Appendix A

Initial Transit Scenarios
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCENARIO ID</th>
<th>RTE ID</th>
<th>TERM. 1</th>
<th>TERM. 2</th>
<th>INTERMED. 1</th>
<th>INTERMED. 2</th>
<th>INTERMED. 3</th>
<th>DEMAND</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>FLYER STOP WITH TRANSFER STATION 1</th>
<th>FLYER STOP WITH TRANSFER STATION 2</th>
<th>HOV LANES 1</th>
<th>HOV LANES 2</th>
<th>HOV LANES 3</th>
<th>EXCLUSIVE TRANSIT-WAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>STATE LINE PARK AND RIDE (NEW)</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td>LIBERTY LAKE PNR (EXISTING)</td>
<td>GREENACRE PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>STATE LINE TO SULLIVAN</td>
<td>HAMILTON TO DIVISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>PENCE-COLE PARK AND RIDE</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td>ARGONNE PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>THOR/FREYA</td>
<td>HAMILTON TO DIVISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic, Higher Intensity</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>STATE LINE PARK AND RIDE (NEW)</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td>LIBERTY LAKE PNR (EXISTING)</td>
<td>GREENACRE PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>PINES/INDIANA</td>
<td>HAMILTON TO DIVISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic, Higher Intensity</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>PENCE-COLE PARK AND RIDE</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td>ARGONNE PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>THOR/FREYA</td>
<td>HAMILTON TO DIVISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCENARIO ID</td>
<td>RTE ID</td>
<td>TERM. 1</td>
<td>TERM. 2</td>
<td>INTERMED. 1</td>
<td>INTERMED. 2</td>
<td>INTERMED.3</td>
<td>DEMAND</td>
<td>FLYER</td>
<td>FLYER</td>
<td>HOV</td>
<td>HOV</td>
<td>HOV</td>
<td>EXCLUSIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 INTENSE</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>STATE LINE PARK AND RIDE (NEW)</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td>LIBERTY LAKE PNR (EXISTING)</td>
<td>GREENACRES PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>PINES/INDIANA</td>
<td>SPRAGUE/FANCHER</td>
<td>STATE LINE TO SULLIVAN</td>
<td>SPRAGUE/FANCHER TO HAMILTON/2ND/3RD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>LIBERTY LAKE TC</td>
<td>U-DISTRICT</td>
<td>GREENACRES PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>PINES/INDIANA PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>SPRAGUE/FANCHER</td>
<td>STATE LINE TO SULLIVAN</td>
<td>SPRAGUE/FANCHER TO HAMILTON/2ND/3RD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>GREENACRES PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td>PENCE-COLE PARK AND RIDE</td>
<td>U-DISTRICT (NEW)</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>ARGONNE/MULLEN</td>
<td>SPRAGUE/FANCHER</td>
<td>SPRAGUE/FANCHER TO HAMILTON/2ND/3RD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCENARIO ID</td>
<td>RTE ID</td>
<td>TERM. 1</td>
<td>TERM. 2</td>
<td>INTERMED. 1</td>
<td>INTERMED. 2</td>
<td>INTERMED.3</td>
<td>DEMAND TARGET</td>
<td>FLYER STOP WITH TRANSFER STATION 1</td>
<td>FLYER STOP WITH TRANSFER STATION 2</td>
<td>HOV Lanes 1</td>
<td>HOV Lanes 2</td>
<td>HOV Lanes 3</td>
<td>EXCLUSIVE TRANSIT-WAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 MORE DESTINATIONS</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>STATE LINE PARK AND RIDE (NEW)</td>
<td>WEST PLAINS TC</td>
<td>LIBERTY LAKE PNR (EXISTING)</td>
<td>GREENACRE S PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>JEFFERSON ST. PNR</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>EVERGREEN FS</td>
<td>SPRAGUE/FANCHER</td>
<td>STATELINE TO SULLIVAN</td>
<td>SPRAGUE/FANCHER TO HAMILTON/2ND/3RD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2110</td>
<td>GREENACRES PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>WEST PLAINS TC</td>
<td>PENCE-COLE PARK AND RIDE</td>
<td>U-DISTRICT (NEW)</td>
<td>JEFFERSON ST. PNR</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>SPRAGUE/FANCHER</td>
<td>SPRAGUE/FANCHER</td>
<td>SPRAGUE/FANCHER TO HAMILTON/2ND/3RD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 HEAVY INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>STATE LINE PARK AND RIDE (NEW)</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td>LIBERTY LAKE PNR (EXISTING)</td>
<td>GREENACRE S PNR (NEW)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>THOR/FREYA</td>
<td>STATELINE TO SULLIVAN</td>
<td>THOR/FREYA TO HAMILTON TO DIVISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>STATE LINE PARK AND RIDE (NEW)</td>
<td>U-DISTRICT</td>
<td>LIBERTY LAKE PNR (EXISTING)</td>
<td>GREENACRE S PNR (NEW)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>THOR/FREYA</td>
<td>STATELINE TO SULLIVAN</td>
<td>THOR/FREYA TO HAMILTON TO HAMILTON/2ND/3RD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCENARIO ID</td>
<td>RTE ID</td>
<td>TERM. 1</td>
<td>TERM. 2</td>
<td>INTERMED. 1</td>
<td>INTERMED. 2</td>
<td>INTERMED.3</td>
<td>DEMAND</td>
<td>FLYER STOP WITH TRANSFER STATION 1</td>
<td>FLYER STOP WITH TRANSFER STATION 2</td>
<td>HOV LANES 1</td>
<td>HOV LANES 2</td>
<td>HOV LANES 3</td>
<td>EXCLUSIVE TRANSIT-WAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>PENCE-COLE PARK AND RIDE</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td>ARGONNE PNR (NEW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>ARGONNE /MULLEN</td>
<td>THOR/FREYA</td>
<td>THOR/FREYA TO HAMILTON</td>
<td>THOR/FREYA TO HAMILTON/ 2ND/3RD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>PENCE-COLE PARK AND RIDE</td>
<td>U-DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>SPRAGUE /FANCHER</td>
<td>THOR/FREYA</td>
<td>THOR/FREYA TO HAMILTON</td>
<td>THOR/FREYA TO HAMILTON/ 2ND/3RD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1025</td>
<td>STATE LINE PARK AND RIDE (NEW)</td>
<td>WEST PLAINS TC</td>
<td>LIBERTY LAKE PNR (EXISTING)</td>
<td>GREENACRE S PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>JEFFERSON ST. PNR</td>
<td></td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>SPRAGUE /FANCHER</td>
<td>STATELINE TO SULLIVAN</td>
<td>HAMILTON TO DIVISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1015</td>
<td>LIBERTY LAKE TC</td>
<td>U-DISTRICT</td>
<td>GREENACRE S PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>EVERGREEN PNR NEW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>THOR/FREYA</td>
<td>STATELINE TO SULLIVAN</td>
<td>THOR/FREYA TO HAMILTON/ 2ND/3RD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCENARIO ID</td>
<td>RTE ID</td>
<td>TERM. 1</td>
<td>TERM. 2</td>
<td>INTERMED. 1</td>
<td>INTERMED. 2</td>
<td>INTERMED.3</td>
<td>DEMAND</td>
<td>FLYER</td>
<td>FLYER</td>
<td>FLYER</td>
<td>EXCLUSIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>STATION 1</td>
<td>STATION 2</td>
<td>STATION 3</td>
<td>TRANSIT-WAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>HIGH INTENSITY SERVICE AND INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>GREENACRES PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>WEST PLAINS TC</td>
<td>PENCE-COLE PARK AND RIDE</td>
<td>ARGONNE PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>JEFFERSON ST. PNR</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>THOR/FREYA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THOR/FREYA TO HAMILTON/2ND/3RD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>HIGH INTENSITY, HOV LANE-CENTRIC</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>LIBERTY LAKE TC</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td>GREENACRES PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>EVERGREEN PNR NEW</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>ARGONNE /MULLEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STATELINE TO SULLIVAN</td>
<td>HAMILTON TO DIVISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1008</td>
<td>LIBERTY LAKE TC</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td>GREENACRES PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>EVERGREEN PNR NEW</td>
<td>U-DISTRICT (NEW)</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>THOR/FREYA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STATELINE TO SULLIVAN</td>
<td>THOR/FREYA TO HAMILTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCENARIO ID</td>
<td>RTE ID</td>
<td>TERM. 1</td>
<td>TERM. 2</td>
<td>INTERMED. 1</td>
<td>INTERMED. 2</td>
<td>INTERMED.3</td>
<td>DEMAND TARGET</td>
<td>FLYER STOP WITH TRANSFER STATION 1</td>
<td>FLYER STOP WITH TRANSFER STATION 2</td>
<td>HOV LANES 1</td>
<td>HOV LANES 2</td>
<td>HOV LANES 3</td>
<td>EXCLUSIVE TRANSIT-WAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>GREENACRES PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td>PENCE-COLE PARK AND RIDE</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>THOR/FREYA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HAMILTON TO DIVISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>GREENACRES PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td>PENCE-COLE PARK AND RIDE</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>ARGONNE /MULLEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HAMILTON TO DIVISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050</td>
<td>LIBERTY LAKE TC</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td>GREENACRES PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>SPRAGUE /FANCHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HAMILTON TO 2ND/3RD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1055</td>
<td>LIBERTY LAKE TC</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td>GREENACRES PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HAMILTON TO DIVISION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCENARIO ID</td>
<td>RTE ID</td>
<td>TERM. 1</td>
<td>TERM. 2</td>
<td>INTERMED. 1</td>
<td>INTERMED. 2</td>
<td>INTERMED.3</td>
<td>DEMAND</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>FLYER STOP WITH TRANSFER STATION 1</td>
<td>FLYER STOP WITH TRANSFER STATION 2</td>
<td>HOV LANES 1</td>
<td>HOV LANES 2</td>
<td>HOV LANES 3</td>
<td>EXCLUSIVE TRANSIT-WAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>PENCE-COLE PARK AND RIDE</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td>ARGONNE PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>U-DISTRICT(NEW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>ARGONNE/MULLEN</td>
<td>FLYER STOP WITH TRANSFER STATION 1</td>
<td>FLYER STOP WITH TRANSFER STATION 2</td>
<td>HOV LANES 1</td>
<td>HOV LANES 2</td>
<td>HOV LANES 3</td>
<td>THOR/FR EYA TO HAMILTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1040</td>
<td>LIBERTY LAKE TC</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td>EVERGREEN PNR NEW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>SPRAGUE/FANCHER</td>
<td>STATELINE TO SULLIVAN</td>
<td>HAMILTON TO DIVISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1041</td>
<td>LIBERTY LAKE TC</td>
<td>WEST PLAINS TC</td>
<td>EVERGREEN PNR NEW</td>
<td>U-DISTRICT(NEW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>ARGONNE/MULLEN</td>
<td>STATELINE TO SULLIVAN</td>
<td>HAMILTON TO DIVISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>PENCE-COLE PARK AND RIDE</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td>ARGONNE PNR (NEW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>ARGONNE/MULLEN</td>
<td>HAMILTON TO DIVISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 EMPHASIS ON CENTRAL VALLEY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCENARIO ID</th>
<th>RTE ID</th>
<th>TERM. 1</th>
<th>TERM. 2</th>
<th>INTERMED. 1</th>
<th>INTERMED. 2</th>
<th>INTERMED. 3</th>
<th>DEMAND</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
<th>FLYER STOP WITH TRANSFER STATION 1</th>
<th>FLYER STOP WITH TRANSFER STATION 2</th>
<th>HOV Lanes 1</th>
<th>HOV Lanes 2</th>
<th>HOV Lanes 3</th>
<th>EXCLUSIVE TRANSIT-WAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2041</td>
<td>PENCE-COLE PARK AND RIDE</td>
<td>WEST PLAINS TC</td>
<td>U-DISTRICT(NE W)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>SPRAGUE/FANCHER</td>
<td></td>
<td>HAMILTON TO DIVISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>LIBERTY LAKE TC</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td>MIRABEAU PNR</td>
<td>U-DISTRICT(NE W)</td>
<td>GREENACRES PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>LIBERTY LAKE TC</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td>MIRABEAU PNR</td>
<td>U-DISTRICT(NE W)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>LIBERTY LAKE TC</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td>MIRABEAU PNR</td>
<td>U-DISTRICT(NE W)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>PENCE-COLE PARK AND RIDE</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td>MIRABEAU PNR</td>
<td>U-DISTRICT(NE W)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>ARGONNE/MULLEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 SEPTEMBER 2022
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario ID</th>
<th>RTE ID</th>
<th>Term. 1</th>
<th>Term. 2</th>
<th>INTERMED. 1</th>
<th>INTERMED. 2</th>
<th>INTERMED. 3</th>
<th>Demand Target</th>
<th>FLYER Stop with Transfer Station 1</th>
<th>FLYER Stop with Transfer Station 2</th>
<th>HOV Lanes 1</th>
<th>HOV Lanes 2</th>
<th>HOV Lanes 3</th>
<th>EXCLUSIVE TRANSIT-WAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>PENCE-COLE PARK AND RIDE</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>SPRAGUE/FANCHER</td>
<td>SPRAGUE/FANCHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>MIRABEAU ANSWER?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1012</td>
<td>LIBERTY LAKE TC</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td></td>
<td>GREENACRES PNR (NEW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>SPRAGUE/FANCHER</td>
<td>SPRAGUE/FANCHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1060</td>
<td>GREENACRES PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>WEST PLAINS TC</td>
<td></td>
<td>MIRABEAU PNR</td>
<td>PINES/INDIA NA PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>U-DISTRICT (NEW)</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>SPRAGUE/FANCHER</td>
<td>SPRAGUE/FANCHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2045</td>
<td>PENCE-COLE PARK AND RIDE</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARGONNE PNR (NEW)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>SPRAGUE/FANCHER</td>
<td>SPRAGUE/FANCHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2046</td>
<td>PENCE-COLE PARK AND RIDE</td>
<td>U-DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>SPRAGUE/FANCHER</td>
<td>SPRAGUE/FANCHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCENARIO ID</td>
<td>RTE ID</td>
<td>TERM. 1</td>
<td>TERM. 2</td>
<td>INTERMED. 1</td>
<td>INTERMED. 2</td>
<td>INTERMED.3</td>
<td>DEMAND</td>
<td>FLYER STOP WITH TRANSFER STATION 1</td>
<td>FLYER STOP WITH TRANSFER STATION 2</td>
<td>HOV LANES 1</td>
<td>HOV LANES 2</td>
<td>HOV LANES 3</td>
<td>EXCLUSIVE TRANSIT-WAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3001</td>
<td>MIRABEAU PNR</td>
<td>WEST PLAINS TC</td>
<td>ARGONNE PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>U-DISTRICT(NEW)</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>THOR/FREYA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1065</td>
<td>LIBERTY LAKE TC</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td>GREENACRES PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>MIRABEAU PNR</td>
<td>ARGONNE PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>THOR/FREYA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2047</td>
<td>PENCE-COLE PARK AND RIDE</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td>U-DISTRICT(NEW)</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>THOR/FREYA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1056</td>
<td>LIBERTY LAKE TC</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td>U-DISTRICT(NEW)</td>
<td>ARGONNE PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>THOR/FREYA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>PENCE-COLE PARK AND RIDE</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>THOR/FREYA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCENARIO ID</td>
<td>RTE ID</td>
<td>TERM. 1</td>
<td>TERM. 2</td>
<td>INTERMED. 1</td>
<td>INTERMED. 2</td>
<td>INTERMED. 3</td>
<td>DEMAND TARGET</td>
<td>FLYER STOP WITH TRANSFER STATION 1</td>
<td>FLYER STOP WITH TRANSFER STATION 2</td>
<td>HOV LANES 1</td>
<td>HOV LANES 2</td>
<td>HOV LANES 3</td>
<td>EXCLUSIVE TRANSIT-WAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3002</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>MIRABEAU PNR</td>
<td>WEST PLAINS TC</td>
<td>U-DISTRICT(NEW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1066</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>LIBERTY LAKE TC</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td>GREENACRES PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>MIRABEAU PNR</td>
<td></td>
<td>3000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2049</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>PENCE-COLE PARK AND RIDE</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td>U-DISTRICT(NEW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1056</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>LIBERTY LAKE TC</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td>U-DISTRICT(NEW)</td>
<td></td>
<td>ARGONNE PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2052</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>PENCE-COLE PARK AND RIDE</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCENARIO ID</td>
<td>RTE ID</td>
<td>TERM. 1</td>
<td>TERM. 2</td>
<td>INTERMED. 1</td>
<td>INTERMED. 2</td>
<td>INTERMED.3</td>
<td>DEMAND TARGET</td>
<td>FLYER STOP WITH TRANSFER STATION 1</td>
<td>FLYER STOP WITH TRANSFER STATION 2</td>
<td>HOV LANES 1</td>
<td>HOV LANES 2</td>
<td>HOV LANES 3</td>
<td>EXCLUSIVE TRANSIT-WAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 THREE</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>LIBERTY</td>
<td>WEST PLAINS TC</td>
<td>MIRABEAU PNR</td>
<td>ARGONNE PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>PLAZA</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROUTE</td>
<td></td>
<td>LAKE TC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARMONY</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>STATE LINE</td>
<td>JEFFERS ON ST. PARK AND RIDE</td>
<td>LIBERTY LAKE PNR (EXISTING)</td>
<td>GREENACRE PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>ARGONNE PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2115</td>
<td>GREENACRES PNR (NEW)</td>
<td>U-DISTRICT</td>
<td>PENCE-COLE PARK AND RIDE</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Property Assessment and Corridor Maps
LEGEND

- LIBERTY LAKE PARCEL - LEVEL 2 EVALUATION
- LIBERTY LAKE PARCEL - LEVEL 1 EVALUATION
- GREENACRES PARCEL - LEVEL 2 EVALUATION
- GREENACRES PARCEL - LEVEL 1 EVALUATION
- STATELINE PARCEL

Mission Ave Frontage Improvements W. city limits to Glenbrook
Funded $750,000 - 2026

Country Vista Rebuild/Operational Improvements W. city limits to Liberty Lake Rd
Funded $3,176,000 - 2024-2025

Legacy Ridge/County Vista Intersection Signalization
Funded $480,000 - 2021-2022
Appendix C

STA HPT Site Selection Level 1 Screening Summary
### Level 1 Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>A5</th>
<th>A6</th>
<th>A7</th>
<th>A8</th>
<th>A9</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>G3</th>
<th>G4</th>
<th>G5</th>
<th>G6</th>
<th>G7</th>
<th>G8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Brower</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Payne</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Blankenagel</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Guebert</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zach Gray</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES**

- **Tim Payne**
  - G7: Zoning is zero due

- **Tim Guebert / Zach Gray**
  - A3: Add as potential Mirabeau location

**Scoring Notes:**

0 = No, the site does not meet the stated objective

1 = Partial applicability or neutral to the stated objective

2 = Yes, the site fully meets the stated objective
## Level 1 Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>L3</th>
<th>L4</th>
<th>L5</th>
<th>L6</th>
<th>L8</th>
<th>L9</th>
<th>L10</th>
<th>L11</th>
<th>L12</th>
<th>L13</th>
<th>L14</th>
<th>L15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Brower</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Payne</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Blankenagel</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Guebert</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zach Gray</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scoring Notes:
- **0** = No, the site does not meet the stated objective
- **1** = Partial applicability or neutral to the stated objective
- **2** = Yes, the site fully meets the stated objective

### NOTES
- Tim Payne: Needs to owners L2. Maybe a site for stateline?
- Tim Guebert / Zach Gray

---

STA HPT Site Selection Level 1 Screening Summary.xlsx
## Level 1 Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer</th>
<th>M2</th>
<th>M3</th>
<th>M4</th>
<th>M5</th>
<th>M6</th>
<th>M7</th>
<th>M8</th>
<th>M9</th>
<th>M10</th>
<th>M11</th>
<th>M12</th>
<th>M13</th>
<th>M14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Brower</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Payne</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Blankenagel</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Guebert</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zach Gray</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES**
- Tim Payne
- Tim Guebert / Zach Gray

**M5: Stormwater Facility**

### Scoring Notes:
- 0 = No, the site does not meet the stated objective
- 1 = Partial applicability or neutral to the stated objective
- 2 = Yes, the site fully meets the stated objective
Appendix D

