

MINUTES OF MEETING  
LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT  
EmX STEERING COMMITTEE

Tuesday, August 2, 2016

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on July 29, 2016, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the EmX Steering Committee for the Lane Transit District held a meeting on Tuesday, August 2, 2016, beginning at 5:30 p.m., at the LTD Board Room, 3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene, Oregon.

EmX Steering Committee

Present: Carl Yeh, Chair, LTD Board  
Alexis Biddle, At Large  
Frannie Brindle, ODOT  
Mike Eyster, At Large  
Gerry Gaydos, At Large (arrived 5:40 p.m.)  
Gary Gillespie, LTD Board  
Dave Hauser, Chamber of Commerce  
Sid Leiken, Lane County Board of Commissioners  
Sheri Moore, Springfield City Council  
George Poling, Eugene City Council  
Rick Satre, At Large (arrived 5:40 p.m.)  
Josh Skov, At Large

Absent: Tammy Fitch, At Large  
Julie Grossman, LTD Board  
Sid Leiken, Lane County Board of Commissioners

LTD Staff A.J. Jackson, General Manager (via teleconference)  
Tom Schwetz, Planning and Development Manager  
Sasha Luftig, Transit Development Planner  
Dan Tutt, Marketing Representative  
Ashley Ziert, Administrative Assistant  
Lisa VanWinkle, Project Communications Coordinator  
Jeanne Schapper, Executive Office Manager/Clerk of the Board

Guests Gary Wildish, LTD Board  
Rob Zako, BEST  
Emma Newman, City of Springfield  
Chris Henry, City of Eugene  
Zack Galloway, City of Eugene  
Bill Johnston, ODOT

**I. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

Mr. Yeh called the meeting to order and called the roll.

**II. CHAIR'S COMMENTS**

There were no comments.

**III. AGENDA REVIEW**

There were no changes to the agenda.

#### **IV. MINUTES**

**MOTION:** Mr. Poling, seconded by Mr. Skov, moved to approve the June 2, 2016, meeting minutes as submitted.

**VOTE:** The motion passed unanimously, 10:0.

#### **V. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

Mr. Yeh explained the procedures for offering comments to the Steering Committee.

**Rob Zako**, Eugene, representing Better Eugene-Springfield Transit (BEST), said that the EmX Steering Committee had been formed when bus rapid transit was a new technology; now it is no longer about the technology as EmX was a means for moving riders. He encouraged the Committee to focus on how LTD was serving riders and ways to improve that service. He commended the staff's report to the LTD Board on Vision Zero. He said that Portland's TriMet system had conducted a pedestrian network analysis, and the outcome identified 10 corridors in the Portland area where there were the most opportunities to improve safety for pedestrians. He said that similar information should be collected on LTD's system through the Vision Zero process in order to identify corridors where the most improvements could be made.

#### **VI. BROADENING EMX STEERING COMMITTEE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

Mr. Schwetz said that this item was the continuation of the Steering Committee's discussion of LTD's 10-year implementation plan that was under development. He said the plan affected more than just EmX; it was many other things that were key to LTD's future success, including moving from a hub-and-spoke configuration to create more connectivity with the regular service. He said that the LTD Board had passed a motion directing staff to develop a broader range of responsibilities to better align the EmX Steering Committee collaboratively with the organization's needs.

Mr. Yeh encouraged an open discussion about the topic. He said that the Board was very interested in the evolution of the Steering Committee's role and the opportunity to utilize its strengths and possibly expand membership to further diversify community representation, particularly from riders.

Mr. Satre and Mr. Gaydos arrived at 5:40 p.m.

Mr. Skov agreed that the Steering Committee's composition could be diversified to include more segments of the community.

Mr. Hauser asked if broadening the Steering Committee's focus meant expanding beyond EmX and thinking more broadly about how to improve transit service generally. Ms. Jackson replied that the Board Service Committee reviewed the deployment of service on an annual basis. She said the Board was interested in a group that looked at the functions of the entire system, including EmX, and how they connected with the community. She said that the group should be inclusive and have key stakeholders/constituents at the table, including elected officials, businesses, and riders.

Mr. Hauser said that a broader involvement for the Steering Committee seemed a logical progression of its role and put the Committee in a position to think more holistically about the system and transit's role in the community.

