

CENTRAL CITY LING STEERING COMMITTEE

MEETING 9:00 A.M.

Meeting Minutes of November 12, 2015 Meeting
Spokane Intermodal Center
Great Northern Room, Suite #310

MEMBERS/ALTERNATES PRESENT

Mark Aden, DCI Engineers
Anne Marie Axworthy, Greater Spokane Inc.
Beth Bousley, Spokane Transit Authority (Alternate)
Lisa Brown, Washington State Univ. – Spokane
Glen Cosby, Spokane Community College
Collen Gardner, Chief Garry Park Neighborhood
John Lemus, People First
Mark Mansfield, University District Dev. Assoc.
Candace Mumm, City of Spokane (Alternate)
Gary Pollard, Riverside Neighborhood Council
Mark Richard, Downtown Spokane Partnership
Scott Simmons, City of Spokane
John Sklut, Gonzaga University
Kevin Twohig, Spokane Public Facilities Dist.
Karl Zacher, Browne's Addition Neighborhood

STAFF PRESENT

Karl Otterstrom, Director of Planning
Kathleen Weinand, Transit Planner
Don Skillingstad, Capital Projects Manager
Brandon Rapez-Betty, Senior Communications Specialist

CONSULTANTS/GUESTS

Mark Brower, CH2M
Catherine Ciarlo, CH2M
Ryan Farncomb, CH2M
Randy Knapick, IBI Group, Inc.
Andrew Warlock, City of Spokane
Brian McClatchey, City of Spokane
Christine Varela, Desautel Hege
Paul Kropp, Citizen

MEMBERS ABSENT

Karen Byrd, Logan Neighborhood Council
Cheryl Kilday, Visit Spokane
Harlan Shellabarger, Cheney Free Press
Steve Trabun, Avista Corporation

1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND AGENDA REVIEW

Karl Otterstrom called the meeting to order at 9:06 a.m. Mr. Otterstrom welcomed the group to the initial Steering Committee meeting. Everyone in attendance introduced themselves and the organizations they represent. Mr. Otterstrom acknowledged that there was a quorum and there are items for action on the agenda. Mr. Otterstrom reviewed the agenda and purpose for the meeting.

2. REVIEW OF STEERING COMMITTEE CHARGE

Mr. Otterstrom reviewed the charge of the Committee which is to provide policy guidance, project related recommendations and input to the STA Board and Spokane City Council, provide a connection to the community and further the vision of the STA Moving Forward Plan through successful collaboration on this project. Mr. Otterstrom briefly explained the effects of the Proposition 1 ballot measure on the Central City Line project (CCL). Candace Mumm asked about funding currently secured. Mr. Otterstrom provided an overview of the funding secured or programmed to date.

Mark Richard joined the meeting at 9:15 a.m.

Mr. Otterstrom explained that the committee position that will represent interests east of Spokane Representative has not yet been filled.

3. ELECTION OF A CHAIR

Mr. Otterstrom explained that the Committee needs to elect a Chair to lead the Committee. Mr. Otterstrom opened the floor to nominations for the Chair.

John Sklut, nominated Amber Waldref. The nomination was seconded by Gary Pollard. Mr. Otterstrom asked if there were any other nominations. There were none. Mr. Otterstrom called for a vote. **Ms. Waldref was unanimously approved as Chair.**

Mr. Otterstrom explained, since Ms. Waldref was not present at the meeting, the Committee needed to nominate a Chair Pro-Tem to proceed through the meeting until a Vice Chair was elected.

Colleen Gardner nominated Mark Mansfield as Chair Pro-Tem. The nomination was seconded by Ms. Mumm. Mr. Otterstrom asked if there were any other nominations. There were none. Mr. Otterstrom called for a vote. **Mr. Mansfield was unanimously approved.**

Mr. Otterstrom then turned the meeting over to Chair Pro-Tem Mansfield.

