

MINUTES

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

July 15, 2010
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Dave Jacobson, chair; Sarah Strand, chair; Phillip Carroll, Richard Beers, Alexandre Lockfeld, Bill Morganti, Eleanor Mulder, Edward Winter, Paul Adkins, Diana Alldredge, Jennifer Smith, Gary Gillespie, members; Sonny Chickering, MPC liaison; Kathi Wiederhold, Andrea Riner, Susan Payne, Paul Thompson, Byron Vanderpool, Lane Council of Governments; Mary Archer, Lane Transit District; David Reesor, City of Springfield; Rob Inerfeld, City of Eugene; Wade Hicks, City Minutes Recorder.

ABSENT: Wendy Butler-Boyesen, Philip Farrington, Rosalia Marquez.

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review

Mr. Jacobson called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. and asked those present to introduce themselves.

2. Comments From the Audience

Mr. Jacobson recognized there were no community members who wished to offer comments or testimony.

3. Approve May 20, 2010 Minutes

Staff handed out the minutes at the meeting, noting that technical difficulties had caused the delay. The committee decided to defer approval of the minutes until the next meeting. Mr. Jacobson noted that the Committee might not hold a meeting in August and the minutes might not be approved until the September 23rd CAC meeting.

4. Member Spotlight

Ms. Wiederhold stated that no CAC members had submitted member spotlight information.

Mr. Jacobson asked the CAC members who had not yet submitted their member spotlight information to do so within the next two months so that the information could be presented in September.

Mr. Jacobson noted changes to the meeting agenda and noted that Mr. Thompson would present information regarding the draft amendment to the RTP as Item 5.5.

5. Annual Review of the Public Participation Plan (PPP)

Ms. Wiederhold directed the CAC members to the copies of the PPP materials included in their agenda packets and suggested that if the CAC completed their work on the annual review of the PPP during the meeting, staff would forward the CAC's recommendations to the MPC at their next meeting.

Ms. Wiederhold stated that the MPO CAC's subcommittee chaired by Ms. Strand had reviewed information relating to the PPP and had arrived at four conclusions. She directed committee members to the memo in the agenda packet.

The CAC members agreed with the conclusions arrived at by the CAC subcommittee.

Ms. Strand arrived to the meeting at 5:34 p.m.

Mr. Jacobson noted suggestions made by LTD Board member Greg Evans that the MPO CAC might coordinate with local churches as part of their public engagement efforts and asked if such a strategy might be incorporated into the PPP.

Ms. Wiederhold responded that staff intended to update the MPO CAC's distribution lists with an emphasis on Title VI environmental justice. She further noted that staff planned to prepare and distribute additional Spanish language outreach materials particularly with respect to elements such as the MPO CAC's recruitment practices.

Mr. Jacobson asked Ms. Wiederhold to send the updated distribution list materials to Greg Evans at LTD for his review and feedback.

Ms. Wiederhold, responding to a question from Ms. Mulder, stated that staff planned to continue to distribute CAC recruitment and MTIP information through local Spanish language publications.

Ms. Wiederhold, responding to a question from Ms. Smith, confirmed that the Central Lane MPO had followed its Public Participation Plan as it conducted public outreach for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Ms. Wiederhold further discussed how the MPO had followed the PPP in conducting public outreach for the proposed changes to the summary table of public involvement.

Ms. Wiederhold, responding to a question from Mr. Lockfeld, described how certain MPO CAC recruitment notifications had been included as part of the MPO's core public involvement tools.

Ms. Wiederhold directed the CAC members to the list of recommended changes to the PPP that had been included in the agenda item summary materials and briefly noted how the recommendations had been formatted for review by the MPC.

Ms. Wiederhold briefly discussed the language and intent of the recommended changes to the PPP as developed by the CAC subcommittee.

Ms. Wiederhold commented that the recommendations for amendments to the PPP would allow for earlier public involvement in MPO and CAC discussions regarding STP-U funding.

Ms. Wiederhold, responding to a question from Mr. Beers, described the criteria that had been used to develop the recommended changes to the PPP and noted that they had been made to increase the breadth of public participation that normally occurred regarding local transportation issues.

