



Main-McVay Transit Study
Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #5
August 26, 2014

MEETING REPORT

SAC Members Present:	Diana Alldredge, Ronna Frank, Randy Hledick, Jerry Hooton, Andrew Knori, Emma Newman, Brett Rowlett, Dan Rupe, Paul Selby, Garry Swanson, Chad Towe, Erin Walters
SAC Members Absent:	David Helton, Lorenzo Herrera, Ken Hill, Rosalia Marquez
Study Team:	John Evans, David Reesor, Stefano Viggiano, Lynda Wannamaker
Facilitators:	Stan Biles, Chris Watchie
Audience:	Rob Zako

KEY MEETING POINTS

1) Introductions & Agenda Review

Stan Biles reviewed the meeting agenda.

2) Baseline Report Revisions

Lynda Wannamaker reviewed Report modifications based on SAC comments.

- Not all comments resulted in changes to the Report.
- Revisions included general edits and formatting.
- Most of the changes focused on adding information about congestion, Main Street pedestrian crossings, Glenwood (historic resources, land use, zoning, safety), and the McVay portion of the corridor.
- The Report will not be finalized until the Governance Team (GT) reviews the SAC's input on the report and agrees on the final elements of the PNGO (Problem Statement, Needs Statement, and Evaluation Criteria). T
- SAC was asked if they had concerns about the proposed changes. None were voiced.

SAC Comments/Questions:

- Appreciation was expressed to the Project Team for addressing concerns and comments.
- Q: Why are the land use and zoning maps not updated for Glenwood/McVay area?
A: We could not make any changes to the agency base map; agency updates base maps on annual basis.

3) Range of Transit Solutions

Stefano Viggiano introduced the range of transit solutions based on the SAC's suggestions, ideas, issues and constraints identified at their July 29 workshop.

- The SAC's task was to review the Range of Transit Solutions and confirm that the Project Team correctly captured their input.
- At this time, the SAC's focus is to establish the Range of Transit Solutions not the merits of each one. That analysis will happen in the two-step screening process (see *Agenda Item #5*).

- The Range of Transit Solutions is based upon the Existing Service, Enhanced Bus, and Bus Rapid Transit mode options.
- For each of the Enhanced Bus and Bus Rapid Transit solutions, Stefano reviewed the applicable elements of Service Options, Lane Configurations, Routing (alignment), Termini, and Station Locations.

Enhanced Service Options include:

- 1) Main Street Enhanced Bus
- 2) McVay Highway Enhanced Bus
- 3) Main Street Express
- 4) Freeway Express

SAC Enhanced Bus Questions:

Q: What about frequency for Main Street Express (Option 3)?

A: The specifics on frequency have not been determined at this time. It is possible that local service (#11 Route) would be reduced if express bus were added to that segment.

Q: Does the Freeway Express (Option 4) go directly to the University of Oregon or are there any stops?

A: It likely would stop once in downtown Eugene before going to the University.

Q: What does “queue jumping” mean? ?

A: A queue jump is a type of roadway geometry used to provide preference to buses at intersections. Buses use a separate lane to access the intersection, then are given an advance green to move forward ahead of the queue of cars.

Q: Is there an option to combine some of these transit solutions? For instance, could you mix and match mode options? Could the Main and McVay Highway Enhanced Bus options be combined to create a corridor-length Enhanced Bus option?

A: Yes, some options can be mixed and matched. However, combinations such as Main Street and McVay Highway Enhanced Bus may not result in a consistent connection because of difference in frequency. We certainly could add that as an option to consider in the screening process.

Q: Was there any discussion to extend the eastern termini to 72nd?

A: Not for Enhanced Bus, but BRT has an option to extend to 72nd Street. That option can also be considered for Enhanced Bus.

- Suggest adding “University” to the Freeway Express Option.
- John Evans reiterated that the basis for the proposed solutions started with the SAC. If the SAC’s input was not translated well into the draft solutions, the Project Team needs to hear that.

