



*Lane Transit District
P. O. Box 7070
Eugene, Oregon 97401
(541) 682-6100
Fax: (541) 682-6111*

**Joint Meeting
LTD Board and Eugene City Council
February 23, 2004 - 5:30 p.m.
Council Chamber, City Hall; 777 Pearl Street, Eugene**

Agenda

LTD staff who will be present: Ken Hamm (can sit at the table with Dennis Taylor). Mark Pangborn, Stef Viggiano, Diane Hellekson, Andy Vobora, and Linda Lynch will sit in the audience near the front. There will be an extra chair at the council table for staff if they are asked to present or answer a question.

- 1. Welcome/Introductions** – Mayor Torrey, LTD Board President Hillary Wylie
 - Board members will be asked to introduce themselves. At least one councilor asked for a brief self-description, which should include a description of the subdistrict you represent, how long you've been on the board and perhaps one more sentence on who you are.
 - Hillary can explain proposed agenda – spend 30 – 40 minutes on BRT but still have time to talk about service, downtown transportation issues and finances before finishing by 7:15. Allow time for councilors to talk, ask questions, get answers.

- 2. Bus Rapid Transit (40 minutes)**
 - Update on Franklin Corridor (schedule, vehicle) – Pat Hocken
 - Refer to timeline included in packet
 - Corridor design is 99% complete;
 - Construction can begin soon; will begin in Springfield
 - Vehicle status

 - Update on Pioneer Parkway Corridor – Pat Hocken
 - Preferred alignment has been selected for part of the corridor; environmental work is underway; working closely with Peace Health to be at new hospital's front door and to continue group pass partnership. (this is the route the council chose before Peace Health ever selected this site)
 - Seeking federal funds

 - Coburg Road BRT Planning – Susan Ban, George Poling
 - Susan - Why Coburg was chosen and process to date – There were many reasons for selecting the Coburg Road corridor as the next Eugene BRT corridor. This corridor formed a loop with Pioneer Parkway allowing a complete system to be put in place, with the ability to travel in both directions.

- Process to date – began in March 2002 when LTD Board approved Coburg Road as next Eugene corridor, at the request of the city council.
 - Stakeholder report – in packet
 - George - Identified issues - George
 - Next steps: None for LTD because funding for the project is not on six year horizon; local match is not available.
- Funding – Pat Hocken
 - Requesting \$31 million in federal funds in reauthorization of TEA 21, for Pioneer Parkway, plus \$4 million for BRT vehicles
 - Both House and Senate versions of the new transportation bill continue the 80%/20% federal to local match, but give preference to overmatch.

3. Service Planning (20 minutes)

- Funding Challenges – Pat Hocken
 - LTD is dependent on the payroll tax for about $\frac{3}{4}$ of its operational budget; revenues are very flat, reflecting the nature of the local economy. For the coming year, like the city, we are facing large increases in health insurance and retirement costs. The ATU contract expires the end of this fiscal year and must be renegotiated.
- Service reductions process and schedule – Dave Kleger

Annual route review – LTD is considering adjustments to current service that would equal about 3-4% of its service. Next year, without economic rebound or change in some financial circumstance, we will consider larger reduction. We've held one public hearing; there will be an open house Feb. 26; there has been a lot of media coverage, and there will be another public hearing in March. We plan a more extensive outreach beginning in May before students leave for the summer, to begin discussions about 05 reductions. In addition, we will have better data on which to make those decisions.
- AVL/APC Project – Dave Kleger

There is some information in the packet about AVL and APC. LTD is currently testing and tuning its implementation of an electronic technology known as the AVL/APC project. The terms AVL (Automatic Vehicle Location) and APC (Automatic Passenger Counting) are associated with a suite of computer based applications collectively referred to as Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS).

Each vehicle in LTD's revenue and service support fleet is equipped with an array of electronic devices connected to a computer. This on-board system controls radio communications, changes destination sign messages, provides information to the driver relevant to schedule performance and LTD system status, makes visual and audio ADA announcements. Of most interest right now is that it collects data such as time of day, geographic position, direction of travel, speed, vehicle equipment status and the number of people who board and

exit the vehicle each time the doors open. This will guide future service decisions.

4. Downtown Transportation Issues (15 minutes)

- CATS – Gerry Gaydos
 - The biggest battle for us is running times. Every change in street and intersection design has an impact on us, and we have to figure it into the system. We remain concerned about the conversion of the rest of 10th Street to one way – we have commented on that formally. This is not just because of BRT but because we are concerned about access to the station. This affects the whole system.
- Federal Courthouse – Gerry Gaydos
 - We are often asked whether we'll serve the new federal courthouse or how we'll serve it. The answer is yes, the courthouse will be served by LTD. If we were proceeding on the Coburg Road BRT corridor, it might become part of that. It may become part of a Breeze route, but that will be more clear when transportation improvements are fully designed and constructed – and when there is a facility to serve.
- Breeze - Gerry Gaydos
 - Ridership statistics are in the packet. They're very good. Challenges are that it is very successful; we bought small hybrid electric buses – largely at the council's urging for smaller cleaner buses. They are too small to meet the needs of the university population, forcing us to alternate with larger buses. The vehicles themselves have been a challenge. They represent new technology and are frequently in the shop. Breeze is still 25 cents!

5. Adjournment



Lane Transit District's BRT Vehicle

At the June 18, 2003, Board of Director's meeting, staff were directed to proceed with contract negotiations with New Flyer of America, Inc. to procure five Invero vehicles for the bus rapid transit (BRT) project. The new Invero is a 60-foot articulated, advanced-design transit vehicle. It has a more streamlined exterior, similar to a light-rail vehicle. New Flyer has recognized Lane Transit District as leaders in the industry for BRT design and innovation. They are enthusiastic about being the first domestic manufacturer to enter this new market.



Features

- 60-foot articulated
- Domestic manufacturer
- Hybrid-electric propulsion
- Modular composite body
- Stainless steel frame
- Doors on left and right side
- Built to accommodate automated guidance system
- Cost: Approximately \$966,000
- Delivery date: Summer 2006
- Prototype delivery: December 2004
- Bikes on board
- 2 wheelchair bays
- 47 seats
- 100 maximum capacity



Lane Transit District

Long Range Financial Projections (FY 2004-2012)

2/23/04

Attached you will find comparative payroll tax information in charts detailing gross receipts since 1988 and a history of rate changes. Also attached is a summary of an eight-year financial projection of the LTD operational and capital budgets. This spreadsheet uses the most accurate projections and data available for LTD revenues and expenses and is the base financial planning document for the District.

Explanation of attached spreadsheet:

1. Major assumptions are listed at the top of the page and highlighted in yellow.
2. The projections in the top half of the page cover operational revenues and expenses.
3. The projections in the bottom half of the page cover capital revenues and expenses.
4. The numbers highlighted in light blue indicate how much money must be annually transferred from the General Fund to the Capital Fund to meet the minimum federal match requirements of LTD's federal grants. All federal grant funds must be matched with a 20 percent appropriation of local, non-federal funds. The blue transfer amount is the minimum match required for the federal funds that LTD anticipates it will receive and spend that specific year.
5. The numbers highlighted in orange represent the expenditures that must be cut from the operational budget in order for the budget to balance in the eight-year projection period and maintain a minimum operation reserve for working capital and self-insurance set asides.
6. The pink numbers represent the amount of resources, federal/state/local separate from local match, which LTD must acquire in order to fund Pioneer Parkway EmX (BRT). LTD is projecting the cost of the 20 percent local match as part of the proposed expenditures, but the other 80 percent has yet to be obtained.

Simply put, this projection indicates that if the operational budget is reduced \$1,800,000 over the next three years, and LTD can control the growth of expenditures consistent with the assumptions in these projections, the remaining operational budget will balance for the subsequent five years. The capital budget can be accomplished if 80 percent of the cost for the Pioneer Parkway EmX can be obtained outside of LTD's current revenue stream.

