

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

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Draft Minutes of the May 21, 2009, Meeting
City Council Chambers
808 West Spokane Falls Blvd., Spokane, Washington

MEMBERS PRESENT

Dick Denenny, City of Spokane Valley, Chairman
Nancy McLaughlin, City of Spokane
Mark Richard, Spokane County
Richard Munson, City of Spokane Valley
Matthew Pederson, City of Airway Heights
Bonnie Mager, Spokane County

MEMBERS ABSENT

Wendy Van Orman, City of Liberty Lake
Al French, City of Spokane
Richard Rush, City of Spokane

STAFF PRESENT

E. Susan Meyer, Chief Executive Officer
Jim Plaster, Director of Finance & Administration
Steve Blaska, Director of Operations
Karl Otterstrom, Director of Planning
Mike Volz, Assistant Director of Finance & Administration
Molly Myers, Communications Manager
Susan Millbank, Ombudsman & Accessibility Coordinator

PROVIDING LEGAL COUNSEL

Laura McAloon, K & L Gates LLP

1. **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Chairman Denenny called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m. and conducted roll call.

2. **RECOGNITIONS AND PRESENTATIONS**

A. **Gabe Fernos, Coach Operator, APTA National Rodeo Competition**

Gabe Fernos placed fourth at the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) national competition. He also had the highest score on the pre-trip inspection category. He was congratulated by the Board for these accomplishments.

3. **PUBLIC EXPRESSIONS** – None.

4. **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

A. **Tariff Policy and Procedures for Fixed Route and Paratransit Services**

Mr. Denenny opened the public hearing at 5:36 p.m., called upon staff for a presentation, called upon the Board for comment, and opened the hearing for comments from the public. Mary Gumm, Clayton Wright, Alan Alexander, Jack and Helen Leighton, and Laree Shanda spoke against the proposed paratransit fare increase. Mr. Denenny closed the hearing at 6:20 p.m.

B. **Proposed September Service Changes**

Mr. Denenny opened the public hearing at 6:21 p.m., called upon staff for a presentation, called upon the Board for comment, and opened the hearing for comments from the public. Bonnie Stewart, Archie Laird, and Diane Foland commented on the proposed service changes. Mr. Denenny closed the hearing at 7:18 p.m.

Verbatim transcripts of these public hearings are on file at STA's Administrative Office, 1230 West Boone, Spokane, Washington, 99201. Copies of the transcripts are attached to these minutes and are posted on STA's website at www.spokanetransit.com.

5. BOARD ACTION: CONSENT AGENDA

As a point of clarification from the meeting on April 16, 2009, Ms. McAloon stated that there is no reason to abstain from voting for approval of the minutes if a Board member was not present at the meeting. The approval of the minutes denotes that a Board member does not object to what is described in them. **Mr. Munson moved to accept consent agendas items 5.A through G. Mr. Richard seconded. Mr. Richard withdrew his second** and requested that item 5.F; Contract modification for Hybridization of Ten Additional Coaches, be removed from the consent agenda for further discussion. **Mr. Munson withdrew his motion. Mr. Munson moved to accept consent agenda items 5.A through G with the exception of 5.F. Mr. Richard seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

- A. Minutes of the April 16, 2009 Board Meeting
- B. Motion to Approve Accounts Payable Voucher and Warrant nos. 556299 through 556829, and Worker's Compensation Warrant nos. 202476 through 202738 totaling \$4,454,168.97 for the period April 1 through April 30, 2009.
- C. Motion to approve execution of a contract for one 2009 Ford F-450 (4WD) truck cab and chassis, under the Washington State Department of General Administration Office of State Procurement Contract, and authorize the CEO to enter into a contract with a vendor to further outfit this vehicle as necessary within the approved \$65,000 budget.
- D. Motion to approve a contract with TrendSource for the purpose of establishing and conducting a Mystery Shopper Program.
- E. Motion to approve a five-year contract for security services to Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.
- G. Motion to authorize the CEO to enter into an agreement with the City of Spokane Parks and Recreation Department in the amount not-to-exceed \$23,000 to continue design of the Community Transit Center located at the Dwight Merkel Sports Complex at Joe Albi Stadium.

BOARD ACTION ITEM 5.F

Mr. Munson moved to approve modification to STA's current contract with Gillig Corporation to hybridize ten of the nineteen 40' coaches currently under contract for the sum of approximately \$2,235,000 (including sales tax) and approve an adjustment to the manufacturing and delivery schedule of one coach from 2009 to 2010. Ms. McLaughlin seconded. The contract with Gillig was awarded in November 2008 for the purchase of nineteen diesel 40' coaches and three 29' hybrid coaches. The additional cost of \$2,235,000 is to hybridize ten of these coaches through the grant request for funding under the Transit Investment in Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction (TIGGER) program. Should the funding request be unsuccessful, STA will fund this amount using local funds from the Board approved 2009/2010 capital budget program. The motion passed unanimously.

6. BOARD ACTION: OTHER ITEMS

A. Award of Contract for Federal Legislative Consultant Services

Ms. Meyer said STA has contracted with federal legislative consultants, K & L Gates, in Washington, D.C., for the past two years. This Request for Proposals (RFP) seeks a consultant who will assist with appropriations, the federal funding process including the Small Starts program, and authorization of the Surface Transportation Bill. Four companies were considered by an evaluation committee. Van

Scoyoc Associates was chosen with the highest evaluation point value of 85.08. This firm has considerable experience in transportation issues and is a bi-partisan, full-service government relations company. Mr. Munson asked what made this company better than the others. Ms. Meyer said it was a combination of experience with other transit agencies including DART in Dallas and C-Tran in Vancouver, Washington, expertise and approach. She added that STA is more likely to be successful in obtaining funding with their assistance. Mr. Richard asked if there could be a shorter contract than five years. Ms. Meyer said staff is ready for a longer term commitment and Van Scoyoc has agreed to the same fee schedule for the first two years. STA can cancel the contract if dissatisfied with the service provided. **Mr. Munson moved to award a five-year contract to Van Scoyoc Associates for federal legislative consultant services at a rate of \$6,500 per month plus approved expenses. Ms. Mager seconded.** Mr. Pederson asked if there had been issues with K & L Gates. Ms. Meyer said there had not, however she felt that Van Scoyoc had more federal funding, small starts funding and other transit-related experience that would be of increased value to STA. Mr. Pederson asked if there will be a specific focus for the next five years. Ms. Meyer said they will seek more appropriations and move onto larger projects such as high performance transit with a potential of obtaining approximately half the funding; \$75 million. Mr. Pederson asked if there was a separate line item in the budget for federal and state lobbying costs. Ms. Meyer said there is. **The motion passed with Mr. Pederson opposing.**

B. Tariff Policy and Procedures for Fixed Route and Paratransit Services

Mr. Munson moved to delay the vote on this subject until next month's Board meeting (June 18, 2009). Ms. Mager seconded. Mr. Munson said the proposed fare increase is reasonable and achieves equity for two customers; the bus riders and the taxpayers who do not ride. There is support in the community for the increase in fixed route fares but not for paratransit. It is difficult to identify low income paratransit users since it is not known who gets a monthly pass provided free of charge and how many times they use it. He suggested holding several public forums within the next four weeks where caregivers, stakeholder agencies and STA staff could discuss other sources of funding. Ms. Mager said a month is not enough time to put this together. Mr. Pederson said he and Ms. Van Orman share the sentiment that this is a significant policy change and they have not received enough information on which to base a decision. He said not all paratransit users have low incomes and there are clients on fixed route who have low incomes. He asked that staff educate himself and Ms. Van Orman. He also agreed with the idea of a public workshop. He added that STA is not going to get grants if the subsidies are made with local funds. Mr. Richard said there has to be a balance between affordable service and no service. The Citizen Advisory Committee and staff have already done a lot of community outreach. He is willing to support the motion but does not support delaying the issue too long. He added that STA is one of the lowest paratransit fares in the state and will continue to be even with the fare increase.

Mr. Munson said he would like the caregivers and social agencies to find out about other funding sources for low income paratransit users. Ms. Meyer said the CAC have been deliberate and thoughtful in their work over the past year. They have held a number of public meetings and received input from the community. Mr. Blaska said the CAC sent out specific invitations to all advocacy groups and followed up with phone calls and they have been aggressive about trying to find out income levels and access to other sources of funding. They heard the same as the Board heard at the last two public hearings; no one seems to know if other funding is available to subsidize the paratransit fares. He added that the transit system in Raleigh, North Carolina, has a reduced fare program for low income users and the funding is obtained from the City department that takes care of housing, food and transportation. Mr. Blaska said there has been input from STA's Paratransit Users Group (PUG). Mr. Munson said the outreach was about a fare increase; this is different. The debate is how to provide assistance to those who need it. Mr. Richard said the adoption of the phased-in increase approach will

motivate the various groups to find solutions. Mr. Denenny said the mission of the newly created CAC was to give them a mission, provide input and be engaged; like a Planning Commission. For the Board to go back when all the work has been done is like contradicting the process. They came up with a recommendation that is reasonable. Ms. Mager agrees with the 30 day delay and hopes to find creative solutions. She said STA is here to serve the public and the Board agrees that fares need to be raised but the CAC was tasked to look at fiscal responsibility rather than creative solutions. Mr. Denenny said the CAC has done an excellent job that STA staff would not have had the capacity to do. Ms. Mager said it would not have been a large allocation of resources and to be compassionate. Mr. Richard said the CAC has demonstrated empathy and compassion; they did not just look at STA's bottom line. If they had, they would have suggested implementing Phase 3 immediately. Mr. Denenny said the CAC was created as a result of the Taskforce in 2003 specifically to provide citizen input. **The motion passed with Mr. Denenny opposing.**

7. BOARD INFORMATION

- A. Committee Minutes
- B. Miscellaneous Correspondence
- C. March 2009 Operating Indicators
- D. First Quarter 2009 Operating Indicators
- E. March 2009 Financial Results Summary
- F. First Quarter 2009 Capital Budget Status Report
- G. First Quarter 2009 Statement of Net Assets and Federal Grants Report
- H. 2009-2011 Paratransit/Special Needs Transit Formula Grant
- I. Revisions to STA Planning Framework
- J. Proposed September Service Changes

8. CEO REPORT

Mr. Denenny commended Ms Meyer for the work on the Bus Rapid Transit project and the bus bench issue. Ms. Meyer said she had recently emailed an application to Representative Cathy McMorris-Rodgers for the Transportation and Infrastructure High Priority Project Request. The project submitted is the Spokane South Valley Corridor High Performance Transit Project under the Small Starts program with a federal match of less than \$75 million. This is a long term project that will require other funding sources. It is included on Ms. McMorris-Rodgers' website along with ten Department of Transportation projects. Ms. Mager congratulated staff on this great opportunity.

Ms. Meyer reported that she made a presentation to the Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) Board requesting increased membership for STA from one to two members; a Board member and the Chief Executive Officer. The SRTC Board will discuss this further at their June meeting. Mr. Pederson said he did not support the CEO position on the SRTC Board since CEO's are administrators, not policy makers. Mr. Richard said he recommended adding another position for the small cities since the STA small cities representation should not be at the expense of a member representing the small cities. Mr. Denenny said he envisages a change in the structure of SRTC. Mr. Munson said the Transportation Committee recommends that the SRTC Board represent constituents and that administrators should be on the Board in an ex-officio role. Ms. Meyer said the interlocal agreement would have to be revised. Mr. Munson said STA has a very important role in the regional transportation plan and needs more representation on the SRTC Board. Mr. Pederson said staff needs to educate elected officials who are representing STA on this Board.

Ms. Meyer said SRTC released the Call for Projects for the Federal Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom projects. Projects that support transportation for low income, disabled and

the elderly are the focus. STA has requested designated recipient status from the Governor. Bloomsday ridership increased 10.3% over 2008 and in 2008 it increased by 35%. STA's participation in this event is very successful. Ms. Meyer said there were no breakdowns and commended the coach operators for their efforts.

9. STAFF REPORTS:

A. 2009 State Legislative Session Final Report

Ms. Millbank reported the following bills were passed and signed by the Governor: SB5352 – Two year transportation budget; ESHB2072 – Special Needs Transportation; SB5540 – establishing high capacity transportation corridor areas; ESSB5513 – unlawful transit conduct; SHB1225 – transportation systems fuel exemption tax; 2SSB5433 – local option tax provisions (option of voter-approved \$20 per vehicle per year fee for transit vetoed). The following bills did not pass: HB1139 – expand by two the number of elected officials on a PTBA Board; HB1940 – reduce greenhouse gas emissions; SB6094 – establish single entity for planning and funding all regional transportation modes in Puget Sound (could be applied to Spokane County); HB1590 – requires a union employee with voting rights on public transportation boards; SB5757 – requires a union employee without voting rights on public transportation boards.

