

## MINUTES

Metropolitan Policy Committee and Citizen Advisory Committee  
Joint Meeting  
Oregon Department of Transportation—Large Conference Room—640 “A” Street  
Springfield, Oregon

October 12, 2006  
6:30 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Bobby Green, Chair; Faye Stewart for Bill Dwyer (Lane County), Anne Ballew, Sid Leiken (City of Springfield), David Kelly, Kitty Piercy (City of Eugene), Susan Ban, Gerry Gaydos (Lane Transit District), Jane Lee (Oregon Department of Transportation), Metropolitan Policy Committee members; Dennis Taylor (City of Eugene), Stefano Viggiano for Mark Pangborn (Lane Transit District), Gino Grimaldi (City of Springfield), Metropolitan Policy Committee *ex officio* members.

Dan Egan, Sylvia Shaw, co-chairs; Webb Sussman, vice chair; Moriah Demers, Kristin Anderson, John Anderson, Rich Hazel, Philip Farrington, Dave Jacobson, Bobby Green, Citizen Advisory Committee members.

George Kloeppel, Kathi Wiederhold, Tom Schwetz, Paul Thompson, Ann Mortenson, Jamon Kent, Bryon Vanderpool, Petra Schuetz, Susan Payne (Lane Council of Governments); Candace Stich (Oregon Department of Transportation), Greg Mott, Tom Boyatt (City of Springfield), Mark Schoening, Chris Henry (City of Eugene), Tom Stinchfield (Lane County), Anita Yap (Lane Transit District), Rob Handy, Zachary Vishanoff, guests.

### WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Green called the second joint meeting of the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) and Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) to order and welcomed those present. MPC and CAC members introduced themselves.

### COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

**Rob Handy**, 455 ½ River Road, Eugene, thanked MPC and CAC members for their time and efforts on the very complex issue of transportation planning.

**Zachary Vishanoff**, Patterson Street, Eugene, expressed skepticism about whether real public involvement was wanted. He said that Lane County did a good job of public involvement but other jurisdictions and agencies had superficial public involvement. He suggested ways to obtain public involvement such as putting the University of Oregon basketball arena and the new Interstate 5 bridge up for a public vote. He did not feel the committee established to address trailer parks was going well. He felt that Eugene’s Parks and Open Space was not responding to the public’s desire to protect the riverfront greenway in Glenwood and that issue should be voted on by the public.

## **METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO) ISSUES**

### **Draft Public Participation Plan (PPP)**

Mr. Green opened the public hearing on the draft Public Participation Plan and called for testimony.

**Rob Handy**, 455 ½ River Road, Eugene, highlighted the comments submitted by Rob Zako. He said the community was interested in how to do things differently to avoid painful situations such as the West Eugene Parkway. He said good public participation that generated buy-in from the community early in the planning process was essential. He wondered whether public participation was measured by quantity or quality and listed five points raised by Mr. Zako about the effectiveness of public participation:

1. Number of issues for which public comments resulted in substantive change from what was originally proposed in a draft.
2. Percentage of people who comment who feel like their comments were heard.
3. Anecdotal stories of cases in which members of the MPO feel like comments from the public led them to revise their views.
4. Percentage of people attending, say, an open house who say that doing so significantly increased their understanding of whatever is at issue.
5. Percentage of members of the public and members of the MPO who feel like meaningful two-way communication is taking place.

Mr. Handy said he had attended a very interesting public participation meeting hosted by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. He said the meeting was a follow-up to a development proposal on which many public comments were received. He said the meeting included the developer, representatives from both agencies, a minutes taker, a facilitator and the public. He said sufficient time for an extensive dialogue with the public was allowed and people left the meeting feeling there was a meaningful two-way communication.

There being no other testimony, Mr. Green closed the public hearing.

Mr. Kelly stated that he liked the draft plan and agreed with the changes proposed in Ms. Wiederhold's memorandum; however, he was concerned about the length of time available for those changes to be made, the revised document to be reviewed and commented on and the MPC to consider those comments and adopt a plan. He suggested that adoption of the plan be moved to December 2006 and asked that changes to the text of the document be in legislative format. He said the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) was a significant body of work and agreed with Mr. Zako's recommendation to hold a public hearing and comment period. He felt there was value in qualitative feedback on the process and suggested that the CAC could explore over the next year ways to achieve a dialogue between the public and decision-makers. He asked that aspirational language be included in the PPP.