STA HPT Site Selection Level 2 Screening Summary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A6</th>
<th>A7</th>
<th>M2</th>
<th>M4</th>
<th>M6</th>
<th>M7</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G3</th>
<th>G4</th>
<th>L3</th>
<th>L11</th>
<th>L13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Minimize Impacts from Critical Area Constraints</td>
<td>1A. Is the site free of challenging topography or other critical areas that would increase construction costs on the site (e.g., are there no steep slopes or no retaining walls/other infrastructure is required)?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Safety</td>
<td>2A. What is the public perception of safety (personal and property) at the site based on the surrounding land uses/developments?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Minimize Impacts to Traffic and Transit Operations</td>
<td>3A. Can existing or planned traffic signals and/or other Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) and infrastructure help to minimize traffic impacts and improve transit and vehicular access to/from the site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3B. Are there planned improvements such as roadway widening, two left turns lanes, overpass, etc. that would improve access?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3C. Is there an opportunity to add improvements nearby to improve site access, such as transit only lanes?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Transit Operations</td>
<td>4A. What are adjacent roadway conditions at peak?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4B. How vulnerable is the site to delay?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4C. Is there potential for the site to be accessed from more than one roadway?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4D. Is there potential to segregate transit operations from general purpose traffic with respect to site access?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4E. How much time will it take to reach the site from the adjacent roadway?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4F. How much time will it take to deviate a current route to the site?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4G. How well does the site facilitate connections to local transit network?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4H. How well does the site location minimize the need for transfers?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Site Accessibility and Functionality</td>
<td>5A. How accessible and functional is the site for transit riders? (e.g., Does the site location minimize the travel distance for riders?)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5B. Are transit and riders able to make a left in and left out of the site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5C. What is the capture ability of this site to intercept local drivers?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5D. What is the ease of navigation from I-90 (e.g. visibility)?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Potential to Develop Nonmotorized Facilities</td>
<td>6A. Is right-of-way available to develop sidewalks and/or bicycle facilities?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Transit Supportive Development</td>
<td>7A. Do the surrounding uses encourage or support future transit oriented development?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

W/ existing Consider as Mall-centr Contingency Contingency
Consider in context with M5

M5 has a large Elevation change of 16-25 feet and is infeasible
Appendix E

Planning-Level Cost Estimates
## BID ITEM QUANTITY UNIT UNIT PRICE AMOUNT (ROUNDED)

### PREPARATION
- CLEAR AND GRUB 0.73 AC $ 8,000 $ 6,000
- REMOVE STRUCTURES & OBSTRUCTIONS 1 LS $ 100,000 $ 100,000
- REMOVE ASPHALT PAVEMENT 2,600 SY $ 31 $ 81,000
- REMOVE SIDEWALK 740 SY $ 20 $ 15,000

### EARTHWORK
- EXCAVATION 350 CY $ 42 $ 15,000
- COMMON BORROW 350 CY $ 10 $ 4,000
- HAZARDOUS MATERIAL REMOVAL 0 LS $ 0 $ 0

### ILLUMINATION
- LIGHTING AND SECURITY 1 LS $ 170,000 $ 170,000

### DRAINAGE
- STORMWATER CONVEYANCE 1 LS $ 50,000 $ 50,000
- FLOW CONTROL 1 LS $ 230,000 $ 230,000
- WATER QUALITY 1 LS $ 100,000 $ 100,000

### ROADWAY
- HMA PAVEMENT FOR PARKING 3,100 SY $ 36 $ 120,000
- HMA PAVEMENT FOR ROADWAY 0 SY $ 73 $ 0
- CEMENT CONC. PAVEMENT 625 SY $ 70 $ 44,000
- CEMENT CONC. CURB RAMP 10 EA $ 2,700 $ 27,000
- CEMENT CONC. SIDEWALK 1,300 SY $ 80 $ 110,000
- CEMENT CONC. SIDEWALK (TO PINE ST.) 1,200 SY $ 55 $ 66,000
- CEMENT CONC. CURB AND GUTTER 3,000 LF $ 8 $ 24,000
- PAVEMENT STRIPING 1,700 LF $ 8 $ 14,000
- PAVEMENT MARKINGS 5 EA $ 200 $ 1,000
- SIGNAGE 1 LS $ 4,000 $ 4,000
- BUS SHELTER 8 EA $ 10,000 $ 80,000

### STRUCTURES
- COMFORT BUILDING 1 LS $ 380,000 $ 380,000
- UTILITY SERVICES 1 LS $ 50,000 $ 50,000
- MISC STRUCTURES 1 LS $ 100,000 $ 100,000

### LANDSCAPING
- SEEDING AND MULCHING 0.4 AC $ 5,000 $ 3,000
- IRRIGATION 1 LS $ 6,000 $ 6,000
- PLANTINGS 1 LS $ 5,000 $ 5,000

### OTHER WORK
- SIGNAL 0 LS $ 500,000 $ 0
- TSP/ITS/SECURITY 1 LS $ 75,000 $ 75,000
- FUTURE PROVISION FOR ELECTRIFICATION 1 LS $ 300,000 $ 300,000

### MOBILIZATION / DEMOBILIZATION
- 5% $ 110,000

### EROSION CONTROL/DEWATERING/SPCC
- 2% $ 44,000

### TRAFFIC CONTROL
- 2% $ 44,000

### DESIGN CONTINGENCY
- 30% $ 660,000

### SUBTOTAL (ROUNDED)
- $ 2,200,000

### CONSTRUCTION SUBTOTAL (ROUNDED)
- $ 3,100,000

### CONSTRUCTION TOTAL (ROUNDED)
- $ 5,400,000

### REAL ESTATE
- REAL ESTATE ACQUISITION 0 SF $ 14.00 $ 0

### REAL ESTATE ACQUISITION TOTAL (ROUNDED)
- $ 0

### TOTAL ESTIMATED PROJECT COST (ROUNDED)
- $ 6,000,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BID ITEM</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT (ROUNDED)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PREPARATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear and Grub</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$61,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove Structures &amp; Obstructions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EARTHWORK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation</td>
<td>1,755</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Borrow</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Material Removal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILLUMINATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting and Security</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DRAINAGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Conveyance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$154,000</td>
<td>$154,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$610,000</td>
<td>$610,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROADWAY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA Pavement for Parking</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$36</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA Pavement for Roadway</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$73</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cement Conc. Pavement</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cement Conc. Curb Ramp</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cement Conc. Sidewalk</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cement Conc. Curb and Gutter</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$55</td>
<td>$385,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Stripping</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Markings</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRUCTURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator Comfort Facility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$410,000</td>
<td>$410,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Shelter</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc Structures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANDSCAPING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeding and Mulching</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER WORK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSP/ITS/Security</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Provision for Electrification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal (Rounded)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MOBILIZATION / DEMOBILIZATION</strong></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EROSION CONTROL/DEWATERING/SPCC</strong></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRAFFIC CONTROL</strong></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DESIGN CONTINGENCY</strong></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Subtotal (Rounded)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE SALES TAX</strong></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$560,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENGINEERING DESIGN</strong></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADMINISTRATIVE</strong></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$560,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSTRUCTION CONTINGENCY</strong></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERMITTING</strong></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Total (Rounded)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REAL ESTATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Acquisition</td>
<td>446,950</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$6,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Real Estate Acquisition Total (Rounded)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Project Cost (Rounded)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Construction Project Overview

**Project:** STA I-90/VALLEY HPT  
**Description:** APPLEWAY STATION PARK AND RIDE  
**Site Description:** 300 STALL PARK AND RIDE, 5 BUS BAYS, 3 LAYOVER BAYS, EB TRANSIT ONLY RAMP FROM I-90 TO TRANSIT CENTER  
**Date:** 5/31/2022  
**By:** MLT/TCG  
**Checked By:** ZRG

## Bid Item Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bid Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Amount (Rounded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear and Grub</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$81,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove Structures &amp; Obstructions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$172,000</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earthwork</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation</td>
<td>3,251</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Borrow</td>
<td>3,251</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Material Removal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illumination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting and Security</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drainage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Conveyance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$560,000</td>
<td>$560,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roadway</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA Pavement for Parking</td>
<td>16,480</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$36</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA Pavement for Roadway</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$73</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cement Conc. Pavement</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cement Conc. Curb Ramp</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cement Conc. Sidewalk</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cement Conc. Curb and Gutter</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$55</td>
<td>$440,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Striping</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Markings</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator Comfort Facility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$410,000</td>
<td>$410,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Shelter</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc Structures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscaping</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeding and Mulching</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSP/ITS/Security</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Provision for Electrification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal (Rounded) $6,400,000

| MOBILIZATION / DEMOBILIZATION | 5% | $320,000 |
| EROSION CONTROL / DEWATERING / SPCC | 2% | $130,000 |
| TRAFFIC CONTROL               | 5% | $320,000 |
| DESIGN CONTINGENCY            | 30%| $2,000,000|

Construction Subtotal (Rounded) $9,200,000

| State Sales Tax              | 10%| $920,000 |
| Engineering Design           | 20%| $1,840,000|
| Administrative               | 10%| $920,000 |
| Construction Management      | 15%| $1,400,000|
| Construction Contingency     | 10%| $1,100,000|
| Permitting                   | 5% | $460,000  |

Construction Total (Rounded) $15,900,000

| Real Estate Acquisition      | 446,950 | SF | $14.00 | $6,300,000 |

Real Estate Acquisition Total (Rounded) $6,300,000

Total Estimated Project Cost (Rounded) $23,000,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BID ITEM</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT (ROUNDED)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PREPARATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEAR AND GRUB</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$83,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMOVE STRUCTURES &amp; OBSTRUCTIONS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARTHWORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCAVATION</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMON BORROW</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZARDOUS MATERIAL REMOVAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLUMINATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIGHTING AND SECURITY</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAINAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORMWATER CONVEYANCE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLOW CONTROL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER QUALITY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROADWAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA PAVEMENT FOR PARKING</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$36</td>
<td>$810,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA PAVEMENT FOR ROADWAY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$73</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEMENT CONC. PAVEMENT</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEMENT CONC. CURB RAMP</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEMENT CONC. SIDEWALK</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEMENT CONC. CURB AND GUTTER</td>
<td>8,050</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$55</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAVEMENT STRIPING</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAVEMENT MARKINGS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGNAGE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRUCTURES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATOR &amp; PASSENGER COMFORT FACILITY</td>
<td>2495</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$975</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSENGER COVERED AREA</td>
<td>3545</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITY SERVICES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC STRUCTURES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDSCAPING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEDING AND MULCHING</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRRIGATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANTINGS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER WORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGNAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSP/ITS/SECURITY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUTURE PROVISION FOR ELECTRIFICATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (Rounded)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBILIZATION / DEMOBILIZATION</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$535,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EROSION CONTROL/Dewatering/SPCC</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC CONTROL</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$535,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN CONTINGENCY</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Subtotal (Rounded)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SALES TAX</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING DESIGN</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION CONTINGENCY</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERMITTING</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$770,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Total (Rounded)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAL ESTATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAL ESTATE ACQUISITION</td>
<td>446,950</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$6,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Acquisition Total (Rounded)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Project Cost (Rounded)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$33,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Bid Item Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BID ITEM</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT (ROUNDED)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear and Grub</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earthwork</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$760,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roadway</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cement Conc. Pavement</td>
<td>7,250</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Structure</td>
<td>5,320</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
<td>$7,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE Wall</td>
<td>24,300</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal (Rounded)** $10,600,000

| MOBILIZATION / DEMOBILIZATION | 5% | $530,000 |
| EROSION CONTROL/DEWATERING/SPCC | 2% | $220,000 |
| TRAFFIC CONTROL               | 5% | $530,000 |
| DESIGN CONTINGENCY            | 30%| $3,200,000 |

**Construction Subtotal (Rounded)** $15,100,000

| STATE SALES TAX          | 10% | $1,600,000 |
| ENGINEERING DESIGN       | 20% | $3,100,000 |
| ADMINISTRATIVE           | 10% | $1,600,000 |
| CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT  | 15% | $2,300,000 |
| CONSTRUCTION CONTINGENCY | 10% | $1,800,000 |
| PERMITTING               | 5%  | $760,000   |

**Construction Total (Rounded)** $26,300,000

| REAL ESTATE ACQUISITION   | 27,200 | SF | $14.00 | $400,000 |

**Real Estate Acquisition Total (Rounded)** $400,000

**Total Estimated Project Cost (Rounded)** $27,000,000
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Site L13 Environmental Baseline Memo
memorandum

date       June 10, 2022

to         Mark A. Brower, P.E., KPFF

from       Silvia Hendrickson and Katie Wilson, ESA

subject    Environmental Baseline Conditions for L13 Station
           Parcel #55175.9049 in Liberty Lake, Washington

INTRODUCTION

This memo provides a summary of the existing environmental conditions within the study area identified as the L13 site and its surrounding areas. The study area includes Parcel 55175.9049. The parcel is bound by E Appleway Ave to the south, Parcel 55175.9048 to the west, exit to Highway I-90 to the east, and Highway I-90 to the north in Liberty Lake, Washington. This study consisted of reviewing online resources for environmentally critical areas, cultural resources, and demographics.

ENVIRONMENTALLY CRITICAL AREAS

In general, environmentally critical areas (critical areas) are defined as providing valuable and beneficial biological and physical functions to the human and natural environment. Critical areas include wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, geologically hazardous areas, and critical aquifer recharge areas as set forth in City of Liberty Lake Development Code Title 10, Article 10-6B, Critical Areas. Local jurisdictions regulate the development and alteration of critical areas and their buffers to protect the natural environment as well as public health and safety.

The Spokane County SCOUT GIS map does not map flood hazard areas, wetlands, or Water Bank Approved Mitigation Areas at the site or near the site; Watershed Boundaries (WRIA) 57 Middle Spokane and Spokane Valley – Rathdrum Prairie Aquifer are mapped at the site and most of the Spokane Valley area. Spokane County’s Aquifer Susceptibility Map depicts the site as within a Well Head Protection Area. Spokane County’s Shoreline Designation Map shows the site as outside of the shoreline, with the nearest body of open water approximately 1 mile north (Spokane River), and Liberty Lake approximately 1.7 miles to the southwest; the National Wetlands Inventory did not map surface waters or wetlands at the site. The Spokane County Priority Habitat Species (PHS) Map and the US Fish & Wildlife IPaC do not map any critical habitats at the site; PHS on the Web from the Washington State Department of Fish & Wildlife maps Eastside Steppe habitat feature along the southeastern boundary of the parcel. No geological hazards and constraints are mapped at the site, within proximity, or adjacent to the site; erodible soils are located approximately 0.50 miles southwest of the site.
Contaminated Areas
The Washington State Department of Ecology lists three sites (CSID: 1083/FSID: 653; CSID 7557/FSID 3926357, and CSID: 14851/FSID: 50340) within a 0.5 miles search distance from the study area. Two of the sites were under Ecology’s Voluntary Cleanup Program and have both received a No Further Action determination from Ecology; one of the sites (CSID: 14851/FSID: 50340) is listed as Cleanup Started. No contamination or cleanups are mapped on the parcel of the study area.

Noise Sensitive Areas
Land uses that are considered sensitive to noise impacts are referred to as “sensitive receptors.” Noise sensitive receptors consist of, but are not limited to, schools, residences, libraries, hospitals, and other care facilities. The following locations were identified as the nearest sensitive receptors to the study area:

- Residences along E Laberry Dr, approximately 1,250 feet west
- Country Vista Apartments approximately 1 mile east
- Selkirk Middle School approximately 0.40 miles northeast
- Ridgeline High School approximately 1,250 feet south

CULTURAL RESOURCES
The Cultural Resources study area for this analysis is a one-mile radius around parcel 55175.9049 in Spokane County. Parcel 55175.9049 is the property known as L13. Based on this preliminary review, the subject parcel appears to have a moderate risk for containing archaeological resources. No known Spokane villages or other named places are known to exist within or adjacent to the subject parcel. It is possible that the subject parcel was once used for root gathering based on its interior setting and landform. The historical General Land Office survey map prepared for the U.S. Surveyor General in the 19th century does not record any features in the subject parcel or immediately adjacent. The nearest features were wagon roads, both over 0.50 mile away, one to the north and the other to the south. A review of historic aerial photographs taken in 1962, 1972, and 1995 show the subject parcel in use as an agricultural field without any visible associated structures or modified features.

According to records held at the Washington State Historic Preservation Office (operating as the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, DAHP), to date show there are no recorded archaeological sites, traditional cultural properties, cemeteries, or historic resources (buildings or structures) within the subject parcel. The parcel has not been subject to a cultural resources assessment. Over 10 surveys have occurred within one mile; several of these surveys were immediately adjacent.

The DAHP maintains a Statewide Predictive Model for the potential presence of precontact-era archaeology. This model classifies the subject parcel as Very High Risk – Survey Highly Advised. Eight sites have been recorded within one mile and date to the precontact and historic era; the majority are north along the banks of the Spokane River. The nearest recorded site is approximately 330 feet south and consists of a ca.1901-1960 agricultural ditch (45SP854); this site was determined not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The second nearest recorded site is approximately 0.30 miles north and is a segment of the former Spokane Inland Empire Electric Line (45SP903); this site has been determined eligible for listing in the NRHP.

A cultural resources assessment of the subject parcel is advised and would likely be required if the project involves funding, permitting, or approvals by a federal agency or receives funding from a state agency.
DEMOGRAPHICS

The Equity and Social Justice (ESJ) study area for this analysis is comprised of census block groups that overlap with a one-half mile radius around parcel 55175.9049 in Spokane County. Parcel 55175.9049 is the property known as L13. Overall, the review found that the study area has lower percentages of people of color, population speaking non-English languages at home, and linguistically-isolated households when compared to Spokane County as a whole. There are no individual languages spoken at home by 5% or more of households, other than English. The study area has a very slightly higher per capita income, compared to Spokane County. Fewer individuals whose ratio of household income to poverty level is less than 2 live within the study area compared to the rest of the county, meaning that poverty is less prevalent in the study area compared to Spokane County as a whole. Specific consideration should be taken to understand more about who is in the study area and how to meaningfully engage with these populations. This can help provide access to the decision-making process and to avoid disproportionately adverse effects on these communities.
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Argonne Station Concept and Planning-Level Cost Estimates
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BID ITEM</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT (ROUNDED)</th>
<th>ASSUMPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PREPARATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEAR AND GRUB</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>$ 8,000</td>
<td>$ 16,000</td>
<td>OVER WHOLE SITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMOVE STRUCTURES &amp; OBSTRUCTIONS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>PROVISIONAL SUM TO ACCOUNT FOR POTENTIAL UNKNOWN STRUCTURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EARTHWORK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCAVATION</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$ 50</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>HIGH ON NORTH SIDE REQUIRING LOTS OF FILL, LESS EXCAVATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMON BORROW</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$ 25</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>FULL, SEE ABOVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZARDOUS MATERIAL REMOVAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>PROVISIONAL SUM TO ACCOUNT FOR POTENTIAL UNKNOWNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illumination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIGHTING AND SECURITY</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>5 LUMINAIRES, 5 J BOXES, 500 LF OF CONDUIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EARTHWORK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORMWATER CONVEYANCE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$ 55,000</td>
<td>$ 55,000</td>
<td>INCLUDES ALL CBL, DRYWELLS, PIPES, ETC. 7,500 SF IMPERVIOUS PER CB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLOW CONTROL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td>0.5 ACRE-FT. PER SQ FT OF NEW IMPERVIOUS, 25,000 SF NEW IMPERVIOUS, $10/CF, GROUNDWATER INFILTRATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER QUALITY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$50,000 PER 0.5 ACRE POLLUTION-GENERATING IMPERVIOUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROADWAY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA PAVEMENT FOR PARKING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$ 36</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>3&quot; HMA OVER 6&quot; CSBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMA PAVEMENT FOR ROADWAY</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$ 73</td>
<td>$ 146,000</td>
<td>8&quot; HMA OVER 6&quot; CSBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEMENT CONC. PAVEMENT</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$ 120</td>
<td>$ 180,000</td>
<td>10&quot; CEM CONC. PAVEMENT FOR BUS LOOP over 6&quot; CSBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEMENT CONC. CURB/RAMP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$ 2,700</td>
<td>$ 22,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEMENT CONC. SIDEWALK</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$ 80</td>
<td>$ 200,000</td>
<td>4&quot; CSBC UNDER SIDEWALK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEMENT CONC. CURB AND GUTTER</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$ 55</td>
<td>$ 113,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAVEMENT STRIPING</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$ 8</td>
<td>$ 14,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAVEMENT MARKINGS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$ 200</td>
<td>$ 3,000</td>
<td>PAINT PARKING STRIPES AND SYMBOLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGNAGE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRUCTURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATOR COMFORT BUILDING</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$ 380,000</td>
<td>$ 380,000</td>
<td>BASED ON ALSCE ESTIMATE FOR MIWAREAU AND GREENACRES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS SHELTER</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td>$ 40,000</td>
<td>PRE-FAB STRUCTURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITY SERVICES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>WATER AND SEWER FOR COMFORT BUILDING, ELECTRIC CONNECTION FOR SITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSC STRUCTURES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>SHORT RETAINING WALLS FOR GRADING AND ON LANDSCAPING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANDSCAPING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEDING AND MULCHING</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td>$ 7,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRRIGATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANTINGS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$ 40,000</td>
<td>$ 40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER WORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGNAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>MAST ARM EXTENSION AT ON-RAMP INTERSECTION FOR ADD LANE, PED BUTTONS AND SIGNALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSP/TITS/SECURITY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUTURE PROVISION FOR ELECTRIFICATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$ 300,000</td>
<td>$ 300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,800,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal (Rounded)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3,900,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Subtotal (Rounded)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3,900,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Total (Rounded)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>6,700,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REAL ESTATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAL ESTATE ACQUISITION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$ 14.00</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>TOTAL ACQUISITION COST INCLUDING TITLE &amp; ESCROW, VALUATION PROCESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Real Estate Acquisition Total (Rounded)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>escalation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDED ESCALATION TO YEAR 2026</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,200,000</strong></td>
<td>4% OVER 4 YEARS COMPOUNDED YEARLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Project Cost (Rounded) 2026</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$8,000,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project: STA I-90/Valley HPT

