

CENTRAL CITY LINE STEERING COMMITTEE
MEETING 1:00 P.M.

Minutes of January 31, 2017 Meeting
SRTC, Paulsen Building
421 W. Riverside Ave., Suite 500

MEMBERS/ALTERNATES PRESENT

Kathy Fritchie, Browne's Addn. Neighborhood
Collen Gardner, Chief Garry Park Neighborhood
John Lemus, People First
E. Susan Meyer, Spokane Transit Authority
Gary Pollard, Riverside Neighborhood Council
Mark Richard, Downtown Spokane Partnership
Jim Simon, Gonzaga University
Steve Trabun, Avista Corporation
Amber Waldref, City of Spokane (Chair)

MEMBERS ABSENT

Anne Marie Axworthy, Greater Spokane Inc.
Lisa Brown, Washington State Univ. - Spokane
Karen Byrd, Logan Neighborhood Council
Ryan Carstens, Spokane Community College
Cheryl Kilday, Visit Spokane
Mark Mansfield, University Dist. Dev. Assoc.
Harlan Shellabarger, Cheney Free Press
Scott Simmons, City of Spokane
John Sklut, Gonzaga University
Kevin Twohig, Spokane Public Facilities Dist.

STAFF PRESENT

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

CONSULTANTS/GUESTS

Mark Brower, CH2M
Catherine Ciarlo, CH2M
Randy Knapick, IBI Group
Andrew Warlock, City of Spokane
Katherine Miller, City of Spokane
Paul Kropp, Citizen, SRTC Advisory Committee

1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND AGENDA REVIEW

Chair Waldref called the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m. Noted there was not a quorum. Chair Waldref welcomed the group to the meeting. Meeting attendees introduced themselves.

2. PUBLIC EXPRESSIONS

Chair Waldref noted there were no members of the public for public expressions.

3. ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS

Chair Waldref noted there was not a quorum so the Committee could not approve the minutes

4. SMALL STARTS FRANT SUBMITTAL TIMELINE UPDATE

Chair Waldref asked Karl Otterstrom for an update on the grant application status. Mr. Otterstrom noted that the grant submittal timeline was delayed in order to wait until the tax measure vote to provide more certainty on funding and to allow for more detailed engineering. Mr. Otterstrom reviewed the current project timeline. Mr. Otterstrom noted that the primary focus right now is completing the grant application.

Collen Gardner asked about if there were any concerns about the current climate in DC with the new administration. Susan Meyer stated that her contacts in DC said not to be alarmed yet. The funding for the grant program comes from the general fund and that there is no idea what will happen. There are a lot of unknowns. One of the organizations that Secretary Chao has been involved with has called for the elimination of the Federal Transit Administration over 5-years, but she was told not to be alarmed yet.

Gary Pollard stated during the campaign there was an emphasis on funding infrastructure.

Ms. Meyer stated she will be going to the APTA conference this year and might get a better sense of the transit climate. She noted this time when they meeting with legislative officials, the project will be funded.

Mark Brower reviewed the work progress to date on the application and that the team is pulling together all of the pieces of information into the grant application.

Mr. Otterstrom briefly reviewed the City and STA process to date and will be coming to the group at the next meeting to ask for a recommendation to the Board for approval to submit the application.

Catherine Ciarlo provided a summary of the information FTA will be looking for and the warrants approach FTA will use to review the application. Ms. Ciarlo briefly explained the warrants approach and that the team is aiming for a Medium to Medium-High rating throughout the rating categories. Some categories are automatically calculated and some are more subjective.

Ms. Ciarlo provided a summary of the land use and economic development portions of the grant application and the highlights of the benefits of the CCL, such as supportive land use policies, providing transportation choices, connections to neighborhoods, connections to the University District, all of which support the CCL and the major investments through the corridor.

