

# MINUTES

Citizen Advisory Committee  
of the  
Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization  
Eugene Public Library – Singer Room  
100 West 10<sup>th</sup> - Eugene, Oregon

November 18, 2010  
5:30 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Dave Jacobson, Chair; Phillip Carroll, Wendy Butler-Boyesen, Alexandre Lockfeld, Eleanor Mulder, Paul Adkins, Richard Beers, Gary Gillespie, Edward Winter, Diana Alldredge, Jennifer Smith, Philip Farrington, Rosalia Marquez, members; Kathi Wiederhold, Paul Thompson, Susan Payne, Lane Council of Governments; Mary Archer, Lane Transit District; David Reesor, City of Springfield; Sonny Chickering, MPC Liaison; Kurt Yeiter, City of Eugene; Wade Hicks, LCOG Minutes Recorder.

**ABSENT:** Bill Morganti, Sarah Strand, members.

## **1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND AGENDA REVIEW**

Mr. Jacobson called the meeting of the Central Lane MPO Citizens Advisory Committee (MPO CAC) to order at 5:30 p.m. and asked those present to introduce themselves.

Mr. Jacobson noted that an additional CAC meeting devoted to LTD's West Eugene EmX Extension (WEEE) project had been scheduled for December 8 in addition to the CAC's regular meeting on December 16.

Ms. Wiederhold added that a CAC officers meeting had been scheduled for November 29, 2010 at 3:00 p.m. in the small 5<sup>th</sup> floor conference room at LCOG.

Ms. Wiederhold, responding to a question from Mr. Farrington, noted that the November 19 officers meeting was for administrative purposes only. Mr. Jacobson added that no action would be taken and that no quorum would be required at the officers meeting.

Mr. Chickering commented he would be unable to attend the CAC's special meeting on December 8 because he had been previously scheduled to travel to Salem to participate in an information meeting regarding House Bill 3337. He noted that the bill concerned the granting of access to commercial and industrial development lands in relation to existing ODOT policies.

## **2. Comments from the Audience**

Mr. Jacobson confirmed there were no members of the public who wished to offer comment or testimony.

## **3. Approve October 21, 2010 Minutes**

Ms. Smith offered corrections to the minutes and asked that her comments regarding CAC member reappointments be revised to indicate that such reappointments represented an opportunity to involve the public in CAC processes rather than a liability.

Ms. Mulder offered a proofreading correction to the minutes.

Mr. Winter offered corrections to the minutes and asked that his comment regarding "the implementation of additional bus lines" be revised to read, "the implementation of additional feeder bus lines."

Ms. Alldredge offered a correction to the minutes and asked that her contribution to the member updates portion of the meeting be revised to indicate that she had not actually attended the meeting of the Springfield TSP Stakeholder Advisory Group.

Mr. Reesor, responding to a request for clarification from Mr. Jacobson, explained that the Springfield TSP Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting to which Ms. Alldredge had referred to had actually been a meeting of the Springfield City transportation staff and consultant partners.

Mr. Jacobson offered a correction to the minutes and noted that Ms. Alldredge's Emerging Leader Award had been awarded jointly by the Labor Education Research Center, Labor Council of Lane County and the Eugene/Springfield Solidarity Network. Ms. Alldredge further noted that Tom Shackleford had received the Seasoned Leader Award and that Bob Bustle had received the Veteran Leader Award from those labor groups.

Mr. Jacobson offered a correction to the minutes and asked that a comment made by Ms. Strand regarding improvements to intersections along Main Street and Highway 126 be more directly attributed to her.

Mr. Jacobson, noting no objections from the CAC members, deemed the minutes of the October 21, 2010 MPO CAC meeting approved as corrected.

#### **4. Lane County Area Commission on Transportation (ACT)**

Mr. Jacobson noted Mr. Chickering had presented information at the CAC's October meeting regarding the Lane County Board of Commissioners' approval of the ACT bylaws and the compromises incorporated therein for the stakeholder representative membership.

Mr. Chickering reported the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) during their regular meeting had approved the charter for the Lane County ACT on November 9, 2010. He noted that he and his colleagues had been attempting to finalize the ACT charter for over five years.

Mr. Jacobson noted the ACT bylaws stated that all of the member jurisdictions would have a representative on the ACT. He further noted the CAC would be expected to select a representative and an alternate from among its members.

