

## MINUTES

Metropolitan Policy Committee and Citizen Advisory Committee Joint Meeting  
Lane Council of Governments Springfield Office – 640 “A” Street  
Springfield, Oregon

July 14, 2005  
11:30 a.m.

**PRESENT:** Anne Ballew (City of Springfield), Chair; Bobby Green (Lane County), Vice Chair; Bill Dwyer (Lane County), David Kelly, Kitty Piercy (City of Eugene), Judy Volta (City of Coburg), Gerry Gaydos, (Lane Transit District), Tom Boyatt (Oregon Department of Transportation), Metropolitan Policy Committee members; Jim Carlson for Dennis Taylor (City of Eugene), Ken Hamm (Lane Transit District), Bill Van Vactor (Lane County), *ex officio* members.

Dan Egan, Rex Redmon, Co-chairs; , Sylvia Shaw, Vice Chair; Peter Leung, Jan Spencer, Melissa Girard, David Roth, Jeanne-Marie Moore, Webb Sussman, Kristen Anderson, Citizen Advisory Committee members.

Byron Vanderpool, Tom Schwetz, Paul Thompson, Jamon Kent, Petra Schuetz, Ann Mortenson, Kathi Wiederhold (Lane Council of Governments); Randy Papé (Oregon Transportation Commission), Greg Mott, Nick Arnis (City of Springfield), Stefano Viggiano, Lisa Gardner, Anita Yap (Lane Transit District); Chris Henry, Kurt Yeiter, Mark Schoening (City of Eugene), Sonny Chickering, Tom Stinchfield (Lane County).

### WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Ms. Ballew welcomed those present to the joint meeting of the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) and the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC). She noted that the joint meeting would continue through agenda item 4.e, after which the CAC would adjourn and there would be a break. She invited CAC members to remain following the break if they wished to observe the actions of the MPC during the remainder of the meeting.

Members of the MPC and CAC introduced themselves.

### CALL TO ORDER/APPROVE JUNE 9, 2005, MINUTES

Ms. Ballew called the meeting of the MPC to order. Mr. Egan and Mr. Redmon called the meeting of the CAC to order.

Mr. Kelly noted that the reference to the Neighborhood Leadership Council at the bottom of page 7 should be changed to Laurel Hill Valley citizens.

Mr. Boyatt noted that the reference to the I-5 permanent bridge replacement project at the top of page 6 should be changed to the I-5/Franklin Boulevard proposed interchange project.

Mr. Green, seconded by Mr. Dwyer, moved to approve the June 9, 2005, minutes as corrected. The motion passed unanimously.

## COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

There was no one present wishing to speak.

## MPO ISSUES

### *Discussion Items:*

#### **Agenda Review and Citizen Advisory Committee Introductions and Report**

Mr. Green, MPC liaison to the CAC, thanked those in attendance at the joint meeting. He indicated that he had requested the meeting to help members of the MPC and CAC become acquainted with each other and gain a better understanding of each other's expectations. He asked CAC and MPC members to briefly share their thoughts, concerns and expectations.

#### CAC comments:

Mr. Egan said the CAC had not met enough yet to make a substantive contribution. There was much to learn about transportation and the CAC recognized its role to act on behalf of the public and also to assist the MPC in forming a good public outreach framework. He hoped that in the future the sequence of work coming to the CAC would allow for a more thorough review and thoughtful comments. He said the CAC would work hard to develop a good public process framework for citizens to provide input to the MPC on transportation issues.

Mr. Redmon agreed that it would take some time for the CAC to fully understand its role. He said the CAC's July 6, 2005, was the first opportunity to address a substantive issue instead of housekeeping matters. He asked for patience during the CAC's transition process.

Mr. Spencer agreed that it was a steep learning curve for the CAC. He appreciated his appointment to the committee and felt there were perspectives that urgently needed to be heard in the realm of transportation. He said one of his goals was to see transportation more closely tied to land use and focused on creating accessibility rather than mobility and reducing use of fossil fuels.

