

# Sprague Avenue Rebuild- Sprague Corridor Investment Strategy

STR-2014-67

## Executive Summary:

This project will fulfill the intents of the South University District Sprague Corridor Investment Strategy by implementing the 3-lane section on Sprague through placement of streetscape and updating traffic signals. Landscaping is also envisioned with possible integrated stormwater disposal.

## Project Justification:

The purpose of this project is to improve transportation for all modes and thus promote a vibrant livable community.

## Location:

Other Location  
Sprague Avenue - Division Street to Fiske Street

## Project Status:

Active  
Application phase seeking design and construction funding. 2014 applications are for the initial phase build-out for hardscape elements, lighting and landscaping at intersections. Future applications will gather funds toward fulfilling these needs along the full corridor.

## External Factors:

This project is not yet fully funded for design and construction. The City is actively applying for grants to move this project forward.

## Maintenance:

*Maintenance of capital facilities, buildings and infrastructure has an impact on a Department's operating budget, and thus routine maintenance costs for new and ongoing projects are identified in the table below.*

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total
Expected Annual Maintenance	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

## Maintenance Comments:

# Sprague Avenue Rebuild- Sprague Corridor Investment Strategy

STR-2014-67

## Spending:

Project Phase	Spending To Date	Estimated Spending						6-Year Total	Total
		2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020		
Construction	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,500,000	\$0	\$4,000,000	\$0	\$10,500,000	\$10,500,000
Design	\$0	\$0	\$700,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$700,000	\$700,000
Planning	\$150,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$150,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$150,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$700,000</b>	<b>\$6,500,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$4,000,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$11,200,000</b>	<b>\$11,350,000</b>

## Funding:

Funding Name	Source	Status*	Funding to Date	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total
ARRA	Federal	Encumbered	\$150,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$150,000
CDBG	Federal	Identified	\$0	\$0	\$300,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$300,000
Other	---	Unidentified	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,900,000	\$0	\$4,000,000	\$0	\$7,900,000
Ped/Bike	Federal	Identified	\$0	\$0	\$80,000	\$720,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$800,000
Redlight	Local	Encumbered	\$0	\$0	\$200,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$200,000
STP	Federal	Applied	\$0	\$0	\$120,000	\$1,880,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,000,000
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$150,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$700,000</b>	<b>\$6,500,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$4,000,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$11,350,000</b>

\*Status definitions:

- Unidentified: Funding source has not yet been determined
- Identified: Funding source has been found, but not yet requested
- Applied: Grant or loan application has been submitted, or budget has been requested
- Awarded: Grant or loan has been offered but the contract has not yet been signed or budget has not yet been approved by Council
- Encumbered: Project contract has been signed and funds have been allocated to spend on the project

Funding amounts in red reflect sources that are unidentified, identified or anticipated.

# **CITY OF SPOKANE**



## **2015 – 2020 SIX YEAR COMPREHENSIVE STREET PROGRAM**



# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Resolutions .....</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>Acronyms .....</b>	<b>x</b>
<b>FINANCIAL INFORMATION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Funding Sources .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Financial Summary.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>SAFETY PROGRAM.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>BRIDGE REHABILITATION PROGRAM.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>PEDESTRIAN &amp; BIKEWAYS PROGRAM .....</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>IMPACT FEE PROGRAM .....</b>	<b>102</b>
<b>NEIGHBORHOOD PROGRAM .....</b>	<b>114</b>
<b>STREET BOND PROGRAM .....</b>	<b>132</b>
<b>STREET OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE .....</b>	<b>152</b>
<b>PAVEMENT MAINTENANCE PROGRAM.....</b>	<b>158</b>

## **City of Spokane Mayor and City Council Members**

David Condon - **Mayor**  
Ben Stuckart - **Council President At Large**  
Mike Fagan - Council Member District 1  
Amber Waldref - Council Member District 1  
Jon Snyder - Council Member District 2  
Mike Allen - Council Member District 2  
Candice Mumm - Council Member District 3  
Steve Salvatori - Council Member District 3

## **City of Spokane Plan Commission Members**

**Dennis Dellwo – President**  
**Brian McClatchey - Vice President**  
John Dietzman - Member  
Asher Ernst - Member  
Gail Prosser - Member  
F.J. Dullanty - Member  
Tom Reese - Member  
Candace Mumm - **City Council Liaison**  
Dave Burnette - **Community Assembly Liaison**

## **Integrated Capital Management**

P. Mike Taylor, P.E. – Director  
Katherine E. Miller, P.E. - Principal Engineer  
Brandon Blankenagel, P.E. - Senior Engineer  
Sam McKee – Engineering Tech IV

Date Printed: 4-15-2014

# **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 the 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's most recent planning effort, the 2000 Comprehensive Plan, (adopted in 2001) complies with the GMA rules and consists of goals, policies, maps, illustrations, and implementation strategies that state how the City should grow physically, socially, and economically. The 2000 Comprehensive Plan consists of over thirty official documents that encompass all aspects of city activities.

