

# 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

May 20, 2009  
5:30 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Dave Jacobson, chair; Diana Alldredge, Edward Winter, Bill Morganti, Alexandre Lockfeld, Richard Beers, Gary Gillespie, Eleanor Mulder, Sarah Strand, Philip Farrington, members; Sonny Chickering, MPC liaison; Kathi Wiederhold, Paul Thompson, Stacy Clauson, Byron Vanderpool, Lane Council of Governments; Mary Archer, Lane Transit District.

**ABSENT:** Wendy Butler-Boyesen-Boyesen, vice chair; John Anderson, member.

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

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

## **Comments from the Audience**

There were no comments from the audience.

## **Approve April 15, 2009, Minutes**

Mr. Lockfeld, seconded by Mr. Winter, moved to approve the April 15, 2009, minutes as submitted. There were no objections.

## **Member Spotlight**

Mr. Winter said he graduated from the University of Minnesota and one of his classmates was Bobby Zimmerman, who later became Bob Dylan. He worked for the Public Health Service in Washington D.C., was a VISTA volunteer in Indianapolis and attended graduate school at Columbia University before deciding that he did not want to become an urban planner. He became a financial manager and moved to Eugene about 22 years ago. In addition to financial management, he also has a small farm where he raises goats and sheep. He uses alternative transportation modes whenever possible.

Mr. Thompson said he was born in North Carolina, lived in Southern California and moved with his family to Oregon 43 years ago. Following high school he traveled extensively and eventually earned a degree in economics. He worked in the private sector for a few years before being hired by Lane Council of

Governments (LCOG) 21 years ago. He has three daughters—a 20-year old, a 17-year old and a 16-day old. He enjoys bicycling, reading, gardening and cooking and is an ordained Buddhist monk.

## **Title VI Plan**

Ms. Clauson said the purpose of the Title VI Plan was to ensure meaningful participation by a broad sector of the population. She reviewed public notice and outreach efforts for the plan and said it was presented to the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) at its last meeting; the MPC was scheduled to approve the plan at its June meeting. She hoped the CAC would feel comfortable making a recommendation that could be provided to the MPC when it made its decision. She reviewed the comments and feedback staff had received from the public and MPC members and referred to her memorandum of May 12, 2009, identifying several areas of focus for the CAC's discussion.

Mr. Beers questioned whether a Title VI plan was needed. Ms. Clauson replied that as a recipient of federal funds, the Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) was required to have a written plan that assured it was complying with the provisions of Title VI. Mr. Vanderpool added that lack of a Title VI plan was noted as a deficiency in the MPO's last review by the Federal Highways Administration.

In response to a question from Mr. Jacobson, Ms. Clauson said adopting the State's Title VI plan was an option, but because the State dealt with a much broader range of projects and issues than the MPO, staff determined it was more appropriate for the MPO to have a plan that responded to the specific activities with which it was involved.

Mr. Beers expressed concern that the plan was addressing a problem that did not exist.

Ms. Alldredge commented that the Human Services Commission was the anti-poverty community action program and its members and staff heard often about the difficulties people who did not own a car had in traveling from one place to another for essential activities like jobs, grocery shopping and doctor appointments. She said the need for a good public transportation system was critical. She suggested that a value statement about the importance of a strong Title VI presence could be added to the policy statements and assurances.

Ms. Clauson said pages 33 and 34 discussed environmental justice as a factor in regional transportation planning and programming, including transit activities.

Ms. Archer noted that Lane Transit District (LTD) also had a Title VI mandate to follow in its planning process and asked if LCOG would need to review it for compliance. Ms. Clauson said the MPO would be submitting an annual report on Title VI activities and would ask partner agencies like LTD to provide a self-assurance statement that Title VI provisions were incorporated in their processes.

Ms. Mulder observed that historically low-income neighborhoods had been disproportionately impacted by transportation projects and that was likely part of the reason for the Title VI requirements.

Regarding language in the plan related to the fair distribution of the burdens and benefits of transportation investment, Mr. Winter said he was not certain transportation dollars were ever fairly distributed or used to specifically address the transportation needs of low-income people. He noted the limitations of bus schedules.

