

MINUTES

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

September 16, 2009
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Dave Jacobson, Chair; Wendy Butler-Boyesen, Vice Chair; Edward Winter, Bill Morganti, Richard Beers, Eleanor Mulder, Philip Farrington, Sarah Strand, Gary Gillespie, members; Paul Thompson, Andrea Riner, Connie Bloom-Williams, Lane Council of Governments; Rob Handy, Lane County Board of County Commissioners; Mary Archer, Lane Transit District.

ABSENT: Diana Alldredge, Alexandre Lockfeld, members.

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Review

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

Mr. Jacobsen noted adjustments to the agenda.

2. Comments from the Audience

No community members were present to offer comments.

3. STP-U FY2011-2013 Framework

Ms. Riner provided an update to the CAC on two items of note from the preceding MPC meeting. She reported that the STP-U funding allocation process for FY2010 had been finalized and the MPC had approved the staff recommendation. The MPC also had reviewed the recommended CAC Work Plan. MPC requested that the MPO CAC make feedback and recommendations on the FY2011-2013 STP-U framework and funding allocation their highest priority.

Ms. Riner reported that staff had completed a first draft of the timeline for the STP-U FY2011-2013 Framework which had been outlined to include three primary phases: 1) public information/involvement; 2) substantive discussions regarding STP-U processes and potential funding allocations; and 3) draft recommendations subject to public review. Ms. Riner noted the MPC would hold discussions regarding the STP-U FY2011-2013 Framework in each of the three primary phases of the framework process.

Mr. Jacobsen asked if any materials related to the STP-U FY2011-2013 Framework would be made available to the MPO CAC before the MPC discussions regarding the same. Ms. Riner responded that due to the schedule, some--but not all--of the materials would be presented and discussed with the MPO CAC

before being presented to the MPC. Also, final recommendations would be discussed at the December CAC meeting in order to provide input to the final MPC decision in January.

Mr. Jacobsen reiterated that the MPO CAC had been charged by the MPC to make their advisory work regarding the STP-U FY2011-2013 Framework their top priority, with subsequent priorities to address issues related to greenhouse gas emissions, the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and the West Eugene EmX Expansion project.

Ms. Riner noted that much of the structure and timeline for the STP-U FY2011-2013 Framework process had been based on input received at the joint MPC/CAC meeting on July 16, 2009.

Mr. Jacobsen asked what topics the MPO CAC would be expected to cover with respect to the STP-U FY2011-2013 Framework process. Ms. Riner noted that this was up to the CAC, but that the MPO CAC might review the funding breakdowns of the current STP-U funding allocations as a first step. She added that the MPC could choose to comment on a range of issues, such as how reducing greenhouse gas emissions might be incorporated into the STP-U evaluation processes.

Mr. Thompson expressed that at this point, LCOG staff was generally asking for feedback regarding the schedule and process involved in determining the STP-U FY2011-2013 Framework. He noted that discussions of any specific projects to be funded by STP-U dollars would begin after January of 2010. Mr. Thompson also expressed that staff was seeking input from the MPO CAC on how the public information/involvement phase of the STP-U FY2011-2013 Framework might best be implemented. Mr. Thompson added that staff was also seeking an assessment of the existing STP-U allocation process with particular emphasis on the continued viability of the 10/25/65 split (i.e. 10% to transportation options activities, 25% to planning activities, and 65% to project development, preservation and modernization activities).

Mr. Jacobsen noted he had requested information at the joint MPO/CAC meeting regarding the history of the 10/25/65 split used in the current STP-U funding allocation. Mr. Thompson responded that he had presented a primer on the split at the June 2009 MPO CAC meeting and would be willing to present such information again if necessary.

Mr. Thompson expressed the LCOG staff's position that the current STP-U funding allocation split was working well primarily because it allowed for a great deal of flexibility in how the MPO might direct funding toward regional transportation concerns. He noted that suggestions such as those made by MPC member Alan Zelenka to create additional funding breakdown categories could be considered, although they could hamper the flexibility provided by the current funding split.

