

# MINUTES

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

March 18, 2009  
5:30 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Dave Jacobson, Chair; Wendy Butler-Boyesen, Vice Chair; Diana Alldredge, Edward Winter, Bill Morganti, Alexandre Lockfeld, Richard Beers, Gary Gillespie, Eleanor Mulder, John Anderson, members; Paul Thompson, Andrea Riner, Kathi Wiederhold, Byron Vanderpool, Lane Council of Governments; David Reesor, City of Springfield; Mark Pangborn, Mary Archer, Lane Transit District.

**ABSENT:** Sarah Strand, Philip Farrington, members; Sonny Chickering, MPC liaison

## **1. Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review**

Mr. Jacobson called the meeting of the Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization Citizen Advisory Committee (MPO CAC) to order at 5:32 p.m. and asked those present to introduce themselves.

Mr. Jacobson noted changes to the agenda.

## **2. Comments from the Audience**

No comments were offered by members of the public.

## **3. CAC Work Program and Operations**

Mr. Vanderpool reported from a recent Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) meeting that concerns had been raised regarding the procedural relationship between the MPC and the MPO CAC. He noted that requests had been made that all substantive issues raised by the MPC be first submitted to the MPO CAC for comment and review. Mr. Vanderpool proceeded to brief the committee on the history of such interaction between the two entities and noted that in the past the CAC had felt overloaded by the amount of items that had been forwarded to them for review. Mr. Vanderpool then directed the CAC members to Ms. Wiederhold's "Charge to the CAC" list which identified the primary public involvement goals of the CAC.

Mr. Vanderpool commented that previous iterations of the CAC had responded by narrowing its focus with respect to what items would be reviewed. Mr. Vanderpool maintained that it might be helpful for the CAC to go through a similar process to reaffirm or re-assess where its priorities lay. He noted that LCOG staff would endeavor to support the CAC regardless of what direction the group decided to take.

Mr. Jacobson suggested that a more efficient relationship between the MPC and the MPO CAC would be ideal because it would help to prevent the duplication of efforts of the MPC and its related advisory committees and member agencies.

Mr. Vanderpool noted that the MPC appreciated the unique perspective that the CAC brought to area transportation issues, particularly since they brought in the viewpoints of members of the community as opposed to staff members.

Ms. Wiederhold suggested that staff would continue to closely coordinate agenda development and scheduling with the CAC officers on a monthly basis as has been done in the past.

Mr. Jacobson noted that he had in the past suggested the formation of CAC subcommittees and specific task forces that might help make the review process between the MPC and the CAC more efficient.

Mr. Gillespie maintained that his first responsibility was to the community and not to the MPC staff. He stated that he would rather duplicate the efforts of the two groups rather than ignore the concerns of the public.

Mr. Vanderpool, responding to a question from Mr. Gillespie, commented that in the past the CAC had streamlined its review process by scheduling a series of joint meetings with the MPC, by developing a manageable task list for the group, and by employing a prioritization process whereby they could determine what items the CAC would best be suited to review.

Mr. Jacobson commented that previous iterations of the CAC had a high turnover rate among its members and it that it now appeared to be a much more stable group.

Mr. Vanderpool reiterated that the MPO CAC provided valuable feedback to the MPC and as such was an enormous benefit to the community.

Mr. Gillespie noted that he had attended a recent TPC meeting and found it to be highly informative in its presentation of the concerns of the different jurisdictions in that committee.

Mr. Anderson commented that one of the original duties of the CAC had been the review of a number of large complex documents. He asked Mr. Vanderpool about the value of this work and further commented that such efforts seemed to waste an enormous amount of the CAC's energy and resources. Mr. Vanderpool replied that the CAC's input regarding such documents as the Unified Planning Work Program had benefited that program considerably and hoped that the CAC would continue to be given the time and resources to serve this advisory role.

Mr. Jacobson commented that the time necessary to train and familiarize new CAC members in regional transportation and the intricacies of the public input processes, including the relationship between the CAC and the MPC was something that invariably impacted the workload of the CAC.

Mr. Lockfeld joined the meeting at 5:49 p.m.

Mr. Beers felt that the CAC's efforts in the past had often amounted to planning for its own sake and did not result in any measurable progress on transportation issues in the community. Mr. Jacobson responded that much of the CAC's work was dictated by legal requirements that often elongated and complicated the process. Mr. Vanderpool agreed that many projects had a great deal of lead time and money associated with them and that subsequently the mechanisms surrounding transportation concerns were part of a long

term process.

