

AGENDA
September 9, 2020
5:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.

To join the meeting from your computer, tablet or smartphone:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81829459040?pwd=RDdpTmp2S0ZDYTI5cCt4OG84b2U0QT09>

Meeting ID: 818 2945 9040

Passcode: 438014

To dial in using your phone:

+1 (669) 900-9128 or **+1 (253) 215 8782**

Meeting ID: 818 2945 9040

Passcode: 438014

Unmute = *6 Mute=*9

***Note:** Times listed are approximate. Items may be considered at any time or in any order at the discretion of the Chair and members of the Commission in order to conduct business efficiently. Individuals interested in a particular item are advised to arrive at the start of the meeting.*

- 1. Call to order** (welcome and introductions) **Quorum = 16** **5:30**
- 2. Review agenda** (additions or deletions) **5:35**
- 3. Consent items** **5:40**

The following items are considered routine and will be enacted in one action by consensus, without any discussion. If discussion is desired, that item will be removed from the consent agenda and considered separately.

 - a. Approve minutes from August 12th meeting (**quorum required**)
 - b. Oregon Transit Association Nomination (**quorum required**)
 - c. Appoint Pete Petty to Highway 126E primary representative and Charles Tannenbaum as the alternate. (**quorum required**)
- 4. Comments from the audience** **5:45**

The LaneACT Chair will ask if there are any comments. Please state your name and address.

5. **Announcements and information sharing** (*please be brief*) **5:50**
a. ODOT update
b. Metropolitan Policy Committee update (minutes attached)
c. Other member updates
6. **Transportation safety, equity and inclusion** **6:05**
Action: Review and discuss next steps.
Presenter: Denise Walters, LaneACT Staff
7. **2024-27 STIP stakeholder engagement** (*quorum required*) **6:25**
Action: Review, refine, and endorse draft responses to questions from OTC.
Presenter: Bill Johnston, ODOT Area 5 Planner

Other attachments (for information only)

- Monthly attendance report
- Membership list (*August 2020*)

Upcoming meetings

- **September 18 – Steering Committee** (11:00 to noon) — ONLINE
- **October 14 – LaneACT** (5:30 to 7:00 pm) — ONLINE
- **October 23 – Steering Committee** (11:00 to noon) — ONLINE
- **November 11– LaneACT** (5:30 to 7:00 pm) — ONLINE

Meeting materials are posted at www.LaneACT.org prior to each meeting. To be included on the email notification list, please contact Denise Walters at 541-682-4341 or dwalters@lcog.org.

AUGUST 2020 -- M I N U T E S

Lane Area Commission on Transportation (LaneACT)
The meeting was held via teleconference

August 12, 2020
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Claire Syrett, Eugene, Chair
Jeff Gowing, Cottage Grove, Vice Chair
John Fox, Coburg
Joe Henry, Florence
Sean VanGordon, Springfield
Calvin Kenney, Veneta
Heather Buch, Lane County
Don Nordin, Lane Transit District (LTD)
Gwen Jaspers, Lane County Transportation Advisory Committee (LC TrAC)
Frannie Brindle, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)
Paul Thompson, Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)
Rob Zako, Environmental Land Use Designated Stakeholder
Sarah Mazze, Bicycle & Pedestrian Designated Stakeholder
George Grier, Other Stakeholder
Shelley Humble, Other Stakeholder

ABSENT: Creswell, Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians, Dunes City, Highway 126E, Junction City, Lowell, Oakridge, Westfir; Port of Siuslaw; Patrick Kerr, Rail Designated Stakeholder, Eugene Organ, Other Stakeholder.

OTHERS: Eric Havig and Bill Johnston, ODOT; Madeline Phillips, City of Creswell; Emma Newman, City of Springfield; Denise Walters, Lane Council of Governments (LCOG); and Pete Petty, public.

1. Call to Order (Welcome and Introductions)

Chair Claire Syrett called the Lane Area Commission on Transportation (LaneACT) meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. Because the Zoom platform allowed everyone attending to see everyone else, no introductions were made.

2. Review Agenda – Additions or Deletions

There were no changes to the agenda.

3. Consent Calendar

a. Approve minutes from July 8, 2020 meeting

Consensus: The July 8, 2020 minutes were approved as submitted.

4. Comments from the audience

Kevin Schaper, Springfield, first spoke on the issue of transportation equity. He relayed information about Paul McClain, a Springfield person of color who was prosecuted for riding an electric bike without a valid driver's license. Mr. Schaper said he had ridden an electric bike for several years and never been stopped and asked for his driver's license. He described the disproportionate allocation of road maintenance funds to affluent neighborhoods as another issue of transportation equity. Mr. Schaper concluded his comments by suggesting the speed limit on Main Street be reduced on Main Street immediately while planning for safety improvements.

Lauren Williams, Springfield, shared her concerns regarding the use of a vehicle as a weapon. She cited the decision not to prosecute the person who drove into Isiah Wagoner, saying it sent a message the behavior was acceptable. Ms. Williams asserted that driving into a protest should at least carry the same stigma and legal consequence as driving under the influence.

5. Announcements and information sharing

a. ODOT Update

Ms. Brindle ceded her time to ODOT business scheduled for later in the meeting.

b. Metropolitan Policy Committee Update

Mr. Thompson referenced the July meeting minutes in the agenda packet. He said at the August meeting the MPO discussed the 2024-27 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funding allocation and received a presentation on the results of a recently conducted travel behavior survey.

c. Other member updates

Commissioner Buch announced she had been appointed to the National Association of Counties (NACo) Transportation Subcommittee on Highways/Highway Safety. She debriefed the first meeting she had attended, noting they were identifying priority local transportation issues. A key issue identified was stabilization of the Highway Trust Fund. Commissioner Buch invited LaneACT members to contact her if they had other issues to be brought forward.

Don Nordin relayed that LTD ridership had stabilized at about 12,000 trips/day (about 30 percent of the pre-Covid ridership of 35,000). He described a number of safety measures in place, including the installation of acrylic shields behind the operators. LTD had implemented a back-up process in the event people were left behind because a bus was too crowded. Mr. Nordin also announced the Cottage Grove Connector was to be reinstated August 17, 2020.

Councilor Syrett said the Eugene City Council had passed the three ordinances she discussed last month: one authorized reduced speed limits on residential streets and two other ordinances related to a pilot project for micro mobility devices (e-scooters).

6. Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Grant application

Madeline Phillips, City of Creswell planner, noted City of Creswell staff and the local school district staff had been working on their SRTS plan for two years. She directed LaneACT members to the map displayed, explaining the two circles represented half-mile radii from the Creslane Elementary School and the Creswell Middle School. Within this area, there were a number of sidewalk gaps. The grant application addressed the gaps as well as adding enhanced crossings (rapid flashing beacons or improved visibility) at Oregon Avenue and Seventh Street and Morse Avenue and Fifth Street. Traffic studies at both intersections had documented average speeds of over 35 miles per hour. Ms. Phillips said the City of Creswell was currently working on a road modernization project on A Street. Concluding her presentation, Ms. Phillips displayed a map showing the population density of the city. The areas with the highest density of student populations were within the improvement boundaries of the SRTS grant application.

Councilor Syrett asked about why traffic speeds were so high so close to schools and if Creswell schools had accessed the services of the rural SRTS coordinator.

Ms. Phillips explained the visibility issues and traffic speed patterns that contributed to higher than posted speeds. She added both schools had new principals and they were working with Cassidy Mills. They planned to add the SRTS education and outreach components.

Commissioner Buch supported the proposal and thanked Ms. Phillips for her work. She thought the improvements would benefit all Creswell residents.

When Ms. Brindle asked if there were crossing guards who worked at the crossings in the SRTS grant proposal, Ms. Phillips said no. There were volunteers who helped the elementary school students cross on A Street. She hoped volunteers would come forward to complement the infrastructure improvement.

Ms. Mazze explained the lack of crossing guards was a regional issue. They were not funded by the Department of Education so schools relied on volunteers or staff to provide the assistance.

Seeing no other LaneACT members wanting to speak, Councilor Syrett asked if there was consensus to support the SRTS grant application.

Consensus: LaneACT members approved the proposed letter of support for the City of Creswell's SRTS infrastructure grant application.