Memorandum

Date: February 12, 2004
To: Mayor Torrey and City Council
RE: Central Area Transportation Study

Subject: Staff Response to Council Questions and Issues on Transit Raised at December 1 Work Session on the Central Area Transportation Study

This memorandum includes excerpts from the City of Eugene Staff memos addressing Council questions and issues raised at the December 2003 work session and the January 26, 2004, public hearing regarding an update to the adopted 1993 Central Area Transportation Study (CATS). These particular issues were addressed by both LTD and Eugene staff in preparing a response to Council. The numbers refer to the number of the item in the larger memo on all issues raised at the December work session.

Staff responses are shown in ***italicized text***.

3. Councilor Bettman suggested that the terms “shuttle” and “BRT” were used interchangeably in the document. She said that they are not interchangeable, as each has a very different purpose.

Staff Response: *Staff agrees that a shuttle and BRT are not the same thing. However, Lane Transit District considers shuttle service as a “connector” service to the BRT system. Along with planned neighborhood connector routes to the BRT main corridor routes, the existing shuttle, as well as a future shuttle serving the new Federal Courthouse District, are considered part of the BRT system.*

As a closed system, a shuttle provides a very different transportation solution than a BRT system. When combined with BRT and fixed route service, it is part of an integrated transit system providing mobility options for the community. As described, the shuttle feeds or links to the BRT system. It is this context in which the terms are used in the discussion of the Proposed Implementation Strategies 7.1 and 7.3.



Lane Transit District

P.O. Box 7070
Eugene, Oregon 97401-0470

3500 East 17th Avenue
Eugene, Oregon 97403

Phone: 541-682-6100
Fax: 682-6111
TTY: 800-735-2900
E-mail: ltd@ltd.lane.or.us
Internet: www.ltd.org

4. Councilor Bettman noted that several streets were “recommended as future BRT routes” on the Transit System Discussion Map (Map 5) and in Implementation Strategy 7.4 and suggested that BRT was essentially a commuter system that was not appropriate for residential streets, including those shown on Map 5 and listed in Strategy 7.4.

Staff Response: *In developing proposed routing of BRT in the downtown area, streets were selected based on the desire to provide direct routing into and out of the downtown area. Streets selected include streets that currently are transit routes into downtown, such as Washington Street, Jefferson Street, 10th Avenue and 11th Avenue. Multiple BRT routes would use the same routing in the downtown area before branching out to separate routes serving different areas of Eugene. The streets shown on Map 5 as potential future BRT routes provide the connection between the Eugene Station downtown to the main BRT routes. While BRT would not likely provide stops in residential areas within walking distance of the downtown Eugene Station, it will provide service from residential areas to cross-town destinations.*

5. Councilor Bettman asked if the adoption of CATS by the City Council will give tacit approval for the potential BRT routes outlined in implementation Strategy 7.4 on Page 55 of the document.

Staff Response: *The BRT routes shown are part of a future system being planned as envisioned in TransPlan. Acknowledgement of these streets as future BRT routes in the CATS document provides the opportunity for coordinated transportation planning of City transportation improvement projects with proposed transit improvement projects. Consideration of transit in street improvement projects is critical, particularly with projects including street widening, sidewalk improvements, or on-street parking. There will be more detailed planning to come before the exact location and timing of BRT implementation occurs. The current routing represents the best vision of the BRT system at this time and may be subject to change in the future with more detailed planning. LTD will continue to work with the City of Eugene on BRT planning, and the City Council will have the opportunity to provide input into planning decisions, including routing decisions. As with the Franklin corridor, City Council approval will be sought prior to implementation.*

6. Councilor Kelly asked staff to clarify proposed Policy 8 on Page 13 of the document. He said that while the policy addresses the need for balance in providing adequate parking, that there was no mention of transit, pedestrian, and carpooling factors that could lower the demand for parking.

Staff Response: *Retaining the spirit and the policy foundation of the 1993 document, CATS is essentially about continuing to implement alternative modes initiatives begun more than 10 years ago. The alternative modes factors that lower the demand for vehicle parking are specifically addressed in Policies 4, 6, 7, and 10, which propose strategies to provide a balanced transportation system for pedestrians, cyclists, transit users, and alternative*

transportation system promotion respectively. CATS, taken as whole, seeks to provide options to automobile travel and, therefore, create conditions that result in a reduction in parking demand.

8. Councilors Kelly, Meisner, and Bettman all suggested that the CATS document include a trolley study as an implementation strategy, as was done in the Downtown Plan.

Staff Response: *The Eugene Planning Commission determined, after considerable discussion, that the fixed rail trolley/streetcar concept is, in fact, a potential economic development strategy. The Commission also acknowledged the conclusion reached in an earlier study conducted as part of the TransPlan Update, that the trolley concept, as discussed, would not provide cost-effective transportation service. That study, referenced in the TransPlan materials as the Urban Rail Feasibility Study, concluded that trolley service provided an economic development tool that typically served a tourist or commercial interest in providing circulation to specific tourist or downtown destinations. In a survey of other downtown U.S. areas served by trolley systems, the service was, in most cases, at least partly, if not fully funded and operated by private interests, such as hotels. Urban rail systems were included in the study as a potential transit solution to reduce congestion and increase mobility within the urban area. While the study agreed that urban rail systems can indeed provide transportation options to meet that goal, it concluded that urban rail systems most appropriately serve urban areas with significantly greater population and employment densities than those projected in the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area within the TransPlan planning horizon. The study further concluded that it would be extremely difficult for Eugene-Springfield to compete for federal funding dollars needed to develop an urban rail system given population and employment densities. The recommendations of the study were to consider an enhanced bus system, such as bus rapid transit, that was an appropriate transit solution for the transportation goals of reducing congestion and increasing mobility for a mid-size metropolitan area.*

As part of the TransPlan process, the study was incorporated into the development of a transit strategy. The transit strategy developed was Bus Rapid Transit. In developing the Bus Rapid Transit strategy in TransPlan, it was agreed that a trolley system does not meet the specific goal of providing a transportation solution for reducing congestion or increasing mobility within the 20-year planning horizon of the plan. For this reason, the Planning Commission recommended that a trolley study not be included as a CATS implementation strategy, but be included in the Downtown Plan as an economic development tool. If Council identifies funding, a new study could be undertaken to re-evaluate the feasibility of a trolley system.

14. Councilors Bettman and Meisner suggested that transit language should be generic and not specifically identify the Breeze, but rather refer to a downtown shuttle service.

Staff Response: *Staff can replace reference to the Breeze with more generic “downtown shuttle service” in the final document.*

**Staff Response to January 26, 2004, Public Hearing:
Transit System**

Testimony offered related to Bus Rapid Transit operational issues, Bus Rapid Transit planning and downtown shuttle routing.

Lane Transit District (LTD) articulated operational concern for the operation of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) on Eugene streets, specifically 10th Avenue. Staff generally concurs with the recommendations and continues to meet with LTD staff to work through the operational details in a cooperative and collaborative manner to ensure that, in particular, the operational efficiencies of the BRT system are not compromised.

BRT along the Coburg Road corridor was planned in TransPlan (adopted 2002) as part of a metropolitan area-wide transit system as one of several general alignments. Specific study of the corridor is currently in progress with a stakeholder group. The Eugene City Council will be discussing the study on February 23, 2004, and will have an opportunity to provide direction prior to further study of the Coburg Road corridor. In addition, Council approval will be sought prior to implementation of any future BRT corridors.

From Proposed Implementation Strategy 7.2: “Evaluate the feasibility of adding a transit connection to the existing bicycle and pedestrian facility that connects 6th Avenue and 7th Avenue on Willamette Street.” And the discussion: “The viability of this connection is unknown and must be studied in more detail before a decision is made to pursue the connection. Staff recommends that the City conduct a feasibility study to evaluate impacts...”

The details of planning, design, impacts, and potential benefits and construction cost would be addressed through a future feasibility study. Any associated rerouting of the downtown shuttle would be addressed by the study. Adoption of the CATS document itself would not pre-approve the construction of the project; it only identifies the project as one needing further study.

