

MINUTES

Metropolitan Policy Committee
Springfield Library Meeting Room - 225 5th Street - Springfield

February 12, 2004
11:30 a.m.

PRESENT: Bonny Bettman, Chair; Bobby Green, Bill Dwyer, Anne Ballew, Jim Torrey, Randy Papé, Gerry Gaydos, Sid Leiken, members; Bill Van Vactor, Dennis Taylor, Ken Hamm, Mike Kelly, Mike Hudson, George Kloepfel, Bob Pirrie, *ex officio* members.

Anita Yap, City of Coburg; Jim Carlson, Susan Muir, Mark Schoening, Chris Henry, City of Eugene; Emily Jerome, Eugene City Attorney; Bill Morgan, Ollie Snowden, Tom Stinchfield, Lane County; Tom Schwetz, Paul Thompson, Jamon Kent, Byron Vanderpool, Ann Mortenson, Lane Council of Governments; Nick Arnis, Len Goodwin, City of Springfield; Karl Wieseke, Oregon Department of Transportation; Terry Connolly, Eugene Chamber of Commerce; Lisa Gardner, Lane Transit District; Lauri Segel, Rob Zako, 1000 Friends of Oregon; Rob Handy, guest.

ABSENT: Hillary Wylie, LTD, member.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Bettman called the meeting to order.

II. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Those present introduced themselves.

Ms. Bettman thanked Bill Dwyer for his service as the Immediate Past Chair of the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC). Mr. Dwyer replied that he had enjoyed serving in that capacity.

III. APPROVAL OF JANUARY 8, 2004 MINUTES

Ms. Bettman changed the first sentence in page 5, paragraph 1, to read, "Mr. Snowden stated that there were \$1.6 billion available for state highway bridges and approximately \$300 million for local agency bridges."

Mr. Green, seconded by Mr. Pirrie, moved to accept the minutes of January 8, 2004, as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

IV. COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Rob Zako, 1280-B East 29th Avenue. Mr. Zako identified himself as representing 1000 Friends of Oregon and said he would address agenda Item 4-D, Integrated Land Use and Transportation Plans. He said since TransPlan had not been adopted and there was not an alternative performance standard by the May 8, 2000 deadline, local governments were required to adopt an integrated land use transportation plan by September 2004.

Rob Handy, 455 ½ River Road. Mr. Handy said he had left out a statement recently at a meeting about the Metro Plan. He said good land use and transportation planning in a bipartisan environment was healthy.

Lauri Segel, 120 West Broadway. Ms. Segel said she was disappointed at the progress in meeting MPO public involvement requirements and offered suggestions for improvements.

IV. COMMENTS FROM STAFF

Mr. Schwetz distributed a February 6, 2004 letter to Mr. Bruce Warner, Director of the Oregon Department of Transportation from David O. Cox, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Division Administrator, U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) and from R.F. Krochalis, Federal Transit Administration, (FTA) Regional Administrator, U.S. DOT.

Mr. Schwetz said the statewide transportation program was reviewed by FHWA bi-annually. As is typical of these reviews, conditions were placed on the STIP approval during the most recent federal review. Referring to condition two, he said he had spoken with FHWA staff earlier today, who felt the issues could be resolved before the next MPC meeting.

VI. MPO ISSUES

a. Fiscal Year 2005 (FY05) Unified Planning Work Planning

Referring to the staff report in the agenda packet, Mr. Schwetz said staff was requesting the MPC to release the recently completed draft FY05 UPWP for public review. He added that FHWA and FTA would be reviewing and commenting on the work program. He said the MPC would be asked to adopt the work plan at the next meeting.

In response to Ms. Bettman's question about how success related to public involvement issues would be measured, Mr. Schwetz said an update to the public involvement plan adopted about ten years ago would be brought to the MPC next month. Mr. Green noted that success would depend upon the definition of success and what benchmarks were measured. Mr. Dwyer said success needed to be measured by output and effort, not by whom or how many people showed up.

Mr. Torrey, seconded by Mr. Green, moved to release the draft FY05 UPWP for public review. The motion passed unanimously.

b. Draft FY2006-2009 STIP Project Priorities

Mr. Thompson provided the staff presentation. He referred to Table 1, *Summary List of OHP Policies Applicable to C-STIP and D-STIP Projects* on page 6 of the staff report entitled "Setting MPO Priorities for the FY2006-2009 STIP." He described the process for listing and approving projects, through local jurisdictions to the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC). He added that this was the beginning of the Metro Area prioritization process.

Mr. Thompson reviewed Attachments 1, 2, and 3, which described the universe of ODOT projects that did not have identified funding. He said staff had reviewed projects that did not have funding and produced an initial assessment of the projects eligibility for C-STIP or D-STIP funding.

Mr. Thompson said staff was asking for feedback today on the lists, on the eligibility determinations, and on the prioritization factors. He reviewed the next steps in the process. Mr. Thompson said there would be a public workshop on Thursday, February 19, 5:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. in the Springfield Library Meeting Room. He said TPC would develop a recommendation on priority projects to bring back to MPC in March to recommend C-STIP and D-STIP priorities for the Metro Area to recommend to the Lane County Board of Commissioners.

Mr. Dwyer expressed concern over loss of job opportunities in Lane County, and asked how projects could be moved up the list to create jobs. Mr. Thompson explained the method by which projects were included on various lists for funded and unfunded projects, and the various funding sources.

A discussion regarding the complexity of federal, state and local funding sources, matching fund requirements, and the complex project prioritization followed.

