



Main-McVay Transit Study

Community Input Summary

December 2 - December 8, 2014

ADDENDUM

Additional email correspondence:

COMMENT:

From: Ronna Frank

Wednesday, December 03, 2014 2:37 PM

Subject: Re: Main-McVay SAC #8 Meeting Materials - Dec 9th

Thanks for all of this, David.

I was in the throes of reading the report you attached, when I came across Erin Waters letter to the Eugene Daily News.

While I understand that Erin has a passionate point of view she needs to express about LTD and EMX, I am shocked and insulted that she chose to editorialize her point of view in The Eugene Daily. In reading what lead up to that article, it felt to me that she was sneaking around to do this, the very thing she is accusing LTD of doing. She put a considerable amount of energy into the correspondence wanting to know what each of us on the SAC does for a living, although, in the end, she backtracked to in asking not who but "how many." I guess she didn't get the sheet the rest of us did from the first meeting, with our names and business or resident/private categories? What was her real purpose in needing this information?

So I want to know from you if she has crossed a line by going behind everyone's backs on the SAC in writing this editorial? Should she have asked the other 16 members on the SAC for permission to "editorialize" her point of view in a newspaper? It feels to me like a betrayal of trust not to have done that. And **who is she representing?** Erin obviously has an agenda, her sole purpose being to "expose" something she sees as a "sinister plot" (my words) by this committee and the LTD to advance the EMX line. My opinion, if she had asked me: she should have gone directly to LTD to discuss her concerns and point of view privately and not used her position as a SAC member to exploit her desire to stop EMX. Was that her sole purpose in wanting to be on the SAC?

The follow-up letter from Stanley Upton, President of Roberts Supply Co, was a direct response to what Erin wrote about EMX. Was he one of the business owners that she said she had spoken to? His "observation" and characterization of those 10 LTD passengers could be a Saturday Night Live sketch, if it wasn't so blatantly insulting: **eight out of ten current and past Lane Transit District passengers are shoplifters, drug and alcohol abusers, or panhandlers. The other two out of ten are either seniors that can get a cheap bus ride to come buy a pair of shoe laces, or people on assistance that have been next door at Goodwill and were walking back to the bus stop on the corner of 28th and Main and just stopped in to let us know how "over-priced" our merchandise is!**

Your thoughts?

RESPONSE:

Mon, Dec 08, 2014 2:25 pm

Subject: RE: Main-McVay SAC #8 Meeting Materials - Dec 9th

Hi Ronna,

Thank you for speaking with me on the phone last week about your concerns listed below. As a follow up to our phone conversation, I am sending you a link to the additional info you requested about SAC protocols, etc. <http://ourmainstreetspringfield.org/main-mcvay-transit-improvement-study/stakeholder-advisory-committee/>. The materials listed under SAC meeting #1 include the "SAC Agreements" which we discussed on the phone as well as some other general info about the SAC such as purpose and role – these are listed in the first few pages of the "SAC Project Initiation Package." Please let me know if you have any further questions and I'd be happy to help.

Best,
David

COMMENT:

Mon, December 08, 2014 4:09 pm

Subject: Re: Main-McVay SAC #8 Meeting Materials - Dec 9th

Hi David,

Thanks very much for the link to the SAC Agreements with the "Draft Group Operating Agreements" from meeting #1.

The document I was referring to in our phone conversation, however, was another one. I don't know at which meeting, but there was a large piece of paper put up on the wall that listed how we would agree to conduct ourselves in our discussions with each other within the meetings and we were asked to sign that. I don't believe we were ever given a copy of that, but I may be wrong. If anyone knows what I am referring to and has a copy that could be handed to me at tomorrow's meeting...or to everyone on the SAC...that would be helpful.

Good result on the Ducks. Looking forward to seeing the Rose Bowl, and hopefully what follows.

