

## MINUTES

Metropolitan Policy Committee  
Springfield City Hall – Library Meeting Room – 225 5<sup>th</sup> Street  
Springfield, Oregon

February 9, 2006  
11:30 a.m.

PRESENT: Bobby Green, Chair; Bill Dwyer (Lane County), Sid Leiken, Anne Ballew (City of Springfield), David Kelly, Kitty Piercy (City of Eugene), Judy Volta (City of Coburg), Susan Ban, Gerry Gaydos (Lane Transit District), Jane Lee (Oregon Department of Transportation), members; Jim Carlson for Dennis Taylor (City of Eugene), Mark Pangborn (Lane Transit District), Bill Van Vactor (Lane County), Cynthia Pappas (City of Springfield), *ex officio* members.

Tom Schwetz, Paul Thompson, Ann Mortenson, Jamon Kent, Byron Vanderpool, Kathi Wiederhold, Milo Mecham, Petra Schuetz (Lane Council of Governments); Tom Boyatt, Gail Curtis, Carolyn Gassaway (Oregon Department of Transportation), Randy Papé (Oregon Transportation Commission), Greg Mott, Nick Arnis, Len Goodwin (City of Springfield), Mark Schoening, Lisa Gardner, Pam Berrian (City of Eugene), Tom Stinchfield, Peter Thurston (Lane County), Stefano Viggiano, Anita Yap (Lane Transit District), Bob Noble (Eugene Airport), Robert Schroeter, Kevin Bell (Comcast), Terry Connolly (Eugene Chamber of Commerce), Rob Zako (1000 Friends of Oregon), Lauri Segel (Friends of Eugene), Rob Handy, Charles Biggs, David Sonnichsen, guests.

### WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Green opened the February 2006 meeting of the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) and welcomed those present. Members introduced themselves.

Mr. Green announced that because of time constraints for some members, action items related to the cable franchise and ConnectOregon applications would be moved to the beginning of the agenda.

### APPROVE JANUARY 12, 2006 MINUTES

Mr. Green noted that although Mr. Cox had remarked that the collaborative process for the West Eugene Parkway was being conducted at the MPC's request, that comment was not accurate. Mr. Kelly pointed out that Ms. Piercy had clarified that statement later in the meeting.

Mr. Dwyer, seconded by Ms. Piercy, moved to approve the January 12, 2006, minutes as clarified. The motion passed unanimously, 10:0.

## COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

**Rob Zako**, 1280-B East 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene, representing 1000 Friends of Oregon, said he had been working recently on the Big Look and on March 17, 2006, a number of groups were sponsoring a presentation on land use planning. He said he did not understand a reference to “e-MPO” in the memorandum related to the agenda item on integration of transportation plans.

**Rob Handy**, 455-1/2 River Road, said he was also confused by the e-MPO reference and hoped that would be clarified during the meeting. Citing sections of the memorandum related to transportation plan integration, he asked what had become of the idea of pursuing a single transportation plan. He urged development of one financially constrained list that everyone could understand.

Mr. Thompson noted that he had distributed correspondence from **David Sonnichsen** to MPC members at Mr. Sonnichsen’s request.

**Lauri Segel** observed that there was no written report on the Citizen Advisory Committee provided in the agenda packet. She urged that MPC meetings be made available by webcast to make it more accessible and better inform the public. She suggested opening the transportation planning process up to stakeholders instead of isolating them in special meetings that were not publicized or integrated with the process in any way that she recognized.

## METROPOLITAN CABLE FRANCHISE RENEWAL

Mr. Mecham directed the attention of Lane County, Springfield and Eugene representatives to a revised resolution distributed by staff. He explained that the franchise could be renewed either by the provisions of Section 16(2)(F) of the franchise agreement or under Section 626 of the federal cable act, hereafter referred to as section 16 and the 626 process respectively. He said section 16 provided Comcast with the option to initiate the renewal process within a specified time period. He indicated that Comcast had notified the MPC in writing ten days before the time period expired of its interest in starting the section 16 process. He reported that since the October 2005 notification staff and Comcast had been unable to reach an agreement on how the section 16 process should commence. He referred to a February 1, 2006, letter from Comcast, which illustrated the problems with starting the renewal process and lead staff to conclude that the 626 process should be used instead. He recommended passage of the revised resolution so that the federal renewal process could be used.

