

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING  
LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT  
SPECIAL BOARD MEETING/WORK SESSION

Wednesday, June 23, 2010

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on June 17, 2010, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District held a regular Board meeting on Wednesday, June 23, 2010, beginning at 5:30 p.m., in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene.

Present:           Mike Eyster, President  
                      Greg Evans, Vice President  
                      Dean Kortge, Secretary  
                      Ed Necker, Treasurer  
                      Michael Dubick  
                      Doris Towery  
                      Gary Gillespie  
                      Mark Pangborn, General Manager  
                      Jeanne Schapper, Clerk of the Board  
                      Katie Dettman, Minutes Recorder

**CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL:** Mr. Eyster convened the meeting and called the roll at 5:34 p.m. With the exception of Mr. Evans who arrived at 6:01 p.m., all Board members were present.

**PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT:** Mr. Eyster stated that there was important work to be done during the meeting, which concluded his comments.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO AGENDA:** There were no announcements or additions to the agenda.

**WORK SESSION**

**City of Eugene Presentation: Draft Climate and Energy Action Plan:** Matt McRae, Climate and Energy Action Coordinator at the City of Eugene, presented the City of Eugene Draft Climate and Energy Action Plan (CEAP). Mr. McRae noted that the community of Eugene was joining more than 50 other American communities that had adopted such plans.

Mr. McRae stated that it was in this context, which illustrated the gravity of the situation, that the Eugene City Council had voted unanimously in the winter of 2008-2009 to ask staff to create the CEAP with specific goals. These goals were designed to work in concert with other planning processes' goals, including the Eugene Comprehensive Lands Assessment, the Envision Eugene process, and the TransPlan update.

The goals listed for the CEAP were:

1. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions

2. Reduce community-wide fossil fuel use by 50 percent by 2030
3. Identify adaptations to climate change
4. Identify adaptations to rising fossil fuel prices

Mr. McRae mentioned some members of the Energy Plan advisory team, including Project Manager Joe McCormack from LTD. He stated that the public process for the CEAP started with a community kick-off event in September 2009 and was followed by six topic-specific public forums: Buildings and Energy; Food and Agriculture; Land Use and Transportation; Consumption and Waste; Health and Social Services; and Urban Natural Resources. He stated that topic specialists from the community helped further refine recommendations for each category. He said that the plan was currently in Phase III, which included sharing the draft plan with partners such as LTD. Mr. McRae added that the draft CEAP would be presented to the Eugene City Council in September 2010. He highlighted that the draft process had a great deal of community support, and the authors wanted to maintain involvement with the agencies outside of the City of Eugene. He reminded the Board that the CEAP was still in draft form and that changes and additions were still being made.

Mr. McRae outlined the Land Use and Transportation section of the CEAP. In this section the CEAP calls for: increasing density in and around the urban core and along high-capacity transit corridors; and diversifying funding sources for LTD.

Mr. McRae outlined the Align City of Eugene Transportation System Plan and the LTD Long-Range Transit Plan actions that help integrate bus routes into the broader alternative transportation system:

- Partner with LTD to maintain communication regarding service changes
- Invest in transit infrastructure that meets future access and mobility needs while consuming less fossil fuel
- Increase promotion of bicycling, walking, and mass transit

Mr. McRae noted that the draft plan had benefited from the support of LTD, specifically from General Manager Mark Pangborn, Director of Planning and Development Tom Schwetz, and Mr. McCormack.

Mr. Schwetz stated that LTD was involved in all aspects of the CEAP and not just actions outlined in the Land Use and Transportation section. He directed the Board to a chart that depicted a variety of transportation modes with respect to life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions. Research showed that LTD had one of the lowest greenhouse gas emissions per passenger mile when buses were full, and had one of the highest when buses were not full. All efforts to increase ridership incorporated in the CEAP, including increasing density around EmX corridors were invaluable.

**RideSource Call Center Second-Year Report:** Accessible Services Program Manager Terry Parker reminded the Board that she and Human Services Transportation Specialist Rand Stamm reported for the first time last year about the RideSource Call Center.

The RideSource Call Center has developed under the following assumptions and goals since taking on the business of Medicaid Non-Emergency Medical Transportation:

- Provides oversight of local Medicaid Non-Emergency Medical Transportation.
- Allows LTD to be in a better position to monitor and better manage risk.
- Improves consumer access to multiple transportation programs.
- Benefits from “economy of scale” with more grouped and full pay trips.

Ms. Parker outlined the Call Center's recent achievements:

1. Cost Allocation Model
  - Met or exceeded Medicaid standard.
  - Applied statistical theory.
  - Used Random Movement Time Sampling for staff activities.
  - Received Department of Human Services approval.
2. Transportation Assessment Program
  - In-person assessments for all participants county-wide and across programs.
  - Collaboration with Senior and Disabled Services and Alternative Work Concepts, local agencies that work with older adults and people with disabilities.
  - Promote independence using "least cost and most appropriate" transportation options.

