

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

PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND EXTERNAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Minutes of the October 4, 2017, Meeting
Southside Conference Room

MEMBERS PRESENT

Amber Waldref, City of Spokane*
John Higgins, City of Medical Lake
Odin Langford, City of Liberty Lake
Tom Trulove, City of Cheney (Ex-Officio)
Rhonda Bowers, Labor Representative
E. Susan Meyer, CEO (Ex-Officio)

MEMBERS ABSENT

Josh Kerns, Spokane County

STAFF PRESENT

Karl Otterstrom, Director of Planning and Development
Lynda Warren, Director of Finance and Information Services
Nancy Williams, Director of Human Resources
Jessica Charlton, Capital Projects Manager
Dan Wells, Deputy Director of Capital Development
Ralph Wilder, Manager Maintenance / Facilities & Grounds
Fred Nelson, Transportation Manager
Mike Kunder, 3939 Representative

GUESTS

Charles Hansen, Citizen Advisory Committee Member
Brian Newberry

* Chair

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

Chair Waldref called the meeting to order at 1:34 p.m. Introductions were made.

2. **PUBLIC EXPRESSIONS**

Charles Hansen, Citizen Advisory Committee member, spoke about the signal at Ermina/Green - Agenda Item 5A1. Mr. Hansen noted he believes it would be great to have a stop light at that corner. He said that he uses that corner very often. Chair Waldref thanked him for his positive feedback and noted the City has wanted to do something there for a long time, saying also that it is great the City could collaborate with STA on this item.

Brian Newberry offered his thanks to everyone at STA for allowing so many to get around the great Spokane community. He spoke regarding the Van Grant proposal – Agenda Item 5A5. Mr. Newberry advised the *Veterans First* Board was created by the Veterans Administration about a year ago. He is working with Goodwill to chair the committee and said the job of the Board is to improve the veteran experience.

Mr. Newberry said the first item he came across when he joined the Board was transportation and noted the Board came by STA and met with Mr. Otterstrom who provided data that indicated why bus transportation could not go to their location. He stated that in the patriotic vein that exists in STA (a company that has “*We Support Our Veterans*” on the billboards on its buses); staff all said maybe there is another answer. He listened to STA and put forth a van grant proposal that he hopes will help some veterans out there with transportation needs so that veterans transporting veterans do not have to use their personal vehicles. He noted the Veterans’ Center in the Valley is not able to take ownership of the van and *Inland Northwest Disabled Vets’ Sports Association* said, “We have some needs for that and will let it be used for other vets to be helped as well.”

Mr. Newberry noted their group is here for every veteran who puts up a hand and says, “I need help”. He thanked the Committee for everything they are already doing and noted they could make good use of a van (if granted) to give vets a chance to get to medical care and all the other things they want to get out there for in the community. He said, “Thanks for your leadership and listening to our request.”

Chair Waldref and Ms. Meyer both thanked Mr. Newberry for coming and sharing his thoughts.

3. **COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT**

Chair Waldref noted that Mr. Blaska is not present and that she and Ms. Warren went through the Agenda to prepare for today.

4. COMMITTEE APPROVAL

A. MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 9, 2017 COMMITTEE MEETING

Mr. Langford moved to recommend approval of the September 9, 2017, Committee meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Mayor Higgins and passed unanimously.

B. SCOPE OF WORK APPROVAL - DIVISION PASSENGER AND OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. Otterstrom advised the overall project scope is in excess of \$1M and the procurement policy says if under \$1M and if in the Capital Improvement Project (CIP), it does not need to go beyond the CEO's approval. However, he noted staff are likely going to break up the contracts based on phasing of work and expressed that staff wanted to ensure the committee has visibility that staff's intent was not to avoid the purview of the PMER Committee.

