MINUTES

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

May 20, 2010
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Dave Jacobson, chair; Sarah Strand, vice-chair; Diana Alldredge, Wendy Butler-Boyesen, Phillip Carroll, Philip Farrington, Alexandre Lockfeld, Bill Morganti, Eleanor Mulder, Edward Winter, Jennifer Smith, members; Sonny Chickering, MPC liaison; Stacy Clauson, Andrea Riner, and Kathi Wiederhold, Lane Council of Governments; Connie Bloom Williams, Lane Transit District; David Reesor, City of Springfield; Wade Hicks, City Minutes Recorder.

ABSENT: Paul Adkins, Richard Beers, Gary Gillespie, Rosalia Marquez.

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review

Mr. Jacobson called the meeting to order at 5:33 p.m. and asked those present to introduce themselves.

Mr. Jacobson noted no changes to the meeting agenda.

Mr. Jacobson noted a postcard he had received from Ms. Smith during her recent travels.

Mr. Jacobson expressed he had traveled to the meeting via an LTD bus and hoped that other Committee members might chose to do the same in the future.

Mr. Jacobson noted that representatives from LTD's point2point Commuter Solutions program planned to set up an information booth at the Eugene Celebration event on August 28 and 29 and that the MPO CAC members had been invited by Connie Bloom-Williams to staff the booth.

Ms. Wiederhold added that Ms. Bloom-Williams' invitation was a good opportunity for the MPO CAC to increase its outreach efforts in the community.

Ms. Wiederhold, responding to a question from Ms. Butler-Boyesen, stated that Committee members who wished to help staff the point2point booth would not need to pay admission to the Eugene Celebration event.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen stated she would be willing to work a shift at the point2point booth at the Eugene Celebration.

Ms. Wiederhold stated that Committee members who wanted to staff the booth at the Eugene Celebration would be partnered with an LCOG staff member or a member of the point2point program to help answer questions.

Ms. Wiederhold stated she would contact any Committee members interested in staffing the Eugene Celebration booth with additional information regarding the event. She further suggested she might organize a brainstorming session with Committee members to come up with specific talking points regarding the point2point program and other local transportation issues.

Mr. Jacobson noted that the CAC would be on recess in August and the MPO CAC meeting for that month had been cancelled.

The Committee members and staff discussed their respective availabilities for the point2point Commuter Solutions booth at the Eugene Celebration event.

2. Comments from the Audience

No public comments were offered.

3. Approve April 15, 2010 Minutes

Mr. Morganti offered corrections to the minutes of the Committee's April 15, 2010 meeting and noted that he usually rode only two LTD buses to travel to River Bend Hospital.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen referred to Mr. Morganti's comment and noted that the new Gateway EmX route would travel from the LTD Eugene Station and travel via the Springfield Station all the way to River Bend Hospital.

The Committee members briefly discussed various details of the new Gateway EmX route.

Mr. Jacobson, noting no objections from staff or Committee members, deemed the minutes approved as corrected.

Mr. Jacobson commended the other Committee members for their comments from the previous meeting and stated that the Committee discussions as reflected in the minutes had been highly productive.

4. Member Spotlight

Ms. Mulder noted that she had emailed her member spotlight information to Mr. Jacobson.

Ms. Mulder, responding to a suggestion from Mr. Jacobson, offered to postpone the presentation of her member spotlight information until the next MPO CAC meeting.

Mr. Jacobson suggested that any CAC members who had not yet submitted their member spotlight information to submit that information in writing so that it might be directly incorporated in the minutes.

