

Central Lane MPO RTP: Projects for Additional Information

A. Western Eugene UGB and Royal Node	
<p><i>This is a cluster of road expansion projects on the far western edge of the Eugene UGB, in an area significantly bounded by wetlands and conservation areas, in the general vicinity of the previously-planned Royal Node. Together these projects appear to represent close to \$40 million in capital investment.</i></p>	<p>The Royal Node was identified as a potential nodal development area in TransPlan and was subsequently designated as a high priority node by the City Council. The Royal Node Specific Area Plan is an adopted land use plan of the City of Eugene. The Royal Node Plan and proposed infrastructure improvements are consistent with the following adopted Growth management policies by the City:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Policy 1 Support the existing Eugene Urban Growth Boundary by taking actions to increase density and use existing vacant land and under-used land within the boundary more efficiently.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Policy 15 Target publicly-financed infrastructure extensions to support development for higher densities, in-fill, mixed uses, and nodal development.</p> <p>To the extent that the Envision Eugene update to the City's overall land use vision leads to changes in this part of Eugene, these will likely be reflected through the update to the Eugene TSP. Any changes can later be amended into the RTP.</p>
Royal Node - Roosevelt Extension (Future Collector F)	RTP #429
Royal Node - Legacy Extension (Future Collector H)	RTP #435
Royal Node - Future Collector J	RTP #441
Royal Node - Colton Way (Future Collector P)	RTP #449
Royal Node - Eugene Nodal Development Infrastructure Funding	
Royal Node - Royal Avenue	RTP #481
Royal Node - Green Hill Road	RTP #485
Royal Node - Green Hill Road	RTP #454
Questions	Responses
1) Given the roadblocks which have arisen to the development of the Royal Node, what is the continuing need for this amount of road development in that area?	Although the existence of wetlands may affect specific development layouts, the Royal Node is still anticipated to accommodate a substantial amount of growth in the future.
2) Given that \$40 million in road expansion on the edge of the UGB is likely to induce relatively high-VMT development (to the extent that it supports development at all), what is the likely impact of these projects, both separately and as a cluster, on the local transportation carbon footprint of Eugene and Lane County?	The purpose of the Royal Specific Area Plan (and other nodal development strategies) is to permit development in a manner that has less VMT and less carbon footprint than other typical development near the urban fringe. While the VMT/capita might be higher than in, say, the downtown core it would be substantially less than current conditions near the urban fringe.

Central Lane MPO RTP: Projects for Additional Information

<p>3) Given that the area that would be supported by these road projects is limited by both the adjacent UGB and the adjacent large area of protected wetlands, what is the cost-effectiveness of investing in this roadway infrastructure, compared to infrastructure investments along key transit corridors and in compact urban growth locations?</p>	<p>TransPlan identified the Royal Node area as a potential compact growth (nodal) area that could be well served by transit.</p> <p>An analysis of the cost-effectiveness of investments or projects, as raised in the question, has not been done in the past and is not part of the current update of the RTP or the local TSPs.</p>
<p>4) This cluster of road development may be contrary to the general recommendations of the West Eugene Collaborative (WEC). How will the WEC recommendations be incorporated into our transportation plans going forward?</p>	<p>The WEC recommendations are being considered through both Envision Eugene and the Eugene TSP processes. To the extent that the WEC recommendations are incorporated into the Eugene TSP, they will then later be amended into the RTP.</p> <p>It appears that the development of the extension of Roosevelt would be consistent with WEC recommendations that there be parallel east-west roads to West 11th ? From WEC: "Improve Beltline and Roosevelt Boulevard within current right of way to complete an "outer" alternative east-west route between Highway 99 and West 11th Avenue."</p>

