

Draft Meeting Summary

WEST EUGENE COLLABORATIVE

14th Meeting

Fire Station # 1
Eugene, Oregon

January 29, 2009

This is a summary of the key informational and action items from the fourteenth meeting of the West Eugene Collaborative (WEC) facilitated by Jamie Damon with assistance from Tim McCabe, representing the Oregon Consensus Program. The meeting lasted five hours. Additional background and supportive material can be found at <http://www.odrc.state.or.us/WestEugeneForum.php> and at http://wiki.eugeneneighbors.org/wiki/West_Eugene_Collaborative

Members Present

John Allcott, Mary Archer, Allan Buck, Rick Duncan, Gerry Gaydos, Rob Inerfeld, Don Kahle, Pat Johnston, Kevin Matthews, Ed Moore, Deborah Noble, Mary O'Brien, Kitty Piercy, Emily Proudfoot, Larry Reed, Rusty Rexius, Jack Roberts, Tom Schwetz, Faye Stewart, Paul Thompson, Jim Welsh, Gary Wildish, Sue Wolling, Jan Westmann, and Rob Zako. Jamie Damon facilitated the meeting. Tim McCabe took notes.

The meeting began with an agenda review and no objections to moving forward with the proposed agenda.

Jamie Damon discussed a dream she had the night before about making maple syrup. The making of maple syrup is a metaphor for this type of collaborative effort: lots of sap and work equals only a small amount syrup. When done, one gets either Grade A (Very Consistent and delicious) or Grade B (Not quite as consistent but equally delicious). Do we have a report that is grade A or B now?

Jamie also reminded the group not to lose sight of what we have done and where we are. And that there are several previous consensus agreements including:

- Protocols
- Values
- Purpose Statement
- Many others

Jamie also noted that part of consensus is reaching a threshold in the level of detail. To represent this, think about an upside down triangle. Lots of ideas and analysis go in to

the triangle, but we can only get a certain amount of detail that the whole group can live with.

Jamie also discussed the Mt. Tabor project she has been working on recently as a context for where the WEC is at. That group worked on the report for several months and they had paid consultants and city staff working on the report. So the WEC is progressing very well on the report.

Jamie then did a comfort check with the current iteration of the report using red, yellow, green cards.

Green – I support the report and have positive comments to share with the full group.

Yellow – I mostly support the report – I have suggestions for the group to consider and/or clarifying questions I need answered that will help me more fully support the report.

Red – I do not support the report as currently written. I have major suggestions for the group to consider and/or substantial questions I need answered before I can support the report.

The check reported mostly yellow cards and some green cards, but no red cards.

Jamie asked the group to comment on the report.

Green cards:

Thanks to all those who worked on the report! The report looks good, yet there is still some final editing that needs to be done. Additionally, the short and medium items are not really clear. Finally, some of the business issues may have been taken too cavalierly. These issues will not be taken lightly by the business community (along West 11th).

It was noted that some members who are employees of government agencies can't take a position on policy issues. However, as a technical resource there were not any major issues, just some small things. Process on how to move forward is OK. There is some repetitiveness. Some small issues/wordsmithing. Additionally, it is good to note that this process is not perfect.

Balance is important. Additionally, mention the West 1st to Bertleson St. as another alternative the WEC discussed.

It is a refined report. ODOT will need to do a higher level of analysis. Some other group will have to take this and run with it.

Yellow Cards

Section 3.11 partnerships: Bold the partnerships. Phasing and implementation: strengthen that further. Bailey hill 5th St. needs additional sentence: study with traffic engineers. This could point a direction for things to occur. Be sure we emphasize the immediate actions and balance the MWB. The MWB is more a land use issue. Finally, remove the word "Cost"

The I-5 Beltline interchange actually will cost 214M not 113M (at today's dollars). The phrase "Over time" implies escalation/inflation. The figures are noted in today's cost. This is very misleading and could make us look foolish. We could alleviate this by using a footnote to clarify this issue.

Currently, it is too long. The Executive Summary is still rough, but the content is good. There still needs to be more detail about how we are integrating land use, transportation, and the environment. Currently there is too much detail around environment and the report needs to be more balanced. Getting there and next steps still a bit rough; and, a project map is needed.

Page 18: 1st mention of the MWB needs definition. Land use issues/ needs to explain more. What you would have to change.

