

## MINUTES

Metropolitan Policy Committee  
Bascom-Tykeson Room—Eugene Public Library—100 West 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Eugene, Oregon

January 14, 2010  
11:30 a.m.

**PRESENT:** Pete Sorenson, Chair; Rob Handy (Lane County), Hillary Wylie, Christine Lundberg (City of Springfield), Kitty Piercy (City of Eugene); John Thiel (City of Coburg), Mike Eyster, Greg Evans (Lane Transit District), David Warren (Oregon Department of Transportation), members; Gino Grimaldi (City of Springfield), Mark Pangborn (Lane Transit District), Jon Ruiz (City of Eugene), Jeff Spartz (Lane County), *ex officio* members.

George Kloeppe, Byron Vanderpool, Andrea Riner, Ann Mortenson, Kathi Wiederhold, Jamon Kent, Petra Schuetz (Lane Council of Governments); Savannah Crawford (Oregon Department of Transportation), Rob Inerfeld (City of Eugene), Tom Boyatt, Greg Mott, Len Goodwin (City of Springfield), Celia Barry (Lane County), Connie Bloom Williams (Lane Transit District), Dave Jacobson (Citizen Advisory Committee), Rob Zako, Carlene Reilly, David Sonnichsen, guests.

### WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

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

### APPROVE DECEMBER 3 AND DECEMBER 10, 2009, MINUTES

Ms. Piercy, seconded by Mr. Handy, moved to approve the December 3 and 10, 2010, minutes.

Mr. Handy noted that the speaker under Public Comments in the December 10 minutes was incorrectly identified as David Wilcox; the correct name was Jim Wilcox.

The December 3, 2010, minutes were approved as submitted and the December 10, 2010, minutes were approved as amended, 9:0.

### ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

Mr. Sorenson removed Item 2 from the Consent Agenda.

### COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

There were no comments.

## **ELECTION OF MPC OFFICERS**

Ms. Piercy, seconded by Mr. Handy, nominated Alan Zelenka as MPC chair. Mr. Zelenka was unanimously elected as MPC chair, 9:0.

Mr. Handy, seconded by Ms. Piercy, nominated Hilary Wylie as MPC vice chair. Ms. Wylie was unanimously elected as MPC vice chair, 9:0.

In the absence of Mr. Zelenka, Ms. Wylie chaired the remainder of the meeting.

## **METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO) ISSUES**

### **Consent Agenda**

- 1. Approve letter of endorsement for Willamette River Bridge ITS project**
- 2. Approve letter to Representative Beyer addressing I-5/Beltline Alternative Financing Plan**
- 3. Appoint MPO representative to Forum on an Area Commission on Transportation for Lane County**
- 4. Appoint MPO representative to the West Eugene EmX Extension Joint LPA Committee**
- 5. Designation of MPO representative to Springfield TSP Stakeholder Committee**

Mr. Eyster, seconded by Ms. Lundberg, moved to approve the Consent Agenda with the exception of Item 2. The motion passed unanimously, 9:0.

### **Items Removed from the Consent Agenda**

- 2. Approve letter to Representative Beyer addressing I-5/Beltline Alternative Financing Plan**

Mr. Handy suggested that the letter be redrafted to reflect points raised by the MPC at its last meeting and readdressed to the Oregon Transportation Commission, with copies to legislators and Super ACT partners who requested that the questions be asked.

Mr. Handy, seconded by Mr. Sorenson, moved to direct the Transportation Planning Committee (TPC) or staff to redraft the letter to include the points they were aware of, address the letter to the Oregon Transportation Commission and present it to the MPC for approval at its February 2010 meeting.

Ms. Riner confirmed that the MPC did not wish to send a letter to Representative Beyer. Ms. Wylie indicated that was correct.

Ms. Lundberg asked for clarification of the points to be included in the letter. Mr. Handy replied that the points were included in a motion and direction from the MPC at its December 2009 meeting.

The motion passed unanimously, 9:0.

