

MINUTES

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

June 9, 2011
11:30 a.m.

PRESENT: Hillary Wylie, Chair; John Fox (City of Coburg), Kitty Piercy, Betty Taylor for Alan Zelenka (City of Eugene), Jay Bozievich, Sid Leiken (Lane County), Sonny Chickering, (Oregon Department of Transportation), Greg Evans, Mike Eyster, (Lane Transit District), members; Gino Grimaldi (City of Springfield), Mark Pangborn, Tom Schwetz, (Lane Transit District), Jon Ruiz (City of Eugene), Don Schuessler (City of Coburg), Celia Barry for Liane Richardson, Liane Richardson arrived at 12:30 p.m. (Lane County) *ex officio* members.

George Kloeppe, Byron Vanderpool, Andrea Riner, Ann Mortenson, Kathi Wiederhold, Petra Schuetz, Paul Thompson (Lane Council of Governments); Rob Inerfeld, Kurt Yeiter (City of Eugene), Tom Boyatt, David Reesor (City of Springfield), Theresa Brand, Tom Schwetz (Lane Transit District), Celia Barry (Lane County), Savannah Crawford (ODOT), Dave Jacobson, Sarah Strand, Edward Winter (Metropolitan Planning Organization Citizen Advisory Committee); David Sonnichsen, Vicki Mello.

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Ms. Wylie welcomed everyone to the meeting. Those present introduced themselves.

2. CALL TO ORDER/APPROVE May 12, 2011 MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Pangborn, seconded by Mr. Fox, moved that the minutes for May 12, 2011 be approved as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

3. ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA/ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM MPC MEMBERS

Mr. Kloeppe announced representatives from the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) had been in town for the quadrennial certification review of the MPO. He appreciated the participation by staff and elected officials in the process. The informal debrief, conducted by staff from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) was held on June 8, 2011. The officials offered positive comments about their observations, what they had learned and the changes made since the last formal review. The formal report would be available in the fall.

Mr. Kloeppe reminded members that the July 14, 2011 MPC would be held at the Coburg Fire Station (Mr. Fox guaranteed there would be sun) and the August 11, 2011 meeting would be held at the Springfield Justice Center.

Ms. Piercy reported the Business Commute Challenge had been very successful. Springfield Mayor Christine Lundburg participated in the celebration and the City of Eugene received a first prize.

4. COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

There was no one who wished to offer public comment.

5. METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO) ISSUES

a. Report from the MPO Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)

Sarah Strand and Edward Winter, representing the MPO CAC, joined the MPC. Ms. Strand directed MPC members to the information in the staff memorandum. She noted MPO CAC members had a variety of opinions on a variety of topics, which reflected the varied opinions of the MPC on the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). She and Dave Jacobson wished to comment on their respect for the MPC and MPO. She found staff in the local jurisdictions to be creative and ingenious. She and Mr. Jacobson had participated in the federal certification review.

Mr. Kloeppel expressed his appreciation to Ms. Strand and Mr. Jacobson for their participation in the federal certification review. He noted some of the public comments regarding the MPO process had gotten off point and onto an LTD project.

Mr. Winter concurred with Ms. Strand that the MPO goals and objectives discussion was lively and a variety of opinions were expressed.

Ms. Wylie thanked the CAC and other community volunteers who worked so hard on committees.

b. Amendment to FY10-13 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP)

Mr. Thompson stated the MPC had a presentation and held a public hearing on the proposed amendment to the FY10-13 MTIP at the May 12, 2011 meeting. Two letters received since May 12 were included in today's agenda packet for consideration by the MPC. The purpose of the amendment was to provide STP-U funding for the Lane County Hyacinth Road sidewalk project. Staff recommended approval of Resolution 2011-05 amending the MTIP and programming funding.

