



Central City Line

Steering Committee Meeting #9

Tuesday, February 28, 2017 | 1:00 – 2:30PM

SRTC, Paulsen Building
421 W. Riverside Ave., Suite 500



Meeting Purpose:

Review the small starts grant submittal timeline, grant submittal components, review outreach and support tactics and timelines.

Meeting Agenda:

	Item	Lead
5 min	Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review	Amber Waldref, Chair
5 min	Public Expressions	Amber Waldref, Chair
5 min	Administrative Tasks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval of December Meeting Minutes • Approval of January Meeting Minutes 	Amber Waldref, Chair
10 min	Small Starts Grant Submittal Timeline Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Schedule • “Early Ratings” Submittal Process and Timeline 	Karl Otterstrom, STA
10 min	Downtown Infrastructure Co-Investments	Susan Meyer, STA Karl Otterstrom, STA
20 min	Finance Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core Infrastructure and Capital Costs • Service Planning and O&M Costs 	Randy Knapick, IBI Group, Mark Brower, CH2M
5 min	Economic Development/Land Use Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview and Highlights 	Ryan Farncomb, CH2M
15 min	Outreach Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Why CCL” Presentation • Letters of Support Templates and Timeline • Outreach Tactics • Station Location and Design Feedback • Gonzaga Open House March 9 	Ryan Farncomb, CH2M Christine Varela, DH Karl Otterstrom
5 min	Next Steps	Karl Otterstrom

Documents/Files Distributed

Date	Method	File/Document Name

CENTRAL CITY LINE STEERING COMMITTEE

MEETING 1:00 P.M.

Draft Minutes of December 1, 2016 Meeting
SRTC, Paulsen Building
421 W. Riverside Ave., Suite 500

MEMBERS/ALTERNATES PRESENT

Lisa Brown, Washington State Univ. - Spokane
Kathy Fritchie, Browne's Addn. Neighborhood
Collen Gardner, Chief Garry Park Neighborhood
John Gillette, Spokane Community College
John Lemus, People First
E. Susan Meyer, Spokane Transit Authority
Gary Pollard, Riverside Neighborhood Council
Mark Richard, Downtown Spokane Partnership
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
Kathleen Weinand, Transit Planner II

CONSULTANTS/GUESTS

Mark Brower, CH2M
Catherine Ciarlo, CH2M
Ryan Farncomb, CH2M
Christine Varela, Desautel Hege
Andrew Warlock, City of Spokane

MEMBERS ABSENT

Anne Marie Axworthy, Greater Spokane Inc.
Karen Byrd, Logan Neighborhood Council
Cheryl Kilday, Visit Spokane
Mark Mansfield, University Dist. Dev. Assoc.
Harlan Shellabarger, Cheney Free Press
Scott Simmons, City of Spokane
John Sklut, Gonzaga University

1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND AGENDA REVIEW

Chair Waldref called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m. Chair Waldref welcomed the group to the meeting. Meeting attendees introduced themselves. Chair Waldref explained the purpose of the meeting.

2. PUBLIC EXPRESSIONS

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

3. ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS

Chair Waldref noted Karl Otterstrom had some information that needed to be passed out to the group. Mr. Otterstrom handed out a Title VI survey, explained STA's Federal reporting requirements and asked the committee to please complete the voluntary survey and return to STA.

4. STA UPDATE

Chair Waldref acknowledged the passing of Prop 1 and asked Mr. Otterstrom to explain how STA is moving forward. Mr. Otterstrom noted the results of the vote by precinct. He noted 100% of the precincts along the CCL alignment voted in favor of the proposition. Chair Waldref was pleased that every jurisdiction in the PTBA voted in favor and credited the work STA has completed in the last 4-years related to Moving Forward. Colleen Gardner thanked Mr. Otterstrom for the work involved. Susan Meyer thanked the work of Chair Waldref and the STA Board for supporting the ballot measure. Mr. Otterstrom explained congress has authorized the FAST Act through 2019 so the framework for funding is in place but anything can happen with a new administration.