Mr. Otterstrom informed that Division Route 95 is STA's busiest route, with over 1M annual boardings and has been identified as a high performance corridor. *STA Moving Forward* (STAMF) provides the beginning of that and its primary intent is to improve bus stops and pedestrian improvements. In 2012/2013, a corridor panel was established and it was determined they would like to see the whole performance transit line using Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) implemented. In the absence of funding for that project at this time, they recommended a project focused on the pedestrian amenities in that corridor. He showed specific examples and provided explanations of why they need to be changed.

Mr. Otterstrom reviewed the General Scope of Work – construction of sidewalks where none exist, infill of 5 existing buss bulbs, construction of ADA pads, and shelter pads where warranted (at nearly every stop). He showed some of the details of the different elements and noted there may be adjustments required to existing utilities.

He informed the project is split into two phases. Stop Improvements in Phase 1 require no right of way and/or easement and will be bid/built in 2018. Stop Improvements in Phase 2 require right of way and/or easement and are anticipated to bid/built in 2019. Staff expects individual construction phases to be within CEO authority to award. Procurement of Shelters are to be separate from construction. To ensure transparency, staff are presenting the entire scope for approval prior to the phased bid approach.

Mr. Otterstrom mentioned that it is expected Phase II will have more work involved with it due to the necessity of working with all the individual property owners and obtaining easements from them. Chair Waldref clarified that staff are looking at the difficulty of each particular area. She asked if Mr. Otterstrom thought that would be more effective than spending next year developing all the details. Chair Waldref asked if STA would get a better deal if it was all bid out and then had the construction completed in one year or a year and a half. Mr. Otterstrom replied that he did not think there would be a significant enough difference to warrant delaying improvements. He also said it is going to be a spread out project no matter which way it is phased. Brief discussion ensued.

He reminded the committee of Spokane Transit's submittal for and receipt of a 2018-2020 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Grant for the Division Street High Performance Transit (HPT) Improvements. He advised the Grant has a value of \$1.5M. The City of Spokane and Spokane Transit (STA) entered into an Interlocal Agreement to which the City of Spokane will reimburse STA local money in the amount of \$220,000 in return for design and construction of a sidewalk between Francis and Magnesium. Additional funding of \$280,000 was added due to favorable bids from other projects.

Mr. Otterstrom stated staff are asking for approval of the Scope of Work, noting it is an Action by Committee Item and will not go to the full Board because it falls within the CIP.

Mr. Langford moved to approve the Scope of Work and authorize staff to release an Invitation for Bids (IFB) for passenger and operational improvements along the Division Corridor as presented. The motion was seconded by Mayor Higgins and passed unanimously.

5. COMMITTEE ACTION

A. Board Consent Agenda

1. APPROVAL OF CITY OF SPOKANE INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT FOR ERMINA/GREENE TRAFFIC SIGNAL

Mr. Otterstrom provided background, saying this is part of a long-standing need to provide safe access and egress to the Transit Center at Spokane Community College (SCC), reducing schedule delays, and improving reliability of the service, as well as providing a safe signalized crossing for pedestrians.

He noted that this is part of the SCC Master Plan in the context of the North Spokane Corridor. He believes STA would have proposed this item many years ago in partnership with the City of Spokane had there not been a recession. He noted the neighborhood became the driving force to use traffic-calming money in designing and completing initial work with the City. At this point, while this project is still important for transit customers and pedestrians that cross Greene Street, staff expects that not too far after the implementation of this signal, STA will be moving away from the current area to the south central portion of campus. STA will continue to receive benefit from this traffic light by the support it provides to the overall circulation at SCC, which becomes something of interest to STA as staff works with SCC in securing a site for the ultimate transit center location in the south central area. Mr. Otterstrom noted that in partnership with the Community College, the City, and the neighborhood, the long-term benefits to transit riders are there as well. He advised the individuals in this neighborhood will have transit access because of the signal to get them to the Community College and staff envisions a pair of bus stops there once the North Spokane Corridor is complete.

Due to the mutual benefits of the project, a partnership between the City of Spokane and Spokane Transit is proposed. He noted the attached draft agreement for sharing the cost of the signal in which it proposes STA contribute up to \$600,000 or 80% of the cost of the signal, whichever is less. The City of Spokane is to contribute \$150,000 or 20% of the cost of the signal, whichever is less. The most recent estimate for the total cost of the project is \$435,698.