7. LaneACT Letters of Support

Ms. Walters described the revisions from prior iterations of the expedited process for letters of support for grant proposals. She explained that because letters of support rose to level of a policy decision, the bylaws also needed to be amended in order to give the Letters of Endorsement Committee a power usually reserved for the full ACT. Ms. Walters said the current proposal stated the Letters of Endorsement Committee was comprised of the Steering Committee and up to five additional members. If LaneACT members approved the bylaws change and the protocol proposal, a subsequent decision was if they wanted to appoint an interim 2020 committee.

Mr. Zako supported the proposals because they struck a good balance between the historic precedence of LaneACT making all decisions as a body, by consensus, and the need to respond more quickly to grant requests.

Mr. Thompson concurred. He thought if LaneACT adopted the proposals, the Letters of Endorsement Committee would be formed immediately, comprised of the Steering Committee. The appointment of the additional people could occur at any time thereafter.

Commissioner Buch also supported the proposals as did Mayor Gowling. He suggested that if the proposals were approved, people wishing to participate in the Letters of Endorsement Committee should send an email to Ms. Walters. The Steering Committee would then schedule the appointment decision on the September agenda.

When Mr. Zako asked if ODOT staff had determined if the proposed changes were considered administrative, Ms. Walters confirmed they had.

Seeing no one else wished to speak on the topic, Councilor Syrett asked if there were consensus on the proposed changes to the bylaws and the proposed protocol for expedited letters of support.

Consensus: LaneACT members approved the proposed bylaws changes.

Consensus: LaneACT members approved the Expedited Letter of Endorsement Protocol for Grant Applications.

8. 2024-27 STIP: Stakeholder Engagement

Erik Havig, ODOT, Statewide Policy and Planning Manager, gave a Powerpoint presentation entitled *Development of the 2024-27 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program*. He explained the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) was reassessing the needs gap in light of HB2017 funding. In general, even with the increased transportation funding provided, the condition and performance of Oregon's transportation system will decline in the future. Mr. Havig detailed the anticipated funding gaps for Preservation (roadways, bridges, and culverts); Safety; Active Transportation (including SRTS); Public Transportation; Multimodal Freight; and Modernization. He emphasized there was not sufficient ongoing revenue to meet the needs in all categories. The 2024-27 STIP required tradeoffs. Mr. Havig explained each STIP cycle had three major phases: funding allocation, project selection; and public review/approval. Tonight's

stakeholder engagement was to get input on funding allocation priorities to help ODOT staff develop funding scenarios that illustrated the trade-offs among options. Mr. Havig said the OTC planned to set the funding allocation in December. He reviewed the funding categories: Enhance Highway; Fix-It; Safety; Non-Highway; Local Programs; and Other Functions.

Councilor VanGordon asked for clarification on when the outreach effort to stakeholders began and when it was to conclude. Mr. Havig clarified that three weeks ago ODOT staff had worked with the OTC to develop the decision-making framework. ODOT staff had begun outreach to MPOs, ACTs, etc., shortly thereafter with the goal of getting input to guide the scenario planning by September. He assured Councilor VanGordon there would be other opportunities for input prior to the final OTC decision in December.

Mr. Havig reviewed the 2021-24 STIP allocation, distinguishing between funds the OTC had discretion about investing and funds earmarked by the legislature. When Councilor Syrett asked what was included in the Local Programs category, he explained they were dedicated funds for local programs resulting from standing agreements with the League of Oregon Cities (LOC) and the Association of Oregon Counties (AOC), MPO planning support, and intergovernmental agreements. There was no money allocated in Local Programs from HB2017.

Mr. Havig reviewed the stakeholder outreach effort, including an online webinar held the prior week. He also noted some differences from past STIPs, including responding to the Governor's mandate regarding reducing greenhouse gas emissions and addressing elements from the OTC's recently adopted strategic action plan priorities (equity, modern transportation system, and funding). He reviewed the discussion questions and noted they would like to have LaneACT's feedback in writing by early September.

Councilor VanGordon offered three suggestions: recognize needs of rural communities, sometimes overlooked because of their less dense populations; allocate more to safety projects; and increase transparency regarding allocation of discretionary funds. He also asked for a quicker process at ODOT for release of safety data.

When Councilor Fox asked if ODOT had considered ways to enhance transportation funding, Mr. Havig responded those changes were more long-term, after the 2024-27 STIP.

Commissioner Buch asked why the timeline for stakeholder feedback was so condensed. She also questioned what happened to allocating funds for enhanced projects that were not part of the ODOT infrastructure.

Mr. Havig reviewed how the timeline had been set. He noted the type of projects Commissioner Buch asked about had been eliminated in the 2021-24 STIP due to lack of funds.

When Mr. Nordin asked about the status of legislative earmarked projects, Mr. Havig said some had been completed and others were in progress. The OTC had no discretion regarding them.

Mr. Thompson said the timeline for submitting stakeholder feedback was insufficient given the importance of the funding allocation decision. He advocated for the OTC to add a month to the

timeline. Mr. Thompson also thought the assumption that federal funding would be reduced was not the only alternative. He thought the OTC should develop a funding allocation scenario should an increase occur that was fully vetted with stakeholders.

Mr. Zako proposed LaneACT make a formal request for a one-month extension to provide their feedback. Mr. Thompson offered a friendly revision, suggesting the request be for the OTC to defer making their decision for one month. The chair asked LaneACT members if they agreed.

Consensus: LaneACT formally requested the OTC defer the funding allocation decision until January 2021 and extend the time for stakeholder feedback by one month.

Mr. Zako acknowledged there was insufficient funding for transportation. Instead of focusing on how to get more resources, he suggested looking at the benefits achieved for each project type.

Councilor Syrett advocated for the reinstatement of the STIP Enhance program because it had really helped livability in communities. She also agreed with Mr. Thompson that OTC needed to be prepared for a change in federal policy, referencing the DeFazio transportation bill and a possible change in leadership in key Washington positions.

9. LaneACT Area Strategy

Councilor Syrett directed LaneACT members to the agenda item summary in the packet. She noted they expected the consultants to present at the September meeting.

10. Transportation Safety, Equity, and Inclusion

Councilor Syrett postponed the agenda item due to lack of time on the agenda.

11. Adjournment

Councilor Syrett announced the next Steering Committee meeting was scheduled for August 21, 2020. She expressed concerns that two items on the agenda were not addressed due to lack of time. She asked LaneACT members to send her feedback regarding extending the meeting to two hours.

Councilor Syrett adjourned the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

(Recorded by Beth Bridges)



Lane Area Commission on Transportation

895 Willamette Street, Suite 500, Eugene, Oregon 97401-2910

541.682.4283 (*office*)

Agenda Item 3B

**Oregon Transit Association Award Nomination:
Ken Rivernider
(*quorum required*)**

Presenter

Denise Walters, LaneACT staff

Action requested

1. Approve or deny award nomination of Ken Rivernider.

Summary

In 1978, Oregon's three major public transit districts established the Oregon Transit Association as a nonprofit association to represent them at our State Capitol. Today, the OTA consists of many members throughout the state. The purpose of the Association is to assist members in the development and improvement of efficient, safe and convenient transportation services, techniques and methods, facilities and equipment. One of their program components is recognizing outstanding work in the field.

This opportunity to recognize Mr. Rivernider was brought to LaneACT by the team overseeing the Eugene-Florence route. A draft nomination letter is attached for consideration and provides an in-depth description of Mr. Rivernider's contributions to the creation and success of the route.

Attachments

- A. Nomination letter

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Attachment 3b1



September 1, 2020

Dear Oregon Transit Association (OTA) Nominating Committee,

The Lane Area Commission on Transportation (Lane ACT) proudly nominates Ken Rivernider for the OTA's Local Distinguished Service Award. Mr. Rivernider is a private citizen and member of the Emerald Valley Chapter of the Blind who has tirelessly and uncompromisingly advocated for transit service between the Lane County coastal community of Florence and the Eugene urban area.

Since 2016 Mr. Rivernider has provided public testimony to Lane ACT regarding the need for transit service connecting Florence and Eugene. He highlighted the needs of our County's community members to access essential services and expand recreational opportunities for those facing mobility barriers. He was a leading voice in successfully advocating for Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) to fund a feasibility study of a Eugene – Florence bus route.

