

MINUTES

Citizen Advisory Committee
of the
Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization
Eugene Public Library—Singer Room—100 West 10th Avenue
Eugene, Oregon

March 7, 2007
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Sylvia Shaw, Co-Chair; Webb Sussman, Vice Chair; David Jacobson, Moriah Demers, John Anderson, Phillip Farrington, Rich Hazel, members; Byron Vanderpool, Kathi Wiederhold, Paul Thompson (Lane Council of Governments), Anita Yap (Lane Transit District), Zachary Vishanoff, David Sonnichsen, guests.

ABSENT: Dan Egan, Jeanne Marie Moore, Ross Notebaart, Kitty Piercy, members.

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review

Ms. Shaw called the meeting of the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) of the Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to order and those presented introduced themselves.

Ms. Shaw reviewed the agenda.

2. Comments from the Audience

Mr. Vishanoff noted the lack of others wishing to comment on the work of the committee and suggested that was due to a general lack of public knowledge about the committee. He recommended the committee work to get more media coverage by publicizing its work more widely as he believed there was a lot of community interest in the transportation decisions the CAC considered. He believed that failure to do so was a reason that local planning efforts ran into “logjams.” Mr. Vishanoff noted upcoming decisions about such projects as EMX and suggested that it was onerous for Eugene citizens to have to travel to Glenwood to offer comment to the Lane Transit District Board of Directors at its headquarters.

Mr. Vishanoff did not think the road improvements associated with the new federal courthouse road would be bicycle friendly and suggested that bicyclists did not want to be considered traffic calming devices. He also thought it would discourage senior citizens from using bicycles because of the need to keep up with traffic.

3. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Farrington, seconded by Mr. Sussman, moved to approve the minutes of January 10, 2007, as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

As Mr. Thompson had not yet arrived from a meeting in Salem, Ms. Shaw moved up item 6 on the agenda.

6. Citizen's Guide to Transportation Planning

Ms. Wiederhold recalled the CAC's January brainstorming exercise around the contents of the guide. She said the guide must meet federal requirements regarding citizen involvement, but she hoped it could also be an easy to use and easy to read introduction to regional transportation planning. She reminded the CAC she had included some potential graphics for inclusion in the guide for members' review in the February packet but that meeting was canceled. Ms. Wiederhold again shared the graphics with the CAC members and solicited members' input, which she recorded.

Ms. Wiederhold encouraged CAC members to contact her with more ideas for graphics to include in the guide.

Mr. Jacobson recommended that the time line include an arrow that could be moved to indicate at what point the process was in the time line, regardless of the project.

5. Recommendation from Officers

Ms. Wiederhold announced that Dan Egan had resigned from the committee due to other commitments. Mr. Sussman encouraged members to refer new potential members to Ms. Wiederhold. Ms. Shaw anticipated the officers would have some recommendations related to the recruitment of new members at the next meeting and encouraged members to contact the officers with suggestions.

Ms. Shaw presented a recommendation from the officers to the CAC, proposing that CAC narrow its focus on the citizen's guide and public participation for the immediate future and then consider next steps. She said that several members had expressed a concern the CAC was trying to do too much and that was draining members' energies. Mr. Sussman said the Surface Transportation Program document was not a full-fledged policy document or one that required much review or CAC input, so the CAC had an opportunity to focus on completing its work on the citizen's guide in a meaningful way. He thought that work was crucial to the committee's future policy work.

CAC members endorsed the proposal. Mr. Farrington agreed with Mr. Sussman's comments about the need to be prepared for the significant work that lay ahead so the public could be engaged in a meaningful way. He suggested a greater emphasis on the citizen's guide now would allow the community to understand the policy debates that lay ahead.

While he appreciated the work done by Mr. Spencer in regard to the scheduling of the special energy meeting, Mr. Farrington did not want to be in the position of being asked to endorse information that he was not completely familiar with; he did not want to be painted in a corner in such a manner, and did not think the policy makers did either. He thought an analysis of energy policy based on climate change was a subject for the policy makers, but it was a big subject and how it was formatted for the public was important.