Mr. Otterstrom advised that to maximize the short-term benefits, it is critical to construct the signal as soon as possible. As such, the attached proposed agreement includes a default termination clause that states if construction of the signal does not start before April 30, 2018, STA will have no responsibility for costs of the signal.

Staff have included this signal project in the approved Capital Improvement Program (CIP) that the Board passed in July, but STA has an Interlocal Agreement that staff are proposing be approved by the Board and placed on the Consent Agenda.

Chair Waldref asked if there were any questions. Mr. Langford asked why the committee needs to authorize this for an apparently short-term period of time. He asked what was the benefit being reaped in the long-term. Mr. Otterstrom replied that in the near term, STA has 16 buses each hour coming in and out of the college; all exiting onto Greene Street, many turning left (about 10 per hour are traveling southbound). Mr. Langford asked how long that has been the practice. Mr. Otterstrom replied it has been since 1985 that STA has been traveling on the campus. He noted that as traffic volumes have increased, this crossing has been a growing safety concern and there have been accidents involving buses.

Mr. Otterstrom explained that the buses exit the campus at the Clock tower unaided by a signal. He said the near-term benefit would be to have that resolved as soon as possible for the buses exiting and entering the campus. Southbound buses, due to heavy traffic volumes, are currently traveling under the bridge onto south Riverton, which causes more travel time as a result. Near-term, there is a travel savings and long-term there are a couple pieces; one being our partnership with the Community Colleges. STA has a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that SCC will provide a location for STA's Transit Center free of cost for the long-term, as staff works with them recognizing the partnership at this light. He said if STA had located in the current area rather than the south, STA would have paid for the light. As a transit operator, it is an ongoing liability to STA for buses accessing that street, as well as pedestrians, with no signal. When looking at transit, FTA considers things that are within the Transit Pedestrian Network within a mile or so of buses as being eligible expenses for transit projects if they are supporting a pedestrian network. There is a long-term benefit of that transit pedestrian access across Greene Street at Ermina.

Mr. Langford asked when the plan was to move to the south side and Mr. Otterstrom said that project is expected to be completed in late 2019. Chair Waldref asked if that was contingent on SCC getting state funding. She wondered how quickly SCC would be implementing their Master Plan that they just adopted. Mr. Otterstrom advised SCC's Master Plan is unfunded, but STA's Transit Center is funded. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Otterstrom said STA provides support to the college campus in consideration of them providing a free location for STA's Transit Center. He noted the long-term benefits are the pedestrian access across Greene Street. Chair Waldref clarified that there will still be bus traffic on Greene where people need to cross to access buses and Mr. Otterstrom agreed.

Mayor Higgins asked if STA had the same issue at Spokane Falls Community College (SFCC). Mr. Otterstrom explained it was a different situation. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Langford asked how much it would cost when STA relocates to the south side of SCC. Mr. Otterstrom stated the overall project budget is \$5M for STA. Mr. Langford questioned \$5M to go from existing to the south side. Mr. Otterstrom advised it was for the new Transit Center and explained that the Transit Center is well above a replacement for the existing (the existing is under capacity) for improvements such as the Central City Line (CCL), and will include driver breakroom and bathrooms dedicated to STA drivers. He said it is not a one for one replacement – it is a more robust facility and is where staff assumes future charging of CCL vehicles. He noted STA has relatively little invested at the existing location.

