M I N U T E S

Lane Area Commission on Transportation
McLane Room—Oregon Department of Transportation, Area 5—644 A Street
Springfield, Oregon

December 9, 2015
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: George Grier, Other Stakeholder, ***Chair***
Sid Leiken (Lane County), ***Vice Chair***
Ray Smith, Coburg
Tom Munroe, Cottage Grove
Dave Stram, Creswell
Maurice Sanders, Dunes City (via teleconference)
Claire Syrett, Eugene
Mike Miller, Florence
Steve Paulson, Lowell
Jim Coey, Oakridge
Hilary Wylie, Springfield
Tim Brooker, Veneta
Chief Warren Brainard, Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians
Ron Caputo, Port of Siuslaw
Don Nordin, Lane Transit District
David Reesor for Frannie Brindle, Oregon Department of Transportation
Paul Thompson, Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)
Jeff Paschall, Lane County Roads Advisory Committee
Charles Tannenbaum, Highway 26 East
Scott Parkinson, Rail Designated Stakeholder
Holly McRae, Bicycle and Pedestrian Designated Stakeholder
Rob Zako, Environmental Lane Use Designated Stakeholder
Eugene Organ, Other Stakeholder
Shelly Humble, Other Stakeholder

ABSENT: Junction City, Westfir, Lane County Roads Advisory Committee, Trucking Designated Stakeholder (position vacant); Ryan Papé, Shelley Humble, Jennifer Jordan, Other Stakeholders.

OTHERS: Jae Pudewell, Jeff Lang, Oregon Department of Transportation; Becky Taylor, Lane County; Erin Reynolds, City of Florence, Ric Ingham, City of Veneta, Michelle Amberg, Creswell, Nancy Rickard, Port of Siuslaw, Rob Inerfeld, City of Eugene; Tom Boyatt, Emma Newman, City of Springfield; Paula Taylor, Denise Walters, Lane Council of Governments; A. J. Jackson, Tom Schwetz, Theresa Brand, Lane Transit District.

1. CALL TO ORDER/WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Grier called the meeting of the Lane Area Commission on Transportation (LaneACT) to order and welcomed participants. Those present introduced themselves.

Mr. Grier announced some letters of support for projects had not been received in time to include in the

agenda packets and those were being distributed by staff at the meeting. Packets of support letters for the following projects were distributed: Lane County - Territorial Road; City of Springfield - Filling in the Gaps Safe Walking Routes to Schools and Moe Mountain Path; City of Veneta - Veneta/Elmira Multi-Use Pathway; and City of Florence - Hwy 101/OR 126 to Siuslaw Valley Bridge. He said the letters should be considered public testimony and asked members to review them prior to the public hearing.

Mr. Grier said a quorum was present and noted that although both primary and alternate representatives for several of the ACT member jurisdictions were present, only the primaries would be voting during the meeting.

2. REVIEW OF AGENDA

Mr. Grier briefly reviewed the agenda. There were no changes.

3. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Approve Minutes (October 14, 2015)

Consensus: The minutes of the October 14, 2015 meeting were approved as submitted.

4. COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

There were no comments from the audience.

5. NOMINATING COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. Reesor thanked members who had volunteered to be on the Nominating Committee which developed a list of attributes, roles and responsibilities for the chair and vice chair, contacted potential candidates, and developed a recommendation for action at the ACT's December meeting. He said the committee's recommendation for 2016 officers, with the intent of balancing urban and rural interests within the area, was:

Chair - Sid Leiken, Lane County
Vice Chair - Tim Brooker, City of Veneta

Ms. Wylie, a Nominating Committee member, said the committee spoke to a number of potential candidates and she was pleased with the recommended slate of candidates.

Mr. Zako and Mr. Smith arrived at 5:40 p.m.

Consensus: The slate of candidates for 2016 LaneACT officers was approved as presented by the Nominating committee.

Mr. Grier thanked the Nominating Committee for their efforts and Mr. Leiken and Mr. Brooker for their willingness to serve.

6. STAKEHOLDER RECRUITMENT PROCESS

Ms. Taylor said that Bill McCoy, who had been Trucking Designated Stakeholder since the ACT's inception had resigned, leaving that position vacant. She described the three options available for filling a

mid-term vacancy: 1) leave the position vacant if there is less than one year remaining in the term; 2) if the vacancy occurs within the first two years of a term, fill the vacancy by appointing a qualified applicant who submitted an application during the most recent recruitment; or, 3) select an alternative approach based on commission consensus. She said in addition to the current vacancy, the Bylaws permitted the ACT to appoint another at-large stakeholder position. She asked for direction to staff regarding whether to pursue the formal recruitment process used when there were multiple vacancies to fill or a modified process that would establish a recruitment period during which ACT members were asked to reach out within their communities to identify individuals who could represent trucking and freight and compliment the ACT's role.

