

MINUTES

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

April 4, 2007
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Webb Sussman, Chair; Moriah Demers, Vice Chair; John Anderson, Phillip Farrington, Rich Hazel, David Jacobson, Jeanne Marie Moore, members; Kitty Piercy, MPC liaison; Byron Vanderpool, Kathi Wiederhold, Paul Thompson, Michelle Yockelson, intern (Lane Council of Governments), Connie Bloom Williams (Lane Transit District/Commuter Solutions); Sue Yockelson, guest.

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review

Mr. Sussman called the meeting of the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) of the Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to order and those present introduced themselves.

2. Comments from the Audience

Mr. Sussman determined no one wished to speak.

3. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Jacobson, seconded by Mr. Farrington, moved to approve the minutes of the March 7, 2007, meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Sussman announced that at the request of staff agenda items 4 and 5 would be taken up following the discussion of the Citizen's Guide.

6. Citizen's Guide to Transportation Planning

Ms. Wiederhold reminded the committee that the Citizen's Guide was intended to be a colorful, user-friendly document to help people understand the transportation planning process and how they could participate. She introduced Michelle Yockelson, a senior at South Eugene High School, who was interning with Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) and had designed some graphics to consider for use in the guide.

Ms. Yockelson explained that she had drawn several animal mascot variations that could be used to add color, lightheartedness and humor to the guide. She provided cutouts of the figures and Ms. Wiederhold asked committee members to experiment by placing the cutouts on a mockup of the guide.

Ms. Wiederhold asked committee members to share their opinions about the approach and the proposed mascots. The following comments were offered:

- liked use of animals and array of transportation modes,
- designs were on the right track,
- caution that whatever animal symbols were used did not inadvertently represent something unintended,
- depict mascots in helmets where appropriate,
- liked use of parachute on the front page as the mascot's entrance,
- liked use of small, swift animals to denote ease of movement more than large, lumbering animals, and
- mascot theme could also be used on a web page.

Ms. Moore arrived at 5:50 p.m.

Ms. Wiederhold reviewed the guide mockup, which was based on ideas put forth by committee members during previous discussions of the guide. She distributed a sample "transportation timeline" of Central Lane County that identified changes in transportation modes from pre-settlement to the present. She asked for comments from the committee on guide content, format and organization.

There was a general discussion of how to introduce the subjects of transportation planning and the function of the MPC in a way that made them human and less bureaucratic. The committee members offered the following suggestions:

- change the phrase *key work products* to something such as *key activities* or *things that matter*
- categorize the transportation options on page 3 under the title *It's How We Get There That Matters* in terms of sustainability
- contact Lane Transit District (LTD) regarding including a free bus day pass as a coupon in the guide
- consider the guide's audience and be cautious about appearing to promote a particular agenda by being selective about which transportation modes were included on page 3 and how they were categorized
- using jurisdictions' growth management policies and goals regarding transportation and sustainability would not be expressing an opinion or agenda
- use the Transportation Timeline to help people understand not only what has changed, but that change will continue and things will be different in 10 or 20 years
- at the end of the transportation timeline add the phrase *What's next? It's up to you.*
- move the information on page 15 regarding the metropolitan planning organization to the center of the document facing the page on key activities (work products) so that one page addresses what the MPO is and the other addresses what it does
- conclude the guide with the transportation timeline and the phrase *What's next? It's up to you.*
- represent the Transportation Timeline as a trailer along the bottom of each page throughout the document
- all transportation modes should be represented under *It's How We Get There...* 80% of people in the community used a car as their primary mode of transportation and it could not be overlooked
- include leveraging private cars for more efficient transportation, such as carpooling
- the importance of freight to a community's commerce should not be excluded

- perhaps illustrate how in the course of a day a person might use or rely on almost all transportation modes
- tell people at the beginning of the guide its purpose and how it is hoped they will use it; carry that theme throughout the document using graphics

Ms. Moore felt that information about the CAC should be at the end of the guide as people would not be interested until they were clear about the purpose of the document. She said she was still unclear about the expected or hoped for result of the guide was. She asked if it was only intended to educate, with no other anticipated outcomes.

