

MINUTES

Metropolitan Policy Committee
Library Meeting Room—Springfield City Hall—225 Fifth Street
Springfield, Oregon

November 4, 2010
11:30 a.m.

PRESENT: Members: Alan Zelenka, Chair, City of Eugene
Kitty Piercy, City of Eugene
Christine Lundberg, City of Springfield
Brian Pech, City of Coburg
Sonny Chickering, Oregon Department of Transportation
Rob Handy, Lane County
Pete Sorenson, Lane County
Mike Eyster, Lane Transit District
Greg Evans, Lane Transit District

Ex officio: Gino Grimaldi, City of Springfield
Jon Ruiz, City of Eugene
Jeff Spartz, Lane County
Tom Schwetz, LTD

George Kloeppe, Byron Vanderpool, Susan Payne, Andrea Riner, Ann Mortenson, Kathi Wiederhold, Paul Thompson, Stacy Clauson, Ruth Atcherson (Lane Council of Governments); Savannah Crawford (Oregon Department of Transportation), Rob Inerfeld, Kurt Yeiter (City of Eugene), Len Goodwin, Tom Boyatt, Greg Mott (City of Springfield), Celia Barry (Lane County), Dave Jacobson, Sarah Strand, Edward Winter (Citizen Advisory Committee), Greg Hyde (Willamalane Parks and Recreation District), Jody Cline (point2point Solutions), Jim Wilcox (Bike Lane Coalition and member of the Lane County Roads Advisory Committee), Carleen Reilly, Kevin Matthews, Zachary Vishanoff, guests.

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Zelenka called the meeting of the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) to order. Those present introduced themselves.

CALL TO ORDER/APPROVE OCTOBER 14, 2010, MINUTES

Mr. Sorenson, seconded by Mr. Handy, moved to approve the minutes of the Metropolitan Policy Committee meeting held on October 14, 2010. The motion passed unanimously.

ADJUSTMENTS FO THE AGENDA/ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM MPC MEMBERS

Mr. Zelenka reordered the agenda to move the MPO Planning Calendars ahead of the Lane Transit District update.

Mr. Sorenson announced that he would be making a presentation at the Applied Solutions Coalition Conference in Boulder, Colorado in the coming week. He said the presentation would be on the use of methane coming from landfills for power generation.

Mr. Chickering stated that the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) planned to take up the discussion of the formation of an Area Commission on Transportation (ACT) for Lane County with the modified charter on November 9. He was hopeful that they would approve the charter and, if they did, the first meeting could be held as early as January.

Mr. Zelenka noted that there would be a representative of the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) on the ACT and it would be on the MPC December agenda to make that appointment.

Ms. Piercy reported that the Oregon Metropolitan Planning Organization Consortium (OMPOC) is hosting a Climate Summit on November 19. Mr. Kloeppel added that LCOG would be hosting a reception at Opus VII in conjunction with the summit on the evening of November 18.

Ms. Piercy also announced the Let's Talk Transit breakfast, planned for 7 a.m. at the Eugene Conference Center on November 9. She said there would also be a neighborhood meeting on transit that evening.

Mr. Schwetz elaborated, explaining that the neighborhood meeting would include a panel focused on transit on the west side. The event was planned to be held at the United Methodist Church.

Ms. Piercy related that Ms. Riner, Mr. Ruiz, and she had attended the Rail-volution Conference in Portland. She had been very impressed, calling it "one of the best conferences" she had attended. She said because Eugene's EmX system was a leader in the country for transit, a discussion on it had been attended by a standing room only crowd and a group of people bussed down to Eugene to ride an EmX bus and take a look at the system. She said although there were other Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) systems around the country, the one in Eugene was fairly unique.

Mr. Schwetz noted that other entities had come to the area to look at the EmX bus system. He related that people from Utah had been to Eugene five times, and they had hosted people from Japan and Australia in addition to other parts of the country.

Ms. Piercy said the conference had wanted them to look at how more rail coming down the corridor in a more frequent and predictable manner would affect the Eugene Depot. She related that another topic had been in regard to about planning for transit-oriented development and being mindful of how it felt on a human scale. She stated that they also talked about focusing on operating costs and not just on construction costs.

