

MINUTES

Metropolitan Policy Committee
Bascom-Tykeson Room—Eugene Public Library—100 West Tenth Avenue
Eugene, Oregon

November 10, 2011
11:30 a.m.

PRESENT: Hillary Wylie, Chair; Sid Leiken, Vice Chair; John Fox (arrived 12:05 p.m.) (City of Coburg), Kitty Piercy, Alan Zelenka (City of Eugene), Christine Lundberg (City of Springfield), Jay Bozievich (Lane County), Lisa Nell (Oregon Department of Transportation), Mike Eyster (left at 1:00 p.m.), Greg Evans (left at 1:00 p.m.), (Lane Transit District), members; Gino Grimaldi (City of Springfield), Ron Kilcoyne, (Lane Transit District), Sarah Medary for Jon Ruiz (City of Eugene), Celia Barry for Liane Richardson (Lane County), Petra Schuetz (for Don Schuessler) *ex officio* members.

Byron Vanderpool, Andrea Riner, Kathi Wiederhold, Paul Thompson, Ann Mortenson, Jamon Kent, Stacy Clauson, (Lane Council of Governments); Rob Inerfeld, Brenda Wilson, Kurt Yeiter, (City of Eugene), Tom Boyatt, Len Goodwin, David Reesor (City of Springfield), Alex Cuyler, (Lane County), Theresa Brand, Natalie Stiffler, Tom Schwetz (Lane Transit District), Amanda Pietz (Oregon Department of Transportation), Rob Zako (Department of Land Conservation and Development), Sarah Strand, Edward Winter (Metropolitan Planning Organization Citizen Advisory Committee); Carleen Reilly, Mark Rabinowitz, Elena Aguero, guests.

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Ms. Wylie welcomed everyone to the meeting. Those present introduced themselves.

2. CALL TO ORDER/APPROVE OCTOBER 13, 2011 MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Eyster, seconded by Ms. Nell, moved to approve the October 13, 2011 minutes as submitted. There was consensus to approve the motion.

3. ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA/ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM MPC MEMBERS

There were no adjustments to the agenda. No MPC members had announcements.

4. COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Mark Rabinowitz distributed two handouts entitled *Peak Money a permanent change* and *Lane County VMT—Oregon State Highways*. Mr. Rabinowitz said federal law required a 20 year planning horizon for federally funded transportation projects. There was no acknowledgement that traffic levels had peaked in Lane County, Oregon or the U.S. The environmental impact study (EIS)

for the Columbia River crossing said peak oil would occur by 2040. Much of the oil used in the northwest came from the Alaska pipeline. He asked what part of the world would give up its oil consumption so that people could drive on the Belt Line. NEPA stated new circumstances must be considered in supplemental EIS. The MPC was planning to waste resources planning for a future that was not possible.

5. METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO) ISSUES

a. Report from the MPO Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)

Sarah Strand and Edward Winter, representing the MPO CAC, joined the MPC.

Mr. Winter said the CAC had recommended the reappointment of five CAC members, Dick Beers, Gary Gillespie, Alexandre Lockfeld, Sarah Strand and Edward Winter. If the five members were reappointed, the CAC would consist of 14 members. He said most of the meeting was dedicated to discussing the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The minutes of the CAC meeting which were included in the agenda packet, included more detailed information on this subject.

Mr. Leiken observed a CAC member was also on the board of a MPC member agency. Although this was not a conflict of interest, Mr. Leiken thought this situation unusual.

Mr. Winter said the issue of Gary Gillespie serving on both bodies was discussed by the CAC at the time of Mr. Gillespie's initial appointment to the LTD board and had been advised it was not a conflict of interest.

Mr. Leiken proposed that the MPO discuss this for future appointments.

Mr. Zelenka stated the City of Eugene policy called for opening board and commission appointments up for new applications which brought in new ideas.

Ms. Piercy said the issue should be separated from the person, and suggested the MPC have a discussion for future appointments and establish rules for those appointments.

Ms. Wylie stated when new councilors joined the Springfield City Council, they resigned from other City commissions.

Ms. Lundberg said the CAC members were not policy makers and their role was different from that of the MPC. She agreed the process for Mr. Gillespie's seat should be opened and Mr. Gillespie's application reconsidered.

Ms. Strand said the recruitment process was intensive and expensive, and there was a steep learning curve for new CAC members.

Mr. Leiken said it made sense to allow Mr. Gillespie to serve the new term and the CAC should discuss the policy.

