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 study process.

One of the first steps in the stakeholder coordination and public involvement process was to identify stakeholder 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. Three SAC meetings and two public meetings have been held at selected key points in the study process. The purpose of each meeting and outreach specifics are described as follows. Meeting recaps, including summaries of the comments received on the project to date are attached.

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 Bicycle Advisory Board
    - Initial email sent to Grant Wencel, City of Spokane Bike-Pedestrian 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
    - Although Inland Empire Rail Association was not on the initial list of contacts, Dick Raymond attended the first meeting as a representative.

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 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

- EconoLodge & 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
- Tresko Monument
- Sunset Junction

SAC Meeting #3 – Held on March 28, 2012, the purpose of this meeting was to present initial rehabilitation solution alternatives and recommendations and solicit comments for refinement.

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 the meeting on Councilman Snyder's behalf. Joel attended SAC Meeting #3.
- Spokane City Council Member Mike Allen
  - Voicemails left for Councilman Allen and Rae-Lynn Conger, Councilman Allen's assistant. Rae-Lynn indicated she would attend the meeting. Rae-Lynn attended SAC Meeting #3.
- Browne's Addition Neighborhood Council
  - Emails sent to Steve Hart and Jim Red (chair and co-chair). No responses from Jim or Steve. No representation from Browne's Addition Neighborhood Council at SAC Meeting #3.
- Latah/Hangman Neighborhood Council
  - Email sent to Kai. Kai emailed that he would be unable to attend SAC Meeting #3 but sent the notice to the neighborhood group. No representation from Latah/Hangman Neighborhood Council at SAC Meeting #3.
- Grandview/Thorpe Neighborhood Council
  - Email sent to Tina, Katy and Karen. Karen replied and indicated she would attend. Karen attended SAC Meeting #3.
- Rosauers
  - Email sent to Jeff Phillips. A representative from Rosauers indicated that Corinne Mullin would attend on behalf of Rosauers. Corinne attended SAC Meeting #3.

- City of Spokane Planning
    - Email sent to Tirrell Black. Tirrell indicated she may attend the meeting. Tirrell attended SAC Meeting #3.
- Spokane Parks & Recreation
    - Email sent to Taylor Bressler. Taylor indicated he would attend the meeting. Taylor attended SAC Meeting #3.
- Spokane City/County Historic Preservation Office
    - Emails sent to Kristen Griffin. She indicated she would attend. Kristen attended SAC Meeting #3.
- SRTC
    - Email sent to Ryan Stewart. Ryan indicated he could not attend the meeting due to a scheduling conflict. Ryan did not attend SAC Meeting #3.
- WSDOT
    - Email sent to Mike Frucci, who indicated he would not be able to attend. Mike did not attend SAC Meeting #3.
- WSDOT
    - Email and follow up call made to Harold White. Harold White did not attend SAC Meeting #3.
- City of Spokane Pedestrian, Traffic & Transportation Committee (PETT)
    - Email sent to Kelly Cruz, who indicated he would attend. Kelly attended SAC Meeting #3.
- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
    - Two emails sent to Howard and Karin. Follow up call made to Howard. Howard indicated one of them would attend. Howard attended SAC Meeting #3.
- City of Spokane Plan Commission
    - Two emails sent to Asher Ernst, who indicated he would attend. Asher attended SAC Meeting #3.
- City of Spokane Bicycle Advisory Board
    - Email sent to Grant Wencel. Grant indicated he would not attend the meeting. Grant did not attend SAC Meeting #3.
- Spokane Tribe of Indians
    - Email sent to Randy Abrahamson. Email and follow up call made to Brea Franco. Brea indicated she would attend. Brea attended SAC Meeting #3.
- Inland Empire Rail Association
    - Email sent to Dick, he indicated he would attend. Dick Raymond attended SAC Meeting #3.

Public Meeting #2 – Held on Thursday, April 19th, the purpose of this meeting was to present rehabilitation solution alternatives and recommendations.

Communication and outreach for the Public Meeting #2 is documented below:

- Direct mail postcard sent to approximately 1,950 residents and businesses within the vicinity of the bridge.
- Classified advertisement placed in the Spokesman-Review (April 15th and 18th) and the Cheney Free Press (April 12th).
- Community calendar listings were distributed to the following:
    - Spokane Journal of Business
    - The Inlander
    - Eventful
    - Inside Events
    - KAYU
    - KREM
    - KXLY
    - LaunchPad INW
    - Spokane7
    - Spokane Events
    - Access Spokane
    - Spokane Net
    - OutSpokane
    - Access Washington
- 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 Tuesday, April 10th), and posted to social media.
- Information on the public open house sent to stakeholder advisory group. Stakeholders were asked via email and in person at SAC Meeting #3 to promote the meeting to their constituents and group members.
    - Latah/Hangman Neighborhood Council distributed information to their group.
    - Grandview/Thorpe Neighborhood Council distributed information to their group.
- 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.
- Phone calls made to 33 surrounding businesses:
    - Spokane House Hotel & Restaurant
    - Northwest Farm Credit Services
    - Sunset Florist & Greenhouse
    - Rosauers
    - EconoLodge & Suites
    - Blue Ox Coffee

- Eastman Counseling Services
- Boulevard Motel
- Sunset Food Mart
- Shangri-La Motel & Apartments
- Radha Yoga Center
- Swamp Tavern
- Frank's Diner
- Frank's Diner (Business Office)
- Harmony Yoga
- Genesis Fuel Tech
- Tresko Monument, Inc.
- Sunset Junction
- Wade Erika J CPA
- TPM LLC
- Adams Glassworks
- Pacific Dispute Resolution LLC
- Design renovations
- Green Business Association of America
- Mojo Services LLC
- ASEA Spokane
- Focus Medical Business Services
- Century Archives Northwest LLC
- Romney & Associates
- Parts Wholesales Inc.
- Spokane Tile & Design
- Mason Industry Promotion
- Pass Word Inc.