Ms. Mulder, seconded by Mr. Farrington, moved to recommend to the MPC that Dave Jacobson be appointed as the Central Lane MPO CAC representative to the Lane County Area Commission on Transportation.

Mr. Jacobson, responding to a question from Mr. Beers, stated that the ACT covered all areas within Lane County. Mr. Jacobson noted that the Lane County ACT was the only ACT that was made up of only one county.

Mr. Chickering further responded to Mr. Beers' question and briefly explained that Lane County had created as its own ACT because it was surrounded by other existing ACT's. He suggested that Lane County might have chosen to join one of the other pre-existing acts but that the member jurisdictions had ultimately chosen not to do so.

Mr. Chickering, responding to a question from Mr. Beers, stated that the ACT representatives would come from Lane County, every incorporated city within Lane County, the Lane Transit District (LTD), the Central Lane MPO, and other groups such as the CAC. He stated there would be about 15 allocated seats on the ACT with approximately eight to ten citizen members to supplement the membership.

Mr. Jacobson, responding to a question from Ms. Mulder, noted that the OTC supervisors would appoint an ACT member to serve as the representative for the area of Highway 126 east of Springfield as there were no incorporated cities in that area.

Mr. Winter volunteered to serve as the CAC's alternate member on the Lane County ACT.

Mr. Chickering, responding to a question from Mr. Adkins, believed that the specific duties for the CAC's representative and alternate to the ACT would be determined by the CAC itself. He further noted that the ACT's primary mode of decision making would be consensus-based.

Ms. Wiederhold, responding to a question from Mr. Chickering, recalled that the advice given to CAC members serving on other committees such as the ACT had been that they were generally expected to carry the interests of the CAC to those outside committees.

Mr. Jacobson responded to Ms. Wiederhold's comment and briefly discussed his own perceptions with regard to how he represented the MPO CAC both as a private citizen and as a member of other committees.

Ms. Mulder maintained one of the major interests of the MPO CAC members was to devote attention towards mass transit issues in the region. She further noted she was satisfied the Lane County ACT had similar priorities with respect to mass transit.

Mr. Jacobson noted from Andrea Riner's agenda item summary memorandum to the MPO CAC that several ACT work sessions would be conducted to more clearly define the roles and specific expectations for the ACT member representatives. He further noted that the ACT's specific communications strategies with respect to its member agencies would also be addressed during the initial work sessions.

Mr. Adkins hoped the MPO CAC representative on the ACT would share information with the CAC on the ACT's processes so that the other CAC members might be better informed regarding the ACT and its work plan. He further believed many areas of the ACT's work plan were relatively undefined.

Mr. Jacobson noted that MPC would have only one official representative on the Lane County ACT. Mr. Jacobson further believed his position as representative on the ACT would be adjunctive to the MPC representative.

Mr. Chickering stated that the MPC's representative on the Lane County ACT would be looked to as an expert on federal funding issues.

Ms. Payne briefly discussed the manner in which the MPC had interacted with Lane County on regional transportation matters previous to the creation of the Lane County ACT. She maintained that the ACT had been formed in an attempt to consolidate transportation interests from both the rural and metro areas of Lane County and to establish funding priorities for the entire region.

Mr. Jacobson noted from previous presentations by members of other ACT's that the Lane County ACT would be expected to take on a more regional point of view with respect to Lane County's transportation needs and also with respect to how those needs corresponded to the transportation issues throughout the State of Oregon.

Mr. Jacobson called for a vote on Ms. Mulder's previously stated motion. The motion passed unanimously, 14:0.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen, seconded by Mr. Gillespie, moved to recommend to the MPC that Ed Winter be appointed as the Central Lane MPO CAC alternate to the Lane County Area Commission on Transportation.

Ms. Mulder stated she also would be willing to serve as the alternate on the Lane County ACT.

Mr. Winter stated he would withdraw his offer to serve as the alternate based on Ms. Mulder's previous comment.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen, with the consent of the second Mr. Gillespie, withdrew her previously stated motion.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen, seconded by Mr. Gillespie, moved to recommend to the MPC that Eleanor Mulder be appointed as the Central Lane MPO CAC alternate to the Lane County Area Commission on Transportation. The motion passed unanimously, 14:0.

Ms. Marquez arrived to the meeting at 5:57 p.m.