Mr. Langford asked if Paratransit would be incorporated in that area. Mr. Otterstrom explained that Paratransit travels to the nearest access point of a person's final destination. However, he said that just as Paratransit utilizes the Plaza, customers intending to make a connection at the SCC Transit Center would utilize the location. Mr. Langford questioned if Paratransit goes door to door, what was the purpose of a trade for property for Paratransit. Mr. Otterstrom clarified that he was not speaking specifically about Paratransit. Mr. Langford asked what the assistance at the red light is in exchange for and Mr. Otterstrom advised that for the fixed route buses, the benefit is this light is something that is important for their college Master Plan. SCC would like to see it implemented. SCC would also like to (if out of the context of us funding this signal) be recognized for a value added for STA imposing on their property for a Transit Center. The value to STA, while not a direct cost born by the college, is working with the City of Spokane and the benefit to the college in exchange for a Transit Center location, is embodied in that agreement as well.

Mr. Langford asked if that was already a “done deal” and inquired if staff have that in writing before spending \$300,000 to \$600,000. Mr. Otterstrom stated staff has an MOU between the Community College, the City, and STA. He noted if STA were not to move, STA still derives value from the light because buses will continue to be accessing the light from the current location. (16 buses an hour throughout the day, every hour of the day, plus evenings and weekends).

Ms. Meyer commented that she understood Mr. Langford's questions and said they are worth having a conversation about because three parties are working together on something that has multiple agendas. Chair Waldref noted it is as if the committee are looking at a bunch of different pieces. She asked about Mr. Langford's comment of having anything in writing. Mr. Otterstrom clarified the MOU says STA agrees the south is the best location from the Community College's standpoint, and that they would provide that... Chair Waldref said it does talk about that.

Mr. Langford asked if the purpose of this was to bring this before the full Board or if this would go into the full Board's Consent Agenda. Chair Waldref said he could make a motion to add it to the Consent or the Legislative Agenda.

Mr. Langford made a motion to move it to the full Board for approval.

Chair Waldref stated the motion is to add it to the regular agenda for action. She recapped for clarification, asking, “Are you making the motion that we approve the agreement; that you would like it on the regular part of the agenda?”

Mr. Langford said he would like to have it available for all members to review and get their input on before saying yay or nay to the item.

Ms. Meyer commented she did not think he is recommending it for approval. Chair Waldref further clarified that Mr. Langford is recommending it be placed on the Board Agenda. She asked if there were a second for that.

Mr. Higgins said \$600,000 is a lot of money and he agreed with Mr. Langford and would 2nd the motion.

Chair Waldref asked for discussion on the motion.

Chair Waldref noted she would like to vote against the motion because she felt the committee should recommend that the Board authorize it and that is why she voted no on the motion because she thinks PMER Committee should just recommend it. She stated she does not mind it being placed on the regular agenda, but supports the project and thinks staff has discussed with the community several times, so it is not out of what has been discussed and planned for in the past.

Mr. Langford asked if staff were up against a timeframe. Mr. Otterstrom said yes, in terms of the benefits that STA would be able to have, staff are seeking approval so the City can go out to bid and begin construction by April 30, 2018. If the City does not meet that deadline, then this Interlocal Agreement would not offer them any money for the construction improvements.

Mr. Langford withdrew his motion.

Chair Waldref asked if there was another motion on the floor. Mr. Langford replied he did not. Chair Waldref informed them it was fine, that she personally would not support it but if the two of them wanted to put it on the agenda, that was fine, or she could entertain another motion. None were forthcoming.

Mr. Langford asked to explain his position. He advised that he is relatively new to the board so he is not privy to many of the conversations that have already happened. He stated he does not doubt staff, never had any reason to, and if staff says it is a good idea, his first inclination is it is a great idea. However, when talking about stoplights, it has been his experience (not with STA) that it is city funded because there has been a traffic study done because they need one. He personally does not know if STA has the authority to put in a traffic light or not. If staff want a traffic light in the middle of I-90 or wherever, you have the authority to go install it. He noted he did not have an idea. In the back of his mind, he advised he is thinking this is a municipal project so, why isn't the city putting it in if it is really a benefit. Why, with a year and a half left, are we hurrying up and spending money on something that has been like that since 1985, but suddenly staff are up against a deadline of April 2019, in consideration of something that has not been firmed up. He sees nothing that he can objectively hang his hat on and say, "I like it." He realizes it is not, in the grand scheme of things, a lot of money, but it is other people's money and that gives him pause. He noted if those several objections can be overcome, he might be able to say okay, I get it, but right now, he advised he does not get it.

