

Public notice was given the
Register-Guard for publication
on November 5, 1981

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
SPECIAL BOARD MEETING

November 10, 1981

8:30 p.m.

Municipal Courtroom #1

A G E N D A

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

Booth_____

Herbert_____

Kohnen_____

Langton_____

Loomis_____

Randall_____

Roemer_____

III. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT

IV. PUBLIC HEARING - ROUTE #17 WEYERHAEUSER

V. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

VI. ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING

A. Eugene Mall Transit Site

B. Deletion of Route #17 Weyerhaeuser

VII. ADJOURNMENT

AGENDA NOTES

Page No.

VI. ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING

1-10

A. Eugene Mall Transit Site

Background: An update on recent developments regarding the Eugene Mall Transit Site was provided at the October meeting. At that time a subcommittee of Dan Herbert, Ken Koehnen and Carolyn Roemer was appointed to direct the staff in the refinement of LTD's proposed site and to present the District's proposal to the Eugene Renewal Agency Board. The Subcommittee has met to narrow the alternatives to be studied and has met with the ERA to attend a joint meeting with the LTD Board to discuss transit alternatives.

The enclosed memo discusses in greater detail the work of the Subcommittee to date and the technical findings regarding the alternative configurations that have been studied. The memo also presents the Subcommittee's recommendation for a Eugene Mall Transit Site design scheme, a timeline for the decision-making process and a preliminary funding recommendation.

Staff Recommendation: That the Board approve the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Eugene Mall Transit Facilities, that is, adopt as the District's proposal the development of a Eugene Mall Transit Site on the north side of 10th Avenue, endorse the decision-making timeline enclosed and advocate that the project be jointly funded with the Eugene Renewal Agency.

Results of Recommended Action: The staff and Subcommittee would prepare an agenda for the joint ERA/LTD meeting on November 17 and would develop more detailed recommendations on the site's design and funding for LTD Board approval in December and ERA Board approval in January. It is expected that considerable further action on the part of both groups will be necessary before the project reaches the actual design phase.

B. Deletion of Route #17 WEYERHAEUSER

11-12

Background: After considerable efforts to design service for Weyerhaeuser employees that would meet work hours, provide service close to work places and serve residences of as many Weyerhaeuser employees as practicable, the service was initiated September 29. As the enclosed memo indicates, the ridership on this route has been extremely low in spite of close coordination between LTD and Weyerhaeuser, promotion of the service by both parties and significant media coverage. There is no reason to believe that ridership would improve in the foreseeable future.

Staff Recommendation: That the Board authorize the deletion of service on Route #17 WEYERHAEUSER effective November 16, 1981 and that the resources of that route be reallocated to other service in Springfield.

Results of Recommended Action: The staff would take steps to publicize the deletion and would work to improve service by a like amount of vehicle-hours on other routes serving Springfield.



LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

November 4, 1981

MEMO

TO: Lane Transit District Board of Directors
FROM: Subcommittee on Eugene Mall Transit Facilities
RE: Preliminary Recommendations

Background:

On September 25, LTD was invited by the Eugene Renewal Agency to submit a proposal for transit-related improvements in the vicinity of 10th & Wilamette. The Agency further requested that the District at least present preliminary recommendations by the November meeting. The Board responded to this request by appointing a Board Subcommittee, composed of Dan Herbert, chair, Ken Kohnen and Carolyn Roemer. The subcommittee was authorized to develop preliminary recommendations for the Eugene Mall Transit Station, using the adopted 8th/10th Contra Flow Plan as a starting point. The Subcommittee made a presentation to the ERA Board on November 3 to review these preliminary findings and to schedule a joint meeting of the full LTD/ERA boards on November 17, at the regular LTD Board meeting.