Mr. Jacobson commented that Rob Zako had drafted a significant portion of the bylaws for the Lane County ACT based on the bylaws of other ACT's. He noted that Mr. Zako had been very helpful in finalizing the creation of the Lane County ACT.

## **5. Greenhouse Gas Planning - Part 3**

Ms. Payne briefly reviewed the previous greenhouse gas planning presentations and noted that the next presentation on this topic would concern greenhouse gas reduction strategies for the Central Lane MPO.

Ms. Payne described the methods by which the greenhouse gas emission inventories for the Central Lane MPO had been determined. She noted the inventories were considered to be a "systems inventory" which evaluated the greenhouse gas emissions related to the consumption of goods, services, transportation, and energy throughout the region.

Ms. Payne summarized the data from the "What is our community's carbon footprint?" information sheet included in her agenda item summary memorandum to the CAC members.

Ms. Payne commented it was extremely difficult to accurately determine the greenhouse gas emissions that resulted from materials (goods and food) production and consumption. She further noted that in the systems approach, the greenhouse gas emissions that resulted from energy consumption =used to heat homes, businesses and other buildings in the region were separately accounted for. Energy used in manufacturing of goods and food were a part of the "materials production and consumption" system.

Ms. Payne, responding to a question from Mr. Lockfeld, stated that there was a typo in the information sheet - the estimated greenhouse gas emissions for energy production and consumption for the Central Lane MPO was actually 0.3 million metric tons per year rather than the 1.3 million represented on the information sheet.

Mr. Jacobson asked Ms. Payne if the greenhouse gas emission data could be considered preliminary and if there might be further modifications to the modeling methodologies used to compute the emissions as further data became available. Ms. Payne responded that the data as developed and presented was intended to provide the CAC members with a context to discuss other transportation issues. No further refinements were planned as the current product provides the intended context with which to move forward to strategies.

Ms. Payne, responding to a comment from Mr. Winter, briefly discussed how the greenhouse gas emissions data had been split between the materials, energy and transportation areas.

Ms. Payne, responding to a question from Mr. Beers, discussed how the majority of the greenhouse gas emissions were the result of the various internal combustion methods used in materials, energy and transportation areas.

Mr. Lockfeld suggested that the greenhouse gas emissions data might include references to how carbon dioxide emissions had naturally occurred prior to modern industrial practices.

Ms. Payne responded to Mr. Lockfeld's comment and noted that much of the information contained in the greenhouse gas emissions data addressed the dramatic rate changes for greenhouse gas emissions caused by man-made energy production and consumption.

Ms. Mulder asked how the transition from a sector-based approach to a systems-based approach to determine the greenhouse gas emissions data had affected the staff's efforts to present the data in a manner that was accessible to the public. Ms. Payne responded that the switch had not been too difficult, but that within a sector, the impact of individual choices made by a person is hidden. The systems-based approach makes the impact of lifestyle choices more evident and more easily understood by the individual.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen commented she had shared the staff's greenhouse gas emissions data with other people and suggested that referring to the regional greenhouse gas emissions as CLMPO Greenhouse Gas Emissions might be confusing. She further suggested that additional information regarding the six greenhouse gases referenced in the data would be helpful.

The CAC members briefly discussed how information on other greenhouse gas emissions besides carbon dioxide might be discussed in the document.

Ms. Payne, responding to a question from Mr. Carroll, stated that staff had prepared the greenhouse gas emissions data at the request of the MPC but that no specific target public audience for the data had been identified.

Ms. Payne agreed that the greenhouse gas data as presented might be too detailed for use as a public outreach tool.

Ms. Payne, responding to a question from Mr. Jacobson, briefly discussed how the CAC members might use the greenhouse gas emissions data in their recommendations and discussions with the MPC. She further suggested that the MPO CAC members might use the data to illustrate to the community how individual and collective carbon footprints might be reduced.

The MPO CAC members and staff held a brief discussion of how the greenhouse gas emissions data might be used to influence local transportation discussions.

Ms. Smith asked if staff had considered overestimating elements of the greenhouse gas emissions data in the event that such data might be used in a future cap-and-trade energy consumption program. Ms. Payne responded that although staff had considered the possible ramifications of a cap-and-trade program, it had been decided that the inventory should represent as accurately as possible the current GHG emissions from the region..

