

Transportation Advisory Committee Meeting

Wednesday, January 25, 2023 | 3:00 PM

Hybrid In-Person/Online Meeting

SRTC Conference Room, 421 W Riverside Ave Suite 504, Spokane WA 99201

On Zoom at:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82126214518?pwd=V0hxY010dHl5aktUZWU0bm1FaXBVZz09>

Meeting ID: 821 2621 4518 | Passcode: 706620

By Phone at: 1-253-215-8782

Meeting ID: 821 2621 4518 | Passcode: 706620

Or find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82126214518?pwd=V0hxY010dHl5aktUZWU0bm1FaXBVZz09>

Public comments are welcome and can be shared during the meeting or submitted in advance via email to contact.srtc@srtc.org or by mail to 421 W Riverside Ave Suite 500, Spokane WA 99201 or by phone to 509.343.6370. Deadline to submit comments in advance is 12:00pm the day of the meeting.

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.

Transportation Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, January 25, 2023 | 3:00 PM

<i>Time</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Page</i>
3:00	1 Call to Order / Record of Attendance	
3:02	2 Approval of December 2022 TAC Meeting Minutes	3
3:03	3 Public Comments	
3:05	4 TAC Member Comments	
3:10	5 Chair Report on SRTC Board of Directors Meeting	

ACTION ITEMS

3:15	6	2023-2026 Transportation Improvement Program February Amendment (<i>Kylee Jones</i>)	6
3:20	7	SRTC 2024-2026 Preservation Call for Projects (<i>Eve McMenamy</i>)	9
3:30	8	Transportation Performance Measures: PM1 Safety (<i>Mike Ulrich</i>)	16

INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

3:45	9	SFY 2024-2025 Unified Planning Work Program Development Overview (<i>Ryan Stewart</i>)	17
3:55	10	Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (<i>Jason Lien</i>)	19
4:05	11	Guest Presentation: WSDOT Complete Streets (<i>Shea Suski, WSDOT</i>)	n/a
4:20	12	Introduction to the Carbon Reduction Program Funding (<i>Kylee Jones</i>)	20
4:25	13	Agency Update (<i>Jason Lien</i>)	n/a
4:30	14	Adjournment	

Spokane Regional Transportation Council – Transportation Advisory Committee

December 21, 2022 | Meeting Minutes

Hybrid Meeting at SRTC, 421 W Riverside Ave Suite 504, Spokane WA 99201 and virtually on Zoom

1 Call to Order/Record of Attendance

Chair Young called the meeting to order at 3:02pm.

In Attendance

TAC Members

Raychel Callary
 Todd Coleman
 Charles Hansen
 Carlie Hoffman
 Caleb Newbill

Bill White
 Charlie Wolff
 Rhonda Young (Chair)
 Claudine Zender
 Kim Zentz (Vice-chair)

SRTC Staff

Ryan Stewart, *Principal Transportation Planner*
 Jason Lien, *Principal Transportation Planner*
 Mike Ulrich, *Principal Transportation Planner*
 Lois Bollenback, *Executive Director*
 Eve McMenemy, *Deputy Executive Director*
 Julie Meyers-Lehman, *Admin-Exec Coordinator*

Guests

Jennifer Simmons
 Tom Sahlberg

2 Approval of November TAC Meeting minutes

Mr. White made a motion to approve the November minutes. Mr. Wolff seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

3 Public Comments

There were no comments.

4 TTC Member Comments

Ms. Callary said she would like the group to discuss what local governments can do about snow removal on sidewalks. The group spoke about the significant safety issues for people with disabilities, pedestrians, bicyclists, children walking to school, etc. because of the failure to keep sidewalks clear of snow and ice.

5 Chair Report on SRTC Board of Directors Meeting

Chair Young shared highlights from the December 9 meeting.

ACTION ITEMS

6 Human Services Transportation Plan: Consolidated Grant Rankings

Mr. Lien provided an overview of the WSDOT Consolidated Grant Program, which provides funding for capital and operating projects for human services public transportation projects, and shared details about the four projects which submitted applications. He spoke about the scoring process, which was done with volunteer members of the TAC and TTC. The suggested ranking recommendation is:

<u>Project Title</u>	<u>Ranking Grade</u>
Deer Park Dial-A-Ride & Community Shuttle	A
Neighbors on the Go	A
Replacement Buses to Sustain Deer Park Services	A
Spokane County Mobility Management	B

The group discussed the funding available through the program in this grant cycle.

