

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

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!