Mr. Roth said he came to the CAC with the perspective of a student, bicyclist and native Eugenean. He agreed with earlier remarks that it was a steep learning curve and the process had been very educational. He felt he was beginning to better understand the expectations of him as a committee member.

Ms. Girard said she was a University of Oregon student and she was there to learn.

Mr. Sussman related that he had a background in transportation planning and technology and represented the bicycle community. He brought that perspective to the meetings and was interested in helping to bring the MPC's transportation planning and policy efforts to a wider audience.

Ms. Moore said that her primary interest was pedestrians and pedestrian safety. She thought that people

were too automobile-oriented and was interested in encouraging people to get out of their cars with creative planning.

Ms. Shaw indicated she was a member of the Lane County League of Women Voters and active in community affairs.

Ms. Volta, seconded by Mr. Gaydos, moved to take up the Regional Transportation Plan amendment for Interstate 5/Coburge Interchange funding, currently item 4.h on the agenda, as the first action item following the break and preceding agenda item 4.f. The motion passed unanimously.

MPC comments:

Mr. Green stated that he had been a member of the MPC for several years and was involved in the creation of the CAC. He said the MPC needed to improve its citizen involvement process and assure transparency on transportation issues. He hoped that the CAC would be of high value to that effort and provide quality advice on the development of a good public process that would reassure people that their input was being heard by the MPC.

Mr. Dwyer agreed that the CAC would be a valuable tool, but it was taking longer than anticipated for it to become functional. He believed that citizen involvement at the CAC level would help to minimize criticism that the MPC did not listen to the public. With respect to the timing of requests to the CAC, he noted that the MPC frequently had to respond to issues within a very short timeframe and while every effort would be made to provide the CAC with information well in advance, there were situations that would require a quick turnaround.

Ms. Piercy commented that she was new to the MPC and on the same learning curve as the CAC members.

Mr. Kelly thanked CAC members for their willingness to serve. He acknowledged the learning curve involved and hoped that whatever decision was facing the CAC, members would ask themselves as members of the community what were the positive and negative impacts to the community. He said the CAC's purpose, as set forth in its bylaws, was to help the MPC design a public input process and also act as proxy for the general public to provide feedback on MPC matters.

Mr. Carlson urged the CAC to approach transportation issues differently than the MPC and look at those issues through a different lens than professional bureaucrats and elected officials in order to explain them to the general public.

Ms. Ballew hoped the CAC would succeed in helping the MPC form a process to better engage the public in transportation issues. She said the CAC were the eyes and ears of the community, but their bigger job was to draw more people into the public participation process.

Mr. Vanderpool asked CAC members to contact him if they had any needs with regard to staffing or support.

Mr. Boyatt noted that he had been to most of the CAC meetings to date. He said that the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) took citizen involvement very seriously and it was Goal 1 in the statewide land use program. He was pleased to see that the CAC was now organized and ready to address its important work.

Mr. Papé indicated that as a representative of the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) he was available as a resource to the CAC and greatly appreciated members' time and efforts on behalf of the MPC and citizens of Lane County.

Mr. Schwetz reiterated earlier comments about the importance of public involvement. He anticipated that the CAC would represent a body of fresh ideas.

Mr. Hamm remarked that the transportation infrastructure was the key to the livability of the community and he welcomed the involvement of the CAC in transportation issues.

Mr. Gaydos emphasized the importance of early public involvement and feedback on transportation issues and appreciated the time and efforts of the CAC.

Ms. Volta agreed that the learning curve on transportation issues was challenging, but said it was worthwhile. She said that everyone involved in the process was committed to improving the transportation system. She asked the CAC to continue to remind the MPC of the need to allow sufficient time for thoughtful feedback on the issues referred to it.