Mr. Zelenka, seconded by Ms. Lundberg, moved to open recruitment for the CAC to bring the membership to 15 people.

Ms. Wylie asked if the recruitment policy was set in stone.

Ms. Riner said the process was not set in stone, but it had been challenging to get qualified applicants. Staff had reviewed the CAC proposal of reappointing the five current members, all of whom were stellar candidates and represented diversity on the CAC. In response to a question from Mr. Eyster, Ms. Riner said the process would have to be opened to solicit new applications. She said recruitment costs included an estimated \$5,000 to \$6,000 for newspaper advertisements in addition to staff time.

The motion passed 7:2, with Mr. Bozievich, Mr. Leiken, Mr. Fox, Ms. Lundberg, Ms. Wylie, Mr. Evans and Mr. Zelenka voting in favor and Mr. Eyster and Ms. Piercy voting against the motion.

Ms. Wiederhold said the recruitment would likely occur in January 2012. Staff would solicit ideas from partner agencies for streamlining the process.

Ms. Wylie proposed extending CAC members' terms until the recruitment process was completed.

Mr. Riner agreed to bring a proposal to the December 8, 2011 MPC meeting for a recruitment process and for extending CAC members' terms until the recruitment process was completed.

Ms. Wylie noted consensus to accept Ms. Riner's suggestion.

Ms. Wylie stated the October 20, 2011 CAC minutes indicated that the CAC "strongly endorses the importance of access to inner-city passenger rail and bus transit for the Central Lane MPO area and encourages prioritizing of state and federal funding for those purposes." She asked how the CAC intended the MPC to carry that out.

Mr. Winter said the CAC wanted to have strong language to support bus transit and to support improving passenger rail between the Eugene/Springfield area and Portland. The CAC had not developed a recommendation for implementing the proposal.

b. Draft 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update

Mr. Thompson offered the staff report. He reviewed the staff memorandum, noting the following highlights:

- TSI Bicycle Policy #1 Policy Definition/Intent Language—At the October MPC meeting the MPC directed staff to draft alternative language for potential inclusion in the Policy Definition/Intent portion of TSI Bicycle Policy #1. At the October staff Transportation Planning Committee (TPC) meeting, the TPC unanimously supported the CAC recommendation with minor clarifying modifications to the language, and recommended the revised language to the TSI Bicycle Policy #1:

In order to encourage walking and bicycling trips by those not currently using those modes and an overall increase in trips and safety for those modes, it is preferable, when practical, that bicycles and pedestrians be as physically separated as possible from the flow of motorized traffic.

Ms. Lundberg liked the TPC recommendation because it embodied all of the CAC's recommendations and included walking.

Mr. Zelenka also liked the addition of walking. He noted the new bicycle track on north Alder Street provided a buffer between the bicycle track and cars.

Mr. Thompson noted consensus of the MPC to support the proposal.

- RTP Adoption—Mr. Thompson noted the CAC discussed the appropriateness of adopting something that had not been fully available as a draft for public review. The CAC ultimately recommended adopting the RTP with the understanding that the statistical data would be available and not significantly different than the data contained in the RTP adopted in 2007. MPO staff subsequently concluded the proposed TSI Bicycle Policy #1 Policy Definition/Intent Language had not had sufficient time for public review. MPO staff was recommending extending the public comment period on the draft 2035 RTP to December 5, 2011, and scheduling adoption of the RTP for the December 8, 2011 MPC meeting. He directed MPC members to a handout entitled *Table 6. RTP 2010-2035 PERFORMANCE MEASURES*. He said the table would be completed by November 14, 2011 and posted on the MPO website.

Ms. Lundberg said the maps were very informative, and asked that consideration be given to changing some colors to further enhance the maps' readability.

- Public Outreach—Mr. Thompson said the speakers' bureau had been very successful. He distributed and reviewed a packet of comments received from the public related to the RTP Update. He reminded that the decision to not revise the RTP policies was based upon direction from the MPC, and that the policies could be reevaluated after the local jurisdictions concluded their land use and transportation policy updates.

c. Draft FY12-15 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP)

Mr. Thompson reported the text of the draft MTIP had not changed and only six new projects had been added. This was primarily due to the uncertainty regarding future transportation funding levels and lack of a new federal transportation bill. Four of the six new projects in the draft MTIP were LTD projects, three of which were continuations of ongoing programmatic formula funding. The fourth new LTD project would program money received from a federal funding process and must be included in the MTIP. The other two new projects consisted of one pavement restoration project and a cable median barrier project. Following today's public hearing, the FY12-15 MTIP would be presented to the MPC for adoption on January 12, 2012.