Mr. Langford further stated that when he made the motion, his thought was simply to have it brought before the Board where he could hear other people who have more experience and hear what they have to say about it and he might actually learn something. At that point, he could either get fully behind it or just stay away from it. He said he did not want to be in a position to deny something that staff wants at this time, but could not, in good faith, make a motion and then vote no against it. He said that is his objection and if there are "handy dandy" answers to them, he would listen.

Mr. Otterstrom offered clarification. He stated it is a city project, it is a municipal project, and STA would be a funding partner, but it is subject to the city's traffic study and analysis that they have done, as well as their design. He said the fact behind the project is a city project and STA often work cooperatively with the city's own projects that have a transit benefit.

Rhonda Bowers offered that the signal in question would be a continually used light, regardless of whether the Transit Center moves or not. She said routes would continue on that street for a great deal of time. Mr. Otterstrom said STA buses would be on Greene Street indefinitely. Ms. Bowers said that light will always be of use to STA. Discussion ensued regarding benefit to STA.

Chair Waldref stated she believes the City Engineers were under the impression that STA wanted the signal and so they put the traffic calming from the neighborhood towards the design of it. She said she did not know if it would meet the City's warrants by itself or not. Mr. Otterstrom stated the neighborhood and the Community College wanted it. Chair Waldref stated the intention was everyone coming together to help fund it. Her concern was that the reason why the city did the design on it and started to move forward was an understanding that there would be partners helping to fund it. Mr. Otterstrom said the timing was such that if this had been a decade ago, staff would have preferred to do it then. He said there is still a long-term benefit beyond those buses exiting the colleges – it provides STA leverage for negotiating the south side because STA has an MOU that recognizes the benefit, and the pedestrian access at the location. He said staff could certainly provide additional background for a full Board discussion later this month.

Mr. Langford asked if that bus stop would be continually used as a bus stop even though STA has a transit center around the corner. Mr. Otterstrom said CCL, the five routes that serve the Community Colleges today, and STA would still have buses on Greene Street and with the lack of bus stops in the area, staff would work to add buses on the street – today they are at the Transit Center just east of the street. STA typically likes to be a quarter mile apart.

Ms. Meyer asked if Mr. Langford meant to ask if STA would be putting bus stops on Greene between Mission and Ermina. Mr. Langford said he was not sure it would be a fluid stop for the school after the Transit Center is relocated. Chair Waldref said there are people who come from the north and use different lines, cross the street, and walk on to campus. Mr. Otterstrom noted it is more nuanced than that and is why he complicated the answer. He clarified that all buses go into the Transit Center now and as there becomes no transit center in this vicinity, for the buses that continue north and south on Greene, STA would work to have bus stops at the light. Staff prefer the stops be at a light from the standpoint of customers. Customers need to be able to cross to both sides of the street to effectively use the bus.

Chair Waldref said if the committee is concerned about an item, they could place it on the agenda without a recommendation. She noted her preference would be to recommend the Board go ahead do it. However, she said she understood Mr. Langford's desire for additional Board input. She asked if he would like to go back to his original motion to place it on the Board Agenda without a recommendation from the committee.

Mr. Langford moved to place on the Board Agenda without a recommendation. Mayor Higgins seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

To answer the question of timing, Mr. Otterstrom advised that when the city rebuilt Greene Street and put in concrete panels 15 years ago, they placed conduit underneath at Indiana. STA had discussed in the past signalizing that intersection. Over time, there have been different discussions on this item. The city's work and traffic signal study and developing a plan at Ermina is what prompted that, but STA has an internal safety committee and those members identified this issue quite a number of years ago. Mr. Langford asked if the school has done anything to improve the safety of their own people coming to school. Mr. Otterstrom said he was not privy to how the school's budget and expenses go. Discussion ensued.

