

MINUTES

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

March 8, 2007
11:30 a.m.

PRESENT: Kitty Piercy, Chair; Alan Zelenka (City of Eugene), Bill Dwyer (Lane County), Anne Ballew, Sid Leiken (City of Springfield), Susan Ban, Gerry Gaydos (Lane Transit District), Judy Volta (City of Coburg), Jane Lee (Oregon Department of Transportation), members; Dennis Taylor (City of Eugene), Mark Pangborn (Lane Transit District), *ex officio* members.

Byron Vanderpool, Ann Mortenson, Kathi Wiederhold, Susan Payne, Paul Thompson (Lane Council of Governments); Ed Moore, Joe Harwood (Oregon Department of Transportation), Tom Boyatt, Len Goodwin, Greg Mott, Mike Harman (City of Springfield), Mark Schoening, Kurt Corey, Chris Henry (City of Eugene), Tom Schwetz, Anita Yap, Connie Bloom Williams (Lane Transit District), Tom Stinchfield (Lane County) David Sonnichsen, Philip Farrington, Carleen Reilly, guests.

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Ms. Piercy called the meeting to order. She welcomed committee members, staff and guests. Those present introduced themselves.

APPROVE FEBRUARY 8, 2007, MINUTES

Mr. Gaydos, seconded by Ms. Ballew, moved to approve the February 8, 2007, meeting minutes as submitted. The motion passed unanimously, 9:0.

COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Ms. Piercy determined there was no one wishing to speak.

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO) ISSUES

Report from the MPO Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)

Ms. Wiederhold announced that CAC member Dan Egan had resigned and that the recruitment process for new committee members had begun. She said Mr. Egan was one of the original committee members and had made valuable contributions during his term. She acknowledged CAC member Philip Farrington, who was in the audience.

Ms. Wiederhold reported that the committee had decided at its March 7 meeting to accept its officers' recommendation to narrow its focus on four key items, at least for the next several months. She said those items were implementing the Public Participation Plan (PPP), the current Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update, producing the Citizen's Guide and providing input for the next RTP update. She said the committee had struggled with how to interest the public in the current RTP update, which was limited in scope. She said one of the suggestions was to combine the public workshops on the RTP update with something else, such as the City of Eugene and/or Lane Transit District (LTD) workshops on the West 11th Avenue corridor. She said several other strategies were discussed and were described in greater detail in her written report and the meeting minutes.

Ms. Piercy apologized to the committee for her inability to attend its meetings.

Programming Surface Transportation Program-Urban (STP-U) Funds for FY07-09 Preservation, Modernization and Project Development

Mr. Thompson stated that the MPC had reviewed a draft proposal and held a public hearing at its February 8, 2007, meeting. He said no public comments were received, with the exception of those made during the hearing. He said the Transportation Planning Committee (TPC) unanimously recommended approval and programming of STP-U funds for the six projects listed in the proposal. He requested adoption of the resolution.

Mr. Dwyer, seconded by Ms. Volta, moved to approve Resolution 2007-02 amending the Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization FY2006-2009 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program. The motion passed unanimously, 9:0.

Amendments to Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP)

Mr. Thompson said the resolution would adopt two amendments to the current MTIP. He said that one of the amendments was cancellation of a Springfield project and the other was addition of a Lane County project. He said details of the amendments were provided in the agenda packet.

Mr. Dwyer, seconded by Mr. Gaydos, moved to approve Resolution 2007-03 adopting amendments to the FY06-09 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program. The motion passed unanimously, 9:0.

FY2010-2013 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Criteria and Factors

Mr. Thompson said that consideration of project eligibility criteria and prioritization factors was the beginning of the 2010-2013 STIP process. He reviewed the development schedule and said that the MPC would be asked to address components of the STIP at several points in the timeline. He reviewed proposed changes to the criteria and factors and highlighted some of the changes that staff felt required some discussion and feedback from the MPC, including increased emphasis on freight considerations.

Ms. Piercy agreed that freight and its impact on roadways was important but it should not be more important than other forms of transportation like bicycles. Mr. Thompson replied that the STIP contained

many separate programs, such as bikes and pedestrians, safety and bridges. He said the MPC was reviewing criteria and factors for the program related to development and modernization projects on the State roadway system. He clarified that the increased emphasis on freight would apply to segments of the State system that were classified as freight routes.

Mr. Thompson pointed out another change that would require ODOT regions to go back and assess prior STIP projects before they were included again in the next STIP. He said that change reflected the fact that it could take many years to develop a STIP project and ODOT wanted to assure that before it went into the construction portion of the STIP information was still current and relevant and the project assessment was still favorable to build it. In response to a question from Ms. Volta, he said that the impetus for that requirement had come from the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC).

Ms. Volta expressed concern about incurring additional costs to reexamine a project for which the need had already been determined and funding allocated.

Ms. Lee commented that there were examples of projects that were not sufficiently funded initially and a reexamination would have identified that problem and determined that either the project should be cancelled or scaled back. She felt the requirement was intended to make a region more accountable for including only projects that could be funded.