City of Spokane

Latah Bridge Rehabilitation Project

Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC)

STAKEHOLDER GROUP	REPRESENTATIVE
Spokane City Council	Jon Snyder (Joel Williamson) Mike Allen
Browne's Addition Neighborhood Council	Steve Hart, *Chair* Jim Red, *Vice-Chair*
Latah/Hangman Valley Neighborhood Council	Kai Huschke, *Chair*
Grandview/Thorpe Neighborhood Council	Tina Luerssen, *Chair* Katy Brown, *Vice-Chair*
Rosauer's	Jeff Phillips, CEO
Spokane L.R. Planning	Tirrell Black
Spokane Parks & Recreation	Taylor Bressler Tony Madunich
City/County Historic Preservation Office	Kristen Griffen
Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC)	Ryan Stewart Anna Ragasa-Bourassa
Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)	Mike Frucci Harold White Chad Simonson
PeTT (Pedestrian, Traffic & Transportation) Committee	Kelly Cruz
Department of Fish and Wildlife	Howard Ferguson Karin Divens
Planning Services Department Plan Commission	Asher Ernst
Bike-Pedestrian Coordinator/Bicycle Advisory Board	Grant Wencel
Spokane Tribe of Indians	Randy Abrahamson
Spokane Preservation Advocates	Kathryn Burk-Hise Matt Cohen
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 an 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 lines, 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 Wencel

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 rations 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.

LATAH BRIDGE REHABILITATION STUDY
STAKEHOLDER MEETING #3 NOTES

Wednesday, March 28, 2012
1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Spokane City Hall – Conference Room 2B

On Wednesday, March 28, 2012, the third and final 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:

- Brea Franco, Spokane Tribe of Indians
- Taylor Bressler, Spokane Parks and Recreation
- Howard Ferguson, 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
- Mark Serbousek, City of Spokane Street Department
- Katherine Miller, City of Spokane
- Corinne Mullin, Rosauers Supermarkets
- Dick Raymond, Inland Empire Rail Transit Association
- Trudy Raymond, Inland Empire Rail Transit Association
- Tirrell Black, City of Spokane Planning
- Sam McKee, City of Spokane
- Karen Carlberg, Grandview-Thorpe Neighborhood Association
- Rae-Lynn Conger, City of Spokane City Council (representing Councilman Mike Allen)
- Joel Williamson, City of Spokane City Council (representing Councilman Jon Synder)
- Marlena Guhlke, CH2M Hill
- Mark Brower, CH2M Hill
- Roger Flint, CH2M Hill
- John Hinman, CH2M Hill
- Kristen Paul, Desautel Hege Communications

Katherine Miller from the City of Spokane kicked off the meeting and reminded stakeholders that this was the third and final meeting in the process. Katherine also reminded stakeholders about the upcoming public open house on Thursday, April 19th.

Mark Brower from CH2M HILL then welcomed stakeholders and gave a recap of the project to date:

- Study looked at potential outcomes and what we can do with the bridge going forward.
- Conceptual options for bridge rehabilitation were developed
- Documents from the study are available for viewing and downloading from project website (http://www.spokaneengineering.org/latah-bridge)
- Study looked at the bridge structure, the environmental context (including the historical aspect of the bridge), and the transportation function of the bridge (including motorized traffic, bicycle, pedestrian, freight and public transit).

Mark then asked the group if they had any questions about the Baseline Conditions Summary. No one in the group raised questions at this point.

Katherine Miller then asked stakeholders to introduce themselves. Each stakeholder introduced themselves and the organization they represent.

Mark Brower then provided an overview of the board entitled "Bridge Sections Considered and Evaluated." Mark reminded stakeholders that when thinking about rehabilitation options, we need to be thinking about the overall function of the bridge.

- Alternatives 1-5 look at what we can do with the bridge in its existing condition. Alternatives 1-4 would keep the bridge's current width.
- Alternative 5 is the same curb to curb width, but expands sidewalks to include a 10' multi-use path.
- Alternatives 6-17 take a longer term approach to the project and restore the bridge to close to its original condition. Curb to curb width is expanded in these options to include a variety of ways of accommodating the bridge functional needs, and to meet current standards.

Katherine Miller noted that if you rebuild the bridge to its current condition, we want to be thinking about the next 100 years.

Mark then pointed out some interesting dimensions to note about the bridge:

- Alternative #1 illustrates the existing physical dimensions of the bridge, including the 31 feet from the center line to the outer edge of the bridge deck, and the 28.25' from the centerline to the outside of the bridge arches. These dimensions may be compared with the bridge widening options to see how much additional width is required for each option.

Mark then talked through the various two-, four- and five-lane options considered. He noted that once the roadway sections were organized, it was apparent that with approximately five to six-feet of deck widening on each side, a number of 4-lane options are possible, that include a light-rail option, and various ways of configuring the deck for motorized and non-motorized traffic.

Mark noted that some of the 17 options were condensed into five main alternatives (A-E). All of these alternatives would extend the life of the bridge by at least 20 years, and alternatives C, D, and E include work elements that intend to extend the life of the structure for a much longer period.

- Alternatives A and B are very similar, but B allows for four traffic lanes, with a widened ten-foot multi-use pathway.
- Alternatives C, D, and E are longer term options and Alternatives D and E include deck widening to provide adequate width for four standard travel lanes and bike lanes (Alternative D), or combined dual light-rail tracks with four traffic lanes and shared use bike lanes (Alternative E).

Kelly Cruz from PETT posed a question about including light rail on the bridge when I-90 is adjacent to the bridge. Mark Brower noted that the light rail option selected for consideration includes an at-grade double track that shares roadway lanes with cars, which is often the case on bridges to save space.

