

(This packet was printed on recycled paper.)

Public notice was given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on February 24, 2004.

## LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT SPECIAL BOARD MEETING

Thursday, February 26, 2004

**NOTE TIME CHANGE: 6 p.m.**

**LTD BOARD ROOM**  
**3500 E. 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene**  
(off Glenwood Blvd in Glenwood)

### A G E N D A

- I. CALL TO ORDER
- II. ROLL CALL  
Kleger \_\_\_\_\_ Lauritsen \_\_\_\_\_ Wylie \_\_\_\_\_ Ban \_\_\_\_\_  
Gant \_\_\_\_\_ Gaydos \_\_\_\_\_ Hocken \_\_\_\_\_
- III. PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT
- IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO AGENDA
- V. DEBRIEF JOINT MEETING WITH EUGENE CITY COUNCIL (15 minutes)
- VI. BUS RAPID TRANSIT BUDGET SCENARIOS (90 minutes)
- VII. MLK JR PARKWAY RIGHT-OF-WAY (30 minutes)
- VIII. FRANKLIN CORRIDOR EmX UPDATE (10 minutes)
- IX. ADJOURNMENT

**Alternative formats of printed material and/or a sign language interpreter will be made available with 48 hours' notice. The facility used for this meeting is wheelchair accessible. For more information, please call 682-6100 (voice) or 1-800-735-2900 (TTY, through Oregon Relay, for persons with hearing impairments).**

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** February 26, 2004

**ITEM TITLE:** BRT BUDGET SCENARIOS

**PREPARED BY:** Ken Hamm, General Manager

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Approve the Board's Preferred BRT Scenario

**BACKGROUND:** Over the last several months, the Board has been discussing various options for the allocation of District resources. The discussion often has been framed as capital versus service or, more specifically, as BRT versus service. This comparison fails to recognize that capital projects, including buses, passenger shelters, and transit stations, as well as BRT, also provide a type of service for our guests. The District receives federal funds that can be used only for capital projects, but which require a 20 percent local match. In Fiscal Years 2002-03 and 2003-04, LTD has been drawing down on capital reserves for the local match, rather than transferring the match money from the General Fund. (And only a small transfer was made in 2001-02.) The budget question the Board is considering is better framed as the appropriate allocation of resources between maintaining the current service level and providing the local match for capital investments designed to improve service in the future.

The spreadsheets included with this packet provide three 8-year budget scenarios. All the scenarios assume that the third BRT corridor (Coburg Road or some other corridor) is not constructed within the eight-year planning horizon. All three scenarios use the same assumptions for growth in revenues and expenditures and assume that the payroll tax increase will be implemented. The three scenarios differ only in their implementation of the Pioneer Parkway BRT corridor. Scenario One assumes completion of the corridor in 2008 at a cost of \$38 million. Scenario Two assumes completion of the corridor in 2008 at a cost of \$19 million (a "BRT Lite" design). Scenario Three assumes that the Pioneer Parkway corridor also is not constructed within the eight-year planning period.

Scenarios One and Two require a \$700,000 reduction in costs over the next two years. This is considerably less than earlier projections and is the result of limiting the increase in personal service costs to 4 percent

per year. Scenario Three does not require a reduction in operating expenditures.

Staff recommend Scenario One. This option provides for a complete BRT corridor with a high level of exclusive right-of-way that will protect the service from congestion impacts well into the future. It is possible that the \$700,000 in reductions could be accomplished through the cost reductions and revenue enhancements being discussed for this coming year's proposed budget.

**ATTACHMENT:** Three Scenarios for the Long-Range Financial Plan

**PROPOSED MOTION:** I move the following resolution:

LTD Resolution No. 2004-007: Resolved, that the LTD Board of Directors approves \_\_\_\_\_ for the purposes of budgeting and planning.