Mr. Sussman said that the guide was intended to help people understand where they could talk about a project and have the most impact.

Ms. Moore urged that the guide be clear about who was being invited to be involved in what process and for what purpose. She said there might need to be several versions of the guide targeted to specific audiences, depending on the purpose. She did not think it was feasible to have one document to reach all audiences.

Mr. Farrington questioned how practical it would be to develop a menu of publications and get those publications distributed. He felt it would be more efficient to have a broad-based document for a general audience.

Ms. Piercy thought the guide should be useful to a neighborhood association that was concerned about a traffic issue and assist them in participating in the system in order to have some influence on the issue.

Mr. Sussman described graphics that would represent the relationship among federal, state, regional and local transportation planning processes and the points at which a person could have an impact on a project, which was typically several years before it was near the construction stage.

Ms. Demers said the guide should be titled A Citizen's Guide to Transportation Planning to make its purpose more obvious.

Mr. Jacobson said the guide could be sent to residents of a neighborhood when a transportation project was being considered to let people know how their voices could be heard.

Ms. Piercy agreed that the guide would be useful now and in the future and be a good tool for organizations whose members wanted to be involved, such as neighborhood associations and chambers of commerce.

Ms. Williams observed that there was no call to action in the guide. She said there were individual choices about how to get around and there were transportation needs within the transportation system. She said options could be presented in the context of goods and services relying on the system and the importance of protecting that investment through long-range planning.

Ms. Moore suggested combining the presentation of different modes of transportation with the concept of planning for the next 20 years and how choices during the planning process will affect the transportation options available to the community. She said that could be used to encourage involvement in the process.

Mr. Sussman asked staff to revise the guide based on input from the committee and email the new version to committee members for review two weeks before the next meeting.

The CAC took a brief break.

4. Election of Officers

Mr. Sussman announced that the slate of officers for the next year consisted of him as chair and Ms. Demers as vice chair.

Mr. Anderson, seconded by Mr. Farrington, moved to elect Mr. Sussman as chair and Ms. Demers as vice chair. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Recruitment and Appointment of New Members

Mr. Sussman reviewed various recruitment strategies used or proposed in the past. Ms. Wiederhold added that the applications received during an at-large recruitment would be provided to a subcommittee of the MPC for review and selection of a slate of applicants to be recommended to the MPC for appointment to the CAC.

In response to a question from Ms. Moore, Ms. Wiederhold said there were currently seven committee members and the bylaws specified 10 to 15 members.

Ms. Moore suggested contacting previous applicants to determine if they were still interested. Ms. Wiederhold said that would be part of the recruitment process but a larger pool of applicants was needed so a broader effort would be required.

Mr. Farrington felt that a larger committee was preferable. He liked the recruitment strategies used in the past and said there should be an effort to target certain populations, such as the Hispanic community, that were not represented on the committee.

Ms. Moore noted that her term would expire in December 2007 and encouraged recruitment among people with disabilities as she did not intend to request reappointment.

Mr. Sussman encouraged representation from the Springfield, Eugene and Coburg chambers of commerce and representation from Cottage Grove, although it was not within the MPO area. He was particularly interested in having someone from Coburg on the committee.

Ms. Wiederhold reviewed the outreach and recruitment strategies used during the last effort. She said that advertisements and applications were in English and Spanish.

Mr. Farrington asked that recruitment materials be sent to the Lane Independent Living Alliance (LILA).

Mr. Sussman recommended posting announcements in local coffee outlets such as Full City and Dutch Brothers.

Ms. Moore suggested using the Eugene Human Rights Accessibility Committee to help recruit.

Ms. Demers suggested emailing recruitment announcements to the Lane Community College and University of Oregon and would provide email addresses.

Mr. Sussman said that the Lillis Business School and urban planning program at the University should be targeted.

In response to a comment from Mr. Sussman, Ms. Wiederhold said that the previous list included freight companies. She would email the list she had used to committee members and ask for suggestions for additions to it.

