

MINUTES

BUS RAPID TRANSIT STEERING COMMITTEE

July 2, 2002

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication, a meeting of the Lane Transit District Board of Directors Bus Rapid Transit Steering Committee was held at 5:30 p.m on July 2, 2002, at Lane Transit District, 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.

PRESENT: Pat Hocken, Chair, Lane Transit District Board Member
Gary Gaydos, LTD Board Member
Tammy Fitch, Springfield City Councilor
Dan Egan, At-Large
Dean Fuller, Oregon Department of Transportation
Gary Gaydos, LTD Board Member
Scott Meisner, Eugene City Councilor
Peter Sorenson, Lane County Commissioner

ABSENT: Dave Jewett, At-Large
Charlie Magee, At-Large
Hillary Wylie, LTD Board Member

I. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Hocken called the meeting to order.

II. ROLL CALL

The roll was called. All members were present with the exception of Mr. Jewett, Mr. Magee, and Ms. Wylie. Also present were Ken Hamm, Charlie Simmons, Dan Tutt, Stefano Viggiano, Joe McCormack (Lane Transit District), Kurt Yeiter (City of Eugene), Al Peroutka, Gary McKenna (City of Springfield), Tom Stinchfield (Lane County), Harriet Cherry, Kari Greene (WBGS), Dan Egan (Springfield Chamber of Commerce), Dave Funk (Funk Levis & Associates).

III. CHAIR'S COMMENTS

Ms. Hocken noted that she was unable to attend the previous meeting, and said a review of the minutes indicated the committee had gotten much done.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MAY 21, 2002

Mr. Meisner moved, with a second from Ms. Fitch, to approve the minutes of May 21, 2002, as written. The motion passed, 7:1:0; Ms. Hocken abstaining from the vote because she had not been present at the meeting.

V.BRT STATION DESIGN

Mr. Simmons was present to discuss the station design for the Bus Rapid Transit system. He said that Lane Transit District was working with a design firm, WBGs, and a consultant, Parker Brinckerhoff, on the BRT station design. Staff and the consultants had identified the functional programming for the stations, and WBGs had developed four different schemes that were narrowed by LTD staff to two. The designs had been presented to different stakeholder groups and the University of Oregon Campus Planning Committee, and the remarks about both designs were positive. Mr. Simmons requested a recommendation from the committee regarding the designs for presentation to the LTD Board on July 17.

Ms. Cherry overviewed the two designs and pointed out programming elements and the similarities and differences between the designs. She described how the two designs lent themselves to maintenance. Ms. Cherry clarified that outside the structure columns, the two designs were largely distinguished by a masted wing and a masted sail roof design.

Mr. Gaydos arrived at the meeting.

Responding to a question from Mr. Sorenson, Ms. Cherry confirmed that the roof designs were suitable for windy areas and would be stable. They would be designed to meet the relevant codes and would not rip off in a high wind. She noted the involvement of her firm's structural engineer in the design process.

Mr. Meisner indicated a preference for the masted sail design. He asked if cost was included in the criteria, as he did not see it listed. He asked if there was anything available through the private sector that met the criteria so that LTD did not have to have a custom design shelter. He also asked if the structures being proposed were readily expandable. Mr. Meisner questioned the experience the people standing in the shelter would have in terms of protection from wind and rain.

In response to Mr. Meisner's second question, Mr. Simmons responded that LTD was considering a custom design because of a lack of choices from the private sector. LTD's needs were unique in that it required two-sided boarding, rather than curbside boarding. Mr. Meisner asked if staff had looked at the station designs associated with light rail systems in other parts of the country. Mr. Simmons said that staff looked at the Tri Met system and found that agency used custom-designed stations. He added that generally any station larger than 4' x 8' was custom-designed; he acknowledged that there may be manufacturers that could build such stations, but they would be unlikely to meet all the criteria. Mr. Meisner asked how cost compared. Ms. Cherry said that she was familiar with Tri Met's costs and had information about other systems. Mr. Simmons said that generally, LTD spends more on its shelters than some other transit systems because they lasted longer.

Responding to Mr. Meisner's third question, Ms. Cherry reported that the structures could be readily expanded and could be used anywhere. She added that she had never seen a manufactured station of the size being contemplated.

Mr. Meisner expressed concern about the message the expenditure sent the community. LTD appeared to be in the position of making serviced reductions because of a lack of resources while discussing significant capital investments. He wanted to ensure that the money was used in the best possible way, not the most expensive way. He reiterated the need to include cost as

a criteria. Mr. Simmons assured the committee that cost was considered. Ms. Cherry agreed, saying that the cost estimates were right on the initial targets, and even though cost was not listed as a criteria, it was something everyone involved in the process had in mind.

Responding to Mr. Meisner's question regarding the level of protection provided by the shelter, Ms. Cherry acknowledged that while the structures provided cover, a waiting passenger would not be protected from wind and rain blown in horizontally, and staff and the consultants were working to address that issue. Both designs were comparable in terms of how much shelter one would feel.

Mr. Egan agreed that information about cost was an important consideration. He asked staff how much they envisioned the structures would change over the years. Mr. Simmons suggested that the platform size would dictate the amount of expansion that occurred in the future. He said that initially, costs could be reduced by reducing the amount of shelter coverage, and the additional needed coverage added later. He pointed out, however, that it would be difficult to do so without interrupting service. Mr. Simmons suggested that rather than expanding the shelters, LTD was more likely to increase headways, serving more people in the same footprint with more frequent service.

