

MOVINGAHEAD OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, April 17, 2018

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on April 14, 2018, the MovingAhead Oversight Committee held a meeting on Tuesday, April 17, 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
Mark Bernard, ODOT
Andrew Martin, LTD
Shareen Springer, JLA
Hart Migdal, LTD
A. J. Jackson, LTD
Tom Schwetz, LTD
David Reesor, Lane County Public Works
Rob Inerfeld, City of Eugene
Terri Harding, City of Eugene
Sarah Medary, City of Eugene
Therese Lang, LTD
Denny Braud, City of Eugene
Don Nordin, LTD Board Member
Alan Zelenka, Eugene City Councilor (arrived at 3:12)
Marina Brassfield, Minutes Recorder

Absent: Greg Evans, Eugene City Councilor

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS — Ms. Luftig convened the meeting at 2:10 p.m. and called the roll.

- Introductions

Those present introduced themselves.

- Review Agenda

Before diving in, Ms. Luftig gave a precursor that the meeting was intended to be a discussion, and members should feel free to ask questions or contribute comments throughout the presentations.

- Approve Meeting Summary

Ms. Luftig reported the last time the MovingAhead Oversight Committee was together in person was March 28, 2016, so even though it was two years ago, the group had to approve the summary. She explained the charter for the committee had voting members, but for this purpose an informal head nod would suffice. There were no corrections or objections to the meeting summary, and it was approved by acclamation.

- Reminder of the Oversight Committee purpose and approach

Ms. Luftig reminded the committee that the charter was included within the packet of materials. She reiterated that the charge of the Committee was to provide direction to the project

management team and guide development of MovingAhead projects; to act as liaisons to the decision making body by providing project information; solicit feedback; and to approve a recommendation on prioritization of corridors for multimodal enhancements.

PUBLIC COMMENT —

There was no public comment. Those present in the audience included Rob Zako, Executive Director of Better Eugene-Springfield and Mike Eyster, Chair of LTD's Strategic Planning Committee.

PROJECT AND SCHEDULE UPDATE—

- Update and Schedule

Mr. Henry presented a PowerPoint. He explained since last meeting, LTD had a new board member, Don Nordin, and had hired a new consultant for the MovingAhead project who had a strong understanding of the bottom line related to the community's interest. Mr. Henry explained they had modified the decision making process and instead of selecting a locally preferred alternative for each of the five corridors, they would be looking at packages of investment. Mr. Henry added there would be two more check-ins with the group, as well as with the LTD Board and Eugene City Council. There would be a decision making process near the end of 2018.

Mr. Henry said the Oversight Committee needed to meet in the summer, prior to the LTD board and City Council, prior to publishing the Alternatives Analysis report. The analysis would launch the public comment period. Fall 2018 would feature a second comment period, reviewing modifications made. By the end of 2018, the decision making process should be complete.

Ms. Luftig wondered if there was feedback, and if the timeline seemed appropriate. There were many meetings toward the end of the year, but she thought the schedule was still doable.

Mr. Galloway provided background. He said in many ways, it was an implementation project. As a community, key corridors were discussed around multimodal transit and those goals were embedded in documents like Envision Eugene. In the past, they talked primarily about bus rapid transit (BRT) on main corridors. Now, they were looking at investments to pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. Mr. Galloway explained the project team was considering multiple corridors at one time.

Mr. Galloway said they were looking at Highway 99, River Road, Coburg Road, Martin Luther King Jr., Boulevard, and 30th Avenue to Lane Community College (LCC). It would provide some efficiencies in doing the environmental analysis for all corridors. Another unique aspect of the projects were that city planning, public works, and LTD were all working together. There were diverse perspectives embedded in project management. Lastly, Mr. Galloway highlighted they were making way toward a decision with elected officials to choose a package. He was excited the projects could be scaled in some ways, so there could be incremental progress and investments.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN —

- Activities
- Key messages incorporating community values

Ms. Springer, JLA Public Involvement Inc., provided a PowerPoint presentation on the public involvement plan. Ms. Springer explained JLA was part of the consultant group, and she was part of the team working on the project including Jeanne Lawson and Adrienne DeDona. Ms. Springer

explained the intent of the plan was to build on the success in the previous phase of outreach. She explained the corridor alternatives MovingAhead was looking at were directly based off feedback from public input in 2015. She said taking the options back to the community and allowing them to see how their input was taken into consideration would be important, as well as giving them an opportunity for continued engagement.

