

MINUTES OF MEETING
Main-McVay Transit Study
Governance Team
Tuesday, June 21, 2016
Springfield Justice Center
3:00 - 4:00 p.m.

PRESENT:

Governance Team Members:

Christine Lundberg, Mayor, City of Springfield
Marilee Woodrow, Councilor, Springfield City Council
Frannie Brindle, Oregon Department of Transportation
Angelynn Pierce, Lane Transit District Board of Directors
Don Nordin, Lane Transit District Board of Directors
Gino Grimaldi, City, Manager, City of Springfield (Ex Officio)
A. J. Jackson, General Manager, Lane Transit District

Project Management Team:

Tom Boyatt, City of Springfield
Emma Newman, City of Springfield
Tom Schwetz, Lane Transit District

Consultants:

Stefano Viggiano, Parsons Brinckerhoff

1. WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW

Mayor Lundberg called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. and reviewed the agenda. Those present introduced themselves.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 15, 2016, and May 26, 2016

MOTION: Ms. Woodrow, seconded by Ms. Pierce, moved to approve the minutes. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

3. REVIEW PROJECT DECISIONS MADE TO DATE

Mr. Viggiano provided brief overviews of the Main-McVay Transit Study decision log and the project options. He referred to two handouts provided in the packet titled: 1) *Main-McVay Transit Study Decision Log*, and 2) *Main Street/South A Street Segment - Lane Configuration Options*.

Mr. Boyatt added that the planning process was designed to find a balance between impacts and public benefits, which still had to go through the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. He emphasized that goals and objectives continued to be evaluated through every stage. He reported that additional project planning would be completed after a Locally Preferred Solution is selected, which would include NEPA analysis.

Ms. Lundberg requested a summary of comments from one-on-one consultant discussions with business owners on Main Street from Phase 1. Specifically, she requested a thorough summary of business owners' comments and clarity on whether or not EmX was discussed. Mr. Boyatt replied that staff have a summary sheet and were working on specifying discussion topics.

Ms. Brindle noticed that the decision log was missing decisions made throughout Phase 1. She indicated that it would be useful to see all of the decisions for Phases 1 and 2 together.

4. BRIEF SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK RECEIVED AT MEETINGS WITH BUSINESS AND PROPERTY OWNERS FRONTING MAIN STREET AND SOUTH A STREET:

Ms. Newman reported that since the last meeting, an additional 25 meetings took place with business owners on Main and South A streets, and more were planned. She reported that many business owners were relieved that the 116-foot option was removed and were happy with the 96-foot cap. However, there was an emphasis on the need to consider specific site impacts. Many expressed gratitude for the ability to establish a connection with project staff throughout the project and to gain a better understanding of the process. Many reported that safety improvements were critical; however, some expressed resistance to change and argued that no amount of infrastructure could fix human behavior. Business owners reported concerns about the implementation of medians but expressed support for the safety benefits they brought and the left-turn lanes that provided access to businesses. Ms. Newman reported that initial impact analysis found that the 96-foot option avoided touching all buildings east of 21st Street, but there was still a need to consider impacts on parking, circulation, and freight and customer access.

5. DISCUSS MAIN ST AND SOUTH A ST WEST OF 21ST ST ROUTE ALIGNMENT OPTIONS, CONSIDER OPTIONS TO ADVANCE TO TECHNICAL EVALUATION:

Ms. Newman referred the Team to the handout titled: *Main Street/South A Street Segment - Route Alignment Options*. She stated that options C (the 14th Avenue Crossover option) and D (Two-Way South A Option) required a seven-foot expansion (60 to 67 feet) on South A Street. She stated that option D impacted seven businesses on South A Street, which would need design solutions work. She reported that option C impacted an additional 12 properties, including a couple of buildings, between 14th and 21st streets along Main Street. Ms. Newman indicated that option C would bring EmX further into downtown on Main Street, and there were concerns about property impacts and turning movements required with the implementation of this option. Overall, business owners from 14th to 21st streets along Main Street consistently supported option D rather than option C. She added that the handout needed a correction: option D should read, "Westbound travel time: 40-45 seconds faster than baseline," rather than "75-85 seconds". This was due to an additional station delay that was included in the original calculation.

Ms. Pierce asked what the business on South A said about EmX. Mr. Boyatt reported that Main Street was constrained and South A has another lane of capacity. Most South A businesses owners said that they are not project supporters but would be able to live with it. He stated that impacts planned to be addressed through design solutions.

6. DISCUSS AND PROVIDE FEEDBACK ON OPTIONS FOR MOVING FORWARD:

Ms. Lundberg asked about the safety of bus riders crossing the street either coming from or going to the LTD station on South A Street. In response, Mr. Boyatt stated that there were plans to improve street crossings at all LTD stations along South A Street, which would include adding flashing lights for pedestrian crossings.