Planning Assumptions:

The transit element of the Downtown Transportation Study is the adopted plan upon which the Subcommittee is basing its recommendations. This transit element is more commonly referred to as the 8th/10th Contra Flow Plan. The name of the 8th/10th Contra Flow Plan is perhaps something of a misnomer in that contra flow is only one element of the plan. The major thrust of the plan is actually the provision of bus parking along 10th Avenue and along 8th Avenue, at two centralized layover sites. In developing a phased approach to the implementation of this 8th/10th Contra Flow Plan, the Subcommittee has attempted to devise a project that meets the following objectives:

- A project that is low cost when compared to the \$2.7 million estimate for the 8th/10th Contra Flow Plan.
- A project that can be under construction within 18 months and a project that can be locally financed.
- A project that is operationally effective for the District in the short run, in light of recent reductions of off-peak headways.

Special Board Meeting
11/10/81 Page 1

- A project that will significantly improve the image of 10th Street through an upgrading of pedestrian amenities and associated bus transfer facilities.
- A project that can ultimately be extended into a full 8th/10th Contra Flow Plan.

Alternatives Analysis:

In developing its recommendations, the Subcommittee evaluated three alternatives for a phased approach to the 8th/10th Contra Plan. They were as follow:

- A. As the first phase of the 8th/10th Contra Flow Plan, re-develop the 10th Street Station, with or without the use of the contra flow technique.
- B. As the first phase of the 8th/10th Contra Flow Plan, develop the 8th Street Station with contra flow or the conversion of 8th Avenue to two way and shift the focus of transit to 8th Avenue.
- C. Develop both 8th Avenue and 10th Avenue under a scaled down version of the original plan; however, covered walkways would not be involved and the effect of recent midday service reductions on the overall effectiveness of split stations will be analyzed.

The firm of Branch Engineering was retained to assist staff with the detailed technical analysis that is necessary to refine the adopted 8th/10th Contra Flow transit plan into an operational facility. This work has been closely coordinated with Jim Hanks, the Traffic Engineer for the City of Eugene.

Technical Findings:

Based on the first phase of the technical analysis, two key findings have emerged:

1. The alternative that would shift the focus of transit from 10th Avenue to 8th Avenue as a first phase of the 8th/10th Contra Flow Plan is not feasible. The District requires approximately 14 to 20 bus parking bays. This bus parking requirement tends to vary significantly by time of day. It has also varied over the years as the District has made adjustments to its routes and schedules. The District cannot obtain more than 7 bus bays on 8th Avenue without either encroaching on park land or disrupting existing retail business. Traffic volumes on 8th Avenue dictate the need for at least three

auto travel lanes. Therefore, since the right of way on 8th Avenue, like 10th Avenue, is only 66 feet, shifting bus activity from 10th to 8th would merely replicate the problems now experienced on 10th Avenue.

2. It appears that a scaled down version of the 8th/10th Contra Flow Plan can be developed, but that in the short run, 10th Avenue must remain the focus for coordinated bus transfers. The justification for concentrating bus parking and bus transfer activity on 10th is twofold. First, under the adopted 8th/10th Contra Flow Plan, a 7 bay bus layover facility can be developed adjacent to the surface parking lot opposite the Arcade; however, all 7 of the bays can only be developed by constructing an uninterrupted curb line adjacent to this parking lot. This would have the effect of eliminating through driveways into the lot, thereby seriously restricting access to this key parking area. Until the development future of this lot has been finalized and until downtown parking policies are re-evaluated, the full complement of seven bus bays should be deferred. Instead, a 2 to 3 bus turnout should be developed that can serve both as a major bus stop for the northside of the Mall and as a holding area for routes with long downtown layovers.

The second justification for maintaining the focus of bus activity on 10th Avenue, during the first phase of the 8th/10th Contra Flow Plan, is the District's recent off-peak headway reduction. When the Downtown Transportation Study was adopted, all urban routes operated every 30 minutes all day long. At this service frequency, the District could reasonably expect to coordinate transfers between two layover points. More importantly, for those occasions where schedules were not met, a missed transfer only costs a patron an additional 30 minutes. However, with the District's shift in emphasis to peak hours, most routes now run once an hour during midday, evenings and weekends. Under this new system, the cost of a missed transfer for many patrons is one hour. The District's ability to guarantee transfer reliability is critical to maintaining existing ridership and to building a broader ridership base. For these reasons, the District should be operationally committed to a policy of coordinated transfer, and in the short run, this policy can only be implemented by continuing to focus bus activity along 10th Avenue.

