

MINUTES

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

February 18, 2009
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Dave Jacobson, Chair; Wendy Butler-Boyesen, Vice Chair; Diana Alldredge, Sarah Strand, Edward Winter, Philip Farrington, Bill Morganti, Alexandre Lockfeld, Richard Beers, Lloyd Gordon, Gary Gillespie, Eleanor Mulder, members; Sonny Chickering, MPC liaison; George Kloeppel, Paul Thompson, Andrea Riner, Kathi Wiederhold, Lane Council of Governments; Savannah Crawford, Oregon Department of Transportation; Mark Bernard, Lane County Public Works Transportation Planning, Lane Transit District; Brad Foster, guest.

ABSENT: John Anderson, member.

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review

Mr. Jacobson called the meeting of the MPO Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) to order at 5:35 p.m. Those present introduced themselves.

Mr. Jacobson reviewed the meeting agenda for the benefit of the committee.

Mr. Farrington noted that it would be helpful in future meeting agendas to include time devoted to a discussion of MPO CAC issues that would then be communicated at the MPO and MPC meetings. Mr. Jacobson and Ms. Wiederhold agreed with Mr. Farrington's suggestion.

Ms. Riner suggested that the committee use the staff update portion of the meeting agendas for the discussions that Mr. Farrington had suggested.

Mr. Jacobson noted that City of Eugene Mayor Kitty Piercy had requested the MPO CAC's input regarding issues related to STP-U project funding.

2. Comments from the Audience

Mr. Foster expressed that he was interested in learning more about the MPO CAC's role in addressing bicycle transportation concerns in the area and offered several suggestions in that regard. He hoped that the committee's efforts might make for safer and more efficient bikeways in the community.

3. Approve January 21, 2008 Minutes

Ms. Wiederhold noted corrections to the January 21, 2008. Upon consensus of the committee, approval of the minutes was postponed until later in the meeting.

4. Member Spotlight

Mr. Gillespie and Mr. Lockfeld briefly discussed their respective backgrounds and how each of their unique perspectives might benefit the MPO CAC's work.

Mr. Gillespie, originally from Savannah, Georgia, commented that as a 31 year resident of Eugene he was looking forward to working on the MPO CAC as a strong advocate for light rail and other alternative transportation issues. He stated that in the past he had served on several political and ballot measure campaigns related to the social and economic justice movement and was looking forward to using that experience to the committee's benefit. Mr. Gillespie also noted that, in addition to being voted in 1995 as one of the five funniest people in Eugene by the Register-Guard, he has worked for the City of Eugene for the past 22 years and currently works in the City library as a librarian's assistant. He noted that for the last 8 years he has served as council president for the Oregon AFSCME Council 75, the city-wide union representing 23,000 workers in the State of Oregon, and had also in the past served as the president of the Fairmount and South University neighborhood associations. Mr. Gillespie noted that his hobbies included baseball, movies, cooking and running.

Mr. Lockfeld commented that, as a practicing neurologist currently living in Springfield, he was looking forward to participating in the MPO CAC's efforts. He stated that he was born in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania and had lived in areas such as England, Washington, D.C., Seattle, Washington and San Francisco, California before settling in the Eugene area a number of years ago. He stated that he had a son with autism who frequently used public transportation and was very interested in the MPO CAC's efforts with regard to public transit accessibility issues. He further noted that, in his capacity as a long time recreational and commuter bicyclist, he shared the ecological concerns of several of the committee members.

5. Annual Review of the Public Participation Plan (PPP)

Ms. Wiederhold noted that the PPP was up for annual review per the direction agreed upon by the committee members in previous meetings.

Ms. Wiederhold directed the committee members to the February 11, 2009 memorandum regarding the PPP and to the evaluation table regarding the PPP's public involvement tools.

Ms. Butler-Boyeson noted that the committee members had not seen the results or the explanatory data from the previous year's review of the PPP. Mr. Wiederhold responded that there were new tracking mechanisms in place on the MPO CAC website that would allow staff to provide the committee members with more quantifiable data, and that survey forms used at MPO CAC outreach events would also allow staff to provide more detailed information.

Mr. Jacobson expressed that it would be important to review not only the numbers of people responding to MPO CAC public involvement tools but also the quality of those responses.

Mr. Gordon suggested that the MPO CAC recruitment target graduate students in marketing at the University of Oregon. Mr. Jacobson recognized the validity of Mr. Gordon's suggestion, but reminded

him that the current discussion was focused on the annual review of the PPP.