Chair Waldref noted that Mr. Hansen was attempting to comment. She informed him that the committee does not take comments on the different items outside of Public Expressions. She extended an invitation to have him attend the Board meeting on October 19, 2017, and bring a couple other people who care about this issue to comment at the beginning of the meeting. She also noted he could chat with committee members after the meeting today.

2. ACCEPTANCE OF PLAZA UPGRADE AND RELEASE OF RETAINAGE

Mr. Otterstrom noted this project requires the Committee's acceptance before staff can pay the retainage. He reviewed the overall budget was \$4.95M and after expenses, staff has a favorable variance of over \$115,000. He credited Jessica Charlton with the fluidity of project in working with the contractors in a very busy environment.

He provided slides of before and after pictures and noted staff are asking the Committee recommend the Board accept the Plaza Upgrade Contract as complete and conditionally authorize release of \$178,778.30 in retainage to Walker Construction. He said it is contingent upon final releases from Department of Revenue, Labor and Employment Security Department.

Mayor Higgins moved to approve as presented. Chair Waldref seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Discussion ensued.

3. AWARD OF CONTRACT – ON CALL ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING SERVICES

Mr. Otterstrom provided an overview of the On-Call Architectural and Engineering Services. He noted STA's typical contract for this type of service is 5 years. Staff expects the overall payout to be above \$1M over the term of the contract, on a time and effort basis.

He said the contract scope included engineering services as noted in the agenda item and slide. Staff went out in July for the approval of the Scope of Work that was approved in July; staff advertised July 17, 2017, received four complete responses. After an evaluation, the top three moved on to interviews where final scoring recommendations were achieved. He said this is not a referendum on the current on-call but a statement of who is most qualified of the firms involved. That is the basis when conducting procurement for Architectural Engineering services.

Mr. Otterstrom reviewed the scoring and noted that Coffman Engineers received a combined score of 96.4, followed by Parametrix at 93.6, and Cortner Architectural Company at 87.4. The scoring was close but Coffman has developed a lot of local expertise with transit facilities, bus stops, and those types of improvements that occur on an “On-Call” basis. He said Parametrix has strong team members and staff hopes to work with them in the future.

Mr. Otterstrom informed that staff are asking the Committee recommend the Board of Directors authorize contract negotiations between STA and Coffman Engineers, Inc. for the 5-year On-Call A&E Consulting Services as published July 16, 2017, and authorize the CEO to execute said contract if the terms are deemed to be fair and reasonable and in the best interest of STA. Furthermore, if said terms cannot be agreed to, recommend the CEO be authorized to proceed with said negotiations and contract execution with Parametrix.

Mr. Langford moved to approve as presented. Mayor Higgins seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

4. 2018 SPECIAL COMMUNITY EVENTS FARE STRUCTURE AND PROPOSED CHANGES TO TARIFF POLICY

Ms. Warren noted she would be presenting on behalf of Ms. Bousley. She advised that staff are proposing to change a few items and informed that there is a new Resolution in member’s folders with the chair information updated.

Ms. Warren presented the proposed changes for Bloomsday, Hoopfest, Valleyfest and First Night. She advised the Bloomsday and Hoopfest tickets are proposed at \$1.75 for a day pass and that Valleyfest and First Night are being recommended as no cost. The reason for the no cost recommendation is due to potential conflict with fare collection and FTA Charter Service Exception requirements that may outweigh potential accrued revenue. Ms. Warrant asked if there were any questions. None were forthcoming.

She advised that another proposed change to the Tariff policy is associated with the new 7-Day Pass that would enable retail pass outlets to begin carrying the new 7- Day Pass (\$15) on January 1, 2018. Currently, retail pass outlets carry Adult (\$50), Youth (\$35), and Reduced Fare (\$25) 31-Day Passes, and receive a \$3 handling fee for each pass. Staff is proposing to institute a \$1 handling fee for the new 7-Day.