Mr. Green determined there was consensus to move adoption of the plan to the MPC's December 2006 meeting.

Ms. Ballew asked for staff response to the points raised by Mr. Zako.

Mr. Egan asked if the MPC had any concerns about the direction of the plan.

Mr. Green said there appeared to be general agreement with the direction of the plan and if members had significant concerns they would have been raised by this point.

Mr. Jacobson commented that the Oregon Department of Transportation's (ODOT) work with stakeholders on the Gateway/Beltline interchange project was a fine example of citizen involvement and could provide some good ideas that would either validate what was in the plan or prompt some changes.

Mr. Leiken remarked that the project had a two-pronged approach: the interchange itself and the portion of the project within the Springfield city limits. He said the process was a showcase of what citizen involvement meant because it included the business community, the neighborhood association and people from all walks of life. He said that ODOT's original plan was different from the final plan that evolved during the process and everyone was pleased with the result.

Mr. Kelly added that the process ended with a unanimous vote and represented the ideal approach for a large impact project with many diverse stakeholders, but that scale of process was not appropriate for all projects. He said the only change he would make was to commence public involvement earlier in the design cycle.

Ms. Lee commented that ODOT's project delivery staff was going through training called Systematic Development of Informed Consent to foster that type of citizen involvement by reaching out to the right stakeholders.

### **MPC/CAC Discussion**

Ms. Shaw thanked MPC members for adjusting their schedules for a joint meeting. She said the CAC wanted a dialogue with the MPC in order to better understand the MPC's expectations. She said the CAC held a retreat recently to explore its role and approach to tasks and questions were raised about how to form a common agenda with the MPC. She indicated that a formal report on the retreat had not been prepared but there were some key issues to which the CAC wanted responses from the MPC and those would be presented by CAC members.

Mr. Hazel said there was a spirited discussion at the retreat of the MPC's charge to the CAC. He said the bylaws indicated that members would be recruited and selected based to some extent on targeted interests. He said it would be valuable to committee members to have a clarification about whether CAC members spoke as direct representatives and individual advocates of those targeted interests or were they a more homogenized group and should look beyond the interests groups for which they were primarily recruited or chosen. He said that had significant influence on how a member came to the table in the sense that they were representing a particular point of view or charged with a broader perspective.

Ms. Piercy said her opinion was that CAC members represented interests, not specific groups, and did not come forward representing a position that was voted on elsewhere. She said members could think from the perspective of an interest, but also think more broadly as a citizen.

Mr. Kelly concurred with Ms. Piercy's remarks. He did not view members as coming from the extreme of either narrowly representing a single perspective or being entirely homogenous. He felt that members brought the knowledge and perspectives of various interests to the CAC's discussions but that should not restrict its deliberations. He was interested in seeing any significant dissenting views when CAC recommendations were forwarded to the MPC.

Mr. Leiken agreed with Mr. Kelly. He said the MPC wanted the CAC to be a diverse group that brought a balanced range of views to the table.

Mr. Green said that being chosen from a particular interest group did not limit members to only representing that perspective. With respect to the MPC's charge, he said the CAC should not spend time on things that could not be changed, such as federal or state requirements, but rather provide its best advice on public policy to the MPC.

Mr. Egan remarked that transportation was very complicated and the CAC had spent considerable time reviewing a huge amount of material in order to understand how to promote good public participation. He said the CAC understood its role was not to make transportation policy but it wanted guidance from the MPC on the extent to which its understanding of and opinion on those policies was wanted, in addition to its recommendations on public participation. He said the CAC also wished to know how useful its input was to the MPC in its deliberations.

Mr. Kelly stated that the CAC had a two part task and those parts were of equal importance. He said that one task related to public participation and the other related to policy and projects. He was as interested in the CAC's input on policies and projects as he was in public participation recommendations. He acknowledged the challenge to a volunteer group charged with understanding the complexities of transportation planning.