Mr. Jacobson, responding to a request for clarification from Mr. Beers, noted that the committee's annual review of the PPP was intended to reveal how many people learned about certain transportation concerns as a result of the MPO CAC's efforts.

Mr. Gordon noted that an over-consumption of television by the average American probably hampered the effectiveness of the MPO CAC.

Mr. Lockfeld maintained that while a lot of people had a legitimate interest in local transportation issues, it was often difficult to hold their attention to a point where they could engage in effective discussion forums on the matter.

Mr. Farrington suggested that the MPO increase its public awareness efforts not only through increased open house events, but also by having committee members visit the public and various community groups directly.

Mr. Gillespie expressed that the Performance Goal, Methods to Meet Goals, and Relevant Objective columns from the evaluation tables were somewhat redundant without more definitive data on the PPP's effectiveness. He suggested that public comment forms offered in conjunction with the MPO CAC public involvement tools might be helpful.

Mr. Winter suggested that it might be beneficial for the MPO CAC to contact area neighborhood associations and related groups in order to notify them about projects related to the MPO. Ms. Wiederhold responded that the public outreach for individual transportation projects was usually handled by the specific MPO partner agency in charge of the project.

Ms. Wiederhold, responding to Mr. Farrington's earlier comment, noted that the MPO CAC had been waiting for the proper time to conduct a broad public outreach about regional transportation planning, such as when there is a comprehensive update of the RTP.

Ms. Butler-Boyeson agreed that certain neighborhood groups would welcome the MPO CAC's public outreach efforts.

Ms. Mulder expressed that the qualitative analysis referred to earlier by Mr. Jacobson was often difficult to assess with regard to responses to the MPO CAC's public involvement tools.

Mr. Lockfeld commented that recent efforts by the City of Eugene to expand public outreach efforts regarding bicycle transportation projects might serve as a model for the MPO CAC.

Ms. Wiederhold noted that the MPO CAC had participated in a shared LTD public outreach event in May 2007, when recruitment for the CAC was open.

Mr. Jacobson, responding to a request for clarification from Mr. Beers, noted that the MPO CAC was concerned with addressing all aspects of surface transportation concerns in the region and not just bike transportation. Mr. Beers was concerned that the MPO CAC might be trying to micromanage its efforts with regard to bike transportation projects.

Mr. Gillespie noted that the MPO CAC's most important motivation tool with respect to its public outreach was the fact that the MPO actually had a significant amount of money to spend on transportation

concerns.

Mr. Jacobson recognized the committee's comments indicating that the MPO CAC needed to increase its public outreach efforts.

Mr. Jacobson, responding to a question from Mr. Morganti, noted that the MPO CAC had recently used a list of individuals and groups to target with its public involvement tools, but that such lists had not been found to be a proactive enough strategy for the MPO CAC's needs.

Mr. Gillespie suggested it might be helpful to have a list of MPO CAC talking points for individual members to use in communicating with the public. Mr. Jacobson noted that staff would draft such a list for the committee members prior to embarking on an outreach.

Ms. Strand suggested that it might be helpful for the MPO CAC to target local community centers as well as middle and high schools with their public involvement tools.

Ms. Wiederhold noted that staff would be drafting a survey/public comment form for attendees at public outreach events to help generate more qualitative data for the committee members.

Ms. Butler-Boyeson, Ms. Alldredge, and Mr. Gillespie, responding to a request from Mr. Jacobson, noted that they would be willing to serve on a subcommittee of the MPO CAC devoted to reviewing a draft comment form. Mr. Jacobson asked Ms. Butler-Boyeson to serve as chair of the subcommittee. .

6. Unified Planning Work Program

Ms. Riner directed the committee members to the February 10, 2009 memorandum detailing the UPWP and noted that the UPWP will now be developed every two years. Ms. Riner proceeded to brief the committee members on the various elements and public participation strategies of the UPWP as listed in the attachments to the memorandum.

Mr. Thompson, responding to a question from Mr. Farrington, commented that the MPO's Title VI plan would also apply to providing services to the elderly and disabled.

Mr. Thompson, responding to a question from Mr. Winter, noted that a training workshop regarding the MPO's Title VI plan had been cancelled and staff has been looking for an opportunity to reschedule it..

Ms. Riner, responding to a question from Mr. Jacobson, stated that she would be happy to receive the MPO CAC members' feedback regarding the UPWP via email.