The final recommendation involves the Employer Sponsored Bus Pass Program. STA’s Employer Sponsored Bus Pass (ESBP) program allows employers to purchase discounted passes for sale to employees. Currently, STA sells monthly passes to the company or organization at a discount of \$3.00 per pass if the company or organization agrees to pass that savings on to the employees and offer an additional discount of not less than \$3.00 per pass. With the increase of the Adult 31-Day rolling pass from \$45 to \$50 effective July 1, 2017, and to \$60 effective July 1, 2018, staff requests increasing the discount per pass to \$4.00 for a total possible discount of \$8 to the employee.

Staff recommends the Board approve, by resolution, the adoption of an amended Tariff Policy to reflect the \$1 7-Day Pass handling fee, the \$4 match for the Employer Sponsored Bus Pass program, and the 2018 Special Events fare structure for Bloomsday, Hoopfest, Valleyfest, and First Night.

Mr. Langford moved to approve as presented. Mayor Higgins seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Bowers said she was approached twice in the past week by passengers asking why they couldn’t purchase a \$15.00, 7-Day Pass at the outlets. Discussion ensued.

5. APPROVAL OF VETERANS FIRST VAN GRANT

Ms. Meyer advised that Mr. Newberry met with staff and she noted how much staff appreciates the collaboration he brought to STA to speak about the transportation needs of the veterans. She reminded that the Valley Veteran’s Center never approached staff before they moved into the building in Spokane Valley. A year later, they came to STA asking for ridership. STA has concluded there is not enough predicted ridership at that location and, therefore, it is not prioritized.

Mr. Newberry was able to bring together Spokane Veterans Administration (VA) Medical Center, Goodwill of the Inland NW, Spokane Valley Veterans Center, Spokane County Veterans Services, and the Inland Northwest Disabled Veterans Sports Association who are collaborating on an initiative to fill transportation gaps for local veterans. A large van, operated by volunteer drivers, could address many of these needs.

The *Veterans First* Board sought out Spokane Transit to support this endeavor through the donation of a 15-seat, large passenger van. Inland Northwest Disabled Veterans Sports Association are able to take ownership of the van. Staff would use the title transfer process and a similar release agreement that we use for awardees under the Van Grant program.

Staff recommends the Board approve the transfer of one retired vanpool vehicle to Inland Northwest Disabled Veterans Sports Association to fulfill the transportation objectives as outlined by the Veterans First Board.

Brief discussion ensued. Mayor Higgins noted that as a Vietnam Veteran, he has seen a real need and expects the program will expand services once people see this come to the community.

Mayor Higgins moved to approve as presented. Mr. Langford seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Chair Waldref asked if they would be able to qualify for the regular Van Grant program next time and Ms. Meyer advised staff would want them to apply to that program next time. They would be more likely to qualify with an ability to quantify how the van would be used after having a van in service for a year before applying for the Van Grant. Chair Waldref said that perhaps staff and the committee should review the criteria going forward.

B. Board Discussion Agenda

(No items presented this month)

6. REPORTS TO COMMITTEE

A. SEPTEMBER 2018 SERVICE REVISION-PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL

Chair Waldref asked if Mr. Otterstrom could hit the highlights of the proposal and, if possible, keep it to about ten minutes so there is time for questions and/or discussion at the end.

Mr. Otterstrom stated this is staff's preliminary proposal for changes on September 2018. He noted there are three categories: 1) More service on existing routes, 2) Modifying Service, and 3) Modifying Routes.

The big move next year is the West Plains Transit Center (WPTC) and staff are on schedule and on budget. The other big change involves the EWU Pierce Union Building (PUB) remodel that will be completed and staff are expecting to have finality on where buses will layover there in the future. Those two items introduce us to a series of potential changes. He noted there are two options – one very much like status quo (Option B) and Option A is saying this is not the status quo but more like where we are going. In either case, the ultimate recommendation or action will not look like either of these but some sort of compromise between the two. Staff are looking for input.

He reviewed the two options as presented and explained the differences.