Mr. Hazel was disappointed the special energy meeting had not taken place and expressed concern about the many "no shows." He expressed appreciation for the officers' recommendation and recommended the committee avoid belaboring issues and attempt to come to its resolution more quickly.

Ms. Demers liked the idea of focusing on one document at a time.

Ms. Shaw identified a focus on four areas: 1) public participation plan; 2) citizen's guide; 3) the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP); and 4) the next level of regional transportation planning, which the officers anticipated would include more policy work.

Mr. Vanderpool said the RTP must be updated but it would not be significantly revised. During the next update cycle, which would begin around January 1, 2008, he anticipated the Metropolitan Policy Committee and CAC would go through the policy framework behind the plan. Mr. Sussman suggested that the special energy meeting rescheduled when the CAC reached that point because the policy framework would exist and the recommendations resulting from the meeting would be more meaningful.

Ms. Shaw determined there was committee support for the recommendation.

The CAC took a brief break.

6. Citizen's Guide to Transportation Planning

Ms. Wiederhold called attention to the materials mailed out with the February packet and shared a display advertisement for making comment and solicited feedback. She asked if the February materials reflected the CAC's input and if more could be added.

Mr. Thompson circulated a document entitled "Planning for Transportation in the Salem-Keizer Area: Highlights of the 2030 Transportation Systems Plan." He said the document identified what was and was not being updated in the plan and also discussed other planning efforts underway. Responding to a request from Mr. Sussman, Mr. Thompson indicated he would receive a copy of the document in electronic form and could share it with committee members.

Responding to a question from Mr. Farrington, Mr. Thompson confirmed that the RTP included consideration of air travel and freight. Mr. Jacobson suggested that access to the airport should be part of the plan.

CAC members offered comment on the display advertisement, which Ms. Wiederhold recorded.

Ms. Yap suggested that in regard to the RTP, it would be useful if the materials indicated what the RTP was and what the CAC was inviting comment on. Mr. Sussman asked what staff would do with comments not applicable to the limited update. Mr. Thompson said that staff would report on the comments but not respond at this time. Mr. Sussman determined from Mr. Thompson that staff could track comments made on the RTP that would not be applicable in a limited update but might be in a more extensive update.

Ms. Wiederhold invited ideas on the form included with the February materials and on the planned outreach activities.

Mr. Jacobson suggested that staff include a comment form in billing inserts with Eugene Water & Electric Board and Springfield Utility Board bills.

Ms. Shaw asked about attendance at past workshops. Mr. Thompson acknowledged that frequently such events were not well-attended. Ms. Yap recommended that Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) staff piggyback on Lane Transit District's plans to hold an open house in west Eugene in connection with the third EMX route.

Ms. Wiederhold recalled Mr. Egan's advocacy for the formation of a key stakeholders group for the next RTP update.

Mr. Farrington recommended staff take the description on page 1 of the Public Outreach Strategy form, distill it, and include it on the display ad.

Mr. Farrington did not advocate for investment in a key stakeholders process for a limited update. He suggested that staff instead contact key stakeholder groups such as neighborhood organizations to briefly explain the scope of the update.

7. Surface Transportation Program-Urban Fund Allocation

Mr. Thompson called attention to the materials related to the topic, which were distributed with the last agenda packet. He said that staff had allocated the funding in the Surface Transportation Program-Urban Fund Allocation (STP-U) as directed by the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) in July 2006. A public comment period had occurred and a public hearing before the MPC was held. One comment had been received. He said that following the hearing, the MPC members had no questions and he anticipated they would approve the funding proposal at the next meeting. He invited CAC input, which he indicated staff would share with the MPC the next day.

