

MINUTES

Citizen Advisory Committee
of the
Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization
Tykeson Room – Eugene Public Library – 100 West 10th Avenue
Eugene, Oregon

September 19, 2007
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Webb Sussman, Chair; Diana Alldredge, Phillip Farrington, Rich Hazel, Dave Jacobson, Wendy Butler-Boyesen, Bob Ransom, Bill Morganti, Eleanor Mulder, members; Kathi Wiederhold, Paul Thompson, Lane Council of Governments staff; Sonny Chickering, Lane County, guest.

ABSENT: John Anderson, Damien Gilbert, Donald Holtgrieve, Jeanne-Marie Moore, Ryan Papé, members; Kitty Piercy, MPC liaison.

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review

Mr. Sussman convened the meeting of the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) of the Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and those present introduced themselves.

Mr. Chickering announced that he would be working for the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) soon.

Mr. Sussman noted that he and Mr. Jacobson had attended the recent Oregon Planning Institute (OPI) meeting, held at the University of Oregon. He felt the meeting had provided them with a “tremendous amount” of information. He quoted one ODOT engineer as having said “transportation planning is very, very important to Oregon because it makes the future suck less.” He said the point was that Oregon would be worse off without transportation planning than it was with such planning.

2. Comments from the Audience

Rob Zako, transportation advocate for 1000 Friends of Oregon, introduced himself. He declared that he was a resource. He averred that transportation planning was important. He acknowledged that at present the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) was adopting the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which they did every three to four years. He felt it was the most important thing the MPO did. He commented that maybe he was “just not smart enough.” He explained that he had been following transportation planning for “five or ten years now” and he could not figure out how to be publicly involved to make comments that made a difference on what the elected officials were doing. He asserted the members of the MPO did not themselves believe they were making decisions or they did not understand the decisions they were making. He opined that anything the public said to them did not have an impact and that the MPO would adopt what staff recommended they should adopt “no matter what is said to them.” He felt frustrated that he would make comments and people did not seem to understand them or “do anything with them.” He also felt that even if the MPO members did understand their decisions the

RTP did not seem to be complete. He could not understand from the plan why one project was more important than another. He cited the projects planned for Highway 126 as an example.

Mr. Farrington believed that Mr. Zako was evidence that one citizen could make a difference. He asserted that Mr. Zako was a “reliable source of information.” He believed that people had made changes to plans as a result of citizen input and cited the proposal for a Valley River bridge as an example of such influence. He encouraged anyone who wished to provide input to do so.

3. Approval of August 1, 2007, Minutes

Mr. Jacobson, seconded by Mr. Farrington, moved to approve the minutes of the August 1, 2007, meeting. The motion passed unanimously, 9:0.

4. Member Spotlight

Members discussed the *Member Spotlight* portion of the meeting and determined the following schedule:

- October – Mr. Sussman and Ms. Butler Boyesen
- November – Mr. Ransom and Ms. Alldredge
- December – Ms. Mulder and Mr. Jacobson
- January – Mr. Hazel and Mr. Morganti.

5. Meeting Schedule

Mr. Sussman ascertained that there were no objections to moving the meeting to the third Wednesday of the month, beginning on January 16, 2008, and the CAC would continue to meet in the Singer Room of the Eugene Public Library.

6. Work Program for Citizen Advisory Committee

Mr. Jacobson reviewed the *Draft Metropolitan Planning Organization Citizen Advisory Committee Work Program*. He noted that there were long range topics and short range topics. He stated that two items were priorities: the freight task force and the Title VI/Environmental Justice for which the CAC was to set up a training and develop a work plan.

Mr. Thompson stated that the recent certification review had requested the set up of a freight committee and the development of a Title VI Plan. Regarding the former he said the charge was to determine how to engage people involved in freight transport in the task force. He related that it had been a challenge in the past because freight providers had not typically seen their interests being served by working with the MPO. Instead, he explained, freight providers tended to work through ODOT directly and through lobbying committees at the state level.

Mr. Thompson said the Title VI Plan would address populations that would be otherwise excluded or not well-involved in the decision-making process.

In response to a question from Mr. Jacobson, Mr. Thompson clarified that ‘environmental justice’ meant the environment in which the transportation network operated and its relationship to people. He stated that it specifically related to minority, elderly, low-income, and disabled populations and how plan improvements or the lack thereof impacted them.

