

# MINUTES

Citizen Advisory Committee  
of the  
Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization  
Singer Room – Eugene Public Library – 100 West 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Eugene, Oregon

April 16, 2008  
5:30 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Webb Sussman, Chair; Dave Jacobson, Vice Chair; Diana Alldredge, Wendy Butler-Boyesen, Rich Hazel, Joseph Vardner, Francesca Patricolo, Eleanor Mulder, Edward Winter, Sarah Strand, Damien Gilbert, members; Kathi Wiederhold, Byron Vanderpool, Andrea Riner, Paul Thompson, Lane Council of Governments; Sonny Chickering, Savannah Crawford, Oregon Department of Transportation.

**ABSENT:** Philip Farrington, John Anderson, Ryan Papé, Bill Morganti, members; Kitty Piercy, MPC liaison.

## **Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review**

Mr. Sussman called the meeting to order and those present introduced themselves. There were no changes to the agenda.

Mr. Vanderpool said he was pleased Ms. Riner had joined Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) staff as the transportation planning program manager. She would be responsible for activities of the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC). He also welcomed Savannah Crawford as the new Area 5 planner for the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT).

Ms. Wiederhold announced that Mr. Morganti was recovering from surgery and hoped to be available for the next meeting. She said Mr. Papé had changed job responsibilities and was required to attend out-of-town meetings that conflicted with CAC meetings. She would be discussing his situation with CAC officers.

Mr. Jacobson determined that continuing to meet on the third Wednesday of the month was acceptable to committee members.

## **Comments from the Audience**

There were no members of the public present.

## **Approve March 29, 2008 Minutes**

Mr. Jacobson, seconded by Ms. Butler-Boyesen, moved to approve the March 19, 2008, minutes as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

### **Public Participation Plan (PPP)**

Ms. Wiederhold stated that the PPP established how federal requirements for public participation would be met for all key MPO products. She said the plan required an annual evaluation, which the committee had been working on since December 2007. She said draft recommendations to the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) had been developed by CAC officers in conjunction with staff and Ms. Piercy and based on the committee's prior discussions. She drew the committee members attention to the nine recommendations set forth in her memorandum of April 16.

Mr. Jacobson encouraged CAC members to attend MPC meetings whenever possible. Ms. Riner noted that MPC meetings were now being televised and would eventually be webcast.

Mr. Jacobson led a discussion of the draft recommendations.

- 1. Establish a central clearinghouse for information on all public involvement opportunities for transportation related activities, plans, projects and programs in this area being conducted by local, state, federal and MPO entities.*

Ms. Butler-Boyesen asked how this recommendation differed from #2. Mr. Jacobson replied that the clearinghouse related to a location for information while #2 referred to a person who could respond to inquiries from the public

Mr. Hazel asked if the eMPO would function as a clearinghouse. Mr. Sussman said that was a possibility, but the recommendation was not specifying how the recommendation would be implemented. The MPC would make that decision.

Ms. Wiederhold said the eMPO website was [www.theMPO.org](http://www.theMPO.org).

- 2. Designate a first point of contact or referral for members of the public trying to find out about transportation activities, plans, projects or programs in the area. This does not have to be a new position.*

Mr. Vardner asked if the intent was to have a position that could refer people to the point of contact on a particular project, not someone who could answer questions on every transportation project. Mr. Jacobson said the intent was to have a position similar to that of an ombudsman who could refer an inquiry about any regional transportation project to the appropriate source of specific project information for a response.

Ms. Wiederhold gave a recent example of facilitating communication between a member of the public with an inquiry and the staff responsible for the project.

- 3. Communicate clear, consistent, easily understood steps for public involvement in the planning, design and implementation processes. Let people know about the opportunities there are to weigh in.*

Mr. Hazel said that specificity about the opportunities to weigh in should be encouraged.

4. *Encourage jurisdictions to enhance their existing efforts to reach out in a transparent and accessible way at the earliest stages, inform the community about those opportunities and help the public determine the impact that the decisions are likely to have.*

Mr. Hazel commented that while the committee encouraged public involvement early in the process, often there was not enough information at that point for the public to know if it was of interest; later in the process when more details were available was often too late to provide meaningful input. He hoped that disconnect could be addressed by encouraging jurisdictions to present “ballpark” information on the process, plan or project and its likely impact.

Mr. Hazel suggested the following wording: Local agencies must improve public outreach to include more project detail in early planning. In cases where plans have not reached the point where project details have been decided, agencies should present likely options and possibilities of a project so the public can better understand the significance and impacts of the plans.

Mr. Sussman suggested broadening the language to include regional and State entities instead of restricting it to local jurisdictions.

