

**Railroad Quiet Zone
Citizen Advisory Panel
Meeting #5
Notes**

Location: Lyle Room. Wells Fargo Bldg
99 East Broadway, Suite 400

Time: 3:00 pm to 5:00 pm, March 8, 2016

Citizen Advisory Panel (Attendees):

- Brad Foster (alternate for Whiteaker Community Council)
- Sue Wolling (downtown resident, Street Repair Review Panel, cyclist)
- Ron Saylor (west side business owner)
- Tom Moseman (alternate for Jeff Althouse, Oakshire Brewery, west side business)
- Bill Randall (Planning Commission, east side business)
- Sherrill Necessary (Downtown Neighborhood Association)
- Marissa Ooyevaar (Alternate for Casey Barrett-Fifth Street Market, east side business)
- Larry Deckman (alternate for Jonathan Brandt)
- Kelsey Weilbrenner (Ya-Po-Ah Terrace)
- Brittany Quick-Warner (Chamber of Commerce)
- Eugene Organ (Lane Independent Living Alliance)

Citizen Advisory Panel members not in attendance:

- Sam Hahn (Whiteaker Community Council)
- Jeff Althouse (Oakshire Brewery, west side business)

City of Eugene Staff Attendees:

- Rob Inerfeld, Transportation Planning Manager
- Eric Jones, Public Affairs Manager
- Kerry Werner, Project Manager
- Andrea Brown, Engineering Technician
- Brian Richardson, Public Affairs Manager

Members of the Public Attending

- Jonathan Brandt (residents – at large)
- Deana Lange (alternate for Ya-Po-Ah Terrace)
- Doug Gubrud (Imperial Floors)
- Doug Partridge (alternate for Downtown Neighborhood Association)
- Sasha Elliot (Oregon Wine Lab, William Rose Wines)
- One name not recorded (gentleman arrived late and left early)

Introduction: Rob Inerfeld

Started the meeting with introductions of panel members, city staff and guests. Also passed around a sign-in sheet.

Review of Agenda: Rob Inerfeld

Rob reviewed the agenda for the meeting highlighting the structure of the agenda and how much needed to be covered.

Continuation of Individual Crossings: Kerry Werner

There are five crossings that still require a decision from the panel members as to which alternative to move forward with. Kerry showed slides of each crossing alternative.

- **Van Buren**

~Quad Gates vs. Median

~Cost for Quad Gates is \$735,000, cost for Median is \$220,000. Kerry reminded panel members that the median with only two gates also has pedestrian flashers opposite the gates so that pedestrians have the same warning signs and signals as vehicles, this contributes to the relatively high cost of the median at this crossing.

~Added the option of three parking slots in the existing planter strip on the southwest side of the crossing.

Brad – still has concerns about parking, traffic for the local businesses park in neighbor's driveways and front yards. Also, current bicycle traffic use the planter strip along with the sidewalk for access, does not like the parking slots in the planter strip.

Kerry – It is possible to widen the sidewalk another 2-4' in this area, however, the current 5' wide sidewalk is a city standard. Also looked into removing the tree which restricts the parking strip on the south side, according to Urban Forestry it most likely can't be removed as it is older than 50 years.

~Another idea is to move the median to the east and keep the existing parking on the west side.

~Larry – What issues or negative aspects do panel members see with the median? Is it possible to resolve them or deal with them and use the much cheaper median option?

~Kerry confirmed that the cost of the quad gates includes re-using and repositioning the existing two gates at this crossing.

- **Panel members recommend keeping both the Quad Gates and the Median as alternatives for the Van Buren crossing.**

- **Washington**

~Quad Gates vs. a One-Way from 5th to 1st Ave

~Kerry reminded panel members that this street gets the highest traffic counts of all ten crossings (2600 northbound, 2200 southbound ADT).

~With the new design for the one-way street, which includes two-way bicycle traffic on the west side, one way northbound vehicle traffic; a total of three gates will be required to protect both vehicles and bicycles. This is due to the limited sight distance for southbound bicycles. The cost for the one-way alternative went up from \$510,000 to \$1.1 million.

~The cost of the Quad Gates would be \$865,000.

~Panel members felt sight issues for bicycles created major safety issues with the one-way option.

~Panel members agreed the one-way alternative from 5th to 1st Ave was no longer a viable alternative.

~Panel members asked if part of the project could include creating easier bicycle access onto the existing bicycle/pedestrian overpass located above Washington on the west side.