### **Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update Schedule and Issues**

Mr. Thompson provided an updated schedule and work plan for the RTP update process that would occur over the next 12 months. He noted the main focus of the update was to extend the plan horizon to maintain the minimum of 20 years required by federal regulations. He said the updated work plan contained more details, particularly of the CAC's involvement in the process, better reflection of how assumptions around extending the 20-year horizon and accommodating growth through 2030 would be analyzed and items related to integration of the RTP and transportation system plans (TSP). He pointed out that merging the RTP and local TSPs into a single federal plan would require agreement by local jurisdictions, not just the MPC. He said that Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) staff was performing an analysis of merger issues in conjunction with staff from the other jurisdictions.

Mr. Kelly noted that the MPC voted unanimously to pursue integration of the transportation plan required by the federal government (RTP) and the transportation plans required by the State (TSP) into one document. He reviewed the involvement of the CAC in the update process and asked why there was no review by the CAC of a draft plan when it was available in April 2006. He also noted that the month of February had been omitted from the schedule. Mr. Thompson said that the CAC was involved in the review of plan components as they were completed and he could add a review of the full document when it was released for public review in April.

Referring to Mr. Kelly's earlier comments regarding the CAC's dual responsibilities of rewriting a public involvement plan and commenting on all transportation issues, Mr. Egan pointed out that those were very different tasks. He asked what sort of comments the MPC was expecting from the CAC as it would be difficult for CAC members to perform a technical review. He offered that the CAC could identify key points where the general public might have trouble understanding issues and recommend ways to better engage people at those points. He asked if the MPC would prefer that the CAC simply provided its reaction to issues.

Mr. Kelly said that as a proxy for the public the CAC could offer its opinion on whether there was a reasonable statistical basis for the growth assumptions used by staff.

Mr. Spencer opined that people who were watching transportation issues needed to feel confident that the MPC was paying attention to global affairs, specifically with relation to energy and petroleum. He said many people he talked to were extremely concerned about the cost of energy and how that would impact the entire civilization and if those kinds of issues were not addressed those people would not be drawn into the process. He said that the MPC needed to acknowledge that the future was uncertain vis-à-vis energy costs. He said that people who shared those concerns would be valuable to the transportation planning process.

Mr. Sussman expressed concern with the bifurcation of the CAC's role. He heard the MPC indicate a desire for the CAC to review the content of plans as well as develop a public involvement process for the plan. He said that the limited time and resources available to the CAC required clearer direction from the MPC on where the CAC's emphasis should be.

Ms. Ballew felt the CAC's greatest contribution would be assistance to the MPC in obtaining greater public involvement and that should be its first priority; as members became more familiar with transportation issues and had more time the CAC could comment and provide input relative to other matters.

Mr. Thompson stated that the Public Involvement Plan (PIP) was a priority on the CAC's work plan and when the PIP was completed it would provide guidance for public involvement in key Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) products. Once the PIP was completed it might need occasional updating, but more time would be available for the CAC to focus on reviewing and commenting on documents.

Ms. Piercy observed that the CAC was charged with accomplishing both tasks and the challenge was to determine how to do that.

Mr. Dwyer observed that the MPC conducted few philosophical conversations about broader global issues because of the limited time it had to address the various State and federal requirements for transportation planning and policy matters. He was not certain that philosophical discussions were appropriate at the MPC level.

Mr. Kelly agreed that the CAC's role was bifurcated as it was created to both improve public involvement and provide substantial comment on issues. He said that there was ambivalence among MPC members about which role was most important.

Mr. Kelly moved, seconded by Mr. Dwyer, to adopt the *Central Lane MPO Regional Transportation Plan Update Schedule* as presented in the agenda packet with the addition of the month of February 2006 and a Citizen Advisory Committee review of draft plan. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Redmon noted that the schedule indicated a twelve-month planning process but the public was involved in commenting only in the three months prior to adoption of the plan, which gave very little time for the comments to be processed and incorporated. He said there should be a way for the public to be involved at an earlier stage while the plan was being developed and there was still time for changes to be made. He acknowledged the difficulties inherent in presenting information to the public before it was fully formulated but encouraged the MPC and staff to explore ways to involve the public sooner and allow more time for the jurisdictions and staff to react to that public input.

