

# 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

April 15, 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, Sarah Strand, Philip Farrington, members; Sonny Chickering, MPC liaison; Andrea Riner, Kathi Wiederhold, Paul Thompson, Stacy Clauson, Lane Council of Governments; David Reesor, City of Springfield; Mary Archer, Lane Transit District.

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

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

## **Comments from the Audience**

There were no comments from the audience.

## **Approve March 18, 2009, Minutes**

Mr. Morganti pointed out that his comments regarding feedback he'd received that the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) portable electronic signs were not beneficial to deaf people should be reflected in the minutes and included in the Wrap-Up section.

Ms. Mulder noted a reference to Mary Archer, Lane Transit District (LTD), in the middle of page 5 should be clarified.

Mr. Jacobson deemed the minutes approved as corrected.

## **Member Spotlight**

Mr. Beers said he was a member of a Lane County pioneer family, both grandfathers having come to the area in the late 1800's. He had been involved with the Cal Young neighborhood association for about ten years and taught forestry classes on a volunteer basis for students in elementary schools. He was involved with several forestry groups and managed a tree farm in Lane County.

Ms. Riner said she was born in Arizona and attended school in Washington, New York and Maryland. She attended college in Madison, Wisconsin and moved to Saratoga Springs, New York to begin a career in landscape architecture. She moved to Oregon in 1991 to attend the University of Oregon and in 1998 went to work for the City of Eugene. She worked for the City of Denver from 2005 to 2007 before returning to Eugene and taking a job with Lane Council of Governments (LCOG). She enjoyed working with the CAC.

Mr. Winter and Mr. Thompson would be featured in the spotlight at the May meeting.

### **Annual Review of the Public Participation Plan (PPP)**

Ms. Wiederhold reviewed the agenda packet materials. She said comments from the committee had been incorporated into the materials. She noted that the CAC had been added as a core public involvement tool on Table 1 – Summary Table of Public Involvement and there was a new line for indicating which of the tools should be used for amendments to the PPP. She asked for suggestions on the appropriate tools to be used for PPP amendments.

Following a discussion by committee members, Ms. Wiederhold summarized consensus on use of tools for PPP amendments:

- Public comment period – varies, depending on magnitude of amendment
- MPC public hearing – varies, depending on magnitude of amendment
- Open house – varies, depending on magnitude of amendment
- Newspaper display ad – varies, depending on magnitude of amendment
- Notice to interested parties – always use
- Web notice – always use
- Interior bus notice – varies, depending on magnitude of amendment
- Citizen Advisory Committee – always use

Continuing, Ms. Wiederhold reviewed changes Table 2 – Evaluating Public Involvement Tools and the Comment Form.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen asked what household income levels would be used on the form. Ms. Clauson said there were many income categories and they could be included in detail or summarized into broad ranges.

Committee members were in agreement with the use of broad ranges and agreed that staff could define those without further input or review from the committee.

Mr. Beers expressed concern about asking for family income information and questioned why it was being requested. Ms. Wiederhold replied that federal regulations required outreach to under-represented groups, including low-income, and the form attempted to document that. Ms. Butler-Boyesen noted that providing income information was voluntary.

In response to a question from Ms. Strand, Ms. Clauson said the ethnicity categories could come from census data. She said they could be adjusted if the census categories changed.

Ms. Wiederhold said that Attachment 4 was new and proposed an amendment to Appendix 2. Public Involvement Tools that would add social networking sites as a tool.

Ms. Archer said that Facebook had been useful to LTD and seemed to be well-used by the public.

Ms. Strand commented that reaching seniors should involve the placement of materials at senior centers, libraries and other venues and not rely on electronic dissemination of information.

Mr. Jacobson felt that the language in Attachment 4 was general and bureaucratic and the intent should be made clearer to the public. Ms. Wiederhold said she would work with the subcommittee to revise the language and provide it to committee members for review.

Ms. Wiederhold reviewed the nine draft recommendations in the agenda item summary which could be forwarded to the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) as a result of the 2009 evaluation of the PPP.

Mr. Anderson, seconded by Mr. Gillespie, moved to approve the 2009 recommendations and forward them to the Metropolitan Policy Committee. The motion passed unanimously.