OPTION	MLK Jr. Parkway Design Alternatives				
	PROS	CONS	ANTICIPATED DESIGN YEAR DELAY	ADDITIONAL WIDENING (Beyond City purchase)	ADDITIONAL ROW & UTILITY COST
Mixed Traffic  City Staff Proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No additional ROW needed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intersection projected to fail in 2012</li> <li>BRT vehicles delays increase over time</li> <li>Does not meet BRT goal</li> </ul>	60 Sec / BRT vehicle	0'	\$0
Back to Back "Q" Jump	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alignment of Parkway Straight</li> <li>Opportunity for alternative future BRT operating arrangements</li> <li>Can be used by emergency service vehicles</li> <li>Provides BRT capacity where needed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional ROW required from all adjacent properties</li> </ul>	15 Sec / BRT vehicle	5' to 10'	\$330,000 to \$1 Million
Conventional "Q" Jump	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides BRT capacity where needed</li> <li>Can be used by emergency service vehicles</li> <li>30% of properties not impacted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parkway alignment not straight</li> <li>No opportunity for alternative operating strategies</li> </ul>	15 Sec / BRT vehicle (Dependent on queue length)	10'	\$220,000

OPTION	MLK Jr. Parkway Design Alternatives				
	PROS	CONS	ANTICIPATED DESIGN YEAR DELAY	ADDITIONAL WIDENING (Beyond City purchase)	ADDITIONAL ROW & UTILITY COST
Double BRT Lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximum BRT capacity</li> <li>• Meets BRT project goal</li> <li>• Ease of scheduling</li> <li>• Can be used by emergency service vehicles</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most impact to adjacent properties</li> <li>• Likely septic field impacts</li> <li>• Will likely require the purchase of 'whole' properties.</li> </ul>	15 Sec / BRT vehicle	21'	\$1.8 Million

OPTION	MLK Jr. Parkway: Back to Back Queue Jump Alternative (Preferred Option)			
	PROS	CONS	ADDITIONAL WIDENING (Beyond City purchase)	ADDITIONAL UTILITY COST & ROW
Keep Power Poles in median of MLK Jr. Parkway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least costly option</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greatest ROW impact</li> </ul>	10'	\$80,000 plus \$250,000 (ROW)
Relocate Transmission lines initially to existing poles on Game Farm, relocating power poles to final position with widening of Game Farm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimizes ROW impact to properties adjacent to MLK Jr.</li> <li>Delays impact to Game Farm Road residents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May commit LTD to funding future relocation of power poles</li> <li>SUB prefers to move the poles only once</li> <li>Requires future easement along east side of Game Farm Road</li> <li>Future concern with EMFs</li> <li>Puts the two major transmission lines serving the area on a single pole.</li> </ul>	5'	Initial cost \$604,000 plus \$120,000 (ROW) Additional future cost: \$350,000
Relocate Transmission line to new poles on Game Farm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimizes ROW impact to properties adjacent to MLK Jr.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Likely to be unpopular amongst Game Farm Road property owners</li> <li>Requires easement along east side of Game Farm Road</li> <li>Concern with EMFs</li> <li>Puts the two major transmission lines serving the area on a single pole.</li> </ul>	5'	\$604,000 plus \$120,000 (ROW)

OPTION	MLK Jr. Parkway: Back to Back Queue Jump Alternative (Preferred Option)			
	PROS	CONS	ADDITIONAL WIDENING (Beyond City purchase)	ADDITIONAL UTILITY COST & ROW
Relocate Power Poles to eastern side of MLK Jr. Parkway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimizes ROW impact to properties adjacent to MLK Jr.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Likely to be unpopular amongst east side property owners</li> <li>Concern with EMFs</li> </ul>	5'	\$232,000 plus \$120,000(ROW)
Underground Transmission line in median of MLK Jr. Parkway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less visual intrusion</li> <li>Eliminates traffic obstruction in median</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not consistent practice</li> <li>High anticipated cost</li> </ul>	5'	\$3-4 million? plus \$120,000 (ROW)