Ms. Riner, responding to comments from Mr. Beers concerning the 65% currently directed towards project development, preservation and modernization, noted that staff could consider additional analysis to examine the portion of funding that was actually applied to completed construction of transportation infrastructure projects.

Mr. Thompson, responding to a question from Mr. Beers, noted that all projects utilizing federal STP-U funds were subject to the prevailing wage provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act. Mr. Thompson further noted that one of the factors for projects seeking STP-U funding was a consideration that addressed the amount of overhead that had to be covered as part of any federally funded project.

Mr. Handy joined the meeting at 5:50 p.m.

Mr. Farrington joined the meeting at 5:52 p.m.

Mr. Winter expressed that the MPO CAC needed to carefully examine the planning activities currently receiving 25% of the STP-U funding allocation to ensure that such funds were being applied reasonably.

Mr. Thompson noted that the notion of 25% of the STP-U funding being applied solely to planning activities was somewhat misleading in that there were certain other administrative, public outreach and strategic elements such as the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) that were funded out of that 25%.

Mr. Thompson noted that public testimony in the spring and summer of 2009 regarding the STP-U funding and UPWP had revealed that many members of the community felt that more funding for planning and public involvement processes were necessary as the regional economy improved.

Mr. Thompson noted that Ms. Bloom-Williams would be presenting information related to transportation options activities and the 10% of STP-U funding directed toward such concerns as part of her presentation on point2point Solutions later in the meeting.

Mr. Jacobsen suggested that the MPO CAC members review the minutes of their June 10, 2009 meeting as well as the minutes of the recent joint meeting between the MPC and the MPO CAC for additional background information.

Mr. Beers, responding to a question from Mr. Morganti, noted that the Davis-Bacon Act governed prevailing wages for projects in the area. Mr. Gillespie added that the Davis-Bacon Act helped to determine the wage standards on public works projects and certain other government funded projects as well. Mr. Gillespie proceeded to briefly describe the basic provisions and applications of the Davis-Bacon Act.

Mr. Thompson commented that many of the federal rules applied to government funded public works projects, such as those that would be implemented with STP-U, were designed to assist or protect disadvantaged business enterprises (DBE).

Mr. Jacobsen introduced Lane County Commissioner Rob Handy and noted that he had accepted the MPC's nomination to serve as the MPC's liaison to the CAC during Sonny Chickering's temporary reassignment.

Mr. Handy stated that he hoped that he might work with the MPO CAC to provide a stronger and more diverse perspective on the history of the 10/25/65 split as well as other issues related to the MPC and MPO CAC.

Mr. Thompson responded to Mr. Handy's comments and noted that the STP-U funding breakdowns for transportation options activities and planning activities had been relatively unchanged because they were based on budget needs established by Commuter Solutions. He further noted that LCOG staff had developed a detailed spreadsheet to determine the planning budget staff needs of the various MPO member agencies.

Ms. Riner confirmed that the MPO CAC requested the following additional information in respect to the group's assessment of the current STP-U funding framework: 1) the history and development of the 10/25/65 split; 2) a clarification of the details surrounding projects affecting the Central Lane MPO; and 3) details regarding the planning activities of the Central Lane MPO.

Mr. Jacobsen asked the MPO CAC members to offer suggestions and comments regarding the CAC's public

outreach strategies with respect to the STP-U FY2011-2013 Framework.

Ms. Riner noted she would be taking feedback from the MPO CAC members and applying it to the more detailed public outreach program being developed by LCOG staff.

Mr. Thompson noted that LCOG staff would be using a variety of public outreach strategies including email lists and bus posters.

Mr. Gillespie suggested that framing the MPO CAC's public outreach efforts in relation to greenhouse gas emission reductions might be a more effective strategy than trying to engender interest and support for the STP-U funding process.

The MPO CAC members discussed a variety of strategies designed to improve and enhance the MPC and the MPO CAC's public information and outreach efforts.

Mr. Winter believed it might be difficult for the MPO CAC to encourage interest in the STP-U framework process among members of the general public.

Mr. Thompson responded to Mr. Gillespie's previous comment and noted that, in addition to educating the public about the funding processes involved in the STP-U, it might be possible to include a recommendation to make greenhouse gas emissions a separate category within the STP-U framework process.