B. Bus Bench Update

Mr. Blaska reported that the City of Spokane is issuing a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a new bus bench contract with improvements. The benches will be at transit stops; Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant; designed to be more aesthetic and advertising will be allowed. The Mayor has set up a Taskforce on which Mr. Blaska serves. Bus benches at the top 100 transit locations will remain in the interim.

C. April 2009 Ridership Highlights

Mr. Blaska reported that April fixed route ridership is up 2.7% over last year with a 4.7% year to date increase. Paratransit ridership decreased by -1.2% with a year to date increase of 0.6%. Weekday ridership was up 5.5% and over one million rides were taken in the month of April which is a record.

D. March 2009 Financial Highlights

Troubling trends in sales tax revenue (over 70% of total revenue base) continued through March (down \$718K or 6.3% from the previous year to date mark). However, operating expense had a favorable budget variance of \$1.2M (primarily the result of fuel costs being lower than anticipated).

Overall year to date budget variances (revenues and expenditures combined) were \$1.2M favorable. However, it remains troubling that the latest sales tax distributions (May – representing March retail activity) were the worst yet this year. The month of May was \$387K or 10.3% below budget and the year to date was \$849K or 4.8% below budget. When compared to the previous year, May was down \$532K or 13.4%, while year to date was down \$1.5M or 8.1%.

10. NEW BUSINESS – None.

11. BOARD MEMBERS' EXPRESSIONS

Mr. Munson said he would like to participate in the outreach sessions with stakeholder agencies on the proposed paratransit fare increase. Ms. Mager also expressed an interest. Mr. Pederson said he meant nothing personal when he did not agree with the idea of the CEO on the SRTC Board since the role of a CEO is an administrator. He said this is his position on all Boards. Mr. Denenny agreed and complimented the Board on a lively discussion.

12. EXECUTIVE SESSION

At 9:05 p.m., Ms. McAloon announced that the Board would adjourn for an Executive Session for the following purpose:

1. Considering the selection of a site, the acquisition of real estate by lease or purchase, or the sale of real estate when public knowledge regarding such consideration would cause a likelihood of increased or decreased price.

The STA Board of Directors will reconvene in open session at approximately 9:15 p.m. If it becomes necessary to extend the executive session, a member of the staff will return to announce the time at which the STA Board will reconvene. If any action is to be taken as a result of discussions in the executive session, that action will occur at the open public session.

At 9:15 p.m. the Board of Directors reconvened and Chairman Denenny declared the meeting back in open public session.

13. CABLE 5 BROADCAST DATES AND TIMES OF THE MAY 21, 2009 BOARD MEETING:

Saturday, May 23, 2009	4:00 p.m.
Monday, May 25, 2009	10:00 a.m.
Tuesday, May 26, 2009	8:00 p.m.

14. NEXT COMMITTEE MEETINGS (1230 West Boone Avenue, Spokane, Washington):

Operations & Customer Service	June 3, 2009, 1:30 p.m. (Southside Conference Room)
Citizen Advisory Committee	June 10 2009, 5:00 p.m. (Northside Conference Room)

15. NEXT BOARD MEETING: Thursday, June 18, 2009, 5:30 p.m., City Hall Council Chambers, 808 West Spokane Falls Blvd, Spokane, Washington.

16. ADJOURNED

With no further business to come before the Board, Chairman Denenny adjourned the meeting at 9:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jan Watson
Executive Assistant to the CEO
& Clerk of the Authority

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE THE
SPOKANE TRANSIT AUTHORITY BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Re: Tariff Policy and Procedures for Fixed
Route and Paratransit Services
and
Proposed September Service Changes

Place: City Council Chambers
808 West Spokane Falls Blvd.
Spokane, Washington

Date : May 21, 2009

Time : 5:36 p.m.

APPEARANCES:

- Board of Directors: Council Member Dick Denenny, Chairman
Commissioner Mark Richard
Mayor Matthew Pederson
Council Member Al French
Council Member Nancy McLaughlin
Mayor Wendy Van Orman
Mayor Richard Munson
Council Member Richard Rush
Commissioner Bonnie Mager

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording,
transcript produced by transcription service.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN DENENNY: So the Public Hearing is now at 5:36.

Mr. Blaska?

MR. BLASKA: Yes. Members of the Board, just a reminder of the time line as we are nearing the end of the process that actually started formally in December when the CAC presented their draft proposal before they took it out for public comment. We had the public hearing on the actual fare structure last month. The public hearing this year is on the tariff policy itself, which is the implementation document, but the heart of it is the fare structure.

The most recent event in this process was the Operations and Customer Service Committee. I did recommend approval of this policy at their meeting this month at a vote of 10/4 and two against. So tonight what I'll do is just review some of the pertinent information that has been covered in some of the previous meetings over the last six months in order to kind of prepare folks for the conversation here.

Again, a reminder of what the recommendation is. It's a fixed route fare structure change in two phases over a year-and-a-half to reach adult fare of \$1.50 and a monthly fare of \$45 for a monthly pass. Paratransit fare increase to reach the same fare level, \$1.50 for one trip and \$45 for a

1 monthly pass. But that's to be conducted over three years or
2 three phases over two-and-a-half years.

3 The summary of this policy is it is consistent with
4 the Board's philosophy and strategy. The Board has a
5 ridership-based philosophy, which essentially says we want to
6 increase fixed route ridership by keeping fares as low as
7 possible. Two of the significant strategies to get there is
8 to keep the fare structure simple and easy to use. But also,
9 even though we want to keep the fares low, to keep our eye on
10 that 20 percent farebox recovery ratio for fixed route, which
11 again is the percentage of the fare that's actually paid for
12 by the user's fee.

13 This policy also supports our current financial
14 forecast. That in light of our financial prognosis and the
15 increasing cost over the last eight years since the last fare
16 increase that this is a part of a funding strategy aimed
17 toward maintaining a sustainable system.

18 And the last part is in general. There's been
19 general public acceptance, particularly with the fixed route
20 part of this fare increase. I'll get into that a little
21 later, but there has been significant discussion about the
22 paratransit element in this proposal.

23 Again, the ridership-based philosophy to encourage
24 ridership through maintaining a low fare structure. And
25 generally, we are charging less than other transits, and I'll

1 show you the update. In fact, this presentation with the
2 updated tables is in your gray folder. And we want to keep
3 the fare structure low, and there are other transits that are
4 already charging more or equal to what we will be charging in
5 a year-and-a-half or two years. But we still as if, even
6 though we're kind of behind in raising our fares, that it's
7 best to implement this in phases given the current economic
8 conditions.

9 So looking at the strategy of keeping our fare
10 structure low, this is the first table. And these tables
11 were presented at the briefing before last, but this is an
12 update to that information.

13 And if you take a look at the table, there are two
14 sets of comparison transits. This first set is ten cities
15 that sits an advisory committee used as comparable transits
16 as they were developing their proposal and recommendation.
17 And looking at the fare structures of these other ten
18 transits currently, currently comparing their current fares
19 with our current fixed route fare, our fare is less than or
20 equal to nine of those ten transits.

21 Currently the only of those communities that has a
22 lower fare structure is Everett Transit that charges 50 cents
23 a ride. And that's 50 cents a ride. They don't have a
24 transfer policy or two-hour pass. That's every time you get
25 on the bus you put in 50 cents. Also, a thing to remember

4

1 about Everett Transit is that's a city transit system. It's
2 significantly smaller than us that serves just the City of
3 Everett. The actual comparable transit for us is Community
4 Transit, which serves Snohomish County. So, again, that's
5 the only transit system that charges less than our fixed
6 route fare currently.

7 On the paratransit side currently, we are the
8 lowest of all those nine comparable systems, to the tune of
9 we are 33 percent to 84 percent cheaper than any of those
10 comparable transits for our paratransit service right now.

11 Then projecting into the future. If you look into
12 the future at phase -- the implementation of Phase 2 in fixed
13 route, a year-and-a-half from now when we've achieved \$1.50
14 for a fixed route fare, adult fare, and \$45 for a monthly
15 fare, projecting a year-and-a-half in advance and compare the
16 current fares of these transits, we'll still be lower or
17 equal to seven of those ten transits. So assuming that they
18 don't increase fares in the next year-and-a-half.

19 And, currently, we would at that point we would be
20 charging the same fare as Lane, which is in Eugene, C-TRAN,
21 Community and Sound Transit, but we would -- their monthly
22 fare would still be higher than ours is in a
23 year-and-a-half. And, again, that's comparing their current
24 fares.

25 Looking into the future on the paratransit fare

1 structure, in two-and-a-half years when we implement -- when
2 or if we implement Phase 3, and we're at \$1.50 fare for a
3 single paratransit trip and \$45 for a monthly paratransit
4 trip, at that point compared to these other transits we would
5 be lower than or equal to six of those nine transits. So,
6 again, in two-and-a-half years we would still be lower than
7 the majority of those other transits.

8 CHAIRMAN: And that is assuming that they make no
9 changes in their fares.

10 MR. BLASKA: That's assuming that they make no
11 changes.

12 CHAIRMAN: You're going by these current?

13 MR. BLASKA: Right.

14 The other set of comparables are -- we looked at
15 Greater Spokane, Incorporated, also has a number of benchmark
16 cities that they look at for comparative information about
17 several kinds of things. So we took a look at those cities
18 and saw how we stacked up with our current fare structure.

19 Currently our fixed route service is less than or
20 equal to all nine of those transit systems. Right now we're
21 tied with Albuquerque and Raleigh. They charge an equal fare
22 that we do.

23 In paratransit we charge less than all nine of
24 those systems, to the tune of we are 50 percent to 83 percent
25 cheaper than any of those fare structures for paratransit

6

1 service.

2 Again, you project into the future, when we're at
3 \$1.50 a trip, \$45 for a monthly pass for fixed route service
4 in Phase 2, we would still be equal to or less than five of
5 the nine transit systems for fixed route fares and the fares
6 that we would currently be -- that currently charge what
7 we're going to charge in a year-and-a-half would be King
8 County. They charge \$1.75 for their -- I'm sorry, we would
9 be tied with Colorado Springs. No, correction. We would
10 still be less than those two transit systems.

11 So then in two-and-a-half years, implementation of
12 Phase 3 when we'd be charging \$1.50 for paratransit, a
13 paratransit trip, and \$45 for a monthly trip. We would still
14 be charging less than eight of those nine systems. The only
15 system that currently charges less than what we would charge
16 in two-and-a-half years is King County Metro, which charges
17 \$1.00 per paratransit trip.

18 So then some folks might ask the question, given
19 those comparison: Are we really going to charge enough?
20 Are we looking at enough in a fare increase? And so that's
21 where the farebox, fixed route farebox return objective of 20
22 percent comes in. Now, that's kind of the governor, because
23 20 percent is kind of the industry standard on what
24 properties want to recover from the user's fee for the cost
25 of that trip. And we'll show you here that this proposal

7

1 does meet that objective in that -- and the pie chart shows,
2 and again this was presented a couple of presentations ago,
3 but just as a reminder that currently our farebox recovery is
4 16.4 percent today. So we're significant below our 20
5 percent objective. In Phase 1 we would achieve 1.5 million
6 more dollars in fare revenue, which would get us to 19.9
7 percent farebox recovery. And then in Phase 2, again which
8 is in a year-and-a-half, we would achieve 2.8 million dollars
9 more in fare revenue than we do today, which would get us to
10 23 percent farebox recovery.

11 Now, this particular model assumes that your
12 operational costs don't increase in order to do the
13 comparisons. So if you look at the -- if you assume our
14 operational costs over the next year-and-a-half increase by
15 about 3 percent a year, then that brings us right in at the
16 20 percent farebox recovery objective. So the proposal
17 achieves that objective.

18 In paratransit service there is no targeted farebox
19 recovery currently. That is subsidized at a little more than
20 98 percent. That the users are paying about 1.8 percent of
21 the cost of that service. Once this recommendation, if it's
22 fully implemented, the users would pay about 5 percent of the
23 cost of that service. And a reminder, the comparative
24 per-trip cost for fixed route is \$3.89 per fixed route trip.
25 It's \$23.15 per paratransit trip. So that would bring us to

1 the point where, again, the users were contributing 5 percent
2 toward the cost of that trip.

