

MINUTES

Lane Area Commission on Transportation
McLane Room—Oregon Department of Transportation, Area 5—644 A Street
Springfield, Oregon

September 9, 2015
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Jerry Behney, Coburg
Tom Munroe, Cottage Grove
Michelle Amberg, Creswell
Maurice Sanders, Dunes City
Claire Syrett, Eugene
Mike Miller, Florence
Steve Paulson, Lowell
Rick Zylstra, Oakridge
Hilary Wylie, Springfield
Ric Ingham, Veneta
Sid Leiken (Lane County), *Vice Chair*
Ron Caputo, Port of Siuslaw (via conference call)
Ron Kilcoyne, Lane Transit District
Frannie Brindle, Oregon Department of Transportation
Paul Thompson, Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)
Dennis Ary, Highway 26 East
Scott Parkinson, Rail Designated Stakeholder
Holly McRae, Bicycle and Pedestrian Designated Stakeholder
Rob Zako, Environmental Lane Use Designated Stakeholder
George Grier, Other Stakeholder, *Chair*
Eugene Organ, Other Stakeholder
Jennifer Jordan, Other Stakeholder

ABSENT: Junction City, Westfir, Confederated Tribes, Lane County Roads Advisory Committee,
Trucking Designated Stakeholder; Ryan Papé, Shelley Humble, Other Stakeholders

OTHERS: David Reesor, Chris Cummings, Walt McAllister, Nancy Murphy, Jae Pudewell, Oregon
Department of Transportation; Lydia McKinney, Lane County; Rob Inerfeld, Chris Henry,
City of Eugene; Tom Boyatt, Emma Newman, City of Springfield; Tom Schwetz, Lane
Transit District; Paula Taylor, Josh Roll, Lane Council of Governments

1. CALL TO ORDER/WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Grier called the meeting of the Lane Area Commission on Transportation (LaneACT) to order and welcomed participants. Those present introduced themselves.

2. REVIEW OF AGENDA

Mr. Grier noted that the agenda had been updated and the Vision Zero and *ConnectOregon* presentations had exchanged places on the agenda.

3. CONSENT CALENDAR
A. Approve Minutes (August 12, 2015)

Consensus: The minutes of August 12, 2015 were approved as submitted.

4. COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

There were no comments from the audience.

5. STIP PROCESS UPDATE AND ROUNDTABLE PROJECT DISCUSSION

Mr. Grier stated that the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) had been accelerated and the process abbreviated. He said a majority of the ACTs' October meetings would focus on a review of initial proposals and he encouraged ACT representatives to assure that someone from their jurisdiction or organization was present at the meeting, which was a critical part of the STIP process and required a quorum to be present.

Ms. Brindle presented an overview of the STIP Enhance program. She said that the funds would be available from October 1, 2018, through September 30, 2021. Approximately \$9 million would be available to Region 2 for non-highway Enhance projects, which could include transit and bike/pedestrian projects; projects could not be for highway improvements. She said due to the effort and expense of administering projects, the target was a \$500,000 minimum for construction projects, although that was not an absolute requirement in order to avoid creating barriers for smaller jurisdictions that might be unable to provide a large amount of match. The threshold would not apply to smaller types of non-construction projects such as planning, design phase, or some aspects of transit. She said if each area within the region could put forward about five projects that would provide the SuperACT with a sufficient number of projects to review and prioritize.

Ms. Brindle described the modal attributes of a good Enhance project, which included:

- Connectivity and system benefit - connections of modes to serve a greater area and benefits to the system as a whole
- Safety and public health - active transportation projects, accessibility and mobility
- Cross-modal criteria (addressed in application form)
 - Economic development benefit
 - Social benefit
 - Environmental stewardship
 - Safety
 - Is the project ready?
 - Leverage

Mr. Reesor reviewed the updated Enhance timeline provided in the agenda packet, highlighting key dates. He said the Central Lane MPO would review and prioritize projects from within the MPO boundary and forward those to the ACT for consideration. He said that written pre-proposals were due on October 1, 2015, for inclusion in the ACT's October 14 agenda packet. He said an ACT Steering Committee meeting had been tentatively scheduled for October 8th for the purpose of developing a preliminary proposal prior to the ACT's meeting if ACT members were in favor of that. He said applicants would be allowed three minutes each at the October 14th meeting to present their projects, there would be time for questions and answers, followed by ranking of pre-proposals by the ACT. Final proposals were due on November 20th, followed by Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) and ACT meetings in December to rank 150 percent lists.

