

## MINUTES

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

December 5, 2007  
5:30 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Webb Sussman, Chair; Dave Jacobson, Vice Chair; Diana Alldredge, Rich Hazel, Wendy Butler-Boyesen, Bill Morganti, Ryan Papé, Eleanor Mulder, Philip Farrington, Bob Ransom, Donald Holtgrieve, Jeanne-Marie Moore, members; Kathi Wiederhold, Byron Vanderpool, Susan Payne, Lane Council of Governments staff.

**ABSENT:** Damien Gilbert, John Anderson, members; Kitty Piercy, MPC liaison.

### **Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review**

Mr. Sussman called the meeting to order and reviewed the agenda. Those present introduced themselves.

### **Comments from the Audience**

There was no one wishing to speak.

### **Election of Officers**

Mr. Jacobson, seconded by Ms. Alldredge, moved to elect the current officers for another term. The motion passed unanimously.

### **e-MPO**

Ms. Payne asked for feedback from committee members on their review of the e-MPO prototype.

Mr. Hazel reported difficulty with the map function. Other committee members indicated they also had encountered problems with the map.

Mr. Jacobson said he had not experienced problems, even with his dial-up connection.

Mr. Papé said he thought the website was well done, but he had been unable to access it for the past few days. Ms. Payne said the server had been changed, but permissions were not updated; that problem was being corrected.

Ms. Moore said she had been unable to locate the text version of the website. Ms. Payne demonstrated the location of the "text only" button. Ms. Moore suggested offering a "skip to text only" option when the site was loading.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen said she did not have any problems with the e-MPO site, but found it difficult to navigate to the Keep Us Moving site. She said the project information on Keep Us Moving was often not current.

Ms. Alldredge suggested indicating on the Keep Us Moving website how often the information was updated. She noted the e-MPO calendar needed a printer-friendly version.

Mr. Ransom said the e-MPO should also have a link to the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) staff person who maintained the website. He said the list of LCOG staff should include a brief description of each person's area of responsibility.

Ms. Payne pointed out options for signing up for email information and notifications.

Referring to the public involvement page, Mr. Farrington remarked that testimony as a form of public involvement was over-emphasized. He had expected more information on how transportation projects evolved, with flow charts that indicated points at which the public could be involved during the development process. He said an annual calendar of events showing Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) and other relevant meetings and opportunities would be helpful. He liked the plans and programs section, which offered brief descriptions and the option to obtain more in-depth information.

Mr. Sussman commented that the site map, menu bars and submenus did not always correspond and sometimes used different terminology. He said that it was not possible to move directly from the home page to some of the choices on the site map. He complimented staff on the site, which he thought was very professionally done.

Ms. Payne determined that the committee agreed it would be useful to have menus that dropped down when the cursor was moved over it.

Ms. Alldredge commended the site for being visually clean and easy to read.

Mr. Hazel said there appeared to be general endorsement for the e-MPO and suggested the committee could receive updates as the site was fine-tuned.

Ms. Payne asked committee members to email any other comments or suggestions to her.

### **Committee Business**

Mr. Sussman stated that a committee member had been absent three of the last five meetings.

Ms. Wiederhold said in the past committee officers had contacted members who missed meetings to determine if they were able or wished to continue to participate on the committee.

Mr. Hazel cited the bylaws, which stated that unexcused absence from three consecutive meetings was a *de facto* resignation.

Mr. Sussman said there had not been three consecutive unexcused absences, but he and Mr. Jacobson would contact the member to determine his status.

Mr. Sussman acknowledged Ms. Moore as one of the original members when the committee was formed. He announced that her term was expiring and presented her with a certificate of appreciation in Braille on the occasion of her last meeting. Committee members expressed their appreciation for Ms. Moore's service and her commitment to accessibility and transportation planning.

### **Air Quality Conformity Determination**

Ms. Payne invited committee feedback on the Air Quality Conformity Determination (AQCD) synopsis. She explained her intent was to briefly describe the document's analytic and technical contents in a way that would allow the reader to decide whether to pursue the subject further.

