

# MINUTES

Metropolitan Policy Committee  
Springfield Library Meeting Room - 225 5<sup>th</sup> Street - Springfield

July 10, 2003  
11:30 a.m.

PRESENT: Bonny Bettman, Vice Chair; Ann Ballew, Mike Dean, Tammy Fitch, Gerry Gaydos, Ken Hamm, Pat Hocken, Mike Hudson, George Kloeppel, Cynthia Pappas, Randy Papé, Bob Pirrie, Peter Sorensen, Dennis Taylor, Jim Torrey, Bill VanVactor, Members;

Paul Thompson, Tom Schwetz, Staff;

Jim Carlson, Jan Childs, Tom Stinchfield, Terry Connolly, Jamon Kent, Greg Mott, Rob Handy, Nick Arnis, Laurie Segel, Guests;

ABSENT: Bill Dwyer

## 1. CALL TO ORDER/APPROVAL OF JUNE 12, 2003, MINUTES

Ms. Bettman called the meeting to order.

Ms. Ballew, seconded by Ms. Fitch, moved to approve the minutes of June 12, 2003, as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

## II. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Those present introduced themselves.

## III. COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

**Rob Handy**, 455 ½ River Road, called attention to a walking tour brochure containing a list of businesses in South Eugene. He said the brochure was a good use of neighborhood matching grants funds.

Mr. Handy stressed the importance of incorporating land use values into the TransPlan.

## IV. MPO ISSUES

### A. Proposed Project Evaluation Criteria and Process for Draft TIP Update

Paul Thompson called attention to the material in the meeting packet. The written material contained a TIP Update schedule, evaluation process for allocation of STP-U Funds, initial screening or eligibility criteria, factors to consider in prioritizing projects for STP-U funding, the scoring system for evaluation of proposals, and requested committee action. He outlined the criteria and process for the update and said staff would expect the committee to adopt those criteria in August. He said staff, at TPC, would then work with local jurisdictions to evaluate projects that were submitted for potential funding based on those

criteria. He said the MPC would see a draft funding list for initial review and a one month period for public input. He said the process would culminate in October with adoption of the updated TIP list and projects.

Mr. Thompson said the day's focus was on the proposed process and criteria for the evaluation of projects to receive funding from the local STP-Urban (STP-U) revenue. He called attention to page 4 of the memo included in the meeting packet. He said the expectation for the new fiscal year was that the area would receive approximately \$2.7 million in STP-U funds. In addition, he noted that there are approximately \$1.2 million dollars of unallocated carry over funds from the previous fiscal year. He said the total of those funds, subtracting \$1.9 million that had already been adopted into the TIP for the current fiscal year, was approximately \$7.5 million to be allocated for the three fiscal years of the TIP period in STP-U funds. He said staff were recommending targeting programming approximately 90 percent of that amount, or \$6.75 million in STP-U funds, over the three-year TIP horizon, to account for the federal "ceiling" on allocating projected variable revenues.

Mr. Thompson said the process staff was putting out for review would be one that had individual jurisdictions (members of the MPO: Lane County, City of Eugene, Lane Transit District, City of Springfield, and City of Coburg) submitting projects to the MPO for STP-U funding. He said the projects would be submitted through TPC and TPC would then evaluate the projects for meeting the eligibility criteria and how they score on the final prioritization criteria approved by the MPC in August. He said staff is proposing four project categories:

1. System Preservation
2. System Modernization
3. Transportation Planning and Project Development
4. Transportation Demand Management

Mr. Thompson said projects submitted for potential funding by the jurisdictions would be submitted under one of those categories and be evaluated in those categories against similar projects. He said this was because it would be difficult to evaluate all submitted projects under a single category. He said funding targets had been set up for each of the four categories to reflect what staff estimated needs to be for TDM and project development and planning, and the relative current priority and need for funding for system modernization and preservation. The recommended 10 percent funding level for the TDM program would help maintain the program at existing levels, but would still fall short of achieving the level of TDM program funding called for in TransPlan. He said staff were recommending that 50 percent of STP funds be allocated to system preservation projects and 20 percent for system modernization.

In response to a question from Mr. Sorenson regarding the definition of system modernization, Mr. Thompson said it meant projects that were new capacity. He said the projects could be roadway, transit, bicycle, or pedestrian in nature.