Mr. Parkinson felt it was important to fill the designated trucking position and preferred to focus recruitment on that position rather than expanding to include another at-large stakeholder position.

In response to a question from Mr. Zako, Ms. Taylor said the next regular recruitment period would occur in June 2017 when several ACT members' terms expired, then again in 2019 when other terms expired.

Mr. Grier felt it was in the ACT's best interests to fill the Trucking Designated Stakeholder position as soon as possible. Mr. Zako agreed that a more focused recruitment process to fill the vacancy was preferable.

Mr. Thompson said in addition to outreach by ACT members, at least a 30-day open recruitment period was required to give interested parties an opportunity to submit applications. Recruitment notifications would be done through the ACT's website and distribution lists.

Mr. Grier suggested a cutoff date of January 15, 2016, for the recruitment period, which would give the Steering Committee an opportunity to review applications and the ACT to make its selection to fill the vacancy at its February 2016 meeting. He clarified that only the Trucking Designated Stakeholder position would be filled.

Mr. Reesor suggested that agenda items #7 and #8 be reversed in order to give ACT members additional time to review letters of support.

Mr. Grier determined there were no objections to changing the order of the agenda as suggested.

8. GOVERNOR'S TRANSPORTATION VISION PANEL

Mr. Reesor said the Governor's Transportation Vision Panel (GTVP) purpose and assigned tasks were described in the agenda materials. The panel would be holding a series of information forums around the state. The Lane County Regional Forum was scheduled for January 13, the date of the ACT's next meeting. He said the ACT January meeting had been canceled and encouraged ACT members to attend the GTVP forum in lieu of the ACT meeting to provide input on key transportation issues facing the area. He said the forum would be held at the University of Oregon Ford Alumni Center on January 13 from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. and elected and appointed officials from Lane County had also been invited to attend.

Mr. Reesor said the panel, established in 2014, was charged with assessing major challenges facing Oregon's transportation system, develop a vision for what that system should look like in the next 30 years, and create a set of recommended actions for 2016 through 2020 that could lay the groundwork for that vision. The objective of the forum was to present preliminary recommendations to attendees and elicit feedback on regional needs and obtain stakeholder input.

Mr. Grier urged ACT members to attend the forum.

7. PUBLIC HEARING: STIP ENHANCE NON-HIGHWAY APPLICATIONS

Mr. Reesor said during the ACT's October 2015 meeting it reviewed and ranked pre-proposals for STIP Enhance Non-Highway projects. Since that time Lane County's Territorial Complete Design project had been withdrawn from the Enhance Non-Highway application process because ODOT had added it to the STIP Leveraged Program where it was a better fit. He said the project would now go through the same review and ranking process for the Leveraged Program. He said the ACT would be reviewing and ranking the following proposals:

- Veneta: Veneta-Elmira Multi-Use Pathway
- Springfield: Moe Mountain Path
- Springfield: Filling the Gaps
- Florence: US 101 Multi-Modal Improvements
- Eugene: Roosevelt Path
- Eugene: Rivers to Ridges

Mr. Leiken said that Lane County was aware of the Territorial Highway projects switch from the STIP Enhance Non-Highway category to the STIP Leveraged Program and agreed with the change. He felt it was an excellent opportunity for Territorial Highway improvements and the project was appropriate for the Leveraged Program. Mr. Reesor added that testimony on the Territorial Highway project would still be accepted during the public hearing.

Mr. Grier opened the public hearing and called for testimony.

State Senator Floyd Prozanski, District 4, voiced support for the Veneta-Elmira Multi-Use Pathway project. He said it was important to assure safe bicycle routes to schools. As a cyclist he had ridden in the area and an independent path for pedestrians and bicycles would them off of a highly traveled stretch of highway with fast vehicular travel. He said the schools served both communities and a multi-use path would benefit students as well as other residents. He thanked the ACT for its consideration of the Territorial Highway project and hoped it would support the project's application for alternate funding.

