



# Central City Line

## Steering Committee Meeting #11

Monday, July 31, 2017 | 1:00 – 2:30PM  
**SRTC, Paulsen Building**  
**421 W. Riverside Ave., Suite 500**



**Meeting Purpose:**

Provide update on the Small Starts Ratings Submittal, an update on current project process and timeline, and coordinate station area outreach process and elements.

**Meeting Agenda:**

	Item	Lead
5 min	<b>Welcome, Acknowledgement of New Members, Introductions, and Agenda Review</b>	Amber Waldref, Chair
5 min	<b>Public Expressions</b>	Amber Waldref, Chair
10 min	<b>Administrative Tasks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approval of March Meeting Minutes</li> <li>• Elect New Chair/Vice Chair</li> </ul>	Amber Waldref, Chair
15 min	<b>Small Starts Ratings Submittal Process Update</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Process and Timeline</li> <li>• Completeness Review and Responses</li> </ul>	Karl Otterstrom, STA Randy Knapick, IBI
10 min	<b>Project Timeline Update</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Development Milestones</li> <li>• Critical Path</li> </ul>	Mark Brower, CH2M
10 min	<b>Project Scope Review</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outreach and Communications</li> <li>• FTA Coordination, Project Readiness, and SSGA</li> <li>• Field Investigations and Final Design/Bidding</li> <li>• NEPA/SEPA Documentation and Permitting</li> </ul>	Catherine Ciarlo, CH2M Randy Knapick, IBI Mark Brower, CH2M
30 min	<b>Station Design Outreach</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• University District Workshop</li> <li>• Spokane Arts, Melissa Huggins Executive Director</li> <li>• Approach and Timeline</li> <li>• DRAFT HPT Station Conceptual Policy Framework</li> <li>• Outreach Example</li> </ul>	Karl Otterstrom, STA Melissa Huggins, Spokane Arts Catherine Ciarlo, CH2M Randy Knapick, IBI
5 min	<b>Next Steps</b>	Karl Otterstrom, STA

**Documents/Files Distributed**

Date	Method	File/Document Name
7/26/17	Email	CCL – SC Mtg 11 Packet.pdf
7/27/17	Email	CCL – SC Mtg 11 Packet.pdf
7/31/17	Email	CCL – SC Mtg 11 Packet.pdf

**CENTRAL CITY LINE STEERING COMMITTEE**

**MEETING 1:00 P.M.**

DRAFT Minutes of March 30, 2017 Meeting  
SRTC, Paulsen Building  
421 W. Riverside Ave., Suite 500

**MEMBERS/ALTERNATES PRESENT**

Anne Marie Axworthy, Greater Spokane Inc.  
Collen Gardner, Chief Garry Park Neighborhood  
John Gillette, Spokane Community College  
Cheryl Kilday, Visit Spokane  
John Lemus, People First  
E. Susan Meyer, Spokane Transit Authority  
Andrew Rowles, Downtown Spokane Partnership  
Scott Simmons, City of Spokane  
John Sklut, Gonzaga University  
Steve Trabun, Avista Corporation  
Kevin Twohig, Spokane Public Facilities Dist.  
Amber Waldref, City of Spokane (Chair)

**STAFF PRESENT**

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

**CONSULTANTS/GUESTS**

Mark Brower, CH2M  
Catherine Ciarlo, CH2M  
Katherine Miller, City of Spokane  
Andrew Warlock, City of Spokane  
Paul Kropp, Citizen, SRTC Advisory Committee  
Jim Simon, Gonzaga University

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Lisa Brown, Washington State Univ. - Spokane  
Kathy Fritchie, Browne's Addn. Neighborhood  
Karen Byrd, Logan Neighborhood Council  
Gary Pollard, Riverside Neighborhood Council  
Harlan Shellabarger, Cheney Free Press

**1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND AGENDA REVIEW**

Chair Amber Waldref called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. Chair Waldref welcomed the group to the meeting. Chair called for the attendees to introduce themselves. Chair asked if there were any changes to the agenda. There were none.