Mr. Stamm presented examples of administrative challenges that the Call Center had experienced during the last year:

- Transportation providers and change in tort law.
- Transportation of children under age 12.

Mr. Necker asked if the new DHS administrative rule that was created to address the challenge of transporting children under age 12 required that children under age 12 had to travel with an adult. Mr. Stamm stated that this was indeed the case. He explained that the administrative rule stated that children under age 12 had to travel with a parent, a guardian, a personal care attendant, or with a Department of Human Services (DHS) volunteer of a DHS program.

Mr. Stamm continued to review some administrative challenges:

- Stretcher car ordinance.
- Creation of Oregon Health Authority.
- Electronic billing through the State's computerized system.

Mr. Stamm stated that the Call Center and LTD staff deal with administrative issues weekly and work with the State to help resolve those issues.

Ms. Parker outlined the cost containment and efficiency achieved by the Call Center. She stated that Fiscal Year (FY) 2007 was the last full year of operation prior to the implementation of the RideSource Call Center under its current structure, and serves as a base year for comparison to subsequent years.

Ms. Parker explained that in FY 2007, the average cost per one-way ride for ADA paratransit trips was \$23.06, and the average cost per one-way ride for all trips (including volunteer and other agency trips) was \$21.68. She added that in FY 2010, the average cost per one-way ride for ADA paratransit trips was \$22.76 and the average cost per one-way ride for all trips was \$21.06. She stated that these numbers showed improvement over the three-year period by keeping costs at or below the 2007 per ride rate. The number of rides provided continued to increase.

Mr. Gillespie asked if the cost of the Call Center rides was included in the cost of each of the rides. Ms. Parker explained that the cost was included in these numbers. She stated that one of the concerns when the Call Center opened was that it would increase the cost of

rides. She stated that the numbers showed that the cost per ride had actually decreased. She did acknowledge that providing a larger number of rides spread the administrative costs over more units of service, which contributes to a per-ride cost decrease. She stated that costs are shared across programs--the two largest being Medicaid Non-Emergency Medical Transportation and ADA paratransit.

Ms. Parker explained that in 2008, the RideSource service provided only a small portion of the Medicaid service. These trips were probably the only trips in the pool that were fully funded and fully reimbursed. She stated that every other ride in the business was subsidized by the pool of resources, which includes LTD General Fund dollars. In FY 2008, 705 Medicaid Non-Emergency Transportation rides were provided; in FY 2009, 3,487 were provided; and in FY 2010, 5,759 were provided. She said that RideSource (as a direct service provider separate and distinct from the Call Center) competes with all other transportation providers, including taxis and stretcher cars, and that RideSource had to remain competitive in order to be selected to provide trips. She stated that the model criteria used to choose which vendor took the rider included: least cost; most appropriate; and Medicaid could not give RideSource any special treatment when these decisions were made.

Ms. Parker stated that development of the FY 2011 work plan continued, and the biggest agenda item was cost allocation. She stated that the in-person transportation assessments were being funded with grant money. However, once the grants run out, these costs would need to be integrated into the business of the Call Center. Ms. Parker added that a cost-allocation model for this was being developed. Other aspects of the FY 2011 work plan included:

- Software and telephone system replacement.
- Integration of trips using all contract providers.
- New funding sources, program development, and expanded community partnerships.

Ms. Parker acknowledged the help of two community partners: Hilyard Community Center and Willamalane Park and Recreation District. Each use an LTD-leased vehicle to provide additional trips that would otherwise be on RideSource and, in turn, have a vehicle to use for their own programming.

Mr. Necker explained that one of the reasons that it was difficult to expand the pool of taxi providers for Medicaid trips was because of the drug and alcohol testing requirements under FTA, which, for taxi providers, increases the costs of providing transportation. Because of this, he explained, many taxi companies were unwilling to participate in ADA trips.

Ms. Parker stated that LTD is working with the Call Center to absorb that cost. This will allow any provider to take on that additional requirement and work within a testing pool so as not to add costs to their business or have to adjust rates. She explained that some providers have indicated a willingness to comply with the federal rules, and staff are getting closer to resolving the issue.

Mr. Stamm added that there currently are six contract providers who would be willing to be contracted ADA providers and would be able to meet all of the requirements.

Ms. Parker added that this would help the program provide lower cost trips for people who did not require a vehicle with a wheelchair lift.

