

## MINUTES

Metropolitan Policy Committee  
Bascom/Tykeson Room—Eugene Public Library—100 West 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Springfield, Oregon

April 12, 2007  
11:30 a.m.

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

Byron Vanderpool, Ann Mortenson, Petra Schutz, Kathi Wiederhold, Paul Thompson (Lane Council of Governments); Ed Moore, Joe Harwood (Oregon Department of Transportation); Jamon Kent (City of Coburg); Len Goodwin, Dan Brown, Greg Mott (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); Terry Connelly, Rob Zako, Philip Farrington, guests.

### WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

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

### APPROVE MARCH 8, 2007, MINUTES

Mr. Green, seconded by Mr. Gaydos, moved to approve the March 8, 2007, meeting minutes as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

### 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 called the committee's attention to the CAC's report and to a draft recruitment ad. She said the committee met with a full quorum the previous week. There were now seven members as vice chair Sylvia Shaw moved out of the area and resigned, and Ross Notebaart resigned to pursue other projects. As a result, the MPC needed to recruit new members. She recommended the MPC's citizen input subcommittee be employed in the recruitment process. She further recommended a six-week

application period, with applications were due by June 15. The subcommittee would review the applications and make an appointment to the MPC at its July 2007 meeting.

Responding to a question from Mr. Green, Ms. Wiederhold suggested that the MPC could recruit both at-large members and members with special expertise. She noted that the applications included a means by which applicants could indicate interest areas.

Responding to a question from Mr. Sorenson, Ms. Wiederhold said that the committee had some geographic representation but had recently lost two members from Springfield. She believed that geographic distribution would be taken into consideration as a factor in the selection of CAC members.

Ms. Piercy noted the long distances that some members might potentially have to travel to meetings and suggested that other methods of communication such as video teleconferencing be considered.

Ms. Piercy, Mr. Green, and Ms. Ballew volunteered to serve as the subcommittee.

Ms. Wiederhold said the CAC was now working on its Citizen Guide to Transportation Planning, entitled "How We Get there that Matters." The CAC also reviewed some display advertising and heard an update from Mr. Thompson on the Regional Transportation Plan project list.

#### **Adopt FY08 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)**

Mr. Thompson asked the MPC to adopt Resolution 2007-04, adopting the Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization FY2007-2008 Unified Planning Work Program. He said that the Metropolitan Policy Committee had reviewed the document and had no comment; the document had also undergone review by the Federal Highways Administration, Federal Transit Authority, and Oregon Department of Transportations. The public comment period ended on March 11 at 5 p.m. and no public comments were received.

Mr. Green, seconded by Mr. Gaydos, moved to approve Resolution 2007-04 adopting the Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization FY2007-2008 Unified Planning Work Program. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **Approve Letter of Endorsement for TGM Grant Applications**

Ms. Schutz overviewed the request, asking the MPC to approve a letter endorsing a grant application for a transportation growth management grant application, noting the application deadline was March 9. The metropolitan planning organization submitted one application, which was for the Coburg Multi-Modal Loop Implementation Strategy. It was intended to examine the feasibility of developing a hard surface multi-modal loop around the city. Ms. Schutz said the MPO was requesting \$65,000 with a local match for a total project cost of \$72,120.

Ms. Volta spoke in support of the application, saying the community wanted something like the loop for a long time. She thought there was the potential for making connections to the systems in Eugene and Springfield.

Mr. Leiken endorsed the grant application.

Mr. Green, seconded by Mr. Gaydos, moved to approve the draft letter of endorsement. The motion passed unanimously, 9:0.

### **Draft Letters Regarding FY10-13 STIP Criteria and Factors and Stakeholder Committee**

Mr. Thompson requested endorsement of two letters, recalling that the MPC had reviewed the first steps in the 2010-13 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) process at its last meeting and had directed staff to draft a letter providing comment to the STIP Stakeholder Committee on the STIP project criteria and factors and one requesting membership on the committee for the Central Lane MPO. He requested direction on the list of those who should receive copies of the second letter.

Mr. Green indicated satisfaction with the first letter and suggested that the letter did not need to be copied to the federal representatives. He supported sending it to the local State legislative delegation as he believed it addressed a local issue. Mr. Gaydos suggested that the letters be revised to be more diplomatic. Ms. Piercy offered to work with staff to revise the letters. There was general concurrence with the remarks of Mr. Gaydos and Mr. Green, as well as concurrence to approve the letters.

