

Appendix A

Documentation of Stakeholder/Public Coordination

LATAH BRIDGE REHABILITATION STUDY DOCUMENTATION OF STAKEHOLDER COORDINATION AND PUBLIC OUTREACH

The stakeholder coordination and public outreach plan for this project was developed to leverage a number of communication strategies to garner interest, provide transparency, and invite two-way dialogue, all throughout the duration of the process.

One of the first steps in the stakeholder coordination and public involvement process was to identify groups and specific representatives for an advisory committee. The purpose of the advisory committee was to provide guidance and feedback to the study team throughout the process. Stakeholder groups were selected and include neighborhood groups, local businesses, City of Spokane Planning, WSDOT, SRTC, WDFW, Historic Preservation Office, PeTT, Spokane Tribe of Indians, and Inland Rail. The complete Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) groups and representatives listing is attached.

The stakeholder coordination and public outreach process occurred in several ways, primarily in organized meetings, and public open houses. Two SAC meetings and one public meeting have been held at selected key points in the study process. One more SAC and Public meeting are envisioned. The purpose of each meeting is described as follows.

SAC Meeting #1 – Held on October 14, 2011, the purpose of this meeting was to introduce the project, affirm the project goals and objectives, and collect initial input, issues, and questions from key stakeholders about the project. A roundtable discussion provided opportunity for each representative to provide input.

The following individuals were invited to the meeting. Specific outreach is documented below:

- Spokane City Council Member Jon Snyder
 - Emails and calls to office. Councilman Snyder's assistant Joel Williamson attended first meeting.
- Browne's Addition Neighborhood Council
 - Initial email sent to Steve Hart and Jim Red (chair and co-chair). Follow up calls made to Steve and Jim. Steve indicated he would not be able to attend. Follow up email made to Jim. Jim indicated he would try to attend the meeting, but did not attend.
- Grandview/Thorpe Neighborhood Council
 - Initial email sent to Tina Luerssen and Katy Brown (chair and co-chair). Karen Carlberg from the association emailed back asking if there was a specific schedule for the meetings. DHC replied to email letting her know more about the project schedule and reminding her of SAC Meeting #1. Follow up calls and emails were made to Tina. Tina was unable to attend, but indicated she would like to know about the next meeting time.
- Latah/Hangman Neighborhood Council
 - Initial invitation sent to Kai Huschke. Kai replied that he put the notice out to the neighborhood council to see if anyone would like to attend. Follow up call made to Kai to check in. Kai indicated he would be out of town and unable to attend the meeting.

- Rosauer's
 - Initial email sent to Jeff Phillips, CEO. He had earlier indicated that Rosauer's would like to be involved in this process. Made follow up calls and emails. Jeff was out of town for the first meeting but his assistant checked to see if someone from the Browne's Addition Store could attend. No representation from Rosauer's at SAC Meeting #1.
- City of Spokane Planning
 - Initial invitation sent to Jo Anne Wright. Tirrell Black from Planning emailed back indicating she would attend the first meeting in Jo Anne's place. Tirrell Black attended the first meeting.
- Spokane Parks & Recreation
 - Initial contact made with Leroy Eadie. Leroy recommended Taylor Bressler and Tony Madunich to attend the stakeholder meetings. Emails and follow up calls were made to Taylor and Tony. Taylor attended first meeting.
- Spokane City/County Historic Preservation Office
 - Initial email invitation sent to Kristen Griffin. Kristen replied that she would attend, and attended SAC Meeting #1.
- SRTC
 - Email and follow up call made to Ryan Stewart. Ryan attended SAC Meeting #1.
- WSDOT
 - Initial email invitation sent to Chad Simonson. Follow up call made to Chad, the office indicated Mike Frucci would attend in place of Chad. Mike attended first meeting.
- WSDOT
 - Email and follow up call made to Harold White. Harold indicated he would attend the first meeting. Harold attended SAC Meeting #1.
- City of Spokane Pedestrian, Traffic & Transportation Committee (PETT)
 - Initial invitation sent to Roland LeMarche. Follow up email sent to Roland LeMarche (as we did not have his phone number). Kelly Cruz from PETT contacted DHC, indicating he would attend the first meeting as the PETT representative. Kelly attended first meeting.
- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
 - Initial invitation sent to Howard Ferguson. Howard replied, copying Karin Divens from his office, indicating neither of them can attend first meeting due to scheduling conflicts. Howard indicated Fish and Wildlife would like to be involved in this process, particularly regarding wildlife issues. DHC responded that we would send them meeting notes and keep them updated regarding future meetings.
- City of Spokane Plan Commission
 - Initial email sent to Asher Ernst. Follow up call and email sent to Asher. Asher indicated he could not make the first meeting, as he would be out of town.
- City of Spokane Planning
 - Initial email sent to Grant Wencel, City of Spokane Pedestrian/Bike Coordinator. Grant indicated he would attend, and attended the first meeting.

- Spokane Preservation Associates
 - Emails were sent to Kathryn Burk-Hise and Matt Cohen. Follow up calls were made to both contacts, with no reply from either.
- Spokane Tribe of Indians
 - Initial invitation sent to Randy Abrahamson. Follow up email sent to Randy, who indicated he would attend the first meeting. Rand attended SAC Meeting #1.
- Inland Empire Rail Association
 - Dick Raymond was notified and attended the first meeting as a representative.
- City of Spokane Capital Programs
 - Sam McKee attended first meeting

SAC Meeting #2 – Held on December 9, 2011, the purpose of this meeting was to communicate initial results of the environmental, traffic/transportation, and bridge condition baseline condition assessments, and solicit input.

