

## MINUTES

Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization  
Citizen Advisory Committee  
Eugene Public Library – Singer Room – 100 W. 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Eugene, Oregon

December 16, 2010  
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Dave Jacobson, Sarah Strand, Diana Alldredge, Paul Adkins, Wendy Butler-Boyesen, Eleanor Mulder, Phillip Carroll, Rosalia Marquez, Dick Beers, Bill Morganti, Gary Gillespie, Edward Winter, Jennifer Smith, members; Kathi Wiederhold, Paul Thompson, Andrea Riner, Lane Council of Governments; Mary Archer, John Evans, Mark Pangborn, Cosette Rees, Lane Transit District; Rob Inerfeld, City of Eugene; Sonny Chickering, MPC Liaison; David Reesor, City of Springfield.

ABSENT: Philip Farrington, Alexandre Lockfeld, members.

### 1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND AGENDA REVIEW

Mr. Jacobson called the meeting of the Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization Citizen Advisory Committee (MPO CAC) to order at 5:30 p.m. and asked those present to introduce themselves.

### 2. Comments from the Audience

None.

### 3. Approve November 18, 2010 Minutes

Mr. Jacobson offered the following correction to page 3, paragraph 4 of the November 18, 2010 minutes:

“Mr. Jacobson, responding to a question from Ms. Mulder, noted that the ~~OTC supervisors~~ *Board of County Commissioners* would appoint an ACT member to serve as the representative for the area of Highway 126 east of Springfield as there were no incorporated cities in that area.”

Mr. Jacobson offered the following correction to page 2, paragraph 4 of the November 18, 2010 minutes:

“Ms. Alldredge offered a correction to the minutes and asked that her contribution to the member updates portion of the meeting be revised to indicate that she had not actually attended the meeting of the Springfield ~~TSP Stakeholder Advisory Group~~ *City Council*.”

Mr. Jacobson explained that this portion of the November 18, 2010 minutes was referring to page 7 of the October 21, 2010 minutes. He explained that Ms. Alldredge had attended the Springfield TSP Stakeholder Advisory Group, but had not attended the Springfield City Council meeting. He noted that page 7 of the October 21, 2010 minutes read: “Ms. Alldredge noted from the Springfield TSP Stakeholder Advisory Group that the recent work session ...” He noted that the work session was held with an in-group that had

met with City staff and outside contractors.

Mr. Jacobson asked that these changes be made to both the October 21, 2010 and the November 18, 2010 minutes.

Mr. Chickering offered the following correction to page 2, paragraph 10 of the November 18, 2010 minutes:

“Mr. Chickering reported the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) during their regular meeting had approved the charter for the Lane County ACT on November 9, 2010. He noted that he and his colleagues had been attempting to finalize the ACT charter for ~~over five years~~ *nearly one year.*”

Mr. Gillespie, seconded by Ms. Butler-Boyesen, moved to approve the November 18, 2010 minutes as corrected. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **4. Nominate Officers**

Mr. Jacobson noted that the CAC was to nominate and possibly elect new officers. The CAC also could nominate new officers and give members a month to think about it before holding the election.

Mr. Jacobson read from the bylaws: “The officers of the committee shall be elected annually at the last regular meeting held during the calendar year, or as needed to fill vacancies.” He noted that this meeting was the last regular meeting to be held during the 2010 calendar year. He continued to read the bylaws: “The term of office shall begin upon election and extend until the first scheduled meeting the following calendar year. Officers shall serve no more than two consecutive terms unless so requested by the Metropolitan Policy Committee.”

Mr. Jacobson said that he had found some inconsistencies in the portion of the bylaws concerning the officer nomination process, which officers would discuss at the Officers Meeting the following Wednesday, December 22. He said that that meeting was open to everyone on the CAC.

Mr. Reesor arrived.

Mr. Jacobson asked those interested in serving as an officer to say a few sentences about why they wanted to be officers. He read from a memo titled *Item 4 – Nominate Citizen Advisory Committee Officers*: “Staff recommends that the Chair take nominations from the floor, and then sound the members for their preference of whether to hold the election at the December 16, 2010 or January 20, 2011 meeting.

Mr. Winter nominated Ms. Strand for co-chair.

Ms. Strand nominated Mr. Winter for co-chair.

Ms. Strand stated that she was fortunate to have no day job, which would allow her to regularly attend Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) meetings. She hoped to work with a co-chair in case she could not make it to all meetings. She hoped she and a co-chair could chair alternate CAC meetings. She had a desire to help the community and to use her mind in a way that would be useful to the future of Eugene and Springfield.

Mr. Winter stated that he had served on the CAC Recruitment Subcommittee and the Annual Review Subcommittee that had reviewed the Public Participation Plan. He hoped to serve another three-year term on the committee (his term was up the following December). For the next year, he hoped to serve as co-

chair of the CAC.

Ms. Mulder, seconded by Ms. Butler-Boyesen, moved to accept the nominations for co-chairs by acclamation. The motion to immediately elect Ms. Strand and Mr. Winter as co-chairs of the CAC passed unanimously.

Ms. Rees and Mr. Evans arrived.

Mr. Jacobson explained that Ms. Strand and Mr. Winter would take office during the first meeting in January.

Ms. Riner asked if the new chairs had to be approved by the MPC.

