

# 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

November 7, 2007  
5:30 p.m.

- PRESENT:** Webb Sussman, Chair; Dave Jacobson, Vice Chair; Diana Alldredge, Rich Hazel, Wendy Butler-Boyesen, Bill Morganti, Ryan Papé, Eleanor Mulder, John Anderson, Phillip Farrington, Bob Ransom, members; Kathi Wiederhold, Petra Schuetz, Byron Vanderpool, Susan Payne, Lane Council of Governments staff.
- ABSENT:** Damien Gilbert, Donald Holtgrieve, Jeanne-Marie Moore, members; Kitty Piercy, MPC liaison.

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

Mr. Jacobson 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 October 3, 2007, Minutes**

Mr. Sussman, seconded by Ms. Butler-Boyesen, moved to approve the October 3, 2007, minutes as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

## **4. e-MPO**

Ms. Schuetz previewed the e-MPO website. She indicated that the website was online, but not yet being publicized during the test phase. She asked committee members to evaluate graphics, ease of use and content and provide feedback to staff during the test phase, which would extend through December. She would provide links to similar websites for comparison purposes.

In response to questions from Mr. Sussman, Ms. Schuetz said that information was available in text format for the visually impaired. She said the site offered people the opportunity to sign up for information via e-mail. She asked committee members for specific feedback on the links to transportation planning related sites. She emphasized that the website provided information on transportation projects of regional significance that that received federal funding and were included in the Metropolitan Transportation

Improvement Plan (MTIP) and Regional Transportation Plan. She said that projects would appear on the e-MPO website when they were in the MTIP as financially constrained.

Mr. Hazel asked if MTIP and RTP projects were on the same map. Ms. Schuetz said they would be on two separate maps, representing different project phases. At this time, the MTIP projects are yet entered into their data base. She said language was being developed to describe that relationship and illustrate consistency between long- and short-range planning processes. Ms. Payne added that two different databases—one for the MTIP and one for the RTP—were involved and that combining the data onto one map might make that map too complicated.

Mr. Farrington arrived at 6 p.m.

Ms. Schuetz concluded her presentation and indicated that data on the website would not be updated in real time during the test phase. She reiterated her request for feedback from the committee, specifically on whether the text clearly explained the relationship between the MPO's function and the map or was there a better way to illustrate that. She also asked for feedback on what should be highlighted in the flash technology space.

Mr. Jacobson asked staff to schedule time on the December meeting agenda to respond to committee questions after members had time to explore the website.

In response to a question from Ms. Mulder, Ms. Schuetz said the graphic version of the website would not be suitable for a dial-up connection, but the text version would be available.

## **5. Primer on Regional Transportation Plan**

Mr. Vanderpool stated the RTP was the long-range plan to guide the MPO through 2031. He said it had been updated in order to be compliant with provisions of the new federal transportation bill. He noted the agenda packet contained public comments through October 24 and referred to additional comments from Rob Zako. He said Mr. Zako's comments discussed a request from the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) to include disclaimer language, but that request was withdrawn when it was determined it would invalidate the RTP according to federal authorities. He said the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) was requesting a delay in adopting the RTP because of concern over the adequacy of local plans that were reflected in the RTP. He felt that was likely prompted by different planning horizons for the RTP and local transportation system plan, although state and federal planning horizons never matched.

In response to a question from Ms. Mulder, Mr. Vanderpool acknowledged that the issue raised by Mr. Zako and DLCD about maintaining current plans was legitimate, but the federal process was a "one size fits all" and imposed the same guidelines on all states and territories. He said that Oregon had stricter land use planning requirements than most states and was doing exactly what was required by the federal process. He noted that no project could be built unless it was in the MTIP and the current MTIP planning horizon was 2011; local plans had horizons of at least 2015, which was adequate for that timeframe. He said there were two separate planning cycles for state and federal plans, but those were seldom in synch; that was why federal requirements were only that plans be consistent.

Mr. Hazel commented that concerns had been raised about lack of meaningful public input on the RTP and that hearings were only held after projects were firmly established. Mr. Vanderpool pointed out that the

RTP did not create projects; projects were generated by jurisdictions through their local planning processes. He also noted that the public participation process for the RTP, which was designed by the committee, included several public workshops, numerous publications, two public hearings and extensive public comment periods. He emphasized that no projects were in the RTP that had not gone through an extensive local planning process, although some projects had moved from the illustrative to the financially constrained list because funding had become available with removal of the West Eugene Parkway from the RTP.