Mr. Rivernider continued to be heavily involved throughout the study's advisory committee with robust comment on concept route details as well as community engagement, including hand delivery of public surveys. 1,554 survey responses were collected achieving a significant response rate. The study affirmed the route was not only feasible but that it would provide a critical service to many. Upon completion of the study, Mr. Rivernider was instrumental throughout the grant application process in advocating for this project to the Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund (STIF) Advisory Committee and Lane ACT. The grant proposal was successful due, in large part, to the tenacity of public comment embodied by Mr. Rivernider. Furthering his dedication to the route, Mr. Rivernider served on the Route Advisory Committee to ensure his main priority of ADA compliance and accessibility for all was manifest in this transit service. To this day he corresponds with transit staff on a weekly basis to continuously improve the service.

The first public transportation route connecting Florence and Eugene initiated service on February 18, 2020. The service has continued to operate throughout COVID conditions with stable ridership which is a testament to the lifeline service it is providing. This vital route may not have happened and certainly would not have been as well planned and implemented had it not been for strong community support lead by community members like Mr. Rivernider.

The LaneACT considers Mr. Rivernider a most welcome regular fixture at our meetings and is grateful for the insights with which he has provided us. Given limitations on his own mobility, it

was not always easy for Mr. Rivernider to attend and speaks deeply to the level of his commitment. At LaneACT's September 2019 and March 2020 meetings Mr. Rivernider again provided testimony; this time to thank LaneACT for its support of the route. It is we who should be thanking him. We nominate Ken Rivernider for this year's Local Distinguished Service Award and strongly encourage the OTA to recognize his contributions to public transportation.

Sincerely,

Claire Syrett,
Chair
LaneACT

DRAFT



Lane Area Commission on Transportation

895 Willamette Street, Suite 500, Eugene, Oregon 97401-2910

541.682.4283 (office)

Agenda Item 3C

Highway 126E representative appointments
(quorum required)

Presenter

Denise Walters, LaneACT staff

Action requested

1. Approve or deny application for Highway 126E primary representative.
2. Reappoint Charles Tannenbaum from primary to alternate representative.

Summary

Charles Tannenbaum, LaneACT's primary Highway (HWY) 126 East representative, informed LaneACT of his desire to step into the alternate representative position rather than continue as primary. LaneACT staff posted recruitment for the primary HWY 126E representative on the LaneACT website and circulated among transportation and community circles consistent with LaneACT Bylaws.

Bylaws Section IV. B. Voting Members

Highway 126 East: *Following public advertisement, LaneACT shall appoint a primary representative and an alternate representative for the Highway 126 corridor east of Springfield. Representatives must live east of the City of Springfield Urban Growth Boundary and west of the Linn County line; with consideration given to those with direct parcel access or dependence on Highway 126 E. (1 member)*

LaneACT received one application from Mr. Pete Petty. The Steering Committee reviewed Mr. Petty's application to confirm eligibility (as set forth in the Bylaws above), recommends the appointment of Mr. Petty, and brings the application before the full LaneACT for decision.

Attachments

- A. HWY 126E Application — Pete Petty



Applicant Criteria

1. Be able to attend monthly meetings on the 2nd Wednesday of each month, from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m. primarily in Springfield but at times at alternate locations;
2. Be willing to serve an up to 4-year term; and
3. Live in Lane County OR represent a business or organization that operates in Lane County.

Name:	PETE PETTY		
Residential/Business Address:	49460 McKenzie Hwy	City	VIDA Zip 97488
	Street		
Mailing Address:	SAME		
	Street	City	Zip
Home Telephone:	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	Work Telephone:	707 816 0022
FAX:	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	E-Mail:	PPetty541 @ AOL.COM
Employment:	Retired		

The LaneACT is recruiting for the following positions:

- A Designated Stakeholder representing **HWY 126E** (east of Springfield community interests).

Stakeholders will be appointed to 4-year terms and may be reappointed to subsequent 4-year terms by LaneACT.

(OVER)

If I understand correctly, one of the major the functions of a member of the LaneACT, is to serve as a conduit for the folks along HWY126 East, bringing to ODOT their concerns and keeping those same people informed of relevant issues regarding our stretch of highway. I would therefore consider my community connections as my major qualification for this position. Soon after my relocation to the McKenzie River community of Nimrod 8 years ago, I became a cohort in the Ford Family Leadership Training Program and became acquainted with many of the leaders of the area. I participated in our Blue River Park renovation project and made even more connections. I have served on the board of directors of the McKenzie Community Track and Field, was instrumental in the formation of the Friends of Eagle Rock Park and served on a Lane County Task Force working on the Master Plan for Lane county parks. I am an active volunteer with the McKenzie River Trust and was recently recognized as an "Outstanding Volunteer". I have organized events such as recycling drives, meet the candidates forums, EARTH DAY EVENT and established a collection program for redeemable beverage containers. The Blue River Bottle Boys have distributed over \$2000.to community non profit organizations as a result of donations of bottles and cans to the program which is now under the auspices of the McKenzie River Community Development Corporation. The River Reflections Newspaper named me as "Man of the Year" in 2019 for my volunteer work. My volunteer efforts in the McKenzie River called community were recognized with the coveted River Reflections "Man of the Year" award in 2019.

Demographic Information (Optional):

The LaneACT collects information on race, ethnicity, national origin, and gender of applicants to the Commission to ensure the inclusion of all segments of the population affected by LaneACT. You have the option of providing this information. You may apply and be selected to be a LaneACT Stakeholder even if you do not wish to provide this information.

Gender	MALE			Number of Persons in Your Household	2			
Annual Household Income:								
<input type="checkbox"/>	Less than \$25,000		<input type="checkbox"/>	\$25,000-\$44,999		<input type="checkbox"/>	\$45,000-\$74,999	
<input type="checkbox"/>	More than \$75,000							
Disability	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	Senior	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	Youth	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	No					<input type="checkbox"/>	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	African American		<input type="checkbox"/>	Hispanic		<input type="checkbox"/>	American Indian/Alaskan Native	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Asian							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander		<input type="checkbox"/>	Multiracial		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	White	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other							

Please Return Your Completed Application to:

Mail: Denise Walters, LCOG / 859 Willamette Street, Suite 500 / Eugene, OR 97401-2910

E-Mail: dwalters@lcog.org

FAX: (541) 682-4099 Attn: Denise Walters

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

MINUTES

Metropolitan Policy Committee
Virtual Meeting via Zoom

August 6, 2020
11:30 a.m.

PRESENT: Pete Sorenson, Chair (Lane County); Lucy Vinis, Betty Taylor (City of Eugene); Joe Pishioneri (City of Springfield); Frannie Brindle (Oregon Department of Transportation); Carl Yeh (Lane Transit District), members; Matt Rodrigues for Sarah Medary (City of Eugene), Aurora Jackson (Lane Transit District); Neil Laudati for Nancy Newton (City of Springfield); Sasha Vartanian for Steve Mokrohisky (Lane County), *ex officio* members.

Brenda Wilson, Paul Thompson, Kelly Clarke, Ellen Currier, Syd Shoaf, Drew Pfefferle, Rachel Dorfman, Dan Callister, Howard Schussler (Lane Council of Governments); Rob Inerfeld (City of Eugene); Tom Boyatt, Emma Newman (City of Springfield); Andrew Martin (Lane Transit District); Bill Johnston, Eric Havig (Oregon Department of Transportation); Neil Moyer (Metro TV); Sue Walling; Tony Iaccarino, John Horvick (DHM Research).

WELCOME, CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Sorenson called the meeting of the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) to order and noted that a quorum was present.

APPROVE July 9, 2020, MEETING MINUTES

Ms. Vinis, seconded by Mr. Pishioneri, moved to approve the July 9, 2020, minutes as presented. The motion passed unanimously, 6:0.

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA/ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM MPC MEMBERS

Mr. Sorenson noted that the meeting agenda had been revised to add an agenda item related to federal performance measures.

COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

There was no one wishing to speak.

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO) ISSUES

Revisions to the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Amendment Approval Authority

Mr. Callister explained the proposed revisions would modify the MTIP amendment approval authority by allowing Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) staff the authority to approve certain changes to MTIP project details. Under the current MTIP the MPC had the authority to approve all project changes and had delegated that authority for most changes to the Transportation Planning Committee (TPC). The problem was the TPC met monthly and during the summer construction season many changes were time sensitive. Delays in approval until the next TPC meeting and then the subsequent ODOT approval process

could be detrimental to timely delivery of projects within the timeframe in which they were programmed. The revisions would streamline the process to improve turnaround time and prevent project delays that could result in penalties. He said the agenda packet included a table of the types of decisions that would be made by the MPC, delegated to the TPC and to MPO staff. He asked that a public hearing on the proposed revisions be held, with action on the revisions taken by the MPC at its September 2020 meeting following a 30-day comment period.

