include but are not limited to funding decisions about off-the-top requests, set-aside for a preservation call, potential set-aside for small towns/small cities, and setting application limits per agency.

Board/Committee Discussions:

The TIP Working Group is currently involved in reviewing and providing suggested improvements to the call for projects application and will meet on 12/14/21 to discuss the application and "Principles of Investment". This is the first touch with the TTC touch on this topic. At the January TTC and TAC meeting, committee members will be consulted on the call for projects application and the "Principles of Investment." Also, TTC and TAC members will also be asked to participate in the scoring of project applications.

The Board will receive a Call for Projects Overview presentation on 12/9/21. The Board will decide on a set of "Principles of Investment" at their February meeting.

Public Involvement:

The 2022 Call for Project schedule is in the TIP Guidebook. The TIP Guidebook has been presented at TAC and TTC meetings open to the public.

Supporting Information/Implications

Call for Projects Schedule

2021	
Nov 17 & 21	TAC & TTC meetings – Call for Projects Overview
Dec 9	SRTC Board of Directors – Call for Projects overview
Dec 13 &15	TAC & TTC meetings – Call for Projects update, principles of investment discussion, applications & evaluation criteria update
2022	
Nov 2021 – Jan 2022	Call for Projects Working Group – develop applications, evaluation criteria, principles of investment discussion
Jan 14	SRTC Board of Directors - Begin Principles of Investment discussion, off the top funding
Jan 22 & 24	TAC & TTC meetings – Call for Projects update, principles of investment discussion, applications & evaluation criteria update

Feb 10	SRTC Board of Directors - Principles of investment, off the top funding
Feb 11	**CALL FOR PROJECTS RELEASED**
Mar 7	**Project Eligibility Worksheet and Complete Streets Checklist DUE by 4:00 pm.**
Apr 4	**APPLICATION Package DUE by 4:00 pm.**
Apr 5-22	SRTC staff screens projects for completeness, consistency with the MTP and CMP. SRTC staff will also calculate the air quality benefits for each CMAQ project at this time
Apr 25 - May 13	Project scoring
May 23	TAC & TTC meetings - review preliminary results
Jun 9	SRTC Board - review preliminary results
Jun 22	TAC & TTC meetings - recommend prioritized lists of STBG, CMAQ STBG Set-Aside, HIP and HIP CRRSAA projects to fund and contingency lists for Board approval
Jul 14	SRTC Board – Approve STBG, CMAQ, STBG Set-Aside, HIP and HIP COVID projects to fund and contingency lists.
Aug – Oct	2023-2026 TIP development process which includes a 30-day public comment period on the draft TIP.

Approximate Available Funding

Fund Type	Fund Qualifications	Projected Amount
STBG	Flexible	$23,300,000
STBG-Set Aside	Transportation Alternatives	$2,800,000
CMAQ	Congestion Relief	$10,600,000
HIP	Highway Infrastructure	$347,000
HIP-CRRSSA	Highway Infrastructure-Flexible	$2,440,000

More Information:

- For detailed information contact: Kylee Jones at kjones@srtc.org or 509.343.6370

SRTC SPOKANE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL
421 W. RIVERSIDE AVE. SUITE 500 • SPOKANE WA 99201 • 509.343.6370 • WWW.SRTC.ORG

To: Transportation Advisory Committee 12/13/2021

From: David Fletcher, Principal Transportation Planner

Topic: **Critical Urban and Rural Freight Corridors Update**

Requested Action:

None. For information and discussion.

Key Points:

- WSDOT's Rail, Freight, and Ports Division is updating the state's Critical Urban Freight Corridors (CUFC) and Critical Rural Freight Corridors (CRFC). They were last updated in 2016.
- CUFC/CRFC routes are part of the National Highway Freight Network, which was established to strategically direct Federal resources—including National Highway Freight Program (NHFP) and INFRA grant program funds—toward improved freight performance.
- In fall of 2021, WSDOT established a working group to coordinate this process with the state's Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) and Regional Transportation Planning Organizations (RTPO).
- To target limited miles towards regional priority routes, WSDOT is taking a "project-first" approach for the 2022 CUFC/CRFC update. This requires MPOs to submit regional freight priorities, to inform corridor designations and FFY 2022–2025 NHFP funding. WSDOT's project solicitation period will run from January to March 2022.
- WSDOT's draft project prioritization criteria, along with their draft project submission form for FFY 2022–2025 NHFP funds, are provided as **Attachments**. The criteria are based on Washington's Statewide Transportation Goals. On December 13, 2021 the MPO/RTPO working group will meet to provide final comments and feedback on these criteria to WSDOT.
- The update process schedule is provided in the Supporting Information/Implications section of this document.

Board/Committee Discussions:

The 2022 CUFC/CRFC update was discussed at the November meetings of both the TTC and Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC). This topic will be presented to the Board on 12/9/21. Staff will seek TTC and TAC input throughout this process, to ensure the development of a competitive and accurate list of regional freight priority projects for potential CUFC/CRFC designation and NHFP funding.

Public Involvement:

All Board and committee meetings are open to the public.

