



# Central City Line

## Steering Committee Meeting #3

\*Special Meeting\* UPDATED  
 Tuesday, March 29, 2016 | 1 –2:30PM  
**Spokane Convention Center, Room 302A**  
**334 West Spokane Falls Boulevard**



**Meeting Purpose:**

Conclude downtown alignment evaluation to develop a recommendation for a single alignment, clarify vehicle mode, provide small starts grant updates, review initial strategic overlay plan policy recommendations, and other project development efforts

**Agenda**

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Lead</b>
2 min	<b>Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review</b>	Amber Waldref, Chair
5 min	<b>Public Expressions</b>	Amber Waldref, Chair
3 min	<b>Administrative Tasks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approval of February Meeting Minutes</li> </ul>	Amber Waldref, Chair
5 min	<b>Project Development Update</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stations and Stop Locations</li> <li>• NEPA/SEPA Documentation</li> <li>• Vehicle and Power</li> </ul>	Don Skillingstad, STA
50 min	<b>Downtown Alignment Alternatives</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision Process</li> <li>• Downtown Alignment Outreach</li> <li>• Recap Last Meeting</li> <li>• Two-Way Main Avenue</li> <li>• Spokane Falls Boulevard</li> <li>• Riverside Avenue</li> <li>• Select Preferred Downtown Alignment</li> </ul>	Karl Otterstrom, STA Catherine Ciarlo, CH2M Randy Knapick, IBI Group
5 min	<b>Vehicle and Power</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vehicle Options and Mode Refinement</li> </ul>	Randy Knapick, IBI Group Karl Otterstrom, STA
5 min	<b>Steering Committee Recommendation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vehicle and Downtown Alignment Refinement</li> </ul>	Amber Waldref, Chair
5 min	<b>Small Starts Grant Update</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ridership/Cost – Warrants Approach</li> <li>• Financial Plan Strategies</li> </ul>	Randy Knapick, IBI Group
5 min	<b>Strategic Overlay Plan</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summarize Public Process &amp; Takeaways</li> <li>• Share Initial Policy Recommendations</li> </ul>	Kathleen Weinand, STA Catherine Ciarlo, CH2M
5 min	<b>Next Meeting Target</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ First week of May</li> </ul>	Karl Otterstrom

**Documents/Files Distributed**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>File/Document Name</b>
03/22/16	Email	CCL - SC Mtg 3 Packet.pdf

**CENTRAL CITY LINE STEERING COMMITTEE**

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

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

**MEMBERS/ALTERNATES PRESENT**

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

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

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

**STAFF PRESENT**

Karl Otterstrom, Director of Planning (Secretary)  
Kathleen Weinand, Transit Planner  
Don Skillingstad, Capital Projects Manager  
Brandon Rapez-Betty, Senior Communications Specialist

**CONSULTANTS/GUESTS**

Mark Brower, CH2M  
Catherine Ciarlo, CH2M  
Ryan Farncomb, CH2M  
Lindsay Gilbert, CH2M  
Randy Knapick, IBI Group, Inc.  
Andrew Warlock, City of Spokane  
Paul Kropp, Citizen

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

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

**2. PUBLIC EXPRESSIONS**

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

**3. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS**

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

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

**4. DOWNTOWN ALIGNMENT ALTERNATIVES**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Chair Waldref recognized members that had joined the meeting.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**6. SMALL STARTS GRANT UPDATES**

No discussion

**7. STRATEGIC OVERLAY PLAN**

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

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

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

**8. NEXT MEETING DATE**

Chair Waldref asked when the next meeting would be.

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

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

**9. ADJOURN**

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Karl Otterstrom, Director of Planning  
Steering Committee Secretary

## Central City Line Brown Bag Discussion Summaries

Brown bag discussion events were held on Jan, 25, 26 and 27, 2016, at several locations throughout downtown Spokane. Five (5) downtown alignment options were presented to the participants in which they were asked to provide comments on the advantages and disadvantages of each option and provide any comments or questions they may have for each. The following is a summary of comments received by the public.

