

Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization

From: elmerfusco3@yahoo.com
Sent: Tuesday, September 25, 2012 9:42 AM
To: ZELENKA Alan; we.emx@ltd.org; Rick.Krochalis@dot.gov; NELL Lisa (OR); Kenneth.Feldman@dot.gov; Thomas.Radmilovich@dot.gov; *Eugene Mayor, City Council, and City Manager; BROWN George R; TAYLOR Betty L; OurMoneyOurTransit@gmail.com; POLING George A; CLARK Mike; FARR Pat M; ORTIZ Andrea F; PRYOR Chris E; BOZIEVICH Jay K; LEIKEN Sid W; SORENSON Pete; HANDY Rob M; STEWART Faye H; Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization; elmerfusco3@yahoo.com
Subject: EA Comments opposing West Eugene EmX

Gary Sherman has written to you about the EA Comments opposing West Eugene EmX, their message is as follows.

"P.S.- Support is a lot less than you think. Poll actual residents instead of the transient student population who have no real stake in the matter!"

You can contact Gary Sherman via email, elmerfusco3@yahoo.com or mail (if available):
1610 Crescent Ave
Eugene OR 97408

Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization

From: elmerfusco3@yahoo.com
Sent: Tuesday, September 25, 2012 8:47 AM
To: ZELENKA Alan; we.emx@ltd.org; Rick.Krochalis@dot.gov; NELL Lisa (OR); Kenneth.Feldman@dot.gov; Thomas.Radmilovich@dot.gov; *Eugene Mayor, City Council, and City Manager; BROWN George R; TAYLOR Betty L; OurMoneyOurTransit@gmail.com; POLING George A; CLARK Mike; FARR Pat M; ORTIZ Andrea F; PRYOR Chris E; BOZIEVICH Jay K; LEIKEN Sid W; SORENSON Pete; HANDY Rob M; STEWART Faye H; Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization; elmerfusco3@yahoo.com
Subject: EA Comments opposing West Eugene EmX

Gary Sherman has written to you about the EA Comments opposing West Eugene EmX, their message is as follows.

"Taking up a lane on 3 critical arteries is absolutely idiotic. It would permanently limit our access to businesses along the route and be a disaster. Ever try to turn left in downtown Portland?"

You can contact Gary Sherman via email, elmerfusco3@yahoo.com or mail (if available):
1610 Crescent Ave
Eugene OR 97408

Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization

From: bigbluee90@mail.com
Sent: Monday, September 24, 2012 9:24 PM
To: ZELENKA Alan; we.emx@ltd.org; Rick.Krochalis@dot.gov; NELL Lisa (OR); Kenneth.Feldman@dot.gov; Thomas.Radmilovich@dot.gov; *Eugene Mayor, City Council, and City Manager; BROWN George R; TAYLOR Betty L; OurMoneyOurTransit@gmail.com; POLING George A; CLARK Mike; FARR Pat M; ORTIZ Andrea F; PRYOR Chris E; BOZIEVICH Jay K; LEIKEN Sid W; SORENSON Pete; HANDY Rob M; STEWART Faye H; Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization; bigbluee90@mail.com
Subject: EA Comments opposing West Eugene EmX

Sandra Minadotty has written to you about the EA Comments opposing West Eugene EmX, their message is as follows.

"<http://sandraminadotty.wordpress.com/2012/09/10/the-emx-bus-line-in-eugene-or-why-does-the-mayor-want-it/>

Here's my blog comment against the emx bus line and the Mayor, thought you would want to read it, let other posters, too. thanks for all the inspiration and work!!--sandraminadotty, at "whattodowhilethe [planetdies@wordpress.com](http://planetdies.wordpress.com) or .org."

You can contact Sandra Minadotty via email, bigbluee90@mail.com or mail (if available):
not available now
Eugene Oregon 97404

Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization

From: ERICROYER1980@HOTMAIL.COM
Sent: Tuesday, September 18, 2012 12:08 PM
To: ZELENKA Alan; we.emx@ltd.org; Rick.Krochalis@dot.gov; NELL Lisa (OR); Kenneth.Feldman@dot.gov; Thomas.Radmilovich@dot.gov; *Eugene Mayor, City Council, and City Manager; BROWN George R; TAYLOR Betty L; OurMoneyOurTransit@gmail.com; POLING George A; CLARK Mike; FARR Pat M; ORTIZ Andrea F; PRYOR Chris E; BOZIEVICH Jay K; LEIKEN Sid W; SORENSON Pete; HANDY Rob M; STEWART Faye H; Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization; ERICROYER1980@HOTMAIL.COM
Subject: EA Comments opposing West Eugene EmX

ERIC ROYER has written to you about the EA Comments opposing West Eugene EmX, their message is as follows.

"Currently, if I wanted to go to from the bus station on W 11th/Olive to Fred Meyer, I would go on several busses that go straight down W 11th. With EMX, I'd need to go through downtown to 6th, then to Garfield, then back up to W 11th. If EMX goes in, it would be faster to continue to take a bus that goes down W 11th. (Unless they cut all service to W 11th between Olive and Garfield)."

You can contact ERIC ROYER via email, ERICROYER1980@HOTMAIL.COM or mail (if available):

Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization

From: grothrock@clear.net
Sent: Sunday, September 16, 2012 5:31 PM
To: ZELENKA Alan; we.emx@ltd.org; Rick.Krochalis@dot.gov; NELL Lisa (OR); Kenneth.Feldman@dot.gov; Thomas.Radmilovich@dot.gov; *Eugene Mayor, City Council, and City Manager; BROWN George R; TAYLOR Betty L; OurMoneyOurTransit@gmail.com; POLING George A; CLARK Mike; FARR Pat M; ORTIZ Andrea F; PRYOR Chris E; BOZIEVICH Jay K; LEIKEN Sid W; SORENSON Pete; HANDY Rob M; STEWART Faye H; Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization; grothrock@clear.net
Subject: EA Comments opposing West Eugene EmX

Gary Rothrock has written to you about the EA Comments opposing West Eugene EmX, their message is as follows.

"I believe that LTD is a very good example of government gone wild.

They live off of government subsidies and are trying to perpetuate the Golden Goose by building a bigger transit system than we need. I am against this eMX extension. Keep more buses on the routes that serve the people rather than this Rapid transit expansion. Leave our current traffic patterns alone, as this expansion will not help."

You can contact Gary Rothrock via email, grothrock@clear.net or mail (if available):

1763 Duke Court
Eugene Or. 97401

Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization

From: Maico55@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, September 16, 2012 12:38 PM
To: ZELENKA Alan; we.emx@ltd.org; Rick.Krochalis@dot.gov; NELL Lisa (OR); Kenneth.Feldman@dot.gov; Thomas.Radmilovich@dot.gov; *Eugene Mayor, City Council, and City Manager; BROWN George R; TAYLOR Betty L; OurMoneyOurTransit@gmail.com; POLING George A; CLARK Mike; FARR Pat M; ORTIZ Andrea F; PRYOR Chris E; BOZIEVICH Jay K; LEIKEN Sid W; SORENSON Pete; HANDY Rob M; STEWART Faye H; Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization; Maico55@aol.com
Subject: EA Comments opposing West Eugene EmX

Stan Steele has written to you about the EA Comments opposing West Eugene EmX, their message is as follows.