Decisions are really important. Red flags around statements "the WEC recommends" There is still a looseness of the language that needs to be tightened. Wetlands issues need to be fact checked. The tone is still negative: the WEP was mentioned 4 times in the first 3 pages. Worried about some of the prescribed issues.

Currently, there is unnecessary negativity to previous plans. The group has avoided negativity purposely. The report needs to have the finesse to discuss what the conversations were. The editorializing does not help. The report needs to be neutral and fact based. The short, medium, and long term issues seem cold rather than a vision. Sections should be closer to what the group worked on specifically. Currently, there is too much emphasis on the short term. "Examples like the WEC believes that within 5 years the traffic will **dramatically** reduce." Many of the fine grain things to still need to be tuned up. Use: "full service transit rather than the brand name." The process needs to be more prominent. It is one of the strengths of the group and the report.

Role of agency: what we can use to move the vision forward. A bit of a concern from that (agency) perspective of is the group (WEC) behind us? A graphic to show how we can move forward would be a benefit. It (the recommendations) is not going to happen just on the weight of LTD and the City moving it forward. The vision will need to have analysis, further design, and engineering. This will help with fine grain things such as cost, help with the NEPA, and analysis of the performance of the vision. We are going forward with a lot of hope, but we still need analysis. There will be changes to the vision with the analysis. This is another reason for us to stay involved. EmX stops (stations) are too detailed in the report.

Like solutions up front. Like the way the recommendations are rolled out and sets it up for understanding the purpose. The land use piece is still short and doesn't seem integrated enough. Short sections need to be added to show how they work together, like how the MWB helps transportation, land use and the environment. The report will also need to make it clear for city council how to implement these things. It could take 10 - 15 years before something happens. Also, there needs to be a picture for a realistic representation of the recommendations.

Encourage the group to move ahead with the solutions first (report). Do away with negativity. The WEC and the report is trying to position the community for change. The right solution at one time (dealing with negativity). What it is today and what we hope to be in the future. Still needs pictures.

There is still a gap around Veneta. The report still needs that aspect. The report also needs to flow better. The report should have a bias for the opportunity is now rather than dwelling on negativity. Put a spin on that. This is a tool to realize that this is part of the process and where we are (in that process). We should put the process part in the solutions chapter. In the graphics front, sketches from Mark Gillem's design studio are available for the WEC to use in the report.

The format was good: Want it to be a success. Currently, It is still not in balance. Need to strengthen land use and pair it down so the report is stronger and balanced. The land use things need to be brought back in. Need to balance the two extremes visionary and specific actions for short term. We can get there!

Drop the current chapter 4 (both versions) and just having a "next steps" chapter. The report is not overbalanced on environment. There needs to be a process where specific comments get integrated to help get those things. In the executive summary, environmental pieces need to be brought in. The next steps should be bullet points.

We should be sensitive to the negative language. How can we get the picture that is in our mind into the paper? Provide areas where it fits in to the picture. The report fills in the gaps of the picture. Not "cost" but "investment" as a word. We have talked about many things but some things are not consensus but should be noted as that.

Section: "The legacy of uncoordinated planning"...just remove it. That section makes it seem that we are here because the WEP failed (this is not true). We are here to help solve problems. Problems chapter: just use "existing conditions," currently the chapter is very deceptive. The next steps/vision needs to be grander than the one that is in section 2.224 on page 21 "long term recommendations." Conclusions should be put in the "next steps," and make it shorter. Land use issues still need to be integrated in. The solutions should be 1st.

Take out the problems. Don't need to tie this to the WEP. Be careful that what we say, we agree on we actually agree on. Process could be important to many folks so it should be more prominent. Solutions should be upfront.

Thanks for the wisdom in the room. BRT is not the ultimate solution (to transit). Use words instead like “transit” or “mass transit.” If there is big differences in what will serve people better. If BRT is all LTD has to offer in 50 years they have failed. Remember that transit oriented development is one way to densify. Currently it is not mentioned here. There is no reason to be too specific. We could use language like “densification around transit routes.” Mark Gillem has done good work around the BRT. Additionally, things are moving quickly at LTD. The group’s wisdom will help.

Plan (solutions) at the beginning. Remove negative tone. This is a vision. A vision is futuristic. The environmental piece is necessary. It helps to relive some of the tension. In total the report should be less than 40 pages.

