

MINUTES

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

June 9, 2005
11:30 a.m.

PRESENT: Anne Ballew (City of Springfield), Chair; Bobby Green (Lane County), Vice Chair; Tammy Fitch for Sid Leiken (City of Springfield), David Kelly, Bonny Bettman for Kitty Piercy (City of Eugene), Judy Volta (City of Coburg), Gerry Gaydos, Susan Ban (Lane Transit District), Tom Boyatt (Oregon Department of Transportation), members; Dennis Taylor (City of Eugene), Ken Hamm (Lane Transit District), Cynthia Pappas (City of Springfield), *ex officio* members.

George Kloeppel, Jamon Kent, Tom Schwetz, Paul Thompson, Petra Schuetz, Ann Mortenson, Kathi Wiederhold (Lane Council of Governments); Randy Papé (Oregon Transportation Commission), Greg Mott, Nick Arnis (City of Springfield), Anita Yap (Lane Transit District); Chris Henry, Lisa Gardner, Rob Inerfeld (City of Eugene), Jack Lee (Oregon Department of Transportation), Karmen Fore (Congressman DeFazio's Office), Terry Connolly (Eugene Area Chamber of Commerce), Lauri Segal, Rob Zako, Kevin Matthews, Zachary Vishanoff, guests.

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Ms. Ballew opened the June 2005 meeting of the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) and welcomed those present.

At the request of Mr. Boyatt, a moment of silence was observed for Don McLean of the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and manager of the Interstate 105 project, who had died recently while hiking Mount Pisgah.

Members of the MPC introduced themselves.

2. APPROVE MAY 12, 2005, MINUTES

Mr. Gaydos, seconded by Ms. Volta, moved to approve the May 12, 2005, minutes as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

3. COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Zachary Vishanoff, Patterson Street, Eugene, stated that bad planning and public involvement were ruining his life. He urged elected leaders to talk more to the public about what the public wanted. He said that the West University neighborhood had recently had alley projects forced upon it for which residents had to pay the bill. He said that some bus rapid transit (BRT) funds had been obtained from student loan

funds, which priced students out of education in order to do BRT. He said that it was recently reported that Lane Transit District (LTD) would use radio frequency identification (RFID) to “tag” handicapped bus riders and that should be discussed. He said that many people in the community did not know who would be served by BRT and speculated that thieves would use BRT to come to Eugene in the evening, spend the night stealing, and use the morning service back to Springfield. He said there should be a public dialogue about the many million dollar projects. He also commented on expenses associated with sports events and venues.

Lauri Segal, 1000 Friends of Oregon, asked for an explanation of the relationship between the air quality issue related to the supposed need to update the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) again and the September 2004 MPC agenda item on revision of the State Implementation Plan for carbon monoxide. She referred to a project plan schedule included in the September 2004 agenda packet that indicated by June 2005 a 45-day comment period would have been held and the MPC would have participated in moving the project forward. She said she found it disingenuous to suggest in the MPC’s May 12, 2005, minutes that the transportation demand management (TDM) grant submitted to ODOT was pursuant to MPC direction to staff to pursue a single transportation plan. She also asked for an explanation of why the current RTP update timeline was more “time inclusive” than the previous RTP update process. She commented that the Citizen Advisory Committee’s (CAC) involvement in the process was marginalized and they were under utilized and should be educated about technical issues.

Kevin Matthews, Friends of Eugene president, asked if the MPC would cross-reference, during its discussions, the agenda items related to the RTP update schedule and the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) notice of intend to appeal the MPC adoption of the 2025 RTP. He said the MPC had evolved and assumed more responsibility, which included an increased need and opportunity to include the public in discussions such as the one related to two comprehensive transportation plans that had a 95 percent overlap and a slight “misregistration”. He encouraged the involvement not just of the CAC but also other significant stakeholders, public interest groups and people at-large to bring additional perspective. He characterized the LUBA appeal as “tough love” to help with the MPC’s evolutionary process.

4. MPO ISSUES

a. Amendment to Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) Bylaws

Ms. Wiederhold reviewed the agenda materials related to the proposed amendment and stated that the CAC had followed the procedures set forth in its bylaws for recommending an amendment to the MPC. She said the amendment would add the category of “employees/workers/organized labor” to the list of interests targeted for membership recruitment. She said the proposal came from a CAC member.

Ms. Bettman said she was not opposed to adding another interest area to the list, but questioned why the CAC spent time on a minor change to the bylaws when there were so many important items on the table, including the need to become familiar with the issues that would come before it. She remarked that her understanding was that the CAC was created to provide stakeholder input at the front end of the process and asked how the CAC was interacting with the Transportation Planning Committee (TPC).