Ms. Piercy recognized that the MPC's schedule did not accommodate philosophical discussions, but

thought that there should be a place for the community to address some of the larger issues raised by Mr. Spencer as they did have an impact on transportation decisions.

Mr. Thompson said that staff would try to take information to the public as soon as possible in the process and release the draft plan several months before adoption, as well as hold public hearings one or two months before adoption.

Mr. Sussman agreed with Mr. Redmon's comments. He said his concern when he reviewed the updated schedule was lack of a public meeting during the October and November 2005 time period or if not a meeting, some type of public involvement that could include a website, radio advertisements, newspaper articles and interviews or other methods to notify the public that the planning process was under way. He also indicated concern with the short reaction time for the public and for staff to make changes or react to suggestions from the public.

Mr. Egan read the following statement of purpose for the CAC:

“Involve the public in regional transportation planning by

- developing associations with other organizations, including serving individually as a liaison
- disseminating information about MPO plans or decisions, subject to review and approval by the Metropolitan Policy Committee
- soliciting and considering input
- developing effective involvement processes for various MPO activities, and

Provide recommendations to the Metropolitan Policy Committee in preparation of the transportation plans and programs specified in the bylaws.”

Mr. Egan asked the MPC to make its expectations of the CAC clear on an ongoing basis and provide explicit direction on where the CAC should focus its efforts and what results the MPC wanted.

Ms. Ballew thanked MPC and CAC members for their patience during the transition period while expectations of the CAC were still being shaped.

### **Central Lane MPO Public Involvement Plan (PIP)**

Ms. Wiederhold said the purpose of the agenda item was to discuss and obtain direction from the MPC and CAC on development of an updated plan. She said the current plan was adopted in 1995 and it was time for an update to meet requirements and suggestions that came out of the federal certification review and make other changes that fit better with the MPC's objectives for a public involvement program. She said there were two areas of focus for the update: the process element that would tell citizens how to get involved in each key product of regional transportation planning and the presentation piece that would provide information in a citizen-friendly, non-technical manner. She distributed documents that provided examples of public involvement plans and presentation materials from other jurisdictions. She said that staff would work with the CAC, based on the direction provided, to bring products back to the MPC.

Mr. Green expressed the hope that an updated plan would improve citizen engagement in and understanding of transportation issues and promote active involvement and buy-in. He used ODOT's “drop-in” sessions for the public as an example of a model informing people about transportation. He

hoped the CAC could find a model that would work best in the community.

Ms. Piercy noted that some people were good at self-selecting and others who should be drawn into the process. She urged the CAC and staff to take a broad look at stakeholders beyond those typically involved in transportation issues and invite them into the process.

Mr. Van Vactor thanked Ms. Moore for reminding the committees that information needed to be provided in alternate formats and not just as written documents.

Mr. Sussman said it was important to begin now to think of different ways to involve the public in the process because there was not as much calendar time left as it appeared on the schedule, particularly when revisions and approval of documents were factored in. He said the CAC was already discussing different techniques for getting information out to the community and those would need to be implemented soon.

Mr. Dwyer stated it was important to educate the public about the need to respond to various federal and State requirements so they would understand why certain actions needed to be taken at certain times; the “who, what, why, and when” of the process should be explained and the importance of speaking out and providing input at the earliest opportunity emphasized.

Mr. Spencer suggested that information include an element of historical continuity to put the issue in context and remind people that these were not new issues but part of an ongoing process. He noted community efforts in Eugene several years ago to develop City goals and policies regarding issues such as compact development, transportation choices, the environment and energy conservation and State goals that were similar. He said the transportation planning process should be accountable to those goals and policies as many people would not participate if they perceived inconsistency with established goals and policies. He said that accountability would help build trust and honesty and encourage public involvement.

