

MINUTES

BUS RAPID TRANSIT STEERING COMMITTEE

November 5, 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 November 5, 2002, at Lane Transit District, 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.

PRESENT: Pat Hocken, Chair, Lane Transit District Board Member
Bob Pirrie, Oregon Department of Transportation
Gerry Gaydos, LTD Board Member
Dave Jewett, At-Large
Hillary Wylie, LTD Board Member
Scott Meisner, Eugene City Councilor
Peter Sorenson, Lane County Commissioner
Dan Egan, At-Large
Tammy Fitch, Springfield City Councilor

ABSENT: Charlie Magee, At-Large

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. Magee. Also present were Ken Hamm, Dan Tutt, Stefano Viggiano, Sue Aufort, Mark Pangborn, Graham Carey, Joe McCormack (Lane Transit District); Chris Henry, Allen Lowe (City of Eugene); Susanna Julber, Nick Arnis (City of Springfield); Tom Stinchfield (Lane County); and George Poling (Eugene City Councilor-Elect).

III. CHAIR'S COMMENTS

The Chair did not have comments; however, she introduced Mr. Meisner's replacement on the Steering Committee, George Poling, Eugene City Councilor-Elect, which will occur after the first of the year. The Committee Members introduced themselves to Mr. Poling. Mr. Meisner also indicated that he is not departing the committee for lack of interest in BRT; however, it is because the Eugene City Council attempts to rotate committee assignments. He indicated that he and the Mayor felt it would be valuable that Mr. Poling serve on the committee, as he also is a Coburg Road representative, which also is part of the BRT corridor.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM SEPTEMBER 3, 2002 (ACTION)

The following corrections were noted:

- Ms. Hocken indicated that under “Roll Call,” it indicates that Mr. Fuller was absent; however, Mr. Fuller is the alternate for Bob Pirrie of ODOT.
- Mr. Carey noted that under “Coburg Road Corridor,” “1) a master plan development and 2) a separate process for route recommendations” that the second process is actually a more detailed segment and design rather than the route will be selected.

Mr. Meisner moved, with a second from Mr. Egan, to approve the Minutes of September 3, 2002, as corrected. The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

V. PIONEER PARKWAY – SOUTH SEGMENT (ACTION)

Mr. Carey gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Pioneer Parkway-South segment, and background material was distributed. The Pioneer Parkway BRT corridor has been split into three planning segments as follows:

1. South (downtown Springfield to Hayden Bridge Road)
2. Harlow Gateway; and
3. RiverBend/International Way

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

The stakeholder group for the south segment has met three times and considered various alignment alternatives for the segment. Mr. Carey indicated that both LTD and Springfield staff support the alignment option of Pioneer Parkway, which the stakeholder group recommended.

The stakeholder group came up with recommendations for the segments. To the north section, they liked the alternative where the BRT lanes were on the eastern side. On the southern section, they liked the idea that the BRT was split on the parkways.

The stakeholder committee reached consensus on preferred alignment alternatives as follows:

- *Pioneer Parkway vs. Fifth Street:* The Stakeholder Group strongly preferred the Pioneer Parkway alternative. The key reasons were reduced transit travel distance and travel time, reduced adverse impacts on adjacent businesses and residences, and greater opportunities for exclusive transit right-of-way.
- *Pioneer Parkway South of F Street:* South of F Street, where the two Pioneer Parkways are a block apart, the Stakeholder Group recommends a split alignment, with southbound BRT service operating on Pioneer Parkway West, and northbound service operating on Pioneer Parkway East (see cross section below). This alternative keeps BRT service operating in the same direction as the adjacent traffic lanes, which minimizes confusion and improves safety. This alternative also has less impact on the existing bicycle/pedestrian path on Pioneer Parkway East.

Pioneer Parkway North of F Street: North of F Street the two Pioneer Parkways are separated by a planted median. In this situation, the Stakeholder Group recommends putting the two BRT lanes along the eastern side of the median. This alternative minimizes impact to the existing bicycle/pedestrian path and on the large trees along the west side of the median.