John Hinman from CH2M HILL then outlined Alternatives A-E:

- Alternative A keeps the bridge reliable for short term use (minimum of 20 years). The bridge needs to be strengthened, as the bridge originally was not designed to handle today's traffic loads, and the bridge has some deterioration. John overviewed the key work items for accomplishing this rehabilitation. The deck roadway surfacing, traffic barrier, a portion of the sidewalk, and the outer pedestrian railing would be removed. A new structural concrete overlay would be constructed to strengthen the bridge superstructure to accommodate today's traffic loads. The decorative hand railing would be replaced, as would the traffic railing. The goal would be to make the newly constructed elements, especially the decorative hand railing, appear to be just like the existing bridge. The drainage and lighting would also be replaced. Basic passive cathodic protection would be used in problem areas to maintain and extend the life of areas that are prone to corrosion. John noted that the arches should be sufficient for the next 20 years. This construction would allow the use of all four lanes on the bridge. Nearly all of the work would be completed above the deck, which would make for a quicker construction process.
- Alternative B is very similar to Alternative A and has the same goal of a 20 year life span. Alternative B, expands the sidewalks to ten-feet, and will require a little bit more detailed formwork for the contractor.

Kelly Cruz from PETT posted a question about the pedestrian belvederes (overlooks at the bridge pier locations). John Hinman informed the group that every alternative would incorporate rebuilding the pedestrian belvederes.

- Alternative C is very similar to Alternative A, but Alternative C will include active corrosion mitigation. This extra work should help maintain the bridge indefinitely. The corrosion mitigation on the main arches and spandrel arches would include electrochemical chloride extraction (ECE), which is a highly detailed process that has been proven to stop the corrosion and manage it for an extended period of time. This alternative will also demolish the bridge superstructure elements (deck system, pier tops, spandrel arches and walls, railings, etc. down to the tops of the arches and rebuilding them to match the existing appearance and dimensions of the bridge.
- Alternative D is the same as Alternative C, with the exception of the bridge deck widening to accommodate four-lanes of traffic, five-foot bike lanes, and 6 foot sidewalks.

Asher Ernst from the City of Spokane Plan Commission asked if the bridge will look the same as it originally did. John Hinman noted that it will look very much the same as its original condition, with only subtle changes.

Sam McKee with the City of Spokane asked if there was currently an issue with the approaches, as we are showing removal of the approaches on options D and E. John Hinman noted that there are some structural issues with the approaches, and for the widening options (D and E), it is very cost effective to replace the approaches, rather than re-work the existing.

Howard Ferguson from Washington Fish and Wildlife asked if Alternative D would use the same electrochemical corrosion protection process as other alternatives. John Hinman noted that this process would be the same for all of the long-term alternatives (C, D, and E).

Kelly Cruz asked what the main differences were between Alternatives C and D. John Hinman noted that Alternative D provides a wider bridge with four twelve-foot traffic lanes, five-foot bike lanes, and six-foot sidewalks.

- Alternative E allows for light rail. This Alternative is very similar to Alternative D in the sense that the same pieces from the bridge are being removed and rebuilt. This Alternative would provide capacity in the center lanes of the structure to accommodate an at-grade double-track light-rail system, with power poles, etc. The light-rail vehicles would share travel lanes with vehicular traffic on the bridge.

Dick Raymond from Inland Light Rail asked if there are any concerns about light rail stray currents impacting the bridge corrosion protection. John Hinman noted that the light rail construction would include stray current protection elements that will protect the bridge sufficiently.

Asher Ernst asked why this option had a 15 foot shared use lane instead of a 10 foot shared foot path. Mark Brower noted that the outside shared use lanes with the wider inside lanes for light rail provide a similar overall curb to curb width as many of the other options, which allows for flexibility for the City to configure the deck in a number of ways that meet the functional requirements.

Dick Raymond asked if there had been any discussion around non-symmetrical ideas such as adding a multi-use path on the north side of the bridge, and maintaining standard sidewalks on the south side. Mark Brower noted that this could be an option and something we will review.

Howard Ferguson asked if adding light rail decreased the lifetime of the bridge because of its added weight. John Hinman noted that this would not decrease the lifetime of the bridge, as the bridge would be strengthened to adequately handle the specific loads.

Asher Ernst posed a question regarding how light rail and traffic would converge at Sunset Blvd and Inland Empire Way. Mark Brower noted that this has been reviewed from the standpoint of making sure that the Latah Bridge would allow for the appropriate horizontal and vertical geometry needed to make this happen in the future. The existing 7th Avenue bridge immediately east of the Latah Bridge will be a challenge and

something that needs further discussion. Katherine Miller noted that as part of the planning process, we want to be sure the Latah Bridge is set up successfully for light rail, and that the Sunset Boulevard corridor, including the Inland Empire Way intersection, would need to be studied as part of a separate project.

John Hinman then reviewed the costs and timeline for each Alternative:

- Alternative A is the least expensive and the fastest construction, with an estimated cost of $13-20M. Almost all the construction happens from above the bridge. The bridge would be closed for approximately 4-6 months. It is possible to maintain some traffic during bridge closure, but this would significantly impact both the cost and timeline.
- Alternative B would cost approximately $13.5-22M and would be a very similar construction timeline to Alternative A.

Dick Raymond asked if there were any constraints with respect to Latah Creek and Latah Valley that are driving costs. John Hinman noted that the construction will not affect the Creek, and that a main goal is to preserve the water quality. Marlena Guhlke from CH2M HILL noted that there will be some permitting costs involved, but there will not be much groundwork or disturbance below the bridge.

Howard Ferguson asked about the traffic detour while the bridge is closed. Mark Brower noted that the detour routes will be investigated at a high-level for this study, and likely options would include I-90 and the bridge below Riverside Avenue, that is located downstream of the Latah Bridge.