The Eugene Planning Commission, on October 27, 2003, modified the Proposed Implementation Strategy 7.3 in the Draft 2003 CATS to delete the second sentence of the discussion as follows:

“Discussion: A future Breeze shuttle route will likely be considered within the next five to ten years. ~~A possible transit river crossing near Autzen Stadium could be considered for routing options for the second Breeze shuttle.~~ The addition of a second shuttle could affect transit routing within the downtown area...”

The CATS draft as considered by the Eugene City Council no longer contains reference to a transit river crossing.

Bus Rapid Transit Project Schedules

1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

Franklin Corridor (Phase 1)

Detailed Planning														
LTD Bd/CC/BCC Rev.		★												
Environmental Review														
Jurisdictional Approval			★											
Final Design														
Construction														
Test System														
Service Start								★						

Pioneer Parkway

Detailed Planning														
LTD Bd/SCC Review					★									
Environmental Review														
Jurisdictional Approval						★								
Final Design														
Construction														
Test System														
Service Start										★				

Coburg Road

Corridor Study														
LTD Bd/ECC Review						★								
Detailed Planning														
LTD Bd/ECC Review									★					
Environmental Review														
Jurisdictional Approval										★				
Final Design														
Construction														
Test System														
Service Start														★

EUGENE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY



Work Session: Joint Meeting with Lane Transit District Board of Directors

Meeting Date: February 23, 2004

Agenda Item Number: B

Department: Public Works

Staff Contact: Mark Schoening

www.ci.eugene.or.us

Contact Telephone Number: 682-5243

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: [Agenda Item Number]

Deleted: [Department]

Deleted: [Staff Contact]

Deleted: [Staff Phone]

Deleted: ¶

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

On February 23, 2004, the Eugene City Council will meet in joint session with the Lane Transit District (LTD) Board of Directors. The session was requested by Lane Transit District.

Deleted: ¶

BACKGROUND

Council Action History

Joint meetings of the council and the LTD Board occur every two to three years. The two agencies are partners on many projects and intergovernmental committees. In May 2001, the council recommended a preferred alignment for the first bus rapid transit (BRT) corridor, from downtown Eugene to downtown Springfield, and in February 2002, the council directed that LTD investigate Coburg Road for its next Eugene corridor.

Deleted:

Deleted: Council

Deleted:

Policy Issues

There are several issues to consider:

1. Should the council and LTD reconsider the next Eugene BRT corridor?
2. What design elements of bus rapid transit are the most important or produce the most results?
3. Does the City have a role in financing bus service or capital improvements?
4. Is LTD planning new central area service when the federal courthouse is built?

Deleted: Council

Council Goal Action Priority

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

A community that retains a high quality of life and a healthy economy, effectively links land use and transportation planning, and successfully manages growth and change in the urban environment.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, Italic

Financial and/or Resource Considerations

Lane Transit District received \$6.75 million in federal FY 04 appropriations to complete the downtown Springfield transfer station. Some of the funds will go toward construction of a new administrative and garage facility for RideSource. For the future, Lane Transit District is seeking federal funding for the Pioneer Parkway bus rapid transit corridor in the surface transportation bill under consideration in Congress. The first Eugene-Springfield corridor was funded with Federal Transit Administration funds as part of the TEA-21 in 1998. The Pioneer Parkway line would be the second BRT line of what is expected to eventually be a network of several BRT corridors serving the community. LTD also is seeking \$4 million in federal participation for the vehicles needed for the Franklin BRT corridor.

Deleted: -

Formatted: Right

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

Deleted: Eugene City Council - Page 3 - Agenda Item Summary - February 23, 2004

Federal funds require at least a 20-percent local match. The long-range financial plan included in this packet assumes a gradual increase in the payroll tax rate. LTD's payroll tax rate is authorized and limited by state law. The rate of \$6 per \$1000 of gross payroll was established in 1969 and remained unchanged until the 2003 legislative session. During the last session, LTD (and TriMet) secured an increase in the rate to \$7 per \$1000 of gross payroll, with a ten-year phase-in period. The law now allows the district to increase the rate to \$6.10 in year one, \$6.20 in year two, etc. LTD has a history of not collecting at the full rate unless needed, and that history is shown in one of the attached charts. Payroll tax revenue represents about 65 percent of all LTD revenue, and it is used for both operations and capital match.

Deleted:

Deleted:

Deleted: District

Other Background Information

Lane Transit District currently is testing and tuning its implementation of an electronic technology known as the AVL/APC project (Automatic Vehicle Location and Automatic Passenger Counting). The terms are associated with a suite of computer-based applications collectively referred to as Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS). The U.S. government assists financially with implementation of these systems to improve the quality and capacity of the country's transportation infrastructure. Transit systems use this technology to manage service, develop appropriate future service, and for timely communication about the status of service to the public.

Deleted: Intelligent

Each vehicle in LTD's revenue and service support fleet is equipped with an array of electronic devices connected to a computer. This on-board system controls radio communications, changes destination sign messages, provides information to the driver relevant to schedule performance and LTD system status, makes visual and audio ADA announcements, collects data such as time of day, geographic position, direction of travel, speed, number of people who board and exit the vehicle each time the doors open and vehicle equipment status. The data is forwarded in real-time via a private radio link to a system of computers at LTD's Glenwood facility. Drivers benefit in the form of reduced workload, while the public reaps the benefit of a more user friendly public transit system. The benefit of having timely and relevant data to assist in management and development of LTD services is the motivation and reason to develop this project.

See attached materials for other information.

ATTACHMENTS

A. Bus Rapid Transit

- Council Resolution No. 4670, approving the BRT pilot project
- EmX Update
- Lane Transit District's BRT Vehicle
- Pioneer Parkway Summary Brochure
- Bus Rapid Transit Project Schedule
- Coburg Road Stakeholders' Report

Deleted: genda

B. Financial Issues

- Long-Range Financial Projections
- Comparative Payroll Tax Information
- Summary Projections for meeting

Deleted: genda

Deleted: Long-Range Financial Plan

- Deleted: Bus Rapid Transit:
 - Council Resolution No. 4670, approving the BRT pilot project
 - EmX Update
 - Lane Transit District's BRT Vehicle
 - Pioneer Parkway Summary Brochure
 - Bus Rapid Transit Project Schedule
 - Coburg Road Stakeholders' Report

Formatted: Right

Deleted: Eugene City Council - Page 3
Agenda Item Summary – February 23, 2004

C. Service

- Ridership, Service, and Service Area Population
- Ridership Data
- LTD Rider Demographics
- Bicycle Counts for LTD

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: ¶
Financial Issues¶
- Long-Range Financial Projections¶
- Comparative Payroll Tax Information¶
- Summary Projections for Long-Range Financial Plan¶
¶

D. Downtown Transportation

- Transit System elements of the draft June 2003 Central Area Transportation Study
- Planning Commission recommendations
- Staff responses to questions raised by City Council of transit elements

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: commission

Deleted: city council

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Staff Contact: Linda Lynch or Stefano Viggiano at Lane Transit District
Telephone: 682-6100
Staff E-Mail: Stefano.viggiano@ltd.lane.or.us; linda.lynch@ltd.lane.or.us

Formatted: Right

-- DRAFT --
EUGENE CITY COUNCIL QUESTIONS FROM THE JOINT MEETING
February 27, 2004

Scott Meisner

1. **Since it is apparent that LTD will not be able to have full build-out in the next 20 years, what is LTD's current projection on how much of the BRT system will be built in 20 years; i.e., a revised plan by corridor of how BRT will be built and when. Can you integrate the realities and opportunities of transit and BRT into your long range plan? Can you articulate it in a way that we can see it there? Would you publish and distribute that? (Stef)**

The build-out of BRT is dependent on funding and on community acceptance. From a funding standpoint, it seems unlikely that federal funds would pay for more than one corridor every six years (the length of a transportation authorization bill). It also would be difficult to accumulate the required local match any faster than that schedule. Assuming that there is community support for the corridors, the 6-year-per-corridor schedule would mean that three additional corridors would be built within 20 years: Pioneer Parkway by 2008; Coburg Road or some other corridor by 2014, and a fourth corridor by 2020.