Mr. Gillespie asked if Ms. Parker thought this shift was a result of the poor state of the economy. Ms. Parker relayed her belief that the Call Center induced the shift. She stated

that she could not speak to the effect of the economy; however, RideSource meets with taxi providers and has demonstrated that the RideSource Call Center does advocate on their behalf and is working to give them more business.

Mr. Stamm agreed. Taxi drivers were looking to expand their businesses, and when the Call Center opened, a lot of transportation was not happening under the Medicaid model. Nevertheless, when the Call Center consolidated services, the number of trips per week escalated for every provider with whom RideSource contracted. He said that he believed that taxi drivers viewed the rides as advantageous to their businesses.

Mr. Kortge asked if the state budget was affecting the Call Center. Ms. Parker replied that the state budget was affecting the program indirectly. She explained that when Senior and Disabled Services saw less funding for programs that may indirectly send more people to their service, RideSource's numbers were affected. She explained that the Call Center recently determined that one of their revenue streams was less than they had predicted, but that it had not been a state budget issue. She explained that one state budget issue is whether or not we would be able to retain the state funding gained in the last legislative session for elderly and disabled transportation through what has been titled Special Transportation Operations.

Ms. Parker recalled that a comment had come up during the RideSource budget sessions comparing what RideSource drivers were paid to what LTD/ATU drivers were paid. She said that RideSource had 39.03 FTE, but that many of the drivers were part-time or did other work, including dispatch and scheduling, as part of their jobs. She indicated that RideSource drivers earned between \$11.68-\$13.83 per hour, while LTD/ATU drivers earned \$16.32-\$21.72 per hour.

Ms. Parker expressed that Specialty Mobility Services, as a small non-profit, had been very good at trying to provide benefits for employees and includes workers with 17.5 hours worked per week and more on their benefit plan. She added that the cost per employee for 100 percent employer-paid health benefits was \$580 for RideSource and \$1,175 for LTD.

Mr. Eyster commended the work that Ms. Parker had done, emphasizing Ms. Parker's role in building LTD's reputation for creativity and resourcefulness. He added that the combination of collaboration and creativity was stellar. He recalled a webinar that Ms. Parker had facilitated more than a year before that helped other districts learn about what LTD was doing. He believed that Ms. Parker is considered a national expert on accessible services.

Ms. Parker said that she had been invited to a forum in Seattle in August, "Coordination: The Good, The Bad, and The Ugly." She emphasized that the RideSource Call Center was being highlighted as the example of "The Good."

Mr. Eyster added that LTD was providing more service, more effectively, at a lower cost per person than other providers at a time when all providers are facing severe budget constraints. He stated that any relief provided was appreciated and that LTD was providing service to those who genuinely needed it.

**West Eugene EmX Extension Project: Refinement of the Range of Alternatives:** Mr. Schwetz explained that the District was altering the process that it was using for the West Eugene EmX Extension (WEEE) project. He explained that the process had originally created 58 distinct alternatives to evaluate. The approach taken to evaluate any EmX corridor was to evaluate the operational needs for EmX and for the rest of the system with

the intent of minimizing and avoiding negative impacts when possible. He stated that as staff attended various open houses, received public input, conducted stakeholder tours, and completed field work, they had defined a range of design refinements.

An example of one refinement was the 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> Avenue option, where the corridor went up Lincoln Street and come back on Charnelton Street. Some of the comments received from the public indicated that residents were concerned about EmX running up Lincoln Street. As a result of that public input, the option of putting two lanes on 12<sup>th</sup> Street was put forward. The revised option was such that the EmX would go up Lincoln Street and down Charnelton. With the intent of minimizing impacts on 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> avenues, staff created the option to redesign an existing lane, which also would help avoid property acquisition. Through such processes as explained above, 58 alternatives were created.

Mr. Schwetz explained that evaluating 58 alternatives was difficult. Staff discussed this with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), who suggested more of a sequential process. Using FTA's suggested process, a smaller list of alternatives could be decided upon. Using the new process, the Alternatives Analysis Report could become a local plan, which would allow more time and flexibility for the process. He explained that the same analysis would still be used, but that this was a procedure change. With the new approach, collaboration with the community would be easier.

Mr. Schwetz further clarified that some newly acquired information indicated that some of the 58 alternatives were no longer feasible. The reasons for this included a range of issues related to criteria established as part of developing the purpose, need, goals, and objectives of the project, including environmental issues, the cost of the project, and projected ridership. Staff hoped to take this information and refine the range of alternatives.

Mr. Schwetz explained the specific criteria used to evaluate the 58 alternatives. He then described three different terminus options that might be taken off the table using the new range of alternatives: 1) the full-length option, which would go out to Ed Cone Boulevard and Willow Creek Road, 2) a Commerce Street terminus and, 3) a Seneca Station terminus.