Recommendations:

Based on the review of the technical analysis, the Subcommittee unanimously makes the following recommendations:

Recommendations, Cont.

Page 4

November 4, 1981

1. In the first phase of the 8th/10th Contra Flow Plan, the focus of bus layovers and bus transfer activity should remain on 10th Avenue. This is essential to insuring coordinated transfers during off-peak times when most routes only run hourly.
2. 10th Avenue should be redeveloped into a two way facility from Charnelton to Oak. Bus parking should then be moved to the north side of 10th Avenue between the east edge of Sears and west edge of the Parcade. A single mixed westbound travel lane, leading to the parking lots at 10th & Olive. Additional bus parking on the east and west sides of Olive, south of 10th Avenue will also be developed, to insure enough bus storage space without increasing the maximum walking distance for transferring patrons. Bus parking on Olive eliminates the District's requirement for bus layover space immediately adjacent to the Sears storefront.
3. In addition to the major bus parking area on the north side of 10th Avenue, a three bus bay turnout should be developed at the southeast corner of 8th and Willamette. This facility will function as a bus stop for the north side of the Mall, as well as a holding area for routes with long downtown layovers. It also represents the first step toward developing a seven bus bay facility on 8th Avenue.
4. By eliminating one travel lane on 10th Avenue, the sidewalk on the north side of 10th will be widened to approximately 20', from the east edge of Sears to the west edge of the Parcade; as a result of this sidewalk widening, there will be a single eastbound travel lane on 10th Avenue between Olive and the west edge of the Parcade.
5. The pedestrian crossing at 10th & Willamette should be narrowed in order to increase the percentage of green time that can be given to eastbound traffic.
6. An off-street bus turnout should be constructed for a major Mall bus stop at Broadway and Pearl. A second major Mall bus stop at Broadway and Charnelton can occur in the contra flow lane but, in the completed 8th/10th Contra Flow Plan, a bus turnout will be required at this location.
7. A contra flow lane should be established on Charnelton, between 8th Avenue and 10th Avenue.
8. Access to the bus bays on 8th Avenue will be provided either by creating a single mixed eastbound lane, making 8th Avenue two way or by implementing a bus only contra flow lane. The decision between a mixed lane versus a bus only contra flow lane will be based on the technical recommendations of Jim Hanks and the District's traffic engineering consultant, Jim Branch.
9. The Lane Transit District Customer Service Center should be moved into the first floor of the Atrium Building.

Decision-Making Timeline:

The Subcommittee has tentatively formulated a decision-making timeline with the goal being a final decision from both LTD and ERA on transit improvements at the Eugene Mall by January 5, 1982. This timeline is admittedly compressed but the dispensation of improved Eugene Mall transit facilities has been in limbo for over 10 years and the current situation constitutes a serious image problem for LTD, ERA and the downtown business community at large. Furthermore, the District is basing its recommendations on the adopted Downtown Transportation Study. This plan has already been through a complete public hearing process and has been ratified by the Eugene City Council, the Eugene Planning Commission, the Downtown Development Board and the Lane Transit District Board of Directors.

Other factors that support a deadline of January 5 are the pending reorganization of the EDA, DDB and ERA as well as a turnover of LTD Board positions at the beginning of 1982. There are members on each of the affected policy boards who are well informed regarding the evolution of public policy for downtown transit facilities; some members on the LTD Board have been active in this process for 8 years. Loss of these key personnel from the final decision-making effort is likely to seriously delay the project.