- Alternative C would cost approximately $18-29M. It would be possible to have the work on the deck done initially and have traffic on the bridge while the ECE work is in process on the arches. The work on the arches would last approximately one year.
- Alternative D would cost approximately $22-35M. While there has not been an exact construction schedule created, this Alternative would be approximately a two year project.

Kelly Cruz asked a question about location for contractor staging area. John Hinman noted that staging and access drive a lot of the construction costs and that a lot of the staging will probably need to be off-site.

Asher Ernst asked about the two year timeline for Alternative D and wondered if the bridge would be closed for the entire two years. John Hinman noted that a two year closure would likely be the case.

- Alternative E could cost approximately $22-35M. This Alternative is very similar to D.

Dick Raymond noted that the safety issues dramatically increase if you try to build under traffic, both for construction personnel, and the travelling public. John Hinman emphasized that this issue is important and would need to be discussed.

Kelly Cruz noted that there would be a safety issue with the area around the light rail.

Rae-Lynn Conger from the City of Spokane asked about funding for this project. Katherine Miller noted that this project is to understand conditions. After the Mayor and City Council approve the final report of this

study, this will start the process for searching for and procuring funding for final design, right-of-way, permitting, and construction.

Kelly Cruz asked if it would be possible to tie this project funding to the 195 project. Katherine Miller noted that yes, we want to work together on this project and coordinate on funding if possible.

Marlena Guhlke then discussed the environmental implications of the study. Marlena noted that as a part of this study, she reviewed background conditions to identify environmental issues and see what needed special consideration. These specifically include:

- Water quality
- Archeological findings
- Potential hazardous materials surrounding the bridge
- Wildlife that live on the bridge (falcons and bats)
- Storm water management
- Historical preservation

Marlena then reviewed environmental impacts for different alternatives:

- The alternatives that involved widening the bridge or working below the bridge in the Latah Valley will have a higher potential for environmental impact. Building a new bridge would also create a greater potential for environmental impact.
- It's important to avoid work in the valley to lessen the impact to water resources. Alternatives A and B have less risk to water resources. Alternatives C-E would have some work that would affect the Latah valley. If these options are selected, the project team would need to be careful during construction.
- Alternatives A and B possess less risk of finding archeological artifacts. Alternatives C-E would involve some Latah Valley work and would likely warrant a cultural resources survey.
- The risk of hazardous materials would be the same for all alternatives.
- In terms of wildlife, the two most important wildlife species on the bridge are bats and falcons.
    - Alternatives D and E would eliminate the bat roosting area.
    - Alternatives A-C would cause some disturbance to the roosting areas but would not remove them.
    - The impacts would be the same for the falcons. There is a chance the birds may leave and not return for a few years, which would be a longer period of absence for Alternatives D and E because of the longer construction schedule.

Howard Ferguson noted that Alternatives A and B may not disturb the wildlife.

Taylor Bressler from Spokane Parks and Recreation asked about swallows near the railroad bridge. Howard Ferguson noted that white throated swallows have nested nearby.

- Marlena continued with her presentation, noting that Alternatives A and B would result in minimal storm water control. Alternatives C – E would result in more storm water management.
- Alternatives A-C maintain more of the bridge's historical appearance. Alternatives D and E widen the bridge and would need some additional evaluation from a historical standpoint.
- Alternatives A and B have minimal impacts to the park, and therefore recreation. The project would need to control construction debris. Alternatives C-E may redirect some recreational activity in order to keep the public safe.

Howard Ferguson asked about the specific location of High Bridge Park. Taylor Bressler and Marlena Guhlke confirmed that High Bridge Park is located underneath the Latah Bridge.

Mark Brower closed the meeting by asking if there were any additional questions and thanking the stakeholders. Mark also reminded stakeholders of the upcoming public open house on Thursday, April 19th.

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

CLIENT: CITY OF SPOKANE
PROJECT: LATAH BRIDGE REHABILITATION
PROJECT NO.: 425825.LB.02

MEETING DATE & TIME:	April 13, 2012	9:00 a.m.
Participants:	Karin Divens/WDFW	Marlena Guhlke (CH2M HILL)
	Lisa Malstrom/City	

DRAFT Notes – PROJECT COORDINATION MEETING

ALTERNATIVES

- Describe Proposed Alternatives and Rationale for Selection
  - Alternative A – 20 Year Design Life (same footprint)
  - Alternative B – 20-Year Design Life with Expanded Sidewalks (wider bridge)
  - Alternative C – Long-Term Design Life (same footprint)
  - Alternative D – Long Term Design Life with 4-Lanes and Bike Lanes (wider bridge)
  - Alternative E – Long Term Design Life with 4-Lanes and Light Rail (wider bridge)

A quick overview of the alternatives was provided by Marlena describing the primary environmental issues related to Latah Bridge rehabilitation alternatives. Lisa provided additional information on construction methodology.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

- More risk for environmental impact for those alternatives that:
  - Have a wider deck
  - Construction activities are necessary in Latah Valley floor
  - Remove the upper bridge structure (exposing and disrupting bat roosting)
  - Have a longer construction season (take longer for falcons to return)

Townsend's big-eared bats that live on the bridge were discussed as follows:

1. *Is it possible to establish an alternative site for hibernacula that would provide a roosting place for the bats during bridge construction? Potential problems include the need to:*
   - *Identify the conditions or characteristics required for a successful hibernacula site that would attract these bats*
   - *Identify a suitable location that might serve as a good hibernacula site*
   - *Obtain access to property*
   - *Determine if Riverside State Park has any suitable areas for locating a hibernacula*
   - *Recreate a hibernacula site that would attract the bridge bats (must have the right humidity level) and other roosting features*
2. *Is it possible to avoid the bat season for rearing their young from April to October?*
   - *It would be difficult to get much work done on the bridge if this time period was excluded from construction*
   - *It would extend the construction season, which would add much more to the cost and the return of the bats would be delayed that much more.*
3. *Because the project is about 10-years out, can research and studies be conducted now to prepare for future bridge construction activities?*
   - *Yes, the City can make the bridge available to WDFW staff, researchers or graduate students to study the bats on the bridge, determine how the bats are using the bridge now, determine where they roost, and what time of the year the bats are on the bridge.*