Mr. Kelly commented that the PIP applied to almost all of the MPC’s activities, not just the RTP. He said the challenge for the CAC was that the revised PIP would not be completed prior to commencement of the RTP update process and therefore the RTP public involvement would be ad hoc rather than guided by the PIP. He said people could be encouraged to educate themselves about the RTP update by reviewing the currently adopted RTP.

Mr. Egan reiterated that the CAC would have difficulty doing a good job if the MPC was not clear about desired outcomes. He said that a better PIP would result if non-transportation people were involved in developing it. He said there were good models available and the CAC could achieve its goal of providing an improved PIP if the MPC provided clear direction about when that product was required.

Ms. Volta commented that she would like to discuss philosophical issues but the MPC was responsible for practical matters pertaining to assuring that the transportation system functioned efficiently and it was important to focus on that job and not become sidetracked.

Mr. Kelly felt the July 2, 2005, memorandum from Ms. Wiederhold set forth a good outline for the PIP.

Mr. Redmon agreed that the MPC was required to process significant technical information at its meetings and the CAC could help bring bigger picture issues into the process and provide a reality check for the long range planning activities.

Ms. Ballew concurred that the memorandum contained the important components of a PIP and asked that an updated matrix be provided consistent with the MPC and CAC discussion of a plan.

Mr. Spencer commented that geology was not the same as philosophy and the MPC should be involved in taking the most practical, accountable action possible. He said that those actions should be accountable to geological evidence was essential.

### **Comments on FY08-11 STIP Eligibility Criteria and Prioritization Factors; FY08-11 STIP Timeline and Process**

Mr. Thompson explained that the development of criteria and prioritization factors was the beginning a two-year process for the FY08-11 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). He said the process was very similar to the FY06-09 STIP process and drew attention to the State and local timelines included in the agenda packet. He noted that the Central Lane MPO timeline included involvement of the CAC at a number of points in the process. He said that the OTC had requested input on priorities for projects that might be funded through the STIP. He said that the criteria had not been substantially modified from those that currently applied and referred to a May 27, 2005, memorandum from ODOT that highlighted changes. He said that staff and the Transportation Planning Committee had reviewed the modifications and unanimously agreed that they should be accepted and there was no need for further comment. He asked the MPC to determine whether it wished to respond.

Mr. Kelly noted the clear role for the CAC in *Attachment 2: Central Lane MPO FY08-11 STIP Timeline* and the fact that adequate time was allowed for the CAC's comments to be considered by the MPC at each step of the process. He also noted that consideration of rail was outside of the STIP process and asked if there were other opportunities for the MPO to comment on the rail portion of the STIP. Mr. Papé said the most appropriate opportunity for comment would be during modification of the State's modal plan for rail, which would begin soon. Mr. Schwetz added that there would also be an opportunity during the STIP process on all prioritizations and could provide feedback at that time, perhaps in conjunction with other MPOs along the corridor.

Mr. Thompson pointed out that the comments being solicited by ODOT were on the eligibility criteria and prioritization factors; there would be a later opportunity to comment on the priority project list.

Ms. Ballew determined it was the consensus of the MPC to submit a letter to OTC in support of the eligibility criteria as proposed.