### **TravelSmart Presentation on Individual Marketing Results**

The MPC heard a presentation from Werner Brög, managing director of Socialdata America and the founder of the TravelSmart© concept, on the results of three TravelSmart projects funded by ODOT and conducted in the cities of Bend, Salem/Keizer, and Eugene commencing in 2005. The project was intended to change behaviors in sustainable ways through applied individual marketing. He shared the methodology and noted the before and after surveys that occurred. He shared examples of the marketing approaches employed and marketing materials. Mr. Brög emphasized the personal, customized approach to behavioral changes in transportation choices that led to increased alternate mode use. He reviewed the local results, which showed gains in all areas of alternate mode use.

Responding to a question from Mr. Sorenson regarding the participation rate, Mr. Brög confirmed that it was sufficiently large to be representative. He said the sample size was quite good for a city the size of Eugene and the results were within plus or minus two percent. He emphasized, however, that the point of the project was to determine if marketing could be effective and its strengths and weaknesses, and the size of the result indicated that it could be effective within a range of minus five percent to six percent.

Mr. Zelenka determined from Mr. Brög that the MPC would receive copies of the final report resulting from the study. A second report on the potential for change was forthcoming. Mr. Brög offered to make copies of the presentation that was scheduled later that day available to members. Ms. Schutz indicated the report would also be posted on the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) Web site.

Mr. Zelenka asked if the carbon reduction resulting from the increase in alternate modes use had been calculated. Mr. Brög said no. It was relatively easy to do, however. Mr. Zelenka asked if LCOG staff could include that in the information provided to the MPC.

Responding to a question from Ms. Volta, Mr. Brög said that the results of the project indicated the gain in the use public transit was approximately 42 percent. He said transportation fluctuated between summer and winter. He observed that one of the myths of transportation was that transit was the mode that most reduced car traffic, and that was not correct; transit was one mode to reduce car traffic, but the project indicated the two modes with most potential to reduce car traffic were walking and cycling, which took the place of short, unnecessary car trips.

Ms. Ballew asked if the university presence in the three cities studied made a difference if compared to another city of equal size without a university. Mr. Brög said the methodology had been applied in the United States in Portland for the first time in 2002 and he had information only about the cities he had discussed, as well as Seattle, and the information from Seattle was taken directly from the university area. He speculated that there would not be much effect, but he did not have enough data to confirm that.

Responding to a question from Mr. Pangborn, Mr. Brög confirmed the study was confined to the city limits of Eugene.

Mr. Sorenson asked Mr. Brög to discuss what motivated people not to drive their car as much: health, the desire to be outside, the desire to reduce greenhouse gases, or the desire to save money? Mr. Brög said that the reasons varied. Some people wanted to save money, some people wanted better health, and others were environmentally oriented. He thought a homeopathic approach that did not impose solutions upon people but first listened to them and then supported them in their choices was likely to be more successful and he suspected, more sustainable because it followed people's ideas and interests.

Ms. Piercy thanked Mr. Brög for the presentation.

### **Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2031 Update: Land Use Scenarios**

Mr. Vanderpool reviewed a timeline for the RTP update mounted on the meeting room wall showing activities related to the RTP and their scheduled deadlines. He said there were two systems at work, one being the federal system for which the MPC was the decision maker, and one being the State system for which the MPC members were the decision makers as part of their individual councils and boards. The two systems needed to work together, and as the MPC moved into the RTP update, it needed to make some decisions about how that would occur. Federal requirements mandate that the RTP be consistent with locally adopted plans, but the plans had different planning horizons.

Responding to a question from Mr. Sorenson about the length of time the RTP would take, and what would occur if the MPC wanted a new RTP, Mr. Vanderpool said that staff would propose that the MPC redo the RTP from scratch. Staff would first bring back an update to the existing RTP and it should be completed in about four months. The RTP must be updated every four years. The last RTP adopted did not meet all the requirements in the new transportation bill.

Mr. Vanderpool indicated that the title "Land Use Scenarios" should actually be "Transportation Modeling Scenarios."

