

**CENTRAL CITY LINE STEERING COMMITTEE**

**MEETING 1:15 P.M.**

Draft Minutes of February 1, 2016 Meeting  
Spokane Intermodal Center  
Great Northern Room, Suite #310

**MEMBERS/ALTERNATES PRESENT**

Ryan Carstens, Spokane Community College  
Kathy Fritchie, Browne's Addn. Neighborhood  
Collen Gardner, Chief Garry Park Neighborhood  
Cheryl Kilday, Visit Spokane  
John Lemus, People First  
Mark Mansfield, University District Dev. Assoc.  
(Vice Chair)  
E. Susan Meyer, Spokane Transit Authority  
Gary Pollard, Riverside Neighborhood Council  
Mark Richard, Downtown Spokane Partnership  
Harlan Shellabarger, Cheney Free Press  
Scott Simmons, City of Spokane  
John Sklut, Gonzaga University  
Steve Trabun, Avista  
Kevin Twohig, Spokane Public Facilities Dist.  
Amber Waldref, City of Spokane (Chair)

**STAFF PRESENT**

Karl Otterstrom, Director of Planning (Secretary)  
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  
Lindsay Gilbert, CH2M  
Randy Knapick, IBI Group, Inc.  
Andrew Warlock, City of Spokane  
Paul Kropp, Citizen

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Mark Aden, DCI Engineers  
Anne Marie Axworthy, Greater Spokane Inc.  
Karen Byrd, Logan Neighborhood Council  
Lisa Brown, Washington State Univ. - Spokane

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

Chair Waldref called the meeting to order at 1:15 p.m. Chair Waldref welcomed the group to the Steering Committee meeting.

**2. PUBLIC EXPRESSIONS**

Chair Waldref asked if there were any members of the public who wished to speak. There were none.

**3. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS**

Chair Waldref asked if there were any changes to the minutes from the November meeting. There were none. **Kevin Twohig made a motion to approve the minutes. Colleen Gardner seconded the motion. Motion unanimously approved.** *[Recording of the meeting is started]*

*[Mark Richard arrived at 1:20 p.m.]*

**4. DOWNTOWN ALIGNMENT ALTERNATIVES**

Karl Otterstrom explained that in order to streamline the environmental process the committee needs to identify one downtown alignment and station plan. Mr. Otterstrom explained that the goal of the

meeting is to get closer to the alignment decision. In order to move forward in the environmental and design processes we need to have one alignment, particularly in the downtown area. Mr. Otterstrom reviewed the project schedule.

*[Steve Trabun arrived at 1:25 p.m.]*

The hope of the meeting is to get closer to an alignment and eliminate alignments that the committee does not like. This will help in the stakeholder process. The goal is to have a recommendation on an alignment in March. Mr. Otterstrom introduced Catherine Ciarlo.

Ms. Ciarlo reminded the committee that there were five alignment options under consideration. Ms. Ciarlo asked the committee members if anyone had attended the brown bag luncheon. Mr. Otterstrom gave a brief overview of what the brown bag luncheons were and their purpose.

Ms. Ciarlo reminded the group that the five alignment criteria were identified at the last meeting. The team has prepared a matrix to help with the review and consideration of the pros and cons of the five alternatives. She explained that all five alternatives are viable options and that there were no fatal flaws in any. In adding up the scores of each alignment in the matrix, the two-way Main alternative scores highest and the Spokane Falls-Riverside option scores lower. Ms. Ciarlo explained that the alignment matrix was not intended to provide the answer on the preferred alternative, the purpose is to give the committee a chance to review the points of differentiation between the alternatives for review and discussion.

Ms. Ciarlo explained that the alignments are likely to have similar ridership numbers. The Main option has the most retail and pedestrian activity. Riverside is an attractive street for transit. Spokane Falls has the convention center and the ark. It is desirable to have inbound and outbound routes as close to each other as possible, if not on the same street, then one block away. The Spokane Falls-Riverside option is two blocks away and that was a negative.

