

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

SPECIAL MEETING / WORK SESSION

Wednesday, June 19, 1996

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on June 13, 1996, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, a special meeting of the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District was held on Wednesday, June 19, 1996, at 5:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Kirk Bailey, Vice President
Patricia Hocken, President, presiding
Dave Kleger, Treasurer
Mary Murphy
Roger Saydack
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary
Susan Hekimoglu, Transcribing Secretary

Absent: Rob Bennett
Thomas Montgomery, Secretary

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 5:40 p.m. by Board President Pat Hocken.

WORK SESSION ON TRANSPLAN:

TransPlan Update Process

Tom Schwetz and Bud Reiff of Lane Council of Governments were present to give an update on TransPlan. Mr. Schwetz spoke first, and stated that he planned to cover points of the recently held open houses and the additional model results since the last time he had addressed the LTD Board. He noted that he recently had received the results of the community survey that was conducted to ask people what they thought about various strategies under consideration, and planned to talk about some of the TransPlan schedule adjustments that were made as a result of the survey. He said that Mr. Reiff would provide more detail about some of the transit modeling that was being done and some of those results.

Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) held two open houses on May 22 and 23. The purpose was to provide updated information and gain feedback about TransPlan.

The open house was organized as an information tour, with several stops giving people an overview of what TransPlan was, why it should be updated, and some of the goals and objectives that were set. In attendance were 15 stakeholders, 59 people who had not been formally contacted before, and 41 people who previously were on the mailing list. They were shown presentations on the land-use measures, system improvements, and demand management measures. The focus of the information tour was on the evaluation of what the technical analysis had shown to date.

Mr. Schwetz directed the Board's attention to the Preliminary Results of Technical Evaluation table on page 5 of materials he had handed out. He explained that this table displayed an example of how these strategies might be integrated. Starting with the Base Case, the TransPlan would add road improvements, then transit improvements, and on top of those would be land-use measures in terms of nodal development. Finally, pricing measures would be added by a \$2.00 gas tax and a tripling of the downtown Eugene parking cost. He pointed out that this particular table was looking at mode choice; what the split was at the various steps. He asked the Board to look at the column labeled *Percent Bus Trips*, and pointed out that there was not a lot of additional ridership until system improvements were added, and then not again until the pricing was added.

This trend tended to hold true with the other modes, non-single occupant vehicles. Looking at the walk and bike modes, increases were shown when land use measures were added. When nodal development was done, there was a tendency to shorten trips, which offered more opportunity for walking and biking. Another set of criteria was used to compare the different strategy integrations, including congested miles of travel. That was the percent of vehicle miles traveled experiencing some sort of congestion. Currently, 3 percent of the VMTs were experiencing some sort of congestion, and no matter what could be done, research had shown that congestion VMTs would increase by 2.5 times by the year 2015. Mr. Schwetz went on to discuss base conditions, at which congested VMTs were at 19 percent. With road improvements, there would be a large improvement to 12 percent. Still, it would not be until pricing occurred that there would be a major improvement in congestion VMTs, projected to decrease to 5 percent.

He directed the Board's attention to the column labeled Daily Vehicle Miles of Travel per Capita, and noted that this was the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) measure that needed to be watched. Under this rule, Lane County was required to reduce VMT per capita to 16.3 percent. According to these projections, the VMTs per capita would hold steady with existing conditions at 17.25 percent once the pricing was added.

The Percent Of Person Trips Under One Mile was another indication of the opportunity for the use of alternative modes. The more trips were shortened, the more there would be increases in alternative modes use. Fuel use and vehicle emissions

were shown as well. Mr. Schwetz noted that once the demand management or pricing was added in, the results were the best.

On page 6 of the handout, a graph illustrated the effects alternative strategies could have on choice of mode. He pointed out that there would not be much of an effect on drive-alone trips until the pricing strategy was added. He noted that at this point, what was identified in terms of strategies was a great deal of difficulty in reaching the VMT target.

Mr. Schwetz noted that the TPR had three goals. Over a 10-year period, Lane County was to hold VMTs steady at 18 percent. The 20-year target called for a 10 percent reduction to 16.3 percent. Then, the 30-year target was a 20 percent reduction in VMTs.

Mr. Schwetz went on to discuss the survey which was conducted by a consultant. He handed out a preliminary results packet to the Board, and pointed out that there were 429 respondents out of 493 who were recruited, which was a remarkable response. The respondents also were asked a series of questions about what the transportation issues were and what the solutions were. Even if they did not want to participate in the survey, the consultant was able to obtain those responses. During the survey, respondents were given the list of strategies presented in TransPlan.

Mr. Schwetz discussed the general results of the survey, and planned to address the Board at a later date with more detailed results. He focused basically on what respondents had to say about issues and solutions. Respondents were asked what the most important transportation problem was in the Eugene/Springfield area, and 25 percent indicated that there was too much traffic congestion; 10 percent indicated that the Ferry Street Bridge area was the single most important problem; and transit-related problems were cited by 13 percent of the respondents.