With respect to the full-length terminus option, it was discovered that storm water runoff was going to be an issue. That specific area of West 11<sup>th</sup> was surrounded by wetlands and there were Bureau of Land Management protected wetlands on the north side. The proposal to add pavement would mean that LTD would have to manage all of the storm water runoff for the entire facility. Cost projections indicated that running all the way out to Ed Cone could cost as much as \$142 million. He stated that \$75 million was the maximum amount FTA Small Starts would award, and LTD hoped to get \$30 million from the state legislature. For these reasons, as well as the relatively low ridership past Commerce Street, staff recommended taking that terminus option off the table.

Mr. Schwetz said that the Seneca Station terminus was another terminus option that should be taken off the list. This option had issues such as: 1) it would be a relatively short extension of EmX; and, 2) it would create a lot of problems with regular service needing to terminate at that point.

Mr. Schwetz explained that another way of examining the alternatives available was to acknowledge the number of alignment alternatives, the following of which were found to be problematic:

- a) The Amazon Alignment would create a number of environmental impacts. Endangered plant species exist there, and the channel was more than 50 years old,

which qualified the channel as a historic resource. Also, both low income housing and park land existed all along the line

b) The Amazon Restoration design option would include moving the channel between City View Street and Oak Patch Road, and would require the displacement of eight residences. This also was the alternative that had the highest public concern.

c) West 7<sup>th</sup> Place – the staff recommendation was to remove this option from further consideration due primarily to low ridership and a projection of only 64 boardings per day in 2030, or one boarding for every two buses passing. This was the lowest projected ridership of all of the alternatives. In addition, there would have to be numerous strips of property acquired to make this alternative work. This option also had the longest travel time of any of the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) alternatives, as well as a high construction cost, and the highest operating cost of any of the alternatives. The projected ridership for the Commerce Street option was between 200 and 400 boardings. There was quite a bit of ridership on the segment between Garfield Street and Seneca Street. If the West 7<sup>th</sup> Place alternative were chosen, LTD would lose the Garfield/Seneca ridership.

Mr. Schwetz stated that there were a lot of alternative options on W. 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue, which included property acquisition. The general approach would be to conduct more detailed design modifications once a preferred alternative was selected. For example: in the original design it was proposed to take out the commercial parking in front of an existing market on 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue east of Mill Street. The business voiced its concerns, and a design was developed to preserve the existing parking lot. These types of specific design modifications are always possible. At that point, an 8-10 percent concept existed in terms of the designs, which allowed a lot of room to work with property owners. There existed opportunities to mix and match alternatives through given segments. Between Garfield and Seneca, the Transportation Systems Management (TSM) options could be utilized to move buses through more quickly.

Mr. Schwetz concluded by stating that these were staff recommendations: the No Build and TSM options were retained; and four design options for the 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> route to Garfield and then down W. 11<sup>th</sup> existed that would be carried into the alternatives analysis:

1. The Lincoln Charnelton couplet
2. Charnelton two-way
3. Adding a lane on 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> avenues, and
4. Reassigning a lane on 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> avenues

Mr. Schwetz stated that in order to approve a reduced list of alternatives, the Board would need to approve the list and put it into the Alternatives Analysis (AA) Report. The FTA would then review the AA report; and it was hoped that by mid to late summer, the report could be changed and circulated for public review. At that point, there would need to be a selection of a Locally-Preferred Alternative (LPA). Mr. Schwetz stated that a joint LPA Committee would make recommendations based on the AA Report. After that, the public notification process would begin. Then the Eugene City Council, the Metropolitan Policy Committee, and the LTD Board of Directors would need to agree on the selection of an LPA.

Responding to a question from Mr. Necker, Mr. Schwetz said that the two-lane transitway design option on W. 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue was the option that was focused on the segment of W. 13<sup>th</sup> between Polk and Tyler streets. There are four residences located there, and the design would require acquiring those properties.

Mr. Eyster asked Mr. Gillespie to characterize the conversation that occurred at the Eugene City Council meeting that morning.

Mr. Gillespie explained that his impression was that the meeting sounded like a conversation deciding whether or not to disconnect a person's life support, and the councilors were struggling to find life support for the West 7<sup>th</sup> Place option. He stated that this option was the one that was discussed most, and that a couple of councilors seemed to be embracing the No Build option for this segment. One other person viewed that area as an area for future development. Mr. Gillespie stated that he understood that ridership was low in that area because it was an industrial area, and yet one of the councilors stated that they thought that area had the potential for infill housing and business development and would prosper. Mr. Gillespie added that the Council felt that leaving W. 7<sup>th</sup> Place in the alternatives did not totally commit them to the W. 11<sup>th</sup> option, and that there was a lot of concern around property acquisition. He stated his belief that there was a misunderstanding about what would have to be acquired: the Council thought parking lots and buildings would have to be acquired, while LTD felt that only rights-of-way and easements would need to be acquired.

