



## Bicycle Advisory Board

Tuesday November 15, 2022 – 6:00 PM to 7:30 PM

**HYBRID – TELECONFERENCE AND IN-PERSON**

**VIRTUAL LOCATION:**

MS Teams ([Link Here](#) and at Bottom of Agenda)

**IN-PERSON LOCATION:**

City Council Briefing Center, Spokane City Hall - Basement

808 W. Spokane Falls Blvd.

Spokane, WA 99201



Staff Liaisons:	Colin Quinn-Hurst	(509) 625-6804	<a href="mailto:cquinnhurst@spokanecity.org">cquinnhurst@spokanecity.org</a>
	Inga Note	(509) 625-6331	<a href="mailto:inote@spokanecity.org">inote@spokanecity.org</a>
	Ryan Shea	(509) 625-6087	<a href="mailto:rshea@spokanecity.org">rshea@spokanecity.org</a>

### Board Briefing Session:

- |             |  |
|-------------|--|
| 6:00 – 6:15 | 1) <a href="#">Approve October 2022 Minutes</a>  |
|             | 2) Liaison Reports                               |
|             | 3) Chair Report                                  |
|             | 4) Staff Report: Board Openings, Liaison Updates |

### Workshops:

- |             |   |
|-------------|---|
| 6:15 – 7:30 | 1) <a href="#">CIP Process</a> - Kevin Picanco, Integrated Capital Management   |
|             | 2) <a href="#">Bike Project Priority Matrix Update</a> - All / Group Discussion |

**Next BAB meeting is scheduled for Tuesday December 20, 2022 at 6pm**

## Microsoft Teams meeting

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Meeting ID: 243 714 005 865

Passcode: g9Z5mc

[Download Teams](#) | [Join on the web](#)

**Or call in (audio only)**

[+1 323-618-1887](tel:+13236181887), 203675843# United States, Los Angeles

Phone Conference ID: 203 675 843#

[Find a local number](#) | [Reset PIN](#)

[Learn More](#) | [Meeting options](#)

**AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA) INFORMATION:** The City of Spokane is committed to providing equal access to its facilities, programs and services for persons with disabilities. The Council Briefing Center in the lower level of Spokane City Hall, 808 W. Spokane Falls Blvd., is wheelchair accessible and also is equipped with an infrared assistive listening system for persons with hearing loss. Headsets may be checked out (upon presentation of picture I.D.) through the meeting organizer. Individuals requesting reasonable accommodations or further information may call, write, or email Human Resources at 509.625.6363, 808 W. Spokane Falls Blvd, Spokane, WA, 99201; or [msteinolfson@spokanecity.org](mailto:msteinolfson@spokanecity.org). Persons who are deaf or hard of hearing may contact Human Resources through the Washington Relay Service at 7-1-1. Please contact us forty-eight (48) hours before the meeting date.

## Bicycle Advisory Board - Minutes

**October 18, 2022**

City Council Briefing Center and Virtual

Meeting Minutes: Meeting called to order at 6:00 PM by Grant Shipley

### Attendance:

- *Board Members Present:* Grant Shipley (Chair), Christina Ramirez, Charles Greenwood, Rhonda Young, Pablo Monsivais, Taylor Stevens, Satish Shrestha, Lauren Pangborn
- *Board Members Not Present:* Aren Murcar
- *Quorum Present:* Yes
- *Staff Members Present:* Colin Quinn-Hurst

**Public Comment:** Jerry Compton and Karim Habib from WSDOT Eastern Region attended and introduced themselves. Karim is most recently from Vancouver, BC and both commute by bike.

### Briefing Session:

Minutes from the August 16, 2022 meeting approved unanimously.

#### **1. Liaison Report -**

- Grant Shipley reported that Citizen Transportation Advisory Board (CTAB) will meet the following night.

#### **2. Chair Report -**

- Grant Shipley reported on the September mobile meeting and preparations for upcoming completion of Riverside Bike Lanes and opening events.

