ROADS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**October 24, 2012**

**MEMBERS PRESENT: Kent Fleming, Jeff Paschall, Jim Wilcox, Ellen Mooney, Larry Reed**

**STAFF & OTHER PRESENT: Bill Morgan, Mark Rust, Howard Schussler, Christy Meyer, Pat Farr**

**MEMBERS ABSENT: Sean Barrett, John Anderson**

Fleming called the meeting to order at 5:46 p.m.

1. PUBLIC COMMENT –

1. APPROVAL OF September 26, 2012 MINUTES

Motion: Reed moved to approve the minutes as is; Paschall seconded; all present voted in favor, motion carried.

1. PRESENTATION: GOSHEN REGION EMPLOYMENT & TRANSITION PLAN – Mark Rust

Rust introduced himself as formerly working in Land Management’s Planning section and is now working for ECS in Transportation Planning. Rust shared a PowerPoint presentation and provided handouts. In 2011 the Board directed Land Management to explore ideas in order to increase employment land in the Goshen area. The first place staff started was to look at Oregon’s State-wide planning, goal #9 for economic planning, which talks about providing adequate opportunities throughout the State for economic activities. Goal #9 applies to Goshen due to it being an unincorporated community with a defined boundary. Staff also tried to ascertain what the need for increased employment in Goshen is and is continuing that work. One place staff referenced is the Oregon Business Plan, and one of the plan’s goals was to identify the need to make more industrial land available, and to make industrial land ready to support creation of high wage jobs. The Board doesn’t have the idea that Goshen will meet immediate needs, but rather, the idea is to anticipate for the future.

The Oregon Employment department says Lane County is the second fastest growing region in the state. With the potential for more growth and jobs, Lane County is definitely on the map and working to establish itself as an economic leader in the State. Reed asked why the County is bothering if, due to the State’s land-use structure, all of the industrial development is to take place inside of cities, and how does this get reconciled? Rust answered it’s a great question and is one of the hurdles to get over. Rust believes there are multiple ways to get there. Rust added there are regional-wide opportunities, and there are provisions that allow for development not within the urban growth boundary.

Rust referenced the Regional Prosperity Economic Development Plan’s goal is to create 20,000 net new jobs in the chosen economic opportunity areas and its key strategies are providing basic business needs and strengthening key industries. Staff is focusing on Advanced Manufacturing as an industry. Lane County’s Strategic Plan is by 2017 it will transform the existing industrial land in Goshen to support increased levels of development, resulting in jobs that pay no less than 150% of the median wage. The Plan includes seven steps, and staff is focused on the first planning hurdle, step #1/Goal 14 Reasons Exception. In 2009, the County began meeting with the State to get direction on how to proceed. The Industrial lands have since been designated by the State as a regionally significant industrial area.

A lot of Goshen’s history has been timber related, and wood product manufacturing has greatly declined over the years. Rust said Goshen was identified as an area to develop to create revenue streams because of the land that’s being under-utilized today. With the existing mill sites that have large lot development potential, the vital transportation links to the Goshen area, as well as a host of other reasons and characteristics, Goshen is unique both regionally and on a State-wide level. These are the reasons Goshen fits into the Goal 14 Exception, which is based on reasons why this development should take place outside of the normal guidelines. The Goal 14 Exception has provisions that allow for urban levels of development to happen on rural land. The rural industrial zoning today limits the size of any building to 40,000 square, but Goal 14 Exception would lift this limitation and focus on manufacturing with large site preservation. The minimum lot size being proposed is 35 acres, which gets us closer to what developers are looking for in future expansion.

Rust explained the public process, which involved a series of public community meetings and notices sent to communities and residents. Rust explained they’ve proposed two different industrial zones – on the West side of Highway 99 would be General Industrial and on the East side of Highway 99 would be light industrial. Rust stated they’ve worked with Senator Beyer with regard to Senate Bill 766 and the provisions it provides for this development. Senator Beyer has been the local champion behind this legislation and has stated Goshen is the poster child for Senate Bill 766, and he envisions in trying to preserve the characteristics such as the Rail, the transportation infra-structure, etc. There is a body in Salem that staff has worked with to make the case, and the Board nominated the industrial land in Goshen to the State to become one of the regional significant industrial areas (RSIA). Goshen has now received that designation from the State and the State is working through finalizing the process.