In response to a question from Mr. Sorenson regarding whether it would be only projects that were on the constrained list in the federal Regional Transportation Plan (RTP, or TransPlan), Mr. Thompson said it would be projects that were either currently on the constrained list or were consistent with TransPlan policies and could be added to the constrained list within the TIP time frame.

Mr. Thompson said the next step would be to evaluate projects submitted to the four categories. He called attention to page 8 of the memo where the process was described. He said there were three factors in the approval criteria;

1. The project must be included in or consistent with the 20 year constrained RTP.
2. The project must be eligible for STP-U funding based on federal guidelines
3. The project must be capable of being implemented within the TIP time frame

Calling attention to page 9 of the memo, Mr. Thompson said projects that passed the first set of screening factors would then be evaluated using the prioritization factors outlined on that page.

1. The ability of the proposal to leverage other public or private funding
2. The extent to which the proposal addresses one or more of the adopted TransPlan policies
3. The extent to which the proposal addresses one or more of the adopted TransPlan Transportation Planning Rule Alternative Performance Measures (APMs)

Mr. Thompson said alternative performance measures were very important to measure the implementation of TransPlan. He said staff would prefer to program funds toward projects that supported the progress toward those benchmarks.

The project prioritization scoring system was based on a maximum score of 100 points. He said the scoring system was outlined on page ten of the memo in the meeting packet.

Mr. Thompson called for feedback and direction from the committee as well as submitting the proposed process for public review before approval in August.

Mr. Schwetz said the public workshop for the process would be held in the Springfield Library Meeting Room on July 24, 2003, from 6-8 p.m.

Mr. Thompson distributed written answers to questions Ms. Bettman had sent to staff the previous day.

In response to a question from Mr. Sorenson regarding the rationale for including projects not on the constrained list, Mr. Thompson said, in order for a project not on the constrained list to be approved, it would need to be adoptable to that list within the TIP time frame.

Mayor Torrey said he endorsed the staff recommendation on that issue. He cited the bridge over the Willamette River as an example and said if that bridge needed to be replaced the City did not want to preclude itself from the ability to accomplish that replacement.

In response to a question from Ms. Bettman regarding the public feedback process and whether the committee was expected to take action at the public workshop, Mr. Thompson said staff were requesting action at the next MPC meeting on August 14.

In response to a question from Ms. Bettman regarding the scoring system for the proposals, Mr. Thompson said while funding by node or purpose or facility could be put into the scoring criteria, funding by jurisdiction needed to be handled cautiously because of federal regulations.

Ms. Bettman expressed a desire to see sample projects run through the matrix. The results could be shown at the public work shop.

Ms. Ballew questioned how a regional body could make decisions for individual jurisdictions. She said she was unsure how equity would be handled by the committee.

Mr. Kloepfel said his perception of the process was that the MPC would become more of a regional deliberative body so that equity would migrate into a sense of equity between the interests of the entire

region rather than individual jurisdictions.

Mr. Hudson agreed and questioned how the Region 2050 committee could weigh in on the process.

Ms. Fitch said she appreciated the early public involvement. She said there were good categories outlined by staff but noted that they might have to be changed.

Ms. Ballew noted that there would be projects specific to a city that would not need approval of the rest of the region. She suggested guidelines for those individual projects that would not take the time of the committee.

In response to a question from Mr. Papé regarding whether freight mobility would be included in the approval criteria, Mr. Thompson said it would be reflected in TransPlan policies that related to freight.

Ms. Hocken said the whole point of the staff proposal was to come up with a uniform process. She stressed the importance of meeting federal requirements for allocation. She said the staff proposal addressed those requirements.

Mr. Thompson said federal regulations did not allow the MPO to allocate funding to a jurisdiction for an unspecified purpose. He said the MPO needed to target funding to a specific project. He said the process was stricter than it used to be.

Ms. Ballew, seconded by Ms. Fitch, moved to open the process for public input on the proposed STP-U project evaluation as proposed by staff. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **B. Final Report and Recommendations from MPC Public Involvement Subcommittee**

Mr. Thompson referred members to the memo entitled; “Final Report & Recommendations from MPC Public Involvement Subcommittee.” He said the subcommittee was recommending adding citizen and stakeholder representation.

Mr. Thompson said the subcommittee had made the recommendations without necessarily working on the details of how to implement them. He said the MPC would need to discuss the recommendations and staff would work on recommendations for implementation.

Mayor Torrey said there was a new chair of the Oregon Transportation Commission who was an adamant supporter of ACTS. He raised concern over taking any action that would offend that group.

