

MINUTES

Metropolitan Policy Committee
Eugene Public Library—Bascom-Tykeson Room—100 West 10th Avenue
Eugene, Oregon

August 9, 2007
11:30 a.m.

PRESENT: Kitty Piercy, Chair; Alan Zelenka (City of Eugene); Bobby Green, Peter Sorenson (Lane County), Anne Ballew, John Woodrow (City of Springfield), Gerry Gaydos, Greg Evans (Lane Transit District), Judy Volta (City of Coburg), Jane Lee (Oregon Department of Transportation), members; Angel Jones (City of Eugene), Bill Van Vactor (Lane County), Dan Brown for Gino Grimaldi (City of Springfield), Mark Pangborn (Lane Transit District), *ex officio* members.

George Kloeppe, Byron Vanderpool, Ann Mortenson, Paul Thompson, Jamon Kent (Lane Council of Governments); Ann Sanders, Ed Moore (Oregon Department of Transportation); Greg Mott, Tom Boyatt, Len Goodwin (City of Springfield), Connie Bloom Williams, Lisa VanWinkle (Lane Transit District); Tom Stinchfield (Lane County); Dave Jacobson (Citizen Advisory Committee), Rob Zako, Terry Connelly, Zachary Vishanoff, Lauri Segel, guests.

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

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

APPROVE JUNE 14, 2007, AND JULY 12, 2007, MINUTES

Mr. Green, seconded by Mr. Woodrow, moved to approve the minutes of the June 14 and July 12, 2007, meetings. The motion passed unanimously, 10:0.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Zachary Vishanoff, Patterson Street, Eugene, raised objections to the sale of vintage homes in the University of Oregon vicinity for \$1. He said a land bank was being created for the purposes of conducting research activities. He asserted that the University and the City of Eugene were in collusion on the basketball arena project adjacent to Franklin Boulevard, which would involve the potential loss of historic buildings in the area, including McArthur Court. He felt that funds should be used to address the backlog of road maintenance and other basic infrastructure projects and a gas tax should be reserved for use special projects and amenities.

Rob Zako, 1280-B East 28th Avenue, Eugene, representing 1000 Friends of Oregon, spoke on the importance of the relationship between land use planning and transportation planning. He said the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update was being done to comply with Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). He cited a section of the legislation

related to the scope of metropolitan planning processes and emphasized the connection to land use planning. He said MPC staff had indicated problems achieving consistency between transportation and land use plans because of the different planning horizons and the RTP update did not appear to promote that consistency.

Lauri Segel, 642 Charnelton Street, Eugene, expressed concern about citizen involvement and the opportunities for citizen participation. She complained about the discrepancy between the minutes adopted by the MPC and the version that was available on the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) website as part of the MPC agenda packet. She said the version on the website was in legislative format and it was not clear to her who had been appointed to the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC). She said the RTP had been substituted to TransPlan and the updates were not occurring as originally proposed. She said that it was difficult for people to participate in the RTP update process because they did not understand the content. She saw problems with the RTP because the metropolitan area was being broken into two population projects with major changes in assumptions.

Ms. Piercy called for responses to the public comments.

Mr. Zelenka stated that the City of Eugene was not involved in any way in eminent domain with respect to the basketball arena. He said that traffic calming efforts in the east campus area resulted from the neighborhood refinement plan, which was developed well before plans for a basketball arena in the area.

Mr. Vanderpool said an edited version of the minutes was inadvertently posted on the website and the initial confusion about appointments had been resolved and a list of new and pending appointments to the CAC was included in the agenda packet and was on the agenda for discussion.

Mr. Kloeppe said that Eugene, Lane County and Springfield had been working with the language of the RTP and drew committee members' attention to a handout that contained language approved by Eugene and Springfield legal counsels. He said the language made the distinction between the RTP as a federal transportation planning document with a long planning horizon and the Metro Plan, which was a land use compliance document.

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO) ISSUES

Report from the MPO Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)

Dave Jacobson, CAC vice chair, thanked the MPC for its recent appointment of four new members to terms effective August 1. He said due to vacancies on the committee, the CAC was requesting that the four individuals who had been approved for terms beginning on January 1, 2008, be appointed immediately. He said that proposed amendments to the bylaws were included in the agenda materials. He invited Ms. Segel to attend CAC meetings, which were held on the first Wednesday of each month and open to the public.

Mr. Green, seconded by Ms. Ballew, moved to waive the provisions of the CAC bylaws and immediately appoint the next four individuals on the list. The motion passed unanimously, 10:0.

Adopt 2008-2011 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP)

Mr. Thompson said the MPC had seen the draft project list and language modification to the 2008-2011 MTIP. He said the public comment period included an open house and a public hearing before the MPC at its July meeting. He said a number of comments were received and those were summarized in the agenda materials, along with staff responses. He pointed out that the resolution for adoption specifically indicated that the MTIP would not go into effect any earlier than October 1 or any later than when the new State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) went into effect. He noted the current MTIP was in effect until the time that the new MTIP would take effect.