- **Panel members recommend Quad Gates for the Washington crossing.**

- **Lawrence**

~After further research, and discussions with ODOT it was determined that Lawrence can be the all access road closure (instead of Lincoln) without the domino effect of the rails west to the Grain Millers. Not 100% approved yet, still waiting on final decision from ODOT's design team.
~Cost for closure would be \$250,000. (\$100,000 to close the crossing; and \$150,000 for street rehabilitation and adding sidewalks where needed from Shelton-McMurphey to 4th Ave).
~Closure would displace 1900 ADT.
~Lawrence has less heavy truck traffic when compared to Lincoln, approximately ½ truck a day.
~Kerry reviewed his conversations from the meetings he had with the local business owners, see Panel Meeting #4 Notes for review and details.

- **Lincoln**

~All access closure would cost \$550,000. (\$400,000 to reconstruct 2 blocks of Lawrence).
~Closure would displace 1200 ADT.
~Lincoln is wider than Lawrence.
~Bill – if Lincoln remains open, is it possible to include upgrades and improvements to the storm and sewer system? Verify poor flow and lots of puddling exist.

- **Panel members recommend closing Lawrence and keeping Lincoln open with the Median for these two crossings. (Pending final approval from ODOT that Lincoln can remain open after Amtrak's Eugene siding installation project. .)**

- **Pearl**

~Quad Gates vs. Three Gate/Median
~Cost difference is \$90,000 between the two options.
~Fire Department does not favor the three gate option, the fire trucks can drive over the medians but ambulances have difficulty with them.

- **Panel members recommend the Quad Gates for the Pearl crossing.**

Trespass Fencing

- Kerry reflected upon the three "E's" of a successful public project:
 - ~Engineering
 - ~Education
 - ~Enforcement
- Goal is to reduce trespass on the railroad right-of-way.
- Kerry is suggesting the panel members recommend that the City enact an ordinance to enforce a \$250 fine for trespassing on railroad right-of-way.
- Rob – reiterated if trespassers are on the tracks or in the right-of-way when trains come through, the trains can and will sound their horns, reducing the effectiveness of the quiet zone.
- UP and FRA also has the capability to cite/ticket trespassers.
- There is currently 7,000 linear feet along the tracks that have no fencing or have substandard fencing that needs to be replaced.
- UP standard fencing costs \$65 per linear foot, and they maintain it.
 - ~Panel members felt this option looks like the fencing around a prison or jail.
- Other fencing option, welded wire or wrought iron, cost \$35 to \$45 per linear foot and the City would have to maintain it.

- Note that both options are graffiti resistant, tamper resistant, and are six feet tall with some version of wire and spikes on top to they cannot be easily climbed over.
- Cost for approximately 7,000 linear feet of city maintained fencing would be \$300,000.
- Existing fencing in good condition will not be replaced.
 - ~Brittany – Is it a possibility to replace all the fencing along the project limits? How much would it cost to fence the entire project?
 - ~Brittany also commented that if the budget does not all fencing in the corridor to be replaced with a uniform type/style, then we should replace sections or install a few different styles so that there is not a mishmash along the corridor.
- Fencing will extend approximately 500 feet north of Chambers Street.
- Maintenance issues
 - ~Consider adding a code/ordinance that maintenance responsibilities will be placed on adjacent property owners (like the current city code/ordinance for sidewalks).
 - ~City will maintain maintenance responsibilities for fencing along the streets.
 - ~Tom – What would be the legal arrangement with property owners and the City as far as liability is concerned? Same as the ordinance for sidewalks? What if someone tries to climb the fencing and gets hurt, who is liable?
- Kerry reminded the panel members asked earlier in the process that trespass fencing be part of the package to be presented to the community and council along with the crossing alternatives. It is both a safety improvement and a protection of public investment in the QZ infrastructure.