Mayor Torrey questioned why the Lane County Roads Advisory Committee would be included in the group. Ms. Bettman said staff had included that as an example of a stakeholder.

Mayor Torrey questioned whether there would be a mandate for ACTs and whether the proposal would meet the threshold requirements of an ACT.

Mr. Papé said he did not anticipate and had not heard any discussion of requiring ACT status. He said the commission was after a broader public involvement in arriving at decisions.

Mayor Torrey said his concern was that jurisdictions would be eliminated from competition for funding allocations because they had not formed ACTs.

Mr. Papé said he appreciated that view point but noted that he had not heard anything that this would be a criteria relative to the selection process. He said he would not move in a direction that would suggest that there would not be dollars allocated because an ACT had not been formed. He said his concern was whether there was appropriate community dialog and discussions.

Mayor Torrey noted that the Senate had discussed the issue of project readiness. He said groups could stop projects and noted it was easy for a project to lose its position in line for implementation because of special interests.

Ms. Hocken questioned whether there had been any feedback from ODOT regarding the issue. Mr. Thompson said there had been ODOT representation at the subcommittee meetings which had been very supportive of the proposals formed.

Ms. Fitch stressed the importance of citizen involvement. She added that number ten on the list of recommendations was crucial. She raised concern over adding more staff time and stressed the importance of streamlining the citizen involvement process.

Ms. Ballew raised concern that the committee could afford the staff time to respond to every public comment. She suggested prioritizing the public input and having staff comment on it in general.

Mr. Thompson said that had been staff's intent.

Ms. Bettman expressed her appreciation of the staff work that was done for the subcommittee as well as the citizen members who had participated. She said she supported the result. She said the most important issue was in recommendation #1 that TPC membership be expanded to add citizen stakeholder representation. She said her endorsement of the final product would hinge on the result of that item.

Ms. Ballew raised concern over taking too much time in getting a finished product.

In response to a question from Ms. Hocken regarding whether it was staff's intention to do the housekeeping update to the TPC by-laws as a separate step, Mr. Thompson said staff had not discussed which of the approaches it might take.

Ms. Hocken said housekeeping measures would determine how many stakeholders should be added to the group and raised concern that the size of the committee might become unwieldy

Mr. Schwetz noted that TPC bylaws would need to be approved by the MPC.

Mr. Papé said OTC was interested in a broad representation of the community. He noted that one member could represent different aspects of the public.

Mr. Sorenson said the report on public involvement and the subcommittees work had a substantial number of gaps that had been identified and said he was in favor of addressing those gaps.

Mr. Sorenson said to be more efficient there would be fewer committees, fewer public involvement opportunities, and less involvement in local government views. He said public involvement would lead to a better, if not faster, decision making process.

Mr. Papé agreed and said there was no replacement for common sense and good judgment.

### **C. Preview of 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter FY04 MPO Work Activities**

Mr. Schwetz said he had attached a memo in the meeting packet showing what would be happening in the next few months. He outlined the MPO work activities for the fiscal year in the document which included:

- Develop Congestion Management System (CMS) Plan
- Update Regional Transportation Plan
- Update TIP and Project Selection Process for STP-U funds
- Update Public Involvement Process Including Citizen's Guide to Transportation Planning
- Update Air Quality State Implementation Plan
- Update Assessment Process for Meeting Title VI and Related Requirements
- Revise MPO Agreements
- Revise MPO Planning Boundary

### **D. Draft FY06 - 09 STIP Criteria**

Mr. Thompson said the list of criteria was the most recent as of June 25. He said comments on the draft criteria had been asked for by August 15, but noted that MPC's next meeting would be on August 14. He said TPC would meet immediately after the current meeting was over to develop a recommendation for MPC.

### **E. MPO Calendar and Information Items**

Mr. Thompson called attention to the MPO Calendar. He said in August the MPC would look at an update of the RTP as well as asking for approval of the Draft FY06-09 STIP criteria.

Mr. Thompson called attention to a memo from Rob Zako, representing 1000 friends of Oregon, requesting clarification on the work program for preparing and adopting an integrated land use and transportation plan.

Mr. Thompson noted that the minutes and agendas from the last OTC meetings were being distributed around the table.

## **V. STATUS REPORTS**

This item was not addressed.

The meeting adjourned at 1 p.m.  
(Recorded by Joe Sams)

*LCOG: L:\MPC\AGENDAMINS\MINS\_20030710.DOC  
Last Saved: February 5, 2004*