Ms. Ciarlo explained the block face map (slide 11) and the transit support level of the three street options. The purpose is to see how the three streets compare to each other. Ms. Ciarlo explained that the brown color on the map represented areas that are not supportive of transit, green was areas that are supportive of transit and blue areas were areas of potential development or redevelopment. The brown and green dashed line meant sometimes there is a lot of transit/pedestrian activity and other times there is not. Ms. Ciarlo asked if there were any questions.

*[Kathy Fritchie and Tim Robinson arrived at 1:30 p.m.]*

Chair Waldref asked if the team looked at the character of the street or the generators. Ms. Ciarlo explained that the colors looked at the character of the street but it's related to the generator. Chair Waldref explained that the convention center area does not have a lot of transit-supportive retail but it is a people generator. Ms. Ciarlo explained that the brown color in front of the convention center was such because it was not a real pedestrian friendly street, high speed traffic and not conducive to consistent transit activity. Ms. Ciarlo stated that one of the considerations by FTA is that sometimes the big generators like the convention center generate a lot of activity at selective times and not a continuous generator and that is something FTA will look at.

*[Ryan Carstens arrived at 1:35 p.m.]*

Ms. Ciarlo explained that there is no technical preference for any of the options. Main and the two-way Main option appears to be a real opportunity, but again, the others do not have a fatal flaw.

Chair Waldref recognized members that had joined the meeting.

Kevin Twohig asked what the matrix point totals were between the five alternatives. Ms. Ciarlo explained that there was a three point difference between the five alternatives. The highest scoring option was two-way Main. The lowest was Spokane Falls-Riverside and the reason was because of the street separation distance of two blocks. Ms. Ciarlo explained that the matrix totals and analysis shows the tradeoffs of each alternative but do not clearly differentiate the options.

Ms. Ciarlo explained the characteristics of Spokane Falls and Main. Mr. Otterstrom explained that the two-way Main option would allow for center stations. This is not possible for Spokane Falls and Riverside. Ms. Ciarlo explained center stations can reduce development costs.

Mr. Mansfield affirmed cost consolidation and targeted investments in the area and other work the City is doing and general development interests in the area.

Ms. Ciarlo explained that community acceptance of a two-way Main option and time to gain acceptance would take time. Mr. Twohig asked about the property owner issue on Main, if you have a property owner who has publicly stated do not change Main to two-way, you have a bigger hurdle than community acceptance, and is there a plan to deal with that. Steve Trabun asked what obstacles exit from changing to a two-way Main from the City perspective. Chair Waldref explained that it has been the cost of the reconfiguration. Mr. Trabun asked what the cost is. Scott Simmons stated the cost could be a quarter of a million to half of a million dollars for each intersection. Ms. Ciarlo explained these costs kept the Main option from scoring even higher in the matrix. Chair Waldref asked if these costs could be covered by the FTA grant. Mr. Otterstrom explained it could. Chair Waldref stated that should be a consideration.

Mark Richard explained that he and Mr. Otterstrom had a meeting with Betsy Cowles and Brin, and he would say that oppose is putting it lightly to converting Main to two-way. The reality is that the Cowles have invested a lot of money in the west Main area and they have timelines with certain tenants and they do not want to rock the boat. He hasn't asked his board but his hunch is they will likely oppose the two-way Main option. Mr. Richard stated he could not vote for the two-way Main option. Mr. Richard also agreed with hashed color for the Riverfront Park area but that it may turn more green in the future due to the future improvements in the future.

Ms. Ciarlo explained that from a pure transit planning perspective you don't generally put a transit investment in front of a park, as it doesn't generally draw regular ridership.

Ryan Carstens referenced 16<sup>th</sup> Street in Denver, which is a transit only street, and asked if something like that was possible for Main. Mr. Otterstrom stated it has never been proposed. The City of Spokane has adopted a downtown plan that looks at a transit/pedestrian mall on Wall Street but not on Main, and no exclusion of cars. Mr. Carstens suggest people go to Denver and look at 16<sup>th</sup> Street an impressive transit corridor with significant pedestrian and retail activity along the street.