3 MR. RICHARD: Mr. Blaska?

4 MR. BLASKA: Yes.

5 MR. RICHARD: On that slide the -- or the bottom
6 pie chart, the 5 percent of recovery projection, that's also
7 based upon current expenditure in that department, correct?

8 MR. BLASKA: Absolutely.

9 MR. RICHARD: So by the time we get to 2012, no
10 doubt the cost of doing business will be greater, and so that
11 will also -- that will go down. So the -- if we were to
12 implement this, the farebox recovery would be less than 5
13 percent we would anticipate?

14 MR. BLASKA: Yes, that's absolutely true.

15 MR. RICHARD: Thank you.

16 MR. BLASKA: Okay. And there has been, as I
17 mentioned before, general acceptance of the need to increase
18 fares, especially in fixed route. There was no public
19 comment at the public hearing last month regarding the fixed
20 route fare increase, and the majority supported a fixed route
21 fare increase in the community survey that we did.

22 The general ridership feedback from all of the
23 outreach that the CAC did was nobody likes to pay a little
24 bit more for a service they're already getting, but there was
25 general acceptance that, you know, it's about time that

9

1 this -- and it seems reasonable that this kind of increase
2 would occur for fixed route service.

3 The increase in the paratransit service is what's
4 generated the greatest debate. And so what I would like to
5 do is just kind of step back and shape that discussion,
6 because I'm sure that that will be most of the discussion
7 here at the public hearing and your deliberations.

8 And if you consider what's been submitted so far
9 and the testimony that we've received is -- we're really
10 getting testimony that's concerned about the affordability of
11 the fare increase from who are -- usually who are always
12 public transit's greatest advocates. Nick Beemer from Aging
13 and Long-Term Care, Greg Faulk and Lance Moorehouse from the
14 ARC, the CORD, have all come forward and stated their concern
15 with such a large percentage paratransit fare increase.

16 And I will tell you that as an organization, STA
17 and those advocates absolutely share a common goal. The goal
18 that we share -- and I know this Board shares -- is that we
19 want to preserve mobility. All of us are passionate about
20 this. And the advocates that have testified and STA as
21 service provider agree that transportation and mobility must
22 be available, and it's all about access to transportation.

23 From our perspective, from the service delivery
24 perspective what increased revenue means from a fare
25 structure is the ability to deliver service. Revenue equals

10

1 the ability to deliver service. And so when we look at the
2 fare increase, we look at 16,500 more paratransit trips, or
3 95,000 fixed route trips. That's what represented by the
4 differential in this -- we're asking for in this fare
5 increase. It's the ability to deliver more service, or
6 deliver those number of trips.

7 And we can't forget as we look at this, a burden
8 sharing, if you will, between paratransit and fixed route,
9 that we have many, many, many customers on the fixed route
10 side who have special needs that use the fixed route service.
11 And so as we trade off priorities, or if we look at how we
12 balance priorities, we need to keep that in mind.

13 So for us revenue is the ability to provide
14 service. And so the seeming disagreement, if you will -- and
15 it's really not a disagreement, but a seeming debate between
16 those that had advocated to keep the paratransit fares low
17 and this particular tariff proposal is not about the quality
18 or the quantity of the service, it's all about whether income
19 and affordability provide a barrier to the access to service.

20 And so many of those that have been concerned and
21 have spoken out about the affordability issue are advocating
22 really for what the Board to do is keep the fare structure
23 low and holding down the fares for all paratransit customers.
24 And that does, that is a blanket solution. It is a simple
25 solution that does ensure that those that couldn't afford it

11

1 do have an affordable fare structure.

2 But it also assumes that no one currently using
3 paratransit service can afford to pay the \$1.50 a trip. And
4 that's -- even though it's still 95 percent subsidized. So
5 that blanket course of action is certainly a course of action
6 available, but it's very expensive. The cost is in capacity.
7 It's in those 16,500 or 95,000 trips. And it's really, if
8 you think about it in direct contravention to our shared
9 goal, preserving and providing for transportation resources.

10 And so what this tariff policy actually does it to
11 use this as an opportunity to really come to a community
12 solution that specifically helps those who cannot afford the
13 fare increase. And we need partners to do this. We really
14 need to separate the issue about what the paratransit fare is
15 and the affordability of that service for specific members of
16 our population that need to use paratransit.

17 So let's address the low-income issue specifically.
18 Let's laser focus on that issue as opposed to an
19 across-the-board, artificial constraint on what our fare
20 structure is.

21 And so the advocacy groups that have come forward
22 in this good, healthy public discussion have been tremendous
23 partners in the past. And we believe that we can find a
24 solution that gets at that issue.

25 Now, one of the things that's tempting is, well,

12

1 the other thing is we have a track record that proves that
2 we've done this in the past. Our Special Use Van Pool
3 Program is a program where we found another subsidy to help
4 offset the high cost of that transportation. The Feed
5 Spokane Program is a program where we don't pay for that
6 program by giving out free passes and not getting any fare
7 revenue. We actually recover that fare revenue through
8 another source, and then it's not at the penalty of revenue
9 that's available to public transportation. We're not
10 subsidizing a low-income program using transportation
11 dollars. And the other case in point is the Student Pass
12 Program.

13 So what we would like to see is the Board go
14 forward with a decision on all three phases, because with
15 Phase 2 and 3 as a policy decision of this Board is that we
16 want to achieve \$1.50 and a \$45 fare for paratransit in
17 two-and-a-half years. And that's a catalyst for change.
18 That's a catalyst for partnerships in order for us to target
19 this low-income issue. And we do need help to do that, like
20 we have help with the Special Use Van Pool Program, the Feed
21 Spokane Program and the Student Pass Program.

22 So we can also, if taking away the Phase 2 and 3 is
23 certainly one of the options, but then understand that we do
24 take away that catalyst for change. And then we will
25 essentially be committing to subsidize this need in our fare

13

1 structure, our overall fare structure as opposed to targeting
2 a specific need.

3 So I'm just prepared to answer questions now, or I
4 can answer other questions. There's been a lot of
5 information presented to the Board. I've got that available
6 to support your deliberations later, or I'm prepared to
7 answer questions now.

8 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: Okay, any questions for
9 Mr. Blaska?

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'll wait.

11 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: With that then we'll begin the
12 public hearing portion, public testimony. And I have a few
13 names here. Do not assume that you will not be able to come
14 forward if you did not get a chance to sign in. So with
15 that, the first person I have on it is Mary Gumm.

16 MS. GUMM: Good evening, Spokane Transit Board and
17 Staff. My name is Mary Gumm with Spokane County Community
18 Services and Housing and Community Development.

19 I work with people with developmental disabilities
20 and the programs that help them find and keep jobs, as well
21 as participate in meaningful activities in their community.
22 Christine Barada, our Director, met with STA staff last week
23 regarding this issue, and she also sent you a letter, which I
24 have additional copies if you need them.

25 We are very concerned that the paratransit increase

14

1 proposed in the 2011-2012 will put a monthly pass out of
2 reach for many of those who need it most. \$45 may not seem
3 like much, but many of the persons who have disabilities in
4 our communities who rely on paratransit have little
5 availability for such an increase. Many are on fixed income,
6 such as SSI or Social Security Disability. Hundreds live in
7 residential settings where they are allowed by rule to keep
8 very little of their income for personal spending, a category
9 that includes transportation.

10 Our colleagues at State Division of Developmental
11 Disabilities have shared with us that there are 320 people in
12 their programs alone that may be subject to a limit of as
13 little as \$62.79 for available spending money. There are
14 hundreds more supported in other DSHS programs with similar
15 limitations on resources. Many more live in other
16 residential settings without such strict limitations on
17 spending money. But unfortunately, persons with disability
18 are most likely to live in poverty and have the least ability
19 to accommodate such a large increase in fares.

20 Under this proposal those who qualify for a reduced
21 fare on fixed route services will only pay \$22.50 for a
22 monthly pass. Those who need to use paratransit because of
23 the nature or severity of their disability will need to pay
24 twice as much to use public transportation services. This
25 seems to put an unfair burden on this population of people.

15

1 We do not support the 2011-2012 proposal as
2 presented. Implementation of the 2010 Phase 1 of the plan
3 could be a compromise. Better still would be to align the
4 paratransit rate increase to match the fixed route reduced
5 fare amounts. At the very least, we believe more time for
6 discussion with input from all community partners is needed
7 before final discussion on the 2011-2012 is made.

8 Our department is pleased that STA has committed to
9 participation in further discussion with stakeholders on how
10 to meet transportation needs of individuals who have
11 disabilities and limited resources. We also believe more
12 work can be done in exploring how persons with disabilities
13 can better use fixed route services and relieve some of the
14 demand on paratransit services.

15 We know STA is facing a budget challenge in this
16 tight economic climate. We know that paratransit services
17 are very expensive to provide. Implementing such a large
18 service and fares for those who are least able to afford it
19 doesn't seem like part of the right solution.

20 Thank you for your time.

21 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: Thank you very much, Ms. Gumm.

22 MR. RICHARD: I have a question. Ms. Grumm, is
23 that right?

24 MS. GUMM: Gumm.

25 MR. RICHARD: Ms. Gumm, a question for you. Do

16

1 we -- out of community services do we provide monthly bus
2 passes for some folks that we serve?

3 MS. GUMM: Not through community -- not through the
4 Development Disabilities Program.

5 MR. RICHARD: Okay. And I just wonder in the
6 aggregate through any of the programs that we have if we --
7 if we're one of those partners that provides funds to
8 purchase bus passes. Because one of the things we found in
9 our analysis is there are some folks that are either buying
10 or they're getting supplied a bus pass, and yet they're only
11 using the paratransit a couple times a month. And so it
12 isn't making sense economically either for the person or the
13 agency. But you're not aware that we provide those?

14 MS. GUMM: I think there's lots of community
15 services within the department, and I'm not familiar with all
16 of them. I know that in experience working with people who
17 are in those residential settings, even for \$1.50 a ride they
18 have payees and they have all these different rules that they
19 have to follow. Getting somebody \$1.50 per day to take the
20 bus is so much paperwork and such a hardship on all the
21 different people in every program that it's easier just to
22 buy the bus pass, so that the person has it with them.
23 Because paperwork for \$1.50 is....

24 MR. RICHARD: That's an excellent point in the home
25 care type setting where they have to manage each and every

17

1 penny of their account and dollars.

2 Also, I just want a quick comment. I think you're
3 aware of it, just the difference in cost. You mentioned
4 fairness, and I -- you're aware that I think Mr. Blaska
5 pointed out the cost of a fixed route ride, we estimate
6 about, I think, \$3.80. The cost for a paratransit ride is
7 \$28.00. So it certainly isn't -- I don't think the
8 committees, nor our desire to put an unfair burden on
9 paratransit riders. And, in fact, as he showed, you know,
10 the burden would be out in 2012 about 5 percent cost recovery
11 versus 20 percent.

12 So I just want to make sure you were aware of that.
13 Don't take away from the fact that you have folks that you
14 work with that would be, you know, challenged by this, but
15 certainly, I don't think from an equitability it's a fairness
16 issue in that regard, but certainly understand the pain that
17 your folks would realize.

18 MS. GUMM: Thank you.

19 MR. RICHARD: Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: Hold just a minute. Mr. Munson?

21 MR. MUNSON: As an agency that provides information
22 and assistance to these folks, have you done any research to
23 find out what other sources of funds would be available for
24 these people to pay for the pass?

25 MS. GUMM: No, I haven't.

18

1 MR. MUNSON: Do you have the capability of doing
2 that?

3 MS. GUMM: My job is to help the agencies provide
4 technical assistance to them, so I could, you know, look into
5 that.

6 MR. MUNSON: Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: Okay, thank you very much.
8 Okay, next we have Clayton Wright.

9 MR. WRIGHT: Good evening. My name is Clayton
10 Wright. I'm the parent of a child with a developmental
11 disability. I also serve on the ARC Board of Directors. And
12 I want to thank you for this opportunity to speak to you
13 about the proposed transit -- paratransit increases. I am
14 not as well versed as Ms. Gumm. I'm unfortunately not as
15 well prepared as she is, but I am here to raise objection and
16 a voice of concern for the level of increase for the folks
17 who have to provide -- who have to receive paratransit
18 services for their basic transportation.

