



Main-McVay Transit Study
Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #4
July 29, 2014

Revised 4/9/15 to reflect correct attendance

MEETING REPORT

SAC Members Present:

Mike Eyster, Ronna Frank, David Helton, Jerry Hooton, Lorenzo Herrera, Ken Hill, Randy Hledick, Andrew Knori, Rosalia Marquez, Brett Rowlett, Paul Selby, Garry Swanson, Erin Walters

SAC Members Absent:

Diana Alldredge, Emma Newman, Dan Rupe, Chad Towe

Study Team:

John Evans, Peter Coffey, Justin Lanphear, David Reesor, Brad Swearingen, Kari Turner, Stefano Viggiano, Lynda Wannamaker

Facilitators:

Stan Biles, Chris Watchie

Study Support:

Susan Oldland

Audience:

Rob Zako

1) Welcome & Agenda

Stan Biles welcomed the SAC and noted the change in the meeting approach. Instead of the SAC responding to preliminary conceptual alignment solutions, the SAC's task is to participate in a workshop with project and technical team members. The SAC's focus is to provide the foundational thoughts and ideas upon which to build the solutions. Stan thanked the SAC for being flexible.



David Reesor reviewed the agenda highlighting the importance and appreciation of the SAC's input.

2) Community Input Summary

Chris Watchie provided an overview of community outreach to date.

3) Solutions Development Overview

John Evans reviewed Study process and status.

- No pen has been put to paper.
- The project team requires SAC's ideas and insights on a broad range of conceptual solutions.
- No ideas are off the table at this point.

- Need the SAC's "big picture" thinking.
- From there, the solutions will go through an evaluation to determine which ones have the potential to address the Study's Purpose and Need.
- The findings and recommendations from this step will be reviewed by the SAC and Governance Team (GT) to determine the narrowed range of solutions for further evaluation (i.e., how they meet the Study's Goals and Objectives).
- Post evaluation, the results will be reviewed by the SAC and GT to determine the range of the most promising solutions for the Corridor.
- If LTD and the city of Springfield decide to move forward into a project phase, the range of most promising solutions will advance into the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process.
- The background information to inform solutions development include:
 - Purpose, Goals, Objectives
 - Mode Options Selection
 - Baseline Existing and Future Conditions Report
 - Service Plan Screening Evaluation
- There are not many feasible alignment options in certain sections of the corridor.
- SAC's key points to consider for feedback:
 - Routing
 - Route termini
 - General route connections
 - General station locations and spacing
 - Lane configuration

4) Review of Revised PGO & Baseline Existing and Future Conditions Report Findings

Lynda Wannamaker reviewed the SAC's Purpose, Goals, and Objectives revisions as recommended by the SAC (Meeting #3), the Governance Team's response, and presentations to decision-making bodies.

- Governance Team (June 26) concurred with the SAC recommendations with minor changes (underlined below) to two objectives:
 - Objective 1.6: Enhance equitable transit for users without regard to race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, marital status, age or disability.
 - Objective 5.: Maintain Minimize adverse impacts to reliable motor vehicle operations and traffic flow, in the corridor such as intersection delay, capacity reductions, and conflicts between buses and cars.
- Both the Springfield City Council (July 7) and LTD Board (July 16) concurred with the revised Purpose, Goals, and Objectives language.

The SAC learned how the Baseline Report was developed and the key findings:

- The report's purpose is to summarize readily available transportation and environmental background information and identify the resulting opportunities and constraints for transit solutions in the Main-McVay Corridor.
- The project team reviewed and analyzed information and data from existing environmental and transportation plans, studies, policies, rules and regulations.
- Windshield surveys were conducted for archaeological, historic, biological and wetlands (no field surveys were conducted).

- The opportunities and constraints are based on natural resources, the built environment, or regulations that may either constrain or provide project development opportunities.

Key findings (see: [SAC #4 Meeting Materials #2 for specific details](#)):

- 7 environmental topics presented opportunities and constraints:
 - Acquisitions and Displacements
 - Historic Resources
 - Land Use
 - Parklands
 - Socioeconomic and Environmental Justice
 - Transportation
 - Visual and Aesthetic Resources
- 10 environmental topics resulted in no significant opportunities or constraints that otherwise could be addressed through mitigation efforts:
 - Air Quality
 - Archaeology
 - Biological Resources & Endangered Species
 - Energy
 - Geology
 - Hazardous Materials
 - Noise
 - Utilities
 - Water Resources
 - Wetlands
- Pinch points defined: Options that require street widening in identified locations that will have greater impacts, such as properties with structures close to the right of way (ROW) and existing transportation structures (e.g., bridges).
- The SAC needs to be mindful of identified pinch points when providing input.
- Two maps were highlighted from Baseline Report (Chapter 5) illustrating existing and potential future Corridor land use (Glenwood and draft activity areas identified in the [Main Street Vision Plan](#)) and areas with zero-auto households per square mile. The information represents opportunities for transit solutions.

