

MINUTES

Metropolitan Policy Committee
Eugene Public Library—Bascom-Tykeson Room—100 West 10th Avenue
Eugene, Oregon

March 13, 2008
11:30 a.m.

PRESENT: Sid Leiken, Chair; Anne Ballew (City of Springfield), Bobby Green (Lane County), Kitty Piercy, Alan Zelenka (City of Eugene); John Thiel (City of Coburg); Greg Evans, Mike Dubick (Lane Transit District), Sonny Chickering, Erik Havig (Oregon Department of Transportation), members; Gino Grimaldi (City of Springfield), Mark Pangborn (Lane Transit District), Don Schuessler (City of Coburg), Scott Luell (City of Eugene), *ex officio* members.

George Kloeppe, Kathi Wiederhold, Petra Schuetz, Byron Vanderpool, Ann Mortenson, Susan Payne, Jamon Kent (Lane Council of Governments); Travis Brouwer (Oregon Department of Transportation); Greg Mott, Len Goodwin, Dan Brown, Tom Boyatt (City of Springfield), Tom Schwetz (Lane Transit District); Kurt Yeiter, Rob Inerfeld (City of Eugene).

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Those present introduced themselves.

CALL TO ORDER/APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 14, 2008, MINUTES

Mr. Leiken called for approval of the minutes.

Mr. Green, seconded by Ms. Piercy, moved to approve the minutes of February 14, 2008, as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Rob Hallyburton, Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) Operations Manager, spoke to the regional -Transportation System Plan, and said he was present to make sure the MPC knew the DLCD thought it an important issue for the region. DLCD staff had been working with LCOG staff on the plan and he thought there were still several issues to be worked through. He assured the committee DLCD would be working with local staff on those issues as they moved forward.

Rob Zako, 1280 B East 22nd Avenue, recalled his past testimony regarding visions and his support of Mr. Pangborn's vision of doubling transit ridership in the area. He quoted from an op-ed article authored by Mr. Leiken, Jim Torrey, and Rick Metzger calling for a single vision and one voice regarding community transportation issues. Mr. Zako asserted that he endorsed that approach. He said visioning looked to the future and predicted what it looked like, but the future was cloudy. He referred the MPC to a recent news story about the high price of gas, and suggested that had such high gas prices been foreseen past plans might be different. He said it was possible gas prices could double again in another four years. Mr. Zako

said that vision was not just about what “we” want to do, but about trying to see into the future, what the challenges were, and how “we” met those challenges. He asked the committee to consider community values as embodied by those without transportation choices, vision as it regarded the type of community “we” wanted to have in the face of rising gas prices as automobiles might not be the first modal choice for all residents, and variety in the form of diversity of investment.

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ISSUES

Evaluation and Report on TransPlan Alternative Measures

Ms. Payne provided a report on the results to date, copies of which were provided to members and were available on the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) Web site. Members asked questions clarifying the data provided in the report.

Ms. Piercy wanted to know if the MPC could revisit the priority bicycle project list. Mr. Inerfeld indicated staff would investigate that possibility.

Ms. Piercy also wanted to know if the MPC could revisit the benchmarks provided and approved by the DLCDD. Mr. Vanderpool suggested the issue for the committee to consider was where the MPC took the information from here. He thought some of the next steps might be more obvious than others. Mr. Vanderpool said the evaluation was a high level look to get a feel as to how the region was going, and it had not been thoroughly discussed by the jurisdictions’ staff or ODOT.

Ms. Piercy said she wanted to know how LCOG used the data to indicate the community was reducing its automobile usage, and to connect that to CO2 emissions and other things the community was trying to accomplish. If the data did not provide what the region needed, she wanted something different.

Mr. Zelenka observed that the region was directed to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT), which was a proxy for reductions in emissions and congestion. He suggested that perhaps the community should measure congestion and emissions as well. Ms. Payne suggested the region’s nodal strategy, when implemented, would have an impact on VMT over time. She believed that in the presence of that strategy, the numbers for emissions and congestion would improve.

Mr. Zelenka thought if the region was to redo TransPlan, it should redo the evaluation, and asked if that was a requirement. Mr. Inerfeld suggested that was related to the next discussion.