19 I'm encouraged by the Board's flexibility in terms
20 of looking at alternative ways to serve this population. I'm
21 encouraged at your compassion for these individuals, which
22 you have expressed as part of your mission statement to
23 improve mobility for all folks.

24 But I do want to raise my voice in concern for the
25 tremendous burden this is going to place on individuals with

19

1 developmental disabilities, and their ability to access their
2 community. I feel that increases more in terms of what
3 you're doing with the fixed route systems is more equitable,
4 and I'm just awfully concerned about the increase in
5 isolation and loneliness that's going to be incurred by these
6 significant increases in paratransit transportation.

7 So thank you very much for the opportunity to
8 speak. I appreciate it very much, and I ask your
9 consideration. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: Thank you very much. Next is
11 Alan Alexander.

12 MR. ALEXANDER: My name is Alan Alexander. I thank
13 you for the time that we can be here.

14 I also would like to reiterate what Ms. Gumm and
15 Clayton have just mentioned, the concern of the increase to
16 \$45 for a monthly pass. We have a friend who has a child and
17 my daughter has Downes Syndrome. She goes to work two days a
18 week at the Bare Boot Park Hotel. Fortunately, she is not
19 strapped for financial aid because of my retirement and she
20 receives part of my Social Security. The issue is for those
21 who are on a fixed income. We have friends who have children
22 with Downes Syndrome that they get at where they're living, a
23 facility, a group home setting, where they receive -- this is
24 not the exact amount, but say \$670 a month from their Social
25 Security. Of that the home will receive all but give them

20

1 \$30, \$30 to \$50 for their own individual finances. For the
2 bus pass to go to \$45, that would give them \$5 a month for
3 spending money, that they could not go to a movie. They
4 would not be able to even get a haircut, much less any other
5 social-type functions.

6 So, again, I would agree with the issue of, yes, we
7 realize that paratransit does need to increase, but to \$45,
8 that's going to cause a real hardship. Where my daughter
9 works at the Mirabeau Park Hotel out in the Valley there are
10 a number of people that rely on paratransit. They do make a
11 little extra money each month, but again this is going to
12 cause a difficulty for them getting to and from work if they
13 are going to be increasing to \$45 a month.

14 Again, I thank you for your time.

15 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: Thank you very much. Helen and
16 Jack Leighton.

17 MS. VAN ORMAN: Mr. Chairman?

18 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: Yes.

19 MS. VAN ORMAN: I just wanted to clarify that the
20 increase to \$45 is in two-and-a-half years.

21 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: Two-and-a-half years. Thank
22 you.

23 Okay. Helen and Jack Leighton.

24 MR. LEIGHTON: Yes, my name is Jack Leighton. I'm
25 the father of a handicapped son. He is autistic. He likes

1 communication skills. I'm concerned about your raising of
2 the cost of paratransit as my son uses it considerably. He
3 works four days a week. He must take a transport to get
4 there. I would say his wages run about \$100 a month,
5 however, and what he gets from Social Security, the amount he
6 makes is what he has to live on.

7 Now, he does have the programs, recreation programs
8 that he goes to in the evenings. Again, dependent upon
9 paratransit. We've been very supportive of your program for
10 years when you had the problem with the microphones a few
11 years back. We were very active in helping you and getting
12 on the phone and so on, so we are concerned. And I'd like to
13 say that we are very thankful for the drivers, who are very
14 courteous on the paratransit system.

15 But I'm also concerned as to the Spokane Parks
16 Program. I hadn't heard anything said here on their program,
17 but they depend on the paratransit to get these individuals
18 to the programs so they can enjoy some of their recreational
19 programs.

20 Now, with the program going up, or the price, that
21 amount of money will be almost half of what he makes. And
22 then to try to have programs where he can go to for
23 recreation, also housing, food and so on to be taken out of
24 there, although \$45 may not be much to you folks, that's a
25 whale of a chunk when it comes out of that amount there.

22

1 His being handicapped with autism is he lacks
2 communication skills. If he were to be let off, I mean on
3 the regular system, and he did not know exactly where he was,
4 he would have to ask, which he cannot do. He cannot obtain
5 information by direct communication as other people can to
6 find out where he is or where he should be or so on. So he
7 could be lost out there and we would have no way of knowing
8 where he will be.

9 I think the humanitarian aspect of this is one that
10 should be as important really as the financial one here, and
11 I would hope that you would give consideration to this
12 particular program and keep the fees lower in terms of the
13 amount of money these individuals have to spend. Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: Thank you very much, Jack.

15 Okay, that is it on the individuals that have
16 signed up. Is there anybody else in the audience that would
17 like to come forward and comment on the tariff policy and
18 procedures for fixed route? Okay, Helen.

19 MS. LEIGHTON: I'm Helen Leighton. My husband just
20 spoke about one aspect. I'd like to point out Jim is 65
21 years old. My husband is 91. I'm 89. As long as I can
22 remember, as soon as we could get Jim into any kind of
23 programs to help socialization, speech and maturity, it has
24 been primarily through the Spokane Parks and Recreation.

25 For years we have been the ones that have

23

1 transported him. We have reached a point where I don't think
2 we're going to be able to drive much longer. Does that mean
3 then that Jim is going to sit and do nothing? He has made so
4 much progress, I hate to see it all just go down the drain.
5 He will still be living longer. We won't. There will be
6 nobody to take care of him. We do not have any other
7 children. We do not have any siblings, Jack or I. He's
8 going to have to depend on wherever he is living, and they
9 certainly aren't going to be able to meet his transportation
10 needs.

11 So you can see as far as he's concerned, he's not
12 going to be able to do much. That's it. There are others
13 that are in similar situations. We have been very active in
14 all the organizations like ARC that we could be to help
15 promote anything that we could do to help handicapped people.
16 For a long time the City of Spokane did very, very little.
17 Anyway, we even built, along with 12 other people, a home
18 over on the coast for the children. Unfortunately, that did
19 not work out too well.

20 But what I'm trying to point out is I think we as
21 parents and many other parents have put all our energies,
22 money and everything else into assisting these handicapped
23 people. Is it all going to be for naught? I hope not.

24 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: Thank you very much, Helen.

25 With that, anybody else that would like to come

24

1 forward to comment?

2 And I would like to repeat, is there anybody in the
3 audience that would like to come forward and comment on the
4 tariff policy and procedure?

5 MS. SHAWN: Hi, my name is Laree Shanda, and I'm
6 the Chief Operating Officer at Skills'kin. We serve people
7 with disabilities and disadvantages, provide supported living
8 and also employment support.

9 I would like to point out that access to the
10 paratransit service is essential for people to seek social
11 opportunities, but also to seek employment. And when that is
12 removed or it's prohibitive by cost those people don't have
13 the same access the rest of us would have.

14 In addition, I found out this past winter when it
15 was so terribly snowy and when paratransit wasn't running
16 that the base cost to get a taxi to accommodate a wheelchair
17 is \$50 just for the pickup, and then they can add mileage on
18 top of that. So many people who have disabilities are not
19 able to access that as an alternative to the paratransit
20 system.

21 I also wanted to point out, we have 500 people that
22 we're the representative or protective payee for. Many of
23 those people are on Social Security Disability income or
24 other disability programs. Those people average between \$600
25 and \$700 a month. With the increase, just on a monthly basis

25

1 that you guys are proposing or that's been proposed, that
2 increase is almost 16 percent of their income. If you take
3 that to the nondisabled population and populations that are
4 working, that percentage is inordinate and prohibitive to
5 them being able to have a life style and make a living.

6 In addition to my role with Skills'kin, I also am a
7 recreation therapist by education. And it's been proven that
8 access to employment and access to activity is clinically
9 beneficial in physical, cognitive, social, emotional, every
10 domain that exists. We have proven in our supported living
11 programs that people who get out in the community have fewer
12 maladaptive behaviors than the people who aren't able to
13 access the community.

14 So I would ask that this not be implemented and not
15 approved. Thank you.

16 MR. RICHARD: A question.

17 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: Go ahead, Mr. Richard.

18 MR. RICHARD: Ma'am, I had a question for you.

19 One of the things that we're contemplating in this
20 policy is to stairstep this over a period of two-and-a-half
21 years. And then during that time, as true partnerships with
22 organizations like yours to either take on some subsidy
23 ourself to find partnerships or to go out and find other
24 funding for the low-income folks, the folks that can't afford
25 it. But to charge essentially by the time we're done with

26

1 this 5 percent of the cost, today's cost, to those who can
2 afford it.

3 Is there any portion of that that you could
4 support? Do you think that that sounds somewhat reasonable,
5 or does that still concern you? And, maybe, why?

6 MS. SHANDA: What I would ask is that that
7 percentage be concurrent with cost-of-living increases, and
8 that we look at what the percentage increases have been in
9 the disability support programs.

10 MR. RICHARD: Uh-huh.

11 MS. SHANDA: I don't think you're going to see a 5
12 percent increase even in the next two years, but those aren't
13 things that I've look at.

14 MR. RICHARD: Okay.

15 MS. SHANDA: So I would ask that perhaps that be
16 investigated.

17 As far as partnerships, we did just obtain a grant,
18 and we were able to get one lift for a van. However, that's
19 very limited when you look at the number of people.

20 MR. RICHARD: Okay. Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: Mr. Munson?

22 MR. MUNSON: Ma'am, obviously you're a very
23 successful caregiver in your organization, and I commend you
24 for that.

25 In this, when you prepare these consultations, are

27

1 you prepared to help people identify other funding sources
2 that would help pay for these, these passes?

3 MS. SHANDA: We do look into that. Unfortunately,
4 in Spokane we're pretty limited when it comes to
5 transportation. And like I was saying, with the taxi service
6 we were going to try to get together and see if some of the
7 organizations could try and appeal that for people with
8 disabilities and limited income.

9 MR. MUNSON: We know that there are some federal
10 and state programs that will provide subsidies for
11 individuals to purchase passes.

12 MS. SHANDA: Yes.

13 MR. MUNSON: Do you identify those to your
14 clientele so they can apply for them?

15 MS. SHANDA: We do.

16 MR. MUNSON: Okay. And those are the people that
17 would be in the most need, correct?

18 MS. SHANDA: Correct.

19 MR. MUNSON: Okay. Would it matter what the price
20 of the ticket is if you identified the need?

21 MS. SHANDA: That I couldn't tell you because I'm
22 not at the level that makes those referrals, so I couldn't
23 say specifically.

24 MR. MUNSON: Okay.

25 MS. SHANDA: I personally am not able to answer

1 that. There are folks at our organization who could.

2 MR. MUNSON: Okay. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: Anybody else?

4 Again, thank you very much for your testimony.

5 MS. SHANDA: Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: So again I will call for anybody
7 else that would like to come forward and testify.

8 Again, call forward, anybody like to comment on the
9 tariff policy on procedures?

10 Again for the third time, anybody like to come
11 forward and address the Board on the tariff policy and
12 procedures for fixed routes and paratransit?

13 Hearing none, I will close the public hearing at
14 6:20, and with that we'll move on to the next public hearing.

15 The next public hearing we have is on the proposed
16 September service changes. Karl Otterstrom is going to give
17 us a presentation, then we will begin the public testimony.

18 I would like to open the public hearing at 6:21 for
19 the proposed September service changes.

20 MR. OTTERSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

21 First off, why are we proposing a service change at
22 this time? We -- it all began and we've shared this with you
23 earlier this year, there are some operating safety issues out
24 in West Plains. And we started looking at it and we saw that
25 there was an opportunity to not only resolve the problem, but

1 look at providing more efficiency in the service, as well as
2 contain costs and actually open up new travel markets for our
3 riders and the communities that are affected. Which include
4 Airway Heights, Browne's Addition, Medical Lake, Spokane
5 International Airport and the surrounding airport business
6 park, as well as Sunset Hill.

7 So the routes that are implicated in this proposal,
8 this recommendation, include the Route 40 Browne's Addition.
9 That route simply goes into Browne's Addition, does a little
10 loop, goes back downtown every half hour, most hours of the
11 day, seven days a week.

12 The Route 61 Airway Heights serves downtown and
13 Airway Heights with service to destinations such as Northern
14 Quest Casino and select trips to Fairchild Air Force Base.

15 MS. MEYER: Mr. Chairman?

16 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: Yes.

17 MS. MEYER: I see everyone looking for this in
18 their packet. Mrs. Watson, can you tell us where this
19 information is?