Mr. Thompson said the third change of note was the addition of “leveraging other funds and public benefits” to project factors and criteria. He said there was concern with the elevation of match to a formal criterion.

Ms. Ballew said that requiring a cash match instead of allowing other forms of contribution could be very difficult for some jurisdictions.

Mr. Thompson said the criterion listed several forms of contributions, including cash or provision of right-of-way. He said recently there had been requests from ODOT for not only local cash match for projects but other local contributions such as local improvements to the system that would support the State project.

Mr. Leiken said that the concern had been raised at earlier MPC meetings because of the uncertainty about Lane County’s ability to continue to partner with local jurisdictions on cash match. He thought match should also be allowed in the form of support from local systems to improve safety or traffic flow of a State project. He hoped the OTC would seriously consider those opportunities and not insist on a cash match. He cautioned that those counties that depended on federal timber revenue might not be able to contribute to a cash match in the future and there should be a discussion about how that would affect implementation of the proposed change. He said of particular concern was the impact on jurisdictions’ ready-to-go projects.

Mr. Dwyer said it appeared that the federal funding for counties in the form of the Secure Rural Schools Act would be extended for one year.

Ms. Piercy asked if the MPC wished to communicate its concerns about the match requirement and loss of federal funds to the OTC and ODOT.

Ms. Volta suggested researching how other areas in the country met match requirements.

Ms. Piercy pointed out that Lane County did not have representation on the STIP stakeholder committee.

Mr. Leiken recommended contacting Representative Terry Beyer, chair of the House Transportation Committee, for assistance on that issue.

Mr. Vanderpool asked for clarification on the content and distribution of the letter to be drafted.

Mr. Dwyer suggested drafting a letter to the Lane County legislative delegation and the chair of the Senate Transportation committee stating that the second largest metropolitan area in the State did not have a seat at the table and asking that ODOT be required to invite the MPO to participate.

Ms. Lee recommended an initial letter to Jerri Bohard, Transportation Development Division administrator, requesting STIP stakeholder membership and providing copies of the letter to the legislative delegation.

Mr. Gaydos pointed out that there were no criteria related to transit and transportation demand management (TDM).

Ms. Piercy summarized that two letters would be drafted: one commenting on the STIP project criteria and factors and one requesting membership for the Central Lane MPO on the STIP stakeholder group.

Ms. Lee said that she was supportive of the request to be on the stakeholder group.

Proposed Modifications to ODOT RTP Roadway Project Lists for 2031 Update

Mr. Thompson explained that the RTP update would address several issues, but primarily was being done to maintain a 20-year horizon for the plan and to address new federal regulations and requirements, including environmental issues. He said the update necessitated revisiting the constrained and illustrative project lists. He said the five jurisdictions had provided changes to the project lists, most of which, with the exception of ODOT, were minor in nature. He said that ODOT's changes were of a greater magnitude because the West Eugene Parkway (WEP) was no longer a viable project. He said that elimination of the WEP would free anticipated revenue for other projects. He said the agenda packet contained the first straw proposal for ODOT roadway projects. He reviewed a color-coded list that identified the WEP components that would be removed from the constrained project list, the current projects that would remain and projects to be moved from the illustrative to the constrained list.

Responding to a question from Ms. Volta, Mr. Thompson explained that the list had a 20-year horizon and removing the WEP had immediately freed \$17 million of funds already previously programmed for the WEP, which was being programmed for other projects around the state. He said the approximately \$150 million of additional funding that was anticipated to fund the WEP in the future would still be available for other projects over the 20-year horizon.

Mr. Dwyer asked what was planned for the Highway 126 corridor from Greenhill Road west to Veneta. He noted there was rapid development in that area and corridor improvements should be on a project list. Mr. Vanderpool pointed out that the MPO was only programming projects that were within the MPO boundary; the Highway 126 corridor west of Greenhill Road was outside of the MPO's boundary.

Mr. Schoening said there should be a study of the gap between Roosevelt Boulevard and West 11th Avenue on the constrained list and a project on the illustrative list to construct improvements in that area. Mr.

Thompson said that adding those should not pose a problem.

Draft FY08 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Mr. Thompson stated that the MPO was required to provide an annual outline of its work program for the fiscal year and list all of the transportation planning activities that would be occurring within the MPO boundary during that period. He said ODOT and the U.S. Department of Transportation had reviewed the draft and there were some changes as a result, although nothing had been substantially changed. He said that an updated draft would be available for public comment on March 14, 2007. He said the document would come before the MPC for adoption at its April meeting.

Follow-up and MPO Calendar

ODOT Update

Ms. Lee reported that she had begun posting OTC, legislative update and other relevant information on the Area 5 website and would email that link to MPC members whenever new information was added. She said that anyone wishing to be added to that email list could contact her or Joe Harwood.

Ms. Ballew said there was an interesting presentation at the March 7 Freight Advisory Committee meeting on diverging diamond interchanges. She said it was a new design and suggested the MPC might want to schedule a presentation.

MPO Dispute Resolution Process

Mr. Vanderpool announced that a joint meeting with the Lane Council of Governments Executive Committee was scheduled for March 20 at 5:30 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)