

Main-McVay Transit Study

Stakeholder Advisory Committee

Meeting #6

September 30, 2014

A collaborative study between





Main-McVay Transit Study

Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #6

September 30, 2014

WELCOME & AGENDA REVIEW

Agenda Review

- Welcome & Agenda Review
- Community Input Summary
- GT Approval of SAC Recommendations from Last Meeting
- Tier I Screening & SAC Recommendations
- Upcoming Screening Evaluation
(if time allows)
- Next Steps & Adjourn



Main-McVay Transit Study

COMMUNITY INPUT SUMMARY

Community Input Summary

- Written Comments
 - None
- Website Input
- Email Correspondence
 - None
- Main Street Interested Parties List Updates
 - Week of October 6
- Community Outreach
 - Presentation to Lane County Area Commission on Transportation



Main-McVay Transit Study

GT APPROVAL OF SAC RECOMMENDATIONS

Revisions to PNGO

- GT Approved SAC Recommended Revisions to PNGO with 2 exceptions
 - Evaluation Criterion for Objective 1.6
 - Evaluation Criterion for Objective 3.5
- GT supported SAC Recommended Modification to previously approved Objective 1.6

Broad Range of Transit Solutions

- GT agreed with all of SAC recommendations with one exception
- GT determined two-way Main Street alignment option not reasonable due to extent of probable impacts to parking and businesses



Main-McVay Transit Study

TIER I SCREENING & SAC RECOMMENDATIONS

Tier I Screening

- High Level “Pass / Fail” Screening
 - *Reasonable potential to solve identified transportation problems*
- Project Team Recommendations
 - Reviewed 25 options against 19 criteria
 - Recommend eliminating 9 transit options from further study
- Basis for Eliminating Options
 - Not cost effective – Increases costs
 - Doesn't provide connectivity
 - Doesn't improve ridership
 - Potential significant adverse impacts

Tier I Screening

- Some factors to consider as you make your recommendation
 - Threshold screening measure – higher level review of solutions
 - Focus on “big picture” and “reasonable potential to solve transportation problems”
- Do you agree with project team’s findings
 - Whether or not range of transit solutions meet Study’s Purpose, Need, Goals and Objectives
 - How well each solution is likely to meet the PNGO or correct the transportation problem?































Tier I Screening













- Rationale for Dismissing Options
 - Does not meet Purpose, Need, Goals and Objectives
 - Is not likely to correct transportation problems in Corridor
 - Does not have potential to decrease impacts or creates new or greater impacts
 - Reasonable probability would not be acceptable or appropriate for Springfield community
 - Is inconsistent with adopted plans or policies
 - Implementation is remote or speculative



Main-McVay Transit Study

SECTION 5.3 ENHANCED BUS OPTIONS

Goals	Objectives	Options				
		1. Main Street	2. McVay Highway	3. Main Street Express	4. Freeway Express	5. Main-McVay
Goal 1: Improve corridor transit service	1.1: Travel time					
	1.2: Reliability					
	1.3: Transfers					
	1.4: Ridership					
	1.5: Access					
	1.6: Equity					
Goal 2: Meet current and future transit demand in a cost-effective manner	2.1: Operating cost					
	2.2: Capacity					
	2.3 Return on Investment					
	2.4: Environmental Impacts					

Goals	Objectives	Options				
		1. Main Street	2. McVay Highway	3. Main Street Express	4. Freeway Express	5. Main-McVay
Goal 3: Support economic development, revitalization and land use redevelopment opportunities for the corridor	3.1: Support plans					
	3.2: Aesthetics					
	3.3: Main Street projects					
	3.4: Franklin improvements					
	3.5: Business impacts					
Goal 4: Enhance the safety and security of the corridor	4.1: Ped and bike safety					
	4.2: Transit user safety					
Goal 5: Enhance other modes of travel	5.1: Traffic impacts					
	5.2: Bike and ped connections					
PNGO Screening Recommendation (Retain or Eliminate)		Retain	Retain	Retain	Eliminate	Eliminate





























Project Team Recommendation













- Retain Options 1, 2 and 3
- Eliminate Option 4
 - Only serves very small portion of Corridor
 - Does not meet goal of cost-effectively meeting current demand in Corridor
 - Would not address several other Corridor objectives
 - This option can be considered by LTD as service improvement
- Eliminate Option 5
 - Connection of two corridors and matching their service levels would require large increase in operating cost on McVay Segment
 - Does not meet goal of cost-effectively meeting current demand
 - Option of maintaining existing service frequency on both segments would result in inconsistent connection for riders