"There are some of us who have been watching this issue in Utah. We just ask "Why isn't this issue being put to a vote of the people?"

That is the democratic way and follows the principles that our country was founded upon."

You can contact Stan Steele via email, Maico55@aol.com or mail (if available):

Saratoga Springs Utah 84045

Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization

From: BRIAN WEAVER <brian1813@msn.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 08, 2012 5:51 PM
To: KILCOYNE Ron (LTD)
Cc: ZELENKA Alan; ORTIZ Andrea F; TAYLOR Betty L; PRYOR Chris E; POLING George A; BROWN George R; CLARK Mike; FARR Pat M; PIERCY Kitty; *Board of Directors; STEWART Faye H; BOZIEVICH Jay K; SORENSON Pete; HANDY Rob M; LEIKEN Sid W; Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization; Ken Feldman; Rick Krochalis; Thomas Radmilovich; Daily Emerald News; Daily Emerald Opinion; TAYLOR Ted (SMTP); Edward Russo; Eugene Daily News; RUIZ Jon R; KEZI (SMTP); KEZI_Gia Vang; KEZI_Jeff Skrzypek; KLCC Radio Station; KMTR_Alex; KMTR_Chris McKee; KNTR News Desk; KVAL (SMTP); KVAL_Walker; KPNW (SMTP); Lars Larson; Register Guard_Chris Frisella; Springfield Times (SMTP)
Subject: Re: Recent email to council misleading.
Attachments: EA Comments.docx; Jerrett Walker Review 120419.pdf

Ron,

Thank you for responding. It is not my intent to go back-and-forth on these important traffic impact questions below, but there are still some looming questions that the public needs answered.

I've indicated resulting questions in blue, below your responses in red. Feel free to follow-up if you wish.

Thank you for your time,
Brian

From: [KILCOYNE Ron](#)
Sent: Friday, September 07, 2012 6:16 PM
To: '[BRIAN WEAVER](#)'
Cc: [Alan Zelenka](#) ; [Andrea F. Ortiz](#) ; [Betty L. Taylor](#) ; [Chris E. Pryor](#) ; [George A. Poling](#) ; [George R. Brown](#) ; [Mike Clark](#) ; [Pat M. Farr](#) ; [Jon Ruiz](#) ; <mailto:kitty.piercy@ci.eugene.or.us> ; [*Board of Directors](#)
Subject: RE: Recent email to council misleading.

Hi Brian,

I have responded to your comments in red below.

Ron Kilcoyne
General Manager
Lane Transit District
3500 East 17th Avenue
Eugene OR 97403

Mailing Address: PO Box 7070
Springfield OR 97475

541-682-6105 (Office)
541-682-6111 (FAX)
203-243-9383 (Cell)

From: BRIAN WEAVER [mailto:brian1813@msn.com]

Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2012 7:16 PM

To: KILCOYNE Ron

Cc: Alan Zelenka; Andrea F. Ortiz; Betty L. Taylor; Chris E. Pryor; George A. Poling; George R. Brown; Mike Clark; Pat M. Farr; Jon Ruiz

Subject: Recent email to council misleading.

Hi Ron,

Today the RG published a quote from a recent email you sent to the City council, which says: ***“LTD contracted with the best traffic engineers and property experts in the state, and whose analysis has been affirmed by staff from the FTA, the Oregon Department of Transportation and the city of Eugene,” he wrote. “LTD is confident that data developed by the project team consultants passes all tests of sufficiency and accuracy and that the FTA will concur with these findings.”***

I did not find anything in the EA that indicates the FTA, ODOT, or the City has “affirmed” or approved any of the traffic impacts, of the LPA. Have any of these agencies done an independent traffic analysis of the LPA? If they have affirmed the impacts, where is it, and who did the actual analysis?

The EA would not be the source for any direct affirmation by FTA, ODOT, or the City of the traffic analysis conducted for the West Eugene project. FTA’s affirmation was in its release of the EA for public review. FTA does not release its environmental documents until it has thoroughly reviewed every element of the analysis and is comfortable with both the methodology used and the conclusions reached. While Mr. Weaver might not have understood how FTA’s affirmation works, he is well aware of ODOT’S review of the traffic analysis by one of its top traffic engineers Dorothy Upton. Based on Ms. Upton’s analysis, ODOT has affirmed the conclusions drawn by the traffic analysis. City staff has been continuously involved in the development of the LPA design and the analysis of its feasibility and support both.

If what you say is actually true, shouldn’t the public expect to see these agencies’ approvals listed in Chapter 8 (Approvals and Permits)? I noticed there is a slew of government agencies listed, and approving a variety of project parameters, but nothing about traffic impacts. If the EA is an assessment of the project, why wouldn’t traffic impact approvals be listed as well? Furthermore, any approvals should be available and verifiable by the public.

Yes, I’m aware of Dorothy Upton’s review of 6th and 7th, but haven’t seen or heard anything from ODOT about W. 11th. Remember, ODOT has ranked W. 11th as the 28th worst choke-points in the state highway system. (See my questions in #5 of EA comments.) Furthermore, as I mentioned in my first fact/question of public comment, Lisa Nell indicated that ODOT’s approval of 6th/7th was pending.

If the City has been continuously involved in the LPA deployment, why would the City Transportation Manager, Rob Inerfeld, tell the councilors that the EmX bus will not block a lane of traffic, while stopped at W. 11th bus stops? The LPA shows two EmX bus stops on W. 11th that will block a through-traffic lane when loading and unloading passengers, this is in a mixed traffic section. (See my question #6 of EA comments.) Inerfeld made this incorrect statement during the 7-11-11 City council work session. I understand Inerfeld favors the project, but the public needs an official assessment from the City, approving the traffic impacts, on both 6th & 7th, as well as on W. 11th.

Is it accurate that a **BusinessAccessTransit** (BAT) lane is now the same as a dedicated BRT lane? Page 4-28 and Table 4.14, of the EA, seems to suggest they are now the same, in calculating the 67% of dedicated BRT lanes, in the LPA. There has been a fundamental difference, in these two lane types, during the last three

years. Does the EA now consider them to be the same? (This is the last of the nine EA questions I submitted during public comment, attached above.)