Ms. Wiederhold stated that they did not. She noted that Ms. Strand and Mr. Winter would chair the next meeting of the MPO CAC on January 20, 2010. The new co-chairs would become acquainted with their new positions at the Officers Meeting the following Wednesday in the small fifth floor conference room at LCOG.

## **5. Funding Request for Regional Transportation Options Plan (RTOP)**

Mr. Thompson passed around a postcard that was meant to publicize the Regional Transportation Options Plan (RTOP) project. It included contact information for the project manager, Petra Schuetz ([pschuetz@lcog.org](mailto:pschuetz@lcog.org), 541-682-3639) and the project's web address, [www.regionalto.org](http://www.regionalto.org). He explained that the cards were being distributed at local meetings like this one and meetings of the MPC.

Mr. Thompson explained that staff recommended funding the project out of the MPO's Surface Transportation Planning-Urban (STP-U) money. The MPC had programmed \$20,000 for the start-up of the project in March 2010. A state grant had been applied for but had not been awarded (the state had received a large number of applications and had chosen to fund very large projects in other areas of the state). However, the plan always has been to fund the balance of the project through STP-U funds if the grant application was not successful. Staff is asking the MPO to fund the project so they can do the work the MPO has asked staff to do (the RTOP).

Mr. Thompson explained that the public comment period on the funding request was currently ongoing, and staff had received two comments from private community members. One did not speak to the project and the other was very much in favor of the RTOP, and expressed a desire to see the project and the plan address parking issues in the area. Staff was asking the CAC to discuss the project, ask questions and make a recommendation to the MPC to fund the project. Staff has unanimously recommended funding the project.

Mr. Jacobson asked for the identity of the community member who had advocated addressing parking issues and Mr. Carroll volunteered that it was he.

Mr. Jacobson asked how much money the MPO was being asked to recommend.

Mr. Thompson explained that the project was initially funded for \$20,000, and staff was requesting an additional \$74,000 each for federal fiscal years 2011 and 2012. It was a fairly extensive project, in that staff was working with all jurisdictions, elected bodies and planning commissions, as well as soliciting public input. The two major products would be a ten-year strategic plan for Transportation Options (TO) activities in the area and a toolkit of best practices. The area has had TO activities, mainly through point2point

Solutions and other smaller, individual programs for a number of years. However, the area had not had an integrated regional TO or Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program. A little over a year ago, MPC, during a funding cycle, asked what would happen if more funding was put towards TO, recognizing that TO is a good way to address congestion, vehicle emissions and greenhouse gas emissions. The answer was the need to identify the most cost-effective activities – would it be parking management or increasing ride share efforts or something else out of the many possible strategies? In the 1990s, when TransPlan was being worked on, mandatory TDM measures were discussed. These were not favored at the time, but might be this time around. Without doing an RTOP, the area did not know what would work best.

Ms. Marquez asked if any of the information was available in languages other than English.

Mr. Thompson said that Spanish translation was available on request. The postcard and some of the other materials available could be developed in both English and Spanish.

Ms. Wiederhold said that a number of basic items, including fact sheets, were available in Spanish. An interpreter was also available and had been on call at one of the public workshops.

Ms. Marquez noted that the information was going to the public. She said that the public was made up of Spanish-speaking people as well as people who spoke other languages. She said that these people took public transportation, and the information needed to be available in as many languages as possible. Many people were confused about what would happen to certain routes when Gateway EmX opened. She requested that the information be made available in Spanish as well as in English. She asked if the translator was certified as an interpreter and translator. She noted that sometimes translated information is poorly done and hard to understand. She said it needed to be done in a simple, precise manner to avoid confusion.

Ms. Wiederhold said she would check to see if the interpreter was certified. She explained that for some of the public outreaches, LTD had put posters on the bus and information in their Bus Talk flyer. She said that every time this had been done, the materials were available in both English and Spanish.

Ms. Marquez said the information was good, but wanted to be sure everyone could understand it. She said that the Spanish-speaking population was growing rapidly.

Mr. Thompson said that he would make sure RTOP items were translated properly. He asked Ms. Marquez to identify a resource for proper translation. He was not sure if some of the information would translate well, and asked for input as to what TO/TDM terms and language would translate best and be most easily understood in the Spanish-speaking community. Some of the information in English was even confusing to native English speakers.

Ms. Marquez said she would be happy to help with the project.

Mr. Beers wanted to know what part of the funding planning came out of.

Mr. Thompson said they were planning funds.

Mr. Beers asked if these were a budgeted, approved item.

Mr. Thompson explained that it was within the 10 percent of the MPO's STP-U funds that had been set aside for planning. Last March, when MPC had approved the project, they had put aside \$20,000 to start it. The \$20,000 had been used to produce the postcard, to meet with planning commissions, to do public

outreach and research. MPC had encouraged the solicitation of outside funds. However, the state grant had not been awarded, and so MPC had agreed that the backup plan would be to fund it internally. Therefore, it had been discussed as part of the funding cycle. He explained that 10 percent was for the TDM/TO program, 25 percent for planning, and 65 percent for projects (mainly road, bicycle and transit projects). He explained that the money staff was requesting MPO recommend for approval to the MPC was out of the 25 percent of the STP-U budget allocated for planning. He said it was discussed during the funding cycle, and staff would not have been able to fund it if the budgeted funds had not been available to do it.

Mr. Jacobson explained that Mr. Beers was concerned about the total cost of the project.

Ms. Riner asked if he meant he was concerned about the request, in addition to what had already been requested.

Mr. Jacobson said this was true.