Commenting about the planned focus group with community members of under-represented interests, Mr. Winter asked what role the CAC would have in the focus groups. Ms. Wiederhold said committee members would host the meetings, listen to comments and ask questions. She said the focus groups would be noticed as public meetings because it was likely that there would be more than a quorum of CAC members present.

### **Citizen Advisory Committee Work Program**

Mr. Jacobson referred to comments by Byron Vanderpool in the March 14 CAC minutes, which addressed questions about the procedural relationship between the MPC and CAC and a request that all substantive issues raised by the MPC be first submitted to the CAC for comment and review. At issue was the CAC's ability to accomplish an even larger workload in the limited time available to it each month.

Mr. Chickering elaborated that MPC member Commissioner Rob Handy was interested in having citizen advisory committees provide policy recommendations, including options for the MPC to consider before making policy decisions. He said LCOG staff had described the effort involved in understanding the complex issues related to transportation planning already required to fulfill the committee's charge as directed by the MPC. He added that staff had also expressed concerns regarding the difficulty the CAC would have responding to requests for policy options and recommendations in addition to its current tasks.

Mr. Jacobson pointed out there had been no formal action by the MPC directing the CAC to take on the additional role of providing policy advice and asked for feedback from committee members on the matter in order to respond to requests.

Ms. Alldredge commented that she took minutes for the Human Services Commission and its Citizen Advisory Committee. In the last three years the advisory committee and provider network had developed budget recommendations, which were not accepted by the elected officials. She said that meant four or five months of work were rejected and she did not want to see the CAC "spin its wheels" because its criteria were different from those of MPC members.

Mr. Winter said the CAC had to prioritize its work as there was too much to do in the time it had available. He stressed the importance of timely receipt of materials so comments could be made to the MPC. He said the CAC did represent the public, but MPC members represented other constituents as well and had to take those interests into consideration when making decisions.

Mr. Beers expressed concern about the process stagnating and costing more money, delaying project implementation and diverting funds from transportation improvements.

Mr. Morganti felt that sometimes staff members became so involved in their jobs they forgot committee members did not have the same frame of reference.

Mr. Lockfeld was in favor of making the CAC aware of major policy decisions the MPC was considering, rather than reviewing things after the fact. He felt the idea of using the CAC to conduct a general review of those major issues and make recommendations was good in principle, even though members lacked the expertise in various field to conduct an in depth study.

Mr. Gillespie stated there were tensions in any group between the elected members and selected members and that was beneficial because each group was advocating for different people. He said it was impossible to be a member of a committee and not bring personal philosophies to bear on the matters being considered. He was willing to look at a different approach for the CAC and wanted to be more than a “rubber stamp” for process.

Mr. Anderson agreed with Ms. Alldredge’s comments. He did not want to spend time pursuing an issue, only to be ignored. He suggested inviting MPC members Rob Handy and Alan Zelenka to attend a CAC meeting and observe its discussions and actions. He preferred to focus on the CAC’s current charges and do them well.

Ms. Strand observed that there was little diversity on the CAC and questioned whether it was appropriate to give a group of self-selected individuals the powerful role of advising on policy. She said staff acted as a filter for information that needed to be brought to the committee’s attention and was doing a good job of advising the CAC about issues that would come before it.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen remarked that the elected members of the MPC had many aspects to their jobs, of which transportation was a part, and were expected to inform themselves about issues before making decisions. She said the CAC was a volunteer group that could assist on certain issues, but should not be required to review all issues before they went to the MPC. She said when the CAC was first established there was a huge volume of material that had to be reviewed, but the committee was not able to make thoughtful and informed comments and recommendations because of the volume of material. It functioned more effectively when it focused its efforts.

Mr. Jacobson said having a calendar projecting activities and deadlines would help smooth out the process and give the CAC time to prepare.

Mr. Chickering said Mr. Handy’s perspective was a new way of doing business and he would continue to pursue advisory committee recommendations on policy and a vision for the future of the region.

Ms. Alldredge asked what criteria the MPC would use to refer issues to the CAC. She suggested forming a subcommittee of MPC and CAC members to review those issues so that the MPC members would be equally invested in committing time to the evaluation process.