Ms. Payne, responding to a question from Mr. Winter, stated that the State had tasked the Oregon Department of Transportation with determining the greenhouse gas emission target reduction levels for all MPOs. She noted that the target levels had not yet been definitively determined. Under the State rule, the levels are required to be representative of 1990, but may, due to lack of data, have to be estimated from 2005, the closest year for which data on vehicle miles travelled are available for all MPOs. Ms. Payne, responding to a question from Mr. Farrington, stated that the transportation portion of the greenhouse gas emissions data had not considered congested traffic speed as a contributing factor because at the time the available EPA emissions model used to convert travel data to GHG emissions had not yet incorporated traffic speed in its calculations. She noted that a newer emissions model released in February of 2010 does incorporate congested speed, and will be used when more detailed travel estimations are needed.

Mr. Carroll suggested that the greenhouse gas emissions data in its current form might be edited down in order to make it more accessible to the community. He further suggested that an additional, more detailed version of the data might be used in discussions with the MPC.

Mr. Jacobson noted that the MPC members had received the greenhouse gas data during their meeting from the previous week.

Mr. Lockfeld concurred with Mr. Carroll's suggestion and further suggested that larger, more succinct headlines might be used in each of the data sections as a more abridged version was created for the public.

The CAC members briefly discussed how the greenhouse gas data might be revised in order to be more accessible for the public.

Mr. Farrington asked how the greenhouse gas emission data corresponded to similar data currently being reviewed by the City of Eugene's Sustainability Commission. Ms. Payne responded that while staff had conferred with members of the Eugene's GHG planning task force, there was currently no plan at this time to directly integrate that group's work plan with that of the Central Lane MPO. She further noted that the greenhouse gas emission work plans of the other MPO's were expected to be similar to the one the Central Lane MPO would use. [The MPO focus is regional, while the City's focus is local, and the scale differences may result in different strategies and emphasis.]

Ms. Payne, responding to a question from Mr. Farrington, stated that the greenhouse gas emissions inventory data compiled by staff had not duplicated but complemented the efforts of the City's Sustainability Commission.

Mr. Jacobson commented that although the greenhouse gas emissions inventory data was a preliminary and necessary component of a successful reduction strategy, it would also be important to consider ways to actively remove carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions directly from of the atmosphere.

Paul Thompson arrived to the meeting at 6:32 p.m.

### **Break**

Mr. Jacobson called for a break at 6:32 p.m. and then reconvened the meeting at 6:39 p.m.

## **6. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Project List Review**

Mr. Thompson apologized for the smaller font size that had inadvertently been used for the RTP project list included with the agenda item summary memorandum. He noted that more legible versions of the list are available on request or online.

Mr. Thompson provided background information and an update on the RTP project list review. He noted that the MPO is required under federal regulations to update the project list every four years. He noted that the update process often resulted in significant changes to the project list. Mr. Thompson further noted that the periodic updates to the RTP are required to maintain a 20-year horizon with respect to the planning goals of the RTP itself. He explained that the project perspectives and the funding availability for the RTP were generally expected to change over the 20-year period.

Mr. Thompson noted that MPO staff had worked with the various member jurisdictions to discuss the current adopted project list for the RTP and also to discuss what additions, deletions or changes to the project list might need to be made.

Mr. Thompson noted that for the most recent update the MPC had directed staff in August of 2010 to review every item on the RTP project list to determine if they were each necessary, viable, and appropriate.

Mr. Chickering noted that the August MPC discussions regarding ODOT's I-5/Coburg interchange project had been somewhat controversial. He noted that members of the MPC had agreed to vote for the approval of the MTIP in exchange for an MPC driven review of each item on the project list.

Mr. Thompson commented that although members of the MPC had advocated for the removal of the I-5/Coburg Interchange project, staff had responded that removal from the RTP was not immediately possible since the federal regulations governing the RTP stated that it must show all of the planned and anticipated capital transportation investments expected to be needed to serve transportation needs for the 20-year horizon period. He further noted that the I-5/Coburg Interchange project already had been adopted in the City of Coburg's TSP and the Coburg Interchange Area Management Plan (IAMP). He summarized that the project could not be removed from the RTP without local and state action on those plans (the Coburg TSP and IAMP) since the need for it had already been demonstrated and formally adopted.

Mr. Thompson reported the MPC had formed a subcommittee to recommend a review process for the entire RTP project list. He noted that Attachment 1 to the agenda item summary memorandum described the process that had been determined by the subcommittee. Mr. Thompson briefly summarized the review process developed by the RTP Project Subcommittee for the benefit of the CAC members.