Ms. Lundberg indicated concern about the bus moving bi-directionally on a one-way street. She inquired about how to account for people not noticing that the bus moved both ways. Mr. Boyatt stated that it would be a traffic control change, and the City's engineering staff were talking about how well it would work and how long it would take for people to get used to it. He said it would require design, signage, and educational solutions.

Ms. Pierce suggested that noise at each intersection crossing to warn pedestrians of an approaching bus might be helpful to implement.

Ms. Woodrow addressed the lack of parking space at the South A LTD station. She stated that option D still had these issues with those driving to the LTD station to take the bus. She emphasized that parking availability needed to be part of the design.

Ms. Lundberg added that if a goal of the project was to encourage more people to utilize public transit and have fewer cars on road, then parking needed to be available for those who chose to utilize the Park & Ride.

Mr. Schwetz reported that surveys done for Park & Rides found that most people headed to the UO drove to catch the EmX. He indicated that should EmX be extended out Main Street, many might get on further east and avoid driving to downtown Springfield, so the number of those parking in the South A LTD station parking lot might increase minimally or possibly decrease.

Mr. Boyatt added that there were discussions of LTD and the City of Springfield partnering on a parking structure.

Ms. Jackson indicated that there needed to be alignment in supporting transit options. She said it was important to consider how to provide options on how to connect transit on major corridors, such as walkability and bike transit. She argued that most chose the options most convenient to them. She added it was important to discourage obstacles that make it more difficult to use transit.

Mr. Nordin asked for clarification about the bike lane options being considered. Ms. Newman referred to the handout titled: *Main Street/South A Street Segment - Lane Configuration Options* and stated that there were no options considering a contraflow bike lane.

Ms. Lundberg said there were options for cyclists other than utilizing Main Street, such as the EWEB Bike Path, and the river path.

Ms. Woodrow reported that there was a population that lived away from Main Street who would find driving to the station most convenient. She also emphasized consideration of those with disabilities who also found a Park & Ride most convenient.

Ms. Pierce emphasized that from a transit perspective, the overall goal was to move people quickly and conveniently. She stated that option D provided less travel time with the least amount of impact.

Ms. Lundberg suggested that the project staff consider option D for technical analysis. Ms. Jackson, Ms. Woodrow, and Ms. Brindle concurred.

Ms. Lundberg also suggested considering and discussing the most minimal design options with the least amount of impact.

Ms. Brindle stated that it was important to provide cyclists with interconnection to public transit. Ms. Lundberg suggested mobility hubs and places to lock up bicycles at LTD bus stations.

Mr. Boyatt reported that the most minimalist option was to implement corridor-based bus rapid transit, which would deploy on Main Street and run in mixed traffic. The design entailed side stations requiring some widening. The process would include locating and building stations, branding the bus, removing the No. 11 bus, and adding queue jumps. It required widening for stations and queue jumps and left other improvements out.

The Governance Team discussed **next steps**, which were summarized at the conclusion of the meeting:

- **Design refocus:** refocus the design team to consider a minimalist design option. Add another option on the handout titled: *Main-McVay Transit Study - Options Advanced for Further Study: As of May 26, 2016*. The option was a minimalist approach, which aimed to retain the current street width and widen only when there was the least amount of impact on business and property, while still working to improve safety. This entailed considering where to add stop stations and queue jumps.
- **Engagement plan:** Ms. Pierce suggested implementing an engagement plan with the community in segments because there were some segments with more safety concerns than others. This plan entailed finding a way to engage business and property owners without having to talk to a lot of individual people by assigning people who could speak on behalf of segments along Main Street. The next step would be to come up with more detailed designs and then meet with groups of people, starting with the most impacted areas then moving to areas where designs were easier to deploy. There were weeks of design solutions meetings scheduled, which could provide opportunities to talk to people in the community and designating area representatives, utilizing a committee structure. Ms. Brindle suggested a cooperative solution strategy in which business and

property owners worked together to come up with solutions. She said that it would be beneficial to facilitate and encourage business and property owners to get involved in safety enhancement and design solutions.

- **Land use and Main Street segment breakdown:** Ms. Lundberg suggested talking to business and property owners about where natural breaks on Main Street took place. Then, those breaks would be compared to and matched up with the breaks determined by the Governance Team, which were based on data of traffic accidents, speed limit changes, and large intersections.

7. ADJOURNMENT: Ms. Lundberg adjourned the meeting at 4:15 p.m.

(Recorded by Emily Mathis)