

MEETING:	SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE METROPOLITAN POLICY COMMITTEE ON ACT PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT GUIDELINES
DATE:	Thursday, February 6, 2003
TIME:	11:30 A.M. - 1:30 P.M.
LOCATION:	LTD Board Room LTD Administration Building 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene (off Glenwood Blvd. in Glenwood)
CHAIR:	Bobby Green, Lane County Commissioner
CONTACT PERSON:	Paul Thompson, 682-4405

A G E N D A

- 1. CALL TO ORDER 5 MINS**
- 2. INTRODUCTIONS 10 MINS**

MPC Subcommittee Members	
Eugene Councilor	Bonny Bettman
<i>Citizen Representative</i>	Lauri Segel
Lane County Commissioner	Bobby Green
<i>Citizen Representative</i>	Tom Poage
Lane Transit District Board Member	Gerry Gaydos
<i>Citizen Representative</i>	Terry Connolly
Springfield Mayor	Sid Leiken
<i>Citizen Representative</i>	Christine Lundberg

- 3. REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE OBJECTIVE & SCHEDULE 30 MINS**

MPC members agreed by consensus to form a subcommittee to work on a model for citizen involvement that would help to meet the ACT guidelines. (Paraphrased from minutes of December 12, 2002 MPC meeting)

. . . the purpose of the subcommittee was not to create an ACT. . . [rather] document the process to go through and determine if there were ways that the process could be improved . . . to increase the public involvement in the process. [The subcommittee will create] a matrix that would compare proposals and identify the gaps, and then, at that point, [MPC] could look at the gaps and identify what

best actions to take. [MPC] should analyze what the potential shortfalls could be and then report to the OTC. (Excerpts from draft minutes of January 9, 2003 MPC meeting)

MPC requested that the subcommittee complete its work within 4 meetings, with the final subcommittee report presented to MPC on May 8th.

4. REVIEW CURRENT MPO/LANE COUNTY STIP PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROCESS 60 MINS

The main focus of the subcommittee's review of the ACT guidelines is on the public involvement process. Included in this packet are tables outlining the general ACT guidelines and the ACT guidelines specific to public involvement. A table outlining the local public involvement process at both the MPC and Lane County Board level during the most recent STIP process is accompanied by a narrative description of that process. Also included is a flow chart that outlines the established local STIP process, as applied during development of the FY2002-05 STIP priorities.

5. LOGISTICS FOR NEXT MEETING(S) – DATE/TIME/LOCATION 10 MINS

Potential dates for 3 additional meetings of the subcommittee are on Thursdays from 11:30-1:30 – March 6, April 3 and April 24.

6. ADJOURN

LCOG: C:\DOCUMENTS AND SETTINGS\CLAS086\LOCAL SETTINGS\TEMPORARY INTERNET FILES\OLKF8\MPC 4D - ATTACHMENT 1 - MPC
SUBCOMMITTEE AGENDA PACKET.DOC

Last Saved: February 5, 2003

ACT GUIDELINES IN GENERAL

Draft ACT Guideline Requirements

- Establish a public process for area project selection priorities for the STIP.
- Provide recommendations to the OTC regarding program funding allocations for the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).
- Develop recommendations to ODOT regions regarding regional STIP funding allocations.
- Prioritize Modernization projects for the STIP.
- Make recommendations to ODOT regarding special funding opportunities and programs.
- Share issues with other organizations,
- Advise the OTC on state and regional policies affecting the Area's transportation system.
- Provide a forum to advance the public's awareness and understanding of transportation issues, alternatives for solutions and outcomes of decisions.
- Prioritization of planning projects.
- Establishment and monitoring of benchmarks for regional transportation improvements.

ACT GUIDELINES SPECIFIC TO PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The ACT public involvement process shall demonstrate explicit consideration and response to public input during the planning and program development process.

