

MINUTES

Citizen Advisory Committee
of the
Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization
Singer Room – Eugene Public Library – 100 West 10th Avenue
Eugene, Oregon

November 19, 2008
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Webb Sussman, Chair; Dave Jacobson, Vice Chair; Sarah Strand, Diana Alldredge, Wendy Butler-Boyesen, Eleanor Mulder, Edward Winter, Philip Farrington, John Anderson, Bill Morganti, Lloyd Gordon, Gary Gillespie, Alexandre Lockfeld, Richard Beers, members; Andrea Riner, Paul Thompson, Lane Council of Governments; Savannah Crawford, Sonny Chickering, Oregon Department of Transportation, Celia Barry, Cress Bates, Mark Bernard, Lane County, Mary Archer, Lane Transit District.

Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review

Mr. Sussman called the meeting of the Metropolitan Planning Organization Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) to order and those present introduced themselves.

Mr. Sussman welcomed new CAC members Lloyd Gordon, Gary Gillespie, Alexandre Lockfeld and Richard Beers.

Mr. Sussman announced that the order of the agenda would be revised by taking up the nomination of officers immediately following the Getting to Know You Exercise. There were no objections.

Mr. Chickering asked to provide a brief update on the 2010-13 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) at some point in the meeting.

Comments from the Audience

There were no comments from the audience.

Approve October 15, 2008, Minutes

Mr. Lockfeld noted a correction to the spelling of his first name.

Mr. Jacobson noted that Mr. Morganti made the motion to approve minutes and he provided the second.

Ms. Mulder noted that that a reference on page 8 to the CAC's February 2008 meeting should be changed to February 2009 and that Mr. Sussman's last name was omitted in the last sentence on page 9.

Mr. Morganti, seconded by Ms. Butler-Boyesen, moved to approve the October 15, 2008, minutes as corrected. The motion passed unanimously.

Getting to Know You Exercise

Ms. Riner explained that the exercise was designed to help CAC members become better acquainted by discovering things they had in common with each other.

Committee members participated in the exercise and reported back on their experiences.

Nominate Officers

Mr. Sussman and Mr. Jacobson explained the duties of the chair and vice chair and invited members to indicate if they were interested in serving as an officer.

In response to a question from Ms. Strand, Mr. Jacobson said he would be willing to serve as CAC chair if no one else was interested.

Mr. Sussman called for officer nomination, with elections to be held at the December 2008 meeting.

Ms. Strand nominated Mr. Jacobson as chair and Ms. Butler-Boyesen as vice chair.

There were no other nominations.

Lane County Geographic Information System (GIS) Show-N-Tell

Cress Bates, Lane County Public Works, demonstrated several GIS web applications available on Lane County's website that allowed the public to access Lane County and regional data. He said GIS systems were becoming increasingly popular; GIS was a layer of information placed upon an accurate set of controls. He said that dozens of information layers provided data related to property, political boundaries, census, public safety and many others; a variety of analysis tools were also available. He described the beginnings of GIS within the Public Works department and noted that a global positioning satellite device was used to accurately locate 2,400 miles of County roads. He reviewed a number of GIS-related projects that established databases related to mile points every 5.28 feet.

Mr. Bates demonstrated several functional capabilities of GIS that provided great positional accuracy and cartographic quality. He said there were five partner agencies involved in GIS technology: City of Eugene, City of Springfield, Lane County, Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) and Eugene Water & Electric Board. He said LCOG had pioneered GIS in Lane County in 1968 by digitizing maps for use in building a property owner database from assessor's maps. He concluded his presentation by demonstrating a variety of search options available in the system.

The CAC took a short break.

2010-13 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Update

Mr. Chickering thanked the CAC for assisting the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) with its STIP open house, which had been very successful. He said since that time ODOT revenue projections indicated that the State gas tax revenue stream was impacted by the economy and increased fuel prices. He said people were buying less fuel and as a result available revenues to fund the 2010-13 STIP were falling short by approximately \$315 million. He said based on that information ODOT had decided to place the 2010-13 STIP on hold for six months to provide the time necessary to accurately assess the amount of revenues that can reasonably be anticipated in the coming years and to adjust to 2010-13 STIP as needed in accordance with those updated revenue projections.. He said there were some options to raise additional revenue that might be considered by the legislature at its next session and Congress might approve an economic stimulus package that could include transportation infrastructure funding.

