



Lane Transit District

Public notice was given to
The Register-Guard for publication
on Friday, July 31, 2015

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
EmX STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
Tuesday, August 4, 2015
5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.**

Please note meeting location:

LTD Board Room
3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene
(Off Glenwood Boulevard in Glenwood)

AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Carl Yeh (Chair) | <input type="checkbox"/> Alexis Biddle | <input type="checkbox"/> Frannie Brindle | <input type="checkbox"/> Mike Eyster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Tammy Fitch | <input type="checkbox"/> Gerry Gaydos | <input type="checkbox"/> Gary Gillespie | <input type="checkbox"/> Julie Grossman |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dave Hauser | <input type="checkbox"/> Sid Leiken | <input type="checkbox"/> George Poling | <input type="checkbox"/> Rick Satre |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Josh Skov | <input type="checkbox"/> Hillary Wylie | | |

II. CHAIR'S COMMENTS (2 minutes)

III. AGENDA REVIEW (3 minutes)

IV. MINUTES (Action) (2 minutes)

Minutes from the April 7 and June 2, 2015, meetings are attached for the Committee's review and approval.

V. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

- Public Comment Note: This part of the agenda is reserved for members of the public to address the Committee on any issue. The person speaking is requested to sign-in on the Audience Participation form. When your name is called, please step up to the podium and give your name and address for the audio record. If you are unable to utilize the podium, you may address the Committee from your seat. Each member of the public wishing to speak will have 3 minutes to address the Committee.

VI. FRANKLIN BOULEVARD IMPROVEMENTS (10 minutes)

This agenda item will provide Committee members with an understanding of the coming improvements to Franklin Boulevard and the project's relationship to LTD's existing EmX service and stations. The first phase of redevelopment of Franklin Boulevard is scheduled to begin later this year. This project will rebuild and widen the section of roadway from the Willamette/Springfield Bridge on Franklin Boulevard east to just beyond the EmX Station at Mississippi Street. The existing EmX stations at McVay and Mississippi will be relocated as part of this project and the intersections at McVay and Mississippi will be converted to roundabouts.

VII. MOVINGAHEAD – UPDATE (60 minutes)

At the end of this agenda item, the Committee will have reviewed design concepts for the MovingAhead corridors; be informed of the MovingAhead process for community outreach; and be prepared to review the Level 1 Screening results. At the October 6 EmX Steering Committee Meeting, the group will have the opportunity to review Level I screening results, discuss the next steps for the project, and provide advice to the Board for their consideration.

VIII. VISION ZERO – NEXT STEPS FOR LTD (10 minutes)

This item is intended to get the committee’s input on the questions listed below. LTD Board members and staff will use this discussion as a basis for further discussion at the next Board meeting.

- What more should LTD do to publicly express and explain the importance of safety for a successful transit system?
- At what level could there be productive collaboration between LTD and local partners (cities and the county)? Joint policy declarations? Staff collaboration? Co-development of project criteria?
- Should LTD have a Vision Zero policy or plan? Should it seek to coordinate policy efforts with local jurisdictions or focus on its own policy for now?

IX. UPCOMING LTD GRANT APPLICATIONS (10 minutes)

Currently there are number of grant opportunities available to LTD and its partners. This agenda item will enable Committee members to gain an understanding of LTD’s submittals to the MPO’s STP-U grant program, and plans for the coming *ConnectOregon* grant program.

X. UPDATE ON CURRENT EmX OPERATIONS AND PROJECTS (5 minutes)

The packet includes an update on operation of the existing EmX service. No presentation will be given unless Committee members have specific questions.