Mr. Coleman made a motion to recommend Board approval of 2023-2025 Consolidated Grant project rankings through the Spokane County RTPO as shown. Ms. Callary seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

7 Recommend Board Presentation of Rail Corridor Identification Program

Mr. Lien explained that SRTC does not currently have passenger rail as a task in agency's work program, which is why the TAC and TTC are being asked to bring the topic forward to the Board. The group discussed the efforts of All Aboard Washington (AAWA) to obtain a letter of support from the Governor's office for funding to do a comprehensive study on restoration of long-distance passenger rail and establishing inter-city passenger rail in Washington, particularly in the eastern and central part of the state.

Ms. Zentz made a motion to recommend that the SRTC Board be presented with information from AAWA regarding the study of intercity passenger rail in Washington State and the Corridor Identification & Development Program. Mr. Hansen seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

8 2023-2026 Transportation Improvement Program January Amendment

Ms. McMenamy spoke about the purpose and development of a TIP and the TIP amendment process. She provided details about the projects in the proposed amendment. There were no questions or discussion.

Ms. Zentz made a motion to recommend Board approval of the 2023-2026 TIP January Amendment. Mr. Wolff seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

INFORMATION & DISCUSSION ITEMS

9 Preservation Call for Projects

Ms. McMenamy provided a background of the \$9.2M of funding set aside by the SRTC Board from the 2021 Call for projects to be used for a call for projects in 2023 for preservation projects only. The group reviewed key dates, draft principles of investment as proposed by the TIP Working Group, the draft project application and draft scoring. Members discussed equity in the draft scoring criteria.

10 DATA Project Update: Household Travel Survey Final Report

Mr. Ulrich shared a history of the DATA Project. The Household Travel Survey was one of DATA Project's six tasks. The group reviewed a summary of the survey timeline and objectives. Mr. Ulrich spoke about the survey sampling, oversampling, response rates, survey design and materials.

Members reviewed the survey results; they discussed the demographic responses by gender and the impact on the transportation system of residents from outside Spokane County commuting in for work or school.

12 Transportation Performance Measures: PM1 Safety

Mr. Ulrich reported on the history of the development of transportation performance management by FHWA. He provided details about current regional safety data and federal safety performance measures. By February the SRTC Board must either agree to plan and program in support of state safety targets or commit to a quantifiable target of its own.

13 Agency Update

Mr. Lien provided a short summary of the WSDOT Bridge Formula funding program which was discussed by the TTC at their meeting earlier today.

He thanked the TAC members who participated in the WSDOT Consolidated Grant Program application scoring.

Mr. Lien noted this was Ms. Young's last meeting as Chair and thanked her for her outstanding service.

14 Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:27 pm.

Julie Meyers-Lehman, Recording Secretary

To: Transportation Advisory Committee

01/18/2023

From: Kylee Jones, Associate Transportation Planner III

TOPIC: 2023-2026 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) FEBRUARY AMENDMENT

Requested Action:

Recommend Board approval of the 2023-2026 Transportation Improvement Program February amendment as shown in the **Attachment**.

Key Points:

One agency has an amendment to the 2023-2026 TIP for the following projects. See the **Attachment** for more details.

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Project</u>
Spokane Valley	Pines/BNSF Grade Separation Project

Board/Committee Discussions:

This is the first time the 2023-2026 TIP February amendment has been discussed by the TAC; the Transportation Technical Committee will also discuss on 01/25/23 and it will be presented to the Board for action at their February meeting.

Public Involvement:

The proposed amendment will be published for a public review and comment period from 01/18/23 through 01/27/23. On 01/18/23 notice of the amendment will be published in the Spokesman Review, posted to the SRTC website (www.srtc.org), and posted to social media platforms. Public comments received during the public comment period will be addressed by SRTC staff and presented to the Board in their February 2023 meeting packet.

Staff Contact: Kylee Jones, SRTC | kjones@srctc.org | 509.343.6370

2023-2026 Transportation Improvement Program

February Amendment (23-02)

FOR ACTION

AGENDA ITEM 6

Attachment

01/25/2023 TAC Meeting

Agency	Project Title Amendment Description	Funding Adjustment		Amendment	
				New Project	Existing Project
Spokane Valley	Pines/BNSF Grade Separation Project Added \$21.7M RAISE (federal) and \$5M Move Ahead Washington (state) funding.	Federal	\$	28,093,821	✓
		State	\$	5,000,000	
		Local	\$	2,023,456	
		Total	\$	35,117,277	

Supporting Information**TOPIC: 2023-2026 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) FEBRUARY AMENDMENT**

- 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.
- 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 proposed February 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 February amendment will be incorporated into the STIP on or around 03/17/23.

To: Transportation Advisory Committee

01/18/2023

From: Eve McMenamy, Deputy Executive Director

TOPIC: SRTC 2024-2026 PRESERVATION CALL FOR PROJECTS

Requested Action:

Recommend Board approval of SRTC 2024-2026 Preservation Call for Projects principles of investment and application as reported in the Attachment.