In response to a question from Mr. Green, Mr. Mecham said that the section 16 process required that Comcast submit information demonstrating compliance with the franchise to the MPC for analysis to determine whether there had been compliance. He said that none of that information had been submitted by Comcast. He said it was now three months after the renewal process should have been finished and it was not yet started.

Bob Schroeter, Comcast Government Affairs Manager, asserted that Comcast had a different perspective on the process. He agreed that Comcast began the process in October 2005 with written notification of its intent and provided information that indicated in Comcast’s opinion it was in compliance with the franchise. He reviewed the renewal provisions of the agreement and said that there was a dispute between Comcast and MPC staff on whether the process was properly begun, which was why Comcast was requesting a definitive response from the MPC on whether the section 16 process could proceed. He referred to correspondence to and from Comcast and felt that halting the section 16 process would be a

mistake. He asked that the MPC agree that the process had been started and extend the period for an additional six months during which Comcast would provide, upon formal request, any and all information relevant to the issues upon the MPC's review. He said that Comcast also had to objection to the MPC taking no action and requesting staff to continue discussions.

Mr. Dwyer compared the situation to filing a notice of appeal, followed by a brief, within specified timeframes. He said that filing the appeal did not necessarily mean that the appellant had complied with remaining provisions. He said the 626 process did not shut anything down, it only diverted to another process. He said that obtaining information from Comcast was always confrontational and at the last minute and since there was to compliance with section 16, the 626 process would be invoked.

Mr. Schroeter reiterated that Comcast believed it had successfully and appropriately triggered the section 16 process.

Mr. Dwyer asked if staff from the three jurisdictions felt there had been substantial compliance with section 16 provisions. Staff from Lane County, Springfield and Eugene unanimously replied that there had not been compliance.

Mr. Kelly emphasized the importance of cable as a public utility and the need to carefully conduct the renewal process. He said that the Comcast materials submitted in the section 16 process asserted compliance but did not provide evidence of it. He would support staff's recommendation to use the 626 process.

Mr. Dwyer, seconded by Ms. Piercy, moved to adopt Resolution 2006-2 authorizing further discussions concerning Section 16(2)(F) of the franchises and setting conditions for those discussions. The motion passed unanimously, 6:0; Lane County, Springfield and Eugene representatives voting.

## **METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO) ISSUES**

### **Report from the MPO Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)**

Mr. Green explained that a written report from the CAC was not included in the packet because its meeting schedule conflicted with the mailing deadline for agenda materials, however a written report had been distributed to the MPC at the beginning of its meeting.

Ms. Wiederhold confirmed that the CAC's meeting schedule, while it did not allow for a written report to be included in the MPC's agenda packet, was the only one that worked for all CAC members. She said the CAC decided at its January 2006 to focus the February and March meetings on a review of the Public Involvement Plan (PIP). She said the February meeting was a very productive discussion of the PIP and the evaluation component of the PIP and the Citizen Guide would be reviewed at the March meeting.

Mr. Green added that the CAC members in attendance at the meetings were very engaged and provided thoughtful suggestions regarding public involvement in transportation planning. He said they brought a helpful variety of perspectives to the process.

Ms. Piercy asked if the CAC bylaws included an attendance requirement. Ms. Wiederhold replied that it did and attendance had not been a problem for current members.

Mr. Green announced that the March 2006 meeting would mark the one year anniversary of the CAC.

Ms. Wiederhold said that recruitment materials had been finalized and recruitment efforts would commence shortly. She reviewed the various recruitment strategies that would be used.

### **Amendments to FY05-07 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP)**

Mr. Thompson stated that the resolution would amend the MTIP to incorporate a \$3,000,000 federal appropriation for the Interstate 5 interchange at Coburg. He noted that an updated table of projects indicating ones that still required action had been distributed. He said that once action on the I-5 interchange amendment was taken only one project requiring action prior to June 2006 remained on the list.

Mr. Dwyer, seconded by Ms. Ballew, moved to adopt Resolution 2006-3 amending the Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization FY2005-2007 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program. The motion passed unanimously, 10:0.

Mr. Dwyer left the meeting at 12 p.m.

### **ConnectOregon Applications Status**

Mr. Schwetz stated that the MPC was being asked to approve letters of endorsement, copies of which were included in the agenda packet, for three ConnectOregon applications:

- Eugene Airport Air Cargo Facilities Improvements
- Eugene Depot platform and vehicular improvements
- Lane Transit District Pioneer Parkway bus rapid transit (BRT)

Ms. Ballew announced that the City of Springfield had endorsed the applications and was co-sponsoring the Lane Transit District application.