2. **Will a non-guided bus require wider lanes or right-of-way (ROW)? (Mark P)**

ANSWER #1: Yes, and the initial corridor has been built so that the EmX vehicle can operate on the exclusive bus lanes without guidance. There were at least two reasons for doing so: (1) Bus guidance is very new and there are only two operable systems available worldwide. One is a mechanical system requiring continuous curbs and that option was not acceptable to the road engineers. The other system uses optical guidance, and it is new enough that there is not enough operating experience to give safety engineers confidence in its reliability. (2) If the guidance system were to fail, the back-up is manual operation so the system was designed for manual operation.

ANSWER #2: LTD continues to pursue in automated guidance and is working with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Partners for Advanced Transit and Highways (PATH), a research group associated with the University of California at Berkeley, on an automated guidance system. However, it is likely that the system will not be developed in time for the start of the Franklin Corridor. Thus, lane widths have been widened somewhat so that the system can operate with manual steering for an interim period. The lanes will be 10.5 feet, which is still narrower than the 12 foot lanes which would otherwise be considered a standard for this corridor. The original concept, with guidance, was for 9.5 foot lanes.

There has also been a question regarding the "grass strip" in the middle of the BRT lane. Decisions regarding locations where the grass strip can be added is not related to automated guidance, but whether the lane is physically separated from other traffic lanes. If the BRT lane has a physical barrier (curb or median) that separates it from other traffic, then a green strip can be added whether or not there is automated guidance. If non-BRT traffic can traverse or drive into the BRT lane, then the grass strip could cause the vehicle to lose traction and lose control. The current design retains the green strip on the lanes on Franklin Boulevard west of Interstate 5 since those BRT lanes are physically separated from other traffic lanes.

ANSWER #3: LTD continues to be interested in automated guidance and is working with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and Partners for Advanced Transit and Highways (PATH), a research group associated with the University of California at Berkeley, on an automated guidance system. However, it is likely that the system will not

be developed in time for the start of the Franklin Corridor. Thus, lane widths have been widened somewhat so that the system can operate with manual steering for an interim period. The lanes will be 10.5 feet, which still is narrower than the 12-foot lanes, which otherwise would be considered a standard for this corridor. The original concept, with guidance, was for 9.5-foot lanes.

3. Shouldn't LTD be at the table with the cities and the county on use of road funds? (Linda)

Yes. LTD will pursue participation in these discussions.

David Kelly

1. Does the City want a decent transit system for 20, 30 or 40 years? (Ken)

It is clear from policy direction provided by the City Council that the City of Eugene is very interested in improved transit service. BRT emerged as part of the TransPlan process as the most cost-effective choice for improved transit for our community. It will clearly require a partnership between the City and LTD to implement the BRT system.

2. What is the City's role in that transit system? (Ken)

The City has a critical role in the development of an improved transit system. Land use densities and development patterns, which are under the control of the City, have a very significant impact on the effectiveness of the transit system. Close coordination between the City and LTD on land use decisions and transit service decisions is necessary. In recognition of this, LTD has deferred to the City on the selection of the sequence of development of the BRT corridors.

3. Does the City have a financial role in transit? (Ken)

Answer #1: Historically, the City has not contributed directly to the cost of providing transit service. However, funding from the City could leverage federal funds and provide for faster implementation of the BRT system and provide for a greater level of transit service. One option is that the City voluntarily choose to pay the LTD payroll tax.

Answer #2: Historically, the City has not contributed directly to the cost of providing transit service. However, funding from the City could leverage federal funds and provide for faster implementation of the BRT system and provide for a greater level of transit service. One option is that the City voluntarily choose to pay the LTD payroll tax. **The State of Oregon has been paying an "in-lieu" payroll tax on all its employees within the LTD service area for many years.**

4. Do we need to rethink the model of revenue for transit and the City's role in it? Payroll tax may not be the way to finance transit. (Ken, Diane, Linda)

LTD is always open to discussion of new approaches for funding transit. **As the City looked at a transportation fee, LTD discussed whether transit should be included as a consideration of such a fee. Also, the State of Oregon pays "In Lieu of" tax for the payroll they generate in LTD's service district. LTD has not approached the city on this possibility knowing how tough economic times have been on our partner agencies. The City was opted out of this in the legislation that created LTD's revenue stream. The**

County and school districts also are opted out. That is not the case in Portland for Tri-Met.

5. The council needs to pick another corridor fast and get moving on it.

LTD has deferred to the Council in determining the sequence of BRT corridor development. Given funding constraints, the decision on the selection of the next BRT corridor to be pursued could take up to a year and not affect the implementation date.

6. Will BRT require immediate service cuts? (Mark P)

No. The first leg of BRT, Eugene to Springfield, is completely funded. No additional money needs to be allocated to this project. Current service is every 15 minutes. If the service starts at 10-minute frequency, then additional funds will need to be allocated to pay for this increased frequency. The second BRT corridor, Pioneer Parkway in Springfield, has yet to be funded. If full federal funding is available, additional local funds will be required to match the federal dollars. Those local funds could come from additional revenues or reducing expenses, which could include cutting service. This is some time in the future, and there will be many other factors affecting the budget during this same period.

Jennifer

1. Why don't we run the next BRT corridor out Hwy 99 to the Airport? (Stef)

The LTD Board has deferred to the City Council to determine the sequence of construction of BRT corridors. The Highway 99 corridor is certainly an option for the next corridor to be built in Eugene. If that corridor is selected, there is some question whether the corridor should be extended all the way to the airport. The airport generates relatively few trips, and the land between the edge of the city and the airport would generate very little ridership. Thus, the productivity of that section may not justify the capital and operating expense.

The LTD Board has deferred to the City Council to determine the sequence of construction of BRT corridors. The Highway 99 corridor is **not an option that LTD feels has merit at this time**. If that corridor **were** selected, there is some question whether the corridor should be extended all the way to the airport. The airport generates relatively few trips, and the land between the edge of the city and the airport would generate very little ridership. Thus, the productivity of that section may not justify the capital and operating expense.

Nancy

1. Do we use BRT to try to steer land use or should BRT respond to current and future projected needs? (Stef)

This is an interesting question. The most common response is that land use and transportation need to be planned together, and that neither should completely steer the other. For BRT, LTD believes that a corridor should primarily serve existing needs, otherwise initial ridership would be low and the additional operating expense (since BRT would not replace existing service) would be high. However, there is clearly a benefit in having some vacant or underdeveloped land along a BRT line that can be developed in a transit-oriented manner. On the Franklin corridor, the Glenwood segment provides a great opportunity for that.

2. We need to design the BRT vehicle so one can easily see in and out of it. (Mark P)

Studies have been conducted on the public's perceptions about bus safety that indicate bus riders and potential riders rate visibility as very important to the perception of safety. Being able to see into the bus from the outside as well as see out from the inside is critical. LTD is working with the vehicle manufacturer to ensure that the EmX is open with clear visibility both in to and out of the vehicle.

3. Why can't "OUT OF SERVICE" buses going to Eugene Station (along Franklin and E. 11th) pick up passengers? (Andy)

Buses displaying "out of service" or "drop off only" typically are operating along corridors where the frequency of other bus service is high and therefore guests have many routes from which to choose. **We are reviewing our policy for out-of-service buses along Franklin and 11th Avenue.** Other bus routes traveling these corridors either are going to a point to begin service or have finished their work and are on the way back to the garage. If the bus is heading toward the Eugene Station it is preparing for service and it is given a limited amount of time to reach the station. Each minute is paid operator time and therefore it is important that scheduling be efficient and that the bus arrives in time for its scheduled departure. Some buses will display "drop off only." These buses are most often limited-stop express buses and travel time is important to the guests who use this service; therefore, other guests are asked to use the frequent service provided by other routes along these corridors.

4. Has LTD done work with clusters of businesses on the group pass; e.g., Valley River Mall merchants? (Stef/Connie)

LTD has not created a group pass program that includes a cluster of employers. However, we have suggested that in the past and are certainly open to those types of arrangements. Simply stated, any definable group can participate in the group pass program, as long as there is 100% participation by all members in the group. The group can be defined as a combination of businesses. It should also be noted that LTD has agreed to offer the group bus pass program to small businesses (with as few as 10 employees) in order to make the program available to more companies.

