

## MINUTES

Metropolitan Policy Committee  
Springfield Library Meeting Room, 225 5<sup>th</sup> Street – Springfield, Oregon

September 9, 2004  
11:30 a.m.

**PRESENT:** Bonny Bettman, Chair, Gary Papé for Jim Torrey (City of Eugene), Bobby Green (Lane County), Sid Leiken, Anne Ballew (City of Springfield), Mike Watson for Judy Volta (City of Coburg), Gerry Gaydos, Susan Ban (Lane Transit District), Robert Pirrie (Oregon Department of Transportation), members; Dennis Taylor (City of Eugene), Ken Hamm (Lane Transit District), Mike Hudson (City of Coburg), *ex officio* members.

Tom Boyatt, Jeff Scheick (Oregon Department of Transportation), George Kloeppel, Tom Schwetz (Lane Council of Governments), Greg Mott, Mark Metzger (City of Springfield), Lisa Gardner (Lane Transit District), Jim Carlson, Chris Henry, Mark Schoening (City of Eugene), Lauri Segel, Rob Handy (guests).

**ABSENT:** Bill Dwyer, Jim Torrey, Blake Hastings, Gary Ross, members; Bill Van Vactor, Mike Kelly, Bob Keefer, *ex officio* members.

### 1. CALL TO ORDER/WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Ms. Bettman called the meeting of the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) to order and announced that Mr. Green had to leave the meeting early and therefore the agenda would be revised to take up public comments first, immediately followed by action items.

### 2. COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

**Lauri Segel**, 120 West Broadway, Eugene, commented that the process to develop bylaws for the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) went well and she appreciated the facilitation of the bylaws committee by staff. She asked that, when the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update was advertised, the relationship to TransPlan be clearly articulated.

### 3. MPO (Metropolitan Planning Organization) ISSUES

#### a. Draft Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) Bylaws

Mr. Green identified members of the subcommittee that developed the bylaws and thanked them for their participation. He called the MPC's attention to the cover memorandum dated September 2, 2004, that described the process and the essence of the subcommittee's discussions. Referring to the draft bylaws, he noted the addition of the following item to allow work to move forward to the MPC in a timely manner:

*Section 8, Item J: In the event that a quorum is not met and there is an action to be taken, attending members of the Committee are charged to form their recommendations individually*

*rather than collegially through a quorum requirement, thereby contributing individual recommendations on the action item to be submitted to the Metropolitan Policy Committee or the Transportation Planning Committee.*

Mr. Schwetz reviewed the schedule for forming the CAC that was set forth in the cover memorandum.

Ms. Bettman observed that Item 8.J had not been discussed by the subcommittee and said that it should be invoked only in the case of an emerging deadline, not just when lack of a quorum prevented committee action. She asked that the phrase “and there is an emerging deadline” be inserted following “...a quorum is not met...” to clarify when the section would apply.

Mr. Green moved, seconded by Mr. Gaydos, to adopt the Citizen Advisory Committee Bylaws as submitted, with the amendment to Item 8.J requested by Ms. Bettman.

Mr. Papé asked why the CAC was not an Area Commission on Transportation (ACT). Mr. Green replied that the Lane County Board of Commissioners had not relinquished authority and the CAC was established to address Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) concerns about public involvement.

Mr. Boyatt added that the CAC was a committee to the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Eugene/Springfield and Coburg metropolitan area. He said that an ACT would take in the larger geographical area of Lane County or a combination of counties.

The motion carried unanimously, 9:0.

#### **b. Endorsement of Transportation Enhancement Grant Applications**

Mr. Schwetz distributed a change to the City of Eugene’s application that increased the scope of a project in response to a request from the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT). He described the Transportation Enhancement Program (TEP) and said that two applications were being submitted; one was from Eugene for the West Bank Trail extension and one from Springfield for a downtown Springfield public improvement project. He said that the MPC was being asked to provide a letter of support to ODOT for the grant applications.

Ms. Bettman asked if the Eugene project was a TransPlan project. Mr. Schoening replied that the project contained elements of three different TransPlan projects, including River Avenue and Division Avenue improvements. He said it was classified under the bike component of the Upgrade to Urban Standards category.

Ms. Bettman characterized the project as an adjunct to a road project that was being done rather than being prioritized in TransPlan as a bike and pedestrian project. Mr. Carlson said the project was listed as a bikeway project with no cost because it was related to a road improvement.