Mr. Jacobson said the four items under the heading of *Short Range Topics* would have to be dealt with earlier. He asked Mr. Thompson to clarify what the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) priorities were.

Mr. Thompson responded that they were just beginning the education about the STIP. He said the STIP was the parent of the metropolitan program and was where ODOT reflected the improvements ODOT intended to build. He stated that the cycle that work had currently been initiated on was for the priorities in 2010 through 2013.

In response to a follow-up question from Mr. Jacobson, Mr. Thompson stated that the process had begun six months earlier and the timeline was such that a recommendation should be made by winter. He said the process would begin with the list of projects that had not been completed from the prior process as there were never adequate resources to build the entire list.

Mr. Jacobson asked what the certification review entailed. Mr. Thompson replied that it was an information item for the CAC so that the committee could understand what the review said about what they did and what improvements and changes needed to be made.

Mr. Jacobson stated that the eMPO was a Web site with links. He explained that the CAC was not building it but would be reviewing it. Mr. Sussman added that in addition to the Web site there were interactive pieces that would allow the public to view the proposed projects and subsequent impacts and provide comments. He said there would be a presentation on the eMPO program at one of the next meetings.

Mr. Thompson said the plan was that when the next prototype was rolled out the CAC would be asked to “play with” it in order to test it and provide feedback.

Mr. Farrington asked when the targeted date for launching the site was. Mr. Thompson responded that the projected date for the launch was January, 2008.

Mr. Hazel remarked that the CAC should have information on the STIP soon if the committee was going to give comments on it.

Mr. Farrington asked if there was a draft STIP available for the committee to peruse on the ODOT Web site. Mr. Thompson replied that it would “almost certainly” be on the October agenda. He explained that staff had started reviewing the list from two years ago and had not changed any priorities. He cited, as an example of the kind of action staff would undertake, that staff had taken the West Eugene Parkway off the list given it was no longer a project. He stated that just recently staff had the current updated information on the last cycle’s list.

Mr. Jacobson asked for four or five volunteers to serve on a subcommittee to develop some kind of framework for a freight task force.

In response to a question from Ms. Wiederhold, Mr. Thompson affirmed that the CAC had some time to accomplish this and would not need to appoint a subcommittee at the present meeting. He added that the freight committee was supposed to provide advisory input to the MPO from the freight stakeholder perspective.

In response to a question from Mr. Morganti, Mr. Jacobson clarified that the task force would be comprised of people in the freight business.

Ms. Mulder asked if the committee would be looking at the interaction of trucking and rail. Mr. Jacobson speculated that it would.

Mr. Sussman reiterated that the primary role of the CAC in this was to try to assist the MPC in figuring out how to reach the freight task force. He determined that the subcommittee on the freight task force would be comprised of Mr. Farrington, Mr. Jacobson, Mr. Ransom, Mr. Anderson, and himself.

Ms. Wiederhold suggested that the CAC could recommend that the task force include a liaison from the CAC that could advance suggestions from the CAC and provide periodic reports to the CAC.

Mr. Ransom called out *Land Use/Transportation Planning Relationship* from the list of *Long Range Topics* as an item he considered to be a critical issue. Ms. Mulder concurred.

Mr. Jacobson observed that there was a lack of unanimity on the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) on including land use issues with transportation.

Mr. Hazel remarked that the CAC did not necessarily have to “neatly follow” the MPC.

Mr. Thompson commented that the issue at the MPC was not necessarily one of what the MPO did; rather it was one of how to address land use and transportation within the region. He stated that the federal MPO did transportation planning and did not conduct land use planning or make land use decisions. He said the federal MPO, under Oregon law, could not undertake land use planning or make land use decisions. He related that federal regulations expected the MPO to do transportation planning while taking in full consideration the land use environment and planning that existed at the local and state level.

Mr. Hazel agreed with Mr. Ransom and Ms. Mulder that the relationship between land use and transportation planning was a high priority.

Mr. Farrington averred that the CAC would benefit from a presentation on *Energy/Peak Oil/Climate Change*. Mr. Jacobson made note of this.

Mr. Hazel felt the CAC needed to focus on holistic solutions.

Mr. Sussman thought the CAC could have a strong impact on local transportation practices with a good education program.

Mr. Jacobson averred that everything the CAC did was “continuing education.”