#### **3. Staff Report -**

- Colin Quinn-Hurst reported on the BICI grant application available through Bloomberg Cities and how it relates to the federal Safe Streets and Roads for All program. Discussed upcoming opportunities for outreach around bike light distributions. Discussed Riverside plowing.

### Workshops:

#### **1. September Mobile Meeting Recap**

- Presentation and discussion by Lauren Pangborn, Colin Quinn-Hurst and group.
- Group discussion ensued regarding key locations and future rides.
- Questions asked by those not in attendance during the ride.

#### **2. 2022 Project Review**

- Presentation by Staff
- Questions asked and answered
- Discussion ensued

#### **3. Bike Project Prioritization review**

- Presentation by Staff
- Questions asked and answered
- Discussion ensued

**Meeting Adjourned at 7:30 PM**

Next Bicycle Advisory Board Meeting scheduled for Tuesday, November 15, 2022

*Notes/Minutes are summarized by staff.*

# **INTRODUCTION**

**The City of Spokane Comprehensive Plan.** The City's first planning activities in the early 1900s were centered on parks and transportation. From these beginnings, planning in Spokane has continued to grow in significance and usefulness. In 1968, the City adopted its first land use plan as one element of the Comprehensive Plan. The 1968 Land Use Plan was updated in 1983. Over the years, topics in the Comprehensive Plan have expanded to include parks and open spaces, bikeways, water and wastewater facilities, shorelines, and individual neighborhoods.

In 1990, the State of Washington enacted the Growth Management Act (GMA) that established rules for communities (such as the City of Spokane) to accomplish community planning. The City conducted a thorough planning effort to create the 2000 Comprehensive Plan, (adopted in 2001) which complies with the GMA rules and consists of goals, policies, maps, illustrations, and implementation strategies that guide how the City should grow physically, socially, and economically. The 2000 Comprehensive Plan consists of over 30 official documents that encompass all aspects of city activities. A major update, completed and adopted in 2017, included a full revision of the transportation chapter.

Importantly, the GMA includes two provisions to ensure that the City follows Comprehensive Plan directives:

- The City must regulate land use and development consistent with the plan; the zoning code, subdivision code, environmental ordinances, and the building code must follow the plan's intent.
- The City must make capital budget decisions and capital project investments in conformance with the plan.

These two GMA rules give the new Comprehensive Plan a much-higher level of importance in managing and guiding the city's growth and development than previous editions of the plan.

**Capital facilities planning.** As defined in the Comprehensive Plan, Capital facilities and utilities are services and facilities that support the physical development and growth of the city. Section 1.1 of the Comprehensive Plan states that the "...city must make capital budget decisions and capital project investments in conformance with the plan." Further, it states, "In addition to ongoing needs for repair and maintenance, these lists of capital facilities include the immediate improvements necessary to support growth, in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan." The Comprehensive Plan, then, strives to contain and manage sprawl, and it encourages investment in infrastructure in support of managed growth areas including focusing high-intensity growth in specified Centers and Corridors and infill development in other areas of the City.

Section 5.3 of the Comprehensive Plan lists certain themes – "Visions and Values" – that Spokane citizen volunteers identified as being important in relation to Spokane's current and future growth. The capital facilities and utilities (CFU) "Vision" states:

- Public facilities and utilities will be provided concurrently with a growing population to meet the safety, utility, transportation, educational, and cultural needs of residents.

The "Values" related to sewer, water and transportation include:

- Ensuring good parks, schools, libraries, and streets in the neighborhoods.
- Providing services and facilities as growth occurs.

**Goals and policies.** Section 5.4 of the Comprehensive Plan addresses certain goals and policies for indicating desired directions, accomplishments, or aims in relation to the growth and development of Spokane. An important, but subtle, provision is included in CFU 1.2, Operational Efficiency. This powerful provision requires “...the development of capital improvement projects that either improve the city’s operational efficiency or reduce costs by increasing the capacity, use, and/or life expectancy of existing facilities.”