Rust shared a map that showed Goshen as a piece of the larger regional framework for what’s happening. The Glenwood refinement plan was just co-adopted by the Board in order to reinvigorate the area. U of O has some interest in the Glenwood plan. LTD has expressed interest in providing another EMX route there. LCC has prepared and presented a master plan that they envision for their campus to provide housing and expanded campus as well as some commercial use, such as hotels. Eugene is looking at the Russel Creek Basin as part of their Envision Eugene process. Springfield has also looked at the Seavey Loop Road area for potentially meeting some of their employment land needs. Rust said Goshen has a key role in all of this.

Rust said the next steps are hammering out Goal 14 and the project is currently in a public hearings process with the Lane County Planning Commission. In addition to this they will continue to work with public interest groups, communities, etc. to iron out concerns. The Board will have a separate public hearing process, which should bring this to a close – depending on if there is an appeal to the State.

Rust said a couple follow up parts include Staff talking with the City of Springfield about the potential for urban renewal district that could also benefit Goshen. Staff is working closely with ODOT to recognize the transportation issues with how Highway 99 and I-5 Interchange will likely need improvements. Sewer is another area to be worked out. There is a domestic water system provided by Willamette Water Company; they believe they have the capacity to serve water for these types of uses. Staff has applied for two different grants – Federal and State – in order to do a Sewer feasibility study and will continue to look for grant money for studies such as this and other areas of interest.

Wilcox asked when staff looks at transportation needs for people, are staff looking how far people will have to drive? One of the things Wilcox shared they are seeing wages so low that people are driving further to less expensive housing, which mitigates the goal of “no less than 150% of median wage”. Rust says they are taking these into account, and a couple of things they are doing is doing analysis for the labor shed, where people come from, where do they drive from, etc. The second item is doing a regional economic analysis, including the County in conjunction with the Cities to find out what the community can absorb. General discussion ensued.

1. FY2011-12 BIKE PEDESTRIAN PROJECT EXPENDITURES – Bill Morgan

Morgan said every year as part of our auditing process, and as part of ORS requirement, we do an analysis of how much money we spend on foot paths and bicycle trails. The requirement states it’s not to be less than 1% of the total amount of funds received from the Highway Fund, which is based on registered vehicles and is made up of gas tax, vehicle registration fees, and weight mile-tax.

We have a very robust cost accounting system that allows us to look at details. Morgan provided a memo and spreadsheet showing costs and details. Morgan explained the methodology, the consistency of the formula used, and how they use Design Standards to classify bike riding areas. Wilcox asked if this is a national standard; Morgan explained further that we use our Design Standards to pull costs and other information together. Morgan walked the group through the spreadsheet to see an example of how they break it down between the different funds that spend money on bike-ped work. We have surpassed the 1% requirement and average about 4% over the last nine or so years. Morgan doubts this message gets out as much as it could to our constituents and interested parties. General discussion ensued.

Wilcox recommended some groups for Morgan to connect with the users and interested groups to showcase the significant dollars invested on bike-pedestrian development. General discussion ensued. Morgan said we are working more and more with cities on regional bike and ped issues rather than just focusing on what’s within our jurisdiction.

1. STIP PROCES UPDATE – Bill Morgan

Morgan said by 11/27, all of our applications are due. We’ve submitted two projects: the Crossing at Mt. Vernon and Bob Straub within the MPO, and Row River Road Mile Post 4 crossing for outside of the MPO. Staff is working out the application details. We received a $50,000 grant to do a corridor analysis on the Row River Road project. In this planning process, we have to get public input in order to develop preferred alternatives along the corridor. What we are struggling a bit with is the timing of the applications. In the Row River Road MP 4 application, we need to state what our preferred alternative is; however the quick deadline to get applications in doesn’t allow us much time to do that work. What this means is we have to try to write this grant application in a broad way, such as saying “grade separated crossing” instead of prescribing either an undercrossing or overcrossing, which will be determined through the public process. There will be presentations in December to the Lane ACT and a public hearing on prioritization in January, and in February the final recommendation will be made by the ACT, and the ACT will produce the list to be submitted to ODOT in March.