**2. PUBLIC EXPRESSIONS**

Chair Waldref asked if any attendee wanted to speak. No one requested to speak.

**3. ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS**

Chair Waldref asked if there were any comments on the February meeting minutes. John Sklut noted that Jim Simon was in attendance and an alternate for Gonzaga University. Chair Waldref called for a motion. **Steve Trabun made a motion to approve the meeting minutes with changes. Colleen Gardner seconded the motion. Chair called for a vote. The vote was unanimous.**

#### **4. SMALL STARTS GRANT SUBMITTAL TIMELINE UPDATE**

Chair Waldref asked Karl Otterstrom to provide an update. Mr. Otterstrom explained there was a five page memo that was prepared and provided in the Committee packet that provides a summary of the ratings package work and materials to date and a schedule of moving forward. Mr. Otterstrom noted that the memo has been revised slightly from the Committee version but the changes are very minor.

Mr. Otterstrom continued and reviewed the project schedule moving forward. Mr. Otterstrom noted that there is not a clear FTA definition of the ratings package that is being submitted in April but it was decided that it is an evaluation and ratings package, with the final package in September. The important thing to note is the package is being submitted for review and rating for future funding and an eventual construction agreement. Mr. Otterstrom continued reviewing the schedule moving forward.

Susan Meyer discussed the federal issuance of the “skinny budget” and the implications of the proposal. Ms. Meyer explained that the proposed Federal budget did not include funding for the Capital Improvement Program or the TIGER grant program. Ms. Meyer stated there is a lot of discussion within congress confirming that programs are needed. This does not mean that the programs have been eliminated. Ms. Meyer stated STA is working with other transit partners in the industry to keep funding for these programs. Ms. Meyer also stated staff have had discussions with FTA for the purposes of understanding what the definition of “apply” is so that both STA and FTA are clear on the process. Further, Ms. Meyer discussed the federal funding process and implications of proposed federal budgets.

Chair Waldref asked for clarifications on the purpose of the submittal and whether STA was asking to be rated. Ms. Meyer clarified the submittal was for an early rating and review and does the application meet the statutory requirements for a rating. If the application meets the rating requirements, then the project management plan and other documents required for a grant agreement would be required later in the process. The funding request would be for 2019 funding.

Mr. Otterstrom continued to inform the Committee on process and actions moving forward towards the April submittal. Mr. Otterstrom stated the grant submittal will be completed prior to the GSI Fly-In to Washington DC.

#### **5. FINANCE UPDATE**

Chair Waldref asked Mark Brower to review the status of the finance plan. Mr. Brower reviewed the cost estimate and the improvements included in the cost estimate as needed for the project including roadway improvements, sidewalks, ADA, charging facilities, vehicles, maintenance facility, fare collection and right-of-way needs.

Kevin Twohig asked how the buses would be charging on Cincinnati. Mr. Brower stated the team is evaluating both inductive and conductive, and both have their merits. The method will be sorted out as the project moves forward.

Colleen Gardner stated there is a proposed traffic light at Ermina and Greene and was wondering where that project was and whether it was being coordinated with Spokane Community College, and if it was separate from the CCL charging stations. Scott Simmons stated they were separate projects. Katherine Miller explained the status of the traffic signal project. Ms. Gardner further asked if SCC was seeking

a \$2 million grant for a project at the campus. John Gillette, Director of Finance with Community Colleges of Spokane, stated he has no knowledge of a grant being submitted. Mr. Otterstrom clarified that STA submitted a grant request for a transit center on the SCC campus, however, the project is not included in the State's budget. STA did receive a grant for a project at Spokane Falls Community College.

Chair Waldref asked if the light at Ermina was critical to the CCL and whether it was included in the grant request. Mr. Otterstrom stated the light benefits STA near term and does have value to CCL operations.