The following individuals were invited to the meeting. Specific outreach is documented below:

- Spokane City Council Member Jon Snyder
 - Email sent to Jon and Joel. Joel indicated he would attend second meeting. Joel came in ahead of the SAC Meeting #2 and indicated he would not be able to attend due to a scheduling conflict.
- Browne's Addition Neighborhood Council
 - Emails sent to Steve Hart and Jim Red (chair and co-chair). Follow up calls made to Steve and Jim. Steve indicated he would not be able to attend. No response from Jim.
- Grandview/Thorpe Neighborhood Council
 - Email sent to Tina and Katy. Tina replied, thanking us for the information and requesting more information on the public open house. Follow up email sent regarding SAC Meeting #2. Tina unable to attend.
- Latah/Hangman Neighborhood Council
 - Email and follow up call made to Kai. Kai emailed that he would be unable to attend SAC Meeting #2.
- Rosauer's
 - Email sent to Jeff Phillips. Michelle Hege from DHC personally followed up with Jeff regarding SAC Meeting #2 (Michelle and Jeff serve on the Greater Spokane Incorporated board of directors together). Jeff did not attend meeting.
- City of Spokane Planning
 - Email sent to Tirrell Black. Tirrell indicated she would attend. Tirrell attended SAC Meeting #2.
- Spokane Parks & Recreation
 - Email sent to Taylor Bressler. Follow up calls and emails made to Taylor. Taylor did not attend SAC Meeting #2.

- Spokane City/County Historic Preservation Office
 - Email sent to Kristen Griffin. Follow up call made to Kristen. She indicated she would try to attend, and if not, send someone in her place. Kristen attended SAC Meeting #2.
- SRTC
 - Email and follow up call made to Ryan Stewart. Ryan indicated he would attend and attended SAC Meeting #2.
- WSDOT
 - Email sent to Mike Frucci, who indicated he would attend. Mike attended SAC Meeting #2.
- WSDOT
 - Email sent to Harold White, who indicated he would attend. Harold White attended SAC Meeting #2.
- City of Spokane Pedestrian, Traffic & Transportation Committee (PETT)
 - Email sent to Kelly Cruz ,who indicated he would attend. Kelly attended SAC Meeting #2.
- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
 - Email sent to Howard and Karin. Howard indicated one of them would attend. Karin attended SAC Meeting #2.
- City of Spokane Plan Commission
 - Email sent to Asher Ernst, who indicated he would attend. Asher attended SAC Meeting #2.
- City of Spokane Bicycle Advisory Board
 - Email sent to Grant Wencel. Follow up call made to Grant, who indicated he would try to attend but may have a conflict. Grant attended SAC Meeting #2.
- Spokane Tribe of Indians
 - Email and follow up call made to Randy. Brea Franco from the Spokane Tribe emailed back, indicating she would attend. Brea attended SAC Meeting #2.
- Inland Empire Rail Association
 - Email sent to Dick, he indicated he would attend. Dick Raymond attended SAC Meeting #2.

Public Meeting #1 – Held on December 14, 2011, the purpose of this meeting was to communicate initial results of the environmental, traffic/transportation, and bridge condition baseline condition assessments, and solicit public input.

All of the data and information obtained during the first set of meetings was compiled, categorized, and referenced when developing initial rehabilitation options.

Communication and outreach for the Public Meeting #1 is documented below:

- Direct mail postcard sent to approximately 2,000 residents and businesses within the vicinity of the bridge.

- Classified advertisement placed in the Spokesman-Review (December 7th and 11th) and the Cheney Free Press (December 8th).
- City of Spokane distributed news release to their distribution list, posted news release on website, emailed the information out on the City's email distribution (email sent out Thursday, December 8th), and posted to social media.
- City of Spokane news release picked up by the Spokesman-Review. Brief article ran Monday, December 12th.
- City of Spokane news release picked up on KXLY's website.
- Information on the public open house sent to stakeholder advisory group. Stakeholders were asked via email and in person at SAC Meeting #2 to promote the meeting to their constituents and group members.
 - Councilman Jon Snyder promoted the event via Twitter and his blog.
 - Latah/Hangman Neighborhood Council distributed information to their group. Kai Huschke from the council also picked up postcards and distributed them at their monthly meeting.
 - Grandview/Thorpe Neighborhood Council distributed information to their group. Karen Carlberg from the Council also attended the open house.
- Information sent to Jonathan Mallahan, Director of Neighborhood Services via email. Jonathan sent the information out to all neighborhood councils via the neighborhood Friday update. Jonathan also passed the information directly on to Browne's Addition, Latah/Hangman and Grandview/Thorpe Neighborhood Associations.
- Information sent to Greater Spokane Incorporated via email. GSI indicated they would promote via social media.
- Information sent to Downtown Spokane Partnership via email.
- Information sent to Barb Chamberlain via email, who promoted it on the Bike to Work Facebook page and other communication channels.
- Information sent via email to the "Morning Ride Group," a bicycle community/group. Group posted it on Spokane Rocket Velo's website.
- Information sent to Staci Lehman at SRTC via email. Posted on SRTC's website, blog, Facebook and Twitter pages.
- Information sent to the Spokane Bicycle Club via email.
- Information sent to the Spokane Audubon Society via email.
- Desautel Hege Communications promoted open house on Facebook and Twitter.
- Phone calls made to 20 surrounding businesses:
 - Spokane Hotel & Restaurant
 - Northwest Farm Credit Services
 - Sunset Florist & Greenhouse
 - Rodeen's Travel
 - Rosauers
 - Econo Lodge & Suites
 - Blue Ox Coffee