\*The numbers beside the comment indicate the number of times that general comment was provided for each alignment.

	#	Advantages	#	Disadvantages	#	Comments
General Consensus		Provides better visibility to businesses, provides more service, provides more development potential, eases traffic concerns		Increased congestion on Riverside, does not serve the convention center, Riverfront Park or hotels; increased number of stations		
Alignment #1 WB Riverside/EB Main		Like visibility of two streets		Bus congestion on Riverside		Overlooks downtown highlights and convention center and park for example
		Reduces traffic on Spokane Falls Blvd		Too many turns		Would committing to this alignment prevent Main from becoming two way in the future? Is STA considering left turn conflicts for each route?
	2	Good for office workers on Riverside		Don't like the idea of eastbound being south of westbound		Does one alignment connect better to parking lots?
	3	<b>Would ease eastbound traffic on Riverside and wouldn't cause problems on eastbound Main Ave. Provides more exposure to businesses by out of town guests (traveling on two streets vs just one)</b>		OK but not as attractive as #3 and #5 due to not touching convention center, park, etc.		Stop at Riverpark Square?
		Main and Riverside will both have new transit routes	6	<b>Does not go past Riverfront Park, convention center, or Davenport Grand</b>		
		Central, serves greater downtown area; no changes in street signal and especially traffic flow	2	<b>Duplication of transit stops, road improvements</b>		
		Simple/clear route		Stops have to be built on multiple roads		
		Development potential		Conflicts with Riverside, especially since MLK will connect to Trent soon?		
				Return on Riverside does not use ex. concrete pavement - wrong side/direction		
				Adding another one way to downtown		
				Not convenient for convention center/hotels connection		
				Too far from Riverfront Park and convention center		
				No downtown shopping/restaurant access		
				Riverside too far from downtown core		
<b>Total Comments</b>		<b>9</b>		<b>15</b>		<b>5</b>

	# Advantages	# Disadvantages	# Comments
General Consensus	Prefer a two-way Main Ave, will benefit businesses, consolidates the number of stations (center stations), easy to use, all transit is on one street; minimize impacts to businesses and parking	Does not serve the convention center, INB or Riverfront Park, costly, change traffic flow on main may cause confusion	Will the City approve a two-way Main option, will there be stops at River park Square?
Alignment #2 WB/EB Main Ave	<p><b>6</b> Like Main going two-way This is my favorite. I like the idea of having a line between River Park Square and East Main Ave. If you can use the center lane here and noticeably reduce the routes along Riverside you could ease congestion caused by buses on what the city seems to be trying to make the major eastbound path from downtown  Like Main both directions  This is my preferred option; line of sight; access to more  One route; no walking</p> <p><b>3</b> Consolidation of stops, road improvements, aligns both directions on major shopping street The bus stations will be in one location unlike the other options and you only have one road to leave and come back to</p> <p><b>5</b> Single street route easier for starting and stopping at same location</p> <p><b>3</b> Appears to minimize distraction for existing business frontages Common stops on Main both directions looks efficient; great opportunity to get two-way back on Main  Main as a two way street is good; center stops reduce on-street parking impact; two directions on one street is easier for visitors to understand  I would like to see this approach; two way traffic on Main with angled parking  Two way Main is great for pedestrians  Two way on Main would maybe increase traffic for businesses on the street  Centrally located (to business core) in downtown Uses and breaks up large (four lane) street Two way Main equals simple to find and use Compromise between Spokane Falls and Riverside Two way Main option makes the most sense, most elegant, most economical; moves forward the cause to restore Main to a two way Pilot project on Main will help test the reduced land concept Two way on Main would (maybe) increase traffic for the business on that street</p>	<p><b>4</b> No direct access to park, INB or convention center Does not help convention center or Riverfront Park  Like the two way Main center island but the line needs to touch convention center, park, etc.  Too much for Main?  Could cause confusion changing from a one way  Changing street directions Added cost of central unload and signal revisions but should be carried by the city?</p> <p><b>3</b> Changing current traffic flow Requires expensive signal and roadway work to convert from one way to two way <b>Added cost of changing Main Ave. to two way</b></p> <p><b>2</b> Added congestion between Sprague and First on Post  Too far from the convention center  Too much congestion Post Street/Davenport  Misses too many attractions; problems on and off loading</p>	<p>Will this impact existing bike lane?  Would a street level significantly reduce cost burden for changing Main to two way?  Appears city is going ahead with Main and Division improvements now, does this impeded STA options?  <b>3</b> Will the city let this happen? It is centrally located but seems to have the most hurdles. How likely is it that Main can be changed to a two way? Second best option if two can be converted with the grant funds</p> <p><b>2</b> Stop at River Park Square?  Stop at River Park Square?  Funding  Double stations less expensive?</p>
<b>Total Comments</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>10</b>

