

# MINUTES

Citizen Advisory Committee  
of the  
Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization  
Singer Room – Eugene Public Library – 100 West 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Eugene, Oregon

October 3, 2007  
5:30 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Webb Sussman, Chair; Diana Alldredge, Rich Hazel, Dave Jacobson, Wendy Butler-Boyesen, Bill Morganti, Ryan Papé, Eleanor Mulder, John Anderson, Damien Gilbert, Donald Holtgrieve, members; Kathi Wiederhold, Paul Thompson, Byron Vanderpool, Lane Council of Governments staff; Sonny Chickering, Lane County, guest; Connie Bloom Williams, Commuter Solutions.

**ABSENT:** Phillip Farrington, Bob Ransom, Jeanne-Marie Moore, members; Kitty Piercy, MPC liaison.

## **1. Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review**

Mr. Sussman called the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting to order and welcomed those present. Members, staff and guests introduced themselves.

## **2. Comments from the Audience**

There was no one wishing to speak.

## **3. Approval of September 19, 2007, Minutes**

This item was postponed until after the break to afford members time to review the minutes.

Mr. Vanderpool reminded committee members that when they attended other community activities, particularly related to transportation, it was perfectly legitimate to identify themselves as members of the CAC, but cautioned them to make certain they did not indicate they were representing the committee unless the committee had taken a position on an issue or sent that member as a representative. He said that was particularly important with respect to the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC). He said encouraged members to identify themselves as part of the CAC, but if they were expressing opinions make it clear the opinions were their own unless they were specifically authorized to speak on behalf of the CAC.

Ms. Wiederhold distributed an updated 2007-2008 meeting schedule and noted that the regular meeting date remained the first Wednesday through 2007, and then switched to the third Wednesday for the 2008 schedule. She said the MPC would act on the CAC bylaw changes at its October 11 meeting and updated bylaws would be distributed in the next CAC agenda packet.

#### 4. Primer on Commuter Solutions Program

Mr. Thompson introduced Connie Bloom Williams, manager of the Commuter Solutions program at Lane Transit District (LTD). He said the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) relied on Commuter Solutions to carry out many of the transportation demand management (TDM) and transportation options (TO) strategies, the purpose of which was to reduce single occupant vehicle trips.

Ms. Williams provided an overview of the Commuter Solutions program, which was governed by a board of directors composed of regional representatives of the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), Lane Transit District, Lane Council of Governments, Lane County and the cities of Springfield, Eugene and Coburg. She referred to the list of programs in the *Commuter Solutions 2005-2010 Strategic Plan* and briefly discussed each of them. She said the greatest challenge was bringing about behavior change, which was necessary as the region grew.

Mr. Sussman asked if the student bus pass program would be extended to organizations like Northwest Christian College and Pioneer Pacific College. Ms. Williams replied that the program was available if those organizations wished to offer that benefit to their students.

Mr. Sussman asked if there had been discussions with a sister organization in Roseburg to develop programs for people commuting from Roseburg to the Eugene/Springfield area for jobs. Ms. Williams said there was no similar organization in Roseburg to coordinate with, but the Commuter Solutions ride share database did include some people from Roseburg.

Ms. Williams stressed the importance of collaboration with community organizations and participation in community events and activities and reviewed the partnerships and sponsorships listed in the strategic plan. She highlighted the plan's goals to increase participation in regional transportation options programs and services and to support local, regional and statewide land use/transportation policies. She said Commuter Solutions was involved in congestion mitigation on major construction projects throughout the region. She noted that the school transit program and Smart Ways to School program were strongly supported by schools, parents and students; likewise, the group pass program had primarily grown by word-of-mouth to include 80 different employers. She concluded her presentation with a review of funding sources and program performance measures.

Ms. Thompson commented that ODOT had steadily decreased the funds available for programs like Commuter Solutions and lobbying efforts were under

Ms. Butler-Boyesen asked for clarification of alternative mobility standards. Mr. Thompson explained those standards were addressed at the State level through establishing mobility standards for the highway system, but allowing jurisdictions to establish alternative standards if they could show good cause.

Ms. Alldredge asked if an online carbon footprint calculator had been considered to demonstrate savings to employers. Ms. Williams said staff was researching online calculators to find one that was user friendly but conveyed the message.