Supporting Information/Implications

CUFC/CRFC update schedule:

	2021		2022							
	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG
1) WSDOT Coordinates with MPOs/RTPOs to Update Freight Project Prioritization Approach										
2) WSDOT Solicits Regional Freight Priority Projects from MPOs/RTPOs for the FFY 2022–2025 NHFP Program										
3) WSDOT Coordinates with MPOs/RTPOs to Prioritize and Select Regional Freight Projects and Develop Freight Investment Plan										
4) CUFC/CURC Designation of Selected Regional Freight Projects (required FHWA review and approval)										
5) Selected Regional Freight Projects Awarded NHFP Funds										

More Information:

- Attachments: 1) Draft WSDOT Project Prioritization Criteria, 2) Draft Project Submission Form for FFY 2022–2025 NHFP
- For detailed information contact: David Fletcher at dfletcher@srtc.org or 509.343.6370

Project Submission for 2022 Washington State Freight System Plan Update

Submittal Instructions

Please read this entire instruction sheet before completing your project submission form. This sheet provides guidance on eligible data types, examples of project concepts, and other information intended to help you complete the submittal form with the best information possible.

Please attach supporting data/documentation in your submittal package. Data, plans, and other information used as supporting evidence for your project should be included in the submittal package to aid in project verification.

For further assistance, please contact:
Wenjuan Zhao, Multimodal Freight Systems Planning Engineer
Wenjuan.Zhao@wsdot.wa.gov
360-763-8070

Part 1 – Project Information

The purpose of Part 1 is to collect background information on the location, scope, schedule, and expected budget of the project.

Project Scope

The following item must be included in the submittal:

- A detailed vicinity map in PDF format, with clearly marked project limits that shows the project location
- Cross-jurisdictional letter of concurrence if applicable (required for projects involving roadways/facilities owned or managed by other jurisdictions)

Please also include a GIS shapefile showing the actual alignment of the project if available.

Project Budget

Please provide information on the amount of funding requested, secured, and unsecured for this project. PE is professional engineering, RW is right of way, and CN is construction.

Project Schedule

Please provide planned milestone dates by month and year (MM/YYY).

DRAFT

PART 2 - FREIGHT PROJECT BENEFITS

The freight project benefits section of the submittal form presents a series of criteria that reflect the six transportation policy goals under RCW. **Clear, succinct responses that support answers to the questions are strongly encouraged.**

Goal 1: Economic Vitality

The economic vitality goal area is intended to measure a project's impact on the local, regional, and state economy. This goal area has three evaluation criteria. Each is listed below with further instructions.

Support the Economy and Promote Employment

This evaluation criterion is measured based on a project's proximity to an identified freight business cluster. The rationale here is that the closer a project is to a freight cluster, the greater the impact it will have on supporting freight movement for these industries.

How to report: You should list the location of your project (urbanized area or not in an urbanized area), and the distance to the closest freight cluster.

The data: You should use the provided freight business cluster shapefile and map to gather the information on urbanized areas and distance to the closest freight cluster.

Scoring: Projects will be sorted into four scoring categories, and scoring thresholds are shown below.

Project's distance from the nearest freight cluster		Points Awarded
Project in Urbanized Area	Project not in Urbanized Area	
0 - 1 miles	0 - 5 miles	100% of points
1 - 5 miles	5 - 10 miles	66% of points
5 - 10 miles	10 - 15 miles	33% of points
10+ miles	15+ miles	No points

Location of the Freight and Goods Transportation System

This evaluation criterion is measured using the Freight and Goods Transportation System (FGTS) designation for the route where the project is planned. The rationale here is that the higher the route's tier, the more important it is for Washington's economy.

How to report: You should report the *highest* FGTS classification or truck count associated with any road, railroad, or waterway segment within your project. If a project is not a designated FGTS route, you should provide information of your own regarding truck, rail, or vessel traffic volumes in the project area.

The data: You should use the Washington Freight and Goods Transportation System (FGTS) dataset. https://www.wsdot.wa.gov/mapsdata/geodatacatalog/Maps/noscale/DOT_Freight/FGTSWA.htm If a project is not on a designated FGTS route, you should supply your own traffic volume data, which might include local supplemental truck counts, rail traffic volumes from Federal Railroad Administration crossing reports, counts of vessel port calls from the US Army Corps of Engineers, or local transportation demand model estimates.

Scoring: Projects will be sorted into six scoring groups. The table below shows potential point assignments for projects based on FGTS or truck traffic volumes. Please note, only one data source is required, and FGTS

information is preferred. You do not need to submit traffic volume information if your project is located on an FGTS network element.

FGTS Designation	Average Daily Truck Traffic Volume	Points Awarded
T-1 / R-1 / W-1	2,500 or more	100% of points
T-2 / R-2 / W-2	1,000 – 2,500	80% of points
T-3 / R-3 / W-3	500 – 1,000	60% of points
T-4 / R-4 / W-4	100 - 500	40% of points
T-5 / R-5 / W-5	0 - 100	20% of points
No designation	No truck volume information	No points

Intermodal Connectivity Between Modes

This evaluation criterion is assessed using a narrative statement about a project's "degree of connection" to an intermodal facility. Eligible projects are not limited to intermodal container facilities and could include any facility that facilitates the movement of goods between two different modes, including bulk or break-bulk cargo port infrastructure, railyard transload, and air cargo transload infrastructure.

How to report: You should provide a written statement of no more than 200 words describing a project's "degree of connection" to an intermodal facility. If the project has some form of connection to an intermodal facility, you should explain whether it is a direct, secondary, or tertiary. The table below provides more details about these three degrees of connection.