Mr. Simmons stated there was no charging station at Coeur d'Alene park and why the uniqueness of having a charging station at Cincinnati. Mr. Brower stated that, given the status of current technology, the CCL may not even need a charging station on the route, however the plan is to have one station for sure. There will be a charging station at the SCC transit Center at the eastern project terminus. A second charging station at Gonzaga University on Cincinnati is envisioned to provide flexibility in case STA would like to run shorter routes from downtown to GU during events.

Mr. Brower continued to review the cost estimate and the FTA standard cost categories. The current estimate is about \$72 million. Mr. Twohig asked for clarification on the cost number and whether those costs were year of expenditure.

Mr. Brower reviewed the proposed service plan and the annual O&M costs. Mr. Brower explained the contingency amounts that have been included in the cost estimate, which is currently about 4-5% for unallocated. This puts the whole project at about 30% total contingency.

Chair Waldref asked if STA has to tell FTA how long it will take to construct the project and whether the construction staging has been worked out. Mr. Otterstrom stated, during the grant agreement process, STA will submit a detailed construction schedule. There is up to three construction seasons estimated in the project. Mr. Brower stated future construction staging will be coordinated with the City. Mr. Otterstrom stated the civil or horizontal elements could be constructed in the first two seasons and the vertical elements could be in the last construction season.

## **6. SMALL STARTS SCORING UPDATE**

Chair Waldref asked for an update on the scoring. Catherine Ciarlo gave an update on the estimated project justification ratings for the project through each of the criteria. Ms. Ciarlo estimated the project should receive a medium for the Project Justification criteria. Ms. Ciarlo continued to review the local financial commitment criteria. Mr. Otterstrom clarified that STA had cut service more than three years ago which was a review criteria by FTA. Ms. Ciarlo further explained that STA is in good financial status.

Ms. Ciarlo explained that the commitment of funds category is strong for STA as the required local capital and operating funding is already committed. Ms. Ciarlo continued to explain the strong financial status and anticipated high ratings for several of the financial criteria. Ms. Ciarlo stated the anticipated rating will be a medium to medium-high rating.

Ms. Gardner asked what needs to happen with the land use criteria to get a higher rating. Ms. Ciarlo stated the warrants are what they are and cannot be changed. The environmental benefits criteria are still being reviewed. Mr. Otterstrom stated the vehicle miles travelled are somewhat biased as they

benefit longer or very high density trips. The trips never taken are not considered. Ms. Ciarlo stated a lower rating does not mean there is no environmental benefit. Ms. Ciarlo stated team has included justification for trips not taken in the narrative of the ratings package.

Andrew Rowles asked who the competitor projects are. Ms. Ciarlo stated there is a map produced by FTA that show other projects in project development. Chair Waldref stated the project runs through the highest density of jobs and there is no other route that would score higher and even if the project scores low in the environmental benefits category the project scores high in other criteria. Mr. Otterstrom stated other project ratings that have been funded would be prepared for the STA Board. Ms. Ciarlo stated the local financial commitment is strong for the project and will be looked upon favorably by FTA.

Mr. Simmons asked, if there are others project that qualify and that score similarly, does one criteria weigh heavier than others. Mr. Otterstrom stated there may be some geographical equity that plays into funding decisions but that is not a specific criteria. This may be favorable for the project since the CCL is the only project in Eastern Washington.

Ms. Meyer stated that historically, every project that has met the medium rating has been funded. Ms. Ciarlo stated that there has been recently been emphasis on the local financial commitment criteria. Mr. Brower stated past projects that have lower ridership but high financial commitment have been funded. Ms. Meyer stated another project relied on an advisory vote to provide the local financial commitment and that project was funded. The CCL is not in that situation.

**7. ACTION: RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD TO AUTHORIZE SUBMITTING THE SMALL STARTS APPLICATION (FOR EVALUATION AND RATING)**

Chair Waldref asked if the recommendation would include the work application. Chair Waldref asked for a motion or if there were any questions. Mr. Simmons asked about the operational cost difference between the 10 and 15 minute frequency. Mr. Brower stated the difference was about \$300,000 in annual cost difference.

