

## MINUTES

Metropolitan Policy Committee  
Springfield City Hall – 225 Fifth Street  
Springfield, Oregon

July 8, 2010  
11:30 a.m.

**PRESENT:** Alan Zelenka, Chair (Eugene); Hillary Wylie, Vice Chair (Springfield); Brian Pech (City of Coburg), Rob Handy, Pete Sorenson (Lane County), Greg Evans (Lane Transit District), Sonny Chickering (Oregon Department of Transportation), Sid Leiken (City of Springfield), members; Jeff Spartz, (Lane County) Mark Pangborn (Lane Transit District), Jon Ruiz (City of Eugene), Jeff Towery (City of Springfield) *ex officio* members.

Byron Vanderpool, Andrea Riner, Ann Mortenson, Kathi Wiederhold, Paul Thompson, Susan Payne (Lane Council of Governments); Savannah Crawford (Oregon Department of Transportation), Alex Cuyler, Mike McKenzie-Bahr, Celia Barry (Lane County), Rob Inerfeld, (City of Eugene), David Reesor, Len Goodwin, Chelsea Steed (City of Springfield), Petra Schuetz (City of Coburg), Tom Schwetz, Price Armstrong (Lane Transit District), Dave Jacobson (Citizen Advisory Committee).

### WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Zelenka called the meeting to order at 11:32 a.m. and asked those present to introduce themselves.

Mr. Zelenka noted no substantive changes to the meeting agenda.

Mr. Zelenka noted that Eugene Mayor Kitty Piercy and LCOG Executive Director George Kloeppe were attending a high-speed rail summit conference in Portland and would not be in attendance.

Mr. Zelenka noted the revised meeting agenda.

### APPROVE May 13th and June 10th Meeting Minutes

Mr. Handy, seconded by Mr. Pech, moved to approve the minutes of the May 13 and June 10, 2010 MPC meetings.

Mr. Zelenka offered corrections to the minutes.

Mr. Zelenka called for a vote on Mr. Handy's previously stated motion. The motion passed unanimously 8:0.

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM MPC MEMBERS**

Mr. Pangborn announced that LTD had scheduled a press conference with Congressman Peter DeFazio and Federal Transit Administration Deputy Administrator Therese McMillan for July 9 at LTD's Springfield Station and hoped that positive news regarding LTD's recent grant applications would be announced.

Mr. Zelenka noted that an MPC subcommittee had reviewed a draft MPO regional greenhouse gas inventory at their most recent meeting.

## **COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE**

No public comments were offered.

## **METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO) ISSUES**

### **Report from the MPO Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)**

Mr. Jacobson reported on the CAC's recent field trip to areas of local transportation interest and thanked those MPC and LCOG staff members who had facilitated the event. Mr. Jacobson further reported that the field trip had involved a trip on LTD's EmX system from Eugene to Springfield and had also involved a stop at the proposed Walnut Station site where City of Eugene staff member Kurt Yeiter had provided a detailed overview of the development plans for the station. Mr. Jacobson briefly noted each of the main points of interest from the remainder of the CAC field trip and particularly thanked LTD bus operator David Martingale for transporting them safely.

Mr. Jacobson expressly thanked LCOG staff member Kathi Wiederhold for her efforts to organize and facilitate the CAC field trip.

Mr. Pech commented he had joined the CAC members on their field trip and had found it to be a highly informative and enjoyable experience. He maintained that the field trip represented an excellent opportunity for the CAC to participate in the future transportation plans for the region.

### **Oregon Travel and Activity Survey Status Report**

LCOG Senior Planner Susan Payne provided a brief overview of preliminary findings from the Central Lane MPO Household Travel Survey and noted that the Oregon Household Activity Survey (OHAS) from which it was drawn represented the most comprehensive statewide travel survey since the 1990's.

Ms. Payne reported that the statewide data collection efforts for the OHAS were expected to be completed in 2012.

Ms. Payne briefly described the number of households involved in the OHAS as well as the manner in which the survey had been conducted. She further noted that, different from the previous statewide travel surveys, the OHAS had included more detailed considerations of long distance and local travel.

Ms. Payne outlined the Central Lane MPO's funding contributions to the OHAS project and noted that the MPC had approved its \$225,000 contribution from STP-U funds in 2007. Ms. Payne further reported that additional fees since that time had brought the Central Lane MPO's total direct contribution to the OHAS to approximately \$280,000.

