

MINUTES

Metropolitan Policy Committee
Lane Transit District Board Room
3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene

March 13, 2003 11:30 a.m.

PRESENT: Bill Dwyer, Chair; Bonny Bettman, Vice Chair; Anne Ballew (for Tammy Fitch), Gerry Gaydos, Gary Papé (for James Torrey), Bobby Green, Ginni Volpert (for Michael Dean), Bob Pirrie, members; Bill Van Vactor, Jim Carlson, Mike Kelly, Mike Hudson, Ken Hamm, Tom Boyatt, *ex officio* members; George Kloeppe, Tom Schwetz, Byron Vanderpool, Tom Schwetz, Paul Thompson, Bud Reiff, Lane Council of Governments; Lisa Gardner, Linda Lynch, Lane Transit District; Jan Childs, David Reinhard, Chris Henry, City of Eugene; Greg Mott, Nick Arnis, Bob Brew, City of Springfield, Tom Stinchfield, Lane County; Rob Zako, Lauri Segel, 1,000 Friends of Oregon, Terry Connelly, Eugene Area Chamber of Commerce; Rob Handy, public.

ABSENT: Sid Leiken, James Torrey, Hillary Wylie, members; Bill Van Vactor, *ex officio* member.

1. CALL TO ORDER/APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 13, 2003, MINUTES

Mr. Dwyer called the meeting of the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) to order.

Ms. Bettman, seconded by Mr. Green, moved to accept the minutes of February 13, 2003, as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Those present introduced themselves.

3. COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Rob Handy, 455-1/2 River Road, referred to the Unified Planning Work Program being considered later in the meeting by the MPC and called for a focus on preservation. He quoted from the Oregon Highway Plan, which called for prioritization of road preservation projects over new capacity projects. He asked the MPC members to keep those thoughts in mind as they considered the work plan.

4. METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO) ISSUES

a. Letter in Support of Springfield Station

Mr. Schwetz distributed copies of a cover memorandum entitled *Letter of Support for Springfield Station Funding* with a draft letter to Representative Peter DeFazio on the reverse. He explained that Lane Transit District had not received all the funding it anticipated for the Springfield Station project, and the Representative DeFazio would like to try to get the projects funded in the new surface transportation bill. Mr. Schwetz requested MPC support for the letter.

Ms. Bettman, seconded by Mr. Gaydos, moved to endorse the letter of support. The motion passed unanimously.

b. Resolution on Designation of Lane Transit District (LTD) as Direct Recipient of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Funding

Mr. Schwetz asked the MPC to take action on a resolution designating LTD as the direct recipient of FTA funding.

Ms. Ballew, seconded by Mr. Gaydos, moved to adopt Resolution 2003-01.

Ms. Bettman confirmed with Mr. Schwetz that the resolution changed the recipient from the Oregon Department of Transportation to LTD. She asked if the resolution precluded the cities from applying for funds. Mr. Hamm explained that the recommended transfer related only to the 5307 formula funds, and it did not preclude the cities for applying for project funds.

Mr. Carlson asked if the dollars would be used throughout the LTD service area or only within the transportation management authority (TMA) area. Mr. Hamm said that they would be added to the operating budget and used throughout the system.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Schwetz indicated the resolution would be forwarded to Governor Ted Kulongoski's office.

c. Transportation Finance—Legislative Status and Options

Mr. Schwetz reported that Victor Dodier of ODOT was unable to attend the meeting because of a conflict in Salem. He said that he had spoken on the telephone that morning to Mr. Dodier, who indicated that a transportation revenue package was beginning to take shape in the legislature.

d. MPC Subcommittee Progress

Mr. Thompson reported that the second meeting of the MPC Subcommittee had occurred on March 6. He said that the subcommittee examined the existing public improvement processes and reviewed a flow chart showing all the local public input processes as they flowed into the

State Transportation Improvement Program. He distributed a large format version of the flow chart to members. Mr. Thompson said that the subcommittee had reviewed four models for public involvement and directed staff to return with some enhancements to the process. He said that among the enhancements mentioned, the subcommittee had discussed adding citizen members to the Transportation Planning Committee (TPC), developing a specific framework for evaluating funding priorities, establishing consistent time lines, and developing policy guidance.

Mr. Thompson reported that staff was working to find a date for the next subcommittee meeting. He anticipated that the MPC would consider the subcommittee's recommendations at its June meeting.

Mr. Green, chair of the subcommittee, agreed that progress was being made and the subcommittee was addressing its charge. He suggested that the community's public involvement program could be a model for other areas. He anticipated a broader MPC discussion of the subcommittee's recommendations.

Ms. Bettman held up the large format version of the flow chart and pointed out the degree to which public input was fragmented now, and said that the subcommittee was hoping to streamline that by increasing the degree of public involvement early in the process. She noted that concern had been raised about the possibility the process would be slowed down, but she believed that if the public involvement was enhanced at those early steps, the community could have ready to go projects and an expedited approach.

Responding to a question from Mr. Dwyer, Mr. Thompson said that staff had looked at public involvement models from other communities, three from Oregon and one from Washington, to see how they were different. He cited the JPAC model in the Portland metro area as an example of where citizens sat on a technical committee similar to the TPC. Mr. Dwyer asked how the citizen members would be selected if such an approach was taken. Mr. Thompson said that the subcommittee had not discussed that subject yet.

Mr. Hudson advocated for inclusion of Coburg's public involvement processes in the flow chart.

