

## **Addendum**

### **Summary**

This is additional information for the December 13 LaneACT meeting. It relates to the LaneACT 2024-25 Work Plan (agenda item 6). This summary and attachments are intended to supplement, not replace (entirely), the documents included in the original packet of information (meeting packet) that was sent to the LaneACT on December 6 (by email).

Attached to this addendum is a revised version of the draft work plan, prepared by LaneACT staff. The version included in the meeting packet is dated December 4. The revised version is dated December 11. (This document replaces the version included in the meeting packet.)

The revised version incorporates additional refinements suggested by LaneACT Vice Chair, Rob Zako in an email he sent on December 4. The edits are shown in track-changes format (as strikethroughs and underlines). LaneACT staff was not able to incorporate these changes before the meeting packet was sent out.

Also attached to this addendum is a copy of Rob Zako's email, along with a response provided by LaneACT staff (Bill Johnston) on December 6. The response explains why some of the Vice Chair's suggested refinements were not incorporated into the revised draft.

The draft work plan is essentially a staff recommendation. It reflects the discussions that have occurred at LaneACT meetings over the last year. It also reflects the perspective of ODOT staff (Vidal Francis and Bill Johnston) on a few topics, especially the frequency of meetings.

The LaneACT may modify the draft work plan if they choose, by providing verbal direction to staff at the meeting on December 13. If it's not clear there is a consensus among the members to make a change proposed by a single member, staff may ask for confirmation that all members agree.

Staff recommends that the LaneACT approve the work plan at the December 13 meeting. ODOT has asked the ACTs to submit their work plans in December, or January at the latest.

### **Attachments**

- A. Draft 2024-25 work plan for the LaneACT – revised December 11 (7 pages)
- B. Email from Bill Johnston, LaneACT (and ODOT) staff, dated December 6, 2023 (10 pages)

# Work Plan for the LaneACT

2024-2025

[ ODOT has provided the ACTs with a template for them to use in developing their work plans for the next two-year period. LaneACT staff have adapted the template to develop this draft work plan for the LaneACT. The comments [in bracketed green text] are intended to help guide the LaneACT while the draft is being developed and refined. These comments will not be included in the final version. ]

## **Contents**

1. Overview (p.1)
2. LaneACT officers (p.1)
3. Interest areas and priorities (p.2)
4. Two-year goals and initiatives (p.3)
5. Meeting topic plan (p.5)
6. References (p.7)

## **1. Overview**

[ The ODOT template provides the following text for the ACTs to include in their work plans. LaneACT staff has modified the text to explain how the LaneACT adapted the template for their needs. ]

Area Commissions on Transportation (ACTs) provide venues for local elected officials and others to discuss regional transportation issues and provide input to the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) to inform their decisions. According to the OTC [Policy on Formation and Operation of ACTs](#), each ACT is expected to prepare a two-year work plan that identifies their areas of interest and specific topics to discuss. This is intended to help focus the work of each ACT and clarify how the group will engage and inform regional and statewide issues.

ODOT provided a template for the ACTs to use in developing their work plans. The LaneACT adapted the template to develop this work plan. The LaneACT work plan includes the specific topics identified by the OTC and ODOT that all the ACTs are expected to discuss during the work plan period ([calendar years](#) 2024-2025). The work plan also includes some additional topics the LaneACT anticipates discussing. Consistent with the direction provided by the OTC and ODOT, these topics have a transportation nexus and are limited to topics the LaneACT has an ability to influence.

## **2. LaneACT officers** (terms expire on 12/31/2023)

- Chair: Shelley Humble – Airport Manager, City of Creswell
- Vice-Chair: Rob Zako – Executive Director, Better Eugene Springfield Transportation
- Ambassador to the OTC: Lucy Vinis – Mayor, City of Eugene

[section break]

### 3. Interest areas and priorities

[ The following instructions, in italics, are included in the template provided by ODOT. They are included in this draft work plan so the LaneACT is aware of what the OTC and ODOT would like included. These instructions will not be included in the final version. ]

*Include and describe a list of ACT interest areas and priorities specific to your ACT and those listed in the ACT Charter. This is the space to detail the priorities as discussed and agreed upon by the individual ACT. This can include a range of topics such as improve economic vitality, decrease crashes, support climate change actions, improve public transportation connections and accessibility, etc. with a nexus to how the ACT can support such outcomes.*

[ The following text is new. It was not included in the October 9 draft. ]

The following are the LaneACT's current priorities. This is a consolidated (shorter) version of the priorities that were identified in the previous LaneACT work plan that was developed in 2016, which are still relevant. The list has been updated to include the transportation investment priorities identified in the LaneACT Area Strategies Report that was developed in 2022, and other minor refinements.