Mr. Thompson stated that the UPWP is primarily produced for the U.S. and Oregon Departments of Transportation to comply with federal requirements regarding transportation policies, and for the benefit of the MPO policy board. He noted that the UPWP might therefore not be as public-friendly as some of the other MPO materials.

Ms. Riner, responding to a question from Ms. Butler-Boyeson, said that the full version of the UPWP was still in development and would be brought to the committee at the next meeting. Mr. Thompson added that a full review draft of the UPWP would be available on March 6, 2009.

Mr. Gordon recommended that the MPO use its website to respond to public comments made regarding the

UPWP.

Mr. Wiederhold, responding to concerns from Ms. Mulder regarding the timeliness of public comments regarding the MPO and the UPWP, noted that there were elements in the public participation plan that would facilitate public comments on all matters related to the MPO.

Mr. Jacobson called for a break at 6:31 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 6:39 p.m.

7. Economic Stimulus Package

Mr. Thompson directed the committee members to a copy of the February 10, 2009 memorandum regarding the Highway Investment Funding in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 and briefly summarized the details of that memorandum.

Mr. Thompson noted that while final details of the economic stimulus bill had not yet been determined, it was generally assumed that the target funding for local MPO surface transportation projects would be approximately \$6.6 million. He noted that current projections placed the amount that would be distributed to ODOT to be approximately \$210 million.

Mr. Thompson commented that each of the MPO stimulus funded projects was considered infrastructure preservation projects.

Mr. Thompson noted that, with respect to any transportation projects in Oregon, 3% of the stimulus funds were required to be devoted to transportation enhancement projects such as the Delta Pond Bike Bridge. He added that the Delta Pond Bike Bridge project was one of the City of Eugene's highest transportation related priorities.

Mr. Jacobson maintained that the Delta Pond Bike Bridge project did not appear to provide as much of an immediate benefit as the four Eugene transportation projects listed in the attachment to Mr. Thompson's memorandum. Mr. Thompson responded that one reason the City of Eugene was intent on the project was that the Delta Pond Bike Bridge project could not be funded with gas taxes as the other Eugene projects might be, and therefore the City was intent on using as much of the stimulus funding on the Delta Pond Bike Bridge project as possible.

Mr. Gillespie noted that the Delta Pond Bike Bridge would provide significant bicycle access on and around Delta Highway, an area that was considered highly inaccessible by many cyclists.

Mr. Gordon noted that the area around Delta Highway and the Valley River Center was neither bicycle nor pedestrian friendly.

Mr. Thompson, responding to a question from Mr. Winter, noted that the stimulus money being distributed to the MPO member agencies would be extremely flexible in its uses toward a wide variety of transportation projects, although one caveat was that the stimulus funding received needed to be obligated within one year plus 21 days from the signing of the stimulus bill.

Mr. Winter advocated for more money to be spent to improve local sidewalks. Mr. Morganti concurred with Mr. Winter's statement.

Mr. Farrington noted that he had spoken with Rob Inerfeld from the City of Eugene's Planning Division

and learned that safety enhancements for pedestrians in Eugene were a relatively easy and inexpensive fix for the City.

Mr. Thompson, responding to a question from Mr. Beers, noted that the City of Eugene would be responsible for distributing any information to the public regarding the effects of the Delta Pond Bike Bridge on the Cal Young Parkway neighborhood.

Mr. Thompson, responding to a question from Mr. Lockfeld, noted that the MPO could choose to distribute its portion of the federal stimulus funds to its member agencies in a variety of ways.

Ms. Riner and Mr. Bernard noted that Lane County Board of County Commissioners would be conducting a public hearing regarding federal stimulus funding of County transportation projects on March 4, 2009.

Ms. Strand hoped that federal stimulus funding might be applied toward improved signage and light controls at traffic intersections. Mr. Jacobson suggested that Ms. Strand bring her concerns before the Springfield and Eugene City Councils.

Mr. Thompson, responding to a question from Mr. Gillespie, noted that the \$6 million in federal stimulus funding expected to be distributed to the LTD would most likely be devoted primarily to capital projects, which would in turn free up other LTD funding and help mitigate LTD's proposed service reductions. In response to a further question from Ms. Alldredge, Mr. Thompson noted that LTD would be making specific announcements regarding their application of federal stimulus funds at their March board meeting.

