M I N U T E S

Citizen Advisory Committee
of the
Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization
LTD Next Stop Center
1099 Olive Street – Eugene, Oregon

February 17, 2011
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Edward Winter, Co-chair; Sarah Strand, Co-chair; Wendy Butler-Boyesen, Alexandre Lockfeld, Bill Morganti, Eleanor Mulder, Dave Jacobson, Diana Alldredge, Philip Farrington, Phil Carroll, Gary Gillespie, Richard Beers, Paul Adkins, Jennifer Smith, members; Sonny Chickering, member and MPC liaison; Kathi Wiederhold, Paul Thompson, Stacy Clauson, Lane Council of Governments; Mary Archer, Tom Schwetz, Lane Transit District; Kurt Yeiter, David Roth, City of Eugene; David Reesor, City of Springfield; Petra Schuetz, City of Coburg; Wade Hicks, LCOG Minutes Recorder.

ABSENT: Rosalia Marquez

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review

Mr. Winter called the meeting of the Central Lane MPO Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) to order at 5:30 p.m. and asked those present to introduce themselves.

Mr. Winter noted there were no additions or changes to the meeting agenda.

2. Approve January 20, 2011 Minutes

Mr. Winter, noting no objections from the Committee members, confirmed that the approval of the January 20, 2011 minutes would be postponed to the next CAC meeting.

3. Comments from the Audience

Ms. Wiederhold reported there were no members of the public present who wished to offer comments or testimony.

4. Check-In on Public Participation Plan (PPP) Annual Review

Ms. Wiederhold briefly described the CAC's development of the PPP and its annual review regarding the same. She reminded the CAC members that they had agreed to use an alternating approach to the annual review whereby more cursory reviews of the Plan would be alternated on an annual basis with much more detailed reviews on alternate years.

Ms. Wiederhold reported that the most recent detailed annual review of the PPP had been completed in October of 2010.

Ms. Wiederhold asked the CAC members if they wished to continue the alternating approach with respect to the annual review of the PPP. The Committee members generally agreed to continue with the strategy.Ms. Wiederhold suggested that the CAC might form a subcommittee to meet one or two times in April to report to the CAC in May regarding the annual review of the PPP. She noted that the CAC's annual review could then be presented to the MPC in July of 2011.

The CAC generally agreed to keep the annual review broad, as it was in 2010, to focus on the MPO public participation program, including the PPP and the Title VI Plan. The Committee also agreed to appoint a subcommittee to conduct the annual review and present a recommendation to the full committee in May, with presentation to MPC in June or July 2011.

Ms. Wiederhold, responding to a question from Mr. Beers, stated that the destination of the CAC's annual field trip had not yet been decided. Mr. Beers suggested that the CAC might travel along the alignment alternative areas for LTD's West Eugene EmX Extension project. Ms. Wiederhold noted that she also planned to confer with staff and other CAC members regarding potential destinations for the field trip.

Ms. Alldredge suggested that they proceed to the formation of a CAC subcommittee to conduct the annual review of the PPP.

Mr. Winter suggested that a smaller CAC subcommittee might better accommodate the timeframe for the annual review process that Ms. Wiederhold had described.

Ms. Alldredge volunteered to serve on the CAC subcommittee.

Mr. Jacobson suggested it might be premature to proceed with the formation of the CAC subcommittee to conduct the annual review of the PPP.

Ms. Wiederhold suggested that the CAC might form its PPP annual review subcommittee at the next regular CAC meeting. Mr. Winter agreed with Ms. Wiederhold's suggestion.

Ms. Wiederhold confirmed that the CAC subcommittee would be formed at the next regular CAC meeting.

5. Updates on Key Transportation Planning Projects

Eugene Transportation System Plan (TSP)

Eugene Transportation Senior Planner Kurt Yeiter provided a general overview of the Eugene TSP and noted that it constituted a comprehensive plan to be executed in tandem with the Envision Eugene initiative. He further noted that the Eugene TSP was the first time the City would maintain and develop its own comprehensive land use and transportation plan.