[ The text included in the October 9 draft has been modified to read as follows. ]

#### A. Advisory and advocacy activities

- Respond to requests for input from the OTC and ODOT relating to the allocation of state and federal funds for transportation improvements.
- Provide input that reflects the investment priorities previously identified by the LaneACT. These priorities are described in the *LaneACT Area Strategies Report* developed in 2022. Four broad investment priorities (themes) are identified in the report: (1) Access, connectivity, and efficiency. (2) Safety, security, and health. (3) Equity. (4) Sustainability and resiliency. Additional explanation and more detailed strategies are included in the report.
- Advocate specifically for funding to improve the transportation system in the LaneACT area, when there are opportunities to do so.

#### B. Education

- Stay informed about new federal and state transportation policies, programs and projects.
- Stay informed about noteworthy local programs and projects in the LaneACT area.

#### C. LaneACT governance

- Fulfill the administrative responsibilities described in the *OTC Policy on ACT Formation and Operation* and the *LaneACT Bylaws*. This includes electing officers and recruiting representatives from special interest groups (stakeholders) to participate as members of the ACT.
- Provide training for new members. [In addition to helping them understand the role and](#)

[responsibilities of an ACT, provide some insight into the history and culture of the LaneACT.](#)

- Periodically review and update LaneACT governing documents. This includes the LaneACT Bylaws, special protocols, and the LaneACT Public Participation Plan.

#### **D. Public involvement**

- Ensure the LaneACT is complying with Oregon Public Meetings Law (ORS 192.610 to 192.690). (The LaneACT Public Participation Plan fully complies with these laws.)
- Ensure the LaneACT is complying with supplemental ODOT public notification requirements. This requires public meetings to be posted on the State of Oregon Transparency website at the following link: <https://www.oregon.gov/transparency/Pages/Public-Meetings.aspx>

## **4. Two-year goals and initiatives**

[ The following instructions, in italics, are included in the template provided by ODOT. They will not be included in the final version. ]

*Use this space to provide the ACT two-year goals and initiatives. Be specific. These goals should relate to the ACT priorities articulated above and have related outcomes and/or strategies. Examples include: learn more about growing industries and related regional transportation needs, engage more members of the public, seek understanding of connection between housing and transportation, etc. tied to tangible desired outcomes of how the ACT will engage in, advance, inform, or learn about different topics in order to advance transportation goals.*

### **Goal 1: Develop a list of priority projects for the LaneACT area**

- The list of priority needs identified by each LaneACT member, compiled in 2023, will provide a starting point. Each member jurisdiction has already identified the highest priority projects within their community. [The LaneACT Area Strategies Report developed in 2022 may also provide some guidance.](#)
- LaneACT will attempt to refine the list, narrowing it down to the top priorities for the LaneACT area as a whole. LaneACT has developed lists of priority projects in the past, without too much difficulty. However, those lists focused on major projects on state highways. For this exercise, additional effort will be required to consider other types of projects. This may be more challenging. It may not be possible to agree on what the priorities are.
- One possible outcome is that LaneACT may only identify examples of the types of projects they believe are priorities for the LaneACT area. This would not be inconsistent with direction provided by ODOT management. They would like the Legislature to focus on funding categories of investment, rather than earmarking specific projects.
- LaneACT may choose to distinguish projects by category. For instance, expensive projects vs less expensive projects; projects on state highways vs projects on local roadways; motor vehicle projects vs pedestrian and bicycle projects.

**Goal 2: Update the LaneACT bylaws**

[ The text included in the October 9 draft has been revised, slightly, to read as follows. ]

- The LaneACT bylaws were last updated in 2019, to incorporate a few minor refinements.
- In 2020 the OTC and ODOT initiated a major review to determine if the ACTs were still needed and, if so, whether the role of the ACTs needed to be redefined. In 2021 the OTC approved a package of recommendations developed by ODOT management. This initiative was referred as the *ACT Reset and Refocus*. The implementation actions were described in a separate work plan.
- In 2022, the OTC approved ODOT’s recommended updates to the *OTC Policy on Formation and Operation of ACTs*, to be consistent with the direction provided in the *ACT Reset and Refocus* documents. This was one of the tasks identified in the implementation work plan. ODOT also developed a code of conduct the ACTs are expected to adopt and adhere to. (Refer to the Work Plan template instructions provided by Amanda Pietz on April 12, 2023.)
- The LaneACT bylaws need to be updated to reflect this new direction provided by the OTC. [The LaneACT may consider other changes such as: \(1\) amending the membership to include representatives from different special interest groups, \(2\) changing the officer and member terms \(start and end dates\) to better align with local elections and to avoid major holidays; \(3\) review the officer election process and the role of the Steering Committee.](#)

**Goal 3: Update the LaneACT Public Participation Plan**

[ This is a new goal that was not included in the October 9 draft. ]

- The *OTC Policy on Formation and Operation of ACTs* requires the ACTs to comply with Oregon public meeting laws. The policy also requires ACT bylaws to specify the ACT’s public involvement process. The LaneACT bylaws refer to a separate, standalone Public Participation Involvement Plan.
- The LaneACT Public Participation Plan was originally adopted, by the LaneACT, in 2011. It was updated in 2013. It fully complies with Oregon public meeting laws. However, it doesn’t reflect the most recent direction provided by the OTC, in the *ACT Reset and Refocus* documents, to expand public engagement if possible, especially for the purpose of advancing ODOT’s social equity goals.
- The LaneACT Public Participation Plan needs to be updated to include some discussion about social equity. Other refinements may be required to ensure the document is consistent with updated LaneACT bylaws, described in Goal 2.