Degree of Connection	Description	Examples
Direct	All or some of the project is within an intermodal facility.	• Improvements to gate of facility or internal roads • Dock wall improvements • On-site rail improvements
Secondary	The project directly connects to an intermodal facility but does not enter the facility.	• Rebuilding or improving access road for facility gate • Rehabilitating or improving rail siding to facility boundary • Installation of fleeting or mooring infrastructure outside of port
Tertiary	The project improves a connection between an intermodal facility and a FGTS T-1 or T-2 roadway or R-1 or R-2 railroad but does not touch the intermodal facility	• Improving signal timing on routes connecting ports with highways • Improving off-ramp geometry to improve truck safety and mobility on a route to an intermodal facility • Offsite railcar staging space for a rail terminal

Scoring: Projects will be sorted into four groups, as shown in the table below.

Project's "Degree of Connection" to an Intermodal Facility	Points Awarded
Primary	100% of points
Secondary	66% of points
Tertiary	33% of points
No demonstration of connections to an intermodal facility	No points

Goal 2: Preservation

The preservation goal area is intended to measure a project's impact on the condition freight infrastructure. This goal area has two evaluation criteria.

Improve the State of Good Repair of Freight Infrastructure

This evaluation criterion is measured using a written statement of no more than 200 words describing how a project will improve infrastructure conditions. The rationale here is simple: if a project improves infrastructure conditions then it will have a positive impact on preservation.

How to report: You should describe if and how your project will improve the condition of freight infrastructure.

Scoring: If your project will improve infrastructure condition then it will be scored on the criterion below.

Assessment of Existing Infrastructure Condition of Project Location

This evaluation criterion is measured using data on the project's existing infrastructure condition. The rationale here is that a project will have a greater impact on preservation if it improves the condition of infrastructure that is already in poor condition.

How to report: Using one of the sources below as evidence, you should provide data on existing pavement or bridge condition observed in the project area.

The data: Multiple datasets are available for use, depending on the network elements associated with the project. Please note that you do not need to report all of the metric examples provided here, only one metric should be submitted.

- State-owned routes use WSDOT's Pavement Structural Condition (PSC) values
- County Roads are scored based on Pavement Structural Condition (PSC) values
- Local Roads are scored based on Pavement Condition Index (PCI) values
- Bridge-related projects use Washington State Bridge Inventory System (WSBIS) attribute "BridgeOverallConditionState"

If you are submitting a project focused on rail or maritime infrastructure, please state the condition of your infrastructure (good, fair, poor) and provide supporting information and evidence about asset conditions.

Scoring: Projects will be scored based on the **worst** observed infrastructure condition within the project boundary, as shown in the table below.

	Score Category	State Owned Roads	County Roads	Local Roads	Bridges	Points Awarded
		Pavement Structural Condition	Pavement Structural Condition	Pavement Condition Index	WSBIS Condition State	
Metric Range	Poor	0 - 48	0 - 48	0 - 55	Poor	100% of points
	Fair	49 - 66	49 - 66	56 - 70	Fair	66% of points
	Good	67 - 100	67 - 100	71 - 100	Good	33% of points

Goal 3: Safety

The safety goal area is intended to measure a project's impact on the safety of freight transportation.

Prevent or Reduce Injuries or Fatalities

This evaluation criterion is measured using a written statement of no more than 200 words describing the project's expected safety benefits. The rationale here is simple: if a project has safety benefits, then it will have a positive impact on freight system safety.

How to report: You should describe your project's expected safety benefits.

Scoring: If your project has elements intended to improve transportation safety, then it will be scored on the second evaluation criterion below.

Count of Serious Injury or Fatality Crashes within the Project Bounds

This evaluation criterion is measured using WSDOT crash data from 2016 to 2020. The rationale here is that a project will have a greater impact on safety if it makes improvements where safety is currently poor.

How to report: Please provide a summary count of the number of serious injury and fatal crashes within your project boundary, and a list of the corresponding crash record identification numbers for these crashes.

The data: Using the provided request form, you may request truck-involved crash records from 2016 to 2020 for your jurisdiction. If your project is located off of the roadway network, please provide information on the historical record of crashes or accidents within the project area, or a narrative description of outstanding safety issues that the project may address.

Scoring: Projects will be sorted into six groups, as shown in the table below.

Percentile of Crash Count	Points Awarded
Top 20% (80-100th percentile)	100% of points
60-80th percentile	80% of points
40-60th percentile	60% of points
20-40th percentile	40% of points
Bottom 20% (0-20th percentile)	20% of points
No crash data provided	0 points

Reduce Conflict with Other Transportation Users

This evaluation criterion first identifies whether there is either (1) a history of conflict or (2) potential for conflict with other transportation users in the project area. If there is either a history of conflict or potential for conflict, you should provide a written statement describing how the project will reduce or mitigate this conflict. This statement is used to measure how effective the project is at reducing conflict between transportation users. The rationale here is that if a project is situated in an area with a history of conflict or potential for conflict, then a project that more effectively addresses this conflict will have a greater impact on safety.

How to report: To report a history of conflict or potential for conflict, you should provide the information listed in the table below.