1. OPEN AGENDA/ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING?

LRAPA Question from Commissioner Handy -

* An email Fleming received from Commissioner Handy asked the RAC to weigh in on what the pros and cons are for Lane Regional Air Protection Agency (LRAPA) ceasing to exist and Oregon DEQ taking over those responsibilities in Lane County due to funding issues. The Board is having a work session on 11/27 to discuss and they’d like the committee’s thoughts by then. The committee acknowledged the request to have this analytical work done and into the BCC by 11/27 doesn’t give much time since they don’t have another meeting until December. Fleming said currently LRAPA is funded half by General Fund and half by the Road Fund. Morgan said this is one of those issues that comes up with one or more partners drop out of funding a service, putting pressure on the other funding sources, similar to what LCAS just went through. Morgan said LRAPA acts as a regulator, but our permits and services go through DEQ. Pat Farr shared that the City is very supportive of LRAPA and they’ve been able to do some creative things such as in-kind funding. Reed asked if it’s a perception or reality that local businesses get better service through LRAPA. Reed said he hears from some that they don’t like what the results they get from LRAPA and would prefer to deal with the State DEQ and some that say it’s much easier to deal with a local service like LRAPA. Paschall commented having just worked with DEQ on a project, he knows that DEQ is just as overworked and therefore the process would be slow. Schussler commented when we go in for permits, we already go to DEQ, not LRAPA for their regulatory role. Schussler said the best example he can think of is for the Landfill with regard to DEQ permits. LRAPA enforces but we must go to DEQ for permits; however LRAPA provides some services such as retro-fitting old diesel engines. Wilcox said he heard DEQ has had cuts, and he also heard LRAPA has a huge knowledge base and he’s not sure how long it would take for DEQ to pull that in and work with that. Wilcox added his base understanding is that we are trying to protect the airshed to protect quality of life. Wilcox would like to know if anyone can say if there is or will be a reduction in the ability to protect the airshed – can we say this change will result in a specific amount of health problems. Schussler interjected that question would need to be modified to state “what portion of this problem is related to transportation” since we are responding on behalf of the RAC and Road Fund, as the rest of that question is an obligation of the General Fund. Wilcox concurred. Wilcox said he would want to ask LRAPA and DEQ questions in order to learn more about these impacts. Morgan said the Committee won’t have another meeting before the Commissioners meet to discuss. Fleming suggested we provide draft minutes to the Commissioners for their meeting on 11/27. Wilcox said he’s not sure there’s a way to say to any degree of certainty what would happen if this was transferred to DEQ. Schussler said the only data we can assess is to say “does it work or not” and Schussler said he hasn’t heard anyone demand that these agencies be recreated elsewhere. Paschall said the real question here is should the Road Fund continue to carry LRAPA, while the majority of the services provided by LRAPA aren’t related to transportation. Paschall said, for example, it’s probably not very often if at all that on a Road project staff has to get an LRAPA or Air Quality Permit. Fleming will respond to the Commissioner with the draft minutes from this subject.

Follow up: Parks Map Improvement Suggestions -

* Wilcox followed up with Parks Manager Mike Russell regarding improvement opportunities for the Parks Map. Wilcox learned there are pallets of boxes of these maps still to be used, and that these were originally created due to grant funding. Parks agreed they will look at improvements when the time comes to redesign.

Items for the next meeting, December 5, 2012:

1. Committee to define accomplishments & set goals for 2013
2. Row River Trail Public Involvement Plan
3. Look at upcoming CIP and discuss considerations for CIP process improvements
4. Farewell Kent Fleming
5. Committee member liability forms

Meeting Adjourned at 7:19pm.
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Christy Meyer, Meeting Recorder