Funding Sources/Options

- Rob briefly went through the possible funding options. See Attachment A of the memorandum written by Mark Schoening for more detail, but the options included:
 1. General Fund
 2. Street Repair Bond Measure Add On (General Obligation Bond)
 3. Railroad Quiet Zone Bond Measure (General Obligation Bond)
 4. Community Development Block Grant Funds
 5. Local Improvement District
 6. Riverfront Urban Renewal District
 7. General Fund Capitol Reprioritization
 8. Transportation System Development Charge Reimbursement Fee
 9. Local Gas Tax
 10. Federal Surface Transportation-Urban (STP-U) Funds
 11. 2012 Street Repair Bond Measure – Bicycle and Pedestrian Component
- Mark’s memo also included three straw proposals for the panel members to consider, comprised of different combinations of possible funding possibilities.
- Sue, who is currently on the committee for the Street Repair Bond Measure, explained the SRRP has strong feelings about not using this bond money on the Quiet Zone.
- Eric discussed how the City of Salem funded their quiet zone, by passing a large general bond measure for \$100 million, of which \$2 million was to fund the quiet zone.
- Rob reminded the panel member that the purpose of this discussion was not to choose one specific funding source, but to set up proposals to present to the community and the City Council. There is no need to agree on one source of funding.
- Eric explained to the panel members to use caution if they ask the City Council to consider one source of funding through a general bond specific to the Quiet Zone rather than recommending a mix of funding sources.

- Panel members asked where the current funding for the City's work was coming from. Kerry stated that current quiet zone related work is being paid for from the Riverfront Urban Renewal District Fund.
~Follow up question: Can this fund also pay for citizen polling and help with the community outreach?
- Sue – Are there any other probable bond measures not mentioned in the memo?
~Rob – Might be a park bond to look into, also keep in mind the City Council determines what goes on the ballot.
~Panel members also asked about a hotel room tax (transient tax?) possibility.
- Brad – Has worries that anything taken out of a general fund might turn away the community.
~Jonathan – No source of funding should be taken out of the discussion, if it is a viable source it should be discussed.
- Bill – Favors straw proposal #3 as each crossing gets funded from its respective geographical location.
- Kerry asked if the panel members would be interested in splitting the project into the east and west phases. Do the east side first, see how the project comes together and while gathering funds that focus on the west side.
~Jonathan – general public consensus is in favor of the quiet zone, so focus needs to be the project as a whole and not just future development. Splitting the quiet zone into east and west phases might turn away or frustrate the community and could have negative results. All ten crossings should be funded and constructed as one phase, one project.
~Panel members had concerns about splitting the project into the east and west phases and how that might really spread out the time line for completion. Kerry reminded panel members of the infrastructure bank that lets the City borrow funding ahead of time for projects to speed up the process and remove the time spent waiting for funding.
- Panel members asked (assuming that funding is secured) when the quiet zone would be in place. Kerry stated that it could be 3 years from the time of receiving the go ahead. This long lead time is needed for engineering design work and the time required to manufacture the gate equipment. Rob asked if we could advance UP engineering by funding the design work only. Consensus of the panel was to start the design as soon as possible so that the project completion date would be as short as possible.
- Eric performed some quick research and calculations and determined that the estimated cost if a local bond measure were used to pay for quiet zone would cost less than \$15 per year for the owner of an average \$190,000 home in Eugene. This is based on an assumption of a \$4.3 million bond measure (not including the costs paid from urban renewal funds or state or railroad grants but including bond issuance costs) and comes from the staff in the City's finance office.
- Panel consensus was to remain open to a variety of funding options, with the preferred option to be using other funds such as the RURD and a state or UP grant (for closing Lawrence Street) as much as possible and to fund the balance of the project cost through a local bond measure.
- .

Public Engagement Plan Update

- Rob briefly discussed the Railroad Quiet Zone Public Engagement Plan (see Quiet Zone website for more details)
~Panel members brought up an open house, citizen polling and an online survey/feedback forum as possible community outreach options.

- The City staff believes the panel has reached the point where they will most benefit from hearing from the public.
- Kerry and Eric have already begun to set up business meetings and public outreach meetings with different community members, neighborhood groups, downtown merchants and stakeholders.
- Rob asked panel members to reach out to him or Kerry or Eric to set up meetings in their neighborhood or specific community area.
~Eric explained a follow up email after the meeting will be sent out to panel members to set up community outreach meetings but asked they not be before March 23rd as the City still needs time to prepare the presentations and documentation.
- End result, after gathering information from the public and the community outreach has been completed, is for the panel to create a report with proposals for each crossing and for funding and present it to the City Council.

Final Questions and Discussion from the Panel:

- Additional Meeting – Panel members did not feel the need for an April meeting as the City would be setting up and scheduling meetings for public outreach.
- Next Meeting
There is not currently another Panel meeting scheduled. Meeting #6 needs to be scheduled for May.
~Agenda Topics:
 - Discuss and evaluate community feedback from public outreach.
 - Prepare/modify report for City Council.

Rob - Meeting Adjourned