Status of Local Land Use and Planning Processes

Mr. Inerfeld, Transportation Planning Manager for the City of Eugene, and Mr. Mott, Planning Manager for the City of Springfield, joined the MPC for the item. Mr. Mott said an issue that continually came up but was never resolved was the relationship between the actions taken by the MPC and the acts adopted by the three local general government jurisdictions. There was clearly overlap and a need for consistency between planning documents. He recalled that the MPC had adopted an update to the RTP that included a number of projects, new population projections, and planning horizons that in turn triggered the need for evaluation of the Transportation System Plan (TSP), or TransPlan, for consistency. The three local jurisdictions were obliged to ensure that their planning documents were consistent with TransPlan. The MPC had the option of making a finding that indicated its TSP and RTP were consistent, or could amend the TSP to make it consistent. Mr. Mott said the rule was fairly recent and he was unsure that any other MPO ever had to implement it. In addition, he pointed out, the region needed to implement the provisions

of House Bill (HB) 3337. He characterized the situation as a “perfect storm.”

Mr. Mott suggested that in order to un-complicate the matter, the MPC consider TransPlan as a transitional document that would be converted into something else. He acknowledged that the MPC had suggested TransPlan could be updated, but the extent of that update had not been decided, and staff could not presume that. The elected officials of the three jurisdictions would decide what happened. Mr. Mott said staff hoped that Oregon Department of Transportation and the DLCDC found that an acceptable approach. Staff would return to the Joint Elected Officials at a meeting in May 2008 to explain how it thought it could create a work program to accomplish the new iteration of the Metro Plan as a result of the passage of HB 3337 and how transportation planning infrastructure documents would have to change as well.

Mr. Inerfeld referred the MPC to page 2 of Attachment 1, *Eugene, Lane County, Springfield Summary of Anticipated Coordinated Transportation and Land Use Planning* and indicated it reflected what would be discussed the following day with DLCDC and ODOT.

Mr. Evans suggested a dialogue about Lane Transit District’s (LTD) role as the transit authority and how it fit into long-range transportation planning should occur. Mr. Leiken said that dialogue was occurring at the State level, and the strategy envisioned was a multi-modal approach. Transit was a very significant element of that and close to the top of the list. Local officials participating in that process were attempting to look out for the interests of Lane County. He said there were limited dollars available for transportation and LTD had access to federal dollars other agencies did not. If LTD could leverage those dollars, the region could put forth a comprehensive transportation strategy. He reiterated that transit was clearly near the top of the conversation and he believed the local area needed to have that same conversation as that occurring at the State level as the TransPlan update moved forward.

Mr. Mott said that the local jurisdictions worked very closely with LTD as both cities’ land use was impacted along transit corridors. Mr. Inerfeld added that transit was woven into the TSP and he expected that to continue.

Mr. Evans said that his concern was more focused on the local planning process, which facilitated residential and commercial development. It was not until the end of the development process that transit needs were considered. The community lacked a transit-friendly infrastructure in north and west Eugene to provide interconnectivity and to allow people to reach transit lines from where they were living. It was his personal perception that the community had made more plans to support single-occupancy vehicles than it had to “put” more people into buses and onto alternative modes.

Mr. Schwetz confirmed that LTD staff was involved in the discussions of transit and transportation that were going on.

Mr. Zelenka appreciated the integration of transportation and planning as it helped him understand the issues better. He thought the requirement for both a federal and State plan was redundant and asked if staff envisioned a dual purpose plan that met the requirements of both levels of government. Mr. Mott suggested that was what the State was attempting to do with its changes to the transportation planning rule (TPR). With respect to a new planning document, he believed that would be a new reality as soon as the community could get a notion of the purposes of and relationships between the regional and local plans. He said the region may have to figure out the relationships between three different plans. The federal requirements stipulate frequent updates to State plans for a 20-year rolling planning horizon; the same was not true of the State plan. He said a coordinated process was one benefit that might result from a single

plan.

Ms. Piercy was pleased to see a timeline for how the MPC would proceed and acknowledged the high level of planning activities currently underway, including the work of the West Eugene Collaborative, which was discussing the role of transit in west Eugene. She did not think the community could reduce its carbon emissions unless transit played a larger role. She asked if there was a way to speed up the process.

Ms. Ballew thought staff had developed a reasonable plan for moving forward. She suggested the MPC confirm its support of the staff recommendation.

Ms. Ballew, seconded by Mr. Zelenka, moved to confirm the MPC's support of the staff recommendation.