Ms. Piercy, seconded by Mr. Leiken, moved that the MPC approve Resolution 2011-05 amending the MTIP and programming funding. The motion passed unanimously.

c. Supplemental FY11 Surface Transportation Program – Urban (STP-U) Funding

Mr. Thompson directed MPC members to the Project List on Attachment 1 of the staff memorandum in the agenda packet. He reviewed the project applications and MPO funding recommendations:

APPLICATIONS	TPC FUNDING
--------------	-------------

	RECOMMENDATION
Coburg: Loop Path	\$400,000
Eugene: Hilyard	-----
Eugene: North Bank	\$670,000
Lane: 30 th	\$20,000
Lane: Maxwell	-----
p2p: Bike	\$90,000
p2p: SRTS	-----
Springfield: Franklin	\$400,000
Total	\$1,580,000

Mr. Thompson said the MPC approved the MPO’s discretionary FHWA Surface Transportation Program—Urban (STP-U) funds for federal fiscal years (FFY) 2011, 2012, and 2013. The programming of funds for FFY2011-2013 was based on a conservative forecast of the amount of STP-U revenue the MPO would receive for those fiscal years. He noted within the MPO, programming of STP-U funds since 2003 had been accomplished under a model that targeted portions of the fund to broad purposes, within which priorities were determined.

Mr. Thompson said the applications for this funding round totaled approximately \$3.5 million in requests for STP-U funding, compared to \$1.58 million available. The public comment period was open between June 3 and July 5, 2011. The MPO had received four written comments as of this morning. Following today’s public hearing, the MPO CAC would discuss the funding proposal and provide comments or recommendations at their June 16, 2011 meeting. Final MPC action would be requested at the July 14, 2011 MPC meeting.

Ms. Wylie opened the public hearing at 11:55 a.m.

David Sonnichsen was speaking as a member of the Citizen Planning Committee (CPC) for the Whilamut Natural Area of Alton Baker Park. He questioned the funding of the North Bank path as it was currently designed. It would be unfortunate if the funding had negative consequences at the western end of the natural area when the CPC had worked so closely with the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) on the I-5/Willamette River bridge project, preserving the forested slope in ODOT’s right-of-way on the west slope of I-5 north of the river. ODOT funded the installation of four Talking Stones in the park and had listened closely when the CPC proposed the alternate route that avoided the potential for a hazard on the bicycle/pedestrian path through Springfield during bridge construction. The CPC had support from the City of Eugene in preserving trees on the west facing slope of I-5. The issue was with a small part of the north bank between the boat launch road and Leisure Lane. He directed MPC members to page 24 of 58 in the agenda packet which contained an aerial photograph of the area. If the project was developed as currently planned, high speed cycling traffic would enter a country lane environment. The CPC felt stopping the widening of the paving at the boat launch road and extending it to the DeFazio Bridge was acceptable. This did not require an over engineered solution and removal of six trees. There were alternates for high speed cycling to Day Island Road.

Vicki Mello is an avid cyclist and walker, and a Nearby Nature volunteer who led nature hikes through the Whilamut Natural Area during the school year. Part of the path improvement area was in close proximity to where grade school students walked through and learned about the Whilamut Natural Area.

She agreed that widening and straightening the path would be an attraction to some bicyclists go travel quickly along the path. The path was shared by pedestrians and bicyclists, and the bicyclists went slower through the winding area. She said the project needed to be replanned to make it safe and usable for everyone.

Ms. Wylie closed the public hearing at 12:03 p.m.

Ms. Piercy and City Manager Ruiz stated that they would follow up on today's testimony.

Mr. Leiken asked staff to have a conversation about the Maxwell Road project. He asserted it was not quite true that it was not necessary to fund it at this time. If it was not funded this year, it was critical that it be funded in 2012.

d. Letter of Support for Transportation, Community and System Preservation Grant Application

Mr. Thompson directed MPC members to a request for a letter of support from the MPO Policy Board for one grant application under development by the City of Eugene. The City had decided to submit a proposal for funding through the Transportation, Community, and System Preservation (TCSP) program for the Blair Boulevard Active Transportation Corridor project as described in the staff memorandum.