4. PUBLIC EXPRESSIONS

Chair Pro-Tem Mansfield opened the floor to public comment on the CCL project. Chair Pro-Tem Mansfield explained that comments are limited to 3-minutes.

Paul Kropp, citizen, county resident since 1981. Mr. Kropp explained that this project is an opportunity to “keep up” with transportation. Spokane will be behind if it doesn’t implement the project. The population of the City of Spokane is half of the County and the CCL will benefit the whole county. The CCL will benefit everyone in the County and Mr. Kropp urged the Committee to move it forward.

5. ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS

Chair Pro-Tem Mansfield explained that there are a number of administrative tasks and turned it over to Mr. Otterstrom. Mr. Otterstrom explained that staff has proposed interim Rules of Procedure for consideration by the Committee. Mr. Otterstrom briefly outlined the proposed Rules.

Lisa Brown asked what the process is if there is a tie vote. Mr. Otterstrom explained that Robert’s Rules of Order would apply.

Kevin Twohig made a motion to approve the interim Rules of Procedure. The motion was seconded by Ms. Brown. Mr. Mansfield called for a vote. **Motion passed unanimously.**

Chair Pro-Tem Mansfield asked if there were any subsequent discussion about the Rules. There were none. Chair Pro-Tem Mansfield explained that the rules require the election of a Vice Chair and opened the floor to nominations.

Ms. Gardner nominated Chair Pro-Tem Mansfield. There were no other nominations. Mr. Mansfield called for a vote. **Mr. Mansfield was unanimously approved as Vice Chair.**

Chair Pro-Tem Mansfield explained that the Committee needed to adopt a regular meeting schedule. Mr. Otterstrom recommended more time to coordinate with the Committee to establish a regular

schedule. Until then, the Committee would operate under special meeting provisions for noticing and agenda preparation. Staff may send out a “Doodle Poll” or something similar to establish a date and time that works for the majority.

Chair Pro-Tem Mansfield turned the floor over to Mr. Otterstrom to discuss the next item on the agenda.

6. DEFINING SUCCESS OF THE PROJECT DEVELOPMENT PHASE

Mr. Otterstrom reviewed the overarching goal and key objectives of the project development phase. Mr. Otterstrom asked if there were any questions or revisions needed to the stated goal. There were none. Mr. Otterstrom reviewed the key objectives of the project development phase, which include:

- Engage Steering Committee to provide input
- Finalize mode selection
- Develop NEPA environmental documentation
- Engage key stakeholders and public
- Determine station and stop designs
- Identify policies that advance transit-supportive development
- Identify potential cost saving and sharing solutions

Mr. Otterstrom reviewed key success factors of the project development phase.

- Selection of a downtown alignment
- Identification of conceptual station and stop locations
- Development of preferred vehicle specifications
- Development of traction power infrastructure specifications
- Identification of land use and economic development opportunities in the corridor
- Approval by FTA of a Small Starts Grant Agreement

Mr. Otterstrom asked if there were any questions or additions that should be added to the list.

Chair Pro-Tem Mansfield turned the floor over to Don Skillingstad and Mark Brower to discuss the next item on the agenda.

7. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT SCOPE REVIEW

Mr. Skillingstad provided a brief overview of this phase of the project, and highlighted the project team. Mr. Skillingstad explained that the Small Starts program is the Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA) primary funding source for larger transit projects like the CCL. Being accepted into this program is an acknowledgement by FTA that the CCL is a viable project. Mr. Skillingstad introduced Mark Brower with CH2M to review the process moving forward.

Mr. Brower briefly reviewed the project development scope of work. In support of the Small Starts Grant Application next summer, a great deal of design development, cost estimating, ridership forecasting, and finance planning work must be accomplished. Further, NEPA environmental documentation must be complete.

In a kickoff meeting with FTA, they noted that the NEPA Documented Categorical Exclusion process would likely apply, but only if options and anomalies are removed from the project. We will need to determine a single approved route through downtown, define a vehicle and power system, and determine the maintenance facility for the vehicle. Further FTA stated that a finance plan, including funding for maintenance and operations would need to be identified for the project to be ready to apply for the small starts grant agreement.