Mr. Eyster stated that when they sat down with the Council members, he was not sure how they would feel about the entire concept of reducing the number of options. It was clear to him that the Council felt it was wise to try to reduce options; and they wanted LTD to eliminate the options that most obviously would not work because of environmental, productivity, or cost reasons. He stated that the Council encouraged the W. 7<sup>th</sup> Place option because the Council did not put it in the same category as other options that were proposed for elimination. He stated that as Mr. Gillespie expressed, there was not uniformity of opinion on the Council: those who were in favor of leaving W. 7<sup>th</sup> Place on the list were not necessarily advocating for W. 7<sup>th</sup> Place or W. 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue, but rather were expressing that they wanted to leave those two options on the table.

Mr. Schwetz stated that the Council was a critical ally as the process moved forward. He explained that staff analysis had been presented, but staff recommended also that the LTD Board consider the Council's position as the Board makes its decisions.

Mr. Kortge expressed his disappointment that the Amazon option was not studied further, as he thought it had huge potential. He thought it had more potential for development than the W. 7<sup>th</sup> Place option, but he added that he understood there were complications with that option.

Mr. Evans cautioned the Board against possibly being shortsighted about the W. 7<sup>th</sup> Place option. He stated that the Board could not necessarily see the potential of EmX as a catalyst for mixed-use development. He mentioned an *Envision Eugene* report, which looked into the 2030s, and reiterated that LTD was looking to the future and building the EmX Extension for the year 2031 and beyond. The W. 7<sup>th</sup> Place seen today is probably will not be what it will look like in the future. There were properties in that area that could be transformed, and there were empty spaces that had potential. The EmX itself could be the catalyst for revitalization of W. 7<sup>th</sup> Place. When revitalization occurs, residential and commercial developers come in, realize the potential for the area, and decide to invest. He expressed his view that LTD should look at the full range of development potentials along W. 7<sup>th</sup> Place.

Mr. Eyster reminded the Board that they were not choosing the option that evening.

Mr. Dubick stated that his concerns included not just the slow speed of the line if it were on W. 7<sup>th</sup> Place, but the distance that people who were now riding on W. 11<sup>th</sup> would have to



walk from W. 7<sup>th</sup> Place to reach their destinations. He stated that this was one reason he did not see the W. 7<sup>th</sup> Place option as a viable alternative.

Mr. Pangborn stated that if the decision were made to use the W. 7<sup>th</sup> Place option, LTD would still have to provide some level of service on W. 11<sup>th</sup>, which would add to the operational cost. He added that the project was a real partnership with the City, and the majority of the Council members favored leaving the W. 7<sup>th</sup> Place option on the list.

Mr. Eyster added that the Council also favored reducing the list of 58 options down to a more reasonable number, and that was what the Board was to approve that evening. Mr. Eyster stated his belief that some councilors, both at this meeting and at previous meetings, leaned toward the No-Build option. He emphasized the need to keep in mind that LTD was not imposing these options on anyone and that the City had requested West Eugene as the next BRT route. TransPlan, he said, stated that the community was committed to 61 miles of EmX build out. Because of this, the West Eugene EmX Extension was part of a larger community vision to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, congestion, and dependence on fossil fuel. He repeated Mr. Evans' belief that the W. 7<sup>th</sup> Place option could incur transit-oriented development along the route.

Ms. Towery stated that the Board hoped to narrow the list of 58 choices. She stated that her understanding was that the Board would not make a decision that evening on where the list was going. She then asked what harm there was in exploring the viability of an extra alternative in terms of timing and transportation for riders as well as its potential as a catalyst for revitalization and for the community to grow in a healthy, sustainable way. She encouraged further partnering with the City while exploring the viability of the W. 7<sup>th</sup> Place option.

Mr. Eyster invited public comments.

## AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

**Wendy Butler Boyeson**, 1265 City View Street, Eugene, explained that she was a regular bus rider representing bus riders' concerns. She stated that transit made sense, especially as the community moved planned for the future. She explained that people at the downtown station were "dazed and confused" by the cuts to LTD routes that had already taken place, and she wasn't sure what would happen when more cuts are made in September. She said that EmX was a wonderful opportunity to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and move people more efficiently. She commended LTD for its response to the public's concerns. She said that there were a lot of logical reasons why the W. 7<sup>th</sup> Place option would not work. She added that LTD could not afford to cut service in one area to build somewhere that may develop in the future. The West 11<sup>th</sup> option, she said, was a fantastic commercial corridor, and EmX would bring more customers to the already commercial location with relatively small property intrusions. She also expressed her appreciation for the W. 13<sup>th</sup> designs, which would allow for a more pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly street. She said that she liked the idea that BRT would encourage development and that there was as much potential for development along W. 11<sup>th</sup> as there was along W. 7<sup>th</sup> Place.