Mr. Winter noted his member spotlight information for the benefit of the Committee. He noted that he grew up in Minnesota and had attended the University of Minnesota where he majored in both mathematics and sociology. He further noted that during his time at the University of Minnesota he had begun carpooling extensively. He stated that upon graduating from the University of Minnesota he had relocated to Washington, D.C. where he had assumed a position as a statistician for the public health service. He noted that during his time in Washington, D.C. he had usually walked or biked to work. He noted that he had then joined Vista as a volunteer for one year in Indianapolis. After Indianapolis, Mr. Winter relocated to New York City in 1970 where he had attended graduate school at Columbia University to study city planning. He then relocated to Kodiak Island, Alaska where he worked in the commercial fishing industry. He then moved back to Minnesota where he lived and worked in various food co-ops for approximately ten years. He noted that he had moved to Oregon in 1986 when he purchased a farm west of Eugene with his wife. Mr. Winter stated that he currently worked with an environmental non-profit organization called the Northwest Coalition for Alternatives to Pesticides and that he also managed the building for the growers market in downtown Eugene. Mr. Winter further stated that he had recently published an article in History magazine regarding his experiences of growing up and working in his father's restaurant in Minnesota.

5. Annual Review of Public Participation Plan (PPP)

Mr. Jacobson asked if there had been any subcommittee activity regarding the PPP since the Committee's last meeting. Ms. Wiederhold noted that there had been no such activity.

Ms. Wiederhold noted that Ms. Riner had suggested that the Committee take a more comprehensive viewpoint with respect to the ongoing PPP annual review process. She noted from the previous Committee meeting that the members and staff had generally discussed whether the MPO CAC was "headed in the right direction" with the goals of the PPP.

Ms. Wiederhold noted that the current discussion would address the objectives of the PPP and would help dictate the best action strategies for the MPO public involvement.

Ms. Wiederhold opened the objectives discussion to the Committee members using the key question, "Are we using the right tools and strategies?" She further noted additional sub-questions as listed in the staff memorandum for the purposes of the Committee discussion on objectives:

- Do they help us meet our goals?
- Are we getting the word out?
- Are they appropriate for community members affected by a decision?
- Are they cost effective?
- Do they reach out to a broad cross-section of the community?
- Are we staying current?
- Are there other tools that we should use?

Ms. Wiederhold noted that Ms. Clauson would ask for the MPO CAC's recommendation to the MPC regarding the Title VI Plan as part of the next agenda item.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen noted that the MPO had not used social networking tools or similar media strategies. She suggested that the MPO research how LTD had used social networking tools such as facebook and twitter to see if any of their methods might be used by the MPO. She further maintained that the MPO clearinghouse website in its current form had not been particularly productive.

Ms. Bloom-Williams responded to Ms. Butler-Boyesen's comments and noted that LTD had been fairly successful in using facebook to communicate with LTD riders regarding the point2point Commuter Solutions program. She also noted that the LTD facebook presence for business commuters had been extremely helpful in communicating with LTD riders.

Ms. Wiederhold responded to Ms. Butler-Boyesen's comments regarding the MPO clearinghouse website and briefly explained that there had been delays in its implementation. She noted that various staffing issues and the completion of the MTIP map had necessitated the delays on the clearinghouse.

Ms. Wiederhold noted that Ms. Riner would provide additional information regarding the clearinghouse later in the meeting.

Mr. Farrington asked if any information was available regarding the number of hits on the point2point Commuter Solutions KeepUsMoving.info website. Ms. Bloom-Williams noted that the site had received over one million hits.

Ms. Bloom-Williams, responding to a question from Mr. Farrington, noted that the point2point program had used various email distribution strategies with various agencies in order to distribute a wealth of information regarding the program. She noted that the program's email strategies had been very effective in notifying area employers of the benefits of the point2point program. She further noted that various face-to-face neighborhood outreach strategies used in the program had also been helpful.

Mr. Farrington suggested that certain public outreach strategies might be implemented more broadly with respect to the MPO and the PPP.

Ms. Bloom commented that it was very important to consider how to communicate the benefits of point2point and other transportation programs to the public as they performed public outreach activities.

Ms. Riner recognized that the point2point Commuter Solutions program had a much different audience than that of the MPO CAC.

Ms. Bloom-Williams pointed out that it would be important for the MPO to coordinate elements of its outreach elements with those of point2point solutions and other local transportation programs.