Ms. Mulder hoped there was a way to keep the acronyms to a minimum, although she recognized the difficulty of doing that.

Mr. Sussman suggested using LCOG's glossary of acronyms.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen suggested developing a glossary of only those acronyms used in a document.

Mr. Hazel suggested a small half-column glossary for acronyms in a document.

Ms. Moore said a half-column would be difficult for text reader programs and suggested spelling out the full name each time instead of using acronyms.

Mr. Vanderpool challenged the committee to explore how staff could write summaries of transportation planning issues that did not require a key or glossary to interpret acronyms and technical terms. He said the summaries should make transportation planning clear and understandable to the public.

Mr. Farrington suggested simply indicating that something was a state or federal requirement instead of identifying the particular state or federal agency.

Mr. Holtgrieve said the synopsis mentioned emissions, but the measurement was concentrations. He said there should be a distinction between the two as they were measured differently.

Mr. Jacobson liked the chart listing pollutants, but it appeared that only carbon monoxide was measured. Ms. Payne said the chart identified the global air quality issues that the Clean Air Act addressed; some jurisdictions had to address many or all of them. The MPO was only required to address carbon monoxide, but the Lane Regional Air Protection Agency monitored several other pollutants and if concentrations changed and worsened the MPO might be required to respond to those in conformity determinations.

Mr. Jacobson asked how incidents such as volcanic eruptions affected the determination. Ms. Payne said there were exemptions for episodic events such as eruptions, field burning and forest fires.

Mr. Jacobson asked if computer modeling to project the amount of carbon monoxide could be challenged. Ms. Payne replied that actual measurements were used to validate model trends.

Mr. Jacobson thought the synopsis and other documents would be easier to read if they were formatted in two columns per page. Ms. Moore said that would present problems with reader programs.

Ms. Wiederhold determined there was consensus that the question/answer format was workable for the synopsis.

Mr. Jacobson suggested that individual committee members rewrite the synopsis without acronyms and email the results to Ms. Wiederhold. Ms. Wiederhold said she would email an electronic version of the synopsis to committee members to use.

The committee took a short break.

### **Approval of November 7, 2007, Minutes**

Mr. Morganti, seconded by Ms. Butler-Boyesen-Boyesen, moved to approve the November 7, 2007, minutes as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

### **Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Primer**

This item was tabled until the next meeting.

### **Public Participation Plan (PPP)**

Ms. Wiederhold stated that the PPP included provisions for an annual review and suggested that could occur within the context of how well it had worked with the Regional Transportation Plan update. She referred to a list of RTP public outreach activities provided in the agenda packet.

Mr. Vanderpool provided an overview of the MPC's discussion of public participation, including questions about the adequacy of public outreach in view of a petition from community members asking that the RTP not be adopted. He said some committee members felt there should be many people at the meeting to testify; others said that level of participation occurred when projects were processed at the local level. He asked for the committee's comments on those points.

Ms. Moore said she read the petition and the 141 names on the list and determined that represented 17 percent of the 800 people on the RTP email outreach list. She said the synopsis of public involvement activities listed meetings, posters, council work sessions and emails. She pointed out the large turnout for meetings about downtown Eugene redevelopment and said people were more likely to participate if they understood how a project would affect them and if they believed that their opinions mattered. She thought the petition included constructive suggestions for improving public involvement. She emphasized the need to flood people with information in order to get their attention.

Mr. Hazel commented that he thought the plan had gone down a path that was completely wrong since by the time a project or plan was before the MPC public input had minimal or no purpose. He said the Transportation Policy Committee (TPC) met during the day when it was inconvenient for the public to attend and did not publish minutes or webcast its meetings, greatly limiting access to what happened. He

said it was not possible to identify the TPC members on jurisdictions' website or to determine what projects were being planned for the future. He said there was nothing that would inform the public about opportunities to get involved in the process at a point where they could influence the outcome.

