

## MINUTES

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

April 13, 2006  
11:30 a.m.

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

George Kloeppe, Tom Schwetz, Paul Thompson, Kim Hascall, Jamon Kent, Byron Vanderpool, Kathi Wiederhold, Petra Schuetz (Lane Council of Governments); Tom Boyatt, Jeff Scheick, Dean Fuller, Terri Harding (Oregon Department of Transportation), Greg Mott, Nick Arnis, Len Goodwin (City of Springfield), Chris Henry, Lisa Gardner (City of Eugene), Tom Stinchfield (Lane County), Anita Yap, Stefano Viggiano, Bob Ransome (Lane Transit District), Connie Bloom Williams (Commuter Solutions), Rob Handy, Lauri Segel, guests.

### WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Green convened the meeting and welcomed those present. MPC members introduced themselves.

### APPROVE MARCH 9, 2006 MINUTES

Mr. Dwyer, seconded by Ms. Piercy, moved to approve the March 9, 2006, minutes as submitted. The motion passed unanimously, 9:0.

### COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

**Rob Handy**, 455-1/2 River Road, Eugene, referred to a recent article in *The Register Guard* about the West Eugene Parkway and the need for bus rapid transit as a part of that project. He urged Lane Transit District (LTD) to advocate for the inclusion of transit and dedicated transit lanes in highway projects, particularly new highways. He suggested that a representative of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) could participate as an *ex officio* MPC member. He looked forward to learning more about Union Pacific's plans for its rail yard during the ConnectOregon discussion.

**Lauri Segel**, 1192 Lawrence Street, Eugene, commented that the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) was more than a work program; it was also a budget. She said she had spent hours reviewing the document and did not agree with remarks in Section IV. Funding that FY06 funding levels were assumed for all sources at this stage in the development of the FY07 UPWP. She listed several figures that she felt were inconsistent with that statement, including the FHWA-PL total that was \$76,629 more than the FY06

total and the STP total that was \$50,000 more than FY06. She also thought there were discrepancies in the allocation of FTA Section 5305 funds to local jurisdictions and Lane Council of Governments. She said the MPC had not scrutinized the UPWP in the past and did not care about comments from the public.

Mr. Green disagreed with Ms. Segel's remarks about the MPC not caring about public input.

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

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

Mr. Green, as the MPC liaison to the CAC, conveyed a request for the MPC for feedback on what impact recommendations from the CAC had on MPC decision making and how CAC input had been used when making decisions. He said the CAC had also requested more frequent meetings with the MPC.

Ms. Wiederhold reported that the CAC had re-elected Dan Egan and elected former vice chair Sylvia Shaw as co-chairs. She said a vice chair would be elected at the next meeting. She said the review of the Public Involvement Plan (PIP) had been completed and staff was compiling those comments and would work with the CAC to prepare recommendations on the PIP for presentation to the MPC at its June or July 2006 meeting. She indicated that work on the Citizen's Guide was continuing.

Ms. Wiederhold announced that recruitment of new CAC members resulted in 10 applications, which would be reviewed by the recruitment committee and nominations presented to the MPC at its May meeting. She said the recruitment committee consisted of CAC members Dan Egan, Rex Redmon and Sylvia Shaw and MPC members Bobby Green, Anne Ballew and David Kelly.

Mr. Kelly supported more frequent meetings with the CAC. He felt to some extent the CAC was still in start-up mode and there had been limited opportunities for them to comment on major projects, but he found the input provided to date to be useful. He said the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) revision was a key task and the CAC's involvement would be critical.

Ms. Piercy suggested that a way be found to institutionalize feedback to the CAC about how their comments and recommendations are used by the MPC in decision-making. She said the MPC should also consider whether a CAC representative should be an *ex officio* member of MPC.