**Description:** Argonne Park and Ride, 63-STALL PARKING AND RIDE ADDITIVE TO AN ALREADY CONSTRUCTED TRANSIT LOOP

**Site Description:** 6/10/2022

---

#### BID ITEM | QUANTITY | UNIT | UNIT PRICE | AMOUNT (ROUNDED) | ASSUMPTIONS
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
**Preparation**
CLEAR AND GRUB | 1.10 | AC | $ 8,000 | $ 9,000 | OVER WHOLE SITE
REMOVE STRUCTURES & OBSTRUCTIONS | 1 | LS | $ 200,000 | $ 200,000 | RESTAURANT BUILDING

**Earthwork**
EXCAVATION | 1,000 | CY | $ 50 | $ 50,000 | Flat, however Building Needs Excavated and Filled
COMMON BORROW | 1,000 | CY | $ 25 | $ 25,000 | FULL SEE ABOVE
HAZARDOUS MATERIAL REMOVAL | 1 | LS | $ 50,000 | $ 50,000 | PROVISIONAL SUM TO ACCOUNT FOR POTENTIAL UNKNOWNS

**Illumination**
LIGHTING AND SECURITY | 1.00 | LS | $ 42,000 | $ 42,000 | 3 LUMINAIRES, 3 J-BOXES, 300 LF OF CONDUIT

**Drainage**
STORMWATER CONVEYANCE | 1 | LS | $ 30,000 | $ 30,000 | INCLUDES ALL CBL, DRYWELLS, PIPES, ETC. 7,500 SF IMPERVIOUS PER CB
FLOW CONTROL | 1 | LS | $ 140,000 | $ 140,000 | 0.5 ACRE-FT. PER SQ FT OF NEW IMPERVIOUS, 25,000 SF NEW IMPERVIOUS. $10/CF, GROUNDWATER INFILTRATION
WATER QUALITY | 1 | LS | $ 100,000 | $ 100,000 | $20,000 PER 0.5 ACRE POLLUTION-GENERATING IMPERVIOUS

**Waterway**
HMA PAVEMENT FOR PARKING | 2,600 | SY | $ 36 | $ 94,000 | 3" HMA OVER 6" CSBC
HMA PAVEMENT FOR ROADWAY | 0 | SY | $ 73 | 0 | 8" HMA OVER 6" CSBC
CEMENT CONC. PAVEMENT | 0 | SY | $ 120 | 0 | 10" CEM CONC PAVEMENT FOR BUS LOOP over 6" CSBC
CEMENT CONC. CURB RAMP | 4 | EA | $ 2,700 | $ 11,000 | 4" CSBC UNDER SIDEWALK
CEMENT CONC. SIDEWALK | 375 | SY | $ 80 | $ 30,000 | $ 4" CSBC UNDER SIDEWALK
CEMENT CONC. CURB AND GUTTER | 1,650 | LF | $ 55 | $ 91,000 | 4" CSBC UNDER SIDEWALK
PAVEMENT STRIPING | 1,600 | LF | $ 8 | $ 13,000 | 4" CSBC UNDER SIDEWALK
Pavement Markings | 2 | EA | $ 200 | $ 1,000 | PAINT PARKING STIPES AND SYMBOLS
SIGNAGE | 1 | LS | $ 10,000 | $ 10,000 |

**Structures**
OPERATOR COMFORT BUILDING | 0 | LS | 0 | 0 | GET UPDATED NUMBERS FROM ALSC
BUS SHELTER | 0 | EA | $ 10,000 | 0 | PRE-FAB STRUCTURES
UTILITY SERVICES | 0 | LS | 0 | 0 | WATER AND SEWER FOR CONFORT BUILDING, ELECTRIC CONNECTION FOR SITE
MISC STRUCTURES | 0 | LS | 0 | 0 | SHORT RETAINING WALLS FOR GRADING AND OR LANDSCAPING

**Landscaping**
SEEDING AND MULCHING | 0.4 | AC | $ 10,000 | $ 4,000 |
IRRIGATION | 1 | LS | $ 50,000 | $ 50,000 |
PLANTINGS | 1 | LS | $ 40,000 | $ 40,000 |

**Other Work**
SIGNAL | 0 | LS | 0 | 0 |
TSP/ITS/SECURITY | 0 | LS | 0 | 0 |
FUTURE PROVISION FOR ELECTRIFICATION | 1 | LS | $ 100,000 | $ 100,000 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtotal (Rounded)</th>
<th>$ 1,100,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOBILIZATION / DEMOBILIZATION</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EROSION CONTROL/DEWATERING/SPCC</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC CONTROL</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN CONTINGENCY</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE SALES TAX</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING DESIGN</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION CONTINGENCY</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERMITTING</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Subtotal (Rounded)</th>
<th>$ 1,500,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| REAL ESTATE | 1 | LS | $ 1,150,000.00 | $ 1,150,000 | TOTAL ACQUISITION COST INCLUDING TITLE & ESCROW, VALUATION PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Total (Rounded)</th>
<th>$ 2,600,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Real Estate Acquisition Total (Rounded)</th>
<th>$ 1,150,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Escalation</th>
<th>16.9%</th>
<th>$ 640,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADDED ESCALATION TO YEAR 2026</td>
<td>4% OVER 4 YEARS COMPOUNDED YEARLY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Estimated Project Cost (Rounded) 2026** $ 5,000,000
Appendix I

MAE Matrix Concepts
### Summary

#### Transportation

1. **Ridership**
   - Projected weekday daily ridership for each alternative, based on future (2045) demand.
   - Inbound ridership – A51-A55 routes combined.

   - **Baseline Scenario:** 3,450
   - **Alternative A:** +17% (9,350)
   - **Alternative B:** +15% (8,865)
   - **Alternative C:** +17% (8,500)

2. **Total Park and Ride**
   - Total Park and Ride accumulation (I-90 corridor only Liberty lake to Pines).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Baseline Scenario</th>
<th>Alternative A</th>
<th>Alternative B</th>
<th>Alternative C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Total employment</td>
<td>Number of jobs available to HH in 2019 east of Fancher within a 60-minute transit</td>
<td>159,366</td>
<td>162,479</td>
<td>162,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Estimated percentage of service delivered on time based on the level of separation of transit from general traffic, the relative delay from signals, and typical reliability for each mode given right-of-way characteristics.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Number of jobs within ½ mile of transit stops, based on walksheds of STA routes</td>
<td>182,270</td>
<td>183,706</td>
<td>183,708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Connectivity

3.1 **Connectivity to employment**
   - Number of residents within ½ mile of transit stops, based on walksheds of STA routes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Baseline Scenario</th>
<th>Alternative A</th>
<th>Alternative B</th>
<th>Alternative C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Number of residents</td>
<td>Number of residents within ½ mile of transit stops, based on walksheds of STA routes</td>
<td>276,094</td>
<td>278,690</td>
<td>278,863</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 **Connectivity to Equity-focused population**
   - Number of equity-focused residents within ½ mile of transit stops.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Baseline Scenario</th>
<th>Alternative A</th>
<th>Alternative B</th>
<th>Alternative C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Number of HH in 2019 within ½ mile of transit stops</td>
<td>Number of HH in 2019 within ½ mile of transit stops, based on walksheds of STA routes</td>
<td>122,981</td>
<td>124,561</td>
<td>124,561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 **Connectivity to all households**
   - Number of HH in 2045 within ½ mile of transit stops, based on walksheds of STA routes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Baseline Scenario</th>
<th>Alternative A</th>
<th>Alternative B</th>
<th>Alternative C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Number of HH in 2045</td>
<td>Number of HH in 2045 within ½ mile of transit stops, based on walksheds of STA routes</td>
<td>137,943</td>
<td>139,605</td>
<td>139,314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 **Connectivity to education – all pop**
   - Number of people living east of Fancher within ½ mile of transit stops, within a 60-minute transit trip to a post-secondary education opportunity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Baseline Scenario</th>
<th>Alternative A</th>
<th>Alternative B</th>
<th>Alternative C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Number of people living east of Fancher within ½ mile of transit stops, within a 60-minute transit trip to a post-secondary education opportunity</td>
<td>Number of people living east of Fancher within ½ mile of transit stops, within a 60-minute transit trip to a post-secondary education opportunity</td>
<td>68,817</td>
<td>69,080</td>
<td>66,608</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 **Connectivity to education – equity-focused pop.**
   - Number of people living east of Fancher within ½ mile of transit stops, within a 60-minute transit trip to a post-secondary education opportunity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Baseline Scenario</th>
<th>Alternative A</th>
<th>Alternative B</th>
<th>Alternative C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Number of people living east of Fancher within ½ mile of transit stops, within a 60-minute transit trip to a post-secondary education opportunity</td>
<td>Number of people living east of Fancher within ½ mile of transit stops, within a 60-minute transit trip to a post-secondary education opportunity</td>
<td>29,983</td>
<td>30,473</td>
<td>29,041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 **Connectivity to Medical Treatment – all pop**
   - Number of people living east of Fancher within ½ mile of transit stops, within a 60-minute transit trip to a hospital.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Baseline Scenario</th>
<th>Alternative A</th>
<th>Alternative B</th>
<th>Alternative C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Number of people living east of Fancher within ½ mile of transit stops, within a 60-minute transit trip to a hospital</td>
<td>Number of people living east of Fancher within ½ mile of transit stops, within a 60-minute transit trip to a hospital</td>
<td>68,979</td>
<td>69,103</td>
<td>68,863</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8 **Connectivity to Medical Treatment – equity focused pop.**
   - Number of people living east of Fancher within ½ mile of transit stops, within a 60-minute transit trip to a hospital.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Baseline Scenario</th>
<th>Alternative A</th>
<th>Alternative B</th>
<th>Alternative C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Number of people living east of Fancher within ½ mile of transit stops, within a 60-minute transit trip to a hospital</td>
<td>Number of people living east of Fancher within ½ mile of transit stops, within a 60-minute transit trip to a hospital</td>
<td>29,096</td>
<td>30,485</td>
<td>30,341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environment

4. **Impacts on traffic**
   - Impact to automobile traffic and vehicle kilometers traveled (VMT) - model-wide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Baseline Scenario</th>
<th>Alternative A</th>
<th>Alternative B</th>
<th>Alternative C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>Number of HH living east of Fancher in 2045 within ½ mile of transit stops</td>
<td>Number of HH living east of Fancher in 2045 within ½ mile of transit stops, based on walksheds of STA routes</td>
<td>10,166,000</td>
<td>-0.1% (10,159,000)</td>
<td>-0.1% (10,158,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Evaluation Accounts and Criteria</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Baseline Scenario</td>
<td>Alternative A</td>
<td>Alternative B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>GHE impacts</td>
<td>Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions based on fuel type and miles traveled for each mode alternative - metric tons</td>
<td>4,110</td>
<td>-0.1% (4,105)</td>
<td>-0.1% (4,105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Environmental health</td>
<td>Relative impacts to environmental health factors including air, water quality, and noise, both during construction and ongoing operations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Capital costs</td>
<td>The estimated cost to implement the project, including allowances/contingencies for O&amp;M facilities (if required) and major cost elements (e.g., bridges)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Total = $73</td>
<td>Mirbeau Exp = $53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Operating costs</td>
<td>The estimated cost to operate the service, based on existing unit costs</td>
<td>$45.3 million per year (Overall System)</td>
<td>$53.2 million per year (Overall System)</td>
<td>$51.9 million per year (Overall System)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Property impact</td>
<td>Assessment of potential impacts on adjacent properties</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Deliverability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Transit integration</td>
<td>Connectivity to other local and regional transportation services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Scalability/Phasing</td>
<td>Ability to phase the construction and scale implementation of the project</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Project risk / ease-of-implementation</td>
<td>Ease of advancing the project and acquiring funding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I-90/Valley HPT Corridor Planning – Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

1. Introductions
   a. Attendees shared their name and what agency/firm they’re from.

2. TAC responsibilities and commitments (Hamid and Karl)
   a. Hamid and Karl walk through the slide outlining the TAC responsibilities and commitments.
   b. Karl: This is not a deciding body, but an informing body. Given this group’s context and activities, you will help guide how we go about this project and process, with elected officials. We have the intent to add Idaho representation, but we are sensitive in how we approach Idaho parties, it’s important we engage them properly at the right time.

3. Corridor Development Plan (Mark)
   a. Mark B: Mark shared the development plan and explained it is a roadmap for both service and infrastructure related improvements to support HPT and greater metro area across statelines.
   b. Project objectives:
      i. Mark walked through the series of project objectives and communicated they are not new to this audience, they’ve seen them before in prior 1:1 meetings. For today’s discussion, we want to validate these objectives. STA has made some minor changes since meeting with groups 1:1. Today, we’ll review them together again.
      ii. Mark asked the group: “Which objectives align most with your jurisdiction’s goals? We want to be complimentary and supportive of goals. Are there some that resonate deeper for your agency?” -- Roundtable share.
      iii. Adam: They look good high level. What I look for is safety – there isn’t a direct mention of safety. I kind of see it in bullet six (“advance service, safe, cost-conscious”) What I practice with safety on sidewalk and street,
I emphasize safety. I don’t see that showing up here directly. “Promote integrated solutions that support safe and health transportations” – I guess I kind of see it now.

1. Hamid: We are thinking about safety when we think about dropping exposure with injuries, DUI, partying, travel, etc.

iv. Lisa: I like these objectives. But another piece that’s missing is the importance with aligning these plans with the local jurisdictions regarding infrastructure for example. Critical to success of project.

1. Mark B: Yes, let’s spell that out. That’s what we mean when we say “integrated”.

v. Jami: I’m new, this is my first meeting. What is our role? Where do we align? I’m on board with all of these objectives. I can offer ideas and solutions. Is this not going to be in Spokane County? Doesn’t seem like it.

1. Karl: We are looking at possibility of facility East of Liberty Lake in unincorporated Spokane County.
2. Jami: I’m very excited about this. We all know how rush hour on I-90 is these days, let’s open up commuting options. This is a good thing.

vi. Karl: This is daunting. We all have lots of plans. As a region, we have a regional plan. We as a Spokane County region, we are disconnected from Kootenai County. Monday’s article about freeway funding is interesting. When that RFQ was put out in ID, did not mention transportation choices. Nothing you’d see in WA state. Kootenai County’s transportation group: grant to explore transit, a transportation desert. “When are you going to talk with STA?” Members of our board is questioning this project, connecting CDA and Washington. When parts of Washington don’t have service. Community engagement is critical.

1. Lisa: if we can look at alternatives, to build relationship if it’s not possible now, maybe it will be in the future. Opportunities for state line and trailhead at state line, creating a park and ride there to pick up people from Kootenai county to get them off the highway and utilize transit. That can be built upon in the future.
2. Jami: Are there any successful examples of this we can point to?
3. Karl: Yes, Vancouver to Portland for example. Places where they aren’t aligned. Usually an MPO involved at high level, data supports. For us, it’s off the MPO’s radars. We are so isolated for our neighbors. There is risk.

vii. Ryan: High level, these objectives are consistent with Horizon 2040. I appreciate the consideration and consistency. Strong consistency with state transportation policy and goals. With cross-border tension and consultation, SRTC managed the Kootenai metro planning for years. Lots of research done. It’s an ongoing challenge. The “Engage our community” objective is critical. Engagement is critical to consider the type of service that recognizes differences in culture, community and politics. If this can
be carried forward in the project. Outreach, engagement, recognition of differences is important, helps us going forward.

1. Mark: We want to engage champions: businesses, schools, pro-transit groups as well.

viii. Jami: what type of demographic research has been done around this? Excited to learn about this.

1. Karl + other: We’ll share about that later in the presentation.

4. Process and timeline (Mark)
   a. Mark: We are identifying ideas, or “building blocks”. How to serve people on I-90? Lots of options to discover. We are looking into these scenarios. Our consultant team will have a brainstorming session following this session to dive into these ideas. We want your help to seed ideas. We are at TAC 1. We’ve developed initial criteria. Today we’re seeding ideas together today. TAC 2 is beginning of next year, where we’ll come back together and share a list of vetted strong ideas.

5. DRAFT Baseline Analysis (Tim Payne and Aaron Gooze)
   a. Tim shared about the draft baseline analysis and data pre and post COVID-19, and ridership/employment trends
   b. Aaron shared about the existing baseline conditions, and the team’s current findings related to population growth, ridership East and Westbound.
   c. Karl asked Lisa about the “Meadow tech campus”: are they changing it to mix-use?
      i. Lisa: They are waiting on information right now. It has to go through three hearings: planning commission, hearing, city council. Not sure. But application is in. Hopefully a net benefit to transit. Within that campus, 200+ housing units potentially. More commercial space too.
   d. Glenn: WSDOT is working with Spokane Valley on the Pines Corridor. We’ve invested high-definition data, coordinating on that corridor together to see where the gaps are. We’ve done minor improvements in the last six months. A little on the back burner, until Montgomery bridge is complete. Timed signals. Something we’re working on with City of Spokane Valley. It’s not the final solution.

6. Discussion following DRAFT Baseline Analysis:
   a. Adam: What about the North South corridor? How does that play into it? Does it impact? Have you studied it?
      i. Tim: It becomes a consideration. Current service design considers N/S corridor into Downtown Spokane, not employment/education sites East to N/S corridor meets I-90. N/S corridor is an interesting topic. We want to backup and think about what’s going on in Spokane Valley, Sprague, University. We didn’t touch on, but it’s all related to thinking through the future when we think about facilities.
ii. Karl: Looking at data where people live/commute to employment, outside of Spokane Valley proper, the next largest group come from NE Spokane to Valley industrial area. The more we can successfully put people on frequent corridors the better.

iii. Tim: An emerging trend in employment times is that it continues to spread out, Amazon is a good example: fluidity in shift time starts and ends. Employment future out East are pointing toward smaller employers likely to have range of shift times.

7. Solutions Brainstorming, via Google Earth (Mark)
   a. Mark walked through Google Earth, flagging the ideas the consultant team has already brainstormed, and asked for the group to react or flag thoughts/ideas/concerns.
   b. Adam: With NSC, isn’t that eastbound moving changing? Not as smooth as it is now? Changes to interchange?
      i. Glenn: there are two current options. One is Hamilton coming onto I-90 and build out a full corridor at the eastbound Hamilton on-ramp, bringing it back to 3rd Ave. into Altamont connection. The second is a “simplified trumpet”, to make a connection to I-90 from Spokane corridor, the Hamilton Eastbound onramp remains metered.
   c. RE: Flyer Station, at Thor/Freya location idea: Karl: we have frequent north Spokane, ends at SCC transit center. We cut it there because lower demand S of Sprague and also railroad tracks cause reliability issues. If we could get bus from SCC to Flyer that connects to Sprague, it connects NE Spokane to Valley and beyond. Big idea. A simplified trumpet. If there was a way to have bus lane to get across tracks reliably, to SCC center, to freeway connection.
      i. Glenn: there is room North South corridor. Room where the trumpet is. You’d create a transit only access and build a structure up and over UP line, up and over Sprague, and come down. It can be done. Cost drives it. It’s possible.
   d. Adam: Valley intends to widen southbound (Argonne) bridge over I-90, there’s opportunity there. All traffic control and moving to make it fit with I-90 operations is expensive. It’s needed for that corridor. It will include non-motorized.
      i. Glenn: Flyer stop in middle of on/off ramp: larger land area on south side. A good location for Seattle style flyer stop (Argonne/Mullan)
   e. RE: Pines/Mirabeau: Karl: We’ve talked to Spokane Valley. Success relies on how it connects with everything else. Want to serve Trentwood area, north of Mansfield. We need to define how to serve whole area there (Pines, Sullivan, Barker)
   f. Karl: Greenacres flyover conversations because of high density multi-family housing being built in that area. Not far from Barker Rd., get to Spokane or EB to I-90.
i. Glen: It’s not off the table. Challenge with bridge and Barker with over-height loads. It would need to be lowered, or we would take out bridge. No plans right now to take Greenacres out of picture.

g. After meeting wrapped up, in organic conversation, Adam brought up a possibility to Karl related to updates at the Sprague Avenue interchange. He will send data to Karl.