BAT lanes are a type of dedicated lane when determining the percentage of the one way mileage that is built specifically for BRT. In other words lanes used exclusively for BRT and lanes in which limited auto access is allowed (no through traffic) are combined to determine this figure. The Business Access and Transit (BAT) lanes have always been one of the many ways in which BRT infrastructure can be configured to deliver lower and more reliable transit travel times and reduced operating costs per boarding. As LTD has planned and implemented the EmX system over the past 15 years, it has evaluated the trade-offs between different types of lane dedication. The underlying design approach for the West Eugene EmX extension project has been to balance the impacts to adjacent properties with achieving the operational goals for EmX in the corridor. BAT lanes have allowed that balanced to be achieved, minimizing the impact to adjacent properties while achieving lower and more reliable transit travel times and reduced operating cost per boarding for EmX in the corridor.

The EA defines the calculated 67% as “dedicated BRT lanes”. To include lanes that are shared with auto traffic, when calculating dedicated BRT lanes, is woefully misleading, and plain wrong. The referenced table, 4.14, does not state “dedicated BRT lanes”. Why use “dedicated BRT lanes” in the text, and then reference a table that instead uses “BAT lanes”? Why not submit an “assessment” that is meaningful, and uses consistent terminology? Switching or combining technical terms does not render a factual assessment.

I measured the entire route in feet and calculated: dedicated BRT lane = 13.7%, BAT lane = 54.8%, and Mixed traffic lane = 31.5%. So, instead of 67% of the LPA in dedicated BRT lane, the actual dedicated BRT portion is less than 15%.

Beyond that, the bulk of your reply above is the same unsubstantiated sales-pitch that LTD has used. An assessment should be objective, consistent, complete, and understandable by the public. A legitimate Environmental Assessment would meet the federal requirements, as outlined by the National Environmental Policy Act?

Last, after much debate, the EA disputes LTD’s steadfast claims that reassigning-a-lane will not reduce traffic capacity. On page 4-39, the EA states the “**LPA would reduce auto capacity**”, on the narrowed sections of 6th and 7th. Is that a misstatement in the EA, or an admission by LTD? (This is my EA question #3, above.)

Unfortunately, the statement “LPA would reduce auto capacity” is taken out of the important context provided by the rest of that section of the EA which demonstrates that, because capacity would be added at several intersections, the LPA improves traffic flow and requires no additional mitigation. This important context includes the following from page 4-39:

“In general, the LPA would improve traffic flow and, thus, freight movement, compared to the No-Build Alternative. It would include BAT and BRT-only lanes that remove the buses (and bus stops) from the general-purpose traffic lanes, except at three locations along the National Highway System (NHS) as discussed below. In addition, the BAT lane would be shared with turning traffic in several sections along the alignment, which would eliminate vehicle turning movements and the potential friction they create from the adjacent lanes.

The LPA would reduce auto capacity on a NHS arterial street in three places. At two locations on West 6th Avenue and one location on West 7th Avenue, the LPA would convert a general purpose lane to a BAT lane shared with right- or left-turning traffic. The locations on West 6th Avenue are between Blair and Fillmore Streets and between Charnelton and Lawrence Streets. On West 7th Avenue, the conversion would happen between Washington and Charnelton Streets.”

Further context from page 4-40:

“The LPA would add street capacity at several intersections that would be used by EmX and turning vehicles. No mitigation measures would be necessary for the LPA.”

No, I have not taken this statement out of context. I have highlighted the two sentences of the EA that clearly states auto capacity will be reduced.

And, I was not referring to the widening of the intersections. Besides, widening some of the major intersections of the LPA will not make-up for the lost capacity in the narrowed sections.

Dorothy Upton recommended that LTD “*provide an explanation of current traffic operations to address the public’s concern about the perceived 25% capacity reduction...*” LTD never did that. Instead, LTD has submitted an EA that now introduces doubt in their long-held adamant claims. Again, a factual assessment should be black-and-white, with no “gray” areas.

Please let me know. Also, feel free to comment on my “transparency” concerns in an earlier email, below.

A couple weeks prior to the Board meeting I had directed that the Jarrett Walker report be distributed to LTD Management staff, the EmX Steering Committee and the Board. When I answered the question in the Board Meeting I was answering based on this fact. After the Board Meeting I went back to verify who received the report and discovered the Board did not receive the report (although those Board members on the EmX Steering Committee did). I immediately sent a copy of the report to the remaining Board members. This was an oversight and not intentional.

OK, that’s fine. At least Walker’s assessment is objective and now part of the record.

Thank you,
Brian Weaver

From: brian1813@msn.com
Sent: Monday, August 06, 2012 9:31 PM
To: [Ken Feldman](#) ; [Rick Krochalis](#) ; [Thomas Radmilovich](#)
Cc: [Dean Kortge](#) ; [Doris Towery](#) ; [Ed Necker](#) ; [Gary Gillespie](#) ; [Greg Evans](#) ; [Michael Dubick](#) ; [Ron Kilcoyne](#)
Subject: Transparency breach by LTD's Ron Kilcoyne

Hello FTA,

There has been a breach in transparency between Lane Transit District’s general manager and LTD's voting board. A significant memo addressed to Ron Kilcoyne, describing the issues of the West Eugene EmX extension, was not disclosed to the LTD board. Then, during a public LTD board meeting on June 20th, Kilcoyne indicated that the memo was shared with the board.

Kilcoyne hired Jarrett Walker, a transit consultant, to conduct an assessment of the WEEE. Walker submitted the results of his assessment in a 15-page memo to Kilcoyne, dated April 19, 2012. Jozef Zdzienicki meet with Kilcoyne on June 15th, and Kilcoyne provided a copy of the memo to Zdzienicki.

At the June 20th LTD board meeting, Zdzienicki mentioned some of the details in the memo, during public testimony. Noticing puzzled looks from LTD board members, Zdzienicki paused to ask Kilcoyne if he had shared Walker's memo with the board members. Kilcoyne nodded "Yes."

After Zdzienicki finished his testimony, LTD board member Dean Kortge rebuffed Kilcoyne, and asked what memo Zdzienicki was referencing. Some of the other board members indicated that they were unaware of the memo, as well. Apparently, Kilcoyne never did share the memo with the board.

I find Kilcoyne's nod to be rather alarming and further illuminating, even if Kilcoyne now may claim he misspoke, or in this case, incorrectly gestured. This continues the pattern of misinformation and misstatements by Kilcoyne and LTD staff.

I have already noted Kilcoyne's gross misstatement aired on Peter Laufer's KPNW public radio show, on Saturday morning, Jan 3rd. (1140 AM dial) In the interview Kilcoyne claimed, with emphasis, "***that no property will be taken from Garfield to Bailey Hill, along West 11th***", which is incorrect. His statement can be heard by moving the time slide-bar to 29.00 min, after clicking on this link. [January 3, 2012 KPNW interview with LTD](#) (Double click on the audio screen to see the time.)