Mr. Ransom remarked that Mr. Zako was contending that projects appeared in the RTP by a mysterious process for a projected need that was not based on any long-range planning process or identified need.

Mr. Farrington thought that Mr. Zako's contentions were debatable as there had been an exhaustive transportation planning process in the 1990s that led to the adoption of TransPlan and resulted in changes to the Metro Plan to integrate transportation and land use planning. He said the RTP was based on an extensive, protracted and community-wide process and the current update was simply to comply with new federal requirements to extend the planning horizon. He agreed the merits of which projects moved from the illustrative to the financially constrained list could be debated, but Mr. Zako was calling for a much more fundamental review of whether transportation and land use was truly integrated. He understood that would occur with the next RTP update instead of the current pro forma amendment to conform to federal requirements.

Mr. Hazel said there were projects in the RTP that had extensive public input, but others that had not. As an example, he pointed out there was a placeholder on the illustrative list for an Interstate 5/Franklin Boulevard interchange that was not developed through a comprehensive planning process that involved the public. He said it was a pet project of elected officials that had the ability to move to the financially constrained list.

Mr. Jacobson asked what decision-making process was used to decide how funds from an eliminated project would be reprogrammed. Mr. Vanderpool said the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) made that decision with respect to the RTP project list. He noted the Eugene City Council named the Eugene projects that had moved to the financially constrained list as its two top transportation projects. He said it was the same situation with Springfield and Coburg projects; all projects were in the local transportation system plans and that was adequate for federal purposes.

In response to a question from Mr. Papé, Mr. Vanderpool emphasized that before a transportation project could be built it had to meet state and federal requirements and be included in local, state and federal plans. He said that reallocation of funds from the West Eugene Parkway was based on prioritization process at the local and state levels.

The committee took a short break.

## **6. Primer on Air Quality Conformity Determination**

Ms. Payne reviewed the agenda packet materials and explained that because the area had not met carbon monoxide standards in the 1980s, it was required to conduct an air quality conformity determination (AQCD) to demonstrate that federal transportation plans and programs would not harm air quality standards in the future. She described the area's air quality plan and pollutants to be measured. She said that additional information and real time data could be found on the Lane Regional Air Protection

Agency's website. She said an AQCD was required when the RTP and MTIP were revised. She asked the committee to review the AQCD synopsis included in the agenda materials and provide feedback on whether it presented the information in a clear and understandable manner.

Ms. Wiederhold commented that the AQCD primer was being provided as background information on components of the transportation planning process.

## **7. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Primer**

Ms. Payne said the TIP was a budgeting and programming document that organized ready-to-be-built projects and provided information on their funding, status and timelines. She distributed a flow chart that illustrated the relationships among local capital improvement programs, transportation system plans, the regional transportation plan and metropolitan transportation improvement program. She said projects from transportation system plans flowed into the regional transportation plan if they were eligible for federal funding; projects had to be in the metropolitan transportation improvement program in order to be in the state transportation improvement program. She distinguished between those documents that were subject to state land use goals and those that were not.

Mr. Jacobson suggested that committee members review the flow chart document and related agenda materials in order to better understand the committee's role and responsibilities.

Mr. Hazel commended the clarity of the flow chart. He noted that in the timeline for development of the 2010-2013 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) it appeared that project selection and scoping was scheduled to be completed in April 2008, but the public review process did not begin until October 2008. He questioned how the public could be effectively involved in a project before it was incorporated in the STIP. Ms. Payne replied that the projects reflected in the STIP had already been subjected to a local planning process that included public participation before they were prioritized for the STIP.

Mr. Hazel said one of the committee's charges was to promote and encourage effective public participation but when public comments were solicited after a time when they could have validity or impact, that charge was not being implemented.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen remarked that a scoping process typically involved public participation, such as workshops. Ms. Payne replied that during scoping transportation planners would attempt to define the specifics of a project and estimated costs.

## **8. Wrap Up**

Mr. Sussman reminded committee members to review the new e-MPO site and write down any questions for concerns for staff.

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

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)