The concept of increasing the use of existing facilities implies – requires – a more dense development pattern, and not the physical extension of services to more consumers. Simply stated, maximizing the utilization of existing facilities reduces future capital costs by eliminating or delaying the need to expand the system in response to internal perimeter growth or external sprawl, and lowers the unit cost of service delivery by distributing capital and certain operational costs over a larger customer base.

Full realization of the CFU 1.2 goal, however, is akin to considering the “chicken or the egg” paradox. Obviously, the cost “savings” cannot be realized unless a more dense development pattern occurs. However, the mere existence of the infrastructure cannot of itself assure denser development without additional incentives: (1) proper or encouraging zoning/land use designation, (2) the shaping of corporate perception, (3) other stimuli. For this reason, the sewer and water utilities have included a provision in their budgets to eliminate the general facilities charge (GFC) for all areas within the state-designated Community Empowerment Zone. This provides a financial stimulus for developing/redeveloping within currently underutilized areas within the city.

In order to fully comply with the Comprehensive Plan, capital sewer, water, and street facilities planning must acknowledge and address at least four simultaneous goals:

1. Adequate infrastructure for infill development must be provided.
2. Facilities must be constructed within the Urban Growth Area (UGA), and also not to the detriment or in lieu of other development that is supportive of and necessary for designated Centers and Corridors.
3. Existing facilities and infrastructure must be maintained and upgraded as needed.
4. Facilities must be consistent with strategic system planning (50 to 100 years).

Occasionally for certain projects, the goals appear to be inconsistent or conflicting, particularly goals #2 and #4 – those dealing with the UGA and strategic planning. For example, assume a water tank project is proposed to be constructed in the next 6 years in a location not only outside the city limits, but also outside the Comprehensive Plan’s UGA. On the surface, the proposal to construct this water tank, together with its requisite transmission main system connection, appears to promote development outside the UGA, which would be a clear contravention of the Comprehensive Plan. This project though is necessary to provide hydraulic consistency (relatively uniform water pressure) throughout the designated hydraulic zone, and the selected tank site meets the necessary engineering criteria under Section 5.13 of the Comprehensive Plan.

Consistency of the water tank project is assured by the policies of CFU 3.6, which direct the City to apply strict limitations for allowing service connections outside the UGA. Specifically, “Any mains that are subsequently extended outside the city’s UGA for the overall operational benefit of the City of Spokane’s utility system shall be for transmission purposes only, with no connections allowed within that portion of the city’s utility service area that is outside the UGA.”

**The Six-year Comprehensive Sewer, Water and Street Programs.** The City of Spokane prepares and publishes a Six-Year Capital Improvement Program (CIPs) annually for all of its capital investments,

including sections for street, water and sewer projects as part of its annual budget process. Additionally, the City adopts its 6-year Street Program separately in July of each year to meet state deadlines. . These capital plans provide a blueprint for improving the City's sewer, water and transportation infrastructure in a rational, coordinated, cost-effective manner. These plans are prepared in support of the City's overall planning efforts:

- The City Sewer and Water (Utility) departments plan over a 20-year financial period, and 6-year capital plans for the utility services are designed to be consistent with each department's twenty-year financial plan.
- The City Comprehensive Plan uses a mandated 20-year planning period for growth, development and expansion, and the Six-Year Comprehensive Sewer, Water and Street Plans are reviewed annually for compliance with the City's overall Comprehensive Plan.
- In addition to the City Comprehensive Plan's 20-year planning horizon, each utility designates a strategic planning period of 50-100 years for major infrastructure elements, and the capital planning supports this strategic planning. In fact, some of the city's existing utility infrastructure is more than 100 years old. As materials improve, even longer useful life spans may be expected.