Key Points:

- As outlined in the 2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Guidebook, SRTC is conducting a Preservation Call for Projects to assist with efficient project delivery and meeting obligation targets.
- In 2021 the SRTC Board set aside \$9.2M of Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) funding during the 2021 Call for Projects to fund capital maintenance & preservation projects to obligate in 2024-2026.
- Principle of investment decisions and approval of the application are needed from the Board of Directors to guide and prepare for the release of the Preservation Call for Projects on 02/10/2023.
- The TIP Working Group offers the following points for discussion for the principles of investment:
 - Limit project applications to include grind and overlays, chip seals and other sealant projects;
 - Limit project awards not to exceed of \$1.5M; and
 - Limit any one jurisdiction total awards not to exceed \$3M.
- SRTC is requesting at least three volunteers from each SRTC committee to assist in scoring applications.
- Federal funding requirements ensure that rural and small cities are distributed a portion of the awards.

Board/Committee Discussions:

On 12/21/22 the SRTC Committees reviewed minor changes suggested by the TIP Working Group to the previous 2021 Preservation Call for Projects principles of investment and application. On 01/09/23 the SRTC Board also reviewed the changes. No additional adjustments were suggested.

Public Involvement:

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

Staff Contact: Eve McMenamy, SRTC | evemc@srtc.org | 509.343.6370

SRTC ~~2021~~ 2024-2026 Call for Preservation Projects Application
For Years ~~2022-2023~~ 2024, 2025 and 2026

PROJECT TITLE:

AGENCY RANKING (1 = highest priority 4 = lowest):

REQUESTED SRTC REGIONAL FUNDS (STBG)- REQUEST LIMITED TO \$~~1~~1.5 Million OR LESS: \$

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

Agency or Organization _____

Phone Number _____

Contact Person _____

Email Address _____

Project Information

Project Location

☐ Urbanized Area ☐ Urban Small ☐ Rural

Federal Functional Classification

Project Description

Project scope (include termini and length)

Existing and proposed conditions

Project purpose and outcomes

☐ The project sponsor must indicate that the project, once completed, will be maintained for the life of the project.

Please describe the plan, cycle, funding source and enforcement mechanisms (i.e. snow removal policy) to maintain this project for year-round/four-season use.

Project Delivery Tools

☐ The project sponsor must certify that they will utilize all project delivery tools available, including eminent domain, to acquire ROW, if necessary, to meet project obligation schedules.

Attachments

- ☐ Vicinity map
- ☐ Typical Cross Sections
- ☐ Cost Estimate
- ☐ Project Endorsement form
- ☐ If possible, please include project GIS shapefile(s)

Cost Information (in addition to the Cost Estimate)

Cost estimate notes (optional if additional information is needed)

Describe the commitment of secured matching funds or other funds and the status of obtaining any unsecured funds.

Note: matching funds must be available at the time of fund obligation. The small towns of Fairfield, Latah, Rockford, Spangle and Waverly may utilize toll credits in lieu of local match.

Please indicate if there are any circumstances that could delay the obligation of funds.

1. ECONOMIC VITALITY – 15 POINTS

Employment and Destination Accessibility

1a (5). To be scored internally by SRTC staff with the maps ~~referenced in the table below~~ in Horizon 2045 in Figure 2.19 ~~x~~ (See respective layers in online [map](#))

Project Score	Category	Criteria and Requirements
5	Provides a <u>Project location is a</u> critical connection within or <u>directly connecting to a regional activity center between two or more core areas (see employment core map)</u>	Increasing the efficiency of one or more modes to an employment core.
3	Serves a regionally significant employment transportation center (see employment center map e.g. park and rides, airport, transit centers)	Improving or enhancing the movement of workers, freight, and/or services to/from an employment center. <u>access to terminals (air, transit, or multimodal).</u>
1	Serves a regional transportation center (see transportation center map) <u>Project location is a critical connection to a local activity center.</u>	<u>Increasing the efficiency of one or more modes.</u> improving access to terminals (air, transit, or multimodal).

1b (5). Does the project have another connection to economic vitality that is not captured by 1a, or in addition to 1a? Please explain. Examples include ~~—~~ access to other activity centers, access to jobs, tourism, regional trailheads, sports complex, ~~—~~. (Score High, Medium, Low)

Freight Network (Internal Use Only)

1c (5). Is this project located on a FGTS classified T1 to T4 route, or on WSDOT's Truck Freight Economic Corridor?
To be scored internally by SRTC staff using the FGTS and WSDOT Truck Freight Economic Corridor (TFEC) Data.