SAC Questions:

- Q: Should we consider the proposed Springfield Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) expansion for the industrial area around Seavey Loop?
A: Likely it would involve a future redesign of the I-5 on/off ramps.
- Q: Would it be considered an opportunity to reduce travel time?
A: It could but the report focuses on natural resources, the built environment, or regulations that may either constrain or provide project development opportunities.

5) Summary of Service Plan Evaluation

Stefano Viggiano reviewed Service Plan Evaluation process:

- Evaluated feasible service connections for the three mode alternatives (conventional bus, enhanced bus, and BRT) using the following criteria:
 - Transfers

- Operational Compatibility
- Route Structure Complexity
- Disruption to Current Service

The SAC reviewed potential service options for each of the three mode alternatives:

No-Build or No-Change option

- Continue existing Main St. and McVay Hwy. service as it is now
- Continue to use existing buses, travelling in mixed traffic, serving stops spaced at about 6 stops per mile

Enhanced Bus

- A: EB replace #11 Thurston service on Main St. segment
- B: EB replace #85 Springfield/LCC on McVay Hwy.
- D: Express service combined with existing local service

Bus Rapid Transit

- A: Main St. / LCC paired, existing EmX as is
- B: Main St. / Franklin paired, Gateway / LCC paired
- D: Main St. and LCC separate, independent corridors
- E: Main St. / Franklin paired, Gateway and LCC separate, independent corridors

The SAC reviewed the range of lane possibilities identifying for each the following:

- **Lane type:** mixed traffic, semi-exclusive (shared with turning vehicles), and exclusive
- **Lane location** (curbside, center)
- **Station location** (median, curbside, and curbside with possible pullouts),
- **Application** (BRT, Enhanced Bus)

Potential lane configurations include (see: [SAC #4 Meeting Materials #2 for graphics](#)):

- Mixed traffic – curbside
- Mixed traffic – left lane
- Business and Transit/Bus and Turn (BAT) lane – converted
- BAT lane – added
- Single center running lane
- Double centered running lane - added
- Mixed traffic – could be left or right lane
- BAT lane replaces parking
- Mixed traffic
- Bi-directional
- Center running exclusive lanes –added

6) SAC Workshop: Conceptual Alignment Solutions Development

Before the SAC began the workshop portion of the meeting, they received guidance to begin development of conceptual solutions:

- 1) Keep the concepts at high level. Do not get into the specifics (for instance, which driveways may or may not have impacts from a particular lane configuration).
- 2) Nothing is off the table at this point. Big picture thinking required.

3) Lane types can be mixed along the Corridor (e.g., lanes could include both mixed traffic and BAT lanes).

4) Focus on the following:

- Routing
- Route termini
- General route connections
- General station locations and spacing
- Lane configuration

5) Based on the SAC's input, the technical team will prepare package of alternatives based on SAC workshop for review at the August meeting.

SAC Comments/Questions:

- We need to be mindful of pinch points. When we go through the screening process, we'll see impacts.
- Based upon the evaluation, the SAC may decide that it is or is not one of the solutions to move forward for further evaluation.
- We need to look out 10 – 25 years from now.
- We need to look at the bigger picture.
- Q: If we are going to expand into businesses' property, they are not going to like it. How will this affect business owners if we decide to do BAT lanes?
A: Your task is to develop the broadest range of solutions and then we'll screen them. Nothing is off the table.
- Q: Who is considering impacts to businesses?
A: The SAC is. The general public also will review the screened solutions late this year and in early 2015.
- Q: Why was the Springfield Station moved from its originally proposed location?
A: Because the 5th St. and B St. location exceeded capacity. It could accommodate four buses. The current station now accommodates eight buses.

7) SAC Debrief

Stan asked the SAC to share anything they felt strongly about or wanted to highlight to other committee members and the project team to consider when further refining the conceptual solutions.

- It was difficult to give input. Prefer to respond to options rather than create them. It was a good idea to lay the map out to better understand it. It's hard to visualize this all.
- Liked mixed traffic lanes because parking is an issue for a lot of businesses.
- Going into Glenwood is a good thing for flow if you are riding a bus or driving.
- Liked the East-West & North-South route ideas for better connections.
- Worked mainly on the McVay Hwy. section. Excited about it. It's important to recognize Lane Community College as an anchor that serves as a connection point to Gateway.
- For McVay, need to think where the road is owned by the City, Lane County, and how will the 30th Ave/I-5 interchange redevelop in future.
- Glenwood is ready, ripe, and the low hanging fruit for this project.
- ROW issues don't exist on McVay Hwy. like they do on Main Street or in West Eugene. Let's get going.