Mr. Thompson repeated that \$20,000 had already been funded, and staff was requesting \$74,000 for federal fiscal year 2011 and \$74,000 for federal fiscal year 2012, for a total of \$168,000.

Ms. Mulder said she had a problem in changing the name of the project so often, including from TDM to TO, and RTOP. She said it seemed to her that MPC was investing in inventing new terms for the project.

Mr. Thompson understood, and noted that it was difficult to use TDM and TO interchangeably over the past year. TDM had been the standard phrase for some time. It was the term used in the current RTP. TO was a newer term, and was supposed to convey that the object was not just to manage the demand but also that there were a range of options available beyond the single-occupant vehicle. In addition, the state had adopted the TO phrase rather than TDM. Staff was trying to be consistent with the state.

Mr. Gillespie left at 6 p.m.

Mr. Thompson stated that most LCOG memos now read "TO/TDM."

Mr. Jacobson said he could accept this.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen asked if the \$74,000 in the budget already had been allocated to something else.

Mr. Thompson said that it had not been allocated to something else, and was available in the budget.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen asked why there was to be no open house or newspaper display ad.

Mr. Thompson explained that last spring, when \$20,000 was proposed to kick off the project, a public comment period and a public hearing had been held. When the grant had been submitted to the state Transportation and Growth Management (TGM), the MPC had endorsed the grant application. Staff supported the required public comment period, public hearing, notice to interested parties and web notice, but requested that the requirement for an open house and newspaper display ad be waived, as these were the most expensive aspects of soliciting feedback from the public. He asked if CAC members thought these were important to do.

Mr. Morganti suggested we contact his dentist's office to learn where they had their materials translated.

Mr. Thompson repeated that staff requested the CAC recommend that the MPC approve the funding requested.

Mr. Jacobson explained that the MPC would make the final decision.

Mr. Thompson said that the MPC would decide whether to fund the project at their January 13, 2011 meeting. So far, public comment had been supportive of the funding of the project. The MPC had also supported the project through their previous actions.

Ms. Strand, seconded by Ms. Butler-Boyesen, moved to recommend funds be allocated to TO as requested.

Mr. Jacobson, Ms. Strand, Ms. Alldredge, Mr. Adkins, Ms. Butler-Boyesen, Ms. Mulder, Mr. Carroll, Ms. Marquez, Mr. Morganti, Mr. Winter, and Ms. Smith supported the motion.

Mr. Beers opposed the motion.

The motion passed, 11:1.

## **6. Regional Transportation Plan Project List Review**

Mr. Thompson stated that the MPC was reviewing the list of projects in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to identify projects about which they had questions or needed additional information. Since the last CAC meeting, Phil Farrington had contacted Mr. Thompson via telephone with questions about Game Farm Road South and some projects in the Gateway area. He had provided Mr. Farrington with details that satisfied his need for more information. Last week, staff had met with the MPC.

Mr. Thompson explained that prior to the last MPC meeting, Commissioner Rob Handy had submitted a list of questions regarding six or seven sets of projects, mainly City of Eugene projects, from both a transportation and a land use perspective. Ms. Riner had been examining those questions. At the MPC meeting, a couple of other MPC members had indicated that they thought Commissioner Handy's questions should be addressed. MPO and City of Eugene staff would work to answer these questions. MPC had identified one or two more general questions at the meeting. Mayor Piercy had had a question about Bethel Drive. At this point, staff was working to answer these questions by the January 13, 2011 MPC meeting. The MPC had not yet identified projects of concern (projects called into question) They had only identified projects about which they wanted further information. He asked if the CAC needed more information about projects on the list. In the next month or two, MPC would identify projects of concern, and staff would forward these on to the CAC for review.

Mr. Winter asked if, once the MPC decided which projects were on the list, they would discuss which got funding the following fall.

Mr. Thompson explained that none of this portion of the process would decide which projects got funding, even in the fall. This was because the RTP was not a funding document, but a 20-year planning document that identified projects that the MPO would try to fund. The Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) was the short-term programming of money that actually funds projects. Within the RTP, he asked if Mr. Winter was asking about the constrained list versus the illustrative list.

Mr. Winter said that he was.

Mr. Thompson provided an example of Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) projects staff and the MPC believed should be planned for in the next 20-24 years. It would be determined which projects would most likely be funded with projected revenue and what projects would not be funded because there

was not enough money available. This discussion would happen between December 2010 and November 2011.

Mr. Winter asked if this discussion would happen when the MTIP would be discussed.

Mr. Thompspon referred Mr. Winter to the stages of the project, outlined on the memo titled Item 5.d: Regional Transportation Plan Project List Review. He explained that at this time, current projects were being examined to see if any changes needed to be made. Then, new projects would be examined (that jurisdictions said had arisen in the last four years).

Ms. Smith asked when this would happen.

Mr. Thompson said it would happen when the current phase was completed, in February, March or April. New projects would be examined over a two-to-three-month period. This process would provide a full new draft list. By February or March, the new revenue forecast would be out and would show how much money was available for the next 24 years. At that point, the list would be compared to the revenue forecast and it would be decided whether projects proposed for the financially constrained list were the best ones to get funded. This discussion would occur in the late spring and summer.

Ms. Riner asked how long the funding period would be.

Mr. Thompson explained that the list would include projects that were believed to be fundable should funding show up in 24 years.

Mr. Winter asked if there were concerns other than funding, such as greenhouse gas emissions. He wondered how these would fit into the discussion.