Mr. Grier said the process represented a series of sieves, with the first round intended to give applicants an opportunity to put forth project ideas without having to develop a full application package. The ACT

would then review pre-proposals at its October 14th meeting, rank those pre-proposals, and encourage applicants with the most viable projects to complete a final application by November 20th. He said the limited funding meant that fewer and smaller projects would be moving through the STIP Enhance program process. He invited questions and comments from ACT members.

In response to a question from Ms. Wylie, Mr. Reesor said that approximately \$9.25 million would be available for projects within Region 2, which consisted of four Areas. Ms. Brindle added that a specific amount was not allocated for each Area; the best proposals from the region would be selected. Mr. Reesor referred to the project attributes discussed by Ms. Brindle and said those proposals that most closely reflected the attributes and criteria set forth in the application would have the greater chance for success. The more regional significance and connectivity a project had the higher it was likely to be ranked.

Mr. Grier invited ACT members to describe projects that jurisdictions might consider proposal for STIP Enhance funding.

Mr. Leiken said that Lane County would be proposing a Territorial Highway (Gillespie Corners to the community of Lorane) design phase project for \$1 million. He acknowledged that it was a large amount, but reminded the ACT that Lane County had stepped aside in the last round of funding. He said the project was timely because Oregon and Travel Lane County were promoting wine and trails recreation. Territorial Highway was a critical link to those activities, had a significant economic development component and was a safety corridor. Lane County was currently attempting to obtain a jurisdiction transfer to remove the road from the state system and place it with the county. He said even if full funding was not received, partial funding could still move the project forward. He said the planning process was completed and the design phase was next.

Mr. Grier noted that *ConnectOregon* projects could not be scaled once applications were completed. He asked if STIP projects could be deemed scalable. Mr. Reesor said it was possible to scale STIP Enhance projects.

Ms. Wylie felt that all members of the ACT should participate in reviewing and ranking pre-proposals rather than the Steering Committee conducting a preliminary review and straw vote. Mr. Grier said the Steering Committee meeting was placed on the schedule tentatively in case the ACT wanted it to conduct a preliminary review, but that did not need to happen.

Mr. Boyatt said the City of Springfield would propose a scalable project that would include sidewalk infill improvements at various locations around the community, likely in proximity to schools, and partner that with crosswalk improvements on Main Street in downtown. He said if there was an opportunity to bundle delivery with the City of Eugene or another partner to address the \$500,000 threshold and provide greater scalability that would be explored. He said the project would address safety, economic development and leverage. Ms. Wylie added that citizens had complained at a recent city council meeting about the lack of safe crosswalks in downtown.

Mr. Kilcoyne said Lane Transit District (LTD) was looking at increasing capacity on the Franklin Boulevard EmX corridor. The current bi-directional running ways strained capacity and timing. He said the project had been considered for some time as ridership increased. The problem would be exacerbated when Eugene hosted the world outdoor track and field championships. He said LTD hoped to leverage some additional funding for the project and the initial phase would add capacity to the Agate Street to Walnut Station.

Mr. Behney agreed with the proposed STIP process and indicated Coburg would not submit an application.

Mr. Miller said Florence had refinanced its urban renewal district and was leveraging a larger project, with a focus on the Highway 101 corridor between Highway 126 and the Siuslaw River bridge, primarily

focusing on pedestrian and bicycle safety. He said the target range was \$750,000 and the project would address economic development and leveraging other funds.

