

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT  
MOVING AHEAD MEETING

Tuesday, July 12, 2018

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on July 5, 2018, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District held a Moving Ahead meeting on Tuesday, July 12, 2018, beginning at 2:00 p.m., at the Next Stop Center, 1099 Olive Street, Eugene, Oregon.

Present: Zach Galloway, City of Eugene  
Chris Henry, City of Eugene  
Sasha Luftig, LTD  
Hart Migdal, LTD  
AJ Jackson, LTD  
Tom Schwetz, LTD  
Rob Inerfeld, City of Eugene  
Terry Harding, City of Eugene  
Sarah Medary, City of Eugene  
Therese Lang, LTD  
Don Nordin, LTD Board Member  
Adrienne DeDona, JLA  
Marina Brassfield, Minutes Recorder

Absent: Denny Braud, City of Eugene  
David Reesor, Lane County Public Works  
Mark Bernard, ODOT  
Greg Evans, City of Eugene  
Alan Zelenka, City of Eugene

**WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS** — Ms. Luftig convened the meeting at 2:08 p.m. and called the roll.

- Introductions

Those present introduced themselves.

- Review Agenda and purpose

Ms. Luftig said the purpose of the meeting was twofold. First, to share findings of the technical analysis; the analysis had been worked on for multiple years and would soon be released. Second, to discuss the outreach approach for MovingAhead; staff had received feedback that outreach could be improved, so they were looking for direction.

Don Nordin arrived at 2:11 p.m.

- Approve meeting summary

Mr. Nordin moved, seconded by Ms. Brindle seconded, to approve the April 2018 meeting summary as presented.

**PUBLIC COMMENT** —

Rob Zako said it was an exciting time for transit and LTD. There was lots of great work being done, but projects were confusing to the greater public and communication needed to improve. It seemed MovingAhead was the same thing as Transit Tomorrow. Mr. Zako thought as a collective body they needed to take an extra effort to explain the differences between the two projects. Secondly, Mr. Zako believed there was a logical hierarchy of decision making because Transit Tomorrow was taking a greater look at Eugene's entire transit system to determine whether it should stay the same, or should be rethought and changed significantly. Logically, it made sense to know that decision prior to making an investment decision. Mr. Zako concluded MovingAhead should keep going forward in their work, but that they should postpone a decision on an investment package until an initial decision was made by Transit Tomorrow.

Pat Hocken was present on behalf of BEST and echoed Mr. Zako's comments.

Ryan Harper – was unaware of the projects. He lived near 29<sup>th</sup> and Alder Street and received a notice in the mail about them, but didn't see any useful information online only that there were "proposed corridors." He wanted to know about the plans and whether they would significantly impact his neighborhood. Mr. Inerfeld said they would look at some of those questions that day. Ms. Luftig said one intent of the letter was to schedule one on one's with property owners.

#### **PROJECT AND SCHEDULE —**

- Review MovingAhead purpose and approach

Mr. Galloway provided an update for members. He noted the information would be presented later that month to elected officials, board members, and city councilors. Options were being evaluated and staff were putting together different packages of investment. Mr. Galloway reported they also met with the sounding board who helped refine the public involvement approach. He explained sounding board membership was made up of folks from different boards and commissions throughout the City, and members helped to ensure there was clarity in graphics and presentations. Mr. Galloway explained staff sent letters to property owners affected and so far had six one on one meetings and over ten phone calls. They would also table at a River Road community event to share information.

- Discuss changing approach based on Sounding Board feedback

Mr. Galloway noted the sounding board pointed out it was a long ongoing project, and in many ways an implementation project of long term planning. For professional planners, the process felt linear but community members needed a better story and understanding of the work done over the past 20 years. Mr. Galloway said the "bigger story" was rooted in the Transportation System Plan, Envision Eugene and other land use plans, and LTD's long range transit plan. All of the plans highlighted the need for extended transit network across the metropolitan area. Mr. Galloway explained MovingAhead was considering five routes/areas: Highway 99; River Road; Coburg; MLK; and Downtown to 30<sup>th</sup> Avenue. They were not only looking at solely transit, but also at improvements for walkers and bicyclists, such as sidewalks and bicycle infrastructure. In addition, both EmX and enhanced corridor options were being considered.

