

# MINUTES

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

March 18, 2010  
5:30 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Dave Jacobson, chair; Sarah Strand, Vice-chair; Paul Adkins, Dick Beers, Wendy Butler-Boyesen, Phillip Carroll, Philip Farrington, Gary Gillespie, Alexandre Lockfeld, Bill Morganti, Rosalia Marquez, Eleanor Mulder, Edward Winter, members; Sonny Chickering, MPC liaison; Kathi Wiederhold, Andrea Riner, Paul Thompson, Lane Council of Governments; Connie Bloom Williams, Lane Transit District; Rob Inerfeld, City of Eugene; David Reesor, Tom Boyatt, City of Springfield, Shane Rhodes, School District 4J.

**ABSENT:** Diana Alldredge, Jennifer Smith, members.

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

Mr. Jacobson called the meeting of the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) to order. Those present introduced themselves. There were no changes to the agenda.

## **Comments from the Audience**

There were no comments.

## **Approve February 18, 2010, Minutes**

Mr. Jacobson determined there were no corrections to the minutes and deemed them approved as submitted.

## **Surface Transportation Program- Urban (STP-U) FY2011 Proposals**

Mr. Thompson reviewed the 11 applications submitted under the new STP-U framework and funding priorities approved by the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC), copies of which were included in the agenda packet. He said applications were reviewed for consistency with four regional priority criteria: preserve existing assets, improve safety, preserve/enhance transit service and reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. He said the Transportation Planning Committee (TPC) recommended funding all or part of nine applications and distributed a chart – *FFY11-13 STP-U Funding Proposal* – that depicted the allocation of funds among expenditure categories. He said one of the applications not recommended was eligible for other funding sources and the other application not funded was a lower priority for the local jurisdiction. He said the STP-U funding level was the same as the last two years, but anticipated that a higher level of

funding could be available under the new federal transportation legislation. He said one person testified at the MPC public hearing and urged that more emphasis be placed on GHG criteria and reduction of vehicle miles traveled (VMT).

In response to questions from committee members, Mr. Rhodes and Ms. Williams explained the 4J School District and point2point Solutions Safe Routes to School programs and why the flexibility of STP-U funds were essential to maintaining and expanding efforts to promote walking, biking, carpooling and using transit.

Mr. Winter observed that there were no good measures yet for the reduction of GHG. Mr. Thompson replied that GHG metrics were being developed at the State level, but agreed that there were no tools currently available to measure GHG emissions reductions. He said the new application process was a first effort at allowing jurisdictions to address the issue in their projects.

Ms. Strand commented that she had attended several meetings at which the STP-U applications were discussed and it was clear that the CAC opinions were important to those making recommendations and decisions.

Committee members discussed the other projects and TPC funding recommendations.

Mr. Jacobson asked for clarification of the model used to project reductions in traffic volume and VMT and an increase in transit volume in the 30<sup>th</sup> Avenue project application. Mr. Thompson said that Lane County staff would need to provide that technical information but said that the reduction was in part due to the expectation that transit was expected to have a larger mode share

In response to a question from Ms. Strand, Ms. Williams said that citizens could influence transportation project proposals through the public participation processes association with the Regional Transportation Plan, the local and regional Transportation System Plans and the Long-Range Transit Plan.

Mr. Lockfeld felt the 30<sup>th</sup> Avenue project should include a bike lane.

Mr. Carroll was pleased that the projects did not include adding motor vehicle lane miles or motor vehicle traffic enhancements.

Mr. Winter wanted to see more flexible funding available to pedestrian, bicycle and transit projects.

Mr. Jacobson asked for a report on the multiple sources of funding available for transportation projects.

In response to a question from Ms. Strand, Mr. Thompson said that more details about projects could be obtained from the local jurisdictions.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen, seconded by Mr. Gillespie, moved to support the FFY 2011-13 STP-U funding proposal as presented for public comment. The motion passed unanimously.

The committee took a short break.

## **Overview of Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Beltline Facility Plan**

Ms. Crawford presented an overview of the Beltline Facility Plan and related public outreach activities, details of which were included in the agenda packet. She described the ten concepts that had been developed, ranging from no build and lower cost/lower footprint to high cost/large footprint, and responded to questions from the committee. She said the current phase of the project developed evaluation criteria and an array of concepts and would narrow the list of concepts to between three and five that would proceed to the environmental process.

## **Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Interim Review**

Ms. Riner said the MPC determined that the UPWP was not a high priority activity in the CAC's work program, but she was providing a copy of the interim review, which included a progress report and recommendations for an addendum to the adopted UPWP. She said the public comment period on the proposed addendum was still open.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen urged committee members to read the UPWP as it was a useful source of information.

## **Reports from CAC Representatives on Outside Committees**

Ms. Strand reported on her participation on the Beltline Facility Plan Stakeholder Advisory Committee. She was pleased with the accountability and responsiveness of ODOT staff.

Ms. Mulder said that it would be helpful to have maps presented in color, rather than black and white.

Mr. Gillespie reported on the high-speed rail conference on March 9. He said it was a very informative event, but unfortunately Oregon was behind Washington in implementation because of a lack of funds to conduct the necessary studies and planning.

Mr. Winter clarified that the subject was really creating a *higher* speed rail connection between Eugene and Vancouver, B.C. instead of the high-speed rail system California was pursuing. Mr. Gillespie added that higher speed rail traveled on existing shared lines, while high-speed required a dedicated line.

## **Wrap-Up**

Ms. Strand commented on the public comments at the MPC meeting from a representative of Friends of Eugene. She found the comments aggressive and adversarial and hoped the CAC could reach out to Friends of Eugene and invite them to attend a future CAC meeting.

Ms. Wiederhold distributed an updated CAC member list and announced that future meetings would be held in the Singer Room.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)