Ms. Wylie opened the public hearing at 12:35 p.m.

Mark Rabinowitz asserted this was not a public hearing. With peak everything occurring, transportation triage was needed. It was a waste of resources to widen the Beltline Highway, since oil, gas and coal would not be available for our grandkids. He said we were running out of gas. The future would not be like the past.

Ms. Wylie closed the public hearing at 12:39. She said the public comment period would remain open through January 9, 2012.

Mr. Thompson proposed the MPC hold a public hearing on the air quality analysis meeting and the draft MTIP at the December 8, 2011 meeting.

Ms. Wylie noted consensus to hold a public hearing on December 8, 2011 on the air quality analysis and draft MTIP.

d. Letter(S) Regarding Funding for Student Transit Pass Program (STPP)

Mr. Thompson said the CAC had recommended that the MPC write a letter to the Legislature, encouraging legislators to identify funding for the Student Transit Pass Program. The MPC subsequently directed staff to draft a letter for approval at the November 2011 MPC meeting. The staff committee suggested also sending the letter to the Oregon Transportation Commission.

Mr. Eyster, seconded by Mr. Fox, moved to approve letters encouraging members of the Oregon State Legislature, the Oregon Transportation Commission, and OTC Commissioner Frohnmayer, to identify funding for the Student Transit Pass Program. The motion passed unanimously with Ms. Nell abstaining.

Ms. Piercy suggested the MPC should keep the LaneACT informed of its decisions.

Mr. Kloeppe said he had been serving as the MPO representative to the LaneACT. Ms. Riner began serving in that capacity on November 9, 2011.

Mr. Thompson said the OTC was scheduled to meet next week at which time they would meet with representatives of all of the ACTs. Mr. Kloeppe suggested the MPC should ask Creswell Mayor Bob Hooker, who chaired the LaneACT, to report back to the MPC. Ms. Piercy agreed to contact Mayor Hooker.

e. GHG Planning Update

Mr. Vanderpool invited Ms. Wilson and Mr. Cuyler to participate in the presentation. He directed MPC members to a letter dated October 28, 2011 to the Central Lane MPO, Eugene, Springfield, Coburg, Lane County and Lane Transit District, from Jerri Borland of ODOT and Jim Rue from DLCD, regarding the ODOT and DLCD Support for Central Lane Scenario Planning as required by the 2009 Jobs and Transportation Act, which was included in the agenda packet for today's meeting. The letter communicated ODOT and DLCD's commitment to supporting the Central Lane scenario planning efforts, noting both agencies were dedicated to helping the effort be successful through financial and technical support following the lead of the Central Lane metropolitan area (MPO, county, cities, and stakeholders).

Mr. Vanderpool said House Bill (H.B.) 2011 required the MPO to develop two or more land use and transportation scenarios that accommodated growth while achieving a reduction in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from light vehicles. The local jurisdictions would work to cooperatively select one of the scenarios but they were not required to adopt the scenarios. H.B. 2001 stated that the

MPO was not required to conduct GHG scenario planning, or to develop needed modeling and technical capabilities until additional funding was provided. He iterated there had been no work done on scenario planning under H.B. 2001. Although the state had notified the MPO that state funding would be provided, it had not yet been received. He added there was no agreement in place with the state and staff had brought no recommendation to the MPC on the process.

Ms. Wilson stated the scenario planning concept was introduced during the 2009 Oregon State Legislature. H.B. 2001 subsequently directed that the metropolitan area of the Central Lane MPO accomplish certain things. The City of Eugene had a long standing policy against unfunded mandates. The Eugene City Council directed Ms. Wilson to amend the bill so that the City of Eugene would not be required to do work under the bill without funding from the State.

Mr. Cuyler said Lane County elected officials had discussed the sustainable communities planning grant, and there had been differences of opinion on whether ODOT would be able to fund the grant. In September, staff had asked ODOT to provide written documentation that State funding would be available for the project, which resulted in the October 28, 2011 letter from ODOT and DLCDC.

Ms. Wilson explained a federal department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) grant had been secured by LCOG to fund a variety of regional planning work, including scenario planning. This work was different than that required under H.B. 2001 and had different funding sources. Phase 1 work under the HUD grant would lead into what needed to be done as a region to comply with H.B. 2001.

