

Forum on an Area Commission on Transportation for Lane County (FACT-LC)

S U M M A R Y

Meeting #3

Wednesday, March 10, 2010, 5:30–8:00 PM

McLane Room, Oregon Department of Transportation, 644 A St., Springfield

At Table

Judy Volta (Coburg); Gary Williams (Cottage Grove); Bob Hooker, Mark Shrives (Creswell);
(Dunes City); Kitty Piercy, Brenda Wilson (Eugene); Phil Brubaker (Florence);
Dwight Coon, David Clyne (Junction City); Warren Weathers (Lowell); Don Hampton (Oakridge);
(Springfield); Sharon Hobart-Hardin, Ric Ingham (Veneta); Neil Friedman (Westfir);
Jeff Stump (Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua & Siuslaw Indians);
Rob Handy, Celia Barry (Lane County); Kent Fleming, Sean Barrett (RAC);
Mike Eyster, Tom Schwetz (LTD); Mark Freeman (Port of Siuslaw); Andrea Riner (CLMPO);
Dave Jacobson, Eleanor Muldor (CAC); Sonny Chickering, Savannah Crawford (ODOT);
Marguerite Nabeta (ERT); Rob Zako (project manager)

In Audience

Mary Salinas (Springfield); Jim Baker (Blue River Community Development Corporation);
Mia Nelson (1000 Friends of Oregon); Sue Wolling (GEARs); Sally Friedman (Westfir);
George Kloeppel, Jamon Kent (CLMPO); Diana Alldredge, Sarah Strand (CAC);
Jeff Lange (ODOT)

1. **Welcome & Introductions:** Those present introduced themselves and indicated where and how they like to travel in Lane County.
2. **Review Aims & Agenda**
3. **Review & Approve February 10 Meeting Summary:** *CONSENSUS* to approve as presented.
4. **Review Task, Schedule, Guidance & Ground Rules**
5. **Public Comment**
 - **Mary Salinas (Springfield):** She comments at all meetings where she sees “LTD.” Buses are absolutely necessary. Many people cannot travel because they are too poor. She is a rep for the homeless. The economy won’t get better [soon]. We’re killing the planet. She’s told 20% of people ride buses. That’s a lot. They will probably need to go up to 30%. She is poor but many are much poorer. Drivers are great.
 - **Jim Baker (Vida):** He is representing Blue River Community Development Corporation. They can volunteer to provide the Highway 126 East representative to the ACT. They have been instrumental in cleaning up Blue River for the past 10 years. They partner with many other entities—USFS, McKenzie Track & Field, water districts, Goal One Coalition, LaneWatch Lane County, McKenzie River Guides. Concerns include lots of heavy traffic and no bike lanes. (In response to a question:) McKenzie Valley Chamber is not very active, but did promote safety improvements at Deerhorn.

- **Mia Nelson (Eugene):** She is representing 1000 Friends of Oregon. She comments on letter from eight mayors. She is concerned about proportional representation. The recommendations from the eight mayors cannot be supported, as it would give 10 of 28 votes to people representing only 12% of Lane County’s population: one vote no matter how big a jurisdiction. Also, the draft bylaws dilute the power of rural (unincorporated) Lane County and Eugene. For example, Westfir gets one vote with a population of only 300. Also, the number of citizen representatives can be as low as three, including Highway 126 East. The proposed changes to the bylaws put control in the hands of small cities, which represent only one-eighth of Lane County’s population. She suggests giving the small cities only 5 votes. Don’t adopt any of the recommendations from the letter from the eight mayors. (Distributes letter.)
- **Sue Wolling (Eugene):** She mostly relies on bicycles, so that is her perspective. She says it is natural to try to promote your city’s priorities. But inevitably you’ll fight over dollars because there isn’t enough. She suggests promoting alternative transportation instead as a solution. She thinks we can reduce single-occupant vehicle use by 50%. Suppose we increase alternative modes by 20%. Then you won’t need those [highway] projects. Also, consider time. Highway projects can take 15 years to build. It is unlikely we’ll be traveling them then the way we do now. Whether we run out of oil and gas, or whether we have too many old people, it’s important that we try to build projects that serve our needs in the future. Also, the ACT should include people who will look beyond current modes of travel.
- **Sarah Strand:** She is the vice-chair of the Central Lane MPO Citizen Advisory Committee. She looks forward to more non-single-occupant-vehicle travel. The ACT has a chance to look at greenhouse gas emissions, climate change, alternative modes of travel, and pedestrian issues. As a group, the ACT has an opportunity to make a difference.

6. Discuss ACT Bylaws Working Draft:

a. Decision Making:

- Need to know first who are the voting members of the ACT.
- Remove “win-win” language.
- Change supermajority to 2/3: proportional concerns with this idea; set up in best way for success—this is possible and has happened; control about who sits at the table; get broad viewpoint.
- *NO CONSENSUS*. Opt to return to discussing voting members.

b. Voting Members:

- **Cities & County:** *CONSENSUS* on one vote each for the cities and the county.
- **Tribes, Ports, Transit Districts:** *CONSENSUS* on one vote each for tribes, ports and transit districts.
- **MPO:** *CONSENSUS* on one vote for the MPO.
- **RAC & CAC:** Concerns around giving votes to Lane County Roads Advisory Committee and Central Lane MPO Citizen Advisory Committee: This gives extra votes (to Lane County and the MPO). But the RAC and the CAC represent under-represented areas. The RAC and the CAC advise other bodies, not are told by other bodies what to think. Could the RAC and CAC members be considered as Citizen (Private Sector) members? The RAC and the CAC can help develop a Public Participation Plan. Maybe have members from the RAC and CAC, but make them non-voting. To the extent that the RAC and the CAC represent alternative modes, they could be Citizen (Private Sector) members. *NO CONSENSUS*.

- **Citizen (Private Sector):** OTC states that ACTs should include non-elected representatives. Having broad representation isn't debated, voting status is debated. ACT, not county, should appoint Citizen (Private Sector) members. Or perhaps there should be some appoint by county and some appointed by ACT. Maybe reduce the number from 7 to just 3 or 4. Maybe one of these could represent Highway 126 East. Remove the language about the county confirming appointments. Proposal: Have 7 citizen reps—CAC, RAC, Highway 126 East, and 4–7 others. Elected officials represent these areas as well, so citizen representatives might not need a vote. Past mistrust between (small) cities and the county needs to be resolved; there is perceived control by the county. Proposal: county appoints Highway 126 East rep, CAC & RAC each appoint own reps, ACT appoints 2 other citizen reps. Good to have more (specialized) knowledge. Advice from other ACTs: 1) bring variety to the table; and 2) use a consensus-based approach. Proposal: No county appointments, ACT appoint 6–7 voting members (could include CAC & RAC), and one of these should be Highway 126 East. What about environmental representation? Proposal: Stick with March 3 draft to maintain flexibility. How to resolve the issue around the role of the county? Maybe the county does not need to confirm, so long as there is broad representation and the ACT hears all voices. What should be the number of citizen reps? The draft allows for up to 8, which is maybe too many. Proposal: county appoints Highway 126 East, RAC & CAC appoint own reps, and then ACT appoints up to 4 citizen reps. Some changes may occur in the future, so proceed along these lines, as things/opinions could change. Develop a list of special interest areas to select citizen members. *TENTATIVE CONSENSUS:* RAC & CAC appoint own reps, county appoints Highway 126 East rep, ACT appoints *UP TO 6* additional citizen reps but need not appoint that many. This approach to bylaws gives ACT flexibility.

7. Next Steps

- *CONSENSUS* to have the *ad hoc* subcommittee look at the issue of decision making.