

MINUTES

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

November 18, 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, Diana Alldredge, Alexandre Lockfeld, John Anderson, members; Rob Handy, MPC liaison *pro tem*; Paul Thompson, Kathi Wiederhold, Andrea Riner, Lane Council of Governments; Mary Archer, Connie Bloom-Williams, Lane Transit District; David Reeser, City of Springfield; Wade Hicks, City of Eugene
Minutes Recorder, L.M. Reese, guest

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 thanked the MPO CAC members who had participated in the Community Alliance of Lane County's (CALC) recent Cornucopia event at the Eugene Hilton and read a thank you note from the CALC representatives.

Mr. Jacobson noted that an MPO CAC recruitment advertisement had recently been placed in a local Latino newspaper Adelante Latino and further noted that the Committee had received fifteen applications for new membership.

2. Comments from the Audience

No community members offered comments.

3. Approve September 16, 2009 Minutes

Mr. Gillespie, seconded by Ms. Butler-Boyesen, moved to approve the minutes of the MPO CAC's October 21, 2009 meeting. The motion passed unanimously, 12:0.

4. Nominate Officers

Ms. Butler-Boyesen nominated Dave Jacobson and Sarah Strand for Chair and Vice-Chair of the MPO CAC which Mr. Jacobson and Ms. Strand then accepted.

Mr. Gillespie, seconded by Ms. Butler-Boyesen, moved to close the nominations. The motion passed unanimously, 12:0.

5. CAC Recruitment Update

Mr. Handy arrived to the meeting at 5:38 p.m.

Mr. Jacobson noted that the MPO CAC recruitment subcommittee would review the applications for new membership on November 30 and present their recommendations to the CAC at the December meeting. The MPC would act upon recommendations from the CAC at their January meeting.

Ms. Wiederhold, responding to a question from Ms. Strand, noted the application period for the CAC had closed on November 15.

Ms. Strand, seconded by Ms. Mulder moved that the MPO CAC accept any late applications for MPO CAC through November 30, 2009.

Ms. Wiederhold noted that the MPC had set the MPO CAC's recruitment period and that the subcommittee could make a recommendation to the MPC to allow late CAC applications to be accepted.

Ms. Strand, with the consent of the second, amended her motion to direct the MPO CAC recruitment subcommittee to recommend to the MPC that late applications for MPO CAC membership be accepted through November 30, 2009.

Mr. Jacobson called for a vote on Ms. Strand's previously stated and amended motion. The motion passed unanimously, 12:0.

6. Update on Greenhouse Gas Planning

Ms. Riner provided a basic overview of the most recent work of the MPO Greenhouse Gas Emissions Task Force and reminded the Committee that that group had been established by the provisions of House Bill 2186.

Ms. Riner reported that Eugene City Councilor Alan Zelenka served as the Central Lane MPO representative on the Task Force and that in addition to representatives from the other 5 Oregon MPO's the Task Force included representatives from the Oregon Transportation Commission, LCDC the State Legislature, Oregon Environmental Council, Homebuilders Association, AAA, and 1000 Friends of Oregon.

Ms. Riner stated the Task force had met three times since September and was currently scheduled to meet again on December 4, 2009.

Ms. Riner noted that the MPO CAC members were welcome to attend a special meeting of the MPC on December 3 at the LCOG office in downtown Eugene. She further noted that the MPC had planned to discuss the goals of the Task Force at that meeting and to provide direction to Mr. Zelenka as their representative to that body.

Ms. Riner directed the MPO CAC members to her memorandum of November 12, 2009 and to the Central Lane MPO Greenhouse Gas Task Force meeting summaries contained therein.

Ms. Riner maintained that the recent GHG Task Force meetings had proceeded very successfully and had contained highly informative presentations by experts in greenhouse gas modeling, scenario planning, and MPO operations. She further noted that the Task Force at their most recent meeting had begun the discussion process surrounding their potential policy recommendations to the State legislature.

Ms. Riner stated the Central Lane MPO website contained links to the ODOT presentation materials used at the previous Task Force meetings.