Bonnie

1. BRT must include dedicated right-of-way or it is not BRT. We need to pick a corridor where BRT can have dedicated right-of-way, like 6th/7th. (Stef)

LTD agrees that exclusive right-of-way is the single most important element of BRT. However, it is not clear that 6th/7th Avenues provide easy opportunities for exclusive right-of-way. In fact, preliminary investigations and analysis of those streets indicates that it will be very difficult to obtain exclusive right-of-way right on 6th and 7th Avenue. Some of the parallel streets may provide better opportunities. When investigating west side BRT routing options, a preliminary design for 13th Avenue was developed that included exclusive right-of way and had other attractive aspects.

2. How much money has been spent to date on Phase I? How much will it cost in total? (Mark P/Diane)

Planning costs: The following costs were expended for staff, related overhead costs, and consulting services related to the following capital projects: BRT Eugene/Springfield (Franklin Corridor), BRT general planning, Springfield Station, and transit signal priority:

FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
---------	---------	---------

\$739,000	\$1,031,000	\$1,014,000
-----------	-------------	-------------

Beginning in FY 2002, LTD began expending design funding for the Franklin Corridor:

FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004
\$519,000	\$1,203,000	\$1,095,000

The cost for construction will commence in June, 2004. Total cost should be \$18,000,000 for planning and construction and \$5,000,000 for vehicles.

3. Where are payroll taxes collected and spent; i.e. are payroll taxes collected in Eugene spent in Springfield or on rural service? (Diane)

The payroll taxes that are collected are invested in a transportation system that is determined by community and rider needs, and popular origins and destinations. The largest group of system users is made up of students who attend the University of Oregon and Lane Community College, but many riders use the system to commute to and from their places of employment. LTD tries to design fixed-route service to be as efficient as possible, and does not base service levels on where the tax dollars are generated. In fact, it is very difficult to estimate how much tax revenue is generated by the individual cities within LTD boundaries, because business chains pay the tax for all operations without breaking down the total by specific store or property. For example, the Oregon Department of Revenue, which collects taxes on LTD's behalf, gets one payment per quarter for all Wal-Mart stores. There are stores in Eugene, Springfield, and Cottage Grove.

4. What demographics will change most easily in transit ridership? (Andy)

There will always be a segment of our population that is dependent upon transit; however, this number is most likely different from the preconceived ideas about who uses transit. The last demographic study was conducted in 1999 and showed the following:

- a. 34 percent are employed outside the home
- b. 30 percent are students only
- c. 20 percent are employed students
- d. 12 percent are homemakers, retirees, or other
- e. 7 percent are unemployed

The student demographic has been one that LTD has targeted successfully over the years. Thousands of kindergarten through university students ride LTD every weekday. These trips are successful for a variety of reasons. First, economics play into the equation. Second, limited parking is a big incentive to using transit. Third, significant investments in bus service have made riding the bus more convenient. Transit will be most successful when there are significant disincentives to driving a personal automobile. Limited or costly parking, and preferably both, will provide transit the best opportunity to attract new guests. Reducing overall trip time, for transit trips, is the single biggest incentive we could offer to attract additional transit trips.

Betty

1. Can't we run smaller buses or taxis to places with lower ridership (Crest Drive)? (Andy)

The Crest Drive route primarily serves school kids and the loads reach 16 to 18 guests. Therefore, a smaller bus could be used for these few trips. The dilemma is that the same

bus, after dropping these students off at school, will deadhead (travel out of service) to begin heavier guest loads. It is very interesting to look at the loads along routes throughout the day and note when larger loading occurs. For many routes, there is no distinct peak period and that is due to the high volume of student riders. If the District chose to schedule buses in a less efficient manner, then several routes that traditionally have lower ridership might be interlined together. This is a very costly operating cost decision, so the District has chosen to allow the service planning staff to schedule the buses as efficiently as possible. The most significant cost of operations is the operator labor cost; therefore, whether the operator drives a 30-foot bus or a 40-foot bus is insignificant. The cost to purchase, maintain, and operate these vehicles is nearly identical and therefore staff has tended toward having as many 40-foot buses in the fleet as possible.

Not sure who

1. Should LTD rethink its mission on service, cutting less utilized services to add frequency in major ridership corridors? (Stef/Andy)

In transit terms, this discussion is often framed as productivity versus coverage. The productivity model suggests putting service where it is most utilized (usually along major corridors), while the coverage model suggests spreading the transit service around the community to serve as many households as possible. The LTD Board has directed staff to emphasize productivity, possibly at the expense of coverage. This direction has resulted in some neighborhoods losing service. The problem when service is being cut is that coverage is lost, but there are no resources to add service on the high productivity routes.

2. How is the RideSource facility funded? Why did we decide to build a new facility? Could we have incorporated RideSource's needs into the City's Roosevelt facility? (Stef)

RideSource is a demand-responsive service that is required by federal law. LTD contracts with a private non-profit firm to provide the service. However, LTD owns the RideSource vehicles and will own the RideSource maintenance facility. The existing RideSource facility is rented and is inadequate. In addition, there is a concern that the current facility will not be available into the future. The search for a new site included consideration of a joint facility, and an option to locate with the State Motor Pool was investigated extensively. Co-location with the City's Roosevelt facility was not identified as an option during the planning and site selection phase. The decision was to construct an independent facility, but to consider purchasing enough land that a future LTD satellite facility for the fixed-route system could be co-located with the RideSource facility. The selected site at 2nd and Garfield provides that opportunity. The land for the facility has been purchased, and the project is in final design with construction expected to start this spring. The construction of the facility is primarily funded with federal funds that are dedicated to special transportation and are administered by the State.

3. LTD needs to develop some key messages. How is LTD communicating its value to the community? (Andy)

LTD recently has revised its Strategic Plan and developed a Brand Plan, and is refining its Public Relations Plan in anticipation of a very active year. The Strategic Plan outlines the District's vision, mission, core values, and guiding principles. Five strategic goal areas are outlined in terms of short-term strategies, long-term strategies, and performance measures. The Strategic Plan is available for review and printing at the LTD Web site. LTD's Brand Plan identifies the unique characteristics the District offers its guests. As part of the Brand Plan, LTD has reviewed its identity and is developing a plan to implement

changes that will present a consistent image and message within the community. New transit ads and television ads have run this winter. These ads demonstrate the commitment to excellence for which LTD is known, and show quality LTD employees providing service to our guests. All ads display LTD's new tag line, "at your service." We believe that this tag line speaks strongly about who LTD is and what LTD brings to the community every day. The Public Relations Plan has identified key issues, including an increase to the payroll tax, labor negotiations, bus rapid transit, Board member changes, and service cuts. Specific strategies and messages for each of these issue areas has been developed and will be implemented in the months ahead.

Q:\Reference\Board Packet\2004\02\Joint Mtg Eugene Council\ECC questions from the Joint Meeting.doc

March 18, 2004

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor Torrey and Eugene City Councilors

FROM: Hillary Wylie, Board President

RE: Follow-up to joint City of Eugene / LTD meeting

City councilors posed several questions to the Lane Transit District Board when meeting in joint session on February 23. While most were answered during the meeting, some remain outstanding. This memo addresses the questions LTD believes were not answered completely. A separate memo to City Manager Dennis Taylor suggests options for how to proceed with decisions on the next Eugene BRT corridor.

- **Since it seems that LTD will not be able to have full build-out in the next 20 years, what is LTD's current projection on how much of the BRT system will be built in 20 years?**

The build-out of BRT is dependent on funding and on community acceptance. From a funding standpoint, it seems unlikely that federal funds would pay for more than one corridor every six years, the length of a transportation authorization bill such as ISTEA and TEA-21. It also would be difficult to accumulate the required local match any faster than that schedule. Assuming that there is community support for the corridors, the 6-year-per-corridor schedule would mean that three additional corridors would be built within 20 years: Pioneer Parkway by 2008; Coburg Road or some other corridor by 2014, and a fourth corridor by 2020. After the first corridors are operational (by 2009), LTD could seek local funding for construction of future segments, thus accelerating the build-out of a BRT system.