Ms. Hocken wondered what exactly were the respondents' concerns in the area of transit. Mr. Schwetz replied that three basic transit related issues were expressed. The first was geographic coverage, the second was the size of the buses, and the third was frequency of service. He noted that those were three fairly common themes that had been heard.

The respondents were then asked to rate on a 1 to 5 scale the seriousness of the transportation problems. The preliminary results showed that the average rating was 3, or somewhat serious, at 40 percent. Mr. Schwetz pointed out that, statistically, people between the ages of 34 and 54 were more likely to find the community's problems to be very serious or extremely serious than those who were either younger or older. His assumption was that this age group traveled more during peak periods and traveled more for a variety of reasons.

The next question asked was what solutions the respondents might offer to some of the issues that they raised. Thirty-one percent responded with solutions related to the street system; the solutions cited most often were more bridges over the rivers, wider roads, and more freeways. Twenty-three percent named solutions related to the transit system, with more frequent service, expanded service, more direct connections, and light rail mentioned most often. Nineteen percent responded with general statements to improve alternative mode use, such as to encourage more biking and carpooling, as well as to provide more incentives to drive less.

With respect to schedule adjustments, there were a lot of comments about the materials that were presented at the workshops. TransPlan staff focused on the one model of integrating the strategies. Respondents wondered if staff had tried pricing first or transit first, and what would happen if they did.

LCOG staff planned to build some additional alternatives to the strategies during the summer. They hoped to hold a stakeholders' symposium in late summer or early fall. Then they would address the planning commissions. Those results would then go to the local elected officials in late fall of 1996. Mr. Schwetz said that this would be where the LTD Board would become more involved, to consider the recommendations of the Planning Commission and give staff direction for the draft TransPlan. It was anticipated that the draft would be ready in the spring of 1997, and it was hoped that the plan would be adopted by the fall of 1997.

Ms. Hocken asked if Mr. Schwetz could provide some specifics on what particular transit improvement option was selected and if there others that LTD could try. Mr. Schwetz replied that Mr. Reiff would go into some of that during his presentation to the Board, but that currently staff were looking at various configurations in conjunction with nodal development. There were a couple of situations where they would test scaling back nodal development to just the major corridors, with a Bus Rapid Transit system serving those corridors.

LTD Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano noted that the LTD Board actually would adopt TransPlan, as would the elected officials. Ms. Hocken wondered if the MPC or each jurisdiction would adopts the plan. Mr. Schwetz replied that each jurisdiction would. However, the LTD Board had the same right to adopt the plan as did the other three jurisdictions. Ultimately, the LCOG Board, as the MPO, would ratify everything that had been adopted.

Mr. Kleger wondered if there was any feedback from the respondents about how they would pay for some of the things they were asking for. Mr. Schwetz replied that he had not looked that far into the results yet, but that the respondents were not asked that question at this time. Mr. Kleger thought that issue should be brought up in the near future. Technically, the community could do a number of the things that people were asking for, but only if there were the funds to pay for those services. Mr. Schwetz

stated that the cost side of the plan would be discussed with the planning commissions in the fall, and that there would be a financial constraint analysis of this plan. The analysis would be included with all the various options that would be presented.

Ms. Hocken inquired about the TransPlan video and whether it would be shown to the LTD Board at this time. Mr. Schwetz had not planned to do so, but he would make it available to be seen at any time. Ms. Hocken stated that she would like to have it shown at the July Board meeting if there was time to do so.

Transit Service Options Modeling Results

Mr. Reiff then addressed the Board about the transit results that were gained as part of the TransPlan Technical Evaluation. He distributed a document titled Preliminary Travel Forecasting Model Results for 2015 Transit Alternatives for the Board to refer to. He stated that the purpose of the modeling up to this point had been to evaluate the TransPlan scenarios, and that it had not been meant as a transit alternatives analysis. The state of the current LCOG forecasting model was not adequate to perform that analysis. However, he thought that the model was producing fairly reasonable results. It was calibrated to replicate, fairly closely, the current mode shares both overall and by trip purpose. It appeared that it had given staff some fairly reasonable results for the future.

Mr. Reiff stated that he would present the ridership numbers for the three alternatives and then discuss the details of the model. He began by saying that in a break from the past, where the assumption was made that the transit mode shares would just be extended into the future (for instance, where the trip interchange was at 2 percent in the past, it was carried into future projections at 2 percent), staff had incorporated a mode-choice model where an attempt was made to actually predict changes in mode shares for all the modes based on changes in the service levels that were forecasted. Consequently, they had encoded transit networks. They had examined a current year network representing 1995, two future year networks, and variations on those. The base case network was an extension of the current transit system into the future, with some additions; for example, anything that was in the STIP, such as the new park and ride facilities at 58th and Main and at West 11th and Bertelson, were assumed in the future-year network. The Eugene Station improvements were assumed. They had maintained the current headways of frequencies into the future, even though it would cost more to do so. But they were assuming that the transit network was keeping pace with the roadway network, and that there were ongoing investments to maintain service levels.