Mr. Sussman asked if ODOT was considering making a weight/mile approach applicable to all vehicles, not just trucks. Mr. Chickering said a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) methodology was tested in the Portland area successfully, but switching to an entirely new revenue stream was a long-term prospect.

Mr. Thompson added that the governor's funding proposal did include an immediate increase in the gas tax and called for continued movement toward a mileage-based revenue source.

Mr. Chickering commented that it would be disingenuous to move forward with a draft STIP when revenue was not available to construct projects. He said the public participation process would be honored when the planning process resumed next year.

Mr. Sussman asked that the CAC be kept informed about the STIP's status.

Mr. Gordon asked if the issue of Peak Oil had been factored into the planning process. Mr. Chickering replied that ODOT economists did consider that in their planning assumptions and forecasts.

Primer on Surface Transportation Program-Urban (STP-U) Funds

Mr. Thompson provided handouts, including a report to the governor from the Statewide Transportation Vision Committee, a copy of the governor's proposed legislation regarding transportation system funding and the Oregon MPO Consortium's legislative priorities summary.

Mr. Thompson used a flow chart entitled *Central Lane (CL)MPO STP-U Process: Preservation, Project Development and Modernization Activities*. He explained that STP-U funds were important to the MPO because they were the only federal funds that could be used flexibly at the local level, within the confines of federal regulations. He said the MPO received \$2.5 to \$3 million STP-U funds by formula annually. He said the MPO prioritized STP-U funded projects at the regional level; it could not be suballocated to jurisdictions. He said that prioritization was based on regional criteria and eight federal planning factors. He distributed and reviewed a list of the federal factors. He said the long-range Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) contained goals, objectives and policies that guided use of funds locally and recent use had emphasized preservation rather than new construction projects.

Mr. Thompson explained that the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) was tied to the STIP and because the STIP was on hold the MTIP was also on hold. He said the CAC would have an opportunity over the next two or three months to provide input on how funds should be used. He said

currently the funds were split among three categories: 10 percent for transportation demand management/transportation options (TDM/TO), 25 percent for planning activities and 65 percent for preservation, project development and modernization activities across all modes.

Mr. Farrington asked if enhancements—grant funded alternative modes supporting projects—were included in any of the categories. Mr. Thompson replied that enhancements could be done within any of the categories.

Continuing, Mr. Thompson said a scoring mechanism was used to prioritize projects in the 65 percent category each funding cycle. He indicated that staff was interested in looking at that category within the broader sense of regional priorities that would be most effective for the preservation, operation and maintenance of the existing system.

In response to a question from Mr. Gillespie, Mr. Thompson explained that a preservation project maintained existing road capacity, while a modernization project increased capacity by adding features and functional improvements.

Mr. Farrington asked for a list of the projects to which the 65 percent category had been allocated. Mr. Thompson said he would provide a link to information online about how funds had been programmed in the past.

Annual Review of the Public Participation Plan

This item was deferred to the December 2008 meeting.

Quick Updates

Mr. Jacobson shared an email from Tom Boyatt, City of Springfield, thanking the CAC for its review of Springfield's transportation website. He said as a result of the review a link to transportation projects had been added to provide better access to citizens.

Ms. Riner reminded the CAC that a joint meeting of the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) would be held in February or March 2009. She said potential discussion topics included the central clearinghouse effort, the Title VI environmental justice process, update on the RTP, CAC recommendations on the Freight Advisory Committee and the next phase of recruitment for CAC applicants.

Ms. Riner reported that at the last MPC meeting the four new CAC members were appointed and there had been some discussion of the recruitment process and the need to assure geographic representation from across the metropolitan area. She said the City of Springfield was developing a recruitment proposal for the remaining vacancy on the CAC.

Ms. Riner said staff would discuss with the CAC the possibility of conducting a comprehensive review of the Public Participation Plan every other year, with a cursory evaluation during the intervening years.

Referring to the OMPOC legislative priorities summary, Mr. Farrington hoped that the CAC would have an opportunity to provide some input to the MPC before the next set of priorities was adopted. Mr. Thompson remarked that the legislative priorities were presented to the MPC exactly as they came from

OMPOC and if action was not taken at the MPC's December meeting there could be an opportunity for the CAC to comment.

Mr. Sussman reminded the CAC that individual members could also email their comments to staff or speak at an MPC meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:33 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)