Draft ACT Guideline Requirements	Minimum (Required) Standard	Preferred Standard
<p>Meeting Notification – Timely notice of ACT meetings allows for broader participation by the general public and stakeholder groups.</p>	<p>One week notice for all meetings where decisions will be made. Notification through local media sources and meeting notices to ACT mailing list. ACTs must develop a mailing list of special interest groups in the ACT area.</p>	<p><i>(in addition to minimum standard)</i> Post notices at local public institutions and email updates to interested parties. Post notices on ACT website, along with links to meeting agendas and minutes.</p>
<p>Meeting Schedule – A regular meeting schedule increases the opportunities for public and stakeholder involvement through its predictability.</p>	<p>If regularly scheduled meetings are not possible, provide extra public notification for each meeting via the preferred method of meeting notification.</p>	<p>Hold regularly scheduled ACT meetings.</p>
<p>Meeting Location – ACT meetings should be held in locations that are easily accessible by the general public, and contain adequate seating and facilities to encourage their attendance.</p>	<p>ADA accessible location. Outreach locations should consider location frequented by target community.</p>	<p><i>(in addition to minimum standard)</i> Location that is easily accessible by public transportation.</p>
<p>Meeting Materials – For the public and stakeholders to truly participate, to give informed input in the decision-making process, they need access to technical materials and supporting documentation. Purely informational materials may be provided at the meeting.</p>	<p>Distribute information related to decision items on the agenda to everyone in attendance at the ACT meeting.</p>	<p>Provide technical materials and supporting documentation one week prior to the ACT meeting, either through the ACT website and/or via mail.</p>
<p>Agenda – When preparing the ACT meeting agenda, consideration needs to be given to the public and stakeholder groups that are interested in providing input or comments.</p>	<p>Provide time on each agenda for general public comment.</p>	<p>Provide advance agenda one week prior to meeting and for action items consider posting an electronic mailing address and encouraging public comment. Copies of all correspondence received prior to the meeting should be available for ACT members and the public.</p>
<p>Meeting Minutes – Minutes shall be prepared for all ACT meetings, with decision items documented.</p>	<p>Prepare and distribute minutes for previous meeting one week prior to next meeting. Make previous meeting's minutes available at each meeting.</p>	<p>Post minutes on the ACT website.</p>

DATE	GROUP	ACTION	PUBLIC HEARING?	PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITY? COMMENT MADE?	NOTES
04-07 STIP Process					
06/25/02	All-Area	Consider Region 2 Priorities	No	Yes/?	Region 2 List Agreed Upon
06/07/02	All-Area	Consider Region 2 Priorities	n.a.	n.a.	Postponed
05/15/02	BCC	Adopt 04-07 STIP Priorities by Board Order	Yes	Yes/Yes	Second hearing after continuance of May 1, 2002 public hearing
05/09/02	BCC	Testimony received as of 5/8/02	n.a.	n.a.	Supplemental memo transmitting testimony as of 5/8/02.
05/01/02	BCC	Consider 04-07 STIP Priorities	Yes	Yes/Yes	Public hearing on priorities. Handed out information on projects and criteria. Continued hearing to 5/15/02 to consider this new information. Record open until 5/8/02.
04/25/02	BCC	2nd notice letter from PW Director	n.a.	n.a.	Draft Priority list and notice of record to close on 5/8/02. STIP criteria approved by OTC on 4/11/02 included.
04/17/02	BCC	Notice letter from PW Director	n.a.	n.a.	Sent to cities with 10/31/01 adopted list and updated draft information
04/16/02	BCC	Worksession on 04-07 STIP Priorities	No	Yes/No	Report on MPC action and preparation for BCC for 5/1/02 public hearing. Draft criteria and previous list from 10/31/02 attached.
04/11/02	MPC	Adopt 04-07 STIP Priorities	No	Yes/Yes	MPC adopted Metro Priorities
04/11/02	OTC	Adopt 04-07 STIP Project Criteria	No	??	Invited testimony from BTA and AOC
10/31/01	BCC	Adopt Preliminary 04-07 STIP Priorities by Board Order	Yes	Yes/?	Metro and Non-metro not yet prioritized. Large and small projects grouped separately.
10/29/01	BCC	Project Information	n.a.	n.a.	Supplemental memo to BCC regarding traffic volume, classification, status for project list
10/11/01	MPC	Adopt Preliminary 04-07 STIP Priorities	No	Yes/No	MPC approved preliminary list of Metro priorities
10/03/01	BCC	Adopt HB 2142 (OTIA) Priorities by Board Order	Yes	Yes/?	Starting point for 04-07 STIP priorities, begins quickly after OTIA