Mr. Yeiter reported that the Eugene TSP was to be executed using a two-phase process whereby the first phase would involve the development of a policy set and strategies that outlined how various land use and transportation work would be coordinated and where the second phase would involve the development of a set of projects and prioritizations.

Mr. Yeiter stated that the there are several other plans that will be integrated into the TSP, including the recently adopted airport master plan as well as the pedestrian and bicycle master plan that is currently being developed.

Mr. Yeiter stated that Gary Gillespie currently served as the CAC representative to the Eugene TSP Advisory Committee that had recently been formed. Mr. Yeiter briefly described how the TSP Advisory Committee would contribute to the development and execution of the Eugene TSP.

Ms. Strand arrived to the meeting at 5:47 p.m.

Mr. Yeiter described how the ongoing Envision Eugene initiative was expected to affect the development of the Eugene TSP and further noted how the specific pillars, strategies and tactics of the Envision Eugene initiative had recently been published.

Mr. Yeiter noted that staff and representatives of the Envision Eugene initiative had recently been involved in joint meetings with the Eugene City Council and Planning Commission. He further noted how those meetings had affected the public engagement and outreach process being used for both the Eugene TSP and Envision Eugene projects.

Mr. Yeiter, responding to a question from Mr. Chickering, acknowledged that some public suggestions had been made to reconfigure the advisory committee. Mr. Yeiter indicated that Eugene is currently reviewing the operation of the advisory committees. Mr. Yeiter further described how the community resource group for the Envision Eugene initiative had originally been formed by various policy setters in the community.

Mr. Lockfeld arrived to the meeting at 5:50 p.m.

Mr. Thompson arrived to the meeting at 5:51 p.m.

Mr. Yeiter discussed the logistics expected to be involved in the coordination between the Envision Eugene initiative and the Eugene TSP, as well as in the coordination between the various advisory groups participating in those areas. Mr. Yeiter noted that some of the key topics to be discussed by the Eugene TSP advisory committee over the next few months include land use, greenhouse gas emissions, climate change, and the City's bicycle/pedestrian master plan.

Mr. Yeiter, responding to a question from Mr. Carroll, described how up to four transportation system alternatives would be evaluated through LCOG's traffic model over the course of the Eugene TSP. He further described that the scope of work to be performed in those evaluations had been dictated by the amount of funding provided by ODOT for the Eugene TSP.

Mr. Yeiter, responding to a question from Mr. Beers, noted that City staff was required to follow State guidelines with respect to land use planning within the Eugene TSP but that staff also intended to work closely with members of the community as the TSP was developed in order to ensure that local concerns were also being addressed.

Mr. Yeiter noted that several members of the local neighborhood association currently served on the TSP advisory committee.

Mr. Yeiter commented that he planned to address the neighborhood leaders council in March to present information regarding the Eugene TSP processes. He further commented that it was the City staff's intention to keep the public well-informed regarding the various land use and transportation strategies that would be used under the TSP.

Mr. Yeiter, responding to a question from Mr. Beers, described how the land use areas of the Eugene TSP would be addressed and also noted that this discussion was part of the Envision Eugene process being discussed at City Council.

Mr. Yeiter, responding to a question from Ms. Mulder, described how the City had previously addressed land use issues inside the urban growth boundary in relation to the land use policies of both Lane County and the City of Springfield.

Mr. Yeiter, responding to a question from Mr. Farrington, stated that the deadline for community members to provide comments on the City's online interactive TSP map had been extended to mid-March. Mr. Reesor commented that the City of Springfield had received approximately 150 comments through it's interactive TSP map while the City of Eugene had received approximately 500 comments.

Mr. Roth briefly described the number and types of comments that had been received in response to Eugene's bicycle and pedestrian master plan, which had been conducted prior to the current TSP website.

Coburg Transportation System Plan

Planning Director Petra Schuetz noted that Coburg's TSP process would be structured similar to that of the City of Eugene.