Mr. Thompson explained that a lot of these things were addressed currently through the RTP. The RTP also looked at the project lists in light of environmental and cultural constraint maps and other filters. A newly-emerged issue was that of greenhouse gas emissions. All of those issues would play some role in the next year, but in the current cycle of updating and adopting the RTP, there would not be greenhouse gas targets or scenarios or tools yet in place. The statewide process would not result in these until after November 2011. This meant that they would be incorporated into the next RTP.

Ms. Strand's understanding was that there was already a system in which different agencies examined planned projects in light of these issues. She wondered what the need was for the "extra work" of MPC conducting its own review of the RTP project list She asked if it would happen consistently.

Mr. Thompson explained that the process over the last several updates had been that staff from individual jurisdictions would review the projects and submit what was needed in terms of changes, updates and modifications to project descriptions and costs. After this process, staff would present the tracked-changes version to MPC, who would then move it into the public review period. This had happened during the 2007 process as well as during processes before this one. This time, Mayor Piercy and Councilor Zelenka had made a motion for the MPC to do a more in-depth, project-by-project review. The first part of this process, the current one, was that MPC and CAC members were submitting project-specific questions to staff. If MPC or CAC members got their questions answered but still had questions relevant to the RTP update, he asked that those be discussed. For example, some projects might be recommended to go back to the local TSP level.

Ms. Strand hoped the process would not occur in this way every year.

Mr. Jacobson asked CAC members to let Mr. Thompson know if they had more questions or concerns. He asked that they examine the list carefully.

Ms. Smith asked if the list was mapped anywhere.

Mr. Thompson said that every project was mapped online. Both the static maps contained in the current 2031 RTP, and a searchable version of the previous (and very similar) RTP project map are online at [www.thempo.org](http://www.thempo.org).

Mr. Pangborn arrived.

## **7. West Eugene EmX**

Ms. Riner provided an overview of how the West Eugene EmX discussion was related to the updates of the various transportation plans that were ongoing. At the last CAC meeting, CAC members had received the most up-to-date information from LTD regarding the *Alternatives Analysis* as well as the beginning work LTD had done in the mitigation process. All of the CAC's questions had gone to LTD.

Mr. Evans distributed LTD's responses to the CAC's questions which had been asked of LTD at the December 8, 2010 special meeting of the CAC.

Ms. Riner wanted to get a sense of some of the main topic areas covered by the questions and concerns identified by the CAC. She suggested that the CAC discuss the first question listed on the *Discussion Guidance* Document: "As you consider the alternatives for extending EmX to West Eugene, including the three Build alternatives, the TSM and the No-Build, what factors will be most important to you?" She requested individual responses as well as items CAC members thought were key factors in the selection of a locally preferred alternative (LPA) to recommend to the MPC. Perhaps a recommendation would come out of those conversations. She noted that the memo titled *Item 7 – West Eugene EmX Alternatives Analysis* asked the CAC to provide advisory comments to the MPC regarding the selection of an LPA, which could include one or more of the following alternatives:

- Recommend an alternative
- Provide advisory comments regarding project components of interest to the CAC
- Decline to provide advisory comments

Ms. Riner identified several issue areas discussed by the Transportation Planning Committee (TPC), which consists of high level planning and transportation staff or their designed representatives from Eugene, Springfield, ODOT, LTD, City of Coburg, Lane County and LCOG. The planning factors TPC identified included:

- Long range community needs, goals, benefits
- Efficiency and cost-effectiveness of transportation System
- Pedestrian and bicycle issues (connectivity, safety)
- Land use relationships
- Congestion
- Sustainable transportation system
  - Environmental (vehicle miles traveled, Green House Gas Emissions)
  - Economic
  - Socially equitable

Issues categories Ms. Riner had identified from CAC questions to LTD were:

- Pedestrian/bicycle
- Money/Sustainability--can the system support itself?
- Property impacts
- EmX/regular service (feeder lines)
- Service area – riders, neighborhoods
- Long-range issues

Ms. Riner thanked LTD for responding to CAC questions so quickly. She asked the CAC to focus on factors that would help them decide which recommendation to make.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen noted that the CAC had identified money and sustainability as issues at their last meeting. Public commenters at the City Council had also brought up the money issue, but LTD had not yet addressed it.

Ms. Riner asked Ms. Butler-Boyesen if she was referring to operations figures.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen answered that she was referring to how much EmX would cost and the economic picture of the route – would it be able to support itself?

Mr. Evans stated that the *Alternatives Analysis* provided a general picture of what the cost comparisons were among the alternatives and what the long-term financial outlook was with those alternatives because it was a major issue in the community. LTD had gone back to find out the answers to these questions in more detail. There were certain high-level assumptions that had been made, and LTD was currently checking those assumptions. By January 1, 2011, LTD would have a more refined set of very detailed, corridor-specific costs that examined the financial differences between all of the alternatives. This undertaking was difficult and time-consuming.

Ms. Mulder asked about a statement LTD had made about a certain number of riders that would enable LTD to fund continued service on the whole system. She asked where that money came from, given the high percentage of riders that were already using bus passes.

Mr. Pangborn explained that every time a rider got on the bus, no matter how they paid for the trip, on average, the fare only paid about 20 percent of the cost of that trip. The argument was that more riders would equal more money for LTD. However, a majority of that needed to be subsidized into the future. Some money would be generated from fares, but fares never paid for the full cost of bus trip. As LTD added more service, LTD might get more riders, but paying for them into the future was an issue. This was a concern whether or not EmX was added.