Mr. Farrington noted that the plan often referenced analyzing a program and asked whether there was the capacity to bring that analysis to a particular project, not just a modality. He used the traffic roundabout in Springfield as an example of a project that had an adverse impact on the elderly and those with impaired vision. He hoped that those types of impacts would be addressed by the plan, the CAC and the MPO.

Mr. Vanderpool said the MPO did not have the resources to check every project, but projects that used federal funds were required to undergo a National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) review process, part of which was a Title VI analysis. He said analyses of both long- and short-term transportation plans included efforts to determine if there were geographic concentrations of protected populations and assure that the plans did not disproportionately impact any particular group.

Mr. Farrington questioned how the MPO could assure it was complying with Title VI requirements if it was unable to conduct reviews at the project level. Mr. Vanderpool said the obligation to comply with Title VI was applicable to any agency that received federal funds. Mr. Thompson added that it was the responsibility of implementing agencies to certify their Title VI compliance as the MPO did not have the resources to verify compliance.

Ms. Strand asserted that Title VI was very important. She felt there was a general prejudice in planning towards vehicles as the preferred transportation mode and that was most evident in the impacts on populations like low-income, the visually impaired, youth, substance abusers and the homeless. She found the Title VI plan helped to focus attention on whether projects were fair. She hoped those principles could be applied to improvements to the highway through Springfield, which was very hazardous for pedestrians.

Mr. Gillespie agreed with comments by Ms. Strand and Mr. Winter. He liked the concept of a subcommittee of the CAC to review and comment on the plan, but was concerned that the CAC membership did not reflect all Title VI protected populations. He said whatever suggestions the subcommittee developed could be presented to representatives of those populations for feedback.

Ms. Wiederhold said that perhaps the community focus group composed of people from under-represented populations, which the CAC is going to host, could continue to be involved as a sounding board for the MPO.

Mr. Morganti felt that Title VI was a bureaucratic title for the plan and people would not relate to it.

Ms. Alldredge asked if there was a mechanism or measure to determine where wealth was concentrated in the community and how that correlated to public transportation systems and access. Ms. Clauson referred to the maps in Appendix D, which identified population concentrations and the location of transportation projects.

Mr. Chickering pointed out that the maps only identified projects in current plans; they did not reflect impacts from previous plans or future plans. He said in any given plan improvement projects might be concentrated in a particular part of the metro area, but that did not mean that other areas had been or would be ignored. Projects were located where the greatest need was and once that need was addressed the next iteration of the plan would focus on another area. He urged that an analysis of equal treatment of areas and populations within the metro area take that into consideration.

Mr. Lockfield felt that the plan put forward noble goals that the MPO might not be able to meet. He said transportation decisions based on the needs of all people, particularly those covered by Title VI, might not

be possible given that a majority of transportation funding was spent on highways and Title VI populations were the least likely to be making single passenger automobile trips.

Mr. Winter was not certain the MPO could state that it actively ensured nondiscrimination based on the CAC's discussion and the long-term dominance of personal vehicles as a mode of transportation.

Mr. Jacobson thought the plan represented an effort to move in that direction. He recommended that staff contact local churches to access populations that were typically not reached by current efforts.

Ms. Alldredge said the Interfaith Alliance would be a good resource.

Mr. Thompson commented that public transportation resources in the community, which had received national recognition, could be better documented.

Mr. Gillespie agreed that the transit system was accessible and sensitive to the needs of special populations, but problems arose with frequency and hours of service.

Ms. Wiederhold summarized the CAC's discussion:

- The CAC would recommend to the MPC adoption of the Title VI Plan
- The CAC supported the recommendations in the plan for implementation and recommended that a value statement be added emphasizing the plan's importance
- The CAC wanted to be involved in furthering Title VI goals in the community

Mr. Lockfeld felt the statement of goals on page 9 was close to a values statement and additional language was not required.