Mr. Kelly said the City of Eugene supported the Eugene Airport and Eugene Depot applications.

Mr. Papé asked if the applications had been prioritized. He suggested that the Eugene Airport application include information on resources generated from the facility's freight users. Mr. Noble said that there were no contracts with small package carriers and the application in part would accomplish that with a distribution facility. He said that currently the airport charged a landing fee based on aircraft weight.

There was a general discussion of the difficulty of prioritizing the applications at the MPC level as they would go through a series of prioritization processes at the stakeholder and area commission levels and while supported by the MPC, were being submitted by separate jurisdictions. The applications also represented three different modes and were not directly competing against each other for priority.

Mr. Schwetz suggested that once the applications had been prioritized with applications from across the state the MPC could consider a strategic prioritization of them.

Ms. Piercy, seconded by Ms. Ban, moved to authorize the MPC chair to sign the letters of endorsement for the ConnectOregon applications. The motion passed unanimously, 9:0.

### **United Front Support Request**

Ms. Volta asked the MPC to direct staff to draft general letters of support for the United Front lobbying efforts on behalf of various projects. She said the United Front team was leaving for Washington D.C. in two weeks.

Mr. Kelly expressed concern because he did not know which projects were on the United Front's list.

Ms. Volta suggested that a list of projects and draft letters could be emailed to MPC members for approval.

Mr. Carlson explained that the book containing a list of United Front projects had been completed and would be available shortly for distribution.

Mr. Green determined there was consensus to distribute the United Front information to MPC members who would vote electronically on authorizing the MPC chair to sign letters of endorsement.

Mr. Leiken left the meeting at 12:15 p.m.

### **Status Report on the West Eugene Parkway (WEP) Collaborative Process**

Ms. Piercy reported that a group of MPC representatives had met to develop selection criteria for a facilitator for the collaborative process. She said that criteria included a person with transportation, environmental and conflict resolution expertise, no interaction whatsoever with the WEP and not from Oregon. She said the group would meet again on February 18, 2006, to review applications from prospective facilitators.

Mr. Van Vactor asked if his understanding was correct that the scope of the process had changed and was now narrower and would consist of an assessment rather than collaboration or mediation.

Ms. Piercy said the Eugene City Council had decided that it wanted to see the results of the assessment before taking the next step. She said the door was still open on the other side of the assessment with respect to next steps.

Mr. Kelly added that the collaborative process had multiple steps and the assessment would help determine the appropriate next steps.

## Report on the Update of the Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP)

Ms. Gassaway, OTP co-manager, distributed copies of the *Draft Oregon Transportation Plan Executive Summary* and the *Public Review Draft: Oregon Transportation Plan* and gave a presentation on the plan update process. She said the OTP was a 25-year statewide multimodal plan that addressed State and local public and private transportation systems, established umbrella goals, policies and strategies for local transportation plan, and identified needs, strategies and key initiatives. She reviewed the challenges and opportunities to be addressed in the plan and listed the policy themes:

- Goal 1: Mobility and accessibility
- Goal 2: Manage system
- Goal 3: Economic vitality
- Goal 4: Sustainability
- Goal 5: Increase safety and security
- Goal 6: Create funding structure
- Goal 7: Coordination, communication and cooperation

Ms. Curtis explained the policy analysis process and the various OTP scenarios that were examined by the steering committee. She said review began with the reference scenario that began with funding based on an assumption of \$0.01 increase per year in the gas tax and a \$15 increase in registration fees on an eight-year cycle, with the registration fees devoted to modernization and the \$0.01 increase devoted to maintenance, preservation and operation. She said a scenario in which revenue remained flat resulted in a fairly swift deterioration of the transportation system. She said a scenario that invested in major improvements, defined as adding a lane both way on Interstate 5 between Portland and Eugene and an additional lane on Interstate 205 resulted in most effective management of the system. She said the steering committee considered the plan principles of accessibility and mobility, economic development, equity, safety and sustainability in developing investment strategies. She identified three investment strategy levels:

- Investment Strategy Level 1: \$2.15 billion (maintain as well as possible)
- Investment Strategy Level 2: \$2.68 billion (preserve existing infrastructure and services)
- Investment Strategy Level 3: \$3.45 billion (add and expand facilities)

Ms. Curtis said that Level 2 represented the reference scenario and included Oregon Transportation Investment Act (OTIA) funds but availability of OTIA funds would decrease in 2008 when payback of the OTIA bonds began. She invited feedback on the potential investment strategies from individuals, jurisdictions and the region.

