

MINUTES

Metropolitan Policy Committee
Eugene Public Library – Bascom-Tykeson Room – 100 West 10th Avenue
Eugene, Oregon

March 10, 2005
11:30 a.m.

PRESENT: Anne Ballew (Springfield), Chair; Bobby Green (Lane County), Vice Chair; Sid Leiken (City of Springfield), David Kelly, Bonny Bettman for Kitty Piercy (City of Eugene), Judy Volta (City of Coburg), Bill Dwyer (Lane County), Susan Ban, Dave Kleger for Gerry Gaydos, (Lane Transit District), Tom Boyatt for Robert Pirrie (Oregon Department of Transportation), members; Mike Kelly (City of Springfield), Dennis Taylor (City of Eugene), Bill Van Vactor (Lane County), Jamon Kent (Coburg) *ex officio* members.

Randy Papé (Oregon Transportation Commission), George Kloeppel, Tom Schwetz, Paul Thompson, Petra Schuetz, Ann Mortenson (Lane Council of Governments); Cynthia Pappas, Greg Mott, Bill Grile (City of Springfield), Lisa Gardner, Mark Schoening, Jim Carlson (City of Eugene).

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Ms. Ballew welcomed those present to the March 2005 meeting of the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC). Members of the MPC introduced themselves.

2. CALL TO ORDER/APPROVE FEBRUARY 10, 2005 MINUTES

Mr. Kelly noted a correction to the last sentence on page 2. He said the word “not” needed to be added following the word “did” so the phrase read “...*project phases did not include...*”

Mr. Kelly, seconded by Mr. Volta, moved to approve the February 10, 2005, minutes as corrected. The motion passed unanimously.

3. COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Bill Sullivan, 1958 Onyx Street, Eugene, Lane Library League president and State Library Board chair, alerted the MPC to legislation recently introduced by Representative Phil Barnhart that would affect library services statewide. He said the Metro Plan currently prohibited approximately 40,000 in River Road and on the borders of Springfield from raising tax money to pay for library service as all library services must be provided by the cities of Eugene and Springfield as an urban service. He said there were now three rural library districts in Lane County, including the Lane Library District based in Creswell. He said the bill would empower districts to annex land within the Eugene metro area and provide services, probably by contracting with the cities of Eugene and Springfield and extending library service to the 40,000 people who had none. He said the legislation was introduced without the knowledge of the League and they did not support it.

Mr. Green asked if Mr. Sullivan had contacted the legislators who sponsored the bill to ask about the rationale for introducing it. Mr. Sullivan replied that the sponsors told him they were aware that the League had been attempting for the past five years to work with Lane County and Eugene to amend the Metro Plan to no avail and felt it was time to “light a fire under” the jurisdictions.

Rob Handy, 455-½ River Road, said he was scratching his head about the transparency and accountability of the MPC. He said in the past there had been public hearings and decisions on the same day and the recent Regional Transportation Plan adoption was characterized as a minor revision but he felt it was a major revision with little opportunity for public input. He said the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) had taken two years to create and was still not functioning. He asked if the CAC would be functioning in time to be involved in the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) process or reexamining freight route designations. He asked the MPC to incorporate community values in its work and not be solely concerned with obtaining funds.

Lauri Segel, 1192 Lawrence Street, Eugene, 1000 Friends of Oregon, echoed Mr. Handy’s remarks. She said the MPC’s action at its last meeting regarding use of lottery funds for local transportation projects was just wrong; schools count first and should not be given short shrift. She said it would have been better for the MPC to ask the governor to find additional funding for local streets but not at the expense of schools. She said the agenda materials related to adoption of the UPWP at its March 2005 meeting contained no indication of what the public involvement process would be. She said the CAC had not yet met and did not appear to be involved in the UPWP, which should be one of their significant roles. She urged postponement of adoption of the UPWP. She questioned accountability for use of \$40,000 in unanticipated STP-U funds.

Jan Spencer, 212 Benjamin Street, Eugene, Metropolitan Planning Organization Citizen Advisory Committee member, said there was an urgent need for fresh perspectives on transportation and expressed frustration with the slow pace at which the CAC was becoming operational. He said that no orientation had yet been provided to members and a meeting was not scheduled until April 2005. He questioned the level of enthusiasm for the CAC’s role and work. He asked that the MPC make no major decisions without the CAC having some type of input.