Ms. Piercy reported that the area would receive \$4.2 million for planning and an environmental study for the Eugene to Portland rail corridor, \$4 million to fund preliminary engineering and environmental studies for renovations and track improvements at the Portland station, \$18.3 million for the Portland to Seattle leg, and \$3.3 for the Seattle to Vancouver, British Columbia leg.

Mr. Kloeppe stated that there had been a meeting in the Bascom-Tykeson Room preceding the MPC that featured Mary McBride, the Region 10 Director from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and local HUD staff members, along with most of the partners associated with the Sustainable Communities Program grant.

Ms. Riner explained that it had been a kickoff for the Lane Livability Consortium. She said attendees included representatives from the University of Oregon Sustainable Cities Initiative and Terry McDonald from St. Vincent DePaul, among staff from Eugene, Springfield, and Lane County. She had been impressed by how well the area's application had been received and how well they had competed, as well as how much they were looking at the project to learn from and to inform the project that HUD was working on. She felt it had been a great meeting.

Mr. Kloeppe added that Mike McKenzie-Barr had expressed concern from the county's perspective on how the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) worked in non-entitlement jurisdictions. He agreed that it had been a positive meeting.

Mr. Zelenka related that Senate Bill (SB) 1059 had passed during the last legislative session. He said one element of the bill was to have the state, through the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), working with the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) and the Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE) to come up with a statewide strategy for transportation and reductions in greenhouse gases. He stated that the bill also included a rule-making for MPOs to address their share of climate change reductions. Ms. Riner, Mr. Schwetz, and he had been asked to serve on that committee for LCDC and they had held their first meeting during the previous week and there would be three more meetings, with the rules to go into effect in June.

COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Jim Wilcox, Director of the Bike Lane Coalition, stated that he worked for a company called Bike Station. He was happy to report that they had put the first Bike Station into use in Hillsboro and attendees at the Rail-revolution had toured it. He wanted to comment on some of the proposed allocations of funding for local roads. He had read in the newspaper of the \$30 million shortfall that School District 4J faced and had asked himself where the community could get that money. He said the county sent \$800 million out of the area annually in gasoline sales. He considered that to be part of the operating cost of the state's road systems. He underscored that the nation was seeing diabetes and obesity continue to rise. Currently there was about a 5 percent average bike mode share in the area. He estimated that each percentage increase in bicycling would bring in approximately \$1 million in additional revenue. He said if they could reduce the \$800 million by 10 percent, it would increase area revenue by \$80 million, an amount with a multiplicative effect given that it would be circulated in the community. He noted that other countries had a 25 percent or above mode share, so a reduction was known to be achievable. He stated that the committed cyclists were already on board, but 60 percent of the population was interested but they were concerned and wanted secure facilities and good bicycle parking. He asked the MPC to consider these amenities as revenue generators.

Kevin Matthews spoke to the agenda item on the Greenhouse Gas Inventory. He averred that the draft methodology that was proposed for use was a systems-based inventory, or a scope 3 inventory. He asserted that the "vast majority" of greenhouse gas inventories being used in climate planning were scope 2 inventories. He felt there were "important issues to understand" about the two approaches. He opined that a systems-based inventory included the carbon footprint that bringing things into the community created was "better in some ways and worse in some ways." He read aloud from the information in the packet,

which indicated that the calculations related to material flows were estimates. He thought basing the inventory on national averages would cause difficulty in measuring whether reduction measures really worked. He advocated for using both a scope 2 and a scope 3 inventory.

Zachary Vishanoff wanted to know what happened to the City of Eugene's historic preservation program. It seemed to him that the historic preservation "officer" had been laid off. He would have preferred that there be a press release about it, rather than finding out incidentally. He had felt that the program was one of the few well-run programs in Eugene. He also took issue with traffic and sidewalk closures in the arena area. He said it was challenging to walk to the market on 13th Avenue and someone could get killed. He wanted the county to hold a sports economic summit every year so the community could come together and discuss how sports projects did not directly or indirectly benefit Lane County.