**Chair called for a motion. Mr. Twohig made a motion to recommend to the Board to authorize submitting the small starts application for evaluation and rating. Ms. Gardner seconded the motion. Chair Waldref called for a discussion on the motion.** Mr. Rowles stated the Downtown Spokane Partnership has endorsed the project on two occasions. Ms. Meyer noted the DSP recently made the decision to recommend approval. Mr. Simmons asked when the committee recommendation will be presented to the Board. Mr. Otterstrom stated the recommendation would go to the Board Operations Committee on April 12 and the STA Board on April 20. The recommendation would also go to the Spokane City Council for first reading on April 20. Chair confirmed that each body would take action prior to submittal of the application. John Lemus asked when the Board would be hearing the Committee recommendation and can the public provide testimony. Mr. Otterstrom stated April 20 and you can provide testimony. **Chair called for a vote. The vote passed unanimously. Chair Waldref abstained. The motion passed 11-0.**

## **8. TIMELINE AND PROCESS FOR KEY NEXT STEPS**

Ms. Ciarlo reviewed the next steps in the review process. Ms. Gardner asked if the Committee will review the submittal package in September. Mr. Otterstrom stated the goal is to have a meeting in late summer and in the fall. Mr. Otterstrom stated the meeting in the summer will provide an update on the FTA response. In the fall there will be review and discussion about station locations and design, and results of outreach being completed throughout the summer.

Ms. Gardner stated the Chief Garry Park planning process will have its last planning meeting if committee members or agencies want to be there.

Ms. Meyer stated STA will provide the Committee with an update on what FTA's comments are. Mr. Twohig asked what the response will be if there is no federal money. Ms. Meyer stated the federal funding that is being discussed at the federal level now is for the 2018 budget and the CCL project will be seeking 2019 funding. If there is no funding in the 2019 budget STA will have to go back to the drawing board, STA will need to consider other options and will include conversations with the stakeholders. Mr. Twohig stated everyone is invested in the project. Ms. Meyer stated the project has a lot for support and is confident congress will come up with a budget that includes FTA grant program funding.

Ms. Gardner asked if there is an advantage to having citizens write or call or provide support. Ms. Meyer confirmed it would be beneficial. Discussion continued regarding the federal budget approval process.

Cheryl Kilday agreed that the legislators need to be updated and kept current on the process.

Mr. Simmons stated he was looking forward to meeting in the future to discuss station locations and design and wanted to be sure to understand the status of stations planning and the process moving forward.

## **9. NEXT STEPS**

Mr. Otterstrom discussed future outreach for station locations and design and indicated current concepts are still preliminary and subject to future outreach. Ms. Meyer wanted to emphasize that the stations are not loading zones like the Plaza and that the station designs will be shared with the Committee and discussed in the future.

## **10. ADJOURN**

Chair Waldref adjourned the meeting at 2:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Karl Otterstrom, Director of Planning  
Steering Committee Secretary

## STA High Performance Transit Station Customization Policy Framework

---

Given the amount of interest in customization, and for the purposes of future public outreach and Steering Committee recommendations and guidance, staff and the consultant team believe it will be essential that the STA Board of Directors adopt a policy framework to address the level and extent of customization at station locations. The following is offered as a starting point of such a conceptual policy framework:

- STA strives to maintain consistent “kit of parts” look, feel and branding of station locations for the CCL and all future HPT corridors while providing for certain limited elements to be customized based on input from recognized neighborhood councils and business associations. Customization improves station identification and integration with the existing surrounding environment.
- Minor adaptations to sizing and scaling of design elements based on input from property owners, businesses and those directly using the service may be approved by the CEO.
- Major customization requests (such as commissioning independent station design, etc.) should be approved by the Board and only under the following conditions:
  - The requested customization is submitted by a recognized community organization or institutional partner; and,
  - The customization will not interfere with essential STA branding placement; and,
  - The proponent of said customization agrees to pay for design and construction expenses that are above the expected costs for the typical shelter design, OR the station will be constructed on institutional property, subject to a third-party agreement and other considerations.