- Eastman Counseling Services
- Boulevard Motel
- Sunset Food Mart
- Vista Counseling Services
- Shangri-La Motel & Apartments
- Radha Yoga Center
- Swamp Tavern
- Frank's Diner
- Harmony Yoga
- Genesis Fuel Tech
- Rainbow School
- Tesko Monument
- Sunset Junction

SAC Meeting #3 – Held on **TBD**, the purpose of this meeting was to present initial rehabilitation solution alternatives and recommendations and solicit comments for refinement.

Public Meeting #2 – Held on **TBD**, the purpose of this meeting was to present initial rehabilitation solution alternatives and recommendations and solicit comments for refinement.

Meeting notes, and all of the comments received on the project to date are included herein.

City of Spokane
Latah Bridge Rehabilitation Project

Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC)

STAKEHOLDER GROUP	REPRESENTATIVE
Spokane City Council	Jon Snyder (Joel Williamson)
Browne's Addition Neighborhood Council	Steve Hart, <i>Chair</i> Jim Red, <i>Vice-Chair</i>
Latah/Hangman Valley Neighborhood Council	Kai Huschke, <i>Chair</i>
Grandview/Thorpe Neighborhood Council	Tina Luerssen, <i>Chair</i> Katy Brown, <i>Vice-Chair</i>
Rosauer's	Jeff Phillips, CEO
Spokane L.R. Planning	Tirrell Black
Spokane Parks & Recreation	Taylor Bressler
City/County Historic Preservation Office	Kristen Griffen
Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC)	Ryan Stewart
Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)	Mike Frucci
Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)	Harold White
PeTT (Pedestrian, Traffic & Transportation) Committee	Kelly Cruz
Department of Fish and Wildlife	Karin Divens
Planning Services Department Plan Commission	Asher Ernst
Bike-Pedestrian Coordinator/Bicycle Advisory Board	Grant Wencil
Spokane Tribe of Indians	Randy Abrahamson
Spokane Preservation Advocates	Kathryn Burk-Hise
Inland Empire Rail Transit Association	Dick Raymond

LATAH BRIDGE REHABILITATION STUDY
STAKEHOLDER MEETING #1 NOTES
Friday, October 14, 2011
10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
City of Spokane Ops Complex – Street Department Building

On Friday, October 14, 2011, the first stakeholder meeting for the Latah Bridge Rehabilitation Project occurred at the City of Spokane OPS Complex, located at 901 N. Nelson. Katherine Miller from the City of Spokane and Mark Brower from CH2M Hill co-facilitated the meeting. Kristen Paul from Desautel Hege Communications served as a note-taker.

Meeting attendees included:

- Katherine Miller, City of Spokane Capital Programs
- Ryan Stewart, SRTC
- Sam McKee, City of Spokane Capital Programs
- Tirrell Black, City of Spokane Planning
- Joel Williamson, City of Spokane (Councilman Snyder's assistant)
- Kelly Cruz, PeTT (Pedestrian, Traffic & Transportation) Committee
- Harold White, WSDOT
- Mike Frucci, WSDOT
- Dick Raymond, Inland Empire Rail Transit Association
- Lisa Malstrom, City of Spokane Street Department
- Randy Abrahamson, Spokane Tribe of Indians
- Taylor Bressler, City of Spokane Parks and Recreation
- Grant Wencel, City of Spokane Planning, Bike and Pedestrian Coordinator
- Lori Price, CH2M Hill
- Kristen Paul, Desautel Hege Communications
- Mark Brower, CH2M Hill
- Kristen Griffin, City/County Historic Preservation Office

Katherine Miller from the City of Spokane kicked off the meeting with an overview of the project:

- This project will not lead to construction in the near future. This is the first step in long term project, and the goal is to understand the current bridge conditions.
- A final completion of the bridge would occur in a minimum of ten years.
- It's important that we get an early start on this project, as DOT is currently working on Highway 195. Outcomes of that project will likely put traffic onto Latah Bridge. It will be important to have a bridge that can handle the anticipated traffic demand.

- Mike Frucci from WSDOT commented that the Highway 195 project is evolving. DOT is working closely with the City; the extent of connectivity to the Latah Bridge may be reduced, causing traffic volume to be lower than originally thought.
- Kelly Cruz from PeTT brought up a question regarding if the new bridge will help to fix the safety issues. Katherine noted that the one of the goals of the final project is to ensure local traffic stays on local roads and highway traffic stays on highways.
- Mike Frucci from WSDOT noted that the transportation network is a system, knows no political boundaries, and all parties need to work together. Latah Bridge is critical for emergency routes from the I-90 corridor.
- Ryan Stewart from SRTC asked if stakeholders from Spokane Transit Authority (STA) had been invited. Mark Brower from CH2M Hill responded that the City and CH2M Hill were working directly with STA.