This lack of disclosure, and then subsequent indication that the memo was disclosed suggests that Kilcoyne has not been transparent with the LTD board, nor has he been honest with the public. An LTD board, voting on a publically funded project, should have the right to view an assessment that was funded with public money; assuming that LTD funded the assessment. Furthermore, Kilcoyne's misstatement on public radio indicates that the general manager is out-of-touch with the design of the project. With all of the district's omissions and misstatements, this project should not be funded.

Thank you,
Brian Weaver

Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization

From: dont.spend.in.west.eugene@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, September 04, 2012 11:59 PM
To: ZELENKA Alan; we.emx@ltd.org; Rick.Krochalis@dot.gov; NELL Lisa (OR); Kenneth.Feldman@dot.gov; Thomas.Radmilovich@dot.gov; *Eugene Mayor, City Council, and City Manager; BROWN George R; TAYLOR Betty L; OurMoneyOurTransit@gmail.com; POLING George A; CLARK Mike; FARR Pat M; ORTIZ Andrea F; PRYOR Chris E; BOZIEVICH Jay K; LEIKEN Sid W; SORENSON Pete; HANDY Rob M; STEWART Faye H; Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization; dont.spend.in.west.eugene@gmail.com
Subject: EA Comments opposing West Eugene EmX

Fed Up Customers has written to you about the EA Comments opposing West Eugene EmX, their message is as follows.

"Ever since I first saw the First NO BUILD sign placed in west Eugene.

I refuse to patronize any business that is west of Willamette Street in the City of Eugene. That was 19 months ago. I have now taken this message to Veneta, Cottage Grove, Creswell, Drain, Lorane, and Junction City. I openly encourage people to take their business to Roseburg, or do like my family does and we drive from Drain to Salem to do our grocery shopping. The amount we save by not shopping in Eugene or Springfield easily surpasses the cost of fuel to travel the extra 75 miles.

So please continue your battle against the green dragon, I'm telling your customers how much they can save by avoiding your businesses all together.

FYI - Try visiting Seattle and riding one of the best bus systems in America, that is based on the idea of dedicated lanes for BUSES ONLY.

You also see this via Google Maps Street view. Try looking at Aurora Ave going from Downtown to Everett. This organization is the stereotypical defenition of a 'NIMBY' (Not In My Back Yard). Well I am doing my to get everyone out of your back yard.

Good Luck in your efforts."

You can contact Fed Up Customers via email, dont.spend.in.west.eugene@gmail.com or mail (if available):

Drain OR 97435

Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization

From: Julia <theserras@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 26, 2012 9:57 AM
To: Rick.Krochalis@dot.gov; Kenneth.Feldman@dot.gov; Thomas.Radmilovich@dot.gov; *Eugene Mayor, City Council, and City Manager; BROWN George R; TAYLOR Betty L; ZELENKA Alan; POLING George A; CLARK Mike; FARR Pat M; ORTIZ Andrea F; PRYOR Chris E; BOZIEVICH Jay K; LEIKEN Sid W; SORENSON Pete; HANDY Rob M; STEWART Faye H; Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization; OurMoneyOurTransit@gmail.com
Subject: NO W 11th. EMX

You are paid by my tax dollars majority of the voters do not want this, majority of the non voters do not want this. You are supposed to uphold what the people want. This is a waste of money that could be used to fix our streets through our Eugene.

Marc Serra

Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization

From: BRIAN WEAVER <brian1813@msn.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 22, 2012 8:27 PM
To: Kitty Piercy
Cc: ZELENKA Alan; ORTIZ Andrea F; TAYLOR Betty L; PRYOR Chris E; POLING George A; BROWN George R; FARR Pat M; Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization; RUIZ Jon R; Ken Feldman; Rick Krochalis; Thomas Radmilovich; FORE Karmen (OR); CLARK Mike; KORTGE DEAN (LCOG List); TOWERY DORIS (LCOG List); NECKER ED (LCOG List); Gary Gillespie; Greg Evans; DUBICK MICHAEL (LCOG List); NELL Lisa (OR)
Subject: Re: WEST EUGENE EmX EXTENSION
Attachments: EMX - ODOT report .pdf

I thought I was more factual, rather than merely stating my opinion. My questions were specifically about the WEEE, where it does not link to anything, really.

It will just link the downtown station to the edge of town, Commerce Street, weaving in-and-out of traffic along the way.

If businesses will prosper, why don't the businesses, who risk their investment every day, agree? Do the "planners", who probably need this project to stay busy, know what is best for those businesses? What will they do for the businesses who's profits wind-up suffering? Springfield Cleaners lost half of their customers, only to have LTD attempt to explain, "That is the cost of doing business."

What are the planners doing for 95% of the commuters who drive cars? It looks like they are taking infrastructure away from them to force a transit ideology.

Look, there was room on Franklin in the grassy medium and population masses at both ends. Yes, so far, so good, however the WEEE is totally different.

There just isn't room for a BRT system, nor is there the population masses.

The Dorothy Upton, the ODOT engineer who did the traffic study, admitted she was bound by LTD's data. (report attached) She did recommend in her conclusion that LTD needed to provide the public with an explanation about the 25% loss of traffic capacity. I wanted to know about that and the actual location of where the traffic were made, since Dorothy concluded that through-traffic must not use the curb-lanes.

Anyone who lives in Eugene and is familiar with 6th, from Van Buran to Fillmore, knows through-traffic uses all four lanes, and especially on 7th, from Washington to Charnelton. LTD couldn't provide a viable answer except to say that expert professional engineers did the work, and offered to sell a CD with literally hundreds of pages of data. Sonny Chickering is a professional engineer, but admitted he overlooked that LTD's predictions were based exclusively on the year 2031, in their Alternative Analysis Report, and voted yes while he was on the MPC.

I still think this is more about self-preservation for LTD and the City planners, and of course the federal money, rather than transit and all the unsubstantiated "goals." If they had a chance to start over and rethink all this, they probably would in a heart beat, but they would lose the money. Can't let that happen.

Thanks, you don't need to reply.

Brian



Oregon

John A. Kitzhaber, M.D., Governor

Department of Transportation

Region 2 Tech Center
455 Airport Rd SE Bldg A
Salem, OR, 97301-5395
Phone: (503) 986-2990
Fax: (503) 986-2839

Date: September 30, 2011

To: Lisa Nell
Interim Area 5 Manager

From: Dorothy J. Upton, PE
Senior Transportation Analyst

Subject: LTD Analysis of West Eugene EmX Extension
City of Eugene
Lane County

FILE CODE:



Purpose:

This memo discusses my review and findings of the data submitted relating to the Lane Transit District (LTD) proposal for the expanding of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) into west Eugene. The routes affect OR 99: West 6th/7th Couplet (Pacific Highway West No. 91) and various other city streets (West 10th, 11th, Garfield, Lincoln, and Charnelton to name a few). My understanding was that Sonny Chickering wanted a general review of the procedures used, the analysis and the findings. He also wanted a specific focus of the impacts along 6th and 7th Avenues because of citizen questions. The questions arose from the 1984 Environmental Assessment (EA) study citing the need for four travel lanes on these facilities.