Mr. Green, as the MPC’s liaison to the CAC, disagreed with Mr. Spencer’s comments regarding the committee. He said that staff was attempting to coordinate with the schedules of 12 members in order to arrange a meeting and it had been difficult to find a time for a full CAC meeting.

Mr. Kelly suggested that a CAC meeting could be held if a quorum was available to begin the process of determining what other issues the CAC should be involved with during the year, otherwise what was the purpose of the committee.

4. Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) ISSUES

a. Comments on Freight Route Designations

Mr. Schwetz said the agenda packet material was essentially the same background materials provided to the MPC in January 2005. He said the staff had proposed at that time waiting to act until cities in the metro area had taken a position on certain freight route designation proposals. He said that had now occurred and staff was recommending the following actions as set forth in the draft letter to Bruce Warner

of the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT):

1. Support designation of the limited access portions of the proposed designations, including Highway 126 from Main Street in Springfield west to Interstate 5 (I-5); and Beltline Highway from I-5 west to West 11th Avenue.
2. Support designation of Highway 99 from Beltline Highway to Airport Road, reflecting the truck use on that segment of Highway 99 and recognizing the inconsistency of support for designation of Highway 99 north at that point.
3. Suggest that West 11th Avenue from Beltline Highway to its junction with Highway 126 West not be designated and that the West Eugene Parkway be designated upon its completion.

Mr. Dwyer said he could not support the letter with designation of Highway 126 from Main Street to I-5 because of opposition to designation of the McKenzie Highway as a freight route and his concern that designation of that portion of Highway 126 would increase truck traffic along the McKenzie River. Regarding the West Eugene Parkway (WEP), he was also unwilling to support designation of a project that might never be built.

Mr. Leiken asked what impact Senate Bill (SB) 894, which would cover all state and federal systems in the State as truck routes, would have if it passed and would it render the MPC's recommendations to ODOT pointless. Mr. Schwetz responded that SB 894 was proposed by the Oregon Trucking Association and was a proposal to designate every federally designated National Highway System route in the State as a freight route and subject to ODOT's freight route standards. He said there were proposed amendments to the bill that would not substantially change the impacts, one of the largest of which was designation of the McKenzie Highway as a freight route. He said the draft letter to ODOT was reacting to a request from ODOT for comments on the proposed freight route designations, although SB 894 had the potential to negate the work. He recommended that the MPC take the opportunity to comment as part of ODOT's process and on the legislation as well.

Mr. Leiken asked whether the MPC should spend time on the matter if the work and any action it took could be negated by SB 894. Mr. Schwetz replied that the work had already been completed and the letter capped that effort. In response to Mr. Dwyer's comments, Mr. Schwetz said that staff had recommended support for the limited access portions of the freight route designations because there was virtually no difference between the standards already required on that segment of Highway 126 and those imposed by a freight route designation. He noted that the metro area was a regional hub and there was already a lot of freight traffic on that stretch of Highway 126.

Mr. Kelly thanked the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) for extending the public comment period on freight route designations and noted that SB 894 contradicted the OTC efforts. He asked if the OTC had taken a position on the bill.

Mr. Papé said the OTC had not taken a position on SB 894. He agreed with Mr. Schwetz's description of the bill and its impact and reminded the committee that the trucking industry also paid for transportation facilities and wanted to see all of the national highways designated as freight route systems. He noted that a freight route designation did not have any effect in terms of limiting or allowing truck traffic on a particular segment, but could have some land use planning aspects related to access. He said he did not know if the OTC would take a position on SB 894; it was not currently scheduled for discussion.

Ms. Bettman said her understanding was that freight route designation did not divert truck traffic on to a route but did make the facility a higher priority for ODOT's funding consideration and potentially eligible to complete for some specialized funding.

Ms. Bettman, seconded by Mr. Green, moved to approve the draft letter to the Oregon Department of Transportation.