In addition to the West Plains Options A and B noted, proposed changes also involve Sprague “Load and Go” at the Plaza; Route 23 on Maple / Ash; Route 2 Medical Shuttle; 124 North Express Safety Improvements; 173 VTC Express; and a couple other changes to further improve 25 Division reliability with a downtown layover and “load and go”; Route 27 Hillyard reliability improvements; and revision of out of direction inbound routing on the 94 East Central/Millwood route.

Ms. Meyer asked some clarifying questions. Discussion ensued.

Staff are seeking feedback through an online survey starting next week. There will be sharing through social media and staff are planning to make multiple presentations to neighborhoods. Staff would be pleased to come out to the City Council Member meetings. STA staff plans to meet with staff at Medical Lake and Cheney, as well.

The service change timeline was presented for the Preliminary Proposal, Draft Recommendation, Final Recommendation, and Services Changes. Full details are in the proposal.

Mayor Trulove asked if WAsDOT had programmed their improvements. Mr. Otterstrom replied it is in the current program budget cycle for the design phase and they have the funding program for the 2019-2021 budget for the actual construction. Mr. Otterstrom provided additional details.

Ms. Meyer noted it is complicated (Option A and Option B) and asked to meet with members in Cheney and Medical Lake and Airway Heights to review.

Mr. Langford asked what ridership to/from Whitworth was like. Mr. Otterstrom noted he did not have it off the top of his head but thought it was relatively low among all the universities and colleges. Ms. Meyer noted staff are working on a Pass Program with Whitworth. Discussion ensued.

Chair Waldref thanked Mr. Otterstrom for his report.

B. CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) UPDATE

Ms. Warren advised that Mr. Charlie Howell was elected the CAC Chair.

The recommendation to align the Charter and remove the \$15.00 travel stipend and to continue with the only a bus pass was discussed and understood.

7. CEO REPORT

- Ms. Meyer reported recruiting for a Chief Operating Officer (replacing current Director of Operations, Steve Blaska) has begun. Staff will hold initial interviews towards the end of next week. Human Resources department is acting as an “in-house search firm” and reaching out to people who are not looking for jobs, which is what a search firm would do, but they are doing it themselves. STA has received approximately 70 applications.
- Pam Haley, Al French, Josh Kerns, Kevin Freeman, Steve Blaska, Ralph Wilder, Nancy Williams, and Ms. Meyer are all attending the APTA Expo 2017 next week and have appointments with five bus manufacturers to talk about battery electric technology, charging stations, and vehicle design for bus rapid transit for Central City Line routes.
- She reported having an appointment with the new acting administrator of the Federal Transit Association (K. Jane Williams) and advised she was appointed as the Deputy Administrator and, in the absence of an administrator, she serves in an acting capacity. Staff are looking forward to meeting with her and discussing the Central City Line project.
- Staff received news on Monday that FTA has given a rating to STA on the project that allows STA to be eligible for funds. She noted staff asked for an early rating and FTA gave it. She noted that while staff would like to shout it from the mountaintops, FTA would like it to not be vocalized because it is an early rating. The first time it will be in writing will be next February in the FTA Annual Report. Staff have the validation that the project is rated highly enough to be eligible for funding and that rating is actually a statutory requirement. By law, agencies must receive a medium or greater rating.

8. COMMITTEE INFORMATION

- A. August Financial Results Summary - *as presented*
- B. September Sales Tax Revenue Information - *as presented*
- C. August 2017 Operating Indicators - *as presented*
- D. 2017 Outreach Communications Update - *as presented*

9. NOVEMBER 1, 2017 COMMITTEE PACKAGE AGENDA REVIEW

10. NEW BUSINESS

None.

11. COMMITTEE MEMBERS' EXPRESSIONS

None.

12. ADJOURN

Chair Waldref adjourned the meeting at 3:17 p.m.

13. NEXT MEETING – WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 2017, 1:30 P.M. STA SOUTHSIDE CONFERENCE ROOM, 1230 WEST BOONE AVENUE

Respectfully submitted,



Dana Infalt, Executive Assistant