Summary:

I believe that the work done for the current project is in accordance with current practices and methods. The inputs are within acceptable ranges and based on current (the last few years) data using contemporary processes that consider the existing road system, recent growth projections, land use and local transportation plans and policies. My review of the consultant work did not identify any substantial issues that would challenge the assumptions used and the analysis performed. Since there are no major roadway changes during the project life (opening to design year: 2017-2031), reporting the design year results with its higher volumes is acceptable, since the 2017 operation of the roadway will experience lower volumes. The memo I reviewed convinces me that the system operates acceptably in 2031. The final analysis should be submitted for our records/future use once the build alternative is determined.

While the consultant has furnished acceptable technical documentation for the project, I recommend that they provide an explanation of current traffic operations to address the public's concern about the perceived 25% capacity reduction from the reassignment of an all-purpose travel lane to a Business, Access and Transit (BAT) lane. I can see from the technical data that during peak the curb lanes operate with high turning volumes so little through traffic uses them. This affects the actual capacity so an explanation of this operational condition should help illustrate that the proposed BAT lanes are not a direct 25% reduction in capacity.

Comparison to the prior work reported in the 1984 EA document should not be made. Our technology, assumptions and processes are completely different for arriving at the answers given the developments over the past 27 years or more. The 1984 EA report was based on direct trending of volume growth in basic procedures that were simple computer processes. Our current methods use a combination of more iterative processes that give a better future projection given the various inputs/assumptions in the models.

Background:

In early June 2011, Sonny Chickering shared an email response to Boyd Iverson (with a cc to Brian Weaver) sharing the basis of his input for alternative selection for the project. It also asked that I review related project data and share an opinion of the work for any further action on ODOT's part.

On Friday August 12, 2011 I received an email link to access the consultant's work documenting the differences between the Alternatives Assessment (AA) proposal and the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) proposals. The work included a draft memo of the comparison, a plan set, a summary table of operational outputs and analysis program outputs for the No-build, AA and LPA work. Because of the size of the files and other computer security issues, I got access to the files for downloading on August 15th and began to get familiar with the current project proposals and the information submitted.

I received an email communication from a local citizen (Brian Weaver) August 16th which shared the Register-Guard article about our (ODOT) review and an email chain that he had with John Evans of LTD. Mr. Weaver's email also had a copy of the 1984 ODOT EA corridor report. He has periodically checked in for the status of this review.

I used the LTD furnished information and the various emails cited to frame my review and discussion.

Data:

1984 EA report – (This work was done over 27 years ago before our current methods or reporting/analysis programs and assumptions were general practice for traffic analysis.)

This project upgraded 6th and 7th Avenues to each have four (4) lanes of capacity to provide the desired level of service in the year 2000. Projections from 1984 to 2000 estimated 30% increase in traffic volumes in downtown with 50-160% increases on 6th and 7th west of Jefferson mostly from the 6th/7th extension and the Chambers connector segments.

The 1981 crash rate for these roadways was 7.08 crashes per million vehicle miles compared to 4.83 for statewide highways. The project furnished 4-lanes on 6th and 7th Avenues between Garfield and High Street (about 1.75 miles). The cross-section included 5.5' sidewalks and 4.5' planting strip on each side with lanes of 12-11-11-12 across but without bike lanes. An alignment was adopted to minimize impacts to large trees in the corridor. An option to only widen to four lanes in areas of need was discarded because of the impacts of the tapers and the weaving/ merging of traffic flows between the three and four lane sections. The widening of 6th/7th to four (4) lanes was considered an interim treatment in the 1978-1990 period based on consideration of a new freeway parallel within this general vicinity.

Other projects proposed and included in the system were the Chambers Connector that linked 6th/7th Avenues to River Road & NW Expressway; West Eugene Parkway connecting 6th/7th Avenues to OR 126 west of Beltline; Roosevelt Blvd extension from Garfield to Terry Street; the Ferry Street Bridge; and the Chambers Street widening to 18th Avenue. Not all of these projects have been built even about a decade after the design life of the document.

The 1984 EA reported impacts to the community were reported based on the existing system and the nearby land uses. Impacts include:

- Most of corridor was zoned as Community Commercial or CBD.
- Most of corridor had numerous signals along 6th and 7th Avenues.
- Bus usage of the corridor at that time was limited to 7th Avenue but service was available throughout the area.
- Bike facilities were furnished along 5th (east-west) and various north-south streets so they were not included in the project cross section. Sidewalks were furnished on both sides of 6th/7th.
- Air quality was non-attainment at that time (but is now in maintenance).
- Traffic and noise levels same between no-build and build.
- Multiple utilities are within the 6th/7th roadways.

The 1982 project traffic projections were reported in Figure 8 on page 27 of the EIS report. These volumes were created by manually trending growth based on simplified assumptions for population, land use and development as well as technology and equipment (typical of that time). There was an assumption that by 2000 over 30% of the trips would be by alternative modes (walking, biking, or using transit). Traffic projections were not expected to vary as a result of the build alternative as 6th/7th Avenues would continue as the major east-west route. The existing condition was a LOS C degrading to D-E-F progressively along the corridor because of the projected volume increases, especially on the west end. (See Table 5 from page 42 of report). With increased congestion, traffic would likely divert onto parallel streets such as 5th and 8th Avenues.

Discussion on the Applicability of 1984 EA report

The 1984 EA report was performed using methods/processes based on the 1965 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) which are now out-dated with our current procedures (HCM 2000 version). The evaluation criteria was qualitative measure of Level of Service (LOS) with the desired standard being no worse than a LOS D. Our current measure of volume-to-capacity ratio is a numerical-based measure that limits the subjectivity of the reported values. Our current standard for 6th and 7th Avenues is 0.85 based on its classification as a Statewide, Non-Freight NHS route. Also, the definition for the LOS measures have changed over the years through at least two updates of the analysis methods and reporting procedures so even the application of those old evaluations have changed. Therefore no direct comparison of the outdated to current methods can or should be done.

Reviewing the 1984 report shows that the volumes used in that analysis were created by trending volumes and inputting them into a simple computer model. Looking into the history of the model, I believe that the process had the input volumes assigned to the network based on a simple one step to the quickest route by travel time. Our current methods use a computer based travel demand model with local population, employment and land use inputs in mathematical algorithms. These algorithms project the location and the amount of growth assigned on the entire Eugene area road network. This technology/model allows for more complex iterations of data analysis to better understand likely future growth in the modeled area. These new models also account for traffic diversions once a road segment is congested.