Gary Pollard explained that during the Jim West administration there was consideration of a two-way Main option but it was discounted primarily because of cost and ownership. The perceived limitations of ridership on Spokane Falls will not be the way it is in the future. Throughout the corridor there has been a lot of investment in the corridor and there will be a lot more activity. The park will have more activity which would increase ridership.

Chair Waldref responded that there will be more activity in the corridor and at the park. Need to look at the day to day, and event ridership.

Ms. Ciarlo explained the Riverside street characteristics. Has more 9-5 activity but quieter after hours compared to Main. Redevelopment potential is lower than Spokane Falls and Main because of the established businesses. Redevelopment may take a while. Heard from brown bag lunch meetings that Riverside was centrally located and liked making the businesses more visible. Also heard that it is far away from the convention center and park.

Ms. Ciarlo explained that we would like to eliminate as many options as possible so that a preferred alternative can be made at the next meeting.

Mr. Trabun explained that the parkade entrance is on Main eastbound. Ms. Ciarlo explained that that was an engineering design detail that could be figured out. Mr. Trabun would like two-way Main to be the option but there may be too many obstacles to overcome.

Mr. Mansfield wanted to be clear that there were two obstacles to two-way Main, cost and a resistance of a landowner. Mr. Mansfield wanted to recognize that the major hurdle seems to be the interest of one and not the judgement that profession transit input is showing.

Susan Meyer stated that there was more than one landowner opposed to two-way Main .

Harlan Shellabarger asked why Riverside two-way was not eligible for center stations, why was it different than two-way Main.

Mr. Otterstrom explained that STA has existing bus routes on Riverside and those buses do not have doors on both sides so there would be a situation where there were center stations and side stations that may confuse riders and STA wants to avoid that.

Mr. Shellabarger asked if there was any opposition to Riverside like there is on Main.

Mr. Twohig stated there may be more opposition to two-way Main whether it is the Downtown Spokane Partnership board, the Public Facilities District board or the Greater Spokane Inc. board, all for the same reasons that they are trying to protect investment in downtown. You suddenly have a much more complicated dynamic.

Mr. Simmons sees Riverside as an existing two-way street that already has infrastructure, so from a cost standpoint it is attractive. Main is much more active, retail already, Riverside is more tired and needs more pedestrian activity. Riverside could be a strong contender to redevelopment opportunities. Riverside is a central east-west arterial. Mr. Simmons likes the two-way Riverside option. Need to continue to provide different levels of housing. There are lots of housing opportunities along 1<sup>st</sup> and Sprague avenue. Mr. Simmons is a fan of the two-way Riverside option.

Mr. Pollard agrees with Mr. Simmons, that there is a great opportunity for economic development on west 1<sup>st</sup> and the Main and Riverside corridors. Has a tendency to like Riverside but how much does it matter whether it is Main or Riverside because there will be residual development. Both options are good and will generate economic development.

Colleen Gardner explained that she is the neighborhood representative on the design review board and the park development is moving forward. Would gladly walk two blocks to attend park events and participate in activities there. Leaning towards Riverside.

Ms. Ciarlo stated it might be good to summarize what was heard on the alignment options.

Mr. Mansfield clarified that he wanted to understand the role of an advisory committee, is it to provide personal dispositions or try to understand the best of the professionals' knowledge? If there is a way to highlight the transit thinking is to help the committee make a decision and not to challenge investment. Mr. Mansfield wants to help support investment and understand the thoughtful process to date.

Ms. Ciarlo suggested, from a technical standpoint, removing the Spokane Falls-Riverside as an option because they are too far apart and they do not hit Main. With respect to two-way Main, technically it scored well but FTA will look for community support and if that support does not exist, FTA will not look kindly on the project. Two-way Riverside is not technically supported due to the interaction with existing service. From a technical standpoint Riverside-Main would be preferred but only if there was a clear connection with Spokane Falls so that the users of the convention center and park knew where the route was.