**Pauline Hutson**, 1025 Taylor Street, Eugene, said that her statement was composed by herself and Jozef Siekiel-Zdzicnicki. They viewed the route on 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue between downtown and Seneca as the one for which the most planning was being done, with far less emphasis on the 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 7<sup>th</sup> Place alternatives. She stated their belief that the option with the most stability in terms of future fiscal health and increasing ridership was the

one that was the most prudent. She said that the opportunities for development on 13<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> avenues were finite for many reasons, which meant that the amount of increased ridership essential for the future financial health of LTD would not happen along those routes. She said that they thought the most pragmatic options were 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> Avenue and W. 7<sup>th</sup> Place, the northernmost connection. These would present easy connections to the build out of River Road/Santa Clara and the Highway 99/Bethel corridors, which are the fastest growing areas in Eugene. The larger population would provide for a larger ridership base. She said that the route should go east to Oak and north to 6<sup>th</sup> and should return on 7<sup>th</sup> to Pearl and south to 10<sup>th</sup>, joining up with the existing transit system. By adding these areas, much of downtown would be included with its major commercial and government centers as well as the Hult Center and the Hilton. It also would be within one or two blocks from the train station, all of which would be great for LTD's business. An analysis done by the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), for the proposed and now-defunct West Eugene Parkway project, showed that only one out of seven vehicles would have been taken off W. 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue. She stated that the following was addressed to the Eugene City Council: "How is your directive of October 7, 2006, which was addressed to LTD, dealing with the traffic problems on W. 11<sup>th</sup> when most of the ridership, both current and future, is to the north and northwest based on LTD's ridership numbers and a survey conducted by Residents for Responsible Rapid Transit (3RT)?" She stated that Ms. Koleszar had the rest of their statement. She gave a copy of the statement to Mr. Eyster.

**Ilona Koleszar**, 875 W. 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene, stated that a comparison of the zoning and address occupancies in the corridors of 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> avenues showed that 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> Avenues was the best alternative for expanding the ridership base and for future economic development, which are two of LTD's main goals for extending EmX to West Eugene. The 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue corridor was zoned more than half residential, medium density, and the rest was community commercial, which allowed for multi-unit housing. In an inventory conducted by 3RT, there were approximately 460 residential residences, 70 commercial addresses, five public or governmental facilities and three empty commercial sites on the 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue corridor. The 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> Avenue route was zoned mostly exclusively commercial, which allows for multi-unit housing with some major commercial and light industrial down by Garfield Street. This route has approximately 470 residential addresses (basically the same number as the 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue corridor); 340 commercial addresses (five times as many as the 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue route); 13 public, land, or government addresses; and 34 empty commercial sites. Both sets of numbers were inclusive of one block north and south of each of those avenues. Of the commercial addresses on 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> avenues, ten motels with 288 units; and, if the Hilton with 269 guest rooms were included, the available accommodations were doubled on that route. The multi-unit property tax exemptions (MUPTE) were already in place for redevelopment on 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> avenues as well as in the Trainsong neighborhood, which leads to Highway 99 north and its potential for growth. She said that she had heard someone at the meeting earlier saying there wasn't any plan by the City for development there, but there was a MUPTE in place, which happened last year or the year before. The redevelopment of Highway 99 would enhance the eroding entryway into Eugene from the airport so that, in the words of Riley West, "I won't have to be embarrassed bringing my friends from the airport by going down Highway 99 to my home in the hills in South Eugene." In addition, the district surrounding the airport needs bus service, which also would be good for potential growth. She said that ended Mr. Siekiel-Zdzicnicki's piece. She said that she was one of the people on the West Eugene Corridor Committee who heavily favored retaining the 7<sup>th</sup> Place option for now. She stated her appreciation for analyzing the W. 7<sup>th</sup> Place option further. She stated that traveling down W. 7<sup>th</sup> Place was currently much faster by car than W. 11<sup>th</sup> was, and that she had a hard time believing it would be slower than W. 11<sup>th</sup> with EmX. She said that she also was not satisfied as a Corridor Committee member with the ridership figures projected--partly because they don't take into account the ability to bring riders down from the south

side by connectors down to the trunk line. She hoped that LTD would continue to consider this. Ms. Hutson and Ms. Koleszar thanked the Board for its time.