Mr. Sorenson opened the public hearing. He determined there was no one wishing to speak and closed the hearing.

Ms. Taylor left the meeting at 11:50 a.m.

Federal Performance Measures Process Agreement

Mr. Thompson said ODOT had requested that the MPC agree to the coordination process document that set forth details of how ODOT, Oregon MPOs and transit providers within the state would coordinate in setting the state performance measure targets that would be used as federal performance measure targets for the MPOs. He said the coordination process has been used informally for many years and the updated draft included in the agenda materials, at the request of the Federal Highways Administration (FHWA), called for agreement by MPO policy boards rather than at the staff level. He said staff had reviewed the document and was comfortable recommending the MPC agree to the document.

Ms. Vinis said she supported the process agreement. She asked if discussion of evaluating the MPO's actions with respect to climate change would be a factor in the performance measures and if not, could the MPO have its own measures that addressed that type of evaluation. Mr. Thompson said the agreement related to working with ODOT on the required federal performance measures that the state and MPOs had adopted. The MPC had already agreed to support the state performance measures and federal required measures. There was no measure that specifically addressed greenhouse gas emissions, but the MPO could choose to adopt additional performance measures beyond the federally required ones. Staff response would be provided at the MPC's September meeting to public comments regarding the MPO and greenhouse gas emissions. Agenda items would be coming before the MPC over the next several months during the update of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and those would include goals, objectives and performance measures; that would be an appropriate place to discuss greenhouse gas emissions.

Mr. Yeh, seconded by Ms. Vinis, moved to agree to the ODOT Coordination Process with MPOs in Setting, Monitoring, and Reporting State Performance Measure Targets. The motion passed unanimously, 5:0.

Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) FY2024-2027 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Funding Allocation

Mr. Havig used a slide presentation to provide a status report on the development of the FY24-27 STIP. He described the OTC's process for collecting data to help inform development of an investment strategy for the STIP. He said even with the significant investments resulting from HB 2017, there would need to be some serious and difficult trade off conversations because there would not be sufficient funds to address all of the investments that needed to be made in the transportation system. He reviewed the conditions of key assets such as bridges, pavement and culverts and the hierarchy of major improvements used to determine system investments. With respect to safety, he said Oregon's goal was to achieve no deaths or life-changing injuries by 2035, which would require major safety investments.

Mr. Havig reviewed ODOT's comprehensive investment strategies to improve the transportation infrastructure and the investments made under the Connect*Oregon* program and HB 2017. He said the full document detailing investment strategies was available on ODOT's website. Regarding the OTC's schedule for development of the STIP, funding allocations would be followed by project selection and finally public review and approval. The current phase was funding allocations and the OTC had indicated it wished to remain with the allocation categories that had been in the STIP for several years. The next step was to create funding scenarios to help inform the OTC's decision at its December 2020 meeting. The categories were Enhanced Highway, Fix It, Safety, Non-Highway Active Transportation and Transit, Local Programming and Other Functions. A stakeholder engagement phase to help inform the OTC's discussion would begin in September. A survey on spending priorities was available online. He said the governor's executive order required a climate lens be applied to development of the STIP and ODOT was developing tools for that purpose.

Mr. Havig said the OTC had approved a set of strategic action plan priorities: equity, a modern transportation system and sufficient and reliable funding. He said each priority included a number of sub-goals and briefly described those related to a modern transportation system. He reviewed the list of questions to be posed to advisory and modal committees to encourage dialogues that would provide stakeholder feedback to the OTC. He invited comments and questions from MPC members.

Ms. Vinis commented that greenhouse gas reduction objectives did not seem to be incorporated across all categories, specifically Enhanced Highway, and asked if those options were available. Mr. Havig replied the Enhanced Highway category was primarily for highway improvements because active transportation enhancements and other system improvements were addressed in the Non-Highway category that addressed modes of travel other than automobile and truck. He said the OTC recognized that managing and relieving congestion was more than the construction of large highway projects but there remained system deficiencies and bottlenecks where some level of investment in the highways was part of the solution.

Mr. Yeh asked what opportunities existed to channel some funding to inter-city transit projects and agreements to relieve pressure on the highway system. Mr. Havig supported the concept of leveraging other funds and investments and one of the challenges would be determining how much could be done with the different funds available in the STIP. He said there was pressure to preserve the existing system because of the level of investment in the transportation network and multi-modal assets. Those were questions advisory bodies would address in their conversations about the STIP.

In response to a question from Mr. Pishioneri, Mr. Havig said the OTC was scheduled to meet in mid-September and would need feedback from the MPC in early September in order to take that feedback into account. He said there would be other opportunities for the MPOs to weigh in on STIP development.

Mr. Rodrigues said there was significant reductions in traffic volume during the COVID-19 pandemic and asked if ODOT was looking at the impact on areas of projected congestion investments and whether those remained as high a priority if telecommuting remained a trend in the longer term. Mr. Havig agreed there had been substantial traffic reductions, but there had been some increases and traffic levels appeared to have leveled off. He said it was hard to predict what the future would look like because of the many factors that impact travel. He expected there would also be an impact on how growth occurred, but areas of congestion would remain.

Travel Barriers Survey Process and Results Draft Report

Mr. Iaccarino, consultant with DHM Research, used a slide presentation to report the results of the travel barriers survey conducted as part of the RTP update. The survey was of residents in the cities of Eugene, Springfield, Coburg and surrounding area for the purpose of gauging perceptions of the transportation system, identifying common travel behaviors, assessing what motivated people to use alternatives and comparing the results to the results of a 2014 survey. He described the survey methodology and identified the key takeaways in the following categories:

- transportation priorities
- general travel behavior
- biking and walking alternatives
- biking and walking motivators
- bus ridership
- bus motivators
- multimodal transportation
- telecommuting

Mr. Iaccarino responded to question from MPC members regarding survey methodology and types of questions asked those surveyed. Mr. Thompson said a final report would be available next week and would be shared with MPC members. He said staff would use the survey information in discussions around updating the RTP goals and objectives.

Follow-up and Next Steps

- **ODOT Update**—Ms. Brindle reported that ODOT leadership had directed that due to the COVID-19 pandemic telecommuting would be extended to the end of October 2020, although it could continue beyond that. She said productivity was good and employees like telecommuting so agency leadership was pleased. She said the I-105 project would be finished with the road surface by the middle of September. The Delta-Beltline project would proceed through the current construction season and into the next one.
- **MTIP Administrative Amendments**—There were no questions.
- **Next Meeting**— September 3, 2020

Mr. Sorenson adjourned the meeting at 1:35 p.m.

(Transcribed by Lynn Taylor)



Lane Area Commission on Transportation

895 Willamette Street, Suite 500, Eugene, Oregon 97401-2910

541.682.4283 (office)

Agenda Item 10

Transportation Safety Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

Presenter

Denise Walters, LaneACT Staff

Action(s) requested

- 1) Consider the issue - weaponization of vehicles;
- 2) Consider process for analyzing broader issues of safety, diversity, equity, and inclusion in transportation; and
- 3) Determine any respective next steps.

Summary

Weaponization of vehicles: At the July meeting of LaneACT members discussed the national trend of weaponizing vehicles at Black Lives Matter activities and protests. The trend has been discussed in the New York Times among other publications and is witnessed in the local incident of a vehicle striking Isaiah Waggoner at a childrens' march in Eugene. At its July meeting LaneACT expressed interest in better understanding the state of current laws in addressing such issues, and if and how other bodies/agencies are considering the issue

Current Laws: Staff discussed the adequacy of existing laws with Lane County District Attorney Patty Perlow. A summary of laws is attached (Attachment A). Ms. Perlow sees existing laws as sufficient for prosecution on the use of vehicles as weapons. Within the body of existing law there are two general paths for accountability: 1) intent and 2) recklessness. Both consider the degree of injury with the charge being one of assault or, if there is a fatality, of manslaughter or homicide. In terms of the intent pathway, there can be significant challenges proving intent. If intent cannot be established, proceeding on this path would be unwise and prosecution would consider proceeding with the recklessness pathway. To proceed with the reckless act pathway, prosecution must prove a person was aware of and consciously disregarded a known risk that injury or death could occur as the result of his/her action or lack thereof. An example of a reckless assault is injuring someone while driving intoxicated.