Mr. Schwetz said that the CAC had provisions for *ex officio* membership on the Transportation Planning Committee (TPC). Mr. Thompson said that a CAC member seldom participated in the TPC meetings, primarily because it was difficult for CAC members to attend daytime meetings.

Mr. Green said the CAC has expressed an interest in having *ex officio* MPC membership and he would take MPC's interest in this back to the next meeting. He commended the CAC for its efforts and interest in determining how effectively it had fulfilled its role.

### **Adopt FY07 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)**

Mr. Schwetz noted that a draft UPWP had been presented to the MPC at its March 2006 meeting and presented to the CAC at its March and April meetings. He said this was the 32<sup>nd</sup> UPWP adopted by the MPO and unlike other documents it was a work program required by the federal government to determine

that the MPO was engaging in tasks that assured compliance with federal requirements. He reviewed the summary of MPO key issues and activities in the UPWP. He said recent passage of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) legislation changed transportation planning requirements in ways that were still being determined. Compliance with changes needs to be accomplished by July 1, 2007. Regarding earlier comments about discrepancies between the FY06 and FY07 budgets, he said that the FY06 budget was amended when SAFETEA-LU was passed and the FY07 figures were consistent with that amended budget. He said the increase of \$50,000 in STP funds reflected the MPC's decision last year to add \$50,000 of funding for Lane County for planning purposes.

In response to a question from Mr. Kelly, Mr. Schwetz explained that a core funding source for MPO operations nationwide was the FHWA-PL funding and those funds were taken as a percentage from the top of SAFETEA-LU funding annually and distributed according to population. He said the funding percentage had also increased from 1 to 1.5 percent.

Mr. Kelly asked if the UPWP was the same as the draft version presented in March. Mr. Schwetz said it was.

Mr. Kelly asked if the CAC had commented on the UPWP. Mr. Schwetz replied that the CAC did not have comments specifically about the UPWP but did express frustration with trying to determine how and when to comment. Mr. Thompson added that the CAC did not feel that the UPWP was a document that required substantive comment on content but was interested in ways to make the document more accessible.

Mr. Dwyer, seconded by Ms. Volta, moved to approve Resolution 2006-04 adopting FY07 Unified Planning Work Program.

Ms. Piercy expressed sympathy with the CAC as it struggled to become familiar with the complex issues of regional transportation planning.

Ms. Ballew encouraged the MPC to periodically provide additional direction about its expectations and become more engaged with the CAC.

The motion passed unanimously, 9:0.

### **Ranking of Local ConnectOregon Applications**

Mr. Schwetz stated that the MPC was the beginning point of a complicated review process for ConnectOregon applications. He said that proposed rankings would be forwarded to the Lane County Board of Commissioners for consideration at its May 3, 2006, meeting. In addition to the three projects already endorsed by the MPC, he said a fourth application had been submitted by Union Pacific Railroad to upgrade and extend existing track and add a layover track to improve ingress and egress of trains. He explained the process used by the TPC to develop a proposed ranking for projects and said the MPC could choose to include the Union Pacific project in its rankings. He listed the proposed MPO ranking but noted that all three projects were very good and met funding considerations. He suggested that the narrative explaining project ranking be included as applications were forwarded through the review process.

Mr. Dwyer questioned, in the case of the Union Pacific application, why public funds should be used to subsidize a private corporation. Mr. Schwetz replied that the ConnectOregon legislation allowed private

sector applications.

Mr. Kelly said the Union Pacific application sounded like a positive project that could improve Amtrak service. He said the more viable the freight rail system was the less impact freight would have on the highway system. He was not certain that the project should be included in the rankings but the MPC could provide supportive comments and a recommendation to consider it for funding. He asked how the subtleties of ranking among the three projects could be communicated as there was very little difference in the actual scores.

Mr. Scheick conceded there would be challenges and difficult choices in prioritizing the \$15 million allocated to Region 2. He noted that regions would compile their recommendations, which would be forwarded to another group appointed by the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) and that group would make final recommendations. He said concurrent with regional recommendations, modal advisory committees were also prioritizing applications from a modal perspective. He said that the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) was interested in understanding the overall priorities for Lane County.