Bus Rapid Transit Service Options:

- 1) Main Street-McVay Highway EmX (existing Franklin-Gateway EmX remains as is)
- 2) Franklin-Main Street EmX and Gateway-McVay Highway EmX
- 3) Separate Main Street and McVay Highway EmX lines (existing Franklin-Gateway EmX remains as is)
- 4) Franklin-Main Street EmX and separate Gateway and McVay Highway EmX lines

SAC BRT Comments/Questions:

Q: Do all the options stop at Springfield station?

A: Yes

Q: When you introduce a transfer, what’s the impact?

A: There is some level of inconvenience. The continuous BRT line from West Eugene to Thurston eliminates the transfer.

Q: Would you run the same route on the weekend?

A: You could have what is called “shortlining” meaning the bus stops short of the usual terminus. For example, the LCC service could be shortlined to end in Glenwood when LCC is not in session.

Q: How is BRT option 2 & 4 different?

A: Gateway and McVay are two separate EmX routes on Option 4. That option requires a transfer between the two routes.

- The service options differ for separate segments.
- The segments have different characteristics.
- Allows us to evaluate them in a different way.
- As we get into it these options, they may be modified, combined, etc.
- We need the SAC to make sure we are not missing anything for the Range of Transit Solutions to consider.
- Not a fan of the two-way option.
- The potential bus lane configuration could be two-way but use the same lane (also called a bi-directional lane. This is used on some sections of the Franklin EmX.
- Looking at BRT lane configuration is the most challenging because of the range of them. A detailed analysis of the most appropriate lane configuration for a particular street section is beyond the scope of this study.
- The study will evaluate three basic BRT lane approaches and level of lane exclusivity: high-level BRT, moderate-level BRT, low-level BRT.

Q: Where is the Haul Road?

A: East side of McVay Highway. It’s the old Sand and Gravel (S&G) Road. It is owned partly by private interests and by ODOT. That solution would require that new street connections be built.

Q: What is the ROW on that road?

A: 20-foot wide. Easement was specific to S&G truck traffic.

- Wouldn’t spend a whole lot of money on exploring that solution because of how many hurdles it has.
- Thought this solution was also about getting a bike/ped path, not just bus.
- Advantage: this solution avoids congestion
- Disadvantage: requires connections and does not serve existing development

Recommendation: Range of Transit Solutions

Stan Biles asked if there was anything missing from the July 29 Workshop that the SAC wanted included in Range of Transit Solutions. The Project Team incorporated your thoughts. Did they get it right?

SAC Comments/Questions

Q: Could one option be existing service but with increased frequency?

A: For existing service (the no change option), the route would be subject to typical LTD service adjustments, which could at some point include increased service frequency if warranted by ridership demand. Enhanced bus options can include frequency improvements.

Q: For Express Enhanced Bus (Option 3) could you consider fewer stops?

A: Yes

Q: At what point with all these options do we think about broader access issues to the street? With the potential additional lanes, what impacts does it have on the ground for bicycles and pedestrian such as crossing distance?

A: That will be considered as part of the evaluation criteria screening.