Mr. Jacobson reported that Eugene Mayor Kitty Piercy had made recent comments stating that the CAC was an important part of the MPC and the MPO's public involvement process and that their work was essential to bringing a public point of view into complicated transportation planning efforts.

#### **4. Lane Transit District (LTD)**

LTD General Manager Mark Pangborn thanked the CAC members for their support and noted that the only reason he had not had the opportunity to speak to them before was that the LTD board usually met at the same time. He further noted that LTD planned to continue sending its representatives to the CAC meetings to assist them in the advisory efforts.

Mr. Pangborn provided a brief overview of LTD's current financial situation. He noted that due to a recent budget shortfall the agency was faced with a 14.5% service cut. He reported that currently LTD is recommending a 3% service cut primarily due to additional funding that had recently been provided as part of the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act. Mr. Pangborn further reported on the LTD projects and services that were expected to be funded by the federal stimulus package.

Mr. Pangborn reported that LTD is requesting \$1.5 million in Surface Transportation Program-Urban (STP-U) funding over the next four years to address LTD's projected ongoing budget shortfalls.

Mr. Pangborn reported that LTD was moving ahead with its Gateway EmX service extension in Springfield. Construction of this project is expected to funnel as much as \$24 million into the local economy over the next eighteen months.

Mr. Pangborn, responding to a question from Mr. Gillespie, noted that while the requested STP-U funding would not be used to fund staff salaries directly, the receipt of such funds would allow LTD to direct funding from other sources in a manner that would ultimately protect LTD positions.

Mr. Pangborn, responding to a question from Mr. Gillespie, noted that LTD would begin charging for its EmX service in the fall of 2009 and further noted that the fare collection system for EmX would employ fare dispensing machines on the EmX platforms.

Mr. Pangborn, responding to a question from Mr. Morganti, noted that the fare for EmX service would be the same as for regular LTD services, \$1.50.

Mr. Pangborn, responding to a question from Mr. Winter, noted that the state legislature was currently considering raising the payroll tax amount to .007% in 2010. He further noted that to LTD such an increase might amount to approximately \$1 million per year in additional payroll tax revenue over the next four years.

Mr. Pangborn commented that the recent closures of Hynix, and other local business had severely decreased the amount of payroll tax revenue for LTD.

Mr. Pangborn and Ms. Archer noted that the American Public Transportation Association provided grants to local citizens groups for transit advocacy and encouraged the committee and staff to investigate the program.

Mr. Pangborn, responding to a question from Ms. Alldredge, noted that the LTD facility on Franklin Avenue was approximately 19 years old and that the maintenance bays at the facility were not large enough to accommodate the longer articulated buses that were being used more frequently by LTD. He noted that LTD was planning to use the federal stimulus funding to improve the maintenance facilities to accommodate the larger vehicles.

## **5. LTD Proposal to Allocate a Portion of STP-U Funds**

Mr. Thompson noted that Mr. Pangborn had sufficiently briefed the board regarding LTD's request for STP-U funding during his presentation.

## **6. Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) & Planning Funding**

Mr. Riner noted that the UPWP had been presented to the MPC at their meeting on March 12th and that staff would be requesting approval of the UPWP from the MPC at their meeting in April.

Ms. Riner distributed a list of potential discussion items to the committee members regarding various aspects of the UPWP and noted that the list was designed to facilitate the exchange of information and feedback between the MPC and the MPO CAC. The discussion items related to questions and comments received to-date regarding the UPWP, including comments from the MPC and the public, and identified climate change planning, the two-year planning horizon, and the public participation process as possible discussion topics.

Mr. Jacobson noted that he had reviewed the Public Participation portion of the UPWP and found that while the public participation strategies for the first year of the UPWP were very detailed the 2<sup>nd</sup> year tasks were presented more in an outline form.

Mr. Riner asked the committee members if they felt that an appropriate amount of public involvement had been applied to the UPWP as reflected in the document submitted to the MPC.

Ms. Butler-Boyeson found it difficult to determine what more could have been included with respect to public involvement in the UPWP.

Mr. Thompson, responding to a question from Ms. Butler-Boyeson, noted that the notification of the UPWP had been emailed to the same list of recipients that was used for all MPC public comment opportunities in addition to the regular media notices used by the MPC. He noted that the email list contained over 800 recipients.

