

Spokane Transit Authority
1230 West Boone Avenue
Spokane, Washington 99201-2686
(509) 325-6000

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

MEETING 10:00 A.M.

Minutes of the June 1, 2016, Meeting
Southside Conference Room

MEMBERS PRESENT

Amber Waldref, City of Spokane*
Candace Mumm, City of Spokane
Shelly O'Quinn, Spokane County
E. Susan Meyer, CEO, Ex-Officio

MEMBERS ABSENT

Ed Pace, City of Spokane Valley
Kevin Freeman, Small Cities Representative
(Millwood), Ex-Officio

*Chair

STAFF PRESENT

Steve Blaska, Director of Operations
Beth Bousley, Director of Communications
& Customer Service
Karl Otterstrom, Director of Planning
Lynda Warren, Director of Finance & Information Services
Susan Millbank, Ombudsman & Accessibility Officer
Brandon Rapez-Betty, Sr. Communications Specialist
Merilee Robar, Executive Assistant, Finance & Information Systems

Guests

Rhonda Bowers, Labor Representative
Mike Markus, Director, Frontier Behavioral Health
Ray Wright, Planning/Grants Engineer, City of Spokane Valley

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair Waldref called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. and roll was called. Guests were introduced. Chair Waldref suggested that the agenda items 5.B.1 Federal Transit Administration Section 5310 Project Funding Awards, and 5.B.2. Resolution to Amend STA Moving Forward be reviewed when Ms. O'Quinn was present. Chair Waldref suggested moving to item 6.A Revised Draft Transit Development Plan for Public Comment after reviewing the minutes.

2. PUBLIC EXPRESSIONS

See Item 5.B.1 Federal Transit Administration Section 5310 Project Funding Awards

3. COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT

None.

4. COMMITTEE ACTION

A. MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2016, COMMITTEE MEETING

Ms. Mumm moved to recommend approval of the May 4, 2016, Planning & Development Committee meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Chair Waldref. Motion passed unanimously.

6. REPORTS TO COMMITTEES

A. REVISED DRAFT TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR PUBLIC COMMENT (PUBLIC HEARING AT THE JUNE 16, 2016 BOARD MEETING)

Mr. Otterstrom gave an overview of the minor revisions that have been made to the Transit Development Plan (TDP) since the Committee reviewed it last month. Revisions include minor corrections and clarifications, the inclusion of estimated annualized revenue hours in the Service Implementation Plan, inclusion of a draft 2019 fixed route network map and also updates to several capital program of projects descriptions. The final draft will include the STA Moving Forward financial projections through 2022. There will be two financial projections included in the plan: one that reflects additional funding received based on

the passage of the ballot measure and one that reflects failure of the ballot measure. A public hearing on the draft TDP will be held at the June 16, 2016 Board of Directors meeting and the Board is anticipated to take action on the TDP in July, 2016 so that it can be submitted to the state by the annual September 1 requirement. Chair Waldref mentioned that she will not be able to attend the June 29th P&D Committee meeting and asked Ms. Mumm if she would chair the meeting in her place. Ms. Mumm agreed to chair the meeting. Mr. Blaska mentioned that the first year of the capital improvement program (CIP) that is approved in the TDP becomes the capital budget in 2017. Mr. Blaska urged Committee members that now would be the time to ask questions if there are any about the CIP or capital budget. Brief discussion ensued.

B. UPDATE ON THE STATION DESIGN FOR SPOKANE FALLS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Chair Waldref mentioned that Ms. Mumm has been involved in supporting the West Hills Neighborhood planning process. Chair Waldref said she has heard many good things about this process and she commended staff for their contributions to the process. Mr. Otterstrom commended Kathleen Weinand for her excellent work on this project. Mr. Otterstrom updated the Committee on the Spokane Falls Community College (SFCC) station design. The design addresses safety concerns and maximizes the opportunity for coordination with SFCC, the City of Spokane and the West Hills Neighborhood. Mr. Otterstrom reviewed the project scope, timeline, and gave a recap of the project kick-off meeting held in January of 2016 and the results of the Community Studio held March 8 – 10, 2016. Studio Cascade is the consulting firm working on this project for STA. The city council will be asked to adopt the plan in July. Chair Waldref and Ms. Mumm agreed that this has been a very efficient process and good collaboration between City of Spokane, STA, SFCC and the West Hills neighborhood and developers. Mr. Otterstrom mentioned that the bus stops will be increasingly important with the housing developments being constructed on the Catholic Charities property.

