

## MINUTES

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

October 11, 2007  
11:30 a.m.

**PRESENT:** Kitty Piercy, Chair; Alan Zelenka (City of Eugene); Faye Stewart (Lane County), Anne Ballew, Sid Leiken (City of Springfield), Mike Eyster (Lane Transit District), John Thiel (City of Coburg), Sonny Chickering (Oregon Department of Transportation), members; Scott Luell (City of Eugene), Bill Van Vactor (Lane County), Jeff Towery (City of Springfield), Stefano Viggiano (Lane Transit District), *ex officio* members.

George Kloeppe, Kathi Wiederhold, Susan Payne, Petra Schuetz, Byron Vanderpool, Ann Mortenson, Jamon Kent (Lane Council of Governments); Jeff Scheick, Ed Moore, Eric Havig (Oregon Department of Transportation); Greg Mott, (City of Springfield), Glenn Svendsen (City of Eugene), Mary Archer (Lane Transit District); Celia Barry (Lane County); Rob Zako, Kevin Matthews, Lauri Segel, guests.

### WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Ms. Piercy called the meeting of the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) to order and welcomed committee members, staff and guests. Those present introduced themselves.

### COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

There was no one wishing to speak.

### METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO) ISSUES

#### **Report from the MPO Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)**

Ms. Wiederhold reported that staff had been working with the committee to orient new members and provide continuing education to ongoing members. She said CAC officers and staff developed a work program, details of which were provided in the agenda packet. She said the CAC had established a subcommittee to explore issues related to establishing a freight advisory committee as set forth in the MPO's certification report as a recommendation. She said the committee had unanimously recommended bylaws amendments, which would come before the MPC later in the meeting.

#### **Draft 2031 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)**

Mr. Vanderpool referred to a memorandum from Paul Thompson in the agenda packet and highlighted several issues. He noted that responses were provided to public comments received after the MPC's last

meeting and Appendix C to the RTP had been updated to provide more complete information. He asked that the MPC hold another public hearing, consistent with its direction at the last meeting, and provide any feedback or direction to staff following the hearing. He said the RTP was scheduled for adoption at the November 8, 2007 MPC meeting.

Ms. Piercy opened the public hearing and called for testimony.

**Lauri Segel**, speaking on behalf of the Goal 1 Coalition, submitted a petition signed by 123 Lane County citizens asked the MPC to delay adoption of the RTP until December 2008 or until there had been an opportunity for the public to be engaged in real transportation decision-making. She said the Goal 1 Coalition supported widespread public involvement as the key to public support for transportation planning. She said meaningful opportunities for public participation in necessary, functional and comprehensive plan updates were missing and urged delaying adoption of the plan. She submitted a written copy of her testimony and the petition.

**Rob Handy**, River Road, Eugene, remarked that MPC members and staff had made it clear the MPC was not a land use policy-making body or interested in making land use decision; therefore, the MPC should follow the lead of the cities and County. He said capacity-building projects should not be added to the RTP that were not currently in local functional plans.

**Rob Zako**, 1,000 Friends of Oregon, asked whether the five capacity-enhancing projects met the goals, objectives and policies in the RTP and were those projects in the relevant local transportation system plans and comprehensive plan. He echoed Rob Handy's comments regarding the MPC's reluctance to be involved in land use planning or decision-making matters. He said as a coordinating body, the MPC should wait until local planning was completed before making decisions about new projects.

**Kevin Matthews**, Friends of Eugene, concurred with the previous speakers. He said until recently there were two large, overlapping transportation plans and that continued to be a source of frustration to the public. He felt there should be a way to efficiently synchronize TransPlan and RTP planning. He felt the RTP should match TransPlan and there should be no projects in the RTP that were not in TransPlan to avoid inconsistency with the underlying local plans. He said that planners and elected officials had a responsibility to deal with scientific reality. The transportation infrastructure should not feed a land use system that generated increasing sprawl and increased carbon emissions. He said any investment in reducing emissions and minimizing the effects of climate change would pay off many times over. He encouraged coordination of plans and increased public input.

**David Hinkley**, Eugene, said it was conspicuous that the only speakers were those who usually attended MPC meetings. He said that citizen participation could be increased by coordinating schedules so that major policy meetings were not occurring at the same time, holding meetings at times that were more accessible to working people, more extensive advertising of meetings and educating the public about why the matters under discussion were important to them.

Ms. Piercy closed the public hearing and thanked those who spoke. She agreed with the importance of linking land use and transportation planning.

Mr. Havig stated that the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) had been engaged throughout the RTP update and supported the process. He said ODOT was cognizant of the need for the MPO to meet federal requirements, but was concerned about increasing the gap between the federal plan and the land use elements in the Metro Plan and the local transportation system plans. He said ODOT did support moving

forward with the RTP update, but wanted it clearly documented in the plan that it did not constitute a land use decision and was for federal compliance purposes only and should not be relied upon for land use decisions or used to support future land use decisions, and that ODOT would be providing language to that effect for insertion into the RTP. He said ODOT expected that local jurisdictions would work expeditiously to begin update their local transportation system plans (TSP) and the area comprehensive plan land use elements and Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) would assist with coordinating those efforts.