Type of Conflict	Information to Provide	Example
History of Observed Conflicts	Using previously-provided truck-involved crash data, list the count of truck-involved bicycle or pedestrian crashes within the boundaries of the project.	"Between 2016 and 2020, there were X truck-involved bicycle crashes and X truck-involved crashes with pedestrians in the project area."
Potential for Conflict	List the number and characteristics of pedestrian or bicycle facilities within the boundaries of the project. If available, provide data on the level of bicycle or pedestrian traffic in the project area, especially if these users are not using designated sidewalks or bicycle facilities. Additional supporting information may include information about the location or characteristics of facilities generating bicycle and pedestrian trips, such as schools, bus stops, malls, employment centers, etc. If the project intersects with a State Route, you may use WSDOT's Level of Traffic Stress for Bicyclists and Pedestrians as supporting information.	"There are 2 crosswalks in the project area, and Main Street is a designated bike route with painted bike lane markers." "An estimated 100 cyclists per day ride on Country Road 1, even though it is not a designated bike route." "This project is adjacent to a high school that generates pedestrian and bicycle traffic."

If there is either a history of conflict or potential for conflict identified, then you should also provide a written statement of no more than 200 words describing how the project will reduce or mitigate conflict between transportation users. You should explain whether the project makes use of a separation or a mitigation strategy. The table below provides more details about these two types of strategies.

Strategy to address conflict	Description	Examples
Separation	This strategy involves physical barriers or spatial separation between roadway and bicycle or pedestrian facilities.	A dedicated curb-protected bicycle lane.
Mitigation	This strategy involves signage, markers, operational changes, or other "soft" changes to improve safety awareness but does not physically separate users.	A flashing bicycle crossing warning sign.

The data: The number of truck-involved bicycle or pedestrian crashes can be sourced from WSDOT crash data. You may use your own data to support descriptions of the potential for conflict.

Scoring: If your project has evidence of potential conflict then you will also be scored on the type of strategy your project uses to address conflict between transportation users. Projects will be sorted into three groups according to the strategy used, as shown in the table below.

Strategy to address conflict	Points Awarded
Separation	100% of points
Mitigation	50% of points
No solution considered	0 points

Goal 4: Mobility

The mobility goal area is intended to measure a project's impact on congestion and bottlenecks.

Reduce Congestion and Improve Reliability

This evaluation criterion is measured using a written statement describing how the project will support a delay reduction or reliability improvement.

How to report: You should provide a written statement of no more than 200 words describing how the project will support a delay reduction or reliability improvement.

Scoring: Projects will be sorted into groups: yes, the project supports a delay reduction or reliability improvement, or no it does not.

Analysis to Determine if a Project is on a Congested Infrastructure Segment

This evaluation criterion is measured using data to determine the existing level of congestion in the project area. The rationale here is that a project will have a greater impact on mobility if it improves reliability on infrastructure that currently suffers from high congestion.

How to report: You should provide data on existing congestion levels in the project area.

The data: If possible, you should provide volume-to-capacity (V/C) information from MAP-21 data reported by WSDOT to FHWA through HPMS. If supplemental information is needed, you may provide your own data such as the items below:

- Level of Service (LOS) based on local data collection. If LOS is provided, please provide supporting documentation showing how your LOS estimate was calculated (ex: traffic volume, traffic density, service flow rate, etc…)

- Peak Period vs. Free Flow Speed (or Posted Speed Limit) ratio as collected or documented in other data or plans
- V/C ratio estimates from travel demand model outputs.

If your project is located off the road network, please provide an assessment of congestion problems expected to be solved by the project, and evidence supporting the assessment of the severity of congestion. For example, container dwell time at railroad intermodal yards, vessel time at berths, etc…

Scoring: Projects will be sorted into three groups, as shown in the table below. Please note, you only need to provide information for one type of metric, not all of the potential metrics listed above and shown in the table below.

Level of Congestion	Volume to Capacity Ratio	Level of Service	Peak Period vs. Free Flow (or Posted) Speed	Points Awarded
High	V/C > 1.0	E - F	0.5 or lower	100% of points
Medium	1.0 > VC > 0.8	C - D	0.5 – 0.8	66% of points
Low	VC < 0.8	A - B	0.8 – 1.0	33% of points

Goal 5: Environment and Communities

The environment and communities goal area is intended to measure a project's impacts on both the natural environment and the human/built environment. This goal area has three evaluation criteria. Each is listed below with further instructions.

Reduce Freight Transportation Activities' Negative Impacts on Washington's Water Quality

The 2021 Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act calls for state freight plans to develop strategies and goals to decrease the impacts on freight movement on flooding and stormwater runoff. This criterion supports this work and asks for a written statement describing the degree to which the project demonstrates a strategy to address potential stormwater impacts.

How to report: You should provide a written statement with supporting evidence as necessary.

The data: Your statement should describe (1) the stormwater management requirements relevant to the project, and (2) whether or not the project meets stormwater management requirements or *exceeds* those requirements, and (3) information or evidence to support your submission.

Scoring: Projects will be sorted into three groups, as shown in the table below.

Does the project implement a strategy to address stormwater above minimum requirements?	Points Awarded
Above minimum requirements	100% of points
Meets minimum requirements	50% of points
Does not meet the minimum requirements (noncompliant)	0 Points

Reduce Freight Transportation Activities' Negative Impacts on Washington's Wildlife

The 2021 Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act calls for state freight plans to develop strategies and goals to decrease the impacts on freight movement on wildlife habitat loss. This evaluation criterion is measured in two parts. First, it identifies whether a project intersects with designated Priority Habitat for species. Then, this criterion asks for a written statement describing how the project demonstrates a strategy to address potential wildlife habitat impacts. When possible, projects should be located outside of designated habitats, so as to avoid further habitat loss or disruption. If a project is located in a Priority Habitat, then it should address wildlife impacts in order to mitigate loss or replace habitat elsewhere.