- **Will a non-guided bus require wider lanes or right-of-way (ROW)?**

LTD continues to pursue automated guidance and is working with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), Partners for Advanced Transit and Highways (PATH), a research group associated with the University of California at Berkeley, on an automated guidance system. However, it is likely that the system will not be developed in time for the start of the Franklin Corridor. Thus, lane widths have been widened somewhat so that the system can operate with manual steering for an interim period. The lanes will be 10.5 feet, which is still narrower than the 12-foot lanes that otherwise would be considered a standard for this corridor. The original concept, with guidance, was for 9.5-foot lanes.

There also has been a question regarding the "grass strip" in the middle of the BRT lane. Decisions regarding locations where the grass strip can be added are not related to automated guidance, but whether the lane is physically separated from other traffic lanes. If the BRT lane has a physical barrier (curb or median) that separates it from other traffic, then a green strip can be added whether or not there is automated guidance. If non-BRT traffic can traverse or drive into the BRT lane, then the grass strip could cause the vehicle to lose traction and lose control. The current design retains the green strip on the lanes on Franklin Boulevard west of Interstate 5 since those BRT lanes are physically separated from other traffic lanes.

- **What is the City's role in the community's transit system?**

The City has a critical role in the development of an improved transit system. Land use densities and development patterns, which are under the control of the City, have a very significant impact on the effectiveness of the transit system. Close coordination between the City and LTD on land use decisions and transit service decisions is necessary. In recognition of this, LTD has deferred to the City on the selection of the sequence of development of the BRT corridors.

- **Does the City have a financial role in transit?**

Historically, the City has not contributed to the cost of providing transit service. However, any funding from the City could leverage federal funds and provide for faster implementation of the BRT system and provide for a greater level of transit service.

- **Do we need to rethink the model of revenue for transit and the City's role in it? Payroll tax may not be the way to finance transit.**

LTD is open to discussion of new approaches for funding transit. As the City considered a transportation fee, LTD discussed whether transit should be included as part of such a fee. The State of Oregon pays "In Lieu of" tax for the payroll they generate within LTD's service district. LTD has not approached the city on this possibility. In 1989, TriMet secured the authority to collect payroll taxes from all political subdivisions except schools. LTD could ask that the statute be amended to allow LTD to do the same.

- **Will BRT require immediate service cuts?**

No. The first leg of BRT, Eugene to Springfield, is completely funded. No additional money needs to be allocated to this project. Currently, BRT service is planned to operate every 15 minutes. If the service begins at 10-minute frequency, then additional funds will need to be allocated to pay for this increased frequency. The second BRT corridor, Pioneer Parkway in Springfield, has yet to be funded. This funding will occur some time in the future, and there will be many other factors affecting the budget during this same period.

- **Do we use BRT to try to steer land use or should BRT respond to current and future projected needs?**

This is an interesting question. The most common response is that land use and transportation need to be planned together, and that neither should completely steer the other. For BRT, LTD believes that a corridor should primarily serve existing needs, otherwise initial ridership would be low and the additional operating expense (since BRT would not replace existing service) would be high. However, there is clearly a benefit in having some vacant or underdeveloped land along a BRT line that can be developed in a transit-oriented manner. On the Franklin corridor, the Glenwood segment provides a great opportunity for that. Set aside of future BRT right-of-way would also be good and would count toward future local match requirements.

- **What demographics could change most in transit ridership?**

There always will be a segment of our population that is dependent upon transit; however, this number most likely is different from the preconceived ideas about who uses transit. The last demographic study, conducted in 1999, showed the following:

- a. 34 percent of LTD riders are employed outside the home;
- b. 30 percent are students only;
- c. 20 percent are employed students;
- d. 12 percent are homemakers, retirees, or other; and
- e. 7 percent are unemployed.

The student demographic has been one that LTD has targeted successfully over the years. Thousands of elementary through university students ride LTD every weekday. These trips are successful for a variety of reasons. First, economics play into the equation. Second, limited parking is a big incentive to using transit. Third, significant investments in bus service have made riding the bus more convenient. Transit will be most successful when there are significant disincentives to driving a personal automobile. Limited or costly parking, and preferably both, will provide transit the best opportunity to attract new riders. Reducing overall trip time, for transit trips, is the single biggest incentive we could offer to attract additional transit trips. Continuing to target the youth segment always will be on the list due to the high turnover rate. Targeted commuter segments will follow where opportunities present themselves. This might include group pass opportunities or new developments such as serving the hospitals in their new locations.

- **Should LTD rethink its mission on service, cutting less utilized services to add frequency in major ridership corridors?**

In transit terms, this discussion often is framed as productivity versus coverage. The productivity model suggests putting service where it is most utilized (usually along major corridors), while the coverage model suggests spreading the transit service around the community to serve as many households as possible. The LTD Board has directed staff to emphasize productivity, possibly at the expense of coverage. This direction has resulted in some neighborhoods losing service. The problem when service is being cut is that coverage is lost, but there are no resources to add service on the high productivity routes.

I sincerely hope that we have been able to answer these questions to your satisfaction, and we appreciate having the opportunity to meet with you to discuss these important issues. Please do let me know if there is additional information we can provide.

Sincerely,

Hillary Wylie
Board President

HW/ll:sjh

**EUGENE CITY COUNCIL QUESTIONS FROM THE JOINT MEETING
March 12, 2004**

City councilors posed several questions to the Lane Transit District Board when meeting in joint session February 23. While most were answered during the meeting, some remain outstanding. This memo addresses the questions LTD believes were not answered completely. A separate memo to City Manager Dennis Taylor suggests options for how to proceed with decisions on the next Eugene BRT corridor.

- **Since it is apparent that LTD will not be able to have full build-out in the next 20 years, what is LTD's current projection on how much of the BRT system will be built in 20 years; i.e., a revised plan by corridor of how BRT will be built and when.**

The build-out of BRT is dependent on funding and on community acceptance. From a funding standpoint, it seems unlikely that federal funds would pay for more than one corridor every six years, the length of a transportation authorization bill such as ISTEA and TEA-21. It also would be difficult to accumulate the required local match any faster than that schedule. Assuming that there is community support for the corridors, the 6-year-per-corridor schedule would mean that three additional corridors would be built within 20 years: Pioneer Parkway by 2008; Coburg Road or some other corridor by 2014, and a fourth corridor by 2020. After the first corridors are operational (by 2009), LTD could seek local funding for construction of future segments, thus accelerating the build-out of a BRT system.

- **Will a non-guided bus require wider lanes or right-of-way (ROW)?**

LTD continues to pursue automated guidance and is working with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), Partners for Advanced Transit and Highways (PATH), a research group associated with the University of California at Berkeley, on an automated guidance system. However, it is likely that the system will not be developed in time for the start of the Franklin Corridor. Thus, lane widths have been widened somewhat so that the system can operate with manual steering for an interim period. The lanes will be 10.5 feet, which is still narrower than the 12-foot lanes, which would otherwise be considered a standard for this corridor. The original concept, with guidance, was for 9.5-foot lanes.

There also has been a question regarding the "grass strip" in the middle of the BRT lane. Decisions regarding locations where the grass strip can be added is not related to automated guidance, but whether the lane is physically separated from other traffic lanes. If the BRT lane has a physical barrier (curb or median) that separates it from other traffic, then a green strip can be added whether or not there is automated guidance. If non-BRT traffic can traverse or drive into the BRT lane, then the grass strip could cause the vehicle to lose traction and lose control. The current design retains the green strip on the lanes on Franklin Boulevard west of Interstate 5 since those BRT lanes are physically separated from other traffic lanes.

- **What is the City's role in the community's transit system?**

The City has a critical role in the development of an improved transit system. Land use densities and development patterns, which are under the control of the City, have a very significant impact on the effectiveness of the transit system. Close coordination between the City and LTD on land use decisions and transit service decisions is necessary. In recognition of this, LTD has deferred to the City on the selection of the sequence of development of the BRT corridors.