Ms. Mulder noted that this was one of the selling points of the EmX route, that it would bring more riders.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen asked if the financial analysis would verify the statement LTD had made that each boarding on EmX cost less than a boarding on a regular route. She asked if this meant LTD was netting a few more pennies per boarding on EmX as a result.

Mr. Pangborn explained that to run an EmX bus or a regular bus down the street cost the same amount. The EmX bus was more expensive, but the driver and the fuel were the same. A regular bus carried, on average for the whole system, about 56 people per hour. An EmX bus carried over 100 people per hour. One

hundred boarders were cheaper on a per-passenger basis than were 56 boarders. This was how the figure was determined. LTD made up the slightly higher cost of running EmX busses by running EmX busses more frequently than regular busses.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen noted that when the first EmX bus began running, it had achieved and surpassed its projected ridership very quickly. She asked if current projections for the West Eugene EmX extension were based on current EmX ridership or on the reduced figures originally anticipated on the Franklin corridor.

Mr. Pangborn said that ridership was projected based on a computer model.

Ms. Riner explained that a lot had been learned from the Franklin EmX. LTD was working to make ridership projections more accurate, which was challenging. Modeling had shown that riders would walk further to board the EmX than they would to board a regular bus and chose it three times more often than regular transit. Estimates for the Franklin corridor EmX were made based on regular transit service estimates. Now, LTD had a better understanding of why people chose to ride the EmX and what kinds of people chose to ride it. Based on this experience and knowledge, ridership estimates for the West Eugene EmX Extension were more accurate.

Mr. Beers noted that in the estimation of costs, LTD had not considered the capital to build the road. If only 10 percent rode the bus, the EmX would increase ridership (not boardings) by only 1,300 people on the West Eugene EmX corridor. He thought boardings were more important than riders because boardings “made the cash register ring.”

Mr. Evans noted that Mr. Beers was asking about the generalized population for what was considered the transit market. The residential population, employment in the area, and people who took advantage of services available in the area were all sources of ridership.

Mr. Beers noted that Eugene and Springfield populations combined were about 225,000. He asked what percentage of those people used public transit.

Mr. Evans said the number was high for an area the size of Eugene/Springfield.

Mr. Pangborn stated that LTD will have carried 11.5 million people in 2010 by the time the year ended (11.5 million boardings). Some people rode the bus two or three times per day whereas others never rode LTD.

Mr. Beers asked how much it would cost to add the West Eugene EmX extension.

Mr. Pangborn explained that it would cost \$850,000 over a year for the No-Build option.

Mr. Evans said this was the cost for the first year. LTD was trying to compute the actual net savings of adding a West Eugene EmX extension. Because of congestion over time, in order to keep up the same level of service, LTD would have to run more busses as congestion, population and traffic increased. Therefore, the costs of maintaining the same service would increase without EmX. EmX had a fixed, long-term cost, which would provide a net savings over time. Compared to No-Build, LTD would save money with a Build option for West Eugene EmX.

Mr. Beers asked if it was true that 80 percent of LTD's income came from payroll taxes.

Mr. Pangborn said that 75 percent of LTD's income came from payroll taxes.

Mr. Beers asked how many jobs LTD would have to add in the West Eugene quadrant (because of the existence of EmX) to meet the costs of adding the West Eugene EmX.

Mr. Pangborn said that LTD was currently computing this number and would let the public know.

Mr. Adkins asked why LTD's preferred alternative was W. 11<sup>th</sup> – W. 13<sup>th</sup> when ridership would be higher on the 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> corridor. He noted that he was on the Whitaker Neighborhood Council, which had voted unanimously that they wanted the EmX in their neighborhood. He did not know if any other neighborhoods wholeheartedly supported EmX in this way. From a public opinion standpoint, the 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> route might be superior. It might be more expensive at first, but this may be offset by increased ridership.

Ms. Riner said she would put this concern on the issues list under “service area.” She hoped the list would help the CAC make a choice between alternatives.

Ms. Mulder asked if the Whitaker neighborhood route might compete with ridership for another route in the area.

Ms. Smith noted that there was a projected route that would take the 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> route towards Hwy 99 in the future.

Ms. Riner stated that the 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> route as an alternative to W. 11<sup>th</sup> – W. 13<sup>th</sup> had to take into consideration that the 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> route was planned as part of a Hwy 99 and/or River Road route in the future.

Mr. Pangborn explained that the options were to take 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> between downtown and Chambers, to West 11<sup>th</sup> via Chambers, and then west on West 11<sup>th</sup> to Commerce; or to take W. 13<sup>th</sup> to Chambers to connect to W. 11<sup>th</sup> to go west to Commerce. The 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> route was a great route for EmX in the future because it could connect to River Road and Hwy 99. In the long-range plan, LTD proposed to run EmX on this route. If the West Eugene EmX Extension went out West 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup>, when the River Road and Hwy 99 routes were put in, a duplication of services would result. LTD would still have to provide fixed route service on W. 13<sup>th</sup>, creating an inefficient service. Therefore, the argument was, it would be better to have ten-minute service on W. 11<sup>th</sup>, and eventually five-minute service on 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup>. However, if 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> were selected, it would not get the same higher level of service initially. Mr. Adkins understood the reasoning, but was trying to make sense in the bigger picture. He thought using 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> as the primary route to West Eugene, as opposed to using both W. 13<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> may end up servicing less riders as an EmX route but may be less costly in the big picture because it was all on one route.