Central Lane MPO RTP: Projects for Additional Information

B. Western Eugene UGB, West 11th Avenue, and Randy Pape Beltline	
<i>These road expansion projects run through areas with protected conservation land and designated critical habitat for Federally listed species, out to the edge of the UGB.</i>	Both of these projects are entirely within ODOT right of way. When RTP project #333 was moved from the illustrative to the constrained list in TransPlan, Eugene and ODOT staff met with staff from federal resource agencies to explain that further work (planning, NEPA, or environmental permitting) was necessary before construction were to occur. Both projects are entirely within Eugene's UGB. There is privately owned land in the West 11 th corridor that is expected to one day develop. Currently this section of W. 11 th Avenue is designed as a rural highway with no pedestrian or bicycle facilities. Both projects are seen as more important to the transportation network in the absence of the West Eugene Parkway.
W.11 th Avenue-Green Hill Road to Terry Street (\$20 million)	RTP #333
Beltline Highway - Study - Roosevelt Boulevard to W. 11th Ave	RTP #312
Beltline Highway - Roosevelt to W11th Ave (* illust.) \$21 million	RTP #312
Questions	Responses
1) Given that SAFETEA environmental maps may not have been updated to reflect designated critical habitat for the Fender's blue butterfly, how will we take those potential conflicts into account in evaluating these projects? What is the likely impact of this project on the future of West Eugene threatened and endangered species?	<p>The environmental maps in the current adopted RTP (November 2007) do reflect the designated critical habitat for the Fender's Blue Butterfly (http://docs.lcog.org/mpo/PDF/cetas_maps/17.1TEspp_CD_CritHab-web.pdf). Preliminary discussions with resource agency staff indicate that the designated habitat has not changed and is still accurately represented.</p> <p>While RTP project #333 is listed on the Financially Constrained list, more work would need to be completed through either environmental planning (NEPA) or environmental permitting before determining the actual alignment and potential impacts to surrounding areas.</p> <p>The next step for project #333 is to complete a facility plan. After that there will be a NEPA study. During the NEPA phase, habitat issues, including Fender's Blue Butterfly will be taken into account. As stated previously, city and ODOT staff have already met with federal agency staff to discuss concerns raised. As has been discussed at MPC meetings, the design of a street is not presupposed; there may be things that can be done as part of a street design that can make it more friendly to the habitat on either side of it.</p> <p>Please note that Financially Constrained RTP project #312 is a Study. While no study has been complete, or is in progress, the planning study would examine various existing conditions, including environmental. In addition, before proceeding with an actual project (as listed in the Illustrative list (RTP</p>

Central Lane MPO RTP: Projects for Additional Information

	<p>#312)), more work would need to be complete, likely through environmental planning (NEPA), before determining the actual alignment and potential impacts to surrounding areas.</p>
<p>2) What is the likely impact of this project on the local transportation carbon footprint of Eugene and Lane County?</p>	<p>Unknown until measurements and methodology are in place to address carbon footprint of projects, alternatives, and plans. The State is currently working on this effort.</p>
<p>3) Given that the area that would be supported by these road projects is limited by both the adjacent UGB and the adjacent large area of protected lands, what is the cost-effectiveness of investing in this roadway infrastructure, compared to infrastructure investments along key transit corridors and in compact urban growth locations?</p>	<p>Based on modeling, public input, and other identified interest/needs, we examine and study areas in need of improvements for safety, mobility, and operations. In determining priority, as to which project in which area to proceed with, this is a larger discussion between the local jurisdiction, the MPC, the LACT, and the ODOT Region to determine project priority based upon funding availability, plans, policies, level of interest/support and identified need.</p> <p>RTP project #333 is in the UGB and there still remains a considerable amount of developable land in this part of Eugene. The current street design is a rural highway that will not serve pedestrians and cyclists well who want to access the rest of Eugene as those areas develop. This section also has capacity issues such as no center turn lane or turn pockets; these issues will be addressed through a facility plan and new urban design for the roadway.</p>