Ms. O'Quinn arrived at approximately 10:23 a.m.

Mr. Otterstrom pointed out that all of the bus stops along the stretch on Ft. George Wright would have signalized crossings. The only approval process anticipated for the plan is adoption through the City of Spokane. Brief discussion ensued regarding traffic, pedestrian traffic and signals.

5. BOARD ACTION – COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AGENDA

A. BOARD CONSENT AGENDA

No items being presented this month.

B. BOARD ACTION AGENDA

1. FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION SECTION 5310 PROJECT FUNDING AWARDS

Mr. Otterstrom presented a summary of the Section 5310 program which is to improve mobility for seniors and people with disabilities by expanding transportation options. Spokane Transit is the designated recipient of these funds. There is a current balance of \$729,374 in 5310 funds. Mr. Otterstrom went on to summarize the requirements of use of these funds. STA issued a call for projects for Section 5310 funding on December 27, 2015. A pre-application meeting was held January 14, 2016, to clarify any questions related to the program or application. The application submittal period ended February 1, 2016. Five applications were received, of which four were capital projects and one an operating project. Of these, only one qualified under the Traditional funding category. The project applications were reviewed and scored by STA and SRTC staff (the following table summarizes the projects and scoring).

Submitted 5310 Project Applications and Scoring

Project Name	Agency	Project Type	Traditional Funds Requested	Other Funds Requested	Average Score (out of 100)
Sidewalk - 9th	City of Spokane Valley	Capital		\$192,000	86
Sidewalk - Coleman	City of Spokane Valley	Capital		\$136,000	80
Mobility Management	Special Mobility Services	Capital	\$160,640		75
Coordinated Transportation System Feasibility Study	Spokane Regional Health District	Capital		\$19,627	61
Care Cars	Frontier Behavioral Health	Operating		256,372	59
Paratransit	STA	Capital	240,516		NA
Total			\$401,156	\$603,999	
Remaining			\$0	(\$275,781)	

Based on the applications received, the Mobility Management project by Special Mobility Services (SMS) in the amount of \$160,640 is the only project eligible for funding under the Traditional Category. After the award to SMS, there will still be \$37,152 in 2015 Traditional funds and \$203,364 in 2016 Traditional funds remaining. Staff recommended that STA apply the remaining funds to STA Paratransit services, as allowed by the FTA. The amount available for “Other” project funding is \$328,218. The total funding amount requested for projects that are eligible under the “Other” category is \$603,999. Fully funding all eligible projects in the “Other” category apportionment would create a deficit of \$275,781. These funding constraints necessitate decisions to be made between eligible projects in the “Other” category.

The Committee reviewed three potential funding scenarios for consideration as a starting point.

Public Comment was received from Mr. Mike Markus, Frontier Behavioral Health Director, regarding the Care Cars program and from Ray Wright, Planning/Grants Engineer, on behalf of the City of Spokane Valley sidewalk project submittals.

After discussion, and based upon several considerations, the Committee concurred with moving forward with “Scenario 2,” as represented in the table below, as a recommendation to the Board for project awards.

Preferred Funding Scenario

Project Name	Agency	Funds Requested	Committee Funding Recommendation
Mobility Management	Special Mobility Services	\$160,640	\$160,640
Paratransit	STA	\$240,516	\$240,516
Total Traditional		\$401,156	\$401,156
Remaining Traditional		<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>
Sidewalk - 9th	City of Spokane Valley	\$192,000	\$192,000
Coordinated Transportation System Feasibility Study	Spokane Regional Health District	\$19,627	\$19,627
Care Cars	Frontier Behavioral Health	\$256,372	<i>\$116,591</i>
Total Other*		\$467,999	\$328,218
Remaining Other		<i>\$(139,781)</i>	<i>\$0</i>

* Sidewalk – Coleman is not funded in this scenario but will have the opportunity to apply for funding next year.