Mr. Gillespie agreed that a broader role for the Steering Committee was appropriate. He hoped to see future discussions of connected routes and next steps to achieve future connectivity. He felt that taking a holistic approach to the system would re-energize the Committee.

Ms. Moore asked what representation from specific groups would be considered if Steering Committee membership was expanded. She said that sometimes a larger committee was not as effective, and she suggested that various members of the Committee could be assigned to obtain feedback from specific groups in the community. She asked if current members provided reports or feedbacks about the needs and concerns of the populations they represented, such as students or riders.

Mr. Eyster said that the Steering Committee's purpose should be to provide assistance and be of value to the LTD Board as a decision-making body. He cited the Budget Committee as an example of a group that recommended a budget to the Board for approval.

Mr. Skov suggested that the LTD Board members consider what additional advisory functions they would like to see the Steering Committee undertake. He said it was also essential to clarify what information would be communicated to the Board and how it would be conveyed. He liked the idea of broadening the Committee's role to consider transit more broadly and agreed with Mr. Hauser's comments. He added that the Steering Committee could explore a more clearly defined relationship with BEST and riders.

Mr. Satre questioned how representation could be diversified. He noted that the Committee was already a large group. With respect to broadening the Committee's role, he said that perhaps the role could mature and evolve with the system--although if it was no longer the EmX Steering Committee and became a steering committee for the whole array of transit, that could mean a loss of focus and effective input to the Board. There was still significant EmX planning occurring.

Mr. Yeh asked if there was interest in expanding Steering Committee membership.

Mr. Skov said that a major consideration was the division of labor with the Board. He said there could be issues that the Board did not have time for, and perhaps some of those could be handed off to the Steering Committee. He stressed the importance of clearly defining the process for communication between the Board and Committee.

Mr. Yeh pointed out that the Steering Committee had demonstrated its ability to independently generate issues and bring them to the Board's attention. He saw the relationship as one in which the Board could refer issues to the Committee and the Committee could also raise issues it felt the Board should consider.

Mr. Biddle suggested that the Steering Committee's meetings could be better timed sequentially with Board meetings.

Mr. Hauser remarked that as the Steering Committee's role and responsibilities were better defined, it would be easier to determine if the current membership was appropriate or expansion was required. He asked if a broader committee role might include providing advice on development of the 10-year implementation plan. Ms. Jackson said that would be an ideal starting point as the Steering Committee represented key community stakeholders and could engage in an exchange of ideas. Instead of expanding the Committee with more permanent members, she said that including other perspectives could occur when needed by inviting people to participate in Steering Committee discussions of specific issues as system development moved forward. Those additional perspectives could help inform the Committee's advice to the Board on various matters and assure that all community interests affected by a particular decision were heard.

Mr. Gillespie said that most of his district was within the West Eugene EmX area. He added that he was a transit-dependent person, and he was in favor of Committee diversification. He noted that LTD was the highest ranked transit district for its size in the country and had completed three successful EmX routes in operation. He said there had been four different Board members on the Steering Committee over the years, and it had primarily been the Committee that questioned its value, not the Board.

Ms. Brindle said she had struggled with the role of the Steering Committee during her membership--especially with respect to what occurred in a jurisdiction when it was grappling with the issue of EmX service, such as what was occurring in Springfield with Main Street. She questioned if the Committee was silent too often when cities were struggling with EmX issues and receiving feedback mostly from concerned businesses who were not the only stakeholders. She said that perhaps it was a role of the Steering Committee to advocate or recommend on those issues and try to influence outcomes.

Ms. Moore thanked LTD for its involvement in the Olympic Trials and doing a wonderful job of moving people around the area. As a new member of the Steering Committee, she had initially questioned why there had been a presentation on Eugene's bike rental program; but upon reflection, she realized that the transit system involved all modes, and making those connections was part of growing the transit system. She commented that the title "EmX Steering Committee" seemed somewhat limiting when actually the Committee looked at a wide range of transportation-related issues such as bikes and pedestrian safety.

Mr. Skov asked what additional role LTD saw for the Steering Committee under a 10-year implementation plan. Ms. Jackson said that the District hoped to engage community members in a continuous discussion of transportation needs throughout the region, along with development of a sustainable 10-year plan that would evolve along with regional needs. She said the plan would address transportation needs through a connectivity and system approach. She envisioned the Committee as part of that strategy as it represented many community interests.