Ms. Fitch indicated that not knowing what issues might arise, that it be wise to keep a couple more options in the mix. Mr. Carey indicated that what was being sought from the committee would be a preference from the group. Mr. Viggiano concurred with Mr. Carey in that they are indicating “preferred alternatives,” and other alternatives are not being excluded. Ms. Fitch indicated her continued efforts to promote the dedicated lane.

Mr. Meisner inquired as to the relation to station siting and design. Mr. Carey said that he believes that when you have two lanes together, you can economize on the space that is needed for stations. Mr. Carey discussed possible station placements. Mr. Meisner continued and indicated how the alternatives relate to station design and placement and asked how they relate to feeders and pedestrian safety getting across between the various stations and feeders. Mr. Carey indicated that LTD’s policy for use of signals, and he discussed variables for the connector routes. Mr. Carey indicated that there would be a station at Centennial, but is not sure what routing will be used at this stage.

Mr. Egan indicated that there is some value in keeping the median whole and not having to take land on either side. With regard to safety, he noted that it appeared the stakeholder committee took that into consideration with their recommendation. He commented that as Pioneer Parkway comes into downtown Springfield, headed toward downtown, that the parking lanes on one side that Mr. Carey was eluding to are not heavily used and could be used as a dedicated lane.

Mr. Jewett indicated that this segment provides the easiest opportunity to have exclusive lanes and rapid transit appearance. His concern was if the opportunities weren’t taken to have exclusive lanes and rapid transit appearance in this segment, how would it be done anywhere? He indicated that he feels the exclusive lanes and rapid transit would be the appeal of the system.

Ms. Hocken indicated that she felt that staff was asking the committee concur with the recommendation of the Pioneer Parkway-South Segment stakeholders. As she understands Mr. Carey’s presentation, is that the committee is asked to name a preference and not eliminating any options.

Mr. Carey indicated that after consideration of the Steering Committee, the proposed alignment would be taken to the LTD Board for approval, and the alignment would be subject to further public comment, environmental review, and eventual final approval by the LTD Board and the Springfield City Council.

Mr. Pirrie noted that from an ODOT perspective, they might want to provide a comment as to what ODOT sees the alternative to be, because no technical analysis has not been assessed.

A roll call was done for committee votes with regard to approval of the Pioneer Parkway-South Segment Stakeholders’ preferred alignment recommendation. The motion passed unanimously, 9:0.

VI. BRT PHASE 1 UPDATE (INFORMATION)

Mr. Pangborn indicated that the corridor was split into two pieces (Eugene downtown to Franklin Boulevard/East 11th then Franklin Boulevard to Springfield). The project is at 95 percent design on the Eugene section. In a month or so issues should be settled. The rest of the corridor is at about 60 percent design. The whole design is coming along in a positive fashion. With regard to BRT construction, Mr. Pangborn indicated that he suspects that the second section should be done in January or February. Construction could begin in April/May depending on the weather, with completion expected around August/September 2004.

Mr. Pangborn indicated that the challenge is the vehicle (Phileas). LTD will be meeting with Phileas representatives on November 21 and 22. Phileas indicates that a prototype development that would take them to the end of 2003; LTD would test the prototype in the first part of 2004; and have the vehicles delivered in November/December 2004 and putting them in service the beginning in 2005. This schedule would be putting BRT along four months longer.

Ms. Hocken requested that Mr. Pangborn explain that part of the delay has to do with the calibration of the automatic docking system. Mr. Hamm indicated that there are two things that drive Phileas' calendar. One of them is their desire to test a prototype in the Netherlands and put it through about six months of testing. The second item is their need to have the corridor completed and actually bring the vehicle here and calibrate the vehicle to the corridor. The vehicle guidance system being employed on the vehicle relies on three onboard computers that calculate the rotation of tires and the degree of steering and then uses magnets to correct itself. Ms. Hocken requested, and Mr. Hamm concurred, Mr. Hamm that the critical piece is the docking at the stations. He said that in a discussion that they had at the University of Oregon, there was a videoconference with Phileas and talked about the timeline. Phileas said that they would talk to their suppliers and look at their projection in terms of time to see if they could correlate it more closely. More discussion would then be held with Phileas during their visit to LTD on November 21 and 22.