Other bodies/agencies: Review of the Oregon Transportation Safety Committee agendas found no reference to weaponization of vehicles or related topic. When expanding the search,

weaponization of vehicles is discussed among organizations more focused on legal aspects of civil and human rights such as the Anti-Defamation League and Southern Poverty Law Center. The topic was brought to the Safe Lane Coalition which has formed a sub-committee to continue consideration of the issue.

Potential next steps on the weaponization of vehicles could include obtaining additional data on the topic, bringing the topic to the attention of the Oregon Transportation Safety Committee and other relevant stakeholders, and/or any steps defined by LaneACT.

Broader issues of equity, diversity, and inclusion: During LaneACT’s discussion in July the broader concept of safety for all arose and specifically around utilization of bikeways, walkways/sidewalks, transit and roadways by Indigenous people, people of color, and other groups impacted by systemic inequities and racism. Lane County, as a whole, has a longstanding commitment to transportation safety and, thus, some existing frameworks to advance the discussion. Potential next steps on the broader issue of safety, diversity, equity and inclusion could be to gather more data to discern issues more explicitly, include the topic in the Lane Area Strategies project, consider the potential to include the topic in the Lane County and Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) safety plans, and/or any steps defined by LaneACT.

Attachments

- A. Summary of relevant Oregon laws.

Summary of Oregon Laws Related to Vehicular Manslaughter and Reckless Driving

Criminally Negligent Homicide

Criminally Negligent Homicide Summary

A motorist who causes the death of another person while driving in a “criminally negligent” manner can be charged with criminally negligent homicide. Basically, a person acts with criminal negligence by *unknowingly* doing or failing to do something that creates a substantial risk to others. The person’s action or inaction must amount to a “gross deviation” from what a reasonable person would do under like circumstances.

Criminally Negligent Homicide Penalty

Criminally negligent homicide is a class B felony. A convicted motorist is typically looking at 35 to 40 months in prison and up to \$250,000 in fines. However, for DUI-related offenses, the prison time generally ranges from 61 to 65 months.

ORS 163.145: Criminally Negligent Homicide Law

- (1) A person commits the crime of criminally negligent homicide when, with criminal negligence, the person causes the death of another person.
- (2) Criminally negligent homicide is a Class B felony.

Manslaughter in the Second-Degree Summary

Manslaughter in the Second-Degree Summary

A motorist can be convicted of second-degree manslaughter for killing another person while driving in a reckless manner. A person acts recklessly by knowingly doing or failing to do something that creates a substantial risk to others. In other words, the person is aware of but disregards the dangerousness of the conduct. The person’s action or inaction must amount to a gross deviation from what a reasonable person would do under like circumstances.

Manslaughter in the Second-Degree Penalty

Second-degree manslaughter. Second-degree manslaughter is a class B felony. A convicted motorist is typically looking at 35 to 40 months in prison and up to \$250,000 in fines. However, for DUI-related offenses, the prison time generally ranges from 61 to 65 months.

ORS 163.125: Manslaughter in the Second-Degree Law

- (1) Criminal homicide constitutes manslaughter in the second degree when:
 - (a) It is committed recklessly;

(b) A person intentionally causes or aids another person to commit suicide; or

(c) A person, with criminal negligence, causes the death of a child under 14 years of age or a dependent person, as defined in ORS 163.205 (Criminal mistreatment in the first degree), and:

(A) The person has previously engaged in a pattern or practice of assault or torture of the victim or another child under 14 years of age or a dependent person; or

(B) The person causes the death by neglect or maltreatment, as defined in ORS 163.115 (Murder in the second degree).

(2) Manslaughter in the second degree is a Class B felony.

Manslaughter in the First-Degree

Manslaughter in the First-Degree Summary

A motorist can be convicted of first-degree manslaughter for killing another person while:

- recklessly driving in a manner that shows an “extreme indifference to the value of human life,” or
- driving with recklessness or criminal negligence and in violation of the state’s DUII (driving under the influence of intoxicants) laws, if the motorist has either three prior DUII convictions that occurred within the past ten years or a prior driving-related assault conviction involving serious bodily injury.

Manslaughter in the First-Degree Penalty

First-degree manslaughter. First-degree manslaughter is a class A felony. A convicted motorist is typically looking at 121 to 130 months in prison and up to \$375,000 in fines.

ORS 163.118: Manslaughter in the First-Degree Law

(1) Criminal homicide constitutes manslaughter in the first degree when:

(a) It is committed recklessly under circumstances manifesting extreme indifference to the value of human life;

(b) It is committed intentionally by a defendant under the influence of extreme emotional disturbance as provided in ORS 163.135 (Extreme emotional disturbance as affirmative defense to murder in the second degree), which constitutes a mitigating circumstance reducing the homicide that would otherwise be murder to manslaughter in the first degree and need not be proved in any prosecution;

(c) A person recklessly causes the death of a child under 14 years of age or a dependent person, as defined in ORS 163.205 (Criminal mistreatment in the first degree), and:

(A) The person has previously engaged in a pattern or practice of assault or torture of the victim or another child under 14 years of age or a dependent person; or

(B) The person causes the death by neglect or maltreatment, as defined in ORS 163.115 (Murder in the second degree); or

(d) It is committed recklessly or with criminal negligence by a person operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of intoxicants in violation of ORS 813.010 (Driving under the influence of intoxicants) and:

(A) The person has at least three previous convictions for driving while under the influence of intoxicants under ORS 813.010 (Driving under the influence of intoxicants), or its statutory counterpart in any jurisdiction, in the 10 years prior to the date of the current offense; or

(B)(i) The person has a previous conviction for any of the crimes described in subsection (2) of this section, or their statutory counterparts in any jurisdiction; and

(ii) The victim's serious physical injury in the previous conviction was caused by the person driving a motor vehicle.

(2) The previous convictions to which subsection (1)(d)(B) of this section applies are:

(a) Assault in the first degree under ORS 163.185 (Assault in the first degree);

(b) Assault in the second degree under ORS 163.175 (Assault in the second degree); or

(c) Assault in the third degree under ORS 163.165 (Assault in the third degree).

(3) Manslaughter in the first degree is a Class A felony.

(4) It is an affirmative defense to a charge of violating:

(a) Subsection (1)(c)(B) of this section that the victim was a dependent person who was at least 18 years of age and was under care or treatment solely by spiritual means pursuant to the religious beliefs or practices of the dependent person or the guardian of the dependent person.

(b) Subsection (1)(d)(B) of this section that the defendant was not under the influence of intoxicants at the time of the conduct that resulted in the previous conviction.

Aggravated Vehicular Homicide

Aggravated Vehicular Homicide Summary

A motorist can be convicted of aggravated vehicular homicide for causing the death of another person while in violation of the state's DUI laws if the driver:

- was at least criminally negligent, and
- has a prior driving-related manslaughter or criminally negligent homicide conviction.

Aggravated Vehicular Homicide Penalty

Aggravated vehicular homicide is a class A felony. A convicted motorist is typically looking at 121 to 130 months in prison and up to \$375,000 in fines.

ORS 163.149: Aggravated Vehicular Homicide Law

(1) Criminal homicide constitutes aggravated vehicular homicide when it is committed with criminal negligence, recklessly or recklessly under circumstances manifesting extreme indifference to the value of human life by a person operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of intoxicants in violation of ORS 813.010 (Driving under the influence of intoxicants) and:

(a) The person has a previous conviction for any of the crimes described in subsection (2) of this section, or their statutory counterparts in any jurisdiction; and

(b) The victim's death in the previous conviction was caused by the person driving a motor vehicle.

(2) The previous convictions to which subsection (1) of this section applies are:

(a) Manslaughter in the first degree under ORS 163.118 (Manslaughter in the first degree);

(b) Manslaughter in the second degree under ORS 163.125 (Manslaughter in the second degree);
or

(c) Criminally negligent homicide under ORS 163.145 (Criminally negligent homicide).

(3) It is an affirmative defense to a prosecution under this section that the defendant was not under the influence of intoxicants at the time of the conduct that resulted in the previous conviction.

(4) Aggravated vehicular homicide is a Class A felony. [2007 c.867 §1]

Note: 163.149 (Aggravated vehicular homicide) was enacted into law by the Legislative Assembly but was not added to or made a part of ORS chapter 163 or any series therein by legislative action. See Preface to Oregon Revised Statutes for further explanation.