Ms. Gardner asked if the neighborhood action plans are incorporated into the discussions of the grant application. Ms. Ciarlo referenced the Strategic Overlay Plan and the actions from that plan that were developed through that process. These actions are included in the grant application. FTA will be interested in whether these actions are supportive by the community and neighborhoods.

Chair Waldref asked about the CCL presentation. Ms. Ciarlo stated the outreach firm was making some revisions to the presentation and would have the final version ready for review. Chair Waldref stated references to the Coeur d'Alene park plan could be referenced in the presentation and how the CCL could provide access to the park and events at the park.

Ms. Meyer asked if there is a picture of Gonzaga and Spokane Community College in the CCL presentation. Ms. Ciarlo stated they could be added.

Mr. Otterstrom stated that the goal of the team is not to bring the entire 100+ page grant document and the dozens of spreadsheets to the Committee for review as it is more of a technical document, but to give them the highlights to get their input.

Mark Richard asked if housing redevelopment could be added to the documentation and multimodal transportation relating to the Centennial Trail and the bike master plan.

Andrew Warlock stated the City has been coordinating with CH2M on proposed and upcoming projects within the City.

Mr. Richard stated the Downtown Spokane Partnership is working with the City to inventory vaults within the corridor and get a sense from landowners on future development. He stated he has a concern about getting the inventory done on time and will there be time to get the information included in the package before the September deadline. Mark Brower stated there is a lot of coordination with the City on the needed improvements so costs can be included in the final cost estimate. Mr. Richards asked if the goal is to include CCL funds to fill in the vaulted sidewalks. Katherine Miller stated the City is looking at all funding opportunities and no decisions have been made. Mr. Richards asked what the goal of the vault inventory. Ms. Miller stated the city passed the street levy and since that time the City has categorized future projects to spend the funds. The highest scoring projects were in the downtown core. The presence of the CCL project raised the CCL streets to the top of the list. The inventory that DSP is doing will help to refine the amount of work needed for future improvements which will help inform the cost estimates.

5. OUTREACH UPDATE

Ms. Ciarlo provided an update of the ongoing outreach activities and opportunities for open houses in the near future. Ms. Ciarlo further stated that the goal is to get thirty letters of support from all forms of stakeholders and entities that care about and have a stake in the project.

Chair Waldref asked if Desautel Hege will be reaching out to stakeholders. Ms. Ciarlo confirmed.

6. PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING UPDATE

Mr. Brower stated the goal is to be at 25-30% design at the time of grant application submittal. Mr. Brower gave an update on the preliminary engineering activities that are ongoing such as roadway changes, sidewalk improvements, charging facilities, operations and maintenance facilities, vehicles and fare collection.

Mr. Brower stated the goal of this work is to prepare a final cost estimate. He noted there are still some gaps in the estimate but it is looking like the cost will be at or under the \$72 million.

Randy Knapick stated one of the criteria of the application is submittal of a service plan. Mr. Knapick stated the proposed service plan is a starting point for a plan. The plan includes a 19 hour service window with more service in the peak hours and less early morning and late night. Mid-day would be about 15 minute service.

Mr. Knapick gave a summary of how service plan operations and maintenance costs are developed. The service plan proposed has an annual O&M cost of approximately \$3.6 million. Mr. Knapick noted that the 2014 estimate was \$4.2 million.

Ms. Waldref asked if a 10-minute weekday frequency was considered and how many more hours would be added. Mr. Otterstrom stated you would have to look at other connections and impacts to other routes going to 10 minute service when the rest of the routes are on 15 minute cycles. Ms. Waldref asked if the universities have reviewed the plan.

Ms. Meyer asked Mr. Richards had an opinion on the 10-minute frequency. Mr. Richards stated he did not have an opinion but could get feedback from his constituency.

Mr. Otterstrom stated the proposed plan is a conservative starting point for the submittal of the application and that later we could vary on the service plan. It is not impossible to change to a different frequency later to meet demand.