- T1 – 5 points
- T2 – 4 points
- T3 or TFEC connector route – 3 points
- T4 – 1 point

2. COOPERATION AND LEADERSHIP – 15 POINTS

Local Planning Alignment

2a (5) Is this project consistent with your Comprehensive plan or other internal local planning objectives? Example – ADA improvements (Score High, Medium, Low)

Agency Coordination

2b (5) Is this project consistent with other external local planning objectives? Example - coordination with STA and transit enhancements due to this project (Score High, Medium, Low)
Explain

2c (5) Is this project on a CMP Corridor? (Horizon ~~2040~~2045-page 2-51 Chapter 2, page 78)
Scored internally by SRTC staff.

Tier 1 CMP Corridor (5 points)
Tier 2 CMP Corridor (3 points)

3. STEWARDSHIP – 15 POINTS

Cost Effectiveness

3a (5). The cost effectiveness of the proposed project will be calculated using the following elements: total project cost, miles of thru-traffic lanes preserved and, estimated treatment life or treatment type. A range of cost effectiveness values and their associated points will be determined based upon the calculated values from all submitted applications. (Standard deviation approach)

Cost Effectiveness Formula=
$$\frac{\text{Total Project Cost}}{(\text{Thru-Traffic lanes Miles}) \times (\text{Estimated Treatment Life})}$$

Thru-Traffic Lane Miles

How many thru-traffic lane miles are being treated in this project? For example, if you are improving the surface of a 1-mile segment with four travel lanes, that would be 4 miles of thru-traffic lane miles. Second example, if you are improving the surface of a 1-mile segment with two lanes and a center turn lane for the entire length, that would be 2 miles of thru-traffic lane miles. The center turn lane is not a thru-traffic lane.

Estimated Treatment Life

☐ Chip Seal (all chip seals will use a 6-year lifespan) ☐ Grind and Overlay (all grind and overlays will use a 14-year lifespan)*

*Treatment Life Values were derived from the WSDOT ~~TAMP~~TAMP Page 29-30, Exhibit 4-4

Roadway Usage

3b (5). What is the ADT and source of ADT?

Urban ☐ 0-4,999 (1) ☐ 5,000-9,999 (2) ☐ 10,000-14,999 (3) ☐ 15,000-19,999 (4) ☐ >19,999 (5) or
Rural ☐ 0-499 (1) ☐ 500-999 (2) ☐ 1,000-1,499 (3) ☐ 1,500-1,999 (4) ☐ >1,999 (5)

Funding

3c (5). Does this project have additional local/state match funds above the required 13.5%? If so, please describe:

☐ 6.5% over required local/state match (total 20% match or more) (3)

☐ 11.5% over required local/state match (total 25% match or more) (5)

4. SYSTEMS OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE AND PRESERVATION – 40 POINTS

Condition

4a (30). Structural Condition Preservation -30 points

What is the pavement OCI and what year was the last measurement?

- ☐ OCI 41-55 (10 points)
- ☐ OCI 56-65 (20 points)
- ☐ OCI 66-85 (30 points)

National Highway System

4b (10) Is the project on:

Scored internally by SRTC staff.

- ☐ The National Highway System (NHS) (10 points)? (Horizon [20402045](#), [page 2-22](#) [figure 2.28](#))
- ☐ A Minor Arterial or Major Collector (~~5-8~~ points)? [\(This change supports need for other arterials and improves scoring for roads from smaller cities/towns\)](#)

5. QUALITY OF LIFE AND MOBILITY – 15 POINTS

Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements

5a (5) Does this project benefit pedestrian transportation and/or mobility? Example – Crosswalk enhancements. [If the project does not require ADA upgrades but the project includes ADA upgrades please include here.](#)

Explain

5b (5) Is this project on the SRTC Regional Bike Priority Network [and](#) will it improve pavement condition in the bike lane/shoulder/travel way? (Horizon [20402045](#), [Page 4-4](#) [Figure 4.5](#))

Explain

If not on the SRTC Regional Bike Priority Network, does this project benefit bicycle transportation?

Explain (3)

Population

5c (5). The project is located within an area of significant existing population.

Scored internally by SRTC staff by population density based on US Census blocks:

- High – 5 points
- Medium –3 points

Low – 1 point

6.0 Equity (Not scored) SRTC will provide a map of the project over the Washington Environmental Health Disparities Map (Score ≥ 7) -and Areas of Potential Disadvantage from Horizon 2045, Figure 2.10.