Reckless Driving

Reckless Driving Summary

Reckless driving is defined as a crime in which someone drives in a way that puts the safety of people or property in danger. This is different than careless driving, and the motorist does not realize they are driving dangerously. Individuals can be charged for either crime, but careless driving charges are typically less severe.

Careless Driving Penalties

The consequences of an Oregon reckless driving conviction depend on the circumstances. But generally, reckless driving is a class A misdemeanor. A conviction carries up to a year in jail and a maximum \$6,250 in fines. The convicted motorist also faces license suspension for a period of:

- 90 days for a first offense
- one year for a second offense within five years, and
- three years for a third offense within five years

ORS 811.140: Reckless Driving Law

- (1) A person commits the offense of reckless driving if the person recklessly drives a vehicle upon a highway or other premises described in this section in a manner that endangers the safety of persons or property.
- (2) The use of the term “recklessly” in this section is as defined in ORS 161.085
- (3) The offense described in this section, reckless driving, is a Class A misdemeanor and is applicable upon any premises open to the public.

Careless Driving

Careless Driving Summary

A motorist can be convicted of the careless driving for driving in a manner that endangers the safety of persons or property. Unlike with reckless driving—which requires proof that the driver knowingly did something risky behind the wheel—motorists can be convicted of careless driving without realizing the dangerousness of their driving

Careless Driving Penalties

Penalties for careless driving are generally less severe than those for a reckless driving conviction.

Possible penalties for careless driving include:

- **Careless driving.** Usually, careless driving is a class B traffic violation and carries \$130 to \$1,000 in fines.
- **Careless driving involving an accident.** A motorist who causes an accident while driving carelessly is guilty of a class A traffic violation and is looking at \$220 to \$2,000 in fines.
- **Careless driving involving injuries or fatalities.** Careless driving offenders who cause “serious physical injury” or death to another person face \$200 to \$2,000 in fines, 100 to 200 hours of community service, and must complete a traffic safety course.

ORS 811.135: Careless Driving Law

- (1) A person commits the offense of careless driving if the person drives any vehicle upon a highway or other premises described in this section in a manner that endangers or would be likely to endanger any person or property.
- (2) The offense described in this section, careless driving, applies on any premises open to the public and is a Class B traffic violation unless commission of the offense contributes to an accident. If commission of the offense contributes to an accident, the offense is a Class A traffic violation.
- (3) In addition to any other penalty imposed for an offense committed under this section, if the court determines that the commission of the offense described in this section contributed to the serious physical injury or death of a vulnerable user* of a public way, the court shall:
 - (a) Impose a sentence that requires the person to:
 - (A) Complete a traffic safety course; and
 - (B) Perform between 100 and 200 hours of community service, notwithstanding ORS 137.129 (Length of community service sentence). The community service must include activities related to driver improvement and providing public education on traffic safety;
 - (b) Order, but suspend on the condition that the person complete the requirements of paragraph (a) of this subsection:
 - (A) A fine of up to \$12,500, notwithstanding ORS 153.018 (Maximum fines); and
 - (B) A suspension of driving privileges for one year as provided in ORS 809.280;and
 - (c) Set a hearing date up to one year from the date of sentencing.
- (4) At the hearing described in subsection (3)(c) of this section, the court shall:
 - (a) If the person has successfully completed the requirements described in subsection (3)(a) of this section, dismiss the penalties ordered under subsection (3)(b) of this section; or
 - (b) If the person has not successfully completed the requirements described in subsection (3)(a) of this section.
 - (A) Grant the person an extension based on good cause shown; or
 - (B) Order the penalties under subsection (3)(b) of this section.

- (5) When a court orders a suspension under subsection (4) of this section, the court shall prepare and send to the Department of Transportation an order of suspension of driving privileges of the person. Upon receipt of an order under this subsection, the department shall take action as directed under ORS 809.280.
- (6) The police officer issuing the citation for an offense under this section shall note on the citation if the cited offense appears to have contributed to the serious physical injury or death of a vulnerable user of a public way.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



Lane Area Commission on Transportation

895 Willamette Street, Suite 500, Eugene, Oregon 97401-2910

541.682.4283 (*office*)

Agenda Item 7

2024-27 STIP stakeholder engagement

Presenter

Bill Johnston – ODOT Area 5 Planner

Action requested

Review, refine, and endorse draft responses to questions from the OTC.

Summary

The OTC has asked for input from the ACTS to help them determine how to allocate the anticipated 2024-27 STIP funding among the various programs that ODOT supports.

At the Aug 12 LaneACT meeting, Erik Havig from the Policy, Data & Analysis Division provided a presentation describing (1) the high-level investment strategy the OTC endorsed in July, and (2) the funding challenges and competing priorities the OTC needs to consider in developing the STIP. The presentation also included (3) four questions for the LaneACT to respond to.

The attached discussion paper lists the four questions along with draft responses prepared by LaneACT staff. The draft responses are based on responses the LaneACT provided to similar questions the OTC asked in the past at various OTC annual workshops and special meetings with individual ACTs. More recent comments from the LaneACT are also incorporated.

The OTC has asked for responses to the questions in advance of their Sept 17 meeting in Salem. In order to meet this timeframe the LaneACT will need to finalize their responses at the Sept 9 meeting. Staff will revise the responses after the meeting, based on direction provided by the LaneACT, and forward them to the OTC.

The LaneACT Chair sent a letter to the OTC on Aug 26 requesting more time to respond, and more data to inform the response. A copy is attached. Also attached is an explanation from Erik Havig describing why more information was not provided. The draft responses are intended to address the questions qualitatively, without data, within the given timeframe.

Attached

- A. Draft responses to questions from the OTC (2 pages)
- B. Responses from Erik Havig to LaneACT question (2 pages)
- C. Letter from the LaneACT Chair to the OTC requesting additional time (2 pages)

Attachment A: Questions to inform development of the 2024-27 STIP

Draft responses from LaneACT – August 31, 2020

Question 1

What are the highest priority transportation needs for funding statewide, and how should the OTC allocate funding between modes of transportation and categories of funding to meet the state's goals?

Note: The different modes of transportation include: motorized vehicles (highways), bicycles and pedestrians, public transportation, rail, aviation.

RESPONSE:

The LaneACT believes all modes of transportation are important. Because we are so dependent on highways this is probably the most important mode – especially maintaining the existing system. The LaneACT understands the significance of I-5 in terms of enabling freight movement throughout the entire state. We also understand the need to replace the Interstate Bridge over the Columbia River, and to relieve the bottleneck at the Rose Quarter in Portland. The LaneACT does not necessarily think funding these very expensive projects should come at the expense of funding important highway projects in other parts of the state, and investing in other modes. There are many unmet needs.

Question 2

How should the OTC allocate funding among Fix-It, Safety, and Highway Enhance programs to meet statewide goals and needs?

RESPONSE:

The LaneACT agrees the top priorities for the state should continue to be maintenance and preservation (Fix-It), and safety. These were OTC priorities in previous STIPs. At the same time, because the population of the state is increasing, there is a real need to expand the capacity of the system. This would seem to provide the justification HB 2017 calls for to support future gas tax increases, which would fund more earmarks for major projects.

Question 3

How should the OTC target non-highway spending to address statewide goals and needs?

Note: Non-highway programs include (1) public transportation, (2) bicycle and pedestrian, and (3) transportation options. Transportation Options (T.O.) includes (a) public outreach and education to promote carpooling, vanpooling, biking, walking and transit options, and (b)

managing the statewide ride matching database (Get There) to help people connect with carpools, vanpools and other travel options.

RESPONSE:

The LaneACT recognizes the importance of all these programs. Without data and analysis from ODOT staff it's difficult for the ACT to recommend program priorities or funding distributions. For instance, a gap analysis of some kind comparing the historical levels of investment to the unmet needs for each program would help inform the discussion. A benefit-cost analysis would also be helpful.

Question 4

Given that transportation system needs exceed available funding, how would you recommend the OTC make tradeoffs when deciding how to allocate limited funding?

RESPONSE:

The LaneACT appreciates the difficult task the OTC has in making these complex funding decisions. As discussed in the response to the previous question, we assume ODOT staff will provide the OTC with data and analysis to help inform and simplify the decisions. The LaneACT could provide more meaningful input if this information was available now. We hope we will have another opportunity to comment when this information is available.