Mr. Zelenka noted that there were big signs on the sidewalk Mr. Vishanoff spoke of that indicated that it was closed during construction. He said other than putting an officer on duty to divert pedestrian traffic 24/7 there was nothing anyone could do to prevent someone from walking there.

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO) ISSUES

Report from the MPO Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)

Mr. Jacobson reported that the MPO CAC had met on October 21. He provided a "thumbnail sketch" of the four people who were up for reappointment to the CAC.

Approve Amendments to MPO Public Participation Plan

Ms. Wiederhold recalled that she and Mr. Jacobson had brought the amendments to the September meeting, which had come out of the conclusion of the committee's 2010 annual review of its Public Participation Plan. She highlighted the amendments. She said no public comments were submitted regarding the plan.

Mr. Eyster, seconded by Ms. Piercy, moved to approve the amendments to the Metropolitan Planning Organization Citizen Advisory Committee Public Participation Plan.

Mr. Handy wondered if the CAC could review the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Plan (MTIP) amendments for the MPC.

Ms. Riner explained that the action regarding the amendments to the public participation plan did not change the current status of administrative amendments and the TPC process; the process remained the same for it.

In response to a follow-up question from Mr. Handy, Ms. Riner reiterated that the amendments that came to the MPC were housekeeping in nature, all of them came to the MPC, and any member of the MPC could pull them for further review or to question the TPC. She explained that the process and criteria were in the MTIP. She said it specifically indicated when amendments came to the MPC for review and approval and when amendments did not need this level of review.

Mr. Zelenka thought they were heading in the right direction regarding public involvement. His one concern was that even with all of the work, they still only heard comments from the "usual suspects."

He surmised that it could be due to the nature of transportation planning in that it was complex and "somewhat mundane," but it did involve large amounts of money and projects had a very big impact to the area. He wondered if there was anything further they could do to bring in more interest.

Mr. Jacobson remarked that, though he found it interesting, it was dry and over the heads of most people.

Ms. Wiederhold thought the CAC had grown and was maturing and "coming into its own." She recalled the community focus group they had convened in August, 2009. She felt that there could be more they could do with that group. She noted that Mr. Chickering had brought up concern about the cost, but sometimes reaching out on a community level took more money. She said even though it was not tangible, there was a long-term benefit in that they could garner some interest from a larger segment of the community.

Mr. Inerfeld thought projects were more tangible for people on a local level. He noted that the City of Eugene Transportation Division had been able to gain input on bicycle/pedestrian amenities from over 600 people. He suggested that because the MPC was looking at projects from a much higher level that it was more abstract for people. He felt it was a challenging issue to determine where to spend money where it brought in the most input.

Mr. Zelenka noted that new media such as Facebook and Twitter were not listed on the matrix. He also suggested that they could go to the public more. Ms. Wiederhold responded that they had done some pieces of that; they had connected with *Adelante Latino* for recruitment with fliers and applications translated into Spanish. She agreed that there were more things they could do.

Mr. Sorenson observed that when decisions became more real, people were more likely to be involved on a personal level. He thought a better way of gaining public sentiment on "big picture" items would be to conduct a more hands-on study of it, such as the one that had been conducted two years earlier in the Bend and Salem areas.

Mr. Handy wanted people to have a way to create projects for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

The motion to approve the amendments to the MPO Citizen Advisory Committee Public Participation Plan passed unanimously.

Reappointment of Citizen Advisory Committee Members

Mr. Eyster, seconded by Mr. Evans, moved to approve the reappointment of Diana Alldredge, Wendy Butler-Boyesen, Bill Morganti, and Eleanor Mulder to the Citizen Advisory Committee. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Zelenka congratulated the four on their reappointment and thanked them for serving.

Letters of Support for ODOT Flexible Fund Program Funding Applications

Mr. Zelenka stated that there were eight projects listed, but the Alder Street project for the City of Eugene was likely to be funded through ODOT's bicycle/pedestrian program and would be dropped off the list.

Mr. Chickering mentioned that ODOT was considering applying for a project not on the list. He said they had been working to improve pedestrian safety on East Main Street in the City of Springfield. He related

that they had recently heard that they may have secured a significant amount of funding for safer crossings, but they wanted to turn in an application for flex funds for some of the other increments they were contemplating in the study, including pedestrian countdown signals, speed feedback signs, and supplemental lighting. He said the dollar amount was \$730,000.