Ms. Wiederhold replied that the bylaws amendment was processed at the request of the CAC. She said the amendment was proposed by a CAC member, who provided supporting documentation, and the committee felt it was important addition and after a thoughtful discussion decided to recommend the amendment to the MPC. She said the committee elected officers at its last meeting and staff planned a meeting with the

three CAC officers to strategize about the committee's schedule and direction. Mr. Thompson added that the TPC bylaws had been amended at the May 2005 MPC meeting to add the CAC chair as a member. He noted that the CAC had elected co-chairs and a vice chair and hoped that one of those three officers would be able to attend TPC meetings on a regular basis.

In response to a question from Mr. Green, Ms. Wiederhold reported that the CAC co-chairs were Dan Egan and Rex Redmon and the vice chair was Sylvia Shaw.

Mr. Green, seconded by Mr. Gaydos, moved to approve MPC Resolution 2005-07 approving amendments to the bylaws of the Citizen Advisory Committee of the Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization. The motion passed unanimously.

b. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update Schedule and Issues

Mr. Thompson reminded the MPC that the RTP update adopted in December 2004 extended the time horizon to 2025 and provided a 21-year horizon at that point that would remain viable for approximately one year as federal requirements mandated a 20-year horizon be maintained in the long-range plan and the current plan would slip below that horizon in December 2005. He referred to quotations in his memorandum of June 1, 2005, from the Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) on the subject of the horizon requirements. He noted that new federal guidance had been issued in April 2005 and was still undergoing interpretation by FHWA at the national and state levels; the information in his memorandum was not the final direction from FHWA.

Mr. Thompson said that staff believed the 20-year horizon requirement not only existed in the RTP but was always a requirement when an air quality conformity determination was done and that determinations were required when the MPC took actions such as major amendments to the RTP or amendments or modifications to the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) when programming projects that either had air quality impacts at the project or MTIP level. He noted that during the December 2004 RTP update there was both the requirement to maintain a 20-year horizon but also a deadline to update the plan within three years of the previous update, which also drove the need to take action. He said the deadline for the upcoming RTP update had more flexibility although if the 20-year horizon was not maintained, according to the latest FHWA guidance it would prevent MTIP amendments until a new planning horizon was established and air quality conformity determination completed. He said the CAC would be used extensively throughout the update process and staff had been providing background information and "primers" on technical topics at CAC meetings. He said the current adopted RTP was published on Lane Council of Government's (LCOG) website and hard copies would be available after July 1, 2005.

Mr. Kelly observed that only one paragraph in the memorandum addressed MPC's direction to pursue integration of the RTP and the Transportation System Plan (TSP) into a single plan and said that should be an integral part of the work plan. He asked staff to provide more detail and confirm that by August 2005 staff could provide the MPC with a definitive answer to whether integration of the plans was possible. Mr. Thompson said that next year's Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), beginning in July, would incorporate pursuit of merging the plans, although staff discussions of that issue were currently under way. He said the additional work associated with merging the documents would be melded into the new RTP work plan. He believed that by August 2005 staff would be able to present a more comprehensive discussion of the pros and cons and obstacles to achieving that goal.

Ms. Bettman asked if the MPO had been presented a choice in December 2004 between the options to adopt an RTP horizon of 2025 that would require further action by December 2005 or adopt an RTP horizon extending through at least 2027 as described in Mr. Thompson's memorandum. Mr. Thompson said that both options were part of the discussions leading up to the December 2004 adoption and based on a technical analysis of the land use allocations, population and employment projections and coordination with local plans to accommodate growth through 2027 staff determined that the second option was not feasible within existing models. Mr. Schwetz added that the analysis indicated it would be extremely difficult to accommodate 2027 growth projections within the existing Eugene-Springfield urban growth boundary (UGB).

Ms. Bettman referred to a section of the memorandum that indicated land use and travel modeling for an RTP horizon beyond 2025 might require policy choices regarding the utilization of land and the accommodation of growth and asked if those were land use issues. She said the challenge to December 2004 RTP update adoption, which claimed that it was a land use decision, was characterized by LCOG as a discrete transportation issue but the memorandum identified land use issues. Mr. Thompson pointed out that the modeling assumptions about long-range growth and the locations of that growth were not land use decisions or a land use plan.

Ms. Bettman commented that the CAC's involvement as set forth in the draft RTP update schedule consisted of engaging them in the public involvement process. She said the purpose of creating the CAC was to obtain citizen input at the front end of the process in terms of community priorities, needs and perceptions and that should be a key component of its involvement. She suggested that the assumptions that would be used in the model should be reviewed by the CAC, as well as the MPC. Mr. Thompson replied that staff did anticipate discussing the model assumptions with the CAC and it was an oversight that it was not reflected on the schedule as a specific activity.