Mr. Pangborn said that one argument stated that EmX could run on 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup>, and regular service could run on W. 11<sup>th</sup>. When this route was put in, LTD could come back to examine W. 13<sup>th</sup> to serve W. 11<sup>th</sup>. Another proposed option was to run EmX on 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup>, and put two transfer points on it to go up Hwy 99 and River Road. This, however, was a disincentive, since riders did not like to transfer. Riders wanted a one-seat ride.

Mr. Adkins said that if EmX was run out W. 11<sup>th</sup>, people in the Whitaker would not be able to take advantage of this one-seat ride.

Mr. Pangborn understood his point, and acknowledged that the 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> route was more expensive, but might generate more riders.

Ms. Riner stated that she put this issue under “long-range issues” on the issues list since it referred to the full build-out of the EmX system.

Mr. Winter asked how much of the funding to build the EmX came from the state government, the federal government, and local governments. He asked how much of the funds would not be available until plans were more firmly established.

Mr. Pangborn explained that the funding breakdown was currently assumed to be 80 percent federal, 20 percent state, and minimal local (other than staff time). The federal funds had to wait on approval from the funding application. LTD was going through this planning process in order to be able to request funding. Of the \$30 million LTD projected it would need from the state, \$1.8 million had been approved by the Oregon State legislature. The other \$28.2 million had yet to be approved, but could be in the next legislative session and the one after it.

Ms. Smith asked if one of the alternatives would be more competitive in LTD's application to the federal government.

Mr. Evans said that LTD needed to examine this from a transit perspective: "Which alternative was most likely to be funded?" The criteria the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) used was which alternative did the most (attracted the most riders) with the least amount of funding. The W. 11<sup>th</sup> – W. 13<sup>th</sup> route came up high on ridership numbers.

Ms. Smith said that the FTA would compare LTD's application with applications from other areas of the country. She asked which alternative would be most competitive against national competitors.

Mr. Evans said that LTD had done a preliminary estimate of around \$100 million to be fundable. A larger number would make the project cost-prohibitive in terms of how much funding LTD could receive relative to how many riders it could attract with the West Eugene EmX Extension. Even though 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> had a projected larger number of riders, it was also a more expensive route and had several other negative factors that might concern the FTA.

Ms. Smith asked if ODOT coordination was one of these negative factors.

Mr. Evans said that ODOT coordination was not a concern of the FTA but was a concern of the project design because there were a couple of properties LTD would have to purchase in their entireties. This was not the case on the W. 11<sup>th</sup> – W. 13<sup>th</sup> route. The property acquisitions would mean a more significant environmental effect, which would require a deeper environmental analysis.

Ms. Alldredge stated she had talked to the Executive Director of ShelterCare, who appreciated LTD's efforts to mitigate the EmX's effects on ShelterCare's property on W. 11<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Pangborn said another ShelterCare facility was on 6<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Alldredge said that ShelterCare's clients were very low income.

Mr. Jacobson asked if riders could stay on EmX and do an entire loop from Eugene Station to Springfield and up to Gateway and back, and if riders could board any EmX to do an entire loop.

Mr. Pangborn said this was correct.

Mr. Morganti said he had been told a trial run of the Gateway EmX would happen on Tuesday, December 21.

Mr. Pangborn said the route would open to the public on January 9. He said that, once the EmX was built

in West Eugene, the EmX bus could be taken from West Eugene, through downtown and all the way through Springfield and to Gateway, and back. On weekdays, busses would run every ten minutes. The loop would not be possible from the Hwy 99 or River Road EmX route. Transfers would have to be made at the Eugene or Springfield Stations. The long-term goal was to have a route on Beltline that would go all the way around and hook up with various EmX lines. At that point, a rider could stay on EmX from Commerce Station to the Beltline loop to River Road or the Delta Highway, all the way to Springfield. Some routes could be taken for longer times than others. On others, transfers might need to be made.

Ms. Mulder stated that riding EmX would be great recreation for kids.

Ms. Strand said EmX might be quite comfortable for people without any place to go.

Mr. Pangborn said that many had suggested the whole LTD system should be free. When LTD had started charging passengers on Franklin, they had lost three to four percent of riders. Making the system free might incur enforcement and behavior issues. Other systems that had become free had experienced these problems. No large systems in the world were free.

Ms. Marquez asked if any of the bus routes that ran on EmX routes would still run if that route was chosen.

Mr. Pangborn referred the CAC to the map titled *Projected Western Sector of LTD Route System for the Year 2015 with 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup>/11<sup>th</sup> BRT Alignment*. He noted that the red line depicted the EmX line. All of the other lines highlighted would be connecting lines. The map showed that the 78 would come up 18<sup>th</sup>, drop down to 11<sup>th</sup> and connect with the EmX at Fred Meyers. The 37 would also connect at Fred Meyers. The 36 would connect with the EmX at the Commerce terminal. The 43 and the 93 would also connect to the EmX at the Commerce terminal. Therefore, when existing lines ended at EmX routes, they would connect to the EmX at major destination points such as Fred Meyers or the Commerce terminal.

Ms. Marquez said that Bethel residents had asked her that question and she did not know the answer. Many Latino residents did not have driver's licenses.