Ms. Springer explained there would be corridor specific outreach as well as broader community outreach. She explained that some goals guiding the development of the plan included building on past successes, making sure communication was clear, making sure the decision making process was transparent and digestible, and looking at opportunities to broaden awareness and interest in the project. Ms. Springer said a big foundation of the work was around inclusivity and equity, especially acknowledging there were populations traditionally underrepresented, or populations who might face barriers to participation and looking at ways to reach them.

Ms. Springer explained some past public involvement. JLA was looking at past successes and building on those to determine tools. She said engagement tools were used to increase awareness. One tool JLA started with was an opinion poll, which was to confirm high level messaging and strategies in the plan. From there, they looked at different educational opportunities for people, and then started outreaching to specific property owners and tabling at events.

Ms. Springer said part of JLA's commitment to inclusion and equity was people could follow only the corridor they were interested in or the project as whole. The choice allowed people to save time, and contribute to the pieces most important to them.

Ms. Luftig said one reason MovingAhead was meeting today was because staff would begin to send letters to property owners who may be potentially impacted by an alternative. Then, letters would be sent to businesses and tenants; as well as the full corridor and properties with smaller impacts. Ms. Medary said in each corridor, there were people who had strong feelings about how they had been served by the City or LTD in past. She wondered if there was a plan to sort through those owners and personally contact them. Ms. Luftig said it would be great to get that list. Those top priority property owners would have follow up phone calls. Ms. Medary would like to see the list before sending letters because there were a few property owners off the top of her head.

Mr. Inerfeld asked how many there were. Ms. Luftig said staff estimated between 50 and 100 that were more impacted and then as a total it as closer to 150 to 250. Mr. Inerfeld appreciated what Ms. Medary said; there was one business displaced by Ferry Street Bridge, so they were extra sensitive because they'd already moved one. Ms. Luftig would develop the list and send to senior staff.

Mr. Reesor ask if there were property impacts on the small Lane County pieces. Ms. Luftig said there were not in the 30th Avenue / LCC area where it was county jurisdiction; the only infrastructure after Spring Boulevard was the LCC LTD station. Ms. Luftig thought the City had jurisdiction on River Road up to Hunsaker Road. Mr. Reesor responded the parcels were patchworked. Ms. Luftig would follow up with Mr. Reesor on a couple River Road properties. Mr. Reesor said Commissioner Pat Farr should be involved in communicating with property owners if it was county land. Mr. Inerfeld said there would likely be jurisdictional transfer on River Road. Ms. Harding said Mr. Farr might know of pieces not annexed to the City yet.

Ms. Springer continued that the survey confirmed what was heard in previous phases. Key priorities heard included safety, livability, connectivity, environmental stewardship, and the economy. Key messages were informed by the survey and were included in the agenda packet.

Mr. Henry said the survey supported a triple bottom line analysis that looked at equity, the economy, and the environment. The questions asked of people came from different planning documents the City and LTD had. Staff pulled values that supported the triple bottom line.

INITIAL KEY FINDINGS —

- Review initial findings in each corridor

Ms. Luftig said they were still doing clean-up work and performing the analysis, which took longer than expected because there were so many corridors at once. Staff was currently in the phase of finalizing the analysis and ensuring its accuracy. Ms. Luftig said in general, there were small differences in corridor alternatives. Both options of Enhanced Corridor or EmX could meet the project objectives and serve the community vision. Ms. Luftig said some key areas of interest identified were capital costs and operational/maintenance costs, property impacts, transit benefits (increased riders and improved/maintained transit travel time reliability), trees, and bicycle/pedestrian improvements. Ms. Luftig reiterated the alternatives were not only about transit, but also about making safe corridors for other modes of travel.

Mr. Martin said one thing to note for Highway 99 was the Enhanced Corridor alternative would run down 11th and 13th Avenues but would not include capital improvements, other than crossings. The EmX alternative would use the existing stations on 6th and 7th Avenues and travel up the Highway 99 corridor. Mr. Martin explained the terminus was tentative at that time, as they had not identified an exact location, but the route was modeled to be north of Barger at Cubit Street. The Highway 99 EmX option had significantly higher capital costs, so there were greater transit benefits but also greater impacts. The Highway 99 corridor was differentiated because there was a relatively low number of acquisition and displacement impacts. The total acres were under two and the project would not impact drivethroughs, which they viewed as potential business closures if not mitigated.

Both alternatives had the highest number of pedestrian crossings, so there were lots of safety improvements. He noted the Enhanced Corridor option did not significantly improve bicycle infrastructure, but the EmX alternative did upgrade bicycle infrastructure.