Mr. Boyatt said there were four points related to the discussion:

- Freight route designation did not change the flow of traffic on the system.
- Land use connections and freight route standards already applied to the Eugene/Springfield freeway portion of Highway 126 because of its designation as an expressway, which was a logical location for freight route designation.
- There was an attempt to balance the different needs along an entire route so that in some segments local land use could take a higher position while other segments allowed trips to recover time and keep moving and those segments worked together.
- There were no firm commitment regarding funding but as the OTC, governor, and legislature placed emphasis on freight there might be points added during project consideration that could elevate a project if it was on a freight route

Mr. Papé added that the trucking industry was primarily interested in capacity and not limiting truck movement on particular stretches of road. He said SB 894 was intended to prevent changes to roads that would create problems for truck traffic, not interfere with communities' ability to design their main streets and facilities. He said the trucking industry had indicated it did not want to impede work on special transportation area (STA) designations and urban business areas (UBA).

Mr. Dwyer said he understood that there was already truck traffic and segments of limited access on Highway 126. He said it was ludicrous to assume a community would build an impediment across a major highway. He said the issue was community control and meaningful community input and the likelihood that in 15 or 20 years no one would remember the MPC's discussion and the original intent would be lost. He urged the MPC to voice opposition to SB 894 on the basis of eliminating local control and policy-making by sending letters to the OTC and legislature.

Mr. Kelly expressed discomfort with the trucking industry's interest in placing a blanket prohibition on a community's ability to, for example, build a roundabout in its downtown business district. He had greater discomfort with placing a freight route priority on the WEP, which did not exist yet and might or might not ever exist, while Highway 126 served as the de facto freight route.

Mr. Kelly, seconded by Ms. Bettman, moved to change the third point in the letter by modifying the language as follows: "We suggest that West 11th from Beltline to its junction with Highway 126 West ~~not~~ be designated, ~~and that the West Eugene Parkway be designated upon its completion.~~"

Ms. Bettman supported the amendment and if it passed would support the letter to ODOT. She did not want to be in the position where funding or assistance for an existing route was foregone because the MPC hoped the WEP would be built. She said the WEP project could take ten years or more and she did not want to inhibit the ability to attract STA or UBA funding and expertise for a route that already existed. She said the ODOT letter was important because there had not been any action on the bill yet and the trucking industry intended to propose amendments that would narrow its scope.

Ms. Volta speculated that the proposed amendments would offset the impact of the legislation within city limits. She could support route designations between cities but had concerns about designations within cities. She said the jurisdictions wanted to promote transportation, but also quality of life and tourism and sometimes those goals could be in conflict. She was concerned that the senate bill was introduced despite the fact that MPOs were discussing the issue of freight route designations. She would support the letter as amended and appreciated the language acknowledging the McKenzie Highway concerns.

Mr. Boyatt announced that he would abstain from voting on the matter as ODOT was staff to the process. He reinforced that the process encouraged MPO feedback.

Mr. Green asked how the amendment proposed by Mr. Kelly would be viewed by Florence and Veneta, which were on record as supporting designation of Highway 126 and whether there would be a disconnect. Mr. Schwetz clarified that the letter as drafted would not leave a disconnect as designation of the future WEP would result in a freight route from Highway 101 into Beltline Highway. He said the amendment would place the designation on the existing facility and not assume that the WEP would be built. He said that was consistent with the positions of Florence and Veneta.

Mr. Dwyer agreed with the amendment but it did not resolve the problem. He said that section of the highway had no sound walls, included a traffic signal, there was development next to the road, and he did not want to encourage that by stating it met the criteria. He would not object if the signal was removed and sound walls built. He saw no value to the community and future problems as a result of the designation.

Mr. Papé referred to his earlier comments that if facilities within a city were transportation areas, they were not part of the capacity issues that would be addressed by SB 894. He said once a facility became a city facility it was a different issue. He said ODOT was concerned with allowing traffic to flow through on the State system. He said the trucking industry had indicated it was not concerned with designation of Highway 126 east of Springfield as a truck route and it was important to understand that trucks would still traverse that route without designation.

Mr. Green asked if it was the MPC's last chance to weigh in on the matter and what would prevent ODOT from designating the WEP as a freight route if it was eventually built. Mr. Boyatt replied that any future decisions would include a public process and opportunity to provide input. He said that Mr. Kelly's amendment would not limit the future of the WEP or potential designation.

Mr. Dwyer asked what benefit would be derived from designation of Main Street to I-5. Mr. Leiken said his understanding was that because of the expressway designation little would change with freight route designation. He said there could be land use issues affecting development along the segment. He said he did not strongly support the designation.