	#	Advantages	#	Disadvantages	#	Comments
General Consensus		Serves the convention center, Riverfront Park, INB and other tourist destinations; addresses traffic concerns; and increases transit service		Increased cost due to a couplet, increased stations, limits service, reduces pedestrian traffic		Where is the stop at River Park Square;
Alignment #3 WB Spokane Falls/EB Main	3	Direct access to the park, INB, convention center	3	Leaves south half of downtown with limited access		Is potential for iner(?) use in Riverfront park the real driver or business
	12	Reduces load on Riverside, more access to park and convention center		Not as close access to Main and mall entrance		Any option on Riverside I see as a dead zone for visitors who don't know Spokane
		Good way to get people from INB/ convention center to River Park Square		Impact on Howard/Wall		Stop at River Park Square
	3	Like; includes convention center, park, plaza	2	The cost of geographically separate lines		
	12	I like how it spreads the traffic around two streets, close proximity to Spokane Falls Blvd and Main	2	Doesn't provide increase pedestrian traffic for Riverside and Ridpath area		
		Goes by Riverfront Park and convention center and Davenport Grand, all tourist destinations		Too many new stations because of the two roads being affected		
		I like directions of Spokane Falls and Main		Misses core of downtown business and area (redevelopment) to the south		
		Is my preferred, uses one ways but keeps them close, hits main attractions, park, convention center, Grand, mall, etc.	3	A stop at Spokane Falls and Main is already busy and scary with traffic		
		Provides more exposure to businesses to out of town guests; (travelling on two streets vs just one)		Skips a lot of business on Spokane Falls Blvd.		
		More visibility and more access to park		Not as efficient as two way Main awkward for pedestrians		
	2	Ties in to future park improvements with Spokane Falls Blvd./Main		Very few retail/late night shopping/eating options		
		Main and Spokane Falls Blvd. will both have routes				
		Maximizes routes on Howard and Wall				
		St. N/S no stops shown but I think it will be good for property values/development				
		Visitor access and exposure to our big amenities, park, opera house, convention center, river, hotels on Spokane Falls Blvd.				
		Convenient for convention center guests				
		Good for convention center delegates				
		Goes by park and convention center				
		Access to convention center and Davenport Grand				
		Looks like the best route of the options				
		The best for public transit for Spokane's most visited amenities (i.e. Riverfront Park, convention center, River Park Square, etc.)				
		Better flow and access to downtown for visitors and locals				
<b>Total Comments</b>		<b>21</b>		<b>11</b>		<b>3</b>