Mr. Otterstrom explained that the Riverside option technically works but it has different opportunities than Main because of the center station options on Main. He explained that the comments from the brown bag lunch meetings showed two-way Riverside and the Spokane Falls-Riverside options had the most negative comments. Comments were supportive of Spokane Falls-Main. Should consider removing Spokane Falls-Riverside option and two-way Riverside as there was no support. The goal of the team was to provide the committee with technical information as well as public support information in order to make a decision. Technically, each option will work but FTA will look at public support.

Chair Waldref asked if Mr. Twohig supported removing the Spokane Falls-Riverside. Mr. Twohig agreed with removing that option. Chair Waldref asked if anyone was opposed to removing the Spokane Falls-Riverside option. **Mr. Twohig made a motion to remove option 5. Mr. Shellabarger seconded the motion.** Chair Waldref asked if there was any discussion. Mr. Simmons stated that the two block separation was not ideal for visitors. He agreed with removing. Chair called for a vote. **Motion passed unanimously.**

Mr. Twohig asked about existing transit service on the three streets. Mr. Otterstrom stated Riverside eastbound service was from the Plaza and there is no consistent direction. Spokane Falls has westbound buses. There is no transit on Main. Historically, there has been transit on Main.

Kathy Fritchie asked if there has been consideration of having the Central City Line move both ways on Main even if Main continues to be one way like Portland. Mr. Otterstrom stated STA has not considered that option. Randy Knapick stated there are options, like a contraflow lane but it introduces other issues with traffic and pedestrian safety unique to such configurations.

Chair Waldref stated Riverside does have some empty lots and redevelopment opportunities. Riverside has some shops and services but not as intense as Main. A Main-Riverside couplet could pick up redevelopment opportunities but there is also opportunities for Spokane Falls-Riverside. Two-way Riverside is not preferred and would like to have Main considered. Ms. Ciarlo stated the technical team supports that.

Chair Waldref asked John Lemus what his comments were. Mr. Lemus stated he like two-way Main because the intersections have stop lights so individuals with disabilities are not that far from stop lights and crossing safely. Mr. Lemus stated Riverside seems old and tired; likes the center stations on a two-way Main from an accessibility standpoint.

Tim Robinson feels the alignment success has a lot to do with the signage and marketing. Something that seems sterile now could end up being robust with proper input.

Chair Waldref stated you don't just plop down the route, there will be a lot of signage in drawing people to access the service.

Mr. Mansfield stated there are multiple conversations in the City and other development interests to align signage.

Chair Waldref asked Mr. Mansfield if the U-District has discussed how the route can connect the U-District.

Mr. Otterstrom stated the preference from WSU has been to use Spokane Falls rather than Riverside.

Mr. Mansfield stated the route through the U-District is already established. He stated that if the Committee advises against the wishes of some, sometimes it is for the greater interests and not looking at the static situation of the day but trying to have an eye for the horizon and the future. There will be significant investments in the area that benefit not only the riders but the whole network of mobility in the future and how do we move about the city.

Mr. Trabun asked if there was anyone from the medical district represented, and do any of the options rise to the top.

Mr. Otterstrom stated that during the alternatives analysis the hospitals were involved. There is currently a medical shuttle, which will extend to the south landing of the University Gateway Bridge.

Mr. Richard confirmed that future service will be provided to the medical district intersecting the Central City Line.

Chair Waldref asked if a two-way street option should be given more points.

Ms. Ciarlo stated that a two-way Main is very attractive, but two-way Riverside is not as attractive.

Chair Waldref asked if two-way Riverside should be removed.

Mr. Robinson asked if one block makes a difference, does it affect whether people will use transit.

Ms. Ciarlo explained Main as a streetscape has a lot of development potential and transit could support that.

Mr. Otterstrom stated that the travel demand model is typically looking at everyday user, housing and jobs. The model sorts out how people respond but doesn't do very well for special generators.

Mr. Pollard is in favor of eliminating two-way Riverside, it doesn't take advantage of any of the attractions, shopping or student services. It doesn't allow for expansion.

Ms. Ciarlo stated that option would concentrate downtown transit on Riverside where there is already a lot of transit.

Chair Waldref reminded the committee that the line will always cross Riverside at some point, it will come close to the historic Davenport.