Mr. Schwetz cautioned that it was important to separate the assumptions made going into a planning process and the model; the model used those assumptions to generate output used as a tool to help provide guidance and inform the planning process. He said that the growth assumptions could be discussed at whatever level of detail the MPC wanted.

Mr. Thompson said the model was used for many different purposes and products and he estimated that the first set of assumptions and outlook on the new time horizon would be available in late summer or early fall.

Mr. Kelly proposed revising the draft RTP update timeline, including the points at which the CAC and MPC would be involved in discussions of model assumptions and merging of plans, and submit the revised timeline and project plan to the MPC for a vote at its July 2005 meeting.

Ms. Ballew commented that it appeared Mr. Kelly was asking the MPC to vote on how staff work was done. Mr. Kelly said he was suggesting the MPC should vote on who was involved and whether the MPC would have a chance to approve the policy assumptions in the model.

Ms. Volta asked staff if they would be willing to bring a discussion of the issues raised by Mr. Kelly to the joint meeting of the CAC and MPC that would likely occur in July.

Ms. Ballew suggested that staff provide a list of the general assumption to be used in the model.

Mr. Kelly agreed that a discussion at the joint CAC/MPC meeting was desirable, but he was still interested in having the MPC approve a revised timeline. Mr. Thompson said that staff would incorporate the points of CAC and MPC interaction in the update process and would also add other activities that needed to happen concurrently with the RTP update to illustrate the staff work load.

Ms. Ballew agreed that staff would return to the July 2005 with a revised work plan and the MPC could then decide whether it wished to take formal action to adopt.

Mr. Kelly asked why the memorandum did not mention a 2030 plan horizon. Mr. Thompson replied that it had not been addressed pending FWHA guidance and a technical analysis as to what growth assumptions could be modeled within the existing UGB and how growth could be accommodated within the MPO boundary.

Mr. Boyatt, noting that the horizon year for the federal plan was an MPO issue, asked if the jurisdictions' elected officials had a sense of when the 2015 comprehensive land use plan might be revisited.

Ms. Ballew observed that updating the comprehensive land use plan was an expensive undertaking and Springfield would not begin that process until necessary.

c. Modification of July and October MPC Meeting Schedule

Mr. Schwetz pointed out that the regularly scheduled October 2005 MPC meeting fell on Yom Kippur and staff proposed rescheduling the meeting to October 20, 2005. He said that a July 14, 2005, joint meeting of the CAC and MPC from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. was being considered. He said that members of both groups were also polled for an August 11 evening meeting and it appeared that a majority of both the CAC and MPC are available for the July date. He asked whether the MPC preferred a July or August joint meeting.

Ms. Ballew determined that there was a consensus to hold the joint meeting on July 14 and extend the meeting time to three hours in order to accommodate a discussion with the CAC and address items on the MPC's regular agenda.

d. Oregon MPO Consortium Meetings

Mr. Schwetz reviewed his memorandum of June 1, 2005, which summarized the Oregon MPO Consortium meeting on May 26, 2005, and included a copy of the adopted consortium bylaws. He noted that an amendment proposed by the Corvallis MPO and adopted by the consortium addressed the concerns raised by the Central Lane MPO related to a majority vote. He highlighted a conversation with Lori Sundstrom, ODOT Chief of Staff, regarding the West Coast Corridor Coalition (WCCC). He said that ODOT expressed concerns with the Discovery Institute, which was acting as consultant to the WCCC. He commented that representatives of some Oregon MPOs would be attending a WCCC meeting later in the month and would report back at the consortium's next meeting.

Mr. Schwetz reported that Rex Burkholder from Portland Metro was elected as chair and Linda Modrell of the Corvallis MPO was elected as vice chair of the consortium.

Ms. Fitch left the meeting at 12:45 p.m.

e. Interstate 5 (I-5)/Franklin System Planning

Mr. Boyatt provided a brief update of the I-5/Franklin Boulevard proposed interchange. He said that exploration of the Franklin Boulevard ramps would move ahead in tandem with the I-5 permanent replacement structure project. He said the I-5 permanent bridge replacement project consisted of four phases:

- Phase I Scoping
- Phase II Decision Process
- Phase III Planning and Analysis
- Phase IV Environmental Document

Mr. Boyatt indicated that Phase II would commence shortly and be an aggressive six-month investigation of options with a companion public involvement process that would ideally reach an outcome that was a decision by local jurisdictions whether to move forward with a plan amendment to support the project. He said it was clear during ODOT's discussions with local jurisdictions that while a smaller representative group would be established to provide oversight and problem-solving, it was necessary for each jurisdiction to indicate approval or disapproval of the project.