Not all of the projects assumed in the original report have been built, 10 years past the projected future condition. There are significant differences in where traffic is routed then, now and in the future based on where the travel demand model would assign those trips. Care must be taken to find the correct number for comparison of population growth in this area. The 1984 EA stated (pages 9-10) that Eugene's population was 105,624 in 1980 and that metropolitan plan (T-2000) projected the population of 294,000 for the Eugene-

Springfield metropolitan area. During the past 30 years, the boundary of the metropolitan (reporting) area was enlarged, covering other communities so direct comparison of numbers is difficult. A check of population values based on census data shows that:

Area's Population	1980	2000	2010
Eugene	105,624	137,890	156,185
Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Service Area (MSA)	192,000**	322,960	351,715

(**MSA smaller than current area since boundary expanded to include other small cities)

Therefore the volumes used in the original report were based on a much different area. The assumption that 30% of trips would be by alternative modes has not been realized, but would be encouraged with this project.

Comparison of Advanced Alternative (AA) to Local Preferred Alternative (LPA) memo and computer outputs: (this is the analysis work that compares the modified LPA to both the No-Build and AA alternative reported in the August 2, 2011 memo).

This comparison reports results for the 2031 projections for No-build, the AA and the LPA alternatives. There are no interim years reported such as year of opening (2017). Between 2017 (opening) and design year (2031) there are no major roadway network changes planned. Major network changes in this case are defined as improvements within the project's influence area, such as new or major widening of other facilities that would influence travel patterns. The only difference in the analysis between the two years then is the additional traffic on the system in 2031 which is above the amount there in 2017. If the roadway operates acceptably in 2031, then operations will also be acceptable with the lower volumes in 2017.

The discussion of the regional traffic operations (pages 2-3) and shown in Table 1 reports the vehicle hours of delay, vehicle hours of travel and the vehicle miles of travel on a per trip basis all grouped by volume to capacity (v/c) ratios. Looking at the data reported, I questioned whether the information was actually based on demand to capacity (d/c) ratios which are slightly different than v/c ratios. A demand to capacity ratio is a relationship of projected non-specific volumes in a generalized roadway network. This generalization means there are few specifics about the data flow and conditions in the model as well as vehicle type, signal information, and other data. I sent an email to the consultant asking for clarification on this point which was confirmed to be the model reported values, so they are actually demand to capacity (d/c) ratios instead. The use of d/c ratios in a case for grouping is acceptable. The use of d/c ratios are adequate to understand relative relationships and comparisons, but cannot be compared directly to the ODOT mobility v/c ratio standard. D/c ratios can be used to understand whether a proposal is under, at or over capacity as well as a relative comparison of multiple proposals on a general basis. Using d/c ratios should be better detailed in the memo.

While the modeling supports the conclusion, the statement "Roadway capacity, beyond what would be available under the No Build alternative would be added in the form of BAT (Business, Access and Transit) lanes on 6th, 7th, and 11th Avenues under both build alternatives" needs a more thorough explanation. In response to my email for clarification, the consultant furnished an acceptable explanation of the technical portions of the process. The difference in the assumed road capacity to account for the different lane configurations was dealt with in the travel demand model by varying the capacity on a link basis to get the travel patterns. This is an acceptable practice as the capacity is one of the components used in the model to generate the projection of the travel patterns. This should be added to the memo for clarification.

Also, a discussion of the operations of the proposed configuration (with BAT lanes) compared to the all-purpose travel lanes should be included. Since there are high turning movements at many of the intersection during the peak hours, they may be acting as de-facto turn lanes, so there is not the same impact to capacity as when the lanes are primarily used for through movements.

The travel demand modeling done for this project was performed by the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG). They are the entity responsible for maintaining and operating the travel demand model for the Eugene-Springfield MPO. The model output numbers were furnished to the consultant to post-process the results and create the project volumes to be used in the project analysis. The consultant used in the Synchro/SimTraffic transportation analysis program to perform their study which is an acceptable process. A review of the summary table and the various outputs shows acceptable values. The Summary Table generally shows what would be expected as the difference. A review of the output sheets shows the consultant used:

- The volumes and lane configurations varied depending on alternative – not much re-routing of volumes at 6th/7th and Garfield intersections occurred because of the road system capacity variations.
- The analysis assumptions used a conservative ideal saturation flow rate of 1800 passenger cars per lane per hour of green time (MPO areas generally use 1900). The output sheets show that intersection information varied appropriately to imply the use of specific data rather than generalized or default values for heavy vehicle percentage, peak hour factors (PHF), lane usage factors, etc. Without recent specific location counts, it is difficult to verify each individual value. However, the analysis used the same data and processes for the alternatives so this should not be an issue.
- The signal cycle length was generally set at 90 seconds which is an acceptable value for intersections within a one-way couplet. Other signal parameters appear to be at acceptable ranges.

Discussion of August 2011 comparative memo:

This work seems to be an adequate comparison of the differences between the two alternatives and the no-build conditions. My only concerns are that some of the information is not clearly described (the d/c versus v/c ratios) but is available. The data and explanations may be detailed more in the DEIS work but not necessarily included in the document to make it more of a complete (stand-alone) report.

Alternatives Analysis/DEIS: (this is the work reported in the July 2010 memo)

Although I do not have a copy of the final version of this work, I did review and comment on a few of the earlier drafts of this work. Most of my comments were to get clarification in the documentation of the work and very little related to analysis methods, procedures and processes. I felt that the work was progressing adequate through the processes, but never did a full review of the final documentation work.

Overall Conclusions:

Any comparison to the prior (1980's era) work should not be made. The assumptions and processes are completely different with today's technology and methodology. The 1984 EA report was based on now out-dated procedures and technology. Our current methods use a more robust, iterative process including computer modeling. This process results in a better future projection given the various inputs/assumptions in the models and it does a much better job of considering the impact of changes to the transportation network (added or reduced capacity, impacts of other transportation projects, etc.) on future demand.

I believe that the work done for the current project is in accordance with current practices and methods. The inputs are within acceptable ranges and based on recent data using contemporary processes that consider the road systems now and in the future, recent growth projections, land use and local transportation plans and policies. My review of the consultant work did not identify any substantial issues related to the assumptions used and the analysis performed. Since there are no major roadway changes during the project life (opening to design year: 2017-2031), reporting the design year results with its higher volumes is acceptable, since the 2017 operation of the roadway will be better with lower volumes. The memo I reviewed showed that the system operates acceptably in 2031 and there is no data to suggest it would operate less acceptably at day of opening in 2017. The final analysis should be submitted for our records/future use once the build alternative is determined.

While the consultant has furnished acceptable technical documentation for the project, I recommend that they provide an explanation of current traffic operations to address the public's concern about the perceived 25% capacity reduction from the reassignment of an all-purpose travel lane to a Business, Access and Transit (BAT) lane. I can see from the technical data that during peak the curb lanes operate with high turning volumes so little through traffic uses them. This affects the actual capacity so an explanation of this operational condition should help explain that the proposed BAT lanes are not a direct 25% reduction in capacity.

In my opinion, it is not necessary for ODOT to perform any additional analysis on the LTD proposal for the expansion of the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) into west Eugene.