### **Evaluation Criteria and Process for Programming FY07-09 Surface Transportation Program-Urban (STP-U) Funds; Schedule for FY06-09 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Update**

Mr. Thompson explained that the agenda item combined both the criteria and process for programming FY09-09 STP-U funds and the schedule for the FY06-09 MTIP update. He said that later in the meeting the MPC would program supplemental STP-U funds for FY06. He stated that STP-U funds were programmed only through FY06 and a current MTIP that covered FY05-07. He said the FY06-09 STIP was about to be adopted and it was desirable at the federal, state and local levels to keep those documents as closely synchronized as possible. He said the MPO needed to embark immediately on a process to update its MTIP to cover FY06-09 and as part of that it was necessary to program STP-U funds out to

FY09. He referred to *Attachment 1: Draft Schedule for FY06-09 MTIP Update and FY07-09 STP-U Funding*, which outlined the process necessary to achieve those goals by December 13, 2005, when the current RTP would slip below a 20-year horizon. He reviewed the proposed schedule and said the accelerated timeframe was mainly due to programming of STP-U funds for modernization projects that would have air quality impacts. He said that projects that would go into the new MTIP that had air quality impacts were the ones that needed to be programmed before the long-range plan slipped below a 20-year horizon; other projects that did not have air quality impacts could be programmed into the MTIP beyond December 13, 2005. He said that if jurisdictions had concerns about the proposed schedule it was possible to take some of the actions prior to December 13 and defer others.

In response to a question from Mr. Carlson, Mr. Thompson said that projects with air quality impacts, such as signal timing, would trigger an air conformity analysis and if there was no impact a project could be programmed into the MTIP with less than a 20-year horizon. He said that staff was asking for direction on the proposed schedule.

Ms. Ballew said that a problem was presented by Eugene and Springfield city councils going on summer break and questioned whether there was time to complete all actions set out in the schedule. She said it was important for jurisdictions to submit their applications for modernization projects as soon as possible, but more time might be needed to submit other STP-U applications the jurisdictions might be considering.

Mr. Thompson suggested another option that would only program STP-U funds in FY07 instead of trying to address the entire three-year period by only submitting modernization projects. He asked for direction from the MPC on what types of applications should be accepted in the August 11-22, 2005 time frame, to assure that jurisdictions were applying for the same set of funds in the same categories. He said that direction should include whether applications would be accepted for all three years for all funding categories, the first year for all categories, or the first year for modernization funds only.

Ms. Piercy stated that Eugene had placed a priority on preservation but with the current criteria those road preservation projects would score near the bottom. She raised the issue of whether there could be scoring criteria developed for preservation projects that would allow Eugene priority street preservation projects to compete for STP-U funds. Mr. Thompson responded that the TPC would review evaluation criteria on July 28, the CAC would review the criteria on August 3 and MPC would be reviewing evaluation criteria, consider recommendations and comments from the TPC and MPC at its August 11, 2005, meeting; there was a very short time period for significant changes to the evaluation criteria.

Mr. Kelly concurred with Ms. Piercy's remarks about the importance of preservation to the City of Eugene and commented that STP-U funds represented one of the few flexible sources of transportation funds. He asked the TPC to consider at its July 28, 2005, meeting how to allow Eugene to compete for preservation projects on a level playing field. He also asked, given the accelerated timeline for modernization projects, that Eugene staff be consulted regarding time on the City Council's schedule to review the applications that would be submitted.

Mr. Spencer remarked that transportation demand management (TDM) funds were like "spare change" with only 10 percent of funds going to TDM. He asked if there had been an analysis of the payback on investment of funds in TDM activities over time. Mr. Thompson replied that TDM and transportation options (TO) projects had a supplemental allocation of \$130,000 in addition to the \$225,000 already programmed in FY06 and could have received additional funds but the program had indicated that it already had so many activities under way that it could not undertake any additional work.

Mr. Carlson indicated that Eugene wanted to look at options for a better way to prioritize preservation projects. He said as an example the current criteria for preservation projects awarded more points for bike path preservation because of TransPlan policies than for street preservation. Mr. Thompson said that staff was considering how criteria could be modified to give more weight to the policy of preserving existing roadways instead of building new ones.

In response to a comment from Mr. Redmon regarding the short time between the CAC meeting in October and the MPC public hearing a few days later, Mr. Thompson corrected the date of the public hearing from October 13 to October 20, 2005. He said that staff would explore other changes to the schedule that would allow more time for review and comments.