### **Report from the MPO Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)**

Dave Jacobson, chair of the CAC, reviewed highlights of the written report, including election of officers and appointment of new members. He said the CAC received a report on greenhouse gasses and was very interested in the issue, suggesting that it be made a priority. He said there was also a presentation on the Surface Transportation Program-Urban (STP-U) funding framework, and the CAC was looking forward to its work during the coming year.

### **MPO Planning Calendar**

Ms. Riner reviewed the updated 3- and 12-month planning calendars and noted that the schedule for STP-U funding allocation process was slightly modified. She noted that the Oregon Metropolitan Planning Organization Consortium (OMPOC) would meet January 29 in Salem and an agenda would be available soon. A rail summit has been scheduled for March 9.

Ms. Piercy commented that she was willing to continue as the Central Lane representative to OMPOC and that she had been asked to chair the OMPOC meeting. She encouraged everyone to attend the rail summit.

### **Appointment of new members to the MPO Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)**

Ms. Riner said a subcommittee of the CAC reviewed the 16 applications and made a recommendation to the CAC at its last meeting. The CAC concurred with the subcommittee's recommendation and was proposing that four applicants be appointed to the CAC immediately and four additional applicants be held in reserve for future appointments. She noted that copies of applications and a screening matrix were included in the agenda packet. She said the TPC discussed the subcommittee's recommended slate of applicants for appointment and reserve and were pleased with the caliber of applications, but concerned with the continuing difficulty obtaining adequate representation from Springfield. She said the TPC unanimously approved a motion to recommend adding the applicant from Springfield to the first tier of new CAC members to be appointed.

Mr. Handy said he was involved in the discussion of applications by the CAC subcommittee and the TPC. He concurred that the caliber of applicant was outstanding. He said the four reserve applicants had not been ranked and suggested that the Springfield resident be ranked first for appointment to the next vacancy.

Ms. Piercy wanted to see the Springfield applicant be the next appointment.

Ms. Lundberg suggested appointing the four applicants recommended by the CAC and keeping the recruitment for Springfield residents open to expand the pool of reserve applications.

Mr. Handy, seconded by Ms. Piercy, moved to approve the four candidates recommended by the CAC subcommittee, acknowledge the four candidates in reserve and consider opening a recruiting process as necessary as the need or concern arose.

Ms. Lundberg reiterated her concern that recruitment remained open.

The motion passed unanimously, 9:0.

Mr. Handy, seconded by Mr. Eyster, moved to reappoint current members who applied for reappointment to the Citizen Advisory Committee. The motion passed unanimously, 9:0.

Ms. Wylie clarified that the intent was to keep the CAC recruitment process open.

### **Regional Transportation Work Plan and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)**

Ms. Riner used a powerpoint presentation to provide an overview of the development of the next RTP update and related regional and local planning initiatives. Maps were used to illustrate the various geographic boundaries, including the Metro Plan boundary, MPO boundary, urban growth boundary (UGB) and city limits. She said the MPO boundary as it currently existed would be the study area for the RTP. She identified the many policy bodies involved in the RTP process and related concurrent land use and transportation projects and processes at the regional and local levels. She compared the timelines for the RTP and related activities and said the federally-mandated RTP had to be completed in 2011; a final Regional Transportation System Plan (RTSP) was due in 2013.

Ms. Riner reviewed work plan progress to date with respect to the Metro Plan and land use and transportation planning among jurisdictions. She said an integrated public involvement process was being developed, giving deference to local jurisdictions. She pointed out the region's performance on 2005 benchmarks and said the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) was particularly interested in performance measures related to nodal development in the next plan. She said next steps would include defining the desired RTSP decision-making structure, conducting a preliminary policy review, finalizing a public involvement plan and identifying potential performance measures. There would be regular check-ins with LCDC throughout the process.

Ms. Piercy expressed concern that the RTP planning process was only repeating previous activities instead of charting a new direction based on current circumstances and emerging issues. Ms. Riner replied said that the local land use and transportation planning efforts were looking to the future and those plans, with input from citizens and elected officials, would inform the regional plan and policies. Her presentation only addressed the RTP planning process framework, not the substance of the plan itself or the regional vision; that would come from the local level.