In the above conceptual framework, the Board would retain final approval of major design changes, minor customization in station design could be addressed in design efforts and the “kit of parts” options, and could include such items as shelter panel etching or color changes, marker pylon graphics or color/copy changes, light fixture changes, or shelter size and scale options. These items could be addressed with minimal impact to the overall look and feel of the station. Staff would strive to ensure consistent design elements while accommodating concerns of the stakeholder.

This framework could be used throughout the CCL design process, while a more defined framework is defined with the completion of the High Performance Transit Facilities Design project (to be completed in 2017) which defines the facilities program and elements for all HPT corridors. This framework could also be incorporated into the 2017 Connect Spokane update, also to be completed in 2017.

Central City Line station area outreach considerations and schedule

Revised: 24 July 2017

Station location	Station size/site characteristics	"Hot button" issues/Features of interest	What is needed to confirm decision and move forward?	Key contact(s)	Meeting date(s) and process	Viewpoint for rendering
<b>First Tier Stations</b>						
4 <sup>th</sup> Ave and Spruce St (Layover)	Right side layover; 103' concrete pad; new sidewalk; adjacent to edge of CDA park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CDA Park impact/views</li> <li>- Presence of Layover vehicles (2 @ 60')</li> <li>- New sidewalk and impact on adjacent trees (replacements?)</li> <li>- <i>Note: No charging infrastructure assumed at this location</i></li> <li>- Impact of/to Neighborhood Festivals (ArtFest, ElkFest)</li> <li>- Close Coordination and approvals with City Parks &amp; Recreation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- City Parks Coordination</li> <li>- Design Review Board</li> <li>- Neighborhood Design Input</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Parks</li> <li>- Emmanuel Lutheran Church</li> <li>- Community Center</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Phone call with Church Pastor (Allen)</li> <li>- Phone call with Community center contact</li> <li>- Get on NA agenda for early September</li> </ul>	Street view, looking S on Spruce St., showing layover, park, and church
2 <sup>nd</sup> Ave and Spruce St (WB)	Right side station with 45' platform/pad; Adjacent to edge of CDA Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CDA Park impact/views</li> <li>- Views from residences/abutters to park</li> <li>- Sidewalk/path/crosswalk modifications</li> <li>- Impact on adjacent trees (replacements?)</li> <li>- Potential future park improvements (e.g. diagonal path)</li> <li>- Impact of/to Neighborhood Festivals (ArtFest, ElkFest)</li> <li>- Close Coordination and approvals with City Parks &amp; Recreation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- City Parks Coordination</li> <li>- Design Review Board</li> <li>- Neighborhood Design Input</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Parks</li> <li>- Civic Group LLC</li> <li>- Karl Zacker</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Call Civic Group LLC</li> <li>- Get on Park Board agenda for Sept</li> </ul>	Combined view of WB/EB stations around corner - looking SE toward the park to see both stations and the park
2 <sup>nd</sup> Ave and Spruce St (EB)	Right side station with 45' shelter/pad; Adjacent to edge of CDA Park					
Pacific and Cannon	Center station west of Cannon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Issues relating to businesses and station aesthetics</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Local business owners at Pacific and Cannon</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Brandon to visit with individual business owners on 7/28</li> <li>- Schedule meeting with business owners prior to neighborhood</li> </ul>	
1 <sup>st</sup> Ave and Adams St	Left side 60' platform/ pad; New bike lane behind island; Crossing/luminaire improvements; Adjacent to CSO site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Combined impact of station, bike lane, CSO site, and intersection improvements</li> <li>- Agreement on how station fits into re-designed street (i.e. impact on parking and travel lanes)</li> <li>- Public/business perception re possible travel lane changes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Coordination with City CSO design team (ongoing)</li> <li>- Downtown business design input</li> <li>- Design Review Board</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- KHQ</li> <li>- Wells Properties</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meet with KHQ</li> <li>- Meeting with Wells Properties re multiple locations along the alignment</li> </ul>	Street level opposite station or aerial (e.g.. SE corner of 1st/Adams) showing CSO site and both stations (requires City concept for CSO site development). Street reconfigurations
Sprague Ave and Adams St	Left side 60' platform and pad; New bike lane behind island; Crossing/luminaire improvements; Adjacent to CSO site					
WSU (Spokane Falls Blvd, EB)	Right Side 60' platform/pad; Modified median island; New midblock crossing; New bike lane behind island	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adjacencies to new and potential WSU facilities (e.g., existing parking lot development)</li> <li>- Connectivity to U-District bike/ped paths, including U-District Pedestrian Bridge</li> <li>- Impact on parking and travel lanes</li> <li>- Median reconfiguration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Design input from WSU</li> <li>- Design input from UDDA</li> <li>- Coordinated agreement with WSU on station amenities and roadway improvements, including who is responsible for which elements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- WSU</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meet with student leadership</li> </ul>	Street level (looking S) showing bridge in background). Alt: aerial looking SE, capturing pedestrian bridge, future parking lot development