Supporting Information

TOPIC: SRTC 2024-2026 PRESERVATION CALL FOR PROJECTS

SRTC Call for Preservation Projects Schedule

2022

- 11/08 TIP Working Group meeting – Preservation Call for Projects – Principles of investment & application review
- 12/13 TIP Working Group meeting – Preservation Call for Projects – Principles of investment & application review
- 12/21 TTC & TAC meeting - Preservation Call for Projects – Principles of Investment (Informational)

2023

- 01/12 SRTC Board meeting - Preservation Call for Projects – Principles of investment & application review (Informational)
- 01/25 TTC & TAC meetings - Preservation Call for Projects – Principles of investment & application (Action) – Request volunteers for scoring
- 02/09 SRTC Board meeting - Preservation Call for Projects – Principles of investment & application (Action)
- 02/10 CALL FOR PROJECTS RELEASED**
- 04/14 APPLICATION PACKAGE DUE BY 3:00 PM**
- 04/17 - 04/21 SRTC Staff Review
- 04/24 - 05/05 Pavement committee fieldwork verification
- 04/24 - 05/12 TTC & TAC (multi-agency) project scoring
 - 05/24 TTC & TAC meeting – Review preliminary results (informational)
 - 06/08 SRTC Board – Review preliminary results (informational)
 - 06/28 TTC & TAC meeting – Recommend preservation funding (Action)
 - 07/13 SRTC Board – Approve awards for preservation projects (Action)
- Aug-Oct 2024-2027 TIP development process which includes a 30-day public comment period on the draft TIP

To: Transportation Advisory Committee

01/18/2023

From: Mike Ulrich, Principal Transportation Planner

TOPIC: TRANSPORTATION PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT: PM1 - SAFETY

Requested Action:

Recommend that the SRTC Board agree to plan and program projects so that they contribute to the accomplishment of WSDOT HSIP targets.

Key Points:

- At the Committee's October meeting staff introduced Transportation Performance Management including regulatory requirements and SRTC's role in setting targets for Safety, Infrastructure, and System Performance. The December meeting focused on safety and staff presented background information, historical data, target setting options, and discussed upcoming long-range planning efforts.
- Pursuant to 23 CFR 924, State Departments of Transportation (DOTs) are required by the federal Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) to annually set five safety performance targets.
- The five statewide safety performance measures are set annually and use five year rolling averages for (1) number of fatalities, (2) rate of fatalities per 100 million VMT, (3) number of serious injuries, (4) rate of serious injuries per 100 million VMT, and (5) number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries.
- To set a target, MPOs must either agree to support the State DOT target or establish a numerical target specific to the MPO planning area.
- In March 2021 the SRTC Board approved a resolution agreeing to plan and program projects so that they contribute to the accomplishment of WSDOT statewide performance targets for safety.
- Target Zero is WSDOT's plan to reduce the number of traffic deaths and serious injuries on Washington's roadways to zero by the year 2030.
- The deadline for the SRTC Board to set the safety targets is 02/27/2023.

Board/Committee Discussions:

The TAC was briefed on safety targets in March 2022. Targets in the other two performance categories are set on four-year cycles. On 12/21/22 the TTC and TAC discussed safety targets and the Board received a presentation for information and discussion on 01/12/23.

Public Involvement:

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

Staff Contact: Mike Ulrich, SRTC | mulrich@srtc.org | 509.343.6370

To: Transportation Advisory Committee

01/18/2023

From: Ryan Stewart, Principal Transportation Planner

TOPIC: SFY 2024-2025 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT OVERVIEW

Requested Action:

None. For information and discussion.

Key Points:

- The Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) is the foundational document outlining the core functions, planning studies, technical support and other ongoing planning activities conducted by SRTC.
- The state fiscal years (SFY) 2024-2025 UPWP covers a two-year period from July 1, 2023 to June 30, 2025.
- Staff is currently working on the preliminary draft of the UPWP. The UPWP development schedule is included in the following Supporting Information.
- Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) has released guidance for developing the UPWP. The guidance includes Federal and State emphasis areas.
- The Federal emphasis areas focus on: climate change; equity and Justice 40; complete streets; public involvement; Strategic Highway Network coordination; Federal land management agency coordination; planning and environmental linkages; and, data in transportation planning.
- The State emphasis areas include: updating Regional Transportation Planning Organizations (RTPO) duties; making public documents accessible; enhancing diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts; developing and implementing several statewide plans; updating functional classifications as a result of urban area boundary revisions; and, financial accounting.
- In response to the emphasis areas, SRTC is considering how to address these in the UPWP. We encourage the TAC to share their perspectives on how SRTC might better engage in this work.
- The UPWP also includes major planning activities identified by Spokane Transit Authority (STA) and WSDOT Eastern Region in the document's appendices.