- *The City inspects the bridge every 2 years and can inform WDFW of their observations and findings related to the bats.*
- *Dr Peggy O'Connell, Wildlife Biologist and Professor at Eastern Washington University may be contacted by WDFW about enlisting interest from a graduate student*
- *WDFW may be able to provide cameras for data gathering purposes*

4. *Would it be possible to establish a temporary roof over the bat roosting area prior to bridge deck construction and during a period of time when the bats are not habiting the bridge?*
   - *It might be difficult to construct the roof because the area where the roof should be located may not be accessible for construction activities; how would workers get in and conduct work?*
5. *Information should be gathered from other bridge projects in this country who have encountered a bat habitat problem to determine what they did to protect the bats.*
6. *Other comments:*
   - *The bridge bats seem to be accustom to the noise and commotion that is generated from the traffic on the bridge, bridge inspectors, and park users below the bridge.*
   - *Townsend bats are rare in this area but they have occupied a cabin on Eloika Lake successfully for many years.*
   - *Peregrine Falcons haven't been observed on the bridge for years. There was a period of time when nesting was occurring on the large arches.*
   - *When this feasibility study is completed, the Council will need to make a decision on future actions related to the Latah Bridge. In any case, bridge work wouldn't be happening for about 10-years.*
   - *Karin pointed out that WDFW can't make bat protection a requirement in their Hydraulic Project Approvals. Habitat protection falls to the City for administration and usually a habitat management plan is required under a Critical Areas Ordinance. WDFW would want to comment on the habitat management plan and look at mitigation related to the project (A technical memorandum on requiring or recommending mitigation was handed out by Karin).*

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

CLIENT: CITY OF SPOKANE
PROJECT: LATAH BRIDGE REHABILITATION
PROJECT NO.: 425825.LB.02

MEETING DATE & TIME:	April 13, 2012	11:00 a.m.
Participants:	Kristen Griffin	Marlena Guhlke (CH2M HILL)
	Lisa Malstrom/City	Lori Price (CH2M HILL)

DRAFT Notes – PROJECT COORDINATION MEETING

ALTERNATIVES

- Describe Proposed Alternatives and Rationale for Selection
  - Alternative A – 20 Year Design Life (same footprint)
  - Alternative B – 20-Year Design Life with Expanded Sidewalks (wider bridge)
  - Alternative C – Long-Term Design Life (same footprint)
  - Alternative D – Long Term Design Life with 4-Lanes and Bike Lanes (wider bridge)
  - Alternative E – Long Term Design Life with 4-Lanes and Light Rail (wider bridge)

Kristen had attended the last Stakeholders Meeting and had heard the alternatives presented at that meeting.

AESTHETIC ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

- All alternatives remove existing balustrades, but replace them to look the same
- All alternatives keep the big arches intact
- Wider deck alternatives may obscure architectural elements beneath the deck or cause shadows
  - Scale of bridge will make these changes less noticeable
  - Views of the bridge are generally at a distance, so these differences may not be noticeable
- Long-term alternatives would replace the small arches and spandrels but they would look the same
- Aesthetics – simulations are not completed; will provide when they are available

1. *Marlena described the primary architectural features on the bridge as follows:*
   - *All balustrades would be replaced with new ones with the same appearance for all of the alternatives*
   - *The big arches will stay the same in appearance; the electrochemical chloride extraction will require temporary falsework in the Latah Valley floor that will be removed; the extraction process will not cause any visual changes to the bridge.*
   - *The small arches and spandrels would be replaced on some alternatives but would look the same*
2. *Kristen's concerns were discussed as follows:*
   - *The regulations allow replacement under certain conditions when the structure has deteriorated, and is no longer strong or as safe as it needs to be*
   - *Will need a way to evaluate the visual impact of the alternative selected in the future. Will want to see before and after simulations of how the wider bridge deck will look up-close and at a distance. Stressed that these would also be important for getting input from the public on the effect to the historic bridge.*
   - *Will want to see examples of other bridges that have been widened to compare differences. Kristen has requested DAHP to send her information on any such projects in Washington State.*
3. *Some discussion occurred about Monroe Street Bridge, which was considered a successful rehabilitation project of a historical bridge:*
   - *Some of the mitigation done for the Monroe Street Bridge could apply to this one.*
   - *Closing the bridge at the end of construction and having a party for the public was a great idea*
   - *Interpretative signs were a great mitigation measure (SPK HPO assisted with them)*

- *Architectural elements look similar, although they are not exactly the same as the original – compromises were made when it made sense to do so*