Ms. Brindle wondered if Statewide Transit Improvement Program (STIP) funding could help expand rural connectivity. Ms. Luftig thought rural connectivity tied into Transit Tomorrow, because that project considered how routes and services connected. The five major corridors would not change, so Transit Tomorrow was considering how to connect those routes to make it easier for people to use them and how to make transfer points more obvious. In response to a request from Mr. Inerfeld, Ms. Brindle explained what STIP funds were and said they were

collected from payroll taxes. Ms. Medary added STIP funds were very inflexible. Ms. Jackson said the new payroll taxes were to provide enhanced services for low income individuals, but they were not intended for existing services already funded by local jurisdictions. Ms. Brindle added the proposed routes had points on their exteriors that could connect to Creswell or go up River Road toward Junction City. Ms. Luftig agreed, and said it would be much easier for those folks to plug into the system without needed to go downtown first. Mr. Migdal said there had been a shift in service from Eugene to Veneta to provide more frequency. With the expansion of EmX, passengers were able to get into Eugene more quickly due to additional transfer points.

Mr. Galloway said in the past, the City and LTD had looked at one route at a time causing the project to take six to 10 years per a corridor. He highlighted they were looking at multiple corridors at the same time; he thought it was essential public knew they were trying to gain efficiency by looking at all five during the technical analysis phase. Mr. Galloway added that the high level conceptual designs allowed them to pinpoint community wide issues and short term projects, making them more scalable over time, which was exciting because they could advance projects incrementally.

Ms. Luftig added the alternatives first began because of feedback from the community; the sounding board reminded them it was very important to effectively change the current community conversation. Mr. Henry said a little over three years ago, there was a workshop in which they asked people to envision what they wanted to see in their neighborhood and community 20 years out into the future. In addition, people were asked how they traveled places and if there were barriers to them meeting their individual needs as well as their values like sidewalks, street trees, and more. That workshop led directly to the preliminary design concepts shared, then the establishment of an environmental footprint and technical analysis over past year and half.

Ms. Luftig explained the packages of investments were brought to the sounding board, which strongly recommended starting outreach to each of the individual corridors. They thought the packages would become confusing if all were brought forward at the same time. In addition, the sounding board recommended holding off on completing the packages until the initial round of corridor specific open houses were complete. Ms. Luftig asked MovingAhead if members thought the advice was appropriate. Ms. DeDona encouraged members to think about Ms. Luftig's question during Ms. DeDona's presentation on the outreach process. Mr. Henry added the project management team would be sharing the recommended process to LTD's board and City Council in the near future.

Mr. Inerfeld wondered if it would be helpful to articulate the thinking behind the recommendation. Ms. Luftig explained initially, they decided a preliminary summary on the potential investment packages would be helpful to the community so members could begin thinking about the different pieces and providing input. However, a lot of information had already been shared with the public, but it had been a while since they were deeply engaged in MovingAhead. It was decided that sharing information on trade-offs for each corridor first to receive input, and then move to the conversation of packages would be most beneficial for community members. Mr. Henry said that recommendation was reinforced during one on one meetings with property owners. In general, they appreciated the overall systematic view of the transit system, they were very concerned about how the projects would directly affect their financial interests. Ms. Luftig noted the sound board didn't appreciate that staff had already come up with packages; they thought it could be seen as disingenuous to the process, even if the work was only used as a starting point which would be refined as public input was received.

- Review schedule

Ms. Luftig shared the 2018 timeline and pointed out, due to scheduling issues, they were a little behind. Staff planned to release the public analysis in mid-August 2018 and then have open houses in September 2018. Ms. Luftig said the current schedule could possibly shift into 2019.

#### **PRELIMINARY INVESTMENT PACKAGES —**

- Review findings from initial evaluation of investment packages

Ms. Luftig explained time was spent analyzing the preliminary investment packages. She asked Mr. Viggiano to share the initial findings. Mr. Viggiano clarified staff was calling them “preliminary investment packages” because they expected them to change after hearing feedback at open houses. Mr. Viggiano explained there were 72 different possible investment combinations but only a few were considered for each corridor. He shared the 15 criteria used during evaluation.

One thing Mr. Viggiano wanted to discuss was possible criteria eliminations including return on investment, service frequency, and displacement. He added there could be the possible combination of the two bicycle/pedestrian criteria, as well as the possible combination of on and off street parking criteria to end up with 10 total.

Mr. Nordin asked about the metrics on return of investment (ROI). Mr. Viggiano said they looked at potential benefits, like ridership. Each of those benefits was given a one through five rating. They then looked at every criterion that provided a benefit and divided its cost by the capital cost of the project. Mr. Nordin wondered if ROI included safety. Mr. Viggiano said yes. Mr. Nordin asked about home value and the effect on other properties. Mr. Viggiano said effect of property value was difficult to measure so it was not included.