How to report: You should identify if the project intersects with an area designated as Priority Habitat. You should then provide a written statement of no more than 200 words describing how the project incorporates strategies to address wildlife impacts.

The data: You should use data from the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife to identify whether the project is located within a Priority Habitat. https://geodataservices.wdfw.wa.gov/hp/phs/

Scoring: Projects will be sorted into three groups, as shown in the table below.

Is the project in priority habitat?	Does the project implement a strategy to address wildlife impacts?	Points Awarded
No	N/A	100% of points
Yes	Yes	50% of points
Yes	No	0% of points

Analysis of Projects Near Vulnerable Communities

This evaluation criterion is measured in two parts. First, it identifies whether a project is located in an area designated as a vulnerable community. Then, this criterion asks for a written statement describing how the project demonstrates a strategy to mitigate potential negative community impacts such as noise, light, vibration, and air emissions. If a project will impact a vulnerable community, mitigation strategies must be implemented to reduce impacts upon the community. Additionally, if a project is *not* located in a vulnerable community but implements investments to mitigate impacts on residents, it receives recognition as well.

How to report: You should identify whether the project is located in an area designated as vulnerable. You should then provide a written statement of no more than 200 words describing how the project incorporates strategies to address community impacts.

The data: You should use the Environmental Health Disparity Map from the Washington Department of Health to identify whether the project intersects with a vulnerable community. A score of an 8, 9 or 10 on this map qualifies an area as a vulnerable community.

Scoring: Projects will be sorted into four groups, as shown in the table below.

Is the project in an environmental justice community (rank 8, 9, or 10)?	Does the project implement a strategy to address community impacts?	Points Awarded
Yes	Yes	100% of points
No	Yes	50% of points
No	No	0 points
Yes	No	-50% of points

Goal 6: Stewardship

The stewardship goal area is intended to measure the degree to which a project is supported by additional sources of funding, and whether or not innovative low-cost approaches were considered or implemented in order to reduce expected project cost. This goal area has two evaluation criteria. Each is listed below with further instructions.

Percent of Project Cost with a Funding Match

This evaluation criterion is measured based on the percent of the project's total cost that has secured a non-federal funding match.

How to report: You should identify the percentage of the project's total cost that has secured a non-federal funding match.

Scoring: You will be scored based on how high the project's secured funding match is, with a high match being awarded more points. For example, a project with a 50% match will get 50% of available points, and a project with a 25% match will get 25% of available points.

Prioritize Lowest-Cost Solutions for the Specific Freight Need

This evaluation criterion is measured using a written statement describing two items:

1. whether you considered low-cost solutions for your specific freight need, and
2. whether you implemented these solutions.

The rationale here is that both the consideration of the feasibility of low-cost solutions and the implementation of such solutions demonstrate an attempt at good stewardship of limited financial resources.

How to report: You should provide a written statement of no more than 200 words describing how you considered low-cost solutions for your freight need and whether or not you are implementing such solutions. If you are not implementing the solution considered, you should explain why you determined that these low-cost solutions were infeasible. Examples of low-cost solutions might include:

- Operations and management changes such as changes to traffic light timings to reduce truck-related congestion or mitigate conflict between trucks and bicyclists.
- Alteration of existing infrastructure as opposed to construction new infrastructure

Scoring: Projects will be sorted into four groups, as shown in the table below.

Were low-cost solutions considered?	Does the project implement low-cost solutions?	Points Awarded
Yes	Yes	100% of points
Yes	No, determined to be infeasible	50% of points
No	No	0 points

Additional Benefit 1: Truck Parking

The truck parking additional benefit functions like a bonus point category and is intended to measure a project's impact on truck parking. This topic will not be relevant to all projects.

This evaluation criterion is measured using a written statement describing the expected truck parking facilities included in the project. The rationale here is simple: a project that includes new or improved truck parking facilities or improves information about parking availability will have a positive impact on truck parking.

How to report: You should provide a written statement of no more than 200 words describing the expected truck parking facilities included in the project. You should make sure to describe how the project will affect truck parking supply, amenities, or information about truck parking availability.

Scoring: Projects will be sorted into four groups, as shown in the table below.

Does the project improve truck parking supply?	Does the project improve truck parking amenities or information?	Points awarded
Yes	Yes	100% of points
Yes	No	66% of points
No	Yes	33% of points
No	No	0 points

Additional Benefit 2: Freight System Resiliency

The freight system resiliency additional benefit functions like a bonus point category and is intended to measure a project's impact on freight system resiliency.

This evaluation criterion is measured using a written statement describing two items:

1. whether you considered resiliency improvements, and
2. whether you implemented these improvements.

The rationale here is that both the consideration of the feasibility of resiliency improvements and the implementation of such solutions demonstrate an attempt to address freight system resiliency.

How to report: You should provide a written statement describing how the project considers and/or implements improvements to freight transportation resiliency. This includes any strategy the project implements to reduce the likelihood of failure or closure due to severe weather, natural disaster, climate change, terrorism, market disruptions, or other unexpected events. It may also include strategies to rapidly re-open or restore service after closures. If you are not implementing the improvement considered, you should explain why you determined that it was infeasible.