8. Next steps
   a. Hamid will send out short survey to TAC members to socialize with their teams to gather feedback and input from TAC members
   b. Phase 1: Washington – come back early 2022 for TAC 2
   c. Phase 2: Idaho
I-90/Valley HPT Corridor Planning – Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

1. Welcome and Introductions (All)
   a. Mark provided an overview of the agenda.
   b. Jerremy Clark (Spokane Valley) introduced himself as a new member of the TAC.

2. TAC Meeting #1 Recap (Mark)
   a. Mark reviewed the objectives of the Corridor Development Plan and provided an overview of the baseline conditions analysis (growth in jobs, housing, traffic) that all help establish the purpose and basis for development of transit solutions for the corridor.
   b. Mark reviewed the overall corridor timeline and Corridor Development Plan timeline and highlighted the key milestones and touchpoints with the TAC and community.
   c. No questions from the TAC.

3. Scenario Development and Evaluation (Tim)
   a. Tim outlined the process for development and evaluation of the initial service and infrastructure scenarios. The challenge was going to be evaluating the top scenarios with the top transit facilities sites, resulting in a large potential combination of options to evaluate. So a preferred service and infrastructure scenario was determined as detailed later in the meeting.
   b. Tim highlighted the building blocks, which are tools that may be used to implement the system, but would likely be considered as add-ons for the solutions that make sense for the geographic spread and service plan. A number of the building blocks would be companion projects in partnership with other jurisdictions, and likely not STA-led (such as HOV lanes, transit priority at ramps, etc.)
   c. Tim discussed the service scenario evaluation process that applied criteria to narrow the 14 initial scenarios to the top 5.
i. We learned no single route would provide the level of access AND the speed that would benefit transit users in the Corridor. For example, one I-90-based route that stretches from Coeur d’Alene to the West Plains Transit Center that attempts to hit all of the key connections/destinations along the way would break down from a travel time and efficiency standpoint.

ii. We explored multiple routes in each scenario to provide connections and break down the distances needed to be covered. Routes parallel I-90 and one scenario route includes a Trent Ave route.

iii. Scenario 14 (Three Route Harmony) ranked highest, with great connectivity north and south of I-90, with a trunk service from Liberty Lake to West Plains TC. It is also compatible with an expansion to Idaho for the pilot service being considered.

d. Zach reviewed the transit facility siting process.

i. Initially 43 sites suitable for transit facilities (transit centers and/or park and rides) were identified. A high-level screening was applied, and then a second screening with more in-depth analysis was used to narrow the number of top sites to 7. The seven sites are located in the Mirabeau, Greenacres and Liberty Lake areas.

e. Tim stepped through the preferred “Three Route Harmony” scenario for HPT architecture:

i. The I-90 corridor was broken up into key zones for possible infrastructure investments - Argonne/Mullen, Mirabeau, Greenacres, Liberty Lake and Stateline.

ii. The purple route on the maps is the “backbone.” It would be high-frequency and travel along I-90 from Liberty Lake/Greenacres to the West Plains Transit Center via Spokane Airport.

iii. The blue route extends from State Line to downtown Spokane and provide access to the Arena/Stadium/Podium activity center on the north bank of the Spokane River.

iv. The red route extends from east valley to the University District and would tie to the high-frequency City Line HPT there.

v. Extending pilot service to Post Falls and Coeur d’Alene is highly compatible with this architecture.

f. Tim noted that there are three alternatives we are beginning to evaluate that each engage a different transit facility locations:

i. Alternative A includes an expanded Mirabeau Transit Center/Park and Ride and adds a new Greenacres Transit Center
ii. Alternative B includes an expanded Mirabeau Transit Center/Park and Ride and adds a new Liberty Lake Transit Center

iii. Alternative C includes an expanded Mirabeau Transit Center/Park and Ride (South of I-90) and adds a new Greenacres Transit Center

g. We will use a multiple account evaluation process that analyze classifications of key criteria that link back to the project objectives. The process will yield a preferred alternative that then will be analyzed, coordinated and refined.

h. Karl paused the presentation at this point to solicit TAC member reactions or observations:

   i. Jami noted that the process seemed well thought out and thorough.

   ii. Adam said that there are no surprises. This is a great progression for the long term investments. He is interested in the next steps.

   iii. Glenn noted that WSDOT owns property at the Greenacres and Stateline that STA may be considering

       1. The stateline rest area location is managed by Spokane County. State Fish and Wildlife also uses the area for wildlife inspections. Access from stateline ramps could be functional. Similarly at Barker and we would need to discuss these considerations and options further. Good work.

       2. He noted his personal excitement for service from the VTC to the U-district, which would help him commute via transit and his bicycle via the Cincinnati Greenway.

   iv. Ryan asked if the presentation may be made available for further review? Karl said that Hamid would send it out to the attendees following the meeting.

   v. Karl added that there really is no one set of right answers, and it is great to progress with this preferred architecture. It is scalable, and progress can be built and improved over time. Does not need to be constructed all at once. "Transfer Penalty" causes delay factored into trips. Back-tracking to go to north bank or to U-District, can be several minutes. Serving the new North Bank sporting facilities better is a great opportunity.

4. Agency and Public Outreach (Hamid)

   a. Hamid provided a summary of the upcoming outreach.

      i. Next event is the virtual Open House to be held on March 2. Hamid showed the project website and how the community will be able to access the Open House, recording and survey from there.

      ii. STA is coordinating from the partner agency elected officials to provide an update.
5. **Q&A Roundtable (All)**

   a. Jerremy asked when and if the specific transit facility locations will be shared?
      i. Karl noted that these will not be shared at the March open house. Results from the evaluation, including the travel demand model will be shared. We are reaching out to agencies to review zoning and access on the sites.
      ii. The Greenacres area is from Barker Road to about a mile east. The model will help determine the viability of which portion of that area to focus on.
      iii. STA is being cautious about going public with any specific sites that are private properties. Want to be sure we are doing proper steps prior to showing any possible scenarios depending on those parcels.

   b. Mark added that we will need to raise the level to a higher altitude for information out to the community. We will spend time defining the basics of HPT along the I-90 Corridor.

   c. Karl noted that we’ve updated our schedule - a little behind the original schedule. We have not yet entered into Kootenai County work. Phase II still needs to be defined for a pilot service option. The importance of defining what connections will exist in Spokane County will be key for discussing possibilities for Idaho connections appropriate to trip termini popularity. Likely to be Idaho to Spokane Valley areas.

   d. Jerremy Clark suggested for the public to keep it general, but showing access north and south of the freeway could spark interest and discussion.
      i. Karl agreed and suggested we add this to the survey. Which side of the freeway is the easiest for you to access...?

   e. With no more discussion, Karl thanked the TAC members and the meeting adjourned.
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1. Welcome and Introductions (All)
   a. Karl provided an overview of the agenda.
   b. Jerremy Clark (Spokane Valley) introduced himself as a new member of the TAC.

2. TAC Meeting #2 Recap (Mark)
   a. Mark reviewed the TAC responsibilities, appreciating participation in the three meetings and requesting final engagement as draft CDP comes together and to promote the outcomes of this work within agencies.
   b. Mark reviewed the objectives of the Corridor Development Plan and the overall timeline for study, design, and implementation of the I-90/Valley HPT corridor.
   c. Mark reviewed the overall corridor timeline and Corridor Development Plan timeline and highlighted the key milestones and touchpoints with the TAC and community.
   d. Mark reviewed the Preferred Scenario for HPT Architecture. The “Three Route Harmony” solution meets objectives for efficient and effective connectivity within and across the length of the corridor. Nodes of infrastructure, indicated on the map, show siting possibilities. Three alternatives include different combinations of the siting nodes that present different ways the preferred scenario could be delivered.
   e. Mark reminded the committee that the next steps leaving meeting #2 was to conduct the multiple account evaluation (MAE) to analyze the alternatives from 6 different viewpoints.

3. Public Engagement Summary (Hamid)
   a. Hamid reviewed the input received both through meetings with elected officials and through a public open house. Hamid shared a few key highlights from the public survey, which garnered over 450 responses.
      i. 46% respondents were bus users, 4% paratransit users, 0.5% vanpool users, and 52% non-users
ii. Reasons for using STA services: shopping/errands, work, medical appointments = top three
iii. Support for methods of improving Bus Reliability: HOV, Flyer stops, and Bus on shoulder = top three
iv. Preferred new transit centers/P&R facilities: Stateline, Sprague AV, and Argonne Rd = top three
v. Preferred changes to service to result in more use: Buses running into the evenings and weekends, bus running more frequently, connecting into Kootenai county = top three
vi. Importance of connecting transit into Idaho: 74% felt it was important
vii. Respondents were 84% from Spokane County and 15% from Kootenai County with greatest density of respondents within close proximity of the I-90 corridor.

b. Jami complimented the team on data collection and outcomes.

4. Multiple Account Evaluation (Tim)
   a. Tim outlined the MAE, reminding the committee that the evaluation is based on the scenario architecture. Each account included 4 to 12 metrics. Used the current SRTC regional transportation model to run the evaluations and draw outcomes. Used updated 2045 land use layer, last validated model, GIS work access algorithms, network travel time evaluation for transit travel time, demographic data, and LEHD data. Also ran preliminary assessment for capital and operating costs for STA to run these alternatives.
   b. Tim clarified that the outcomes of the 3 route analysis are inter-dependent on the existing local routes. The presence of routes and trade-offs with implementation of this system caused lower outcomes for Alternative C. Service split north and south of the freeway with alternatives A and B providing a new local route connection elevated them for social and economic accounts above alternative C.
   c. Tim shared the key findings. All alternatives result in a multi-fold increase in ridership over baseline.
      i. Direct connectivity from the Valley to the West Plains, Airport, and downtown Spokane North Bank offer great improvements in ridership.
      ii. A new facility east of Sullivan road responds better for a site closer to Barker Road than a site nearer Harvard Road.
      iii. Mirabeau Park and Ride continues to provide value for connectivity, so improvements to elevate to a Transit Center are worthwhile.
      iv. Connectivity to Argonne Road performs very well.
      v. Karl pointed out that the non-callout of ridership numbers is purposeful, as these results are model forecasts, and should be realized as a total network outcome instead of route by route outcomes for each run.
      vi. Glenn was appreciative that simplifying to “multi-fold” is more appropriate than using exact numbers.
      vii. Ryan also agreed that these outcomes sound correct and are voiced appropriately.
5. Corridor Development Plan Preparation
   a. Karl discussed the key ingredients to the CDP.
      i. Long Range preferred architecture.
      ii. Funded delivery commitments through STA Moving Forward.
      iii. Key projects, strategies to fill full buildout of corridor.
   b. Tim again reviewed the Preferred Scenario for HPT Architecture, and described how the CDP fits in.
   c. Tim shared the Preferred Plan Summary
      i. Service Plan for the next 5 years – funded under STA Moving Forward
         1. Route 74 becomes Route 7 mainline, 7-day a week service with peak overlay from Mirabeau for 15 minute service and an extension to West Plains Transit Center via the Spokane Airport
         2. Route 77A (Liberty Lake express) begins in the vicinity of Knox and Molter, serves present Liberty Lake Transit Center, then enters freeway after serving new Liberty Lake/Barker Road site (Greenacres) with 15-minute service extending through downtown to the North Bank and future all day service extending east to Stateline
         3. Interline 98 Sprague, starts at Barker Rd site with service to U-District, revising express service to get on at Sprague and off at Hamilton, connecting to City Line in lieu of the Plaza
         4. 2026 introduction of pilot service to Coeur d’Alene connecting to Barker/Liberty Lake Park and Ride and Mirabeau Transit Center. This accounts for ridership in both directions between Spokane and Kootenai county.
      ii. Facilities Plan for the next 5 years – funded under STA Moving Forward
         1. Enhance existing Mirabeau site as a transit center (improved bus capacity, passenger amenities. Important will be to explore acquisition of rights for a ped crossing directly over/under the UP tracks from high-density housing to the north.
         2. Develop a Liberty Lake/Barker Road site as a park and ride with site planned to support transit center in the future.
            a. Include eastbound off-ramp from eastbound on-ramp
            b. Future-proof for future flyover westbound on-ramp
            c. Accommodate opportunity for roundabout
      iii. Long term service plan – pending funding
         1. Add new express service from Liberty Lake/Barker to Mission between Evergreen and Pines (there is a great opportunity to serve in the vicinity of the Whimsical Pig.
         2. Extend a route to Stateline from Liberty Lake
         3. Extend frequencies and span of service based on outcomes
      iv. Long term facilities plan – pending funding
         1. Implement Argonne/Mullan transit stops and access (flyer?)
2. Stateline Par and Ride – communicate with WSDOT regarding desirability for new transit facility in Stateline on existing WSDOT ROW

3. Barker/Liberty Lake Park and Ride – develop roundabout project and exclusive transit on-ramp to westbound I-90

4. Seek out partnership for enhancing Mission Avenue and the possible site across from the Whimsical Pig with opportunity to support freeway-running service operation along Mission. Potential for TOD on the open site that exists today.

v. Long term policy plan – pending funding
   1. Partnership with WSDOT to develop transit priority at freeway on- and off-ramps, transit lanes or possibly managed lanes or shoulder running lanes
   2. Work with jurisdictional partners to create Transit priority pathways from facilities to on and off ramps and pursue transit priority pathway along the corridor, especially between downtown and east to Freya/Sprague interchange.

   d. Zach shared the preferred facility site concepts
      i. Zach: Mirabeau 1 site includes an enhancement/expansion of the existing Mirabeau Point Park and Ride. This requires an in-lane stop on Indiana for HPT routing. Includes an extension of sidewalk west to Pines Road.
      ii. Ryan was involved in the original design of this site. He was pleased to see the extension of facilities to more fully use the property
      iii. Jami was interested in better active transportation connections in pedestrian and bicycle safety, particularly with higher speed/volume roadways in this area.
      iv. Inga also pointed out that the Valley Millwood trail was at one point considered to be routed along this corridor. The connection across the railroad would be wonderful.
      v. Zach: Greenacres (L-13) site situated at the intersection of Appleway and the Greenacres interchange (east-bound on-ramp and westbound off-ramp). This new site would require bus-only interchange ramps (east-bound off-ramp and west-bound on-ramp). Great opportunities at this site to connect active modes of transport, and has sufficient size for a large park and ride and full transit center.
      vi. Inga pointed out this could easily tie to the Appleway trail with an appropriate crossing of Appleway.
      vii. Karl also pointed out the high-capacity transit right of way that is adjacent to this site. Great opportunity for TOD and BAT possibilities.
      viii. Inga asked how this interacts with the new Kramer overpass
           1. Karl pointed out that that overpass does not have any interchange plans, so this would be independent.
           2. Kramer does have bicycle infrastructure crossing over the freeway.
ix. Glenn pointed out that this will require normal WSDOT processes to break access, but this will be simplified due to the nature of it being for buses only, not causing additional general traffic levels. Will probably need to consider limited access conditions existing today. No fatal flaw in this layout at this point.

e. Karl shared the reconciliation layout for CDP to *STA Moving Forward*
   i. *STA Moving Forward* includes introduction of more nights and weekend service along I-90 between Spokane and Liberty Lake
      1. CDP Response: Route 7 will be the primary route in the corridor and will have night and weekend service
   ii. STAMF: Expand commuter parking capacity east of Sullivan Road
      1. CDP Response: Preferred location at Greenacres Interchange in Liberty Lake
   iii. STAMF: Direct, non-stop peak hour service between Liberty Lake and Spokane
      1. CDP Response: Route 77A will serve Liberty Lake and a new park and ride at Greenacres before traveling express
   iv. STAMF: Construct a new Mirabeau Transit Center
      1. CDP Response: Mirabeau Park and Ride will be expanded in capacity to serve as transit center
   v. STAMF: As a cross-state partnership, create an extension of HPT: I-90/Valley to Post Falls and Coeur d'Alene on a two-year pilot basis
      1. CDP Response: The preferred architecture accommodates the pilot with service between Mirabeau Transit Center and CDA

6. **Outreach Summary (Karl)**
   a. Karl reviewed the outreach process and the next steps.
      i. Next steps include Coordinate draft development between May 20 and June 16th
      ii. Open house coordinated between Valley and SVCOC June 14th
      iii. Public Hearing with STA Board June 16th

7. **Q&A Roundtable (All)**
   a. Ryan pointed out that Hamid would present to the TTC. Asked if this should go before the SRTC Board.
      i. Karl agreed this would be helpful. Perhaps share in the June 9th meeting or after the STA Board action in July.
      ii. Ryan asked about WSDOT’s acceptability policy-wise for flyer stops such as have been built on the west side?
         1. Glenn mentioned that Karl had shared this with WSDOT Eastern Region leadership and they were in favor of such options. They want to support transit for its positive impacts on the system
   b. Karl pointed out that as part of STA Moving Forward, and in response to the early outcomes of this CDP study, there is another element moving
Argonne/Mullan option forward toward June grant opportunities. This is in discussion with WSDOT and being developed as a park and ride potentially sited south of the interchange in WSDOT ROW and potentially requiring additional ROW. This is in response to the model outcomes and public voice on behalf of a connection in this area.

i. Glenn said that this is a great improvement of ROW being under-utilized today, and could begin to operate relatively quickly.

ii. Ryan spoke positively about the greater connection to the network through this facility.

iii. Karl pointed out this would be applied through Regional Mobility Grant program to be installed in 2027
Appendix I

TAC Meeting Notes
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1. Introductions

   a. Attendees shared their name and what agency/firm they’re from.

2. TAC responsibilities and commitments (Hamid and Karl)

   a. Hamid and Karl walk through the slide outlining the TAC responsibilities and commitments.

   b. Karl: This is not a deciding body, but an informing body. Given this group’s context and activities, you will help guide how we go about this project and process, with elected officials. We have the intent to add Idaho representation, but we are sensitive in how we approach Idaho parties, it’s important we engage them properly at the right time.

3. Corridor Development Plan (Mark)

   a. Mark B: Mark shared the development plan and explained it is a roadmap for both service and infrastructure related improvements to support HPT and greater metro area across statelines.

   b. Project objectives:

      i. Mark walked through the series of project objectives and communicated they are not new to this audience, they’ve seen them before in prior 1:1 meetings. For today’s discussion, we want to validate these objectives. STA has made some minor changes since meeting with groups 1:1. Today, we’ll review them together again.

      ii. Mark asked the group: “Which objectives align most with your jurisdiction’s goals? We want to be complimentary and supportive of goals. Are there some that resonate deeper for your agency?” -- Roundtable share.

      iii. Adam: They look good high level. What I look for is safety – there isn’t a direct mention of safety. I kind of see it in bullet six (“advance service, safe, cost-conscious”) What I practice with safety on sidewalk and street,
I emphasize safety. I don’t see that showing up here directly. “Promote integrated solutions that support safe and health transportations” – I guess I kind of see it now.

1. Hamid: We are thinking about safety when we think about dropping exposure with injuries, DUI, partying, travel, etc.

iv. Lisa: I like these objectives. But another piece that’s missing is the importance with aligning these plans with the local jurisdictions regarding infrastructure for example. Critical to success of project.

1. Mark B: Yes, let’s spell that out. That’s what we mean when we say “integrated”.

v. Jami: I’m new, this is my first meeting. What is our role? Where do we align? I’m on board with all of these objectives. I can offer ideas and solutions. Is this not going to be in Spokane County? Doesn’t seem like it.

1. Karl: We are looking at possibility of facility East of Liberty Lake in unincorporated Spokane County.
2. Jami: I’m very excited about this. We all know how rush hour on I-90 is these days, let’s open up commuting options. This is a good thing.

vi. Karl: This is daunting. We all have lots of plans. As a region, we have a regional plan. We as a Spokane County region, we are disconnected from Kootenai County. Monday’s article about freeway funding is interesting. When that RFQ was put out in ID, did not mention transportation choices. Nothing you’d see in WA state. Kootenai County’s transportation group: grant to explore transit, a transportation desert. “When are you going to talk with STA?” Members of our board is questioning this project, connecting CDA and Washington. When parts of Washington don’t have service. Community engagement is critical.

1. Lisa: if we can look at alternatives, to build relationship if it’s not possible now, maybe it will be in the future. Opportunities for state line and trailhead at state line, creating a park and ride there to pick up people from Kootenai county to get them off the highway and utilize transit. That can be built upon in the future.
2. Jami: Are there any successful examples of this we can point to?
3. Karl: Yes, Vancouver to Portland for example. Places where they aren’t aligned. Usually an MPO involved at high level, data supports. For us, it’s off the MPO’s radars. We are so isolated for our neighbors. There is risk.

vii. Ryan: High level, these objectives are consistent with Horizon 2040. I appreciate the consideration and consistency. Strong consistency with state transportation policy and goals. With cross-border tension and consultation, SRTC managed the Kootenai metro planning for years. Lots of research done. It’s an ongoing challenge. The “Engage our community” objective is critical. Engagement is critical to consider the type of service that recognizes differences in culture, community and politics. If this can
be carried forward in the project. Outreach, engagement, recognition of
differences is important, helps us going forward.
1. Mark: We want to engage champions: businesses, schools, pro-
transit groups as well.

viii. Jami: what type of demographic research has been done around this?
Excited to learn about this.
1. Karl + other: We’ll share about that later in the presentation.