Mr. Vanderpool said that the transportation planning rule (TPR) gave the local jurisdictions twelve months to complete their work, and staff began to meet with legal staff in December to discuss the implications of that at the local level. He did not yet have an answer. For the purpose of the planning horizon analysis only, the State indicated nothing would trigger drastic changes at the local level. There may be other changes because the project listed changed.

Mr. Vanderpool asked the MPC for direction to model a range of development patterns from accommodating all growth through 2031 within the existing urban growth boundary (UGB) at higher than observed current densities to accommodating growth at currently observed actual densities, including accommodating a portion of the growth through 2031 beyond the current UGB. He said the models were not breaking down, the approach met federal requirements, and it did not appear to cause a lot of work for the MPC.

Mr. Thompson said the RTP would state the local area was modeling futures but primarily looking at the comprehensive rules in place and allowable densities, although greater than observed. A secondary scenario was expanding the UGB. He said staff did not know which option would occur, and placed them in that order because the option of expanding the UGB under the TPR tends to trigger even more requirements under the TPR that must be met within 12 months.

Ms. Piercy wanted to ensure that the text of the RTP included language indicating the inclusion of the two options did not imply commitment to either one. Mr. Vanderpool agreed. He said that was not the point of the exercise. Mr. Thompson said the action the MPO took regarded the RTP, which could not create any obligations under State rules.

Mr. Green asked why staff would propose a new RTP. Mr. Vanderpool clarified that staff would not recommend that occur until the current process was completed, which would be next year. Mr. Thompson said that staff would propose a new RTP for the next four-year cycle. Mr. Vanderpool attributed the recommendation to the length of time since the last comprehensive update and the need to reexamine the policy framework.

Responding to a question from Mr. Zelenka, Mr. Vanderpool confirmed that the modeling for the next RTP would not include the West Eugene Parkway.

Mr. Zelenka asked how staff would model the expansion of the UGB: did the model reach the details of where, and how much? Mr. Vanderpool said the model used observed growth patterns and projected them out. Mr. Thompson said the transportation system modeled included the entire MPO boundary, which went beyond the UGB already. Mr. Vanderpool emphasized that the model was not a land use analysis. Mr. Zelenka asked if the model would identify specific areas for expansion. Mr. Thompson said no. Mr. Vanderpool said the RTP was not designed for that purpose.

Mr. Sorenson advocated for a comprehensive community land use planning process in association with the RTP update. He wanted to ask the community if it wanted to grow up or out so that transportation planning was congruent with what the community wanted in land use. Mr. Vanderpool pointed out the plan already must be consistent with local processes, and the question for the MPC was the best place to have that discussion. He asked if the MPC should be making land use decisions. Mr. Sorenson said the community should make those decisions together. Mr. Vanderpool said the RTP was intended to help the MPC coordinate the various plans and it should reflect the choices being made locally. The community had another venue, the local land use planning process, for those discussions to occur. He said that there was a connection, but the issue was where those discussions were best held.

Ms. Piercy believed that the members of the MPC needed more time to think about Mr. Sorenson's suggestion.

Ms. Ballew said the issue was consistency and the fact that the local plan horizons went to 2015 and the RTP went out to 2031. On behalf of Springfield and before it committed itself to the RTP, Ms. Ballew asked LCOG staff to prepare text to include in the RTP that it would not trigger the local jurisdictions having to open their comprehensive plan to review immediately. She wanted to have text making it clear what the consistency relationship would be. Mr. Vanderpool said that LCOG staff would work with local planning and legal staff to minimize what needed to be done. He did not want to promise no changes would be made because some readings of the TPR would require some changes because of changes in the project list over which the local area had no control. Ms. Ballew said she did not want to conjoin the local and federal processes because of the length of time it took to do comprehensive planning.

Mr. Green supported the position of Ms. Ballew. He wanted to be in compliance with federal and State law, and wanted to ensure that any plan the local area committed itself was not proscriptive because of resource issues. He acknowledged changes might be necessary, but the County had to consider its resource limitations.

Mr. Zelenka was unclear as to what staff was requesting. He was unprepared to act without more consideration and more discussion with “people back home.” He shared Ms. Ballew’s concerns about how to proceed and did not want to take action without having those issues resolved. Mr. Vanderpool clarified that he was seeking direction to continue on.