Mr. Torrey encouraged making the public participation process as people friendly as possible, to encourage public participation.

Mr. Torrey left at 12:20 p.m.

Mr. Pirrie explained the process used by the OTC to develop project and funding priorities on a regional level. He noted when federal funding was sought for earmarking and there was a match requirement, the OTC had identified how match funding would be allocated.

Mr. Pape explained that the list for earmarking for ODOT match funding had been established to facilitate collaboration with communities statewide when seeking federal funding.

Mr. Holden thanked Mr. Pirrie and Mr. Pape for the explanations. He expressed concern if federal money was allocated through the United Front lobbying efforts and was turned back due to insufficient match funding. Mr. Green said Lane County was not in a position to fund match money at the present time.

In response to Ms. Bettman's question, Mr. Pape said OTC had prioritized projects of statewide significance, and had taken the position that it would not provide match funds to projects that were not on the list.

Ms. Ballew said the process of funding large scale public improvements was a long one.

Mr. Green said Lane County Road Fund Partnership money could be reserved to use toward the match. He noted it could be challenging whether that match would be sufficient. He added there were inconsistency issues at the state level regarding matching funds.

Mr. Van Vactor noted that projects moved through the United Front and the OTC processes through mutual respect among the governments.

In response to Ms. Bettman's question, Mr. Dwyer said projects were sometimes listed prior to availability of funding because it often took several rounds to secure funding for specific projects. He reiterated his concern about lost economic opportunities resulting in job loss.

Mr. Hamm said the earmarking process would be reviewed by the Oregon Congressional Delegation to ensure that the matching funds were in place to ensure the allocations would be used in a timely manner. He supported Mr. Van Vactor's comments that there should be a dialogue at the local level to establish priorities.

Mr. Pape said that the Economic Opportunity Fund provided a limited amount of money through statewide competition. He added there was difference between the federal reauthorization which was currently under debate at various levels of the federal government through the appropriations process.

In response to Ms. Bettman's questions, Mr. Thompson noted that any projects on the RTP list that had already been funded were not included in this analysis of potential priorities for STIP funding. He added that several of the projects on the STIP list could also be eligible for OTIA funding. Ms. Bettman reiterated Mr. Torrey's comments that the materials needed to be more accessible and understandable to the public. Mr. Thompson said materials being prepared for the February 19 forum were being prepared in a people friendly format. He added that a web page would be available by February 16 containing background documents on various ODOT and STIP projects and processes.

Mr. Green, seconded by Mr. Gaydos, moved to open the public comment period on the Draft FY2006-2009 STIP project priorities. The motion passed unanimously.

c. Draft MPC Letters of Support for United Front Reauthorization Earmark Requests

Mr. Schwetz referred to his February 12, 2004 memorandum to the MPC regarding ***MPC Letters of Support for United Front Reauthorization Earmark Requests***. He said an updated set of letters originally approved by the MPC and sent to the Oregon Congressional Delegation in February 2003 was being requested because the reauthorization process had been delayed. Support letters were requested for the following projects:

- I-5/Beltline Interchange
- Courthouse District Transportation Improvements
- I-5/Franklin and Glenwood Interchange Study
- Beltline Road Corridor Study
- I-5 Interchange at the City of Coburg
- Bus Rapid Transit: Pioneer Parkway Corridor Construction
- Bus Rapid Transit Vehicles

- Rivers to Ridges Bicycle and Pedestrian Paths
 - Delta Ponds Path
 - South Bank Trail Extension
 - Middle Fork, Willamette Path
 - McKenzie River Multi-Use Path Design
- Eugene Depot

There was a brief discussion regarding the methodology used to develop the project list.

Ms. Volta, seconded by Mr. Green, moved to approve the letters of support for United Front Reauthorization Earmark Requests. The motion passed unanimously.

d. Draft Legal Opinion on Requirements for Integrated Land Use Transportation Plan

Mr. Schwetz introduced Emily Jerome, Eugene City Attorney. Ms. Jerome said the legal opinion had been jointly developed by attorneys for Lane County, the City of Eugene and the City of Springfield. She added that Lane Transit District (LTD) legal counsel would be consulted as the issue impacted LTD.

Ms. Jerome provided information about the analysis offered during the public comment period of this meeting by Mr. Zako. Referring to the opinion in the agenda packet, she said it stated that the MPC was not legally required to complete an Integrated Land Use Transportation Plan. Ms. Jerome explained the TransPlan Amendment process that would be required if the MPC chose to develop such a plan. She added that the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) had not taken a position on the issue.

e. MPO Calendar and Information Items

Mr. Schwetz said the U.S. Senate had taken a cloture vote on reauthorization for SAFE-TEA. He added that the U.S. House of Representatives had recently adopted a four month extension to all more time to review the issue. He noted that the two Houses of Congress were not close on the issue.

Mr. Thompson said staff would be closing the public comment period next month and asking the MPC for action on the UPWP. He said action would also be requested on the STIP priorities following a public hearing. He said a major update of the public involvement plan would be brought to the MPC and some MTIP administrative amendments would come to the MPC at a future meeting. Mr. Thompson said the Road User Fee Task Force would come before the MPC in April.

Ms. Ballew thanked Mr. Pape for continuing to attend the MPC meetings.

The next meeting was scheduled for March 11, 2004.

The meeting adjourned at 1:05 p.m.

Recorded by Linda Henry.

*LCOG: L:\MPC\AGENDAMINS\FY04\MINS_20040212.DOC
Last Saved: March 4, 2004*