In response to a question from Ms. Bettman, Mr. Boyatt said that composition of the oversight body, which would then be appointed, had not yet been determined.

Ms. Bettman made the point that the CAC should be included early in the process to provide stakeholder input and community support.

Mr. Boyatt commented that the CAC would be informed about the process but it was advisory to the MPO and ODOT was dealing with issues at the jurisdictional level.

Ms. Bettman said the TPC should be having those discussions with the CAC. Mr. Thompson commented that the CAC bylaws listed its specific topics and responsibilities and did not include the I-5/Franklin Boulevard interchange project unless it was directed by the MPC to address it.

Ms. Bettman, seconded by Mr. Gaydos, moved to direct the Transportation Planning Committee to engage the MPO Citizen Advisory Committee in the I-5/Franklin Boulevard interchange project.

Mr. Kelly said that obtaining the CAC's comments at the current point in the process would be valuable and inform them about the project.

Ms. Volta stated that the MPC involved a wider scope than Eugene, Springfield and Lane County; the CAC was part of that body. She said she was not opposed to the CAC's involvement in another issue but ODOT had made a concerted effort to involve citizens through neighborhood associations and the public involvement should be through other stakeholder avenues than just the MPC.

Ms. Bettman explained her motion was based on her understanding that in order for the TPC to engage the CAC on the project, direction from the MPC was required. She was felt the project was exactly the type of process the CAC was created to be involved in.

Mr. Green observed that the CAC had asked him to emphasize to the MPC that if a quality product was desired it needed to receive tasks in advance. He said there was also an issue of timing and the capacity to deliver the desired product. He urged the MPC, when considering its decisions, to be aware that the CAC's plate was still full to the degree that it was still in the learning process.

Mr. Boyatt pointed out that the part of the decision by jurisdictions to move forward would include an amendment to the RTP, which could provide a good opportunity for the CAC's involvement. He agreed that ODOT could add the CAC to the list of stakeholders with which it would consult.

Mr. Thompson asked for clarification of Ms. Bettman's motion to direct the TPC to engage the CAC when the ODOT process was not with the TPC but rather involved a number of other groups. His earlier comment was intended to indicate that in order for the CAC to be involved in the project in any way, not just through the TPC, MPC direction was required.

Ms. Bettman amended her motion to remove reference to the Transportation Planning Committee. Mr. Gaydos, as second, agreed to the amendment.

Mr. Boyatt clarified that the project was proposed to ODOT by the community and while ODOT was facilitating the partnership specifically with Eugene and Springfield staff and elected officials, the project should not be characterized as an ODOT project.

Ms. Bettman said that the project was not yet a community project and placed on the table by a few people who had the power to move it to the front of the queue. She said it would not be a community project until it had been submitted to public input and received support.

Mr. Green disagreed with Ms. Bettman's assessment of the project as it was on the list of projects submitted to the State and from that standpoint was a priority. He was not certain what "community" Ms. Bettman was referring to.

Mr. Papé reminded members that there were two projects: one was to replace the bridge crossing the Willamette River on I-5 and was funded by Oregon Transportation Improvement Act (OTIA) funds and had to be completed within a required timeframe. He said that as that project came forward the community indicated an interest in revisiting the question of an interchange at Franklin Boulevard as part of the construction. He indicated that while ODOT felt there was merit to the interchange proposal, the timeframe and other considerations for the interchange, including lack of funding, made a parallel process necessary. He said that ODOT had contributed some funding for the interchange study and would consider a bridge design that could accept ramps in the future. He emphasized that significant community support for and involvement in the interchange project would need to be in evidence before ODOT or the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) would support further funding for the project. He said that ODOT's initial goal was simply to replace the bridge.

Mr. Kelly relayed concern from the Neighborhood Leadership Council that bicycle ingress/egress be considered during system design. Mr. Boyatt pointed out that ODOT policy required that existing bicycle ingress/egress be preserved and enhanced where possible.

The motion passed unanimously.

f. Seaside Funding Contingency Update

Mr. Boyatt related that ODOT Region 2 Manager Jeff Scheick had developed a contingency funding plan for consideration by the OTC in the event the Seaside Highway 101 project was cancelled. He said the OTC had directed that the contingency plan be revised to reflect priority funding for the Highway 20 Pioneer Mountain to Eddyville project. He indicated that the revision would reduce the original amount of \$8.6 million in additional funds for the I-5/Beltline Highway interchange project to \$3 million.