Mr. Reiff stated that extensions of service into newly developed areas were also assumed in the base case. The land-use forecast for the 2015 base had a lot of new development, particularly in Southeast Springfield, on Goodpasture Island Road, and in the Bethel-Danebo area. The model showed extended transit service into any areas

where there was significant new development. In most cases, this was done by altering existing transit lines by either extending them or adding branches onto an existing route. They tried to maintain current headways, and in cases where they had split the lines, they assigned half of the buses to the branch, with the other half remaining on the existing route.

The second transit alternative that they examined was one that approximated the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system. They replicated an LTD-prepared map that sketched out what the BRT would look like on their modeling software, to be included in the TransPlan analysis and represented by references to BRT. Mr. Reiff directed the Board's attention to page 1, item A, of his handout, and explained that the MR3d referred to Model Run 3d for TransPlan. He stated that the land use assumptions were the same for each of the two networks that were in the summary results on page 1. They both were base case land use assumptions, which was an assumption that basically extended existing development trends under Metro Plan. Growth typically was evenly allocated to available land, depending upon the Metro Plan designation of the land. The results for the 1995 model were based on an estimation of 22,100 average weekday one-way person transit trips. The 2015 Base Case, which was the extension of existing transit service, estimated 35,500 daily one-way person trips. For the 2015 BRT, they estimated 49,700 daily one-way person trips. He noted that the percent of total person trips, which included all modes, would increase slightly in the base case, with a fairly hefty boost with the BRT model. The percent of motorized person trips (by only car or bus) were somewhat higher in each of these models.

The next comparison that was done was the BRT system on different TransPlan land use and TDM alternatives. The first model was the same Land Use Base 2015 assuming 49,700 average weekday one-way person trips. The next model was the Nodal Development 2015 (MR3c) in which 48,100 average person trips were assumed, where a fair amount of the growth in employment and multi-family dwellings was concentrated in 40 nodes around the region, and the balance of the growth was evenly allocated to available land by Metro Plan designation. The third model was the Nodal Development, with an assumption of a \$2.00 gas tax and a tripling of the parking costs in the central Eugene area, in which 57,900 average person trips were assumed. There was not an assumption of an extension of paid parking to other areas.

The results showed a slight decrease in the ridership forecast under Nodal Development. He thought that was due to the longer inter-nodal trips, such as home-based work trips. More importantly, with the nodal development, the average trip length for a lot of the non-work trips was decreased. Those trips, therefore, were poor candidates for transit service. Additionally, the analysis segmented the market by household auto ownership. In effect, transit and non-motorized travel were after that same market – households with fewer cars than drivers. In the case where there was a shortening of the trips, the non-motorized mode tended to increase. With the gas tax and parking cost increases, there was a hefty increase in transit ridership forecast, as

well in all of the other non-single occupant vehicle modes. That was, in fact, the only model that began to get close to reaching the TPR goal.

The Operating Comparison models were not completed, but Mr. Reiff wanted to discuss the number of transfers involved, and say something about how they modeled BRT specifically. All of the assumptions were listed on page 7 of his handout. The system, as it was presented, contained four pairs of BRT lines that were modeled as continuous pairs that extended through the Eugene Station. There was one other BRT line that was a circumferential line that traveled the length of the Beltline Highway, extending up 30th Avenue, along 11th Avenue, along the Beltline, all the way to Mohawk, and through Glenwood. Most of the other lines were feeder lines. Some existing lines were extended into the future and two or three express lines were kept. Mr. Reiff explained that where the feeder lines met the BRT lines, a wait time and a transfer time were implied. Both of those cost something in terms of the attractiveness in the mode choice model. That wait time was reduced to 30 seconds, which then would not penalize that transfer between a feeder bus and a BRT bus as much. It still assumed a transfer at that point. The Operating Comparisons showed 2/3 of a transfer per trip for the BRT and only about 1/3 of a transfer for the Base Case. The models showed that the majority of transfers in the Base Case would take place at the Eugene Station, whereas relatively few transfers would be made at the Eugene Station in the BRT model.

Mr. Reiff stated that some other research that he wanted to conduct was to look at some of the differences in zone-to-zone movement to see which geographic markets would be served with BRT. One question he had was whether we were getting a lower percentage of Eugene central business district destinations or destinations elsewhere.

He thought that he also should mention that the way a mode-choice model worked was to evaluate the relative attractiveness of each mode against all the competing modes. That attractiveness depended upon the characteristics of the mode, and it also depended on the characteristics of the traveler. The traveler previously had been segmented by auto ownership.

A number of elasticities were built into the mode choice model in this evaluation of each mode. In addition to those, there were modal bias constants that explained the part of the choice that was not otherwise explained by the elasticities, or the unexplained part of the model. The modal bias constants were the results of calibration of the choices to both the LCOG 1994 Household Survey and the LTD 1994 Origin and Destination Survey. The mode shares by trip purpose were approximately correct.