Ms. Bettman stated that she did not object to the project, but did not think it was the highest priority for Eugene and would vote against approving the letter. In response to a question from Mr. Green she said the project did not go through the Eugene City Council.

Mr. Schoening said the application was submitted to the council's Intergovernmental Relations (IGR) Committee for review and applications for the funding sought projects that would be most competitive and score the most points, not necessarily projects that were the highest priority. He said it was a balance between what was most important and what would successfully compete with other applications from across the state.

Mr. Green asked if grant applications were required to go before the City Council or could they be submitted directly by staff. Mr. Schoening said that the City Manager, in consultation with the IGR Committee and assuming the project was in TransPlan, made the decision based upon recommendations by staff.

Ms. Bettman asked if the project was in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). Mr. Schoening said the project would be included in the updated CIP with the notation that the project was contingent upon approval of funding.

Mr. Pirrie clarified that the Eugene project would compete with other projects submitted by the deadline and another project could not be submitted in its place.

Mr. Leiken said that the Springfield project had strong support from the City Council in coordination with City staff and he hoped that a negative vote would not compromise its submission.

Ms. Bettman stated that she approved of the Springfield project and felt it was a high priority and good use of funds and her negative vote was directed toward the Eugene project.

Mr. Green moved, seconded by Mr. Gaydos, to approve endorsement of the letter of support for local Transportation Enhancement Program applications. The motion carried, 8:1; Ms. Bettman voting in opposition.

**c. State Implementation Plan (SIP) Limited Maintenance Plan**

Mr. Schwetz explained that the action requested was approval of the development of a limited maintenance plan for carbon monoxide in the Eugene-Springfield Air Quality Maintenance Area. He said that the Clean Air Act (CAA) required renewal of 20-year maintenance plans at the mid-point or 10-year mark. He said that under the CAA renewal could follow a limited maintenance path if attainment goals had been met. He said that a limited maintenance plan would significantly reduce paperwork while not affecting the ongoing monitoring of air quality in the area. He said that, if LRAPA did not exist, the Department of Environmental Quality would assume the role currently filled by the Lane Regional Air Pollution Authority (LRAPA). He indicated that there was little risk of exceeding the carbon monoxide standard in the next 20 years because the area was so far below the standard.

Ms. Bettman asked for clarification between the standard process and the limited maintenance program. Mr. Schwetz responded that a conformity determination was still required, but the need for an air quality budget check was eliminated. He said that air quality would still be monitored on a regular basis but no formal demonstration to the Environmental Protection Agency would be required.

In response to a question from Mr. Papé, Mr. Schwetz said the contingency plan was an EPA requirement for all maintenance plans that identified procedures to be followed in the case of a violation. He said the contingency plan would be triggered if there were two violations in a year.

Mr. Green moved, seconded by Mr. Gaydos, to approve the development of a limited maintenance plan for carbon monoxide in the Eugene-Springfield air quality maintenance area. The motion passed unanimously, 9:0.

**d. Approval of July 8, 2004, Minutes**

Mr. Green moved, seconded by Ms. Ban, to approve the minutes of the July 8, 2004, MPC meeting as submitted. The motion passed 7:0; Mr. Papé and Mr. Watson abstaining.

Mr. Green left the meeting at 11:55 a.m.

At Ms. Bettman's request, those present introduced themselves.

**4. COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE (continued)**

**Rob Handy**, 455 ½ River Road, Eugene, commented on and raised question about a number of topics, including the increase in traffic congestion, the CAC and its role, the impact of the West Eugene Parkway on the Highway 126 congestion corridor, cost of the parkway, and the Eugene TEP project and its number on the TransPlan project list.

Ms. Bettman asked how members of the public who asked specific questions could obtain answers.

Mr. Kloeppel said that at the MPC's direction staff could respond to questions either later in a meeting or at a subsequent meeting. He encouraged questions to be raised by MPC members, for whom staff was working.

Ms. Bettman said that questions from the public should be answered and suggested that staff could respond by email. Mr. Kloeppel said that could be possible within reason; all MPC members and staff shared the responsibility for being good stewards of the time and resources available to support the MPC.

Ms. Bettman said she also wanted an answer to the TransPlan project list question and felt that most of the other questions raised by Mr. Handy could be easily responded to.