The data: You should use existing risk studies whenever possible to support your written statement. Such studies might include, but are not limited to:

- Washington State Enhanced Hazard Mitigation Plan
- Resiliency Assessment: Washington State Transportation Systems (Cascadia Subduction Zone)
- The Washington State Highway Seismic Screening Tool (HSST)
- NOAA's Sea Level Rise Viewer
- Washington State Department of Natural Resources' Geologic Hazards information
- Washington State Department of Natural Resources' Tsunamis information
- Additional Resources at UW Climate Impacts Group

Scoring: Projects will be sorted into four groups, as shown in the table below.

Level of Resiliency Consideration	Description	Points Awarded
High	The project improves resiliency by promoting continuous transportation operations or providing redundancy. Example design elements could include hardening, securing, or relocating infrastructure. Other approaches could include investments in emergency response or resiliency planning or preparation.	100 % of points
Medium	The project improves system resiliency by improving the ability to rapidly restore operations after a closure.	66% of points
Low	Evidence of consideration of investments to address an identified resiliency concern, but resiliency improvements not feasible or not implemented within scope of project.	33% of points
None	No consideration	0 points

Additional Benefit 3: Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The greenhouse gas emissions additional benefit functions like a bonus point category and is intended to a project's impact on GHG emissions.

This evaluation criterion is measured using a written statement describing three items:

1. Aspects of the project intended to reduce GHG emissions. These aspects might include congestion mitigation, reduction of VMT, electrification, alternative fuel infrastructure or corridors, idle reduction for trucks, service to reduce empty vehicle movements, etc…
2. Whether you implemented these strategies in the scope of your project, and
3. Information about the extent of information reduction measures e.g. estimate VMT reduction, or number of vehicles affected.

The rationale here is that both the consideration of the feasibility of emission mitigation strategies and the implementation of such strategies demonstrate an attempt to address greenhouse gas emissions.

How to report: You should provide a written statement describing the three items above If you are not implementing the strategy considered, you should explain why you determined that it was infeasible.

Scoring: Projects will be sorted into three groups, as shown in the table below.

Emissions Reductions Considered	Emissions Reduction Measure Implemented	Points Awarded
Yes	Yes	100% of points
Yes	No, determined to be infeasible	50% of points
No	No	0 points

DRAFT

Project Scoring for 2022 Washington State Freight System Plan Update

Discussion question: do we take the weighted approach based on the importance of the transportation policy goals for project scoring or not?

Goal	Criterion	Measure	Policy Goal weight (example weighting based on 2017 process)*	Maximum point allocation (based on 2017 weighting)
Economic Vitality	Support the Economy and Promote Employment	Project's distance from the nearest freight cluster.	30%	10
	Location on the FGTS	FGTS Designation (or AADTT if off the FGTS)		10
	Project's Degree of Connection to an Intermodal Facility	Degrees of connection		10
Preservation	Assessment of Existing Infrastructure Condition of Project Location	Pavement and/or Bridge Condition	15%	15
Safety	Prevent or Reduce Injuries or Fatalities	Count of serious injury or fatality crashes within the project bounds	10%	5
	Reduce Conflict with Other Transportation Users	For project areas with history of conflict, separation or mitigation effort		5
Mobility	Reduce Congestion and Improve Reliability	Degree of congestion in project area	25%	25
Environment and Communities	Reduce Freight Transportation's Negative Impacts on Washington's Water Quality	Does project address stormwater impacts	10%	3
	Reduce Freight Transportation's Negative Impacts on Washington's Wildlife	Does project address wildlife impacts		3
	Reduce Freight Transportation's Negative Impacts on Vulnerable Communities	Does project address impacts on vulnerable communities		4
Stewardship	Percent of Project Cost with Funding Match	Percent match	10%	5
	Prioritize lowest-cost solutions for the specific freight need	Lowest cost project tailored to freight need		5
Total			**100%**	**100**

*Note: policy goal weights shown here reflect what was applied in 2017 freight prioritization process based on Freight Advisory Committee recommendation and are subject to change.

Bonus Categories		
Criterion	**Measure**	**Maximum point allocation**
Improve Truck Parking	Does the project improve truck parking supply, amenities, or information?	10
Improve Freight System Resiliency	Does the project improve resiliency to maintain operations or the ability to quickly restore operations after closure?	10
Reduce GHG Emissions	Does the project reduce GHG emissions	10

DRAFT

DRAFT Project Submission for 2022 Washington State Freight System Plan Update

Submittal Instructions

WSDOT is requesting a prioritized regional freight project list from Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) and Regional Transportation Planning Organizations (RTPO) for FFY 2022-2025 NHFP funding consideration. The regional prioritized freight project list and completed project submission forms must be submitted by MPO/RTPOs to WSDOT Rail, Freight and Ports Division at Wenjuan.Zhao@wsdot.wa.gov by March 16th.

MPOs and RTPOs are strongly encouraged to coordinate with their local jurisdiction members, including cities, counties, and ports to create the regional prioritized freight project list for NHFP funding consideration and complete the freight project submission form for each project on the list.

Please read the attached submittal instruction sheet before completing your project submission form. That sheet provides guidance on required documentation, eligible data types, examples of project concepts, and other information intended to help you complete the submittal form with the best information possible.