Mr. Inerfeld said widening roads were expensive so it would be interesting to look at tradeoffs for protected bike lanes. He asked whether the pedestrian bridge was included in both options. He thought that was a great benefit because it would greatly enhance connectivity for that neighborhood into the Bethel area. Mr. Henry said during the process, a jurisdictional transfer would take place, which could create more opportunity for space without widening. Ms. Luftig explained that around the Highway 99 option, they heard from Trainsong neighbors that the pedestrian bridge was important to connectivity.

Mr. Martin said the River Road Enhanced Corridor concept would serve the Whiteaker Neighborhood on Blair Boulevard, and then continue out River Road to the new Santa Clara Community Transit Center. The EmX Alternative was projected to use routing along 6th and 7th Avenues and continue to the Santa Clara Community Transit Center. Key findings included that operating costs were somewhat less than Highway 99 and travel time savings were lower but still

significant, when compared to other corridors considered. Mr. Martin said the EmX alternative would be converting a general purpose travel lane to a business access transit lane, a lot like what was done to the West Eugene corridor. Acquisition and displacement impacts were similar in scale to Highway 99, but there would be drivethrough impacts unless they could mitigate them. The options were modeled with travel time savings, so any modifications to mitigate impacts would affect how much travel time was saved. The Enhanced Corridor concept would not reconstruct any bicycle facilities along River Road, but the Emx concept would create protected bicycle lanes from the NW Expressway to Silver Lane. Then, a mixed use path would be created from Silver Lane to Division Avenue.

Ms. Medary asked why there was such a difference in investment in bike facilities between the enhanced corridor and EmX options. Mr. Henry said the shared use path was how to get through the interchange on River Road without requiring some structural modifications under the bridge. There was not room to fit everything in, so bicycle lanes move to a shared sidewalk. Mr. Migdal said the bike pedestrian bridge on Highway 99 had a significant cost as well. Mr. Inerfeld said the protected bike lane was to show two different options. Ms. Luftig said with a BRT level investment, they were touching more of the ROW so there was more opportunity to add to pedestrian and bicycle facilities. It made more financial sense.

Mr. Martin highlighted the EmX alternative on River Road would impact more trees, not necessarily meaning they would be cut down, but concrete lanes could affect growth and roots. The impacts would be mitigated to the best ability, but it was still a possibility. Ms. Luftig said the River Road community prioritized trees. Mr. Galloway added 132 trees on River Road were cherry blossom trees, so there was a lot of community affinity for those; however, urban foresters and city planners said they would not plant those trees now, because they shed a lot of fruit creating a mess, certain hazards, and liabilities. There was an opportunity to plant appropriate species, but they had to be sensitive to the neighborhood's wants. Ms. Luftig said the BRT lane concept came from desire to create a safer facility.

Mr. Martin said 30th Avenue to LCC went down Oak and Pearl Streets, Amazon Parkway, then 30th Avenue to the LCC terminus. Key findings included the lowest capital costs, partially because there was a low level of exclusivity. They designed projects in a way where they did not need to take many lanes or parking to construct improvements. Impacts were concentrated on Oak and Pearl Streets, leaving the downtown area, and included quite a bit of on street parking impacts. They were looking at ways to mitigate them. Mr. Martin explained other proposed projects could lessen impacts. For example, the proposed High Street cycle track, which would create a two way bike lane, was already moving ahead on its own timeline, so many of those parking impacts on High Street would no longer be part of MovingAhead. Mr. Martin said the team also conducted a parking utilization study and only about 53% of parking was used.

Ms. Luftig said LTD had been preemptive in coming up with mitigation options where the analysis showed there were larger impacts, and believed there were key areas in the 30th Avenue to LCC Corridor alternatives where they would propose advancing mitigation options. Mr. Henry said mitigations were not part of the technical analysis, but thought when talking to property owners that they valued parking so the project team wanted to be responsible.

Mr. Inerfeld asked if they had considered issues with bus routes involving the seasonality of LCC. Mr. Martin explained the Enhanced Corridor Alternative was modeled with 15 minute service frequency, and EmX was modeled at 10 minute frequencies. When LCC was in session, there

was servicemore than every 15 minutes. Service planners made sure lots of busses were going there. Mr. Schwetz said the area had numerous routes serve it in different ways. Creating a BRT corridor was an opportunity to look at how service was deployed and how to create better connections. Mr. Inerfeld wondered how to frame the issue in a simple way for community members.

Mr. Martin said the time savings were lowest, and ridership gains were comparable to other corridors. He said there were quite a few tree impacts due to BAT lanes and general construction on Oak and Pearl Streets. Most trees were in the charter tree boundary and LTD would use mitigation tools to not impact charter trees. Mr. Martin explained one difference between the two alternatives was that the enhanced had one enhanced crossing, whereas the EmX option had eight enhanced crossings. Ms. Luftig added enhanced crossings were associated with the High Street Cycle Track, so once the team relooked at the alternatives they may be more similar. With both alternative, the team would have to remove a pedestrian bridge looking over Civic Stadium so a signal could go in at 20th Street, where the road would be pushed through.