Mr. Dwyer asked if designation would foster the placement of sound walls to protect property owners along the route. Mr. Papé referred to legislative priorities when the Oregon Transportation Improvement Act (OTIA) was enacted. He said that language related to freight mobility on certain projects was applicable to freight route designation but did not guarantee additional funding for things such as sound walls. He reminded the MPC that lack of designation did not limit the flow of trucks and noise consequences.

Ms. Bettman offered a friendly amendment to change "suggest" to "support"

designation of” in order to be consistent with the other recommendations in the letter. Mr. Kelly accepted the friendly amendment.

The motion to amend passed, 9:0; Mr. Boyatt abstaining.

The main motion as amended passed, 8:1; Mr. Dwyer voting in opposition, Mr. Boyatt abstaining.

b. FY06 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Overview

Mr. Schwetz reviewed the staff memorandum dated March 3, 2005, setting forth the purpose of the MPO and the items that were included in the federally required annual work program. He said the work program included the activities of Lane Council of Governments (LCOG), the cities of Eugene, Springfield, and Coburg, Lane Transit District (LTD), and ODOT. He said that development of the UPWP outlined maintaining the transportation model and underlying data, updating the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), ongoing updates and amendments to the Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP), related air quality conformity determinations, maintaining a public involvement program, providing technical assistance and staff support, and coordination among agencies regarding transportation issues. He said the UPWP contained both a description of the work, expected products, and funding details of planning activities. He said the final funding amounts for FY06 were still unknown because LCOG was still awaiting federal reauthorization, but expected funding levels would be similar to FY05. He said a key source of planning funds was the State Transportation Program – Urban (STP-U) funds, which was a separate agenda item. He said the UPWP would come before the MPC for adoption at its April 2005 meeting.

Mr. Kelly asked how the CAC would have input on the UPWP before it was adopted. Mr. Schwetz said the MPC needed to discuss that issue as the CAC’s first meeting was on April 6, 2005. He said the MPC needed to take action on the UPWP in April because it would become the basis for an intergovernmental agreement with ODOT and intergovernmental agreements with Eugene, Springfield, and Coburg that would direct funds into a contract. He explained that the contract needed to be in place by July 1, 2005.

Mr. Kelly encouraged staff to work with ODOT to provide for adoption of the UPWP in May after the CAC had an opportunity to provide its input. He said the UPWP alluded to a Transportation System Plan (TSP) update and asked if that was a regulatory requirement and how it related to synchronization with the RTP. Mr. Schwetz said the Metro Plan partner agencies had jointly submitted an application for Transportation Growth Management (TGM) funding for the update of the TSP, which was why it was included in the UPWP. He said that synchronizing the TSP and the Regional Transportation Plan was an issue that staff continued to work on but there was some flexibility that allowed the two plans to be out of sync periodically.

Mr. Kelly requested a more definitive answer.

Mr. Boyatt explained the process necessary to maintain the flow of planning funds through intergovernmental agreements and contracts. He said that ODOT was willing to investigate the impact of postponing adoption of the UPWP until May but wanted the MPC to be aware that ODOT had to negotiate the UPWP contracts with MPOs around the state and bundle those as part of ODOT’s contractual arrangement with the Federal Highways Administration in order to access funds. He said an additional month might not be available.

Ms. Volta suggested the CAC could review the UPWP at its April 6 meeting prior to consideration by the MPC at its April 14, 2005, meeting. Mr. Kloeppe said the time sequence would be rushed and the CAC would need advance preparation on what they would be reviewing prior to the April 6 meeting, but there was some opportunity for comment.

Mr. Kelly noted that much of the technical work included in the UPWP was modeling based on origin/destination data that was more than a decade old. Mr. Schwetz replied that the origin/destination data from a 1994 survey was used in the model but as the data aged it was relied upon less and less. He said the model was calibrated continuously to existing ground counts from which the model had the ability to infer origin and destination. He anticipated a new statewide survey of household travel behavior in 2006.

Ms. Bettman supported Ms. Volta's suggestion and also suggested that staff could provide a copy of the last approved document for comparison, along with a glossary of all acronyms, to expedite the CAC's review.

Ms. Ballew cautioned that the CAC should be given an opportunity to understand the issues and not be overwhelmed with information at its inception.