Ms. Mulder believed most members of the public would be more interested in learning about alternative transportation projects rather than the funding mechanisms involved. She suggested that the MPO CAC attempt to steer their strategies accordingly.

Ms. Bloom suggested that the MPO CAC, in their public information efforts, approach issues from an individual's perspective, with an emphasis on helping members of the public understand, "What's in it for me?"

Mr. Farrington agreed that it was somewhat esoteric for the average citizen to wrap their minds around issues such as the 10/25/65 STP-U funding split. He maintained that the purpose of the MPO CAC's public outreach efforts was to get people interested and engaged in local transportation issues and suggested that the MPO CAC coordinate with the Elks, the Lions and the Eugene City Club in order to further their public information goals.

Ms. Riner noted that these ideas related well to the findings of the Community Focus Group. She added that LCOG staff would try to synthesize the MPO CAC discussions about the STP-U process in a manner that would also be helpful towards the MPO CAC's goal of improving public awareness of regional transportation issues.

Mr. Thompson noted that he had brought examples of STP-U funding strategies from other MPO's to the LCOG staff and asked if it would be beneficial to bring that information to the MPO CAC members. Mr. Jacobsen responded that Mr. Thompson should feel free to email the information to the MPO CAC members for them to review.

Ms. Strand believed that, regardless of the current levels of public awareness surrounding the matter, the current STP-U framework process had been handled responsibly by those involved. Ms. Butler-Boyeson

agreed with Ms. Strand's comment and further stated that the projects that had come through the STP-U process most recently had seemed reasonably thought out and responsibly allocated.

Mr. Gillespie expressed that it would be important to include issues related to long-term planning commitments into the MPO CAC's public information strategies.

Mr. Handy agreed it was important to effectively communicate planning and execution strategies to the public with respect to regional transportation issues addressed by both the MPC and the MPO CAC. He hoped the MPO CAC's review and discussions of the current STP-U framework would positively affect the FY2011-2013 framework process. He further hoped that the STP-U funds would continue to be applied responsibly to shovel-ready projects that met the needs of the community.

4. P2P Solutions: Update and STP-U Priorities

Ms. Bloom-Williams presented an update on the point2point Solutions program (formerly known as Commuter Solutions) in relation to the overall goals of the regional Transportation Demand Management (TDM) initiatives begun in 1995. Ms. Bloom-Williams reported that the primary target of the Commuter Solutions and p2p Solutions programs had been commuter trips for employers and employees in the community, although other types of commuter trips had since been identified.

Ms. Bloom-Williams noted the p2p Solutions program was currently overseen by an advisory group called the Transportation Options Advisory Committee (TOAC) representing local jurisdictions and the State of Oregon. She further reported that the p2p Solutions program currently incorporated major program areas such as Transit Ridership (employer and student programs), Ride Sharing (carpool and vanpool programs), Special Employer Programs (training/outreach), and Program Administration.

Ms. Bloom-Williams noted that under the new p2p Solutions identity, the program had been separated into three behavior-oriented categories: School Solutions, Work Solutions and On-the-Go Solutions. She further reported that ridership in the School Solutions program category had increased by almost 20% in recent years.

Ms. Bloom-William commented the TOAC oversaw the strategic plans and work plans for the p2p Solutions program as well as the budget prioritization process for p2p Solutions. She further explained that the TOAC, as part of its budget prioritization responsibilities, typically made budget recommendations to the Transportation Planning Committee (TPC), who in turn forwarded those budget and funding recommendations to the MPC.

Ms. Bloom-Williams expressed that p2p Solutions was uniquely situated to help find and implement immediate solutions to local transportation challenges rather than long-range planning solutions. She noted that the program had been quite successful in helping people overcome both real and perceived transportation barriers, resulting in significant reductions in local vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and increases in the use of area transit mechanisms and other transportation options.

Ms. Bloom-Williams briefly described the funding processes involved in the p2p Solutions program and noted that it was primarily funded through the STP-U with additional funding provided by the Oregon Department of Transportation. She proceeded to provide additional information regarding additional funding sources for the program including funding provided by the Lane Transit District, Lane County, and the Cities of Eugene and Springfield.