Main-McVay Transit Study

SECTION 5.4 BRT SERVICE OPTIONS

		Options			
		1. Franklin-Gateway; Main-McVay	2. Franklin-Main; Gateway-McVay	3. Franklin-Gateway; Main; McVay	4. Franklin-Main; Gateway; McVay
Goals	Objectives				
Goal 1: Improve corridor transit service	1.1: Travel time				
	1.2: Reliability				
	1.3: Transfers				
	1.4: Ridership				
	1.5: Access				
	1.6: Equity				
Goal 2: Meet current and future transit demand in a cost-effective manner	2.1: Operating cost				
	2.2: Capacity				
	2.3 Return on Investment				
	2.4: Environmental Impacts				

		Options			
		1. Franklin-Gateway; Main-McVay	2. Franklin-Main; Gateway-McVay	3. Franklin-Gateway; Main; McVay	4. Franklin-Main; Gateway; McVay
Goals	Objectives				
Goal 3: Support economic development, revitalization and land use redevelopment opportunities for the corridor	3.1: Support plans				
	3.2: Aesthetics				
	3.3: Main Street projects				
	3.4: Franklin improvements				
	3.5: Business impacts				
Goal 4: Enhance the safety and security of the corridor	4.1: Ped and bike safety				
	4.2: Transit user safety				
Goal 5: Enhance other modes of travel	5.1: Traffic impacts				
	5.2: Bike and ped connections				
PNGO Screening Recommendation (Retain or Eliminate)		Eliminate	Retain	Eliminate	Retain













Project Team Recommendation

- Retain Options 2 and 4
 - Best met Goals and Objectives
- Eliminate Option 1
 - Would require significant increase in operating costs in McVay Highway Segment to match frequency of Main Street service
 - Option of maintaining existing service frequency on each segment would result in inconsistent connections
 - Is not consistent with BRT Service Plan which includes an east/west (Franklin/Main) connection
- Eliminate Option 3
 - Requires greater number of riders transfer than other options
 - Is not consistent with BRT Service Plan which includes an east/west (Franklin/Main) connection and north/south (Gateway/McVay) connection



Main-McVay Transit Study

SECTION 5.5 LANE CONFIGURATIONS

Goals	Objectives	Options		
		1. High Exclusivity	2. Moderate Exclusivity	3. Low Exclusivity
Goal 1: Improve corridor transit service	1.1: Travel time			
	1.2: Reliability			
	1.3: Transfers			
	1.4: Ridership			
	1.5: Access			
	1.6: Equity			
Goal 2: Meet current and future transit demand in a cost-effective manner	2.1: Operating cost			
	2.2: Capacity			
	2.3 Return on Investment			
	2.4: Environmental Impacts			

Goals	Objectives	Options		
		1. High Exclusivity	2. Moderate Exclusivity	3. Low Exclusivity
Goal 3: Support economic development, revitalization and land use redevelopment opportunities for the corridor	3.1: Support plans			
	3.2: Aesthetics			
	3.3: Main Street projects			
	3.4: Franklin improvements			
	3.5: Business impacts			
Goal 4: Enhance the safety and security of the corridor	4.1: Ped and bike safety			
	4.2: Transit user safety			
Goal 5: Enhance other modes of travel	5.1: Traffic impacts			
	5.2: Bike and ped connections			
PNGO Screening Recommendation (Retain or Eliminate)		Retain	Retain	Retain

































Project Team Recommendation





- Retain all 3 lane configuration options
 - More detailed concept designs and screening based on evaluation criteria will provide specificity needed to assess options
 - Key evaluation criteria will be transit travel time, service reliability, return on investment, and business impacts



Main-McVay Transit Study

SECTION 5.6 BRT ROUTING MAIN STREET EAST ROUTING OPTIONS AND EASTERN TERMINUS

Goals	Objectives	Options			
		1. Thurston Station (with connector service)	2. Thurston High School (with connector service)	3. Thurston Road to 69th	4. Main to 72nd
Goal 1: Improve corridor transit service	1.1: Travel time				
	1.2: Reliability				
	1.3: Transfers				
	1.4: Ridership				
	1.5: Access				
	1.6: Equity				
Goal 2: Meet current and future transit demand in a cost- effective manner	2.1: Operating cost				
	2.2: Capacity				
	2.3 Return on Investment				
	2.4: Environmental Impacts				

Goals	Objectives	Options			
		1. Thurston Station (with connector service)	2. Thurston High School (with connector service)	3. Thurston Road to 69th	4. Main to 72nd
Goal 3: Support economic development, revitalization and land use redevelopment opportunities for the corridor	3.1: Support plans				
	3.2: Aesthetics				
	3.3: Main Street projects				
	3.4: Franklin improvements				
	3.5: Business impacts				
Goal 4: Enhance the safety and security of the corridor	4.1: Ped and bike safety				
	4.2: Transit user safety				
Goal 5: Enhance other modes of travel	5.1: Traffic impacts				
	5.2: Bike and ped connections				
PNGO Screening Recommendation (Retain or Eliminate)		Retain	Retain	Eliminate	Eliminate