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** February 26, 2004

**ITEM TITLE:** BRT: MLK JR. PARKWAY DESIGN

**PREPARED BY:** Stefano Viggiano, Director of Development Services

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Make Commitment on Purchase of Property for BRT along Martin Luther King Jr. (MLK) Parkway

**BACKGROUND:** The Pioneer Parkway BRT project has been through a preliminary design process and is now in environmental review. One section of the corridor that was not addressed during the preliminary design process was the section of the new MLK Parkway just north of Hayden Bridge Way. The MLK Parkway is a new road that will be constructed along an old railroad right-of-way (ROW). The section just north of Hayden Bridge Way travels between backyards of homes. The existing 60-foot ROW is approximately 16 feet less than will be needed to accommodate the road. Including dedicated ROW for BRT would require widening the ROW by an additional 6 to 14 feet, depending on the option that is selected.

MLK Parkway is scheduled to be under construction in 2005. The BRT project will not be ready for construction until at least 2007. If the road is built without including the added ROW for BRT, it is unrealistic to expect that the BRT right-of-way could be added at a later date. Consequently, a decision on the ROW must be made as part of the road project. The Federal Transit Administration, recognizing the timing problem of these decisions, has authorized LTD to do a "protective buy" of land prior to the completion of the environmental review for the project.

The Springfield City Council will hold a public hearing on the MLK Parkway design on March 15, 2004, and could make a decision as early as that evening. The February 2004 Board meeting is the last scheduled Board meeting prior to that date.

LTD and Springfield staff have been working on various design options, with the hope that a mutually agreeable design can be identified. In addition, the Board BRT Committee will be meeting prior to the Board meeting to discuss the issue and may have a recommended course of action for the Board. Staff will be presenting the options, background information, and the possible Board Committee recommendation at the meeting.

**ATTACHMENT:** Design Options Memorandum from Graham Carey with attachments

**PROPOSED MOTION:** To be determined



February 26, 2004

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: LTD Board  
FROM: Graham Carey, Project Engineer  
RE: MLK Jr. Parkway Design Options

During the next few months, the Springfield City Council and the Lane County Commissioners will be reviewing and selecting a final design of the new Martin Luther King Jr. (MLK) Parkway, which is a northern extension of Pioneer Parkway. Of particular interest to LTD is the portion of the MLK Parkway that is between Hayden Bridge Road and RiverBend Drive, because that section is part of the proposed Pioneer Parkway BRT route. The section just north of Hayden Bridge Road travels along an old railroad right-of-way and between the backyards of private homes. That section, which has been called the "narrow segment," has the greatest right-of-way constraints because of its impact on the adjacent homes.

All current design options for the narrow segment include four vehicle travel lanes (two in each direction), a median, six-foot shoulders, and sound walls. None of the options include sidewalks or bike lanes. Three design options currently are being consideration:

1. Design without BRT (City Staff Original Proposal): Under this design, there will be no provision for BRT. The BRT vehicle would travel in mixed traffic along this stretch.
2. Back-to back Queue Jump Lanes (LTD Staff Preferred Proposal): This alternative extends each of the two queue-jump lanes for half the length of the narrow segment, allowing the car travel lanes to remain straight throughout the segment.
3. Conventional Queue Jump Lanes (LTD Proposal): This design would include queue-jump lanes at both the northern and southern ends of the narrow segment. The middle portion (about 30 percent of 2,000-foot length of the narrow segment) would not have BRT facilities.

The queue jump options include sub-options that include or do not include power lines along the Parkway. If the power poles are located in the median of MLK Parkway, the right-of-way requirements are greater than if the power poles are relocated out of the MLK Parkway right-of-way.

The attached matrices provide information on the right-of-way requirements, cost, and advantages and disadvantages of the Parkway design options.



**Lane Transit District**

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

*3500 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Eugene, Oregon 97403*

*Phone: 541-682-6100  
Fax: 541-682-6111  
TTY: 800-735-2900  
E-mail: [ltd@ltd.lane.or.us](mailto:ltd@ltd.lane.or.us)  
Internet: [www.ltd.org](http://www.ltd.org)*