Mr. Vanderpool said staff could also request lists of transportation dependent businesses from the chambers of commerce.

Ms. Williams suggested writing articles for inclusion in the chambers of commerce newsletters and local newspapers.

Ms. Wiederhold emphasized that applicants were not being recruited to fill "slots" representing particular interests. She said that applicants were screened using a matrix approach and in most cases represented a range of interests. She distributed the recruitment materials used last time and asked committee members to email suggestions for updating.

Mr. Sussman determined there were no objections to extending the meeting time by 30 minutes, until 7:30 p.m.

7. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update

Ms. Wiederhold distributed an updated poster announcing the RTP update for review by the committee.

Mr. Sussman said he was still concerned with the two of the bulleted items under the update purpose section that referred to adjusting assumptions and forecasts and updating project lists and costs. He said those items did not indicate why someone would be interested in or care about those issues.

Ms. Moore agreed that it was not clear why someone would want to be involved in the update process.

Ms. Demers suggested providing more guidance on why and how to comment.

Mr. Hazel said that how comments could be made should be clarified.

Mr. Farrington and Mr. Anderson felt the poster was fairly clear and concise and any revisions should be the same.

Mr. Jacobson suggested adding the phrase "Be part of the process" preceding the request for comments.

Ms. Piercy said the public should be informed that the update was an opportunity to hear the best thinking and forecasting on population, land use, employment and transportation to help guide future decision-making for the community.

Mr. Thompson pointed out that the population and employment assumptions were only being adjusted based on extending the current plan to 2031 and no new assumptions or forecasts would be done.

Mr. Farrington remarked that the only actions of likely interest to the public were extending the plan horizon and updating the project lists and costs.

Mr. Thompson said that while the bullets for population and employment under assumptions and forecasts could be eliminated he encouraged keeping the land use and transportation bullets.

Mr. Vanderpool said the problematic word was "adjust" as the purpose was to examine the plan and determine if it accommodated projections. He said the CAC would be involved in the next RTP update, which would be a major revision.

8. Proposed Modifications to ODOT Roadway Project Lists for Regional Transportation Plan Update

Mr. Thompson explained that removal of the West Eugene Parkway (WEP) project from the plan would have a significant impact on ODOT roadway project lists. He said that elimination of the WEP made available reasonably expected revenue in the future for use on other projects. He reviewed the financially constrained and illustrative project lists, which represented all of the projects needed to serve anticipated growth; the constrained list identified projects that could be built given expected revenue. He said based on direction from the MPC, staff had moved four projects from the illustrative to the financially constrained list and he briefly reviewed those projects.

Mr. Farrington asked how projects to be moved to the constrained list were identified. Mr. Thompson replied that the selection was based on ODOT's identification of those projects with the highest priority on the state highway system.

Mr. Jacobson remarked that it appeared enhancement of intersections was based on projections of higher populations in those areas. Mr. Thompson said that technical analysis indicated more vacant land and probably more growth and trips generated in the eastern end of the MPO area than in already developed areas.

Ms. Demers asked for clarification of urban standards as it related to reconstruction of 8th Avenue in the courthouse district. Mr. Thompson said that urban standards defined a basic set of construction standards for an urban collector or arterial that related to lane width, operational capacity, curbs, gutters and sidewalks.

Mr. Hazel expressed concern with congestion points in the system and emphasis on eastern mobility improvements that would tend to bring traffic into the core area while core projects remained on the illustrative list.

Mr. Farrington agreed with moving the projects identified in the ODOT analysis to the constrained list.

Mr. Anderson agreed with Mr. Hazel's remarks but recognized there were many factors involved in identifying priority projects.

Mr. Sussman asked Mr. Thompson to provide any responses to comments via email.

Mr. Thompson agreed and clarified that the Delta Highway was a County facility and on the County's project list.

8. Wrap up

Mr. Thompson announced that the MPO staff would be participating in a quadrennial certification review by the U.S. Department of Transportation on May 1-3. He said the CAC May 2 meeting would not be part of that process but the committee was invited to the public comment session on the evening of May 1; details would be provided via email.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)