

MINUTES

Special Streets Sustainability Committee Meeting
Meeting #7: 1:00 p.m. Tuesday, October 12, 2021

ATTENDANCE:

Committee Members:

1. Lance Beck
2. Cal Coblentz
3. Robin DeRuwe - *absent*
4. Tom Dingus - *absent*
5. Kyle England
6. Matt Ewers – *absent*
7. Mike Frucci - *absent*
8. Kelly Fukai - *absent*
9. Jesse Granado - *absent*
10. Todd Henry
11. Chris Moan
12. Karl Otterstrom
13. Kevin Person – *absent*
14. Greg Repetti - *absent*
15. Melanie Rose
16. Ben Small - *absent*
17. Cheryl Stewart
18. Frank Tombari
19. Joe Tortorelli
20. Kevin Wallace: replacement Lois Bollenback
21. Diana Wilhite
22. Kathe Williams

Internal Staff:

1. Adam Jackson, Planning/Grants Engineer
2. John Hohman, Deputy City Manager
3. Chelsie Taylor, Finance Director
4. Bill Helbig, City Engineer
5. Taylor Dillard, Administrative Assistant
6. Lesli Brassfield, Economic Development Specialist
7. Chris Bainbridge, City Clerk

External Staff:

1. Joy York, Whitworth University, Moderator
2. Linda Pierce, NCE Engineering, Consulting Engineer

1. Introduction & Overview – Joy York

Ms. York welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted that today's focus today is to present the draft final report, and to give time for committee members to provide feedback and ask for clarifications or questions on the report's contents, which she noted will occur toward the end of today's meeting.

2. Presentation of Draft Final Report

Ms. York explained that this committee's purpose and goals were to evaluate citizen interest and support for maintaining city streets, identifying preference for maintaining city streets, then investigate current revenues and potential funding sources for maintaining those streets. She stated that the committee met to get input on those considerations, and that other public meetings and workshops were held to give the public an opportunity for their input; she noted the formation of a survey to also gather public input; said there were visual and print media campaigns to inform the public about this work, and to invite them to be engaged in the process. She noted that the survey questions were intentionally open-ended questions so as not to create a platform to seek the public agreement on a goal; said the goal was to ask and listen, then report on those responses. Ms. York also noted that committee members will be invited to participate in submitting the final draft report to Council at their November 9 Council meeting.

Mr. Jackson added that he is hopeful everyone had a chance to read the report as today's focus is on the findings; he went over the summary of findings found in the report on page 13, 14 and 15; he brought attention to a trend he noted and is shown on page 16 of those in favor of surface treatments by engagement type, i.e. public survey, public meetings, and committee. Mr. Jackson briefly mentioned some of the information shown on pages 17 through 20, showing the most preferred option of a TBD (transportation

benefit district) as noted in Figure 17, Funding Option Approval Rates. Mr. Jackson also mentioned that the public survey did not specifically ask for input on whether PMP funding should or should not rely on annual surplus fund transfers, but that the committee discussed the topic extensively and the committee's questionnaire responses indicate that the city should stop using annual surplus fund transfers to offset deficits on the PMP; and he brought attention to the quotes in 'blue' noted on page 21.

3. Breakout #1 Discussion: What feedback do you have on the content of the final report?

Members broke out into their discussion groups about at 1:22 p.m., and returned at 1:32 p.m.

Group 1: felt there were some inconsistencies in the language, but were overall impressed; said Mr. Jackson did a great job in collecting the responses into one cohesive report. City Finance Director Taylor said she will get together with Mr. Jackson later to discuss some of the inconsistency issues.

Group 2: agreed there were some inconsistencies between figure 16 Committee Ranked Funding Options, and the survey preference and would like clarification to make sure we are describing it accurately. Mr., Jackson said staff has figured out how to address that issue. A question arose on whether a TBD can be a tax combination of vehicles and sales and use, and Ms. Taylor said it can include both, but sales tax has to be voter approved while a vehicle TBD could be council-manic. There was also a comment that the public survey lumping property and utility tax into one category, but the committee combined the TBD as one concept and it was suggested to have Figure 16 show the comparisons more directly with the public responses. Mr. Jackson said the findings in Table 2 might be misleading as the committee also evaluated five other options, but the public had two TBD's to choose from; however, it noted that the TBD is the most preferred option. Mr. Jackson mentioned that there are baseline assumptions in the appendixes and said that information could be pulled out as part of the main report; and that the table following the narrative shown on page 18 (page 20 of the PDF) could be edited to include dollar values.

Group 3: felt it is very important that messages should be carefully crafted to the public to tell them what the \$8 million will get them, as that wasn't seen in the report. Deputy City Manager Hohman said that while that is not in the report, perhaps we could do some brief scenarios, such as with x amount of money, here's the project that could be expected. It was mentioned that this committee never discussed projects and asked about the City's ability to generate a project list. Mr. Hohman said there are a multitude of possible projects and he suggested perhaps an activity list with three different runs of a street scan and perhaps put something like that in an appendix.

4. Questions and Final Considerations

It was asked if staff has considered what might prevent Council from moving forward as they haven't moved forward previously; and perhaps what questions are being missed. Mr. Hohman said that staff is working on ideas of how to pull all the information together so as to give Council a presentation about findings; said the City Manager will also likely have some comments, and he encouraged committee members to look on-line to read about the City Manager's comments during his budget messages, especially about the challenges of street fund 101. A concern was voiced about the timing of such a presentation, with Mr. Hohman noting there is probably never an ideal time to handle these issues and if we wait until next year, we take a risk of having to explain this information to new people. Mr. Jackson added that he will have a quick meeting with staff about the issues raised today and if anyone has any edits, to please send them to him by the end of the day Thursday, October 14 in order to wrap up these issues before the end of October.

5. Twenty-Second Member Video

Mr. Hohman invited committee members to attend the November 9 Council meeting, and said staff would like to include a video of committee member's perspectives on this work; to include anything members would like to express to Council and that staff will put something together for that presentation; that perhaps

at the end of today's meeting in a breakout room, or to record on a smart phone and e-mail to Mr. Jackson, or members could contact Mr. Jackson and set up an appointment to record something on zoom. Mr. Jackson said the intent is that every committee member have the opportunity to be present with this report, whether by video and/or in attendance at the November 9 meeting. Mr. Hohman said staff will work to put the presentation together, and that we have to be mindful of maybe having a smaller group at the presenting table on the 9th; and have a larger group to make comments. Mr. Hohman said staff will be in touch with committee members, and he extended his appreciation to each committee member for their work.

The meeting adjourned at 2:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Chris Bainbridge
Spokane Valley City Clerk