**Goal 4: Adjust LaneACT meeting format**

[ This goal, referred to as Goal 3 in the October 9 draft, generated considerable discussion at the November 8 LaneACT meeting. It has been revised to read as follows. Hopefully this version is more agreeable. ]

- The *ACT Reset and Refocus* documents recognize the role of the ACTs has changed since they were originally formed in the late 1990s. (The LaneACT was formed in 2010.) The ACTs are no longer directly involved in allocating funding for specific projects. The ACTs still have a role in providing

input to the OTC, on specific topics, when input is requested. However, their primary purpose is to provide a forum for exchanging-sharing information.

- Given this reduced level of responsibility, the LaneACT understands it may not be necessary to meet every month as they have in the past. Meeting every other month may be sufficient. This would be consistent with the other ACTs. Most of the other ACTs have transitioned to an every-other-month meeting format. (Some ACTs meeting quarterly.)
- Continuing to meet every month, if there is not a need to do so, creates an unnecessary burden on LaneACT members and LaneACT staff. It takes a significant amount of effort to prepare for and conduct meetings. This has both a direct and indirect cost, in terms of paying for contract staff support and diverting ODOT staff from their other important responsibilities.
- It may not be possible to make this transition immediately. As described in this work plan, the LaneACT intends to develop a list of priority projects for the LaneACT area. (Refer to Goal 1.) This could require a significant amount of time and effort in the first year of this two-year work plan. It may not be possible to transition from a monthly meeting format to meeting less frequently until the second year of the work plan.
- The LaneACT may consider other changes to the meeting format such as: (1) conducting some meetings by videoconference only, and (2) installing a second camera in the meeting room to better facilitate hybrid meetings.

## 5. Meeting topic plan

[ The following instructions, in italics, are included in the template provided by ODOT. They will not be included in the final version. ]

*Each ACT should identify a two-year meeting plan with dates/timing and discussion topics. All ACTs have a minimum list of topics (provided by OTC staff). This section should include that minimum list and others selected to support and inform the ACT members. Examples of required topics include Federal Infrastructure Bill presentations, STIP process, Connect Oregon review, Oregon Transportation Plan and other modal plan updates. Optional topic examples include regional priorities, ODOT Climate Change initiatives, Strategic Action Plan Implementation, Oregon State Rail Plan Implementation, etc.*

[ The text included in the October 9 draft has been revised to read as follows. ]

The following is a list of specific topics the LaneACT anticipates discussing during this work plan period (2024-2025). This list includes topics identified by ODOT, along with additional topics identified by the LaneACT.

An approximate timeframe for discussing these topics is also provided. Refer to the calendar of future topics included in each LaneACT meeting packet for a more current and accurate list of topics planned for the upcoming six-month period.

### A. Topics identified by ODOT

- 2027-2030 STIP development

- May-June 2023: This phase will focus on introducing the public to the STIP and the funding constraints for the 2027-2030 STIP. ODOT seeking ACT input on funding priorities.
- August-October 2023: This phase will focus on seeking input on the funding scenarios.
- Connect Oregon
  - Likely early to mid-2024
- Oregon Highway Plan
  - ACT engagement in this plan update to begin in 2024
- Rail Plan
  - ACT engagement in this plan update in 2024
- Transportation Safety Action Plan
  - Next update on this plan to begin in late 2024
- Issues of statewide interest (e.g., revenue and funding discussions, legislation, etc.)
- Identify regional funding needs and priorities
- Seek support for legislative funding requests
- Equity and transportation
  - Engage diverse voices
  - Consider equity in transportation plans, projects and processes

#### **B. Additional topics identified by the LaneACT**

The following are additional topics and tasks identified by the LaneACT. Some of these overlap with the topics identified by ODOT.

- Develop a list of priority projects for the LaneACT area – Refer to Section 4, Goal 1.
  - This effort will begin in early 2024. It will take approximately four meetings to complete.
- Update the LaneACT bylaws – Refer to Section 4, Goal 2.
  - This effort will begin in late 2024. It will take approximately three meetings to complete. A subcommittee will probably be formed to work through the details.
- Update the LaneACT Public Participation Plan – Refer to Section 4, Goal 3.
  - This effort will begin in 2025, after the bylaws have been updated. It will take approximately two meetings to complete.
- Legislative updates – Receive regular updates during the legislative session.
- Grant opportunities – Inform LaneACT members about state and federal grant opportunities.
  - This will occur at various times during the year as grants are announced.
- Local transportation successes and challenges – Allow time during LaneACT meetings for members to describe noteworthy transportation-related planning and construction projects in their

communities.