Mr. Pangborn noted that LTD wanted to connect as much as possible to the EmX in order to encourage riders to ride it.

Ms. Marquez noted that she had ridden the EmX when her car had broken down, and thought it was wonderful and fast.

Mr. Pangborn said that LTD valued time, and wanted to offer a service that was as fast as possible in order to attract riders.

Mr. Winter asked what happened to the existing routes once they hit the transfer points at the EmX routes.

Mr. Pangborn said that they would turn around at the transfer points, and go back to the beginning of their routes.

Ms. Marquez said a jail and a hospital facility would be added soon in Junction City. She asked if LTD planned an EmX out that far if funding was available.

Mr. Pangborn said that LTD currently ran service to Junction City. How far the EmX would run toward Junction City would depend on ridership. He thought the same thing would happen with the 95 to Junction City as would happen with the 36 and the 93 – it would turn around when the EmX route began. Many

facilities needed to be serviced, including the airport.

Ms. Strand expressed her belief that the W. 11<sup>th</sup> – W. 13<sup>th</sup> route was a good one because of the potential for development at the Fairgrounds and near the Armory. She also thought it was a good one because of the plan to develop an EmX route on 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> in the future. She asked if it was true that the new EmX busses had motors that could be pulled out and replaced with electric motors in the future.

Mr. Pangborn said that this was the hope. At this time, the new EmX busses were hybrid-electric, like the Prius. The hope was that the technology would advance to such an extent that the busses could run on 100 percent electricity. The busses were slated to last for 20 years, and LTD hoped that the technology would be available in 20 years. He also noted that the Fairgrounds and the Armory area were being examined as a land bank on which to build low- to moderate-income housing.

Mr. Jacobson expressed his view that the CAC should make as broad a recommendation to the MPC as possible in order to capture the body's range of viewpoints.

Mr. Carroll, seconded by Ms. Butler-Boyesen, moved that the CAC make a recommendation to the MPC on a specific preferred alternative.

Mr. Jacobson offered a friendly amendment to include other points of view for the MPC to consider.

Mr. Carroll accepted the amendment.

Ms. Riner re-read the memo titled *Item 7 – West Eugene EmX Alternatives Analysis*, which stated: “The CAC is requested to provide advisory comments to the MPC regarding the selection of a Locally Preferred Alternative. This could include one or more of the following options: Recommend an alternative, Provide advisory comments regarding project components of interest to the CAC, and Decline to provide advisory comments.”

The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen asked if it was proper to assume that the CAC was considering only the two mitigation alternatives as opposed to the other alternatives. She said she was referring to the alternatives “in yellow” on the document titled *West Eugene EmX Extension Alternatives Analysis: Key Results” IN PROGRESS – DECEMBER 7, 2010*.

Mr. Pangborn stated that this was correct.

Ms. Riner confirmed that she was referring to those alternatives that included the mitigation measures.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen said that the alternatives were called MC 13<sup>th</sup> and MC 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> on the document.

Mr. Carroll asked if the MPC would be better served by the CAC having considered the same thing they considered, including No-Build and TSM.

Mr. Chickering stated that the CAC's recommendation would go to the MPC. The *West Eugene EmX Extension Alternatives Analysis: Key Results” IN PROGRESS – DECEMBER 7, 2010* document originally had 12 alternatives, and two more had been added to it (in yellow), which were the mitigation options. He asked if Ms. Butler-Boyesen was suggesting eliminating the original 12 alternatives, and only considering the two mitigation alternatives.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen stated that that was her suggestion since the week before, the CAC had discussed all of the changes made on the mitigation alternatives in response to community concerns.

Ms. Alldredge stated that this made these alternatives more palatable to those who were not supportive of EmX.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen agreed.

Ms. Riner stated that the CAC had made a motion to make a recommendation to the MPC on a route alternative. She asked where the CAC stood on making a recommendation.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen asked if it were true that the MPC had to consider the No-Build and the TSM alternatives, in addition to any Build alternatives recommended to them.

Ms. Jacobson said she was correct.

Mr. Beers moved to recommend the No-Build option to the MPC. The motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Winter, seconded by Ms. Smith, moved to recommend the W. 11<sup>th</sup> – W. 13<sup>th</sup> alternative with mitigation to the MPC.

Mr. Carroll said that Mr. Adkins' points about the 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> route were good ones. He had felt frustrated with his neighborhood association, Jefferson Westside, because they were so vehemently opposed to EmX. However, he felt that the logistics and the future system benefits of having the EmX run down W. 11<sup>th</sup> and W. 13<sup>th</sup> outweighed the Jefferson Westside Neighbors' opposition to the project. He was excited to express his support for EmX in general and this route in particular. His concerns had been addressed, and he thought it was a great public works project.

Mr. Beers asked if there was a time constraint on when LTD could apply for the FTA funds for EmX.

Mr. Pangborn said that the sooner the funds were applied for, the better. At the state level, there was a time constraint because LTD's intent was to ask for the second wave of funding for EmX in January 2011. This opportunity would be lost for two years unless it was pursued by March or April 2011 at the latest.

Ms. Smith said that the project got more expensive the longer the community waited to build.