Ms. Piercy expressed appreciation for the public comments received on the MTIP, particularly those related to Eugene Water & Electric Board (EWEB) and collaborative planning initiatives.

Ms. Ballew, seconded by Mr. Evans, moved to approve Resolution 2007-07, adopting the Central Lane MPO FFY08-11 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program as shown in Exhibit A to the Resolution. The motion passed unanimously, 10:0.

Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2031 Update: Preliminary Draft

Mr. Thompson referred to the preliminary draft of the 2031 RTP. He said the draft was available for public comment and discussion, a public hearing was scheduled for the MPC's September 2007 meeting and adoption was scheduled for the October meeting. He noted that modeling for performance measures in Chapter 4 had not been completed yet, but would be included in the September version. He said the public comment period opened on August 6 and would remain open until just before the October meeting. He noted the handout containing draft language clarifying federal and state plan interaction, which was being proposed for incorporation in the RTP. Regarding consistency between transportation and state and local plans, he said that guidance from the Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) indicated they did not expect the federal process to lead land use or economic development planning processes. He said FHWA had reviewed the draft RTP and planning processes and were satisfied.

Ms. Ballew understood that the RTP was a document intended to comply with federal requirements and while there were references to land use planning and TransPlan throughout the document, intermingling the documents would lose the distinction among plans. She felt that appendices E and F did not belong in a federal transportation plan and Chapter 2 was a repetition of TransPlan policies. She preferred to eliminate those things and reduce the RTP to a more streamlined and understandable document.

Mr. Thompson said when the RTP and TransPlan were one document in 2001-2002, it was a much larger document; when the RTP was adopted as a separate document its size was reduced somewhat and perhaps further reductions could be made. He said the appendices were included to establish the linkage between the RTP and local plans.

Mr. Sorenson noted the memorandum from Mr. Zako contained a number of recommendations for actions the MPC should take in advance of adopting the RTP and asked if those were possible. Mr. Thompson said the actions were possible. He said that LCOG staff had been working with the transportation and land use staff and legal counsels from Lane County, Springfield and Eugene to address those issues.

Mr. Sorenson asked if adoption of the RTP could be delayed and federal officials notified in order for those actions related to a greater degree of coordination between land use and transportation planning to occur. Mr. Thompson replied that it would not be necessary to request permission to delay adoption as federal officials were primarily concerned that the MPO had SAFETEA-LU compliant processes in place and had given preliminary indications that they found the MPO to be in compliance.

Mr. Sorenson asked if adoption of the RTP on the current schedule meant the MPO had committed to a transportation plan in advance of the state-required land use plan, raising a public concern that pavement would be laid and planning would occur later. Mr. Thompson said the MTIP was the document that actually contained pavement projects and it only had a four year horizon; the RTP had a 24-year horizon and was required to be updated every four years in order to keep up with changing planning assumptions.

Mr. Green commented that the County was facing potential loss of federal timber receipts and was currently analyzing the feasibility of system development charges as a means to increase revenue in the face of financial uncertainty.

Mr. Zelenka asked for a written response from LCOG before the next MPC meeting to the five points raised in Mr. Zako's memorandum. He asked for an explanation of the two projects related to Beltline that had been added to the RTP. Mr. Thompson said the RTP project lists had been presented to the MPC in April and the two related to Beltline had been added by the Oregon Department of Transportation. He asked an ODOT representative to discuss those projects.

Mr. Moore explained that both projects had been submitted to the MPC by the City of Eugene as ODOT had allowed local jurisdictions to determine what projects would take the place of the West Eugene Parkway projects that had been removed from the plan.

Mr. Gaydos noted that Lane Transit District had a number of projects in the RTP and it was important that the process continue to move forward. He said LTD required those public dollars to continue to provide service to the community. He noted that local jurisdictions drove the project list and it was important to understand that transportation and land use planning was linked at the local level.

Ms. Ballew agreed with Mr. Gaydos and did not think the MPC was in a position to make land use planning decisions; that responsibility remained with local jurisdictions and that distinction needed to be clear.

Ms. Piercy observed that many people believe land use planning affected transportation and those things had to be considered together.

Mr. Green remarked that when the MPC was originally created there were discussions of land use issues and when conflicts arose, the MPC made recommendations to local jurisdictions. He said as the MPC began to focus on transportation there was no longer that direct involvement in land use issues, but there should still be discussions of how to work together as a region to avoid the types of conflicts that used to occur.

Mr. Zelenka considered transportation and land use to be so inextricably linked that it was difficult to separate them; they needed to function together to create a healthy community. He was not certain what the term "consistency" meant in the federal context, but thought it should mean that transportation and land use planning should support each other and be considered in the same comprehensive way.