- **Does the City have a financial role in transit?**

Historically, the City has not contributed to the cost of providing transit service. However, any funding from the City could leverage federal funds and provide for faster implementation of the BRT system and provide for a greater level of transit service.

- **Do we need to rethink the model of revenue for transit and the City's role in it? Payroll tax may not be the way to finance transit.**

LTD is always open to discussion of new approaches for funding transit. As the City looked at a transportation fee, LTD discussed whether transit should be included as a consideration of such a fee. The State of Oregon pays "In Lieu of" tax for the payroll they generate within LTD's service district. LTD has not approached the city on this possibility. In 1989, TriMet secured the authority to collect payroll taxes from all political subdivisions except schools. LTD could ask that the statute be amended to allow LTD to do the same.

- **Will BRT require immediate service cuts?**

No. The first leg of BRT, Eugene to Springfield, is completely funded. No additional money needs to be allocated to this project. Currently, BRT service is planned to operate every 15 minutes. If the service begins at 10-minute frequency, then additional funds will need to be allocated to pay for this increased frequency. The second BRT corridor, Pioneer Parkway in Springfield, has yet to be funded. This funding will occur some time in the future, and there will be many other factors affecting the budget during this same period.

- **Do we use BRT to try to steer land use or should BRT respond to current and future projected needs?**

This is an interesting question. The most common response is that land use and transportation need to be planned together, and that neither should completely steer the other. For BRT, LTD believes that a corridor should primarily serve existing needs, otherwise initial ridership would be low and the additional operating expense (since BRT would not replace existing service) would be high. However, there is clearly a benefit in having some vacant or underdeveloped land along a BRT line that can be developed in a transit-oriented manner. On the Franklin corridor, the Glenwood segment provides a great opportunity for that. Set aside of future BRT right-of-way would also be good and would count toward future local match requirements.

- **What demographics could change most in transit ridership?**

There always will be a segment of our population that is dependent upon transit; however, this number most likely is different from the preconceived ideas about who uses transit. The last demographic study was conducted in 1999 and showed the following:

- a. 34 percent are employed outside the home
- b. 30 percent are students only
- c. 20 percent are employed students
- d. 12 percent are homemakers, retirees, or other
- e. 7 percent are unemployed

The student demographic has been one that LTD has targeted successfully over the years. Thousands of elementary through university students ride LTD every weekday. These trips are successful for a variety of reasons. First, economics play into the equation. Second, limited parking is a big incentive to using transit. Third, significant investments in bus service have made riding the bus more convenient. Transit will be most successful when there are significant disincentives to driving a personal automobile. Limited or costly parking, and preferably both, will provide transit the best opportunity to attract new riders. Reducing overall trip time, for transit trips, is the single biggest incentive we could offer to attract additional transit trips. Continuing to target the youth segment always will be on the list due to the high turnover rate. Targeted commuter segments will follow where opportunities present themselves. This might include group pass opportunities or new developments such as serving the hospitals in their new locations.

- **Should LTD rethink its mission on service, cutting less utilized services to add frequency in major ridership corridors?**

In transit terms, this discussion often is framed as productivity versus coverage. The productivity model suggests putting service where it is most utilized (usually along major corridors), while the coverage model suggests spreading the transit service around the community to serve as many households as possible. The LTD Board has directed staff to emphasize productivity, possibly at the expense of coverage. This direction has resulted in some neighborhoods losing service. The problem when service is being cut is that coverage is lost, but there are no resources to add service on the high productivity routes.

Lane Transit District

EmX Update

February 2004

Franklin Corridor

- Corridor divided into two segments – Franklin segment and Eugene segment
- Final design completed in both segments – February 2004

Construction information

- Construction to start in Spring 2004. The order of construction will be:
 - Downtown Springfield – Spring/Summer 2004
 - Franklin Blvd:
 - widen road, Summer 2004
 - construct median transit lane, Summer 2005
 - Glenwood – Summer 2005
 - Downtown Eugene – Summer 2005 and Spring 2006
- Pruning of tree canopies and root systems – February 2004
- Budget for construction: \$17 million

Undergrounding Utilities

- Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed by City of Eugene, EWEB, and LTD in November 2003. Agencies agree to split the cost of the undergrounding project.
 - Undergrounding of utilities on the north side of Franklin from Onyx to mid-block between Riverfront Parkway and Moss Street
 - EWEB working on designs for location of vaults and transformers – February 2004
 - Meetings with property owners explaining the process and discussing location of equipment on their property to be complete by the end of February 2004
 - Project completed by June 30, 2004

Operational facts

- Ten stations served (Eugene Station, new Springfield Station, and eight (8) stations in-between)
 - Begin construction of stations in Spring 2005. All stations complete by Spring 2006
 - Redesign of vehicle bays at Eugene Station for Invero vehicle – Spring 2006
- Sixty-five (65) percent of the corridor is in exclusive transit right-of-way
- Transit travel time to decrease approximately 25 percent when it opens and by about 40 percent for the year 2020 (compared to projected travel time without EmX)
- Decision yet to be made whether service will be 10- or 12-minute frequency
 - System will require four (4) buses to operate ten-minute service or three buses to operate 12-minute service
- Transfer introduced for Thurston riders traveling through downtown Springfield to Eugene
- Service to start in Fall 2006

LTD Rider Demographics

The following information was taken from a 1999 on-board survey. This survey is conducted every three to five years and tracks demographic information along with origin and destination data. The next on-board survey is scheduled for Spring 2004.

- Nearly one-third of riders ride seven days per week
- Rider age groups:
 - 32% are under 20
 - 32% are 21 to 30
 - 32% are 31 to 60
 - 4% are over 60
- Rider income:
 - 37% under \$10,000 annually (high student ridership influences this greatly)
 - 42% \$10,000 to \$30,000
 - 12% \$30,000 to \$40,000
 - 9% over \$50,000
- 54% are female and 46% are male
- Occupation:
 - 32% employed outside the home
 - 30% are students only
 - 20% are students and employed
 - 7% are unemployed
 - 12% are retired, homemakers, employed in the home, or other
- Student riders represent 51% of all riders
 - 37% of the student trips are taken by UO and LCC students
- 35% of riders would have driven themselves or been driven if they had not taken the bus
- 77% of riders begin their trip in Eugene and 20% in Springfield
- 74% of riders use a pass as fare payment and only 19% pay the cash fare

Ridership Data

Annual Boardings	8,103,040
Average Annual Weekday Boardings	20,591
Highest Average Weekday Boardings - October	24,290
Lowest Average Weekday Boardings - August	15,316
System-wide Average Boardings per Revenue Hour	34

University of Oregon ridership remains the single largest ridership group. The chart below records data collected this school year:

Date	Student* Boarding Count
11/18/2002	6,052
11/19/2002	6,988
11/20/2002	6,808
11/21/2002	6,787
11/22/2002	6,363
Average	6,600

*System-wide

Lane Community College ridership contributes significantly to LTD's daily totals. In a recent count of activity at the LCC Station, the following ridership data was recorded:

Date	Deboarding Activity
11/18/2003	1,120
11/19/2003	1,181
Average	1,150

Middle-school and high-school ridership has not been surveyed recently; however, sales of youth passes indicate this group is actively using LTD buses.

FY 03/04	1 month Passes	3 Month Passes	Total
October	1,487	494	1,981
November	1,477	538	2,015
December	1,416	406	1,822

In 2001, LTD introduced the Breeze. The Breeze service blends a unique vehicle, independent route structure, special signage, and custom bus shelters with a frequent schedule to provide guests many riding opportunities. The Breeze ridership chart illustrates how successful this service has been over the past couple of years:

Period	Weekday Boardings per Revenue Hour	Boardings per Weekday	Sampling Method
Fall 2001	31	2,227	Operator counts
Fall 2003*	38	1,952	Automatic Passenger Counting System

*One-third fewer hours of service are being operated.

-
-
Subject: Staff Response to Council Questions and Issues on Transit Raised at December 1 Work Session on the Central Area Transportation Study

-
This memorandum includes excerpts taken from the City of Eugene Staff (submitted by Chris Henry and Allen Lowe) memos addressing Council questions and issues raised at the December, 2003 work session and the January 26, 2004 public hearing regarding an update to the adopted 1993 Central Area Transportation Study (CATS). The questions and responses included here reference transit issues raised at the work session.