XI. OTHER BUSINESS

XII. NEXT MEETING AND FUTURE MEETING AGENDA ITEMS (10 minutes)

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, October 6, 2015. The last bi-monthly meeting for 2015 is scheduled for December 1. Possible topics for this and future meetings include the following:

Topics
Multi-Unit Property Tax Exemption (MUPTEx) and Transit – Is There a Connection?
Bikeshare System and Transit Connection
West Eugene Service Redesign

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

The facility used for this meeting is wheelchair accessible. If any special physical or language accommodations are required, please contact LTD’s Administration office as far in advance of the meeting as possible, and no later than 48 hours prior to the meeting. To request these arrangements, please call 541-682-6100 (voice) or 7-1-1 (TTY).

**MINUTES OF MEETING
LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
EmX STEERING COMMITTEE**

April 7, 2015

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on April 3, 2015, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the EmX Steering Committee for the Lane Transit District held a meeting on Tuesday, April 7, 2015, beginning at 5:30 p.m., in the LTD Board Room at 3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene.

EmX STEERING COMMITTEE

PRESENT:	Carl Yeh, Chair, LTD Alexis Biddle, At Large Frannie Brindle, ODOT Mike Eyster, At Large Tammy Fitch, At Large Gerry Gaydos, At Large	Julie Grossman, LTD Dave Hauser, Eugene Chamber of Commerce George Poling, City of Eugene City Council Sid Leiken, Lane County Commissioner Rick Satre, At Large Josh Skov, At Large
ABSENT:	Gary Gillespie, LTD	Hillary Wylie, Springfield City Council
<u>LTD STAFF</u>	Ron Kilcoyne, General Manager John Evans, Senior Project Manager Sasha Luftig, Development Planner	Tom Schwetz, Planning & Development Manager Dan Tutt, Planning & Development Associate Lisa VanWinkle, Project Communications Coordinator
<u>GUESTS</u>	Bob Macherione Jozef Siekiel-Zdzienicki	Gary Wildish Kurt Yeiter

The document, *MovingAhead, Streets and Places Reimagined*, had been placed at each member's place at the table.

I. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Mr. Yeh called the EmX Steering Committee meeting to order at 5:34 p.m. and called the roll.

II. CHAIR'S COMMENTS

Mr. Yeh introduced Ashley Neet, newly hired at LTD, as Administrative Secretary for the Planning and Development and Service Planning work units.

III. AGENDA REVIEW

Mr. Yeh noted there were no changes to the agenda.

IV. MINUTES APPROVAL

MOTION: Mr. Leiken moved, seconded by Mr. Poling, to approve the minutes of the March 3, 2105, meeting as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

V. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Bob Macherione (Our Money, Our Transit) expressed their strong support for the Frequent Transit Network's (FTN) enhanced corridors approach. He thought an enhanced corridor for all of West 11th Avenue was better than the current EmX design. Mr. Macherione wondered if LTD's move to enhanced corridors had been caused by the resistance to EmX. He noted the best deterrents to future EmX development were current EmX buses taking up traffic lanes and running with low ridership. He advocated for LTD to stop its work on the West 11th EmX. Referring to the Main-McVay Transit Study, he said feeder buses were needed for the Thurston area.

Mr. Gaydos and Mr. Satre joined the meeting at 5:47 p.m.

Jozef Siekiel-Zdzienicki referenced previous discussions regarding corridor connectivity. He said connectivity among routes required a transfer ticket system. Mr. Siekiel-Zdzienicki thought LTD was resistant to using transfer tickets. He advocated for rethinking of that position.

VI. FREQUENT TRANSIT NETWORK (FTN) – PLANNING ISSUES AND BENEFITS

Mr. Schwetz gave a presentation entitled, *Frequent Transit Network (FTN) – Planning Issues and Benefits*. He discussed ways to compare transit options. One was financial, cost per boarding (\$/Bdg). Another was descriptive, listing elements that reduced travel time and attracted riders. Mr. Schwetz showed a draft radar graph where transit options were charted on the variables of equity, economy (job access), community (permanence), efficiency (\$/Bdg), and environment. He noted all transit options (regular service, enhanced corridor, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)) provided equal equity. The BRT system provided the most benefit in the other areas charted. Mr. Schwetz then detailed an approach used by TriMet, in the Portland area, to develop frequent service weighting criteria for decision-making. He described how LTD might adapt the approach. Mr. Schwetz summarized his presentation as giving the EmX Steering Committee members ways to determine which transit option worked best for which routes.