4. Process and timeline (Mark)
a. Mark: We are identifying ideas, or “building blocks”. How to serve people on I-
90? Lots of options to discover. We are looking into these scenarios. Our
consultant team will have a brainstorming session following this session to dive
into these ideas. We want your help to seed ideas. We are at TAC 1. We’ve
developed initial criteria. Today we’re seeding ideas together today. TAC 2 is
beginning of next year, where we’ll come back together and share a list of vetted
strong ideas.

5. DRAFT Baseline Analysis (Tim Payne and Aaron Gooze)
a. Tim shared about the draft baseline analysis and data pre and post COVID-19,
and ridership/employment trends
b. Aaron shared about the existing baseline conditions, and the team’s current
findings related to population growth, ridership East and Westbound.
c. Karl asked Lisa about the “Meadow tech campus”: are they changing it to mix-
use?
   i. Lisa: They are waiting on information right now. It has to go through
      three hearings: planning commission, hearing, city council. Not sure. But
      application is in. Hopefully a net benefit to transit. Within that campus,
      200+ housing units potentially. More commercial space too.
d. Glenn: WSDOT is working with Spokane Valley on the Pines Corridor. We’ve
   invested high-definition data, coordinating on that corridor together to see
   where the gaps are. We’ve done minor improvements in the last six months. A
   little on the back burner, until Montgomery bridge is complete. Timed signals.
   Something we’re working on with City of Spokane Valley. It’s not the final
solution.

6. Discussion following DRAFT Baseline Analysis:
a. Adam: What about the North South corridor? How does that play into it? Does it
impact? Have you studied it?
   i. Tim: It becomes a consideration. Current service design considers N/S
corridor into Downtown Spokane, not employment/education sites East
to N/S corridor meets I-90. N/S corridor is an interesting topic. We want
to backup and think about what’s going on in Spokane Valley, Sprague,
University. We didn’t touch on, but it’s all related to thinking through the
future when we think about facilities.
ii. Karl: Looking at data where people live/commute to employment, outside of Spokane Valley proper, the next largest group come from NE Spokane to Valley industrial area. The more we can successfully put people on frequent corridors the better.

iii. Tim: An emerging trend in employment times is that it continues to spread out, Amazon is a good example: fluidity in shift time starts and ends. Employment future out East are pointing toward smaller employers likely to have range of shift times.

7. Solutions Brainstorming, via Google Earth (Mark)
   a. Mark walked through Google Earth, flagging the ideas the consultant team has already brainstormed, and asked for the group to react or flag thoughts/ideas/concerns.
   b. Adam: With NSC, isn’t that eastbound moving changing? Not as smooth as it is now? Changes to interchange?
      i. Glenn: there are two current options. One is Hamilton coming onto I-90 and build out a full corridor at the eastbound Hamilton on-ramp, bringing it back to 3rd Ave. into Altamont connection. The second is a “simplified trumpet”, to make a connection to I-90 from Spokane corridor, the Hamilton Eastbound onramp remains metered.
   c. RE: Flyer Station, at Thor/Freya location idea: Karl: we have frequent north Spokane, ends at SCC transit center. We cut it there because lower demand S of Sprague and also railroad tracks cause reliability issues. If we could get bus from SCC to Flyer that connects to Sprague, it connects NE Spokane to Valley and beyond. Big idea. A simplified trumpet. If there was a way to have bus lane to get across tracks reliably, to SCC center, to freeway connection.
      i. Glenn: there is room North South corridor. Room where the trumpet is. You’d create a transit only access and build a structure up and over UP line, up and over Sprague, and come down. It can be done. Cost drives it.
        It’s possible.
   d. Adam: Valley intends to widen southbound (Argonne) bridge over I-90, there’s opportunity there. All traffic control and moving to make it fit with I-90 operations is expensive. It’s needed for that corridor. It will include non-motorized.
      i. Glenn: Flyer stop in middle of on/off ramp: larger land area on south side.
        A good location for Seattle style flyer stop (Argonne/Mullan)
   e. RE: Pines/Mirabeau: Karl: We’ve talked to Spokane Valley. Success relies on how it connects with everything else. Want to serve Trentwood area, north of Mansfield. We need to define how to serve whole area there (Pines, Sullivan, Barker)
   f. Karl: Greenacres flyover conversations because of high density multi-family housing being built in that area. Not far from Barker Rd., get to Spokane or EB to I-90.
i. Glen: It’s not off the table. Challenge with bridge and Barker with over-height loads. It would need to be lowered, or we would take out bridge. No plans right now to take Greenacres out of picture.

g. After meeting wrapped up, in organic conversation, Adam brought up a possibility to Karl related to updates at the Sprague Avenue interchange. He will send data to Karl.

8. Next steps
   a. Hamid will send out short survey to TAC members to socialize with their teams to gather feedback and input from TAC members
   b. Phase 1: Washington – come back early 2022 for TAC 2
   c. Phase 2: Idaho
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I-90/Valley HPT Corridor Planning – Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

1. Welcome and Introductions (All)
   a. Mark provided an overview of the agenda.
   b. Jerremy Clark (Spokane Valley) introduced himself as a new member of the TAC.

2. TAC Meeting #1 Recap (Mark)
   a. Mark reviewed the objectives of the Corridor Development Plan and provided an overview of the baseline conditions analysis (growth in jobs, housing, traffic) that all help establish the purpose and basis for development of transit solutions for the corridor.
   b. Mark reviewed the overall corridor timeline and Corridor Development Plan timeline and highlighted the key milestones and touchpoints with the TAC and community.
   c. No questions from the TAC.

3. Scenario Development and Evaluation (Tim)
   a. Tim outlined the process for development and evaluation of the initial service and infrastructure scenarios. The challenge was going to be evaluating the top scenarios with the top transit facilities sites, resulting in a large potential combination of options to evaluate. So a preferred service and infrastructure scenario was determined as detailed later in the meeting.
   b. Tim highlighted the building blocks, which are tools that may be used to implement the system, but would likely be considered as add-ons for the solutions that make sense for the geographic spread and service plan. A number of the building blocks would be companion projects in partnership with other jurisdictions, and likely not STA-led (such as HOV lanes, transit priority at ramps, etc.)
   c. Tim discussed the service scenario evaluation process that applied criteria to narrow the 14 initial scenarios to the top 5.
i. We learned no single route would provide the level of access AND the speed that would benefit transit users in the Corridor. For example, one I-90-based route that stretches from Coeur d’Alene to the West Plains Transit Center that attempts to hit all of the key connections/destinations along the way would break down from a travel time and efficiency standpoint.

ii. We explored multiple routes in each scenario to provide connections and break down the distances needed to be covered. Routes parallel I-90 and one scenario route includes a Trent Ave route.

iii. Scenario 14 (Three Route Harmony) ranked highest, with great connectivity north and south of I-90, with a trunk service from Liberty Lake to West Plains TC. It is also compatible with an expansion to Idaho for the pilot service being considered.

d. Zach reviewed the transit facility siting process.

i. Initially 43 sites suitable for transit facilities (transit centers and/or park and rides) were identified. A high-level screening was applied, and then a second screening with more in-depth analysis was used to narrow the number of top sites to 7. The seven sites are located in the Mirabeau, Greenacres and Liberty Lake areas.

e. Tim stepped through the preferred “Three Route Harmony” scenario for HPT architecture:

i. The I-90 corridor was broken up into key zones for possible infrastructure investments - Argonne/Mullen, Mirabeau, Greenacres, Liberty Lake and Stateline.

ii. The purple route on the maps is the “backbone.” It would be high-frequency and travel along I-90 from Liberty Lake/Greenacres to the West Plains Transit Center via Spokane Airport.

iii. The blue route extends from State Line to downtown Spokane and provide access to the Arena/Stadium/Podium activity center on the north bank of the Spokane River.

iv. The red route extends from east valley to the University District and would tie to the high-frequency City Line HPT there.

v. Extending pilot service to Post Falls and Coeur d’Alene is highly compatible with this architecture.

f. Tim noted that there are three alternatives we are beginning to evaluate that each engage a different transit facility locations:

i. Alternative A includes an expanded Mirabeau Transit Center/Park and Ride and adds a new Greenacres Transit Center
ii. Alternative B includes an expanded Mirabeau Transit Center/Park and Ride and adds a new Liberty Lake Transit Center

iii. Alternative C includes an expanded Mirabeau Transit Center/Park and Ride (South of I-90) and adds a new Greenacres Transit Center

g. We will use a multiple account evaluation process that analyze classifications of key criteria that link back to the project objectives. The process will yield a preferred alternative that then will be analyzed, coordinated and refined.

h. Karl paused the presentation at this point to solicit TAC member reactions or observations:

i. Jami noted that the process seemed well thought out and thorough.

ii. Adam said that there are no surprises. This is a great progression for the long term investments. He is interested in the next steps.

iii. Glenn noted that WSDOT owns property at the Greenacres and Stateline

1. The stateline rest area location is managed by Spokane County. State Fish and Wildlife also uses the area for wildlife inspections. Access from stateline ramps could be functional. Similarly at Barker and we would need to discuss these considerations and options further. Good work.

2. He noted his personal excitement for service from the VTC to the U-district, which would help him commute via transit and his bicycle via the Cincinnati Greenway.

iv. Ryan asked if the presentation may be made available for further review? Karl said that Hamid would send it out to the attendees following the meeting.

v. Karl added that there really is no one set of right answers, and it is great to progress with this preferred architecture. It is scalable, and progress can be built and improved over time. Does not need to be constructed all at once. "Transfer Penalty" causes delay factored into trips. Back-tracking to go to north bank or to U-District, can be several minutes. Serving the new North Bank sporting facilities better is a great opportunity.

4. Agency and Public Outreach (Hamid)

a. Hamid provided a summary of the upcoming outreach.

i. Next event is the virtual Open House to be held on March 2. Hamid showed the project website and how the community will be able to access the Open House, recording and survey from there.

ii. STA is coordinating from the partner agency elected officials to provide an update.
5. **Q&A Roundtable (All)**
   a. Jerremy asked when and if the specific transit facility locations will be shared?
      i. Karl noted that these will not be shared at the March open house. Results from the evaluation, including the travel demand model will be shared. We are reaching out to agencies to review zoning and access on the sites.
      ii. The Greenacres area is from Barker Road to about a mile east. The model will help determine the viability of which portion of that area to focus on.
      iii. STA is being cautious about going public with any specific sites that are private properties. Want to be sure we are doing proper steps prior to showing any possible scenarios depending on those parcels.
   b. Mark added that we will need to raise the level to a higher altitude for information out to the community. We will spend time defining the basics of HPT along the I-90 Corridor.
   c. Karl noted that we've updated our schedule - a little behind the original schedule. We have not yet entered into Kootenai County work. Phase II still needs to be defined for a pilot service option. The importance of defining what connections will exist in Spokane County will be key for discussing possibilities for Idaho connections appropriate to trip termini popularity. Likely to be Idaho to Spokane Valley areas.
   d. Jerremy Clark suggested for the public to keep it general, but showing access north and south of the freeway could spark interest and discussion.
      i. Karl agreed and suggested we add this to the survey. Which side of the freeway is the easiest for you to access...?
   e. With no more discussion, Karl thanked the TAC members and the meeting adjourned.
I-90/Valley HPT Corridor Planning – Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

1. Welcome and Introductions (All)
   a. Karl provided an overview of the agenda.
   b. Jerremy Clark (Spokane Valley) introduced himself as a new member of the TAC.

2. TAC Meeting #2 Recap (Mark)
   a. Mark reviewed the TAC responsibilities, appreciating participation in the three meetings and requesting final engagement as draft CDP comes together and to promote the outcomes of this work within agencies.
   b. Mark reviewed the objectives of the Corridor Development Plan and the overall timeline for study, design, and implementation of the I-90/Valley HPT corridor.
   c. Mark reviewed the overall corridor timeline and Corridor Development Plan timeline and highlighted the key milestones and touchpoints with the TAC and community.
   d. Mark reviewed the Preferred Scenario for HPT Architecture. The “Three Route Harmony” solution meets objectives for efficient and effective connectivity within and across the length of the corridor. Nodes of infrastructure, indicated on the map, show siting possibilities. Three alternatives include different combinations of the siting nodes that present different ways the preferred scenario could be delivered.
   e. Mark reminded the committee that the next steps leaving meeting #2 was to conduct the multiple account evaluation (MAE) to analyze the alternatives from 6 different viewpoints.

3. Public Engagement Summary (Hamid)
   a. Hamid reviewed the input received both through meetings with elected officials and through a public open house. Hamid shared a few key highlights from the public survey, which garnered over 450 responses.
      i. 46% respondents were bus users, 4% paratransit users, 0.5% vanpool users, and 52% non-users
ii. Reasons for using STA services: shopping/errands, work, medical appointments = top three
iii. Support for methods of improving Bus Reliability: HOV, Flyer stops, and Bus on shoulder = top three
iv. Preferred new transit centers/P&R facilities: Stateline, Sprague AV, and Argonne Rd = top three
v. Preferred changes to service to result in more use: Buses running into the evenings and weekends, bus running more frequently, connecting into Kootenai county = top three
vi. Importance of connecting transit into Idaho: 74% felt it was important
vii. Respondents were 84% from Spokane County and 15% from Kootenai County with greatest density of respondents within close proximity of the I-90 corridor.

b. Jami complimented the team on data collection and outcomes.

4. Multiple Account Evaluation (Tim)
   a. Tim outlined the MAE, reminding the committee that the evaluation is based on the scenario architecture. Each account included 4 to 12 metrics. Used the current SRTC regional transportation model to run the evaluations and draw outcomes. Used updated 2045 land use layer, last validated model, GIS work access algorithms, network travel time evaluation for transit travel time, demographic data, and LEHD data. Also ran preliminary assessment for capital and operating costs for STA to run these alternatives.
   b. Tim clarified that the outcomes of the 3 route analysis are inter-dependent on the existing local routes. The presence of routes and trade-offs with implementation of this system caused lower outcomes for Alternative C. Service split north and south of the freeway with alternatives A and B providing a new local route connection elevated them for social and economic accounts above alternative C.
   c. Tim shared the key findings. All alternatives result in a multi-fold increase in ridership over baseline.
      i. Direct connectivity from the Valley to the West Plains, Airport, and downtown Spokane North Bank offer great improvements in ridership.
      ii. A new facility east of Sullivan road responds better for a site closer to Barker Road than a site nearer Harvard Road.
      iii. Mirabeau Park and Ride continues to provide value for connectivity, so improvements to elevate to a Transit Center are worthwhile.
      iv. Connectivity to Argonne Road performs very well.
      v. Karl pointed out that the non-callout of ridership numbers is purposeful, as these results are model forecasts, and should be realized as a total network outcome instead of route by route outcomes for each run.
      vi. Glenn was appreciative that simplifying to “multi-fold” is more appropriate than using exact numbers.
      vii. Ryan also agreed that these outcomes sound correct and are voiced appropriately.
5. **Corridor Development Plan Preparation**
   a. Karl discussed the key ingredients to the CDP.
      i. Long Range preferred architecture.
      ii. Funded delivery commitments through *STA Moving Forward*.
      iii. Key projects, strategies to fill full buildout of corridor.
   b. Tim again reviewed the Preferred Scenario for HPT Architecture, and described how the CDP fits in.
   c. Tim shared the Preferred Plan Summary
      i. **Service Plan for the next 5 years – funded under STA Moving Forward**
         1. Route 74 becomes Route 7 mainline, 7-day a week service with peak overlay from Mirabeau for 15 minute service and an extension to West Plains Transit Center via the Spokane Airport.
         2. Route 77A (Liberty Lake express) begins in the vicinity of Knox and Molter, serves present Liberty Lake Transit Center, then enters freeway after serving new Liberty Lake/Barker Road site (Greenacres) with 15-minute service extending through downtown to the North Bank and future all day service extending east to Stateline.
         3. Interline 98 Sprague, starts at Barker Rd site with service to U-District, revising express service to get on at Sprague and off at Hamilton, connecting to City Line in lieu of the Plaza.
         4. 2026 introduction of pilot service to Coeur d’Alene connecting to Barker/Liberty Lake Park and Ride and Mirabeau Transit Center. This accounts for ridership in both directions between Spokane and Kootenai county.
      ii. **Facilities Plan for the next 5 years – funded under STA Moving Forward**
         1. Enhance existing Mirabeau site as a transit center (improved bus capacity, passenger amenities. Important will be to explore acquisition of rights for a ped crossing directly over/under the UP tracks from high-density housing to the north.
         2. Develop a Liberty Lake/Barker Road site as a park and ride with site planned to support transit center in the future.
            a. Include eastbound off-ramp from eastbound on-ramp
            b. Future-proof for future flyover westbound on-ramp
            c. Accommodate opportunity for roundabout
      iii. **Long term service plan – pending funding**
         1. Add new express service from Liberty Lake/Barker to Mission between Evergreen and Pines (there is a great opportunity to serve in the vicinity of the Whimsical Pig.
         2. Extend a route to Stateline from Liberty Lake.
         3. Extend frequencies and span of service based on outcomes
      iv. **Long term facilities plan – pending funding**
         1. Implement Argonne/Mullan transit stops and access (flyer?)
2. Stateline Par and Ride – communicate with WSDOT regarding desirability for new transit facility in Stateline on existing WSDOT ROW
3. Barker/Liberty Lake Park and Ride – develop roundabout project and exclusive transit on-ramp to westbound I-90
4. Seek out partnership for enhancing Mission Avenue and the possible site across from the Whimsical Pig with opportunity to support freeway-running service operation along Mission. Potential for TOD on the open site that exists today.

v. Long term policy plan – pending funding
   1. Partnership with WSDOT to develop transit priority at freeway on- and off-ramps, transit lanes or possibly managed lanes or shoulder running lanes
   2. Work with jurisdictional partners to create Transit priority pathways from facilities to on and off ramps and pursue transit priority pathway along the corridor, especially between downtown and east to Freya/Sprague interchange.

   d. Zach shared the preferred facility site concepts
      i. Zach: Mirabeau 1 site includes an enhancement/expansion of the existing Mirabeau Point Park and Ride. This requires an in-lane stop on Indiana for HPT routing. Includes an extension of sidewalk west to Pines Road.
      ii. Ryan was involved in the original design of this site. He was pleased to see the extension of facilities to more fully use the property
      iii. Jami was interested in better active transportation connections in pedestrian and bicycle safety, particularly with higher speed/volume roadways in this area.
      iv. Inga also pointed out that the Valley Millwood trail was at one point considered to be routed along this corridor. The connection across the railroad would be wonderful.
      v. Zach: Greenacres (L-13) site situated at the intersection of Appleway and the Greenacres interchange (east-bound on-ramp and westbound off-ramp). This new site would require bus-only interchange ramps (east-bound off-ramp and west-bound on-ramp). Great opportunities at this site to connect active modes of transport, and has sufficient size for a large park and ride and full transit center.
      vi. Inga pointed out this could easily tie to the Appleway trail with an appropriate crossing of Appleway.
      vii. Karl also pointed out the high-capacity transit right of way that is adjacent to this site. Great opportunity for TOD and BAT possibilities.
      viii. Inga asked how this interacts with the new Kramer overpass
           1. Karl pointed out that that overpass does not have any interchange plans, so this would be independent.
           2. Kramer does have bicycle infrastructure crossing over the freeway.
ix. Glenn pointed out that this will require normal WSDOT processes to break access, but this will be simplified due to the nature of it being for buses only, not causing additional general traffic levels. Will probably need to consider limited access conditions existing today. No fatal flaw in this layout at this point.

e. Karl shared the reconciliation layout for CDP to *STA Moving Forward*

   i. STA Moving Forward includes introduction of more nights and weekend service along I-90 between Spokane and Liberty Lake
      1. CDP Response: Route 7 will be the primary route in the corridor and will have night and weekend service

   ii. STAMF: Expand commuter parking capacity east of Sullivan Road
      1. CDP Response: Preferred location at Greenacres Interchange in Liberty Lake

   iii. STAMF: Direct, non-stop peak hour service between Liberty Lake and Spokane
      1. CDP Response: Route 77A will serve Liberty Lake and a new park and ride at Greenacres before traveling express

   iv. STAMF: Construct a new Mirabeau Transit Center
      1. CDP Response: Mirabeau Park and Ride will be expanded in capacity to serve as transit center

   v. STAMF: As a cross-state partnership, create an extension of HPT: I-90/Valley to Post Falls and Coeur d’Alene on a two-year pilot basis
      1. CDP Response: The preferred architecture accommodates the pilot with service between Mirabeau Transit Center and CDA

6. **Outreach Summary (Karl)**

   a. Karl reviewed the outreach process and the next steps.
      i. Next steps include Coordinate draft development between May 20 and June 16th
      ii. Open house coordinated between Valley and SVCOC June 14th
      iii. Public Hearing with STA Board June 16th

7. **Q&A Roundtable (All)**

   a. Ryan pointed out that Hamid would present to the TTC. Asked if this should go before the SRTC Board.
      i. Karl agreed this would be helpful. Perhaps share in the June 9th meeting or after the STA Board action in July.
      ii. Ryan asked about WSDOT’s acceptability policy-wise for flyer stops such as have been built on the west side?
         1. Glenn mentioned that Karl had shared this with WSDOT Eastern Region leadership and they were in favor of such options. They want to support transit for its positive impacts on the system

   b. Karl pointed out that as part of STA Moving Forward, and in response to the early outcomes of this CDP study, there is another element moving
Argonne/Mullan option forward toward June grant opportunities. This is in discussion with WSDOT and being developed as a park and ride potentially sited south of the interchange in WSDOT ROW and potentially requiring additional ROW. This is in response to the model outcomes and public voice on behalf of a connection in this area.

i. Glenn said that this is a great improvement of ROW being under-utilized today, and could begin to operate relatively quickly.

ii. Ryan spoke positively about the greater connection to the network through this facility.

iii. Karl pointed out this would be applied through Regional Mobility Grant program to be installed in 2027
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I-90/Valley HPT Corridor Planning – Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

1. Introductions
   a. Attendees shared their name and what agency/firm they’re from.

2. TAC responsibilities and commitments (Hamid and Karl)
   a. Hamid and Karl walk through the slide outlining the TAC responsibilities and commitments.
   b. Karl: This is not a deciding body, but an informing body. Given this group’s context and activities, you will help guide how we go about this project and process, with elected officials. We have the intent to add Idaho representation, but we are sensitive in how we approach Idaho parties, it’s important we engage them properly at the right time.