Board/Committee Discussions:

This is the first time the SFY 2024-2025 UPWP development process has been presented to the TAC. The SRTC Board will receive an overview in February.

Public Involvement:

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

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

Supporting Information

TOPIC: SFY 2024-2025 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

OVERVIEW

- The following is the tentative SFY 2024-2025 UPWP development schedule.

SRTC SFY 2024-2025 UPWP Development Schedule	
Key Due Dates	Key Action
25-Jan-23	SFY 2024-2025 UPWP Overview provided to TAC and TTC
9-Feb-23	SFY 2024-2025 UPWP Overview provided to the Board
15-Feb-23	Staff finish review and edits to assigned tasks
22-Feb-23	SFY 2024-2025 UPWP Preliminary Draft provided to TAC and TTC (if ready, if not present in March)
15-Mar-23	STA and WSDOT submit their sections
Mar-23 TBD	1st Draft UPWP complete
TBD	Preliminary draft to WSDOT TRIP (3 weeks in advance of on-site meeting)
26-Apr-23	Draft SFY 2024-2025 UPWP presented to TAC and TTC (1 st touch)
TBD	Review meeting (onsite and/or remote) with WSDOT TRIP, Public Transportation Division, WSDOT, FHWA, and FTA
TBD	UPWP out for public comment
11-May-23	Draft SFY 2024-2025 UPWP presented to Board (1st touch)
TBD	Comments due from TAC and TTC and public comment period
24-May-23	TAC and TTC recommendation of Board approval of draft SFY 2024-2025 UPWP (2 nd touch)
8-Jun-23	Board approval of SFY 2024-2025 UPWP (2nd touch)
15-Jun-23	Approved SFY 2024-25 UPWP submitted to WSDOT TRIP
22-Jun-23	WSDOT TRIP submits approved SFY 2024-2025 UPWP to FHWA/FTA
30-Jun-23	FHWA/FTA UPWP approval date
1-Jul-23	SFY 2024-2025 UPWP takes effect

To: Transportation Advisory Committee
From: Jason Lien, Principal Transportation Planner
TOPIC: BICYCLE LEVEL OF TRAFFIC STRESS

01/18/2023

Requested Action:

None. For information and discussion.

Key Points:

- Conducting a Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) analysis is in the SRTC Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) concluding this fiscal year. The intent of analyzing LTS is to provide a useful data point in understanding the function of, and barriers on, the Regional Bicycle Priority Network in Horizon 2045.
- LTS utilizes a number of factors – thru-lanes, speeds, traffic volumes, presence of parking, shoulder or bike facility width – to determine the level of stress a rider may experience while cycling along a particular route. Higher stress routes may discourage bicycle use absent adequate facilities that increase the user's sense of security. By default, separated trails (e.g. Centennial Trail) are defined as low-stress.
- SRTC's analytical approach is to:
 - Use the Horizon 2045 Regional Bicycle Priority Network as the input network layer.
 - Build a GIS database of relevant factors to calculate LTS in accordance with the LTS 1-4 grading system developed by the Mineta Transportation Institute.
- Staff will discuss and look for input from the TAC on the methodological approach.

Board/Committee Discussions:

This is the first time at the TAC for this item.

Public Involvement:

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

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

To: Transportation Advisory Committee

From: Kylee Jones, Associate Transportation Planner III

TOPIC: CARBON REDUCTION PROGRAM (CRP) FUNDING

01/18/2023

Requested Action:

None. For information and discussion.

Key Points:

- SRTC is responsible for distributing federal funds that are specifically allocated to the Spokane region. These funds come from the following programs: Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) program, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program, Highway Improvement Program (HIP), HIP Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act (HIP-CRRSAA) the STBG Set Aside (formerly Transportation Alternative Program (TAP)).
- There is a new federal funding program, the Carbon Reduction Program (CRP), established through the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA), that provides funds for transportation projects designed to reduce transportation emissions. [CRP Fact Sheet](#)
- The CRP brings an additional ~\$4.9 million to the region through 2022-2026.
- SRTC will use the Contingency List Process outlined in the SRTC TIP Guidebook (see **Attachment**), to award funds to CRP eligible projects. See **Supporting Information** for policies.
- CRP funds will be added to the annual obligation target
- Draft Carbon Reduction Program allocations detailed below:

Draft Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) Allocations	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
Urbanized >= 200,001	\$710,207	\$710,207	\$710,207	\$710,207	\$710,207	\$3,551,035
Urban Small >5,000 and < 49,999	\$49,460	\$49,460	\$49,460	\$49,460	\$49,460	\$247,300
Rural<=4,999	\$221,928	\$221,928	\$221,928	\$221,928	\$221,928	\$1,109,640
Total						\$4,907,975

Board/Committee Discussions:

This is the first time at the TAC for this item.