Chair Waldref stated it is important to stay within the service levels that were portrayed to the public. Mr. Richard agreed that it is important to set a service plan that will be approved by FTA and also stated he would like to see the analysis between people using the line and those that use it to get to a transfer station.

Mr. Otterstrom stated what we proposed in the grant application will be expected by FTA when the service opens so we need to make sure we can meet the plan and cover the operating costs as proposed. There are benefits to not having a high service plan as you can easily increase service but it is difficult to reduce service.

Chair Waldref stated we should find ways to make the midday service more frequent than 15-minute service as that is the level of service today. Ms. Garner stated this plan meets the requirements of the grant application and it could always be changed in the future.

7. **FINANCE UPDATE**

Mr. Knapick stated the ingredients of the cost estimate are coming together, the only missing piece is project partners and the costs of other non-core projects. Mr. Knapick reviewed the current cost estimate and funding amounts and the requirements for the local match requirements under the grant criteria. He stated STA is in sound financial standing and should rate high. The most important criteria may be the local commitment criteria. He states this is really important to FTA. Currently, the project rates well.

Mr. Knapick reviewed four different funding scenarios, from the existing scenario of a \$72 million project up to a \$100 million project. Identifying the core and non-core infrastructure costs. If any costs are added into the project, the local commitment costs rise.

John Lemus asked if any additional funds the City used for street projects would increase the local match. Mr. Knapick stated it could be considered local match.

Ms. Meyer stated any projects included in the project will require compliance with Buy America. Ms. Miller stated the City has experience in compliance with Buy America and Buy American.

Mr. Richard asked if we have the local match now. Mr. Knapick stated we currently have the local match requirement met for up to \$74 million to meet the target match of 25%. Mr. Richard stated some owners have discussed the possibility of an LID for a portion of the corridor and whether it would work now or whether it should be delayed. Ms. Miller explained the process of an LID and how it could work.

Mr. Knapick stated one of the most important aspects of the financial rating is the commitment of local funds. Seventy-five percent must be locally committed. He stated we do not need full commitment of funds now but in the future the project would need agency commitment of the funds with no other action required by the agency.

Mr. Knapick reviewed the reasonableness capacity and how that can be debt capacity, cash reserves, etc. The bar to meet a high rating is you must have access to 50% of the total capital cost. He reviewed what the reasons for this capacity were and that it is used to cover cost over runs.

Mr. Knapick reviewed the pros and cons of adding additional city projects and stated there are advantages to considering City projects but that brings risks and other financial commitments. Also

brings project complexity, project management implementation, federalizing all projects. He closed by saying that coordination of projects may make sense but need to consider the risks to the core CCL project.

Mr. Richard asked if there was other criteria that affects the project and bringing in other projects. The local versus grant percentage is attractive but what are the criteria and risks. That would be good information to know. Mr. Richards would like to see a new scenario with a 25% match requirement look like to keep us competitive.

8. NEXT MEETING TARGET

Mr. Otterstrom stated at the next meeting the team will be looking for an endorsement of the project and an amount and forwarding to the Board.

Ms. Meyer stated the decision to add to the existing project cost will not be taken lightly by the Board. If the bottom line cost changes then the Boards approval changes.

Chair Waldref stated it is not just the amount that changes it will be the messaging to the public if City projects are included and the total project costs go up. Would need the help of the downtown business community, the City and STA communications will need to all work together on messaging.

Mr. Richards stated there was discussion during the ballot measure there was messaging about aesthetic improvements contemplated, and are those costs included in the cost estimate.

Mr. Otterstrom stated there are some aesthetic improvements included more for the stations but there are some costs that are not fully defined that could be used.

Ms. Meyer stated there are some assumed costs in the estimate for aesthetic improvements.

Mr. Otterstrom stated the next meeting would be February 28, 2017.

9. ADJOURN

Chair Waldref adjourned the meeting at 2:55 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Karl Otterstrom, Director of Planning
Steering Committee Secretary