- Other topics – Budget time (when planning future meetings) for unanticipated topics or emerging issues that may be identified by the OTC, ODOT or the LaneACT.

## 6. References

- OTC Policy on Formation and Operation of the Area Commissions on Transportations (ACTs), revised January 20, 2022. [https://www.oregon.gov/odot/Get-Involved/ACT/OTC\\_ACTpolicy.pdf](https://www.oregon.gov/odot/Get-Involved/ACT/OTC_ACTpolicy.pdf)
- ODOT Reset and Refocus documents – (1) Resetting OTC/ACT Engagement, discussed with the OTC on December 1, 2020. (2) *Refocus of Area Commissions on Transportation (ACTs): Next Steps and Recommendations*, discussed with the OTC on March 11, 2021. (3) *Implementation Work Plan: ACT Engagement Refocus*, discussed with the ODOT on May 13, 2021. (4) *Advisory Committee Code of Conduct*, developed by the ODOT Statewide ACT Project Steering Team, finalized in March 2023.
- Instructions for preparing ACT work plans – (1) Email from Amanda Pietz (ODOT Policy, Data, and Analysis Division Administrator) dated April 12, 2023. Refer to attachment titled: *Work Plan Template Instructions*. (2) Email from Amanda Pietz dated May 31, 2023. Refer to additional instructions in the body of the message, and to the attachment titled: *ACT Work Plan Info*.
- [LaneACT Bylaws – revised June 12, 2019.](#)
- [LaneACT 2016-2017 Work Plan – this is the most recent previous version.](#)
- [LaneACT Public Participation Plan – originally adopted in 2011; updated in 2013.](#)
- [LaneACT Area Strategies Report – completed in 2022.](#)



**From:** [JOHNSTON Bill W](#)  
**To:** [Rob Zako](#); [FRANCIS Vidal T](#)  
**Cc:** [HUMBLE Shelley \(SMTP\)](#); [WEISS Keith](#); [CLARK Shelly](#); [VINIS Lucy K](#); [Paul Thompson - LCOG](#); [Anais Mathez](#)  
**Subject:** LaneACT draft 2024-25 work plan refinements (supplemental comments)  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 6, 2023 8:31:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [LaneACT work plan 2024-25 \(draft\) 2023.12.04 v1a.pdf](#)

---

[ The original version of this email was sent on 12/06/2023. This version of the email was edited on 12/11/2023 by Bill Johnston. I inserted some additional comments (highlighted in yellow) explaining how I incorporated Rob Zako's suggested refinements. I also made some minor formatting adjustments to improve readability.]

Hello again Rob (and others following this discussion) – Thank you for your thoughtful comments and suggestions.

Attached is a revised version of the draft work plan, dated December 4, prepared by LaneACT staff (me and Vidal). It shows (in track changes format) additional refinements to the previous version I sent to you (and the others) on 12/02/2023. This version (with the changes accepted) will be included in the packet for the December 13 LaneACT meeting.

I prepared this over the weekend, before I received your comments on Monday morning (December 4). I didn't have time to consider or incorporate your suggested refinements. The cut-off date for submitting documents to be included in the meeting packet was Monday morning. I will prepare another revised version that incorporates some of your refinements (shown in track changes format). Anais will send it out as an addendum to the meeting packet. The packet will go out today (December 6). The addendum probably won't be sent until Monday (December 11).

If you're interested, below (highlighted in green) are my preliminary responses to your comments and suggested refinements. No need to respond unless you want to. It would probably be best to involve the entire LaneACT in this discussion at the meeting on December 13. In the interest of keeping everyone informed, I will include this email discussion in the addendum.

We may or may not need additional time at the January 10 meeting to complete the work plan. Hopefully the LaneACT will approve it at the December meeting. I think it's good enough, or it will be good enough, after I incorporate some of the additional refinements you suggested. Keep in mind that the LaneACT can amend the work plan later if they want.

**Bill Johnston**, AICP, Transportation Planner

**Oregon Department of Transportation** | Region 2 Area 5 | 2080 Laura St; Springfield OR 97477 | 541.747.1354  
| [bill.w.johnston@odot.oregon.gov](mailto:bill.w.johnston@odot.oregon.gov)

I'm teleworking from home until further notice. Hours: M-F, 8-5. I can be reached by email (preferred) or cell phone: 503.910.5058

**ADDITIONAL RESPONSE** (12/11/2023): LaneACT staff (me and Vidal) have taken the lead in developing this draft work plan for the LaneACT. We took this approach, rather than recommending that the LaneACT form a committee, because we were short on time and because this method is more efficient. ODOT has asked the ACTs to submit their work plans in December, or January at the

latest.