Board of Commissioners Meetings Generally

All of the Board meetings (marked as BCC) on the spreadsheet were regularly scheduled Board meetings held in the Public Service Building (PSB) in downtown Eugene at 125 E. 8th Street. They meet the requirements of the public meetings law in terms of notice, availability of materials and access, minutes recorder, etc. Each meeting begins with a public comment period, usually with a maximum 20 minutes and a request that each speaker limit their remarks to 3 minutes so that the agenda can proceed. This comment period occurs whether a public hearing is scheduled or not. The Board takes action on project priorities, letters, and some policy matters formally by approving specific documents by Board Order.

04-07 STIP Priorities

The County staff began the STIP priority setting process as usual – by reviewing previous lists, learning what staff can about the criteria for the funding program under consideration, consulting with ODOT and local staff on project concepts and status, and assembling preliminary lists and project information. County staff also coordinates with LCOG and other local staff to go to MPC for metro area priorities before combining these with small city and rural area project priorities.

Preliminary List Adopted October 31, 2001

This list was adopted after receiving input from MPC on October 11, 2001. County staff assembled a list that ranked Metro Area projects and Non-Metro projects separately. Staff also separated the projects in Large Projects and Smaller Projects. The actual criteria for 04-07 STIP inclusion were not finalized until April 11, 2002. There was a brief staff report by Tom Stinchfield, Lane County, and Bob Pirrie, ODOT Area Manager. At the public hearing, testimony was given by representatives of the Cities of Creswell, Florence, and Springfield. The Board approved Order 01-10-31-14 on a vote of 5-0.

Countywide List Adopted May 15, 2002

The Board considered the countywide priority list again in April and May, 2002 after the OTC approved the final STIP criteria on April 11, 2002 and after MPC action on Metro Area priorities on the same day.

April 16, 2002. The Board held a work session to set a public hearing date of May 1, 2002. There was a short staff presentation by Pirrie and Stinchfield. No public comment was made. Materials in the packet included the October list, draft materials dated March 1, 2002 from the ODOT Director to the OTC, and information on project status for the 02-05 STIP. Stinchfield stated that a combined priority list would be produced before the hearing on May 1st.

April 17, 2002. A notice letter was sent to the cities, ODOT, and Lane Transit District by the County Public Works Director inviting them to the May 1st public hearing. It included the October 31, 2001 list and an update on project status (OTIA and county CaPP programs) as information. It promised a second letter with a prioritized list.

April 25, 2002. A second hearing notice letter was sent to the cities, ODOT, and LTD by the Public Works Director. It included the draft combined priority list as an attachment. It also included the adopted STIP criteria and a list showing projects that would be affected by the pending TransPlan amendments related to the West Eugene Parkway.

May 1, 2002. A public hearing was held on the priority list. County staff handed out supplemental information containing a table on how the projects related to the STIP criteria and a project narrative sheet. The Board

Chair elected to extend the public hearing record to May 8, 2002 so that people could react to this new information. The Board also decided to scheduled an additional public hearing on May 15, 2002 as a result. Staff presentations were made by Stinchfield and Pirrie. Nineteen people testified at the public hearing. Written testimony was submitted by five people, including Bob Pirrie, Area Manager.

May 9, 2002. After the close of the record, six additional pieces of written testimony were distributed to the Board.

May 15, 2002. A second public hearing was held. Four people testified. After discussion, the Board approved Order 02-5-15-11. The Order approved a letter which forwarded the list, some comments on Transportation Demand Management (TDM) priorities, and information on the County's Capital Project Partnership (CaPP) which partially funded several projects on the state system.

Setting Transportation Priorities for the FY2002-05 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