Staff responses are shown in *bold italicized text*.

-
-
Questions and Comments from December 1, 2003 work session

-
This memorandum addresses questions and issues raised at the December 1 work session. Staff responses are shown in *bold italicized text*.

Questions and Comments from the January 24, 2004 Public Hearing:

3. Councilor Bettman suggested that the terms “shuttle” and “BRT” were used interchangeably in the document. She said that they are not interchangeable, as each has a very different purpose.

Staff Response: Staff agrees that a shuttle and BRT are not the same thing. However, Lane Transit District considers shuttle service as a “connector” service to the BRT system. Along with planned neighborhood connector routes to the BRT main corridor routes, the existing shuttle as well as a future shuttle serving the new Federal Courthouse District, are considered part of the BRT system.

As a closed system, a shuttle provides a very different transportation solution than a BRT system. When combined with BRT and fixed route service, it is part of an integrated transit system providing mobility options for the community. As described, the shuttle feeds or links to the BRT system. It is this context in which the terms are used in the discussion of the Proposed Implementation Strategies 7.1 and 7.3.

4. Councilor Bettman noted that several streets were “recommended as future BRT routes” on the Transit System Discussion Map (Map 5) and in Implementation Strategy 7.4 and suggested that BRT was essentially a commuter system that was not appropriate for residential streets, including those shown on Map 5 and listed in Strategy 7.4.

Staff Response: *In developing proposed routing of BRT in the downtown area, streets were selected based on the desire to provide direct routing into and out of the downtown area. Streets selected include streets that are currently transit routes into downtown, such as Washington Street, Jefferson Street, 10th Avenue and 11th Avenue. Multiple BRT routes would use the same routing in the downtown area before branching out to separate routes serving different areas of Eugene. The streets shown on Map 5 as potential future BRT routes provide the connection between the Eugene Station downtown to the main BRT routes. While BRT would not likely provide stops in residential areas within walking distance of the downtown Eugene Station, it will provide service from residential areas to cross-town destinations.*

5. Councilor Bettman asked if the adoption of CATS by the City Council will give tacit approval for the potential BRT routes outlined in implementation strategy 7.4 on page 55 of the document.

Staff Response: *The BRT routes shown are part of a future system being planned as envisioned in TransPlan. Acknowledgement of these streets as future BRT routes in the CATS document provides the opportunity for coordinated transportation planning of City transportation improvement projects with proposed transit improvement projects. Consideration of transit in street improvement projects is critical, particularly with projects including street widening, sidewalk improvements, or on-street parking. There will be more detailed planning to come before the exact location and timing of BRT implementation occurs. The current routing represents the best vision of the BRT system at this time and may be subject to change in the future with more detailed planning. LTD will continue to work with the City of Eugene on BRT planning, and the City Council will have the opportunity to provide input into planning decisions, including routing decisions. As with the Franklin corridor, City Council approval will be sought prior to implementation.*

6. Councilor Kelly asked staff to clarify proposed policy #8 on page 13 of the document. He said that while the policy addresses the need for balance in providing adequate parking, that there was no mention of transit, pedestrian and carpooling factors that could lower the demand for parking.

Staff Response: *Retaining the spirit and the policy foundation of the 1993 document, CATS is essentially about continuing to implement alternative modes initiatives begun more than 10 years ago. The alternative modes factors that lower the demand for vehicle parking are specifically addressed in policies 4, 6, 7 and 10 which propose strategies to provide a balanced transportation system for pedestrians, cyclists, transit users and alternative transportation system promotion respectively. CATS, taken as whole, seeks to provide options to automobile travel and, therefore, create conditions that result in a reduction in parking demand.*

8. Councilors Kelly, Meisner and Bettman all suggested that the CATS document include a trolley study as an implementation strategy, as was done in the Downtown Plan.

Staff Response: *The Eugene Planning Commission determined, after considerable discussion, that the fixed rail trolley/streetcar concept is, in fact, a potential economic development strategy. The Commission also acknowledged the conclusion reached in an earlier study conducted as part of the TransPlan Update, that the trolley concept, as discussed, would not provide cost-effective transportation service. That study, referenced in the TransPlan materials as the Urban Rail Feasibility Study, concluded that trolley service provided an economic development tool that typically served a tourist or commercial interest in providing circulation to specific tourist or downtown destinations. In a survey of other downtown U.S .areas served by trolley systems, the service was, in most cases, at least partly, if not fully funded and operated by private interests, such as hotels. Urban rail systems were included in the study as a potential transit solution to reduce congestion and increase mobility within the urban area. While the study agreed that urban rail systems can indeed provide transportation options to meet that goal, it concluded that urban rail systems most appropriately serve urban areas with significantly greater population and employment densities than those projected in the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area within the TransPlan planning horizon. The study further concluded that it would be extremely difficult for Eugene-Springfield to compete for federal funding dollars needed to develop an urban rail system given population and employment densities. The recommendations of the study were to consider an enhanced bus system, such as bus rapid transit, that was an appropriate transit solution for the transportation goals of reducing congestion and increasing mobility for a mid-size metropolitan area.*

As part of the TransPlan process, the study was incorporated into the development of a transit strategy. The transit strategy developed was Bus Rapid Transit. In developing the Bus Rapid Transit strategy in TransPlan, it was agreed that a trolley system does not meet the specific goal of providing a transportation solution for reducing congestion or increasing mobility within the 20 year planning horizon of the plan. For this reason, the Planning Commission recommended that a trolley study not be included as a CATS implementation strategy, but be included in the Downtown Plan as an economic development tool. If Council identifies funding, a new study could be undertaken to re-evaluate the feasibility of a trolley system.

14. Councilors Bettman and Meisner suggested that transit language should be generic and not specifically identify the Breeze, but rather refer to a downtown shuttle service.

Staff Response: *Staff can replace reference to the Breeze with more generic “downtown shuttle service” in the final document.*

Staff Response to January 26, 2004 Public Hearing:

Transit System

Testimony offered related to Bus Rapid Transit operational issues, Bus Rapid Transit planning and downtown shuttle routing.

Lane Transit District (LTD) articulated operational concern for the operation of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) on Eugene streets, specifically 10th Avenue. Staff generally concurs with the recommendations and continues to meet with LTD staff to work through the operational details in a cooperative and collaborative manner to ensure that, in particular, the operational efficiencies of the BRT system are not compromised.

BRT along the Coburg Road corridor was planned in TransPlan (adopted 2002) as part of a metropolitan area-wide transit system as one of several general alignments. Specific study of the corridor is currently in progress with a stakeholder group. The Eugene City Council will be discussing the study on February 23, 2004 and will have an opportunity to provide direction prior to further study of the Coburg Road corridor. In addition, Council approval will be sought prior to implementation of any future BRT corridors.

From Proposed Implementation Strategy 7.2: "Evaluate the feasibility of adding a transit connection to the existing bicycle and pedestrian facility that connects 6th Avenue and 7th Avenue on Willamette Street." And the discussion: "The viability of this connection is unknown and must be studied in more detail before a decision is made to pursue the connection. Staff recommends that the City conduct a feasibility study to evaluate impacts..."

The details of planning, design, impacts and potential benefits and construction cost would be addressed through a future feasibility study. Any associated rerouting of the downtown shuttle would be addressed by the study. Adoption of the CATS document itself would not pre-approve the construction of the project; it only identifies the project as one needing further study.

The Eugene Planning Commission on October 27, 2003 modified the Proposed Implementation Strategy 7.3 in the Draft 2003 CATS to delete second sentence of the discussion as follows:

"Discussion: A future Breeze shuttle route will likely be considered within the next five to ten years. ~~A possible transit river crossing near Autzen Stadium could be considered for routing options for the second Breeze shuttle.~~ The addition of a second shuttle could affect transit routing within the downtown area..."

The CATS draft as considered by the Eugene City Council no longer contains reference to a transit river crossing.