Ms. Lundberg commented that the issue was whether there should be a regional vision and priorities that informed local transportation planning efforts. Ms. Riner said discussions were being held at the staff level to allow planners from the various agencies to check-in with each other, determine how local planning efforts were progressing and keep the RTP process moving forward. She said staff could begin to formulate details of the RTP process and schedule at this point at the MPC's direction.

Ms. Lundberg cautioned that local planning efforts should not get too far ahead of the development of regional priorities and policies. Mr. Kloeppel remarked that while planners' work was aimed at creating that larger vision, they were often swamped with the myriad technical details incorporated in the planning process. He said collectively planning at the regional level was an iterative process with local land use and transportation planning efforts.

Mr. Handy observed that the world had changed a great deal in the past four or five years and there needed to be a comprehensive regional vision; local transportation system plans (TSPs) would not be sufficient to assure the region was well positioned to identify priorities and successfully obtain funding. He said there were new policy options and choices that were driving a different approach to planning, such as an

integrated, facilitated public process that addressed the broader regional and statewide issues and helped inform local TSPs. He pointed to the West Eugene Collaborative process as an example.

Ms. Piercy said she was sympathetic to the work load, but did not want planning efforts to be driven by the work instead of policies. She agreed with Mr. Handy that more collaborative discussions to develop a common vision should be occurring.

Ms. Wylie said the language of planning was often confusing and complex and did not convey the impression of people discussing their priorities and vision for the community.

Ms. Piercy wanted the planning process expressed in way that someone with a 5<sup>th</sup> grade education would clearly understand it.

Mr. Handy urged consideration of a facilitated process that would involve the public in policy discussions and provide that information to policy-makers.

Ms. Riner reiterated that local level plans were intended to provide the forum for public discussions of policies and priorities and provide the visions that would inform the RTP.

Ms. Piercy felt there should be a common vision that provided direction for the development of individual local plans to avoid potential conflicts.

Mr. Handy suggested a transportation summit or special MPC meeting focused on developing a regional vision and priorities.

Ms. Piercy asked the City Managers as MPC *ex officio* members to consider concerns raised during the MPC's discussion and suggest how they could be approached.

Mr. Handy said concern was whether to delay the RTP process and allow the TSPs to move forward; another was how to proactively address a changing world at the MPO level.

Mr. Ruiz said he thought the intent was to understand what the MPO hoped to accomplish before the planning process had gone too far in a different direction, including identifying issues that impacted transportation planning such as greenhouse gas, economic development and land use.

Ms. Lundberg said there should be agreed-upon regional goals and policies to provide a framework and context for local plans.

Ms. Riner clarified that the work plan had been approved by the joint elected officials and LCDC. The MPC needed to determine how the RTP process related to that larger work plan.

Mr. Evans observed that the MPO was attempting to define its "end game" while recognizing that would likely change in the future. He said there was an interdependence of actions that required collaboration among jurisdictions to address common problems such as transit operations and road maintenance and system development funding. He said the MPC should be mindful that they were crafting a future for their children and grandchildren.

Ms. Barry asked if it would be useful for staff to make presentations on how local planning efforts were addressing emerging issues such as climate change and the substance of plans.

Mr. Grimaldi said the City Managers would discuss how a staff presentation would fit into their response to the MPC.

Mr. Spartz said the MPC's goals were clear, but the planning process was extremely complex. He said the purpose of the process was to develop a set of executable strategies and tactics to achieve the goals. It was important to keep that in mind and not become enmeshed in and overwhelmed by the process.

### **FFY 2011-2013 STP-U Funding Framework and Next Steps**

Ms. Riner asked for final direction from the MPC on the funding framework so staff could move forward on the process of programming STP-U funds. She said the intent was for the MPC to review a preliminary list of projects at its February 2010 meeting, conduct a public hearing at the March meeting and then approve projects at its March meeting. That timeline would provide ample opportunity for public input and approval of projects in order to incorporate them in the regional Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). She reviewed the current funding model, evaluation criteria and regional priorities and noted that a draft project application form had been updated to more clearly identify how projects responded to those priorities so they could be compared within categories.