Mr. Riner opined it would be interesting to see how the Task Force discussions would progress and believed that the Task Force would take a measured approach toward the drafting and implementation of policies designed to address greenhouse gas emissions in the region. She believed the Task Force was likely to schedule additional meetings to prepare for the 2011 legislative session.

Ms. Riner commented the Task Force had endeavored through their discussions to understand the complex relationships between density, congestion and transportation demand management strategies with respect to their effect on greenhouse gas emissions.

Ms. Riner, responding to a question from Mr. Jacobson, believed the Task Force had not discussed the nature of other greenhouse gases besides carbon dioxide. She further noted that the Task Force had focused its discussions primarily on the transportation sector's effect on area greenhouse gas emissions rather than on industrial and agricultural sectors.

Ms. Riner, responding to a question from Mr. Morganti, stated that legislation in HB 2001 required several State agencies to provide data to establish the appropriate MPO greenhouse gas targets, which would include an estimate of future use of electric vehicles to reduce area greenhouse gas emissions.

Mr. Morganti believed that increased use of electric vehicles would significantly decrease greenhouse gas emissions and other forms of pollution. Mr. Lockfeld countered that the nature of how electricity for such vehicles would be produced might negate the environmental benefits of those vehicles.

Mr. Winter suggested the Task Force would need to consider various land use and land development issues with respect to their greenhouse gas emission discussions.

Ms. Riner, responding to a question from Mr. Jacobson, noted that the MPO CAC's role with respect to the Task Force recommendations would relate to the public involvement required as the community considers alternative land use and transportation planning strategies.

Ms. Riner, responding to a question from Mr. Jacobson, noted that the City of Eugene's Climate Action Plan will go beyond the transportation sector, as they have also been considering greenhouse gas emissions from industrial sectors in the region.

Mr. Jacobson noted that the cyclic nature of greenhouse gas emissions would be difficult to break and was glad that the Task Force and MPO CAC were exploring the issue.

Mr. Handy thanked Ms. Riner for her highly informative summaries of the previous Task Force meetings. He encouraged the MPO CAC members to continue advising the MPC with respect to TDM strategies that would help address the problem of greenhouse gas emissions and hoped that the MPO CAC might bring any recommendations in that regard to the special MPC meeting on December 3.

Ms. Riner, responding to a question from Mr. Beers, noted that a statistic referenced in the second Task Force meeting that "20% of workers commuting from outside of the MPO contribute to 60% of the GhG emissions" had been provided by a Senior Transportation Analyst with ODOT's Transportation Planning and Analysis Unit (TPAU), Brian Gregor.

Mr. Beers believed it would be necessary for the MPO CAC and the Task Force to consider a variety of viewpoints in relation to greenhouse gas reduction and global climate change issues.

Mr. Lockfeld questioned the nature of the statistic referred to by Mr. Beers and asked if vehicles traveling from outside the MPO would have all or any of their greenhouse gas emissions attributed to the MPO. Ms. Riner responded by encouraging those interested in the detailed data to visit the ODOT website for the Greenhouse Gas Task Force.

Ms. Mulder asked if the data such as that presented in the recent West 11th Avenue Corridor study indicated that reductions in the overall amount of car travel in that area could change or significantly reduce the amount of greenhouse gas emissions. Ms. Riner responded that a number of technology-based strategies such as signal synchronization may also be beneficial in reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Mr. Farrington expressed that some of the strategies suggested by the West 11 Avenue Corridor study were not land use and transportation related and asked how much latitude the MPO CAC had to consider such strategies with respect to their recommendations to the MPC. Ms. Riner replied that the Task Force recommendations would require the MPO to look at a wide variety of greenhouse gas emission strategies.

Mr. Handy commented that the MPO CAC was in a unique position to suggest strategies that affected both land use and transportation, including transportation demand management issues which could directly address the goals of the GHG Task Force recommendations.

Ms. Mulder noted that, with respect to the MPO CAC's recommendations regarding land use policies, the Committee should advocate transportation connectivity strategies between neighborhoods that encouraged more pedestrian and bicycle travel.