**The purpose of the Six-year Capital Plans.** The Six-Year Capital Plans for the utilities are used for five distinct purposes:

1. The City Utilities are "enterprise" activities that are managed similarly to many successful businesses. A utility builds, operates and maintains infrastructure (pipes, buildings, pumps, etc.) to provide a service to customers, and the fees charged to customers fund the utility activities, so that no City taxes are used to pay for utility operations. In order to operate a utility efficiently, the infrastructure must be constructed and maintained in an orderly, rational manner, and the Six-Year CIPs provide the planning structure that supports efficient system improvements.
2. The 20-year utility financial planning periods and the six-year capital plans are directly related and attempt to promote a predictable and even cash flow for the Utilities. By matching improvement projects with cash flow and revenues, peak capital spending can be minimized; projects can be spread out to minimize costly short-term borrowing; and large fee increases can be avoided.
3. Grants and low interest loans are available from federal and state agencies for utility infrastructure improvements. These agencies require that projects proposed for funding are part of an approved capital improvement program..
4. All infrastructure capital plans are closely coordinated with each other. This coordination allows efficient installation of utility improvements in conjunction with street projects and prevents costly multiple construction projects in the same area. In addition, the plans are shared with Spokane County and state agencies to ensure that other public projects are consistent with City projects.
5. The capital plans are used by the public. These programs contain information that supports redevelopment, private construction projects, and other City economic activities.

**New projects.** New projects are added annually to the Six-Year Sewer, Water and Street Programs, and completed (or cancelled) projects are removed from the programs. Proposed new projects must be "needs-driven" to be considered for inclusion in the programs. For street projects, considerations include the following goals from chapter 4 of the Comprehensive Plan:

- **Promote a Sense of Place** - Promote a sense of community and identity through the provision of context-sensitive transportation choices and transportation design features, recognizing that both profoundly affect the way people interact and experience the city.

- **Provide Transportation Choices** - Meet mobility needs by providing facilities for transportation options – including walking, bicycling, public transportation, private vehicles, and other choices
- **Accommodate Access to Daily Needs and Priority Destinations** - Promote land use patterns that include transportation facilities and other urban features that advance Spokane’s quality of life.
- **Promote Economic Opportunity** - Implement projects that support and facilitate economic vitality and opportunity in support of the City’s land use plan objectives
- **Respect Natural & Community Assets** - Protect natural, community, and neighborhood assets to create and connect places where people live their daily lives in a safe and healthy environment
- **Enhance Public Health & Safety** - Promote healthy communities by providing and maintaining a safe transportation system with viable active mode options that provides for the needs of all travelers particularly the most vulnerable users.

A citizen oversight committee was formed in 2015 to drive the selection of new street projects based on a 20-year Street Levy, which was approved by City voters in November 2014. A Transportation Subcommittee of the City’s Plan Commission (PCTS) was created and worked through a process of project selection in which the above criteria, as well as existing physical conditions of arterial streets, were weighed against land-use designations that suggest economic potential and against opportunities for cost savings through integrating with utility needs and potential grants. A resulting project scoring matrix became a “first-cut” tool for prioritization of capital street projects. Through this tool, street projects are selected from the highest priority rankings.

The matrix was never expected to be a perfect tool for determining the priorities. Because of this, an additional method for justifying moving a low-scoring project into the program was developed. Such projects would be determined to be “Roadways of Significance”. The method is used in rare circumstances to elevate the prioritization of an arterial roadway based on heightened economic activity or economic potential that aligns with City Council-adopted Target Investment Areas or similar designations. Roadways of Significance must still be presented and accepted through the PCTS and City Council as part of the proposed annual update to the Six-Year Comprehensive Street Program.

**The six-year capital program annual process.** Updating the City’s Six-Year Capital Improvement Program is an annual activity that begins immediately after the most recent plan is adopted. A summary of the processes is provided below:

**Streets Program.** The six-year capital street program is required by State law to be completed by June 30 of each year:

**July-December:** Capital Programs solicits input from various City and agency sources.

**January - February:** A rough draft of the Program is prepared and then reviewed with City staff.

**February-April:** A working draft is prepared; the environmental process is started (SEPA checklist); and the draft is coordinated with the proposed utility budget.