Mr. Skov clarified that the weighting criteria better informed discussions on the progress towards achieving FTN performance. He noted any weighting system was arbitrary.

Ms. Brindle questioned the assertion that all transit options provided equal equity. She noted it was easier and faster for those with disabilities to use EmX.

Mr. Gaydos concurred. He also stressed the importance of the community (permanence) factor. Although he understood the reasons for the enhanced corridor transit option, he had concerns that it

did not address the permanence factor as well. Exclusive right-of-way purchases might be postponed, resulting in higher costs.

Ms. Fitch recalled the unhappiness caused when LTD shifted routes. She advocated for using enhanced corridors where high-density development, e.g., retirement centers, had already occurred. Ms. Fitch also questioned the relative rating of transit options on the environment.

Mr. Leiken said that EmX was a business decision. Its purpose was to get people to a place in a certain time. That goal should take precedence over other considerations, such as equity or multi-modal connectivity. He also questioned using TriMet as a benchmark. Speaking to the benefits of the community factor, Mr. Leiken thought the Franklin corridor improvements provided a test case: Would an improved transportation system foster new development?

Mr. Kilcoyne explained that the FTN was just part of the LTD vision for transit service. He likened it to the “backbone” of the system. Mr. Kilcoyne suggested communities such as Champaign, Nevada, was a better comparable than TriMet. He said that LTD did not have the most robust transit system for a community its size.

Mr. Hauser arrived at the meeting at 6:10 p.m.

Mr. Schwetz recapped that the key issue was how best to align the investment in transit to support the communities’ land use goals.

VII. NEXT STEPS ON MAIN-McVAY TRANSIT STUDY

Mr. Evans gave a presentation entitled, *Next Steps for Main-McVay Transit Study*. He reviewed that the purpose of the study, a collaboration between the City of Springfield and LTD, was to analyze the need, technical viability, and public support for transit improvements on Main Street. Mr. Evans described how the project team had started with 25 options, combinations of transit solutions to the five subareas between Main and 66th Streets to McVay Highway and Lane Community College (LCC), and narrowed the options to those proposed for further analysis. For Main Street, three options were identified: no change, enhanced bus corridor, and BRT. For the McVay portion, two options were recommended: no change and enhanced bus corridor. The recommendations were to be considered by the Springfield City Council on May 4, 2015, and May 18, 2015, and at the LTD Board meeting on May 20, 2015.

EmX Steering Committee members discussed the McVay portion of the study, especially as it related to LCC. Responding to Mr. Satre’s question as to why BRT was not included in the recommendation for McVay, Mr. Evans explained that there was insufficient development in the area to justify the investment in BRT. Mr. Schwetz added that when LCC was not in session, ridership dropped significantly on the McVay corridor. Mr. Satre opined that if the LCC basin were annexed to the City of Eugene, development in the area would justify BRT. Mr. Skov added that the area should be considered an urban reserve even if not annexed in the near future. Mr. Leiken noted that LCC had chosen not to participate in the Envision Eugene process and the LCC Master Plan did not mention annexation. Mr. Poling clarified that there had been discussions with LCC staff about participating in the City of Eugene planning process, but they had chosen not to do so.

Mr. Skov wondered if an enhanced bus corridor was a staged approach to BRT. He also asked why “no change” was part of the recommendation, given the ridership level to LCC.

Mr. Evans responded that the “no change” option was included because it was important to gauge the willingness of the community to accept the changes needed to implement the enhanced bus corridor, e.g., queue jumps and signal priority.

When Ms. Brindle asked what were the next steps for the City of Springfield and LTD Board to adopt the study’s recommendations, Mr. Evans said the study group would further refine the options to one preferred solution.