Ms. Mumm moved to recommend Board approval of funding scenario 2 (represented above). Ms. O'Quinn seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

2. RESOLUTION TO AMEND STA MOVING FORWARD

Mr. Otterstrom explained that this item is a follow-up to the Board discussions that have taken place in the preceding months and in response to the action that the Board took in April to adopt Resolution 742-16 to seek voter approval to levy a sales tax of up to 2/10 of a cent (1/10 in 2017, 1/10 in 2019) to fund STA Moving Forward through 2028. Mr. Otterstrom reminded the Committee that the plan has been developed over several years. There are no changes to the map depicting the corridors and projects planned throughout the region. Staff is recommending that the Board approve updating the STA Moving Forward (STAMF) Plan to reflect the 18-month delay from original plan implementation, projects impacted by external factors, and Board direction given in Resolution 742-16 to accelerate service. The Committee reviewed the handout received in the packet (Exhibit 5.B.2 – STA Moving Forward Appendix B) which outlines the STAMF updated projects timeline, contingent on November 2016 voter approval. There was brief discussion about the importance of being able to communicate how vital the Central City Line (CCL) is in order for many of the projects in the STAMF to occur. Chair Waldref commented that the 10 minute frequency of the CCL makes all of the routes that align with it faster, whether to West Plains, to the Valley or North Spokane because it is all interrelated. Slides representing the estimated available funds for implementing STAMF through 2028 and estimated use of STAMF sales tax funds over time (subject to voter approval) were reviewed. The overall estimated sales tax anticipated to be collected is \$220.7M (all projections are based on the Board adopted projections, plus the operating assumptions and capital project cost assumptions). Approximately \$94.9M of the overall sales tax would go to operation of service; \$70.1M to local capital; \$47.9 replacement capital funded by STAMF (vehicle and other replacement beyond the life of the Capital Improvement Program); and a programmatic contingency of approximately \$7.7M is included. An estimated additional \$23.4M in fare revenue and \$94.9M in grant funds are also anticipated to be available to fund STAMF. Chair Waldref thanked Ms. Warren for the detailed graphs and tables provided. Ms. Mumm commented on the sales tax levy language on slide 17. She said it was correct in what was sought; however, she brought up the point that the 1/10 in April 2019 is not a requirement - it authorizes the Board to start collecting at that time but it does not specifically have to be April. Mr. Otterstrom clarified that it can only be collected when the state department will allow it, which is three times a year (January, April or July). All of the financial forecasts presented are assuming the start date of April 1. Further charts were reviewed as well as the 6-year forecasts for the Transit Development Plan (TDP). Due to timing (TDP is required to be adopted and submitted to the State by September 1 of each year), two scenarios will be included in the TDP: 1) reflecting the passage of a ballot measure to fund STAMF, and 2) a financial forecast reflecting no increase in sales tax percentage collected. Ms. Mumm asked if the name of the measure (Proposition 1) had been changed. Brief discussion ensued with the outcome being that staff will follow up with Mr. French regarding his follow up with Ms. Dalton (County Auditor) on specifics on naming or renaming a ballot measure. At issue is potential confusion if there are multiple "Proposition 1s" to vote on in November 2016. Mr. Otterstrom reviewed the proposed changes to the resolution which include:

- Strikes language in the plan that was specific to the original timeline and financial forecast assumptions
- Annotates Appendix A of the plan as a historic implementation timeline
- Adds a new Appendix B to reflect the updated sequencing of the plan

Chair Waldref reiterated the main points of the amendment to the resolution and asked if there were any concerns. Ms. O'Quinn said she would like it to be brought to the Board for a presentation. Ms. O'Quinn stated that she did not want to provide a recommendation. Chair Waldref and staff assured Ms. O'Quinn that the item is brought to the Committee with the intent of presenting a recommendation to the Board. Chair Waldref said the Board will receive the same presentation that the Committee has received. Ms. Mumm said that the Committee needs to recommend the draft which is what the Board had asked to be

done. Chair Waldref agreed that everything presented was consistent with what the Board voted on with the resolution put on the ballot. Ms. O'Quinn indicated that the Committee should go ahead and take a vote.

Ms. Mumm moved to recommend the Board adopt, by resolution, the amendments to the STA Moving Forward Plan, originally approved in December 2014, to reflect updates to the implementation schedule targets and related changes. Chair Waldref seconded the motion. To clarify, Ms. Mumm added that the intent of her motion was that the full presentation go to the Board for final determination. Motion passed 2:1 as follows:

Amber Waldref Yes

Candace Mumm Yes

Shelly O'Quinn No

Chair Waldref stated that she needed to leave for another meeting soon but wanted to talk about the item 6.C.1 – New Service & Policy Considerations.