Cc: Sonny Chickering, Region 2 Manager
Richard Little, Region 2 Public Information Officer

From: [Kitty Piercy](#)

Sent: Sunday, July 22, 2012 5:56 PM

To: [BRIAN WEAVER](#)

Cc: [Alan Zelenka](#) ; [Andrea F. Ortiz](#) ; [Betty L. Taylor](#) ; [Chris E. Pryor](#) ; [George A. Poling](#) ; [George R. Brown](#) ; [Pat M. Farr](#) ; [Metropolitan Policy Committee](#) ; [Jon Ruiz](#) ; [Ken Feldman](#) ; [Rick Krochalis](#) ; [Thomas Radmilovich](#) ; [Peter DeFazio](#) ; [Mike Clark](#) ; [Dean Kortge](#) ; [Doris Towery](#) ; [Ed Necker](#) ; [Gary Gillespie](#) ; [Greg Evans](#) ; [Michael Dubick](#) ; [Lisa Nell](#)

Subject: Re: WEST EUGENE EmX EXTENSION

Brian,

I can accept that your opinions or your "take" is different than mine. Both ODOT and the Feds conclude EmX will offer relief to congestion. As you have seen the use of EmX grows and will continue to increase as the system is completed.

Building a multi modal transportation system is the goal at every level and includes walking, biking, transit, cars and trucks. For some years now we've had the foresight to plan for mass transit corridors that link to bus routes. I fully support both and believe they are needed and necessary.

I was not in office but I know there was study done that concluded this was the most efficient and cost effective form of transit and it was envisioned to link up the metro area for easy and frequent travel. So far, so good.

Good thing we are changing that code. Please look up TOD or transit oriented development. It's being used by top planners and successful cities in many, many places. It'll answer a lot of your questions. And most of all, it makes the business case. This is about transportation and land use planning, mobility, access, equity, livability, and places for people and business to prosper.

Kitty Piercy

(541) 682-5010 (work)

(541) 954-9089 (mobile)

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 22, 2012, at 5:09 PM, BRIAN WEAVER <brian1813@msn.com> wrote:

Kitty,

Your comments below are not true and certainly have not registered well with the public. People know better.

What pot of money will fund the required fixes that the Eugene EmX will ultimately need? The EmX will add two "choke-points" to our state highway system, resulting in more traffic problems for Eugene; similar to the mess at the Delta Highway and Beltline interchange. Incidentally, ODOT has rated Beltline as the 18th worst traffic choke-point in the state. I find it stunning that Eugene officials are comfortable with adding two more traffic SNAFU'S to Eugene's traffic conditions.

Only about 5% of all commuters currently use transit. The increase of usage will be marginal considering the numbers. An increase of 34,000 people by 2031 will add 1,700 *possible* transit riders, and that's based on population and NOT the commuters. (34,000 x .05) So, by 2031 only a few hundred new riders will be added, certainly NOT worth the permanent impacts and the continued up-roar implementation will cause.

How can you say, "We need to give people choices", when you and the City have refused to recognize the public majority, and have ignored their *choice* of disapproval, which is supported by objective reasons? We have a transit system in place now. I find using the "choice" argument as justification for the project to be two-faced, hollow, and superficial.

The Eugene EmX will increase the cost of transit and make it less efficient. Less than 15% of this segment will run in exclusive dedicated lanes, which will replicate our current system, except with increased operating cost. I may add that LTD has said they will do more "route optimizing", which means more route *cuts*, to afford this needless cost increase in 2017. Cutting more regular bus routes will defeat the EmX, and will make transit less appealing.

You can not claim that Eugene "passed" this project. Hand picked committees quietly decided on the EmX, otherwise why were the business and property owners along the corridor the last people to be officially informed? In fact, it must have been such a quiet affair because the City Planning and Use Department, seemingly unknowing of the plan, imposed a code change effective 6-2002, which required a maximum setback of only 15' on all new buildings on West 11th. (Before this date, there was no required maximum setback.) Now, LTD is trying to shoe-horn the route, conceding to running in too much mixed traffic, and planning narrowed sidewalks, butted-up against buildings, with no room for landscaping. So much for planning and "redeveloping" West 11th.

What kind of development and type of business is "transit oriented"? The EmX will repel businesses. How about encouraging development that attracts businesses and creates jobs? (Not just temporary construction jobs.) How will running almost 80 EmX trips per day, in mixed traffic for 1/3 of the route, going to reduce congestion? How will taking lanes, or reassigning lanes on 6th and 7th, going to reduce congestion? Adding choke-points will only exasperate current congestion on these avenues. How will the EmX "stimulate prosperity in a time when we really need it", when instead it will jeopardize prosperity along the corridor, and upset the public?

Its time for the City, LTD, and proponents who "somewhat support" the project look at the facts and stop dreaming unrealistically of a mass exodus to public transit, and rethink the same ridicules and unsubstantiated rational. Like I said, people know better. Implementation will make transit worse, create congestion, and foster a deepening resentment toward the people forcing this project.

Thank you,
Brian Weaver

From: [Kitty Piercy](#)
Sent: Monday, January 17, 2011 2:11 PM
To:
Subject: Re: WEST EUGENE EmX EXTENSION

P and K,

We agree that Beltline is a top priority but that comes from an entirely different pot of money than transit.

Usage of transit is high and will continue to grow. We need to give people choices. For example, I choose to take EmX to campus rather than a car.

There are actually buses within a short radius of where everyone lives in the metro area. We are fortunate. The EmX is different since it is designed to go along major transportation corridors. It can carry more people frequently at less cost. That's because of dedicated lanes and signalization.

We built this transportation system plan into all our overall planning documents passed by both cities some years ago and now have 2 segments in place.-working on the 3rd.

Both communities have adopted this plan and have worked with people at all levels of government to acquire the funding. It has been hard work, year after year.

Whenever we do a big road project, it has impacts and we will do our best to minimize those.

There is a need, both now and into the future. This will help those who rely on public transportation. It will encourage transit oriented development and business where we would most like to have it, reduce congestion, co2 emissions and reliance on foreign oil. It will help us meet local, state and federal goals. It will help us development neighborhoods that connect well to transit corridors that are car, bike, pedestrian and transit friendly that stimulate prosperity in a time when we really need it.

Kitty Piercy

(541) 682-5010 (work)

(541) 954-9089 (mobile)

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 17, 2011, at 1:36 PM, <P and K > wrote:

My wife and I strongly oppose the West Eugene EmX extension.

After listening to both sides of the debate, it is our opinion that the project should be abandoned and our energy directed toward improving Belt Line over the Willamette River.

Eugene is not New York City where the citizens must rely on public transportation. The vast majority of us use automobiles as there is no bus service close to where we live. It would not be prudent for taxpayers to provide this means of transportation.

We can fully understand why businesses along West Eleventh oppose the disruption to build something that is not necessary and certainly very costly. Federal funds or whatever, we taxpayers expect our money to be

spent to resolve a need, not a justification for the Lane County Transit District to exist.