There were no objections and Mr. Zelenka deemed the letters of support for ODOT Flexible Fund Program funding applications to be approved.

Greenhouse Gas Inventory

Ms. Clauson stated that this was part of the work activity that was outlined in the unified planned work program for the year. She said there were several methods to do greenhouse gas inventorying. She explained that systems-based inventorying had been chosen because it looked at the full consumption costs of products that came into the community and all of the "upstream" factors that contribute to the greenhouse gases from products that were used and disposed of in the community. She explained that this inventory approach had been put together by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which used a sector-based inventory that looked at greenhouse gas produced by different sectors found in the economy. She related that it transposed it into a systems-based inventory that looked at all of the processes that went together to produce and transport a product.

Ms. Clauson said Metro had decided to use this approach, with the Good Company. Staff had been working with Metro and the Good Company and they had provided guidance and consultation for their approach here. She related that some provisions came from national standards, because it was difficult to model commodity flows at a regional or local level. She reviewed the graphs contained in the report entitled *What is our Community's Carbon Footprint?*

Ms. Clauson reported that the area showed less materials transported because of the lower purchasing power in the community. She said because of the renewable portfolio of the local utilities, the community also had lower electrical consumption. She stated that the area had less vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita than Portland.

Ms. Piercy asked if they had done any comparisons with other cities of a similar size to the local community. Ms. Clauson replied that the systems-based inventory was an evolving approach and they could go back and take a look at cities that were on a similar scale.

In response to a question from Mr. Kloeppel, Ms. Clauson stated that all modes of freight transport were included in the 8 percent listed for *Long-Distance Freight* on the pie chart representing the *GHG Emissions with Materials Split*.

Mr. Sorenson asked if the inventory included freight transportation that went through Lane County but did not stop. Ms. Clauson responded that this was not included. Mr. Sorenson opined that this was a huge component of local greenhouse gas emissions.

Ms. Riner pointed out that the greenhouse gas emission planning required by SB 1059 had a different characterization of what was included in the metropolitan transportation and what they would have to account for at the statewide level. She said they would bring that before the group at a later date and it would provide a different way of parsing this out.

Ms. Clauson reviewed the next steps, which included making the inventory available for public comment. She said they would like to work with the CAC to see if they had any suggested changes to it. She stated that there still needed to be a significant amount of review.

In response to Ms. Piercy, Ms. Clauson said the inventory let them focus on how to change behavior and where the behavior changes could occur. She related that when thinking about freight traffic coming to deliver goods to the area, the behavior driving it was consumption choices. She said they could target those choices that would allow for reduction of that piece of the pie.

Mr. Zelenka commented that the methodology had been done by Metro and they were "kind of the big dog." Because of this, he thought they would do well to follow them. He said the fact that Good Company was involved in the inventory and "checked off" on it lent credibility to it. He had utmost respect for them as they were a local company with a national reputation. He asked what it would take to inventory both the community and the system. Ms. Clauson replied that they would have to do more review of this. She thought some of the inputs they inventoried would apply to a sector-based inventory but they would have to obtain additional inputs.

Mr. Zelenka asked staff to determine what it would take to do both. He said they were looking for a "nod of the head" that they were moving in the right direction. He added that eventually the inventory would come back before the MPC for approval.

Mr. Handy supported getting more information. He averred that one thing they were lacking in the last ten years in the RTP was that they had "spent buckets of taxpayer money" and what had they gotten for it? He wanted ways to measure the carbon footprint in relation to picking projects and creating new projects so that it was "not just an arbitrary throw a dart at the wall" to determine the next project.

Ms. Clauson stated that there was a lot of research under SB 1059 and they had just participated in a Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) workshop to look at some of the issues and reduction strategies. She said the research was still happening and they planned to use the outputs of the research to enable them, when they got to the reduction strategies segment of the greenhouse gas planning effort, to use those tools.