Ms. Piercy was interested in the project but did not yet have enough detail about the proposed plan. She asked that the letter of support be signed and followed up with more information.

Mr. Eyster asked if this letter would put the City of Eugene's project in competition with the City of Springfield's project for which the MPC approved a letter of support in May.

Mr. Thompson said it was not necessary for the MPC to prioritize the projects. The TCSP program had requested that a jurisdiction prioritize projects if more than one was submitted from that jurisdiction.

Mr. Eyster, seconded by Ms. Piercy, moved that the MPC endorse a letter for signature by the MPC chair. The motion passed unanimously.

e. Annual Review of Title VI Plan

Ms. Riner said the annual report was an overview of the past year's activities with respect to Title VI issues.

Ms. Wiley asked MPC members to provide feedback to staff after they had an opportunity to read the report.

f. MPO Interaction with Lane Area Commission on Transportation (LaneACT)

Ms. Riner explained the LaneACT work program included ongoing coordination with the MPO, including the opportunity to discuss early on how that coordination would take place. Prior to the formation of the LaneACT, the MPO had a long-standing history and protocol for interacting with the Lane County Board of Commissioners (Commissioners) when the body was essentially fulfilling the

obligations of an ACT for Lane County. The new LaneACT bylaws and work program addressed the desire of the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) to have ACTs coordinate with the MPOs within their boundary.

Mr. Thompson added that the example in the diagram illustrated the process used whenever ODOT asked for input on priorities. The purpose of this request was to direct the LaneACT representative, Mr. Kloeppe, to take this as a discussion item to an ACT meeting.

Mr. Kloeppe reiterated the request reflected protocols and relationships with the Commissioners for a number of years. He added staff was genuinely seeking MPC input for other ways the MPC should interact with LaneACT.

Ms. Piercy noted LaneACT was a one county ACT, which differed from other ACTs. She asked if this method was used in other parts of the state.

Mr. Chickering thought this memorandum accurately described the process and relationship that had worked in the past between the MPO and the Commissioners. He thought it great that this body was making a recommendation to the LaneACT for discussion, which would discuss the recommendation as an independent body, and then reply.

Ms. Crawford did know how other MPOs and ACTs coordinated with each other. She knew the proposed process has worked for the Lane County area.

Ms. Piercy asked for information on how other ACTs coordinated with the MPOs. She recalled there had been axes to grind in the system used in the past and she wanted to ensure the groups were being thoughtful in their actions to ensure those actions were as beneficial as possible for everyone. It was important for the groups to have clarity on their roles.

Ms. Wylie supported Ms. Piercy's perspective. Her understanding when the ACT was formed was different than that shown on the chart on Attachment 1. She understood the MPC would be the last body reviewing information before it went to ODOT, which was not reflected in this chart. This was a good time to ensure the system was workable, while the LaneACT was new and there was still quite a bit of good will that would encourage people to work together. She saw potential problems with the proposed system if something was contested, and how priorities would be determined. She was concerned there could be problems if the ACT priorities were substantially different from those of the MPC.

Ms. Riner said it would be helpful to staff to understand the nature of the MPC's concerns. She asked if the MPC concerns were regarding whether or not the ACT would maintain the order of the MPO's priorities, or whether or not the ACT would place the MPO priorities at the desired level relative to other County-wide projects.

Mr. Kloeppe echoed Ms. Piercy and Ms. Wylie's observations. As the MPC representative to the LaneACT, it would be important for the MPC to work creatively to find the relationship balance that would work best for the region. He suggested the upcoming OMPOC meeting in Salem would be an opportunity for Mr. Evans and Ms. Piercy to chat with their colleagues from other MPOs to determine how they worked in Salem, Medford and Bend. It was important for LaneACT to do it right in building the relationship.

Mr. Chickering said he and Ms. Crawford would take information about this conversation to the LaneACT steering committee next week.