Project Team Recommendation

- Retain Options 1 and 2
 - Lower operating cost if avoid need to extend high-frequency BRT service and BRT capital improvements east of 58th Street
 - Include neighborhood connector service that can be tailored to east Springfield needs
 - Hybrid of Options 1 and 2 which extends BRT service to Thurston High School during high rider demand times can be considered
- Eliminate Options 3 and 4
 - Extending high-frequency BRT and capital improvements east of 58th Street will have higher operating costs and lower return on investment
 - East Springfield service limited to streets served by BRT



Main-McVay Transit Study

SECTION 5.7 BRT MAIN STREET DOWNTOWN ROUTING OPTIONS

Project Team









Recommendation

- Not enough data and information detail to screen the 3 BRT Main Street Downtown Routing options against Goals and Objectives
- Retain all 3 Options
 - South A Street/Main Street couplet (bus travels with existing traffic flow)
 - Two-Way on South A Street (westbound BRT travel would be contraflow to existing traffic flow)
 - Two-Way of South A Street routing west of 10th or 14th Street, and South A Street/Main Street couplet east of 19th or 14th (westbound bus would be contraflow west of 10th or 14th Street)



Main-McVay Transit Study

SECTION 5.8 BRT ROUTING MCVAY SOUTH

Goals	Objectives	Options		
		1. McVay Highway (west side of I-5)	2. Old Franklin (east side of I-5)	3. Haul Road (east side of I-5)
Goal 1: Improve corridor transit service	1.1: Travel time			
	1.2: Reliability			
	1.3: Transfers			
	1.4: Ridership			
	1.5: Access			
	1.6: Equity			
Goal 2: Meet current and future transit demand in a cost- effective manner	2.1: Operating cost			
	2.2: Capacity			
	2.3 Return on Investment			
	2.4: Environmental Impacts			

Goals	Objectives	Options		
		1. McVay Highway (west side of I-5)	2. Old Franklin (east side of I-5)	3. Haul Road (east side of I-5)
Goal 3: Support economic development, revitalization and land use redevelopment opportunities for the corridor	3.1: Support plans			
	3.2: Aesthetics			
	3.3: Main Street projects			
	3.4: Franklin improvements			
	3.5: Business impacts			
Goal 4: Enhance the safety and security of the corridor	4.1: Ped and bike safety			
	4.2: Transit user safety			
Goal 5: Enhance other modes of travel	5.1: Traffic impacts			
	5.2: Bike and ped connections			
PNGO Screening Recommendation (Retain or Eliminate)		Retain	Retain	Eliminate

Project Team
















Recommendation










- Retain Options 1 and 2 (McVay Highway and Old Franklin)
- Eliminate Option 3 (Haul Road)
 - Requires construction of new roadways in potentially environmentally sensitive areas
 - Would not serve existing development
 - Rated as poor for ridership, access, return on investment, and potential environmental impacts



Main-McVay Transit Study

SECTION 5.9 BRT STATION SPACING

Goals	Objectives	Options		
		1. Stations spaced less than 1/3 mile apart	2. Stations spaced approx. 1/3 mile apart	3. Stations spaced more than 1/3 mile apart
Goal 1: Improve corridor transit service	1.1: Travel time			
	1.2: Reliability			
	1.3: Transfers			
	1.4: Ridership			
	1.5: Access			
	1.6: Equity			
Goal 2: Meet current and future transit demand in a cost-effective manner	2.1: Operating cost			
	2.2: Capacity			
	2.3 Return on Investment			
	2.4: Environmental Impacts			

Goals	Objectives	Options		
		1. Stations spaced less than 1/3 mile apart	2. Stations spaced approx. 1/3 mile apart	3. Stations spaced more than 1/3 mile apart
Goal 3: Support economic development, revitalization and land use redevelopment opportunities for the corridor	3.1: Support plans			
	3.2: Aesthetics			
	3.3: Main Street projects			
	3.4: Franklin improvements			
	3.5: Business impacts			
Goal 4: Enhance the safety and security of the corridor	4.1: Ped and bike safety			
	4.2: Transit user safety			
Goal 5: Enhance other modes of travel	5.1: Traffic impacts			
	5.2: Bike and ped connections			
PNGO Screening Recommendation (Retain or Eliminate)		Eliminate	Retain	Eliminate

