

# MINUTES

Citizen Advisory Committee  
of the  
Metropolitan Planning Organization  
Oregon Department of Transportation—Large Conference Room—640 “A” Street  
Springfield, Oregon

October 12, 2006  
5:30 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Dan Egan, Sylvia Shaw, co-chairs; Webb Sussman, vice chair; Moriah Demers, Kristin Anderson, John Anderson, Rich Hazel, Philip Farrington, Dave Jacobson, Bobby Green, members; George Kloeppe, Kathi Wiederhold, Tom Schwetz, Paul Thompson, Ann Mortenson, Jamon Kent, Bryon Vanderpool (Lane Council of Governments), staff.

**ABSENT:** Rex Redmon, Jan Spencer, Jeanne-Marie Moore, Ross Notebaart, members.

## **Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review**

Ms. Shaw convened the meeting and welcomed those present. She briefly reviewed the agenda.

## **Comments from the Audience**

There was no one wishing to speak.

## **Approve September 6, 2006, Minutes**

Mr. Egan noted that he had designated Philip Farrington and Dave Jacobson for the member spotlight at the October meeting, but both had already been in the spotlight.

Mr. Egan, seconded by Ms. Shaw, moved to approve the September 6, 2006, minutes as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

## **MPC Report and Calendar Review**

Mr. Thompson asked if there were questions or comments on the information provided in the agenda packet.

Mr. Farrington commented that he was unable to find copies of various plans and planning documents at the Eugene Library. He asked if the committee’s minutes could be posted at the library. Ms. Wiederhold said that minutes could be accessed via the Internet and she would check to see if they could also be posted.

Mr. Egan remarked that the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) calendar contained many acronyms and was difficult to interpret. He asked that acronyms be spelled out whenever possible. Mr. Thompson said that he could spell out those acronyms that were not commonly used in the calendar and list them, along with the most frequently used acronyms, on the back of the calendar. He said that OMPOC was the Oregon MPO Consortium.

In response to a question from Mr. Jacobson, Ms. Wiederhold said that the plan included glossaries of acronyms alphabetically both by the acronym and by the meaning of the acronym.

### **Follow-Up from the Retreat of the Citizen Advisory Committee**

Ms. Shaw asked members for feedback regarding the committee's recent retreat.

Mr. Jacobson commented that it was a good exercise that allowed members to get to know each other and share ideas, but he felt somewhat pressed for time. He asked if there was a specific reason for the retreat.

Ms. Shaw said the retreat was prompted in part by the committee's feeling that it was constantly rushed and a need for more clarity regarding members' representation of various community interests and the MPC's expectations of the committee beyond developing the Public Participation Plan (PPP).

Mr. Egan said another purpose was to review the past year's activities and identify what went well and how the committee's tasks could be better managed, as well as identify points for discussion and clarification with the MPC.

Mr. Sussman remarked that the retreat was held for several reasons, including to integrate new members, decide on a form and format for committee meetings and determine how to manage the committee's workload and accomplish assigned tasks.

Ms. Shaw agreed that one purpose of the retreat was to develop a statement or report from the CAC but that had not yet been done. She indicated Mr. Sussman had prepared some suggested points to raise with the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) and those were distributed via email. She asked for a discussion of talking points to be addressed with the MPC at the joint meeting.

Ms. Anderson asked if Mr. Sussman's email represented the thoughts of all committee officers. Mr. Sussman replied that he had developed the points based on discussions with the other officers and the addition of his own thoughts. They were not necessarily based on the retreat and offered for the purpose of providing a framework for the committee's discussion of points to be raised with the MPC.

Ms. Anderson requested a summary of the retreat discussion and comments.

Mr. Farrington felt that the email did reflect comments made during the retreat, particularly the need for clarification of the committee's role.

Ms. Shaw asked that the points be summarized into two or three main topics for discussion with the MPC.

Mr. Hazel expressed concern that there was not sufficient time to adequately discuss and summarize the points, which he did not feel reflected retreat comments. He noted that the bylaws stated members were selected based on their representation of certain groups and he was interested in clarification about whether

members were expected to solicit input from those groups or represent those perspectives as individual members.