Mr. Schwetz related staff concern that the CAC should have sufficient time to become familiar with its role and subject matter and certain time sensitive issues might not initially go to the CAC for comment. He said that staff could send the UPWP out to members to review prior to the April 6 meeting and hoped to return some useful comments to the MPC when it considered adoption of the work program. He hoped the CAC could focus on resolving many of the public involvement problems and make strong recommendations for how each of the MPO products should be processed through a public involvement procedure. He proposed having the MPC approve interim operating procedures developed by the CAC.

Ms. Bettman expressed surprise at Mr. Schwetz's proposal as she understood the CAC was created to fulfill the public involvement component. She said the CAC was intended to be an advisory committee on project lists, criteria, and priorities at the beginning of projects and the proposal would turn it into a citizen involvement committee to design processes by which the MPO engaged citizens, which was a completely different mission.

Mr. Schwetz said the CAC was not intended to fulfill all of the MPO requirements for public involvement and federal requirements would not allow public involvement to be limited to the 12 people on the CAC. He said that the staff presentation to MPC on a CAC had identified it as an important component to a full program of public involvement that would still include public hearings. He said the CAC was an important body to provide input on how the MPC would conduct public involvement.

Mr. Kelly asked that background information on creation of the CAC be provided to new MPC members. He noted that regional planning activities on page 3 of the UPWP included adoption of alternative mobility standards for state facilities and asked staff to provide details on that at the MPC's April 2005 meeting. He asked if interchange area management plans (IAMP) were adopted locally or by ODOT. Mr. Boyatt replied that ideally the IAMP was adopted locally and by ODOT but there were few in existence yet.

Mr. Dwyer suggested that to avoid items becoming time sensitive for the CAC timelines should be developed that met the needs of the CAC first and the MPC second.

Ms. Ballew commented that there appeared to be some differences in opinion regarding the purpose of the CAC.

Mr. Schwetz asked for direction from the MPC and said that staff could provide the legislative history of creation of the CAC.

Ms. Ban said that review of the UPWP, accompanied by a glossary and the previous plan, was a good place for the CAC to start. She suggested that it could form the basis for a CAC discussion of what role it should have with respect to MPO products. She agreed that it would be helpful for the MPC to have the legislative history of the CAC. She said that the UPWP could help the CAC determine which items it should review and which items it could pass over and the MPC could continue to discuss how the CAC could best be used.

Ms. Bettman agreed with Ms. Ban's comments. She said that it could take a very long time to educate the CAC on every activity and they should learn by doing with a review of the UPWP. She said that LCOG had the expertise to develop public involvement processes and it would be redundant to use the CAC for that.

Mr. Schwetz commented that one of the MPO's primary products was a public involvement plan and what better committee to help develop a more robust plan than the CAC. He said a draft was ready for the CAC's consideration and recommendations as one of its initial tasks.

Mr. Thompson said that update of the MPO's public involvement plan was a federal requirement and as one of the MPO's major projects it was reasonable to have the CAC review it before it was presented to the MPC. He said the CAC bylaws adopted by the MPC spoke both to the CAC advising on the public involvement process and project priorities and evaluation criteria. He said that acronyms included as an appendix in the Regional Transportation Plan could be provided to the CAC as a glossary.

Ms. Ballew asked staff to provide a list of CAC functions to the MPC at its April 2005 meeting.

c. Programming State Transportation Program – Urban (STP-U) Funds for FY06 Planning and Project Development

Mr. Thompson explained that the first round of STP-U funds was programmed in October 2003 for the four funding categories and targets that the MPC established across three years. He referred members to the spreadsheet contained in the agenda packet entitled *Central Lane Adopted FY05-07 MTIP: Showing Only STP-U Funded Projects* and noted that planning and project development in FY06 was not funded at that time because of conservative revenue projections. He said that updated estimates of FY06 STP-U revenues were adequate to fund the planning and project development target of 20 percent of the STP-U revenues and the Transportation Planning Committee (TPC) would consider at its March 24, 2005 meeting recommendations for programming FY06 STP-U funds for Eugene, Springfield, Coburg, LTD, and LCOG.