Ms. Wiederhold suggested she could electronically transmit the recommendations to committee members, who could then respond back to her and those responses would also be provided to the MPC. She asked committee members to respond to her rather than to each other to avoid violating open meetings requirements. The committee decided to recommend adoption of the plan and members could submit individual comments as part of the public comment process if they chose to do so. Ms. Wiederhold said she would send them an email reminder about commenting.

Mr. Morganti, seconded by Ms. Mulder, moved to recommend to the Metropolitan Policy Committee adoption of the Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization Title VI Plan.

Mr. Lockfeld offered a friendly amendment to include the individual comments of Citizen Advisory Committee members in addition to the general recommendation to approve the Title VI Plan. Mr. Morganti accepted the friendly amendment.

The amended motion passed, 9:1; Mr. Beers voting no.

Ms. Wiederhold noted that CAC members could also submit their comments during the public comment period.

Mr. Jacobson asked anyone interested in being in the member spotlight for the next meeting to email Ms. Wiederhold.

The committee took a short break.

### **Citizen Advisory Committee Work Program and MPO Planning Calendar**

Mr. Jacobson stated that he had explained to the MPC at its last meeting the number of MPO work products that the CAC reviewed and that the reviews were accomplished during two-hour monthly meetings. He also posed the question raised by the CAC at its last meeting: “What do you really want us to do?” He said he had not received any responses to date.

Mr. Vanderpool noted that the agenda packet included three calendars: Regional Transportation Work Plan: Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area, Planning Calendar: RTP Completion, and 12-Month Planning Calendar. He reviewed the three calendars and said the intent was to clarify for the MPC and CAC the schedule of planning activities and deadlines for various MPO products. He said the planning processes were managed by different agencies, but had to be coordinated because of the interrelationships among population, employment and the transportation infrastructure. He asked for feedback on the format and content of the calendars.

Mr. Lockfield suggested including a key to symbols on each calendar.

Mr. Jacobson asked if the CAC would have a document for review two to three months before it needed to forward a recommendation to the MPC. Mr. Vanderpool said that was the goal and it could be met for some documents; the challenge arose when staff was dependent on an outside source of information before it could proceed, which did not change the deadline for completion of a document but did shorten the time available for the CAC’s review.

Mr. Vanderpool described the planning documents included in the calendars and their linkages to other regional planning documents. He said there were post-adoption plan amendments (PAPAs) that addressed the requirements of House Bill 3337, population forecasts and updated project lists.

Mr. Gillespie commended the calendar concept, with the addition of a key, because it demonstrated the interconnectivity of planning activities and promoted accountability.

In response to a question from Mr. Jacobson, Mr. Vanderpool said staff was working with a consultant to develop a mechanism for tracking and adjusting calendar activities in the event of delays or early completions and explaining the impact of those adjustments.

Mr. Farrington appreciated the calendars and liked the format and content, which would allow the CAC to plan for upcoming activities. He asked if it would be helpful for the CAC to have a briefing on the draft State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and priorities. Mr. Vanderpool replied that it might be helpful when more was known about how the State wished to proceed.

Committee members and staff discussed the scheduling of various planning documents for review and comment by the CAC and the public outreach processes associated with those documents. Committee members emphasized the importance of providing the CAC with ample time to review documents and materials so they could make informed recommendations to the MPC.

In summarizing the CAC's discussion, Mr. Vanderpool said he heard agreement on the format of the calendar with the addition of a key and that the level of detail was appropriate.

### **Staff Updates**

Ms. Wiederhold reported that the Commuter Solutions staff had provided the following feedback on the draft concept for the central clearinghouse website:

- The name Keep Us Involved would be confusing to the public
- The symbol implied that the clearinghouse related only to cars and roads

The CAC did not suggest any changes in the draft concept page for the website.

Ms. Strand invited any interested committee member to attend a meeting of the Beltline project stakeholders' group on June 3.

Ms. Wiederhold announced that the Oregon Planning Institute, produced by LCOG, was a statewide planning conference. It would be held September 16-18 and LCOG would likely offer the CAC members opportunities to attend, as was done last year.

### **Wrap-Up**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)