Therefore, the Subcommittee recommends that the Board adopt the following decision-making timeline:

<u>Completed</u>	August 25	In its annual goal-setting session, ERA determined that improvements to the 10th and Willamette area would have first priority in FY 81-82 and LTD, along with EDA and DDB, were invited to submit proposals for how this area should be upgraded.
<u>Completed</u>	October 6	LTD presented to the Eugene Renewal Agency (ERA) a proposal for a work program to analyze the three alternatives for a phased implementation of the adopted 8th/10th Contra Flow Plan.
<u>Completed</u>	October 20 7:30 a.m.	Eugene Renewal Agency endorsed the work program and requested LTD to submit its preliminary recommendations by November 3 so that they could be considered along with input from the DDB and EDA.
<u>Completed</u>	October 20 7:30 p.m.	LTD Board established a three member subcommittee and authorized this subcommittee to prepare preliminary recommendations for the November 3rd meeting with E.R.A.

Recommendations, Cont.

Page 6

November 4, 1981

<u>Completed</u>	October 28	LTD Subcommittee adopted preliminary recommendations for improved Eugene Mall Transit Facilities.
<u>Completed</u>	November 3	LTD Board Subcommittee presents preliminary recommendations to ERA.
	November 10	A special LTD Board meeting will be held to review the subcommittee's work and to formulate the District's recommendation for improved Eugene Mall Transit Facilities.
	November 17	A special joint LTD-ERA Board meeting is proposed to review the technical details of the District's recommendations, to identify policy issues that need resolution and to initiate discussion on joint funding for the project; the chairpersons of the DDB and EDA would also be invited as special guests.
	December 2	LTD staff will present the District's recommendation to the DDB for review and comment.
	December 9	LTD staff will present the District's recommendations to the EDA for review and comment.
	December 15	The LTD Board will adopt a finalized set of recommendations for Eugene Mall Transit Facilities, including a proposed formula for joint funding by LTD and ERA.
	January 5	The LTD Board will request the ERA Board to adopt the finalized set of recommendations for Eugene Mall Transit Facilities, including a formula for joint funding.

Project Funding:

Due to the compressed timelines, preliminary cost estimates will not be available until the November 17 board meeting. However, the Subcommittee recommends that the Board initiate discussions with the Eugene Renewal Agency, with the understanding that the District's recommendations will hopefully lead toward a project that will be jointly funded by LTD and ERA. A funding formula has not been established nor has the cost of the project been determined. However, these issues are less important at this time than the pressing need to end a 10 year impasse on the siting of improved transit facilities for the Eugene Mall. The Subcommittee believes that these improvements are vital to the future well-being of the District and they deserve funding priority in the preparation of the budget for FY 82-83.

Action Requested:

1. Adopt the Subcommittee recommendations for improved Eugene Mall Transit Facilities.
2. Endorse the decision-making timeline.
3. Advocate that this project be jointly funded by LTD and the appropriate agency for the City of Eugene.

LTD SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE EUGENE MALL TRANSIT SITE

Minutes

October 28, 1981

Lyons Restaurant

Participants: Daniel Herbert, Carolyn Roemer, Ken Kohnen, Paul Shinn,
Ellen Bevington, Jim Branch (Consulting Engineer).

The LTD Subcommittee meeting was called to order by chairman, Dan Herbert, at 7:30 a.m. All committee members were present. Ellen Bevington handed out a memo to the committee on the analysis of alternatives for sites for a possible downtown station. She indicated that the purpose of the process was to move from the adopted Downtown Transportation Study to a new plan that could be accomplished in less time and with less money. She summarized three alternatives for a station site; A) Develop a 10th Avenue station, B) Develop an 8th Avenue station, C) Develop both a 8th and 10th Avenue station as a scaled down version of the original contra flow plan. Ms Bevington indicated that the 8th Avenue alternative had been discarded because it would force removal of parking places from the lot at 8th and Willamette and because there's not sufficient sidewalk width for passenger loading. She said that a 10th Avenue development could be the first phase of an 8th/10th contra flow plan, but that the contra flow plan itself could not be implemented at the present time because of long midday headways.