In answer to Ms. Fitch’s question as to if LCC students currently had to transfer at the Springfield EmX station to take the 11X LCC route, Mr. Schwetz confirmed they did.

Mr. Schwetz referenced the increasing competition for federal funding for transit improvements. He stressed that LTD must demonstrate strong community support for EmX corridor projects.

Mr. Eyster joined the meeting at 6:37 p.m.

VIII. MOVING AHEAD (FORMERLY KEY CORRIDOR STUDY) – OVERVIEW AND RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

Ms. Luftig referenced the document previously distributed, *MovingAhead Streets and Places Reimagined*. She discussed the importance of the *MovingAhead* brand as a consistent component of the public involvement effort and emphasized the project’s two key messages:

- “Residents in our region value transportation that is safe and accessible for everyone whether on foot, bike, a bus, or in a car.
- A safe, accessible transportation system supports great neighborhoods and helps keep us and our economy healthy.”

Ms. Luftig described the workshops to be held in Spring 2015 for the seven corridors under consideration (Beltline, Highway 99, River Road, 30th Avenue/LCC, Valley River Center, Coburg Road, and Martin Luther King (MLK) Jr. Boulevard/Centennial Drive). The community engagement efforts also included presentations to existing community organizations, e.g., Chamber of Commerce, and a revised website (MovingAhead.org). In Winter 2015, up to four corridors would be selected for refined study and review as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Ms. Luftig referred to the Oversight Committee, comprised of representatives from the City of Eugene and LTD Board, discussed at the prior meeting.

When Mr. Yeh asked what role the EmX Steering Committee had in the MovingAhead program, Ms. Luftig explained that the topic would be a standing agenda item for the committee.

Mr. Biddle queried about the definition of a corridor. Did it have to be one of the seven outlined or was it possible for a corridor to be selected that was a combination of segments? Mr. Schwetz replied that a combination was an option.

Mr. Biddle departed at 6:50 p.m.

Responding to Mr. Skov’s question regarding what involvement the City of Springfield had with the project given one of the corridors under consideration extended into Springfield, Ms. Luftig explained that she was meeting with Springfield staff the next day to see what role they would like. She said Springfield was heavily engaged in the Main-McVay Transit Study. Mr. Skov observed that LTD had

done a lot of work already on multi-mode needs identification, and he hoped the process might focus more on the concept development phase.

Ms. Luftig acknowledged that there had been much work accomplished under needs identification. She said it was at a more general level, and the workshops intended to focus on specific solutions for the corridors under consideration.

Mr. Schwetz added that LTD continued to work to improve its efforts to engage residents in the corridor design decision-making processes.

IX. PEDESTRIAN SAFETY AND TRANSIT

Mr. Evans distributed a handout entitled, *Bike, Pedestrian and Safety Enhancements Costs on EmX Projects*. He noted that the costs only reflected construction costs, not design.

Mr. Schwetz highlighted the \$12 million in enhancements, including the \$2 million for pedestrian and bike bridges along West 11th Avenue.

EmX Steering Committee members shared their observations of successful enhancements. Ms. Fitch described the pedestrian safety improvements at the MLK roundabout. Mr. Skov referenced the pedestrian crossing at Alder and 30th Streets in Eugene.

Discussion turned to the Vision Zero initiative, which advocated for improved street design to account for human error. The goal of the initiative was no human fatalities due to traffic accidents (www.visionzeroinitiative.com). Mr. Skov advocated for local jurisdictions to adopt designs that improved safety. He said that Portland and Seattle had Vision Zero plans, and many of their initiatives could be applied here. Ms. Brindle said that ODOT embraced the goal of Vision Zero. She noted that people in urban environments were demanding traffic speeds be lowered (a change ODOT planned to implement on Main Street in Springfield). Ms. Brindle also discussed education and awareness training for bus drivers to improve pedestrian safety. Mr. Leiken pondered if Vision Zero strategies could be applied retroactively to the transportation system.