Mr. Sussman asked if a real time ride matching system had been considered. Ms. Williams said that was also being researched. She said a model was being developed in the Portland area that could possibly be replicated statewide.

Ms. Alldredge asked if employers were encouraged to use alternate work schedules. Ms. Williams replied that staff was working with employers to explore ways to reduce peak congestion, but that would not necessarily reduce the number of vehicles on the road.

## **5. Certification Review**

Mr. Thompson directed the committee's attention the final report of the onsite review by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA). He said an exhaustive onsite examination of the MPO was conducted every four years to determine if it was in compliance with federal performance requirements. The review also included obtaining feedback from the public and elected and appointed officials on MPO performance. He reviewed the summary of recommendations and corrective actions. He said overall the certification review was very good, with only three corrective actions compared to eight corrective actions in the last review. He said that corrective actions related to better integration of congestion management into planning, project prioritization and selection; establishing a timeline for developing a Title VI Plan and working with partner agencies to develop a plan within one year.

Ms. Alldredge asked if the plan would include increasing bus passes to nonprofit agencies. Mr. Thompson replied that could be a strategy when the plan was developed.

Mr. Hazel asked if any background information had been provided on why the various recommendations were made. Mr. Thompson said that information was not included in the final report, but was discussed by federal representatives during a three-day meeting at the conclusion of the review and addressed in the voluminous documentation that was part of the review process. He briefly discussed some of the recommendations and noted that one of them was to form a freight task force; however, the body of the report only specified that the MPO should consider forming a freight task force. He said staff would take that recommendation to the MPC for direction. He thought it would be beneficial to have greater involvement by freight in transportation planning processes.

Regarding the recommendation to provide more information on projects selected in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Mr. Hazel asked if there had been discussions on how that could be accomplished. Mr. Thompson said that would be challenging because the TIP included projects from five or six jurisdictions and there was no consistent approach yet to providing that information across jurisdictions.

Mr. Hazel asked if that was an issue that would have to be addressed further "upstream" in the planning process before projects moved to the TIP. Mr. Thompson said that was possible. He said another new federal initiative linked planning and NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) processes to assure that environmental issues were addressed much sooner in the planning process.

Mr. Thompson said that full documentation of the review was available to any committee member who wished to look at it.

## **6. Freight Subcommittee**

Mr. Anderson reported that the CAC formed a subcommittee to consider the possible structure of a freight committee in anticipation of staff taking a recommendation to the MPC. He distributed a draft of the

subcommittee's recommendations for a freight advisory committee and said it was intended as a starting framework for the discussion. He reviewed the recommendations for committee composition, work plan and issues and meeting logistics.

Mr. Sussman remarked that public safety was also included because of the potential impact of the hazardous material shipments.

Ms. Mulder asked if Greyhound was included as a freight carrier. Mr. Anderson said it was.

Mr. Jacobson commented that the list of members was intended to be representative examples and other representatives, such as a member of the State's freight advisory committee, could be included. He said it was the CAC's responsibility to make recommendations to the MPC on how to meet the federal requirement for a freight committee. He used the analogy of a mosaic composed of many tiles to illustrate how transportation planning was composed of many, many pieces and urged committee members to be patient during the learning process. He thanked the subcommittee for a good report and asked the CAC to determine how it wished to make recommendations to the MPC.

Mr. Thompson said the certification review report was on the agenda for the next MPC meeting on October 11. He said the initial staff report would point then out the recommendation to form a freight advisory committee and provide some background on that issue. He felt it would be appropriate to point out that establishing a freight committee was a priority, the CAC's interest in the subject and its proactive approach and include the recommendations for MPC consideration.

Mr. Jacobson asked whom Mr. Thompson was referring to when he said that a freight committee was "our" priority. Mr. Thompson said it was a priority for MPO staff because it was an important part of transportation planning.

Mr. Jacobson, seconded by Ms. Mulder, moved to accept the Freight Subcommittee's report and direct staff to work with the Citizen Advisory Committee to determine the best way to proceed with recommendations to the Metropolitan Policy Committee. The motion passed unanimously, 11:0.

## **7. Getting To Know You**

Ms. Wiederhold guided committee members through an exercise in getting to know each other by sharing information about their backgrounds, experience and interest in transportation planning.

## **8. Member Spotlight**

Mr. Sussman stated that member spotlight would be resumed at the next meeting.

## **9. Wrap Up**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)