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 of infrastructure in support of the 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 Horizons 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 just 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 the Six-Year Capital Improvement Programs (CIPs) annually for street, water and sewer

projects. These programs are termed the Six-Year Comprehensive Sewer Program; Six-Year Comprehensive Water Program; and the Six-Year Comprehensive Street Program. These programs provide a blueprint for improving the City's sewer, water and transportation infrastructure in a rational, coordinated, cost-effective manner. The Six-Year Comprehensive Programs are prepared in support of the City's overall planning efforts:

- The City Sewer and Water (Utility) departments plan over a twenty-year financial period, and the Six-Year Comprehensive Utility Plans are designed to be consistent with each department's twenty-year financial plan.
- The City Comprehensive Plan uses a mandated twenty-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 Six-Year CIPs support 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 Programs.** The Six-Year Comprehensive Utility Programs 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 CIPs 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, and the City's Six-Year CIPs satisfy that requirement.
4. All Six-Year CIPs 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 Six-Year CIPs are shared with Spokane County and state agencies to ensure that other public projects are consistent with City projects.
5. The Six-Year CIPs 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 Comprehensive 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, and new projects can originate from one or more of the following sources:



- Utility maintenance and operations staff identify infrastructure needing immediate replacement or upgrade based on observed conditions.
- Adopted facility and management plans list projects needed for continued system operation.
- Other City projects (such as street or bridge work) create an opportunity for cost-effective upgrades or facility replacements.
- Planning documents, such as the City Comprehensive Plan, provide guidance on expansion and growth related projects.
- Regulatory agencies (such as the Washington Department of Ecology and the Department of Health) have ordered improvements to the infrastructure system for public health and safety.

**The six-year program annual process.** Updating the Six-Year Comprehensive Programs is an annual activity that begins immediately after the most recent plan is adopted. A summary of the processes is provided below:

**Streets, sewer, and water programs.** 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:** A rough draft of the Program is prepared and then reviewed with City staff.

**February-March:** 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 Planning, Community, & Economic Development 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.

*Page Reserved  
for  
Council  
Resolution*





## **ACRONYMS**

<b>ARRA</b>	American Recovery and Reinvestment Act
<b>BOND</b>	2004 Street Bond
<b>BNSF</b>	Burlington Northern Sante Fe Railroad
<b>CDBG</b>	Community Development Block Grant
<b>CDF</b>	Community Development Funds
<b>CIP</b>	Capital Improvement Program
<b>CMAQ</b>	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program
<b>CSAC</b>	Citizens Street Advisory Commission
<b>CTP</b>	Centennial Trails Program
<b>DWSRF</b>	Drinking Water State Revolving Fund
<b>Fed Appr.</b>	Federal Appropriation funds
<b>FedFRA</b>	Federal Railroad Administration
<b>FMSIB</b>	Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board
<b>FTA</b>	Federal Transportation Administration
<b>HPP</b>	High Priority Projects
<b>HSIP</b>	Highway Safety Improvement Programs
<b>IUF</b>	Integrated Utility Funding
<b>GF</b>	City of Spokane General Fund
<b>IPSBI</b>	Integrated Plan Stormwater Basins Improvements
<b>ISTEA</b>	Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act
<b>Impact Fee</b>	Funding source developed according to RCW 82.02.050
<b>LID</b>	Local Improvement District
<b>MtgnFee</b>	Private Funds (From development mitigation) SEPA based
<b>MVA</b>	Motor Vehicle Administration
<b>Paths/Trails</b>	Paths and Trails Reserve
<b>ProgMatch</b>	Programmatic Match (Additional STP funds)
<b>PWTF</b>	Public Works Trust Fund
<b>RCO</b>	Recreation and Conservation Office
<b>REET</b>	Second 1/4% Real Estate Excise Tax
<b>RET</b>	First 1/4% Real Estate Tax (Helps fund street maintenance work)
<b>SAS</b>	State Arterial Street Fund (City share of the State Motor Fuel Tax)
<b>SEC 5317</b>	Federal Transportation Administration Funds
<b>SRHD</b>	Spokane Regional Health District
<b>SRTC</b>	Spokane Regional Transportation Council
<b>SRTS</b>	Safe Routes to Schools
<b>State Dscrt.</b>	State Discretionary (earmark funds)
<b>SMFT</b>	State Motor fuel Tax
<b>STA</b>	Spokane Transit Authority (Cooperative project funds)

### **ACRONYMS(Continued)**

<b>STP</b>	Surface Transportation Program
<b>STP-BRM</b>	Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation
<b>STP-ENH</b>	Surface Transportation Enhancement Funds
<b>STP-HES</b>	Surface Transportation Safety Funds
<b>STP-STWD</b>	Surface Transportation Statewide Competitive Funds
<b>STP-U</b>	Surface Transportation Urban Area Funds
<b>TBD</b>	Transportation Benefit District
<b>TCSP</b>	Transportation, Community, and System Preservation program
<b>TIB</b>	Transportation Improvement Board
<b>UAP</b>	Urban Arterial Program
<b>UDRA Fund</b>	University District Revitalization Area Fund
<b>UCP</b>	Urban Corridor Program
<b>USP</b>	Urban Sidewalk Program
<b>WQTIF</b>	West Quadrant Tax Increment Finance
<b>WSDOT</b>	Washington State Department of Transportation

This page intentionally left blank