3. Corridor Development Plan (Mark)
   a. Mark B: Mark shared the development plan and explained it is a roadmap for both service and infrastructure related improvements to support HPT and greater metro area across statelines.
   b. Project objectives:
      i. Mark walked through the series of project objectives and communicated they are not new to this audience, they’ve seen them before in prior 1:1 meetings. For today’s discussion, we want to validate these objectives. STA has made some minor changes since meeting with groups 1:1. Today, we’ll review them together again.
      ii. Mark asked the group: “Which objectives align most with your jurisdiction’s goals? We want to be complimentary and supportive of goals. Are there some that resonate deeper for your agency?” -- Roundtable share.
      iii. Adam: They look good high level. What I look for is safety – there isn’t a direct mention of safety. I kind of see it in bullet six ("advance service, safe, cost-conscious") What I practice with safety on sidewalk and street,
I emphasize safety. I don’t see that showing up here directly. “Promote integrated solutions that support safe and health transportations” — I guess I kind of see it now.

1. Hamid: We are thinking about safety when we think about dropping exposure with injuries, DUI, partying, travel, etc.

iv. Lisa: I like these objectives. But another piece that’s missing is the importance with aligning these plans with the local jurisdictions regarding infrastructure for example. Critical to success of project.

1. Mark B: Yes, let’s spell that out. That’s what we mean when we say “integrated”.

v. Jami: I’m new, this is my first meeting. What is our role? Where do we align? I’m on board with all of these objectives. I can offer ideas and solutions. Is this not going to be in Spokane County? Doesn’t seem like it.

1. Karl: We are looking at possibility of facility East of Liberty Lake in unincorporated Spokane County.

2. Jami: I’m very excited about this. We all know how rush hour on I-90 is these days, let’s open up commuting options. This is a good thing.

vi. Karl: This is daunting. We all have lots of plans. As a region, we have a regional plan. We as a Spokane County region, we are disconnected from Kootenai County. Monday’s article about freeway funding is interesting. When that RFQ was put out in ID, did not mention transportation choices. Nothing you’d see in WA state. Kootenai County’s transportation group: grant to explore transit, a transportation desert. “When are you going to talk with STA?” Members of our board is questioning this project, connecting CDA and Washington. When parts of Washington don’t have service. Community engagement is critical.

1. Lisa: if we can look at alternatives, to build relationship if it’s not possible now, maybe it will be in the future. Opportunities for state line and trailhead at state line, creating a park and ride there to pick up people from Kootenai county to get them off the highway and utilize transit. That can be built upon in the future.

2. Jami: Are there any successful examples of this we can point to?

3. Karl: Yes, Vancouver to Portland for example. Places where they aren’t aligned. Usually an MPO involved at high level, data supports. For us, it’s off the MPO’s radars. We are so isolated for our neighbors. There is risk.

vii. Ryan: High level, these objectives are consistent with Horizon 2040. I appreciate the consideration and consistency. Strong consistency with state transportation policy and goals. With cross-border tension and consultation, SRTC managed the Kootenai metro planning for years. Lots of research done. It’s an ongoing challenge. The “Engage our community” objective is critical. Engagement is critical to consider the type of service that recognizes differences in culture, community and politics. If this can
be carried forward in the project. Outreach, engagement, recognition of differences is important, helps us going forward.

1. Mark: We want to engage champions: businesses, schools, pro-transit groups as well.

viii. Jami: what type of demographic research has been done around this? Excited to learn about this.
1. Karl + other: We’ll share about that later in the presentation.

4. Process and timeline (Mark)
a. Mark: We are identifying ideas, or “building blocks”. How to serve people on I-90? Lots of options to discover. We are looking into these scenarios. Our consultant team will have a brainstorming session following this session to dive into these ideas. We want your help to seed ideas. We are at TAC 1. We’ve developed initial criteria. Today we’re seeding ideas together today. TAC 2 is beginning of next year, where we’ll come back together and share a list of vetted strong ideas.

5. DRAFT Baseline Analysis (Tim Payne and Aaron Gooze)
a. Tim shared about the draft baseline analysis and data pre and post COVID-19, and ridership/employment trends
b. Aaron shared about the existing baseline conditions, and the team’s current findings related to population growth, ridership East and Westbound.
c. Karl asked Lisa about the “Meadow tech campus”: are they changing it to mix-use?
   i. Lisa: They are waiting on information right now. It has to go through three hearings: planning commission, hearing, city council. Not sure. But application is in. Hopefully a net benefit to transit. Within that campus, 200+ housing units potentially. More commercial space too.
d. Glenn: WSDOT is working with Spokane Valley on the Pines Corridor. We’ve invested high-definition data, coordinating on that corridor together to see where the gaps are. We’ve done minor improvements in the last six months. A little on the back burner, until Montgomery bridge is complete. Timed signals. Something we’re working on with City of Spokane Valley. It’s not the final solution.

6. Discussion following DRAFT Baseline Analysis:
a. Adam: What about the North South corridor? How does that play into it? Does it impact? Have you studied it?
   i. Tim: It becomes a consideration. Current service design considers N/S corridor into Downtown Spokane, not employment/education sites East to N/S corridor meets I-90. N/S corridor is an interesting topic. We want to backup and think about what’s going on in Spokane Valley, Sprague, University. We didn’t touch on, but it’s all related to thinking through the future when we think about facilities.
ii. Karl: Looking at data where people live/commute to employment, outside of Spokane Valley proper, the next largest group come from NE Spokane to Valley industrial area. The more we can successfully put people on frequent corridors the better.

iii. Tim: An emerging trend in employment times is that it continues to spread out, Amazon is a good example: fluidity in shift time starts and ends. Employment future out East are pointing toward smaller employers likely to have range of shift times.

7. Solutions Brainstorming, via Google Earth (Mark)
   a. Mark walked through Google Earth, flagging the ideas the consultant team has already brainstormed, and asked for the group to react or flag thoughts/ ideas/ concerns.
   b. Adam: With NSC, isn’t that eastbound moving changing? Not as smooth as it is now? Changes to interchange?
      i. Glenn: there are two current options. One is Hamilton coming onto I-90 and build out a full corridor at the eastbound Hamilton on-ramp, bringing it back to 3rd Ave. into Altamont connection. The second is a “simplified trumpet”, to make a connection to I-90 from Spokane corridor, the Hamilton Eastbound onramp remains metered.
   c. RE: Flyer Station, at Thor/Freya location idea: Karl: we have frequent north Spokane, ends at SCC transit center. We cut it there because lower demand S of Sprague and also railroad tracks cause reliability issues. If we could get bus from SCC to Flyer that connects to Sprague, it connects NE Spokane to Valley and beyond. Big idea. A simplified trumpet. If there was a way to have bus lane to get across tracks reliably, to SCC center, to freeway connection.
      i. Glenn: there is room North South corridor. Room where the trumpet is. You’d create a transit only access and build a structure up and over UP line, up and over Sprague, and come down. It can be done. Cost drives it. It’s possible.
   d. Adam: Valley intends to widen southbound (Argonne) bridge over I-90, there’s opportunity there. All traffic control and moving to make it fit with I-90 operations is expensive. It’s needed for that corridor. It will include non-motorized.
      i. Glenn: Flyer stop in middle of on/off ramp: larger land area on south side. A good location for Seattle style flyer stop (Argonne/Mullan)
   e. RE: Pines/Mirabeau: Karl: We’ve talked to Spokane Valley. Success relies on how it connects with everything else. Want to serve Trentwood area, north of Mansfield. We need to define how to serve whole area there (Pines, Sullivan, Barker)
   f. Karl: Greenacres flyover conversations because of high density multi-family housing being built in that area. Not far from Barker Rd., get to Spokane or EB to I-90.
i. Glen: It’s not off the table. Challenge with bridge and Barker with over-height loads. It would need to be lowered, or we would take out bridge. No plans right now to take Greenacres out of picture.

g. After meeting wrapped up, in organic conversation, Adam brought up a possibility to Karl related to updates at the Sprague Avenue interchange. He will send data to Karl.

8. Next steps
   a. Hamid will send out short survey to TAC members to socialize with their teams to gather feedback and input from TAC members
   b. Phase 1: Washington – come back early 2022 for TAC 2
   c. Phase 2: Idaho
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1. Welcome and Introductions (All)
   a. Mark provided an overview of the agenda.
   b. Jerremy Clark (Spokane Valley) introduced himself as a new member of the TAC.

2. TAC Meeting #1 Recap (Mark)
   a. Mark reviewed the objectives of the Corridor Development Plan and provided an overview of the baseline conditions analysis (growth in jobs, housing, traffic) that all help establish the purpose and basis for development of transit solutions for the corridor.
   b. Mark reviewed the overall corridor timeline and Corridor Development Plan timeline and highlighted the key milestones and touchpoints with the TAC and community.
   c. No questions from the TAC.

3. Scenario Development and Evaluation (Tim)
   a. Tim outlined the process for development and evaluation of the initial service and infrastructure scenarios. The challenge was going to be evaluating the top scenarios with the top transit facilities sites, resulting in a large potential combination of options to evaluate. So a preferred service and infrastructure scenario was determined as detailed later in the meeting.
   b. Tim highlighted the building blocks, which are tools that may be used to implement the system, but would likely be considered as add-ons for the solutions that make sense for the geographic spread and service plan. A number of the building blocks would be companion projects in partnership with other jurisdictions, and likely not STA-led (such as HOV lanes, transit priority at ramps, etc.)
   c. Tim discussed the service scenario evaluation process that applied criteria to narrow the 14 initial scenarios to the top 5.
i. We learned no single route would provide the level of access AND the speed that would benefit transit users in the Corridor. For example, one I-90-based route that stretches from Coeur d’Alene to the West Plains Transit Center that attempts to hit all of the key connections/destinations along the way would break down from a travel time and efficiency standpoint.

ii. We explored multiple routes in each scenario to provide connections and break down the distances needed to be covered. Routes parallel I-90 and one scenario route includes a Trent Ave route.

iii. Scenario 14 (Three Route Harmony) ranked highest, with great connectivity north and south of I-90, with a trunk service from Liberty Lake to West Plains TC. It is also compatible with an expansion to Idaho for the pilot service being considered.

d. Zach reviewed the transit facility siting process.

i. Initially 43 sites suitable for transit facilities (transit centers and/or park and rides) were identified. A high-level screening was applied, and then a second screening with more in-depth analysis was used to narrow the number of top sites to 7. The seven sites are located in the Mirabeau, Greenacres and Liberty Lake areas.

e. Tim stepped through the preferred “Three Route Harmony” scenario for HPT architecture:

i. The I-90 corridor was broken up into key zones for possible infrastructure investments - Argonne/Mullen, Mirabeau, Greenacres, Liberty Lake and Stateline.

ii. The purple route on the maps is the “backbone.” It would be high-frequency and travel along I-90 from Liberty Lake/Greenacres to the West Plains Transit Center via Spokane Airport.

iii. The blue route extends from State Line to downtown Spokane and provide access to the Arena/Stadium/Podium activity center on the north bank of the Spokane River.

iv. The red route extends from east valley to the University District and would tie to the high-frequency City Line HPT there.

v. Extending pilot service to Post Falls and Coeur d’Alene is highly compatible with this architecture.

f. Tim noted that there are three alternatives we are beginning to evaluate that each engage a different transit facility locations:

i. Alternative A includes an expanded Mirabeau Transit Center/Park and Ride and adds a new Greenacres Transit Center
ii. Alternative B includes an expanded Mirabeau Transit Center/Park and Ride and adds a new Liberty Lake Transit Center

iii. Alternative C includes an expanded Mirabeau Transit Center/Park and Ride (South of I-90) and adds a new Greenacres Transit Center

g. We will use a multiple account evaluation process that analyze classifications of key criteria that link back to the project objectives. The process will yield a preferred alternative that then will be analyzed, coordinated and refined.

h. Karl paused the presentation at this point to solicit TAC member reactions or observations:

i. Jami noted that the process seemed well thought out and thorough.

ii. Adam said that there are no surprises. This is a great progression for the long term investments. He is interested in the next steps.

iii. Glenn noted that WSDOT owns property at the Greenacres and Stateline that STA may be considering

   1. The stateline rest area location is managed by Spokane County. State Fish and Wildlife also uses the area for wildlife inspections. Access from stateline ramps could be functional. Similarly at Barker and we would need to discuss these considerations and options further. Good work.

   2. He noted his personal excitement for service from the VTC to the U-district, which would help him commute via transit and his bicycle via the Cincinnati Greenway.

iv. Ryan asked if the presentation may be made available for further review? Karl said that Hamid would send it out to the attendees following the meeting.

v. Karl added that there really is no one set of right answers, and it is great to progress with this preferred architecture. It is scalable, and progress can be built and improved over time. Does not need to be constructed all at once. "Transfer Penalty" causes delay factored into trips. Back-tracking to go to north bank or to U-District, can be several minutes. Serving the new North Bank sporting facilities better is a great opportunity.

4. Agency and Public Outreach (Hamid)

   a. Hamid provided a summary of the upcoming outreach.

   i. Next event is the virtual Open House to be held on March 2. Hamid showed the project website and how the community will be able to access the Open House, recording and survey from there.

   ii. STA is coordinating from the partner agency elected officials to provide an update.
5. **Q&A Roundtable (All)**

a. Jerremy asked when and if the specific transit facility locations will be shared?
   
i. Karl noted that these will not be shared at the March open house. Results from the evaluation, including the travel demand model will be shared. We are reaching out to agencies to review zoning and access on the sites.
   
   ii. The Greenacres area is from Barker Road to about a mile east. The model will help determine the viability of which portion of that area to focus on.
   
   iii. STA is being cautious about going public with any specific sites that are private properties. Want to be sure we are doing proper steps prior to showing any possible scenarios depending on those parcels.

b. Mark added that we will need to raise the level to a higher altitude for information out to the community. We will spend time defining the basics of HPT along the I-90 Corridor.

c. Karl noted that we’ve updated our schedule - a little behind the original schedule. We have not yet entered into Kootenai County work. Phase II still needs to be defined for a pilot service option. The importance of defining what connections will exist in Spokane County will be key for discussing possibilities for Idaho connections appropriate to trip termini popularity. Likely to be Idaho to Spokane Valley areas.

d. Jerremy Clark suggested for the public to keep it general, but showing access north and south of the freeway could spark interest and discussion.
   
   i. Karl agreed and suggested we add this to the survey. Which side of the freeway is the easiest for you to access...?


e. With no more discussion, Karl thanked the TAC members and the meeting adjourned.
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1. Welcome and Introductions (All)
   a. Karl provided an overview of the agenda.
   b. Jerremy Clark (Spokane Valley) introduced himself as a new member of the TAC.

2. TAC Meeting #2 Recap (Mark)
   a. Mark reviewed the TAC responsibilities, appreciating participation in the three meetings and requesting final engagement as draft CDP comes together and to promote the outcomes of this work within agencies.
   b. Mark reviewed the objectives of the Corridor Development Plan and the overall timeline for study, design, and implementation of the I-90/Valley HPT corridor.
   c. Mark reviewed the overall corridor timeline and Corridor Development Plan timeline and highlighted the key milestones and touchpoints with the TAC and community.
   d. Mark reviewed the Preferred Scenario for HPT Architecture. The “Three Route Harmony” solution meets objectives for efficient and effective connectivity within and across the length of the corridor. Nodes of infrastructure, indicated on the map, show siting possibilities. Three alternatives include different combinations of the siting nodes that present different ways the preferred scenario could be delivered.
   e. Mark reminded the committee that the next steps leaving meeting #2 was to conduct the multiple account evaluation (MAE) to analyze the alternatives from 6 different viewpoints.

3. Public Engagement Summary (Hamid)
   a. Hamid reviewed the input received both through meetings with elected officials and through a public open house. Hamid shared a few key highlights from the public survey, which garnered over 450 responses.
      i. 46% respondents were bus users, 4% paratransit users, 0.5% vanpool users, and 52% non-users
ii. Reasons for using STA services: shopping/errands, work, medical appointments = top three
iii. Support for methods of improving Bus Reliability: HOV, Flyer stops, and Bus on shoulder = top three
iv. Preferred new transit centers/P&R facilities: Stateline, Sprague AV, and Argonne Rd = top three
v. Preferred changes to service to result in more use: Buses running into the evenings and weekends, bus running more frequently, connecting into Kootenai county = top three
vi. Importance of connecting transit into Idaho: 74% felt it was important
vii. Respondents were 84% from Spokane County and 15% from Kootenai County with greatest density of respondents within close proximity of the I-90 corridor.

b. Jami complimented the team on data collection and outcomes.