Mr. Kelly asked that information about the category each project was under, such as modernization, preservation, planning and project development, and transportation demand management (TDM), be included on the spreadsheet. He asked if the TPC had reviewed the criteria that prevented Eugene from submitting preservation projects to compete for modernization funds. Mr. Thompson said there had been some discussions by the TPC but the Eugene voting members of TPC had not yet placed a motion before

the committee to recommend modifying the criteria. He said that any changes would apply to FY07 as allocations for FY06 in the categories of preservation, modernization and TDM had already been made.

In response to questions from Ms. Bettman regarding the spreadsheet, Mr. Thompson explained that in FY05 \$125,000 was allocated to Eugene, \$87,500 to Springfield, \$20,000 to Coburg, \$312,500 to LTD and \$250,000 to LCOG for planning and project development. He said the planning and project development allocation represented 20 percent of the \$3 million STP allocation. He clarified that the \$1.35 million for planning and development referred to in the staff memorandum was a funding target across three years.

Ms. Ballew suggested the addition of column totals to the spreadsheet.

d. Report from United Front Participants

Mr. Leiken reported that the United Front participants' meetings in Washington D.C. were very productive, particularly with respect to transportation. He said that the earmark for the I-5/Beltline project was \$20 million, the Coburg Road/I-5 was \$9 million, and the area was anticipating approximately \$33 million in transportation funding. He said that the House and Senate were nearing a compromise on the transportation reauthorization bill. He said there were informative discussions of education issues.

Ms. Volta added that Congressman DeFazio was an effective representative and Senators Wyden and Smith had pledged their support. She commended the value of an effort like United Front that brought people together to achieve a common goal.

e. I-5/Beltline Earmark Timing Issues

Mr. Thompson pointed out that even though the funding outlook for the I-5/Beltline project was good, the timing could be of concern depending on how quickly or slowly the transportation reauthorization bill moved through the federal process because ODOT intended to go to bid in December 2005. He said in order for that to happen the funding had to be in place. He said that LCOG would continue to monitor the progress of the federal earmark and if there was a concern about the timing for a December 2005 bid, staff would return to the MPC through the TPC with a recommendation for a contingency plan to fill the financial gap on a temporary basis. Once the earmark was available it would backfill the temporary stopgap measure.

Mr. Kelly asked how earmark funds could be used to backfill other projects if they were dedicated to a specific project. Mr. Thompson clarified that the funds would be "on the books" as committed so the project could go to bid; the earmark would be available before funds were expended.

f. Follow-up and MPO Calendar

i. I-105 Preservation Project Update

Ms. Schuetz reported that bridge and rail work were now over the I-5 section and the project was on target in terms of time, but the contract closure work was pushed back 12 days and closures would not start until May 9, 2005.

ii. Report from Oregon MPO Summit III

Mr. Schwetz reported that the third MPO Summit had occurred March 2-3, 2005. He distributed copies of a presentation made to both the Senate and House Transportation committees introducing the MPO consortium. He said that participants met with Representative Greg Smith, chair of the transportation subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee, who expressed his interest in working with the MPOs and commended their efforts to work collectively. He said the consortium discussed establishment of a more formal set of bylaws and those would be sent to members for review as the consortium was interested in scheduling another summit before the legislature adjourned.

Mr. Thompson added that MPOs would each be asked to appoint two representatives and two alternates to the consortium and those appointments would be made at the MPC's April 2005 meeting so that representatives could attend the next summit in May.

Ms. Bettman said she was not aware until the last minute that neither of the Eugene delegates could attend the March summit meeting. She said the MPO consortium needed the full participation of elected officials on an ongoing basis and should not become staff-driven.

Mr. Kelly encouraged the date of the May 2005 summit to be established as soon as possible so representatives could plan their attendance. He said the Eugene City Council had clarified its bylaws to specify that Eugene representatives to the MPC or similar bodies should reflect adopted council policy when it related to a vote of the body. He suggested such a provision in the MPO consortium bylaws.

iii. MTIP Administrative Amendment

Mr. Thompson reported that the TPC had acted administratively in February 2005 to amend \$40,000 in funding into the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Plan (MTIP) to cover the expenses related to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) appeal and start-up costs related to the CAC.

Mr. Kelly asked how the \$40,000 had been previously allocated. Mr. Thompson replied that the funds were derived from the increased forecast for STP-U funds for the current fiscal year and had not previously been allocated to any use.

Ms. Ballew adjourned the meeting at 1:35 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)