Attachment B: Responses from Erik Havig

At the Aug 12 LaneACT meeting, Erik Havig from the Policy, Data & Analysis Division provided a presentation describing the OTC's approach to developing the 2024-27 STIP. The LaneACT expressed concerns about not having enough data or analysis from ODOT staff to provide the OTC with meaningful input.

After the meeting, LaneACT staff followed up by email with Erik to clarify the LaneACT's request for additional information. The following are the specific questions staff asked, along with Erik's written responses (edited by staff for this summary).

1. Does ODOT have any data indicating how effective the previous STIP funding allocations have been in terms of achieving the intended outcomes?

RESPONSE: This is a difficult question to answer. There is some data and analysis provided in the OTC Investment Strategy document the OTC approved in July. The presentation I provided to the LaneACT highlighted some of the key findings. The performance measures that ODOT tracks are available on the OTC website. Correlating the performance measures to previous STIP funding allocations would be complicated and require more analysis.

2. How have the previous funding allocations improved the transportation system in Lane County?

RESPONSE: Assessing the effect of previous funding allocations on an individual county would be complicated. Individual projects would need to be assessed. It's not possible for ODOT to analyze individual counties within the short timeframe (for discussing funding allocations with the OTC).

There are several documents that provide a bigger-picture view of the statewide system needs and how those needs affect the residents of the state. The Investment Strategy includes some analysis. Another document titled Rough Roads 2 explains the impact of the Fix-It Program on household budgets. Finally, the statewide modal plans describe the needs of the system and the investments required to achieve the desired goals.

3. How much economic activity, associated with improved freight movement, has been generated by previous STIP investments?

RESPONSE: This is difficult to quantify. The Rough Roads 2 document I referred to in my previous response provides some analysis. However, it's more from the standpoint of what the State could lose economically if the transportation system is not maintained.

- 4. Lane County has one of the highest number of roadway fatalities in the state. How did previous STIP investments address safety? To what degree?**

RESPONSE: As I described previously this would require analyzing individual safety projects, which is something we can't do on short notice for just one county. Anyone can pull up the STIP on line and look for Safety projects in Lane County to see what projects were completed. As far as benefits, the Safety program is a data driven. To qualify for funding, projects have to demonstrate a benefit-cost relationship in terms of reducing or eliminating fatal and serious injury crashes using proven counter measures.

- 5. Is there an “irrecoverable” funding scenario? For example, considering that the cost of repairing roadways increases exponentially over time as roads are allowed to deteriorate, if insufficient funds are allocated for Fix-It would we create a backlog of repair needs so large that the needs could never be addressed?**

RESPONSE: This is a great question. There is probably a point where this could occur. ODOT already prioritizes certain routes for Fix-It funding, which means there are many other highways that will continue to degrade. The Investment Strategy includes more information about this.

- 6. The LaneACT would like to provide meaningful recommendations to the OTC. It's difficult because the ACT doesn't understand the implications of various investment scenarios. Whatever additional information you can provide to assist the LaneACT (and other ACTs) would be greatly appreciated.**

RESPONSE: Fair point. My advice would be for the ACT to consider the information that has been provided along with their own knowledge of the system needs in their area. The objective is to help the Commission think about the various trade-offs, and provide recommendations for increasing or decreasing funding levels – understanding that the total budget is fixed. In other words, if the total funding available is X, and the recommendation is to increase funding for Program A, what program should be reduced? Because Fix-It is the biggest pot of funding, this is likely where the funds would come from.



Lane Area Commission on Transportation

859 Willamette Street, Suite 500
Eugene, OR 97401

August 26, 2020

Oregon Transportation Commission

Dear Chair Van Brocklin and Commissioners,

As Chair I am writing on behalf of the Lane Area Commission on Transportation (LaneACT). We appreciate the opportunity to inform development of the 2024-27 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). At our August 12th meeting Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) staff presented on development of the 2024-27 STIP. This presentation provided a sense of overall statewide need, funding shortages, purpose of the different funding categories, funding allocated to each category in the 2021-24 STIP, and the STIP development timeline. As you know, the ACTs' knowledge of local and regional needs is an irreplaceable asset in creating a statewide transportation system that is safe, efficient, and effective in achieving multiple objectives. However, information critical to LaneACT providing informed comment continues to remain elusive.

Last year, the LaneACT provided the following input to ODOT staff: "it is difficult for the ACT to respond to the question without actual data... the slides and talking points we have received from the Director's Office so far describe various investment options but do not provide real numbers along with an analysis of the *implications*." We made essentially this same request again to ODOT staff present on August 12th — please provide data that the LaneACT can use to understand the effectiveness of current and past STIP investments. At this same meeting the ACT passed a motion formally requesting that the OTC grant us an additional month and provide additional data to assist us in providing the OTC with meaningful comments and input.

At the October 2019 meeting, OTC heard concerns about limited communication between the OTC and the ACTs, and a growing frustration over lack of consideration and/or response to input provided to ODOT staff on a range of topics through various outreach efforts. In response Chair Van Brocklin asked Director Strickland to come back to the OTC as soon as February with a plan on how to address these issues. This is the last LaneACT has heard of the matter. We believe that this breakdown in communication makes quick and thoughtful responses to requests for input difficult as there is essentially no context from which to draw: the OTC does not have a solid picture of LaneACT's priorities, issues, opportunities or particular challenges; and LaneACT does not have a solid picture of OTC's issues and challenges, nor of the on the ground funding and policy implications decisions affect.

The COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted our transportation infrastructure weaknesses and strengths. Schools have become even more of a lifeline for rural communities, emphasizing the need to support increased safe bicycle and pedestrian routes to schools for meal and distance learning tool pick up. More people than ever are walking and biking, and at the same time, we are seeing more fatal

crashes on roadways. Efficient movement of goods and services has rarely been more prescient. There is much of great weight for the LaneACT, and the OTC, to consider when determining funding priorities and how we build the needed infrastructure of the future.

Finally, the LaneACT continues to request that the OTC develop illustrative funding priorities for the use of potential additional federal funding. Over the course of the 24-27 STIP it is likely Congress will act to increase federal transportation funding. We believe planning for this potential should occur now, rather than at the last minute, and should include input from the ACTs to thoughtfully make the most of new resources should they materialize.

The LaneACT respectfully requests an additional month to provide input on this important topic per the formal motion adopted at our August 12th meeting. ODOT staff have frequently termed the current phase of STIP development as the “most important” phase for planning and implementation. We see no reason why this comment phase cannot overlap with the next phase of analysis necessary for ODOT staff to stay on target with the STIP timeline. Sufficient time should be allowed for the OTC’s Area Commissions to adequately consider their input.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Claire Syrett". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Claire Syrett, Chair
LaneACT

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

<p>July 8, 2020</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe Routes to Schools Grants • Expedited Letters of Endorsement • Area Strategies Pilot 	<p>August 12, 2020</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe Routes to Schools Grants • Area Strategies Pilot • Expedited Letters of Endorsement • Safety, diversity, equity, and inclusion 	<p>September 9, 2020</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area Strategies Pilot • Safety, diversity, equity, and inclusion • STIP 2024-27
<p>October 14, 2020</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area Strategies Pilot • MPO and Lane County Safety Plan Update • Establish Nominating Committee • Letter of Endorsement Committee 	<p>November 11, 2020</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nominating Committee • ODOT ADA Program Update • Area Strategies Pilot 	<p>December 9, 2020</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area Strategies Pilot • Nominating Committee Report and possible election
<p>January 13, 2021</p> <p>TENTATIVE RECESS</p>	<p>February 10, 2021</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area Strategies Pilot • Legislative concepts 	<p>March 11, 2020</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eugene-Florence Transit Update
<p>April 14, 2021</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBD 	<p>May 12, 2021</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBD 	<p>June 9, 2021</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBD

The topics listed are tentative and subject to change.