4. *Kristen said that the important architectural elements of the Latah Bridge are the arches, railings and overlook areas. If an architectural change is made, the visual change would need to be evaluated from several different vantage points to determine its significance.*
5. *Lisa explained how inspecting the small arches and spandrels is difficult because the size of the openings makes it hard for the U-bit to get into positions needed for a good inspection. Therefore, she wondered if these arches and spandrels could be redesigned somewhat to make bridge inspections easier.*
   - *Kristen said that changes to the character-defining features of the bridge may be considered a significant impact. She wondered if there were other options to aid bridge inspections.*
   - *Lisa said that catwalks could be added to the bridge to make inspections easier. Although they are not presently part of the historical bridge, they wouldn't be noticeable by the public and the bridge would remain visually the same. The catwalks would add to the cost of the bridge but would not be a huge additional cost.*
6. *In order to avoid widening the bridge, which would be Kristen's optimal desire, she wondered about the question which was asked at the Stakeholders Meeting about evaluating another alternative that would have pedestrian sidewalks and bikeways on only one side of the bridge. This would mean off-setting the vehicular lanes somewhat and would result in an asymmetrical arrangement.*
   - *Lisa explained that a non-symmetrical layout would not be in keeping with the historical layout, and there is no financial benefit to do so*
   - *This alternative would need to be explored further to determine if it has merit*
7. *Marlena asked Kristen if the bridge could be widened.*
   - *Kristen said that the bridge could be made wider if it does not cause a significant visual change; and it is warranted due to bridge condition or deterioration.*
   - *When asked who determines "what is a significant change", she said that the DAHP, the City's HPO, and other interested parties would be part of that determination.*
   - *Kristen asked about funding the project and Lisa said that no funding was currently available, but future funding would probably involve federal funding, which would require environmental evaluations under Section 106 and Section 4(f).*
   - *Lori pointed out that the necessary Section 4(f) Evaluation for the project may make architectural changes, such as bridge widening, more difficult to do but not necessarily impossible.*
8. *Kristen asked about bridge lighting. "Have we looked at lighting up the bridge structure so it can be more visible at night and have we looked at lighting fixtures on the bridge?"*
   - *No, there has been no discussion on lighting up the bridge structure, and if it was done, the lights would need to be in the upper part of the bridge structure where the fixtures would be inaccessible to vandalism. Because it is in primarily a residential area, the type of lighting would also have to consider the impact on the residential areas.*
   - *It is too early to look at lighting details on the bridge deck. The existing lights do not have an old, historical look to them but new lights could be chosen that would give that appearance.*
   - *This led to discussion on how old, historical photos of the bridge would help in making fixture selections. Sources of photos include the MAC, Spokesman Review and websites.*
9. *During the meeting, it was mentioned that the bridge had been inventoried by the Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), but had not been listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or locally. Because it was deemed eligible for the NRHP, it is protected in the same way as if it was listed.*
   Note: After the meeting, the cultural resources report was checked by Lori Price and it was determined that It was listed in the NRHP on July 16, 1982, which makes it also listed in the Washington Heritage Register (WHR). The bridge was documented as part of an inventory of bridges, trestles and aqueducts in the state of

Washington, and then listed in the NRHP as part of "Bridges and Tunnels in Washington State". The bridge was documented in 1979 on a Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) form.

10. *Kristen wondered about the City's priorities for bridge projects and Lisa said that future bridge work is dependent upon the condition of the bridge that could lead to bridge closure and to the funding that is available. State and Federal funding priorities are based primarily on transportation issues.*
11. *Marlena said that Kristen's input would be incorporated into the report being prepared for the feasibility study and Lisa acknowledged that the Spokane HPO would be kept informed and involved should the project move forward.*

SPOKANE TRIBE OF INDIANS MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

CLIENT: CITY OF SPOKANE
PROJECT: LATAH BRIDGE REHABILITATION
PROJECT NO.: 425825.LB.02

MEETING DATE & TIME:	April 18, 2012	11:00 a.m.
Participants:	Randy Abrahamson	Katherine Miller (City of Spokane)
	Brea Franco	Lisa Malstrom (City of Spokane)
		Marlena Guhlke (CH2M HILL)

PROJECT COORDINATION MEETING

ALTERNATIVES

- Describe Proposed Alternatives and Rationale for Selection
  - Alternative A – 20 Year Design Life (same footprint)
  - Alternative B – 20-Year Design Life with Expanded Sidewalks (wider bridge)
  - Alternative C – Long-Term Design Life (same footprint)
  - Alternative D – Long Term Design Life with 4-Lanes and Bike Lanes (wider bridge)
  - Alternative E – Long Term Design Life with 4-Lanes and Light Rail (wider bridge)

Katherine provided a project overview, and explained that any construction work wouldn't be done for another 10-20 years.

AESTHETIC ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

- Alternatives that require construction in Latah Valley has more potential risk of impacts than those alternatives where work is conducted primarily on the bridge deck

Marlena explained that some alternatives have less potential for risk of environmental impacts than others.

- Work in Latah Valley is generally low risk of impact because it is for falsework and shoring required to do the electrochemical chloride extraction and to remedy existing stormwater disposal that comes out at the piers

Marlena mentioned that only the long-term Alternatives C, D and E require construction work in Latah Valley except that Lisa explained that stormwater control improvements would be necessary in the Valley and would apply to all alternatives because currently, the stormwater at deck level is directed to the piers where it passes to the ground below.

- Wider deck alternatives will require some excavation at Valley rim at bridge deck level

Some alternatives have less potential for risk of impacts than others. Other potential project elements that may result in ground disturbance include, the stormwater control system, risk of encountering contaminated soils from an adjacent underground storage tank, widening the bridge deck and abutments, and future park trail improvements (Trail improvements would likely not be part of the bridge project unless it became a mitigation measure to compensate for potential recreational parkland impacts to High Bridge Park). All ground disturbance activities have a potential for disturbing archeological findings of importance, both from a historic perspective and from a tribal resource perspective.

- Is the project area within a Traditional Cultural Property?

  Randy said that it would be desirable to have a Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) study conducted sometime in the future that would encompass a regional review of lands including those near High Bridge Park, Centennial Trail, Kendall Yards, Council Circle, and the City's CSO project. It was mentioned that any cultural resources analysis for the Latah Bridge Rehabilitation Project, including ethnicity and historical use, would likely be limited to only the project area because funding for projects don't go outside of project boundaries.

- What would the tribes want the project to consider for future planning purposes?

