

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

PUBLIC COMMENTS: MARCH 11–APRIL 6, 2010

Gary Wildish (Chambers Construction)

From: Gary Wildish

Date: April 1, 2010 2:09:32 PM PDT

To: Rob Zako <robzako@gmail.com>

Subject: RE: [LCACT] Comments on Lane County ACT wanted for Wed 4/14 meeting

Hi Rob, This looks good. At times it would have been more efficient at the WEC to have used your proposed Supermajority when consensus was so difficult. It might have resulted in a higher level of recommendations and reduced the time. Good job!

Thanks for all you do, Gary

Dan Herbert (retired UO professor, City Club of Eugene)

From: Dan Herbert <dherbert@uoregon.edu>

Date: April 1, 2010 4:43:52 PM PDT

To: Rob Zako <robzako@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: [LCACT] Comments on Lane County ACT wanted for Wed 4/14 meeting

Rob;

Thanks for sending the bylaw material. I was going to suggest that you look into the spectrum of roles for public participation—and then discovered you have already included it. It's so important that both the speakers and listeners have similar expectation about what their mutual roles are. I hope you (or they) can build this in. Another thought on the subject: It might be possible for the optimum level to vary from one time or topic to another, so it might be good for the group to make an affirmative decision about this for each occasion.

I'm very impressed with the evident depth of your thinking on this project.

Best wishes,

Dan

Jack Radabaugh (LCRAC, Harlow Neighbors)

From: Jack Radabaugh
To: Rob Zako
Sent: Friday, April 02, 2010 12:46 PM
Subject: ACT

Dear Rob,

Once again I am going to suggest having some sort of representative of neighborhood interests. My neighborhood is criss crossed by roaring health threatening freeways. ODOT is about to undertake construction of 10.1 million dollars worth of sound walls up Interstate 5 from Harlow Road to Willakenazie. I feel more than adequately represented by representation from the Lane County Roads Advisory Committee of which I am a member. I think the towns and villages should have the principal advisory say regarding the obscene amounts of money ODOT is authorized to spend on transportation. I think you have done a fine job in your effort to create our ACT.

Jack Radabaugh
Lane County Roads Advisory Committ
Harlow Neighbors Executive Committee



534 SW Third Avenue, Suite 300 • Portland, OR 97204 • (503) 497-1000 • fax (503) 223-0073 • www.friends.org

Southern Oregon Office • PO Box 2442 • Grants Pass, OR 97528 • (541) 474-1155 • fax (541) 474-9389

Willamette Valley Office • 220 East 11th Avenue, Suite 5 • Eugene, OR 97401 • (541) 653-8703 • fax (503) 575-2416

Central Oregon Office • 115 NW Oregon Ave #21 • Bend, OR 97701 • (541) 719-8221 • fax (866) 394-3089

April 6, 2010

Rob Zako
Project Manager
Lane County Process to Form an ACT
1280-B East 28th Avenue
Eugene, OR 97403-1616

Re: Comments on Lane-ACT Charter

Dear Mr. Zako:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the latest version of the draft LACT charter. 1000 Friends of Oregon is a nonprofit, charitable organization dedicated to working with Oregonians to enhance our quality of life by building livable urban and rural communities, protecting family farms and forests, and conserving natural and scenic areas.

We have two primary concerns with the current draft: 1) the lack of proportional representation and 2) the manner of selection for citizen members.

The OTC guidelines state that an ACT "will have a voting membership which is reflective of its population and interest groups and will be broadly representative of those impacted by ACT recommendations." In order for the LACT to be properly "reflective of population," it must do more to provide proportional representation. It is less important that each discrete incorporated city has its own representative, as under the current draft. When it comes to the matters that will concern the LACT, there is no nexus between the incorporated status of a community and the importance of the interests of that community.

Given the population distribution, it appears that those living in the rural areas, Eugene and Springfield may be at risk of disenfranchisement under the draft proposal, which provides the same voting power to tiny Westfir as to the entire City of Eugene. Eugene has nearly 500 times as many citizens as Westfir.

To protect the rights of the majority of Lane County citizens, small city representation on the LACT should be reduced, and rural county and large city representation should be increased. The below table shows one way to accomplish this. Small cities in one area, such as Lowell, Westfir and Oakridge, are grouped together with approximately 5-10,000 citizens per representative. Large cities and the county are given more representation, in light of their much greater populations, with 30-50,000 citizens per representative. Even with these changes, the



Celebrating Thirty-five Years of Innovation

April 6, 2010

Rob Zako

Page 2 of 3

proportional voting power of the small cities is still at least five times what would be warranted based on population, but may be a reasonable compromise.

ENTITY	2009	CURRENT	PROPOSED
	POPULATION	DRAFT	VOTES
		VOTES	
Cottage Grove	9,485	1	1
Creswell	4,790	1	1
Dunes City & Florence	10,940	2	1
Junction City & Coburg	6,540	2	1
Lowell, Oakridge & Westfir	5,125	3	1
Veneta	4,975	1	1
Springfield	58,085	1	2
Eugene	157,100	1	3
Rural County	90,650	1	2
Tribes		1	1
Ports		1	1
LTD		1	1
MPO		1	1
Lane RAC and CAC		2	2
Highway 126		1	1
Citizens		6	6
ODOT		1	1
TOTAL VOTES		27	27

PROPOSED CHANGE #1: The first sentence of Article IV, Section A(1) should be changed to read as follows: "The governing bodies of Lane County and the incorporated cities within the Area are invited to designate a primary representative and an alternate representative to LACT as follows: Lane County: 2 representatives, Coburg and Junction City: 1 jointly-appointed representative, Cottage Grove: 1 representative, Creswell: 1 representative, Dunes City and Florence: 1 jointly-appointed representative, Eugene: 3 representatives, Lowell, Oakridge and Westfir: 1 jointly-appointed representative, Springfield: 2 representatives, and Veneta: 1 representative."

Regarding our second concern, Article IV, Section A(6) currently provides that selection of the six citizen members of LACT will be done by the other LACT members. The prior draft's requirement that the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) confirm these appointments has been removed.

April 6, 2010

Rob Zako

Page 3 of 3

Citizen members are there to speak for those not already represented on the LACT, such as bicyclists, pedestrians, rail, tourism, public safety, seniors, trucking, farmers, land use and environmental interests. The way these citizen members are selected may affect the diversity of the interests that are represented. If the LACT appoints its own members, the interests already present on the LACT may become even more concentrated. The BCC is a better choice for this role, since it is the only body that represents all of Lane County, and as such is in the best position to have a broad overview of the issues facing our area. The proposed change would prevent a circular, inward-looking selection process and increase the odds that LACT will indeed be "broadly representative of those impacted by ACT recommendations" in accordance with the OTC's guidelines.

PROPOSED CHANGE #2: The first sentence of Section A(6) should be changed to make the BCC the appointing body: "Following public advertisement, the Lane County Board of County Commissioners shall appoint up to six (6) citizens as members of LACT."

We hope these comments prove helpful in crafting a charter that serves the public interest, and look forward to continuing to participate in these proceedings as the charter moves to the BCC for discussion.

Sincerely,



Mia Nelson
Willamette Valley Advocate
1000 Friends of Oregon
220 East 11th, Suite 5
Eugene, OR 97401
541.653.8703

Cc: Lane County Board of Commissioners