Mr. Green asked if there was a consistent practice across the State on use of STP-U funds or did practices vary among MPOs. He noted that Eugene wanted to increase the weight given to preservation projects and asked what approach other jurisdictions used. Mr. Thompson replied that the MPO must program funds across the region without regard to jurisdiction. He said that evaluation criteria were a local decision and varied from MPO to MPO.

Mr. Kelly stated he was hesitant to provide direction at the present time because much depended on what occurred at the July 28, 2005, TPC meeting and whether the TPC could develop criteria that all of the jurisdictions accepted.

Ms. Piercy commented that Eugene's interest in preservation had been known for a considerable period of time.

Mr. Egan observed that there was a finite amount of funds available for which jurisdictions could complete; it appeared that Eugene wanted to change the rules of competition to favor its projects. He asked if it was inherent in the current scoring system that preservation projects were not treated fairly. Mr. Thompson explained that the scoring criteria were the same across categories based on TransPlan policies, which had less emphasis on preservation.

Mr. Schwetz clarified that the intent of the proposal was to modify the preservation criteria so that it made more sense, not to benefit a particular jurisdiction. He gave roadway resurfacing as an example of a project that would serve transit and pedestrians as well as cars and should score higher than a single mode project such as a transit shelter.

Ms. Ballew suggested that 20 percent of the anticipated \$3.5 million be set aside for modernization applications and ask staff to equalize treatment for paving preservation projects.

Mr. Kelly said that Ms. Ballew's suggestion made sense pending decisions by the TPC at its July 28, 2005, meeting.

Mr. Green asked who scored the applications. Mr. Thompson replied that the applications were scored by the jurisdictions based on the criteria.

Mr. Green commented that it was acceptable to keep the playing field level but priorities could change in ten years and it was important to remember that the funds were flexible.

Ms. Ballew determined that there was consensus to reserve 20 percent of the \$3.5 million for modernization funds and urged jurisdictions to submit their applications quickly.

The Citizen Advisory Committee meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m. The Metropolitan Policy Committee took a short break.

Ms. Ballew reconvened the meeting of the MPC at 7:45 p.m.

***Action Items:***

**Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Amendment for I-5/Coburg Interchange Funding**

Mr. Thompson pointed out an omission in the July 6, 2005 staff memorandum. He said that in addition to \$2.5 million in Lane County road fund money and \$9.2 million in the reauthorization of the federal transportation bill, there was \$3 million more in federal funding for a total of \$14.7 million for the project.

He said the \$14.7 million met the federal requirement for reasonably expected revenue and the project should be included on the RTP financially constrained project list and subsequently, upon completion of the federal reauthorization process, the federal and County funds should be programmed into the MTIP. He reviewed the timeline for the RTP amendment adoption process. He asked for MPC direction to staff. He said that ODOT was currently working on a management plan for the project, which could result in changes to the project cost estimate.

Mr. Dwyer, seconded by Mr. Green, moved to direct staff to immediately proceed with amending the Regional Transportation Plan to move the Interstate 5/Coburg interchange project from the “illustrative” project list to the financially constrained project list and present the amendment to the MPC at its August 2005 meeting.

Mr. Boyatt drew the MPC’s attention to the fact that the MTIP amendment would be sent to ODOT as a STIP amendment after the project was scoped out and costs determined. He said the MPC would have to determine how to fill any gap in funding between the \$14.7 million available for the project and the estimated costs.

Mr. Kelly asked why the project was not in the RTP update adopted in December 2004. Mr. Dwyer replied that the project was not yet in the reauthorization bill.

The motion passed unanimously.