Ms. Ballew agreed that questions from the public should be answered whenever possible, but emphasized the need for balance when one person presented multiple questions.

**5. MPO (Metropolitan Planning Organization) ISSUES (continued)**

**e. Briefing from ODOT Region 2 Manager Jeff Scheick on Oregon Transportation Investment Act (OTIA III) Program**

Mr. Scheick presented an overview of the OTIA III modernization program. He said that \$500 million in modernization funds were allocated among four categories:

- freight mobility/industrial access/job - \$100 million
- modernization equity split - \$100 million
- statewide significant projects - \$100 million
- ODOT federal earmarks - \$200 million

Mr. Scheick noted that the Oregon Transportation Commission would be meeting at the end of the month and would continue their conversation about the modernization program. He stressed that no decisions had yet been made and distributed spreadsheets of the projects that were being recommended. He said that Congress was currently debating the six-year surface transportation reauthorization legislation and ODOT hoped for approval in the fall of 2004, although that could be delayed until sometime in 2005.

Mr. Scheick used a slide presentation to explain details of the four categories and the types of projects that were included in the list of recommendations. He pointed out two Eugene-Springfield area projects to which funds from the modernization equity split category were proposed to be added: reconstruction of the Interstate 5-Beltline interchange for \$7.8 million and reconfiguration of the Beltline at Coburg Road interchange for \$4.1 million.

Mr. Scheick stated that ODOT was recommending \$20 million be set aside in the statewide significant projects category for public/private partnerships. He used a map to illustrate the location of various projects throughout the state. He directed the committee's attention to tables in the agenda packet material that displayed the percentages of funds in each of the four categories that were recommended for award to Region 2 projects.

Ms. Bettman asked how the \$361 million for county and city maintenance and preservation through OTIA III was distributed. Mr. Scheick said that allocations were made in conjunction with the League of Oregon Cities and Association of Oregon Counties. Mr. Carlson said the funds were distributed as part of the State Highway Trust Fund payments and Lane County chose to distribute its OTIA III maintenance funds to cities. He said that Eugene had dedicated those monies from the County to preservation.

Mr. Leiken asked about the status of ODOT's rewrite of Goal 12 transportation goals. Mr. Scheick replied that the information gathering process was being completed and the information would be compiled for review by a subcommittee.

Mr. Leiken expressed his appreciation for the partnership with ODOT that had been forged during the past few years and the quality projects that partnership had produced.

Mr. Papé inquired about the status of the Interstate 5 replacement bridge project. Mr. Scheick said that there were three versions of the six-year transportation reauthorization bill: the House version, the Senate version, and the President's version. He said that the earmark levels in all versions were lower than OTC wanted and he asked for help from local elected officials to increase those funding levels and help make OTIA III funds go farther. He said that now that the temporary bridge was open, ODOT would be working closely with cities and the County on the planning process, land use, public involvement, and environmental procedures. He said it was necessary to develop a strategy for funding the permanent replacement bridge project.

Mr. Ballew asked if less federal funding was available or the demand was greater and Lane County was not as competitive. Mr. Scheick said that federal funds were distributed in two ways: there was a base distributed to states by formula as part of the six-year reauthorization bill and there were earmarks, for which there were many competing demands. He said the Oregon congressional delegation was being encouraged to increase Oregon's formula allocation as much as possible. He said that competing successfully for earmark funds would require clear priorities, unity, and a specific game plan.

Mr. Hamm commented that the President had indicated to Congress that he would not accept a proposed transportation reauthorization bill that exceeded \$297 billion but it was uncertain whether that cap would hold following the national elections.

**f. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update Status**

Mr. Schwetz said that the RTP would be updated in accordance with federal requirements by December 2004. He said the update was considered to be minor and would include:

- Extending the planning horizon to 2025
- Updating the financial constraint analysis, which require assumptions because the transportation reauthorization legislation was still pending
- Expanding the MPO boundary to encompass the urbanized area that included Coburg

Mr. Schwetz reviewed the status of a number of work tasks related to the update as outlined in the memorandum from Paul Thompson dated September 2, 2004. He also reviewed the RTP adoption schedule over the next three months that was included in the memorandum. He said that an air quality conformity determination would be conducted concurrent with the adoption of the updated RTP.

Ms. Bettman asked if the federal requirement to complete the update by December 2004 could be waived because new funding data coming out of the federal reauthorization would not be available until the spring of 2005. Mr. Schwetz replied that his recommendation was to proceed with those tasks that could be accomplished and an amendment would be proposed when the funding information became available. He said that obtaining a waiver was unlikely.