Mr. Sanders said Dunes City would not submit an application. He preferred to see proposals ranked in a straightforward manner, beginning with No. 1 for the highest ranked proposals and continuing numerically to the lowest, rather than taking a tiered approach. He felt a more structured ranking process would better allow the ACT to speak with one voice. He did not feel that was necessary for the review of pre-proposals.

Ms. Syrett said Eugene was considering two projects, but would likely submit an application for only one of them. She said both were bicycle/pedestrian enhancements. Those projects included an extension of the Roosevelt path to connect it to Highway 99, with an estimated total cost of \$781,447; the other project was a two-phase High Street protected bike lane, with a first phase estimated cost of \$620,000. She said both projects would address bike safety and pedestrian connectivity.

In response to questions from Ms. Syrett, Mr. Grier said that staff could make the pre-proposal presentations at the next ACT meeting and the ACT could consider scheduling a public hearing later in the review process.

Mr. Paulson said Lowell would not submit an application. He felt the STIP process was too accelerated.

Mr. Munroe said Cottage Grove would not submit an application, but supported Lane County's Territorial Highway project because it would also benefit Cottage Grove, which was experiencing an expansion of winery and bicycle tourism.

Mr. Zylstra said Oakridge had several projects it was considering. The first project related to bicycle/pedestrian connections that would get bicycles off Highway 58; the cost had not yet been determined. He said improvements to North Shore, which was the detour route between Oakridge and Lowell when Highway 58 was closed due to accidents and weather, would address safety concerns. He said another project related to a visitor center on Highway 58 with recreational vehicle parking and charging stations would address economic development; the estimated cost was \$200,000 and Oakridge was in the process of purchasing the property. He said Oakridge also had the need for enhanced transit services and the estimated cost for additional trips and connections with Amtrak and Greyhound was \$639,000.

Ms. Amberg said Creswell had 44 acres of prime industrial land that was undevelopable until traffic issues related to the area between Interstate 5 and Highway 99 south, which was controlled by ODOT. She said if the industrial land could be developed it would have a major economic development impact on Creswell and the region. Development required good connections to transportation. She said Creswell had several unsafe intersections, including Highway 99 and Mill Street and Highway 99 and Front Street. Traffic congestion and poor signage at those locations made pedestrian and bicycle crossings dangerous.

Mr. Ingham said Veneta would submit a Safe Routes to School project that would connect Veneta and Elmira via a multi-purpose path. Preliminary engineering had been completed. The project would address safety, community health, and connectivity. The estimated cost was \$900,000.

Mr. Zako concurred with Ms. Syrett's request for a public hearing on proposed projects.

Mr. Thompson said the MPO would not directly submit an application, but would support applications from MPO jurisdictions and was encouraging jurisdictions to install permanent bicycle and pedestrian counters as part of those types of projects to enhance the regional system the MPO was constructing and maintaining. He said the cost was \$5,000 per device.

Mr. Organ asked if modal committees would participate in proposal reviews at the state level. Mr. Grier said the modal committees would not be part of the process.

6. VISION ZERO PRESENTATION

Mr. McAllister said Vision Zero had originated in Sweden as a response to traffic death and injury concerns. He said the Vision Zero goal was to eliminate death or serious injuries in the transportation system and Oregon had established 2035 as its target for achieving that goal. He said the concept was to design a transportation system to accommodate how humans behaved to avoid accidents. He gave a slide presentation that demonstrated how Sweden was marketing the Vision Zero concept to other countries because traffic fatalities were a worldwide health problem. He said safety should be a pre-condition of mobility and death should not be a cost of mobility.

Mr. McAllister said data from Sweden indicated that while traffic volume was increasing, traffic deaths were declining. He explained that implementing Vision Zero in the United States would face a number of challenges not experienced in Sweden, where the transportation system was under the national government's control, rather than individual jurisdictions. Sweden also had far stricter drunk driving laws.