Mr. Stewart arrived at 11:55 a.m.

Mr. Scheick emphasized ODOT's interest in continuing its partnership with local jurisdictions' planning efforts. He urged jurisdictions to keep in mind when updating their TSPs that the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) would be looking at whether planning work was done when considering what projects would be adopted into future State Transportation Improvement Programs (STIP).

Mr. Kloeppe affirmed that LCOG staff had been in contact with ODOT and the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) regarding their expectations and would be working to convene the appropriate staff level meetings of local planning partners and state officials.

Mr. Zelenka observed that the linkage between transportation and land use was increasingly clear, but those connections were not readily apparent in planning processes. He asked staff to address comments during the public hearing about inconsistencies between the RTP and TransPlan because the same projects were not in both plans.

Mr. Vanderpool commented that this was exactly the type of conversation that the federal government intended MPOs to have. He said Oregon had very comprehensive land use laws, but that was not true in every state and the MPO regulations had to apply to all states. He said LCOG had discussed the concern of consistency with the Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and those agencies were very clear that the RTP met federal requirements for consistency. He said that meant the MPO was coordinating work at the local level and the State's transportation plan to meet federal requirements; it did not mean they were exactly the same. He said an RTP update was required not less than every four years; State requirements for local transportation system plan updates were less clear and the cycles did not mesh. He said the meetings referred to by Mr. Kloeppe were to discuss that issue.

Mr. Vanderpool stated that projects in the RTP were included in local plans and had been in those adopted plans for some time, in some cases since 1986. He said that some projects may have moved from the illustrative to the financially constrained list, but they had all been in local plans for years and gone through the local processes in addition to the RTP process.

Mr. Zelenka questioned why so few people participated in the RTP process, which obligated huge amounts of money and shaped communities in the future. He hoped the MPO could create a process that would attract a much higher level of public participation.

Ms. Ballew pointed out that the two Springfield projects in the RTP were not new and had been planned since 1986; both had been through a public process at the local level. She said that generally the public did not become involved in issues unless they were unhappy about something.

Mr. Leiken remarked that it was often challenging to coordinate land use and transportation planning, but agencies were able to resolve their differences and move forward in a cohesive manner to determine how the community would look in the future. Regarding public involvement, he said the Springfield projects

were the subject of significant outreach at the local level during the early planning stages. He said that many people often felt more comfortable participating in a smaller venue such as a neighborhood meeting than speaking in public at a City Council or MPC meeting. He felt that by the time projects reached the MPC they had been well vetted at the community level by the public and local elected officials.

Regarding combining transportation documents, Ms. Ballew said the RTP was primarily a financing document while TransPlan addressed land use issues. She felt it was better to keep them separate.

Ms. Piercy noted that the RTP and TransPlan did need to be in compliance with each other. She said that the metro area's largest source of carbon emissions was transportation and was a factor in planning for the system.

Mr. Zelenka said planning should also consider ways to decrease the amount of time vehicles spent idling and alternate modes to address emissions and Peak Oil.

Mr. Vanderpool stated there was a discrepancy between State and federal law that created a one-year gap between timelines for air quality conformity. He said the deadline to meet Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) requirements for air quality conformity was December 13, 2007; the federal guidelines would allow the RTP to remain current until December 2008. He said staff was concerned that if the air quality conformity lapsed the argument could be made that the RTP and Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) were no longer valid. He said it was not possible to only update the air quality conformity. He said the RTP and TransPlan cycles were not synchronized because of overlapping regulations at the State and federal levels.

#### **APPROVE SEPTEMBER 13, 2007, MINUTES**

Ms. Ballew, seconded by Mr. Leiken, moved to approve the minutes of the September 13, 2007, meeting. The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

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

##### **Draft MPO Air Quality Conformity Determination (AQCD)**

Ms. Payne provided an overview of the air quality conformity determination. She said carbon monoxide had been identified as the only transportation maintenance issue for the Eugene-Springfield area. She explained that there must be an approved AQCD for the RTP and MTIP to be recognized and the one-year gap between planning cycles occurred because DEQ required air quality updates on a three-year cycle, while the RTP was on a four-year update cycle. She reviewed the public outreach activities and said that no comments had been received to date.

In response to a question from Mr. Zelenka, Ms. Payne said the area easily met the standard with carbon monoxide significantly below the budget level. She said a future concern could be ozone as ozone standards were being revised to lower the acceptable level. She said ozone also resulted from sources other than transportation.

Ms. Piercy opened the public hearing and called for testimony.