This draft work plan is essentially a staff recommendation. It reflects the discussions that have occurred at LaneACT meetings over the last year. It also reflects ODOT staff's perspective on a few topics. We (Vidal and me) do have some say in how the LaneACT operates, especially concerning the frequency of meetings.

The LaneACT may modify the draft work plan if they choose, by providing verbal direction to staff at the meeting on December 13. If it's not clear to staff that there is a consensus among the members to make a change proposed by a single member, we may ask for confirmation that all the members agree.

Hopefully there will not be a need to make many, or any, changes. Vidal and I have attempted to address the concerns that were discussed at the November 8 meeting, and to incorporate many of the refinements suggested by Rob Zako in this email. This draft work plan also reflects our best judgement as ODOT staff, in terms of providing the information the OTC is requesting in the format they have specified.

---

**From:** Rob Zako <[rob@best-oregon.org](mailto:rob@best-oregon.org)>

**Sent:** Monday, December 4, 2023 8:00 AM

**To:** JOHNSTON Bill W <[Bill.W.JOHNSTON@odot.oregon.gov](mailto:Bill.W.JOHNSTON@odot.oregon.gov)>; FRANCIS Vidal T <[Vidal.T.FRANCIS@odot.oregon.gov](mailto:Vidal.T.FRANCIS@odot.oregon.gov)>

**Cc:** HUMBLE Shelley (SMTP) <[shumble@creswell-or.us](mailto:shumble@creswell-or.us)>; WEISS Keith <[kweiss@ci.veneta.or.us](mailto:kweiss@ci.veneta.or.us)>; CLARK Shelly <[shclark@creswell-or.us](mailto:shclark@creswell-or.us)>; VINIS Lucy K <[LVinis@eugene-or.gov](mailto:LVinis@eugene-or.gov)>; Paul Thompson - LCOG <[pthompson@lcog.org](mailto:pthompson@lcog.org)>; Anaïs Mathez <[anais.mathez@3j-consulting.com](mailto:anais.mathez@3j-consulting.com)>

**Subject:** Re: ODOT ACT Reset and Refocus documents

Dear Bill and Vidal ... and others,

Thank you for your work and for an opportunity to review the revised draft work plan and AIS. Following are my detailed comments and suggestions.

### **Generally, it is a good idea for LaneACT to update its work plan, even if not being asked to do so by ODOT**

As best as I can tell, the current [2016–17 work plan](#) was adopted in November 2016, when Lane County Commissioner Sid Leiken chaired LaneACT, Frannie Brindle was the ODOT Area 5 Manager, Bill Johnston had recently succeeded David Reesor as the ODOT Area 5 Manager, and LaneACT was staffed by Denise Walters and Paula Taylor with LCOG.

Obviously, much has changed since then:

- The makeup of LaneACT is almost entirely different, with just a handful of us still on LaneACT from even just two years ago.
- Oregon House Bill 2017 (Keep Oregon Moving) was adopted in 2017, changing funding streams

and the role of ACTs.

- The U.S. has seen two new presidents and the adoption of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA).
- We have been through a pandemic that has changed our economy and travel patterns in ways that are still being learned.

## **Following a standard template makes sense for OTC / ODOT and is flexible enough for LaneACT to be able to follow**

In particular, these standard sections are reasonable:

1. Overview
2. LaneACT officers
3. Interest areas and priorities
4. Two-year goals and initiatives
5. Meeting topic plan
6. References

### **I suggest the following changes to the revised draft...**

**0. Work plan period.** The current work plan was for the 2016–17 fiscal year: July–June. Make clear whether the new work plan is for calendar years January 2024–December 2025, or rather for fiscal years July 2024–June 2026. I am guessing the former is intended, but the latter would be more in line with common practice.

**RESPONSE:** The format of the dates shown in the title of the draft LaneACT work plan (2024-2025) is consistent with the format shown in the template provided by ODOT. I will add a note somewhere clarifying, as Rob suggests, that the work plan applies to the calendar year (January – December)

### **1. Overview.**

**1a. Purpose of LaneACT.** As the [current work plan](#) does, begin by quoting the purpose of LaneACT as stated in our [bylaws](#).

The purpose of the Lane Area Commission on Transportation is identified in its bylaws, which state: *Lane Area Commission on Transportation (LaneACT) is an advisory body established to provide a forum for stakeholders to collaborate on transportation issues affecting Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Region 2, Area 5 (“Area”) and to strengthen state/local partnerships in transportation.*

**RESPONSE:** The template provided by ODOT provides standard language for all the ACTs to include in their work plans. It describes the purpose of the work plan, not the purpose of the ACT. The text Rob proposes inserting comes from the LaneACT bylaws. It’s not necessary to include this in the work plan.