Ms. Fitch liked both designs but suggested the masted sail design would lend itself more readily to easy maintenance. She concurred with Mr. Simmons about the lack of readily available large manufactured shelters.

Mr. Fuller agreed with Ms. Fitch's reasoning for supporting the masted sail design.

Mr. Sorenson concurred with Ms. Fitch regarding maintenance. He determined from Ms. Greene that the relative size of the poles was not substantially different in terms of costs. Ms. Cherry indicated that utilities were accommodated in the design.

Mr. Simmons said that the sail may be slightly more expensive than the wing design because it was more complicated and more materials were involved, but both designs were within the parameters of the budget. He said, in response to a question from Mr. Sorenson, that maintenance costs were where the real project costs were. He said that both designs were to be constructed of durable materials, which would help to keep costs down. He did not believe there would be a significant difference between the designs in terms of operational costs. Mr. Simmons confirmed that LTD's maintenance lead's views had been sought, and he indicated a preference for the masted sail design but also indicated both would work.

Mr. Egan observed that the wing design seemed to lend itself to a long, linear station, and asked if it would be more expensive to replace the panels associated with that design. Ms. Cherry said that was staff's initial reaction, but she acknowledged that since the roofing materials had not been selected, she could not say for sure.

Responding to a question from Mr. Meisner, Mr. Simmons said he believed that the structures could be made locally.

Mr. Meisner moved, with a second from Mr. Sorenson, to indicate to the board the committee's preference for the masted sail design first, followed by the masted wing design.

Ms. Hocken determined from Mr. Meisner that his motion incorporated his concerns about cost.

The motion passed unanimously.

VI.BRT NAME

Mr. Funk described the internal process LTD used to arrive at the recommended name. He said that participants in the process used the concepts of position, personality, and distribution in evaluating the choices that were proposed. In addition, participants weighed local and industry criteria related to the naming process. Mr. Funk reviewed those criteria.

Mr. Funk noted that 345 names were considered in the process, and they were eventually reduced to three, and then one. The name finally selected to be forwarded for consideration, suggested by LTD staff Hannah Bradford, was "Q." Mr. Funk said that the BRT service lines would be distinguished by colors, so, for example, there could be a "Red Q" serving downtown, a "Blue Q" serving Coburg Road, etc.

Steering committee members discussed the proposed name. Mr. Meisner noted that in Europe, to "queue" implies a delay, to "hurry up and wait." However, he liked the simplicity of the name.

Mr. Sorenson asked if there were cross-cultural implications to the name. Mr. Funk said that he had researched all negatives using a variety of references and was unable to discover any.

Mr. Egan said he tended to like the name. It implied Quick, Quality, and uniQue. He thought it clever and somewhat singular, and suggested that was a cutting edge type of name. Mr. Egan said that the name was not incorruptible, but nothing was.

Ms. Fitch indicated support for the name.

Responding to a question from Mr. Gaydos, Ms. Cherry acknowledged that her first reaction to the name was similar to Mr. Meisner's, and she was not yet convinced of the appropriateness of the name.

Ms. Hocken also was not convinced that "Q" was the correct name. She was concerned about the cross-cultural implication of the fact that Chinese people traditionally wore "queues." She also was concerned that "Q," unlike "BART," for example, did not stand for anything.

Mr. Sorenson asked if the name would be tested. Mr. Funk said the name could be tested, but he urged that testing occur contextually so that people could see it in actual use before they evaluated it.

Mr. Sorenson also supported the proposed name.

Mr. Sorenson moved, with a second from Ms. Fitch, to recommend that the LTD Board consider the name "Q" for the BRT system.

Responding to a question from Mr. Meisner about how the name would be used, Mr. Funk expected that to some degree, "Q" would subsume the identify of LTD; he anticipated that people would talk about taking the "Q" rather than taking the "LTD Q."

Ms. Fitch advocated that the special needs population be kept in mind when considering signage. It should be easy and identifiable. She said that the use of consistent base colors would help.

Mr. Stinchfield observed that "Q" has a meaning to engineers in terms of volume per second, or flow throughout. Mr. Egan felt that meaning supported the name being proposed.

The motion passed 6:1, Ms. Hocken voting no.

VII.ART SELECTION COMMITTEE

Mr. McCormack solicited volunteers from the steering committee to serve on an Art Selection Committee for the BRT project. He said that the committee would be a seven-member committee and would include three committee members, LTD graphic artist Hannah Bradford, Ms. Greene, and two artists. He anticipated three meetings would take place.

Responding to a question from Mr. Egan, Mr. McCormack indicated that there was \$85,000 available for art throughout the project.

Ms. Hocken and Ms. Fitch volunteered to serve on the committee. Ms. Hocken suggested that staff poll absent committee members regarding their interest in serving on the committee.

Mr. Egan urged the committee to work toward decisions that made people feel better about being in the BRT stations and to find quality art that could work to discourage vandalism.

IX.PIONEER PARKWAY CORRIDOR UPDATE

Mr. Viggiano reported that LTD staff recently met with staff of the Federal Transportation Administration regarding the question of whether the median and the bicycle path would be considered a 4F resource. He said that the agency seemed to reception to LTD's determination, and staff was waiting a final decision.

X.OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business before the steering committee

XI.NEXT MEETING

The next meeting was tentatively scheduled for August 6, 2002.

Ms. Fitch noted that she would be out of town during the committee's September 3 meeting.

XI.ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Hocken adjourned the meeting at 7 p.m.

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)

Q:\BRT\COMMITTEES\STEERING COMMMINUTES 07-02-02.DOC