	#	Advantages	#	Disadvantages	#	Comments
General Consensus		Efficient and easy to use; will prompt development; consolidate improvements to one street, reducing cost		Does not serve the convention center, Riverfront Park, INB or River Park Square; increased traffic congestion		Where is the stop at River Park Square?
Alignment #4 WB/EB Riverside	4	Fast	12	Access to free parking		Potential for economic impact for business?
	2	Seems efficient with less impact on other streets		Too far from park, INB, convention center, mall		Too simple; will want to expand after
	2	Will prompt development of retail on Riverside		Bus congestion on Riverside		Future traffic flow on Riverside?
	2	Consolidation of street improvements but not stops; can save some money vs improving two streets		Too far from River Park Square and park		Stop at River Park Square?
		Existing central two way arterial takes advantage of that		Worry about increase congestion on Riverside with city plans for MLK Blvd		Don't majority of bus routes already run on Riverside?
		I like option #2, one station location per stop along one road		Congestion on Riverside?		
		Single street route easier for starting and stopping at same locations	7	Riverside is too congested		
		Will help with needed development on Riverside in 100-300 west blocks; two way is good to reduce parking impact		This route is too far away from key attractions		
		Common stops for travel both directions looks efficient; Riverside has low use by private vehicles, less congestion		Takes pedestrian activity away from Main/shopping street		
		Adding vitality to street level retail		Conflict with future traffic control		
		Activates Pine Street which in my opinion is a big positive		Further south from the park and riverpark square		
				Too far from convention center		
				Possible confusion by riders on prepay CCL and post boarding pay buses		
				Adding congestion to riverside		
				Too far from convention center		
				Bad for convention center and River Park Square		
				Too far from parking, convention center		
				Too far from convention center		
				Access to park?		
				Far from convention center and River Park Square and park		
				Riverside too busy		
				Not tourist oriented		
<b>Total Comments</b>		<b>11</b>		<b>23</b>		<b>5</b>

	#	Advantages	#	Disadvantages	#	Comments
General Consensus		Provides service to convention center, Riverfront Park, Davenport Grand and tourist destinations; increases service, provides exposure to businesses		The routes are too far apart; congestion on Riverside; cost		Where is stop at River Park Square?
Alignment #5 WB Spokane Falls/EB Riverside	6	Goes by Riverfront Park, convention center, Davenport Grand, tourist destinations; I like this one and #3 I like the routes that go on different streets  More services; more parking  This plan comes closest to a trolley like service downtown Direct access to park, INB, and convention center  Access to INB, convention center  Like exposure with two different streets Ok, but second choice to option #3 Use of existing routes; access to Riverfront Park Alternative route on Riverside only (two way) during special events More visibility and access to park	3	Cost of separate routes and stations  Not sure I like this on Spokane Falls Blvd.  "Less line of site"  Misses people who want to go between east Main and River Park Square		Clarify north/south on Howard option  Can this be free to riders for one year? Can such a wide couplet increase the economic impacts (increase geographic area)  <b>Where is stop at River Park Square?</b>
	2	Provides more exposure to businesses by out of town guests (travelling on two streets instead of just one)	3	<b>Bus congestion on Riverside</b> Riverside is already congested and the city seems to be pushing via MKL Blvd the main way out of downtown to the east  Stations are too far apart each direction  Just don't like - don't know why  Too split apart east/west  Misses south side of Plaza		Please have roll on roll off bike access  North/south streets? Where is State St. Where is Pine St? To Gonzaga?
	5	Spokane Falls and Riverside will both have routes for travelers  Good for convention center delegates  Goes by convention center, goes by park	9	<b>Streets are too far apart for each route</b>  East route is too far from west route for people to figure out with out a map  Return turn on Riverside too far from park and convention center  Too far between east and west bound One station for both directions would be nice from maintenance and ease of use standpoint Confusing Distance between lines (eastbound and westbound) Too much overlapping; raising costs Distance between pick up stops		
<b>Total Comments</b>		<b>15</b>		<b>19</b>		<b>6</b>

## Central City Line Browne's Addition - West Downtown Workshop Comment Summaries

The Browne's Addition - West Downtown Workshop was held on Mar. 1, 2016. The public was asked to provide comments on several topics. The following is a summary of comments received by the public.

\*The numbers beside the comment indicate the number of times that general comment was provided for each alignment.