Ms. Payne noted that data collection efforts regarding the OHAS were still underway in the Salem and Portland metro areas but that the data collection for most other regions in Oregon had been completed.

Ms. Payne introduced Vice President for Survey and Consulting Dr. Stacey Bricka of NuStats, the professional transportation survey firm that had been contracted by ODOT to manage the OHAS project, to provide the initial results of the Central Lane MPO Household Travel Survey.

Dr. Bricka noted that she also served as the project manager for the 1994/1995 Oregon travel survey.

Dr. Bricka stated that the overall objective of the OHAS was to create a snapshot of travel both demographically and in terms of behavioral travel characteristics.

Dr. Bricka described the manner in which the OHAS and the Central Lane MPO Household Travel Survey had been conducted and addressed the various data, demographic information, control variables, and response rates that had been involved. Dr. Bricka stated that the survey had been conducted using a modular survey approach wherein core data elements were identified for each region in the survey.

Dr. Bricka proceeded to describe in greater detail the primary sampling, outreach and data elements of the Central Lane MPO Household Travel Survey for the benefit of the MPC members.

Dr. Bricka described the travel diary that had been issued to survey respondent households and individuals in order to accurately record their various forms of travel behavior data.

Dr. Bricka described the outreach strategies for the Central Lane MPO Household Travel Survey and commented that they had been used to help the Central Lane MPO and the MPC ensure the legitimacy of the study.

Dr. Bricka commented that the informational brochure developed as part of the outreach strategies had been distributed in both English and Spanish language formats.

Dr. Bricka listed in extensive detail the results of the Central Lane MPO Household Travel Survey with particular emphasis on the respondent and travel behavior characteristics examined as part of the survey.

Dr. Bricka stated that the travel behavior data from the Central Lane MPO Household Travel Survey had been compiled using place-based data whereas the previous transportation survey had been conducted using location-based information. She noted that the current place-based method had resulted in much more accurate and comprehensive data that had subsequently required much more extensive processing. Dr. Bricka proceeded to describe additional elements of the place-based data strategy as well as survey results that had resulted from that strategy.

Dr. Bricka, responding to a question from Mr. Pangborn regarding the response biases for the survey that involved low-income respondents, briefly noted how the representation from the survey data for such respondents had been increased to adjust for the biases.

Dr. Bricka noted the various data limitations that had been encountered as part of the Central Lane MPO Household Travel Survey.

Dr. Bricka provided comparison information relating the Central Lane MPO Household Travel Survey and the OHAS to the 1994/95 State survey efforts. She expressed that it could not be determined if improvements in the survey results were the result of improved survey methods or actual shifts in regional transportation elements and that such a determination would need to be made before the conclusion of the OHAS.

Ms. Bricka listed the preliminary conclusions of the Central Lane MPO Household Travel Survey.

Mr. Zelenka asked when the final OHAS survey results would be available for the MPC and other local agencies to incorporate into their local transportation planning efforts. Dr. Bricka and Ms. Payne responded that the data from the survey was still being analyzed and that it was unknown whether the final survey results would be available to use for current transportation planning efforts.

Ms. Payne noted that LCOG staff had discussed a potential partnership with the Salem-Keizer MPO wherein that agency might split the cost of certain elements of the data analysis with the Central Lane MPO in order to make the survey results available more quickly. Ms. Payne further expressed that the Central Lane MPO Household Travel Survey results would not be completed in time for the Central Lane MPO to develop an entirely new transportation model but rather would only allow it to revise the current model.

Eugene City staff Rob Inerfeld, responding to a question from Mr. Zelenka, noted that he and other Eugene City staff would need to confer with Ms. Payne to see how and when the Central Lane MPO Household Travel Survey could most efficiently be incorporated into Eugene's current transportation planning efforts.

Ms. Payne noted that the completion of the Salem-Keizer MPO data collection efforts would allow Dr. Bricka to begin an analysis of commuter transportation data across multiple MPO regions.

Dr. Bricka, responding to a question from Mr. Sorenson, briefly described how the place-based approach of the OHAS and Central Lane MPO Household Travel Survey had affected the survey results concerning multiple modes of transit.

Dr. Bricka, responding to a question from Mr. Sorenson, reported that 1,768 households had been included in the OHAS data set.

Mr. Sorenson asked if any elements of the OHAS had overlapped with the previous ODOT SmartTrips research that had been performed regarding regional transit issues. Dr. Bricka responded that those two surveys had been entirely separate. Ms. Payne maintained that the SmartTrips research performed by ODOT had not been aimed at gathering statistical data that appropriately matched the socio-economic characteristics of the region.