State Representative Paul Holvey, District 8, said he was pleased to see the ACT in operation. He spoke in support of the Veneta-Elmira Multi-Use Pathway. He was concerned about children's safe access to schools and Veneta and Elmira were sister communities and it was often difficult for them to get their needs addressed. He said the pathway would provide safe access to schools for students from both communities.

Mayor Sandra Larson, City of Veneta, thanked the ACT for considering the City's Veneta-Elmira Multi-Use Pathway application and considering all of the letters of support. She said the pathway would be entirely in unincorporated Lane County. She said Veneta submitted the application in the interests of public safety, public health and rural livability. Three of the four schools that Veneta students attended were in Elmira and a safe walking and biking route to school was critical. In addition to safety, the project would also promote healthy and active living and provide benefits to both communities.

Ron Caputo, Port of Siuslaw, spoke in support of the US 101 Multi-Modal Improvements project. As a resident of Florence he said the highway intersected the community and was used by multiple transportation modes: cars, buses, trucks and bicycles coming from the north, south and east into the Highway 101 corridor. Florence needed to safely move traffic, pedestrians and bicyclists from a four-lane

highway across a two-lane bridge to the other side of the community. The project would provide a number of safety improvements, promote economic development and benefit the City of Florence.

Mr. Grier determined there was no one else wishing to speak and closed the public hearing.

9. STIP ENHANCE NON-HIGHWAY APPLICATION RANKING

Mr. Grier said the task before the ACT was to develop an absolute priority for the projects. He said the process would be challenging and he was not certain there would be 100 percent consensus on a ranking and asked if members would prefer to use an 80 percent consensus or identify another approach to the ranking process. He reminded the ACT that the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) had ranked projects within the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) boundaries and the ACT protocols required that ranking be preserved. He said non-MPO projects could be ranked above, below or interspersed with MPO projects as long as the priority order of MPO projects was not changed.

Mr. Zako suggested that the ACT focus its attention on the non-MPO Florence and Veneta projects, how they ranked and where they would fit among the MPO projects.

Mr. Grier said the ACT was charged with developing a 150 percent funding list. Based on historical allocations, the 150 percent funding target was $3.4 to $4.8 million. After withdrawal of the Territorial Highway project, the remaining projects totaled $4.8 million and the ACT did not need to leave any projects off its 150 percent list to be forwarded to the SuperACT for consideration.

In response to a question from Ms. Syrett, Mr. Grier said it was unlikely that all projects on the ACT's 150 percent list would be funded. The benefit of having an absolute ranking was to assist the ACT chair in negotiations during the SuperACT process. Mr. Reesor said Region 2 was guaranteed $9.2 million but no area within the region was guaranteed a specific amount. Developing a list of projects for funding at the SuperACT level would require negotiations among Region 2 ACTs and the LaneACT's ranking would help inform the LaneACT chair during that process.

Mr. Thompson said the SuperACT would also be prioritizing to the 150 percent target level. He said the funding estimates were based on the Oregon Transportation Commission's assumption of a reduction in federal funding, but the new federal transportation bill actually increased funding levels. He recommended that the ACT aim for the high end of the 150 percent target and put as many projects forward as possible.

Ms. Wylie suggested ranking the Roosevelt Path, Filling the Gaps, US 101 Multi-Modal Improvements and Veneta-Elmira Multi-Use Pathway as the top four projects, which would total about $2.8 million. The Rivers to Ridges and Moe Mountain Path projects could follow those. She agreed that it was important to prioritize all of the projects in the event that more funding than anticipated became available or other projects were withdrawn.

Consensus: STIP Enhance Non-Highway projects would be ranked 1 through 6 by the LaneACT.

Mr. Grier reviewed the criteria against which projects would be evaluated and funding decisions made.

Mr. Thompson said the MPO had prioritized the four MPO projects as follows: 1) Eugene: Roosevelt Path, 2) Springfield: Filling the Gaps, 3) Eugene: Rivers to Ridges, and 4) Springfield: Moe Mountain Path. He reiterated that ACT protocols required that the four MPO projects remain in that order and the two non-MPO projects could be interspersed anywhere among them.

Mr. Grier invited ACT members to discuss the ranking of all four projects.

Ms. Wylie ranked projects as follows: 1) Eugene: Roosevelt Path, 2) Springfield: Filling the Gaps, 3) Florence: US 101 Multi-Modal Improvement, 4) Veneta: Veneta-Elmira Multi-Use Path, 5) Eugene: Rivers to Ridges, and 6) Springfield: Moe Mountain.