Mr. Farrington commented that there were other local transportation strategies that were not necessarily tracked by the MPO or the MPC.

Mr. Jacobson recognized that there were large numbers of students and younger individuals who used public transportation in the area and suggested that the MPO might communicate with groups from the University of Oregon as part of its public outreach efforts. He further noted that the MPO might adopt strategies for tracking the amount of transportation funding in the area as a way of determining the effectiveness of the PPP and other plans related to transportation issues.

Mr. Carroll recognized that the best outcome from effective public outreach strategies was a high level of informed and deliberative public input on local transportation issues. Mr. Carroll asked for greater clarification regarding the capacity of the MPO CAC for receiving and addressing public input. He suggested that CAC work elements might be enhanced in order for the group to respond to the needs of the public more efficiently.

Ms. Riner stated that not many community members had taken advantage of the Committee's public comment opportunities and agreed with Mr. Carroll that it would be a good idea to understand why the CAC was not perceived to be a public forum for community input.

Mr. Jacobson referred to Mr. Carroll's previous comments and noted that certain elements of the MPO CAC's public outreach and advisory work program functions had actually been set in the Committee's bylaws.

Mr. Morganti referred to comments he had made in previous Committee meetings regarding the use of roundabouts at different roadway intersections in the community. Mr. Jacobson responded that there were serious logistical problems regarding the use of roundabouts in the areas that Mr. Morganti had suggested, which had been brought to the CAC's attention by visiting members of the public providing input.

Ms. Wiederhold stated that the Committee was scheduled to visit the roundabout on Martin Luther King in Springfield during their upcoming field trip in June.

Mr. Winter felt it was difficult to get people involved in the planning issues for transportation and further believed that the MPO needed better evaluation tools for its various public outreach and communication strategies.

Mr. Farrington suggested that a speakers bureau comprised of Committee members and staff might serve as an effective means of communication regarding a variety of transportation issues. Mr. Farrington noted that the MPO's website did not contain enough comprehensive or detailed transportation information that might be used by casual observers.

Ms. Wiederhold stated that the public involvement tools listed in the evaluation table were required as part of the outreach for the key products of the MPO.

Mr. Lockfeld referred to Mr. Morganti's earlier comments and noted that the MPO CAC was essentially a public involvement tool for the MPC.

Mr. Lockfeld stated that the CAC did not normally receive any feedback from the MPC regarding the recommendations they had made to that group. He further noted that the CAC did not normally receive any information regarding any MPC decisions that had been made as a result of those recommendations.

Ms. Riner, responding to Mr. Lockfeld's comments, noted that the CAC was not necessarily expected to serve as an investigative or deliberative component of the MPC.

Ms. Smith shared Mr. Farrington's concerns that the CAC did not receive a great deal of public comment from community members and believed that the CAC often displayed a lack of large guiding principles that might impassion members of the community.

Mr. Jacobson commented on the importance of feedback responses to the CAC's public engagement efforts.

Ms. Strand felt the CAC needed more information on which issues would engender the greatest level of public participation and support. She suggested that the CAC might increase its solicitation of public feedback as it provided information and open house opportunities to the community.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen referenced previous public comments that had been made before the CAC and noted that one community member had advocated for increased earthquake preservation efforts for local buildings.

Ms. Alldredge believed that the CAC had not been discussing the tangible elements of transportation issues that related to the objectives of the PPP.

Ms. Mulder believed that the CAC had not reached out to a broad enough cross-section of the community with its public engagement activities. She further maintained that there was a distinct lack of diversity among the CAC members themselves and that more representation from community members of different educational and economic backgrounds was necessary.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen believed that the MPO's public comment tools were useful but further suggested that more work could be done to attract further public input.