Mr. Havig emphasized the importance of coordination to the State and said the staff meeting would be very important. He said that ODOT and LCDC had concerns about the proposed work plan and he thought there were issues that needed to be worked out, and he looked forward to the conversations between State and local staff. He said that other regions were experiencing the same issues. Mr. Havig said that only Salem-Keizer was the only community he was aware of with a coordinated plan; that had been a choice, not a requirement. He believed it was important to keep the issues involved as local priorities for both the elected officials and staff. He also believed that the MPC had a role to play, and suggested that local goals and values would have an impact on the final product.

Mr. Pangborn said that the LTD was interested in knowing its role. Mr. Leiken suggested that would be clearer after the staff discussion.

Mr. Leiken said that the MPC frequently heard that TransPlan should be a living, breathing document, and it was not; it was set in stone. He did not think the community had anticipated the growth that would occur in Veneta, Creswell, and Junction City, but those communities were not part of the conversation. The MPC talked about reducing VMT and might actually be doing so locally, but residents from the smaller communities were driving 40 miles a day to reach their jobs in Eugene-Springfield. He did not think that resulted in a reduction of VMT. Mr. Leiken welcomed the "words of wisdom" from the State on those issues.

Mr. Leiken was pleased to hear ODOT talking about partnerships, which would be critical to the success of the process. He emphasized how quickly things could change. Mr. Leiken looked forward to staff moving on some of the issues during its meetings with the State.

Mr. Vanderpool encouraged the MPC to postpone action on the motion until the State and local staffs had a chance to meet.

Ms. Ballew said even if the MPC supported the approach, she anticipated each jurisdiction would discuss the subject for individual action.

Mr. Green suggested that any action taken by the MPC should be more refined.

Ms. Ballew withdrew her motion. Mr. Zelenka withdrew his second.

Mr. Evans asserted that the federal government was discussing a revision of the MPO structure to give

transit representatives a more prominent role, under pressure from transit representatives who wanted to see a “different conversation” happening.

MPO ISSUES

Report from the Metropolitan Planning Organization Citizen Advisory Committee

Ms. Wiederhold referred the MPC to the report in the packet regarding the work of the Metropolitan Planning Organization Citizen Advisory Committee (MPO CAC) and briefly summarized its contents.

Appointment of Citizen Advisory Committee Members

Ms. Wiederhold said the CAC had been reduced to 11 members due to attrition. She reviewed the members recommended for appointment to the committee.

Ms. Piercy, seconded by Mr. Green, moved to accept the nominations for membership on the MPO CAC. The motion passed unanimously.

ODOT Region 2 FY10-13 STIP Modernization Straw Proposal

Ms. Payne reviewed the staff report and requested the MPC take action to approve a letter responding to ODOT on the straw proposal for 2010-13 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) modernization funding.

Mr. Leiken disclosed that a family business partner owned a piece of property in Coburg and he had a financial interest with that individual. He said he would recuse himself as that property could potentially benefit from a Coburg interchange.

Mr. Green assumed the chair for the remainder of the item. He expressed appreciation that the Coburg interchange needs had been addressed.

Mr. Vanderpool suggested that Mr. Green sign the transmittal letter to ODOT. There was no objection.

Responding to a question from Mr. Thiel, Mr. Chickering said the Coburg Interchange Phase 1 improvements would be constructed on the west side of I-5. He said that \$1.6 million would allow ODOT to complete the necessary access controls on the east side and some property acquisition.

Mr. Zelenka, seconded by Mr. Dubick, moved to accept the staff recommendation. The motion passed unanimously.

Televising MPC Meetings

Mr. Vanderpool reminded the MPC that not everything it did was done in its role as MPO, so the federal money the MPO received could not pay for the entire cost of televising and Web casting MPC meetings. He reviewed the proposed cost breakdown. Mr. Vanderpool recommended that the funding split be revisited in the future. He noted the MPO CAC’s support for the proposal.

Mr. Green asked why LTD and the City of Coburg were not asked to contribute to the costs of televising and Web casting meetings. Mr. Vanderpool attributed it to the fact that the MPC when not acting as the MPO, did not include LTD and Coburg.

Mr. Green noted Lane County's budgetary problems and said it might be possible that Lane County would not be able to support the cost in the future.

Ms. Piercy supported the recommendation and suggested that the MPC await the outcome of the Lane County budget situation and address the funding split at that time. Mr. Green agreed. He said that Lane County wanted to participate if possible given the importance of public input.

Ms. Piercy, seconded by Mr. Green, moved to approve the staff recommendation. The motion passed, 8:1:0; Mr. Thiel abstained from the vote as Coburg would not be participating financially.