For further assistance, please contact:
Wenjuan Zhao, Multimodal Freight Systems Planning Engineer
Wenjuan.Zhao@wsdot.wa.gov
360-763-8070

PART 1 - PROJECT INFORMATION

Contact Information

Project Owner:	
Contact Name:	
Contact Email Address:	
Contact Phone Number:	
Name of Metropolitan or Regional Planning Organization	

DRAFT

Project Scope

.

Project Name:				
Location:	Begin Project Limit: Start Latitude: Start Longitude:		End Project Limit: End Latitude: End Longitude:	
	*Note: Provide lat./long. in decimal degrees (e.g. W 120.111 Degrees)			
Total Project Length (miles):				
Brief Description:				
Freight Intermodal Project Identification	Please indicate whether your project falls under any of the following categories or not: 1) Projects within the boundaries of public or private freight rail or water facilities (including ports) that provide surface transportation infrastructure necessary to facilitate direct intermodal interchange, transfer, and access into or out of a freight rail or water facility; or 2) Modernization or rehabilitation of a lock and dam, or on a marine highway corridor, connector, or crossing designated by the Secretary under section 55601© of title 46 (including an inland waterway corridor, connector, or crossing)			

Attachment

The following items must be included in the submittal:

- A detailed vicinity map in PDF format, with clearly marked project limits that shows the project location
- Cross-jurisdictional letter of concurrence if applicable (required for projects involving roadways/facilities owned or managed by other jurisdictions)

Please also include a GIS shapefile showing the actual alignment of the project if available.

Project Budget

	NHFP Requested $[1]	Secured $[2]	Unsecured $[3]	Total $	Match[4]	Match %[5]
PE:						
RW:						
CN:						
Total:						

Notes:
1. the total NHFP funding requested by project phase. Round all amounts to the nearest thousand dollars.
2. funding already secured from any other source.
3. funding gap without an identified source.
4. Match is the amount of non-federal funds.

5. A minimum match % (match divided by Total Cost) of 13.5% must be provided for non-interstate projects for each phase; for interstate projects the minimum match requirement is 9.33% .
6. list the source(s) of matching funds for phase(s) applicable, and specify the match amount from each source if more than one source is listed.

Project Schedule

Begin PE	
Environmental Documents (NEPA) Approved	
Right of Way completed (certification, if required)	
Construction Authorization (by FHWA)	
Construction Contract Advertised	
Construction Contract Awarded	
Open to Public	

PART 2 - FREIGHT PROJECT BENEFITS

Please answer the questions below to describe how your project meets the criteria, and provide summarized data and facts, if applicable. Clear, succinct responses that support answers to the questions are strongly encouraged.

Goal 1: Economic Vitality

Measure Area	Questions
Local, regional, and state economy and employment	Is the project in an urbanized or a rural area? How many miles is the project from a freight cluster?
	Is the project located on the FGTS (e.g., T-1 through T-5)? If so, please provide the classification. If the project is not located on the FGTS, please provide supplemental information on freight traffic volumes within the boundaries of the project.
Intermodal connectivity between different freight modes	Does the project maintain or improve intermodal connectivity between different freight modes? If yes, please describe the “degree of connection” the project has with an intermodal facility.

Goal 2: Preservation

Measure Area	Question
State of good repair of freight infrastructure	Does the project improve the state of good repair of freight infrastructure? If yes, please describe how this project will improve infrastructure condition.
	If yes, please provide supporting documentation on the condition of infrastructure within the project area.

Goal 3: Safety

Measure Area	Questions	
Fatalities or serious injuries on the freight system	Does the project include elements intended to improve transportation safety? If yes, please describe this project's expected safety benefits.	
	If yes, what is the count of fatal and serious injury crashes within the project bounds between 2016 and 2020? If the project is off the road network, please provide information about accident history or safety concerns at the project site.	
	Fatal Crashes:	
	Serious Injury Crashes:	
	Crash Identifiers / Other Information:	
Conflict between freight modes or between truck traffic and other roadway users	Is there a history of conflict between freight transportation users and bicyclists/pedestrians from 2016-2020? If yes, please list the count of the truck-involved bicycle or pedestrian crashes within the boundaries of the project between 2016 and 2020. Otherwise, write "0."	
	Are there pedestrian or bicycle facilities within the boundaries of the project? If so, please provide a summary of the pedestrian and bicycle facilities present. If no facilities are present, but pedestrian and bicycle activity is still observed, provide information on pedestrian or bicyclist activity in the area.	
	If yes for either of the two questions above (conflict between roadway users or presence of pedestrian/bicycle facilities/activity), please describe how this project will reduce or mitigate potential conflict with other transportation users (200 words or fewer).	

Goal 4: Mobility

Measure Area	Questions
Freight congestion and bottlenecks	Does the project support delay reduction or improve freight transportation reliability? If yes, please describe (200 words or fewer).
	If yes, please identify the segment's volume-to-capacity ratio as provided by FHWA HPMS. If this data is unavailable for your project, you may provide information from other sources, please see the instruction sheet for further details.

Goal 5: Environment and Communities

Measure Area	Questions
Environmental impacts of freight	What are the stormwater management requirements relevant for your project? If there are relevant requirements, please state whether or project meets or exceeds those requirements, and provide information the design elements intended to accomplish this task.
	Does the project sit within or intersect an area designated as Priority Habitat by Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife? If yes, please describe how habitat impact mitigation has been incorporated into the project.