Central Lane MPO RTP: Projects for Additional Information

C. Southern Eugene UGB	
These two road expansion projects run through an area with protected conservation land, significant geological hazards, and regional parkland, out to the edge of the UGB.	
Dillard Road – expansion	RTP #298
Fox Hollow Road – expansion	RTP #245
Questions	Responses
1) Given the limitations of documented geologic hazards, the high proportion of regional parkland nearby, and the relatively full buildout of the nearby residential lands, what is the continuing need for this amount of road development in that area?	<p>There is a need to improve this section of Fox Hollow for a couple of reasons. There is undeveloped land zoned for residential development along Fox Hollow. There are side streets of Fox Hollow that have had residential development and this section of Fox Hollow has no sidewalks or bike lanes to serve the people who live on these side streets. This section of Fox Hollow also connects an already upgraded section of Fox Hollow that has bike lanes and sidewalks with a County-maintained section that has wide shoulders that provides access to the Ridgeline Trail.</p> <p>Likewise, Dillard Road has undeveloped land zoned for residential development along it and is a popular bicycling street for trips into the countryside.</p> <p>The road improvements will also provide the opportunity to mitigate geologic hazards that are exacerbated by existing unimproved roads</p> <p>The city will review both projects as part of the Eugene TSP Update.</p>
2) Given that road expansion on the edge of the UGB is likely to induce relatively high-VMT development (to the extent that it supports development at all), what is the likely impact of these projects, both separately and as a cluster, on the local transportation carbon footprint of Eugene and Lane County?	Unknown until measurements and methodology are in place to address carbon footprint of projects, alternatives, and plans. The State is currently working on this effort.
3) Given that the area that would be supported by these road projects is limited by both the adjacent UGB and the adjacent large area of protected lands, what is the cost-effectiveness of investing in this roadway infrastructure, compared to infrastructure investments along key transit corridors and in compact urban growth locations?	An analysis of the cost-effectiveness of investments or projects, as raised in the question, has not been done in the past and is not part of the current update of the RTP or the local TSPs.

Central Lane MPO RTP: Projects for Additional Information

D. Bicycle Projects	
These are bike/ped projects associated with certain road projects.	
30th Avenue / Amazon Parkway - striped lane (what costs \$654K?)	RTP # 209
Dillard Road - Striped Lane, shoulders	RTP # 298
Fox Hollow Road - Striped Lane, shoulders	RTP # 254
Green Hill Road - Striped Lane, shoulders - W. 11th Avenue to Crow Road	
Green Hill Road - Striped Lane - Barger Drive to West 11th Avenue	
Questions	Responses
1) How can we tell if the costs of these projects are realistic relative to the actual costs of the new ped/bike infrastructure? Are costs that could be reasonably attributed to the primary road project being shifted into the bike/ped category? Just for example, let's take a close look at \$654,000 for a striped bike lane on 30th Avenue / Amazon Parkway, in an area already served by a multiuse path.	The update of Eugene's Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan (PBMP) and the TSP update will include some revised cost estimates for projects.
2) What is the long-term costs effectiveness and ridership effectiveness of striped bike lane projects compared to separated facilities for bicycles?	Striped bicycle lanes (on-street) will continue to be a useful tool for accommodating bicyclists on City streets for the long-term. They are relatively inexpensive and serve an important function for urban non-motorized mobility.
3) How can we evaluate the real network significance and ridership benefit of striped bike lanes on widened urban standards streets out at the edge of the urban growth boundary? Compared to separated facilities for bicycles in urban core areas?	The City's objective is to build complete streets that serve all modes throughout Eugene. The comparison suggested has not been done in the past and is not part of the scope of work for either the PBMP or TSP.

Central Lane MPO RTP: Projects for Additional Information

E. Transit Projects	
These projects project twenty years of relatively linear buildout of the BRT system.	
Buses	RTP # 1110
BRT corridors (5 corridors, 30 miles)	RTP # 1117
BRT corridors (5 corridors, 30 miles)	RTP # 1115
Park and Ride lots	RTP # 1105
Bus stops	RTP # 1130
Transfer stations	RTP # 1300
Questions	Responses
1) What is the potential over the RTP's 20 year planning horizon for electrification of transit vehicles on primary transit corridors in the MPO area? What is the comparative transit carbon footprint with and without electrification?	Please see Lane Transit District staff response in Attachment 2
2) What are long-term operating costs, projected ridership level, and capital costs for a state-of-the-art electric streetcar system, compared with continued BRT buildout over 20 years? What about the magnitude of associated transit-oriented development? Please take into account the recent findings in Portland comparing enhanced bus routes to streetcar routes.	Please see Lane Transit District staff response in Attachment 2

F. BETHEL DRIVE	
Bethel Drive Urban Standards	RTP #414
Question	Response
How will this project impact the neighborhood?	The project would maintain the street as a neighborhood street.