Ms. Anderson said that some of the ideas in Mr. Sussman's email were new and the tone was different from the retreat. She preferred to have a record of comments from all members at the retreat as those who were present took great care with the specific wording of their comments.

Mr. Egan said he would be interested in presenting to the MPC the one or two questions that had concerned the CAC since its inception. He agreed that many of the comments from the retreat were not reflected in the email, but felt it was important to go forward to the joint meeting with some talking points instead of waiting until the next time.

Mr. Jacobson felt that the committee could identify two or three talking points from Mr. Sussman's email as a preliminary presentation to the MPC. He requested a typed copy of comments from the retreat.

Ms. Demers proposed raising the second point in the email: "The CAC cannot achieve all of the goals which the MPC seems to desire of the CAC given one two-hour meeting a month. The MPC and CAC need to either agree on a reduction or focusing of the CAC's role or both." She said that encompassed many of the points raised by members and would help clarify the committee's role.

Ms. Anderson said an issue often raised by Ms. Moore was the extent to which the committee's opinions counted or whether it was just a "rubber stamp."

Ms. Shaw agreed that a major theme was whether the CAC's recommendations and opinions counted; were they wanted and helpful.

Mr. Green said that his initial reaction to Mr. Sussman's email was to regard the tone as offensive. He emphasized that the MPC did not regard the CAC as a rubber stamp. He said the MPC desired public input and for that reason formed the CAC, but the CAC was not a substitute for public participation. He said both the bylaws and the MPC's direction could be clarified although he was not certain how the MPC would respond to a request to reduce the CAC's role.

Ms. Shaw observed that CAC members brought their opinions on issues not necessarily referred to them by the MPC and it was a challenge to integrate that into the committee's role. She asked if the MPC was interested in opinions that were not directly solicited from the CAC.

Mr. Green responded that the MPC was interested in opinions on issues that affected all of Lane County and the CAC was not restricted only to referred issues. He felt that the CAC could legitimately consider policy issues and provide the MPC with citizen input and advice on those issues.

Ms. Shaw summarized the points to be raised with the MPC:

- Does the MPC just want specific local issues addressed or do they want the CAC to comment about transportation issues and solutions
- Do CAC members represent the perspectives of various groups identified in the bylaws or are members regarded simply as a conduit to obtain more public opinion from those groups
- The CAC seems to lack focus and more than 50 percent of its time was spent reviewing documents and information. To what extent and depth should various documents be studied and commented

on and to what purpose should the committee address documents such as the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).

### **Discuss Draft Responses to Public Comment on the Draft Public Participation Plan (PPP)**

Ms. Wiederhold reviewed comments received from the public on the PPP and the proposed changes to the final document, which were provided in the agenda packet. She said there would be a public hearing at the joint meeting with the MPC and time for discussion of those comments. She said there were four general categories of potential changes:

- Text changes to clarify both the plan's role as a framework for public participation with product-specific plans being more extensive and the plan's relationship to the Citizen's Guide
- Additional policies to clarify the goal of public outreach activities
- Changes to the summary table
- Revisions to the evaluation process, including addition of qualitative measures

Ms. Wiederhold said the plan would be referred to the Transportation Planning Committee for comment and recommendations following the CAC and MPC public hearing and discussion, the CAC would review the plan and make recommendations to the MPC at its November 2006 meeting and the MPC would take action at its November 9, 2006, meeting.

Mr. Egan urged committee members to review the comments submitted by Rob Zako.

Mr. Farrington said that Mr. Zako had also recommended holding a public hearing and comment period prior to development of the UPWP but that was not reflected in the PPP. Ms. Wiederhold said that staff felt a public hearing was not necessary, but a public comment period for the UPWP was added.

Ms. Anderson noted that Mr. Zako also suggested holding meetings in the evening to make them more accessible to the public and that should be included in the plan.

Mr. Hazel felt that changing the phrase "Quality of Comments" to "Stimulate more effective comments by improving the quality of presentation materials" was unnecessary and confusing.

### **Wrap up**

Ms. Shaw said that the written comments from the retreat would be provided to the CAC and discussed at its next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:20 p.m. in order to reconvene in joint session with the Metropolitan Policy Committee at 6:30 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)