Mr. Jacobson concurred with Mr. Hazel. He said the project flow chart should clearly identify points in the local planning process, before a project reached the regional level, where the public had the best opportunities for meaningful participation. He used a Highway 126 at 52nd Street improvement project to demonstrate how those who lived in the area were unaware of how the need for the project was determined and a decision to spend those funds was made.

Ms. Mulder did not disagree with Mr. Hazel and Mr. Jacobson, but raised the issue of timing. She questioned how many of the petition signers lived in the area or were paying attention when the initial decisions about RTP projects were being made at the local level.

Ms. Alldredge remarked that the issue was how to educate people about public involvement opportunities at the local level. She said that earlier notification to the community and better communication, particularly through the media, about how a project would affect people and how they could get involved would be helpful.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen questioned whether there were true opportunities in the local jurisdiction decision-making process for public involvement. She said the information about a project would need to be publicized so people would understand its potential impact.

Mr. Vanderpool used TransPlan as an example of a lengthy process that involved thousands of citizens and was a very involvement-rich opportunity; that plan was not currently being updated, but was used to drive many other decisions.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen said the fact that current projects were based on extensive public involvement during the TransPlan process should be better communicated to people.

Mr. Sussman pointed out that while projects were under the umbrella of TransPlan, individual projects had their own processes involving outreach and hearings; it depended on the jurisdiction how well those were publicized.

Mr. Vanderpool said there were other processes, such as capital improvement programs, budget development, city council discussions, environmental analyses and planning commission meetings that also presented public participation opportunities and it was difficult to know where it was best to become involved.

Ms. Moore emphasized the need to break information down into more easily understood segments and provide more ways for people to give their comments. She did not believe that the issues were well connected, as there were many groups in the community involved in various aspects of transportation planning and it was not clear how they were connected to each other or to a jurisdiction's planning process. She said that initiatives were too insulated from each other.

Mr. Farrington said that insisting the TransPlan process start over so each project would be commented on was a disservice to the thousands of people and countless citizen participation hours involved in developing it. He said it should be clearly explained that the RTP update was not intended to start the planning process over again and there would opportunities to review projects and policies during the

TransPlan update. He agreed there was a need for better communication to the public about what they could comment on. He said projects like the Highway 126 improvements were moved from the illustrative to the financially constrained list because the West Eugene Parkway project was cancelled. He said the TPC had used criteria to identify which projects should move to the constrained list, but the public did not understand that rationale and was not given an opportunity to comment on it. He said the people commenting on the RTP update appeared to have fundamental issues with the RTP itself—the projects and policies—more than with the update. The public involvement plan needed to be ready to provide a fair hearing on all of those issues.

Mr. Papé said it appeared the public needed to be better educated on when to get involved so they could be heard. He asked if it was the committee's responsibility to identify the best vehicles for that education process or to actually conduct the outreach. He said if a good education process was in place, it would be the responsibility of individuals to avail themselves of that information and become involved.

Mr. Jacobson pointed out that the committee was supposed to be involved in the movement of projects from the illustrative list, but there was no quorum at that meeting. He said the agenda packet for that meeting included the criteria used to select projects. He had attended MPC meetings and invited those present to attend the CAC meetings, but no one had come. He agreed that the PPP should point out early opportunities at the local level to become involved in the planning process.

Mr. Hazel said that people needed to be given an opportunity to participate and shown how to do that; the committee was not responsible to making that involvement happen.

Mr. Farrington suggested a multi-year calendar that identified milestones in the planning process, decision-making points and public involvement opportunities.

Mr. Holtgrieve suggested a public information officer as the single point of contact for citizens.

Ms. Wiederhold remarked that the committee recommended a public participation process on the RTP update that was of limited scope because there were no new policies; the committee anticipated a large outreach effort would occur when major revisions were being considered.

Mr. Vanderpool summarized the committee's concern that it was not just the MPO portion of the process that needed to be addressed with respect to public outreach; the public should be given a comprehensive picture that included all of the agencies involved. He said a longer timeline that included the federal and local processes was being discussed and more information could be provided to the committee as the project moved forward.

## **Wrap Up**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)