Mr. Zako proposed retaining the ranking of the top four projects from the ACT's October meeting, followed by the Eugene: Rivers to Ridges project and the Springfield: Moe Mountain Path project.

Ms. Syrett concurred with Ms. Wylie's rankings. She said the MPO ranked the Eugene: Roosevelt Path at its highest priority and she agreed it was a higher priority than the Eugene: Rivers to Ridges project.

Mr. Stram ranked the Florence: US 101 Multi-Modal Improvements project as the first priority and the Veneta: Veneta-Elmira Multi-Use Path as the second priority, followed by the MPO projects in the MPO's priority order.

Mr. Munroe concurred with Mr. Stram's ranking.

Mr. Leiken preferred a rural/urban/rural/urban order. He ranked projects as follows: 1) Florence: US 101 Multi-Modal Improvements, 2) Eugene: Roosevelt Path, 3) Veneta: Veneta-Elmira Multi-Use Path, and 4) Springfield: Filling the Gaps. He felt those four projects had an excellent chance of being funded. The ACT was responsible for representing both MPO and rural interests, but because the Florence project was the ACT's top priority he listed it at the top, followed by an urban project, the Veneta project, and then another urban project.

Ms. Wylie preferred to see the positions of the Veneta and Springfield projects in Mr. Leiken's ranking reversed, with Springfield in the third position and Veneta in the fourth position.

Mr. Coey agreed with Mr. Leiken's order of rural/urban/rural/urban projects.

Mr. Paulson ranked the Veneta project first and the Florence project second. He said historically urban projects had been funded and he hoped to see both rural projects funded.

Mr. Munroe agreed that the Florence and Veneta projects should be in the top three priorities.

Mr. Zako said if the top four projects were likely to be funded the ranking might not be so important, but if funds were tighter he suggested the following ranking: 1) Florence, 2) Eugene: Roosevelt Path, 3) Springfield: Filling the Gaps and 4) Veneta.

Mr. Thompson understood support for the Veneta project's benefit to children, but pointed out that the Springfield's Filling the Gaps would also do that by creating safe routes for many more children and schools with a less expensive project. It was equally qualified in that respect.

Ms. Syrett agreed that safe access to schools was important, which was why she supported Ms. Wylie's proposal. She said while the Springfield project was urban, it would benefit many children across the City of Springfield. A strong case was made for the Veneta project for the same reason and that was why she ranked those projects above the Florence project, which was also important but did not provide the same benefit.

Mr. Stram concurred with Ms. Syrett and Mr. Thompson. He said transportation of children was critically important and he ranked the Veneta project first and the Springfield: Filling the Gaps project as second and questioned why the MPO ranking could not be changed.

Mr. Grier reminded ACT members ultimately projects would be evaluated according to how well they addressed the funding criteria. MPO staff had carefully reviewed project applications and made their recommendations based on their technical expertise and experience with past funding processes. He said both the Florence and Veneta projects were strong and addressed ongoing concerns. The ACT would need to decide if they would meet the criteria when reviewed by ODOT staff.

Mr. Zako suggested focusing on the Veneta and Florence projects and determining which was the stronger project.

Mr. Smith agreed with Mr. Zako's suggestion to prioritize the Florence and Veneta projects, and then determine how they would be interspersed with MPO projects. He felt the third and fourth ranked MPO projects should be the final two projects on the ACT's 150 percent list.

Mr. Grier called for a show of hands to determine whether the Florence or Veneta project would be ranked highest. The results were:

Florence - 10
Veneta - 13

Mr. Caputo objected to ranking Veneta higher than Florence.

Mr. Coey pointed out that the Veneta project, as important as it was, did not meet the criteria for improving statewide transportation needs by improving the state's transportation system. Mr. Reesor said that Territorial Highway is indeed a state highway and thus, satisfies that criterion.

Mr. Thompson elaborated on Mr. Coey’s point. He said under the state highway classification system, Hwy 101 was the highest classification and Territorial Highway was the lowest. Additionally, the Florence project would leverage and coordinate with other ODOT work on Hwy 101.

Mr. Reesor, speaking as a voting ACT member, said good points regarding project leverage criteria had been raised. He said there were also criteria for modal attributes and public health and the Veneta project's primary purpose was to benefit school-age children, which were the most vulnerable users of the transportation system.

Mr. Brooker suggested placing the Veneta and Florence projects at the top of the list, followed by the MPO projects. He said both were good projects and meaningful to the ACT and should be at the top of the priority list.