Mr. Chickering recognized that it was unusual and amazing to be able to find fifteen people to serve on an advisory body such as the MPO CAC. He further stated that he looked to the MPO CAC to provide recommendations on actions that the MPC had considered. He further noted that the MPO CAC also served as a way to represent the public to the MPC and that the CAC could expand or contract its efforts in order make that representation more productive.

Mr. Chickering, responding to a question from Mr. Winter, noted that the MPC did not necessarily receive more public comments than the CAC during its meetings.

Ms. Wiederhold called for an informal straw vote focused on the broad question: Are we using the right tools and strategies? A good portion of the committee felt like the MPO is using the right tools and strategies. However, more members felt like the MPO needed to broaden and strengthen its public involvement.

Mr. Jacobson called for a break at 6:34 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 6:42. p.m.

6. Annual Review of the Title VI Plan

Ms. Clauson briefly noted that the Title VI Plan had been adopted by the Central Lane MPO in April of 2009 after a review by the CAC and represented an effort to better guide the MPC's discussions regarding the transportation planning issues that affected certain under-represented portions of the community.

Ms. Clauson noted that staff had taken certain steps since the adoption of the Title VI Plan. She noted that staff would submit information regarding those activities to ODOT to incorporate into their annual report regarding the progress of the Title VI Plan.

Ms. Clauson wished to discuss with the CAC additional tools that might be used by the Committee and the MPC for reaching out to Title VI communities.

Ms. Clauson stated that the CAC's community focus group and CAC recruitment efforts had been considered to be successful Title VI strategies.

The Committee members and staff briefly discussed the various public outreach strategies that had recently been used to reach out to Title VI communities.

Ms. Wiederhold commented that the CAC's recent notice in Adelante Latino, a monthly Spanish language newspaper, had been very well received. She further noted that she had received an email from the Latina publication asking if the CAC planned to post additional notices.

Mr. Jacobson suggested that the CAC might distribute literature to local churches as a means of reaching out to under-represented portions of the community. Ms. Butler-Boyesen added that such a strategy might be an excellent way of communicating with the ancillary social service groups who worked with those churches.

Ms. Mulder suggested that the CAC might also reach out to community members who visited the warming centers that were often organized at churches during the colder months of the year.

Ms. Clauson referenced the public involvement tools from the summary table of public involvement (Table 1 in the PPP)that had been distributed and asked which of those items might be used to reach out to broader sections of the community.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen stated it would be important to get more information into the Title VI communities regarding STIP-U funding and the decision items that related to the funding.

Mr. Lockfeld commented that broad transportation discussions did not attract average members of the community and only attracted participation from people who were heavily invested in local transportation planning issues.

Ms. Strand suggested that the CAC might institute a bi-annual public outreach event in order to reach out to the community and to remind them of the goals and strategies of the CAC and the MPC.

Mr. Lockfeld noted that the MPO products listed in the summary table of public involvement were so nebulous that it was unlikely they would ever encourage a strong level of public interest. He further noted that the MPC and the CAC might attempt to frame their discussion in terms of more polarizing transportation issues in order to generate more public involvement.

Mr. Lockfeld suggested that the CAC might hold one or two public forum events each year that were devoted to broader transportation discussions such as bicycle and pedestrian paths rather than more obtuse matters such as STIP-U funding mechanisms. Ms. Alldredge agreed with Mr. Lockfeld's suggestion

Mr. Jacobson commented that the CAC needed to maintain a presence in local communities

Mr. Lockfeld commented that Adams Sustainable Table was holding a dinner event for local bicyclists on May 21 and suggested that the CAC might distribute an information flyer at such events.

Ms. Wiederhold commented that the CAC had developed the Citizen's Guide, a colorful friendly booklet, to distribute as part of its public outreach efforts.

Ms. Riner expressed that the public's role with respect to the CAC was to inform the discussions and the recommendations that the Committee presented to the MPC. She noted that simply increasing the number of community members who offered public input would not necessarily raise the level of the CAC's discussions.

Ms. Strand commented on ODOT projects along Main Street in Springfield and noted that it was important for the CAC to reach out to minority populations in that area.