Community or social impacts of freight	What is the highest Environmental Health Disparity ranking that the project lies in or intersects?
	Does the project mitigate freight impacts to the community such as air emissions, noise, light, and/or vibration? If yes, please describe how (200 words or fewer). Important: If the ranking from the above question is 8, 9 or 10, this question must be answered. For all other projects, the mitigation efforts listed below may qualify the project for additional points.

Goal 6: Stewardship

Measure Area	Questions
Financial support by project owners	What percentage of the project cost is matched with non-federal funds?
Lowest cost/lifecycle cost consideration	Does the project implement low-cost solutions? If yes, please describe how (200 words or fewer). If no, does the project consider low-cost solutions? If yes, please describe how low-cost solutions were considered and determined to be infeasible (200 words or fewer).

Additional Benefit 1: Truck Parking

Does this project improve truck parking? If yes, describe the expected truck parking related investments, with specific attention to increased supply, amenities, or parking information.

Additional Benefit 2: Freight System Resiliency

Describe the resiliency concerns present for this project, such as severe weather, natural disaster, or security concerns. Describe the approaches investigated to address these resiliency concerns, and whether or not these approaches are feasible and implemented in the project.

Additional Benefit 3: Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Does this project include aspects intended to reduce GHG emissions? If yes, describe how. These aspects might include congestion mitigation, reduction of VMT, electrification, alternative fuel infrastructure or corridors, idle reduction for trucks, services to reduce empty vehicle movements, etc. Include information about the extent of the emission reduction measures, such as the estimated VMT reduction or the number of vehicles affected.

SRTC SPOKANE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL
421 W. RIVERSIDE AVE. SUITE 500 • SPOKANE WA 99201 • 509.343.6370 • WWW.SRTC.ORG

To: Transportation Advisory Committee 12/13/2021

From: Jason Lien, AICP, Principal Transportation Planner

Topic: **DivisionConnects – Phase 2 Study Update**

Requested Action:

None. For information and discussion.

Key Points:

- DivisionConnects is a multi-jurisdictional study to analyze the Division Street corridor, including implementation of bus rapid transit (BRT).
- The first phase of the study concluded with identification of a locally preferred alternative (LPA) for BRT and other corridor improvements. The STA Board adopted the LPA by resolution at their April 2021 meeting. The SRTC Board accepted the LPA and Phase 1 study conclusions, as documented in the DivisionConnects Corridor Development Plan, at the June 2021 meeting.
- The second and final phase of the study kicked off in the summer. Its focus points are active transportation connectivity and evaluation of land use opportunities in the Division corridor.
- Two public engagement efforts have been conducted this Fall—the Land Use StoryMap & Questionnaire, which is closing on December 15, and the Active Transportation Map & Questionnaire, which will close on December 31.

Board/Committee Discussions:

Emphasizing a regional approach to major transportation corridors was born out of the SRTC Board's strategic plan in late 2017. The SRTC funding portion for the Division Street Corridor Study was approved by the Board in March 2018, consisting of a $400,000 STBG allocation as part of the 2018 SRTC Call for Projects. The Board took action to accept the preferred BRT alternative at the June 2021 meeting. The Board was updated at their November 2021 meeting. The TTC and TAC were last updated at their respective October 2021 meetings. The Division Street Corridor Study is identified in SRTC's 2-year Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).

Public Involvement:

The study process involves extensive public engagement, and a project website is available (divisionconnects.org). Over the course of the study, information has been distributed through Neighborhood Councils, email lists, focus groups, one-on-one interviews, print media, direct mail, online questionnaires, agency newsletters, and social media. An online Land Use StoryMap & Questionnaire opened on October 26. An online Active Transportation Map & Questionnaire launched on November 24 and will close on December 31.

Supporting Information/Implications

DivisionConnects is a coordinated planning effort with Spokane Transit Authority (STA) to engage the community and analyze opportunities in the Division Street corridor from a multimodal transportation and system perspective. Project partners are WSDOT, City of Spokane, and Spokane County. With identification of a preferred alternative for bus rapid transit and approval by the STA and SRTC Boards in Spring 2021 concluding the first phase of the study, the second and final phase is looking at land use opportunities that can leverage the future transit investment as well as supportive active transportation connections along and through the Division corridor.

The Phase 2 scope of work consists of three areas:

- Active Transportation Planning – review of gaps, safety, and connectivity of facilities for people walking and rolling in the corridor. This will culminate in project recommendations with cost estimates and preliminary design information.
- Land Use Planning – this task is evaluating existing assets (e.g. parks, transportation infrastructure, employment clusters, vacant land) to see what areas may have the greatest potential for land use development/redevelopment in alignment with BRT investment. Opportunity areas have been identified in a number of “nodes” along the corridor. The higher priority nodes will be selected and used to help inform future focused planning work at the City and/or County.
- Public Engagement – to inform the two tasks above, the project team is engaging the community through two online products: 1) A StoryMap with information about the land use nodes under evaluation, and 2) An interactive map and questionnaire to gather feedback on active transportation options. The StoryMap questionnaire is closing on December 15, and the Active Transportation questionnaire is open through December 31. Links to these public engagement platforms are accessible at divisionconnects.org.

The study will review feedback from public engagement, and combined with agency team workshops, use this information to make recommendations for land use and higher priority active transportation projects. High-level guidance is provided through the project steering committee. The study will conclude with its final recommendations in Spring 2022.

More Information:

- For detailed information contact: Jason Lien at jlien@srtc.org or 509.343.6370