Ms. Piercy thought that whatever they did locally had to be in line with Metro. Mr. Zelenka agreed, noting that SB 1059 and House Bill 2001 all relied on Metro to be the lead agency on this because of their larger staff and financial resources.

Mr. Zelenka said on page 3 one of the key findings was that on a per capita basis in order to meet local targets, current gasoline usage would need to be reduced from 258 gallons annually to 68 gallons annually by 2050.

Ms. Lundberg observed that this was an emerging science at the moment so how they remained flexible in putting together inventories and then reviewing them would benefit the discussion.

Mr. Zelenka ascertained that the MPC was in support of the work thus far. He thanked Ms. Clauson for the good report.

Regional Transportation Plan Project List Review

Mr. Zelenka provided an overview of the process to review RTP project lists as developed by the MPC Subcommittee. They decided that the first phase was for staff to look at the list and "clean it up." He said

they deleted the projects that were done or no longer in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). He stated that the next step was to review lists, by jurisdiction, and to identify which projects they want more information about. He asked that they pick projects they truly did not understand and in December they would ask for more information from staff about them. He said in January they would get the information they requested and they would put projects on the table for discussion. He clarified that only the projects placed on the table would be discussed for modification or approval and everything else would be deemed okay.

Mr. Thompson passed out revised Springfield lists around for auto constrained and bicycle constrained projects. He explained that as they reviewed the list, they had entered the updated information over the adopted information instead of in addition to it and these were the corrected copies. He underscored that staff had done their best to review all of the projects and to update the information from what had been adopted three years earlier in November, 2007. He noted that the City of Eugene had not updated project costs yet. He said the project costs would be updated before the meeting in December.

Mr. Handy had emailed a longer list of possible criteria to everyone on the MPC earlier in the day. He felt they could "have the cart before the horse." He thought that if they started putting projects on the table it "could be a little sensitive" and people could wonder why they were picking on one project or another. He thought they should create criteria to help them measure, review, and understand how they had "done so far." He saw on the list that Eugene and Springfield had no projects on the automobile illustrative list and only projects on the constrained list.

Mr. Thompson indicated that this was correct. He reminded him that Eugene and Springfield had determined that they would only put projects into the RTP's constrained list that could be reasonably expected to be funded over the 24 year horizon of the plan and that also served existing needs as well as growth and development during that time.

Mr. Handy wanted to have the actual cost of projects and the final cost of projects and what the margin of error was between projected and final costs. He asked Mr. Thompson to define 'regionally significant.' Mr. Thompson explained that it was shorthand for the federal requirement for what was incorporated in the RTP. He noted that on the top of page 2 of his cover memorandum there was an explanation of some of the language. He read the following from the memorandum:

"... The plan shall contain, at a minimum, the identification of transportation facilities (including major roadways, multimodal and intermodal facilities, and intermodal connectors) that should function as an integrated metropolitan transportation system..."

He said it was the regionally significant projects that met that intent and the requirements in federal legislation. He emphasized "at a minimum," because the other requirement was that the plan incorporate or include any projects in the list that were anticipated to use any federal funding. He reiterated that this was supposed to be an information piece and a long-range plan to inform the community of all of the investments that were needed for serving the 24-year transportation needs of the region. He said this meant that there could be projects on the list that might not need federal funding, but a jurisdiction had decided to include them for information purposes. He noted that the list was half to two-thirds as long as it was in 2001.

Mr. Handy asked if there was an implied weight with the words 'regionally significant' with regard to funding. Mr. Thompson responded that there was no weight implied. He said indicating that a project was regionally significant was stating that it met that requirement and had to remain in the RTP.

Mr. Handy surmised that if a project had federal funds it had to automatically be on the list. Mr. Thompson replied that if a project was anticipated to use any federal funding, regardless of the facility, it needed to be in the RTP.

Mr. Handy remarked that the word 'anticipated' meant that it was "not a sure thing." Mr. Zelenka pointed out that they were looking at a 24-year plan.

Mr. Handy commented that a project might not be appropriate anymore as time went by. Mr. Zelenka responded that it could be dropped from the list if that was the case.