C. BOARD DISCUSSION AGENDA

1. NEW SERVICE & POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Mr. Otterstrom said that to respond to Mr. Peterson's request at the May 19, 2016 Board meeting, the Board Chair had asked that the request be reviewed and added to the Planning & Development Committee meeting agenda. Mr. Otterstrom apologized that Mr. Peterson's request list was not distributed as a hard copy as he had intended to provide that. Mr. Otterstrom reminded the Committee that Mr. Peterson's request, which was read aloud at the May Board meeting, consisted of about ten different ideas. Chair Waldref stated that many of the items had to do with policy items to consider in STA's planning, how STA interacts with other transportation services, and some specific service changes. Ms. O'Quinn said that she had assumed that the discussion would occur as part of the STA Moving Forward Resolution amendment conversation. Chair Waldref said she would like to look at the projects as far as whether they could be implemented in the next five to ten years, but that would be a completely new public process. Ms. O'Quinn said she had assumed that these areas would be looked at to determine if there had been unanticipated area growth which created the need for inclusion in STA Moving Forward. Chair Waldref said that Chair French had asked that Mr. Peterson's request go to the Planning & Development Committee to discuss. Chair Waldref said that in reviewing Mr. Peterson's request, many of the items seem to be of a policy nature and addressing those items had been her intention to discuss at the Committee level. Chair Waldref stated that many of the items were related to how STA interfaces with other types of transportation and that Mr. Peterson makes some good points about considering these things. Chair Waldref thought these emerging transportation alternatives that interact with transit would be appropriate to consider when updating the Comprehensive Plan next year and other long-term planning. Chair Waldref said that in terms of service improvements, some of the areas were considered in the public process for the STAMF plan over two years and they were not prioritized but they remain on the list. Chair Waldref suggested for consideration that the list of unprioritized projects be reviewed for the next round of improvements, after STAMF, as to when they might be able to be implemented. Chair Waldref said she did not feel comfortable adding new projects into the STAMF plan without more public process around project prioritization. Ms. Mumm said it seemed that there was the expectation by Mr. Peterson that the review process would be reopened due to his request. Ms. O'Quinn said she thought there was the expectation that the P&D Committee would look at the service improvement requests and then make a recommendation as to whether the Board reopen the review process or not. Discussion ensued.

Ms. O'Quinn said she felt that she and Mr. Peterson brought up several locations for service improvements that have been requested by the public repeatedly and they are asking to address these

requests for improvement. Ms. Mumm asked what the timeline was for reviewing service requests. Mr. Otterstrom explained that the overall framework for service improvement plan review includes development of the TDP annually and an update to the Comprehensive Plan within every three years. The last update to the Comprehensive Plan was in 2013 and the next update is included in the Planning & Development Committee work program to begin later this year. In the 2013 Comprehensive Plan amendment, geographic areas were identified for added service and there were more areas than were able to be included in STAMF. Those areas are based on population density and access to other areas of transit. There were many areas identified as needing service but they did not rise to the STAMF project list due to the ranking process. Ms. Mumm said she would like more information regarding the short term requests that have come to STA and how they were analyzed and where they ranked previously in order to respond with data. Ms. Mumm said that what is being asked is that something be taken away from the STAMF plan in order to add others. Ms. O'Quinn said that just discussion is being requested. Chair Waldref said that she thought that the Board consensus was that everyone was good with the program. Ms. O'Quinn stated that her opinion was that the plan was the basis of further work. Board member, Ms. Rhonda Bowers requested to speak from the audience. Ms. Bowers stated that planning and accomplishing goals such as STAMF requires continued forward movement or the risk is losing all of the projects. Ms. Bowers said that not every project desired can be accomplished so a goal has to be focused on and that is what STAMF represents. Ms. O'Quinn asked that staff call her about the two areas she had specifically identified. Ms. O'Quinn stated that what was requested was a conversation - she was told that the P&D Committee was the place to have the discussion and make a recommendation if appropriate. Ms. O'Quinn said that if the P&D Committee was not the place to have this discussion then a new Committee should be created to make a determination. Chair Waldref asked if there was a motion regarding whether anything new is part of the ballot measure package at this point. Ms. O'Quinn said it has been several years since the plan was developed and is it worth going back out to see if there are other areas that should be included in the plan as the Board goes back out to the public. Chair Waldref explained that there had been the last year and a half to talk about the plan and several opportunities provided to talk about it. Ms. O'Quinn stated that she needed to leave for another meeting. Chair Waldref said she is sensitive to Ms. O'Quinn's concerns but said she thought that the Board needed to move forward with what it has.

Ms. O'Quinn departed at approximately 11:50 a.m.