Mr. Viggiano explained the three preliminary investment packages for the five corridors. Options were labeled A, B, and C. One package was a low level investment on all five corridors; on the opposite end of the spectrum, there was a package that included doing EmX on four out of five corridors. He added the options were developed at the staff level to show a representative combination, but there were many possible alternatives that could be considered.

Mr. Galloway added the sounding board saw options A, B and C for the five packages, and they understood the accompanying analysis. They thought A, B, and C looked like functional packages to take forward, but they were concerned it would appear the project was all predetermined. Mr. Galloway said they proposed to back off A, B, and C and come up with different packages based on the first round of public engagement. Ms. Medary did not think the slide Mr. Galloway shared provided useful information to community members. Ms. Luftig agreed; it was complicated, and the graphics were intended to help decision makers.

Mr. Nordin appreciated that the McVay Highway/Springfield connection to LCC and 30<sup>th</sup> Avenue would be a possible future development, however, there was no discussion about Springfield on the maps. He thought there could be placeholders, for example, so the public knew they were taking other things into consideration, like Springfield and rural areas. Mr. Henry shared a map included in all literature created for the project, which included McVay Highway and Main Street. Mr. Nordin asked if LTD staff was working with City of Springfield staff to connect the projects. Ms. Luftig said yes, it was their intent. She added ideally the infrastructure investments would be identified all at once but it was complicated to do that because there were different partner agencies with different jurisdictions.

Ms. Brindle clarified the sounding board recommendations were to discuss two options with each corridor community. Ms. Luftig responded no, they recommended bringing all alternatives including the no build option. The options to be presented were based on technical analysis and comments from the community thus far.

Mr. Viggiano walked through the five options, as listed within the PowerPoint presentation included in the Agenda Packet. He said one advantage of looking at five corridors together was to look at how the service was connected. Mr. Viggiano discussed details about how each option would affect ridership and connectivity of the system. He noted the EmX package was the opposite of an enhanced corridor because it required a higher level of investment and had higher operational costs, but provided greater benefit.

Mr. Viggiano pointed to package A results. Green meant EmX routes, while gray indicated enhanced corridor. Ms. Brindle clarified 30<sup>th</sup> Avenue to LCC was enhanced corridor, not EmX. Mr. Viggiano said yes. Ms. Brindle thought EmX could not be linked to enhanced. Mr. Viggiano explained and said in that particular case, Highway 99 was linked with 30<sup>th</sup> Avenue so it was an enhanced corridor linking to another enhanced corridor. Mr. Viggiano then explained package B and package C results, and explained the summary rating and key.

Mr. Henry said one thing the sounding board was related to costs. If the no build option was included in a corridor package, that could affect costs. The person who commented thought lower costs equated to the best solution to the community, as people would generally pick the lowest collection of investments. Mr. Henry said that was not staff's intent; they wanted to provide a range of choices in order to understand trade-offs. Mr. Nordin clarified the model showed a million extra riders per year with the EmX option. He thought that was quite an improvement in service to the community. Mr. Viggiano responded yes.

Ms. Medary asked how staff determined green, yellow, and red classifications. She wondered what they were measuring and what they wanted to deliver. Mr. Viggiano said each criteria were looked at individually. The criteria was not weighted, it was based strictly on numbers. Ms. Medary thought it was subjective to have one criteria be more desirable one less. She was unsure if desirability of certain items was based on comments from the community. Ms. Luftig thanked her for the feedback and explained "desirability" was based on the decision makers' weighing of criteria. She wondered if that was appropriate. Ms. Medary thought so, but would move away from categorizing items by green, yellow, red. She didn't think public employees should rank options, and should only share the numbers and the facts, unless they heard from the community what they wanted. Ms. DeDona wondered if the icons themselves were okay. Ms. Medary didn't have an issue with that she simply didn't like the wording included. Mr. Henry said added they were avoiding having a table of text and numbers. They wanted icons to provide value. Ms. Medary also said she wouldn't number the criteria; she was unsure a community member would be so concerned about cost, for example. They might be more concerned about displacement or equity. She wanted to ensure they were not putting too much of their personal-professional judgement into the criteria to ensure authenticity.