Mr. Beers noted his concern that certain elements of the PPP were overly focused on particular groups and not enough on the general population of the Central Lane MPO. Ms. Riner responded that the PPP and the recommended changes to the PPP were intended to allow community members of different ethnic, social and economic backgrounds to participate in transportation planning efforts.

Ms. Wiederhold referenced the general recommendations that had been included in the recommended changes to the plan and stated that the recommendation to capitalize on one significant transportation issue had been made as a result of the CAC's discussions at their April and May meetings.

Mr. Lockfeld suggested changes to the language of the third general recommendation.

Ms. Wiederhold, responding to a question from Ms. Smith, briefly described how staff would execute the provisions of the PPP once the recommendations had been approved by the MPC.

Mr. Jacobson noted that the CAC had discussed the notion of "piggybacking" on another agency's open house in order to maintain a presence in the community as part of the PPP.

Mr. Lockfeld suggested that whatever significant transportation issue was chosen needed to be somewhat controversial in order to engender feedback from as many areas of the community as possible.

Ms. Wiederhold briefly described the continuing recommendations regarding MPO Public Involvement Program and expressed that those recommendations had been made in order to address any outstanding issues from the previous iterations of the PPP including the CAC central clearinghouse and the CAC policy review.

Ms. Mulder suggested that the City's Envision Eugene events in September might be an opportunity for the CAC to carry out many of goals represented in the continuing recommendations.

Ms. Riner responded to Ms. Mulder's comment and asked Mr. Inerfeld to keep the CAC members and support staff apprised of the dates and planning efforts for the Envision Eugene events. Mr. Inerfeld suggested that Ms. Wiederhold contact Eugene Senior Planner Terri Harding for information regarding the Envision Eugene events.

Mr. Gillespie, seconded by Mr. Morganti, moved to approve the subcommittee recommendation regarding the Annual Review of the MPO public involvement program and forward the recommendation to the Metropolitan Policy Committee.

Mr. Jacobson expressed that the subcommittee had done an excellent job drafting the recommendations.

Mr. Jacobson called for a vote on the previously stated motion. The motion passed unanimously, 13:0.

6. Draft Amendment to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

Mr. Thompson reported that the City of Eugene had requested that the Central Lane MPO's staff draft an amendment to the RTP to add the City's Franklin Boulevard Multiway Boulevard project to the RTP's illustrative list.

Mr. Thompson briefly described the City's multiway boulevard project and noted that further details regarding the project had been included in the agenda materials. He further noted that the project was part of the City's Walnut Center mixed use center project.

Mr. Thompson stated the City had made their request to the Central Lane MPO in such an expedited fashion because the City had planned to submit an application for federal grant funding in conjunction with the City of Springfield and the Lane Transit District (LTD).

Mr. Thompson stated that the Springfield segment of Franklin Boulevard had already been addressed in the current RTP.

Mr. Thompson, responding to a question from Mr. Morganti, briefly described the TIGER II federal competitive grant funding process that the City planned to use for the Franklin Boulevard project.

Mr. Thompson explained that the City of Eugene had requested the approval of the Central Lane MPO's Transportation Planning Committee (TPC) regarding the Franklin Boulevard project but that the TPC had not approved the request. He stated that the TPC had instead passed a motion regarding the amendment that allowed for a full 30-day public comment period regarding the matter and which had also delegated the TPC to have final approval authority regarding the City's request.

Mr. Thompson asked that the MPO CAC provide any input it had regarding the City's multiway boulevard project and the request it had made to the Central Lane MPO for the amendment to the RTP.

Mr. Inerfeld noted that the Eugene City Council had unanimously approved the Walnut Station mixed center project plan at its July 12 meeting.

Mr. Jacobson noted that Public Works Engineering Senior Planner Kurt Yeiter had briefed the CAC members on the Walnut Station project during the CAC's recent field trip.

Mr. Thompson noted that no members of the public had yet come forward to offer comments or testimony regarding the City's proposed amendment to the RTP.

Ms. Strand appreciated that the TPC had referred the proposed amendment to the CAC for further discussion and agreed with the TPC's efforts to preserve public input opportunities regarding the matter.