Mr. Thompson, responding to a question from Mr. Winter, briefly outlined the next steps of the federal stimulus process and noted upcoming meetings of the Transportation Planning Committee and MPC.

Mr. Thompson, recognizing the strong interest from the CAC members, suggested that they might make a formal motion to recommend certain pedestrian improvements and related initiatives.

Mr. Lockfeld, seconded by Mr. Winter, moved that the MPO CAC forward a recommendation that the MPO consider pedestrian improvements in addition to roadway preservation and bicycle improvement projects. The motion passed unanimously, 12:0.

Ms. Butler-Boyeson commented that both the Delta Pond Bike Bridge and EWEB Bike Path Resurfacing projects could be considered to be pedestrian improvement projects.

Mr. Thompson noted that the City of Coburg had been trying to fund their Diamond/Locust Streets Preservation project for a number of years and that Coburg had often had trouble raising matching funds for the project in previous efforts. He added that as the stimulus had no matching requirement the project might finally be realized.

Mr. Thompson noted that the federal stimulus allocations to the MPO were planned to include \$500,000 for improvements to regional land use and transportation modeling in the area and that this proposal had a great deal of staff and technical support. In response to a question from Mr. Gillespie, Mr. Thompson noted that those improvements were expected to create a number of jobs in the area although he did not have any quantifiable data to present in that regard.

8. Approve January 21, 2008 Minutes

Mr. Gordon made comments not related to the minutes regarding his concerns that he was not being allowed to bring in items on behalf of the Oregon Bus Project for discussion to the MPO CAC meeting. Mr. Jacobson deemed that Mr. Gordon's comments were out of order.

Mr. Gordon excused himself from the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

Mr. Jacobson and Ms. Wiederhold noted corrections to the January 21, 2008 minutes and, noting no objections to the same, Mr. Jacobson deemed the minutes approved.

9. Central Clearinghouse Updates

Ms. Wiederhold directed the committee members to the Draft Work Program regarding the MPO CAC's Central Clearinghouse, which was included in the agenda packet. The recommendation to establish a central clearinghouse had come out of recommendations brought forth by the MPO CAC during the previous year's review of the public participation plan. She further noted that the work program showed the MPO staff's progress on the Central Clearinghouse project.

Ms. Wiederhold proceeded to provide a brief overview of the work program for the benefit of the committee members.

Mr. Thompson, responding to a question from Ms. Butler-Boyeson, noted that staff would incorporate a text only option for the Central Clearinghouse web presence for the benefit of visually impaired members of the public.

Mr. Bernard noted that the Central Clearinghouse website would need to clear the legal processes of Lane County to directly link the Lane County website to the Central Clearinghouse.

Mr. Thompson agreed with Mr. Bernard's estimation that it would be important to maintain active links between the Central Clearinghouse and the City of Eugene and Lane County websites.

10. Staff Updates

Ms. Riner noted that LTD had recently requested approximately \$2 million in STP-U finding and that a discussion of that request and how it might affect other MPO partner agencies would be conducted at the local level. For example, the request was scheduled for discussion at a meeting of the Eugene City Council on February 23.

Mr. Thompson, responding to a request for clarification from Mr. Farrington regarding the \$2 million requested by LTD, briefly described the nature of the STP-U funds allocated by the MPO and how those funds had typically been distributed in the past.

Ms. Riner noted that a number of factors related to LTD's budget, especially during the economic downturn, were highly uncertain. This is especially true given the district's reliance on payroll taxes.

Mr. Gillespie expressed that LTD's needs might be greater than the needs of the other MPO member agencies as LTD was the one agency that directly affected every community in the region.

Ms. Butler-Boyeson suggested that LTD and the other MPO agencies might review how the City of

Portland and Tri-Met had coordinated the development of their mass transit systems with the economic development of the city itself. She maintained that an investment in public transit was in itself an investment in the community at large. Mr. Thompson concurred with Ms. Butler-Boyeson's statement.

11. Wrap-Up

Ms. Strand, referring to Mr. Gordon's earlier statements, expressed that she would like the committee to review the MPO CAC bylaws as well as Roberts Rules of Order at a future meeting.

Mr. Thompson commented that there would be a stakeholder advisory committee formed regarding the current ODOT Beltline Highway planning project and that the MPO was planning in March to ask a member of the CAC to serve on that committee, pending direction from the MPC.

Mr. Jacobsen adjourned the meeting at 7:35 p.m.

(Recorded by Wade Hicks)