Draft FY08-09 Urban Planning Work Program

Mr. Leiken opened the public hearing.

Rob Zako, 1280-B East 12th Avenue, hoped the MPC appreciated that he volunteered his time to attend MPC meetings because otherwise there would be no one offering testimony. He referred to Table 1 of the draft Urban Planning Work Program (UPWP) and advocated for funding to model greenhouse gas emissions, funding for a regional transportation system plan, funding for an integrated land use and transportation plan, and funding for more public involvement that was clear as to what decisions were made being to impel more public involvement. He called for more reporting of greenhouse gas emissions.

There being no other requests to speak, Mr. Leiken closed the public hearing.

Mr. Vanderpool said the UPWP was a key product of the MPC and staff was not asking for approval today. He noted that the plan had been put out for public comment. Staff would return for action in April. The plan had been reviewed by the federal and State governments and some changes had been made as a result. He provided a brief overview of the document.

Mr. Green determined from Mr. Chickering that Delta-Beltline would be a major component of the Beltline study, the funding for which had just been restored to the STIP.

Ms. Piercy emphasized the importance of tracking and modeling emissions. Ms. Payne acknowledged that current modeling was not sufficient in regard to estimating CO₂ but a new model would soon be available that could provide more precise information. Ms. Piercy said the community needed to reduce its transportation-related emissions and the MPC needed a tool that allowed its members to ask effective policy questions.

Mr. Pangborn emphasized the importance of modeling VMTs as well. He said that new CAFE standards for cars would reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but VMT projections ensured that greenhouse gas emissions stayed flat at best.

Ms. Ballew did not want to duplicate any of the work being done by the Lane Regional Air Protection Authority (LRAPA) and encouraged coordination. Mr. Vanderpool said LCOG and LRAPA attempted to support one another and avoid duplication.

ODOT/MPO/LTD Transportation Planning Intergovernmental Agreement

Mr. Vanderpool introduced the draft Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA), calling it a positive step and indicating it did not change anything now in place. It would be forwarded to the LTD Board of Directors for consideration on its March 19 Consent Calendar. He requested approval to execute the document

Mr. Green, seconded by Mr. Evans, moved to approve the document. The motion passed unanimously.

Draft Oregon Transportation Commission Earmark Policy

Mr. Vanderpool called the MPC's attention to a draft policy proposed by the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC). He reported the Lane County Roads Advisory Committee had offered comment on the policy, and Lane County staff was present to answer questions about that if necessary. In addition, the Transportation Planning Committee (TPC) had composed a draft letter for the MPC to send to the OTC. He reviewed the letter, which expressed concerns that the OTC did not solicit input from the six federally designated MPOs in Oregon and that the policy allowed ODOT to determine if a federal earmark secured by a local jurisdiction was counted as the jurisdiction's local project match.

Mr. Brouwer said the OTC was considering the policy to formally clarify expectations about earmarks and to establish a more formal process to elicit input from the stakeholder agencies on earmarks. The OTC wanted to offer input from stakeholders on what regional priorities were to both ODOT and the federal government. The OTC was hoping to take an approach modeled on the local United Front approach used by the governments of Lane County. Mr. Brouwer said the policy did not preclude an agency from requesting a federal earmark for either a State or local project. He assured the MPC that ODOT had no intention to preclude those earmarks.

Mr. Brouwer said he had reviewed the letter drafted by staff and indicated he thought inclusion of the MPOs was a good one and he believed the policy would be revised accordingly. He invited input as to how to do that. He noted that the other issue the letter raised was the earmark as a local contribution. He thought it good for the MPC to take a formal position. Mr. Brouwer said the policy was adopted to ensure that local contributions were leveraged for the transportation system. He said there had been inconsistencies between the regions in regard to the use of earmarks as a local match, so the OTC was seeking consistency. He said that the OTC believed that allowing local agencies to use earmarks as a local match did not meet the intent of leverage and it encouraged everyone to seek federal earmarks, which did not bring additional resources into the state; any money dedicated to earmarks came out of money that would otherwise be allocated to the STIP.

Mr. Brouwer also noted that in regard to the prioritization process, Lane County employed a different system and it was up to Lane County as to whether it wanted to participate in the more formal ODOT participation process or use a different system of more informal collaboration. He said there could be more than one way to collaborate. He invited to share the MPC's concerns with the ODOT director and OTC.