Ms. Smith commented that the CAC had normally only reacted to the MPC's transportation agenda and suggested that the CAC as representatives of the community actually needed to influence that agenda in a more proactive manner.

The CAC members and staff generally discussed a variety of transportation issues that affected Title VI communities with particular emphasis on the role of the CAC in reaching out to those communities.

Ms. Riner stated that an annual or semi-annual public forum event such as had been suggested by Mr. Lockfeld might serve as an effective component of the PPP and might also help CAC discussions more accurately reflect the values and needs of the community at large.

Mr. Jacobson stated that the CAC might serve as the focal point for an annual community forum event regarding local transportation issues.

Ms. Mulder suggested that the Eugene Celebration might be a good place to generate interest in the CAC's public engagement efforts.

The Committee members and staff briefly discussed how the MPO CAC might organize an annual public forum or open house session as part of the Eugene Celebration or similar high-profile community event. Ms. Riner noted that staff might prepare a speakers bureau information kit that the CAC members could use for public forums.

Mr. Winter suggested that most community members would not attend a public forum devoted to general transportation topics and that the CAC should focus on one or two high-profile topics for such forums.

Mr. Lockfeld asked how many of the CAC members served on their respective neighborhood associations.

Mr. Lockfeld noted that there were a number of urban gardening bike tours during the summer and that the CAC might try to coordinate its public outreach efforts with those tours.

Mr. Jacobson asked what the CAC could do in the immediate future with respect to the Title VI Plan. Ms. Clauson responded that the CAC might improve on its efforts to expand its public outreach strategies to broader cross-sections of the community. She further suggested that the CAC might focus on more "hot button issues" such as greenhouse gas emissions in order to generate greater levels of community interest and involvement.

Mr. Jacobson responded to Ms. Clauson's comment and noted that the CAC needed "a hook to get them into the tent."

Ms. Riner suggested that the CAC members review the documentation from recent community focus group hosted by the CAC for indications on how the CAC might create a coherent identity and a clear message.

7. MTIP Public Outreach Strategy

Ms. Wiederhold reviewed the public outreach strategy regarding the MTIP as described in her May 13 memorandum to the Committee members and asked if there were any additional elements that needed to be included.

Mr. Farrington expressed support for the MTIP public outreach strategy but further suggested that it needed to be generated and distributed much earlier so that the CAC and other associated groups would have sufficient opportunity to review elements of the MTIP itself.

Ms. Wiederhold responded to Mr. Farrington's comment and noted that the MTIP was not one of the regular items on the CAC's work plan but that the MPC was still required to check in with the CAC regarding the public outreach strategy for the MTIP.

Mr. Farrington expressed doubt that the CAC would be able to adequately inform the public regarding the MTIP public outreach strategy within the current time frame.

Ms. Riner briefly described the MPC's public involvement timeline regarding the MTIP.

Ms. Wiederhold noted that staff had already sent notices regarding the MTIP to the public using the MPC's email distribution lists.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen questioned if sufficient time had been provided for the MTIP public outreach strategy.

Ms. Riner commented on the fact that the public involvement emphasis had been on prioritizing STP-U projects in the MTIP and expressed that it had been challenging to ensure adequate time for input at every stage of the MTIP process.

The Committee members and staff briefly discussed how the projects involved in the MTIP were reviewed and sometimes changed by the MPC member agencies.

Ms. Riner commented that it was important for staff and the CAC to clarify to the public that the projects involved in the MTIP were still subject to review and discussion.

Ms. Wiederhold, responding to a question from Mr. Jacobson, commented that local media outlets generally did not cover or publicize the MPC discussions of the Central Lane MPO's work product items.

Mr. Jacobson suggested that the CAC collectively draft a statement containing the goals and meeting information for the Committee to submit to the op-ed page of the Register-Guard newspaper. Ms. Wiederhold recommended the CAC check in with the MPC before drafting any such statement. Ms. Clauson further stated that the CAC members were welcome to draft statements individually.