Ms. Volta left the meeting at 12:45 p.m.

Mr. Kelly observed that the plan did not include any mechanisms for measuring or tracking success in achieving goals or implementing policies.

Ms. Ballew noted that it was unlikely there would be sufficient revenue in the future to maintain the system without changes, but there was also the issue of cost. She asked at what point was the cost of projects too high. Ms. Gassaway said that the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) reviewed project costs across the state and tried to identify disparities.

Mr. Schwetz, who had participated on the steering committee, commented that the plan would seek to address an unprecedented change, complex interrelationships of issues and a tremendous amount of uncertainty. He said one of the best outcomes of the plan update was the beginning of a more urgent collective dialogue around how to address those bigger issues.

Ms. Piercy expressed appreciation for the goals and strategies to address finite resources. She asked how that translated into the decision-making about higher up front costs but savings over the long-term and conflicts with the current goals. Ms. Gassaway said that was part of the discussion of what were strategic investments. Ms. Curtis added that sustainability was also a part of that discussion. She said that the OTP would also have an implementation plan.

Mr. Gaydos thanked the steering committee for the numerous references to mass transit, but noted that corridor enhancement was missing. He said that both light rail and bus rapid transit enhanced and made more efficient use of existing corridors by moving more people through the same space.

Ms. Lee pointed out that criteria for selection of projects were directly tied to the OTP and the ability to meet plan goals.

Mr. Schwetz asked if the MPC wanted to provide a letter of comment from the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). He said a final draft was being prepared for presentation to the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) and there would be another opportunity to comment on that final draft as well. He said if there were major issues the MPO wanted to see addressed in the final draft this would be the time to make to comments. He said ODOT was willing to have staff forward collectively any comments from members made by March 1 and staff would prepare a draft letter from the MPC incorporation those comments for consideration at its March meeting.

Mr. Green determined there was consensus to accept Mr. Schwetz's suggestion.

Mr. Kelly asked that staff clarify that any comments submitted by March 1, 2006, were the comments of individual MPC members and did not reflect the position of the committee.

### **Report on the Integration of Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Transportation System Plan(s) (TSP)**

Mr. Kelly suggested that the integration of plans be deferred to the March meeting to allow more time for discussion.

Mr. Van Vactor asked that the March discussion include information about the cost and timeline for integration.

Mr. Green agreed that the item would be deferred to the March meeting and staff would provide the additional cost and timeline information.

### **Oregon MPO Consortium Meeting**

Mr. Schwetz stated that copies of the agenda for the February 24-25, 2006, meeting in Central Point had been distributed to MPC members. He said that Ms. Ballew would be attending as the MPC's

representative and asked other members who wished to attend to let him know so that arrangements could be made. He reported that Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) had agreed to develop a website for the consortium and had purchased the domain name OMPOC.org. He said a rudimentary site with meeting information was available.

### **Oregon Department of Transportation Update**

Ms. Lee distributed maps of OTIA bridge projects in ODOT regions 2 and 3 that would be constructed during the next three to five years. She said that 20 bridge projects were currently under construction in Lane County, 19 would be added in 2006 and 29 would be added in 2007. She said a bridge project typically took two to three years to complete. She noted that the Olympic Trials would occur in 2008 and there would still be about 40 bridges under construction in Lane County.

Mr. Schwetz remarked that the group that had successfully managed traffic mitigation on the Interstate 105 project would be reconvened to address coordination of efforts.

In response to a question from Mr. Kelly, Ms. Lee said that ODOT would be meeting with each of the city councils and the County individually to discuss the I-5/Franklin Boulevard interchange and planned a presentation to the MPC at its March meeting.

Mr. Papé said as a result of community meetings it appeared the interchange project was more complex in terms of its acceptability than initially expected and further discussion with the County and local jurisdictions was necessary.

### **Interstate 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary**

Mr. Schwetz said the agenda materials had been miscopied and would be redistributed for the March meeting and were also available on the LCOG website.

### **MPO Calendar**

There were no questions or comments.

Mr. Thompson announced that the next two meetings would also be held at the Springfield Library meeting room.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:20 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)