Mr. Brower described the overall timeline for implementation of the CCL. The current project development phase is planned to be complete in 2016 to enable potential federal funding in 2017 as intermediate design is complete. In 2018, final design is completed and construction begins, with anticipated project service beginning in 2020.

Mr. Brower reviewed the high level roll-up schedule for the project development phase. Mr. Brower reviewed key decisions and milestones that need to be completed in spring 2016, including:

- Decision on the Downtown Alignment
- Decision on the Vehicle and Power Characteristics
- Identify Infrastructure Investments Strategy
- Identifying Station and Stop Locations
- Finalize Small Starts Grant and Financial Strategy
- Complete the NEPA Process
- Complete Preliminary Engineering

Mr. Brower emphasized that the committee will be integral to many of these decisions and we need their help to make this project move forward.

Mark Richard asked if the committee get a chance to review and discuss the financial plan as part of the committee charge so that the committee can confidently support the project.

Mr. Otterstrom responded, yes – the group will be asked to endorse the full grant application and its integral parts including both capital and operating costs. The group needs to be confident in the financial aspects of the project.

Mr. Richard suggested adding an additional “charge” for the Committee to review and endorse the financial plan for the Small Starts grant agreement.

Mr. Brower then turned the floor over to Chair Pro-Tem Mansfield.

Chair Pro-Tem Mansfield stated the next item on the agenda was to discuss the alignment through downtown Spokane.

Chair Pro-Tem Mansfield turned the floor over to Mr. Brower.

8. DOWNTOWN ALIGNMENT ALTERNATIVES

Mr. Brower provided an overview of four initial alignment options through downtown. The intent was to solicit early thoughts from the group. The four options included:

- Option 1: WB Riverside / EB Main
- Option 2: WB / EB Main
- Option 3: WB Spokane Falls / EB Main
- Option 4: WB / EB Riverside

Mr. Brower asked if there were any questions regarding the alignment options. The team passed out a blank alignment map for the members to propose their own alignment.

Ms. Mumm asked what criteria will be used to determine the alignment options. Does the team have data to support the proposed alternatives?

Mr. Otterstrom explained some of the criteria used to help determine alignment options and that the proposed options are fairly close in proximity to each other and that likely, routing will reach most of the downtown no matter which final route is chosen.

Catherine Ciarlo reviewed the process for making the decision on the final downtown alignment and the proposed criteria to be considered in determining the preferred alignment.

Ms. Gardner asked if the Committee was only reviewing the downtown alignment for now. Ms. Ciarlo affirmed that the outstanding decision on the alignment is the downtown portion.

Mr. Otterstrom added that the termini through Browne's Addition and Spokane Community College also need to be finalized but are less critical at this point.

Ms. Ciarlo explained that the team has proposed alignment criteria are for consideration by the committee. Ms. Ciarlo highlighted eleven initial criteria that may be evaluated by the CCL technical team to help facilitate a decision. Ms. Ciarlo noted that in all likelihood the criteria won't show a strong distinction between the options, as the alignments are so close in proximity. The team is proposing criteria that will help show some differentiation between the alternatives. Ms. Ciarlo asked if there any comments on the criteria or any criteria that need to be introduced to help facilitate the decision.

Mr. Twohig stated there has been significant efforts to install bike lanes downtown, how will the committee and the team ensure that the CCL works with the bike lanes.

Ms. Ciarlo stated the team will review existing plans and improvements and assess impacts from a design standpoint and apply those to the criteria.

Mr. Otterstrom explained that the team will provide the committee and City of Spokane with information to help make decisions about bike lane integration with the CCL and station design and locations. Mr. Otterstrom suggested in some cases, stations could support or enhance bicycle facilities in the corridor.

Ms. Brown suggested the Committee take a field trip to experience the alignment options.

Randy Knapick suggested providing renderings and visualizations for the committee to review as well. He appreciated the idea of conducting a tour.