Mr. Handy observed that the Q Street project referred to "future EMP" and asked what that meant. Mr. Zelenka replied that this was exactly the type of question he expected MPC members to come up with between the present meeting and the one in December. He said these were the kinds of questions they were supposed to come up with as part of their "homework" over the next few weeks.

Mr. Handy wanted to highlight that phase one was to review and identify projects that they needed additional information about. He reiterated that this was "a little bit of the cart before the horse" because "there's a lot of big issues" and they needed more discussion before they started talking about projects.

Ms. Riner pointed to the planning calendar posted on the wall, which showed that they were initiating the project review, at the request of the MPC, to look at the existing projects from the current RTP because there were questions about the current projects and the desire to learn more about them. She underscored that this was not meant to be the "be-all end-all discussion" of the regional transportation system. This was a first step to answer specific questions that members might have about projects already on the adopted RTP project lists.

Mr. Handy asked the agenda team to consider the time blocks. He felt time at the meeting was short and they should, perhaps, "ratchet down" some of the CAC reports and focus more on "substantive issues."

Mr. Handy asked what would happen if he placed 35 projects on the table at the December meeting. He could not anticipate how that would be received without a discussion about some criteria first. Mr. Zelenka reiterated that the goal was to ask specific questions about the projects at the December meeting. He said then once they had all of the information and had reviewed it, they could decide which projects to place on the table for discussion.

Mr. Chickering suspected that most projects that would be brought forward would be from ODOT, because ODOT had the most controversial large projects that were federally and regionally significant. He said if they could have a conversation that would allow Mr. Handy and others to feel comfortable to the point where there were questions about 5 projects rather than 35 it would save ODOT staff a lot of effort.

Mr. Zelenka stated that the thought process behind the recommendation from the committee was that when members reviewed the list they would consult their staff and be able to ask those kinds of questions and get answers at that point. He expected that more substantive issues would come forward for the December meeting.

Ms. Riner asked that MPC members with clarifying questions, such as what an EMP was, to email them to her and she would provide answers.

MPO Planning Calendars

Ms. Riner reviewed the *MPC/CAC 3-Month Calendar* and the *Regional Transportation Work Plan and GHG Planning*, included in the agenda packet.

Lane Transit District West Eugene EmX Extension Update

Mr. Schwetz noted that the Jefferson/Westside Neighbors meeting that Lane Transit District staff would be attending was scheduled for November 9 at 7:30 p.m. He said they also planned to talk to the River Road Community Organization (RCCO) about their interest in the EmX on River Road. He related that this would be the third time they attended an RCCO meeting and that they had also attended three Active Bethel Citizen (ABC) meetings.

Mr. Schwetz reported that Lane Transit District (LTD) was entering into a period of decision-making regarding the West Eugene project. He said with the release of the alternatives analysis report and the executive summary, they had the information to make that decision. He stated that the Joint Local Preferred Alternative Committee (JLPAC) had met for the first time on October 29. He related that there had been extensive community involvement and they planned additional opportunities to involve the community.

Mr. Schwetz stated that the MPC was one of the bodies that would make the decision on the locally preferred alternative, together with the Eugene City Council and the LTD Board. He explained that when the JLPAC made its recommendation, this would begin a process involving the three bodies in making the selection. He wanted to return for the next MPC meeting to provide a more extensive overview of the project. He acknowledged the "considerable effort" of Ms. Piercy on the behalf of the EmX project.

Ms. Piercy observed that it was a tough discussion. She emphasized that they wanted to find the best way to move forward a robust and successful transit system for the community and were willing to listen to all of the input.

Follow-up and Next Steps

1) ODOT Update

Mr. Chickering had nothing further to report.

2) Regional Transportation Policy Set

Ms. Piercy thanked the Lane Board of County Commissioners for coming to the table to work on the bylaws for the ACT.

3) Greenhouse Gas Planning

There was nothing further to report.

4) Rail

There was no update on rail at this time.

5) MTIP Administrative Amendments

There were no amendments for consideration.

6) Next Steps/Agenda Building

Mr. Zelenka reviewed the agenda for the next meeting, which included more information on greenhouse gas emissions and the questions members would bring back regarding the RTP, after further studying the list.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:31 p.m.

(Recorded by Ruth Atcherson)