Mr. Hauser thanked LTD staff for the information. He believed it was important to emphasize the problems that had been solved by the improvements, not only list the expenditures.

Ms. Fitch left at 7:07 p.m.

X. UPDATE ON CURRENT EmX OPERATIONS AND PROJECTS

Ms. Luftig referred members to the *EmX Ridership Update* table in the agenda packet. She noted that the data for March 2015 only reflected ridership through March 30, 2015, not March 31, 2015.

XI. OTHER BUSINESS

No additional topics of business were raised by committee members.

XII. NEXT MEETING

Mr. Yeh asked the committee if they had requests for future agenda items. In response, Mr. Satre commended staff for the topics presented at the meeting. Mr. Schwetz suggested that the June agenda include an update on the Next Steps for the Frequent Transit Network. Mr. Yeh invited committee members to e-mail him agenda item requests.

The next meeting of the LTD EmX Steering Committee was scheduled for Tuesday, June 2, 2015. Additional bi-monthly meetings for 2015 are: August 4, October 6, and December 1.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Yeh adjourned the meeting at 7:13 p.m.

(Recorded by Beth Bridges)

MINUTES OF MEETING
LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
EmX STEERING COMMITTEE

Tuesday, June 2, 2015

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on May 29, 2015, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the EmX Steering Committee for the Lane Transit District held a meeting on Tuesday, June 2, 2015, beginning at 5:30 p.m., in the LTD Board Room at 3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene.

EmX Steering Committee

Present:	Carl Yeh, Chair, LTD Gary Gillespie, LTD Rick Satre, At Large Josh Skov, At Large	Alexis Biddle, At Large Julie Grossman, LTD Dave Hauser, Eugene Chamber of Commerce
----------	--	---

Absent:	Frannie Brindle, ODOT Gerry Gaydos, At Large George Poling, Eugene City Council Sid Leiken, Lane County Commissioner Hillary Wylie, Springfield City Council	Mike Eyster, At Large Tammy Fitch, Springfield City Council
---------	--	--

<u>LTD Staff</u>	Ron Kilcoyne Sasha Luftig Andy Vobora Lisa VanWinkle	Tom Schwetz John Evans Ashley Neet Dan Tutt
------------------	---	--

Guests	Rob Zako, BEST Bob Macherione, OMOT	Rob Inerfeld, City of Eugene Jozef Siekiel-Zdzienicki
--------	--	--

I. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Mr. Yeh called the meeting to order and called the roll.

II. CHAIR'S COMMENTS

Mr. Yeh reminded those who wished to speak during audience participation that a yellow light would indicate when the speaker had 30 seconds left to conclude his or her remarks.

III. AGENDA REVIEW

Planning and Development Manager Tom Schwetz asked to postpone Item IX: West Eugene Service Redesign to a future meeting. There were no objections.

IV. MINUTES

This item was postponed as there was no quorum.

V. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Bob Macherione, Eugene, representing Our Money, Our Transit (OMOT), said his group had been invited to sit in on the stakeholder committee for the Main-McVay Transit Study. He said there were 17 members of the group and 12 represented public entities. He said one of the representatives was Mike Eyster, former LTD Board chair, who was representing Better Eugene-Springfield Transit (BEST). He felt that BEST was a shill for LTD and should not have been represented in the group. He said Randy Hledik, who was the head of Wildish Land and Development Company, should not have been on the committee either because his company was the contractor for the West Eugene EmX Extension project. He saw that as a conflict, and it should not have happened. He did not feel the public was being represented and should know about the conflict. He said the stakeholder committee should be composed of actual property owners, not public entity people with a predisposed opinion. He said former LTD Board members should not be on stakeholder committees. He objected to the stakeholder committee's composition.

Mr. Skov asked about LTD policies regarding conflict of interest disclosures. He said there should be transparency about the primary affiliation of those on stakeholder groups. Mr. Kilcoyne pointed out that the Main-McVay Transit Study was a joint project with the City of Springfield and not exclusively an LTD initiative. Mr. Schwetz said he would report back on the conflict of interest policies.