Ms. Piercy said it was as important for the CAC to feel its opinions were valued by the MPC as it was for the public to feel its participation in the larger planning process was meaningful.

Mr. Egan said it would be helpful to the CAC to understand when its opinions or recommendations were most useful to the MPC in the development of MPO products.

Mr. Kelly suggested that the CAC could develop an annual work plan to be presented to the MPC that would establish its focus and priorities for the coming year. He said any additional referrals from the MPC during the year would then be negotiated in terms of what was dropped from the work plan in order to accommodate that referral. He said it could also be helpful to have a CAC member at the table when the MPC was deliberating on an issue that had been discussed by the CAC. He saw the Regional Transportation Plan update as the highest priority over the next nine months.

Mr. Gaydos observed that the CAC's role was still a work in progress and the CAC was helping to create it. He viewed CAC members as MPC colleagues in exploring how to better involve citizens early in the transportation planning process. He encouraged the CAC to bring priorities for its work to the MPC and agreed with Mr. Kelly's idea of an annual work plan.

Mr. Green thanked the CAC for raising questions. He said that timing was a major issue in transportation planning and sometimes the MPC felt pressured to make decisions to accommodate state or federal schedules, which resulted in issues being referred to the CAC with inadequate time for a complete review. He urged the CAC to tell the MPC what it felt its priorities should be. He said that opinions from citizen advisory groups were always valuable to decision-makers. He stressed that the Delta Highway/Beltline corridor was a major transportation issue regardless of whether a hospital was located in that area and the CAC should be involved in that at a very early point.

Mr. Leiken asserted that the CAC's opinions were of considerable use and he read minutes of the meetings

and spoke to individual committee members to understand the CAC's discussions. He felt that great value was added by the CAC's input.

Ms. Ballew remarked that she was not certain the MPC knew exactly what it wanted from the CAC. She said the MPC should review the calendar of projects and processes for the next year and identify priorities on which the CAC should focus.

Mr. Sussman said that in addition to the policy and fiscal pieces, there were several major stand alone projects that had check-in points, including Delta Highway/Beltline and the Interstate 5 interchange and bridge, as well as projects just now being considered. He said any check-in points for the CAC related to those issues should also be on the calendar.

Mr. Egan concurred with the idea of a calendar to focus the CAC's efforts.

Mr. Sussman commented that there were reoccurring themes from the CAC in part because of a steady turnover of members and as new members went through a learning curve some of the same questions were raised, although perhaps in a different way. He asked the MPC to remain patient and flexible as the CAC worked through those issues.

Ms. Piercy asked why members left the CAC. Ms. Anderson replied that in conversation with those who had left and some current members there was uncertainty about the benefit, given the significant amount of time invested in committee activities. She said a lack of technical expertise among members raised the question of how meaningful CAC suggestions were and lack of feedback from the MPC about how those suggestions and recommendations were used added to that concern.

Mr. Kelly asked that copies of CAC minutes be included in MPC agenda packets.

Mr. Sussman said that initially there was some concern from outside the committee that members lacked the necessary technical backgrounds. He did not feel that the committee had problems addressing technical issues as there was broad enough experience among members and sufficient resources were available to enable the CAC to deal with any issue that came before it.

Mr. Egan asked that joint meetings occur more often and suggested that a CAC member selected by the committee attend MPC meetings.

Ms. Piercy suggested that the CAC continue to pursue responses from the MPC on its recommendations.

Ms. Anderson repeated her request for a response from the MPC on what difference the CAC had made other than developing the PPP.

Mr. Kelly responded that the MPC had not had enough exposure to the CAC's work for it to have the influence it should have.

Ms. Ban suggested meeting jointly twice a year.

Mr. Sussman said the CAC retreat produced a recommendation for quarterly joint meetings.

Mr. Green adjourned the joint meeting and convened the MPC meeting.

## **APPROVE AUGUST 10, 2006, MPC MINUTES**

Mr. Kelly pointed out a typographical error on page 6.

Mr. Kelly, seconded by Mr. Stewart, moved to approve the August 10, 2006, minutes as corrected. The motion passed unanimously, 9:0.