Responding to a question from Mr. Jacobson, Mr. Thompson confirmed that there was not sufficient funding to fund all projects. Mr. Jacobson suggested a subcommittee of the CAC should look at the applications and make recommendations because he felt arterials carrying more traffic should have a higher priority. For example, he perceived more need for a Eugene road project than for a Springfield road project because the Eugene road carried more traffic. Mr. Thompson said each city requested funding for their top priorities, and Eugene's road projects came from a much longer list than Springfield's. He agreed that traffic loads should be considered in prioritizing projects.

Mr. Sussman advocated for raising the Goodpasture Island Road project in priority as that area had experienced a tremendous amount of growth and an increase in truck traffic, and the new hospital would only exacerbate that. Mr. Farrington said that the application scoring indicated that some of the roads proposed for funding were in far worse shape than Goodpasture Island Road or Barger Road, which he had been concerned about.

Mr. Hazel termed it "unfortunate" that the update did not include more funding for road preservation and that Springfield had chosen to advance new projects rather than preservation projects. He thought it important to preserve what was there. Mr. Farrington pointed out that Eugene's projects were almost entirely preservation projects while some of Springfield's proposals added capacity to projects that were already underway, which was why the MPC and Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) were willing to take the money left over from the West Eugene Parkway project and put it toward such projects.

Speaking to Mr. Hazel's remarks, Mr. Thompson noted that Springfield had funded its preservation program with its gas tax and its staff felt that city had a handle on its preservation backlog, unlike Eugene, so those projects were not its top priorities.

8. FY2010-2013 STIP Criteria and Factors

Mr. Thompson reported that the OTC and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) had begun development of the fiscal year 2010-2013 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). ODOT had sent out a schedule, included in the meeting packet as Attachment 1. He noted the two-year overlap with the previous STIP.

Mr. Thompson called attention to Attachment 2, *2010-2013 STIP Project Eligibility Criteria and Prioritization Factors Summary of Proposed Changes*. He reviewed the changes, particularly highlighting the change related to the reassessment of prior STIP projects and projects that leveraged other funds. Speaking to the latter change, Mr. Vanderpool said staff understood the concept of leveraging other money but feared the practical result would be that the local area would not be able to put enough "cash on the table" and State money would go to an area that had more.

Mr. Sussman expressed concern about the change requiring reassessment of prior STIP projects before they were included in the next STIP. Mr. Thompson said that several smaller communities had expressed concern about the change, and he would share Mr. Sussman's feedback with the MPC. Mr. Vanderpool concurred. He said that MPC staff agreed with the concept but had expressed concern about the process.

Mr. Thompson said the MPC would review the information before the CAC at its meeting the next day and would provide its comments to ODOT by April. He anticipated the CAC would see the information again.

Mr. Farrington asked what counted toward the local match, saying that local jurisdictions had secured federal funding for their road projects and then ODOT had assumed that money as its own and would not count it toward the local contribution. He asked what could be done about that situation. ODOT requested that cities submit their federal lobbying requests to it, which it then ranked to determine the top ten priorities to support.

Mr. Thompson reported that the STIP Stakeholder Committee had never had a Eugene-Springfield area representative. The MPC had asked to have a place at the committee table and had been told no. He said that ODOT's local area regional manager was asked to pursue the issue again by metropolitan planning organization staff.

8. Wrap up

Mr. Sussman expressed disappointment that the special energy meeting had to be canceled and acknowledged the work of staff in preparing for the meeting. Mr. Thompson noted that he had been asked to make the presentation intended for the joint meeting to the Oregon Chapter of the American Public Works Association. Mr. Farrington hoped a similar meeting could be arranged for the future. He suggested that Mr. Thompson could make the presentation to a larger group that included the CAC.

Mr. Hazel expressed appreciation for the work of staff and commended the meeting materials. He believed

the CAC needed more members for effective discussions of the materials. He looked forward to a more focused committee work environment and effective long-range planning.

Ms. Shaw also complimented staff. She anticipated that the CAC would elect new officers in April. She indicated she was likely to be leaving the area in the next month and would not be at the next meeting.

Mr. Jacobson thanked staff for its work on the CAC Web page.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

(Recorded by Kim Young)