Ms. Volta suggested that the Union Pacific application be advanced without comment. She asked if it was likely to be in a different bucket than the other projects. Mr. Schwetz said the Union Pacific application would move forward even without MPC support or comment.

Ms. Ballew was not certain what would be gained by adding the Union Pacific application to the MPC's list.

Ms. Piercy remarked that the key to Oregon's future in terms of a complete transportation system was to improve the accessibility of trains and she did not want to give the impression that the MPC was not interested in rail.

Mr. Kelly, seconded by Ms. Volta, moved that the Metropolitan Policy Committee forward the rankings as described in the agenda packet, with narrative at the front that explained the close scoring of the projects and with a statement that the Metropolitan Policy Committee encouraged favorable review of the Union Pacific proposal.

Mr. Dwyer stated he would not support the motion as it was inconsistent with his philosophy. He said that Union Pacific was a public corporation and any public funds were given in dividends to stockholders who lived elsewhere. He felt if the project was necessary for operations Union Pacific itself would fund it.

The motion passed, 8:1; Mr. Dwyer voting in opposition.

### **Letter of Support for United Front Projects**

Mr. Dwyer, seconded by Ms. Piercy, moved to approve letters of endorsement from the Metropolitan Policy Committee for United Front transportation project requests. The motion passed unanimously, 9:0.

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

Mr. Thompson reviewed proposed amendments to the FY05-07 MTIP adding two projects funded by SAFETEA-LU: Job Access/Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom.

Mr. Kelly asked if the JARC and New Freedom programs required an application or were distributed by formula. Mr. Pangborn replied that funds for JARC and New Freedom was previously discretionary and required an application, although Lane Transit District (LTD) had not applied. He said with passage of SAFETEA-LU the funds were made part of a formula distribution, although their use was still restricted to the original program purposes.

Ms. Ban commented that LTD staff was discussing how the funds could be used with the human services network.

Ms. Ballew suggested that LTD staff also contact the Lane Workforce Partnership.

Mr. Dwyer, seconded by Ms. Piercy, moved to approve Resolution 2006-05 adopting amendments 2006-06 and 2006-07 to the FY05-07 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program. The motion passed unanimously, 9:0.

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

Ms. Piercy reported that the Osprey Group chosen to conduct an assessment of the parkway situation was in town and scheduling interviews with stakeholders. She said a community forum on April 10 was well attended.

Mr. Taylor pointed out that the Osprey Group was soliciting interested persons lists and encouraged MPC members to forward the names and email addresses of anyone they felt should be on a list to receive a copy of the written assessment prior to a public meeting to discuss the results.

Ms. Piercy emphasized that the Osprey Group would not take a position on the parkway.

Mr. Gaydos remarked that his experience during the interview indicated the Osprey Group were very good listeners. He asked if Ms. Piercy saw a relationship between the assessment process and returning to consideration of the FY07-09 MTIP.

Ms. Piercy said she did but was focused on moving things along and would see what happened with the group process.

## **Status of Programming STP-U Funds**

Mr. Thompson noted a minor correction to his memorandum of April 5, 2006, first paragraph, page 3: "In the Planning category, the total requests for funding included in the applications far exceeded the ~~40~~ 20 percent target." He said the memorandum provided a status report of staff discussions but was not a proposal. He expected a draft proposal for programming funds to be considered by the TPC, reviewed by the CAC and presented to the MPC at its next meeting. He hoped a new framework for programming

funds would be in place by June 2006. He reminded the MPC that transportation demand management (TDM) and modernization funds for FY07 had already been programmed and he hoped that planning funds could be programmed in July. He said it was possible that FY07 preservation funds would be rolled into FY08 because it might be too late to get those funds contracted and used in the next fiscal year.