Mr. Jacobson agreed that any Committee members who wished to speak out individually to local news outlets regarding high-profile transportation issues were welcome and encouraged to do so.

Ms. Wiederhold requested a motion regarding whether any additional outreach strategies were needed for the MTIP.

Mr. Morganti, seconded by Ms. Butler-Boyesen, moved that the Citizens Advisory Committee of the Central Lane MPO recommend to the Metropolitan Policy Committee that it open the outreach for the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program and conduct said outreach using the core public outreach strategy specified in the Public Participation Plan.

Ms. Riner, responding to a question from Mr. Jacobson, noted that an amendment to the MTIP had been incorporated at a recent MPC meeting that would provide funding for the Springfield Franklin Boulevard environmental assessment project.

Mr. Jacobson called for a vote on Mr. Morganti's previously stated motion. The motion passes unanimously, 9:0 (Mr. Lockfeld voting in abstention).

8. Update on Local and Regional Transportation System Plans

Ms. Riner commented that the MPO and several other local agencies were on the "precipice of a transportation planning tsunami" and offered a brief summary of the various public involvement activities that were being planned concurrently. Ms. Riner hoped that the CAC might use the information to help better coordinate the public involvement efforts of the Cities of Eugene, Springfield, Coburg, the Lane Transit District and the MPC's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Ms. Riner stated that the enormous amount of upcoming transportation planning activities would demand that the CAC's central clearinghouse website tool be fully operational.

Ms. Riner planned to present additional information regarding the various public outreach tools available to the CAC during the MPC's next meeting.

Mr. Jacobson referred to the goals and objectives for the RTP as included in Ms. Riner's memorandum to the CAC and reported that MPC Chair Alan Zelenka had planned to form a subcommittee to study the goals of the RTP. Mr. Jacobson asked any CAC members with backgrounds in municipal or transportation planning to contact him with their input regarding any potential modifications to the goals of the RTP.

Ms. Riner noted she had recently conferred with staff from LTD and reported on the various public engagement opportunities that LTD had offered with respect to the West Eugene EmX Extension (WEEE) project. She further noted that LCOG staff are participating in the environmental review and the draft environmental impact statement that was being generated by LTD as part of the WEEE project.

Ms. Riner stated that a discussion regarding LTD's overall transportation planning efforts and the WEEE project would likely be placed on an upcoming CAC meeting agenda.

Mr. Wiederhold stated that the date for the CAC's field trip had been set for June 17 and that many of the specific locations and activities for the field trip were yet to be determined. She further noted that anyone with mobility or transportation problems in relation to the field trip should contact her.

Mr. Morganti stated that he would need transportation assistance to and from the field trip staging area at the LTD Eugene Station.

Ms. Bloom Williams, responding to a question from Mr. Farrington, stated that LTD would hold a public hearing regarding the WEEE project and additional EmX expansion plans on June 9 and that the WEEE Steering Committee would hold their regular meeting on June 1, 2010 at LTD's Next Stop Center.

9. Reports from CAC Representatives on Outside Committees

Ms. Alldredge invited the CAC members to volunteer to serve on the advisory committee to the Community Health Center of Lane County and distributed information regarding the advisory committee.

Ms. Alldredge, responding to a question from Mr. Jacobson, noted that the Community Health Center of Lane County served a variety of Title VI populations.

Mr. Winter announced that he managed a building at the intersection of Fourth Avenue and Willamette Street and that he was working with the City of Eugene to install an on-street bike corral near that location. Mr. Jacobson suggested that Mr. Winter provide further information regarding the bike corral during the upcoming field trip or at the next regular CAC meeting.

10. Wrap-Up

Mr. Jacobson adjourned the meeting at 7:34 p.m.

(Recorded by Wade Hicks)

Mr. Jacobson adjourned the meeting at 7:32 p.m.

(*Recorded by Wade Hicks*)