2020-2021

Future potential topics (schedule to be determined)

LaneACT Attendance 2020-2021

Stakeholder	JUL'20	AUG'20	SEP'20	OCT'20	NOV'20	DEC'21	JAN'21	FEB'21	MAR'21	APR'21	MAY'21	JUN'21
Coburg	A	X										
Cottage Grove	X	X										
Creswell	X	A										
Dunes City	A	A										
Eugene	X	X										
Florence	A	X										
Junction City	A	A										
Lowell	A	X										
Oakridge	A	X										
Springfield	X	X										
Veneta	X	X										
Westfir	A	A										
Lane County	X	X										
Port of Siuslaw	A	A										
Lane Transit District	X	X										
CTCLUSI	X	A										
ODOT Area 5	X	X										
Central Lane MPO	X	X										
Lane County TrAC	X	X										
Highway 126 E	X	X										
DS Trucking-vacant												
DS Rail	A	A										
DS Bike/Ped	X	X										
DS Envir LU	X	X										
OS - Eugene Organ	X	A										
OS - George Grier	X	X										
OS-VACANT (of Jan)												
OS - Shelley Humble	X	X										
OS - NOT UTILIZED												
TOTAL	17	19										

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



Lane Area Commission on Transportation

859 Willamette Street, Suite 500, Eugene, Oregon 97401
541.682.4283 (office)

Membership 2020-21
Last Update August 20, 2020

Jurisdiction	Member	Email	Phone	Address
Lane County				
Primary Rep	Heather Buch Commissioner	Heather.Buch@co.lane.or.us	541.682.4203	125 E 8 th Avenue, PSB Eugene, OR 97401
Alternate Rep	Jay Bozievich Commissioner	jay.bozievich@co.lane.or.us	541.682.3719	125 E 8 th Avenue, PSB Eugene, OR 97401
Coburg				
Primary Rep	Ray Smith Mayor	coburgray@gmail.com	541.485.3498	32789 E Thomas Street Coburg OR 97408
Alternate Rep	John Fox	councilorfox@ci.coburg.or.us		
Cottage Grove				
Primary Rep	Jeff Gowing Mayor	mayorgowing@cottagegrove.org	541.510-5992	337 N. 9 th St. Cottage Grove OR 97424
Alternate Rep	Mike Fleck Councilor	councilorfleck@cottagegrove.org		923 S. U Street Cottage Grove OR 97424
Creswell				
Primary Rep	Misty Inman Councilor	minman@creswell-or.us	541.895.2531	PO Box 276 Creswell OR 97426
Alternate Rep	Maddie Phillips City Planner	mphillips@creswell-or.us	541.895.2913	PO Box 276 Creswell OR 97426
Dunes City				
Primary Rep	Robert Orr Councilor	robertvorr@gmail.com	541.997.3338	83541 Jensen Ln. Florence, OR 97439
Alternate Rep	Jamie Mills City Recorder	recorder@dunescityor.com	541.997.3338	PO Box 97 Westlake OR 97493
Eugene				
Primary Rep	Claire Syrett Councilor	claire.m.syrett@ci.eugene.or.us	541.682.8347	125 East 8 th Avenue 2 nd Floor, PSB Eugene OR 97401
Alternate Rep	Alan Zelenka Councilor	alan.zelenka@ci.eugene.or.us	541.682.8343	125 East 8 th Avenue 2 nd Floor, PSB Eugene OR 97401

Florence				
Primary Rep	Joe Henry Mayor	joe.henry@ci.florence.or.us	541.999.2395	250 Hwy 101 Florence OR 97439
Alternate Rep	Mike Miller Public Works Manager	mike.miller@ci.florence.or.us	541.997.4106	250 Hwy 101 Florence OR 97439
Junction City				
Primary Rep	Mark Crenshaw Mayor	markcrenshaw@comcast.net	541.998.2153	PO Box 250 Junction City OR 97448
Alternate Rep	Jim Leach City Council	leaco@comcast.net	541.998.8489	385 Timothy Street Junction City OR 97448
Lowell				
Primary Rep	Don Bennett Mayor	donbennett47@q.com	541.937.2312	540 Sunridge Lane Lowell OR 97452
Alternate Rep	TBD			
Oakridge				
Primary Rep	Kathy Holston Mayor	mayor@ci.oakridge.or.us	541.782.2258	PO Box 1410 Oakridge, OR 97463
Alternate Rep	TBD			
Springfield				
Primary Rep	Sean VanGordon City Councilor	svangordon@springfield-or.gov	541.221.8006	225 5 th Street Springfield OR 97477
Alternate Rep	Christine Lundberg Mayor	mayor@springfield-or.gov	541.520.9466	2031 Second Street Springfield OR 97477
Veneta				
Primary Rep	Calvin Kenney City Council	ckenney@ci.veneta.or.us	541.935.2191	87827 Greenley St. Veneta OR 97487
Alternate Rep	Ric Ingham City Administrator	ringham@ci.veneta.or.us	541.935.2191	PO Box 458 Veneta OR 97487
Westfir				
Primary Rep	Dawn Hendrix Councilor	dmechelle@gmail.com	541-782-3103	47365 1 st Street Westfir OR 97492
Alternate Rep	TBD			
Confederated Tribes				
Primary Rep	Chief Warren Brainard	wbrainard@ctclusi.org	541.297.1655	1245 Fulton Avenue Coos Bay OR 97420
Alternate Rep	Jeff Stump	jstump@ctclusi.org	541.888.9577	1245 Fulton Avenue Coos Bay OR 97420

Port of Siuslaw				
Primary Rep	Craig Zolezzi Board Commissioner	craig@zianw.com	541-915-4059	100 Harbor Street Florence OR 97439
Alternate Rep	David Huntington Manager	manager@portofsiuslaw.com		100 Harbor Street Florence OR 97439
Lane Transit District				
Primary Rep	Don Nordin Board Member	don.nordin@ltd.org dnordin@efn.org	541.942.7895 (C)	239Adams Avenue Cottage Grove OR 97424
Alternate Rep	Aurora Jackson General Manager	aurora.jackson@ltd.org		PO Box 7070 Springfield OR 97475
ODOT Area Manager				
Primary Rep	Frannie Brindle Area 5 Manager	frances.brindle@odot.state.or.us	541.726.5227 (W)	1121 Fairfield Ave. Eugene OR 97402
Alternate Rep	Bill Johnston Area 5 Planner	Bill.W.JOHNSTON@odot.state.or.us	541.747.1354 (W)	1121 Fairfield Ave. Eugene OR 97402
Central Lane MPO				
Primary Rep	Paul Thompson Transportation and Infrastructure Program Manager	pthompson@lcog.org	541.682.4405 (W)	859 Willamette St., Suite 500 Eugene OR 97401
Alternate Rep	Brenda Wilson Executive Director	bwilson@lcog.org	541.682.4395 (W)	859 Willamette St., Suite 500 Eugene OR 97401
LC TrAC				
Primary Rep	Gwen Jaspers TrAC Vice-Chair	burdock@efn.org		Email only.
Alternate Rep				
Highway 126 East				
Primary Rep	Charles Tannenbaum	caroltan@q.com	541.736.8575	40882 McKenzie Hwy Springfield OR 97478
Alternate Rep				

Designated Stakeholders					
Trucking	VACANT				Term Expires May 31, 2022
Rail	Patrick Kerr	pkerr@portofcoosbay.com	541.266.3706	125 Central Ave. Ste. 300 Coos Bay, OR 97420	Term Expires April 30, 2023
Bicycle & Pedestrian					
Primary Rep	Sarah Mazze	mazze_s@4j.lane.edu	541.790.7492	1975 W. 8th Ave, Eugene OR 97402	Term Expires January 10, 2022
Alternate Rep	Laughton Elliott-Deangelis	laughton.elliott-dea@springfield.k12.or.us			Term Expires January 10, 2022
Environmental Land Use	Rob Zako	robzako@gmail.com	541.343.5201 (H) 541.346.8617 (W)	1280-B East 28 th Ave Eugene OR 97403-1616	Term Expires June 30, 2023
	Alexis Biddle	alexis@friends.org	541.233.9001	454 Willamette Street, Suite 213 Eugene, OR 97405	Term Expires June 2023 or March 2024
2023 or March 2024 Other Stakeholders					
	George Grier	ggrier@efn.org	541.726.6131	1342 ½ 66 th Street Springfield OR 97478	Term Expires June 30, 2021
	Eugene Organ	eorgan@lilaoregon.org	541.683.6556 (H) 1.866.790.8686 (W)	2850 Pearl Street Eugene OR 97405	Term Expires June 30, 2021
	VACANT				
	Shelley Humble	shumble@creswell-or.us	541.895.2913 (W) 541.953.9197 (C)	PO Box 276 Creswell OR 97405	Term Expires June 30, 2021
	VACANT				