4. Multiple Account Evaluation (Tim)
   a. Tim outlined the MAE, reminding the committee that the evaluation is based on the scenario architecture. Each account included 4 to 12 metrics. Used the current SRTC regional transportation model to run the evaluations and draw outcomes. Used updated 2045 land use layer, last validated model, GIS work access algorithms, network travel time evaluation for transit travel time, demographic data, and LEHD data. Also ran preliminary assessment for capital and operating costs for STA to run these alternatives.
   b. Tim clarified that the outcomes of the 3 route analysis are inter-dependent on the existing local routes. The presence of routes and trade-offs with implementation of this system caused lower outcomes for Alternative C. Service split north and south of the freeway with alternatives A and B providing a new local route connection elevated them for social and economic accounts above alternative C.
   c. Tim shared the key findings. All alternatives result in a multi-fold increase in ridership over baseline.
      i. Direct connectivity from the Valley to the West Plains, Airport, and downtown Spokane North Bank offer great improvements in ridership.
      ii. A new facility east of Sullivan road responds better for a site closer to Barker Road than a site nearer Harvard Road.
      iii. Mirabeau Park and Ride continues to provide value for connectivity, so improvements to elevate to a Transit Center are worthwhile.
      iv. Connectivity to Argonne Road performs very well.
      v. Karl pointed out that the non-callout of ridership numbers is purposeful, as these results are model forecasts, and should be realized as a total network outcome instead of route by route outcomes for each run.
      vi. Glenn was appreciative that simplifying to “multi-fold” is more appropriate than using exact numbers.
      vii. Ryan also agreed that these outcomes sound correct and are voiced appropriately.
5. **Corridor Development Plan Preparation**

a. Karl discussed the key ingredients to the CDP.
   i. Long Range preferred architecture.
   ii. Funded delivery commitments through *STA Moving Forward*.
   iii. Key projects, strategies to fill full buildout of corridor.

b. Tim again reviewed the Preferred Scenario for HPT Architecture, and described how the CDP fits in.

c. Tim shared the Preferred Plan Summary
   i. Service Plan for the next 5 years – funded under STA Moving Forward
      1. Route 74 becomes Route 7 mainline, 7-day a week service with peak overlay from Mirabeau for 15 minute service and an extension to West Plains Transit Center via the Spokane Airport
      2. Route 77A (Liberty Lake express) begins in the vicinity of Knox and Molter, serves present Liberty Lake Transit Center, then enters freeway after serving new Liberty Lake/Barker Road site (Greenacres) with 15-minute service extending through downtown to the North Bank and future all day service extending east to Stateline
      3. Interline 98 Sprague, starts at Barker Rd site with service to U-District, revising express service to get on at Sprague and off at Hamilton, connecting to City Line in lieu of the Plaza
      4. 2026 introduction of pilot service to Coeur d’Alene connecting to Barker/Liberty Lake Park and Ride and Mirabeau Transit Center. This accounts for ridership in both directions between Spokane and Kootenai county.
   ii. Facilities Plan for the next 5 years – funded under STA Moving Forward
      1. Enhance existing Mirabeau site as a transit center (improved bus capacity, passenger amenities. Important will be to explore acquisition of rights for a ped crossing directly over/under the UP tracks from high-density housing to the north.
      2. Develop a Liberty Lake/Barker Road site as a park and ride with site planned to support transit center in the future.
         a. Include eastbound off-ramp from eastbound on-ramp
         b. Future-proof for future flyover westbound on-ramp
         c. Accommodate opportunity for roundabout
   iii. Long term service plan – pending funding
      1. Add new express service from Liberty Lake/Barker to Mission between Evergreen and Pines (there is a great opportunity to serve in the vicinity of the Whimsical Pig.
      2. Extend a route to Stateline from Liberty Lake
      3. Extend frequencies and span of service based on outcomes
   iv. Long term facilities plan – pending funding
      1. Implement Argonne/Mullan transit stops and access (flyer?)
2. Stateline Par and Ride – communicate with WSDOT regarding desirability for new transit facility in Stateline on existing WSDOT ROW
3. Barker/Liberty Lake Park and Ride – develop roundabout project and exclusive transit on-ramp to westbound I-90
4. Seek out partnership for enhancing Mission Avenue and the possible site across from the Whimsical Pig with opportunity to support freeway-running service operation along Mission. Potential for TOD on the open site that exists today.

v. Long term policy plan – pending funding
   1. Partnership with WSDOT to develop transit priority at freeway on- and off-ramps, transit lanes or possibly managed lanes or shoulder running lanes
   2. Work with jurisdictional partners to create Transit priority pathways from facilities to on and off ramps and pursue transit priority pathway along the corridor, especially between downtown and east to Freya/Sprague interchange.

d. Zach shared the preferred facility site concepts
   i. Zach: Mirabeau 1 site includes an enhancement/expansion of the existing Mirabeau Point Park and Ride. This requires an in-lane stop on Indiana for HPT routing. Includes an extension of sidewalk west to Pines Road.
   ii. Ryan was involved in the original design of this site. He was pleased to see the extension of facilities to more fully use the property
   iii. Jami was interested in better active transportation connections in pedestrian and bicycle safety, particularly with higher speed/volume roadways in this area.
   iv. Inga also pointed out that the Valley Millwood trail was at one point considered to be routed along this corridor. The connection across the railroad would be wonderful.
   v. Zach: Greenacres (L-13) site situated at the intersection of Appleway and the Greenacres interchange (east-bound on-ramp and westbound off-ramp). This new site would require bus-only interchange ramps (east-bound off-ramp and west-bound on-ramp). Great opportunities at this site to connect active modes of transport, and has sufficient size for a large park and ride and full transit center.
   vi. Inga pointed out this could easily tie to the Appleway trail with an appropriate crossing of Appleway.
   vii. Karl also pointed out the high-capacity transit right of way that is adjacent to this site. Great opportunity for TOD and BAT possibilities.
   viii. Inga asked how this interacts with the new Kramer overpass
       1. Karl pointed out that that overpass does not have any interchange plans, so this would be independent.
       2. Kramer does have bicycle infrastructure crossing over the freeway.
ix. Glenn pointed out that this will require normal WSDOT processes to break access, but this will be simplified due to the nature of it being for buses only, not causing additional general traffic levels. Will probably need to consider limited access conditions existing today. No fatal flaw in this layout at this point.

e. Karl shared the reconciliation layout for CDP to *STA Moving Forward*

i. STA Moving Forward includes introduction of more nights and weekend service along I-90 between Spokane and Liberty Lake
   1. CDP Response: Route 7 will be the primary route in the corridor and will have night and weekend service

ii. STAMF: Expand commuter parking capacity east of Sullivan Road
    1. CDP Response: Preferred location at Greenacres Interchange in Liberty Lake

iii. STAMF: Direct, non-stop peak hour service between Liberty Lake and Spokane
    1. CDP Response: Route 77A will serve Liberty Lake and a new park and ride at Greenacres before traveling express

iv. STAMF: Construct a new Mirabeau Transit Center
    1. CDP Response: Mirabeau Park and Ride will be expanded in capacity to serve as transit center

v. STAMF: As a cross-state partnership, create an extension of HPT: I-90/Valley to Post Falls and Coeur d’Alene on a two-year pilot basis
   1. CDP Response: The preferred architecture accommodates the pilot with service between Mirabeau Transit Center and CDA

6. Outreach Summary (Karl)
   a. Karl reviewed the outreach process and the next steps.
      i. Next steps include Coordinate draft development between May 20 and June 16th
      ii. Open house coordinated between Valley and SVCOC June 14th
      iii. Public Hearing with STA Board June 16th

7. Q&A Roundtable (All)
   a. Ryan pointed out that Hamid would present to the TTC. Asked if this should go before the SRTC Board.
      i. Karl agreed this would be helpful. Perhaps share in the June 9th meeting or after the STA Board action in July.
      ii. Ryan asked about WSDOT’s acceptability policy-wise for flyer stops such as have been built on the west side?
         1. Glenn mentioned that Karl had shared this with WSDOT Eastern Region leadership and they were in favor of such options. They want to support transit for its positive impacts on the system
   b. Karl pointed out that as part of STA Moving Forward, and in response to the early outcomes of this CDP study, there is another element moving
Argonne/Mullan option forward toward June grant opportunities. This is in discussion with WSDOT and being developed as a park and ride potentially sited south of the interchange in WSDOT ROW and potentially requiring additional ROW. This is in response to the model outcomes and public voice on behalf of a connection in this area.

i. Glenn said that this is a great improvement of ROW being under-utilized today, and could begin to operate relatively quickly.

ii. Ryan spoke positively about the greater connection to the network through this facility.

iii. Karl pointed out this would be applied through Regional Mobility Grant program to be installed in 2027
Appendix I

TAC Meeting Notes
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1. Introductions
   a. Attendees shared their name and what agency/firm they’re from.

2. TAC responsibilities and commitments (Hamid and Karl)
   a. Hamid and Karl walk through the slide outlining the TAC responsibilities and commitments.
   b. Karl: This is not a deciding body, but an informing body. Given this group’s context and activities, you will help guide how we go about this project and process, with elected officials. We have the intent to add Idaho representation, but we are sensitive in how we approach Idaho parties, it’s important we engage them properly at the right time.

3. Corridor Development Plan (Mark)
   a. Mark B: Mark shared the development plan and explained it is a roadmap for both service and infrastructure related improvements to support HPT and greater metro area across statelines.
   b. Project objectives:
      i. Mark walked through the series of project objectives and communicated they are not new to this audience, they’ve seen them before in prior 1:1 meetings. For today’s discussion, we want to validate these objectives. STA has made some minor changes since meeting with groups 1:1. Today, we’ll review them together again.
      ii. Mark asked the group: “Which objectives align most with your jurisdiction’s goals? We want to be complimentary and supportive of goals. Are there some that resonate deeper for your agency?” -- Roundtable share.
      iii. Adam: They look good high level. What I look for is safety – there isn’t a direct mention of safety. I kind of see it in bullet six (“advance service, safe, cost-conscious”) What I practice with safety on sidewalk and street,
I emphasize safety. I don’t see that showing up here directly. “Promote integrated solutions that support safe and health transportations” — I guess I kind of see it now.

1. Hamid: We are thinking about safety when we think about dropping exposure with injuries, DUI, partying, travel, etc.

iv. Lisa: I like these objectives. But another piece that’s missing is the importance with aligning these plans with the local jurisdictions regarding infrastructure for example. Critical to success of project.

1. Mark B: Yes, let’s spell that out. That’s what we mean when we say “integrated”.

v. Jami: I’m new, this is my first meeting. What is our role? Where do we align? I’m on board with all of these objectives. I can offer ideas and solutions. Is this not going to be in Spokane County? Doesn’t seem like it.

1. Karl: We are looking at possibility of facility East of Liberty Lake in unincorporated Spokane County.

2. Jami: I’m very excited about this. We all know how rush hour on I-90 is these days, let’s open up commuting options. This is a good thing.

vi. Karl: This is daunting. We all have lots of plans. As a region, we have a regional plan. We as a Spokane County region, we are disconnected from Kootenai County. Monday’s article about freeway funding is interesting. When that RFQ was put out in ID, did not mention transportation choices. Nothing you’d see in WA state. Kootenai County’s transportation group: grant to explore transit, a transportation desert. “When are you going to talk with STA?” Members of our board is questioning this project, connecting CDA and Washington. When parts of Washington don’t have service. Community engagement is critical.

1. Lisa: if we can look at alternatives, to build relationship if it’s not possible now, maybe it will be in the future. Opportunities for state line and trailhead at state line, creating a park and ride there to pick up people from Kootenai county to get them off the highway and utilize transit. That can be built upon in the future.

2. Jami: Are there any successful examples of this we can point to?

3. Karl: Yes, Vancouver to Portland for example. Places where they aren’t aligned. Usually an MPO involved at high level, data supports. For us, it’s off the MPO’s radars. We are so isolated for our neighbors. There is risk.

vii. Ryan: High level, these objectives are consistent with Horizon 2040. I appreciate the consideration and consistency. Strong consistency with state transportation policy and goals. With cross-border tension and consultation, SRTC managed the Kootenai metro planning for years. Lots of research done. It’s an ongoing challenge. The “Engage our community” objective is critical. Engagement is critical to consider the type of service that recognizes differences in culture, community and politics. If this can
be carried forward in the project. Outreach, engagement, recognition of differences is important, helps us going forward.

1. Mark: We want to engage champions: businesses, schools, pro-transit groups as well.

viii. Jami: what type of demographic research has been done around this? Excited to learn about this.

1. Karl + other: We’ll share about that later in the presentation.

4. Process and timeline (Mark)
   a. Mark: We are identifying ideas, or “building blocks”. How to serve people on I-90? Lots of options to discover. We are looking into these scenarios. Our consultant team will have a brainstorming session following this session to dive into these ideas. We want your help to seed ideas. We are at TAC 1. We’ve developed initial criteria. Today we’re seeding ideas together today. TAC 2 is beginning of next year, where we’ll come back together and share a list of vetted strong ideas.

5. DRAFT Baseline Analysis (Tim Payne and Aaron Gooze)
   a. Tim shared about the draft baseline analysis and data pre and post COVID-19, and ridership/employment trends
   b. Aaron shared about the existing baseline conditions, and the team’s current findings related to population growth, ridership East and Westbound.
   c. Karl asked Lisa about the “Meadow tech campus”: are they changing it to mix-use?
      i. Lisa: They are waiting on information right now. It has to go through three hearings: planning commission, hearing, city council. Not sure. But application is in. Hopefully a net benefit to transit. Within that campus, 200+ housing units potentially. More commercial space too.
   d. Glenn: WSDOT is working with Spokane Valley on the Pines Corridor. We’ve invested high-definition data, coordinating on that corridor together to see where the gaps are. We’ve done minor improvements in the last six months. A little on the back burner, until Montgomery bridge is complete. Timed signals. Something we’re working on with City of Spokane Valley. It’s not the final solution.

6. Discussion following DRAFT Baseline Analysis:
   a. Adam: What about the North South corridor? How does that play into it? Does it impact? Have you studied it?
      i. Tim: It becomes a consideration. Current service design considers N/S corridor into Downtown Spokane, not employment/education sites East to N/S corridor meets I-90. N/S corridor is an interesting topic. We want to backup and think about what’s going on in Spokane Valley, Sprague, University. We didn’t touch on, but it’s all related to thinking through the future when we think about facilities.
ii. Karl: Looking at data where people live/commute to employment, outside of Spokane Valley proper, the next largest group come from NE Spokane to Valley industrial area. The more we can successfully put people on frequent corridors the better.

iii. Tim: An emerging trend in employment times is that it continues to spread out, Amazon is a good example: fluidity in shift time starts and ends. Employment future out East are pointing toward smaller employers likely to have range of shift times.

7. Solutions Brainstorming, via Google Earth (Mark)
   a. Mark walked through Google Earth, flagging the ideas the consultant team has already brainstormed, and asked for the group to react or flag thoughts/ideas/concerns.
   b. Adam: With NSC, isn’t that eastbound moving changing? Not as smooth as it is now? Changes to interchange?
      i. Glenn: there are two current options. One is Hamilton coming onto I-90 and build out a full corridor at the eastbound Hamilton on-ramp, bringing it back to 3rd Ave. into Altamont connection. The second is a “simplified trumpet”, to make a connection to I-90 from Spokane corridor, the Hamilton Eastbound onramp remains metered.
   c. RE: Flyer Station, at Thor/Freya location idea: Karl: we have frequent north Spokane, ends at SCC transit center. We cut it there because lower demand S of Sprague and also railroad tracks cause reliability issues. If we could get bus from SCC to Flyer that connects to Sprague, it connects NE Spokane to Valley and beyond. Big idea. A simplified trumpet. If there was a way to have bus lane to get across tracks reliably, to SCC center, to freeway connection.
      i. Glenn: there is room North South corridor. Room where the trumpet is. You’d create a transit only access and build a structure up and over UP line, up and over Sprague, and come down. It can be done. Cost drives it. It’s possible.
   d. Adam: Valley intends to widen southbound (Argonne) bridge over I-90, there’s opportunity there. All traffic control and moving to make it fit with I-90 operations is expensive. It’s needed for that corridor. It will include non-motorized.
      i. Glenn: Flyer stop in middle of on/off ramp: larger land area on south side. A good location for Seattle style flyer stop (Argonne/Mullan)
   e. RE: Pines/Mirabeau: Karl: We’ve talked to Spokane Valley. Success relies on how it connects with everything else. Want to serve Trentwood area, north of Mansfield. We need to define how to serve whole area there (Pines, Sullivan, Barker)
   f. Karl: Greenacres flyover conversations because of high density multi-family housing being built in that area. Not far from Barker Rd., get to Spokane or EB to I-90.
i. Glen: It’s not off the table. Challenge with bridge and Barker with overheight loads. It would need to be lowered, or we would take out bridge. No plans right now to take Greenacres out of picture.

g. After meeting wrapped up, in organic conversation, Adam brought up a possibility to Karl related to updates at the Sprague Avenue interchange. He will send data to Karl.

8. Next steps
a. Hamid will send out short survey to TAC members to socialize with their teams to gather feedback and input from TAC members
b. Phase 1: Washington – come back early 2022 for TAC 2
c. Phase 2: Idaho
I-90/Valley HPT Corridor Planning – Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

1. Welcome and Introductions (All)
   a. Mark provided an overview of the agenda.
   b. Jerremy Clark (Spokane Valley) introduced himself as a new member of the TAC.

2. TAC Meeting #1 Recap (Mark)
   a. Mark reviewed the objectives of the Corridor Development Plan and provided an overview of the baseline conditions analysis (growth in jobs, housing, traffic) that all help establish the purpose and basis for development of transit solutions for the corridor.
   b. Mark reviewed the overall corridor timeline and Corridor Development Plan timeline and highlighted the key milestones and touchpoints with the TAC and community.
   c. No questions from the TAC.

3. Scenario Development and Evaluation (Tim)
   a. Tim outlined the process for development and evaluation of the initial service and infrastructure scenarios. The challenge was going to be evaluating the top scenarios with the top transit facilities sites, resulting in a large potential combination of options to evaluate. So a preferred service and infrastructure scenario was determined as detailed later in the meeting.
   b. Tim highlighted the building blocks, which are tools that may be used to implement the system, but would likely be considered as add-ons for the solutions that make sense for the geographic spread and service plan. A number of the building blocks would be companion projects in partnership with other jurisdictions, and likely not STA-led (such as HOV lanes, transit priority at ramps, etc.)
   c. Tim discussed the service scenario evaluation process that applied criteria to narrow the 14 initial scenarios to the top 5.
i. We learned no single route would provide the level of access AND the speed that would benefit transit users in the Corridor. For example, one I-90-based route that stretches from Coeur d’Alene to the West Plains Transit Center that attempts to hit all of the key connections/destinations along the way would break down from a travel time and efficiency standpoint.

ii. We explored multiple routes in each scenario to provide connections and break down the distances needed to be covered. Routes parallel I-90 and one scenario route includes a Trent Ave route.

iii. Scenario 14 (Three Route Harmony) ranked highest, with great connectivity north and south of I-90, with a trunk service from Liberty Lake to West Plains TC. It is also compatible with an expansion to Idaho for the pilot service being considered.

d. Zach reviewed the transit facility siting process.

i. Initially 43 sites suitable for transit facilities (transit centers and/or park and rides) were identified. A high-level screening was applied, and then a second screening with more in-depth analysis was used to narrow the number of top sites to 7. The seven sites are located in the Mirabeau, Greenacres and Liberty Lake areas.

e. Tim stepped through the preferred “Three Route Harmony” scenario for HPT architecture:

i. The I-90 corridor was broken up into key zones for possible infrastructure investments - Argonne/Mullen, Mirabeau, Greenacres, Liberty Lake and Stateline.

ii. The purple route on the maps is the “backbone.” It would be high-frequency and travel along I-90 from Liberty Lake/Greenacres to the West Plains Transit Center via Spokane Airport.

iii. The blue route extends from State Line to downtown Spokane and provide access to the Arena/Stadium/Podium activity center on the north bank of the Spokane River.

iv. The red route extends from east valley to the University District and would tie to the high-frequency City Line HPT there.

v. Extending pilot service to Post Falls and Coeur d'Alene is highly compatible with this architecture.

f. Tim noted that there are three alternatives we are beginning to evaluate that each engage a different transit facility locations:

i. Alternative A includes an expanded Mirabeau Transit Center/Park and Ride and adds a new Greenacres Transit Center
ii. Alternative B includes an expanded Mirabeau Transit Center/Park and Ride and adds a new Liberty Lake Transit Center

iii. Alternative C includes an expanded Mirabeau Transit Center/Park and Ride (South of I-90) and adds a new Greenacres Transit Center

g. We will use a multiple account evaluation process that analyze classifications of key criteria that link back to the project objectives. The process will yield a preferred alternative that then will be analyzed, coordinated and refined.

h. Karl paused the presentation at this point to solicit TAC member reactions or observations:

i. Jami noted that the process seemed well thought out and thorough.

ii. Adam said that there are no surprises. This is a great progression for the long term investments. He is interested in the next steps.

iii. Glenn noted that WSDOT owns property at the Greenacres and Stateline that STA may be considering

1. The stateline rest area location is managed by Spokane County. State Fish and Wildlife also uses the area for wildlife inspections. Access from stateline ramps could be functional. Similarly at Barker and we would need to discuss these considerations and options further. Good work.

2. He noted his personal excitement for service from the VTC to the U-district, which would help him commute via transit and his bicycle via the Cincinnati Greenway.

iv. Ryan asked if the presentation may be made available for further review? Karl said that Hamid would send it out to the attendees following the meeting.

v. Karl added that there really is no one set of right answers, and it is great to progress with this preferred architecture. It is scalable, and progress can be built and improved over time. Does not need to be constructed all at once. "Transfer Penalty" causes delay factored into trips. Back-tracking to go to north bank or to U-District, can be several minutes. Serving the new North Bank sporting facilities better is a great opportunity.

4. **Agency and Public Outreach (Hamid)**

   a. Hamid provided a summary of the upcoming outreach.

   i. Next event is the virtual Open House to be held on March 2. Hamid showed the project website and how the community will be able to access the Open House, recording and survey from there.

   ii. STA is coordinating from the partner agency elected officials to provide an update.
5. Q&A Roundtable (All)
   a. Jerremy asked when and if the specific transit facility locations will be shared?
      i. Karl noted that these will not be shared at the March open house. Results from the evaluation, including the travel demand model will be shared. We are reaching out to agencies to review zoning and access on the sites.
      ii. The Greenacres area is from Barker Road to about a mile east. The model will help determine the viability of which portion of that area to focus on.
      iii. STA is being cautious about going public with any specific sites that are private properties. Want to be sure we are doing proper steps prior to showing any possible scenarios depending on those parcels.
   b. Mark added that we will need to raise the level to a higher altitude for information out to the community. We will spend time defining the basics of HPT along the I-90 Corridor.
   c. Karl noted that we’ve updated our schedule - a little behind the original schedule. We have not yet entered into Kootenai County work. Phase II still needs to be defined for a pilot service option. The importance of defining what connections will exist in Spokane County will be key for discussing possibilities for Idaho connections appropriate to trip termini popularity. Likely to be Idaho to Spokane Valley areas.
   d. Jerremy Clark suggested for the public to keep it general, but showing access north and south of the freeway could spark interest and discussion.
      i. Karl agreed and suggested we add this to the survey. Which side of the freeway is the easiest for you to access...
   e. With no more discussion, Karl thanked the TAC members and the meeting adjourned.
I-90/Valley HPT Corridor Planning – Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

1. Welcome and Introductions (All)
   a. Karl provided an overview of the agenda.
   b. Jerremy Clark (Spokane Valley) introduced himself as a new member of the TAC.