Mr. Sorenson asked why certain survey information and data elements had been made specific to the Central Lane MPO Household Travel Survey but not the overall OHAS. Dr. Bricka responded that many outlying areas for ODOT did not have a strong interest in transit matters and that the Oregon Modeling Steering Committee subcommittee had determined that such matters should not apply to the larger OHAS.

Mr. Handy asked the MPC members from LTD for their reactions regarding the preliminary Central Lane MPO Household Travel Survey results. Mr. Pangborn expressed that Dr. Bricka's presentation was the first time he had viewed the Central Lane MPO Household Travel Survey results and also that the survey had revealed very interesting information regarding households that had chosen not to use regional transit services.

Dr. Bricka responded to Mr. Pangborn's reactions and noted that the Central Lane MPO Household Travel Survey had been designed to reveal very specific information regarding the reasons certain household might choose not to use transit services. Ms. Payne briefly listed some of those reasons for the benefit of the MPC members.

Mr. Pangborn elaborated upon Ms. Payne's previous comment and noted that certain studies had revealed that persons who had already paid the overhead costs for automobile and other forms of transportation were less likely to use regional transit services.

Mr. Leiken asked how the OHAS and Central Lane MPO Household Travel Survey information would ultimately be used. Ms. Payne responded that the survey information had been primarily designed to facilitate updates to regional transportation models and had been designed for use by government agencies such as ODOT and their consulting partners who worked on those models.

Mr. Leiken discussed how the survey information might be considered by agencies such as ODOT in relation to their future funding priorities for transit and other transportation issues. Mr. Leiken believed that the ultimate completion of the OHAS in 2012 would provide a clear indication of what transportation goals would be most important to the region.

Mr. Leiken asked for further information regarding what agencies would use the survey data and how such data would be used. Ms. Payne responded that each MPO in Oregon would use the survey data in their local transportation planning efforts and that the data would also be available to the national audience of researchers that addressed transportation planning. Dr. Bricka added that NuStats would also provide recommendations for a public use data set in order to maintain the confidentiality of the survey respondents.

Mr. Schwetz recognized that the OHAS and Central Lane MPO Household Travel Survey would influence local transportation discussions regarding operational funding and agreed that the surveys would provide a much more accurate picture of how transit services such as LTD's West Eugene EmX expansion could benefit the region.

Dr. Bricka, responding to a question from Mr. Zelenka, briefly noted how certain elements of the respondent characteristics information from the Central Lane MPO Household Travel Survey compared with the actual reported data.

Dr. Bricka, responding to a question from Mr. Evans, noted that the OHAS and Central Lane MPO Household Travel Survey results had not yet been analyzed with respect to transit-dependent and choice riders but that such analysis would be conducted in the future. Mr. Evans noted that the number of transit-dependent individuals in the region was increasing and that more detailed analysis regarding those population sectors would be very important.

Dr. Bricka thanked the MPC members for their time and noted that they could contact her with any further questions regarding the surveys at [sbricka@nustats.com](mailto:sbricka@nustats.com).

### **Draft Amendment to Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)**

LCOG Senior Planner Paul Thompson provided an update on the RTP and noted that the funding for the Franklin Boulevard Multiway Boulevard improvement project as described in the draft amendment to the RTP had not yet been identified. He expressed that the MPO's Transportation Planning Committee (TPC) had determined that further public engagement regarding the draft amendment was necessary and had recommended to the MPC that a 30-day public comment opportunity be provided and that the authority for final approval of the draft amendment be granted to the TPC. Mr. Thompson noted that the 30-day public comment period had been opened on July 2 and that notice had been sent to the MPC's distribution lists and posted on the MPC website. Mr. Thompson further noted that the City of Eugene had already conducted extensive public outreach regarding the Franklin Boulevard project and that an additional MPC open house event regarding the project and the draft amendment to the RTP was unnecessary.

Mr. Zelenka noted that there were no community members who wished to offer public comment or similar testimony regarding the draft amendment to the RTP.

Mr. Zelenka confirmed that the MPC's public comment period regarding the draft amendment to the RTP would be open until August 1, 2010 and that TIGER grant applications regarding the Franklin Boulevard project were due before the MPC's September meeting. Mr. Zelenka reminded those present that the MPC had planned not to have a meeting in August.