Mr. Thompson, responding to a comment from Mr. Lockfeld, noted that while agencies such as ODOT sometimes ran more extensive newspaper ads as part of their public outreach efforts on certain projects, the MPC had not considered the UPWP to have a high enough profile to warrant the use of more extensive and therefore more expensive notification strategies. He added that the MPO did use newspaper display ads and other more extensive outreach strategies during efforts such as an update of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Mr. Lockfeld suggested that efforts should be made to increase the public's awareness of the existence of online documents such as the UPWP. He noted that members of the public who were not significantly aware of groups such as LCOG or the MPO would have no real way to learn about the UPWP.

Ms. Butler-Boyeson noted that LTD maintained a presence on Facebook and suggested that the MPC might use similar online social networking tools to increase awareness of both the MPC and the UPWP.

Mr. Jacobson agreed that it was important for the MPC to find ways to make the general public more aware of initiatives such as the UPWP.

Mr. Anderson commented that the MPC and the MPO CAC's efforts toward public outreach initiatives were inefficient and counterproductive and that the transportation program described in the UPWP was hostile toward business and transportation development concerns. He further hoped that the UPWP might be revised to strike a more appropriate balance between environmental and business issues.

Mr. Thompson responded to Mr. Anderson's comments and noted that the UPWP had not been designed to set policies regarding business development concerns but rather as a work plan to implement established MPO policies.

Ms. Alldredge maintained that the MPO CAC was a forum where ideas regarding the UPWP and other MPO initiatives might be discussed in order to better address the public's concerns.

Ms. Riner stated that the identification of specific public participation goals within the UPWP would be an effective use of the MPO CAC's time and resources. She further noted that the list of discussion items she had distributed were not meant to limit the conversation but only to provide the CAC with an overview of MPC discussions regarding issues such as public involvement on the UPWP.

Ms. Butler-Boyeson expressed that the UPWP should include some public participation activities related to addressing economic investment concerns in the community.

Mr. Winter commented that he was supportive of the UPWP Air Quality element as well as any other portions of the UPWP that would address the environmental needs of the community.

Mr. Anderson commented that the UPWP and the MPO members were not doing anything to address traffic congestion in the area. Mr. Jacobson and Ms. WHO--Archer?? commented that LTD currently had a number of alternative transportation initiatives beyond its regular transit services that were meant to address traffic congestion in the area.

Mr. Gillespie was concerned that the citizen's advisory and review process portions of the UPWP had changed from a one year to a two year timeline for evaluations of the program.

The committee members discussed various aspects of their evaluative processes and how they might improve those processes with respect to the UPWP as well as to their functioning relationship with the MPC.

The committee members briefly discussed various aspects of the Air Quality work elements of the UPWP, and Mr. Thompson further commented that the MPO had been aggressively preparing for any new air quality control requirements that might be implemented in the near future.

Mr. Jacobson commented that the MPO CAC members were often asked to provide input and facilitate public feedback on items such as air quality control standards for which they were neither trained nor qualified.

Mr. Lockfeld noted his understanding that the MPC was seeking more specific input from the MPO CAC

members regarding the UPWP and maintained that many members of the CAC were not prepared to do so.

Mr. Jacobson averred that the committee's comments indicated a need for them to make a broader effort to involve different areas of the public in regional transportation issues.

Mr. Jacobson reiterated that the MPO CAC members were not able to give the MPC information and feedback that was as detailed as that which they received from staff. Ms. Riner responded that the MPC wanted input from both staff and from the public, and that they did not expect these two entities to necessarily comment on the same things.

Mr. Jacobson called for a break at 6:44 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 6:55 p.m.

## **7. Approve February 18, 2009 Minutes**

Mr. Lockfeld noted corrections to the minutes. Hearing no objections, Mr. Jacobson deemed the minutes of the February 18, 2009 MPO CAC meeting approved as corrected.

Mr. Jacobson noted from the recent MPC meeting that Commissioner Handy had appreciated the MPO CAC's motion recommending pedestrian improvements.

Ms. Riner and Mr. Jacobson, responding to a question from Mr. Winter, reported that while the CAC's motion and subsequent recommendation to the MPC had not resulted in an actionable item for them, the MPC decision considered the CAC's input in the matter.

## **8. Beltline Facility Plan Stakeholder Advisory Committee**

Mr. Jacobson reported that the MPC had voted to have one representative and an alternate from the MPO CAC serve on the Beltline Facility Plan Stakeholder Advisory Committee. He further noted that Sarah Strand had volunteered to be the CAC's representative to that committee, with Mr. Beers agreeing to serve as the alternate.

Mr. Winter, seconded by Mr. Gillespie, moved to appoint Sarah Strand as the MPO CAC representative to the Beltline Facility Plan Stakeholder Advisory Committee and to appoint Richard Beers as the alternate MPO CAC representative to the same. The motion passed unanimously, 10:0.