There was one set of modal bias constants for transit, even though the modal choice structure could accommodate a separate bias constant for regular transit and premium transit. Because premium transit did not exist in our region when the 1994 surveys were conducted, there was not a good modal bias constant for that type of

service. Mr. Reiff stated that this was important because among certain user groups, such as households with more cars, higher-income households, or park and ride users, there may be a higher modal bias for transit. If this bias existed, it was not included in this study. Mr. Reiff was not sure how it could be included. He wanted the Board to be aware of this because there could be some response to the operating characteristics of BRT, such as different buses, more comfort, or the perception of safety, that may appeal to certain user groups.

Mr. Bailey asked about the BRT ridership comparison to land use alternatives, and whether the numbers shown, including the gas tax and parking cost increase, were mirrored in the other results, so that the overall effect was included in the chart that was given to the Board. Mr. Reiff replied that they were, and the percentages were a percent of total person trips, including the non-motorized trips. Mr. Bailey asked what the BRT plus the whole TDM / Land Use models did to biking, walking, and carpooling, and how it affected the overall mix. Mr. Reiff thought that those other modes, particularly the walk and bike, increased more than transit. Mr. Schwetz stated that the various modes were all listed in the table that he had distributed to the Board on page 3, *Preliminary Results of Technical Evaluation, Part 1*. Where transit was projected at 3.6 percent at the final model where the pricing was added in, walking increased to 9.5 percent, and biking rose to 3.6 percent.

Mr. Kleger asked if there was a basis for any idea of what would happen if the land use and pricing changes were made without any enhancement of transit service. In other words, if it were made tougher to use the car and people were given no alternatives, would people continue to use their cars anyway? Mr. Schwetz recalled that this scenario had been looked at and the general result was that people tended to continue to use their cars. Mr. Kleger stated that he would like to have that documented somewhere, to show that investing in transit along with the land use and pricing measures would better bring about the desired result.

Mr. Bailey wondered why the assumptions did not include separate rights of way. Mr. Reiff replied that assuming right of way would be easier to model than what they had been doing, since they would just use a fixed speed. Mr. Viggiano mentioned that transit travel speeds were assumed, because separate right of way would not really affect mode choice unless it significantly shortened the time of the trip. What was more important was the assumed speed of the bus relative to the speed of the model. Some assumptions were made about how fast that should be. He asked Mr. Reiff to summarize what those were. Mr. Reiff stated that typically for transit, in the 1995 Base Case network and in all non-BRT lines in the BRT scenario, assumptions were made that transit generally operated 10 percent slower than cars. In other words, travel time over a given distance was the automobile travel time plus 10 percent, because of acceleration characteristics. That was exclusive of dwell time or boarding time. Where BRT was operating in multi-modal corridors, such as Main Street, West 11th Avenue, and Coburg Road, and just those corridors between major nodes in their nodal

development, they assumed that it would operate 10 percent faster than the automobile, because there would be features such as signal preemption and cue bypasses that would enable BRT to operate faster than cars, overall. The other assumption was that since BRT service was now being introduced on freeways, those buses would operate at freeway speeds with the general traffic; the auto time was also the bus time.

Ms. Hocken asked for clarification on what Mr. Reiff said about dwell time. She wondered if the 10 percent slower figure was just when BRT was running, or if it would take 10 percent longer to get from someplace on the bus compared with the car. Mr. Schwetz asked Mr. Reiff to discuss what the total transit travel time was composed of. Mr. Reiff explained that the operating travel time consisted of the operating time plus the dwell time. In addition, with the transit trip, other times also were involved, such as a walk or drive time to get to the bus, and a wait time at the bus stop. All these times were summed up, and each one had a different waiting time in the mode choice model. He cited that a wait time of waiting for a bus was penalized as if there were two times the same number of minutes actually riding the bus. He noted that these were from people's perception that waiting time is longer. The main components of the actual transit running time were the operating speed relative to cars and the dwell time. Typically for transit, they were assuming the dwell time to be one minute per mile where the bus was making a number of stops along the way. This corresponded to three to four stops per mile.

Mr. Reiff then pointed out that the BRT had a limited number of stops. Their assumption was that BRT actually was making those stops, with a dwell time assumption of 12 seconds per stop. He stated that they could change an assumption, for example, they could assume that the service was so frequent that the bus would only make one-third of the stops and that dwell time would be reduced even further. Mr. Kleger pointed out that this assumption could be made in the beginning, but that over time, as the service became more popular, it would not be a good assumption.

Ms. Hocken wondered if anyone had given thought to running a model where the road improvements were not done first. Mr. Schwetz replied that emphasizing other alternatives first would be the next set of alternatives they would be looking at.

Mr. Bailey wondered if different TDM measures would be modeled in the different strategy packages other than within the pricing strategy. Mr. Schwetz replied that they would be looking at increases in participation rates in the various strategies. TDM could be broken into three general classes. One would be voluntary measures that were currently in place; assumptions could be made about increased participation rates in voluntary measures. Another would be mandatory measures, for which they had already done some modeling. The third would be a pricing category that would also force mandatory TDM use. He said that they would be looking at various strategies like that.