Katherine Miller continued with a project overview:

- We are here to understand the existing conditions of the bridge and to understand what functions the rehabilitated bridge will need to serve, and how best to accommodate these needs, structurally. This project is very similar to the Monroe Street Bridge.
- The outcome of this project will include recommendations for what this bridge will look like, cost assessment, and next steps. The City will take this information and build the bridge off this study.
- The co-lead for the project is Lisa Malstrom.

Mark Brower from CH2M Hill gave an overview of the project goals and objectives and key milestones.

- As a part of this project, we want to have two-way dialogue. Stakeholders have a true stake in the work. Now is an important time to be involved as the project is developing and in the early stages.
- Latah Bridge is a vital link to the West Plains and is also vital for the City of Spokane's bike plan and STA's master plan.
- Overview of project goals, objectives and metrics (referenced poster board):
- Primary Goal:
 - Develop rehabilitation solutions for the Latah Bridge to ensure the long-term vitality of the critical link it provides in the region's transportation system.
- Key Study Objectives:
 - Provide the appropriate level of inspection and structural capacity analysis of the existing structure that will provide accurate estimates of work scope and estimated costs.
 - Define the baseline existing and forecast traffic demand for the corridor, to include accommodating pedestrians, bicycle facilities, and potential future light rail.
 - Develop bridge rehabilitation evaluation and recommendations to include the following four primary scenarios:
 1. Repair or rehabilitate the bridge to extend its life for 20 years.
 2. Repair or rehabilitate the bridge to extend its life for 20 years, including non-motorized facilities (bike lanes, sidewalks)

3. Alternatives to repair or rehabilitate the bridge to its original like-new condition for a much longer service life.
 4. Rehabilitation or strengthening requirements needed to accommodate future multi-modal loading, in addition to current legal loads.
 - Comply with regulatory requirements, including State and Federal Historic Preservation requirements, while still meeting bridge performance requirements.
 - Understand environmental and permitting requirements and how these could impact the project solutions or costs.
 - Understand existing and future utility requirements and how these could impact the project solutions or costs.
 - Provide a collaborative and transparent stakeholder coordination and public involvement process with purposeful touch points and access throughout the process.
- Success Metrics:
 - A publicly supported rehabilitation plan that is both flexible to meet future transportation and utility demands and highly competitive funding resources.
 - Project budget and timeline adequate to accomplish the plan.

Some stakeholders then brought up specific questions:

- Kelly Cruz from PeTT asked if a traffic study conducted a couple years ago would be used as a gauge to see how traffic has changed.
- Lisa Malstrom from the City of Spokane answered that they are conducting traffic analysis as well as structural analysis.
- Kelly Cruz from PeTT expressed that the Monroe Street Bridge was rehabilitated to have a life longer than 20 years.
- Katherine Miller from the City of Spokane replied that the Monroe Street Bridge project was very similar, and the City looked at both short term and long term options.
- Taylor Bressler from Spokane Parks & Recreation brought up the possibility of an access trail to lead to the south and freeway interchange to connect Fish Lake Trail and High Bridge Park.
- Katherine from the City of Spokane noted that we should discuss this and note this idea in the process.

Mark Brower from CH2M Hill reviewed timeline (poster board), including work to date and upcoming key milestones. Mark noted that the stakeholder group will meet again in early December to review and discuss the baseline findings.

Mark Brower from CH2M Hill then facilitated a roundtable discussion, asking stakeholders to voice opinions, concerns, and anything they'd like noted related the Latah Bridge Rehabilitation project. Kristen Paul from Desautel Hege Communications recorded comments on a flip chart. Comments are listed below and organized by organization:

- Spokane Tribe: Noted to keep in mind doing a cultural resource survey in the area underneath the bridge. Concerned about potential impacts to the area. Tribal cultural artifacts may be in the area, and they are important to the tribe even if they have lost integrity (out of context). Want to ensure that the area is kept protected, that sites would not be made vulnerable by new trails, for instance. Suggested monitoring during construction for any ground disturbance.
- Inland Empire Rail Transit: There may be a potential for light rail in the future. Consideration of potential LRT in this project would pose an opportunity to save money in the long run. One challenge for this is the geometry on the east end of the bridge. A future light rail project could include reimbursements to the City. City should consider noting light rail costs, such that there may be opportunities to capture them in potential future rail project financing. Would like to continue discussion on the possibility of a light rail.
- Historic Preservation: Keep in mind that the area around the bridge is sensitive. The bridge is also an icon in our community. While not listed on the local historic register, the bridge is eligible as a state and national historic structure. Noted that city is a CLG (certified local government) and as such will be a partner in planning the project and will review any survey plans. It will be important to work closely with the Department of Archaeology throughout the process. There are also some historic districts near the bridge – need to take into consideration the view these areas have (of the bridge), as this can have an effect on those districts.
- PeTT: This group is an advocate of multi-modal and pedestrian activity on the streets and bridges, and would like to see these options with this project (including bike lanes). Would also like to see some planters on the observation decks to enhance the pedestrian experience. Look at stream restoration. Remember that the Latah Bridge is an important connection to Finch Arboretum.
- SRTC: Noted to keep the West Plains study in mind. The bridge is a critical East/West link, and carries traffic from I-90. This group is also interested in traffic counts, including splits for trucks.
- Parks and Recreation: Noted the bridge's access to High Bridge Park (via trails). Noted that extensive fill has been dumped in the area under the bridge and around Latah Creek in the past. Long term stability of these slopes is a concern for Parks. Interested in the opportunity to connect to existing trails in the area. Also noted a potential wildlife concern (below the bridge) and noted that they are working on re-planting some areas below the bridge. Other potential concerns are long-term access via the road under Latah Bridge, and the litter issue below the bridge. Stated that he knew of no funding from LWCF (Land and Water Conservation Fund) or UPARR grants have been used for acquisition or improvement to the trails or parkland in the vicinity of the bridge that could be impacted by the project.
- City of Spokane Planning: Consider shoreline jurisdiction and protection for wildlife. It will be important to work with local surrounding neighborhoods. Explore bike and pedestrian options for the bridge. Be sure to consider the West Plains study – the bridge provides a critical link for Fairchild, Spokane International Airport, etc.
- WSDOT: Keep in mind security issues for structure. Be sure to understand any grant requirements underlying existing constructed facilities in the immediate area that may affect the project.