Ms. Mumm said that to respond to the Board Chair's request for this as an agenda item, she would like to see more information regarding the short-term requests and how they were analyzed and where they ranked previously (why a project was or was not chosen). Chair Waldref said STA receives many requests and comments for better or new service and has a list of those it continually updates. If the Board is to look at a new list of projects to consider, or a contingency list over the next 10 years, there needs to be a public process for input from many sectors. Ms. Mumm requested that the list that Mr. Peterson provided be reviewed and annotated for the next Board meeting. Ms. Mumm suggested that the Committee recommendation could be that the Board has looked at these service requests and there has not been substantial change. The new areas could be suggested for review in the regular iteration process. Ms. Waldref said that she was hoping for was a recommendation from staff regarding how STA will analyze new projects, new service, or service improvements over the next three years. Mr. Otterstrom asked if it would be helpful to bring all of the other requests that STA has received over the last six months. Ms. Mumm agreed that it would be helpful and also to bring a timeline for reviewing those requests. Chair Waldref and Ms. Mumm agreed that there has to be a vetting process and it has to be fair and equitable. Mr. Otterstrom responded that inherent in the plan is an item to "optimize the network" which requires that performance metrics are continually reviewed to guide improvements to service. Chair Waldref said the Planning & Development Committee is not set up to make a recommendation about service changes without a whole public process around it. Mr. Otterstrom said that typically once it gets into the implementation stage of the service it will go to the Performance Monitoring and External Relations Committee because it has a public relations focus. Chair Waldref referenced that there were only four specific projects that two Board members brought up and the rest of

Mr. Peterson's requests were policy oriented. Chair Waldref said that she would report on the item as the Committee Chair at the next Board meeting. Ms. Mumm suggested showing framework for the public process. Mr. Otterstrom said it was also important to note that the full Board reviewed the implementation sequence and concurred that it would be the basis for STA Moving Forward and not any additional projects at this time. Ms. Bowers suggested that it would be beneficial to look at and separate the elements to be addressed in those areas to demonstrate that the request was considered. Chair Waldref asked if Mr. Otterstrom could take Mr. Peterson's list and separate the policy items that can be addressed in the Comprehensive Plan update. Chair Waldref apologized that she did not direct staff to have something more for the Committee to address today but there was a short time-frame. Mr. Otterstrom said the only thing that staff had prepared to bring was Mr. Peterson's list but the major focus of the meeting was to be STA Moving Forward and the 5310 item had also required more attention than anticipated.

Chair Waldref said she thought it would be a good idea to have a contingency plan of projects that could move forward if funding becomes available.

Chair Waldref moved that staff provide the Board with:

- **A list of policy issues brought forward by Mayor Peterson that can be addressed during the Comprehensive Plan update next year.**
- **The process by which new service and routes can be considered through the annual public process of developing the Transit Development Plan.**
- **For context, a list of proposed service improvements and routes that have been generated by public input (including the service improvements Commissioner O'Quinn and Mayor Peterson mentioned at the last Board meeting).**

Ms. Mumm seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Blaska reiterated that the process for reviewing service requests is the Transit Development Plan and the three-year Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Blaska suggested that to give due diligence, the next TDP cycle would be the appropriate time in the review cycle to address the new requests.

Ms. Millbank mentioned that in response Mr. Peterson's request regarding "define paratransit for wheelchairs and elderly," STA's legal counsel offered to meet with Mr. Peterson and discuss this. Mr. Peterson declined to meet but asked that the federal law be sent to him and he has now received copies of the relevant laws and guidance.

6. COMMITTEE INFORMATION

A. CENTRAL CITY LINE STRATEGIC OVERLAY PLAN

As presented in packet.

8. CEO REPORT

None.

9. NEW BUSINESS

None.

10. COMMITTEE MEMBERS' EXPRESSIONS

Ms. Mumm thanked Mr. Otterstrom for the information on the Spokane Falls Community College station design. Chair Waldref thanked staff for the information on the 5310 item.

11. REVIEW OF JUNE 29, 2016, COMMITTEE SPECIAL MEETING DRAFT AGENDA

As presented in packet.

12. NEXT MEETING – SPECIAL MEETING WEDNESDAY, JUNE 29, 2016, 10:00 A.M. STA SOUTHSIDE CONFERENCE ROOM, 1230 W BOONE AVENUE

13. ADJOURN

Chair Waldref adjourned the meeting at 12:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Angela Stephens, Executive Assistant