	What do you think about the different station designs?	What do you like or dislike about them	What amenities (lighting, benches, etc.) are most important to have at stations?
<b>Station Renderings/Alternatives</b>	What about a more architecturally appropriate design for Browne's neighborhood? EX. Victorian	Transients camping in shelters	More benches very important; lighting especially west downtown
	Yes! (to the above comment)	Need a design that looks old but is new. I don't link any of the examples.	Best if stations are more enclosed or people get colder and wetter in winter. Thx!
	Carry historic theme of existing shelters	Taller vertical elements that contrast with the horizontal and low make the stops playful and visible from a distance.	Lighting to prevent a nights sleep
	Cantilever - timeless Triangle - will get dated soon		Amenities - outlets or charging stations in the bus shelters
	Ugly! Too modern. Browne's Addition is an historic neighborhood with historic architecture. These don't fit!		Raised buses don't have to lower (less noise)
	"Less is more" Don't overbuild them, provide just enough to reduce impact from the elements.		
	Simple, planer structure will be food for the inclusion of art to customize each stop for variety and recognition for users.		
<b>Total Comments</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>

		Alternative #1 2nd Ave/Rosauers/Sunset Blvd	Alternative #2 Chestnut/Cannon St.		
<b>Alignment Alternatives</b> (Let us know what you think ab out the downtown alignment choices)		Lots of traffic here (2nd Ave at Rosauers)	What about charging availability during festivals, events, runs around the park		
		2nd Ave. is dangerous now, adding a bus could make it worse	Concerned about right onto Chestnut. Very narrow		
		Fast traffic coming around corner (2nd Ave and Sunset Blvd)	Add stop between Cannon and Spruce		
			Yes		
			Chestnut is too narrow, too close to the park		
<b>Total Comments</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>		

	<b>What opportunities or challenges to you see with new development in the neighborhood?</b>	<b>How can we ensure that new development or redevelopment projects fit with the character of the neighborhood?</b>	<b>Where is new development or redevelopment most appropriate in or near the neighborhood?</b>
<b>Opportunities/Challenges</b>	As discussed in the meeting, there's a bit of a void between Browne's Addition and West Downtown. Better lighting, more small commercial establishments could help address this problem.	There needs to be a parking structure in this area.	West end of downtown please.
	South and east side of B.A could accept higher density residential redevelopment and supporting services.	A façade improvement grant program could help make the most of W. downtown older buildings	Need more benches (not just bus stop benches) downtown and Browne's
			Make benches art or art benches
			Along the R/R on 2nd & Sunset
			West end of downtown for housing. For new commercial 4th & 5th Ave south of the RR & west of Maple There are quite a few developable parcels in west downtown.
<b>Total Comments</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>

<b>General Comments</b>				
<b>Total Comments</b>				

## Central City Line ED-UD Workshop Comment Summaries

The East Downtown/U-District Workshop was held on Feb. 2, 2016. The public was asked to provide comments on several topics. The following is a summary of comments received by the public.

\*The numbers beside the comment indicate the number of times that general comment was provided for each alignment.

		What do you think about the different station designs?	What do you like or dislike about them	What amenities (lighting, benches, etc.) are most important to have at stations?
<b>Station Renderings/Alternatives</b>		Slice!	Cantilever design seems most easily approached, or used for waiting from either side. Seems more open and would be busiest to clean/maintain	Lighting, benches, trash can, shelter
		Slice - functional, modern, good Triangle - bit complicated Cantilever - alright, function, plain	Prefer slice style; triangle would be unique but not provide enough cover and a little restrictive	Free passes to college students
		Prefer large station	Extra small; may be too restrictive for those with handicaps (from first glance)	More enclosed
		Build it sooner - If you build it we will come	Triangle: extra small and small design create awkward personal spaces for seated people and people reading signs	Digital signage with arrival times
		Trash cans on sign poles at current stops are too small like; like the big cans	Triangle - closed off areas do not seem as welcoming and safe	All glass walls for security
		Incorporate smart cities technology into stations all along line	I like the clear panels; well lit and visible	solid roof and shade
		Like handicapped boarding area, but have cover/shelter nearby for weather protection		Lighting, schedules provided, seating, shade (for summer)
		No preference, but keep the design as open and visible as possible to reduce opportunities for crime		Contactless pay system (Apple Pay, etc.); e.g.. Ventre(?) (Chicago); Degrid/Solar; wayfinding
		Cantilever is old looking; Triangle is to 70's; I like the slice		Bike lockers
		Me too (like slice)		Open lighting for safety and welcoming appearance
		Slice design is top pick		Marker sign; benches, call box, off-board fares, bike rack
		The slice is much more appealing to the eye		Digital signage?; connected to real time info!
		Prefer cantilever		Sunscreen or sun shades in glass - non-glare for vehicle drivers
		Make spots for community bulletin boards to prevent people taping on glass		
	Clear glass; the brown/yellow glass looks dingy			
<b>Total Comments</b>		<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>13</b>