Mr. Twohig noted that some of the downtown alignments have a lot of turns in them. It would be interesting to know how the turns affect transit operations.

Mr. Brower noted that the team will consider turns, especially left turns as they are slower and present more safety concerns.

Mr. Richard suggested public acceptance or public resistance as a criteria, that the Main Avenue two-way option may not be desirable for some downtown stakeholders. Mr. Richard stated there are concerns from some downtown land owners regarding the project and them not wanting it directly in front of their business. How is the team planning on engaging the public?

Ms. Ciarlo noted that it may make more sense for the team to provide technical analysis, and let the committee have discussions about the level of community acceptance. If the team and committee provides a rating it may bind the Committee.

Mr. Otterstrom added that the team has talked internally about having small group discussions, with Mr. Richard's help, to discuss alignment options. It will be beneficial to have a committee member present at this meetings to support outreach.

Glen Cosby stated there needs to be consideration of snowfall and snow removal processes and needs for snow removal.

John Lemus pointed out that curb cuts/ADA ramps do not meet ADA requirements and there needs to be consideration for improvements to meet ADA requirements. Mr. Brower stated the team will work with the City of Spokane to ensure improvements meet ADA requirements. Ms. Ciarlo added that FTA also looks at ADA accessibility, and it's beneficial to the project to improve these conditions.

Ms. Mumm pointed out the proposed criteria includes "comparative delay based on traffic modeling." A different take could be "does this remove single occupancy vehicles" or "does the route improve traffic mobility?"

Ms. Ciarlo responded that we will flag this issue around sustainability (reducing SOV) and a separate issue of affecting traffic.

Candace Mumm inquired about impacts on street parking. Looking at this differently – will the alignment reduce the need for parking?

Ms. Mumm asked about qualifying how businesses will be benefited by the CCL, or how existing investments may be leveraged. Ms. Ciarlo referenced the Strategic Overlay Plan and how that planning effort may address this question.

Scott Simmons said we should consider the operational efficiencies that might occur because of alignment choices. Potential opportunities to derive efficiencies and route optimization that affect cost.

Anne Marie Axworthy asked if alignments are chosen based on where the existing riders on, or instead where you anticipate riders might be in the future? Who are the riders that the CCL is after?

Mr. Otterstrom acknowledged the chicken and egg issue. Fundamental considerations are jobs, housing, and other destinations. Dense destinations and development generate ridership. Do need to consider how major trip generators are served; for example, the convention center is not well served currently. Need to figure out how to serve these major destinations.

Ms. Ciarlo referenced the ECONorthwest economic study and the finding that the CCL should do very well, creates a sense of permanence and will increase ridership to include shoppers, business folks and commuters.

Ms. Brown asked about future growth and how that's accounted for. Recent residential development at Kendall Yards, for example and that the new nursing school could be operational prior to the CCL being operational.

Mr. Richard noted we need to take future projects into account, like the SportsPlex and a number of others. Need to remember the goals and purpose of the CCL as the group looks at criteria. What is it trying to achieve; more ridership, economic development, alternatives to reduce traffic congestion, better accessibility, or all of the above, or service to universities. He suggested we need to be aware of the goals.

Mr. Cosby added that the north/south freeway will have a major impact on SCC and possibly the CCL. A park and ride facility may be beneficial because of new traffic flow.

Ms. Ciarlo asked if there were any additional questions on the criteria or process. The team will review and revise the criteria based on the comments and bring back to the January meeting.

Mr. Otterstrom noted that there appeared to be no opposition to the criteria presented and staff will add criteria based on the comments provided, which were all valid additions.

Chair Pro-Tem Mansfield introduced the next agenda item and turned it over to Kathleen Weinand to discuss the overlay plan.

9. OVERLAY PLAN

Ms. Weinand provided a summary of the strategic overlay plan and its purpose and objectives. Ms. Weinand explained that the Strategic Overlay Plan directly supports the successful development of the Small Starts Grant Agreement and successful implementation of the CCL by looking to align City land use and economic policies that increase potential ridership.