Mr. Zelenka agreed that the proposed Franklin Boulevard project was very important to the City of Eugene and that extensive public involvement efforts had already been conducted by Eugene City staff.

Mr. Handy averred that he was comfortable with the MPC's decision-making process surrounding the draft amendment to the RTP and agreed that the Franklin Boulevard proposal was a wonderful project that would provide for an effective integration of various land use and local transportation goals.

Mr. Thompson, responding to a question from Mr. Handy, briefly discussed how the City of Eugene and the other member agencies of the Central Lane MPO might wish to amend the RTP in order to take advantage of TIGER grant funding for various transportation projects such as the Walnut Station Mixed Use Center.

Mr. Zelenka referred to Mr. Handy's previous comment and asked what would be involved in the development of future transportation projects for federal funding. Mr. Inerfeld responded that Eugene City staff had conferred with representatives from the City of Springfield about submitting proposals for the federal Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) process through the United States Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and Department of Transportation (DOT) offices.

Mr. Ruiz commented that the public engagement process regarding the Walnut Station Mixed Use Center had been exemplary and hoped that the process for any projects developed through the West Eugene Collaborative (WEC) would be equally productive.

Mr. Inerfeld, responding to a question from Mr. Zelenka, briefly described how certain federal HUD community challenge grant funding operated in relation to TIGER II grant funding. Mr. Inerfeld further noted that the MPC member agencies were allowed to apply for each type of funding at the same time.

Mr. Ruiz noted that the Eugene City Council had planned further discussions regarding the WEC and the federal funding opportunities that might be used to fund transportation and urban development projects along the West 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue corridor.

Mr. Pangborn commented on the ways in which federal agencies such as HUD, the DOT and the EPA had merged efforts to provide federal funding for various regional projects designed to improve housing, transportation and other community priorities.

Mr. Thompson stated that the project lists in the RTP need to describe the projects at a very high level of detail in order to move forward with the federal funding processes. He further stated that he was unsure if the City of Eugene's project description was detailed enough to proceed, but that staff would ensure that it was.

Mr. Thompson, at the request of Mr. Leiken, briefly restated the staff recommendations regarding the draft amendment to the RTP.

Ms. Wiley, seconded by Mr. Evans, moved to delegate final approval authority regarding the RTP draft amendment to the MPO's Transportation Planning Committee after the close of the public comment period on August 1 but before the TIGER II grant funding application deadline.

Mr. Towery maintained that the motion as stated carried the presumption that it would be acceptable to the City of Eugene.

Mr. Zelenka called for a vote on Ms. Wiley's previously stated motion. The motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

### **Adopt FY2010-2013 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP)**

Mr. Thompson noted the revisions to the MTIP and noted that the most recent revision had addressed testimony provided during a public hearing on June 10, 2010 regarding the Bertlesen Road project. Mr. Thompson noted that the modified MTIP language concerning the Bertlesen Road project had been drafted by Eugene City staff.

Mr. Thompson commented on recent MPC discussions regarding the funding of the MTIP projects and noted that 26 of the MTIP projects were devoted to roadway preservation including bicycle and pedestrian components, 24 were devoted to transit projects, 8 were devoted to transportation planning projects, 6 were devoted to roadway modernization projects, and 9 were specifically devoted to bicycle/pedestrian projects. Mr. Thompson briefly discussed how the MTIP funding had been applied to each area.

Mr. Thompson noted that the most recent draft of the MTIP contained only minor revisions apart from the aforementioned Bertlesen Road revisions. He further noted that an Appendix G containing six Title VI environmental justice maps had been added to the most recent draft. He expressed that it was important for the Central Lane MPO to clearly demonstrate the Title VI information to the public as it moved forward with the MTIP projects.

Mr. Thompson noted the staff recommendation to approve Resolution 2010-06 adopting the FFY10-13 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program and maintained that it was important to adopt it immediately as ODOT would soon incorporate MTIPs from throughout Oregon into the STIP which would be approved by the OTC in the fall.

Mr. Handy commented on the Coburg Interchange project on I-5 and noted that the Lane Board of County Commissioners had at their recent work session expressed their desire for the MPC to either postpone the approval of the MTIP as submitted or to remove the Coburg Interchange project from the MTIP itself.

Mr. Thompson, responding to a question from Mr. Zelenka, noted that the MPC would review the air quality conformity components of the MTIP in September once the Committee passed the resolution to adopt it. Mr. Thompson further described the deadlines for incorporating the MTIP into the STIP funding process. He further noted that it might be possible to amend certain portions of the MTIP even after the STIP had been closed.