Ms. Riner summarized points raised by the committee thus far:

- Establish priorities
- Determine what was possible given time constraints
- The more issues referred to the committee, the less value applied to each. Identify key products to focus on.

Mr. Lockfeld noted the CAC was supposed to represent the views of the general public and the public did not have training in metropolitan transportation planning. He thought having the committee evaluate major transportation policy decisions being contemplated by the MPC was appropriate.

Ms. Mulder said her interest was in transportation and she preferred to look at issues in depth instead of focusing on bureaucratic processes.

Ms. Strand felt involving the CAC in larger policy issues was exciting, but questioned how that could be done within the time constraints. She suggested holding an open house on those policy issues to solicit feedback from the public and begin the conversation.

Mr. Gillespie asked to have an invitation to attend CAC meetings extended to elected officials on the MPC.

Ms. Riner asked committee members to inform her about any MPC issues that they felt had bypassed the CAC in the past that should have been referred to them for comment, and to bring any future instances to her attention as well.

Mr. Jacobson determined that there was not a coalescence of issues on this item and continued it to the next meeting.

The CAC took a short break.

Mr. Farrington arrived at 6:30 p.m.

### **Primer on Title VI Requirements**

Ms. Clauson used a slide presentation to provide an overview of the background and key issues associated with Title VI and Environmental Justice related to Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) projects and public participation. She described the required components of the MPO's Title VI plan and reviewed draft guiding principles. With respect to evaluating current practices, she said the MPO already had actions in place to assure that people had meaningful access to the planning processes. She asked the CAC to consider how those actions could be improved and whether there were any additional strategies that should be included in the plan. She reviewed the next steps in plan development and said the CAC would review the Title VI plan at its May meeting. She noted there was a Title VI training opportunity on May 15 and CAC members were invited to participate. A notice of the training was distributed at the meeting.

Mr. Anderson left the meeting at 7 p.m.

Referring to the earlier agenda item, Ms. Wiederhold confirmed with committee members that the PPP amendment was considered minor and the appropriate public involvement tools were:

- Citizen Advisory Committee
- Web notice
- Notice to interested parties

### **Central Clearinghouse Implementation**

Ms. Wiederhold said the CAC's comments had been conveyed and staff was working on details of the regional land use database. She said the application Regional Lane Information Database was being updated and improved to provide accurate weekly data on street projects. She said staff was also working on marketing strategies for the Keep Us Involved website and the MPO website.

### **Staff Updates**

There were no updates.

### **Wrap-Up**

Mr. Jacobson observed that pages 31-33 of the draft Title VI plan provided good descriptions of the various MPO products that were of concern to the CAC. He said there was no effective CAC orientation packet and asked members to email Ms. Wiederhold and him with ideas about what information would have been helpful when they joined the committee.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen concurred that the Title VI draft plan had excellent descriptions of major MPO work products and would be useful information to put on the MPO website.

Ms. Strand enjoyed the introductory meeting and presentations when she was appointed to the CAC; it was very helpful.

Ms. Riner announced that the MPC approved the two-year Unified Planning Work Program and associated funding at its last meeting. She said Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) amendments were also approved to incorporate \$6.6 million in economic stimulus funds for LTD, bringing the total for the Eugene/Springfield metropolitan area to approximately \$15.8 million.

Mr. Gillespie liked the new member orientation meeting, but said it was hard not to be overwhelmed initially by the amount of information provided.

Mr. Farrington liked plans described during the Title VI presentation to conduct outreach to the Latino community. He hoped input from seniors could also be obtained.

Ms. Archer remarked that the economic stimulus funds LTD received would be used to significantly reduce planned services cuts and expand the operations facility to accommodate the larger articulated buses.

Mr. Winter expressed his appreciation for work on the Title VI plan and Ms. Clauson's presentation. He looked forward to outreach to minority communities.

Ms. Mulder distributed brochures with elected officials contact information.

Ms. Alldredge said when she was asked by people why she served on the CAC she commented that if the region had not been ready with ideas on how to use economic stimulus funds, the money could not be spent.

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

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)