Ms. Weinand noted that the final plan will include policy recommendations regarding pedestrian facilities, zoning, design standards, affordable housing, parking, and other incentives.

Ms. Weinand informed the committee that the first neighborhood workshop (Chief Garry Neighborhood) would be Stevens Elementary School at 6 pm.

Mark Aden noted that affordable housing does not seem competitive with economic development. He expressed concern that we are burdening the CCL project with the complex issue of affordable housing AND economic development.

Ms. Weinand stated that the overlay project will be looking at this issue and working with partners to develop strategies to address and minimize any impacts. Ms. Ciarlo added that when FTA looks at the grant application they have a series of economic and land use criteria that they will consider in rating the project. In that same group of criteria they look at affordable housing. FTA wants to make sure projects do not price out groups that need affordable housing.

Mr. Aden stated he was hearing two different things. Transit can create opportunity for access, which can address affordable housing. Also hear that the goal might be to allow people to remain where they are even though property values may increase. Is our mission to dive into the affordable housing issue? Not sure that is achievable. Referenced LINK in Seattle with all of the development along that line. Allows people access to downtown but people have been priced out along that corridor. They are not necessarily competing objectives, not sure it's our mission to solve those problems.

Ms. Brown suggested addressing the affordable housing at the state level will make the project more competitive at the federal level. Potential to influence where Housing Trust Fund investments are made in the community. Will be a new bridge linking the north and south side of the U-District which will impact this project.

Ms. Mumm added this discussion has occurred in many communities. There are communities that have successfully implemented affordable housing, market rate housing, and retail; referenced Denver. It is a good idea to identify examples from other communities of where this has worked. Might be helpful for our research to reference other success stories in other communities.

Karl Zacher stated he owns an apartment complex in Browne's Addition and he didn't think it would negatively affect the supply of affordable housing.

Ms. Gardner lives on Mission Avenue and this project will impact her and her neighborhood. Affordable housing is very important. Chief Garry Park is also involved in a neighborhood planning

process. The discussion is necessary so the neighborhood can understand what impacts will occur from the CCL vis-à-vis affordable housing.

Mr. Pollard stated he is the Chair of the Affordable Housing Committee and a lot of the housing on 1st Avenue is senior housing, affordable housing, housing for disabled, etc. Housing influx is also coming from universities. Many students need access to universities and work downtown. Will provide a big benefit to students. Need to find ways to ensure that affordable housing is protected, but also to enhance it. Project will impact housing, need to identify ways to minimize impacts.

Mr. Cosby asked is there a place in the plan for the sustainability and fiscal sustainability of the CCL?

Mr. Otterstrom stated the financial feasibility of the project will be addressed as part of the project development phase of the project.

Chair Pro-Tem Mansfield stated that it is important to remember how important transit is as a matter of shaping our communities, not only for those who cannot afford cars but those who prefer transit as the mode of transportation. The best communities are not just those who can afford a car but those who can afford to ride transit.

Chair Pro-Tem Mansfield turned the floor over to Mr. Otterstrom.

10. NEXT MEETING TARGET

Mr. Otterstrom stated that the next meeting will likely be in late January or early February. He asked if there are other route options that should be looked at, and if there are, they could be discussed now or members could mark up a map and return to the team.

Ms. Brown asked if the stations identified on the map were to be discussed now.

Mr. Otterstrom stated that the station locations would be addressed through the project development process.

Mr. Richard stated that committee members should be engaged in the downtown group meetings.

Mr. Otterstrom stated the committee members will be notified of meeting dates with business groups.

11. ADJOURN

Chair Pro-Tem Mansfield called for a motion to adjourn. **Mr. Pollard made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Gardner seconded the motion.** Chair Pro-Tem called for a vote. **The motion passed unanimously.**

Meeting adjourned at 10:51 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Karl Otterstrom, Director of Planning
Steering Committee Secretary