

**From:** [Rob Zako](#)  
**To:** [Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization](#)  
**Cc:** [\\*LCOG TPC](#); [BEST Safe Streets Committee](#)  
**Subject:** Project Proposals for MPO Redistribution Funding - BEST's comments  
**Date:** Monday, February 13, 2023 8:01:52 AM

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside the organization. DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Central Lane MPO ... and TPC,

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:** BEST suggests no substantive changes to [TPC's proposed recommendation](#) on how to allocate \$2.4 million of federal redistribution STBG funds to five proposed project:

\$600,000.00: Eugene - Bikeshare Operations & Expansion  
\$500,000.00: Eugene - Hunsaker Safety Improvements project additional funding  
\$198,304.00: Lane County - Coburg Rd and Game Farm Rd local overmatch  
\$242,432.40: Lane County - Clear Lake Rd project local overmatch  
\$859,263.60: Springfield - Mill St Reconstruct South A St to Centennial Blvd  
-----  
**\$2,400,000.00: TOTAL**

**POLICY ISSUES:** All five projects are for pavement preservation, to support active transportation, or for a combination of the two. In general, as Oregon's Constitution currently limits the use of state and local motor vehicle taxes to be used for investments in roads, we favor using flexible federal funding for projects that could not be funded with such state or local taxes. For example, bike share operations and expansion could not be funded from such state or local funds, hence using federal funds is smart. On the other hand, pavement preservation projects that primarily benefit motor vehicle drivers should be substantially paid for by revenues aimed at such uses, for example, state or local gas taxes, or street repair bond measures. We appreciate that current revenues streams are not sufficient for preservation needs, but question using flexible federal funds to backfill such needs.

**PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ISSUES:** BEST opted to NOT testify to the [recent public hearing before MPC](#). As we have noted before, it is often not clear what sort of public comment is helpful. In this case, as TPC is recommending funding all five proposed projects, and as MPC is likely to ratify that recommendation, it is not clear what, if anything, BEST or other members of the public could say to have any impact on the funding allocation. Absent any apparent alternatives, we are not motivated to oppose funding for any of the five projects. Nor are we motivated to suggest tweaks to the distribution of funding.

For some time, we have been wanting to submit more comprehensive comments on the [Central Lane MPO's public participation efforts](#), but have had more pressing issues to address. In brief, the Central Lane MPO could do a better job INFORMING the public about how taxpayer monies are being spent, in particular, maintaining a comprehensive list of funded projects, not just posting and taking down when there is a public hearing. Beyond simply informing the public, Central Lane MPO could do more to highlight the policy choices they are facing and how the public could be CONSULTED or INVOLVED in helping to set funding priorities. In general, we are seeing the Central MPO operating at the lowest levels of the [Spectrum of Public Participation](#).

For BEST,  
Rob