Mr. Winter advocated for the recommendation of neighborhood land use strategies that would not only reduce greenhouse gas emissions but overall gas usage for vehicles within the MPO.

Mr. Handy excused himself from the meeting at 6:13 p.m.

Mr. Beers briefly commented on the traffic signal timers used in many areas of the City of Eugene.

Mr. Jacobson briefly commented on how tree planting strategies incorporated as part of multi-use boulevard transportation demand management strategies might reduce area greenhouse gas emissions.

Ms. Strand recalled that she did not feel that the characterization of the CAC discussion at their October meeting had been well represented in the MPC packet. She stated that the MPO CAC's discussions regarding the STP-U framework that the Committee does support transportation demand but that they were in favor of maintaining the flexibility of the current STP-U funding framework. Ms. Butler-Boyesen agreed with Ms. Strand's comment.

Mr. Jacobson observed from the previous MPO CAC meeting that there was a general acceptance of the current STP-U funding framework and that there had not been a strong desire for the funding framework to be significantly revised.

Ms. Bloom-Williams commented that the City of Eugene as part of its Climate & Energy Action Plan initiative, would be holding a community open house discussion regarding land use and transportation issues on December 1, 2009 at 6:00 p.m. The event will be held at EWEB. She suggested that the event might be a great opportunity for MPO CAC members to learn more about land use and transportation demand management issues.

Ms. Riner, responding to a request from Mr. Beers, briefly described the funding statistics for the six Oregon MPO's as detailed in the table included in the staff memorandum.

She further noted that the Task Force was charged with assessing the cost implications of their recommendations, including the cost of implementing strategies within the various MPO's.

Ms. Mulder expressed that there were numerous private costs associated with TDM strategies that were not reflected in the table under discussion. Mr. Winter agreed with Ms. Mulder's comment.

Mr. Jacobson thanked Ms. Riner for her presentation.

Ms. Riner urged the Committee members to visit the ODOT Task Force website and reminded the Committee that the Task Force efforts were a response to specific State legislation and were not the result of any specific actions of the MPC or the MPO CAC.

Mr. Jacobson called for a break at 6:26 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 6:37 p.m.

7. STP-U FY2011-2013 Framework

Ms. Riner commented she had not attended the most recent MPC meeting.

Ms. Riner noted that LCOG staff had completed the assessment of the existing STP-U framework and that the preliminary findings from that assessment had been described in Ms. Riner's November 12, 2009 memorandum to the Committee. She further noted that the memorandum contained various recent MPC and MPO CAC discussion components.

Ms. Riner described in detail the four draft alternative STP-U framework options from her memorandum for the benefit of the Committee.

Ms. Riner, responding to a question from Mr. Farrington, noted that the \$2.5 million in total STP-U funding described under each of the four options was a projected conservative estimate for an annual STP-U allocation.

Ms. Strand again referred to the summary of the CAC discussion listed in the Assessment of Existing Framework document included as Attachment 1 to Ms. Riner's memorandum to the CAC. She believed that the CAC's recognition of the "need for flexibility" with respect to the STP-U framework needed to be made more clear. Mr. Lockfeld responded that the CAC's discussion to increase the level of support for TDM and other transit related concerns satisfied Ms. Strand's concerns in that regard.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen commented on previous CAC discussions regarding the point2point Solutions program and noted that those discussions had focused on maintaining the flexibility of the STP-U framework in a manner that might ensure funding for point2point Solutions and other similar programs.

Mr. Winter stated that there had not been a consensus among the Committee in the discussions regarding TDM strategies from their previous meeting. He commented that Ms. Bloom-Williams had commented during the previous meeting there was the possibility that State funding for TDM activities might be cut by as much as 30%. Ms. Bloom-Williams noted she had learned that ODOT was hoping to backfill any funding cutbacks for TDM activities such as the point2point Solutions program through other funding mechanisms.

Mr. Jacobson noted the CAC might suggest that any efforts to backfill any cutbacks that would affect programs such as point2point Solutions could come from the 65% STP-U allocation for PPM activities.