- Gasoline Alley is closer to population and it seems like ROW is constrained. On McVay, might have more opportunity for expansion if the distances and run times are close. Need to look at in closer detail.
- Important to note that population in Glenwood will grow. Pedestrian safety important for street crossings. Make them very well lit. People don't see amber. Make them all red.
- We need to change city lighting.
- Very exciting. It is an honor to ride the bus. South A is very narrow. For BRT, it would be too narrow.
- Will comment more once I see more ideas. Want the transit experts to take our ideas and have us respond to them.
- Like the East-West/North –South concept. Love the idea that it could be possible to take the bus from Thurston out to Walmart on West 11th.
- Loved to see station beyond 69th to serve more to the east. You'll get a lot more use if you extended it.
- The lane options are fascinating. Like to see balanced approach in areas that get congested. Add the right type of lane that will have the lowest level of impacts to businesses. Need to balance impacts to business and transit.
- Why not create a combined HOV lane and transit lane?
- The 30th/I-5 interchange will need to be improved. At this point there are no detailed plans. ODOT anticipates urban development in that area but no decisions have been made by the cities. It is a placeholder on map. When the interchange is redesigned, it will look significantly different to what it is now. Given that, avoid dedicated lanes with major capital investment that could need to be torn up.
- Both bridges on McVay are too narrow with high congestion.
- For the McVay section you might be able to get exclusive ROW off the roadway which could be a heavy investment.
- Regarding extending the eastern terminus beyond 69th, not sure. Like the Thurston station terminus more because it can create place making and opportunities for redevelopment.
- Options with center running lanes (exclusive lanes) will restrict left turn lanes into businesses along Main. In those locations, think BAT lane is better suited.
- Instead of looking at the road symmetrically, look at it asymmetrically: one travel lane in one direction, two in other direction which could then reverse direction subject to time day.
- Thinking about constraints with crossing the river. Perhaps build another bridge somewhere.
- Very pleased with combining the issue of safety with lane configuration options. Good to see crossings.
- The crossing themselves - amber lights are not as effective as red.
- Read entire 300-page report and focused on demographic areas that will explode with population. These people have to get to work and in a timely fashion. Look where high-density areas and work centers are.
- Need to get people, trucks and traffic all moving up and down the Corridor.
- In 20 years, it's going to be crowded and we need to do something now.
- Dedicated lanes (exclusive transit) may not work in certain areas.
- In favor of bus turnouts but need to put them behind lights.
- Need to make sure there is the real estate to do it.
- Can't tell you the preferred mode or alignment at this point.

- Support terminus at Lane Community College.
- There is a huge number of students in Thurston. Currently LCC has 300 nursing students who travel out to RiverBend.
- Support making McVay a safer route and the Seavey loop expansion.
- If we widen the Corridor for buses and vehicles, let's not make it less safe for bikes and pedestrians.
- If we make it four lanes, people will go faster.
- If BRT is on the other side of Gasoline Alley, need to consider where existing homes are.
- If we decide to do a North-South route, we should modify frequency during the summer.
- Lane Community College did a students' origin and destination analysis.

8) Next Steps & Adjourn

Stan thanked group for being versatile and for the good thinking.

- August meeting is a full agenda. Stan requested the SAC be prepared to stay until 5:30 p.m.
- Upcoming meetings and key tasks:
 - Technical Team**
 - Refine and package alternatives based on SAC workshop, staff and GT feedback
 - Suggested revisions to Problem Statement, Need Statement and Evaluation Criteria
 - Baseline Report revisions based on staff, GT and SAC feedback
 - Send to SAC August 19

SAC Meeting #5 – August 26

Before meeting SAC

- Send Baseline Report comments, revisions to John and Dave by August 12
- Review revised Problem Statement, Need Statement and Evaluation Criteria
- Review Range of Solutions Package
- Email any questions to John and David
- Be prepared to discuss your suggested revisions at meeting

Agenda:

- Baseline Report Revisions
- Recommendations to GT:
 - Broad Range of Alternatives to advance into screening evaluation
 - Suggested Revisions: Problem Statement, Need Statement, Evaluation Criteria
- Upcoming Screening Evaluation

Governance Team – September 4

- Broad Range of Alternatives to advance into screening evaluation
- Revised Problem Statement, Need Statement, Evaluation Criteria

Resource List:

Mtg. #1

SAC Meeting #4 Report

[Springfield Transportation System Plan](#)
[OR 126 Safety Study](#)
[Lane Transit District Long Range Transit Plan](#)

Mtg. # 2

[Central Lane MPO Regional Transportation Plan](#)
[Regional Transportation Options Plan](#)
[Springfield Bicycle Plan](#)
[Eugene - Springfield Safe Routes to School](#)
[SmartTrips Springfield](#)
[The Bus Rapid Transit Concept Major Investment Study \(MIS\)](#)
[Eugene/Springfield Area Urban Rail Feasibility Study](#)
[Oregon Freight Plan](#)
[Oregon Rail Plan](#)
[Oregon Transportation Options Plan](#)
[Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan](#)
[Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act \(MAP-21\)](#)
[FTA Small Starts Program](#)

Mtg. #3

[Glenwood Refinement Plan](#)
[Glenwood Refinement Plan Update Project](#)

Mtg. #4

See: Page 30 [Section J: Main-McVay Transit Study Baseline Existing and Future Conditions Report](#) for a complete list of the Report's information and data resources