		Alternative #1 WB Riverside/EB Main	Alternative #2 WB/EB Main	Alternative #3 WB Spokane Falls/EB Main
<b>Alignment Alternatives</b> (Let us know what you think about the downtown alignment choices)		SCC/Browne's makes no sense; northtown/downtown, South Regal/downtown makes more sense	Predominant wind direction; will my guests get rained on when the wind blows?	Thank you!
		Routing buses onto one way roads contributes to longer walks and confusion for tourists	Works well with existing street frontages	1. Very looking forward to this transportation on Gonzaga campus after dark, walk to cross 2 busy streets wait in dark by liquor store for bus to go downtown to dance class. 2. I am often apprehensive waiting alone at night. It is really not safe. The current 1-hr service at night on some routes is inadequate. Weekend have been terrible for past 6-years when I came here.
		I feel there are definitely redevelopment opps on Riverside east end. Could address brownfield remediation through partnership w/COS	Prefer Main St. both ways	Park to convention center are inconsistent destinations (nights/non-event days)
		Parking changes on Main!	This is better as it stays off of Riverside (future light rail) and it minimizes couplet	Spokane Falls in vicinity of convention is a big dead zone much of the time.
		IIRC Riverside/MLK is meant to be an alternative car/truck route in/out of the DT core. Don't load it up with buses.	Option 2 requires extra cost of changing traffic directions. That's a bad idea because its amore expensive and disruptive	Option 3 does not need to change traffic signals, saving costs for other amenities
		My personal favorite; more supportive w/good opportunities; shares the love.	Parking changes on Main!	Support of this will overcome objection to Main
		Provides more consumer access to downtown businesses	Main St. is centralized between the Riverside and Spokane Fall routes. Easy to walk between	Same as Alternative #1; more crossing issues and impacts on traffic flow.
		Option #5 plus Kendall Yards, Riverfront Park, Arena need to be on the line U-District (Falls)	Option 2 stand to add the most business growth in addition to service. Will direct more customers downtown and actually give the feel of a "main" street for our city.	My destinations are typically Riverfront Park, or River Park Square, so option 3 makes the most sense.
			Changing to a w-way Main St. would resolve so many issues of people looping around and around to get to location	Best visitors connection for convention center; entertainment district.
			Very pedestrian and tourist friendly. Would promote business growth.	Good alignment for WSU campus and for visitors/park
		Salvage angle parking by moving to side streets, Riverside and Spokane Falls Blvd and/or steal some street from 12' wide sidewalks		
		Easiest to find going either east or west on same street. More concentrated; transit oriented development		
<b>Total Comments</b>		<b>8</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>10</b>