Mr. Richard stated you need to put on the hat of the group you are representing but also need to consider the technical as well as the political realities as vetting tools. If there is a future tax measure

and the voters are asked to support this project you need to have groups behind you. There is a level of support for service on Main, just no support for two-way Main to the west, which could result in some support turning into opposition. If the route is on Main and Riverside, the transit is on routes with undeveloped real estate opportunity. Would support removing two-way Riverside.

Chair Waldref confirmed that there would still be transit service on Riverside if the two-way Riverside option were removed.

Mr. Otterstrom said there is likely to be investments in the Riverside corridor in the future.

Mr. Mansfield asked what if the committee wasn't advocating for a route choice but rather advocating for the principles by supporting transit and targeted investment and what that does to support a city.

Chair Waldref stated if the committee were to remove the two-way Riverside option there would still be three options.

Mr. Carstens is in favor of removing the two-way Riverside option. Would look at Main because everything is a block away. If you are looking to increase the ridership look at the shortest walk time. If you are more centralized you are closer to everything.

Chair Waldref stated Mr. Carstens is not far off from comments that have been received.

Mr. Simmons agreed with Mr. Richards comments on the block face map on Riverside. Agreed with Mr. Otterstrom comments on two-way Riverside option. Need to encourage more pedestrian activity on Riverside.

John Sklut stated there is a visibility aspect of the project. Potential riders could get lost on two-way Riverside, it's just another bus as opposed to Main or Spokane Falls.

Chair Waldref called for a motion to remove the two-way Riverside option. **Mr. Richards moved to remove the two-way Riverside option. Mr. Gardner seconded the motion.** Chair called for discussion. There was none. Chair Waldref called for a vote. **The motion was approved unanimously.**

Mr. Otterstrom suggested a brief overview of the overlay project and station concepts.

## **5. STATION AND STOP LOCATIONS**

Randy Knapick stated there is a parallel effort to develop station concepts and branding for the Central City Line and the future HPT corridors. The team is developing station designs and focused on the consistency of how they look and feel, how branding looks, quality amenities, and making sure they are scalable and appropriate to their locations. The team is taking a kit-of-parts approach of saying each station may be a different size and include differing amenities depending on location. There will be three concepts presented at a workshop tomorrow. Mr. Knapick reviewed the three conceptual designs.

Chair Waldref stated the idea is to have the Central City Line be one of many high performance lines. One line would be to Cheney. These lines would be branded differently but you would know you are on an HPT line. Chair Waldref asked where the workshop was being held.

Mr. Otterstrom stated the workshop was in the lobby of the pharmaceutical and biomedical building in the U-District from 4-6 p.m.

**6. SMALL STARTS GRANT UPDATES**

No discussion

**7. STRATEGIC OVERLAY PLAN**

Ryan Farncomb reviewed the purpose of the strategic overlay plan project. Looking at policies, strategies and actions that could support the urban environment and transit, and a competitive grant application. Are developing recommendations for three general areas, the Chief Gary Park Neighborhood, downtown Spokane and the Browne's Addition neighborhood. Have upcoming workshops in the neighborhoods to gather information and present project information.

Mr. Richard suggested looking at and supporting tax exemptions for subsidized and market rate housing. It would be of benefit to support market rate exemptions for housing.

Chair Waldref stated the Spokane City Council is starting to talk about extending multi-family tax credit in the lower south hill and then take a more comprehensive look at the whole program. Maybe there are some areas along the Central City Line route that city could look at tax exemptions to support the project.

**8. NEXT MEETING DATE**

Chair Waldref asked when the next meeting would be.

Mr. Otterstrom said a new Doodle poll was sent out to determine the next date. It is looking like mid to late March.

Chair Waldref thanked staff for the summary of outreach comments and suggested the committee members be thinking about the three remaining alignment options. If the committee had any questions, please send them to Mr. Otterstrom

**9. ADJOURN**

Chair Waldref adjourned the meeting at 3:14 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Karl Otterstrom, Director of Planning

Steering Committee Secretary