20 MS. WATSON: It wasn't included in the gray
21 folders.

22 MR. OTTERSTROM: My apologies.

23 MS. MEYER: It wasn't? Okay. I have -- I think I
24 have two copies that I can share, for you to share.

25 MR. OTTERSTROM: So there's a report in your

30

1 packet, as well as the gray folder, and it's basically the
2 same general information.

3 MS. MEYER: Is this in their packet?

4 MR. OTTERSTROM: Yes, in their gray folder.

5 MS. MEYER: Okay. So --

6 MR. OTTERSTROM: As well as the draft of --

7 MS. MEYER: The PowerPoint isn't in the packet, but
8 on the first page it has the recommended changes.

9 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: Okay, yeah, the executive
10 summary?

11 MS. MEYER: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: Okay, thank you very much.

13 MR. OTTERSTROM: So I apologize. We'll walk
14 through this and I'll verbalize what's on the screen in an
15 expeditious manner.

16 So the Route 61 going to Airway Heights and the Air
17 Force Base, Route 62, which serves downtown Medical Lake, as
18 well as the outlying hospitals surrounding Medical Lake.
19 And, finally, Route 64, which today provides service to the
20 Spokane Airport, as well as the airport business park to the
21 south, and Geiger Boulevard. And as of May -- recently it's
22 changed to be seven days a week, and this is part of the
23 operations changes we did to eliminate a safety issue.

24 So there's a -- the public outreach process we've
25 gone so far started out with information posted on the web

31

1 site. We actually distributed, mailed to over 10,000
2 addresses in the affected community, a very simple, low-cost
3 postcard that directed people to the web site to read the
4 information, as well as participate in an on-line survey.
5 And so this card, I believe, either you got it by email or in
6 the mail a few weeks ago. So we had that open for a little
7 over two weeks. And that yielded about 164 surveys, both
8 online, as well as hard copies that people requested and we
9 sent and they mailed back to us after completing.

10 So a very substantial amount of input. We at this
11 point are presenting not only what we proposed to the
12 community, but what we've learned from the community and what
13 we're finally proposing to you. We're not asking for public
14 action on your part tonight. We're asking for public
15 comment, and this will be followed by Board action at the
16 following meeting and preceded by June operations committee
17 meeting, where you would make a recommendation to the Board.

18 In the report you have there's a map showing what
19 we've presented to the public. This is on page 4 of the
20 report. And essentially you see the areas covered is Airway
21 Heights, Medical Lake, Browne's Addition and the Airport and
22 the area around the airport. So those four routes are shown
23 here, as well as the options we presented to the community.

24 I'm going to walk through the options by community.
25 We can refer back to this map. Starting with Browne's

1 Addition. So if you -- the Route 40, as I said earlier, it
2 does a loop in Browne's Addition. And what we propose is
3 combine the route that goes to the airport and the route that
4 goes in Browne's Addition to essentially be one route full
5 time, half hourly service during most hours of the day. And
6 what this would do is create a two-way pattern through
7 Browne's Addition instead of the current loop. We would move
8 existing shelters in Browne's Addition neighborhood, which
9 actually aren't in use and haven't been in use for a number
10 of years because they're not on the route. One of those
11 would be in use simply because now we're providing two-way
12 service, and the others we would relocate in order to be on
13 this new routing that would be on the south end of
14 Coeur d'Alene Park and then exit the neighborhood, if you see
15 in that insert map, Cannon Park down to Sunset Boulevard and
16 then out to the airport, directly up Sunset Boulevard to
17 Airport Drive. We would move stops and space the stops more
18 efficiently, like every other block, to improve the
19 rationale -- the ration in stops.

20 The info we've received from the public over -- of
21 those people that had an opinion liked the proposal, 89
22 percent. We had one person -- we had all sorts of different
23 comments that we haven't provided verbatim, but we have
24 summary comments in your packet. One person mentioned: I
25 like the increases to the airport with fewer resources used.

1 87 percent of the respondents with an opinion said that they
2 either liked or could accept the discontinuation of service
3 along Cannon Street. And if you recall, that's a segment of
4 about three blocks. It's one-way service today that we would
5 be eliminating and people would need to be walking either to
6 Fourth Avenue or to Pacific Avenue. And generally a very
7 strong support of this. People that had issues with it
8 generally liked the stop where it was, or they were concerned
9 with the ability to get easy access to the Rosauers.

10 So what we are recommending is simply what we did
11 recommend, propose to the public, which would be to eliminate
12 Route 40 and Route 64 to provide an all-day Route 60 that
13 would operate two ways, all the way to the airport, directly
14 and back.

15 We're also recommending, and we'll get more into
16 this with Airway Heights, to take the Airway Heights bus
17 through Browne's Addition, which creates a pattern of service
18 every 15 minutes. So as we offset the schedules so that
19 people have the convenience, just like in corridors like
20 Monroe Street or Division Street, of having a bus come all
21 the time. And it would provide a consistent pattern up
22 Sunset Hill.

23 So here's the map of how we're proposing these two
24 routes to be configured through the neighborhood. So Pacific
25 Avenue, again we serve today, as well as South Coeur d'Alene

1 Street and Fourth Avenue. Simply dropping the South Cannon
2 Street and exiting onto Sunset Boulevard to go up to the West
3 Plains.

4 For Airway Heights we again, one of the operating
5 issues we were dealing with was Route 61 was going to the
6 airport at night. We're taking it out of the airport in
7 order to avoid a left-hand turn onto Highway 2. And this
8 allows us to have the bus up to Airway Heights all the time,
9 and we're proposing to include it into the Browne's Addition
10 routing. And we asked the public whether they thought we
11 should be serving the casino on every trip. Today we serve
12 it every hour. And what that would also allow us to do if we
13 moved it to every trip we'd be able to install and move the
14 stops for the Walmart onto Hayford Road and put shelters
15 there, where we cannot accommodate it today on Highway 2.

16 The responses, 92 percent of respondents with an
17 opinion liked or could accept the change to redirect the
18 Route 61 through Browne's Addition. We had an even number of
19 respondents that said go to casino on all trips, or go to
20 Lawson Road. So let me back up here to this map.

21 So if you look at the top center of the map where
22 the casino is, there's also the dashed line to the West
23 Spokane Industrial Park. So one of the options was to
24 eliminate service there in order to serve the casino on all
25 trips. So that was really a mixed bag because people were

35

1 concerned about the walking distances, as well as lack of
2 service there.

3 So what we heard on that, it was mixed. And then
4 people liked, 76 percent of those who currently ride Route 61
5 liked the idea of sharing a similar pattern for the proposed
6 Route 60. So that's an important factoid as well.

7 So our final recommendation for Airway Heights
8 would be that it would no longer serve the airport on nights
9 and weekends. And that actually has taken effect this week.
10 And this would make it long term in effectuation.

11 We are also proposing to route it through Browne's
12 Addition, similar to the Route 60. And we actually, after
13 hearing the public comments and looking at the schedule, we
14 can go to the casino on every trip and still serve like we do
15 today the south side of Highway 2 without any increase of
16 costs. So retain that service, as well as add more frequency
17 of the bus every half hour to the casino rather than every
18 hour, as well as that helps us with the safety issues at the
19 Walmart stop. And, again, so adding those shelters on
20 Hayford Road.

21 So it would look something like this out in the
22 West Plains on Highway 2. The green line there is depicting
23 Route 60, this new Route 60 going directly to the airport.
24 And that saves about three minutes of time from the current
25 routing. And the Route 61, basically there's no time

1 increase going through Browne's Addition. It's related to
2 the traffic lights and the operations of Second and Third
3 versus the lack of lights for Browne's Addition.

4 Medical Lake, I have to say I really appreciate
5 people coming from Medical Lake tonight. The next bus to
6 Medical Lake is at 10:00 at night. And so we do have people
7 that are here that are interested in speaking, and I
8 appreciate them coming, to sacrifice their time to talk to
9 the Board about our changes out there.

10 So we suggested to the public in order to not have
11 the route going to the airport, not serve some of the area
12 south of the airport, we proposed that the Route 62, which
13 generally for most trips on average it's very under utilized.

14 It's one of our most expensive services to provide in terms
15 of an all-day, seven-days-a-week service. To actually be
16 able to pick up more passengers by serving the airport
17 business park south of the airport, the Geiger area, this
18 would add about five minutes of time. We suggested to make
19 that time even out we were going to drop some time in the
20 city of Medical Lake with a loop that goes on Campbell Avenue
21 and Prentiss. So back to our original map here. You see
22 there on the bottom left-hand side there was a section of
23 Medical Lake. That area we are proposing to drop as an
24 option along with adding the service to the airport business
25 park.

37

1 So what we heard was that 70 percent of respondents
2 liked or could accept the change for Route 62 to include the
3 airport business park. People cited efficiency, things like
4 that, but at the same time others were concerned about
5 missing their connections because of the increased travel
6 time. If you looked at just those people that live or work
7 in Medical Lake, there was a greater concern that 46 percent
8 could not accept the changes going through this airport
9 business park. And there was substantial concern about
10 dropping this area of Campbell Street in Medical Lake. And
11 there was actually a citizen's petition that's in your Board
12 gray folder that was -- they are concerned about removing the
13 service away from retirement facility on the east end of
14 town.

15 So from that and talking with the employers out
16 there, we are recommending actually two routes to operate to
17 Medical Lake. One would be the Route 62, which would be
18 dedicated -- well, anybody could ride it, but it would be an
19 express trip basically to the hospitals. And it would line
20 up with the shift changes, which is really their demand. In
21 fact, about 90 percent of the people that use those stops out
22 there are going to the hospitals. The rest of the day
23 there's maybe zero to one people on those buses. And it adds
24 about 20 minutes of travel time for those living in Medical
25 Lake because we circle through those hospitals each trip.

38

1 Then we would propose a new Route 67, which would
2 be an all-day, two-way service that would not go to the
3 hospitals, but instead serve this Campbell Street area of
4 town. We would add trips to that in the morning, but more
5 significantly, I think, for a lot of people we'd have another
6 trip and the PM peak at 5:27 p.m., and then a trip at
7 7:20 p.m. And we can do this because we're saving operating
8 costs by not going to the hospitals all the time, as well as
9 adding a few extra minutes, about five extra minutes to go
10 into the airport business park.

11 So we feel it's a workable compromise for the
12 different needs, where you have the hospital workers out
13 there demanding speed versus those that would like more
14 service all the time, and we still save them time by not
15 going through the hospitals on those local trips. And it
16 would operate on weekends and nights as well. So currently
17 the airport business park has no service at nights and
18 weekends, so this would be an additional service for that
19 area.

20 So a map of this service change proposal, the
21 orange line is Route 62, and this is in your report on page
22 11. So Route 62 would serve the hospitals and focus on the
23 shifts that actually carry passengers. We do today serve the
24 night shift, and we really don't carry -- there's about one
25 rider typically, so it's very expensive to have the bus

1 operate for one person all that distance. And so we've
2 pulled that out in order to provide more trips on the 67,
3 which would be directed to downtown Medical Lake as well as
4 that eastern route. The only difference here in terms of
5 routing that we're proposing is recommending dropping off a
6 little small loop on the edge of that, which would make
7 people walk about two blocks, about 600 feet, the same
8 distance from here to the Red Robin restaurant in order to
9 catch a bus to improve the simplicity of the route.

10 So we've talked through the airport. This Route 60
11 would basically be a 30-minute service all day, 60-minute
12 service at night. And rather than, right now we only have
13 60-minute service to the airport. Every hour there's a
14 bus. So we're doubling the frequency of service. It's
15 going to be more direct because it doesn't go through the
16 business park. We also feel we're going to be able to carry
17 more riders to the airport because we're hitting a very dense
18 population before going out there.

19 We gave an option to go through the Group Health on
20 the side, which is more or less an opportunity for people to
21 have a more direct trip to the front door but doesn't
22 necessarily get them much closer. What we found was 99
23 percent of respondents liked or could accept the suggested
24 increase in frequency to the airport. The one percent that
25 didn't, he just didn't like bus service. But one respondent

40

1 said this would be more convenient. Another said it's so
2 nice to have frequency options for getting to the airport.
3 And some people could not accept, or didn't like the changes
4 simply because of the routing structure, but they said they
5 could still accept it.

6 So what one of the impacts here would change is not
7 serving Geiger Boulevard where the Waste To Energy Plant is
8 directly. So there would no longer be service there. We
9 estimate that's about an impact of 25 to 30 riders at the
10 most that would be lost service. That would be a walking
11 distance of about a quarter mile. And the 67 would serve
12 airport business park rather than the airport service. And
13 now these people going to jobs at the airport business park
14 would actually have a route that comes from the Jefferson
15 Park and Ride.