  Randy and Brea provided the following suggestions for future planning of the project:
  - *The most important thing that this project could do is to include signage on the bridge and if trails are involved, along trails that would describe nearby archeological findings, the historic use of the property, and the tribal's history and life in early times. Also, it was mentioned that the history and naming of "Hangman Creek" should be explained on a sign, and how that name was changed to Latah Creek so that that this earlier history is not erased from memory.*
  - *If a trail under the bridge is incorporated into the future project, care should be given to avoid a historic campsite that lies under the bridge. It was noted that this trail would likely be on the valley's hillside and above the campsite, but locating above the known archeological finding may still result in new findings during trail construction.*
  - *Also, there is a burial site located south of Latah Bridge and I-90 Bridge above the Latah Creek Valley floor. It is recognized that this project is not near the burial site, but it serves as a reminder that these types of findings are possible within the project area.*
  - *An Inadvertent Discovery Plan needs to be prepared before ground is disturbed or the bridge is constructed to have procedures in place should any archeological discoveries be made.*
  - *Should anything be found (burials or other archeological findings), these resources need to be placed in the care of the Spokane Tribe of Indians.*

LATAH BRIDGE REHABILITATION STUDY
PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE #2 EVENT RECAP

Thursday, April 19, 2012
4:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.
Woodland Center at Finch Arboretum

On Thursday, April 19, 2012, the second and final 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 and Katherine Miller from the City of Spokane served as event staff to answer questions and serve as content experts. Michelle Hege and Emily Easley from Desautel Hege Communications served as event support and staffed the check-in table.

There were 35 open house attendees in all and included:

- Robbi Casllilug
- Ju Casleberry
- Vern Bucky
- Jebin Buchof
- James Allen
- Boh Bauson
- L.L
- Jacqui Halvorson
- Chris Sneider
- Doug Pennell
- Carrie Pennell
- Claire Rudolf Murphy
- Robert Woodford
- Nancy Woodford
- Doug Pines
- Phillis Holmes
- Robert Brost
- James E. Rogers
- Annette R. Rapp
- Bob Gordina
- Steve Boldwin
- Brandon Betty
- Mike Tidesco
- Janet Brow
- Georj Fesser
- Calin Harris
- Richard W. Bryant
- Linda Milsow
- Katie Heylman
- Warren Heylman
- Richard Adams
- Carol Adams
- Gordon Thompson
- Mark Serbousek
- Steve Adam

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:

- Do the bridge rehabilitation concepts presented today capture the functional uses for the bridge that are important to you? (For example: Car, Bicycle, Pedestrian, Transit, etc.) Please check one.
    - Yes
    - No. If not, please let us know what's missing.
- Do the bridge rehabilitation concepts presented today capture other issues that re important to you? (For example: Environmental, Historic Preservation, Cost, Connectivity, etc.) Please check one.
    - Yes
    - No. If not, please let us know what's missing.
- What comments or questions do you have about the projects or the concepts presented today?

The following information was collected from 16 open house attendees that filled out comment cards to provide feedback. Please note that comments are verbatims from the comment form.

- Do the bridge rehabilitation concepts presented today capture the functional uses for the bridge that are important to you? (For example: Car, Bicycle, Pedestrian, Transit, etc.) Please check one.
    - Yes
    - No. If not, please let us know what's missing.

        - Yes. Long term fix makes more sense to me the 18 million dollars.
        - Yes. I'd like bike an option that allows for future light rail and a shared bike/pedestrian lane.
        - Not all of them – I would like to see bike land and light rail.
        - Yes.
        - Yes.
        - Yes. Glad to hear light rail is a potential in the future and will structurally, be part of the design.
        - Yes. Must consider effect on businesses west of bridge and up sunset hill.
        - Yes. This bridge is my "freeway" – I use it several times (and more) every day.
        - Yes.
        - Yes.
        - Yes.
        - Yes.
        - Yes. For once someone is planning ahead for light rail transit.
        - Yes.
        - No. The plan needs to include gateway features – signage, great landscaping and perhaps ant. The signage should be as impressive as the gateway.

- Do the bridge rehabilitation concepts presented today capture other issues that are important to you? (For example: Environmental, Historic Preservation, Cost, Connectivity, etc.) Please check one.
    - Yes
    - No. If not, please let us know what's missing.

        - Yes. Lighting, graffiti issues, garbage – Do now!
        - Yes. Maintain the historic features of the bridge is critical and brings value to Spokane.
        - This is.
        - Yes.
        - Yes.
        - Yes. Environ. – re-use of existing structure hist pres – gorgeous historic structure!
        - Yes. Consider winter run off e.g. on Latah Creek.
        - Yes. Light rail system = let's do it!!
        - Yes.
        - Yes.
        - Yes.
        - Not sure. Historic preservation would be an important issue, but at what cost? Or would there be any safety compromise?
        - Yes.
        - No. Gateway features, beautification. Also, this area has high recreational use: Riverside state park, high bridge, fish lake, etc.
        - No. No, please see note above.

- What comments or questions do you have about the projects or the concepts presented today?

        - I support alternative 4 – include light rail option.
        - I think it is important if putting in time and money to really support bikes/light rail for support of energy conservation. I appreciate your doing this and hope you will include citizen input in final study.
        - Alternatives D & E are a much better use of funds. A 20 year flan that costs close to a total renovation is a waste of money.
        - Kathryn answered my questions. Great presentation!
        - Good 1st step.
        - Comments: good clarification of the length of time to start and finish project.

- Being in business close to the bridge, concerns about connecting traffic to our business (Rosauers) during construction. If entire bridge is close, how long is project? How long is construction process?
- Keep the bicycle and cars separated. Let bikes ride on side so we can have a good way into town from west side and fish lake trail. Get it done yesterday. Thanks you.
- How does growth management let impact this if at all? Pedestrian, bicycle, light rail, historic preservation would all be cool, but at what cost? Vision must have some practical guidelines.
- As a resident of the area, closure of the bridge should be minimal time possible. Closing it entirely for one year is preferable to a more extended process. Also, although costly, the long term alternative is a better investment for the vitality of the west hills neighborhood.
- Can we please include gateway features? Why are gateway features not included? Gateway features appear to be neglected from this plan, is this correct?