Mr. Hazel said his suggestion was based upon the origination of projects with local jurisdictions, which was the first point where strong public involvement should occur. He preferred not to dilute the focus on the early local planning.

Ms. Patricolo suggested using the term “communities,” which could have local, regional or neighborhood connotations.

Mr. Sussman commented that the word “communities” had a certain implication of being locally focused and not including State and regional entities.

Mr. Vanderpool urged the committee to use language that resonated with members and forward recommendations to the MPC that reinforced how best to communicate to the public.

Following a general discussion of which term to use, Ms. Wiederhold determined that Mr. Hazel and other committee members agreed to have her work with CAC officers to incorporate it in the recommendations as long as the concept was communicated to the MPC.

5. *Develop a multi-year calendar/timeline that identified milestones in planning processes, decision-making points and public involvement opportunities that are most relevant to regional transportation planning.*

There were no comments.

6. *Include policy review in the next update of the Regional Transportation Plan. Use the process as an opportunity for a broad outreach to the public.*

Mr. Hazel asked for clarification of the first sentence. Ms. Wiederhold said an RTP update was recently completed and it did not include a review of policy. Mr. Thompson said the policy framework of the RTP had not be reviewed or updated since 2001.

7. *Encourage and assist staff of MPO and MPO partners to use language that is common across jurisdictional boundaries and reflects a regional perspective.*

There were no comments.

8. *Whenever the MPO or an MPO member jurisdiction is planning a transportation related open house or other event, encourage inclusion of the other jurisdictions as an opportunity to provide regional transportation information to supplement the specific focus of the event.*

Ms. Strand commented that the earliest planning stages referred to in #4 could be the point at which information from other jurisdictions and projects could be provided.

9. *Encourage the MPO and MPO member jurisdictions to collaborate on a regional transportation event (open house or other formal) periodically. This event would not necessarily need to have a project or other specific focus, but would provide a one stop shopping opportunity for the public to learn about what is currently transpiring in the world of transportation.*

Mr. Vardner did not think the recommendation was a lofty goal when tied to a policy review on a broader regional scale, which could provide opportunities for collaboration.

Mr. Sussman noted that the MPC could encourage, but not require, local and regional jurisdictions and ODOT to take action; that decision would be theirs.

Mr. Thompson remarked that the actions recommended in #8 and #9 had occurred in the past and were not unreachable goals. He suggested reordering the recommendations to place #7 and #8 following #4.

Mr. Sussman determined there were no objections to Mr. Thompson's suggestion to reorder the recommendations.

Mr. Sussman suggested making the term "periodically" in #9 more specific, such as annually.

Ms. Mulder commented that those activities were budget-dependent.

Mr. Jacobson said the intent was to allow the MPO to make the determination of frequency.

Mr. Sussman called for a short break to allow Mr. Hazel and Ms. Patricolo an opportunity to develop revised language for #4.

Following a short break, Mr. Hazel reported that it was not possible to develop language in that timeframe.

Ms. Wiederhold said Mr. Hazel and Ms. Patricolo had agreed with giving conceptual direction for the revisions to be made following action by the committee and prior to forwarding the recommendation to the MPC.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen, seconded by Ms. Mulder, moved to present the recommendations for changes to the Public Participation Plan, including revisions consistent with Mr. Hazel's concept, to the Metropolitan Policy Committee at its May 18, 2008, meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Thompson reminded the committee that the Transportation Planning Committee (TPC), consistent with the CAC bylaws, would be reviewing the recommendations and providing input.

Mr. Sussman expressed concern about delaying presentation to the MPC. Mr. Vanderpool said based on past practices he did not anticipate any delay in presenting the recommendations to the MPC.

### **Land Use and Transportation Planning/Calendar Activities**

Mr. Vanderpool stated that staff had been working on recommendations to the MPC and local elected bodies that would facilitate better synchronization of federal, State, regional and local land use and transportation planning process. He described the process to date and said once a combined proposal met with approval of jurisdiction staff representatives, including the State, the recommendations would be presented to policy makers. He distributed a Transportation/Land Use Planning Framework timeline that illustrated the current and future land use and transportation planning activities.

In response to a question from Mr. Sussman, Ms. Riner said she would research with LCOG technical staff providing the timeline in a format that could be downloaded and imported or emailed. Mr. Thompson commented that the timeline reflected a four-year period, but specific dates could be identified only in the first few months. He said timing was subject to change farther out in the period.

Ms. Riner said the timeline was a prototype and in the preliminary draft stages. Mr. Thompson said the timeline still needed to be reviewed by other jurisdictions to assure that all of their activities were reflected accurately.