Ms. Schuetz described how the Coburg TSP is scheduled to be completed by the end of the year, with the following six months devoted to the formal adoption process surrounding the TSP. She further noted how the City of Coburg's existing conditions report for the TSP was nearing completion.

Ms. Schuetz noted that the City of Coburg had scheduled an open house event on February 23, 2011 to present the existing conditions report as well as other detailed information regarding the TSP.

Ms. Schuetz noted that the City of Coburg planned to complete a traffic analysis after the February 23 open house event. She further reported that Coburg would be the first TSP in Lane County to receive the results of its three transportation modeling scenarios from the Lane Council of Governments.

Ms. Mulder stated that she was curious as to how potential changes to schools in the Coburg area might affect the implementation of projects under the Coburg TSP.

Ms. Schuetz responded to Ms. Mulder's comment and noted how Coburg's recently completed urbanization study had demonstrated the amount of residential lands that would be needed near Coburg schools in the future.

Ms. Schuetz, responding to a question from Mr. Winter, stated that Coburg's traffic volume was low enough in its historic district so that additional sidewalks would not need to be constructed under the Coburg TSP. The City has decided to use local streets as a shared facility. She further noted that the absence of sidewalks in the Coburg historic district was very important to the community and contributed to the area's commitment to keeping shared mobility concepts and essential component of local streets.

Ms. Schuetz commented on the Coburg loop path project planned as part of its TSP and noted that it was essentially comprised of a ten-foot wide path in and around the City of Coburg, connecting to the metropolitan path system at Armitage Park.

Springfield Transportation System Plan

Springfield Senior Transportation Planner David Reesor distributed copies of a project overview information sheet regarding the City of Springfield's TSP and briefly described Springfield's 20-year plan in relation to its TSP.

Mr. Reesor noted that the materials distributed to the CAC members included copies of a slide presentation given by Springfield staff at a recent public workshop regarding the Springfield TSP.

Mr. Reesor suggested that the City of Springfield might follow up its bicycle master plan from 1999 with a more specific bicycle/pedestrian plan as part of its TSP projects.

Mr. Reesor elaborated upon the TSP project overview items contained in the information sheet and briefly noted the stakeholder advisory committee meetings that had been held thus far.

Mr. Reesor reported that Springfield staff had consulted with the Springfield City Council several times regarding the local values that needed to be incorporated into the City's TSP projects and policies.

Mr. Reesor commented on the public outreach strategies that had been conducted regarding the Springfield TSP and noted that the online survey and interactive comment maps at springfieldtsp.org would soon be completed. He maintained that the online resources were a good representation of how the various projects had been coordinated.

Mr. Yeiter commented that much of the development of the Eugene and Springfield online TSP resources had been directly influenced by feedback from the MPO CAC.

Mr. Reesor, responding to a question from Mr. Beers, indicated that the TSP process is not reached the point where the City is making determinations on new transportation projects, but will be getting to that in the future.

Mr. Winter called for a break at 6:19 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 6:29 p.m.

Eugene Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan

Eugene Associate Transportation Planner David Roth provided an overview of Eugene's pedestrian and bicycle master plan and stated that the plan had been kicked off in June of 2010 and was on schedule to be completed in June or July of 2011.

Mr. Roth described the various public outreach processes used for the pedestrian and bicycle master plan and noted how both technical and project advisory committees had been informed to facilitate public feedback and discussion regarding the plan.

Mr. Roth noted that City staff had conducted a public meeting regarding the pedestrian and bicycle master plan in October 2010 and had there presented the draft existing conditions report to illustrate current bicycle and pedestrian transportation elements.

Mr. Roth described how the existing conditions report had been used to develop various system recommendations which would be presented to the public at an open house event on March 3. He further noted that the system recommendations represented the 20-year plan for Eugene's pedestrian and bicycle transportation network.

Mr. Roth stated that the goal of the pedestrian and bicycle master plan was to double the mode share for walking and biking in Eugene. He further stated that that goal would eventually be incorporated into the Eugene TSP.

