

ROADS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

January 27, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Anderson, Kent Fleming, Jody Ogle, George Goldstein, Jack Radabaugh, Sean Barrett
MEMBERS ABSENT: Jim Wilcox
STAFF & OTHER PRESENT: Marsha Miller, Christy Mosier, Bill Morgan, Celia Barry, Shashi Bajracharya.

Anderson called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

I. PUBLIC COMMENT – None.

II. ELECTION OF CHAIR & VICE CHAIR

Motion: Ogle nominated Anderson as Committee Chair; Fleming seconded; all present voted in favor.

Motion: Anderson nominated Fleming as Committee Vice Chair; Ogle seconded; all present voted in favor.

III. APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 2, 2009 MINUTES:

Motion: Ogle moved to approve the minutes as-is; Barrett seconded; all present voted in favor.

IV. WELCOME NEW MEMBER SEAN BARRETT

The group welcomed Barrett and did brief introductions.

V. DEFINE 2009 ACCOMPLISHMENTS & DEVELOP 2010 WORK PLAN TO BE FILED WITH THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OFFICE

The group reviewed the 2009 work plan in order to identify accomplishments for the past year and prepared their 2010 work plan. General discussion ensued.

Motion: Fleming moved to approve the 2010 Work Plan; Ogle seconded; all present voted in favor.

Motion: Fleming moved to approve the 2009 Accomplishments; Ogle seconded; all present voted in favor.

VI. FISCAL YEAR 2011-2015 DRAFT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTN PROGRAM

Bajracharya summarized the draft CIP provided to the group and said he is seeking the committee's approval to release this document to the public. General discussion ensued. Bajracharya clarified some items under Projects and Structures by stating Sweet Creek is externally funded by the Forest Highway Program, Goodpasture Covered Bridge has been carried over from last year and has a structural issue, and Layng covered bridge is a rehabilitation project. Group discussion ensued. Bajracharya said February 24 will be our standard CIP Public Hearing during our committee meeting

Motion: Ogle moved to approve the CIP document be released to the public with the one adjustment Bajracharya agreed to make; Barrett seconded; all present voted in favor.

VII. 2012-2105 STIP PROJECT ELEGIBILITY CRITERIA AND PRIORITIZATION FACTORS

Barry reviewed the STIP process and said this is presently at the stage of developing eligibility criteria and prioritization factors for the State, and it is a unique step because this stage welcomes comments beyond modernization projects and includes comments for all transportation. The Roads Advisory Committee has this opportunity to make comments specifically for this stage. Barry added usually they don't change much from cycle to cycle, but due to concerns about climate change and greenhouse gas emissions, and passage of House Bill 2001, the eligibility criteria have changed to address these issues. Barry referred the group to Attachment one, page seven that explains this in depth.

Barry explained that the timing of when we receive materials from ODOT and our local processes means that there has not been an opportunity to review and discuss this document with others, or conduct analysis of the document, so it is difficult to give the RAC any guidance in commenting at this time. Fleming commented that Commissioner Handy asked why we don't get opportunity to comment sooner. Barry explained we didn't receive the draft early enough from ODOT, having only received it at the end of December. Barry said comments are due February 19. Anderson said in the past there has been opportunity to make suggestions and prioritize items that we thought were eligible for the STIP. Barry said we will have the opportunity to do that at a later stage in the STIP process. Currently we are just at the step of commenting on eligibility criteria and prioritization factors. Goldstein interjected that he wants the committee to help ensure the whole focus of this is not on central urban transportation. Radabaugh mentioned two non-transportation issues related to climate change that could have devastating results. He thinks failure to address these non-transportation issues is a problem. Radabaugh said they include warming of the ocean and ocean acidification. Anderson said he understands Radabaugh's point of being good stewards. Barry said it's estimated that a third of carbon emissions are from statewide transportation with about 50 percent being estimated to be transportation here in the local area— which is why there is an emphasis on transportation in state legislation. Radabaugh said his objection to reports like these is that they don't go as far as they can in looking at what they're trying to solve. Barrett asked if there is anything that stands out to Barry that the committee may want to comment on. Barry referred the group to attachment two, second column, second row which emphasizes looking at transportation solutions that involve local facilities, and not only state facilities. Barry explained this is a transition to a system wide approach that she thinks should be supported. Group discussion ensued regarding the STIP document. Barry offered to pass on comments that are due in by February 19th. The RAC elected not to comment but asked to hear what the Board said about the document.

Anderson asked if anyone had any items they would like to mention. Hearing no comments, Anderson recommended this go to the Board and MPO.

VIII. REPORT ON 1ST FORUM ON AN AREA COMMISSION ON TRANSPORTATION FOR LANE COUNTY (FACT-LC)

Barry summarized by stating Lane County is required by new legislation to form an ACT and the Board hired Rob Zako, who met with us at the last RAC meeting. Zako held the first meeting, called a Forum on Area Commission on Transportation (FACT) and it was a well attended meeting with good discussion. Action taken at this meeting included formation of a sub-committee to develop the charter purpose and mission statement, as well as discussion around voting structure and concerns.

Barry said questions on behalf of Mr. Zako,

1. **Will one of our committee members attend the February 10th meeting?**
2. **Does the RAC want to comment on their opinion whether a commissioner is the appropriate representative or someone else be a better choice for the unrepresented 126 East Corridor?**

Ogle suggested ensuring someone from the McKenzie River area is involved such as local associations like Home Owners Association that can speak for that group and have first hand knowledge of their issues. Radabaugh said he corresponded with Zako about bringing neighborhood associations and entities on board too. Barry said there is public comment period during each of these meetings and they are trying to get notices out to everyone with the next meeting being February 10th at 5:30 p.m. Barry asked if the committee thinks there are stakeholders that should be represented on the ACT, that the upcoming meeting is the opportunity to do so. Anderson stated it seems since we are advisors to the Board and represent the Board, it would be a duplication by having the RAC participate on this committee. Barry asked about the previous comment regarding HWY 126. Ogle clarified that yes, she thinks we should contact Blue River and McKenzie River community groups and associations. Barry asked whether the commissioner is the appropriate representative for the corridor, or whether a citizen or other entity would be more appropriate. Group consensus reached that users of the corridor (Blue River Community) will be better as the representative. Barry said there seem to be two schools of thought that seem to be moving ahead at the FACT – one is “let’s stick to the State program”, and the other is “Let’s bring other things to the table”.

Anderson will attend the February 10th FACT meeting and will report back.

- IX. OTHER BUSINESS – None.
- X. NEXT MEETING – February 24, 2010

Meeting adjourned @ 7:30 p.m.

Christy Mosier, Transcribing Secretary