Mr. Thompson stated that MPO staff had requested at the MPC meeting on November 4, 2010 that the MPC members review the project list and select by the December 9 MPC meeting those projects they wanted further information on. He further stated that MPO staff then planned to respond to the MPC members' requests in January of 2011 and that by February of 2011 the MPC and MPO staff would finalize a list of RTP projects that warranted more extensive discussion and review.

Mr. Thompson stated that MPO staff did not intend to extensively review every item on the RTP project but rather intended to review and collect information regarding those individual projects the MPC members were concerned about.

Mr. Thompson stated that MPC members would need to articulate their various reservations regarding specific RTP projects so that they might be discussed and reviewed in a productive and open fashion.

Mr. Gillespie asked if the MPC members' individual concerns might create the possibility that certain projects might be removed from the RTP. Mr. Thompson responded in the affirmative but again noted that there were certain projects such as the I-5/Coburg Interchange project that could not be immediately removed from the RTP due to other factors such as the need for local actions first.

Mr. Thompson, responding to a question from Mr. Farrington, confirmed that the MPC members' concerns might create the possibility of new projects being added to the RTP.

Mr. Farrington referred to the staff's intent to identify those existing RTP projects for which the CAC required additional information and further asked how various urban standards would be considered with respect to the various RTP projects. Mr. Thompson answered that each project description needed to be detailed enough to allow for accurate representation of the project in the MPO's transportation and air quality models.

The CAC members and staff briefly discussed various projects on the RTP project list and whether or not those projects might have areas of concern for the MPC.

Mr. Thompson, responding to a question from Mr. Winter, described how items on the RTP project list had and had not been prioritized. He noted that the roadway, bike and transit lists are separated into constrained and illustrative categories. He further noted that funding mechanisms for the projects in the illustrative category had not yet been identified.

Mr. Thompson, responding to a question from Mr. Winter, briefly explained the collector and arterial road classifications as used on the RTP project list.

Mr. Thompson, responding to a question from Mr. Beers, described the nodal development planning project listed on the constrained project list. Mr. Gillespie commented that the recent CAC field trip had stopped at Walnut Station and that the station was an example of nodal development. Mr. Thompson further explained that nodal development projects emphasized a greater focus on the land use aspects of transportation investments.

Mr. Gillespie stated that the Crescent Village was also an example of nodal development.

Mr. Thompson, responding to a question from Ms. Mulder, explained how various population forecasts had affected the development of the Coburg/I-5 Interchange project. He reported that the more recent population forecasts anticipated greater levels of population growth in the area than had initially been shown when the project was first developed.

Mr. Thompson, responding to a question from Ms. Smith, explained that numbers for each of the RTP projects did not indicate the length of time a project had been on the list. He stated that the RTP numbers are intended as “unique identifiers” as well as a geographic reference for staff.

Mr. Thompson, responding to a question from Mr. Jacobson, explained how the individual MPC members would review certain projects and identify those which had areas of concern to them. Mr. Thompson further noted that the MPC intended to complete its current discussion regarding the RTP projects by February of 2011.

Mr. Thompson stated that the MPO staff intended to identify those existing projects for which the CAC required further information in a manner similar to MPC's identification of such projects.

Mr. Thompson briefly discussed the manner in which an MPO CAC member might identify any projects of concern and also discussed the manner in which he and other MPO staff would respond.

Mr. Thompson indicated that staff might also request the CAC's input on those projects identified by the MPC.

Mr. Chickering, responding to a question from Mr. Farrington, stated that the Beltline Highway Study listed on the RTP as No. 312 was unrelated to the Beltline Highway projects listed as Nos. 506 and 555. Mr. Chickering added that Project No. 555, the Beltline Highway D-STIP Development Work, actually represented the NEPA process that ODOT would engage in following the current work on the Beltline Highway.

Mr. Chickering stated that Project No. 505 to improve capacity across Willamette had been revised to an estimated cost of approximately \$60 million. He noted that the capacity improvements for that item were construction projects to be initiated upon completion of the Beltline study.

Mr. Chickering, responding to a question from Mr. Farrington, stated that Project No. 312, the Beltline study from Roosevelt Boulevard to West 11th Avenue, was a remnant from the cancellation of the WEP.