Dan Herbert asked about the possibility of making 8th Avenue two way in conjunction with bus turnouts. He wondered if the two way portion of 8th would be only two blocks long. Jim Branch indicated that that item was under study. Mr. Herbert asked if the plan was being coordinated with the city traffic engineers, Mr. Branch answered that he was using the city's computer model to look at the traffic impacts of any plan and that he was working with the city engineers on all alternatives. Mr. Herbert asked if we would address loitering problems. Ms. Bevington indicated that we would be looking at what other towns have experienced but that we really can't make a definitive answer.

Ken Kohnen asked if it's possible to find out how many of the loiterers are bus riders. Ms. Bevington answered it's difficult to say, but many of the loiterers probably have more to do with the type of business located along the present station at 10th Avenue than they do with the buses. Mr. Herbert indicated his desire to encourage the city to exert more control over what type of businesses can locate downtown.

Mr. Branch displayed three maps of 10th Avenue, as it exists now, as it would exist under the improved southside alternative, and under the northside alternative. The "10th Avenue South" alternative would widen the sidewalk to 20' or more throughout the station. This would be accomplished by having one less lane for traffic on 10th Avenue. This alternative would also move bus parking one block to the west, so that no buses would park under the overpark. Bus parking would be added behind the present Section F and on both sides of Olive Street south of 10th. Mr. Branch indicated that the advantages of this plan were that it had the least impact on traffic, it allowed wider sidewalks throughout the station, and that is a fairly minor change for everyone concerned. The major disadvantage is that it closes the door to development of the contra flow plan in the future.

The 10th Avenue north alternative would have buses parked along the north side of 10th Avenue in a westbound direction. This could be accomplished either with a contra flow bus only lane on 10th or by making 10th two way. Bus parking would extend from the alley west of the overpark to the parking lot east of Sears and would include parking on both sides of Olive. This alternative would relocate 10th Avenue south in front of the Atrium Building in order to provide wider sidewalks in that area. Mr. Branch indicated that the advantages of this plan would be that it would minimize disruption of retail activities, it could interface with redevelopment of the Ardel Building, and that it would be the first step toward eventual implementation of the contra flow plan. The major disadvantage is that the sidewalk could not be widened in some areas without taking one more lane out of 10th Avenue.

Mr. Herbert asked if the sidewalks could be widened if 10th had only one east-bound lane. Mr. Branch answered that it might cause cars to back up at the light at 10th and Willamette to an extent that is not acceptable to the city. Mr. Kohnen asked if either plan lengthens the walking distance for transferring bus passengers. Mr. Branch indicated that the walking distance would be about the same under either alternative as it is now. Mr. Herbert asked if making 8th Avenue two way would allow 10th to be a one lane street without undue traffic congestion. Mr. Branch indicated a computer analysis of this possibility is being made. Mr. Herbert stated that he felt that a wider sidewalk is very important and that he would like to see what happens to traffic on 10th if the north side sidewalk is widened throughout the length of the station. Carolyn Roemer said she felt that the north side alternative would be more popular if it included making 10th a two way street.

Mr. Kohnen asked about the timing of the decision making process. Ms. Bevington indicated that the staff was requesting that the committee endorse two preliminary technical findings listed at the end of the memo at the present meeting and that they present a preliminary study to the Eugene Renewal Agency Board on November 3, 1981. She indicated that it was envisioned that a recommended alternative would be presented to the LTD Board on November 17 and to the ERA Board in December.

After discussion, the committee members agreed that they preferred the north side of 10th Avenue alternative. Mr. Herbert indicated that he would like to see the south side alternative refined further, but that the accent should be put on the north side alternative. Ms. Roemer asked if cost estimates for the alternatives were available. Ms. Bevington answered that they are not yet ready. She expressed hope that the ERA Board would be interested in bearing a portion of the cost of any improvement, but that this issue had not been brought up with the ERA Board as yet.