Please direct your energy to Belt Line which is compacted and dangerous to drive/ride every day.

Thank you for listening!

P and K

Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization

From: BRIAN WEAVER <brian1813@msn.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 22, 2012 5:10 PM
To: Kitty Piercy
Cc: ZELENKA Alan; ORTIZ Andrea F; TAYLOR Betty L; PRYOR Chris E; POLING George A; BROWN George R; FARR Pat M; Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization; RUIZ Jon R; Ken Feldman; Rick Krochalis; Thomas Radmilovich; FORE Karmen (OR); CLARK Mike; KORTGE DEAN (LCOG List); TOWERY DORIS (LCOG List); NECKER ED (LCOG List); Gary Gillespie; Greg Evans; DUBICK MICHAEL (LCOG List); NELL Lisa (OR)
Subject: Re: WEST EUGENE EmX EXTENSION

Kitty,

Your comments below are not true and certainly have not registered well with the public. People know better.

What pot of money will fund the required fixes that the Eugene EmX will ultimately need? The EmX will add two “choke-points” to our state highway system, resulting in more traffic problems for Eugene; similar to the mess at the Delta Highway and Beltline interchange. Incidentally, ODOT has rated Beltline as the 18th worst traffic choke-point in the state. I find it stunning that Eugene officials are comfortable with adding two more traffic SNAFU’S to Eugene’s traffic conditions.

Only about 5% of all commuters currently use transit. The increase of usage will be marginal considering the numbers. An increase of 34,000 people by 2031 will add 1,700 *possible* transit riders, and that’s based on population and NOT the commuters. (34,000 x .05) So, by 2031 only a few hundred new riders will be added, certainly NOT worth the permanent impacts and the continued up-roar implementation will cause.

How can you say, “We need to give people choices”, when you and the City have refused to recognize the public majority, and have ignored their *choice* of disapproval, which is supported by objective reasons? We have a transit system in place now. I find using the “choice” argument as justification for the project to be two-faced, hollow, and superficial.

The Eugene EmX will increase the cost of transit and make it less efficient. Less than 15% of this segment will run in exclusive dedicated lanes, which will replicate our current system, except with increased operating cost. I may add that LTD has said they will do more “route optimizing”, which means more route *cuts*, to afford this needless cost increase in 2017. Cutting more regular bus routes will defeat the EmX, and will make transit less appealing.

You can not claim that Eugene “passed” this project. Hand picked committees quietly decided on the EmX, otherwise why were the business and property owners along the corridor the last people to be officially informed? In fact, it must have been such a quiet affair because the City Planning and Use Department, seemingly unknowing of the plan, imposed a code change effective 6-2002, which required a maximum setback of only 15’ on all new buildings on West 11th. (Before this date, there was no required maximum setback.) Now, LTD is trying to shoe-horn the route, conceding to running in too much mixed traffic, and planning narrowed sidewalks, butted-up against buildings, with no room for landscaping. So much for planning and “redeveloping” West 11th.

What kind of development and type of business is “transit oriented”? The EmX will repel businesses. How about encouraging development that attracts businesses and creates jobs? (Not just temporary construction jobs.) How will running almost 80 EmX trips per day, in mixed traffic for 1/3 of the route, going to reduce

congestion? How will taking lanes, or reassigning lanes on 6th and 7th, going to reduce congestion? Adding choke-points will only exasperate current congestion on these avenues. How will the EmX “stimulate prosperity in a time when we really need it”, when instead it will jeopardize prosperity along the corridor, and upset the public?

Its time for the City, LTD, and proponents who “somewhat support” the project look at the facts and stop dreaming unrealistically of a mass exodus to public transit, and rethink the same ridicules and unsubstantiated rational. Like I said, people know better. Implementation will make transit worse, create congestion, and foster a deepening resentment toward the people forcing this project.

Thank you,
Brian Weaver

From: [Kitty Piercy](#)
Sent: Monday, January 17, 2011 2:11 PM
To:
Subject: Re: WEST EUGENE EmX EXTENSION

P and K,

We agree that Beltline is a top priority but that comes from an entirely different pot of money than transit.

Usage of transit is high and will continue to grow. We need to give people choices. For example, I choose to take EmX to campus rather than a car.

There are actually buses within a short radius of where everyone lives in the metro area. We are fortunate. The EmX is different since it is designed to go along major transportation corridors. It can carry more people frequently at less cost. That's because of dedicated lanes and signalization.

We built this transportation system plan into all our overall planning documents passed by both cities some years ago and now have 2 segments in place.-working on the 3rd.

Both communities have adopted this plan and have worked with people at all levels of government to acquire the funding. It has been hard work, year after year.

Whenever we do a big road project, it has impacts and we will do our best to minimize those.

There is a need, both now and into the future. This will help those who rely on public transportation. It will encourage transit oriented development and business where we would most like to have it, reduce congestion, co2 emissions and reliance on foreign oil. It will help us meet local, state and federal goals. It will help us development neighborhoods that connect well to transit corridors that are car, bike,pedestrian and transit friendly that stimulate prosperity in a time when we really need it.

Kitty Piercy
(541) 682-5010 (work)
(541) 954-9089 (mobile)
Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 17, 2011, at 1:36 PM, <P and K > wrote:

My wife and I strongly oppose the West Eugene EmX extension.

After listening to both sides of the debate, it is our opinion that the project should be abandoned and our energy directed toward improving Belt Line over the Willamette River.

Eugene is not New York City where the citizens must rely on public transportation. The vast majority of us use automobiles as there is no bus service close to where we live. It would not be prudent for taxpayers to provide this means of transportation.

We can fully understand why businesses along West Eleventh oppose the disruption to build something that is not necessary and certainly very costly. Federal funds or whatever, we taxpayers expect our money to be spent to resolve a need, not a justification for the Lane County Transit District to exist.

Please direct your energy to Belt Line which is compacted and dangerous to drive/ride every day.

Thank you for listening!

P and K

Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization

From: J <slbooks4me@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 19, 2012 3:15 PM
To: Rick.Krochalis@dot.gov; Kenneth.Feldman@dot.gov; Thomas.Radmilovich@dot.gov; *Eugene Mayor, City Council, and City Manager; BROWN George R; TAYLOR Betty L; ZELENKA Alan; POLING George A; CLARK Mike; FARR Pat M; ORTIZ Andrea F; PRYOR Chris E; BOZIEVICH Jay K; LEIKEN Sid W; SORENSON Pete; HANDY Rob M; STEWART Faye H; Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization; OurMoneyOurTransit@gmail.com
Subject: EMX - w 11th

We do not want this waste nor the congestion. You are supposed to be working for the people not for yourselves. NO EMX!!!!!!

Julia
Eugene Resident who lives near w11th and is dreading the congestion from you jack wagons pushing this thing through anyway!