Mr. Leiken asked how many timber-dependent counties were within the Salem region. Mr. Brouwer acknowledged that only Polk County received timber funding. Mr. Leiken said that the past chair of the OTC had assured Lane County that its earmarks would not be counted against it. He also objected that the policy "just appeared"; he realized it was a draft policy but it had certainly caught his attention and raised several issues. He said that the County was not attempting to take money out of the pot of State money,

but it had relied on its lobbying to come up with the match dollars needed for projects. Mr. Leiken reiterated his disappointment the policy had “come out of the blue” and that it was dated November 2007 and only being discussed now with the MPOs.

Mr. Green shared some of the concerns expressed by Mr. Leiken. He suggested the process used to develop the policy was flawed. He said if ODOT really wanted to know what the local governments really thought it would have asked them first rather than dropped a draft policy on them and then asking them their thoughts about it. He recommended that ODOT start over and solicit feedback and ideas from local jurisdictions. He asked what the rush was in establishing the policy given the anticipated lack of future funding.

Mr. Green said that somewhere along the line, the game had changed. He believed that the State was looking to local governments to help subsidize its projects through systems development charge and other funding sources. If local jurisdictions received earmarks, the State considered them on their own. That did not seem like a level playing field to him. Mr. Green was also concerned that the policy seemed to disregard Lane County’s Road Fund deficit. He asked why ODOT would make it more difficult for the jurisdictions to receive money if it really wanted to make projects work. He pointed out the unintended consequence of such a policy on the local economic base.

Mr. Green observed that the OTC would have some vacancies in 2008. He suggested that it was ironic the OTC lacked any representation from the district of Representative Peter DeFazio, who chaired the House Transportation Committee. He urged the elected officials to contact the State about giving the Fourth District that representation.

Ms. Piercy supported the remarks of Mr. Leiken and Mr. Green. She said that there had been long-time omissions of representative from the local area on policy making State bodies. She agreed with the contention that the jurisdictions should have been asked for input earlier. She emphasized that cities were affected by County funding. It was crucial to the region that it be treated with respect and be given full participation at the front end of the conversation.

Ms. Ballew acknowledged the State’s concern about earmarks but said not every jurisdiction was irresponsible in the earmarks they sought. She thought the State was taking a ten pound hammer to a little nail. It appeared to want to preclude the local jurisdictions from contacting their federal representatives for assistance and she suggested it was “stepping on our town’s civil rights.”

Mr. Brouwer invited text changes to the policy. He assured Ms. Ballew that it was not the State’s intent to preclude local jurisdictions from seeking assistance from their Congressional representatives. He did not think the policy was intended to penalize anyone, only to set out rules and responsibilities.

Mr. Evans suggested the draft policy was a sort of “shake down.”

Mr. Green said that the policy conveyed the message that a project not on the OTC’s list would have to be locally funded. Such a project could enhance the State system as well; he cited improvements to the Gateway area as an example. He said if the State was not to be a partner in local transportation projects it would place a greater tax burden on Eugene-Springfield residents than on other state residents.

Mr. Green said that if the issue was a statewide issue, he could see the need for uniformity. However, if the issue was unique to a single area where the locals were “going off campus” and sought a bailout from their Congressional representative, that was different and should be addressed with a policy specific to the

area in question.

Mr. Brouwer believed that the State was seeking to establish consistent statewide policies. He anticipated that the OTC would likely modify the policy to indicate that projects not on the State list would not receive an advance commitment but could still be eligible for State funding once it went through normal processes.

Mr. Dubick, seconded by Ms. Ballew, moved to send the letter drafted by staff to the OTC. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Ballew, seconded by Mr. Evans, moved to extend the meeting five minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

Follow-up and MPO Calendar

1. Follow-up
 - a. ODOT Update

Mr. Chickering noted the current openings on the OTC. He said he had also provided contact information to Mr. Vanderpool about inviting the new OTC members to Eugene-Springfield.

- b. LTD No-Fare Update

Mr. Vanderpool called attention to the update, and anticipated it would be an agenda item on the April agenda.

- c. FY08-11 MTIP Amendments

Ms. Payne announced there were 13 TIP initial amendments proposed by the TPC at its last meeting. She briefly reviewed two new projects and indicated the majority of amendments addressed project “slippage” from one year to another.

2. MPO Calendar

A corrected calendar was provided at the meeting.

The next meeting was scheduled for April 10, 2008, in the Bascom-Tykeson Room at the Eugene Public Library.

Mr. Leiken adjourned the meeting at 1:37 p.m.

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)