Chair Waldref asked if we are competing with any other cities for funding. Mr. Otterstrom explained Indianapolis has already received a recommendation for funding without having local funding in place. Mr. Otterstrom noted cities that had tax measures that did not pass.

Steve Trabun and Kathy Fritchie arrived at 1:10PM.

5. SMALL STARTS GRANT SUBMITTAL TIMELINE UPDATE

Mr. Brower gave an update on the grant submittal timeline, working group schedule and major milestones. Mr. Brower explained the need for presenting a solid application and one that has community support to FTA.

Mark Richard arrived at 1:15PM.

6. PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING UPDATE

Mr. Brower explained the work being completed on the cost estimating. Much of the initial work is looking at the core infrastructure costs, which are those costs and improvements required for the project. The initial estimate appears to be slightly lower than the \$72 million planning level estimate. The team is currently working on gaps in the estimate, or areas that need additional research and design.

Gary Pollard noted there will be a lot of improvements going on in the City and asked if the team was coordinating with the City on their projects. Chair Waldref noted city staff is working with the STA team on city projects. Mr. Pollard noted the Adams St. CSO tank as one example of a project that needs to be coordinated.

Mr. Brower continued to explain there are challenges estimating stakeholder improvement costs and schedules, and other complimentary projects that the City may be planning. There are also Gonzaga, Community Colleges and City Parks projects so those efforts need additional work. Mr. Brower explained that there is funding capacity for the project that allows the project to expand to a total project costs of \$100 million dollars based on projected ridership. Mr. Otterstrom explained that the project could be expanded to a total cost of \$100 million which could include other projects that tie into transit if needed, however the CCL project costs would still be at or just below \$72 million. This would represent a \$54 million grant request for the core project.

Lisa Brown asked if the team is meeting with contractors on other projects. Mr. Otterstrom stated contractors are on the list to contact. Ms. Brown stated the developers of the Jensen Byrd building

should be included on the list. Kevin Twohig asked about the coordination with SCC at the end of the line. Mr. Otterstrom stated the SCC project is a separate project but there is tie in to the CCL and the team has been coordinating with them.

Chair Waldref asked about the capacity to ask for more federal money above the \$54 million request and the strings attached.

Mr. Brower continued discussion schedules if City of Spokane projects are included in the project and the complexities of coordinating project schedules. Ms. Gardner asked about the restrictions on the money from FTA. Mr. Brower explained the restriction is you only get the amount of the grant request and that's it.

Mr. Twohig asked if the leveraging opportunity was discussed in the ballot measure. Ms. Meyer stated no. Chair Waldref said there was a mailer that explained funding. Mr. Otterstrom stated the ballot measure communications focused on the project costs, which does not change if the grant request is for more to include supportive projects. Chair Waldref stated messaging would need to be clear that the project has not increased in cost. Mr. Twohig reiterated the messaging would need to be clear.

Mr. Brower continued that the initial cost estimates for the downtown projects is between \$25-\$60 million and there is discussions with the City about future grant opportunities.

Mark Richard stated Downtown Spokane Partnership has been asked by the City to engage with property owners about future redevelopment on properties and asked if there are other things they should be asking the property owners at the same time.

Mark Brower reviewed three funding scenarios the team is currently considering. These include the core project costs, core projects plus transit enhancing projects and finally core project plus transit enhancing projects and opportunistic projects such as parks projects. A matrix is being prepared on the different scenarios. Further discussions are needed on the final cost assumptions.

Don Skillingstad explained the team has been coordinating with the City on their capital improvement plan to determine whether any of the projects are core to the project or whether they are enhancements to the CCL.

Ms. Meyer stated there should not be an un-mitigatable risk to the project if including supportive projects.

Mr. Richard stated owners at the west end of downtown have discussed the opportunity of creating a Local Improvement District (LID) and said there may be an opportunity for this type of mechanism to help provide more local funds for the project. Mr. Skillingstad stated funding has been the topic of several meetings with city staff related to funding a regional project that includes City projects. Mr. Skillingstad continue to outline other coordination efforts with the City.

Ms. Meyer stated she appreciated all of the input from everyone.