**April-May:** The working draft is presented to the Public Infrastructure, Environment & Sustainability (PIES) Committee. The draft is then presented to the Plan Commission where the new program elements are critically reviewed for consistency with the city’s overall Comprehensive Plan. Lastly, the final draft is then prepared and presented at a Plan Commission public hearing.

**June:** The pre-publication draft along with the Plan Commission’s recommendation is presented to the City Council for acceptance.

Project Name	Limits	On School Walk Route?	In 6-year plan?	Construction Year (Forecasted)	Design %	On Bike Plan?	Ped Plan Priority Area?	Other Planning Doc	Funding Notes	Est Cost (Millions)	Funded?	Level of Traffic Stress for Bicycling (1 to 4)	Bicycle Network Analysis	Presence of important destinations	Addresses Network Gap <1,000 feet	Ped-Bike Crashes - 2013 - 2021	Steepness	<a href="https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/placeandhealth/svi/index.html">Social Vulnerability Index (0-1) https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/placeandhealth/svi/index.html</a>	BAB Ranking ( 1 to 23 )
<b>1st Avenue</b>	Maple St. to Bernard St.	No	Yes	2028	15%	Y	Y	Downtown Plan	Potential for federal Safe Streets and Roads for All SS4A funding	\$2.0	N	4	High Stress	Yes: Downtown services and businesses	No	1 serious injury, 10 possible or minor injury	Level	.71 - Moderate to High	
<b>29th Avenue</b>	Washington to Monroe	No	Maintenance Project	2024	15%	Y	N	South Hill Coalition	Local Ped-Bike Match	\$1.0	Y	2	High Stress	Comstock Park	No	1 minor injury	Level	.04 Low	
<b>44th Avenue</b>	Crestline to Altamont	No	Yes	2022	100%	Y	N	South Hill Coalition	Local Ped-Bike Match	\$1.0	Y	2	Low Stress	Parks	No	0	Level	.32 Low to Moderate	
<b>Ben Burr Trail - River Extension</b>	Under Trent Bridge	No	No	2023	60%	Y	Y	TOD Framework Study	Coordination with Trent Bridge/WSDOT	\$3.0	N	3	High Stress	U-District; Gonzaga	Yes	3 crashes: 1 evident injury 1 suspected injury 1 minor injury	Short length of Moderately Steep	.90 High	
<b>Boone Ave Protected Bike Lanes</b>	Howard to Ruby	No	Yes	2023	0%	Y	Y	Draft North Bank Plan		\$2.0	N	4	High Stress	Arena; N. Riverfront Park	No	1 bicycle possible injury; 2 ped possible injury; 2 ped suspected minor injury; 1 ped minory injury;	Level	.92 High	
<b>Broadway Ave</b>	Post to Chestnut	No	Yes	2024	30%	Y	Y	West Central Neighborhood Plan	Local Ped-Bike Match	\$1.0	N	3	High Stress	County Services	No	1 bicycle evident injury; 3 ped suspected minor injury	Level	.67 moderate to high	
<b>Centennial Trail - Mission Gap</b>	Mission Park to Upriver Drive	No	Yes	2025-26	0%	Y	Y	Logan Neighborhood Plan	State and Federal Transportation Grants, State Recreation Grants	\$8.0	N	4	High Stress	Mission Park; Witter Pool; Gonzaga	Yes	1 ped possible injury; 1 bicyclist no apparent injury; 1 ped suspected serious injury;	Strongly sloping	0.91 High	