VI. FREQUENT TRANSIT NETWORK (FTN) - CONTINUED DISCUSSION

Mr. Schwetz said the Frequent Transit Network (FTN) had been adopted by the cities of Eugene and Springfield and by LTD in its Long-Range Transit Plan. He said the concept of enhanced corridors embodied a spectrum of services and capital investments that could facilitate the efficient movement of transit vehicles through congested corridors. He used a PowerPoint slide presentation to compare elements of bus rapid transit (BRT) with enhanced corridors. He posed the following issues to committee members for discussion:

1. How frequent transit leverages community visions for growth
2. Ways in which LTD can employ corridor enhancements (queue jumps, transit signal priority, etc.) to maintain efficient transit operations along congested corridors until the point that broader community goals and corridor development opportunities warrant investment in BRT
3. At what point might broader community goals and corridor development opportunities warrant investment in BRT

Mr. Satre observed that any one of the three issues could be the topic of an entire meeting. He hoped the extensive amount of long-range planning by jurisdictions in the region included consideration of the issues Mr. Schwetz had highlighted.

Mr. Skov asked that the slide presentation be distributed to committee members as it contained useful information about FTN and BRT. He asked if staff could provide a crosswalk with the characteristics of a corridor, and current or anticipated transit volumes, to better inform discussions of the three issues. He commented that BRT was the only FTN option that required frequency, high capacity, reliability, and lower operating costs; and he wanted to assure that people were not given a false choice of having everything on a corridor except BRT.

Mr. Schwetz said the spectrum of service could be looked at as gradually increasing levels of capital investment. He said the full BRT option took considerable time and capital expense to realize and

represented the long-term vision; FTN represented more immediate options for gaining efficiencies and increasing ridership on corridors that could not be achieved through regular bus service.

Mr. Kilcoyne said that determining the demand for service and the level of service a corridor could support was addressed in a study Nelson/Nygaard completed for the District last year. A copy of that study could be provided to committee members.

In response to a question from Mr. Yeh, Mr. Schwetz said the objective of the agenda item was to engage in a discussion of the role of transit in creating mixed-use neighborhoods and supporting other strategies reflected in regional planning efforts.

Mr. Skov emphasized the importance of sharing a clear message with the community about how transit fit with land use and community planning efforts.

Mr. Hauser said it would be helpful to have brief excerpts from regional plans that indicated how transit related to community goals such as housing density along transit corridors and downtown revitalization. He said those could provide talking points as well as assurance that LTD was aligned with the work that had been done.

Mr. Satre agreed that it would be helpful to have a matrix of local long-range planning efforts and the role of transit in each of those to provide a framework to help the committee understand when and where transit was being discussed in the community.

Mr. Yeh asked the staff to consolidate the information in a condensed format that would provide easy reference for committee members.

Mr. Skov asked to hear from the staff on the types of communications tools that were useful in conveying a true and compelling message.

Mr. Gillespie said the committee was looking at seven different corridors and West Eugene EmX. The key was how to connect people to West Eugene EmX and the final recommendations on the corridors. He said that was a major task. When he attended the corridor workshops, it was clear that participants wanted some type of enhanced transit and improved connections.

VII. MAIN-MCVAY TRANSIT STUDY OUTCOMES AND NEXT STEPS

Senior Project Manager John Evans illustrated the scope of the project with a map of the study area. He said it was divided into two segments: the Main Street corridor and the McVay Highway. The project's steering and governance committees identified overcrowding, lack of capacity, and safety as projected problems on the corridors, particularly on Main Street. The project was charged with determining the need and technical viability of studying the future of transit on the corridors. Steps included developing the project's need and purpose, identifying a range of feasible solutions, and winnowing down that range to a list of the most promising solutions.