Project Team Recommendation

- Retain Option 2
 - Average station spacing of 1/3 mile for BRT service has been shown to be appropriate balance between access and operating efficiency
 - Distances greater than or less than 1/3 mile may be used depending on location of activity centers and on adjacent land uses
- Eliminate Options 1 and 3
 - Station spacing of less than 1/3 mile increases travel and operating cost
 - Station spacing greater than 1/3 mile creates pedestrian access issues



Main-McVay Transit Study
Stakeholder Advisory Committee

NEXT STEPS & ADJOURN

Next Steps

Date	Actions
October 9	GT Review and Decision: Narrowed Range of Transit Solutions
October	Evaluation Criteria Screening of Narrowed Range of Transit Solutions
October 28	SAC: Introduction to Screening Evaluation Process
November 18	SAC Workshop: Draft Range of Most Promising Solutions

ADJOURN

Main-McVay Transit Study

TIER II SCREENING

Screening Purpose

- Effective high-level process to determine if there are viable solutions for further consideration
- Used to quickly focus on critical factors in selecting options for more in-depth study
- Efficient use of time and money

Tier II Screening

- Tier II Screening based on established evaluation criteria
- Each transit solution will be scored 1 (worst) through 5 (best) for each criterion
- Focus on comparing and contrasting between possible solutions
- Criteria not weighted

Tier II Screening

- Project Team will make recommendations on scoring for SAC consideration
- SAC recommendation will go to GT
- Developing range of most promising solutions; not final decision
- Solutions that have greatest probability of solving identified Corridor transportation problems

Rationale for Dismissing Options

- *Relative to other options*
 - Less likely to correct transportation problems in Corridor
 - Greater potential to decrease impacts or create new or greater impacts
 - Less cost effective – Higher potential costs
 - Less connectivity
 - Less potential to improve ridership
 - Greater reasonable probability would not be acceptable or appropriate for Springfield community

Tier II Screening

- Avoid spending time focused on design-related issues that cannot be addressed at this time
 - Such as driveways that might be eliminated, trees that might be removed or station design
 - During preliminary and final design stages of project, LTD and City of Springfield will invest great deal of effort in avoiding or reducing impacts
- Avoid spending time focused on issues that are already part of LTD's standard operating procedures
 - Such as improving ADA access

General Assumptions

- LTD has constructed number of major transit investments including two EmX Corridors and two signature transit stations
 - With each project, LTD has improved its record of avoiding and reducing impacts beyond what was estimated in environmental review
 - LTD has constructed (or is constructing) community facilities such as bike lanes and paths, sidewalks, street crossings, traffic signals, bridges over waterways, and community meeting spaces

General Assumptions

- When considering which transit options to retain or eliminate, you can make following general assumptions about LTD's major transit investments
 - Bicycle improvements such as bike lanes, bike paths, bike parking and storage
 - ADA access improvements such as ramped sidewalks
 - Sidewalk improvements such as sidewalk widening, completing unimproved sidewalk areas
 - Safe bicycle and pedestrian crossings to stations
 - Landscape improvements – meets or exceeds minimum requirements
 - Latest and most appropriate bus technology that seeks to provide greatest passenger capacity and comfort, ease in driving, reduced air quality impacts, reduced energy consumption

Goals and Objectives		Evaluation Criteria	Transit Solutions		
			Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Goal 1: Improve corridor transit service					
Objective 1.1: Improve transit travel time	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Round trip transit pm peak travel time between select origins and destinations	1	3	3	
Objective 1.2: Improve transit service reliability	<ul style="list-style-type: none">On-time performance (no more than 4 minutes late) of transit service	5	3	1	
Objective 1.3: Provide convenient transit connections that minimizes the need to transfer	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Number of transfers required between heavily used origin-destination pairs	3	3	3	
Objective 1.4: Increase transit ridership and mode share in the corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Average weekday boardings on Corridor routes	1	1	5	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Transit mode share along the corridor	1	1	1	

Goals and Objectives		Evaluation Criteria	Transit Solutions		
			Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Goal 1: Improve corridor transit service					
Objective 1.5: Improve access of other modes such as walking, bicycling, and auto (park and ride) to transit	• Population with ½ mile of transit stop	1	1	5	
	• Bicycle capacity at stops, stations, and on the bus	3	3	3	
	• Number of park and ride spaces with direct transit access to major destinations	5	1	1	
	• Assessment of accessibility by persons with mobility challenges	1	1	5	
Objective 1.6: Enhance equitable transit for users without regard to race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, marital status, age, disability, or economic status	• Distribution of transit service and facility improvements that avoid disproportionate impacts on those populations along the Corridor.	3	5	3	
Scoring Subtotal Goal 1		24	22	30	
Team Recommendation		Eliminate	Eliminate	Retain	