Mr. Martin said the relative percentage of pedestrian bicycle improvements was similar in all alternatives, but when projects were scaled up there would be more pedestrian improvements.

Mr. Martin moved onto Coburg Road. The Enhanced Corridor would travel on Oak and Pearl Streets; 7th and 8th Avenues; then out Coburg Road to Crescent Drive, Chad Drive, and Game Farm Road, ending at Gateway Station. There would not be improvements on the corridor beyond I-5 where it turned into Springfield. The EmX used essentially the same routing, but 6th and 7th Avenues instead. Mr. Martin added this corridor option was the only one that would create a unique connection between EmX lines, as it would connect into the existing Gateway line. The Coburg Road corridor was the highest cost as well as the highest impact. There would be two drivethrough impacts, where mitigation would be considered. Property acquisitions were generally strip takes and absolutely necessary to get travel time savings. The travel time was almost identical between both the enhanced corridor and the EmX option. Ridership would see the highest increase for the EmX corridor. Mr. Martin said the Enhanced Corridor had low tree impacts, whereas EmX had significant tree impacts. Again, EmX had the greatest number of enhanced crossings, but not as many bicycle facilities. He concluded it was a big level of investment but there were some significant benefits.

Mr. Martin shared the only option considered for Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard (MLK), which was an enhanced corridor. The improvements ended at the Springfield border at I-5 and transit service continued on Centennial Boulevard. The option would use the Ferry Street Bridge, and improvements would occur after the bridge. He said the corridor was the lowest capital cost, but had the highest operating costs increase for concepts because LTD would add a lot of trips. Mr. Martin said the corridor did not impact many properties or parking. The option was modeled to receive fairly high ridership gains, but again, it would be a big service add so they would expect more ridership.

Ms. Medary said there were a couple new City Councilors since MovingAhead started. She wondered if it would be helpful to do a reminder of why MLK was stopping at I-5. She also wondered if operational efficiency could be created by going all the way through. Ms. Luftig said Springfield would be getting the same service increase, which was one reason why operational costs were higher. She thought it was an attractive corridor for EmX investment but without coordinating with Centennial Boulevard it would be hard to operate. Mr. Schwetz said the service

on MLK would be the same service going onto Centennial Boulevard in Springfield. Mr. Schwetz explained they found in early screening that MLK to Centennial Street had higher density housing and proximity to the city core than other corridors.

Mr. Nordin wondered if there were bicycle facilities adjacent to stops so there were places for bike share, lockers, and other infrastructure. Ms. Luftig said for Emx alternatives, the team spent time trying to identify which stations would benefit from potential long term bike lockers or bike share. They had not clearly defined what an enhanced stop would look like, but knew it was not the same level of investment as an EmX station.

Mr. Henry said as the community invested more in active transportation, they saw more benefit. In addition, the MovingAhead approach was unique because it was scalable, which had not been possible in the past. As the team moved through the process and selected packages of investments, then they would look at a more detailed design.

DECISION MAKING PROCESS —

- Packages evaluation
- Criteria review
- Public comment process

Mr. Zelenka arrived at 3:12 p.m.

Ms. Luftig introduced the decision making process, as it had changed. She explained that instead of discussing a locally preferred alternative and selecting one per corridor then prioritizing them, they were discussing investment packages. More than one mode could meet the objectives of the project and serve the community. It added flexibility in terms of implementation and scalability. Ms. Luftig said it would be important to be strategic in order to make changes efficiently and effectively, especially due to uncertain funding at the federal level. She explained the team thought discussing packages would allow them to see synergies, specifically around ridership increase.

Ms. Luftig said when looking at packages, they were considering the full transit system, which was another benefit. She explained they had “bookends,” so there was a package of all Enhanced Corridor alternatives, and another package of all EmX alternatives plus Enhanced Corridor for MLK. The options allowed them to see all options in the middle and where the best benefit was. Ms. Luftig explained the packages were created through analysis and past public involvement. The team also made some assumptions about which corridors made the most sense to advance at that time; however, Ms. Luftig assured the group, they were essentially starting places for community conversations. The team wanted to bring information to the community for their reaction, then take their input and make refinements to the packages. Ms. Luftig added there would be two public comment periods and the project team needed to be clear in their messaging that it was a starting place.