Ms. Waldref asked if the next meeting will include more detailed information about financing and the coordination with City projects and whether the next meeting will be appropriate to talk about the timeline, and will FTA hold us to the timeline.

Mr. Otterstrom stated we will want to have a firm handle on the timeline for the project and there will be more detailed information about the funding at the next meeting.

Ms. Gardner if there is the same consideration of complimentary projects within the neighborhoods. Mr. Otterstrom referenced the handout that lists projects throughout the corridor that are being considered.

Ms. Waldref stated there is now a quorum and asked of the committee could approve the meeting minutes from previous meetings. **Chair Waldref called for a motion to approve the two meeting minutes. John Lemus made a motion to approve the two meeting minutes. Ms. Gardner seconded the motion. Chair called for a vote. The vote was unanimous.**

7. FINANCE WORKING GROUP UPDATE

Mr. Otterstrom discussed the core objectives and opportunities of the CCL. Mr. Otterstrom reviewed the alignment and the connecting routes to the CCL. Mr. Otterstrom then reviewed the four service plan scenarios being considered with varying levels of service. The levels of service directly feed into the system operating costs and the finance plan. Mr. Otterstrom explained that the operating costs for an electric vehicle are less than other vehicles. Mr. Otterstrom stated the service plan should not be less than 21,000 hours as the community is expecting more. Mr. Twohig asked for clarification of the service plan summary table.

Ms. Meyer asked the committee how many hours should the CCL operate. Ms. Brown asked if there is data on transfers for users and those people without cars, the people that are going to school and catching other buses. Ms. Waldref agreed with Ms. Brown and liked Scenarios 1 & 4, and may like 4 more because of the shorter peak frequency. Mr. Otterstrom stated the team will bring visuals to the next meeting to help further explain the transit terminology and the differences in the scenarios.

Mr. Twohig asked if the team has looked at 15 minute service all day. Mr. Otterstrom stated Scenario 3 is almost that but the team can look at that. That level of service would be less hours than Scenario 1.

Mr. Richards asked what was budgeted in the planning phase. Ms. Meyer stated Scenario 1 was assumed. Mr. Richards agreed with more service during the peak periods and extended hours for the night time crowd.

Kathy Fritchie asked if the 18 hours of service goes late into the night and like the late service for the service industry.

Mr. Pollard stated he heard two concerns that have a lot of merit which are going downtown in the evening hours and employees who work downtown late at night. Also, higher education being served, those sectors need to be served. Mr. Otterstrom stated students are currently served in the later hours but the CCL will have additional frequency and will extend later into the night. Mr. Otterstrom stated the STA Moving Forward plan adds additional system wide service too.

8. LAND USE/ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT WORKING GROUP UPDATE

Catherine Ciarlo explained the team has prepared a presentation that helps to sell the CCL project and that the Committee can use at meetings they attend. Ryan Farncomb gave a summary of slides in the presentation. Ms. Ciarlo continued to give a summary on slides.

Ms. Waldref said the team should consider art as part of the project.

Ms. Ciarlo continued discussion about the student population importance Ms. Brown had discussed. Another goal of the presentation is to further discuss the momentum of the development throughout the corridor.

Mr. Farncomb continued reviewing the final slides in the presentation. Ms. Waldref asked if the Centennial Trail could be added to the map in the slide.

9. OUTREACH STRATEGIES

Ms. Ciarlo explained the outreach strategies the team is working on to gather support for the project that include letters of support.

Ms. Gardner thanked Mr. Farncomb and Andrew Warlock for their support and efforts in the Chief Garry Neighborhood planning process.

10. NEXT MEETING TARGET

Ms. Waldref stated the next meeting would be held in January and asked if the presentation could be sent out to the committee members. Ms. Ciarlo said it can be provided. Mr. Skillingstad stated the next three meetings will be held after the STA Board meetings. Mr. Otterstrom stated staff will be sending out a Doodle poll.

11. ADJOURN

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Karl Otterstrom, Director of Planning
Steering Committee Secretary

CENTRAL CITY LINE STEERING COMMITTEE

MEETING 1:00 P.M.

Draft 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 brining 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