Station location	Station size/site characteristics	"Hot button" issues/Features of interest	What is needed to confirm decision and move forward?	Key contact(s)	Meeting date(s) and process	Viewpoint for rendering
WSU (Spokane Falls Blvd, WB)	Right Side 60' platform/pad; Modified median island; New midblock crossing; New bike lane behind island		- Design Review Board			Street level (looking NW towards WSU) capturing crossing and center station.
Desmet Ave and Cincinnati St.	Center 70' platform with pads; Realigned street/crossings/swale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Median station configuration, street/sidewalk/swale reconfiguration</li> <li>- Proximity to GU facilities and landmarks (e.g. Hemmingson Center)</li> <li>- Connectivity to GU campus, paths</li> <li>- New station plaza</li> <li>- Bicycle accommodations and facilities</li> <li>- Architectural features (bollards, etc.) and enhanced pavement materials extending along Cincinnati and into campus</li> <li>- Utility pole removal/relocation and undergrounding of utilities</li> <li>- Mountable truck curb on NW corner Desmet St.</li> <li>- Custom GU amenities? Shelter, wayfinding, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Design coordination among STA, City, and GU about who is responsible for various improvements (roadway, plaza, station amenities, etc.)</li> <li>- Design Review Board</li> </ul>	Scarpelli	- Contact property owner through letter	Aerial capturing station/plaza improvements and relation to adjacent university facilities. Plan view of full length Cincinnati St. improvements, stations, driveway reconfig., charging/layover area, roundabout, etc.
Mission Ave and Regal St. (EB)	Right side 45' platform/pad; In-lane bus stop; Continuous sidewalk through station; NS and FS options for EB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bulb-out of station beyond existing sidewalk limit (ROW acquisition)</li> <li>- Pedestrian/crosswalk/safety improvements?</li> <li>- Adjacency/impact on Chief Garry Park, Trees, fence, utility pole (EB Opt 1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- City Parks coordination</li> <li>- Design Review Board</li> <li>- Neighborhood design input</li> <li>- Design input from business owners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Barber Engineering</li> <li>- Letter Carriers Union</li> </ul>	Meet with Barber Engineering - Meet with president of Letter Carriers (who is this?)	Are we rendering option 1 or option 2?  Combined aerial view of WB/EB stations (looking EB or WB down street) Alt: street view from diagonal opposite corner of Regal from stations
Mission Ave and Regal St. (WB)	Right side 45' platform/pad; In-lane bus stop; Continuous sidewalk through station	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Driveway reconfiguration/abandonment (EB Opt 2)</li> <li>- Future land use?</li> <li>- Section 4(f) NEPA documentation required for ROW take for EB Opt 1</li> </ul>				
<b>University District Stations</b>						
Main Ave and Division St. (EB)	Right Side 60' platform/pad; Bulbout station into parking lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How does station fit into re-envisioned Main Avenue?</li> <li>- Timeline/coordination with planned improvements (Downtown Plan update, Main Ave reconfiguration)</li> <li>- Relationship to adjacent storefronts</li> <li>- Relationship to adjacent redevelopable lot (corner Main/Division)</li> <li>- Removed parking/compatibility with diagonal parking</li> <li>- Bicycle accommodations?</li> <li>- Pedestrian/crosswalk improvements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Design Review Board</li> <li>- Neighborhood design input</li> <li>- Design input from business owners</li> </ul>	- Harlan Douglass property on corner	- Contact through letter	Street level looking SW towards redeveloped corner lot, storefronts