16 So most people didn't really have an opinion about
17 Geiger Boulevard, and so it was very mixed. There wasn't a
18 strong response on that. So most people actually skipped the
19 question.

20 So basically we've covered all that information one
21 way or the other. And I just want to go over the financial
22 impacts. As compared to what we're providing on the street
23 today, the annualized cost of this is actually a net savings,
24 a reduction of \$100,000 a year. There would be some capital
25 costs, including the shelter improvements, that we're looking

1 at. We're trying to put a stop in on Sunset Boulevard as
2 well, and some of that comes from our transit enhancement
3 funding. We believe based on different elasticities related
4 to frequency improvements through Browne's Addition and the
5 airport, as well as increased service to the casino, that it
6 usually takes about 18 months to 24 months to really see what
7 you get from a service change. Based on the 2,000 riders
8 daily we have on these routes, we expect about 500 new daily
9 riders, which comes out to be \$127,000 plus a year. So if
10 you talk about that, plus the \$100,000 in net savings and the
11 operation costs, it's a net benefit of about \$180,000
12 annually. And, again, out of all this there are 28 to 30
13 people that are losing a bus stop within a quarter mile's
14 walk.

15 We have some general questions in our survey, and I
16 think this just gives you an impression of what people think
17 of this. One of them: If implemented, how would the overall
18 proposal affect your use of Spokane Transit's bus service?
19 25 percent said they'd use a bus more often. A little over
20 half said just about as much as today. We saw some people
21 say less, and 4 percent say they would continue not riding.
22 We did have people that don't ride our service. They were
23 very much the minority. Some of them said I will continue
24 not to ride, whereas others said I'll start riding because
25 this is actually an option for me.

42

1 Another question we asked was: Given this proposal
2 and the options do you think STA is either heading in the
3 right direction -- 40 percent said yes -- improve, but still
4 room to go -- about an equal amount -- and then we had about
5 an equal of 10, 11 percent saying same as always or worse
6 off. And so that gauges if this was an election or President
7 of the United States it would be pretty positive, but again
8 there's always things we can improve.

9 The next step, of course, is you're here tonight to
10 receive public comments. We would take the public comments
11 and the recommendation from staff to your Operations and
12 Customer Service Committee to develop a recommendation on
13 June 3rd to take to the Board, this full Board here for
14 action on June 18th. And we are hoping and working towards a
15 service change effective September 2009 in order to save the
16 costs, as well as improve the service now when September is a
17 much better time than some other times in the year to make
18 changes.

19 So if there's any questions?

20 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: Okay, Mr. Munson?

21 MR. MUNSON: Well, I commend you on this very, very
22 informative presentation, and the great paper that
23 accompanied it because it was very interesting.

24 But is there a reason why we got it tonight and not
25 before the meeting?

1 MR. OTTERSTROM: That one there was actually a
2 draft in your packet from last week, in the Board packet. It
3 should have been under Item 7(j).

4 MR. MUNSON: In last month's packet?

5 MR. OTTERSTROM: Excuse me, last week --

6 MR. MUNSON: This is under Item 4(b) in this
7 packet.

8 MR. OTTERSTROM: I'm sorry, I got my --

9 MR. MUNSON: The public hearing is under 4(b). Oh,
10 you're correct, I do have it.

11 MR. OTTERSTROM: You're correct. There's an
12 information only --

13 MR. MUNSON: This is 7(j).

14 MS. MEYER: 7(j), yes.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Board information.

16 MR. MUNSON: Yeah. And that's why I think I
17 missed it, too. Thank you.

18 MR. OTTERSTROM: So it's in there. One of the
19 reasons why we are targeting to move fast with the change, we
20 also wanted to get the public input. So last week we gave
21 you a draft of that information.

22 MR. MUNSON: Okay, you answered my question. Thank
23 you.

24 MR. OTTERSTROM: Okay.

25 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: Yes, Mr. Richard.

1 MR. RICHARD: Thanks for the presentation as well.

2 A couple of questions.

3 One, the business park along Highway 2, you'd
4 indicated at one point that was an option as to whether to
5 discontinue that. And I didn't quite follow you to the end.
6 In terms of the end result of your input you decided to
7 provide constant traffic to the casino, but at one point I
8 thought I heard you saying that would come at the expense of
9 losing that industrial park route. Were you able to keep
10 that in or has that been eliminated?

11 MR. OTTERSTROM: So this is what we're proposing
12 here --

13 MR. RICHARD: The West Spokane Industrial --

14 MR. OTTERSTROM: The West Spokane Industrial Park
15 is on the top center, a little more in the center, just
16 northwest of the compass in the middle. That would be on
17 select trips. The same select trips as today.

18 MR. RICHARD: Okay.

19 MR. OTTERSTROM: So it wouldn't be an increase of
20 service, but it would be a status quo.

21 MR. RICHARD: Good.

22 MR. OTTERSTROM: Whereas the Northern Quest Casino,
23 we would be hitting it on every trip. During nights and
24 weekends we actually already do it on all trips, so it's
25 something we can accommodate in the schedule. And that's

45

1 something we've responded to in our proposal based on the fee
2 fact we've had. I think we feel pretty satisfied in taking
3 that in.

4 MR. RICHARD: Okay. Better collect their fee
5 before they go into the casino?

6 The other question is on the other business park
7 you had talked, the airport business park.

8 MR. OTTERSTROM: Yes.

9 MR. RICHARD: About a discontinuation. I can't
10 recall now if it's the Medical Lake route. Discontinuation
11 of service to the business park and then also, if I heard you
12 right, to the airport, and I'm not sure if it was the same
13 route, on nights and weekends. And I'm wondering, you
14 obviously indicate you don't think there will be an impact on
15 ridership, so I would have to assume that there's not much
16 traffic flow during that time?

17 MR. OTTERSTROM: I apologize for the confusion.
18 Today we don't serve the airport business park on nights and
19 weekends.

20 MR. RICHARD: Okay.

21 MR. OTTERSTROM: So this proposal, basically taking
22 Flight Line to Spotted and then back down, providing a loop
23 around that area would be provided later in the evening with
24 return trips after more like 7:00 and on the weekends.

25 MR. RICHARD: Okay.

1 MR. OTTERSTROM: Whereas today we do not serve that
2 at all on nights and weekends.

3 MR. RICHARD: All right.

4 MR. OTTERSTROM: The loss of service is on Geiger
5 Boulevard.

6 MR. RICHARD: Okay. Are there folks working in
7 that business park at night and on weekends?

8 MR. OTTERSTROM: That we don't know, but there are
9 people -- there's actually a trailer park. One of our bigger
10 reasons we have ridership in that area --

11 MR. RICHARD: Good.

12 MR. OTTERSTROM: -- is there's a trailer park just
13 south of -- I don't know if you can see that where the "R"
14 and "K" is actually on top -- underneath that "R" and "K"
15 there was about 20 riders a day that come from that area.

16 MR. RICHARD: Okay. So we'll either maintain -- or
17 actually enhance the service to them?

18 MR. OTTERSTROM: It's a slight reduction in
19 frequency, but the span is greater than today's.

20 MR. RICHARD: Right.

21 MR. OTTERSTROM: Seven days a week is something
22 they can plan their lives around, rather than just part time.

23 MR. RICHARD: One last comment. I appreciate the
24 outreach on the postcards. Many people, however, don't have
25 access to the internet, so I'm wondering did we -- or if we

47

1 didn't, could we next time contemplate providing some sort of
2 a voice mail where they could leave a message or something?

3 MR. OTTERSTROM: I skimmed over that. Actually we
4 put a phone number on the back of this, and we said either go
5 on the web site or call this number. And we sent out, I
6 believe, 96 packets.

7 MR. RICHARD: Okay.

8 MR. OTTERSTROM: And we got 33 of them back. What
9 I didn't say, and it should be in your information, actually
10 what we saw, the people that responded by paper were the
11 majority had VIP passes. So they're on -- they're disabled
12 seniors, what have you. And what the response, besides that
13 point, were generally the same in terms of their -- the
14 majority, favoring the majority of the service changes, with
15 the exceptions of some of the changes in Medical Lake.

16 MR. RICHARD: Great. Thank you. Well done.

17 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: Mr. Pederson?

18 MR. PEDERSON: Yes. I have quite a list of
19 questions.

20 MR. OTTERSTROM: Great.

21 MR. PEDERSON: First of all, in regards to the City
22 of Cheney. Are there any route changes or what are we
23 looking at with the City of Cheney?

24 MR. OTTERSTROM: So we did not look at Cheney at
25 all in this change. We actually had a fair amount of

48

1 feedback from people in Cheney, Medical Lake and Airway
2 Heights saying, gee, it would be really nice if we could get
3 between our communities better. And we have done some
4 brainstorming prior to this, but it initiated more
5 brainstorming.

6 What it comes down to is some of the infrastructure
7 that needs to be there, particularly we believe a good way to
8 do that would be to have buses coming on and off the
9 highway -- the Cheney bus in particular, off at Highway 92
10 and I-90 interchange, but we don't have the ability today to
11 either turn around a bus or even pick up passengers based on
12 the infrastructure and the roads without severely delaying
13 people on the Cheney bus.

14 However, we are very interested in making that
15 happen because there are some real advantages connecting all
16 three of those cities, Medical Lake, Cheney and Hayford Road
17 basically goes straight up from that interchange. And so we
18 see that as a great opportunity. And these changes now, with
19 the timing as well as the costs, we're looking at what can we
20 do short term versus a longer term? And I think longer term
21 we have some concepts that we'll take out to the community in
22 the future.

23 MR. PEDERSON: Okay. I do know the conductivity
24 between the three cities on the West Plains is an issue.
25 Now, you have folks who are employed at -- there are some

1 major employers out there, whether they be Fairchild Air
2 Force Base, Eastern Washington University, Northern Quest
3 Casino or Airway Heights Correction Center. So they
4 generally tend to reside nearby, and each one of those
5 cities, depending on the job site, are attractive to them.
6 But as ridership has increased over the last number of months
7 and years with varying factors, you know, being gas and other
8 transportation needs, you know, I'm talking to more and more
9 people in that area that are utilizing the bus and other
10 modes of transportation more frequently. So I echo that
11 sentiment that you brought up.

12 My next question is service to Fairchild Air Force
13 Base. I didn't see a mention of Fairchild in the past. You
14 know, post 9/11 bus service to Fairchild had decreased mainly
15 because of the accessibility to the Base. So could you talk
16 a little bit about the needs of Fairchild Air Force Base and
17 how this proposal fits into that?

18 MR. OTTERSTROM: This remains it at status quo.
19 That is we -- on select trips we go into the Base, and other
20 trips we simply go to the gate. In general, all the trips we
21 go to the gate at least, and about nine trips a day we go
22 inside the Base.

23 Those trips that go in the Base generally we
24 only -- the ridership is very limited to work shifts, and in
25 the morning, the afternoon at the far end of the Base. And

1 so we haven't seen the ridership we'd like to see. One of
2 the challenges when we put more trips in there it's very
3 tight on the schedule. And there's liability issues because
4 when there are issues with security, basically all passengers
5 that aren't going to the Base actually all the time have to
6 get off the bus if they're trying to go elsewhere, and get
7 back on. And sometimes the bus can get -- if there's a
8 lockdown the bus is stuck on the Base.

9 So we're not proposing to increase that because it
10 is a risk to the reliability of the system, as well as having
11 the ridership. However, I think as we spend more time there
12 will be an opportunity to address this when we talk about
13 further connectivity in the West Plains.

14 MR. MEYER: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to add that
15 Fairchild has quite a number of van pools.

16 MR. PEDERSON: That was one of my questions. Have
17 we had any input from Fairchild Air Force Base on this issue?

18 MR. OTTERSTROM: As far as we know, we did plaster
19 Fairchild Air Force Base with all the information everybody
20 else has. We have not -- because we didn't propose any
21 changes, we've not at this point directly contacted saying
22 this is what we'd like to do. But we haven't got any
23 feedback from them of any interest on this, specifically from
24 somebody -- I think there's maybe one input in the survey of
25 the 160 people that lived on the Fairchild Air Force Base.

51

1 So very minimal.

2 MR. PEDERSON: Have we reached out directly to
3 Fairchild staff and asked their needs, if they've changed at
4 all, or are we just relying solely on the survey?