- City of Spokane Bike/Pedestrian Coordinator: Consider the master bike plan. While the current plan does not specifically designate bike lanes for the bridge, they would encourage the City to explore the idea of bike lanes for the bridge.

Mark Brower from CH2M Hill then closed the meeting, noting again the next time the stakeholder group will convene (early December 2011). Email contact information for Mark Brower (mark.brower@ch2m.com) and Lisa Malstrom (lmalstrom@spokanecity.org) was made available to the group for any future questions or comments.

LATAH BRIDGE REHABILITATION STUDY
STAKEHOLDER MEETING #2 NOTES
Friday, December 9, 2011
10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Spokane City Hall – Conference Room 2B

On Friday, December 9, 2011, the second stakeholder meeting for the Latah Bridge Rehabilitation Study occurred at Spokane City Hall, located at 808 W. Spokane Falls Blvd. Mark Brower from CH2M Hill facilitated the meeting. Kristen Paul from Desautel Hege Communications served as a note-taker.

Meeting attendees included:

- Mike Frucci, WSDOT
- Harold White, WSDOT
- Brea Franco, Spokane Tribe of Indians
- Karin Divens, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Asher Ernst, City of Spokane Plan Commission
- Kristen Griffin, City-County of Spokane Historic Preservation Office
- Kelly Cruz, PeTT (Pedestrian, Traffic & Transportation) Committee
- Lisa Malstrom, City of Spokane Street Department
- Ryan Stewart, SRTC
- Grant Wencel, City of Spokane Planning, Bike and Pedestrian Coordinator
- Mark Serbousek, City of Spokane Street Department
- Dick Raymond, Inland Empire Rail Transit Association
- Tirrell Black, City of Spokane Planning
- Marlena Guhlke, CH2M Hill
- Mark Brower, CH2M Hill
- Craig Grandstrom, CH2M Hill
- John Hinman, CH2M Hill
- Kristen Paul, Desautel Hege Communications

Mark Brower from CH2M Hill kicked off the meeting with an update on where the project is at in the process.

- Presented key milestones and project schedule visual board.
- Reminded the group that this project is at a very early stage in the overall process.
- Noted that John Hinman and his team at CH2M Hill have been assessing the structure of the Latah Bridge, pulling very detailed structural model, understanding the condition of the bridge as established and what condition the bridge is in today.
- Noted that Craig Grandstrom has been conducting traffic analysis, understanding traffic capacity, and understanding non-motorized as well as motorized transit for the future.

- Noted that Marlena Guhlke has been conducting research on the environmental side.
- Reminded the stakeholder group that we need input and want dialogue as a part of this process.
- Reminded group of timeline – today is the second stakeholder meeting, reminder about first public open house on Wednesday, December 14th. The third and final stakeholder meeting will likely occur in the spring, where the group will review initial rehabilitation alternatives.

Marlena Guhlke from CH2M Hill then gave an update on the environmental research as part of the project:

- As a part of our research, we are looking at existing environmental conditions and looking at potential issues.
- Completed a desktop review. This means we haven't gone out and done surveys; however, those may happen during latter stages of design, once a project is defined.
- The results of the research show there are no wetlands associated in the project area.
- The results of the research show there are no endangered or threatened species in the area; however, we do have some species to keep in mind.
- The area contains no public water wells or drinking water wells.
- As we continue this study, we will continue to revisit environmental issues that may influence decision making.
- The area does not appear to have an environmental injustice issue, which relates to low-income populations. The rehabilitation of the bridge should benefit all populations.
- Marlena thanked Tirrell Black with City of Spokane Planning for helping to establish boundaries for this research.
- Marlena then showed particular areas on visual display boards:
 - Showed the channel migration zone on a visual board. Noted that the channel migration zone shows how the creek may move over time.
 - Noted the 200 foot buffer area (shown by blue dots on the visual board), noting that the project may need a shoreline permit.
 - Showed the 100 year flood zone and the 500 year flood zone on the visual board, noting that we'll need to keep this in mind as we go forward.
 - Noted that we'll need to consider water quality issues as the project moves forward.
 - Noted that there is a nearby hazardous material site. This site previously had underground storage tanks that have since been removed. This site is something to keep in mind, and while it doesn't mean there are contaminated soils, there may be a potential for contamination.
 - In the Latah Valley, there have been archaeological findings. These include tribal camps and burial sites. Reminded the group that when any soil is disturbed, there is a potential for finding additional artifacts.
 - The area around the bridge is also home to priority species, including peregrine falcons and Townsend big eared bats.