Mr. Evans said three options were considered for each corridor:

- No change in current service
- Enhanced bus - somewhere between regular service and bus rapid transit
- Bus rapid transit (BRT)

Mr. Evans said all three options were recommended for the Main Street segment and only the first two options were recommended for McVay Highway, without BRT. The recommendations for both segments were approved by the Springfield City Council and the LTD Board of Directors. The next phase of the project would include robust community involvement, identification of a locally preferred alternative, and determination of readiness to enter project development and environmental review.

Mr. Hauser asked if the potential funding sources had been identified for the next phase. Mr. Evans said some unspent funds from the first phase could be carried forward, but additional funds would be required.

Mr. Schwetz said staff would need to outline a rough scope of work for the next phase and estimate costs. The unspent funds would be insufficient for the next phase. He said the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) was beginning its cyclical allocation process for Surface Transportation Program-Urban (STP-U) funds and the Main-McVay Transit Study would be an eligible project. He said once staff has developed a rough scope of work the City Council and Board of Directors would be asked if that was acceptable, with the understanding that the project would ultimately result in the need to make a future decision about investment. He said staff would need to move quickly in order to take advantage of the STP-U funding cycle if additional funds were needed. More detailed information on the project's next phase would be available at the next Steering Committee meeting.

Mr. Skov commended staff for their public involvement process. He asked what had been learned about communicating the spectrum of service options and to what extent did land use planning play a role in those discussions. He hoped that LTD would formulate a position on safety relative to the Vision Zero initiative as that was a much a part of the planning process and broader vision of the community as land use issues.

Mr. Skov left the meeting.

Mr. Evans said the Main-McVay Transit Study was moving forward in concert with a number of other Main Street vision projects the City of Springfield had undertaken. He said there was a definite correlation between land use, the City's desire for continued growth, enhanced density and livability along Main Street, and the critical nature of high capacity transit as a part of that. How that evolved would be the next phase of the study. He said safety issues were a major concern shared by those involved in the projects. He said it would be up to the Steering Committee to direct staff on how, and to what extent, it wished to be involved in the next phase of the study so that could be included in the scope of work.

Mr. Gillespie commented that the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) had discussed Main Street safety issues at its last two meetings and would likely continue the conversation at future meetings.

Mr. Yeh said a discussion of the committee's interest in the next phase of the study would be on the agenda for the next meeting.

VIII. MOVING AHEAD - SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS

Transit Development Planner Sasha Luftig said five corridor-specific community workshops were held over the last two weeks. The workshops introduced participants to the long-range plans developed by regional partners and their connections to transit as a tool to help the community achieve its vision for how to accommodate future growth. An overview of the decision-making process was presented so the public could understand where the key decision points were and when their input could be given. She said the initial seven corridors would be narrowed to four during this initial screen phase; the selected corridors would then move through an evaluation process to identify preferred alternatives. She said participants were asked to identify needs along the corridor, barriers, opportunities, and a vision of what the corridor should be like in 20 years in order to be successful. She distributed design materials that were used during the workshops and asked if those who attended had found them useful.

Mr. Biddle said the materials were very helpful, although occasionally participants became bogged down in too much detail.

Mr. Gillespie observed that in the workshops he attended people stayed within the right-of-way boundary during design exercises. He said the South Eugene corridor was the most complex and in each of the workshops participants felt that corridor should move to the next phase.

Mr. Yeh remarked that people were very engaged in the workshops, and the exercise of trying to fit options into the existing right-of-way was very educational.

Ms. Luftig also distributed a handout entitled *Preliminary Purpose and Need, Goals and Objectives*. She asked committee members to review the document and provide feedback. She reviewed the next steps in the project, which would involve compiling information from the workshops and developing corridor concepts for presentation to the public at open houses. Information received at the open houses would be compiled, and after a technical analysis, the Project Management Team would make a recommendation to the Oversight Committee about what corridors were ready to move forward to the evaluation phase. The Oversight Committee was composed of representatives from the LTD Board and city councils, and senior staff from the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), the cities, and LTD.