Mr. Roth described how the pedestrian and bicycle master plan had also been designed to thoroughly update various bicycle and pedestrian transportation tools in Eugene.

Mr. Roth reported that staff planned to move forward on the adoption process for the pedestrian and bicycle master with the Eugene Planning Commission and City Council in the spring or summer of 2011.

Mr. Roth noted that staff had yet to assign project costs and prioritizations to those items listed in the system recommendations.

Mr. Roth, responding to a question from Ms. Butler-Boyeson, stated that more bicycle than pedestrian feedback had been received at the public meetings. He further noted that much of the pedestrian feedback received had addressed difficult intersections and sidewalk improvements.

Mr. Roth described how the pedestrian and bicycle master plan had been coordinated with the City's Climate and Energy Action Plan which called for the implementation of 20-minute neighborhoods for the City of Eugene.

Mr. Carroll asked Mr. Roth to email the CAC members a reminder about the March 3 open house event regarding the pedestrian and bicycle master plan.

Long Range Transit Plan

LTD Transit Development Planner Mary Archer described how LTD's long range transit plan was consistent with the various TSP's that had been developed. She further described the various scenario planning processes that had been applied to the long range transit plan.

Ms. Archer provided information regarding the project advisory committee assigned to review the long range transit plan. She noted that the project advisory committee had already met three times to provide feedback and suggestions regarding the long range transit plan.

Ms. Archer described the public outreach process that was being used with regard to the long range transit plan.

Ms. Archer, responding to a question from Mr. Farrington, stated that the memorandums that had been developed to guide the specific execution of the long range transit plan were primarily designed for internal use by LTD's project management teams.

West Eugene EmX Extension

Mr. Schwetz provided a status update on the WEEE project and noted that the joint locally preferred alternative committee (JLPAC) had recently been working to develop a joint recommendation for the LTD Board, the MPC and the Eugene City Council. He noted that the most recent meeting of the JLPAC where the draft recommendation had been discussed had been attended by over 300 people and that 76 individual community members had offered comments and testimony.

Mr. Schwetz stated that a video recording of the most recent JLPAC meeting was available on the Eugene City Council's website.

Mr. Schwetz commented that the applications for the FTA's Small Starts funding program would be due in mid to late August and that a decision regarding the locally preferred alternative and the subsequent environmental process would need to be completed in time to apply for the Small Starts funding.

Mr. Schwetz responded to an article that had appeared in the Register-Guard newspaper earlier in the day and noted that the headline indicating that LTD had delayed the EmX vote was more definitive than what had actually taken place at the JLPAC public hearing. He noted that the LTD board had actually taken no formal action regarding the LPA but had instead discussed a process to allow for more time in the selection of the LPA.

Mr. Schwetz noted that the JLPAC at their final regular meeting on February 14 had voted to forward both the 6th/7th Avenue and the 11th/13th Avenue alignment alternatives for further consideration by the three decision-making agencies. Mr. Schwetz further noted that the LTD Board, the MPC and the Eugene City Council would collectively reach a decision regarding one of the alternatives. He maintained that carrying forward more than one alignment alternative might adversely affect LTD's ability to meet the Small Starts grant funding application deadline.

Mr. Schwetz, responding to a question from Mr. Beers, briefly discussed the public's perceptions with respect to those in favor of the WEEE project and those against it. He estimated that the split between the West Eugene EmX supporters and opposition elements was approximately 50/50 when considered in relation to the various media and public engagement strategies that had been used.

Mr. Beers asked why there appeared to be large numbers of community members opposed to the WEEE project.

Ms. Butler-Boyeson believed that many of those individuals opposed to the WEEE project possessed a limited understanding of the factors that were involved in the project.

Mr. Morganti believed that many of the individuals who were opposed to the WEEE project were of the mind that "if it ain't broke, don't fix it." Mr. Gillespie added that the opposition position of many individuals might be summarized as "If I don't use it, I don't care."