Mr. Thompson, responding to a question from Mr. Gillespie, stated that it was unknown how the City's proposed amendment to the RTP would affect future development by the City of Springfield along Franklin Boulevard.

Mr. Chickering expected that the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) was likely to approve of ODOT being a co-applicant to the Eugene and Springfield federal funding requests.

Mr. Reesor noted that the City of Springfield had previously applied for TIGER I federal grant construction funding but that that application had been denied. Mr. Reesor further stated that the current TIGER II grant applications made in conjunction with Eugene were for planning funds needed to conduct the environmental analysis for the multiway boulevard project.

Mr. Reesor, responding to a question from Mr. Jacobson, noted that the MPC had approved approximately \$400,000 in STP-U funding for the environmental analysis on multiway boulevard project but that the complete environmental analysis had been expected to cost much more than that.

Mr. Thompson noted that the MPC had indicated its clear support for the multiway boulevard project.

Mr. Inerfeld, responding to a question from Ms. Smith, described how the City of Eugene planned to apply STP-U and TIGER II grant funding toward the preliminary engineering and environmental analyses for the multiway boulevard project.

Ms. Smith asked if the City of Eugene planned to apply for TIGER II grant funding for any other projects. Mr. Inerfeld noted that, upon review of the criteria for TIGER II funding, the Franklin Boulevard project seemed like the best fit for TIGER funding.

Mr. Lockfeld asked if a joint application for TIGER II grant funding by the Cities of Eugene and Springfield would be significantly more likely to be approved. Mr. Reesor believed a joint application was much more likely to be successful than separate ones.

Mr. Chickering, responding to a comment from Mr. Jacobson, described the areas of Franklin Boulevard that were under ODOT's jurisdiction.

Mr. Thompson, responding to a request for clarification from Mr. Jacobson, suggested a motion that would indicate the CAC's support for the amendment to the RTP.

Mr. Winter, seconded by Mr. Morganti, moved that the CAC support the proposed draft amendment to the RTP to add the Franklin Boulevard Multiway Boulevard project in Eugene.

Mr. Reesor, responding to a question from Ms. Mulder, stated that the affordable housing land banking strategies related to the RTP were still to be determined. Mr. Inerfeld stated that such strategies were not generally considered a component of transportation projects in the RTP.

Ms. Riner asked if the Cities of Eugene and Springfield could provide a web link to information regarding their respective components of the multiway boulevard project.

Mr. Inerfeld noted that the Eugene City Council had approved only the concept for the multiway boulevard at their meeting on June 12. Mr. Thompson added that the Council's actions represented only the first step towards implementation of the project.

Mr. Reesor noted that Springfield City planning staff had recently developed a Glenwood refinement plan update that had made references to Springfield's portion of the multiway boulevard project. Mr. Inerfeld added that the City of Eugene also had conducted extensive conceptual design work regarding the project.

Ms. Riner described the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for the benefit of the CAC members and also noted how that Act required certain environmental reviews by any agency seeking federal funding assistance.

Mr. Jacobson called for a vote on Mr. Winter's previously stated motion. The motion passed, 13:0.

7. Lane County Area Commission on Transportation (ACT)

Mr. Jacobson noted that the item had been placed on the agenda to discuss the current timeline and development of the Lane County ACT.

Mr. Vanderpool updated the Committee on the status of the ACT and noted that the Lane Board of County Commissioners had indefinitely postponed their meeting regarding the development of the ACT. Mr. Vanderpool further stated that it seemed premature for the CAC to appoint representatives to the ACT since the Lane County Board had postponed further action and the timing of subsequent development of the ACT was uncertain.

Mr. Chickering agreed with Mr. Vanderpool's assessment and noted that the Lane County Board agreed with most of the components of the bylaws with the exception of those regarding the number of and the process of selecting citizen members to serve on the ACT.

Mr. Chickering reported that the Lane County Board had until September 30 to submit the draft bylaws and charter for the ACT to the OTC.

Mr. Chickering stated that a letter drafted by the leaders of many of the communities of Lane County had been sent to the Lane County Board that expressed their collective reservations regarding the Board's desired process for appointing citizen representatives to serve on the ACT.