Mr. Cuyler said under the HUD grant, the elected officials had adopted a restructured governance format consisting of a leadership team including mayors from Eugene and Springfield and Chair Stewart from Lane County; and a project management team chaired by Len Goodwin from the City of Springfield, consisting of Mr. Cuyler (Lane County), Mr. Vanderpool (LCOG), Ms. Medary (City of Eugene) and Ms. Nell (ODOT). The project management team was developing a revised work plan.

Ms. Wilson said modeling needed to be developed by July 1, 2013 for scenario planning which required development of two or more scenarios for alternative land use/transportation scenarios that would accommodate growth and address a reduction in GHG emissions for vehicles of 10,000 lbs GVW or less. After a public review and comment period, all of the MPO local governments were required to cooperatively select a planning scenario. The MPO was then required to report to the Legislative Assembly between January 2013 and July 2013 on the implications to implement a scenario. Between July 2013 and February 2014, the MPO needed to report to the interim committees of the legislature on its recommendation for what a cooperative process for rule making enforcement would look like.

Mr. Eyster and Mr. Evans left at 1:00 p.m.

Ms. Wylie said the MPC appointed Mr. Zelenka as representative and Ms. Wylie as the alternative to the Governor's Task Force on GHG emissions in 2010. She had been appointed by the MPC to testify before the OTC in 2010. She testified that while the MPC was well suited to undertake the scenario planning work, it needed money to do so. She was pleased with the news that the financial piece was coming together.

Mr. Leiken noted Amanda Pietz and Rob Zako were in the audience and asked for their reaction.

Ms. Pietz understood ODOT had no significant concerns with the MPO timeline and two phased approach. ODOT's commitment was to ensure the jurisdictions and MPO had adequate funding. She added ODOT was willing to discuss additional funding for elements of the project out of the scope of the HUD grant.

Mr. Zako understood the Central Lane MPO was required to report to the legislature in February 2014 and February 2015. He noted there was not one single way to do scenario planning and the State wanted to be flexible.

Mr. Vanderpool expected the MPC would be asked to approve a proposed work plan, a proposed budget, and a proposed agreement.

Mr. Leiken thought the lead was the role of the cities and it was important for the MPC to do it right.

Mr. Zelenka thanked ODOT and DLCD for the funds for the project.

Ms. Wylie noted there was no longer a quorum present and suggested the MPC take an advisory vote.

Mr. Cuyler offered an advisory motion that the MPC direct that MPO staff in collaboration with local agency staff, to work in accordance with the guidance established by H.B. 2001, Section 38-A, and the October 28, 2011 letter from ODOT and DLCD, to bring back to the MPC a draft work plan, draft budget, and draft Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) for approval.

Mr. Fox asked if Coburg was covered in the HUD grant funding.

Mr. Cuyler said Coburg was covered in the HUD grant inasmuch as it had a part of the work under **task 4** that involved the MPO.

Mr. Vanderpool said the work under H.B. 2001, Section 38-A, Coburg would be covered. It would be important to include information in the budget and work plan for the agreement with the State on funding. Coburg was not a partner in the HUD grant except through its relationship with the MPO and Coburg would not directly receive HUD funding.

Ms. Pietz said ODOT had a relationship with the HUD grant and the H.B. 2001 requirements. ODOT's relationship with the HUD grant was to provide the largest share of cash match for the grant through development of an IGA which would cover Phase 1 work. As part of Phase 1, ODOT would negotiate funding with Coburg for required Phase 1 work.

Ms. Wilson said under the HUD grant, additional partners were welcome to discuss their participation with the consortium members.

Ms. Piercy said it would be good if staff would spend time with Mr. Fox and Coburg staff to enable them to understand the state and HUD funding parameters.

Ms. Wylie concurred with Ms. Piercy, iterating that Coburg needed to be fully informed.

Ms. Wylie noted consensus to move ahead and have staff report to the MPC on a monthly basis.

f. MPO Planning Calendars

Ms. Riner had no additional comments on the planning calendars.

e. Follow-up and Next Steps

- **ODOT Update**—Ms. Nell noted the Connect Oregon applications were due November 21, 2011.
- **Rail Update**—Ms. Piercy reported that the first rail meeting had occurred. The group was choosing a facilitator and a project manager.
- **MTIP Administrative Amendment**—Mr. Bozievich attended the opening of the Coos Bay railway at American Bridge. It was exciting to have the freight line to the coast and the deep water port.
- **Next Steps/Agenda Build**—There were no additional comments.

The next meeting was scheduled for December 8, 2011 at the Bascom-Tykeson Room, Eugene Public Library.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:35 p.m.

(Recorded by Linda Henry)