- The solutions that move through the screening process will have continual refinement.
- The SAC doesn't have to design it but you can determine what it should include and not include.
- The Enhanced Bus Service Freeway Express (Option 4) feels like "scope creep" because we are deviating outside of the corridor.
- That's a good question for the committee. In the spirit of inclusivity, we added it.
Q: Do we have origin/destination numbers from Thurston to the UO?
A: Not at this time.
 - If there was enough ridership from Thurston to UO, it could reduce congestion.
 - That information would be part of the screening process.
 - I'd like to see the ridership numbers for that option. What's the count? Where are people going? Where are people coming from?
- Q: Was this the same route that LTD removed?
A: Yes. That route had limited service (Thurston, downtown, to UO).
- I suggest we leave the Freeway Express option in but we need more analysis of it.
Q: Has there been any analysis of Thurston to Gateway or LCC?
A: The Thurston to LCC connection is part of BRT Option 1. The Thurston to Gateway connection would mean that the remaining two legs, Franklin and LCC, would be connected, which is not a logical or efficient pairing.
Q: How would these options change if the NW Corridor Study results in a connection to the LCC from the other side of 30th?
A: That study would consider any proposed Main-McVay options to LCC. The BRT routes from Springfield and Eugene could be connected at LCC, though there would likely be little through movement for that connection.
- I see this as really about north/south and east/west connections.
Q: Do we need to eliminate any options now?
A: No. The screening process will do that.
Q: Do we have enough options on the table?
A: That is not for the Project Team to say. It is whether the SAC feels the Range of Transit Solutions covers their input.
- If we go with a BRT option, it could take a while for ridership to build and could disrupt current riders. Should we wait until demand is higher?
- Whenever you make a change it affects ridership. It is best to implement the change that benefits the greatest number of riders and let people adjust accordingly. Waiting to make the change does not make the transition any easier.

Recommendation: Range of Transit Solutions to Move into Screening

Stan Biles called for the recommendation.

- Mike Eyster moved to approve proposed Range of Transit Solutions to move into Screening Phase with noted additions to:
 - 1) Enhanced Bus Service options
 - a. Create a solution that combines option #1 (Main St. Enhanced Bus) and #2 (McVay Highway Enhanced Bus)
 - b. Extend Option #1 terminus beyond 69th to 72nd
 - c. Option #4: add "University" to title
 - d. Create more combined options
 - e. Explore frequency increases in Enhanced Bus solutions
 - f. Explore fewer stops for Option #3: Main Street Express service
 - 2) BRT option, East of Bob Straub Pkwy, Main St. to 58th to Thurston to 69th: Change terminus to Thurston High School rather than proposed Thurston/58th roundabout.
- Randy Hledick seconded.

Stan Biles called for further discussion.

- Having none, the motion was put to vote.
- The motion passed unanimously **13 to 0** with David Helton, Lorenzo Herrera, Ken Hill, and Rosalia Marquez in absentia.

4) PNGO & Evaluation Criteria Revisions

Lynda Wannamaker and Stefano Viggiano reviewed the PNGO status:

- **Problem Statement**
 - Added wording to introduction to clarify status of existing transit on the corridor
 - Added information to McVay Highway Segment Problem Statement
 - Clarified that transit demand is seasonal
 - Added information on pedestrian safety issues in McVay Highway Segment
 - Added information on congestion issues in and around Interstate 5 interchange
 - Referenced growth and development expected in Glenwood area
- **Purpose Statement** (previously reviewed and approved)
- **Needs Statement**
 - Provided additional information on current ridership on Main Street Segment
 - Documented pedestrian safety issues on Main Street and McVay Highway segments
 - Documented congestion issues along corridor
 - Added information regarding needed improvements at Interstate 5 interchange
 - Added information on LTD operating expenses
- **Goals** (previously reviewed and approved)
- **Objectives** (previously reviewed and approved)
- **Evaluation Criteria**
 - Added criterion for Objective 1.6
 - Objective: Enhance equitable transit for users without regard to race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, marital status, age, or disability
 - Evaluation Criterion: Distribution of transit service and facility improvements relative to concentrations of minority populations along the Corridor

SAC Comment/Questions:

- It would be good to include both pedestrian and bicycle fatalities.
 - The data does not include bicycle crashes on the entire Corridor.
- Q: Regarding Objective 1.6 why is it referred to minority populations?
A: It's one of the factors we look at because it can be measured.
- Q: Why do we need to have term "minority"?
A: It's part of the Title VI language that the GT used to develop Objective 1.6.
- Q: Do we need to have the data broken out to this degree?
A: It needs to be measurable and able to be collected. Minority communities are measurable populations.
- Q: Where did Objective 1.6 come from?
A: The SAC requested the GT provide guidance to help define "equity."
Q: Can we just do the minimal?
A: Measure that which is available.
- Think statement of equity is important.
 - Only keep things in that are measurable.
 - Use data on those equity issues that we can actually measure.