MEETING NOTES

CLIENT: CITY OF SPOKANE
PROJECT: LATAH BRIDGE REHABILITATION STUDY
PROJECT NO.: 425825

MEETING DATE & TIME: May 24, 2012 2:00 p.m.

Attendees: Katherine Miller (City)
Anna Ragaza-Bourassa (SRTC)
Craig Grandstrom (CH2M HILL)
Mark Brower (CH2M HILL)

NOTES – AIR QUALITY COORDINATION MEETING

MEETING PURPOSE

- Coordinate bridge study project with SRTC to understand if specific air quality analyses and/or documentation is recommended or required at this time.

DISCUSSION

- Mark Brower and Craig Grandstrom reviewed the project baseline traffic analyses that were performed and the results that are published in the Vol. 1 Baseline Conditions Summary document.
    a. Project utilized 2008 SRTC MTP Visum model for 2030 forecast. Traffic counts were conducted for the roadway segment and intersections to understand and better develop Synchro traffic models to understand LOS at Sunset Boulevard intersections with Government Way and 4th Ave.
    b. Results indicated that by 2030, we will need to have 4-lanes of capacity on Sunset Boulevard, so the Latah Bridge will need to be rehabilitated to accommodate 4-lanes of traffic to current design load standards.
    c. Underpass at Sunset Boulevard and Inland Empire Way were briefly analyzed to ascertain how 4-lanes of capacity, and potential future light rail, might be accommodated.
- Anna noted that the air quality "Hot Spot" analyses are typically conducted as part of the design process, when more design elements are known. Further these analyses are typically accomplished when the project area includes an intersection that is at LOS D, E, or F or will be as a result of the project.
- Katherine Miller noted that this project would ultimately restore two lanes of traffic in each direction to the bridge.
- Katherine noted that the study briefly looked at initial ideas for how we might carry the two lanes of traffic in each direction east of the Latah Bridge at the Inland Empire Way underpass location, where there is currently only one lane in each direction available. Any improvement to capacity in this location should generally improve air quality conditions.
- Katherine said that the City expects this project to be part of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) update. As such, the City would choose to pursue any needed air quality analyses, at this time.
- Anna recommended that for this level of study, no air quality analyses are needed, other than to indicate in the study report that SRTC should be consulted in the design phase to review the project and perform any needed analyses at that time.

ACTION ITEMS

- Mark Brower will send Anna an electronic copy of the Vol. 1 Baseline Conditions Summary document.
- Mark Brower will publish meeting notes, and include summary of the meeting results in to the Vol 2. Bridge Rehabilitation Alternatives Summary document.

From Spokesman Review, March 19, 2012

As Sunset bridge nears 100th birthday, city considers rehab

Jonathan Brunt The Spokesman-Review

Archive Photo

The bridge over Latah Creek is shown under construction, looking northeast. It opened to traffic in 1913.

Thirty-three years after the Sunset Boulevard Bridge over Latah Creek opened to traffic in 1913, one of its designers came back to Spokane and reminisced about the project.

“The city was looking well ahead into the problems of highway transportation when it built that bridge,” said Ernest Howard, the bridge designer who was in town in 1946 for a meeting of civil engineers. “That was long before the day of widespread use of the automobile.”

Nearly a century after the bridge went up, city officials say that while the design was forward-thinking for 1913, the structure needs an update.

While the bridge’s seven pairs of massive arches remain strong, the deck has suffered considerable wear, and some beams underneath have eroded enough to expose rebar. Perhaps more problematic, only the bridge’s middle portion, designed for streetcars, is considered strong enough for modern traffic. The city closed the outer lanes a few years ago because of wear and the weaker deck structure holding up the sides.

“It was never designed for the loads of today’s driving public,” Spokane Street Director Mark Serbousek said. But he stressed: “It’s still safe to go over the top of.”

The city contracted last year with CH2M Hill to study the bridge and its possible rehabilitation. The $631,000 study, paid for with a federal grant, is expected to be finalized in the next few weeks.

Serbousek said he suspects that, as with the recent reconstruction of the Monroe Street Bridge, the large arches of Sunset Boulevard Bridge can be saved. But the deck may have to be torn off and replaced.

The study will consider future light rail; whether room should be made for bike lanes; and how many car lanes a rebuilt bridge should support.

“Right now it’s working well with two,” said Lisa Malstrom, the city’s senior engineer in charge of bridge inspection and maintenance. “At what point might we need four lanes back on the bridge?”

City officials say whether they move forward with rehabilitation would depend on finding federal or state money to pay for it. The 1913 structure cost about $422,000, which the city financed with bonds.

The Spokane Transit Authority has requested that any long-term rehabilitation of the bridge make it strong enough for light rail, STA spokeswoman Molly Myers said. An STA plan that considers a light rail system suggests placing a line to Airway Heights along the bridge. Myers said the STA provides about 4,000 bus rides daily on two routes that use the bridge, but light rail would be extremely unlikely on the bridge for at least a couple of decades.

The STA’s goal is to prevent a “decision that would prohibit options down the road,” she said.

Councilman Jon Snyder said the city pursued the grant for the bridge study in part because of a state proposal for improving the safety of U.S. Highway 195 that the city feared would result in diverting traffic to the deteriorating Sunset bridge.

Snyder said any rehabilitation should preserve the bridge’s design.

“To me it’s like the sister bridge to the Monroe Street Bridge, and that rehabilitation was a massive success,” Snyder said.