There were no further questions, and Ms. Hocken thanked Mr. Schwetz and Mr. Reiff for their presentation.

PRELIMINARY REPORT ON BUS RAPID TRANSIT FOCUS GROUPS

Ms. Loobey introduced LTD Public Affairs Manager Ed Bergeron, who would report on the preliminary report from the recent BRT focus group sessions.

Mr. Bergeron explained that the report actually was not received until late on the day prior to this meeting, so staff had not yet digested all of the report. He noted that this was a preliminary report that the consultant was able to get to staff within the week following the focus groups. A more detailed report of the consultant's findings and recommendations would be forthcoming.

Mr. Bergeron relayed the history of the BRT process to this point. The focus groups were suggested by the Board in March, believing that staff should test some of the assumptions that they were making about BRT and hear reactions from some members of the community. He stated that the District was fortunate to contract with the focus group and research consultant that the TransPlan team had been using, Williams Research. The consultant already was aware to a certain extent of transportation issues in our community.

Four focus groups were conducted during the week of June 10. Two were held with representatives from the business community, one from Springfield and one from Eugene. The other two were held with a group of bus riders and a group of non-bus rider corridor users. From those groups came the responses and the directions that were in the preliminary report that was distributed to the Board.

The consultant began by asking each group their general feelings about transportation in our community and their experiences with transportation. Specifically, relative to LTD, the consultant asked what thoughts came to the participants' minds when they thought of Lane Transit District. They were asked if LTD was regarded as a visionary agency or just a bus company, and if they would think of LTD as a person, how they would describe the person. The consultant used questions to help get the participants thinking about LTD, what they knew and what their thoughts were, as a warm-up to the real issue of the focus group, which was specifically BRT. The participants were given materials, drafts of which the Board had seen in recent months, and were asked to react to those materials. They were given pictures of possible buses that might be used in the BRT system, both large buses for the major corridors and possible smaller buses for the neighborhoods. They also were shown possible names for the BRT, including Bus Rapid Transit itself. Lastly, they were shown possible paint schemes, ranging from rather conservative and traditional to something a little bit more

aggressive and attention-getting. Mr. Bergeron thought that there had been a wide range of reactions from the various groups.

Mr. Bergeron again mentioned that staff had not had much opportunity to debrief on the preliminary report, but noted that he had attended all four of the focus groups, along with other LTD staff and representatives from Cappelli Miles Wiltz + Kelly (CMW+K), the LTD communications consultant. In general, what Mr. Bergeron heard was that BRT as a concept would be quite acceptable in our community and somewhat of an easy sell. However, most people seemed to want some fundamental, basic knowledge about LTD that they could relate to BRT being the logical next step. They wanted to know more about LTD's ridership and about the transportation problems in the community, and how BRT represented a logical solution that fit with where the community was going, and where those challenges were.

With respect to the possibility of communicating BRT as a stepping stone to light rail, some of the participants understood that and thought that it made sense, while others thought that the community was just not big enough to even think about light rail at this point, and that LTD would be well advised to just focus on the specific benefits of BRT in the short term of the next few years. Some felt that our community had a short-term focus, and that it would be easier to think of what would make sense for the next two years than it would be to look 20 to 30 years out.

Mr. Bergeron stated that staff would take the next few weeks to review this information and talk with the communications consultants, as well as with the researcher, to see what they thought that it meant and how LTD might be able to apply this information to the District's communications plans and programs.

Mr. Bergeron stated that he was willing to answer questions now or after the Board members had more time to look over the preliminary report. He noted that he would forward copies of the more detailed report once it was available.

Ms. Murphy inquired about item number 8 under Reactions to the Concept (packet page 17) where it was stated that several participants did not understand how "traffic signal priority" would work. She thought that signal priority had been in the community since 1962 for emergency vehicles. Mr. Bergeron thought that some people were more familiar than others with how transportation systems and the technology associated with it worked. Some were concerned that this could create an additional traffic hazard. He thought that the important thing for LTD to understand was that if traffic signal priority was going to be used as one of the features of BRT, people needed to understand how it worked and how it was a safe approach that was tried and true, not only in our community, but in other cities as well, and just devote a little more attention to that.

Mr. Saydack wondered how the participants had been chosen. Mr. Bergeron replied that the consultant had done that, but his understanding was that the business people were chosen by the consultant's staff, who went up and down the corridor that was used for this research and randomly selected business. Qualitative research such as focus groups have the limitation that it is not a random sample, and staff would need to be careful about drawing too strong an assumption about what was heard at the focus groups to be representative of the whole. However, it did give a sense of the communications issues that LTD may want to deal with. He stated that he did not know if the participants were chosen in any kind of rigorous, random basis. He also thought that the consultant understood that and had done a good job with selecting the participants. The bus riders were recruited on the bus or in the transit station. The corridor users were recruited in a similar fashion. There was an attempt to get a mix of walkers, bicyclists, and car drivers.