## **9. Annual Review of the Public Participation Plan**

Ms. Butler-Boyeson briefed the CAC members on the work of the subcommittee to draft a comment form and revise the two tables in the Public Participation Plan and copies to the committee. She reported that a column listing the CAC as a core public involvement tool had been added to Table 1. A row adding the CAC has been added to Table 2. Otherwise, the tables were essentially the same as the CAC members had seen them at previous meetings.

Ms. Butler-Boyeson noted that the MPO intended to use the public comment form to gauge the effectiveness of its Public Participation Plan. She distributed a draft of the comment form to the CAC members and noted that it was an amalgamation of similar forms previously used by the MPO and drew on

examples from MPO partner jurisdictions. She further requested that the CAC members each review the comment survey form at their convenience and return with specific feedback at the next MPO CAC meeting.

Ms. Wiederhold noted that she would send out an email reminder regarding the comment form and the two revised tables before the next CAC meeting and specifically reminded the members to send response emails to her and not any “reply all” recipient lists in accordance with public meeting requirements.

Ms. Wiederhold reminded the CAC members that the summary table contained information regarding all of the MPO’s key products and was the MPO’s guiding document with respect to its public participation efforts.

The committee members briefly discussed various aspects of the summary and evaluation tables as presented by Ms. Wiederhold.

Ms. Wiederhold commented that she would check whether information regarding online social networking resources was included in Appendix 2 to the PPP. If not, staff would draft information to add to the appendix.

Mr. Jacobson requested that Ms. Wiederhold collect and compile the CAC’s members’ responses to the draft comment form well in advance of their next meeting.

## **10. Member Spotlight**

Mr. Jacobson, hearing no objections from the committee members, postponed Mr. Beers’ member spotlight until the next MPO CAC meeting.

## **11. Central Clearinghouse Implementation**

Ms. Wiederhold reported that staff had been developing the design concept of the Central Clearinghouse project and further noted that she was seeking cursory reactions from the CAC members with regard to the draft concept design for the home page that she handed out.. She briefed the committee on the rough design of the Central Clearinghouse website.

Ms. Wiederhold, responding to a question from Mr. Anderson, noted that the functions of the map features of the Central Clearinghouse website had not yet been determined. She noted that there would be a staff meeting in two weeks to discuss those as well as other features central to the website.

Ms. Wiederhold commented that she would provide a status report at the next CAC meeting.

The committee members briefly discussed the various design elements of the Central Clearinghouse website and generally agreed that the basic presentation of the website was acceptable. They commented favorably on the colors, graphics, and clean look of the draft design. They also liked KeepUsInvolved for the name of the site and asked to be included in discussions about the map for the site.

## **12. Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) & Planning Funding**

Ms. Riner summarized the committee's comments regarding the draft UPWP from earlier in the meeting and confirmed them to the CAC members as follows:

**Recommend approval of UPWP with following comments:**

- **Public participation: Improve outreach to and participation with business and economic development interests.**
- **Support 2-year plan: Recognizing opportunity for review and assessment next year and ability for MPC to amend as necessary.**

**Other general comments:**

- **Stress need for a balance between environmental and economic development benefits**
- **Continue to diversify outreach to increase community awareness of the MPO's role and activities**

Mr. Jacobson asked if Ms. Riner's summation was a satisfactory assessment of the committee's position regarding the UPWP and related initiatives. Mr. Gillespie replied that it was a satisfactory synopsis of the group consensus regarding local transportation concerns.

Ms. Riner, responding to a comment from Mr. Winter, noted that the MPO CAC's intention to support underrepresented groups outside of business and economic development interests was already cited in the UPWP.

### **13. Staff Updates**

Mr. Jacobson noted that staff updates would be postponed until the next MPO CAC meeting.

### **14. Wrap-Up**

Mr. Gillespie noted that the MPO CAC would be discussing recruitment efforts in April and encouraged the committee members to identify community representatives who might be able to broaden the scope of the current CAC membership.

Mr. Jacobson commented that Ms. Wiederhold would be able to send out recruitment information to any potential members the committee might recommend.

Ms. Wiederhold, responding to a question from Mr. Winter, stated that MPO staff had been discussing strategies to solicit interest from the Latino community as well as representatives from other minority populations in the area.

Mr. Morganti suggested that a discussion of possible destinations for the next MPO CAC field trip be placed on the agenda for their next meeting.

Mr. Jacobson adjourned the meeting at 7:31

*(Recorded by Wade Hicks)*