Ms. Bloom-Williams noted that she had been able to negotiate an arrangement with the local Business Energy Tax Credit program through p2p Solutions' student transit pass program, whereby a tax credit was returned to LTD to cover the cost of the student transit passes..

Ms. Bloom-Williams reported that the p2p Solutions program received approximately \$82,000 in van pool subsidy funds and that it had also recently negotiated with ODOT to set up a \$200,000 seed fund to provide start up funds to the Mid-Willamette Valley Transportation Management Group's van pool program.

Ms. Bloom-Williams noted that the p2p Solutions program currently had over 18 vans on the road in the community providing transportation services, in effect removing over 100 vehicles from the road per day and reducing area VMT's by over 2,107,000 miles per year.

Mr. Thompson noted that STP-U funding of the p2p Solutions program had diminished in recent years. He added that transportation options funding from ODOT was also likely to be reduced in FY2010 by as much as one-third.

Ms. Bloom-Williams noted that a Comprehensive Group Pass Survey had been completed in 2008 to gauge the p2p Solutions program's effectiveness among transit pass users. She further noted that, compared to similar survey data collected since 2002, the survey had indicated that the p2p Solutions program had effectively reduced drive alone work commuting trips in the area by 8%. She proceeded to outline the remainder of the survey results for the benefit of the MPO CAC members and noted that the survey had served to demonstrate the high level of effectiveness of the p2p Solutions program.

Ms. Bloom-Williams averred that LTD's planned expansions of its EmX service, as well as the implementation of car sharing and bike station practices, represented a series of emerging opportunities for the p2p Solutions program.

Ms. Bloom-Williams, responding to a question from Mr. Morganti, briefly described the basic elements of a standard car sharing program and noted that such practices generally worked very well in densely populated urban areas.

Ms. Bloom-Williams stated that various telecommuting and teleconferencing strategies also represented excellent opportunities for the p2p Solutions program to reduce VMT in the region.

Ms. Bloom-Williams noted that a Regional Transportations Options Plan (RTOP) was underway to enhance the various strategies and practices of the Regional Transportation Plan. She suggested that a member from the MPO CAC might also serve on the RTOP subcommittee that had been formed.

Ms. Bloom-Williams concluded her presentation and noted that the p2p Solutions would continue to do its part to address transportation issues in the community.

Ms. Bloom-Williams demonstrated a series of television commercials that had been playing on the local ABC affiliate station recently and which were designed to bring awareness to the p2p Solutions program.

Ms. Bloom-Williams distributed a list of the p2p Solutions workplace participants and noted that the list represented the largest increase in business participants since 2002, with businesses employing 25 or fewer employees representing the largest portion of that increase.

Ms. Bloom-Williams commented that the p2p Solutions Emergency Ride Home program had become very

popular and was open to any business regardless of whether or not they participated in other areas of the p2p Solutions program.

Mr. Gillespie thanked Ms. Bloom-Williams for her presentation and appreciated that the program was also targeting families and single parents who might be less inclined to investigate or use alternative transportation options. Mr. Bloom-Williams responded that, to that end, p2p Solutions was also working with the Kidsports youth organization to implement transportation options for children and families traveling to after-school sports activities.

Mr. Jacobsen called for a break at 6:52 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 6:59 p.m.

5. Approve August 19, 2009 Minutes

Ms. Butler-Boyeson noted corrections to the minutes.

Mr. Morganti, seconded by Mr. Gillespie, moved to approve the minutes of the August 19, 2009 Metropolitan Planning Organization Citizen Advisory Committee. The motion passed unanimously, 10:0.

6. Citizen Advisory Committee Recruitment Outreach

Mr. Jacobsen asked if any of the MPO CAC members wanted to be on the group's recruitment subcommittee to help screen applications and conduct telephone interviews.

The MPO CAC members and staff briefly discussed their various availabilities for serving on the recruitment subcommittee.

Mr. Jacobsen noted he, Mr. Winter, Mr. Morganti and Ms. Butler-Boyeson would be serving on the recruitment subcommittee and that Ms. Riner, Ms. Wiederhold and Mr. Handy might be participating as well.