Mr. Kohnen moved and Ms. Roemer seconded that the committee endorse the two preliminary technical findings: That emphasis in bus activity cannot be shifted from 10th Avenue to 8th Avenue at present, and that a phased approach to the 8th/10th Contra Flow Plan should be pursued with the first phase placing bus parking and bus transfer activity along 10th Avenue. The motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Kohnen moved and Ms. Roemer seconded that the staff be authorized to refine the two 10th Avenue alternatives, including widened sidewalks on the north side, with more accent on the refinement of the north side, with the south side being refined for comparison purposes only. Motion was passed unanimously.

The committee agreed that Mr. Kohnen and Mr. Herbert would make a presentation on the alternatives to the ERA Board at their November 3rd meeting and that they

would meet with Mr. Branch and Ms. Bevington prior to that November meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 a.m.



LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

November 4, 1981

To: LTD Board of Directors
From: Planning
Re: Recommended Termination of Weyerhaeuser Service

The experimental bus service designed for Weyerhaeuser employees has proven unsuccessful. Despite careful planning of routes and schedules, ridership on the route has been extremely poor. The following table compares the ridership and productivity of the Weyerhaeuser route with systemwide ridership and productivity:

TABLE 1

RIDERSHIP AND PRODUCTIVITY OF
WEYERHAEUSER SERVICE COMPARED TO ENTIRE SYSTEM

	<u>Vehicle Hours per Weekday</u>	<u>Avg. Ridership per Weekday</u>	<u>Productivity of Service</u>
Weyerhaeuser	14	4	0.3
Entire System	670	15,600	23.3

These poor ridership statistics also translate into a very high average trip cost on the route. The following table shows the cost of providing service to Weyerhaeuser:

TABLE 2

COST OF PROVIDING
WEYERHAEUSER SERVICE

<u>Vehicle Hours per Weekday</u>	<u>Cost per Vehicle Hour</u>	<u>Cost per Weekday</u>	<u>Cost per Week</u>
14	\$30.00	\$420.00	\$2,100.00

The average cost per trip on the Weyerhaeuser route is thus \$105.00. This compares to a system wide average trip cost of \$1.85. Many factors are responsible for this dismal performance. Perhaps most important is that historically, industrial workers have shown a very low propensity to use transit. For example Tri-Met in Portland made a similar unsuccessful attempt to cater to industrial workers with their Swan Island project.

Special Board Meeting
11/10/81 Page 11

Another factor contributing to poor patronage is that the route within the plant is still 2 to 3 blocks from several of the major work places; a routing change designed to serve these buildings more directly was deemed unsafe by Weyerhaeuser administrators due to potential conflict between buses and other heavy logging equipment.

It seems very unlikely that the service can be redesigned to significantly improve its performance. LTD staff worked closely with Weyerhaeuser in tailoring the service to its employees. The route travels within 3 blocks of 75% of the employee's homes and is scheduled to meet the daytime shifts. The service was also heavily promoted. Information about the route appeared in 3 company newsletters and every Weyerhaeuser employee in Springfield received a letter of invitation and a route timetable from LTD. In addition (on the first day of service), free rides, coffee and donuts were provided. Based on this analysis LTD staff and the Weyerhaeuser administrators both recommend that the service be terminated as soon as possible. In the short run, these resources will be reallocated to those routes which are currently experiencing ridership overloads. These routes (especially the #11 Thurston and the #21 LCC/Harris) are now supplemented by trips operated by "extra board" drivers, generally at overtime rates. Therefore, replacing these drivers with the Weyerhaeuser drivers would save money. By January, 1982, the resources that had been allocated to Weyerhaeuser can be integrated into regular driver runs and can be reallocated to other routes in Springfield. Specifically, the resources should be used to increase service on Main Street and to increase midday frequency between LCC and downtown Springfield. Both these routes have experienced heavy ridership and warrant additional service.

Action Requested

Authorize termination of the #17 Weyerhaeuser, effective November 16, 1981 and reallocate these resources to those Springfield routes that are experiencing overloads.