Ms. Brindle said moving toward a Vision Zero goal in this country would require all partners to be at the table, including all aspects of the transportation system, cell phone providers, the auto industry, etc., because no one sector would be able to accomplish the Vision Zero task.

Mr. McAllister agreed and gave examples of technologies related to vehicles and transportation systems that were being developed and tested. He said Vision Zero was possible, real and making a difference. He said most Oregon transportation projects included a safety component and data showed a downward trend in accidents and fatalities. He said the transportation system was being improved to make it safer and more efficient and human behavior would need to be addressed through enforcement, although enforcement resources were currently very limited.

Ms. Syrett commented that advances in technologies to make vehicle travel safer were being made. She said part of the solution would be legislative and societal changes and asked how elected officials were being involved in the Vision Zero process to help accomplish changes such as reducing the acceptable blood alcohol content level and use of cell phones and other mobile devices while operating a vehicle. Mr. McAllister said those types of proposals were presented to legislators, but the general sense at this time was that the public was not ready for that level of change.

Ms. Syrett suggested partnering with public health agencies to make the case for public safety and public health to elected officials.

Mr. Munroe observed that while blood alcohol levels were an issue, he had heard no discussion about pharmaceuticals and marijuana, which also posed transportation safety concerns.

7. *Connect*OREGON PRESENTATION

Mr. Cummings distributed a fact sheet entitled ***ConnectOregon VI: Oregon's Multimodal Investment Program***. He said *ConnectOregon* was a non-highway transportation grant program that could involve air, marine, rail, transit and bicycle and pedestrian modes, although the purchase of bikes or their use as match dollars was not allowed. He said *ConnectOregon* now required a 30 percent match and that had to come from some type of cash outlay by the applicant, such as actual cash or property, but could not include match products from others for which the applicant did not pay. He said staff labor was an allowable match.

Mr. Cummings said \$45 million was available for this round of funding and there was no minimum or maximum threshold for proposals. A minimum of 10 percent of the funding would go to each of five regions. He reviewed *ConnectOregon* program changes and project selection considerations listed on the fact sheet. He said the first three selection considerations on the list had been designated by the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) as strategic and stressed the importance of providing complete answers to all of the questions on the application form. He could provide examples of previous successful applications upon request.

Mr. Cummings said the proposal review process was robust, with modal and regional committee reviews of applications, followed by a review by a final committee composed of representatives from the other committees. He said representatives of applicants could not participate on the final committee. He noted that the *ConnectOregon* grant process was also open to private sector and nonprofit applicants and it could be advantageous to a jurisdiction to let a project partner submit the application.

In response to a question from Mr. Grier, Mr. Cummings said that if two entities partnered on a project, only the partner submitting the application would be prohibited from sitting on the final review committee. All committee meetings were open to the public. He said application packets would be available October 5, 2015, and applications were due on November 20th. He said STIP proposals were due on the same day, but the *ConnectOregon* applications would not go to ACTs for preapproval before they were submitted.

In response to a question from Mr. Grier, Mr. Cummings said inquiries about projects that might be eligible for either STIP or *ConnectOregon* funding could be directed to him or regional ODOT staff. He said there would be few projects that could qualify for both funding sources because *ConnectOregon* projects were those that could not be funded with motor fuel taxes and had to be off-highway; STIP projects would be primarily on-highway, but there could be cross-over with bicycle/pedestrian and transit projects. Funding agreements with recipients would be for a five-year period; requests for extensions beyond that timeframe were considered on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Kilcoyne asked how the new application form differed from the previous version and if grant funds from a source other than *ConnectOregon* could be used as match. Mr. Cummings replied that a grant was considered the applicant's money and could be used for match. He said the new application had been updated to reflect new requirements and streamlined, but still included an extensive number of questions, particularly related to project readiness.