Station location	Station size/site characteristics	"Hot button" issues/Features of interest	What is needed to confirm decision and move forward?	Key contact(s)	Meeting date(s) and process	Viewpoint for rendering
Riverside Ave and Division St (WB)	Left side 60' platform/pad, midblock; Bulbout station; Adjacent landscaped areas and curb cut modifications	- Timeline/coordination with planned improvements in the Downtown Plan - Redevelopment of adjacent surface parking lots - Proximity and impacts on the fire station/adjacent curb cuts - Pedestrian/curb improvements at Division St.	- Design Review Board - Neighborhood design input - Design input from business owners	- McDowell - Fire Station 01	- Meet with McDowell - Meet with fire station	Street level - looking NW towards fire station, redeveloped parking
Main Ave and Pine St. (EB/WB)	Center 60' platform/pads; New midblock crossing on north end of station	- Relationship to Jensen Byrd redevelopment site - Compatibility with existing bicycle lanes - Adjacent changes to left turn lane/street parking on Main Ave.	- Design Review Board - Neighborhood design input - Design input from business owners	40 Main LLC	- Contact through letter	Aerial, looking NE, showing station and Main Ave improvements, redevelopment parcels to the east
WSU (Spokane Falls Blvd, EB)	See above					
WSU (Spokane Falls Blvd, WB)	See above					
Cincinnati St. and Springfield (EB/WB)	Center 60' platform/pads; Springfield Ave crosswalk improvements Reconfigured turnaround bulb and trail crossing	- Event coordination/parking ingress and egress, access controls - Interface with Centennial Trail - Coordination with City greenway street configuration - Relationship to EZ loader current operations and future redevelopment - Reconfigured turnaround bulb at north end of the public	- Design coordination among STA, City, and GU about who is responsible for various improvements (roadway, plaza, station amenities, etc.) - Design Review Board	EZ Loader	- Meet with EZ Loader to learn about their plans for the site	Aerial, looking N up Cincinnati, showing station, trail/bulb/parking improvements
Desmet Ave and Cincinnati St. (EB/WB)	See above					
Mission Ave and Hamilton St. (EB)	Right Side 60' station/pad Continuous sidewalk through station	- Resolve question about routing, traffic flow at Cincinnati or Hamilton (routing, geometry, access considerations) - TSP/Queue jump operations for WB vehicles in the right hand lane - Impact on driveway curb cut (EB stop)	- Design coordination among STA, City, and GU - Additional analysis and coordination with City traffic - Neighborhood design input	- Safeway - Honeysuckle properties	- Meet with Honeysuckle properties	Aerial, looking W, showing both stations and Mission/Hamilton lane config (possibly also Mission/Cincinnati left turn pocket)  Alt: Street level view looking at WB station from opposite side of Mission
Mission Ave and Hamilton St. (WB)	Right Side 60' station/pad Continuous sidewalk through station					Alt: Street level view, looking at EB station from opposite side of Mission
Napa and Mission				- Frank Tombari - Mission Napa LLC - Baines Gas Station	- Meet with Frank Tombari - Meet with Mission Napa LLC	