Mr. Viggiano thought within categories, there was good and bad that everyone could agree on. Ms. Medary didn't agree. Ms. Harding said there was a lot of talk about trade-offs, and agreed she would stay away from most and least desirable. Ms. Luftig said they could come up with a different term. Ms. DeDona suggested the scale could be more about meeting project goals.

Mr. Viggiano wanted feedback on the criteria. He also asked members to think about the most obvious federal funding sources for the projects. Mr. Inerfeld asked whether the alternatives would be given graphics for the metrics as well. Ms. Luftig said the graphics were mostly the same. Mr. Inerfeld thought travel time and daily ridership could be explained in more tangible ways.

Ms. Medary thought elected officials would want the criteria to be viewed in a triple bottom line framework. She thought equity criteria was not well described. In addition, Ms. Medary did not have an opinion whether there were 10 or 15 criteria, but thought if the five extra helped the storyline they should be kept. Mr. Inerfeld said infographic information on all packages would also be available for people to dive deeper into. Ms. Luftig clarified if Mr. Inerfeld thought the numbers on displacement were necessary for the packages. Mr. Inerfeld said Ms. Medary made a good point that they wanted people to see there was a small number of displacements. He wanted people to be aware. Mr. Inerfeld asked if there had been discussion around social equity criteria, and wondered how to capture it. Ms. Luftig responded yes, and said the challenge was that providing more service wasn't necessarily better on an equity perspective. She thought there could be a way to pull out information more explicitly. Ms. Brindle said at the federal level, they wanted to know the impacts to the low income population when compared to other incomes. Mr. Inerfeld thought part of the challenge was it was nuanced because Eugene wasn't as separated as other communities by income. Ms. Luftig said income was not a big differentiator, but was still important for people to understand. Mr. Henry posed that dollars invested per acre community member could be a concern.

Ms. Luftig asked if members had qualms about combining some criteria. Mr. Inerfeld assumed they were pretty similar. Mr. Viggiano said yes. Ms. Medary asked if the sounding board had weighed in on combining criteria. Ms. Luftig responded they had not weighed in on what to combine. There was discussion about criteria. Mr. Inerfeld didn't necessarily want changes, but he thought travel time was very valuable because people wanted to spend less time on trips. He saw additional ridership as another benefit. Mr. Inerfeld wondered if demographic data was available on current ridership for each corridor. Ms. Luftig said yes, it was part of the analysis. Mr. Migdal said they looked at demographics whenever there was a change in service to ensure there wasn't a disproportionate impact to those communities. He added during the most recent analysis, they looked at overall demographics of the corridors but not specifically of riders. The last time LTD specifically looked at ridership demographics was 2015.

Ms. Harding appreciated a shorter list of criteria because it was easier to read and less cumbersome, but she liked detail and didn't want them to lose any. She suggested presenting them in multiple ways. Mr. Inerfeld felt opposite. Ms. Luftig would bring the feedback to staff so it could be incorporated.

#### **OUTREACH STRATEGY, EVENTS, AND INFORMATIONAL MATERIAL —**

- Review infographics
- Review key messages
- Review calendar of activities
- Review sequence of open houses and what feedback will be sought from the community

Ms. DeDona provided an update on public involvement activities. Outreach was beginning, as technical work wrapped up. In addition, community opinion polls were complete which showed values of the community and some informed key messages to prepare materials and hit on the

right things for the community. JLA wanted to test those values in the outreach process during open houses to ensure what they heard was still true and resonated with the community.

Ms. DeDona explained they revised website content, sent several email updates to stakeholders, and posted on social media platforms. In addition, outreach to impacted property owners and sit down meetings were underway. The plan was to next contact community groups to schedule presentations, such as neighborhood associations. Ms. DeDona shared they had also began tabling; included on page 60 of the Agenda Packet was a calendar of events where they would have a presence. Additionally, JLA would schedule listening sessions to have focused discussions with important stakeholder groups. If members had specific groups in mind for those session, Ms. DeDona wanted members to let her know. Ms. Luftig added the sessions were also an opportunity to target groups that didn't necessarily have time or opportunity to attend an open house. Specifically, they would focus on historically underserved communities.

Ms. DeDona said the report would be release in August 2018, and they would have these events in conjunction with the first 30 day public comment period. Finally, to close the feedback loop, there would be a community wide open house in November 2018.