Mr. Green stated that he had participated in both OTC meetings as a Region 2 representative and praised Jeff Scheick and his staff for developing a contingency plan that kept the funds in the region when the Seaside project was cancelled.

g. Disposition of Correspondence to MPC

Mr. Schwetz stated that staff was proposing posting MPC correspondence on the LCOG website as it was received unless there were objections.

Mr. Kelly liked the idea and asked that MPC members receive an email alert when correspondence was posted so that they could review it.

Mr. Thompson clarified that the proposal was to post correspondence that was received outside of public comment periods; public comments requested on a topic would be forwarded in MPC agenda packets.

Ms. Ballew determined that there were no objections to the proposal.

h. Follow-up and MPO Calendar

i. I-105 Preservation Project Update

Ms. Schuetz reported that the project continued to be perfectly on schedule and in fact had been accelerated. She said that the first and second closures over I-5 had been completed and the third and fifth closures would be combined. She expected that construction would be completed by June 27, 2005.

Mr. Kelly asked if any measurements of delays elsewhere in the system had been done. Ms. Schuetz replied that as part of the congestion mitigation program an evaluation would be conducted on eight corridors at the end of the project. She said that actual traffic counts would be compared to the model. Mr. Schwetz added that discussions would also be held with key Eugene and Springfield staff about their experiences during the project.

Ms. Schuetz commented that part of the qualitative analysis would be interviews with all of the stakeholders and partners, from engineering to planning to communications, to see how well the project was implemented and the report would be available by the end of the summer.

ii. Report from Citizens Advisory Committee

Ms. Wiederhold reported that the CAC had decided to elect co-chairs in order for the work load of officers to be more manageable. She said that Dan Egan, executive director of the Springfield Chamber of Commerce, and Rex Redmon, landscape architect and member of the Lane County Roads Advisory Committee, were elected co-chairs; Sylvia Shaw, long-time community activist and member of the League of Women Voters was elected vice chair. She commended the CAC's selection of officers who could provide effective leadership.

iii. MTIP Administrative Amendments

Mr. Thompson stated that the item was information for purposes of reporting the TPC's May 19, 2005, action to adopt seven administrative amendments. He said that copies of the amendments were included in the agenda packet. He emphasized that the amendments were developed by the jurisdictions.

Mr. Kelly asked that staff provide short summaries of MTIP administrative amendments to afford an easier overview of the scope and purpose of amendments. He noted that three of the projects related to courthouse district transportation improvements and it appeared the purpose was to allocate existing funds among projects rather than add funds. Ms. Gardner replied that the amendments moved funds to the year of expenditure and reflected the rescission in the Federal earmark.

Mr. Kelly commented that in some cases a project had an "official" name that was different than the name by which the project was commonly known and asked staff to clarify when appropriate.

Ms. Bettman asked that the criteria under which the TPC had the authority to make a decision regarding an amendment be included in the project description. Mr. Thompson said that he would provide the requested information in the future. He noted that the amendments were now submitted on a form required by ODOT and while it did expedite the process he agreed they were less readable.

iv. LUBA Notice of Intent to Appeal MPC Adoption of 2025 RTP

Mr. Thompson pointed out that the first 17 pages of the petitioners' brief filed before the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) were included in the agenda packet. He said the remaining pages, which consisted of attachments, were available to MPC members upon request. On the advice of legal counsel he was unable to further discuss the matter until the MPO's response brief was filed on June 16, 2005.

Mr. Kelly asked that the response brief be emailed to MPC members or posted on the LCOG website. He noted that the petitioners' brief addressed the dissonance and confusion about having two separate plans.

v. Other Items

Ms. Bettman announced that the Eugene City County Intergovernmental Relations Committee (CCIGR) unanimously and retroactively opposed the transportation growth management (TGM) grant.

Mr. Thompson clarified that the City of Springfield had put forth an application for a TGM grant to update

the Eugene-Springfield TSP and included Eugene's participation in that grant process; the Eugene CCIGR had retroactively pulled Eugene from that process, but Springfield was still proceeding.

Mr. Schwetz referred to a recent newspaper article related to a State study of mileage tax. He said the pilot project was supposed to happen in Lane County and he was surprised to see that it would occur in Portland. He reported that ODOT had indicated there had been no interest among Lane County gas station owners in the project and Portland was selected as an alternate site to test the technology.

Ms. Ballew reminded members that the July MPC meeting would be held at 5:30 p.m. She adjourned the meeting at 1:20 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)