Mr. Farrington commented it would be difficult to determine precise funding strategies for TDM activities when it was unknown if the overall STP-U funds available would suffer a net reduction from 2009 levels.

Ms. Riner, responding to comments from Mr. Farrington, noted that the portion of STP-U funding for transit would be directed to capital maintenance and would help offset any significant drains on LTD's general fund. Ms. Archer added that such funds were used by LTD to fund capital maintenance projects so that LTD's general fund could be primarily directed to maintaining operational services.

Mr. Gilliespie asked *[Mr. Thompson] (Who? Not Mr. Thompson, since as noted below, he arrived later in the meeting)* to explain the Overview of Expenditures data listed in the framework assessment document. He further noted that the minutes from the previous CAC meeting seemed to indicate the Committee's support for increased TDM funding within the framework but noted that such support was only generally discussed and never specifically voted upon.

Mr. Jacobson noted the MPC had organized a subcommittee comprised of Mr. Handy, Eugene Mayor Kitty Piercy, Springfield City Councilor Christine Lundberg and LTD Board President Mike Eyster to review the framework in the same manner as the CAC and LCOG staff.

Mr. Jacobson was not sure it was necessary to change the STP-U framework because certain elements regarding the STP-U process and the specific funding amounts related to that process were still up in the air.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen noted that the current STP-U framework provided maximum flexibility to the relevant parties.

Mr. Farrington appreciated the idea of incorporating a certain amount of flexibility into the framework but noted it was important to consider recommendations that directed funds toward projects that would provide a number of benefits, including the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions in the area.

Ms. Riner, responding to a question from Ms. Strand, clarified that the assessment document was intended to serve as an informational tool for both the MPC and the MPO CAC groups and that the assessment had not been intended to communicate the CAC's specific recommendations to the MPC. She further noted that today's meeting would hopefully provide the perfect opportunity for the MPO CAC to coalesce their discussions into a set of recommendations for the MPC.

Mr. Lockfeld asked if the MPC could decide to change the STP-U funding breakdowns from year to year if they saw fit. Ms. Riner replied that the MPC was required to have a framework for the STP-U funding process and that while the process had typically been allocated on a three year basis it was possible for the MPC to change the funding breakdowns year to year as Mr. Lockfeld had mentioned.

Mr. Winter agreed that the STP-U framework should continue to be flexible but hoped that provisions could be put in place to recommend STP-U funding assistance for important programs such as point2point Solutions should the need for such funding arise.

Ms. Bloom-Williams clarified from her presentation at a previous MPO CAC meeting that the overall State funding for the point2point Solutions program was only about \$110,000 and that State cuts to TDM activities funding did not necessarily represent the loss of massive amounts of money.

The Committee members briefly discussed the funding data described in Ms. Riner's November 12 memorandum.

Mr. Gillespie asked if Mr. Farrington was encouraging proportional decreases and increases for STP-U funding for TDM activities. Mr. Farrington replied that he was not but suggested that priorities for PPM funding did not necessarily have to supersede TDM funding.

Ms. Archer, responding to a question from Ms. Strand, noted that in FY10 LTD had "stepped back" and opted not to utilize STP-U funding but in doing so that they had communicated that they anticipated needing the funding for FY11 through FY13.

Mr. Thompson arrived to the meeting at 7:08 p.m.

Ms. Riner briefly discussed various aspects of the STP-U funding and process and noted that the MPO CAC was free to recommend either the allocation of specific STP-U funding amounts or a percentage of the available STP-U funding.

Mr. Jacobson asked the CAC members to summarize their respective positions regarding the STP-U framework.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen supported sufficient funding for LTD and other TDM strategies and noted that she appreciated the flexibility provided by the current STP-U framework structure.

Ms. Alldredge was concerned that reducing STP-U funding for non-profit agencies might also negatively affect any matching funding that such groups might have.

Ms. Mulder agreed with Ms. Butler-Boyeon and Ms. Alldredge's comments and expressed that the flexibility of the current structure had worked well for LTD and other associated transportation agencies.

Mr. Anderson believed the current STP-U funding framework had worked well and allowed the money to be directed where it was most needed.