Ms. Mulder observed that even though the MPO had a limited function under the federal regulations, the CAC could look at transportation from a more global level because the committee was not beholden to the federal government. Mr. Sussman responded that the MPO wore “several hats” and only the transportation

piece was governed by the federal government. Mr. Thompson stressed that the committee was a federal CAC in some sense.

Mr. Thompson requested that the subcommittee on the freight task force keep him in the loop as he would be working on it.

7. Proposed Amendments to the Bylaws

Mr. Sussman moved that the Citizen Advisory Committee accept the amendments to the bylaws as drafted.

Mr. Hazel took issue with the use of the word 'shall' on item (g) section 8 as he was uncertain the CAC would be able to adequately adhere to Robert's Rules of Order.

Mr. Jacobson was amenable to changing the word 'shall' to the word 'should.'

Mr. Sussman revised his motion to reflect the suggested word change. Mr. Farrington provided a second to the revised motion. The motion passed unanimously, 9:0.

Mr. Sussman called for a 10-minute break and reconvened the CAC at 6:45 p.m.

8. Primer on Regional Transportation Plan and Status Report on Update

Mr. Thompson reviewed the *Primer on Regional Transportation Plan and Status Report on Update*. He said he included a four page memorandum along with extracts from the RTP in member packets. He reiterated that the federal transportation plan was the main product and the long-range plan of the MPO. He stated that it was required to project ahead at least 20 years. He discussed the history of the RTP and how it related to the TransPlan document.

Mr. Thompson listed the federal requirements of the RTP, as follows:

- The local jurisdictions must look at the projects that are needed to serve projected growth over 20 years.
- A financial constraint analysis must be conducted on the projects to determine how many of those projects could reasonably be paid for over the next 20 years.
- The operations and maintenance of the existing system is reviewed in order to determine that the existing system could be operated and maintained over the 20 year period.
- Transit and transit services and other modes must be considered.

He underscored that the RTP exceeded those requirements. He noted that the Safe Accountable Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act-A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) was the most recent and current transportation bill that gave the laws that the local jurisdictions did the work under and authorized the money.

Mr. Thompson said the goals, objectives, and policies had been built around a "three-legged system," the legs of which were the transportation system, land use, and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). He noted that the BRT was a major innovation in the plan. He related that the land use policies had remained in the RTP though when the federal policy board wanted to review the policy set, the land use policies were probably

not ones the MPO would be involved with. Rather, the MPO would look to the local jurisdictions to look at land use policies.

Mr. Thompson stated that Chapter 3 of the RTP delved into the projects, how they could be financed, what the projects consisted of, how much of the projects could be paid for, and if the projects were built what would the performance of the system look like. He provided an overview of the tables of the projects. He noted that the illustrative list consisted of projects that were needed but for which there was not adequate revenue to build them.

Mr. Jacobson asked who decided whether a project would be on the financially constrained list or the illustrative list. Mr. Thompson replied that all of the jurisdictions individually and jointly made those decisions. He explained that all of the projects were assigned to a jurisdiction and the jurisdiction would decide which projects had priority. He said generally the other jurisdictions would be in agreement regarding the local projects. He stated that the MPO had a great deal of input on the ODOT and other regional priorities.

In response to a follow-up question from Mr. Jacobson, Mr. Thompson affirmed that the CAC would have input on the prioritization.

Mr. Farrington asked how the MPO and MPC had arrived at the decisions regarding which projects the funds that were reallocated from the West Eugene Parkway (WEP) would be allocated to. He wondered what the process was by which those projects were selected.

Mr. Thompson noted that Mr. Zako had mentioned that he perceived that there had been a lack of process and a lack of public input. He agreed that it was sometimes very difficult for the public to understand where they could provide input in these processes. He said when the 2001 version of the RTP was adopted it did not have the WEP; it had been added by amendment in 2002. He related that approximately 50 people had testified mostly in opposition to the WEP at meetings in October and November, 2004. Ultimately the project had been pulled out of the financially constrained list, something he attributed largely to public input. He explained that by taking the WEP off of the financially constrained list it had freed approximately \$160 million that had been earmarked for it and allowed some projects to be moved from the illustrative list to the financially constrained list. He stressed that the projects were not new. He related that ODOT had looked at the list of projects and consulted with staff in order to determine what projects were most needed and which projects were most likely to be built within 20 years time.