Mr. Eyster, seconded by Mr. Evans, moved to adopt the recommended FFY 2011-2013 STP-U framework.

Mr. Handy distributed a memorandum outlining 2012-2015 STIP project eligibility criteria and prioritization factors. He said that the STP-U framework addressed the substance of those, but without measures lacked a link between intention and implementation. He said more work was needed to develop criteria and measures and the framework should be referred back to staff. He asked that Lane Transit District (LTD) provide information on how use of funds allocated to transit could be successfully measured.

Ms. Piercy agreed that the use of STP-U funding should be consistent with achieving overarching goals associated with all activities, regardless of funding source, but cautioned against attaching specific measurements to STP-U funds.

Mr. Inerfeld commented that most projects used funds from multiple sources and questioned where metrics should live. He suggested that the best place for metrics might be plans, rather than specific funds.

Ms. Riner stated that while metrics may be available for pavement preservation, or perhaps even for safety, there were no agreed-upon metrics as of yet for greenhouse gas reduction; those were being developed by the State and would take several years. She suggested asking for measurements information as a part of project evaluation and application process. She said there were limited resources available to develop an extensive metrics and monitoring system that would lead to a better decision-making process.

Mr. Sorenson supported providing LTD with funding, but that should be attached to a measurement that would indicate it resulted in improvements, such as a reduction in accidents. He agreed with Mr. Handy that more work on the framework was necessary to develop criteria and measures upon which funding decisions could be based.

Ms. Piercy supported the concept of developing measures, but did not want to delay the STP-U process.

Ms. Riner said that applicants could be asked to provide measures as part of their projects, but cautioned that it would be challenging to base decisions solely on measures when those were likely to vary considerably among projects.

Ms. Lundberg preferred to keep STP-U funds in relationship to other funds and not assign specific measures to them. She agreed with the subcommittee's recommendation for the STP-U framework and wanted to move forward with that process. She supported developing measures in a broader context outside of the framework for a specific funding source.

Mr. Handy reiterated his requests that staff return next month with suggestions for criteria and measures and LTD provide performance measures for the use of STP-U funds.

Mr. Eyster said LTD could provide information on use of the funds. He agreed with Ms. Lundberg that the STP-U funding process should move forward separately from the development of measures.

Ms. Riner stated that without an agreed-upon framework an application process could not proceed and the current timeline for approving projects would be compressed.

Ms. Piercy agreed that the MPC should move the STP-U funding framework forward and commit to the development measures.

Mr. Handy disagreed with separating the issues.

The motion failed, 6:3; Mr. Sorenson, Mr. Handy and Mr. Thiel voting no.

Ms. Riner asked for clarification on what the MPC wanted in terms of data or a project rating system.

Mr. Eyster said he understood the intent was for entities to which STP-U funds were allocated to provide some criteria for measuring success.

Mr. Sorenson said he was not certain how much information was available, but it was clear that MPC members wanted to make decisions based upon information and, to the extent possible, measurable criteria. He was looking for criteria and measures of improvement that could be evaluated by staff. He agreed that projects could not necessarily be compared to each other, but government action should be based on returns on investments that could be measured instead of business as usual.

Ms. Wylie asked the CEOs of participating jurisdictions to work with elected officials and LCOG staff to determine what would be brought back to the MPC.

Mr. Kloeppe confirmed that STP-U projects would not be solicited until the MPC had approved the funding framework at its next meeting.

### **Follow-up and Next Steps**

- **ODOT Update**

Mr. Warren announced that a draft of the 2012-2015 STIP project eligibility criteria and prioritization factors was available for public comment. Comments were due by February 19, 2010. He invited input from the MPC.

- **FFY08-11 MTIP Administrative Amendments**

There were no questions.

- **Next Steps**

The next meeting was scheduled for February 11, 2010, at the Springfield City Hall.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)