Mr. Winter appreciated the flexibility provided by the STP-U framework but wanted to ensure that transportation agencies such as LTD would be adequately funded through the STP-U process. He hoped that some sort of guarantees could be made to LTD that their portion of the STP-U funds would be appropriate for their needs.

Mr. Morganti approved of the flexibility provided by the current STP-U framework.

Mr. Beers disagreed with the current funding breakdown figures and believed that the public was "in for hard times" in the coming year. He further advocated that the current STP-U funding split be maintained in order to protect funding for roadway maintenance and improvements.

Ms. Strand supported the continuation of the current STP-U funding split and commended the various agencies involved in the STP-U framework process for their cooperation.

Mr. Farrington believed that the flexibility provided by the current funding split needed to be maintained and hoped that ways could be found to support LTD's efforts. He further noted that the STP-U funding might help LTD offset recent reductions in payroll tax revenues allowing them to maintain their current operational and service levels.

Mr. Lockfeld supported Option C from the staff memorandum which described a new transit funding target of 20% to the STP-U framework. He hoped that the STP-U process would continue to incorporate flexibility that would allow area STP-U funding to be taken out of those transportation budgets that could best afford it.

Mr. Gillespie noted that the current STP-U funding process had engendered cooperation between local transportation agencies. Mr. Gillespie further supported Options B and C from the staff memorandum. He further hoped that STP-U funding levels for transportation planning activities would be maintained.

Mr. Jacobson asked for a motion from the Committee regarding the STP-U framework process and further requested an additional motion recognizing the Committee's support for LTD funding.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen, seconded by Mr. Morganti, moved that the MPO CAC recommend that the MPC adopt a STP-U framework with maximum flexibility to put the dollars where they were most needed.

Ms. Strand asked that Ms. Butler-Boyesen's motion be amended in order for the sake of clarity and opined that the phrase "maximum flexibility" was open to a wide variety of interpretations.

Ms. Strand offered a friendly amendment whereby the phrase "adopt a STP-U framework with maximum flexibility" from the previously stated motion be replaced with the phrase "maintain the current flexible STP-U framework." Ms. Butler-Boyesen accepted Ms. Strand's friendly amendment on the condition that the word "flexible" be omitted. (CONSENT OF THE SECOND NEITHER REQUESTED NOR GIVEN at 1:37:44)

Mr. Jacobson, responding to a comment from Mr. Gillespie, noted that any CAC motions supporting LTD would be made separately from the previously stated motion.

Mr. Beers offered a friendly amendment to Ms. Butler-Boyesen's previously stated motion to include a specification reference to the current 10/25/65 STP-U funding split. The amendment was accepted by Ms. Butler-Boyesen with the consent of the second, Mr. Morganti.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen restated her amended motion for the benefit of the Committee as follows:

Ms. Butler-Boyesen, seconded by Mr. Morganti, moved that the MPO CAC adopt the current 10/25/65 STP-U framework to put dollars where they are most needed.

Mr. Jacobson, responding to a comment from Mr. Lockfeld, noted that a CAC motion supporting LTD would be made separately from the previously stated motion. Mr. Lockfeld maintained the issue warranted further discussion.

Mr. Farrington briefly commented on how a CAC motion to maintain the current funding split percentages might affect the CAC's support to have a specific STP-U dollar amount directed toward LTD.

Mr. Gillespie noted he was inclined to vote against the motion currently under discussion and noted that a direction to specify a specific dollar amount for LTD might negatively affect the current STP-U funding split.

The Committee members briefly discussed how the CAC might express its support to have a specific STP-U funding amount directed to LTD as opposed to a percentage of the total available STP-U funds.

Mr. Thompson viewed the flexibility inherent in the current STP-U funding split as coming primarily from the 65% allocated to PPM activities. He clarified that the 10% directed to TDM activities had been supported by annual budgeting exercises by various transportation agencies.