**Mark Robinowitz**, PO Box 51222, Eugene, said that state law required transportation and land use to be coupled together, yet there was no evidence that this had been done anywhere along any of the route options. For example, Lowe's was built right next to Home Depot. He said that if LTD were going to plan any transportation along W. 11<sup>th</sup>, there had to be a change in the way land use and transportation was coupled. Federal law governed the process however, he did not see any mention of the environmental impact statement (EIS), yet that was what LTD was preparing. Under federal transportation law, he said, LTD had to consider new circumstances not considered in the EIS; and if passing the point of peak oil was not a new circumstance that governed how transportation worked, then nothing was. He referred to Title 23, U.S. Code, 771. He stated if this was not factored in, LTD would need a supplemental draft EIS. He added that LTD had not even planned for the cost increases in petroleum, and this was why LTD was having financial problems keeping existing routes, yet it was spending more public money studying BRT. He stated that if one looked at a population density map of West Eugene, one could see that most people lived on W. 18<sup>th</sup>, on Bethel Drive, and on River Road. He said that if it was his decision, he would choose the 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> Avenue option up to Highway 99. LTD would have to plan for a future without funding for these types of projects. He stated that this was not a recession, but was reaching the limits of growth on a finite planet. It was an unpopular topic, but physics was not subject to politics. Energy made money, not the other way around. He said that if LTD really wanted to fund BRT, they should take money away from the Interstate-5 expansion. He said that the community had decided to spend \$1 billion to widen freeways through the rest of the era of oil. Solar energy could not fuel transportation, and people will have to do a lot more with a lot less because growth was over. He said that BRT could be done well and it could be done poorly, and putting a bus line out to big box stores surrounded by giant parking lots would be a tremendous waste of money that would be better spent keeping the existing buses going. He asked the Board to consider Highway 99, since this was a federal transit decision, not a City of Eugene or LTD decision. He asked that LTD and the City use taxpayer money to do the right thing. He handed Board members a handout titled *Peak Traffic Planning: NAFTA Superhighways at the End of the Age of Oil*.

**Betsy Payne** 1245 Jefferson St., Eugene, stated that the 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue route would go right in front of her house. She said that she was unnerved to read an article in *The Register-Guard* on June 16 regarding the changes proposed on W. 11<sup>th</sup>. The article stated "...but structures built close to West 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue prevent the street from being widened. That, officials say, conflicts with Lane Transit District's goal to widen West 11<sup>th</sup> and build 12-foot-wide bus lanes for its West Eugene bus rapid transit line, called West Eugene EmX." She stated that she thought no decision had been made, but the City seemed to think that LTD had chosen the W. 11<sup>th</sup> route. She thought perhaps that was because, as Mr. Eyster was saying, most of the research done so far had looked at the W. 11<sup>th</sup> and W. 13<sup>th</sup> routes, and not much had been heard about 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> avenues. She said that the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> Avenues option seemed much more logical because the route could later be branched up Highway 99 and go out to River Road and other areas where there was future build out. She said that if the State built a hospital and prison in Junction City, more transportation options would need to be available. She said that the W. 11<sup>th</sup> route did not make sense, as businesses on W. 11<sup>th</sup> were not businesses she would visit on a bus (car repair and furniture businesses, for example). She encouraged the Board to look more at the 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> option, as she thought it was more logical. She thanked the Board.

Mr. Eyster reminded those present that, up to that point, LTD had been adding options to the list and that no decisions had yet been made regarding routes. He stated that LTD had 58

options on the table at present, and regardless of what *The Register-Guard* said, no decisions had yet been made. He stated that the LTD Board was not the only body that would be making the decision; other bodies that would be involved were the Metropolitan Planning Organization and the City of Eugene. He stated that tonight's discussion would consider whether or not it made sense to reduce the list of 58 options. He said that there was a specific question on the table regarding the W. 7<sup>th</sup> Place option.

There being no further testimony, Mr. Eyster closed the public hearing.

## ITEMS FOR ACTION

### West Eugene EmX Extension Project Refinement of the Range of Alternatives

Mr. Gillespie asked if the proposed resolution now included the W. 7<sup>th</sup> Place option.

Mr. Eyster explained that the W. 7<sup>th</sup> Place option was off the table in the resolution.

MOTION Mr. Gillespie moved to approve LTD Resolution No. 2010-026 adopting actions relating to the West Eugene EmX Extension Project as outlined in the Resolution with the addition of the W. 7<sup>th</sup> Place option. Mr. Kortge provided the second.

Mr. Gillespie stated his opinion that it was still prudent to examine the W. 7<sup>th</sup> Place option while keeping in mind the cost of doing so.

Mr. Evans stated that he was not advocating for any one option, but that he wanted to try to maintain as many options as were available to be able to discuss, study, and vet. He stated that since he represented northwest Eugene up to Junction City, he did have an interest in maintaining LTD's ability to easily go out Highway 99 and River Road when that time came. He stated that this option also was included in the 61-mile build out map.