Mr. Thompson noted that federal funding for the MTIP projects by the FHWA could be suspended if the MTIP was not approved by October 1, 2010.

Mr. Chickering referred to Mr. Handy's earlier comment regarding the Coburg Interchange project and noted his concern regarding Mr. Handy's proposal to postpone adoption of the MTIP. He believed that it would be not worth the risk to the entirety of the MTIP to postpone adoption for the sake of the Coburg Interchange project. Mr. Chickering offered a counter-proposal regarding the Coburg Interchange project whereby the \$1.03 million in local match funding from Lane County instead be provided by ODOT. He further noted that ODOT would feel much more comfortable having the Coburg Interchange project included in the adopted MTIP so that the project could move forward. He also believed that as a United Front partners project, the cancellation or postponement of the Coburg Interchange project might jeopardize the availability of federal earmark funds for the Coburg Interchange and other future United Front projects.

Mr. Zelenka referred to Mr. Chickering's counter-proposal and asked for further information on how it might affect the execution of the Coburg Interchange project. Mr. Chickering responded that ODOT had continued to pursue authorizations from Lane County necessary for the execution of the project including an intergovernmental agreement regarding access management and construction permits.

Mr. Pech worried that the Coburg Interchange project might be cancelled or that the federal earmarks for the project might be eliminated if it were removed from the MTIP. He believed the MPC needed to continue to support the Coburg Interchange project and that it should remain in the MTIP in its current form.

Mr. Thompson briefly discussed the federal requirements for the earmark funding that had been committed to the MTIP and noted staff's discomfort with the proposal to adopt the MTIP without properly indicating how those federally committed funds would be matched locally. He further suggested that doing so might put the federal earmark funds at risk.

Mr. Evans asked the Commissioners whether or not they could support including the Coburg Interchange project in the MTIP in its current form, allowing for the possibility of later amendment.

Mr. Handy appreciated ODOT's willingness to work to move the Coburg Interchange project forward. In addition to the local match, remaining issues including right-of-way acquisition and clarification of Phase I and Phase II still need to be addressed.

Mr. Zelenka asked if it would be acceptable to the Lane Board of County Commissioners if the MTIP was revised in order to list ODOT as the local matching funds source for the Coburg Interchange project instead of Lane County and to move the MTIP forward. Mr. Handy expressed he would need to confer with the other Lane County Commissioners but was confident that the matter could be resolved.

Mr. Handy, responding to a request for further clarification from Mr. Zelenka, indicated he would be unwilling to support the resolution adopting the MTIP even with the funding adjustment to ODOT.

Mr. Zelenka noted that further MPC discussion surrounding the MTIP and the projects contained therein might delay the approval of the resolution until August or September. Mr. Thompson added that such delays might adversely affect the execution of many of the MTIP projects.

Mr. Sorenson briefly commented on the Lane County Commissioners' recent work session meetings regarding the MTIP and the Coburg Interchange project. He further indicated that he would be willing to schedule additional MPC meetings and advocated for the approval of the MTIP without the Coburg Interchange project so that it might be added back in later.

Mr. Zelenka stated that an affirmative vote from all three of the Central Lane MPO jurisdictions (Eugene, Springfield, and Lane County) would be necessary to pass the proposed resolution.

Mr. Vanderpool, responding to a question from Mr. Zelenka, stated that staff might be able to schedule a conference call meeting in the near future to discuss the MTIP and the Coburg Interchange project in greater detail and in which the public would be provided an opportunity to participate. Mr. Vanderpool cautioned that the public would need to be properly notified and expressed reservations regarding the manner in which scheduling such a meeting would be perceived by the community.

Mr. Thompson clarified that the Coburg Interchange project was already part of the existing MTIP and that the project would continue for the next several months regardless of the proposed FY10-13 MTIP. He further noted that the proposed MTIP would not go into effect without the accompanying air quality conformity determinations.

Mr. Thompson, responding to a question from Mr. Zelenka, noted that the MPC was scheduled to submit its proposed FY10-13 MTIP by the end of July and that it was scheduled to be acted upon by the OTC in October.

Mr. Chickering, seconded by Mr. Pech, moved to modify the I-5 Coburg Interchange project to change the \$1.03 million match from Lane County to the Oregon Department of Transportation.

Mr. Handy appreciated ODOT's willingness to work with Lane County regarding the Coburg Interchange project but stated he would not support the motion.