5 MR. OTTERSTROM: We have not, but we -- it's merely
6 a matter of timing, but we do intend to do that. Especially
7 as we talk about other ways to improve service in the West
8 Plains, in the near, very near future. In fact, I told
9 somebody today to call. So we're working on it.

10 MR. PEDERSON: Okay. Now, as I mentioned earlier,
11 Airway Heights Correction Center, you talked about the
12 increased ridership with Northern Quest Casino and increased
13 service. Now, with Airway Heights Corrections in the close
14 proximity -- and I'm not certain of the status with the
15 corrections center -- are we servicing directly to the
16 correction center nowadays or on --

17 MR. OTTERSTROM: On select trips.

18 MR. PEDERSON: On select trips. How frequent are
19 those?

20 MR. OTTERSTROM: I would have to pull my schedule.
21 (Inaudible comment.)

22 MR. PEDERSON: Thank you. That's my assumption.
23 Sorry, but -- because, again, yes, I do hear from folks who
24 work at Airway Heights Corrections. And outside of those
25 that were employed there, there are a number of individuals

52

1 that use the bus service for visitation times. And I've
2 noticed that there's an increasing number of folks who are
3 walking from Northern Quest Casino to Airway Heights
4 Correction Center, whether they be employees or those who I
5 would assume are there to visit family, utilizing a very
6 unsafe pedestrian corridor of Sprague Avenue. It has not
7 been designed for that purpose, so by putting them in that
8 situation, I believe, it's created some issues with
9 pedestrian safety.

10 I also understand that part of that is by design of
11 the corrections department, Department of Corrections, and
12 we're not in full control of the bus times, I guess, if you
13 would, or are we?

14 MR. OTTERSTROM: I don't know whether we -- why we
15 wouldn't be. I mean the only thing by design would be that
16 the facility -- now development is creeping around and it's
17 more feasible to contemplate full-time service there. But
18 the only thing by design was that it was placed somewhere
19 that's off the beaten path, if you will, from a routing
20 standpoint rather than, say, on Highway 2 or south of the
21 casino.

22 MR. PEDERSON: But if you're going to have one of
23 these facilities, you're not going to stick it in your
24 neighborhood.

25 MR. OTTERSTROM: Well, that's very true.

1 MR. PEDERSON: It would be nice if it was a little
2 further out of the way, but that's a personal issue.

3 Moving on beyond that, Medical Lake. Medical Lake
4 has had an issue for a number of years with the lack of STA
5 service. We hear most frequently about the service to those
6 hospitals. The employees in the past used to be able to rely
7 upon STA service much more heavily than they do today. And
8 it's -- I believe it's increased over the last maybe five
9 years. But looking beyond that, there was at one time a
10 significant cut to service to those facilities. And beyond
11 the, beyond the employees there's also residents of certain
12 facilities that utilize the bus service heavily in years past
13 again much more frequently. But due to the fact that those
14 bus routes are no longer available it makes it very
15 difficult.

16 Now, Medical Lake is a community that outside of
17 the facility that I'm speaking of, the commercial aspect or
18 the commercial sector is not as vibrant as it once was, which
19 does not create the necessity for continuous service. But
20 it's also a community that has grown substantially over a
21 number of years on the residential sector that has really
22 limited the ability for youth, for one, to access the bus
23 system due to a lack of service. But I also understand that
24 there's really no easy fix, as we've heard from the City of
25 Medical Lake a number of times. And unfortunately due to the

54

1 window between when the survey went out to when it was
2 completed to today, moving along very quickly, I've not
3 personally had a chance to sit down with City of Medical Lake
4 officials and talk about their need for service. But going
5 on past experiences and past conversations, I believe I have
6 a good general understanding of what their experiences have
7 been and what the needs have been in the past, but I can't
8 say that it definitely fits today. So I would like the
9 opportunity to be able to follow up with both them and the
10 City of Cheney before moving on with an action.

11 But with those services, the service to the
12 hospitals, you mentioned the night shift and having a low
13 ridership. When you say the night shift, are you talking
14 about the swing shift or the late-night shift, which I
15 believe starts about 11:00? It's like 11:00 to 7:00?

16 MR. OTTERSTROM: 11:00 to 6:30, 7:00, yes.

17 MR. PEDERSON: Okay. So you're having issues
18 filling those buses or --

19 MR. OTTERSTROM: Zero to one passenger on one of
20 the surveys we've done.

21 MR. PEDERSON: And how frequently do we make a bus
22 available?

23 MR. OTTERSTROM: So how we've -- the service in
24 Medical Lake, if I could just back up one step. The Route
25 62, as far as I can tell, let's say ten years ago, it was

1 strictly geared towards the hospital shifts. And the -- if
2 you go to page 12 of this report there's a chart here --

3 MR. PEDERSON: Is that this one here, or is it the
4 one on 7(j)?

5 MR. OTTERSTROM: The new one in your gray folder.
6 So this was additive based on the more data we pulled in the
7 last week.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It says final on the front.

9 MR. OTTERSTROM: Yes.

10 MR. PEDERSON: What's that, sir?

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It says final on the front.

12 MR. PEDERSON: Okay, that's the one I'm looking
13 for.

14 MR. OTTERSTROM: On page 12 we show how we serve
15 shifts today. So if you look at the top, these are shift
16 times based on my communications with the Employee
17 Transportation Coordinator at the hospitals. These shifts
18 historically -- see that there's green, yellow and red.
19 Green means we serve the going and the coming away from that
20 shift. Yellow means we only serve it one way, which really
21 doesn't do anybody any good.

22 MR. PEDERSON: I'm sorry. On mine it's either
23 dark gray or light gray.

24 MR. OTTERSTROM: I'm sorry.

25 MR. PEDERSON: Sorry, if there's more than --

56

1 MR. OTTERSTROM: I didn't realize it was black and
2 white. I thought it was color.

3 So the weekday is all green today. And Saturday
4 is -- we serve the day shift. And then basically all other
5 shifts on the night, Sunday and swing shift on the weekends
6 we do not serve, either because we don't serve in both
7 direction or one direction only.

8 So if you see here, we show also the existing
9 ridership. And it fluctuates because it's based on either
10 going or coming. And you see that the shifts that are
11 daytime shifts, they have 11 to 25 passengers going to the
12 hospitals or coming from the hospitals. And then five to
13 eight on the swing shift. Saturday it's about 11 to 12. And
14 then those other times in yellow, or the night shift we serve
15 on the weekends, it's very, very low.

16 Now, if -- those are -- that's how the route was
17 set up initially to serve all of those shifts. Strictly
18 that's what it was. There was another route that was every
19 hour that came from Fairchild Air Force Base in Airway
20 Heights that was every hour that also served all the
21 hospitals. We combined the two, but we cut some of the
22 weekend service that made it more difficult for people to use
23 a bus consistently because of working different days on a
24 weekday.

25 What we're proposing here because of low ridership

57

1 on those either swing shifts or the weekend night shifts, and
2 they have the night shift on the weekdays is to serve the
3 weekday shifts that aren't -- where we do see the ridership
4 today. And I should say one of the reasons that night shift
5 is so hard to serve is because the rest of our service, of
6 our system, is not operating very much. There's no bus to
7 connect to downtown at 10:40. You have to sit around the
8 Plaza for a half hour. And so it really is less useful for
9 anybody. So we're proposing to cut that trip. We'd still
10 serve the inbound trip for the people coming home from swing
11 shift. And we do that by actually adding a trip to the Route
12 61 at 10:22 at night and then bringing it back from Medical
13 Lake inbound.

14 So there's little things in the schedule, not
15 details we've put in here, but we're trying to maximize the
16 benefit to these communities while at the same time looking
17 at the ridership we do have to the hospitals. We exploit
18 this to maximize the benefit, but at the same time reduce the
19 cost for trips and shifts we're not serving today very well,
20 and we don't expect an increase of ridership.

21 MR. PEDERSON: Thank you. Now, outside the
22 hospitals, the City of Medical Lake again with a growing
23 population, and we've heard from one representative speaking
24 of the needs of citizens in Medical Lake, did you mention
25 that there was a letter or --

1 MR. OTTERSTROM: Petition.

2 MR. PEDERSON: Petition.

3 MR. OTTERSTROM: In your gray folder there's a --

4 MR. PEDERSON: Okay, here we go. Okay. And what
5 this -- could you touch briefly on what the goal of this
6 petition was and what request -- it looks like we're talking
7 about Campbell Grant?

8 MR. OTTERSTROM: This first map here we proposed to
9 delete all the service basically east of the Medical Lake
10 Transit Center within the City of Medical Lake. There is
11 this little loop on the end of that loop where essentially
12 what it does is, for no other purpose it appears, but it does
13 serve an important purpose of putting a bus stop right in
14 front of a retirement home. We get about six to even
15 boardings a day. And what we proposed initially was to
16 eliminate this entire loop. The concern, they have two
17 concerns in that petition. One was this is far too far for
18 us to walk to downtown -- to the Medical Lake Transit Center.
19 And, second, we don't want to be inconvenienced by this
20 travel time in the airport business park.

21 So the final recommendation is to bring -- continue
22 that service all the way to Prentiss Street, which is about
23 600 feet away, where there's an elementary school there. And
24 rather than having those people with their concern about
25 added travel time, instead of adding travel time to the

59

1 already long travel time these people spend, if they want to
2 be coming from that bus they spend 20 minutes on the bus
3 circling through the hospitals before they start getting on
4 the highway to go to Spokane.

5 MR. PEDERSON: I've been on that bus. I know
6 exactly what you mean.

7 MR. OTTERSTROM: So we'd like to take those trips
8 that aren't associated with the shift and allow these people
9 to save 20 minutes and add five minutes for a total reduction
10 of 15-minute service. However, we are still recommending
11 moving 600 feet over. And I think their concern probably
12 still stays the same. I think they enjoy the stop where it
13 is, but we feel this is a good compromise. We still serve
14 that area within walking distance, while still allowing us to
15 serve the airport business park, and have them have a fast
16 trip.

17 MR. PEDERSON: Okay. So outside the relocation of
18 one bus stop, are we going to see any other service changes
19 within the City of Medical Lake?

20 MR. OTTERSTROM: No. The only change would be more
21 trips. These changes, it is actually -- it does cost
22 something, but we're saving some resources elsewhere because
23 of the airport and the efficiency with Route 40, but we are
24 adding a morning trip, an extra morning trip, and then right
25 now the last trip -- we have a trip at 5:12 p.m. to Medical

60

1 Lake. And if you want to get off at this downtown area you
2 have to go all the way through the hospitals then you get
3 into downtown Medical Lake. And then there's no more trips
4 until 9:57 p.m. So we're proposing to have a 4:57 p.m. trip,
5 a 5:27 p.m. trip, and a 7:22 p.m. trip.

6 So we feel -- that's one of the other concerns that
7 we heard a lot of people saying, if you move -- add service,
8 increase travel time, I'm not going to be able to make my
9 transfer and then I have to sit around here for five hours.
10 Well, we looked at where people are transferring from, and we
11 feel that actually the people at 5:12 p.m., most of them are
12 sitting around for 20 minutes to get that bus if they are
13 transferring. So moving that a little earlier and then
14 having the trip at basically 5:30 allows them to be able to
15 get in from a lot of other routes, including Route 25, Route
16 24, the 90, which are where we see a lot of the people coming
17 from to catch the Medical Lake bus.

18 So there are those benefits and those changes to
19 the service.

20 MR. PEDERSON: I'm going to go back to my notes
21 here. Thank you for that.

22 Moving out to Geiger Boulevard. We discussed a bus
23 stop on Geiger Boulevard or a lack thereof, I guess it would
24 be. Is that what the case was?

25 MR. OTTERSTROM: We're proposing to eliminate

61

1 service from Grove Road to Sunset Boulevard on Geiger
2 Boulevard.

3 MR. PEDERSON: To Grove, okay.

4 MR. OTTERSTROM: So it's a little over a mile.
5 There is the Waste to Energy Plant. There's a small mobile
6 home park of about eight or nine trailers, and some
7 businesses that are closer to Sunset Boulevard. And then
8 there's a lot of empty space.