- Add “low income” to the criteria
- Concern that red lights are not being used in new pedestrian crossings. David Reesor will follow up later.
- Objective 2.4 reads that it is only concerned with the environmental impacts of construction not about the buses themselves (e.g. fuel).
- The analysis of greenhouse gases and environmental impacts relates to that. It will show the reduction of vehicle miles traveled and related GHG reduction.

Recommendation: Proposed changes to Problem, Need, and Evaluation Criteria

Stan Biles called for the recommendation.

- Mike Eyster moved to Approve proposed changes to Problem, Need, and Evaluation Criteria with the following additions:
 - 1) Objective 1.6: add term “economic status”
 - 2) Objective 1.6 Evaluation Criteria: modify language “concentrations of populations along the corridor for which data is readily available”
 - 3) Include data on bicycle fatalities for both Main Street and McVay Highway
- Randy Hledick seconded.

Stan Biles called for further discussion.

- Having none, the motion was put to vote.
- The motion passed unanimously **13 to 0** with David Helton, Lorenzo Herrera, Ken Hill, and Rosalia Marquez in absentia.

5. Upcoming Screening Evaluation

Lynda Wannamaker reviewed the purpose and process of the screening evaluation.

- Purpose: Determine which transit solutions are most appropriate for Corridor and hold most promise in solving identified problems.
- Process:
 - Narrow broader range of transit solutions to smaller range of solutions for further study
 - Evaluates each transit solution in terms of its potential adverse or beneficial effect to project area environment
 - Two steps
 - 1) Step 1: Purpose Needs Goals and Objectives Screening
 - Purpose and Need Screening
 - “Fatal Flaw” screening
 - Gauges *whether or not* transit solutions address PNGO
 - Note this step changed from original plan
 - Modified to include Goals and Objectives
 - Allow for greater scrutiny of options
 - Transit solutions best meeting PNGO should be advanced to next level of evaluation
 - 2) Step 2: Evaluation Criteria Screening
 - Screen transit solutions using evaluation criteria
 - Gauges *how well* transit solutions meet Goals and Objectives
 - Each option scored
 - Data and scoring used to compare and contract transit solutions
 - Narrow range to most promising solutions
- Using available data and resources at this point. No independent research will happen because of time and funding.

SAC Comments/Questions:

Q: Could all solutions move forward?

A: To be efficient with the Study's resources, transit options that are not likely to solve the identified transportation problems should be eliminated from further study. Using the original approach of screening only with Purpose and Need, all solutions would move forward. By adding goals and objectives to the Level 1 screening (fatal flaw analysis) it will help narrow the range.

- The Existing Service Mode (no change) always goes forward through the screening process.

6) Next Steps

Lynda Wannamaker reviewed next steps for the process:

SEPTEMBER:

- September 4: GT Review and Decision:
 - Range of Transit Solutions
 - Problem Statement
 - Needs Statement
 - Evaluation Criteria
- Level 1: PNGO Screening of Range of Transit Solutions
- September 30: SAC Meeting #6:
 - SAC Recommendation: Narrowed Range of Transit Solutions

OCTOBER

- October 9: GT Review and Decision: Narrowed Range of Transit Solutions
- Level 2: Evaluation Criteria Screening of Narrowed Range of Transit Solutions
- October 28: Introduction to Screening Evaluation Process
- November 18: SAC Workshop: Draft Range of Most Promising Solutions

Adjourn

Stan Biles thanked the SAC for their continued good work and dedication.

Resource List:

Mtg. #1

[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

Mtg. #5

See: [SAC Mtg. #5 8-26-14](#) (Memo to SAC re: Range of Possible Solutions) for graphics