Karin Divens from the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife then commented on the species that live in and around the bridge:

- There is no current nesting for the falcons, although they could come back. The bridge is an ideal structure, and the falcons have plenty of prey around the area.
- Karin then handed out a photo of the bridge and the Townsend big eared bats that nest in the bridge. (Photo was taken in 2007)
 - Karin discussed her hand out, noting that it shows the bridge and where there is a documented maternity colony of bats. The colony nests in the west side of the bridge where the first arch is. Karin showed how the bats use the bridge as a cave. Noted that the City assists with access to the bridge, and in recent access to the bridge, about 30 bats were seen.
 - Karin showed how the bats huddle together for warmth. The maternity colony of bats consists of all females and their offspring.
- The Townsend big eared bats are a candidate for federal species of concern and therefore, the population is being monitored. The bats have been found statewide but the species is considered rare because of the distinct roosting needs.
- Karin was unaware of how many bats are at this particular location (Latah Bridge).
- The female bats typically arrive in April. The bats may have an alternative site they are using for roosting. In August the bats start dispersing, while some bats will stay until mid-September. The most sensitive time for the bats would be from April – September, specifically from June – September.
- At this time, Karin was unsure if the bridge is used as hibernacula, but would be interested in seeing if the bats are using it as a wintertime place to hibernate.
- Karin's main concern was if the bridge will be opened up during construction, as the bridge serves as a cave for the bats now. Karin also wanted to know how the bridge would change long term, as they currently don't know what the temperature and humidity needs are for the bat colony.
- Finally, Karin noted that they are conducting some surveys regarding a white nose fungus that bats are contracting.

Mark from CH2M Hill asked what types of restrictions they place on bridge project during the sensitive time for bats.

Karin from Fish and Wildlife let the group know that it would likely depend on where the construction is.

Kelly Cruz from PETT asked if there were any other documented colonies in any other areas near the bridge or if there were any other competitors or threats to the bats.

Marlena from CH2M Hill continued with her environmental presentation:

- Another issue to consider is that the storm water management off the bridge isn't ideal. A future project would need a better way to manage the water.

- It's important to note the location of High Bridge Park below the bridge. The park is north of Latah Bridge and resumes south of Interstate 90. The land directly under the bridge is not part of the actual park project. While it is not in the technical boundaries, the area under the bridge is still used as part of the park in terms of recreation.
 - In terms of the parks, the project needs to avoid impacts to the parks and maintain the public use of the parks.
- Any permitting related to water quality will need to be considered for all bridge alternatives.
- The bridge is very important from a historical perspective. It is registered on the national and state registers. This needs to be kept in mind in terms of protecting the appearance and historical elements of the bridge.
- From a social economic standpoint, the bridge does serve as a vital link between the downtown core and the West Plains. It's important when the bridge is rehabilitated to keep that link strong.

Asher Ernst from the City of Spokane Planning Commission also noted the capacity of Sunset Boulevard, and noted that it functions as a backup to Interstate 90. Asher noted that as a part of the study, we should not underestimate the capacity for Sunset Blvd.

Kelly from PETT echoed this thought.

Mark from CH2M Hill noted that as a part of the project, CH2M Hill and the City are looking at bridge alternatives and are still understanding the limits of the work. As soon as the exact project is developed, Marlena from CH2M Hill will be reviewing those alternatives to better understand them.

Craig Grandstrom from CH2M Hill presented on transportation analysis:

- Noted that CH2M Hill has worked with the City of Spokane staff to understand what we want to evaluate as part of the project.
- Looked at existing conditions and year 2030 conditions.
- Looked at conditions on the bridge, intersections off the bridge, and how the bridge intersects with Inland Empire Way.
- Looked at capacity issues on the roadway, on the bridge, east of the bridge (Sunset Highway and Inland Empire Way) and underneath Interstate-90.
- Craig noted that SRTC helped with this analysis.
- The traffic forecasts up to 2030 are a little over 1% per year. Inland Empire Way and Government Way have a slightly higher growth rates.
- The existing conditions of the bridge show 600-800 vehicles in peak hours.
- The analysis revealed that demand is starting to show on the bridge and there is some congestion based on a single lane in each direction.
- The intersection of Sunset Blvd. and 4th is operating at level "F" (poor). Vehicles are having difficulty finding gaps to turn.
- Keeping Latah Bridge at one lane each direction will cause the bridge to be at near capacity in the future, and lead to long term potential congestion.

Mike Frucci from WSDOT asked about plan improvements that generated 2030 numbers.

Craig from CH2M Hill noted that the adopted MTP model does have the improvements with Lindeke extension and goes to Cheney-Spokane Road.

Mike from WSDOT noted that it would be good to know how far the extension goes and will be interesting to see how the 195 Corridor feeds this.

Mark Brower from CH2M Hill noted that we looked at a couple of scenarios with the City surface street extended just to Thorpe, and then the original condition with it extending to Cheney-Spokane Road. There is not a significant difference on Sunset Blvd. between the two models.