**1b. Need for work plan.** In addition to summarizing current ODOT guidance on developing a work plan, also quote the relevant language in our [bylaws](#):

*V. OPERATION ...*

*D. Work Plan and Report*

*LaneACT shall develop and adopt a Work Plan. The Work Plan can be amended at any time. Accomplishments, based on the Work Plan and other achievements, shall be reviewed at least once every two years and a Report prepared. The Report shall review how well LaneACT is functioning, including staffing, public participation, and coordination with other entities. The Report shall be provided to the OTC.*

**RESPONSE:** This is the work plan. There's no need to include language from the bylaws. Note also that the language Rob proposes to include is obsolete. A biennial report is no longer required. This is one reason why the LaneACT bylaws need to be updated.

**3. Interest area and priorities.** At least for the purposes of discussion, include in the revised draft the six elements of LaneACT's mission as stated in our [bylaws](#). Connect the proposed interest areas to those six elements, allowing LaneACT members to see which parts of our mission are proposed to be advanced and which are not:

**RESPONSE:** The four topic headings shown in the draft work plan I prepared are the same headings used in the 2016 LaneACT work plan. When the LaneACT developed the previous work plan, they decided this consolidated list (4 topics rather than 6) was adequate (and appropriate) for the work plan. The two topics that were not included (consider all modes of transportation, and review and monitor the condition of the Area's transportation system) are discussed in items 3 and 4, below.

1. *Provide a local forum for sharing information, understanding, coordinating, and gaining consensus around transportation plans, policies, projects and funding;*

**COMMENT:** "A. Advisory and advocacy activities" represents a narrowing of this element of the mission, as it focuses on requests from OTC/ODOT and on funding rather than more broadly on coordinating the entire transportation system plans and policies.

**RESPONSE:** It's not necessary to include language from the bylaws in the work plan. This language describes the purpose of the LaneACT. A work plan is supposed to be focused. The language included in the draft work plan I prepared refers specifically to the *LaneACT Area Strategies Report* developed in 2022, which provides a framework for the LaneACT to provide more meaningful input to the OTC and ODOT, in their role as an advisory body.

**COMMENT:** "B. Education" is in line with the "understanding" portion of this element of the mission.

2. *Engage key stakeholders and the general public with a process consistent with state and federal laws, regulations and policies;*

**COMMENT:** "D. Public involvement" reflects this element of the mission.

3. *As applicable, consider all modes and aspects of the transportation system, including air, marine, rail (freight and passenger), road, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, and pipelines;*

**COMMENT:** I am not seeing this element of the mission reflected in the proposed work plan.

**RESPONSE:** When the LaneACT developed the previous work plan, they did not think this language from the mission statement needed to be elevated, to define a separate category of work tasks. Considering all modes of transportation is more like a qualifier that would apply to all tasks (that involve commenting on transportation priorities). I will add this to Goal 1 (in the

following section) to clarify that the list of priority needs the LaneACT will be developing includes all modes of transportation.

**ADDITIONAL RESPONSE** (12/11/2023): Goal 1 already refers to other modes of transportation. The last bullet refers to pedestrian and bicycle projects. Goal 1 also refers to the LaneACT priority needs that have been identified by each jurisdiction. Those lists include pedestrian and bicycle projects, and transit service improvements. It's implied that the LaneACT, consistent with the mission statement, will be considering other modes of transportation, besides motor vehicles.

4. *Review and monitor the condition of the Area's transportation system, using appropriate benchmarks;*

COMMENT: I am not seeing this element of the mission reflected in the proposed work plan.

**RESPONSE:** When the LaneACT developed the previous work plan, they did not think it was necessary to include this language. They probably recognized that it's too ambitious. The LaneACT doesn't have a role in monitoring roadway conditions. Occasionally they review condition reports prepared by ODOT and local governments. When the bylaws are updated, the LaneACT may want to consider removing this from the mission statement.

5. *Recommend short- and long-term transportation investment priorities based on state and local plans and addressing identified needs of the Area's transportation system while balancing local, regional and statewide perspectives; and*

COMMENT: "A. Advisory and advocacy activities" reflects this element of the mission, but again perhaps more narrowly than the mission calls for.

**RESPONSE:** Refer to my previous response to item 1.

6. *Communicate and coordinate regional recommendations, priorities and activities, and collaborate with other organizations and interests, including as applicable the Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization (CLMPO), other ACTs, the OTC, ODOT advisory committees, the Regional Solutions Team, regional partnerships and investment boards, state legislators, Oregon's congressional delegation, and other agencies and stakeholders.*

COMMENT: "A. Advisory and advocacy activities" represents a narrowing of this element of the mission, as it focuses on communicating with OTC/ODOT and does not reference the other listed bodies and decision-makers.

**RESPONSE:** The LaneACT's primary purpose is to provide input to the OTC and ODOT, on specific topics, when input is requested. The LaneACT (and other ACTs) have complained they don't have enough opportunities to provide input, especially concerning funding decisions. The language included in the draft work plan I prepared reinforces the LaneACT's interest in this regard. Communicating with the other groups referred to in the mission statement is a lower priority. It's not necessary for the LaneACT work plan to describe all possibilities, especially in this section. The focus of the work plan is Section 4 (goals and initiatives) and Section 5 (meeting topic plan).