Mr. Eyster questioned the intent of the discussion when the Board had not asked the Steering Committee for help. Mr. Skov agreed that the Board should be decide how the Committee could be of assistance.

Mr. Hauser commented that the Board did direct the Steering Committee to consider broadening its focus, which he felt indicated an interest in having the Committee focus more at the system level, rather than limiting itself to EmX.

**MOTION:** Mr. Skov, seconded by Mr. Eyster, moved to establish a subcommittee composed of EmX Steering Committee and Board members to develop a specific proposal regarding the Committee's future role.

Mr. Satre said the subcommittee could be charged with bringing a proposal to the Steering Committee's October meeting for discussion and refinement by all members.

In response to Mr. Yeh's call for volunteers to serve on the subcommittee, the following members agreed to serve: Brindle, Gillespie, Hauser, Skov, and Biddle.

**VOTE:** The motion passed unanimously, 12:0.

## **VII. MOVING AHEAD UPDATE AND EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Mr. Schwetz said that the mandated planning process was geared toward selecting a locally preferred alternative (LPA) and structured to stimulate a robust public discussion. He said it was essential that performance measures reflect the values and priorities that were important to the community.

Ms. Luftig briefly summarized the intent of MovingAhead as a process to develop a capital investment program for biking, walking, and transit on the most important street; and once EmX or other transit improvements were identified, it was a system-level approach to completing required environmental documentation to advance those projects to construction. She said the agenda packet included MovingAhead goals and objectives and evaluation criteria, as well as summary findings from the Level 1 screening process. She said the Level 2 alternatives analysis had begun. Some of the items that would be considered:

- acquisition and displacement
- air quality
- capital costs
- cultural resources
- ecosystem
- energy and sustainability
- financial analysis

Mr. Henry noted that the items represented federal requirements that had to be addressed, but other local issues could be included in the process.

Ms. Luftig said some of the goals and objectives were not included in the Level 1 evaluation but would be captured in Level 2 and help to inform the trade-offs analysis.

Mr. Skov said it was important to be aware that the federal requirements did not always include issues that were meaningful to the local community, and those should be incorporated in the process.

Mr. Eyster asked if reduction of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) was a goal. Mr. Schwetz indicated that it was a state goal for reduced reliance on the automobile; the MovingAhead goals were driven largely by federal requirements.

Ms. Brindle commented that multi-modal included not only bicycle and pedestrian, but also could include car/transit such as park and ride facilities.

Mr. Galloway showed how data from the technical analysis would be used to demonstrate the beneficial properties of EmX and translated into tangible and meaningful benefits to the community, such as how connectivity would make transit more convenient for users.

Ms. Luftig said staff were working with an ad hoc group of community members on what was being measured and how that data would be used to communicate with the public and decision-makers, as well identify any gaps in that information. The results of that work would be presented to the Steering Committee for feedback. Staff were also identifying opportunities for the Steering Committee to weigh in on projects. She reviewed the schedule of Level 2 activities and the Committee's points of involvement. She clarified that the Steering Committee would be making recommendations to the LTD Board on selection and prioritization of the LPAs based on the alternatives analysis results and community input. She said that she hoped to bring a report back to the Committee at its October meeting.

In response to a question from Mr. Biddle, Ms. Luftig said that staff did not intend to weight the evaluation criteria; the information would be presented to decision makers so they could consider multiple important factors.

Mr. Hauser said that the federal process asked for an evaluation of the corridors, but the Steering Committee had discussed how to build a system and evaluate connectivity, which greatly enhanced the system's efficacy. He asked if it was possible as part of the MovingAhead process to consider connectivity and system impact, such as whether certain pairs of corridors might bring greater value to the system. Mr. Schwetz said new tools were available to help measure connectivity and increased accessibility.

Mr. Skov stated that his concern with the focus on an LPA for each of four different corridors was that ultimately it would result in a jurisdiction selecting its preference when the community at large was interested in the increment of investment in the transit system. MovingAhead was designed to fast track corridor development and perhaps build two corridors concurrently instead of having a five- to ten-year gap between them. But the federal process requires an LPA for each corridor. He stated his concern that the federal process would not encourage the best local discussions.

Mr. Schwetz said that the current process to determine LPAs at the corridor level did not prevent pairing corridors in a funding proposal.