Mr. Saydack wondered about the next step, and how staff would be using this information. Mr. Bergeron replied that first of all, staff wanted the Board's Community Outreach Committee to begin meeting, and he hoped that the complete report would be received by that time. He thought that the committee could make some decisions about what the findings meant and how they might apply to the communications steps associated with the BRT work plan. He wanted to meet with staff from CMW+K and apply this information to the "leave behind" brochure that was being prepared. Once that was done, he thought the Board could move ahead with the Walkabout process. He thought that the Committee could bring recommendations about how that Walkabout process should work, and what the specific Board assignments should be relative to that.

Mr. Saydack thought that one of the things Mr. Bergeron identified was the need to explain BRT as the next logical step for LTD. Participants saw it as a good idea, but were not necessarily persuaded that it was the only good idea out there. Mr. Bergeron agreed. He thought that a large part of that was based on a lack of understanding really of where LTD was today in terms of ridership, growth, and technology. He thought that the District would have to establish a higher foundation of awareness of where LTD currently stood in order to have credibility in suggesting that it was time for LTD and the community to move to the next step.

Mr. Bailey, referring to item numbers 9 and 10 on page 17, where exclusive bus lanes and pullouts were mentioned, asked about Mr. Bergeron's sense of how strong the positive support was for the pullouts as opposed to the exclusive bus lanes. Mr. Bergeron thought that the pullouts were not contrasted directly by the participants. What he recalled was that the discussion about the pullouts was more in the spirit of allowing traffic to continue to move freely and safely. Based on the initial discussion about transportation and traffic problems in the community, participants thought when the bus stopped continuously, it created an impediment for the traffic to flow smoothly and created a bit of a safety hazard as well for the people who were driving. There was

a feeling that the pullouts would move the bus out of the way while people were boarding and deboarding, allowing traffic to move along. Mr. Bergeron said that he did not know if there was a high level of understanding, though, that it was difficult at times for the bus to get back into traffic once it was out of the flow. Those were trade-offs that he thought would require education.

Mr. Bergeron thought that people just did not realize how exclusive bus lanes it could work, because in their minds, the lanes were necessary to keep auto traffic flowing. He thought that this was an indication that there would be a challenge in communicating the value of those exclusive bus lanes, and how it might engineer to the benefit of all those concerned, including the cars and car drivers. He did not believe that they were linked.

Ms. Murphy voiced concern that Springfield and Glenwood business owners were grouped together. She felt that there would have been a more positive response from Springfield, rather than "it looks pretty expensive" and "buses are always empty in our area." She felt that to the Glenwood business owners, the buses would usually look empty as they were usually traveling to and from the shop. Mr. Bergeron thought that might have been the case had different business people been selected. However, there was a woman in the Springfield group who actually lived in Harrisburg and drove in every day. She owned a business in downtown Springfield within a block or two of a tremendous amount of service and a tremendous amount of ridership. Her reaction to the group was that she did not see any people riding the bus; she did not understand the value; and LTD ought to do a better job of what it was doing now before it began building something new and fancy. On the other hand, one of the business owners from Glenwood was somewhat supportive. She stated that several of her employees rode the bus; they seemed to respond favorably to it; and they were always at work on time. However, by the end of the evening, she was leaning toward the direction that the woman from Harrisburg had taken in terms of whether this was a good idea or not. He stated that this was the type of discussion he would want to have with the consultant, because, while some negative attitudes were brought forth from that group, there also were some positive ones, and he wondered why the consultant felt that those should not have been represented.

Ms. Murphy stated that she would like to have seen participants who were truly living members in the Springfield or Glenwood communities. Mr. Bergeron agreed, but on the other hand, he thought that it was also good to hear from the other side and then be able to factor that information in. Mr. Viggiano added that the woman from Harrisburg owned a business that was located on a part of Main Street where the buses did not actually travel, because they circled the transit station at 5th and B Streets. He got the impression from her discussion that she actually drove directly from Harrisburg to her business and back and did not spend any other time in the community. She had commented that she had never seen a bus with more than three people on it, when in fact the buses coming in from Thurston were heavily-loaded buses. He felt that this

particular focus group did not really get at the issues as well as the others. Ms. Murphy thought that the feelings of this particular group of business owners from Springfield and Glenwood reflected the opposite of what she had heard, seen, and experienced from being in the Springfield community, riding the bus, and talking with business owners and people who worked in the community. However, she felt that the lessons to be learned from this group were good ones.

Mr. Bergeron mentioned that the focus groups were videotaped and recorded, and Board members could view the tapes, if they wished.

Mr. Viggiano then addressed the Board about the BRT work plan that had been shared with the Board at their May work session. He recalled that the Board members had held a discussion and were given a handout about a decision model for BRT. Staff were now suggesting that this be an action item at the July meeting. He thought that it would be important that Mr. Bennett be given the chance to participate, since he was such an active participant in the BRT issue.