The process part is important. Chief interest up in Salem was the process: and how to get those who disagree to agree. The Process should be a chapter. Talk about what we still need to test, not where we concluded. This will keep us out of trouble. Through the process, the vision evolved. We don’t have a narrow solution, we have a vision that emerged from the work that people did. Additionally, because the change in county commissioner, the WEC should send members to meet with the new commissioner. Finally, we still need to bridge the gaps between where there is consensus and where more examination/study is needed.

Impressed with the report. Something we still need to think about is how to present this to decision makers. How do we back our conclusions? We have consensus on some issues, but not on others. Also, it needs to be clear about the cost: today’s dollars or future dollars? Additionally, what does it look like if the project stops etc.

Process for Finishing

The group then took a short break and reconvened to discuss a process for finishing. It was noted that there should not be any additional committees convened. It was also noted that the group could send the report back to Tim to adjust and tweak the report to make it more amenable to the entire group. Another suggestion was to send the report to the Coordinating Committee to make the necessary adjustments.

The Coordinating Committee can make sure what the WEC agreed on is in the report. Additionally, it was noted that we can get a professional proofreader/editor to finish tightening up the document after the document is cleaned up by the Coordinating Committee. Yet, it was also noted that it is unrealistic to rely on the Coordinating Committee and to use staff time to finish the report.

Additionally, it was noted that the group should assign staff to complete a more polished report, and then send that to the Coordinating Committee or Revision Committee. It was also noted to trust the Coordinating Committee to make sure the work get done so there are no pre-steps or hand offs. Additionally, it was noted that this is not a big deal, but the more clear directions the group can give the better. Provide as much direction as possible today for those who are going to work on the revisions.

Additional Questions and Comments

- Solutions before problems?
- Identify what goes well: focus on intent
- Strengthen land use pieces
- Future focus/opportunities
- Use the words the group agreed to
- Provide context to integrated short, medium, and long term
 - Short (5yr): within current policies
 - Medium (10 yr) Tweaking policies
 - Long (20 yr) Major policy changes

Group Discussion

The group then discussed the report as currently written with the most current draft on the screen. Please note: the draft on the screen was a more revised version with attached graphics and maps.

Executive Summary

The revision committee placed a disclaimer on the Executive Summary: “Points in the executive summary below are numbered for ease of reference during the WEC’s internal discussion. But the executive summary will be reformatted into paragraphs without numbers in the published version of the report.”

It was noted multiple times during this discussion that the Executive Summary needs to be reformatted into paragraphs and written in a positive manner.

Additionally it was noted:

- The Executive Summary needs to match the solutions section
- It is missing all the environmental recommendations
- What are the substantive issues that need to be included here?
- The Executive Summary is a summary of the report

It was noted that there was concern and a need to get to closure on this issue.

Solutions

- It was noted that the solutions section needs to emphasize things that were agreed to. Label those items that do not have explicit consensus as “The WEC discussed”
- New consensus agreements?

2.2.1.1 (Transportation)

- “A third proposal...”
 - Indicate this proposal has less consensus
 - Label this as something that was not agreed to
- West 11th (Short term)
 - There was some concern about Access Management.
 - It was also noted that the statement is entirely consistent with the MWB.
 - Possibly change “recommendation” to “consideration”
 - Make some comments generalized (operational):
 - Need facility enhancements to improve traffic flow
 - Re-order to make it non-controversial. Put the heat on the West 11th Corridor study
 - Maybe put what was on the matrix here
 - Look at ways to help improve traffic (based on the W 11th Corridor Study)
 - To some degree of specificity
 - Short term fix vs. MWB
 - Practical viability—if this intent to balance the short term and MWB
 - ODOT is currently looking at roundabouts as a serious consideration for all intersections.
 - Should be in the report as something we discussed

Additional Comments

The group then discussed some additional items which are included below:

- No WEP, or just a small mention of it.

- Find a way to filter the recommendations and the discussions
- Be clear with the recommendations
- “Recommends” block, then note possibilities
- History of West Eugene

Next Steps

- The Coordinating Committee will meet next week (2/4/09).
- Tim and Mary will meet to further synthesize the report prior to 2/4
- Tim will send out a meeting wizard following the input from the Coordinating Committee for the meeting dates of the next full WEC meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00