**Supplemental Programming of FY06 STP-U Funds**

Mr. Thompson reviewed Resolution 2005-08, which set forth amendments to the FY05-07 MTIP to program STP-U funds in FY06 consistent with direction from the MPC to target the \$1.3 million in additional funding in three project categories. He noted that the original estimate of \$1.3 million had been increased to approximately \$1.721 and that amount was recommended for programming into the MTIP. He reviewed the *FY06 STP-U Fund Application Summary* spreadsheet that provided a description of all applications received, funding requests, screening criteria and evaluation, and recommended programming of STP-U funds.

Mr. Green, seconded by Ms. Volta, moved to approve Resolution 2005-08 adopting amendments to the FY05-07 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement

Program to program Surface Transportation Program-Urban funds in FY06.

Mr. Kelly questioned categorization of a Lane Transit District (LTD) project as preservation instead of modernization. Ms. Yap explained that the project did not represent any expansion of service.

The motion passed unanimously.

### **Amendments to Central Lane MPO FY05-07 MTIP**

Mr. Thompson reviewed the eight amendments that were included in Resolution 2005-09. He said the amendments primarily represented adjustments in timing or refinements to funds related to match amounts or increases in federal funding for LTD projects. He said the City of Springfield project amendment was somewhat different and would move all unobligated STP-U funds originally programmed earlier for Springfield planning activities and reprogram them into new Springfield planning projects with regional significance.

Mr. Kelly, seconded by Ms. Piercy, moved to approve Resolution 2005-09 adopting amendments to the FY05-07 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program.

Mr. Boyatt asked if the RTP or MTIP went out of conformity would the MPC be able to take those actions. Mr. Thompson replied that it could if there were no air quality impacts.

Mr. Kelly suggested that the agenda packet could contain project summary sheets only with a reference to project details available on the LCOG website.

The motion passed unanimously.

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

#### **Interstate 105 (I-105) Preservation Project Update**

Ms. Schuetz reported that the project was completed and an evaluation of the project and congestion mitigation and public outreach efforts would be presented to the MPC at a future meeting.

Mr. Boyatt expressed ODOT's gratitude to the communities for their cooperation during the closures and to Commuter Solutions and its outreach program.

Mr. Schwetz noted that the "Keep Us Moving" project and website would be used for future projects as it had proven its effectiveness.

#### **Proposed Amendments to the Oregon Highway Plan**

Mr. Thompson remarked that the proposed amendments had originated as the proposed changes to freight route designations reviewed previously by the MPC. He said the TPC had reviewed the amendments and

found no need to submit further comments, although the MPC could choose to send a letter to the OTC thanking them for incorporating the comments and for the amendments.

Ms. Volta asked staff to keep the MPC apprised of the actions on the Oregon Highway Plan.  
Mr. Boyatt said the OTC would adopt the amendments at its August 17, 2005, meeting, which would add 32 segments to the State's freight routes.

Ms. Ballew determined it was the consensus of the MPC to direct staff to draft a letter to the OTC regarding the proposed amendments.

### **MTIP Administrative Amendments**

Mr. Thompson reported that the TPC, in accordance with the conditions outlined in the MTIP, had adopted eight administrative amendments at its June 23, 2005, meeting. He referred to a summary of the amendments included in the agenda packet.

### **Respondent Brief to LUBA No. 2004-223; Motion to Strike**

Mr. Thompson reported that the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) had heard oral arguments on the case on June 30, 2005, and a ruling was expected on July 28, 2005.

Mr. Van Vactor noted that the LUBA appeal and related materials were available on the LCOG website.

Mr. Kelly said he would arrive late at the August 11, 2005, MPC meeting and asked that action items be moved to the end of the agenda.

Mr. Green thanked everyone for their participation in the joint meeting with the CAC and felt it was beneficial for both groups.

Ms. Volta thanked Mr. Green for requesting the joint meeting.

Ms. Ballew thanked everyone for their participation and reminded MPC members that their next meeting would be held at 11:30 a.m. on August 11, 2006. She adjourned the meeting at 8:15 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)