Mr. Thompson, responding to a comment from Mr. Farrington, noted that the phrase "planning activities" as used to describe the 25% portion of the current STP-U funding split didn't convey the wide scope of these funds as there were a number of divergent activities that fell under that category such as public involvement work, modeling, data maintenance, and the full range of activities committed to in the MPO's Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).

Mr. Jacobson thanked Mr. Thompson for his comments.

Ms. Alldredge was encouraged by the inter-agency cooperation reflected in the STP-U framework and further pointed out that the State budget was very flexible with respect to regional transportation issues.

Mr. Jacobson called for a vote on Ms. Butler-Boyesen's previously stated and amended motion. The motion passed, 9:2 (Mr. Gillespie and Mr. Winter voting in opposition.).

Mr. Jacobson noted he would entertain an additional CAC motion expressing general support for LTD's efforts and TDM strategies. He maintained that any attempts to specify a dollar amount in that regard might prevent the CAC from reaching a consensus on the matter.

Mr. Winter suggested the CAC support that \$500,000 of the STP-U funding allocation for PPM activities be directed to local transit activities.

Mr. Winter, seconded by Mr. Gillespie, moved that the CAC support that \$500,000 of the 65% be directed towards transit in the years that transit funding needed those funds.

Mr. Jacobson asked Mr. Winter to specify what "transit funding" referred to in his motion. Mr. Winter replied that it referred specifically to LTD funding.

Mr. Lockfeld proposed a friendly amendment to have Mr. Winter's motion instead state that the CAC recommend to the MPC that taking out of the existing 10/25/65 framework that they fund LTD during budget cycles when it is needed to maintain services.

Mr. Jacobson asked Mr. Lockfeld to clarify his proposed amendment. Mr. Lockfeld replied that the CAC would recommend that the MPC fund LTD when such funds were needed to maintain existing services.

Mr. Morganti excused himself from the meeting at 7:32 p.m.

Mr. Lockfeld proposed a friendly amendment to have Mr. Winter's motion instead state that the CAC "recommend that the MPC provide funding to LTD taking as they see fit from within the existing [STP-U] framework when it is needed to maintain existing transit services."

Mr. Gillespie asked if his friendly amendment specifically eliminated the mention of the dollar figure included as part of Mr. Winter's previously stated motion. Mr. Jacobson confirmed that the dollar figure would indeed be omitted as part of Mr. Lockfeld's friendly amendment.

Mr. Winter and Mr. Gillespie did not accept Mr. Lockfeld's friendly amendment.

Mr. Jacobson called for a vote on Mr. Winter's previously stated motion. The motion failed 2:7 (Ms. Alldredge, Ms. Mulder, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Beers, Ms. Strand, Mr. Farrington, and Mr. Lockfeld voting in opposition.).

Mr. Farrington, seconded by Mr. Gillespie, moved that the MPO CAC recommend to the MPC that \$500,000 be allocated out of STP-U funds for LTD transit services to maintain operational capacity.

Mr. Farrington, responding to Mr. Jacobson's concern that his motion was identical to the motion that had previously been voted down, stated that his motion was specifically stated to direct the \$500,000 allocation towards the maintenance of LTD's operational capacity. Mr. Farrington noted the presumption of his motion was that the \$500,000 would be distributed equitably.

Mr. Farrington hoped that an analysis might be conducted to better determine where the \$500,000 STP-U funding allocation to LTD would come from.

Mr. Jacobson called for a vote on Mr. Farrington's previously stated motion. The motion passed, 6:3 (Mr. Jacobson, Mr. Beers, and Ms. Strand voting in opposition.).

Ms. Strand, seconded by Mr. Gillespie, moved that the MPO CAC direct the MPC to put more weight on the issues of TDM and transit requests when they considered where STP-U funds should be directed.

Mr. Thompson recommended that Ms. Strand's motion might be more appropriately considered later on when the MPC held more specific deliberations regarding the specific transportation areas where STP-U funding would be applied, as the MPC considered the specific funding applications submitted by the MPO jurisdictions.

Ms. Strand withdrew her previously stated motion with the consent of the second.

Mr. Jacobson adjourned the meeting at 7:40 p.m.

(Recorded by Wade Hicks)