Public Involvement:

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

Staff Contact: Kylee Jones, SRTC | kjones@srtc.org | 509.343.6370

2024-2026 SRTC Contingency List (Updated Aug 2022)							STBG		CMAQ	STBG Set-Aside		HIP	HIP-CRRSSA	AWARD 2024-2026
Priority Ranking	Agency	Project Name	Match	Final Score as %	Requested	Project Phase	Urban	Rural	Inside AQ Boundaries	Urban	Rural	Urban Large Only	Urban Large Only	
1	SV	Pines Rd/BNSF Grade Separation	33.5%	86.0%	\$23,130,199	CN	\$1,525,600		\$4,879,000					\$6,404,600
2	STA	Division St BRT Project Development	33.5%	80.8%	\$1,000,000	PE			\$1,000,000					\$1,000,000
3	CoS	Sunset Highway Pathway - Royal St to Spotted Rd	33.5%	79.8%	\$4,437,000	PE, RW, CN	\$4,437,000							\$4,437,000
4	SV	Bigelow-Sullivan Corridor: Sullivan/Trent Interchange	33.5%	77.7%	\$2,212,500	PE							\$1,367,500	\$1,367,500
5	AH	SR2 Multi-Modal and Pedestrian Enhancements (with 2 Roundabouts)	13.5%	74.2%	\$876,991	PE	\$876,991							\$876,991
6	STA	I90/Valley HPT Line Park & Ride Construction	33.5%	74.0%	\$1,200,000	RW, CN			\$1,200,000					\$1,200,000
7	SV	Argonne Rd/I-90 Bridge	13.5%	72.1%	\$1,297,500	PE						\$224,222	\$1,073,278	\$1,297,500
8	CoS	Pacific Ave Neighborhood Greenway	33.5%	71.0%	\$3,496,000	PE, RW, CN			\$370,000	\$3,126,000				\$3,496,000
9	SV	Barker Corridor: Appleway to Sprague	33.5%	69.7%	\$2,095,072	PE, RW, CN	\$1,083,400							\$1,083,400
10	CoS	US 195/Meadowlane J-Turn	33.5%	69.4%	\$2,417,000	PE, CN	\$1,607,204							\$1,607,204
11	SC	Bigelow-Gulch Road Project 2	33.5%	68.6%	\$6,000,000	CN								\$0
12	CoS	Fish Lake Trail Connection Phases 1 (Phases 1-3: \$19,477,771)	23.5%	64.6%	\$4,931,719	PE, RW, CN				\$787,984				\$787,984
12	CoS	Fish Lake Trail Connection Phases 2	23.5%	64.6%	\$7,653,201	PE, RW, CN								\$0
12	CoS	Fish Lake Trail Connection Phases 3	23.5%	64.6%	\$6,892,851	PE, RW, CN								\$0
13	CoS	Spokane Falls Blvd Reconstruction - Post St to Division St	33.5%	63.8%	\$9,074,000	RW, CN								\$0
14	SC	Commute Trip Reduction Program	33.5%	63.0%	\$991,924	Program			\$991,924					\$991,924
15	CoS	Broadway Ave Reconstruction - Ash St to Lincoln St	33.5%	63.0%	\$7,589,000	PE, RW, CN								\$0
16	CoS	Millwood Trail - Children of the Sun Trail to Fancher	33.5%	62.7%	\$6,406,000	PE, RW, CN								\$0
17	CoS	Palouse/Freya Roundabout	23.5%	62.3%	\$4,900,000	PE, RW, CN								\$0
18	CoS	Riverside Ave - Monroe to Wall Reconstruction	33.5%	61.8%	\$5,343,000	CN								\$0
19	CoS	Cook St Greenway	33.5%	61.7%	\$1,682,000	CN								\$0
20	SC	Harvard Rd Phase 2	13.5%	60.0%	\$5,481,000	PE, RW, CN	\$2,271,000		\$3,210,000					\$5,481,000
21	SC	Cascade Way Reconstruction & Stormwater Project	23.5%	59.7%	\$1,123,000	PE, CN	\$1,123,000							\$1,123,000
22	SC	Nevada Rd Reconstruction: Hawthorne to US 2	23.5%	59.3%	\$1,234,000	PE, CN								\$0
23	CoS	Signals - Maple & Rowan and Ash & Rowan	33.5%	57.7%	\$1,966,000	PE, RW, CN								\$0
24	CoS	Wellesley Ave, Freya to Havana	33.5%	57.4%	\$379,000	PE, RW, CN								\$0
25	SC	Argonne Rd & Upriver Driver Intersection	13.5%	57.3%	\$260,000	PE								\$0
26	SV	Barker Corridor: 4th Ave Roundabout	33.5%	56.6%	\$2,272,157	PE, RW, CN								\$0
27	SV	Barker Corridor: Sprague to 4th	33.5%	56.2%	\$1,735,025	PE, RW, CN								\$0
28	SV	Barker Corridor: 8th Ave Roundabout	33.5%	55.3%	\$1,967,633	PE, RW, CN								\$0
29	SC	Centennial Trail-Argonne Gap Alternatives Study	13.5%	53.7%	\$160,000	Study								\$0