<p><b>1. What aspects of the University District and East Downtown do you like now?</b></p> <p><b>2. Are there challenges and opportunities you'd like to note?</b></p> <p><b>3. How can we best make transit work for you in the University District and East Downtown?</b></p>			
<b>University District Opportunities/Challenges Map</b>	Scalable; bike accommodations	Scalable; bike accommodations on bus, 3-5 spots	Not sure about station here (SPFalls/Division) given existing traffic and odd vehicle circulation
	(SPFalls/Pine) Visibility because of landscaping; hard to see peds	Bike lane in between sidewalk and station platform to avoid conflicts (Dexter Ave. in Seattle)	Would prefer to consolidate to a single station at Riverpoint (Major multimodal hub)
	Use Front Ave. to connect MLK Way to E. Central neighborhood to swing back around to Trent/Spokane Falls Blvd to Cincinnati	Shifts street parallel to improve sight lines at trail x-ing (Cincinnati at Centennial Trail crossing)	Centennial trail x-ing is dangerous at Cincinnati
	Turning left on to Boone (west) and turning north up Standard St. would dramatically increase GU ridership. There's a built in GU park and ride and fits historically with the old trolley car system.	What will happen to service at Gospel Mission/SSA?	
<b>Total Comments</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>

	<b>Pedestrian Bridge Color Rendering</b>	<b>Main/Spokane Falls Rendering</b>	<b>Riverside/Division Rendering</b>
<b>General Comments</b>	Ensure connectivity W/E Main	Is there a way using GPS (onboard) to display time remaining until next bus arrives (and have that be visible to patrons of cafes, etc. across the street?)	Multi-use development
		Yes Please (to comment above)	Roof-top gardens; greenspace
		No tissue box office buildings. Activate to the street w/storefronts, awnings, etc.	Green inf. Lined streets
		Enforce the Urban Growth Boundary!	Add bike rack here
		Encourage this type of human-scale development - looks great!	Curbside stops have the advantage of letting riders wait indoors, ex. In coffee shops, until the bus arrives, rather than waiting at a center-of-the-road stop, or running to cross the street
<b>Total Comments</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>

## Skillingstad, Don

---

**From:** Shahrokh Nikfar <shawn@nwfairhouse.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 16, 2016 3:56 PM  
**To:** awaldref@spokanecity.org; klarson@spokanecity.org; Skillingstad, Don  
**Subject:** Main Street

Attn: Amber Waldref, Spokane City Council Member District 1, STA Board Member [509.625.6275](tel:509.625.6275)  
Kaitlin Larson, Legislative Assistant to Council Member Amber Waldref [509.625.6719](tel:509.625.6719)  
Don Skillingstad, Project Manager for STA Alignment Options Downtown [509-344-1869](tel:509-344-1869)

As owner of two local businesses located on Main Avenue, I am writing to urge you to support Option #2 for the alignment of the proposed Central City Line through downtown. This Option, as we understand it, includes the restoration of a two-way Main Avenue.

The restoration of Main Avenue to a two-way street has been a goal of ours for over a decade. We understand the ramifications, and have discussed and advocated for this at every opportunity. **It is important to note that our West Main Streetscape Pilot Project, scheduled to be completed this spring, is compatible with the STA's Central City Line proposal for Main.**

Please note our neighborhood on Main Avenue has a mission statement that has been agreed upon by all:

*We support traffic calming streetscape enhancements that improve bicycle and pedestrian safety as well as parking access on our block, with the ultimate goal of restoring Main to a two-way street.*

Thank you,

Shahrokh Nikfar  
19 West Main Ave.  
Spokane, WA 99201

## Skillingstad, Don

---

**From:** Lupito Flores <lupito@kyrs.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 17, 2016 11:40 AM  
**To:** Skillingstad, Don  
**Subject:** Main Ave.

Dear Don,

I'd like to voice my support for Option #2 for the alignment of the proposed Central City Line through downtown. This Option includes the restoration of a two-way Main Avenue. I support traffic-calming efforts, bicycle and pedestrian enhancements.

Also, the West Main Streetscape Pilot Project fits right in with the Central City Line proposal.

Thank you,

Lupito Flores, KYRS Station Manager  
Thin Air Community Radio  
88.1 & 92.3 FM

Listen & Donate  
<http://www.kyrs.org>

[Donate your old car/truck/boat!](#)  
It's quick, easy, and you get a tax receipt!