Mr. Kelly noted that there was no information about how projects would be evaluated so that preservation projects could compete with modernization projects. Mr. Thompson said the issue was being discussed but there were no preliminary conclusions as yet.

Mr. Kelly hoped that the evaluation would include subjective criteria such as the cost of not doing a project.

Mr. Dwyer left the meeting at 12:45 p.m.

### **Alternative Mobility Standards Overview**

Mr. Schwetz stated that ‘mobility standards’ was a term comparable to the local ‘level of service standards’ and applied only to the State highway system. He said that mobility standards were generally a volume over capacity ratio at peak hours and the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) provided for the development of alternative mobility standards where achieving the current mobility standards was proving to be infeasible. He reviewed an excerpt of the OHP provided in the agenda packet that described the requirements for alternative mobility standards and the process that must be used to develop them. He said alternative standards could be proposed for highway segments in metropolitan areas.

With respect to the provision of alternative mobility standards, Mr. Schwetz said that local plans needed to include specific actions to manage transportation demand and ensure efficient use of the capacity of the State highway system. He said local commitments could include land use actions and local system improvements such as bus rapid transit, nodal development, priority bike projects, intelligent transportation system investments, TDM strategies and local road system improvements. He said ODOT reviewed new development from the perspective of how it would affect mobility standards and mobility standards were used in the regional sense to help prioritize projects.

Mr. Schwetz said that congestion management was used to identify areas where land uses might be “congestion-tolerant” and areas with significant concentrations of through and freight-related trips that were characterized as “mobility-dependent.” He encouraged MPC members to share information with their respective policy bodies and said that MPO staff would be scheduling presentations to those bodies to inform them about the purpose of alternative standards and present proposed standards for their review.

Ms. Volta asked if accident rates were factored in to mobility standards. Mr. Schwetz said that accident rates were part of the discussion of congestion and the nature of congestion on the State system.

Continuing, Mr. Schwetz said that he would continue to present information to the MPC at its monthly meetings and staff hoped to have proposed alternative standards developed by fall 2006. He said that ideally the alternative standards could be integrated into the RTP update, followed by amendments to the OHP to be adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission.

Mr. Kelly requested a complete list of State facilities within the MPO.

## **Follow-up and MPO Calendar**

### **MTIP Administrative Amendments**

Mr. Thompson briefly reviewed the two administrative amendments unanimously approved by the TPC and noted that details of the amendments were posted on the Lane Council of Governments website.

### **ODOT Update**

Ms. Lee reported that Transportation Enhancement applications had been received and included five applications from the Lane County area: one from Junction City, one from Springfield and three from Eugene. She said that final applications were due June 30, 2006, and would require a regional signature. She asked that application packages get to her two or three weeks before the deadline so she could facilitate the signature process.

Ms. Lee announced that there would be \$5 million available statewide for bike/pedestrian grants for FY08 and FY09. She said any jurisdiction could apply for the funds but was limited to one application, although cities over 200,000 could submit one bike application and one pedestrian application. She said a minimum 10 percent match was required and encouraged local jurisdictions to take advantage of the under-utilized funding opportunity. She said that applications were due July 28, 2006.

Ms. Ballew asked if projects had to be listed in local plans to be eligible. Ms. Lee said they did not.

Mr. Scheick thanked LTD for its tour at a recent Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) meeting in Eugene. He conveyed the commission's thanks to Mayors Leiken, Piercy and Volta and Commissioner Green for a good discussion. He said the OTC's business meeting included a report on the impact of the President's budget on County road funds. He said that ODOT's bridge and modernization projects were going well and there would be 48 bridges in construction in Region 2 in the current, increasing to 60 next year; ODOT would make a presentation on its plans to manage mobility during construction at a future MPC meeting.

The next meeting was scheduled for May 11, 2006, at the Eugene Library Bascom-Tykeson Room.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:10 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)