Mr. Thompson responded to Mr. Chickering's previous comment and noted that transportation studies are not required to be listed in the RTP under the federal rules. He added that the transportation studies are listed because of their size or for information purposes.

Mr. Adkins suggested that he might need further information on all of the RTP projects in order to sufficiently understand them. He suggested that the RTP project information might need to use some sort of formula to demonstrate how each project might affect levels of greenhouse gas emissions or vehicle miles traveled.

Mr. Thompson responded to Mr. Adkins comment and stated that the plan-level assessment that was required for the RTP used alternate performance measures to demonstrate the benefits of the plan as a whole every five years. He noted that in the first five year reporting period the RTP had exceeded all of the performance measure benchmarks with the exception of the land-use focused measures related to residential and employment growth in nodes.

Mr. Thompson further discussed the alternate performance measures used in the RTP project list and noted that the 2001 Transplan had been comprised of the federal RTP and the Eugene and Springfield TSP's.

Mr. Thompson stated that there were currently no federal requirements for the performance measures that had been previously been incorporated into the joint RTP/TSP project list.

Mr. Chickering responded to Mr. Thompson's previous comments and commented that performance measures were addressed at the plan level rather than the individual project level because it was very difficult, in relation to the 20-year time frame of the RTP, to determine the specific effects of individual projects on elements such as greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles traveled.

Ms. Butler-Boyesen maintained that RTP projects related to specific safety concerns did not appear to be highlighted. She noted that such projects were of significant interest to the CAC and hoped that there might be a way to delineate those projects in the RTP more specifically.

Mr. Thompson responded to Ms. Butler-Boyesen's comment and agreed that staff could do a better job in highlighting the different safety investments within the RTP. He believed that many projects related to different transportation safety elements had not been incorporated into the RTP since they were not considered capital investments. Mr. Thompson believed that the majority of safety projects did not rise to the level of capital investment necessary for their inclusion into the RTP. He also believed that many of the capital projects that are included in the RTP have safety elements that are not adequately described in the project descriptions since the safety element may not be the primary reason for the project. Mr. Chickering added that such projects also needed to be proven to be regionally significant for their inclusion into the RTP.

The CAC members and staff briefly discussed the manner in which safety projects and transportation improvement projects related to safety might or might not be incorporated into the RTP project list.

Mr. Jacobson commented on the level of discussion between the staff and the CAC members and believed that the previous iterations of the CAC had not been able to discuss the matter as thoughtfully and carefully.

Mr. Thompson stated that any CAC members with further questions regarding the RTP project list were welcome to contact him for further information.

## **7. Updates**

Mr. Jacobson noted the MPC had accepted the MPO CAC's annual review of the Central Lane MPO public participation plan (PPP). He further noted that the MPC had also accepted the recommended reappointments of the CAC members.

Mr. Gillespie noted that the City of Eugene's TSP subcommittee had sent out a notice of proposed meeting times. Mr. Yeiter stated that many members of that subcommittee had indicated that there were only available to meet during the day.

Mr. Jacobson commented on the CAC's election of officers that had been scheduled for the December CAC meeting agenda. He maintained that the MPO CAC as an advisory group had matured greatly since its inception. He noted that his term as chair of the CAC would expire in January of 2011 and that the CAC's recommendations for officer appointments would also be presented to the MPC in January.

Ms. Wiederhold reminded Mr. Jacobson and noted that the MPC did not appoint officers to the CAC and that the CAC was empowered to elect and appoint its own officers.

Mr. Jacobson briefly discussed the time commitments for the CAC members and elected officers. He asked that any CAC members interested in serving in an officer position come to the December CAC meeting prepared to speak regarding their intentions.

Mr. Jacobson commented on the basic work processes of the CAC and discussed how those members appointed to the CAC officer positions would be expected to consider the inclusive and long-range transportation goals of the Committee.

Mr. Jacobson maintained that it would be easier for those CAC members with more free time available to serve as officers.

## **8. Wrap-Up**

Mr. Jacobson, responding to a question from Mr. Lockfeld, stated that opponents of the West Eugene EmX Extension project would be welcome to attend the CAC's special meeting on December 8 although no action would be taken at that meeting and no public comments would be heard. He further noted that those invited would be welcome to submit their comments at the CAC's regular meeting on December 16.

Mr. Jacobson adjourned the meeting at 7:31 p.m.

*(Recorded by Wade Hicks)*