Mr. Farrington observed that the intersections that had been added to the list were on “the high end of congestion.” Mr. Thompson affirmed that was so.

Mr. Jacobson agreed with the prediction that traffic would increase in that area of Springfield.

Mr. Thompson stated that in April the complete list of projects had been presented to the MPC, both funded and unfunded. He stressed that when staff was working on the project lists, staff was not just acting alone. He stated that staff met inter-jurisdictionally and then returned to consult with staff and elected officials of their jurisdictions.

Mr. Sussman asked what impact House Bill (HB) 3337, which bifurcated the UGBs of Springfield and Eugene, had on land use and transportation. Mr. Thompson replied that he was not certain at this point. He said that any impacts would be reflected in a future RTP. He clarified that HB 3337 had required that

all cities in Lane County with a population greater than 50,000 were now required to develop a buildable lands inventory and to establish their own UGB.

In response to a question from Mr. Jacobson, Mr. Thompson affirmed that prior to HB 3337, Eugene, Springfield, and Lane County had to approve of what the other jurisdiction was doing for major land use decisions within the joint UGB.

Mr. Farrington recalled that the Region 2050 process had been undertaken in part because the state handed down to each county a population projection and then it was up to the cities within the county to “slice the pie.” He attributed the demise of the Region 2050 process to disagreements with how this distribution should occur. He felt the City of Springfield had “greater ambitions” to grow while the City of Eugene was less growth oriented and this had created conflict with some of the policy decisions that Eugene made. He thought the RTP, which was updated every four years, was “about on track.”

Ms. Mulder understood that one reason the City of Eugene did not want to expand the UGB was to promote infill.

Mr. Farrington agreed, but he averred that Eugene did not wish to acknowledge that this took some of the growth and scattered it in outlying communities.

Mr. Thompson said it was a fact that the State provided a countywide population figure, the most recent of which was for 2035, and the county had to determine how to allocate the growth to the incorporated and unincorporated areas in the county. He stated that a town within the county then based its infrastructure planning as well as the funding for it on the projection. He agreed that one of the things that had blocked the Region 2050 process from reaching its end was the discord between Eugene and Springfield about where the growth should occur. He said that once there were two separate UGBs it could still be difficult to coordinate population projections because, for example, Eugene could still object to allowing Springfield to have the higher adopted projection.

Ms. Mulder remarked that just because something was planned for did not mean that it happened.

Mr. Jacobson commented that a lot of the growth would also be driven by where builders could build and where the land was affordable to buy. He said the Oregon population may double in the 21st century.

Mr. Thompson continued his discussion of the RTP. He reiterated that a new RTP was slated to be adopted in November, an update that would extend the 2004 RTP to 2031 and looked at the effects of it on revenue and projects. He said the update did not look at the policy set or the details of the plan that was adopted in 2001, 2002, and 2004, because direction from the policy board was that those were still “good in the long range sense.” He related that the MPO staff would like to be able to look at the policies in light of the list of things that were on the CAC work list and had been noted during the recent MPO certification review.

Mr. Sussman said there was a move afoot to look at the congestion issue and to reset policy regarding congestion. He explained that the goal in mind was not to manage congestion but to eliminate or significantly reduce it through new construction, new transit systems, and others.

Mr. Thompson stated that in terms of all of the modeling that had been done and the different scenarios that had been reviewed it was apparent that it was impossible to build a way out of congestion. He

underscored that it was not possible to build enough capacity, both because once built it would be filled and because it was not affordable.

Mr. Sussman averred that the answer to the latter was to price it effectively.

Mr. Thompson responded that there were state policies regarding tolling that would make that mode of raising revenue difficult. He said there were inherent barriers to tolling in a small metropolitan area without a lot of real transportation bottlenecks. He averred that another approach would be to look into how one managed to reduce the demand for capacity by getting more people on buses or by getting them to have shorter trips through better land use patterns.

Mr. Sussman noted that the federal government was projecting that it would not be receiving enough revenue from the gas tax to continue supporting the highway trust fund by 2009. Mr. Thompson predicted there would be action to address that.

Mr. Sussman thanked Mr. Thompson for his presentation.

9. Wrap Up

Mr. Jacobson reminded freight subcommittee members that he would email them to schedule a meeting time.

Mr. Sussman announced that the next meeting was scheduled for October 3.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:32 p.m.

(Recorded by Ruth Atcherson)