Mr. Jacobsen, responding to a question from Ms. Butler-Boyeson, noted that the MPC had recently accepted the MPO CAC's recruitment proposal.

Mr. Handy hoped that the MPO CAC recruitment efforts might focus on bringing in greater representation from minority groups to satisfy certain Title VI provisions.

Mr. Jacobsen noted that two former MPO CAC members, Ryan Pape and Francesca Patricolo, had expressed interest in serving on the committee once again. He further noted that there would probably be three or four open committee positions for the next year.

Ms. Riner noted that LCOG staff was currently updating the MPO CAC application materials and that they were also coordinating to distribute the application materials on their website in conjunction with bus postings, newsletters and various other public and business outreach strategies.

Mr. Jacobsen suggested it might also be advisable to contact the Springfield and Eugene Chambers of Commerce to circulate information regarding the MPO CAC and to solicit applications for membership.

Mr. Jacobsen noted that recent focus groups had revealed that many members of the public did not know what an MPO was. He further proposed that language recently suggested by Mr. Thompson indicating that “the MPO is responsible for disbursing federal monies in its designated area” be included with any and all MPO CAC recruitment information and application materials.

Ms. Riner maintained that the MPO CAC recruitment and application materials were aimed at people already familiar with the MPO programs. She suggested that the MPO CAC add some materials that present CAC participation as a valuable community service and that as members they would be addressing issues important to average citizens in the community.

Mr. Jacobsen asked if it would be possible for staff to submit the revised application materials to the recruitment subcommittee before they were distributed.

Mr. Jacobsen noted he would be emailing additional information to the recruitment subcommittee members.

Mr. Jacobsen suggested that the MPO CAC members feel free to email Kathi Wiederhold the names of anyone interested in applying to become an MPO CAC member.

The MPO CAC members briefly discussed various aspects of the recruitment process.

Mr. Gillespie suggested each applicant be contacted at the end of the selection process to gauge their interest in either serving on another committee or serving on the MPO CAC at a later time.

Mr. Jacobsen hoped the recruitment subcommittee would be able to select good team members who were able to contribute to the MPO CAC process in a positive manner.

Mr. Gillespie believed that one of the primary goals in the recruitment process should be to try to meet the goals of the Title VI imperative as much as possible and suggested that such criteria might even be the deciding factor between applicants with similar qualifications. Mr. Jacobsen agreed with Mr. Gillespie’s comment and recognized that there appeared to be a general consensus from the other MPO CAC members in that regard.

Mr. Jacobsen suggested that any applicants not ultimately selected be waitlisted to serve on the MPO CAC at a later time.

Ms. Riner asked the CAC to discuss whether or not they wanted to continue to current process such that applicants not initially selected would be waitlisted to serve on the MPO CAC at a later date.

The committee members briefly discussed how the MPO CAC might address diversity issues related to the recruitment and selection process for new members.

Mr. Jacobsen noted that the deadline for application submissions would be November 15, 2009.

7. Updates

Mr. Jacobsen noted that the next MPO CAC meeting would be on October 21, 2009.

Mr. Gillespie announced he had been recommended by Governor Kulongoski to serve on the LTD board of directors representing District 5. He noted that his appointment as an LTD board member might preclude

his further participation in the MPO CAC as the meetings for those groups were often held at the same time.

Mr. Gillespie noted he had received information from LCOG staff member Bob Denouden regarding a new statewide household survey. Ms. Riner noted that much of LCOG's modeling and data practices were linked to results of that behavioral survey. Mr. Farrington added that he had participated in a previous iteration of the survey from five years ago and noted that it was very detailed and involved.

Mr. Farrington commented he had learned that the City of Springfield had recently applied for federal TIGER grant funding for significant transportation system improvements in the Glenwood area. He suggested that a briefing on the matter might be presented at a future MPO CAC meeting.

8. Wrap-Up

Mr. Jacobsen noted again that the next MPO CAC meeting would be on October 21, 2009 at 5:30 p.m.

Mr. Jacobsen adjourned the meeting at 7:31 p.m.

(Recorded by Wade Hicks)