Board members were given a model that showed decisions being made by direct policy at least in some aspects of BRT. Staff suggested that it might be important to broaden the decision-making model beyond LTD to the community, and that MPC might be a good forum for that, since it had representatives from Eugene, Springfield, Lane County, and ODOT. At this point, staff thought that if a decision was going to be made on the pilot corridor in the fall, they should go to the MPC in September with an update about BRT. He thought the decision model should be introduced to MPC at that time, to see what members thought about actually being involved in making decisions, assuming the LTD Board favored this approach. He asked the Board to think about this approach, and prepare for discussion at the July meeting.

Mr. Kleger asked Mr. Bergeron if there had been a clear understanding on the part of the focus groups that the electric bus was not being considered for BRT, but rather for a downtown circulator. Mr. Bergeron replied that the different types of vehicles were presented as possible buses that LTD might use at some point in the future, in conjunction with BRT. He further explained that the participants were asked to not be concerned with the power plan, that any of the buses could be run by electricity, diesel, or any other power. However, once they saw the electric bus, they were compelled to discuss it, and it was clear that they liked the idea, could see benefits in the community, felt it would be popular, had anecdotes of similar vehicles that they had seen in other cities, and so forth. But what they were asked to focus on was the way the bus looked – its size and shape – and to give their first impression.

Mr. Kleger asked if there was any strong, either favorable or unfavorable, reaction to articulated buses. Mr. Bergeron thought the reaction was generally unfavorable, and it was more of a function of the length of the bus than anything else. The 45-foot, four-door bus and the articulated bus both brought negative comments. In

general, the participants preferred the smaller vehicles for this community. Interestingly, the small bus that was favored the most was the one that looked more like a transit bus.

Mr. Bailey wondered if staff had any idea about the extent to which people's concerns about the safety for larger buses related to their somewhat negative view of the operators as being inconsiderate drivers. Mr. Bergeron replied that the comments about the operators had come up earlier in the meetings before they had seen the specific pictures of the buses, so he thought that it was discussed more during the warm-up time. Since most of them were non-bus riders, but rather car drivers who shared the road with buses, they all had stories to tell of the time that the bus cut them off in traffic, etc. Most of them recognized the challenge that driving a bus presented, and that they had been cut off in traffic by other cars, as well. Therefore, he thought that their concerns of safety for larger buses were related to their experiences as car drivers rather than from looking at the pictures of the buses or something that LTD might do in the future.

Mr. Saydack had questions about the BRT decision model, and he wondered if he should wait and ask them at the July Board meeting. Ms. Hocken stated that there was time for his questions. He asked Mr. Viggiano if LTD, MPC, and the city councils of both Eugene and Springfield would have to concur for a decision to be made. Mr. Viggiano replied that the intent was that the decision would move up the model, and the two city councils were there as options for the MPC members. If they felt that they needed the support of their city councils before they would support something in MPC, then they would go back to them. Staff would not necessarily go through the city councils, but rather directly to MPC.

Mr. Saydack then asked if the MPC would be the ultimate decision maker. Mr. Viggiano replied that that was what staff were suggesting, not on every issue, but on some of the key issues; for example, the selection of the pilot corridor. MPC would not, for example, decide whether or not a pre-paid fare system would be used. Mr. Saydack wondered how staff planned to sort those issues out in terms of who would decide what. Mr. Viggiano thought that staff would generate a list of what the key decisions were, and the Board would ultimately decide what decisions would go to MPC. Mr. Saydack asked if there were any other LTD processes like this for decisions to be made. Mr. Viggiano stated that for an LTD project, this would be a first. Community members had been involved in various projects, but he did not think that there had been a situation where an LTD project was sent off to someone else for approval. Ms. Hocken brought up TIP, TransPlan, and Park and Rides, but Mr. Viggiano noted that those were metro-area decisions.

Ms. Loobey stated that closest thing to a model for this was in the Tri-County area. The equivalent to MPC was JPAC, the Joint Plan Advisory Committee, for all the transportation planning project issues, including the capital issues. Anything that has to

do with the transportation infrastructure went through JPAC, which included members from each of the counties and each of the cities. JPAC then reported through to the metropolitan service district as the MPO. She went on to say that MPC was structured a lot like JPAC, where there were governing board members and a technical staff who supported the governing board members who sat on JPAC.

Ms. Hocken thought that one of the issues was that at some level MPC needed to be involved, either at the TransPlan level or the TIP level, but wondered if LTD was making it more complicated than it had to be by setting up this decision model this way. She thought that LTD would need to be very clear as to what sort of approval was truly needed from MPC, and what kind of approval would be nice. Mr. Saydack agreed that this was a significant step, and one that should be defined very carefully. Ms. Loobey agreed. She stated that staff had begun discussing this issue following the combined federal agenda campaign trip to Washington, D.C., in February, where Senator Hatfield, more than any other delegate from Oregon, questioned the lack of community support. With the importance of federal funding, the light rail improvements were really driven by actors other than Tri-Met.

