



Downtown Transit Alternatives Analysis Sounding Board, Meeting #3

**August 31, 2010 – 5:30PM to 7:30PM – Global Credit Union
Meeting Notes**

In Attendance: John Barber, Liz West, Toby Hatley, Judy Gardner, Kennet Bertelsen, Gary Pollard, Mike McLeod, Phyllis Holmes, Robert Zimburean, Karen Byrd, Marian Evenson, Paul Kropp, Harold Vanderpool, Diana Smith, and Karl Otterstrom

The following notes are a summary of the group discussion during the meeting.

1. Schedule and Open House:
 - a. The schedule is on track.
 - b. Good feedback from the public on the location.
 - c. Attendance was a little more than expected.

2. Review of Alternatives
 - a. Three new alternatives were added as a result of the feedback (green, navy and taupe.)
 - b. Would like to see the brown alternative brought up closer to 4th/5th, so you don't go so far out of the way (the bottom of the route.)
 - c. Question: "What did they use back then?" - referring to the old trolley routes. "Seems they've already done this - how can we use what they've already researched." Karl then talked about the two competing street cars back in the 20's. Will look at grades as part of next phase
 - d. "The loop system (green) does not lend itself to phasing."

3. Discussion of Evaluation Framework criteria
 - a. David Knowles reviewed the Evaluation Framework Criteria
 - b. Question: "Should we expand beyond the word "downtown?"
 - c. The word downtown seems very limiting - it's much more than that.
 - d. Need to be cautious of terminology.
 - e. Need to correctly define the project area.
 - f. Group would like to create a brand new term.
 - g. Possible terms:
 - i. Greater Downtown

- ii. Central City
 - iii. Central Core
 - h. Wonder if “Central City” will catch on with the general public?
 - i. Thinks it’s good to create a new term, so we can define it from the very start and there are no pre-conceived opinions.
 - j. Need to be smart about marketing the new term to the public.
 - k. “Does constructability mean brand new construction or adding to existing?”
 - l. Air quality concerns (from the open house) – we need to address.
 - m. Energy conservation should be a main concern (this will be discussed by the TAG group)
 - n. Travel time savings concern – “Will our current bus system help the new alternative?”
4. Alternative Screening Questions to create the short list(from handout)
- a. The three most important areas to connect (from the open house) are: medical, university district and downtown.
 - b. Are there ways to combine the alternatives to be more efficient?
 - c. Don’t want to downplay the “convenience” – people may be willing to pay more or have it take a little longer, if it’s convenient for them.
 - d. Need to consider where an alternative plugs into the current system – consider for upcoming screening.
 - e. Might be good if it doesn’t touch the current system at all – you’d be adding brand new service.
 - f. The “regional plan” would be good if this new alternative can possibly connect other areas in the future. (Spokane Valley, North Side, etc.)
5. Funding
- a. David reviewed the universal list of funding options, both federal and local
 - b. Question about “private sector” funding – but no known examples.
 - c. Privately run transit system – is it impossible to make a profit?

Next meeting: September 28th