Craig from CH2M Hill noted that there was more traffic demand using this as a way to the south.

Kelly from PETT asked why northbound traffic wasn't as heavy.

Craig from CH2M Hill noted that it's an afternoon-based analysis, and therefore only shows one part of the day.

Mike from WSDOT asked about trip generation associated with West Plains area, potentially with a new Boeing facility in the West Plains.

Ryan Stewart from SRTC noted that this is not included in the plan yet.

Harold White from WSDOT asked about the level of capacity for volume from Interstate 90 to Sunset Highway

Mike from WSDOT echoed Harold's question around total capacity.

Craig from CH2M Hill noted they have not yet looked at I-90 conditions yet.

Mark from CH2M Hill noted we'll likely need two lanes in each direction on the Latah Bridge.

Craig from CH2M Hill noted that if the bridge were to expand to two lanes, per volume/capacity (V/C) ratios, there would be less volume.

Mike from WSDOT noted that he'd like to see the same analysis done on Sunset Hill and to look at what is happening to the west of the Government Way intersection, to help avoid a bottleneck.

Harold from WSDOT discussed the Interstate 90 connection at Geiger and all the development in that area. This is secondary access, which connects directly to this route. All the development will have direct access to this corridor.

Mark from CH2M Hill noted that we don't have good data on this yet.

Kelly from PETT asked about current pedestrian use of the bridge.

Craig from CH2M Hill noted that some pedestrian data does exist, which they can review.

Dick Raymond from Inland Light Rail asked if there was some underlying issue regarding funding for the bridge and potential involvement with WSDOT.

Mike from WSDOT replied no, there is no underlying funding or involvement with WSDOT. WSDOT is currently working with the community and the City to revise the 195 corridor plan. Mike noted that it seems like these revisions would not show as many trips on the Latah Bridge with the Lindeke road extension to Government Way.

Asher from the City Planning Commission noted that to make good planning decisions, we have to look at all options.

Harold from WSDOT noted that this gives a baseline for the project.

Kelly from PETT noted that Government Way would be impacted by the Lindeke road extension, which would likely create bottlenecks.

Mark from CH2M Hill discussed the coordination between CH2M Hill and Spokane Transit Authority (STA):

- STA currently runs two routes on the bridge, serving Spokane International Airport and Airway Heights.
- There are four stops within the identified project area. The bus runs on 30 minute intervals, with 60 trips a day.
- A recent planning study, Connect Spokane, was conducted to meet anticipated demand on the West Plains. The study discusses bolstering the frequency STA runs the routes. The fleet mix will probably change over time as well to larger busses.
- STA has noted they would like to consider light rail for the future, although they are not sure when the cost-benefit breakout will happen over time.

Mark from CH2M Hill then gave an overview of the current pedestrian conditions on the bridge:

- Pedestrian accessibility westbound is challenging. There are sidewalks east of bridge; however, west of the bridge, the sidewalks essentially disappear.

Asher from the City Plan Commission mentioned that there are no sidewalks on Sunset Hill after Government Way.

Kelly from PETT asked if they would recommend sidewalks on one or both sides of Sunset Hill.

Tirrell Black from City Planning asked for the Fish Lake Trail to be identified as part of pedestrian activity.

Mark from CH2M Hill noted that the City would typically put in a five foot sidewalk with ADA ramps.

Mark from CH2M Hill then gave an overview of the current bicyclist conditions on the bridge:

- As part of the Master Bike Plan, east and west of the bridge has a potential for bike lanes, but the bridge itself is not designated for bike lanes.
- If the bridge is used in a four-lane configuration, there is no room for bike lanes.
- Grant Wencel from the City had mentioned we look at bike lanes on the bridge for options that would include any deck widening.

Harold from WSDOT noted that bikes are restricted on Interstate 90.

Asher from the City Planning Commission noted that since the bridge has been converted from four to two lanes, some obstacles have been removed and recently the bike traffic has increased. People are getting used to Sunset Highway being available for bicyclists in a way it wasn't before.

John Hinman from CH2M Hill then presented on the bridge structure analysis:

- As a part of this analysis, we are trying to find out what the original condition of the bridge was, what the condition is now, and what it takes to restore capacities that have been lost.
- There are four different components of the bridge:
 - The **arch and spandrels** are part of the main carrying capacity/function of the bridge. There are two ribs with thin foreslab in between.
 - There is a fair amount of deterioration on the bridge now. On the arch itself, there is not much cracking. For the age the bridge is in, it's in fairly good shape.
 - The bridge could carry about one and a half (1.5) times the designed traffic loads.
 - The **bridge columns** have more deterioration, but still have quite a bit of capacity. This deterioration hasn't hurt the bridge much yet, it's possible to stabilize this and keep the load carrying capacity.
 - The **bridge deck** is supported by exterior floor beams. The bridge was originally designed for transit. The analysis shows that the as-built condition of the interior part of the bridge is good. Salt water is corroding some of the floor beams.
 - The edge of the bridge deck is also in fair condition.
 - The rails on the bridge have deteriorated.
 - The **bridge piers** are hollow, massive and carry a lot of force. These piers are severely deteriorated. The piers from the deck level down are remarkably sturdy; however at the deck level, the piers are not in good condition. This is why the bridge was converted to a two-lane bridge.
 - The outside of the bridge is weaker than the inside of the bridge (noted that the inside of the bridge is where people are currently driving.)
 - There is some deterioration of the bridge approach arch spans, but it is manageable and repairable. The west end of the bridge is more deteriorated.
 - The bridge decks are fairly robust.
 - A lot of the bridge deterioration stems from corrosion. One concern is regarding the parts of the bridge that have water running over them. The analysis found that ongoing corrosion activity is fairly low and can be controlled at some points of the bridge.

