

November 6, 2003

To: Metropolitan Policy Committee

From: Paul Thompson

Subject: Item 4e: Implementation of Public Involvement Enhancements: Citizen Representatives on the Transportation Planning Committee (TPC)

## **Background**

At the October 9, 2003 Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) meeting, MPC members directed staff to pursue the following option as one way to increase citizen participation in the MPO's transportation planning process.

*Add citizen representatives to TPC to attend all meetings, either as full voting members, members who can vote only on recommendations to MPC, or as nonvoting advisory members.*

TPC is currently comprised of voting representatives from the five central jurisdictions within the MPO;

- Eugene (4)
- Springfield (3)
- Coburg (1)
- Lane County (3)
- Lane Transit District (LTD) (2)

as well as one voting representative from each of the following organizations:

- Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)
- Lane Regional Air Pollution Authority (LRAPA)
- Cottage Grove
- Creswell
- Junction City
- Veneta

Non-voting members include representatives from the Eugene-Springfield Joint Planning Commission Committee (JPCC), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG). It is anticipated that a near-term update of TPC's bylaws will result in removal of the representatives from Cottage Grove, Creswell, Junction City and Veneta from voting membership positions.

This memo provides recommendations for implementing MPC's direction to add citizen representatives to TPC.

## Discussion

There are several questions to resolve in deciding how to add citizen representatives to the TPC process:

- How many citizen representatives should be added as members of TPC?
- What would be the role of the citizens?
- Would it be preferable to specifically involve citizens with technical or professional expertise related to the MPO issues?
- How would the recruitment, selection and appointment of the citizen representatives occur?

TPC staff has discussed the questions above, considered the advantages and disadvantages and the potential cost of various options and developed a preferred scenario for the recruitment, selection and appointment of citizen representatives to TPC. This scenario, along with a discussion of the questions raised above, is presented below.

### Recommended Approach to Add Citizen Representatives to TPC

The following four items comprise TPC's recommended scenario for adding citizen representatives to TPC. Under each of the four items are discussion points for MPC to consider as it provides direction to staff to move forward with the recruitment of citizens.

1. Recommend four citizen members. This number of citizen representatives can represent a range of interests without unduly straining the TPC process and committee support. These representatives would be "interest-based" to the extent possible, not jurisdictionally-based.

- a. Is four the right number?
- b. Interest-based representation (such as public transportation/rail, environment/land use, freight/business, bike/pedestrian/safety) is the goal.
- c. Citizen representatives would vote on all matters before TPC.

2. The MPC Subcommittee report included the option of a Lane County Roads Advisory Committee (RAC) member on TPC. This was discussed at the October 29th RAC meeting. The RAC supported the idea. Among the benefits would be: coordination and sharing of information on STIP and other priority setting issues; broader county perspective to add to metro transportation discussions.

- a. Add RAC member to TPC?
- b. In addition to the four citizen representatives?
- c. Should position be non-voting or voting? JPCC position on TPC is non-voting.

3. Other TPC members' terms are not limited. Staff recommends two year terms for citizen representatives, with two appointed for a year and two appointed for two years initially, to create an offset in changeover.

4. Staff recommends an open recruitment process where interested citizens would fill out an application form and be evaluated by staff. Recommendations could be made by an MPC subcommittee or TPC to the MPC.

- a. Is an open recruitment process OK?
- b. The application would ask about experience and interest in transportation issues, etc. Could be modeled on applications for Planning Commissions or other advisory committees.
- c. Do you want to appoint a subcommittee to assist TPC in development of the recruitment and evaluation process?

By whatever means citizen representatives are incorporated, the responsibility for determining the appointees should rest with MPC. The regional role of the MPO should be kept in mind when appointing representatives, drawn from diverse interest groups, who will speak for the citizens of the region, not for any one jurisdiction.

TPC recommends that MPC initiate, via TPC, a comprehensive recruitment process to solicit applications from citizens interested in serving as a representative on TPC. The recruitment process should strive to reach as many specific interest and stakeholder groups, citizen, civic and business organizations, and members of the general public as possible. From the pool of applicants generated by the recruitment, TPC would then assist MPC in selecting four representatives that could bring to TPC as broad a set of perspectives as possible.

### Next Steps

MPC approval of the recommended scenario would result in staff commencing development of the recruitment process and materials, and developing amendments to the TPC Bylaws. TPC would bring to MPC's December meeting a proposal for the recruitment process and a proposed update of the Bylaws. Upon MPC's approval of the process, recruitment would proceed over approximately a two-month period, with a target of recommending to MPC the citizen appointees to TPC in February or March 2004.

**Action Requested:** Discuss and consider proposed scenario for adding citizen stakeholder representation to TPC. Provide direction to staff to proceed with development of recruitment of citizens to serve on TPC.