<b>Chestnut/Elm Greenway - Crossing Improvements</b>	Centennial Trail to Longfellow	No	No	TBD	30%	Y	Y	West Central Neighborhood Plan	West Quadrant TIF funding application	\$2.4M	N	3	High Stress	Dutch Jakes Park; AM Cannon Park	Yes	1 ped evident injury; 1 bicyclist evident injury; 1 ped suspected serious injury; 1 bicyclist suspected minor injury; 1 ped suspected minor injury; 1 ped possible injury;	Level	.67 moderate to high	
<b>Washington Street Bike Lanes Downtown</b>	3rd Ave to SF Boulevard	No	Yes	2023	0%	Y	Y	Downtown Plan	Potential for federal Safe Streets and Roads for All SS4A funding	\$5.0	N	4	High Stress	High Density of Destinations	No	1 evident injury bicyclist; 1 evident injury ped; 11 possible/minor injury	Gently sloping	.71 moderate to high	
<b>Everett Ave Greenway - Crossing Improvements</b>	Division to Children of the Sun Trail	Yes	Yes	2023	0% except HAWK	Y	N	Neighborhood Plans	State Safety Grant	\$1.5M	Y	4	High Stress	Division Street Services	Yes	1 bicyclist serious injury; 1 bicyclist evident injury; 1 bicyclist possible injury; 1 bicyclist suspected minor injury; 1 serious injury ped; 2 suspected serious injury ped	Level	.84 High	
<b>Fish Lake Trail Connection</b>	Lindeke to Sandifur	No	Yes	2025	30%	Y	N	Fish Lake Trail Study	Study complete, applications expected next grant cycle	\$15.0	N	4	Low Stress	Sunset Blvd. Services; Parks	Yes	1 serious injury - bicyclist hit by vehicle; 1 evident injury bicyclist	Gently sloping to steep (24deg)	.39 low to moderate	
<b>Fish Lake Trail Phase 3b - Bridges</b>	1/4 mile trail & RR crossings in County	No	Yes	2026	60%	Y	N	Parks Plans	6yr Streets Plan	\$7.2	N	3	NA	Cheney	Yes	0	Gently sloping	.11 low	
<b>Longfellow Greenway - Crossing Improvements</b>	Driscoll to Cook	Yes	Yes	2023	0% except HAWKS	Y	N	Neighborhood Plans	Funded through state safety grants	\$2.8	Y	4	High Stress	Division Street Services	Yes	1 bicyclist evident injury; 1 ped possible injury; 1 pedestrian minor injury; 1 bicyclist suspected minor injury; 1 bicyclist serious injury; 2 ped suspected minor injury; 3 ped serious injury	Level	.82 high	
<b>Main Avenue</b>	Monroe to Browne St.	No	Yes	2026	0%	Y	Y	Downtown Plan	Local Ped-Bike Match	\$5.4	Y	3	High Stress	High Density of Destinations	No	2 bicyclist evident injury; 2 bicyclist suspected minor injury; 3 bicyclist possible injury; 6 ped possible injury; 1 ped suspected minor injury;			
<b>Mallon Avenue</b>	Monroe to Howard	No	Yes	2027	15%	Y	Y	Draft North Bank Plan	Local Ped-Bike Match	\$1.5	Y	3	High Stress	North Bank Destinations	No	0	Level	.82 High	
<b>Maple/Ash</b>	NW Blvd. to Rowan Ave	Yes	Maintenance Project	2023	15%	Y	Y	Neighborhood Plans	Local Ped-Bike Match	\$0.5	Y	4	High Stress	Local Businesses and Services	No	1 serious injury bicyclist; 3 evident injury bicyclist; 1 serious injury ped; 2 evident injury ped; 8 possible/minor injury bicyclist; 11 possible/minor injury ped; 1 no-injury bicyclist	Gently sloping (3deg) to Strongly sloping (7deg)	.84 High	