Harold from WSDOT asked about geological effects on the bridge.

John from CH2M Hill replied that they haven't seen any significant geological effects in the analysis.

John from CH2M Hill noted that this type of bridge would not survive a major earthquake.

Kelly from PETT asked how involved all the repairs are to the bridge, in comparison to the Monroe Street Bridge.

Asher from the City Planning Commission asked about capacity on the bridge, and the area that narrows to one lane.

Mark from CH2M Hill noted that this area will be an issue.

Brea from the Spokane Tribe asked if there was a scope of work for construction.

Mark and John from CH2M Hill noted that there is no scope of work for construction. This phase will likely be in the long-term future. There is currently no funding for further design.

Kelly from PETT asked about lighting on the bridge and potentially adding lighting in the future from a safety perspective for the bike and pedestrian users.

Brea from the Spokane Tribe asked if there was any way to incorporate a TCP or cultural study into the project.

Mark from CH2M Hill noted that they would recommend this type of study be conducted in future phases.

Kristen Paul from Desautel Hege Communications reminded the group about the upcoming public open house on Wednesday, December 14th.

LATAH BRIDGE REHABILITATION STUDY
PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE #1 EVENT RECAP
Wednesday, December 14, 2011
4:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.
Woodland Center at Finch Arboretum

On Wednesday, December 14, 2011, the first public open house for the Latah Bridge Rehabilitation Study occurred at the Woodland Center at Finch Arboretum, located at 3404 W. Woodland Blvd. Mark Brower from CH2M Hill, Marlena Guhlke from CH2M Hill, Katherine Miller from the City of Spokane, and Lisa Malstrom from the City of Spokane served as event staff to answer questions and serve as content experts. Kristen Paul and Emily Easley from Desautel Hege Communications served as event support and staffed the check-in table.

Open house attendees included:

- Scott Orme
- Karen Carlberg
- Robert Brost
- Joel Soden
- Tirrell Black
- Tim Lawhead
- Mary Bartol
- Jon Snyder
- Jim Lehr
- Keith Metcalf
- Alan Eschenbrecha
- Nathan O'Bleness
- Dan Schaffer
- David Chittim
- Heidi Chittim
- Andrea Smith
- Grant Wencil

The event was set up as an open-house, with various visual boards placed throughout the room for participants to view, comment on and ask questions about. City of Spokane and CH2M Hill staff served as content experts, answering questions and providing information to attendees. Attendees were asked to sign in with their name and contact information, so that the Latah Bridge Rehabilitation Study team can follow up with them.

Participants were offered a one-sheet hand out with project information to take home. Participants were also asked to fill out comment cards with the following questions:

- How do you currently use the Latah Bridge? (check all that apply)
 - Car
 - Freight
 - Public Transit
 - Bicycle
 - Pedestrian
 - Other (please specify)
 - Additional comments:
- How often do you use the Latah Bridge?
- What's important to you about the future of the Latah Bridge?
- What comments or questions do you have about the project?
- If you'd like an answer, please fill out your name and contact information.
 - Name
 - Phone and/or email

The following information was collected from open house attendees. Please note that comments are verbatims from the comment form.

How do you currently use the Latah Bridge? (check all that apply)

- Car: 10
- Bike: 7
- Pedestrian: 5
- Public transit: 2

How often do you use the bridge?

- 10 times per week
- Daily
- Every day
- 3-6 trips per week
- A couple of times a week.
- 4 times per week
- 8 times a day
- Currently, only about once a month

What's important to you about the future of the Latah Bridge?

- The bridge is important for those not able to drive the freeway to Geiger or the airport.
- I hope that it continues to encourage bicycling and walking – current “bike lanes” are great!
- Maintain accommodation to bikes, busses, cars and walkers.
- Safe bicycle use.

- Keep it safe. Don't spend a lot of money.
- Preserve its beauty, ensure transit compatibility. Improve pedestrian and bicycle amenities, capacity construction with low VMT growth projections.
- Safety – the current two lane set up is dangerous where cars make left turns onto CDA road. Also, traffic volume.
- Keep the historic character! Please keep bike and pedestrian access.
- To get across the valley.
- Will be building on top of hill in next couple years.

General comments:

- I think the bridge should be repaired instead of replaced.
- Glad it's happening! Glad your prioritizing bike and pedestrian use. Grandview-Thorpe Neighborhood Association wants to stay involved.
- Two lanes work well because they force a merge before the bridge (eastbound), but need a left turn pocket at east approach to avoid backing up all the eastbound traffic. Alternately, block the left turn access entirely.
- This is a special bridge that could be considered for preservation. 2030 V/C ratios are overblown and four lanes are not needed. It is a strong pedestrian and bicycle connection for Finch Arboretum and Fish Lake Trail and High Bridge Park. It is also an important transit route between Spokane and the West Plains.
- This is an important connection to the Fish Lake Trail. Great bridge to walk over.