Mr. Henry commented that funding was the roadblock to building out the system. He noted that Eugene deliberated at length about which should be the next corridor; and if multiple corridors could not be built concurrently, with possibly five to 10 years between corridor completions, then the choice had to be based on what corridor would most benefit the community.

Mr. Schwetz said that "five to ten years" was based on previous experience developing corridors. The MovingAhead process of simultaneously finding LPAs for multiple corridors was intended to shorten that time. LTD corridors were typically four to five miles in length; Portland was considering a 15-mile corridor. The strategy would be to pair corridors in such a way as to present the most competitive package. He said that he hoped the Steering Committee would have more in-depth discussions about how to build the system and about the available resources.

In response to a question from Mr. Biddle, Ms. Luftig said the environmental analysis did have a shelf life, but elements could be easily updated for future use instead of going through the entire process again.

Mr. Gillespie said MovingAhead was initiated to reduce the timeline for corridor development from eight to ten years, to closer to five years. He said that the Beltline loop corridor on which transit time could have been most enhanced was dropped at the beginning of the process. Ms. Luftig said it was dropped because it was a different type of connectivity investment; it was more a service investment than a bus rapid transit investment.

Ms. Brindle said that expansion of capacity on routes under various transit enhancement scenarios was return-on-investment information that should be provided to decision makers.

Mr. Skov felt there was some danger in not being clear about the changes that the community would see in the medium- and long-range implementation of corridors. Ms. Luftig said that developing a 10-year implementation plan would help to clarify some of those issues and identify what steps were necessary to reach community transit goals.

Mr. Hauser asked if the federal process would provide information that could be used for the public narrative about return on investment. It was important to be able to convey that to the community.

### **VIII. MAIN STREET UPDATE AND SCHEDULE**

Ms. Luftig said that the City of Springfield had been awarded All Roads Transportation Safety (ARTS) funding for the proposed median down the center of Main Street. She said that design solutions work with fronting businesses along the corridor under the Main-McVay Transit Study had been paused while the City and Oregon Department of Transportation determined how best to move forward with that grant and how it would be incorporated with the study.

In response to a question from Mr. Eyester, Ms. Newman said that the Governance Team had directed staff to look at a median in a context-sensitive approach. A median was still being explored, concerns from property owners and businesses were being taken into consideration, and no decision had been made. Ms. Newman emphasized that the ARTS funding would be used to study a Main Street median, not build it. Ms. Luftig added that LTD's position with respect to a median was to follow the City's lead.

Ms. Brindle described the dangers to pedestrians trying to cross Main Street and how a median could improve safety along the route. She said ARTS funding could also be used for improved lighting for pedestrians. She added that the Governance Team, in response to concerns from stakeholders along the corridor, had dropped the 116-foot right-of-way option and was looking at the narrowest possible right-of-way that would accommodate the necessary enhancements.

Mr. Eyester submitted that many people in the community understood that there would be no median on Main Street.

Ms. Moore agreed that the City would like to see a median to improve safety, but convincing the community of its benefits would be difficult and require extensive individual outreach to business and property owners.

### **IX. PROGRESS REPORT ON LTD BOARD RESOLUTION SUPPORTING VISION ZERO**

Mr. Schwetz distributed a document titled *Progress Summary on Implementation of LTD Board Resolution 2016-012* and briefly reviewed implementation actions and status of each of the six provisions. The City of Eugene had requested an LTD Board member to serve on the City's Vision Zero Task Force, and Mr. Yeh has been appointed, with Ms. Jackson as his alternate. Mr. Schwetz distributed a copy of the City of Eugene's *Resolution No. 5143 Establishing an Official Vision Zero Policy and Goal*.

Mr. Skov commended staff for the progress report. He asked the internal team to determine how it could connect with other local data collection and tracking efforts. He reported that the City of Eugene's Budget Committee would be reviewing the capital improvement plan over the winter, and it would be useful for that group to have information about LTD's plan and how the City and LTD's investments could compliment each other.

### **X. UPDATE ON CURRENT EMX OPERATIONS AND PROJECTS**

This item was postponed to the next meeting.

### **XI. NEXT MEETING AND FUTURE MEETING AGENDA ITEMS**

Mr. Yeh asked Committee members to contact staff with suggestions for future agenda items.

### **XII. ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Yeh adjourned the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

*(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)*