Ms. Luftig explained there were three additional packages, which had been created to see and experiment where there might be ridership gains or losses. Package A looked at the benefit by providing frequent transit service on 11th and 13th Avenues with an Enhanced Corridor version on Highway 99 and EmX on River Road. For 30th Avenue to LCC, they were looking at an Enhanced Corridor level of investment because there was not a large difference in travel time between the

two options. Ms. Luftig said while it was the most expensive alternative proposed, the team was curious to see the connection between Coburg Road and the Gateway area.

Ms. Luftig said in Package B, the team was curious about modeling what would happen by increasing service on 6th and 7th Avenues. For Coburg and MLK, LTD was considering an enhanced corridor level of service. There were the same travel time benefits on Coburg Road, with less money and less impact, based on the initial findings. Package C looked at synergies when River Road was aligned with 30th Avenue and LCC as one long corridor. Package C was also a lower end level of investment, so there was “no build” selected for Coburg Road and MLK. Ms. Luftig wanted to be clear that “no build” did not mean not ever, it just meant not within the ten year window. Ms. Medary thought the term “no build” should be changed.

Ms. Luftig explained the criteria used for analyzing the packages. She explained the project team would ask the community what they liked about each package. The criteria were developed with an understanding of what the community cared about, and what was important to look at in terms of the system.

Mr. Zelenka asked if they looked at environmental and co-benefits. Ms. Luftig responded all of the alternatives were evaluated through the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. They would be producing the alternatives analysis report. Mr. Zelenka asked how the NEPA information interplayed with the criteria. Ms. Luftig said it was an overlay. The analysis allowed them to understand the on and off street parking and displacement effects from the alternatives.

Ms. Medary asked if they looked at non-transit transportation impacts along the corridors, because many community members would look at whether options impacted their commute, or getting kids to school. Ms. Luftig said that would be a chapter on its own within the report. Mr. Henry said the analysis did not make the decision process easier but it was responsible to perform one.

Mr. Braud asked about how the different alternatives would support corridor development because Highway 99 was different than Coburg Road and 30th Avenue. He was curious how they looked at property values and jobs. Mr. Galloway responded it was pretty high level. There was a greater level of investment with EmX alternatives, and it provided permanent infrastructure, so it gave private investors assurance to invest along the corridor. He concluded it was based on a level of public investment and an expectation of private investment.

Mr. Inerfeld wondered if they looked at the difference around value of land and how it could affect development. Ms. Luftig said that was not in the analysis. Mr. Schwetz said an issue with transit service on Highway 99 was one side of the street had a thin layer of development, and then the rail line. He wondered if thought had been given to what went into that space long term. Mr. Braud said not necessarily, but he wondered what EmX would do to property values along the corridor. He said a project could change the landscape there, whereas Coburg Road was already very economically successful. Mr. Braud said Mr. Inerfeld had a point, since property values on Coburg Road were higher, there could be more potential for continued development by inserting more stimulus. Ms. Jackson mentioned sometimes transit investments were best where property values were low because the transit dependent population generally lived there. It was important to look for opportunities where the investment would be utilized.

Ms. Luftig said at a future meeting, the Oversight Committee would select their preferred investment package of multimodal improvements. She shared the proposed schedule. The target was to decide by the end of 2018 but that timeline could be extended if the decision making process took longer. The next meeting would be at the end of June, so they would need to work on scheduling the meeting right away. During the meeting, they would have additional information on analysis of packages.

Ms. Luftig said another meeting would take place right before the alternatives analysis report was released to the public, in order to share final findings and the executive summary. The last two meetings would be aligned with the end of each of public comment period, so the group could hear feedback and provide recommendations to the City Council and LTD board.

NEXT STEPS AND ADJOURN —

- Review upcoming key milestones

Ms. Luftig said on April 18, 2018 they would present an update to City Council on the project so people were informed of what was coming. She said letters to property owners would be sent, and meetings would occur throughout Summer 2018. The alternatives analysis report would be published in early August 2018. Tentatively, the first 30 day public comment period would start early August and last until early September 2018. The second public comment period would be October to November 2018.

Mr. Henry added after the two public comment periods, there would be a joint work session with the LTD board and City Council. Following that was a public hearing, which was where they saw possible need for additional time for more deliberation.

Mr. Inerfeld asked when the two bodies would first meet. Ms. Luftig said they planned to have a work session prior to release of the alternative analysis. Mr. Inerfeld said there used to be joint meetings of the LTD Board and City Council to discuss areas of common interest; it had been many years since that happened, but it was something to think about separately from the corridor projects.

- Adjourn

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Luftig adjourned the meeting at 3:35 p.m.