Mr. Bozievich said if the message from the MPC was that the LaneACT could not touch the priorities, it would not be well received. One reason the rural communities wanted the ACT formed was the perception that the MPC priorities were metro-centric, when much of the rural areas of Lane County had to travel through the MPO to get to I-5 and other points in Lane County. The thoroughfares that made that travel easy often were not the highest priority of the MPC. Additionally, some of the thoroughfares that drove Lane County's economy were not high priorities. If the MPC's initial approach to the LaneACT was "do not touch our priorities", it would be considered adversarial. The MPC needed to think more broadly about the region and talk about how it could set its priorities so that the LaneACT could keep them in the same order. The rural mayors would hit the ceiling if their priorities were not included in the MPC recommendation.

Ms. Wylie said the goal was to ensure rural mayors were heard and the right decisions were made by all the bodies. The key was to ensure that happened without engaging in adversarial relationships. There needed to be checks and balances to ensure equity and respect were maintained.

Ms. Piercy said when the LaneACT was formed, there was a fair amount of trust and chance taking and giving up proportional voting by the larger cities, and it was important to be respectful of the larger cities needs also.

In response to a question from Ms. Riner, Ms. Crawford said the FY12-15 draft STIP, which would be brought to the MPC in July 2011 contained no new modernization projects because there was no new money. However, there would be a public comment period which would close by July 30, 2011. The draft STIP would be presented to LaneACT on July 13, and the MPC on July 14, with public hearings at both meetings.

g. MPO Planning Calendars

Ms. Riner briefly reviewed the calendars for the summer noting the MPC would be reviewing the draft STIP and holding a public hearing. The MPC would be taking action on the STP-U funding in July.

Mr. Thompson noted the draft 2012-2015 MTIP would also come before the MPC this summer.

Ms. Richardson arrived at 12:30 p.m.

h. Follow-up and Next Steps

- **ODOT Update**

Ms. Crawford had covered her item under agenda item 5.f.

- **Rail**

Ms. Piercy reported she met with ODOT staff and staff from the Governor's office to review the work done with stakeholders around the state in establishing the rail committee. The key issues identified by stakeholders were:

- Rail alignment between Portland and Eugene.

- Projects should achieve economic benefit, viable passenger transportation, sustainable transportation, vision for the long term with results now.
- Connectivity and integration with local and regional systems for overall efficiencies and complimentary transportation.
- Health and viability of freight rail.
- It should be bi-partisan and have statewide support. Structure of the committee should be a larger, core group with geographic based working groups.
- Maintain geographically balance committee.
- There would be ample opportunity for all interested parties to participate.

She said that currently the most heated discussion across the state was between people who wanted true high speed rail as the end goal versus those who thought that was not likely to happen soon and were more interested in more frequent and on-time movement of passengers and freight. She thought the group would try to figure out how to identify short and long range goals.

Ms. Piercy said she recently became aware that there were ten rail crossings in Eugene and the community was separated every time a train went by. If the project was successful in increasing the amount of passenger and freight rail traffic, the crossings would be one of the challenges.

Ms. Wylie noted the trains blew the whistles at all hours. Ms. Piercy said the cost of doing anything about the whistles was prohibitive.

- **Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Update**

Ms. Riner said LCDC adopted targets for the MPOs of cutting approximately 20 percent per capita by 2035. She would bring information from today's toolkit group presentation on appropriate modeling tools and strategies for Oregon to the MPC in the future. The statewide policy committee that was looking at a strategy for light and heavy vehicles was back on track after not meeting for a while. She expected they would have preliminary recommendations at their next meeting.

- **MTIP Administrative Amendments**

There were no comments on the Administrative Amendments.

- **Next Steps/Agenda Build**

Ms. Wylie said the next meeting was scheduled for July 14, 2011, at the Coburg Fire Station and the August meeting was scheduled for August 11, 2011 at the Springfield Justice Center. The meeting was adjourned at 12:40 p.m.

(Recorded by Linda Henry)