Mr. Thompson responded to Mr. Schwetz's previous comment and noted that there were two public opinion surveys taken in November of 2010 and January of 2011 regarding the WEEE project. He noted that the results of the surveys indicated that the opposition and support percentages from the public were very close.

Ms. Strand noted she had been offended by the signs posted in opposition to the WEEE project and asked who had financed the distribution and posting of those materials. Mr. Schwetz reported that most of the signage posted in opposition to the WEEE project had been organized by the ourmoneyourtransit group.

Mr. Schwetz, responding to a request for clarification from Mr. Lockfeld, stated that under the federal process being used for the WEEE project the ultimate decision making agencies regarding the alignment alternatives were the MPC, Lane Transit District Board, and the Eugene City Council. Mr. Schwetz further noted in response to Mr. Lockfeld's question that all three agencies were required to reach a consensus regarding the selection of the locally preferred alternative.

Ms. Butler-Boyeson, responding to a question from Mr. Morganti, noted that several of the speakers from the public hearing on February 8 had also submitted written testimony. She further noted that several attendees had left the public hearing before they had the opportunity to speak.

6. Primer on Least Cost Planning

Senior Planner Paul Thompson provided an overview of the development of a Least Cost Planning (LCP) methodology by ODOT. He noted that ODOT staff intended to develop the methodology to compare direct and indirect costs of various projects and initiatives in an attempt to identify the most cost effective arrangement of transportation options. He also commented that LCP represented a variation of benefit-cost analysis whereby not all of the direct and indirect costs of projects were monetized, allowing for more qualitative or subjective evaluation of certain criteria.

Mr. Thompson provided examples of the application of the LCP methodology and further described the three-stage timeline for the development and application of the Oregon LCP method.

Mr. Thompson reviewed the ten categories of general indicators that would be used to evaluate the LCP methodologies.

Mr. Thompson discussed how the STIP stakeholder committee and the staff-level workgroups would contribute to the development and implementation of the LCP methodologies.

Mr. Thompson suggested that the various MPO's would be expected or even required to use the LCP methodologies in the future with respect to the development of the RTP and the RTSP.

Mr. Thompson noted that the STIP stakeholder committee and the staff-level workgroups might apply the LCP at a regional planning level before applying the methodologies to groups of more specific projects.

Mr. Thompson commented that he had recently been asked by ODOT staff if the Eugene/Springfield area might be one of the first locations where the LCP methodology might be prototyped and implemented.

Mr. Thompson, responding to a question from Mr. Carroll, stated that the list of indicator categories he had previously referenced had been generated by the STIP stakeholder committee in conjunction with a consultant team.

Mr. Thompson further noted that much of the monetization process that had been applied to the list of indicator categories had been drawn from the application of LCP in other regions.

Mr. Thompson, responding to a question from Ms. Strand, discussed how the LCP methodologies might be used by ODOT staff to evaluate a number of past and future transportation planning policies.

7. Updates

Mr. Jacobson reported that the Lane County Area Commission on Transportation (ACT) had its first meeting on February 9 and that Creswell Mayor Bob Hooker and Eugene Mayor Kitty Piercy had been elected as Chair and Vice-chair of the ACT, respectively. Mr. Jacobson further noted that he had been appointed to serve on the ACT steering committee which was scheduled to have its first meeting on February 25.

Mr. Chickering reported that the Lane ACT was currently recruiting citizen members and that applications for those positions were due on March 16.

Mr. Chickering stated that the Lane County ACT met the second Wednesday of each month and that the group's next meeting would be March 9.

Mr. Jacobson noted that Lane County had appointed Charles Tannenbaum as its ACT representative for the area east of Highway 126.

Mr. Gillespie noted that the February meeting of the Eugene TSP advisory committee on which he served had been cancelled and that the next meeting had been set for March.

Mr. Yeiter noted that City staff had approached the Friends of Eugene to appoint a representative to the Eugene TSP advisory committee.

Mr. Winter adjourned the meeting at 7:27 p.m.

(Recorded by Wade Hicks)