Mr. Jacobson asked for clarification of the difference between an RTP and an RTSP. Mr. Vanderpool replied that the State Transportation Planning Rule required local jurisdictions to have a transportation system plan (TSP) as part of the land use regulatory framework in Oregon. He said State law also referred to a regional transportation system plan (RTSP), but the nature and content of the plan was not clear and LCOG was working with the State and local jurisdictions to clarify that. He said an RTSP would cover all jurisdictions within the MPO.

Mr. Sussman asked staff to bring a wall chart of the timeline, as well as the CAC goals, to each committee meeting.

Mr. Vanderpool pointed out that transportation planning and land use planning were not separate activities and transportation planning was dependent on land use plans and how communities intended to grow.

Ms. Riner said the timeline was also an effective tool for communicating and coordinating activities and timing with MPO partners. She said as the timeline was refined there would be a public involvement opportunities overlay.

Mr. Winter asked about the source of 2008 base conditions. Mr. Thompson explained that when transportation and regional modeling was done, base conditions on which future modeling would be predicated were updated every two years. He said base conditions included land use, population and employment data.

Mr. Jacobson observed that coordination of planning efforts was complicated by situations such as Eugene and Springfield taking different approaches to land inventories. Mr. Thompson said that issue was somewhat resolved by having separate urban growth boundaries, which would allow two sets of assumptions. Mr. Vanderpool added that separate UGBs would also require decisions about the Metro Plan and TransPlan, which were currently joint documents.

Ms. Crawford remarked that she would work with LCOG staff to assure that ODOT activities were also reflected on the timeline.

Ms. Riner commented that her concern was for the timeline to be as inclusive and as clear as possible and avoid providing so much detail that it was not usable.

### **Field Trip Planning**

Ms. Riner said periodic field trips helped to provide the CAC with spatial context and a sense of the diversity of projects reflecting a multimodal transportation system and different stages of development.

Mr. Sussman invited committee members and staff to offer recommendations for field trip options. The following suggestions were made:

- A route transecting the area from Thurston through West Eugene
- Environmental justice
- Challenges of favoring one mode over another, such as forcing people to purchase vehicles they cannot afford and how that was affected by what transportation projects were built
- The strip of 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> avenues between Chambers Street and Four Corners
- How transportation plans affected what was considered a community's "downtown" by influencing commercial development (examples: 43<sup>rd</sup> and Main streets in Springfield, Coburg Road and Oakmont Street in Eugene) with a "car centric" focus
- Impact on the constant sounding of train whistles along Northwest Expressway, where there were few cross streets versus intermittent whistles in downtown.
- The impact on large freight trucks (triples) and moving freight from trucks to rail. Examine possibilities for multimodal transfer points.
- LTD headquarters facility and EmX planning activities
- EmX Pioneer Parkway corridor
- Alternate transportation modes – how youth who have been denied access to public transportation can go from one side of town to another
- See how LTD operates the transit system
- Hold a CAC meeting at LTD's headquarters facility
- Railroad crossing project (Butler-Boyesen – location not specified)
- Truck terminal/train depot
- Environmental justice – exploitation of politically vulnerable neighborhoods (Roosevelt neighborhood and railyard, industrial sites along West 5<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> avenues)
- "Bikability" of community – ease of traveling throughout an area by bicycle (safety, connectivity). Examples of bicycle disconnects: Walnut Station and Chambers Street to 5<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> avenues on the west side of Highway 99
- Poor "walkability" of area, crosswalk and school zones safety concerns. Examples: 46<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Donald Street, south Willamette Street, 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> Avenues at Oak Street

- ODOT project to add sidewalks, curbs and gutters along the segment of Highway 99 between Garfield Street and Four Corners
- ODOT I-5/Beltline flyover project

Ms. Riner thanked the committee for its suggestions and said staff would develop some tour options for its consideration. She said all of the suggestions would be tracked for possible inclusion in future field trips.

### **Wrap Up**

Ms. Alldredge asked for resource recommendations so she could better education herself about transportation planning. Mr. Thompson said he would provide materials and resources, including online resources, based on her interests and invited her to meet with LCOG staff as well.

Mr. Vardner asked that a future agenda include a discussion of using subcommittee to explore certain issues in greater detail than could be achieved in a regular committee meeting.

Mr. Winter asked that a future agenda include the topic about how to address global warming and pollution from transportation and land use.

Ms. Mulder announced that a representative from 1000 Friends of Oregon would be speaking at the April 17 League of Women Voters meeting

The meeting was adjourned at 7:32 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)