Referring to the staff memorandum on the topic, Mr. Zelenka expressed concern that the local jurisdictions might be asked to take action on a UGB expansion. Mr. Thompson said the memorandum was a compilation of the discussions that been occurring between staff and the attorneys, and the text in question referred to the fact that under the TPR there were additional obligations imposed if the RTP modeled the future that assumed expansion of the UGB. For the MPO to adopt an RTP that assumed expansion of the UGB, it must work with the local jurisdictions to consider how that expansion might take place. Staff discussed looking at both scenarios because it did not want to drive or assume a scenario. Staff had included the two options in the order stated and had received feedback from the Department of Land Conservation and Development that the options would not trigger any additional requirements in the TPR around modeling the UGB expansion.

Mr. Zelenka wanted to know how the previous presentation and the increased price of gas were integrated into the planning for transportation needs. Mr. Thompson said the model included assumptions about future fuel prices and travel behavior. Mr. Vanderpool added that the transportation demand management strategies were also built into the RTP.

Responding to a question from Ms. Piercy about next steps, Mr. Vanderpool proposed that LCOG staff continue to work with the staff of the local jurisdictions and develop text for the RTP so the actions needed in the future became clearer.

Mr. Leiken believed that combining transportation and land use issues was a major task. He said the local area must comply with the federal regulations, but he cautioned against getting the land use issues “too much in bed” with the transportation issues, because that would cause a “blow out,” and it was a way to delay things and to increase costs. He said the MPC must be careful and members consistent with their own jurisdiction’s policies while abiding by federal regulations. Like Mr. Green, he questioned why a new RTP would be needed.

Ms. Volta noted her concern about the costs of redoing the RTP for the local jurisdictions. She asked that staff avoid doing too many updates. Every time the MPO revisited a new issue, it increased in cost and complexity. She supported consistency and meeting the federal regulations.

Mr. Sorenson asked if an RTP update required a TransPlan update. Mr. Thompson said staff did not know. Staff believe the removal of the West Eugene Parkway from the RTP probably triggered a TPR requirement to either have the Transportation System Plan (TSP) be found to be consistent, or have it amended to be consistent. He did not know what the local jurisdictions, which controlled the TSP, would do.

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

### **ODOT Update**

Ms. Lee introduced ODOT's new transportation growth management manager, David Helton.

Ms. Lee distributed and reviewed talking points for the Pioneer Mountain project. Mr. Green said that it appeared the local impact would be to endanger funding for the I-5/Beltline project. Ms. Lee said at its last meeting, the Oregon Transportation Commission had discussed the reallocation of the funding intended for the West Eugene Parkway, and did not approve the funding for the I-5/Beltline project because of its awareness of the Pioneer Mountain project. She said the \$12 million intended for the I-5/Beltline project could be relocated to that project.

Ms. Lee offered to answer questions about House Bill 2997, which would establish an Area Commission on Transportation (ACT) in Lane County. Mr. Green said it was reported by Representative Paul Holvey that ODOT testified in favor of the bill and asked if that was correct. Ms. Lee said she understood it had been reported that ODOT had asked Representative Holvey to put forth the bill, but she was not aware of that. Mr. Green expressed concern that ODOT had endorsed the bill and indicated that he and Commissioner Bill Dwyer had conveyed their position of opposition to Representative Holvey. He objected that the bill singled out Lane County while leaving the Portland metropolitan area without an ACT. Mr. Green felt that Lane County's current process worked well, particularly as it had been augmented with the Citizen Advisory Committee charged with public involvement, a former area of concern for ODOT. Ms. Lee said she had been asked to review the bill and had suggested some changes, but that did not mean she had thought it up or proposed it.

### **MPO Dispute Resolution Process**

Mr. Vanderpool called attention to the letter from the LCOG Board president in the meeting packet, which noted the postponement of the joint meeting with the Lane Council of Governments Executive Committee, originally scheduled for March 20 at 5:30 p.m. He invited questions.

### **Proposed Modifications to ODOT RTP Roadway Project Lists for 2031 RTP**

Mr. Thompson said the item was a follow-up the last meeting and the committee's suggested changes were reflected.

### **MTIP Administrative Amendments**

Mr. Thompson called the MPC's attention to two administrative amendments adopted by the Transportation Planning Committee and invited questions.

### **MPO Calendar**

Mr. Thompson called the MPC's attention the special May 2 meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:41 p.m.

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)