See you tomorrow.
Ronna

COMMENT:

Monday, December 08, 2014 11:18 AM

Subject: Main-McVay Transit Improvement Study

David / John / Lynda / Stefano –

I see in Part B of the Draft Tier II Screening Evaluation Report that you are recommending the elimination of the extension of BRT service from the Gateway EmX line to McVay Highway (Option 2B), and also elimination of the Franklin-Main;Gateway-McVay alternative (Option 1) (page 46 and 47).

I need you to help me understand this recommendation ...

On page 44, Option 1 outscores both Option 2A and 2B. This is reflected in the Revised BRT Service Options Data on Table D-3 (pages D-20 to D-33) where Option 1 has better scores than either 2A or 2B in numerous categories. Therefore, despite the stated higher operating costs associated with Option 2B, why wouldn't it make sense to recommend Option 1 since the overall outcome is superior?

Based on the Comments/Notes provided in Table D-3, there are a number of comments made which appear to compare and play Main Street off against McVay – implying that we need to choose one or the other. Again, I don't understand this logic when the overall score of Option 1 is greater than 2A and 2B combined.

Please help me understand what the cost effectiveness requirements for the FTA's Small Starts are, and what the significance of this program is to the overall funding of potential Main-McVay transit improvements.

Please also help me understand the math on page D-25. Why are the current and planned population and employment numbers for Option 1 less than the corresponding numbers for Options 2A and 2B when they are added together?

And on page D-29, why is Option 2B scored as "does not affect Franklin Blvd / McVay Highway projects" on both objective/criterion 3.4 a & b when the Glenwood Refinement Plan includes the following objective and policies & implementation strategies (pages 72 and 73):

- "Re-design and re-construct McVay Highway as a multi-modal transportation facility to support redevelopment in Glenwood as envisioned in the Land Use Chapter, while also providing an improved arterial connection between Springfield, Eugene and Interstate 5."
- "Design ... dedicated bus rapid transit or other transit facilities ..."
- "Partner with LTD regarding planned bi-directional bus rapid transit service or other future transit requirements in the corridor, and coordinate planning of street improvements to address future transit system requirements."
- "Locate transit stations where they will provide optimal, safe pedestrian access to existing uses and the adjacent areas planned for employment mixed-use development."

Given the plan for Glenwood and a key role that improved transit has in the area's redevelopment, if the McVay BRT line cannot be recommended all the way from Franklin Blvd in Glenwood out to LCC, perhaps it can still be justified within the city limits.

Wouldn't it make sense to make improvements to a transit route before the adjacent land is developed in order to avoid some of the problems – and costs – associated with making those improvements through an area once it's built-out?

Randy

RESPONSE:

Mon, Dec 08, 2014 5:50 pm

Subject: Re: Main-McVay Transit Improvement Study

Randy- thank you very much for your questions. We wanted to make sure we provide you with answers before tomorrow's SAC meeting, so I've provided responses in blue text that follow your questions below. We can also discuss these issues with you in more detail before the meeting to make sure your concerns have been addressed adequately. Since the meeting is tomorrow, if possible for you, Stefano or I will try contact you by phone Tuesday morning or early afternoon.

Thanks

John Evans, AICP

David / John / Lynda / Stefano –

I see in Part B of the Draft Tier II Screening Evaluation Report that you are recommending the elimination of the extension of BRT service from the Gateway EmX line to McVay Highway (Option 2B), and also elimination of the Franklin-Main; Gateway-McVay alternative (Option 1) (page 46 and 47).

I need you to help me understand this recommendation ...

On page 44, Option 1 outscores both Option 2A and 2B. This is reflected in the Revised BRT Service Options Data on Table D-3 (pages D-20 to D-33) where Option 1 has better scores than either 2A or 2B in numerous categories. Therefore, despite the stated higher operating costs associated with Option 2B, why wouldn't it make sense to recommend Option 1 since the overall outcome is superior? The ratings and scores are intended to show the relative strengths and weaknesses of the various options based on the criteria. Since there is no weighting of the objectives or criteria, the scores were never intended to be the sole determinant of the best option. Some objectives and criteria may be more critical and have more influence on the decision than other criteria. In this case, a critical objective is the operating cost. Service on the McVay Highway segment is currently every 30 minutes, with no evening or weekend service. As a BRT route, it would be required to have 10 minutes peak service, a minimum 15-minute service frequency for 14 hours per day, and service on weekends. This would require a tripling of the number of trips currently provided on that segment, resulting in a near tripling of operating cost. In addition, more than 90 percent of the current Route #85 ridership is to or from LCC, which suggests that there is little demand during evening and weekends when classes are not typically held.