7. *Other*

COMMENT: I am not seeing that "C. LaneACT governance" directly advances an element of our mission but is rather administrative in nature and reflects specifically compliance with our [bylaws](#), which in turn are consistent with the more general [Policy on Formation and Operation of ACTs](#). This is fine, but as it is administrative in nature, I would move this to be the last interest area and priority.

**RESPONSE:** This topic was included in the previous LaneACT work plan. It's an important topic. Two of the four goals (and the associated tasks) identified in the draft work plan I prepared (refer to the December 4 version) relate to this priority area of interest. Goal 2 calls for updating the LaneACT Bylaws. Goal 3 (new) calls for updating the LaneACT Public Participation Plan.

#### **4. Two-year goals and initiatives.**

##### **Goal 1: Develop a list of priority projects for the LaneACT area**

COMMENT: In general, this goal and initiative is good. It actually does (or should) advance all six elements of our mission. Add language to the work plan to make clear the connection to LaneACT's mission:

- *"coordinating, and gaining consensus around transportation plans, policies, projects and funding"*
- *"engage key stakeholders and the general public"*
- *"as applicable, consider all modes and aspects of the transportation system"*
- *"review and monitor the condition of the Area's transportation system"*
- *"recommend short- and long-term transportation investment priorities"*
- *"communicate and coordinate regional recommendations, priorities and activities, and collaborate with other organizations and interests"*

**RESPONSE:** I explained in my previous responses why it's not necessary or appropriate to include language from the mission statement in the work plan. The work plan is supposed to be specific. Inserting vague language from the mission statement obscures the intent of the goal statement, which describes specifically what the LaneACT wants to accomplish in the next two years. I would add that neither the goals, or the more specific tasks described in Section 5, need to explain exactly how the LaneACT will complete the task. It's understood that the LaneACT will work out these details later, when they begin working on the task.

*Language should also be added to make clear that this goal builds on the Area Strategy Pilot Project authorized by the OTC a few years ago.*

**RESPONSE:** Good suggestion. I refer to the *Area Strategies Report* in Section 3.A. I will include a reference to it in this goal statement.

##### **Goal 2: Update the LaneACT bylaws**

##### **Goal 3: Adjust LaneACT meeting format**

COMMENT: Both of these goals are administrative in nature. I suggest combining them into a single larger goal and also including these additional tasks

**RESPONSE: (1)** The revised (December 4) version of the work plan I prepared includes a new Goal 3 (update the LaneACT Public Participation Plan). The previous Goal 3 (Adjust LaneACT

meeting format) is now referred to as Goal 4. I do not recommend combining these two goals. They are separate tasks that will be initiated and completed on separate schedules. **(2)** I like Rob's list of additional tasks. I will try to incorporate some of them into the revised version of the work plan I will be preparing (for the addendum), in the descriptions provided for Goal 2 (update the LaneACT bylaws) or Goal 3 (update the LaneACT Public Participation Plan). **(3)** I may not be able to incorporate all of them. As I explained previously (in Goal 1), it's not necessary to describe the entire scope of the task. The OTC and ODOT only need to have general understanding of what the LaneACT will be working on over the next two years. [I moved this comment to beginning of this section. It was at the end of this section in the 12/06/2023 version of the email.]

- As part of the review of the bylaws, consider changing membership categories. For example, as LaneACT has struggled to have rail and trucking representatives, consider adding business as a category. As shared micromobility was not a thing when LaneACT was formed, consider adding this as another modal representative.

**ADDITIONAL RESPONSE** (12/11/2023): I added this to Goal 2.

- As part of the review of bylaws, consider standardizing member and officer terms to better align with external timelines.

**ADDITIONAL RESPONSE** (12/11/2023): I added this to Goal 2.

- Coming out of the pandemic, develop a more effective process for orienting new LaneACT members and instilling the culture of the group.

**ADDITIONAL RESPONSE** (12/11/2023): Section 3.C already identifies as a priority the need to provide training for new members. I added some additional language that reflects Rob's suggestion.

- Review the process by which officers are selected and the role of the Steering Committee, aiming to ensure LaneACT has the leadership needed to be effective and efficient.

**ADDITIONAL RESPONSE** (12/11/2023): I added this to Goal 2.

- Review the meeting format (in-person, hybrid, or remote) in light of changing needs / expectations of members and the broader public.

**ADDITIONAL RESPONSE** (12/11/2023): I added language to Goal 4 (bullet 5) that refers to this.

- Review communication technologies (Zoom, email, web, etc.) and practices, ensuring these meet the needs of members as well as Public Meeting Law requirements.

**ADDITIONAL RESPONSE** (12/11/2023): I added language to Goal 4 (bullet 5) that refers to this.

- Review and possibly update the [2011 / 2013 Public Participation Plan](#).