Mr. Pangborn said this was correct.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen noted that the efforts for mitigation for business property owners, including the BAT lane and other changes along W. 11<sup>th</sup> and W. 13<sup>th</sup> were impressive. She hoped LTD would do something about the utility poles in the sidewalk. A lot of work had been done, and despite the reduction in service (mainly the loss of #30) and the rerouting of #76 to maintain service, the existing buses along W. 11<sup>th</sup> are very full, so there is plenty of demand there. Good thought, design and planning had gone into the mitigation plan regarding trees and parking. This would do a lot to improve the neighborhood. She was

impressed by the drawings she had seen. LTD was to be commended for doing a lot of work to reduce individual impacts wherever possible.

Mr. Winter restated the motion to recommend to the MPC the W. 11<sup>th</sup> – W. 13<sup>th</sup> route alternative with mitigation.

Mr. Jacobson, Ms. Strand, Ms. Alldredge, Mr. Adkins, Ms. Butler-Boyesen, Ms. Mulder, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Morganti, Mr. Winter, and Ms. Smith supported the motion.

Ms. Marquez and Mr. Beers opposed the motion.

The motion passed, 10:2.

Mr. Morganti wanted to make a motion to recommend the 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> alternative.

Mr. Jacobson reminded Mr. Morganti that he had just voted to recommend the W. 11<sup>th</sup> – W. 13<sup>th</sup> alternative with mitigation. He suggested Mr. Morganti put forward 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> for additional consideration by the MPC.

Mr. Morganti put forward 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> for additional consideration by the MPC.

Mr. Winter said that the CAC was recommending the W. 11<sup>th</sup> – W. 13<sup>th</sup> route with mitigation. If this was the chosen route, he still felt very strongly, and knew Mr. Adkins and Mr. Carroll also felt it would be great to have an EmX route built on 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> out to either River Road or Hwy 99 in the future. It was not a consideration in this discussion, but he wished it to be made clear that the CAC wanted the 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> route considered in the future.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen continued his comment, stating that recommending W. 11<sup>th</sup> – W. 13<sup>th</sup> with mitigation did not mean the CAC did not want 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> considered in the future.

Mr. Winter agreed.

Ms. Smith said that there was a population that needed to be served along 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Adkins said that given the understanding that 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> would likely mean more riders, the community was only delaying the future expansion of 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> up Hwy 99 and or River Road. Currently, it made sense to first build out the W. 11<sup>th</sup> – W. 13<sup>th</sup> corridor, and then to build out the 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup>/11<sup>th</sup> corridor.

Mr. Carroll, seconded by Ms. Strand, stated that the CAC recognized the value of the 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> route to the future of the system-wide EmX.

Mr. Beers stated that freight and the population needed to be moved down one corridor. If the EmX was run down W. 11<sup>th</sup> – W. 13<sup>th</sup>, it would be detrimental to the whole transportation system. LTD needed to be very careful about how much road surface would be taken up by busses. He wondered how freight would be moved, and how people would be moved, since only 10 percent of the area population rode the bus. If W. 11<sup>th</sup> – W. 13<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> were turned into bus lanes, what was left? He asked for constraint.

Ms. Mulder said that the assumption was that it would be easier to move freight with EmX on the roads than without it.

Mr. Winter agreed with Ms. Mulder and disagreed with Mr. Beers' assumption that EmX

would make traffic worse for cars. He thought EmX would make traveling by car easier because there would be fewer cars and trucks on the roads if more people were riding EmX.

Ms. Marquez said that a lot of public housing would be affected on W. 11<sup>th</sup> and W. 13<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Mulder said that residents of public housing would be well served by EmX.

Ms. Marquez said that with the new design, a lot of businesses and residents of public housing would be affected. Residents would have to walk two or three blocks to EmX. She asked how these people would be helped, and worried that many of them would have to be relocated.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen said that the EmX would run on W. 11<sup>th</sup> and would not run through Acorn Park or Westmoreland.

Mr. Pangborn said that no housing or businesses would be displaced with the W. 11<sup>th</sup> – W. 13<sup>th</sup> route.

Mr. Inerfeld said that in this region, public housing meant it was owned by the Housing and Community Services Agency (HACSA). He asked if Ms. Marquez was also referring to low-income housing.

Ms. Marquez said that she was.

Mr. Pangborn said that none of those residencies would be displaced, but that residents would have better access to public transit with EmX nearby.

Ms. Riner restated the motion, which was that the CAC wanted to recognize the value of a 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> route to the future build out of EmX, sooner than later.

Mr. Jacobson, Ms. Strand, Ms. Alldredge, Mr. Adkins, Ms. Butler-Boyesen, Ms. Mulder, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Morganti, Mr. Winter, and Ms. Smith supported the motion.

Ms. Marquez and Mr. Beers opposed the motion.

The motion passed, 10:2.

Mr. Jacobson asked for other considerations the CAC wanted considered by the MPC.

Ms. Riner said that all aspects of the conversation, including the minutes, would be provided to the MPC.

Mr. Jacobson noted that the CAC was recognizing the needs of the community over the next 20 years.

Ms. Riner thanked the CAC and LTD for their work.

## **8. Updates**

Mr. Jacobson said that there was an item brought before the MPC the previous week related to

appointments to the ACT of a Central Lane MPO representative and a CAC representative and alternate. There proposal was to appoint Ms. Riner as the MPO representative and Mr. Jacobson as the CAC representative. The MPC did not address this agenda item at their meeting because there was no voting MPC member present from Lane County. These would be included as action items on the next MPC meeting agenda.

**9. Wrap-Up**

Mr. Jacobson adjourned the meeting at 7:28 p.m.

*(Recorded by Katie Dettman)*