Mr. Pangborn discussed two other projects going on at LTD that do have an impact on the overall picture (expansion of fleet maintenance building to accommodate the articulated vehicles and the Springfield Station project).

Ms. Fitch indicated that one of the things that had been brought to the attention of Springfield Council (information from the audience and a couple of citizens) is the question of, "Is there still a bike lane or something going through Glenwood." Mr. Pangborn said, "Yes," and discussions about that issue are currently going on.

Mr. Egan asked where Phileas has buses in operation. Mr. Hamm indicated that Phileas currently does not have any of them in operation; that they are on test tract and have about a half dozen in production.

VII. COBURG ROAD CORRIDOR (INFORMATION)

Mr. Carey indicated that the stakeholder committee for the Coburg Road Master Plan has met two times. The first meeting was about some of the background. The second meeting consisted

of some of the issues along the corridor. They have a tour of the corridor scheduled for November 6, and their third meeting will be held on November 13, which will include a debrief of what members saw on the tour; and the following meeting will be a design charrette.

In the interim, Mr. Carey indicated that there has been some correspondence from various members of the committee with regard to justification as to why BRT is moving on Coburg Road versus Oakway. Information in response to that issue will be available to committee members at the next meeting.

Mr. Poling, who also is a member of the Coburg Road Steering Committee, indicated that he feels the major concern of the committee members is the section of the route from the Ferry Street Bridge through the Oakway area.

The next meeting on November 13 will start at 7:30 a.m. at LTD Administrative Office, Board Room.

VIII. PIONEER PARKWAY – HARLOW/GATEWAY SEGMENT (INFORMATION)

Mr. Carey indicated that this segment would be very similar to the Pioneer Parkway – South Segment. There currently are about 18 members on the group. An open house for the Harlow/Gateway segment of the Pioneer Parkway BRT line was held on October 3 2002. The stakeholder group for that segment met for the first time on October 9, 2002. Two additional meetings are planned. The next meeting is scheduled for November 19, 5:00 p.m., at Selco Credit Union Board Room. At that meeting, there will be discussion of actual design. After the November 19, there will be another meeting about six weeks or so later with refined ideas.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Sorensen mentioned that Lane County's process is a little different than the Eugene process for assigning commissioners to various groups, and they will do that in January after their new Board is constituted.

Ms. Hocken inquired from LTD staff if there was any update on Pioneer Parkway/PeaceHealth area. Mr. Carey indicated that there has been a quick response on that project by DLCD for that area, and there is a report that has just been released. He indicated that it is the state's way of looking at that whole area including the hospital, the nodes to the north, and seeing if PeaceHealth's design fit in with the overall area. The report is out, and LTD staff will be commenting with regard to the BRT point of view.

Mr. Pirrie indicated that the Beltline decision team, which is comprised of representatives from Eugene Council, Springfield Council, Commissioner Dwyer, John Gernhauser (Federal Highways), and himself will be meeting on November 14 to make a recommendation as to moving forth with an alternative for the Beltline/I-5 Interchange and also the intersection at Gateway. From that meeting, the environmental assessment will be moved forward or ceased.

Mr. Sorenson indicated that he had not received a packet for this meeting.

Ms. Hocken discussed the BRT name issue and indicated that staff had to go back to the beginning with the previous chose name of "Q," because a local radio station, "The Q," had some objections to using "Q" for the BRT name. The BRT Naming Committee is working on alternatives.

X. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the BRT Steering Committee is scheduled for December 3, 2002, at 5:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room.

Ms. Fitch indicated that she would be out of town.

XI. ADJOURMENT

Ms. Hocken adjourned the meeting at 6:50 p.m.

(Recorded by Annette Speck)

Q:\BRT\Committees\Steering Comm\Minutes - 11-05-2002.doc