Ms. Ballew commented that it was preferable to update the plan now and amend it at a later date when new information was available.

Ms. Bettman suggested that materials used for notification of the public contain more understandable language, including referring to the document as TransPlan. She noted no objections to identifying the document as the TransPlan.

Ms. Bettman asked what constituted a major update. Mr. Schwetz said that a major update would address changes to the policy language.

Mr. Kloeppel reminded the committee, with respect to developing the financially constrained plan without certain knowledge of the revenue available, that the planning horizon was 20 years and funding uncertainties could be addressed at best for only a six-year period if the transportation reauthorization bill was adopted. Mr. Schwetz noted that with reauthorization at the federal level occurring every six years, any given 20-year planning horizon would include three cycles of reauthorization.

Mr. Papé encouraged staff to use effective public relations techniques to advertise opportunities for public participation in the update process.

**g. Planning for Second MPO Summit**

Mr. Schwetz referred to the draft agenda for an October 15, 2004, MPO Summit to be held in Eugene. He asked for feedback from the MPC on agenda topics.

Ms. Bettman commented that there were funds remaining from the last MPO Summit that might be available to help with expenses. Mr. Kloepfel said that the funds had already been received.

Mr. Papé said that a discussion of the revitalization of the railroad for both passenger and freight purposes was critically important to the Eugene City Council. Mr. Schwetz remarked that the Corvallis MPO was also interested in that topic.

Ms. Bettman said she hoped the discussion on flexibility of funds would address use by jurisdictions for maintenance and preservation.

**h. Proposed MPO Consent Calendar**

Mr. Schwetz said that staff was proposing the addition of a consent calendar to the MPC agenda to better facilitate the MPO portion of the meeting and asked for direction on how to proceed.

Ms. Ballew said she supported the concept.

Ms. Bettman said she disagreed with the proposal because the MPC only met once a month and if items were pulled from the consent agenda it could actually increase the length of meetings. She noted that most items on the MPC's agenda required some amount of discussion.

Mr. Kloepfel observed that staff were attempting to find the right balance between staff oral presentations and written materials and solicited comments from MPC members. He said the intent was to provide sufficient information for a discussion and decision, but not waste members' time.

**i. Congestion Management System Baseline Report**

Mr. Schwetz noted that members were provided with a copy of the full *Congestion Management System Baseline Report*, which was developed as one of the responsibilities of being a Transportation Management Area (TMA). He said the first report was identified as a baseline and the intent was to update the report on a regular basis in conjunction with other major plan updates. He said the report extracted from the planning process those issues associated with congestion and described how the TMA was implementing strategies that affected the level of congestion.

Ms. Bettman asked for a memorandum from staff responding to several questions:

- How projects were selected and what assumptions were involved
- How were priorities determined

- How were congestion management strategies selected

Ms. Bettman requested ten copies of the report for distribution to a neighborhood transportation committee involved with the West 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue area. She said the report should contain much more emphasis on land use and access management as they related to congestion.

Mr. Schwetz said the intent of the report was to identify the most congested corridors, using a model to identify both the current and future congestion on the corridors. He said the purpose of the congestion management system was to help focus on issues of congestion, including land use and access.

Ms. Bettman reiterated her request for an explanation of how the model operated. Mr. Schwetz said that information could be provided and staff was willing to make a presentation to the neighborhood group.

Mr. Boyatt said the State's approach was to take a congested segment and do refinement planning for that segment.

Mr. Papé asked why current data was not used instead of the model to identify current congestion. Mr. Schwetz replied that current data was not available for the entire network and the model was used for those segments where there were no current traffic counts.

#### **j. Project Coordination Status**

Mr. Schwetz briefly reviewed the progress on coordination of projects as detailed in the *2004-2006 Central Lane MPO Project Coordination Matrix*. He noted that the Delta Ponds project was incorrectly shown as including the entire length of the Delta Highway.

#### **k. Upcoming MPO-related Activities**

Ms. Bettman reminded members that the October 2004 MPC meeting would be held in the Eugene Public Library meeting room.

The meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)

*LCOG: T:\MPO\COMMITTEES\MPC\FY05\OCT 04\MPC040909.DOC  
Last Saved: October 8, 2004*