**ADDITIONAL RESPONSE** (12/11/2023): I previously added this as a task in Section 5.B.

- [Review staffing for LaneACT, especially in light of possibly changing scope or needs.](#)

**ADDITIONAL RESPONSE** (12/11/2023): I added language to Goal 4 (bullet 3) that refers to this.

**5. Meeting topic plan.** If I understand what is being asked, then I think expanding our current month-by-month calendar from 1 to 2 years is what is called for. The calendar includes a combination of internal tasks where we have more control over the timing and external ones driven by deadlines others impose. Do we know enough about external deadlines to at least pencil in some topics for each meeting over two years? Some dates to consider:

- 2024 and 2025 legislative sessions
- STIP, Connect Oregon, and other funding cycles
- Primary and general elections in May and November 2024 and how that affects the timing of LaneACT member and officer elections

**RESPONSE:** I don't think it's necessary to include a two-year calendar in the monthly LaneACT meeting packets. It's too difficult to plan that far ahead. However, we could include (below the calendar) a list of important dates (like those Rob identified above) for the LaneACT to keep in mind in planning future meetings. If I recall, we used to do this

**6. References.** In addition to the [Policy on Formation and Operation of ACTs](#), include references to these documents:

- [Bylaws](#)
- [2016–17 Work Plan](#)
- [Public Participation Plan](#)
- Area Strategy Report
- Current Member Roster

**RESPONSE:** The revised (December 4) version of the work plan I prepared includes some additional references. I included the *ODOT Reset and Refocus* documents. I will add references to these LaneACT documents to revised version of the work plan I will be developing (for the addendum).

**ADDITIONAL RESPONSE** (12/11/2023): I added references to all these documents except the current member roster. It's not clear how this relates to the work plan. Including it may confuse the OTC or anyone else reviewing this document.

**Further discussion might be needed before LaneACT reaches consensus on a new work plan.**

Again, I look forward to hearing from other members of LaneACT, especially during the discussion on December 13. Finally having time to review the (revised) draft in detail, having heard comments from some members to date, seeing the revised draft as still rough, and with only 30 minutes to "review, revise as necessary, and adopt" the work plan, it is possible that the discussion will need to continue into next year before LaneACT is ready to adopt a work plan.

**RESPONSE:** We may or may not need additional time at the January 10 meeting to complete the work plan. Hopefully the LaneACT will approve it at the December meeting. I think it's good



enough, or it will be good enough, after I incorporate some of the additional refinements suggested by Rob. Keep in mind that the LaneACT can amend the work plan later if they want.

As you know, LaneACT's standard for decision-making is consensus, which the [bylaws](#) define quite deliberately as follows:

**Consensus:** *LaneACT will use a consensus decision-making process and will foster mutual respect and a collaborative approach to problem solving. Members will seek to advance broad interests and look for win-win solutions. Consensus means that all voting members present can live with the decision. Members are encouraged to voice and have recorded all views. Once a consensus decision has been reached, all members agree to support that decision.*

As you understand, consensus is an incredibly high standard to meet, one that other policy bodies across Lane County do not often achieve. And yet, since it began in 2011 LaneACT has always been able to reach consensus. I suggest there are several ingredients that have made this possible:

- Mutual respect.
- Actively asking for input from each LaneACT member.
- Looking for win-win solutions by trying to address minority concerns into final decisions.
- Strong leadership that is able to "herd cats" by "reading the room," gauging when the group is close to consensus or when it needs to do more work.

**RESPONSE: (1)** I have a different perspective on the consensus decision-making model, having worked with the LaneACT over the last seven years. Attempting to address everyone's concerns is commendable. The downside is that it's time consuming and inefficient. Agenda items requiring a decision, that could be resolved at a single meeting with a simple up or down vote, are sometimes continued to a second or even third meeting, to address everyone's questions and concerns. Even then, it's not clear that this results in a better decision or finished product. **(2)** Another criticism of the consensus decision-making model (in the literature) is that it allows a few individuals (the minority) to block an agreement by the majority. This gives the minority disproportionate influence, and leverage, to maintain the status quo when the majority desires change. **(3)** For these reasons, when the bylaws are updated the LaneACT may want to consider abandoning the consensus decision-making model. It may not be serving them well.

I hope these comments are helpful. **RESPONSE:** They are. Thank you Rob.

Respectfully,  
Rob

--

**Rob Zako** (*he/him/his*)  
Executive Director  
Better Eugene-Springfield Transportation (BEST)  
PO Box 773, Eugene, OR 97440-0773  
541-343-5201 (home office)  
541-606-0931 (mobile)  
[rob@best-oregon.org](mailto:rob@best-oregon.org)  
[www.best-oregon.org](http://www.best-oregon.org)  
[facebook.com/BetterEugeneSpringfieldTransportation](https://facebook.com/BetterEugeneSpringfieldTransportation)

*BEST is building a successful community by bringing people together to promote transportation options, safe streets, and walkable neighborhoods.*