Mr. Carlson observed that it was difficult from the flow chart to determine how the STIP priorities were reached. He further pointed out that the STIP projects were State facilities and were not included in the local communities' capital improvement programs. Mr. Thompson said that fact led to the recommendation for a public hearing on the STIP priorities before the MPC.

Mr. Carlson noted that the State frequently gave local communities short time lines to provide input into State highway priorities and indicated appreciation for Ms. Bettman's comments regarding streamlining the public involvement effort. Mr. Green concurred, adding that the State frequently asked the community to comment on policy changes on short notice as well.

Ms. Volpert noted that public hearings were often at inconvenient times and at inconvenient locations, and people often feel that their input was being solicited after a decision had been made. She believed that the earlier involvement being proposed would help avoid that problem.

Ms. Ballew asked the subcommittee to place a dollar figure on the proposal it developed. She believed that there many opportunities for the public to be involved now if the public would “show up.”

Mr. Dwyer believed that many meetings occurred when people could attend, but he concurred about the benefit of earlier involvement.

Mr. Green said that whatever model the MPC adopted, it should pass the ODOT funding test.

e. Overview of FY04 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Mr. Schwetz distributed and reviewed copies of a document entitled *Overview of Federal Requirements for Central Lane MPO Process*.

Mr. Schwetz called the MPC’s attention to the cover memorandum entitled *Item 4d: Unified Planning Work Program Overview*. He reviewed the key issues to be addressed in the fiscal year 2004 UPWP and noted the work items currently on hold.

Mr. Green asked if the federal government had a proscribed public involvement process. Mr. Schwetz said yes, and noted that the federal process called for such things as early public involvement, proactive public involvement, and reasonable citizen access to all technical information. Mr. Green asked if the federal government did all those things. Mr. Schwetz did not think so.

Responding to a question from Mr. Dwyer, Mr. Schwetz clarified that the Lane Regional Air Pollution Authority and the MPO shared responsibilities for overall air quality planning and monitoring, but the MPO is the lead agency for making conformity determinations for carbon monoxide.

Responding to a question from Mr. Papé, Mr. Schwetz clarified that federal planning funds were available only to MPOs.

Responding to a question from Ms. Bettman, Mr. Schwetz confirmed that the MPC’s adoption of the UPWP would constitute a commitment to the budget as well.

Ms. Bettman asked if there was anything in the plan that was not required. Mr. Schwetz indicated that almost all items in the plan were required. Ms. Bettman asked if the Congestion Management Plan was completed. Mr. Schwetz said no, that it would need to be completed as part of the 3-year update.

Ms. Bettman raised an issue on behalf of Eugene Councilor David Kelly, who expressed concern about the age of the household survey. Mr. Reiff indicated that he was a member of the Oregon Modeling Steering Committee, which was looking into the issue and discussing a variety of approaches to the issue. He added that one of the hurdles that was faced was funding. Mr.

Schwetz confirmed, in response to a follow-up question from Ms. Bettman, that if funding was found for an update to the survey the UPWP would be modified with the addition of appropriate work tasks and funding.

Ms. Ballew wanted to see a list of deliverables and associated time lines. Mr. Schwetz responded that the UPWP includes products for each work element to be completed over the course of the fiscal year.

Mr. Schwetz reviewed the funding sources for the UPWP and noted a change to the administration of STP funds used in the UPWP. Whereas STP funds used to flow through ODOT to the MPO, these funds now flow directly to the MPO. He indicated that, as a result of TMA status, the MPO now needs to program the STP funds used in the UPWP in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). In order to have the funds available at the beginning of the fiscal year, a TIP amendment would be needed at the June MPC meeting.

Mr. Schwetz called the MPC's attention to a peer comparison included in the memorandum comparing the Central Lane MPO's costs with the costs of other MPOs. He noted that all the other MPOs surveyed were using STP funds to support the MPO activities.

Mr. Schwetz briefly reviewed the structure of the UPWP.

Mr. Dwyer asked MPC members to e-mail questions about the UPWP to staff. He said that the MPC would take action on the UPWP in April.

f. MPO Calendar & Information Items

- 1) Follow-up
 - (a) OTC Minutes for February 2003

Mr. Thompson distributed copies of the February 12, 2003, minutes of the Oregon Transportation Commission.

- 2) Upcoming MPO-related activities
 - (a) Calendar

Copies of an updated calendar were distributed to members. Mr. Thompson previewed the agendas for April, May, and June.

- (b) TMA Certification Review–Overview and Schedule

Mr. Schwetz called the MPC's attention to the TMA Certification review schedule, noting the memorandum in the meeting packet on the item. He referred MPC members to the elements of the review.

g. Regional Large Project Strategy

Mr. Pirrie reported on a meeting where participants from Region 2, including Mr. Torrey, discussed a large project strategy for the region. He noted that there was only \$20 million allocated to modernization projects, and the region had many competing interests. Participants discussed how they could affect State funding decisions and be supported by the entire region in that effort. He said there was no resolution at this point. Mr. Pirrie noted that the definition of a large project and the equitability of funding distribution were issues. He anticipated there would be another meeting.

Mr. Schwetz noted that the issue of large project funding was critical to the MPO because there were several large unfunded projects and the desire to fund the BRT project.

Mr. Kloepfel anticipated a change in the meeting venue and indicated staff would work to find an adequately sized space.

The meeting adjourned at 1:22 p.m.

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)

Mins_20030313.doc

LCOG: \\CLSRV111\LGS\MPC\AGENDAMINS\MINS_20030313.DOC Last Saved: April 1, 2003