## **MPO ISSUES (continued)**

### **Amendments to Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP)**

Mr. Thompson stated that the Transportation Planning Committee (TPC) unanimously recommended approval of the six MTIP amendments. He said all six amendments were ODOT projects.

Ms. Ballew, seconded by Ms. Ban, moved to approve Resolution 2006-13 adopting amendments 2006-37, 2006-41, 2006-43, 2006-45, 2006-49 and 2006-54 to the FY06-09 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program. The motion passed unanimously, 9:0.

### **Programming FY07 and FY08 Surface Transportation Program-Urban (STP-U) Planning and Transportation Demand Management/Transportation Options (TDM/TO) Funds**

Mr. Thompson stated that the agenda item addressed STP-U funds for planning activities and Commuter Solutions TDM and TO activities in FY07 and/or FY08. He said that applications and recommended funding levels for those activities had gone through the TPC process. He briefly reviewed the table of projects included in the agenda packet and said the TPC unanimously recommended adoption of amendments to the FY06-09 MTIP to program funds.

Mr. Green asked if \$145,000 in baseline FY07 planning funds were allocated to Lane Council of Governments. Mr. Thompson replied that those funds were allocated to jurisdictions.

Ms. Ballew, seconded by Mr. Gaydos, moved to approve Resolution 2006-14 adopting amendments to the FY06-09 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program to program Surface Transportation Program-Urban funds for planning and Transportation Demand Management/Transportation Options activities in FY07 and FY08.

Mr. Kelly mentioned that the Eugene City Council, at its October 9 meeting, had recommended approval of the STP-U funding, approved an EmX study of the West 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue corridor, advocated for priority funding for Beltline from River Road to Coburg, West 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue improvement from Greenhill Road to Terry Street, a study of Beltline from Roosevelt Boulevard to West 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue, initiated design of changes to the land use code for access management and scheduled a work session on better use of Roosevelt Boulevard as an east/west arterial.

Mr. Leiken pointed out that Springfield had requested \$45,000 for bike path planning but that was reduced to \$20,000.

The motion passed unanimously, 9:0.

### **Alternate MPO Dispute Resolution Process**

Mr. Green determined there was consensus to postpone discussion of an alternate dispute resolution process to another meeting.

### **Transportation Cost Trends**

Ms. Lee said there were several factors causing construction costs to increase, including less competition among contractors because of the large number of major construction projects and high diesel costs. She said a further complication was lack of skilled labor; there were not enough graduates to compensate for retirees. She said that ODOT was developing recruitment and internal training programs but it would be difficult to keep up with the demand for skilled labor. She anticipated that the costs for labor and materials would continue to rise.

In response to a question from Mr. Kelly, Ms. Lee said that ODOT was committed to existing projects and the additional costs of construction would mean that fewer new projects were added to the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) or ODOT might reshuffle its own projects, such as bridge improvements. She said that those decisions were discussed with local representatives but ultimately made by ODOT. She said that ODOT could ask MPOs to vote on revising funding for modernization projects instead of simply canceling them if there was a funding shortage.

Mr. Schoening reviewed data on the City of Eugene's escalation of costs for pavement preservation projects and a comparison of actual and projected costs for arterial street rehabilitation. He said those figures illustrated the need for Eugene to move forward on its locally controlled and sustainable pavement preservation funding.

Mr. Schwetz compared County Road fund resources, which remained flat, to the substantially increased costs of materials. He said that the costs of fuel and other materials had also contributed to the problem.

Mr. Green said the Lane County Budget Committee had been presented with that information. He noted uncertainty about the Secure Rural Schools reauthorization had prompted some counties to choose not to build new roads and Lane County might have to consider that. He said that the shortage of skilled labor could be addressed through community colleges if there was sufficient funding and hoped the legislature would consider the systemic impact of not providing adequate funding for education.

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

#### **MTIP Administrative Amendments**

Mr. Thompson announced that administrative amendment 2006-55 was withdrawn by ODOT as unnecessary.

**OMPOC 2006 Fall Congress**

Mr. Schwetz said that a full report would be provided at the November 2006 meeting.

The next meeting was scheduled for October 12, 2006.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:36 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)