Ms. Loobey stated that the decision model was significant. BRT would be folded into TransPlan, and maybe that would be enough in and of itself, because all of the governing bodies would have to adopt TransPlan. She was not certain, because it depended on how BRT and TransPlan were handled. If it were presented in a conceptual way, without any specifics or commitments to action for implementation, then she felt that the TransPlan would not be enough in regard to securing funding. Whereas, if it were treated for purposes of securing funding and getting commitments from local units of government to be partners with LTD in the implementation phase, LTD would need to be very deliberate through this decision model. She thought that the Board would need to weigh that in what context BRT would be explained in TransPlan. Mr. Saydack agreed that while this may be a good way to get support for federal funding, it also could be a structure that could get away from LTD, both in this project and future projects. This was not necessarily a structure that applied only to transit issues that were initiated by the Transit District, but it could be applied to transit issues that were initiated by someone else.

Ms. Hocken thought that another issue was that having MPC in the decision model assumed that there was a direct county-detailed involvement. She wondered whether, if there was something conceptual about BRT in TransPlan, LTD would need to back that up with agreements specifically with the Cities of Eugene and Springfield in terms of some of the features, such as transit signal prioritization. And, if MPC conceptually approved those particular features, would they also need to sign off on the specific agreements? She emphasized that if LTD were to go to MPC, LTD would need a vote from each jurisdiction, so she did not think there would be a setback by dealing directly with the cities once MPC agreed to the concept.

Ms. Loobey stated that this was the reason the decision model would be presented for Board discussion. During the past 10 years or so, JPAC had grown into its responsibility and accountability. In fact, it was because of the strong commitment in JPAC that Portland was able to get the special funding for the light rail bill in the special session. Mr. Saydack asked if MPC was a state-created agency. Mr. Schwetz replied that it was a division of LCOG. The LCOG Board delegated certain MPO responsibilities to MPC, but MPC also had taken on a conflict resolution status for regional issues, Metro Plan as well as TransPlan. Mr. Saydack also wondered if there was a counterpart to MPC in other counties, such as JPAC. Ms. Hocken thought there was something similar called the Mid-Willamette Valley COG that was in place in Corvallis and in Albany. Mr. Schwetz stated that the Mid-Willamette COG was a policy committee like MPC. Ms. Hocken stated that MPC was made up of two people from each of the Cities of Springfield and Eugene, and Lane County. LTD also had two representatives at MPC. LTD was allowed to vote on anything that had to do with transportation planning, such as the local TIP, which included all of the transportation projects in the regional area. MPC had the responsibility of approving the TIP before it was incorporated into the state-wide plan. One vote from each of the four jurisdictions was required before anything passed. It was a place where a lot of the conflicts were resolved between the various jurisdictions.

Ms. Murphy thought that this discussion tied in very well with a conference she had attended that was sponsored by Liveable Oregon on creating collaborative communities and how to be invited at the table and how to be effective. She thought that often there was not a table, but that this seemed to her like the table being set and the invitations being passed, and getting input and buy-in from community members, versus getting the sabotage of the roadblocks later on.

CALENDAR: Ms. Loobey informed the Board that a 30-foot, low-floor bus would be at the Glenwood property at 9:00 a.m. on Friday, June 21.

Ms. Hocken brought up the tentative dates of November 2nd and 3rd for the Board retreat. A tentative date for the Eugene Station groundbreaking was set for November 8, 1996, when Senator Hatfield most likely would be able to attend. Ms. Hocken asked the Board to provide feedback to staff about the dates for the retreat and whether or not they wanted to go out of town. Ms. Sullivan said that at this point, she needed to know about the Board member availability, and in particular if they knew that those dates would not work. Ms. Loobey also thought it was important to know the preference for where to hold the retreat, as a place would need to be booked, if it were not to be held at the LTD facility. Mr. Kleger stated that all of those dates were open for him. Ms. Hocken stated that the retreat dates were fine for her, and that she would prefer to remain in town, but not necessarily at the LTD facilities. Mr. Saydack stated that the retreat dates were fine with him, as did Ms. Murphy and Mr. Bailey. All agreed that a nice location with windows and transit access would be preferable.

Ms. Hocken stated that Ms. Loobey would be away from the office for the end of June and first part of July. Ms. Loobey stated that she would be on vacation for two weeks, and then she would travel to Washington, D. C., with Mr. Bailey and Mr. Bergeron to meet with the lobbying attorney Jim Smith of Smith, Dawson, and Andrews, to begin plans to position BRT as a possible demonstration project in the reauthorization of ISTEA. They also planned to meet with Representative Bunn, who was on the House Appropriations Committee, Representative DeFazio, who was on the Public Works Committee, and Senator Wyden, who was on one of the Public Works Transportation subcommittees.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further discussion, the meeting was unanimously adjourned at 7:20 p.m.



Board Secretary