Mr. Sorenson said one concept was that transportation was part of an organic process that involved education, health care, land use planning, public structures and it all needed to be done together; the other concept was that transportation meant highways, railroad and airports. He said the MPC needed to recognize that if it was going to use federal funds it did not get to have that debate and would have to follow federal law. He said the congressional policy shift to expand the scope of the federal transportation planning process to include consistency between transportation improvements and state and local plans for growth and economic development the issue was resolved.

Mr. Woodrow suggested that if references to local plans had to be in the RTP, an introductory statement should be included that explained the purpose and source of those references.

Mr. Thompson stated that a 2004 decision by the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) had determined that the MPO's decisions and federal RTP were not land use actions.

Ms. Volta agreed with the need for land use plans, policies and decisions, but when the MPC became involved in those issues it effectively halted moving discussions forward. She hoped that land use issues would be decided outside of the MPC and the MPC could move forward with transportation planning in an efficient, collaborative way.

Mr. Gaydos felt that MPC members agreed with the connection between land use and transportation planning. He said the reality was that land use planning decisions occurred at the local jurisdiction level and the transportation projects were generated by those jurisdictions and submitted to the MPO. He said the State had a good record of land use planning and had done a good job of integrating transportation and what occurred in Oregon could have been a model for federal requirements.

Smart Routes to Schools Applications

Lisa VanWinkle, Commuter Solutions, provided an overview of the funding provided in SAFETEA-LU to all fifty states to promote walking and biking to school for grades kindergarten through eight. She said funding could be used for projects in two categories: infrastructure such as bike paths, bike racks and sidewalks and education/enforcement. She said schools could apply for funds in one or both categories. She described applications from four schools: Monroe Middle School and Roosevelt Middle School in Eugene, Thurston Elementary School in Springfield and Veneta Elementary School. She commended the schools for the significant amount of work that went into preparation of the applications. She expected decisions on the education/enforcement applications to be made in September or October and the infrastructure application decisions after the first of the year.

Mr. Green asked how the amount of match funds from the City of Veneta for the sidewalk project was determined, as it did not appear there was an assessment to property owners. Ms. VanWinkle said she was not certain how that figure was determined.

Mr. Green asked if all schools were aware of the opportunity. Ms. VanWinkle said that all schools should have been informed, but because the application process was arduous many of them chose not to apply. She said there would be future opportunities to apply and she would be happy to discuss that with interested schools. She noted that the Smart Ways to School program had provided support to three of the schools in preparing their applications and the Veneta school was assisted by an AmeriCorp volunteer.

In response to a question from Ms. Ballew, Ms. VanWinkle clarified that Safe Routes to School was a national initiative to improve safety for children who walked or biked to school and Smart Ways to School was a program provided by Commuter Solutions and LTD that offered free services to families in Lane County, including the transit pass program and support for walkers and bikers.

Mr. Zelenka asked about the amount and duration of funding. Ms. VanWinkle said the State received a total of \$5 million, but portions of that had to cover program administration by ODOT and actual dollars available to schools over five years was approximately \$3.8 million. She said it had taken considerable efforts to develop a system to administer the program and award funds to schools in a competitive process. She said the administrative funds would be expended over the five-year life of the program and if Congress decided to provide additional funding, the infrastructure would be in place. She said an advisory committee would make funding recommendations and ODOT would make the final funding decisions.

Mr. Green asked if local matching funds were required for applications. Ms. VanWinkle said no matching funds were required, but a match would add points to an application. She noted that applications did not have to be submitted by schools or school districts; a government jurisdiction could submit an application in partnership with and on behalf of schools.

Ms. Piercy expressed her pleasure with Commuter Solutions services and student access to free bus passes.

In response to a question from Mr. Sorenson, Mr. Pangborn said that he and Mr. Van Vactor had been in discussions regarding a County employee bus pass program.

Mr. Zelenka remarked that a 24 percent administrative rate seemed excessive. Ms. Lee said that she would check into the matter and provide a response. Ms. VanWinkle added that administrative expenses included education and outreach to promote the program and training to assist rural schools to develop applications.

Follow-up and MPO Calendar

ODOT Update

Ms. Lee introduced Ann Sanders, who would be the ODOT interim area manager. She said that invitations were being issued to a luncheon with Senator Gordon Smith and Representative Peter DeFazio. She said the luncheon would be preceded by a tour of the Beltline project. She reported that the legislature had passed ConnectOregon II and encouraged local jurisdictions to be active and creative in applying for funds for Lane County projects.

Ms. Ballew asked if there had been any discussion of a statewide gas tax increase. Ms. Lee indicated she was not aware of any discussion.

MTIP Administrative Amendments

Mr. Thompson reviewed the amendments approved by the Transportation Planning Committee. He said the two amendments corrected programming of bus rapid transit project funds.

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO) ISSUES (continued)

Presentation of e-MPO Prototype Web Site

Mr. Thompson demonstrated a prototype of the e-MPO web site, which would feature interactive maps and detailed information about local transportation improvement projects.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:55 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)