Mr. Sanders asked if donated right-of-way property could be used as match. Mr. Cummings said the land could be used for the project, but its value could not be considered as match because there was no cash outlay involved. He said that an applicant did not need to have the match when the application was made, but it had to be available when *ConnectOregon* funds were spent because the grant payments were on a reimbursement basis. If projects were not completed ODOT had to be reimbursed for *ConnectOregon* funds.

Mr. Grier asked when the regional SuperACTs would develop a 150 percent list. Mr. Cummings said applications would be distributed to modal committees in February/March 2016 and applications would be distributed to ACTs at the same time. ACTs would conduct their proposal reviews in April/May 2016 when modal committee input was available. The final review committee would convene in June, there would be a public hearing in July and the OTC would take action in August.

8. OREGON TRANSPORTATION SAFETY AND ACTION PLAN

Ms. Murphy stated that the Oregon Transportation Safety and Action Plan was a partnership between the Planning and Transportation Safety divisions. She said the Oregon Transportation Safety Committee was appointed by the governor to oversee the plan, which was also adopted by ODOT. She reviewed the elements of the plan and said the near term, data-driven emphasis areas would be the focus of resources

and programs. The plans vision statement embodied the Vision Zero concept. Crash trend analysis would support the selection of emphasis areas. She used a slide presentation to highlight the planning process and present an overview of some of the data to be used. Additional information was available on the Transportation Safety and Action Plan website. The plan would be released for public review and comment sometime in the May/June 2016 timeframe, with adoption anticipated in September 2016.

Mr. Reesor said he would provide ACT members with an electronic copy of the slide presentation.

Mr. Sanders asked if performance benchmarks would be included in the plan. Ms. Murphy said appropriate benchmarks would be developed later in the planning process. The Transportation Safety Division had many measures that could be used.

Mr. Sanders asked if strategies would include proposals to the legislature to help change behaviors. Mr. McAllister replied that data would be used to identify areas where specific behavioral changes were necessary and develop appropriate legislative proposals.

Mr. Sanders stressed the importance of having specific benchmarks against which progress could be measured. Mr. McAllister said benchmarks for the current plan were still being developed and information about past plans and performance was available on the plan website.

Ms. Murphy reviewed the six goals in the plan:

- Create a safety culture
- Infrastructure
- Technology
- Safe and healthy communities
- Collaboration and communication
- Strategic investments

9. WHAT'S COMING UP

Mr. Grier announced that the October 2015 ACT meeting would focus on STIP pre-proposal presentations and ranking. Election of officers would be coming up and he invited ACT members to indicate their interest in being on the Nominating Committee or serving as an officer.

Mr. Grier said the regularly scheduled November 2015 ACT meeting would fall on Veterans Day and the Steering Committee was proposing moving the meeting to November 18. He said staff would poll members regarding availability on that or an alternate date.

Mr. Reesor said he would send ACT members information on an upcoming safety conference.

10. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFO SHARING

Mr. Leiken reported Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Policy Advisory Committee, which was working on the state's 20-year plan, would meet once more to discuss financing options for plan strategies. The plan would be issued for public review and comment sometime in October 2015.

Mr. Kilcoyne announced that Federal Transit Administration Acting Administrator Theresa McMillan would visit Eugene to announce the award of a \$75 million grant for the West Eugene EmX Extension project.

Ms. Jordan said the Surgeon General had issued a call to action around walking and creating walkable communities.

Mr. Zako said that Better Eugene-Springfield Transit (BEST) would have a booth at the Eugene Sunday Streets event on September 20th and would be encouraging all transportation system users to take the Vision Zero pledge and become more responsible system users.

Mr. Reesor reminded ACT members that STIP project pre-proposals should be a one-page narrative of the project that included contact information and a high level cost estimate. Pre-proposals could be submitted directly to him.

Mr. Kilcoyne said a MovingAhead open house event would be held September 14th at 4:00 p.m. in the Eugene Public Library.

Mr. Reesor announced that the City of Springfield was awarded a Transportation Growth Management (TGM) grant for a continuation of the Main Street visioning process.

The next LaneACT meeting was scheduled for October 14, 2015.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)