Mr. Chickering requested that a roll-call vote be taken regarding the previously stated motion. Mr. Zelenka, Mr. Pech, Mr. Chickering, Mr. Evans, Mr. Leiken and Ms. Wiley voted affirmatively. Mr. Handy and Mr. Sorenson voted in opposition. The motion failed (6:2) as one of the MPC member jurisdictions did not have an affirmative vote.

Mr. Zelenka suggested that the MPC members and support staff schedule a meeting for August 12, 2010 to discuss the MTIP.

Mr. Leiken asked Mr. Chickering how any postponements regarding the FY10-13 MTIP would affect the funding process for the I-5 Beltline Interchange project. Mr. Chickering responded that Unit 2 of the project was currently funded and under construction and that Unit 3 was not scheduled to begin construction until later in 2010.

Ms. Wiley asked how the outstanding issues regarding the MTIP might be resolved by the Lane County Commissioners and the other MPC members before the MPC's August 12 meeting. Mr. Handy responded that he was confident that Lane County would be willing to work with the ODOT and City of Coburg representatives to arrive at an effective solution as expediently as possible.

Mr. Chickering stated that he and other ODOT staff would continue to provide factual information in order to facilitate the MPC's discussions regarding the projects included in the MTIP.

Ms. Wiley asked if an approval of the FY10-13 MTIP in August would be an acceptable timeframe for its incorporation into the STIP. Mr. Thompson noted he would confer with the ODOT STIP manager later in the afternoon to notify him of the Central Lane MPO's intentions regarding its approval timeline for the MTIP.

Ms. Wiley believed it would be better to approve the complete MTIP package in August rather than attempt to pass it immediately without the Coburg Interchange project.

Mr. Handy maintained that the risks involved in postponing the approval of the MTIP could be mitigated. Mr. Handy further noted for Mr. Chickering that although Lane County looked forward to ODOT providing additional factual information, Lane County was more interested in further adjustments in their negotiation regarding the intergovernmental agreements involved in the Coburg Interchange project.

Mr. Chickering stated he was uncomfortable with the risks associated with postponement of the MTIP.

Mr. Spartz, responding to a comment from Mr. Leiken, confirmed that Lane County's congressional delegations had been made aware of the possibility that the Central Lane MPO's MTIP might be postponed.

Mr. Vanderpool noted that a quorum would be required for an August 12 MPC meeting and asked for an indication from those present regarding their intentions and availability to attend that meeting.

Mr. Sorenson suggested that MTIP discussion should be the sole agenda item for the August 12 meeting.

The MPC members and staff briefly discussed their respective availabilities for the August 12 meeting.

Mr. Vanderpool confirmed the date and time for their August meeting to further discuss the MTIP.

Mr. Thompson asked if there were any other items to discuss regarding any elements of the proposed FY10-13 MTIP.

Mr. Thompson, responding to a question from Mr. Handy, noted that the project description requirements for the MTIP were very stringent because of the air quality standards associated with those descriptions. He further noted that the project descriptions in the MTIP database that was forwarded to the ODOT were often more detailed than the project description table that is published in the adopted MTIP.

Mr. Thompson, responding to a question from Mr. Zelenka, stated that he would forward the complete Coburg Interchange project description to the MPC members.

### **MPO Planning Calendar**

Ms. Riner noted that the MPO's planning calendar had been updated to describe the next three months and also included information listing elements of the next RTP process.

Ms. Riner noted that the MPO's three-month planning calendar would be amended to include the MPC's August meeting.

### **Follow-up and Next Steps**

Ms. Riner confirmed that the MPC's Regional Policy Set and Greenhouse Gas Inventory items would likely be placed on the agenda for the MPC's September meeting.

### **ODOT Update**

Mr. Thompson noted that the next round of modernization funding in the FY12-15 STIP would probably be very small and further noted that he had learned at a recent quarterly statewide STIP meeting that there would be no discretionary modernization funds included in that iteration of the STIP.

Mr. Thompson planned to have a draft version of the FY12-15 MTIP submitted to the MPC in July of 2011.

Mr. Thompson noted that the statewide flexible funding committee on which Kitty Piercy and Mr. Pangborn served had had its first meeting on June 28, 2010. He noted that that committee had been directed to review the State's available flexible funding for redirection to non-highway uses.

Mr. Zelenka adjourned the meeting at 1:31 p.m.

(Recorded by Wade Hicks)