<i>Pacific Ave Greenway - Crossing Improvements</i>	Howard to Perry	Yes	No, but will be added in 2023	2026	15%	Y	Y	U-District TOD Study	State and Federal Transportation Grants	\$7.0	Partial	4	High Stress	House of Charity; Downtown; S. U-District	Yes	1 pedestrian fatality; 3 possible or minor injury bicyclist; 4 ped serious injury; 1 ped evident injury; 8 ped possible/minor injury;	Level to gently sloping (3deg)	.71 moderate to high	
<i>Riverside Ave, Ph. 2 - Full Rebuild</i>	Monroe to Wall St	No	Yes	2026	30%	Y	Y	Downtown Plan	State and Federal Transportation Grants	\$8.5	N	3	High Stress	High Density of Destinations	No	3 ped possible injury; 1 ped evident injury; 1 bicyclist possible injury;	Level	.71 moderate to high	
<i>South Gorge Trail - Monroe Underpass</i>	Under Monroe Street Bridge	No	Yes	2023	30%	Y	Y	Traffic Calming Program	State Recreation Grants	\$3	N	4	High Stress	Peaceful Valley to Downtown Connection	Yes	1 bicyclist serious injury; 1 ped possible injury	Strongly sloping	.71 moderate to high	
<i>Spokane Falls Blvd</i>	Post to Division	No	Yes	2026	15%	Y	Y	Downtown Plan	Local Ped-Bike Match	\$1	Y	3	High Stress	High Density of Destinations	No	9 possible injury ped; 3 possible injury cyclist; 2 pedestrian suspected serious injury; 1 minor injury cyclist; 2 pedestrian suspected minor injury; 1 cyclist evident injury; 1 cyclist suspected minor injury; 1 pedestrian evident injury; 1 pedestrian no apparent injury	Level	.71 moderate to high	
<i>Strong Rd. Pathway &amp; Improvements</i>	5-Mile to Austin	No	Yes	2027	15%	Y	N	Neighborhood Plans	Local Ped-Bike Match	\$1	N	3	High Stress	Parks	No	0	Gently sloping (5deg) to Level	.32 low to moderate	
<i>Inland Empire Way</i>	US-195 to Sunset Hwy	No	in 195 Study	TBD	0%	Y	N	US 195 Study	Statr and Federal Transportation Grants	\$2	N	3	High Stress	Latah Commercial Center to Downtown	No	1 possible injury pedestrian	Level to strongly sloping (6deg)	0.45 low to moderate	
<i>Whistalks Way</i>	Government Way to River	No	Yes	2026	15%	Y	N	Neighborhood Plans	Local Ped-Bike Match	\$5	N	4	High Stress	SCC Campus; Housing	No	1 ped suspected serious injury; 1 evident injury bicyclist; 1 no injury pedestrian	Gently sloping (4deg) to level	0.42 low to moderate	
<i>Sunset Boulevard</i>	Inland Empire Way to 2nd Avenue	No	No	NA	5%	Y	Y	Neighborhood Plans	Initial crossing concepts developed for future grant applications	NA	N	4	High Stress	Browne's Addition to Downtown	No	2 ped suspected serious injury; 1 cyclist suspected serious injury; 1 cyclist suspected minor injury; 1 evident injury pedestrian; 1 cyclist possible injury	Gently sloping (4deg) to level	0.45 low to moderate	



Question 1

\*Rank the Projects

Please drag and drop the listed projects, placing highest-ranked projects at the top of the list.

1st Avenue

1

29th Avenue

2

44th Avenue

3

Ben Burr Trail River Extension - Under Trent Bridge

4

Boone Ave Bike Lanes

5

Broadway Avenue

6

Centennial Trail - Mission Gap

7

Chestnut/Elm Greenway

8

Washington Street Bike Lanes

9

Everett Avenue Greenway

10

Fish Lake Trail Connection - Sunset Trailhead to Sandifur Bridge

11

Fish Lake Trail - Railroad Bridges to Fish Lake

12

Longfellow Avenue Greenway

13

Main Avenue Bike Lane Improvements

14

Mallon Avenue Bike Lanes

15

Maple/Ash Bike Lanes

16

Pacific Avenue Greenways

17

Riverside Avenue - Full Rebuild - Monroe to Wall Street

18

South Gorge Trail - Monroe Street Underpass

19

Spokane Falls Boulevard - Bike Lane Improvements

20

Strong Road Pathway and Crossing Improvements

21

Inland Empire Way Bike Lanes

22

Whistalks Way Pathway and Crossing Improvements

23

Sunset Boulevard Bike Lanes and Crossing Improvements

24

NEXT