Ms. DeDona said JLA wanted to package results into easily digestible graphics for community members and decision makers. She wanted members to evaluate the proposed graphics to ensure they were understandable and approachable. Ms. DeDona pointed to the graphics within the agenda packet. Each corridor had similar presentations that included corridor specific information. She hoped to hear MovingAhead members' perspectives.

Ms. Medary asked Ms. DeDona to describe the jobs and populations item. Ms DeDona said the area identified jobs and populations served; the wording needed more explanation. Ms. Luftig added that N/A would be an option for folks that would indicate no build. Ms. Jackson commented that the shading so close together in the key, it was difficult to tell if she lived in that area she would wonder whether actions had already been determined. In addition, unless the graphic was explained to her she wouldn't be able to figure it out; she wondered if a cover letter was needed. Ms. Jackson wondered how the general public would digest the information to determine whether the proposed projects would affect them. Ms. DeDona understood Ms. Jackson's concern, and said each graphic or brochure was not meant to be stand alone; during open houses and meetings there would be other accompanying information and staff to answer questions. Ms. Luftig added that an executive summary would be created and staff would ensure everything was clearly explained. Ms. DeDona said there would also be a video to tell the story of the project.

Mr. Nordin liked that idea, and thought an embedded YouTube that pointed out details would be beneficial. Mr. Inerfeld noted some of the graphics showed an intersection with a q-jump but that was not mentioned anywhere else so he thought staff should more closely consider how that concept was introduced. Mr. Inerfeld knew staff was asking for the public's feedback on no build, enhanced corridor, or EmX, but he wondered if staff was also soliciting comments on the more detailed designs. Ms. Luftig said staff was trying to capture the issue during one on ones, and it was a question they wanted to pose at open houses. The issue was they would not be making changes to the designs. The analysis had been done and the next phase was project development phase. Staff did not want to set up false expectations. Mr. Inerfeld thought asking for feedback wasn't making a commitment, and he thought those comments would inform the group moving forward. He also didn't want people to miss an opportunity and feel like they couldn't provide feedback. Mr. Henry said they wanted to hear everything people had to say.

Ms. Harding appreciated the “cheat sheet” included in the last page of the Agenda Packet, which illustrated the different options. Ms. Medary suggested adding a narrative to bottom of page. Ms. DeDona said they would plan to add more information. Mr. Nordin reiterated the focus of MovingAhead and Transit Tomorrow; he said they were creating an EmX loop near Gateway to Coburg Road and it made sense to connect them at some point in the future. He thought when staff presented the information there could be some narrative for future development.

Ms. Harding left at 4:52 p.m.

Ms. Dedona said additional feedback could be sent to her after the meeting. Finally, Ms. DeDona shared one different perspective of looking at same information. The graphic showed how modes and options stacked up together against the criteria. JLA ended up thinking the graphic could be too complex for public outreach opportunities, but maybe useful to decision makers. Mr. Inerfeld said the other perspective made it easier to compare alternatives but he would not show it to the greater community. Mr. Schwetz said the criteria were measured by least performing to best performing, so the lines would look the same in a big circle if the corridor was meeting all the right criteria.

Ms. Medary added that during a presentation, there was a word cloud and one city councilor thought it was gimmicky. Her point was if staff felt something truly would help clarify the projects she would include it. Otherwise, she would not. Mr. Henry said it was ironic, because staff had tried to find more creative ways to share information in more intuitive ways. Ms. Medary told MovingAhead that Council would ask questions about how the proposed plan helped implement climate recovery, housing affordability, and Vision Zero. She thought it should be included as criteria in their presentation.

#### **NEXT STEPS AND ADJOURN —**

- Review upcoming key milestones
- Adjourn

Ms. Luftig shared upcoming outreach events. She said there was a joint work session scheduled for July 25, 2018 where they would likely do a deep dive on items mentioned that evening and process for public engagement. She asked if it seemed appropriate for an update after the work session update. MovingAhead members thought so.

Ms. Brindle left at 4:01 p.m.

Ms. Jackson thought another meeting on the communication process might be beneficial. Ms. Medary was also concerned that neither of her voting members were present at that day’s meeting. Mr. Inerfeld thought they could ask the Council and Board about the outreach process during the work session. Ms. Medary thought that was a great idea.

Ms. Jackson and Ms. Lang left at 4:03 p.m.

Mr. Henry said there was a sponsor meeting at 11:15 p.m. thon Monday. Ms. Luftig said they were hoping to have one more oversight committee meeting and she was working to schedule that meeting.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**



Ms. Luftig adjourned the meeting at 4:05 p.m.