2. TAC Meeting #2 Recap (Mark)
   a. Mark reviewed the TAC responsibilities, appreciating participation in the three meetings and requesting final engagement as draft CDP comes together and to promote the outcomes of this work within agencies.
   b. Mark reviewed the objectives of the Corridor Development Plan and the overall timeline for study, design, and implementation of the I-90/Valley HPT corridor.
   c. Mark reviewed the overall corridor timeline and Corridor Development Plan timeline and highlighted the key milestones and touchpoints with the TAC and community.
   d. Mark reviewed the Preferred Scenario for HPT Architecture. The “Three Route Harmony” solution meets objectives for efficient and effective connectivity within and across the length of the corridor. Nodes of infrastructure, indicated on the map, show siting possibilities. Three alternatives include different combinations of the siting nodes that present different ways the preferred scenario could be delivered.
   e. Mark reminded the committee that the next steps leaving meeting #2 was to conduct the multiple account evaluation (MAE) to analyze the alternatives from 6 different viewpoints.

3. Public Engagement Summary (Hamid)
   a. Hamid reviewed the input received both through meetings with elected officials and through a public open house. Hamid shared a few key highlights from the public survey, which garnered over 450 responses.
      i. 46% respondents were bus users, 4% paratransit users, 0.5% vanpool users, and 52% non-users
ii. Reasons for using STA services: shopping/errands, work, medical appointments = top three

iii. Support for methods of improving Bus Reliability: HOV, Flyer stops, and Bus on shoulder = top three

iv. Preferred new transit centers/P&R facilities: Stateline, Sprague AV, and Argonne Rd = top three

v. Preferred changes to service to result in more use: Buses running into the evenings and weekends, bus running more frequently, connecting into Kootenai county = top three

vi. Importance of connecting transit into Idaho: 74% felt it was important

vii. Respondents were 84% from Spokane County and 15% from Kootenai County with greatest density of respondents within close proximity of the I-90 corridor.

b. Jami complimented the team on data collection and outcomes.

4. **Multiple Account Evaluation (Tim)**

a. Tim outlined the MAE, reminding the committee that the evaluation is based on the scenario architecture. Each account included 4 to 12 metrics. Used the current SRTC regional transportation model to run the evaluations and draw outcomes. Used updated 2045 land use layer, last validated model, GIS work access algorithms, network travel time evaluation for transit travel time, demographic data, and LEHD data. Also ran preliminary assessment for capital and operating costs for STA to run these alternatives.

b. Tim clarified that the outcomes of the 3 route analysis are inter-dependent on the existing local routes. The presence of routes and trade-offs with implementation of this system caused lower outcomes for Alternative C. Service split north and south of the freeway with alternatives A and B providing a new local route connection elevated them for social and economic accounts above alternative C.

c. Tim shared the key findings. All alternatives result in a multi-fold increase in ridership over baseline.

i. Direct connectivity from the Valley to the West Plains, Airport, and downtown Spokane North Bank offer great improvements in ridership.

ii. A new facility east of Sullivan road responds better for a site closer to Barker Road than a site nearer Harvard Road.

iii. Mirabeau Park and Ride continues to provide value for connectivity, so improvements to elevate to a Transit Center are worthwhile.

iv. Connectivity to Argonne Road performs very well.

v. Karl pointed out that the non-callout of ridership numbers is purposeful, as these results are model forecasts, and should be realized as a total network outcome instead of route by route outcomes for each run.

vi. Glenn was appreciative that simplifying to “multi-fold” is more appropriate than using exact numbers.

vii. Ryan also agreed that these outcomes sound correct and are voiced appropriately.
5. **Corridor Development Plan Preparation**

   a. Karl discussed the key ingredients to the CDP.
      i. Long Range preferred architecture.
      ii. Funded delivery commitments through *STA Moving Forward*.
      iii. Key projects, strategies to fill full buildout of corridor.

   b. Tim again reviewed the Preferred Scenario for HPT Architecture, and described how the CDP fits in.

   c. Tim shared the Preferred Plan Summary
      i. Service Plan for the next 5 years – funded under STA Moving Forward
         1. Route 74 becomes Route 7 mainline, 7-day a week service with peak overlay from Mirabeau for 15 minute service and an extension to West Plains Transit Center via the Spokane Airport
         2. Route 77A (Liberty Lake express) begins in the vicinity of Knox and Molter, serves present Liberty Lake Transit Center, then enters freeway after serving new Liberty Lake/Barker Road site (Greenacres) with 15-minute service extending through downtown to the North Bank and future all day service extending east to Stateline
         3. Interline 98 Sprague, starts at Barker Rd site with service to U-District, revising express service to get on at Sprague and off at Hamilton, connecting to City Line in lieu of the Plaza
         4. 2026 introduction of pilot service to Coeur d’Alene connecting to Barker/Liberty Lake Park and Ride and Mirabeau Transit Center. This accounts for ridership in both directions between Spokane and Kootenai county.
      ii. Facilities Plan for the next 5 years – funded under STA Moving Forward
         1. Enhance existing Mirabeau site as a transit center (improved bus capacity, passenger amenities. Important will be to explore acquisition of rights for a ped crossing directly over/under the UP tracks from high-density housing to the north.
         2. Develop a Liberty Lake/Barker Road site as a park and ride with site planned to support transit center in the future.
            a. Include eastbound off-ramp from eastbound on-ramp
            b. Future-proof for future flyover westbound on-ramp
            c. Accommodate opportunity for roundabout
      iii. Long term service plan – pending funding
         1. Add new express service from Liberty Lake/Barker to Mission between Evergreen and Pines (there is a great opportunity to serve in the vicinity of the Whimsical Pig.
         2. Extend a route to Stateline from Liberty Lake
         3. Extend frequencies and span of service based on outcomes
      iv. Long term facilities plan – pending funding
         1. Implement Argonne/Mullan transit stops and access (flyer?)
2. Stateline Par and Ride – communicate with WSDOT regarding desirability for new transit facility in Stateline on existing WSDOT ROW
3. Barker/Liberty Lake Park and Ride – develop roundabout project and exclusive transit on-ramp to westbound I-90
4. Seek out partnership for enhancing Mission Avenue and the possible site across from the Whimsical Pig with opportunity to support freeway-running service operation along Mission. Potential for TOD on the open site that exists today.

v. Long term policy plan – pending funding
   1. Partnership with WSDOT to develop transit priority at freeway on- and off-ramps, transit lanes or possibly managed lanes or shoulder running lanes
   2. Work with jurisdictional partners to create Transit priority pathways from facilities to on and off ramps and pursue transit priority pathway along the corridor, especially between downtown and east to Freya/Sprague interchange.

d. Zach shared the preferred facility site concepts
   i. Zach: Mirabeau 1 site includes an enhancement/expansion of the existing Mirabeau Point Park and Ride. This requires an in-lane stop on Indiana for HPT routing. Includes an extension of sidewalk west to Pines Road.
   ii. Ryan was involved in the original design of this site. He was pleased to see the extension of facilities to more fully use the property
   iii. Jami was interested in better active transportation connections in pedestrian and bicycle safety, particularly with higher speed/volume roadways in this area.
   iv. Inga also pointed out that the Valley Millwood trail was at one point considered to be routed along this corridor. The connection across the railroad would be wonderful.
   v. Zach: Greenacres (L-13) site situated at the intersection of Appleway and the Greenacres interchange (east-bound on-ramp and westbound off-ramp). This new site would require bus-only interchange ramps (east-bound off-ramp and west-bound on-ramp). Great opportunities at this site to connect active modes of transport, and has sufficient size for a large park and ride and full transit center.
   vi. Inga pointed out this could easily tie to the Appleway trail with an appropriate crossing of Appleway.
   vii. Karl also pointed out the high-capacity transit right of way that is adjacent to this site. Great opportunity for TOD and BAT possibilities.
   viii. Inga asked how this interacts with the new Kramer overpass
        1. Karl pointed out that that overpass does not have any interchange plans, so this would be independent.
        2. Kramer does have bicycle infrastructure crossing over the freeway.
ix. Glenn pointed out that this will require normal WSDOT processes to break access, but this will be simplified due to the nature of it being for buses only, not causing additional general traffic levels. Will probably need to consider limited access conditions existing today. No fatal flaw in this layout at this point.

e. Karl shared the reconciliation layout for CDP to *STA Moving Forward*
   i. STA Moving Forward includes introduction of more nights and weekend service along I-90 between Spokane and Liberty Lake
      1. CDP Response: Route 7 will be the primary route in the corridor and will have night and weekend service
   ii. STAMF: Expand commuter parking capacity east of Sullivan Road
      1. CDP Response: Preferred location at Greenacres Interchange in Liberty Lake
   iii. STAMF: Direct, non-stop peak hour service between Liberty Lake and Spokane
      1. CDP Response: Route 77A will serve Liberty Lake and a new park and ride at Greenacres before traveling express
   iv. STAMF: Construct a new Mirabeau Transit Center
      1. CDP Response: Mirabeau Park and Ride will be expanded in capacity to serve as transit center
   v. STAMF: As a cross-state partnership, create an extension of HPT: I-90/Valley to Post Falls and Coeur d’Alene on a two-year pilot basis
      1. CDP Response: The preferred architecture accommodates the pilot with service between Mirabeau Transit Center and CDA

6. Outreach Summary (Karl)
   a. Karl reviewed the outreach process and the next steps.
      i. Next steps include Coordinate draft development between May 20 and June 16th
      ii. Open house coordinated between Valley and SVCOC June 14th
      iii. Public Hearing with STA Board June 16th

7. Q&A Roundtable (All)
   a. Ryan pointed out that Hamid would present to the TTC. Asked if this should go before the SRTC Board.
      i. Karl agreed this would be helpful. Perhaps share in the June 9th meeting or after the STA Board action in July.
      ii. Ryan asked about WSDOT’s acceptability policy-wise for flyer stops such as have been built on the west side?
         1. Glenn mentioned that Karl had shared this with WSDOT Eastern Region leadership and they were in favor of such options. They want to support transit for its positive impacts on the system
   b. Karl pointed out that as part of STA Moving Forward, and in response to the early outcomes of this CDP study, there is another element moving
Argonne/Mullan option forward toward June grant opportunities. This is in discussion with WSDOT and being developed as a park and ride potentially sited south of the interchange in WSDOT ROW and potentially requiring additional ROW. This is in response to the model outcomes and public voice on behalf of a connection in this area.

i. Glenn said that this is a great improvement of ROW being under-utilized today, and could begin to operate relatively quickly.

ii. Ryan spoke positively about the greater connection to the network through this facility.

iii. Karl pointed out this would be applied through Regional Mobility Grant program to be installed in 2027
Appendix K

Public Survey Results
Survey Sections

• Travel Behavior/Travel Preference
• Public Perception toward the Corridor and Service
• Sociodemographic Features
• Location of the respondents
Travel Behavior & Travel Preference

Transportation Modes used for Commuting and other Purposes

- Personal automobile: 75% (Commute to work)
- Public transportation: 54% (Commute to work)
- Biking: 48% (Daily life (Purposes other than commuting to work))
- Walking: 72% (Commute to work)
- Carpool: 18% (Daily life)
- Other: 13% (Daily life)

Response Rate: 99%
Car Ownership in the Household

- Yes, more than one: 65%
- Yes, just one: 23%
- No, but we frequently borrow a car from family/friends: 2%
- No: 11%

Using STA services in the last six months

- STA buses: 46%
- STA Paratransit: 4%
- STA Vanpool: 0.5%
- Have not used any STA service in the last 6 months: 52%
How often do you ride an STA bus?

- 25% 3 days a week or more
- 7% 1-2 days a week
- 21% Occasionally
- 48% I don't use STA bus services

Reasons for using STA Services

- 49% Shopping/errands
- 46% Work
- 31% Medical Appointments
- 28% To see family/friends
- 27% Other (please specify)
- 12% School
- 0% Airport (for travel)
Physical or mental disabilities that seriously limit or prevent you from doing any:

- Driving a vehicle: 9.05%
- Driving a vehicle on the freeway: 7.66%
- Walking outside the home: 6.26%
- Riding a bicycle: 7.89%
- Using public transit: 3.71%
- None of these: 82.83%

Travel Preference:

- Prefer Bike to drive: 49%
- Prefer Trasnit to driving: 43%
- Prefer Walking to Driving: 43%
- Driving Safer than Walking/biking: 43%
- Pay tax for new highways: 26%
- Travel time is wasted: 15%
- Travel time is wasted: 29%
- Travel time is wasted: 31%
- Travel time is wasted: 26%
- Travel time is wasted: 28%
- Travel time is wasted: 29%
Perception Toward the Corridor and Service

Using currently operates routes along I-90

- 74 Mirabeau / Liberty Lake: 69% Never Ridden, 9% Have ridden before, but not in the last six months, 5% Ride Occasionally, 17% Ride Regularly
- 173 Valley Transit Center Express: 66% Never Ridden, 16% Have ridden before, but not in the last six months, 12% Ride Occasionally, 5% Ride Regularly
- 172 Liberty Lake Express: 75% Never Ridden, 16% Have ridden before, but not in the last six months, 5% Ride Occasionally, 16% Ride Regularly
- 190 Valley Express: 70% Never Ridden, 15% Have ridden before, but not in the last six months, 11% Ride Occasionally, 15% Ride Regularly
- 663 EWU VTC Express: 81% Never Ridden, 13% Have ridden before, but not in the last six months, 3% Ride Occasionally, 3% Ride Regularly

Response Rate: 96%
**Reason(s) you no longer ride the route**

- **The bus route or schedule was not convenient to meet my needs**: 40%
- **I changed where I live or work**: 28%
- **Other**: 24%
- **I was unsatisfied with the service**: 8%

**Importance of improving the reliability of bus service**

- **Unimportant**
  - Median: 7*
  - Average: 6.4

- **Important**
  - 65%

- **Neutral**
  - 35%
Importance of boarding the bus quickly and efficiently

- Important: 84%
- Unimportant: 16%

Median: 8  Average: 7.30

Response Rate: 82%

Importance of Investments in making it easier to Walk and Bike to Bus Stops and Stations

- Important: 77%
- Unimportant: 23%

Median: 8  Average: 7

Response Rate: 83%
Importance of connecting transit into Idaho

- 74% Important
- 26% Unimportant

Median 8
Average 7

Support for Methods of Improving Bus Reliability

- HOV: 59%
- Flyer Stops: 56%
- Bus on Shoulder: 54%
- "Bus Only" lanes: 52%
- Queue Jumps: 48%

Response Rate 84%
Response Rate 85%
Preferred new Transit Centers / Park and Ride

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stateline</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprague AV</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argonne Rd</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan Rd</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pines Rd</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barker Rd</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Lake Rd</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway AV</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greencrscr interchange</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Rd</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importance of New Transit Facilities and Amenities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passenger shelters &amp; lighting</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real time info signs &amp; customer info</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer restrooms</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car parking</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle parking and bike paths</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Wi-Fi on buses</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use development including housing</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public art features</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preferred Changes to Service that result in more Ridership I-90 Corridor

- Buses running into the evenings and weekends: 179
- Bus running more frequently: 162
- Connection to Kootenai County: 79
- Discounted fares: 69
- Dedicated transit lanes: 68
- Improved customer information: 59
- Easier ways to pay fare: 56

Further Thoughts or Comments

146 Comments
Sociodemographic

Gender

- Woman: 43%
- Man: 44%
- Non-binary: 7%
- Prefer not to answer: 2%
- Prefer to self describe: 4%
### Types of Residence

- Single-family house: 72%
- Apartment: 20%
- Townhouse: 4%
- Multi-family house: 4%
- Dorm: 1%

### Estimated Annual Household Income

- Under $25,000: 19%
- $25,000 - $49,999: 22%
- $50,000 - $74,999: 17%
- $75,000 - $99,999: 13%
- $100,000 - $150,000: 17%
- Over $150,000: 12%
Location of Respondents

Density of Respondents in Zip Code Areas of Spokane County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spokane County</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kootenai County</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response Rate: 76%
Main Findings

- There is general support for additional transit investments
- Night and weekend service and improved frequency lead by a wide margin as the most improvements according to survey respondents
- Spokane County residents support connecting bus service to Idaho (77%) more than Idaho residents (41%)
- Stateline, Sprague and Argonne were identified as the top preferred interchanges for new park-and-ride locations
  - Stateline may provide reasonable strategy for addressing increasing traffic demand from Kootenai County in the coming decade
- Strong interest in exploring ways to ensure investments support connectivity to jobs and destinations in an area more broadly defined than the I-90 corridor
Overview of the Survey

- The Survey has 17 questions in 5 main sections:
  - Transit use
  - Questions about I-90/Valley project
  - Sociodemographic features
  - Location of the respondents
  - Main findings
- Number of respondents: 58
- The survey was available online during June 5 through June 27, 2022
Transit Use

On average, how often do you ride the bus?

- 3 days per week or more: 47%
- Weekly: 12%
- 1-3 days per month: 7%
- Less than once a month: 19%
- Never: 14%
Why do you ride the bus

Commute to work: 49%
Shopping/errands: 42%
Social events: 39%
To see family/friends: 30%
Medical appointments: 23%
Airport (for travel): 19%
Other purposes: 19%
Commute to school: 12%

Questions about I-90/Valley Project
On a scale of 1 to 100, how serious would you say is the problem of traffic congestion on the I-90/Valley corridor?

Average: 78  
Median: 80  
93% of respondents ranked this problem over 50

Use of STA routes that operate along I-90

- Regularly using it
- Used it within the last 12 months
- Used it before COVID time
- Never used it
Satisfaction with each of the STA services along I90-Valley corridor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adherence to schedule</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local switching or hub/terminal service</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective action was taken when a service failure occurred</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule or Transit times</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Familiarity with the I-90/Valley Corridor HPT project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am following the process of corridor development</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I attended the first public open house on March 2, 2022</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I participated in the first survey</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I checked the project webpage</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I watched the recording of the first public open house</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I read the Draft Corridor Development Plan</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I plan to attend the second public open house on June 14, 2022</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I heard about this project before</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is the first time I am hearing about this project</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Importance of the elements of the STAMF plan for I-90 Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not so Important</th>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More nights and weekend services</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak express service to Liberty Lake</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot extension of service to Coeur d’Alene</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a new transit center at Greenacres Interchange in Liberty Lake</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Mirabeau Park &amp; Ride to serve as transit center</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The most importance element of the STAMF plan for I-90 Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More nights and weekend services</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak express service to Liberty Lake</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot extension of service to Coeur d’Alene</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a new transit center at Greenacres Interchange in Liberty Lake</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Mirabeau Park &amp; Ride to serve as transit center</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Importance of other investments along I-90 recommended by the Corridor Development Plan

- More all-day service on routes along I-90: 69%
- Transit priority pathways in the corridor: 69%
- Future park and ride facility at Stateline: 61%
- A new park between Barker and Greenacre: 45%
- Expanding Mirabeau Park & Ride north of railroad tracks: 34%
- Advance a Park & Ride facility at Argonne/Mullen: 35%
- Transit improvements along Mission Avenue: 31%

Demographic Features
**Racial or ethnic group of respondents**

- White or Caucasian (Non-Hispanic): 73%
- Hispanic or Latino: 9%
- Another race: 7%
- Black or African American: 5%
- Asian or Asian American: 4%
- American Indian or Alaska Native: 2%

**Age**

- Under 18: 0%
- 18-30: 18%
- 31-45: 51%
- 46-60: 16%
- Older than 60: 15%
**Gender**

- Male: 50%
- Female: 41%
- Non-binary: 5%
- Prefer not to answer: 4%

**Level of employment**

- Employed full-time: 64%
- Employed part-time: 13%
- Not currently employed: 9%
- Retired: 13%
- Full-time student and don't work: 2%
Location of the respondents

### Zip codes of the respondents’ Addresses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zip code</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99016</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99216</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99027</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99201</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83854</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**
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- 6 - 8
Zip codes of the respondents’ work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zip code</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99201</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99027</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99216</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99016</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99202</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Findings of the Survey
Main Findings

- Over 50% of the respondents ride the bus weekly or more frequently and around 50% of them commute to work by the bus.
- A high majority of the respondents (93%) believe that the problem of traffic congestion on the I-90/Valley corridor is serious.
- The highest rate of satisfaction with the STA routes along I-90 is “schedule and transit times”. While “adherence to the schedule” is the issue with the lowest rate of satisfaction.
- “More night and weekend services” is the most important element of the STAMF plan for the I-90 corridor followed by “peak express services to Liberty lake and the new Park and Ride facility in Greenacres” and “a pilot extension of the services to Coeur d’Alene”.
- Among the investments along I-90 recommended by CDP, “all the services on routes along I-90” is the most preferred followed by “developing transit priority pathways in the corridor” and “future park and ride facility at Stateline”.
- Assessment of the sociodemographic features of the respondents shows that they are a relatively proper representative of the Spokane County area. Meanwhile, 50% of the respondents are in the age group of 31-45.
- Two zip codes in East Spokane Valley have the highest rate of respondents’ homes while the zip code related to Downtown Spokane has the highest number of respondents’ job locations.