9 MR. PEDERSON: Of course. So then you're
10 discussing in the area of Allied Trailer, Washington State
11 Patrol on the south side of Geiger Boulevard, Waste to Energy
12 on the north side, and then you have --

13 MR. OTTERSTROM: We're serving Grove Road --

14 MR. PEDERSON: -- a gap between Sunset Boulevard
15 and those businesses which are closer to -- would it be
16 Spotted where the --

17 MR. OTTERSTROM: There's Grove Road and Spotted.
18 So we've come off the freeway at Grove Road, and then
19 essentially feeds into Spotted. So the State Patrol, a lot
20 of those facilities are right around the interchange. It's
21 the areas that we feel there's a segment closer to Sunset
22 Boulevard where we do see some ridership or basically where
23 Highway 2 comes over, there's no way to get onto Highway 2
24 from there. That area there we see about 20, 18 to 25, 30
25 daily riders.

62

1 MR. PEDERSON: And those are boarding on Sunset?

2 MR. OTTERSTROM: On Geiger Boulevard today.

3 MR. PEDERSON: On Geiger, okay.

4 MR. OTTERSTROM: So those people, there's some
5 limited businesses on that stretch through there. The part
6 closer to Grove Road interchange, Spotted Road, that area
7 we're basically serving with -- right now only during the
8 daytime. We had nights and weekends, but less frequency than
9 today.

10 MR. PEDERSON: Okay. So right there at the Geiger
11 interchange I believe there's a stop currently near the
12 Flying J, Denny's area. That stop will be maintained?

13 MR. OTTERSTROM: We will still be serving that
14 area. I can't say -- I'm quite sure we're still at that
15 stop. If anything changes, it's just across the street.

16 MR. PEDERSON: Okay. Now, the folks -- and I'm
17 sorry if I'm going too far into detail here. The folks at
18 the U.S. Postal Service Annex, are we seeing some ridership
19 there or are we servicing that area?

20 MR. OTTERSTROM: We are servicing about 16 a day.
21 It's not significant. When you add all this loop up there is
22 about 50 a day. Which to give you some perspective, we have
23 about 90 a day today on the hospitals out of Medical Lake.
24 So it is a healthy ridership, so when we serve all three or
25 four points on here near Geiger, the USPS, and the Flying J,

63

1 we come up with something that does make sense to continue
2 serving. But we feel that the Geiger Boulevard section
3 itself from that interchange over to, you know, past the
4 Waste to Energy Plant, there's really not a lot of activity.

5 MR. PEDERSON: I'm very familiar with that sector.
6 So to sum it up, we're really looking at the impact only
7 being there on Geiger Boulevard. All of the services will
8 remain the same or --

9 MR. OTTERSTROM: So Geiger Boulevard, the only --
10 in summary, the only places that lose service that would have
11 any issues would be on Geiger Boulevard east of that
12 interchange. And then this stop which is in walking
13 distance. Although we understand it's difficult for many
14 people to walk two blocks in the snow and ice. But those two
15 areas are the areas that we're basically pulling service out
16 of.

17 MR. PEDERSON: Okay. Well, I believe that sums up
18 my questions for the evening. Again, I would like the
19 opportunity to be able to touch base with the small cities
20 that I represent on the West Plains that are impacted, but
21 that's it for today.

22 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: Thank you very much.

23 Ms. Mager?

24 MS. MAGER: The only question I had is on the
25 Cannon and -- well, actually on all the routes. Once the

64

1 changes are made, if we pass this, what's the plan for
2 tracking the ridership and comparing it to what was previous?

3 MR. OTTERSTROM: Well, we track ridership in two
4 basic ways. One is by the farebox. And we have that on a
5 daily basis. That data isn't stop level, so we can say this
6 new Route 60, you know, after a week's implementation we
7 could say this is what we're looking at.

8 We also do surveys every day. We have people,
9 part-timers and some of our -- a data technician counting bus
10 ridership today. We could focus more heavily on those trips.
11 We survey over, I want to say, about 8,000 trips a year. So
12 out of all 300,000 bus trips we provide a year, I don't know
13 what the number is, but it's a lot of bus trips. And we're
14 surveying a segment of those, so we actually have stop level
15 data. So we'll be able to see the changes.

16 MR. MAGER: So will there be a focus, though, on
17 looking at that to see what the change has provided or not?

18 MR. OTTERSTROM: We certainly will because we want
19 to be able to say this has worked for the betterment of this
20 community.

21 MS. MAGER: All right. Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: By the changes in the Valley, I
23 know that they gave really good specific data as we began to
24 make those changes.

25 MS. MAGER: Okay.

1 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: Any other questions?

2 MR. RICHARD: Just one other questions. Did we
3 consult with the drivers on this proposal? And did they give
4 comment and generally support or --

5 MR. OTTERSTROM: The only comment we actually
6 received from drivers is, the last I knew, concern about
7 cutting service east of the Medical Lake Transit Center.
8 And, specifically, that stop at Grant Street. Generally, we
9 haven't heard anything else from drivers. They also --

10 MR. RICHARD: Did they support eliminating that,
11 or --

12 MR. OTTERSTROM: They did not support it.

13 MR. RICHARD: Did not.

14 MR. OTTERSTROM: They were concerned about it.

15 MR. RICHARD: Okay.

16 MR. PEDERSON: Sorry, I said I wouldn't ask any
17 more questions.

18 What specifically were the concerns of the drivers?

19 MR. OTTERSTROM: Was essentially the same as the
20 residents of that community, that moving the bus stop. And
21 when she expressed her concerns it was still -- the proposal
22 was basically to move the stop all the way to the Transit
23 Center, which is more than a half mile. And so she wrote it
24 with that situation in mind, but she was concerned about the
25 elderly people, the senior citizens and disabled that live in

1 that particular complex.

2 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: Okay. Any other questions?

3 Okay, thank you very much, Karl. And I would like
4 to -- Mr. Pederson, obviously a lot of questions, a lot of
5 time involved in it, but I take that as a real compliment.
6 You were here to represent the small cities, and I know that
7 myself if we were dealing with issues related to the Valley's
8 situation and the roots there, Mr. Munson and I would
9 hopefully be able to bring those forward. So I really
10 commend you in being prepared to ask those questions of your
11 constituents.

12 With that we will continue on the actual public
13 hearing. I have one person who is signed up, Bonnie Stewart,
14 to comment on the proposed September service changes. So
15 thank you for waiting.

16 MS. STEWART: Good evening. I'm Bonnie Stewart. I
17 live at 2227 West Fourth Avenue, which is in Browne's
18 Addition. Unfortunately, I don't see anyone here from the
19 Parks Department, and maybe my comments are more geared
20 towards them.

21 I'm here this evening to comment on relocating of
22 the coach stop or the bus shelter to the southwest corner of
23 Coeur d'Alene Park on Fourth Avenue. A year ago I purchased
24 a cooperative housing unit in Victor Manor. This building
25 sits on the northwest corner of Fourth and Spruce, which is

67

1 directly across from the proposed relocation of the bus
2 shelter. Victor Manor was established as a cooperative
3 housing unit in 1949. The structure appears to be a
4 two-and-a-half story apartment building but, in fact, the
5 units are purchased and are permanent homes to the people
6 that live there.

7 One of my prime reasons for purchasing the unit was
8 the incredible view of Coeur d'Alene Park. I'm afraid if the
9 bus shelter is relocated directly across from Victor Manor it
10 will block the views of the park. This shelter is an
11 open-air look, but the roof is large and quite expansive.

12 So I would respectfully request that if it's
13 necessary to move this coach stop that it be snugged up as
14 close as possible to the southwest corner of the park so that
15 it minimizes the obstruction of the park views.

16 That's all I have. Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: Any questions?

18 And duly noted, Karl, you'll take those comments to
19 mind.

20 Sir, I did not get your name but would you like to
21 make the comments that you made earlier so that it is on the
22 record as part of the public testimony here?

23 MR. LAIRD: Yes. I'm Archie Laird. I live at 121
24 South Walker in Medical Lake.

25 I was one of them that got the petition going for

68

1 the gamble grant loop.

2 There's a lot of people that lives in that complex.
3 Maybe we only have two or three or four on a bus ride, but
4 those people depend on the Spokane Transit to go to doctors,
5 to go grocery shopping, for their entertainment. And even to
6 move it the three -- or two blocks will make a hardship on
7 them. There's no sidewalk on Campbell, or one of those
8 blocks at all. And some of them cannot walk even two blocks.

9 Otherwise, I think the route plan is really good
10 for Medical Lake and for the Transit people. I thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: Again, thank you very much.

12 MS. MAGER: I just have one question.

13 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: Please.

14 MS. MAGER: Would you be -- do you feel like if
15 this goes in then you would be transferring to the
16 paratransit service or --

17 MR. LAIRD: There is quite a few of them that
18 probably would.

19 MS. MAGER: Okay, thank you.

20 MR. LAIRD: I wouldn't be because I've got my
21 chair, so I can get on the regular bus.

22 MS. MAGER: Okay. And you're okay even in the
23 snow?

24 MR. LAIRD: Yeah.

25 MS. MAGER: Okay, thank you.

1 MR. LAIRD: Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: Okay, with that anybody else in
3 the audience wish to comment on the proposed September
4 service changes?

5 MS. FOLLAND: My name is Diane Folland (phonetic).
6 I'm the ETC for Airway Heights Correction Center. And I only
7 knew of this hearing because I spotted it in the paper. The
8 survey that came out to the ETCs of the West Plains was
9 forwarded to me by the ETC at Pine Lodge, so we didn't even
10 have much of an opportunity to respond to it.

11 About ten years ago we had probably 12 riders. And
12 at that time we had maybe 400 employees. And through the
13 different shift changes or schedule changes of the routes
14 we're down to maybe three. It gets there at 6:38 in the
15 morning, 7:38 and 8:38. So you're either 50 minutes ahead of
16 time for your shift or you're ten minutes late, and you still
17 have to clear the slider. Then it leaves at 4:30 and 5:30,
18 so you're sitting around waiting for half an hour and
19 whatever.

20 Like he said, we have people coming down from the
21 casino, walking down there, dragging little kids to come to
22 visiting. I've sent letters in the past. You know, you're
23 hitting the casino every hour and it's only a five-minute
24 loop to come down there. We've got people walking down
25 Sprague Road dragging little kids to come to visiting. We

70

1 have visiting on the weekends that the public would probably
2 be able to use, if we were to hit the facility on the
3 weekends, in the -- if someone gets dropped off for visiting,
4 I think we've seen several people get on the 4:30 bus to come
5 back into town. So I know our visitors are using the return
6 trip.

7 But my concern, my initial concern was how the
8 connection changes would be. If I were to -- if you're going
9 to be going through Browne's Addition, does that mean I would
10 have to make my connection earlier or be even later to work?
11 That was my initial concern, but it would be nice if they
12 would try to work -- we've got 25 different shift schedules
13 pretty much, but it would be nice if we could hit some of
14 them.

15 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: Any particular questions?

16 Karl, have you had any direct communication with
17 Geiger?

18 MR. OTTERSTROM: Unfortunately, not.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Airway Heights Correction.

20 MS. FOLLAND: Uh-huh.

21 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: I'm sorry, yes, Airway Heights.
22 Thank you. I've got to remember that.

23 MR. OTTERSTROM: I apologize that the ETC wasn't
24 (inaudible).

25 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: Okay. Well, this is an

71

1 opportunity. Again, this is not going to come before us
2 again for another month, so if there is an opportunity for a
3 direct connection it would probably be appreciated by both
4 parties. Okay.

5 MS. FOLLAND: Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN DENENNY: Thank you very much for your
7 testimony.

8 Again, anybody else wish to come forward and
9 testify on behalf of the proposed September service changes?

10 Again I will ask, anybody in the audience wishes to
11 testify at this public hearing, proposed September service
12 changes?

13 Third request, proposed September service changes,
14 any testimony from anybody in the audience?

15 Hearing none, we will close the public hearing at
16 7:18.

17 (Public Hearing concluded at 7:18 p.m.)

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 STATE OF WASHINGTON)
) ss: Certificate
2 COUNTY OF SPOKANE)

3

4 I, Terry Sublette, Notary Public in and for the State of
5 Washington;

6 DO HEREBY CERTIFY:

7 That the foregoing is a true and correct transcription
8 of the recording of the Public Hearing on the date and at the
9 time and place as shown on page one hereto;

10 That I am not related to any of the parties to this
11 litigation and have no interest in the outcome of said
12 matter;

13 Witness my hand and seal this 2nd day of July, 2009.

14

15

16

Notary Public in and for the State
of Washington, residing in Valleyford
My commission expires: 8/22/10

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

73

SUBLETTE AUDIO/VIDEO, et al.
South 169 Stevens, Spokane, Washington 99201
(509) 928-1217 - Fax (509)291-5762