Mr. Jacobson noted an additional deadline regarding the Lane County ACT that the Lane County Board would be required to report to the State Legislature if they had not completed the ACT bylaws by October 31.

Ms. Strand requested further clarification regarding the Lane County Board's reservations regarding the way citizens are appointed to the ACT. Mr. Chickering responded and added that in both of the proposals each citizen member of the Lane County ACT would have a vote.

Mr. Jacobson stated that Rob Zako had been re-hired by Lane County as a consultant on the formation of the ACT.

Mr. Chickering, responding to a question from Mr. Winter, stated that the CAC's representation on the ACT was not a point of contention from the Lane County Board.

Mr. Vanderpool referred to the CAC's previous protocol discussions and cautioned the Committee members against representing themselves as CAC members unless they were specifically authorized to do so, and when their opinion represented a verified position of the CAC. Mr. Vanderpool clarified that when they participated in other groups or endorsed letters drafted by other agencies, they must do so as an individual, particularly in areas where certain members disagreed with the collective will of the CAC.

Mr. Vanderpool noted that the CAC members were free to endorse any group they wished so long as they did so as private citizens and not as official representatives of the MPO CAC.

Mr. Chickering, responding to a comment from Ms. Mulder, noted that the Lane County Board was concerned that the OTC might not approve the charter and bylaws for the ACT if there did not seem to be unanimous support from those parties that would be involved in the ACT.

Mr. Thompson noted that there might be further legislative action by the OTC to create the ACT in the event that the Lane County Board failed to submit an acceptable charter and bylaws.

Mr. Thompson and Ms. Riner briefly described that the legislature could chose to create their own charter and bylaws for the Lane County ACT for submission to the OTC.

Mr. Jacobson called for a break at 6:26 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 6:35 p.m.

8. Household Travel Survey Findings

Senior Planner Susan Payne provided a brief overview of the Central Lane MPO Household Travel Survey and noted that Oregon Household Activity Survey (OHAS) of which the MPO's survey is a part, represents the most comprehensive statewide travel survey since the 1990's.

Ms. Payne briefly reported on the OHAS survey efforts from the other Oregon MPO's and noted that the Salem-Keizer survey had recently been completed.

Ms. Payne provided a slide presentation and described the goals and objectives of the Central Lane MPO Household Travel Survey as well as the data sampling and collection efforts that had been used.

Ms. Payne reported that the Central Lane MPO had contributed \$225,000 in STP-U funding for their portion of the OHAS.

Ms. Payne briefly noted how data regarding survey respondents who traveled into and out of the Central Lane MPO region would be incorporated into the analyses for both this area and other MPO's.

Ms. Payne directed the CAC members to their copies of the Central Lane MPO Household Travel Survey diaries and described how the respondents had been expected to use them to record their respective household's travel behaviors.

Ms. Payne described the data elements that had been used for the Central Lane MPO Household Travel Survey and the variables that had been identified.

Ms. Payne listed in extensive detail the results of the Cenral Lane MPO Household Travel Survey with particular emphasis on the respondent and travel behavior characteristics examined as part of the survey.

Ms. Payne, responding to questions from Mr. Lockfeld and Ms. Mulder, briefly described how information regarding different types of travel segments had been incorporated into the survey.

Mr. Carrol referred to the survey results regarding various travel modes and suggested that it was often up to the survey takers to determine how certain travel behaviors were classified. Ms Payne replied that in this survey each household was interviewed after their assigned travel day and the travel diary responses were reviewed for accuracy.

Ms. Payne reviewed the various travel destination and travel time information as reflected in the survey results.

Ms. Payne reviewed the various data limitations that had been identified during the course of the survey and noted that the survey coverage of University of Oregon students was relatively poor due to several factors: many are difficult to contact as they have cell phones with out-of-state numbers; they belong to an age group with low participation rates; and many live in dormitories or group quarters that were not surveyed.

Ms. Payne mentioned the ongoing analysis efforts surrounding the Central Lane MPO Household Travel Survey and asked the CAC members to suggest the kinds of travel behavior questions they would like to have answered. She noted that the analysis results would be used to update regional travel models.