30	SV	Barker Corridor: 4th to 8th	33.5%	53.7%	\$1,849,290	PE, RW, CN								\$0
31	CoS	Signal Controller Upgrades	33.5%	53.6%	\$258,000	PE, CN								\$0
32	STA	Sunset HPT - Preliminary Engineering	13.5%	53.5%	\$600,000	PE								\$0
33	CoS	Nevada/Lincoln Intersection	23.5%	52.2%	\$1,160,000	PE, RW, CN								\$0
34	SV	Appleway Trail & Stormwater Improvements	13.5%	51.1%	\$1,110,059	PE, CN								\$0
35	SC	Magnesium Rd Preservation: Crestline to Market	13.5%	50.0%	\$616,000	PE, CN								\$0
36	SV	Broadway Ave Reconstruction (Havana to Fancher)	33.5%	48.9%	\$2,618,547	PE, RW, CN								\$0
37	SC	Wall St & Country Homes Blvd Intersection	13.5%	48.5%	\$2,493,000	PE, RW, CN								\$0
38	STA	Wellesley HPT - Preliminary Engineering	13.5%	47.6%	\$400,000	PE								\$0
39	SV	Spokane Valley River Loop Trail	33.5%	46.9%	\$2,021,033	PE, RW, CN								\$0
40	CoS	Mallon Ave - Monroe to Howard Reconstruction	33.5%	46.2%	\$2,521,000	PE, RW, CN								\$0
41	DP	N Colville Reconstruction, Third St to North City Limits	13.5%	45.1%	\$3,239,717	PE, RW, CN		\$1,767,000						\$1,767,000
42	SC	Deno Rd Reconstruction - Rambo Rd to Craig Rd	13.5%	44.2%	\$2,374,400	PE, RW, CN								\$0
43	CoS	Arthur St Sidewalk & Greenway	33.5%	43.2%	\$1,224,000	PE, RW, CN								\$0
44	FF	Railroad Ave Rehabilitation	13.5%	41.8%	\$320,232	PE, CN								\$0
45	CoS	Driscoll Sidewalk - Garland to Wellesley	33.5%	41.3%	\$1,741,000	PE, CN								\$0
46	SC	Craig Rd Project 1	13.5%	40.4%	\$2,424,000	PE, RW, CN								\$0
47	CoS	King Cole Way - Wood Bridge in Riverfront Park	13.5%	38.7%	\$869,000	PE, CN								\$0
48	SC	Starr Rd Preservation	13.5%	36.1%	\$1,359,000	PE, RW, CN								\$0
49	ML	Lake St ADA Upgrades	13.5%	32.9%	\$442,015	PE, CN					\$511,000			\$511,000
50	SG	Patching and Chip Seal Various Locations	13.5%	29.9%	\$311,212	PE, CN								\$0
51	SG	Old Hwy 195 Rehabilitation	33.5%	19.2%	\$500,277	PE, CN								\$0

Legend:

	Fully funded
Strike	Funded through other grant process
	Partially funded

Supporting Information**TOPIC: CARBON REDUCTION PROGRAM (CRP) FUNDING**

TIP Guidebook policies relevant for allocating CRP funding through the Contingency List Process:

Policy 4.7

SRTC will maintain a Contingency List selected through a regional process and approved by the SRTC Board of Directors. Projects on the Contingency List may be selected for future funds available through the contingency funding process (see Policy 6.8). The most recently approved Contingency 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 6.2

Although **cost overruns** are the responsibility of the project sponsor, for eligible cost overruns (see Policy 6.3) on projects awarded on regional allocations of federal funds, the project sponsor may request additional funds through the SRTC Executive Director or the SRTC Board.

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 Contingency 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 guides the contingency funding process:

- Evaluate the eligibility of Contingency 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 contingency funds.

In collaboration with the TIP Working Group, SRTC staff will bring a draft recommendation to the TTC for consideration to recommend Board approval of funding based on the criteria above. The TTC and the SRTC staff will make separate or joint recommendations to the SRTC Board of Directors for funding consideration.