## Skillingstad, Don

---

**From:** dana oxford <dana@community-building.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 16, 2016 4:06 PM  
**To:** awaldref@spokanecity.org; klarson@spokanecity.org; Skillingstad, Don  
**Subject:** Central City Line Option 2

Attn: Amber Waldref, Spokane City Council Member District 1, STA Board Member [509.625.6275](tel:509.625.6275)  
Kaitlin Larson, Legislative Assistant to Council Member Amber Waldref [509.625.6719](tel:509.625.6719)  
Don Skillingstad, Project Manager for STA Alignment Options Downtown [509-344-1869](tel:509-344-1869)

Please restore Main Avenue to a pedestrian-friendly, traffic-calming two-way street. This will also make it less frustrating for out-of-towners (and Spokaneites) to make their way around the downtown core whether driving or riding the bus.

Please note our neighborhood on Main Avenue has a mission statement that has been agreed upon by all:

*We support traffic calming streetscape enhancements that improve bicycle and pedestrian safety as well as parking access on our block, with the ultimate goal of restoring Main to a two-way street.*

Thank you,

Name: Dana Oxford

Address: 924 E 18th Ave, Spokane, WA 99201

Affiliation: Community and Saranac Buildings

Contact Information: 509 768-41066

--

Dana Oxford  
Saranac Building, LLC  
509 768-1066

## **Skillingstad, Don**

---

**From:** Carol Tomsic <carol\_tomsic@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 17, 2016 11:09 PM  
**To:** Skillingstad, Don  
**Subject:** option two

Hi Don

I support option two. The central city line should run on a restored two-way main avenue.

Thank you

Carol Tomsic

## Skillingstad, Don

---

**From:** Patsy O'Connor <patsy@po-architects.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 18, 2016 3:37 PM  
**To:** awaldref@spokanecity.org; klarson@spokanecity.org; Skillingstad, Don  
**Subject:** Main Street Development

Attn: Amber Waldref, Spokane City Council Member District 1, STA Board Member [509.625.6275](tel:509.625.6275)  
Kaitlin Larson, Legislative Assistant to Council Member Amber Waldref [509.625.6719](tel:509.625.6719)  
Don Skillingstad, Project Manager for STA Alignment Options Downtown [509-344-1869](tel:509-344-1869)

We are writing to urge you to support Option #2 for the alignment of the proposed Central City Line through downtown. This Option, as we understand it, includes the restoration of a two-way Main Avenue.

The restoration of Main Avenue to a two-way street has been a goal of ours for over a decade. We understand the ramifications, and have discussed and advocated for this at every opportunity. **It is important to note that our West Main Streetscape Pilot Project, scheduled to be completed this spring, is compatible with the STA's Central City Line proposal for Main.**

Please note our neighborhood on Main Avenue has a mission statement that has been agreed upon by all:

*We support traffic calming streetscape enhancements that improve bicycle and pedestrian safety as well as parking access on our block, with the ultimate goal of restoring Main to a two-way street.*

Thank you,

Name: **Patsy O'Connor**

Address: **25 W. Main, Suite 400 Loft**

Affiliation: **Business Owner**

Contact Information: **838-3600**

-----  
Patsy O'Connor, Architect  
25 W Main, Suite 440 Loft  
Spokane, WA  
838-3600

## Skillingstad, Don

---

**From:** Mike Petersen <mpetersen@landscouncil.org>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 20, 2016 11:31 AM  
**To:** awaldref@spokanecity.org; klarson@spokanecity.org; Skillingstad, Don  
**Subject:** Central City Line location

Amber, Kaitlin and Don,

Greetings. Thank you for your efforts to move the Central City Line forward. I believe locating the line on Main Street would have the most benefits for Spokane, as well as businesses and offices along Main Street. Option 2 would work well, with a goal of turning Main Street back into a 2 way street, with the Central City Line in the Center. Plans for landscaping Main between Division and Browne would be compatible with Option 2 and actually start the flow and traffic calming that the Central City Line would eventually provide.

I hope you can support this option.

Sincerely,

Mike Petersen  
Executive Director of The Lands Council