Ms. Payne, responding to a question from Mr. Beers, briefly noted how the survey results could be statistically applied to regional populations in the Central Lane MPO and throughout the State.

Ms. Payne, responding to a question from Ms. Alldredge, noted that the data sets for the survey had been over-sampled with respect to local transit services in order to determine if people were more or less likely to use transit.

Ms. Payne, responding to questions from Mr. Morganti and Mr. Lockfeld, stated that a national transportation household survey similar to the OHAS had been conducted.

Ms. Payne and the CAC members briefly discussed the manner in which the survey questions had been presented to the respondents. Ms. Payne further commented that many of the questions had been designed to ensure that the resulting data were appropriate for incorporation into the regional travel models of the MPO and the State. The Oregon Modeling Steering Committee (OMSC, an ODOT committee) will be working on analyses techniques to assist all MPOs in obtaining rigorous results from their surveys.

Ms. Payne asked that the CAC members email Ms. Wiederhold any questions they might have regarding either the Central Lane MPO Household Travel Survey or the OHAS.

Ms. Payne noted that staff planned to meet with OMSC in at the end of July to review the more pressing questions that needed to be answered by the data from the Central Lane MPO Household Travel Survey. Ms. Payne stated that she would forward appropriate notes from that discussion meeting to the CAC members.

9. Greenhouse Gas Planning – Part 2

Ms. Payne reminded the CAC that staff had been tasked to develop a community-based greenhouse gas inventory for the Central Lane MPO as part of its work program.

Ms. Payne described the manner in which the greenhouse gas inventory had been conducted and presented information which demonstrated the value of using a system-based inventory rather than a sector-based one. Ms. Payne maintained that the system-based inventory helped demonstrate more effectively how personal behavior contributes to greenhouse gas emissions.

Ms. Payne, responding to a question from Mr. Lockfeld, noted how the transportation of food had been considered with respect to the system-based greenhouse gas inventory.

Ms. Payne noted that the inventory had used the energy emissions factors and energy usage provided by local utilities in order to determine how much of the regional greenhouse-gas inventory was based on the use of energy by residences.

Ms. Payne, responding to a question from Ms. Smith, noted that with respect to the greenhouse gas inventory it was often very difficult to track the source of electrical energy that was consumed in an area due to the distribution being through a regional network into which multiple producers supply energy from different sources.

Ms. Payne noted that the manner in which the inventory had been conducted allowed the Central Lane MPO to compare itself with the inventories from other metro areas, and in particular with Portland Metro which has completed a community greenhouse gas inventory using the same process.

Ms. Payne suggested that the CAC might participate in the greenhouse gas inventory discussions pertaining to emissions due to local passenger transportation.

Ms. Payne, responding to a question from Ms. Smith, noted that the discussions of how materials related to the greenhouse gas inventory were generally beyond the purview of the Central Lane MPO and the CAC. This community inventory sets the context for emissions within the MPO area; the MPO will next develop strategies that specifically target the transportation system.

Ms. Riner thanked Ms. Payne for her presentation.

10. Wrap-Up

Ms. Wiederhold followed up on the CACs previous discussions regarding Committee recommendations to the MPC and reminded the Committee members that they were each received email announcements to MPC agenda materials, including minutes, that described how the MPC had addressed the CAC recommendations. She said she would look into other ways to apprise the committee of MPC discussions regarding CAC recommendations.

Ms. Wiederhold announced that the Oregon Planning Institute statewide planning conference had been scheduled for September 15-17 at the University of Oregon. She noted that LCOG would pay for the chair, the vice-chair, and two additional registrations to be shared amongst the other members of the MPO CAC. Ms. Wiederhold noted she would email further information regarding the event to the CAC members.

Ms. Wiederhold noted that no MPO CAC meeting had been scheduled for the month of August and that the Committee's next meeting had been scheduled for 5:30 p.m. on September 23, 2010. The change from the regular meeting time is due to a conflict with the Oregon Planning Institute.

Ms. Strand suggested that a significant portion of the next CAC meeting agenda be devoted to a discussion of the Public Participation Plan.

Mr. Jacobson adjourned the meeting at 7:29 p.m.

(Recorded by Wade Hicks)