Based on the Comments/Notes provided in Table D-3, there are a number of comments made which appear to compare and play Main Street off against McVay – implying that we need to choose one or the other. Again, I don't understand this logic when the overall score of Option 1 is greater than 2A and 2B combined. The intent was not to compare the two segments except to explain the ratings. BRT service on one segment does not in any way preclude or discourage BRT service on the other segment. Note that Enhanced Bus options are recommended for both segments.

Please help me understand what the cost effectiveness requirements for the FTA's Small Starts are, and what the significance of this program is to the overall funding of potential Main-McVay transit improvements. FTA Small Starts is a funding program that is used for fixed guideway or corridor-based high-capacity transit projects that cost less than \$225 million and use less than \$75 million in federal funds. This funding program has been used for the last two EmX projects and is the only currently realistic funding source for possible future large LTD service projects. Small Starts projects are evaluated based on several factors, one of which is cost-effectiveness. In simplified terms, the cost-effectiveness criterion compares ridership to cost. Based on our experience with Small Starts, we do not believe that the McVay Highway segment would score well on the cost-effectiveness criterion.

Please also help me understand the math on page D-25. Why are the current and planned population and employment numbers for Option 1 less than the corresponding numbers for

Options 2A and 2B when they are added together? Options 2A and 2B each include downtown Springfield in their population and employment totals, since both service that area. If 2A and 2B are simply added together, the population and employment for downtown Springfield would be double-counted.

And on page D-29, why is Option 2B scored as “does not affect Franklin Blvd / McVay Highway projects” on both objective/criterion 3.4 a & b when the Glenwood Refinement Plan includes the following objective and policies & implementation strategies (pages 72 and 73): This is an error. Option 2B supports the Glenwood/McVay Highway projects, which is noted under “Comments / Notes”. The correct text for those two cells should be “Support for Plan projects”. Note, however, that Option 2B was correctly scored with a “3” for criteria 3.4a and 3.4b in Table 3.4-2 (page 43).

- “Re-design and re-construct McVay Highway as a multi-modal transportation facility to support redevelopment in Glenwood as envisioned in the Land Use Chapter, while also providing an improved arterial connection between Springfield, Eugene and Interstate 5.”
- “Design ... dedicated bus rapid transit or other transit facilities ...”
- “Partner with LTD regarding planned bi-directional bus rapid transit service or other future transit requirements in the corridor, and coordinate planning of street improvements to address future transit system requirements.”
- “Locate transit stations where they will provide optimal, safe pedestrian access to existing uses and the adjacent areas planned for employment mixed-use development.”

Given the plan for Glenwood and a key role that improved transit has in the area’s redevelopment, if the McVay BRT line cannot be recommended all the way from Franklin Blvd in Glenwood out to LCC, perhaps it can still be justified within the city limits. This is an option that the SAC can discuss. Operating cost and ridership concerns would be an issue for that segment, as would that ability of that service to qualify for FTA Small Starts.

Wouldn’t it make sense to make improvements to a transit route before the adjacent land is developed in order to avoid some of the problems – and costs – associated with making those improvements through an area once it’s built-out? There is a valid argument to be made regarding preparing for transit prior to high levels of development that increase cost and impact. Developing a mechanism to protect right-of-way could be something that the SAC recommends to the City of Springfield. It should be noted, however, that there may be legal constraints in limiting development rights on private property. Note that the Project Team Recommendation is that BRT should be considered for the McVay Highway once development has reached a level that can support that type of service.

Randy

Study Updates and Community Outreach:

Central Lane MPO Metropolitan Policy Committee: Thursday, December 4, 2014