**Kevin Matthews**, Friends of Eugene, indicated he was speaking for that organization and as a private individual, but was also a member of the Lane Regional Air Protection Agency (LRAPA) Budget Committee, which gave him some familiarity with air quality issues. He referred to a graph on page three of the AQCD demonstrating progress in reducing carbon monoxide levels. He said the document was written to comply with Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) requirements for the Clean Air Act, but EPA was determined to be in violation of the Act because it did not consider carbon dioxide to be a Clear Air Act pollutant. He pointed out the projected 50 percent increase in the amount of miles traveled by 2031. He pointed to a map showing the discrepancies between planned nodal development and expansion of the bus rapid transit system. He asked the MPC to direct LCOG to begin tracking carbon dioxide as an air pollutant, documenting the carbon footprint implications of area transportation plans and comparing the carbon emissions of those plans to reasonable targets.

**David Hinkley**, Eugene, said the AQCD was an arcane document because it had not been translated into language that would be understandable to the public. He suggested putting the RTP update on a three-year cycle, followed by a one-year cycle, followed by a three-year cycle, followed by a one-year cycle to address the State and federal planning cycle discrepancies in the short-term.

Ms. Piercy closed the public hearing.

Ms. Payne stated that LCOG had worked with others to develop a carbon dioxide emissions analysis; however, a more refined transportation emissions model was needed in order to effectively evaluate carbon dioxide levels and responses to those levels.

Mr. Stewart suggesting inviting a representative from LRAPA to give a presentation on how that agency was addressing the issue of carbon dioxide.

### **Letters of Support for ConnectOregon II Applications**

Mr. Vanderpool stated that November 21 was the deadline for ConnectOregon II applications. He said that letters of support from MPOs were not required, but were commonly provided. He the only application to date was from the City of Eugene for Phase 2 of the Eugene Depot project and asked the MPC to endorse signing a letter of support for the project.

Mr. Leiken, seconded by Mr. Zelenka, moved to approve a letter of support for the City of Eugene ConnectOregon II grant application for Eugene Depot Phase 2 - Platform and Vehicular Improvements. The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

### **Amendments to Citizen Advisory Committee Bylaws**

Ms. Wiederhold reported that the CAC was recommending approval of the draft amendments to its bylaws. She said an amendment was necessary to provide greater flexibility in the timing of CAC appointments; other amendments were housekeeping in nature.

Mr. Eyster, seconded by Mr. Chickering, moved to approve Resolution 2007-08 adopting amendments to the Citizen Advisory Committee Bylaws. The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

## **Central Lane MPO Certification Review Final Report**

Mr. Vanderpool referred to the final report on the certification review that was included in the agenda packet. He said an onsite review of a transportation management area (TMA) was required every four years. He pointed out that the area was determined to be in compliance and the report included both corrective and recommended actions; those actions would inform development of a work plan for the next two to four years.

In response to a question from Ms. Ballew, Mr. Vanderpool said the area's congestion management plan had new federal requirements and was now called a congestion management process (CMP); MPO staff was in the process of including the additional steps necessary to bring it into compliance.

## **ODOT Budget, Program Funding and Region 2 Large Project Strategy**

Mr. Scheick explained that ODOT's 2008-2011 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) faced a shortfall of approximately \$168 million compared to projected funding in 2005. He said the shortfall occurred due to a number of factors such as lower fuel tax revenues, legislative adjustments, redistribution of \$56.2 million from the state highway fund to counties in 2008 and unanticipated need to seismically retrofit ODOT headquarters. He said ODOT is attempting to address the shortfall in a number of ways, including potential cuts to the STIP. The Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) was considering reducing modernization by about \$70 million and emphasizing maintenance and preservation of the system. He would provide an update at future meetings on the OTC's deliberations and the process for making any cuts.

Ms. Ballew asked if the funding trend would continue downward. Mr. Scheick replied that it was likely fuel tax revenue would continue to decline as technology continued to improve vehicle mileage and people drove less because of high fuel costs. He said the OTC was exploring other sources of funding. He mentioned there was a potential shortage of federal funds by 2009, potentially resulting in Oregon receiving about \$150 million less.

In response to questions from Mr. Zelenka, Mr. Scheick said the State gas tax was the largest contributor to ODOT's budget after federal funds; a vehicle mile fee system was being researched as a funding option. He speculated that the federal funding shortfall was primarily due to reduced gas tax revenues and significant increases in materials costs.

Mr. Scheick distributed a handout entitled *Region 2 Large Project Strategy - September 2007*. He said the document was meant to be a guide for prioritizing projects for the 2010-2013 STIP. He pointed out changes to the Region 2 Large Project List.

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

### **ODOT Update**

Mr. Chickering remarked that it was his fourth day as ODOT's area manager and he was looking forward to working with MPC member jurisdictions and agencies.

Mr. Scheick indicated he was very pleased at having hired Mr. Chickering and thanked all who participated in the recruitment effort.

### **MPO Calendar**

Mr. Vanderpool announced that the Oregon MPO Consortium summit had been cancelled and would be rescheduled at a later date. He noted the next MPC meeting would be held at LCOG's office in the Wells Fargo building.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:10 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)