Mr. Hauser asked at what stage of the process fiscal constraints would be addressed. Ms. Luftig said that would occur next summer when locally preferred alternatives were identified.

Mr. Schwetz commented that the concept was new to the region, and agencies were trying to determine how to work together to integrate planning and visioning activities, including fiscal issues, to deliver a multi-modal transportation system.

IX. WEST EUGENE SERVICE REDESIGN

This item was postponed to a future meeting.

X. VISION ZERO, PEDESTRIAN SAFETY, AND TRANSIT

Mr. Schwetz said that Mr. Skov had suggested the agenda item. Vision Zero was an initiative that began in Sweden. The purpose was to change how transportation safety was approached based on the concept that no loss of life was acceptable. He said Seattle and Portland both had Vision Zero plans, and HB 2736 in the Oregon legislature proposed formation of a Vision Zero Task Force for the state.

Mr. Schwetz asked the committee to begin a conversation about what role LTD could play in assisting cities in their efforts to plan a safe transportation system. He said Seattle's website made it clear that transportation safety should begin with the design of the system and not place the onus on users of the system. He pointed out that EmX investments included many safety enhancements.

Ms. Grossman believed a good starting point would be a policy statement from the LTD Board consistent with the Vision Zero concept. She said the Vision Zero initiative would encourage all transportation planning agencies to speak the same language and strive for a common goal.

Mr. Biddle said that Vision Zero was a new approach to road design. Previously roads were designed for through-put and mobility; this would make safety a top priority. He agreed with Ms. Grossman's suggestion for a Board policy.

Mr. Gillespie liked the concept of safety being an integral part to any transportation system and concurred that LTD should have a statement and vision for a safe system.

Mr. Yeh read an excerpt from the Seattle Vision Zero goal statement, which embodied concept and qualities of a safe transportation system. He also agreed with the importance of having an LTD Board policy on the issue. He determined there was consensus among committee members to encourage the LTD Board to develop a policy.

Mr. Biddle suggested that when investigating a crash involving LTD vehicles we should also include an examination to determine if system design elements were factors in the accident.

Mr. Schwetz commented that while bus pull-outs were not usually a desirable option, they were critical on higher speed facilities to avoid having buses rear-ended at stops. Pull-outs were a design feature to enhance safety along certain sections of corridors.

Mr. Yeh said it would be helpful to the committee members to better understand various design options in LTD's system that were specifically intended to increase safety. Mr. Schwetz said he would have LTD staff come to an upcoming committee meeting to discuss system design elements. Mr. Evans said LTD worked closely with the City of Eugene during the West Eugene EmX design process to identify safety issues and design solutions in the high capacity corridor.

XI. UPDATE ON CURRENT EmX OPERATIONS AND PROJECTS

West Eugene EmX Communications Coordinator Lisa VanWinkle said that one of the goals of the West Eugene EmX project was to incorporate what had been learned about a good urban forest design that would support and maintain travel capacity on busy roadways. She said key aspects of that effort were choosing trees that would thrive in the local urban environment and sites along the

corridor, and providing those trees with a suitable growing situation that would assure a long and healthy life. She said many of the trees removed along 6th and 7th Avenues were a single species; the new trees would have greater diversity with 42 different species, none of which would represent more than 10 percent of the total.

Ms. VanWinkle said that 260 trees were slated for removal; 160 have been removed to date. Those trees would be replaced with 460 new trees. She said that all wood from removed trees was being used locally in a variety of ways. She identified a number of locations along the corridor where tree planting was in progress.

XII. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

XIII. NEXT MEETING AND FUTURE MEETING AGENDA ITEMS

The next meeting was scheduled for August 4, 2015.

Future agenda items:

- Public outreach
- Integrating transit and community visions for growth
- MUPTE and transit
- Glenwood Franklin project

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Yeh adjourned the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)



EmX Ridership Update

January 2007 through June 2015