Mr. Evans reiterated that there was a No Build, a Transportation Systems Management (TSM), and a Build option on the table. The District would be vetting each option with multiple pieces of the Build on the route and could mix and match all three, two, or whatever comes out of the process as the best solution for that section of town. He stated that the analyses had to be thorough enough so that if any of the options came off the table, the vast majority of people would be comfortable with the analysis around it.

Mr. Kortge left at 7:13 p.m.

Mr. Dubick said that he respected what Mr. Evans and Ms. Towery said in terms of leaving the W. 7<sup>th</sup> Place option on the table in order to study it further. He said that he wanted to make sure that when the process was complete, the Board had not created a solution that did not solve the problem they were trying to fix in the first place. If that were the case, he would have a very hard time supporting it. He wanted the Board to keep in mind that there was a request to solve the problem using BRT, and if it was not politically feasible to solve the problem, then maybe the Board needed to walk away at that point.

Mr. Evans called for the question.

Mr. Eyster reiterated the original motion, asking all those in favor of the motion to take a number of the options off the table as recommended by staff, specifically specifying that the W. 7<sup>th</sup> Place option remain under consideration.

VOTE The motion was approved as follows:

AYES: Dubick, Eyster, Necker, Evans, Towery, Gillespie (6)  
NAYS: None  
ABSTENTIONS: None  
EXCUSED: Kortge (1)

Mr. Eyster reiterated that No Build was an option, TSM was an option, and there were a number of Build options on the table. The Board had not yet selected a corridor, but would do so in collaboration with community partners. He thanked those present for their comments.

### **ADDITIONS TO AGENDA**

**Lane Area Commission on Transportation (LACT) Proposed Bylaws:** Mr. Schwetz brought the Board's attention to the handout, titled "Lane Area Commission on Transportation (LACT) Proposed Bylaws." He explained that during the 2009 Legislative Session, the Oregon Legislature had decided that one of the best ways to report on the process of prioritizing state highways was to form Area Commissions on Transportation (ACT) at a local level. The concept was to use the framework that the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) uses with State: maintenance districts and areas overlapping those districts that were building on the front end of development process. ODOT Area Manager Sonny Chickering was in charge of helping put the LACT together. Most ACTs in the state were multi-county, and Lane County was the only one that had a single-county ACT. This had caused some problems. LTD had been close to establishing an ACT through the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) Board, but the process halted because Commissioner Anna Morrison argued, as did the rest of the Commission at the time, that the County Commissioners represented counties. Consequently, another commission should not be formed. As a result, for the next nine to ten years, various people tried to put the ACT together, and the legislature finally passed a bill to do so. The intent of an ACT was to bring local interests together to discuss the range of transportation priorities and issues that need to be resolved; and to develop, on a regular basis, a set of priorities from one area to put into the mix as the Oregon Transit Association considered its priorities for the State's transportation improvement plan.

Both Mr. Schwetz and Mr. Eyster had participated in many of the LACT meetings. At some point, staff would ask the Board to approve or give a resolution in support of the process. The Lane County Board of Commissioners had met that day, and in attendance were the chair of the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) Gail Achterman and OTC Commissioner Alan Brown, who talked about their expectations for the process. Ultimately, the OTC will approve the formation of the LACT pending a decision by the County Commissioners to approve the bylaws. From a staff standpoint, LTD was in a good position. LTD had been considered a critical part of the LACT.

Mr. Eyster stated that there was a lot of suspicion and ill will between mayors of some of Oregon's smaller towns and other jurisdictions. Therefore, to get consensus on something like this represented some incredible work. It was important for LTD to be represented in the bylaws in a way that was significant and appropriate, and LTD could have confidence that a lot of work had been done to get to this agreement. He stated that he did not have any reservations about fully endorsing it or asking the rest of the Board to endorse it when it came time to vote.

Ms. Towery mentioned that she gave a presentation to the Coburg City Council for United Way. During the same meeting, LCOG gave a presentation regarding LACT. She said that

Coburg Mayor Judy Volta did an excellent job of explaining the process in the same way that Mr. Eyster had, including the amount of work that had gone into it. The process allowed for more engagement and allowed for a more collaborative process.

Mr. Schwetz added that it was important to pick up on what Mr. Eyster was saying in terms of the work that was done. As was stated by Friends of Eugene at a recent meeting, as constructed, the ACT does not proportionally reflect city populations in terms of voting rights. It reflects a senate model rather than a representative model. The largest cities in the county, Eugene and Springfield, had decided that all entities needed to work collaboratively.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Mr. Eyster adjourned the meeting at 7:29 p.m.

---

Board Secretary