Mr. Zako observed that the ACT did not actually control the awarding of funds and should give its negotiator, the ACT chair, the necessary ammunition to successfully negotiate for projects at the SuperACT by speaking to the project evaluation criteria. He asked what strategies had been successful in past negotiations.

Mr. Grier said that having a rural project as the first priority would be a compelling point.

Mr. Leiken said the federal transportation authorization would increase the amount of funding available for STIP projects, although negotiations at the SuperACT level would still be necessary. He agreed that listing a rural project first was a good negotiation strategy. He said that final funding decisions would be made by the OTC.

Mr. Grier said it was not a good idea to have the most expensive project on the cusp; it should be first. Based on the cost of projects, Veneta should be first, not last, with Springfield's Filling the Gaps last. He said from a bargaining perspective the Springfield project was a compelling and competitive project.

Mr. Grier asked ACT members to indicate if they could support the following ranking:

1. Veneta: Veneta-Elmira Multi-Use Path
2. Eugene: Roosevelt Path
3. Florence: US 101 Multi-Modal Improvements
4. Springfield: Filling the Gaps
5. Eugene: Rivers to Ridges
6. Springfield: Moe Mountain Path

Ms. Syrett said she had some concerns, but could support the ranking.

Ms. Wylie expressed concern that Springfield's Filling the Gaps project might not be funded if it was in fourth place.

Mr. Reesor explained the process by which projects are determined to be eligible, ranked within each area by the ACTs, then information from ACTs compiled by ACTs and forwarded to the SuperACT for Region 2 prioritizing at the 150 percent level. ODOT staff then would scope projects in conjunction with the applicant jurisdictions to determine as closely as possible actual project costs and feasibility, and that information would go back to the SuperACT, which would then narrow the list down to 100 percent through another round of negotiations.

Mr. Thompson said it was difficult for him to support placing Springfield's Filling the Gap in fourth place because it addressed the criteria and was a very cost effective project that served more children at a lower cost.

Mr. Zako proposed ranking the Filling the Gaps project at third and the Florence project as fourth. He felt it was likely the top three projects would be funded. He asked if the Florence project, which was well leveraged and on a top tier state highway and coordinated with ODOT project, would be competitive in negotiations or would it be preferable to leave the projects in the current order, leaving a less expensive project in fourth place.

Mr. Thompson viewed all six projects being forwarded to the SuperACT as the LaneACT's 150 percent list. He felt confident that the first four projects would be funded. Following the MPC's direction, he agreed with Mr. Zako's suggestion.

Mr. Grier pointed out that the first four projects totaled $2.7 million, which was close to the 100 percent funding target. He said the area would receive at least $2 million and wanted the three strongest projects at the top of the list, with Springfield's Filling the Gap in fourth place.

Mr. Stram agreed with Mr. Grier's suggested ranking.

Mr. Paulson asked why the MPO had ranked Eugene's Roosevelt Path project higher than Springfield's Filling the Gaps. Mr. Thompson said both were very strong projects, but there were advantages to the Roosevelt Path project because it filled a significant gap in a regional system and leveraged recent ODOT work. He said ODOT had emphasized in this round of STIP funding that it wanted to see less "horse trading" at the SuperACT and have the strongest projects move forward in the process, regardless of where they were located.

Mr. Grier called for a show of hands on the ranking he has proposed. The results were:

Supported the proposed ranking of the six projects: 21
Did not support the proposed ranking of the six projects: 2 (Ms. Wylie, Mr. Thompson)

Ms. Wylie proposed the following ranking:

1. Veneta: Veneta-Elmira Multi-Use Path
2. Eugene: Roosevelt Path
3. Springfield: Filling the Gaps
4. Florence: US 101 Multi-Modal Improvements
5. Eugene: Rivers to Ridges
6. Springfield: Moe Mountain Path

Mr. Grier called for a show of hands on Ms. Wylie's proposed ranking. The results were:

Supported Ms. Wylie's ranking: 14

Ms. Wylie and Mr. Thompson said they could support Mr. Grier's proposed ranking.

Consensus: Recommend the following 150 percent priority list to the SuperACT:

1. Veneta: Veneta-Elmira Multi-Use Path
2. Eugene: Roosevelt Path
3. Florence: US 101 Multi-Modal Improvements
4. Springfield: Filling the Gaps
5. Eugene: Rivers to Ridges
6. Springfield: Moe Mountain Path

Mr. Zako said he sensed that the ACT thought all of the top four projects met the funding criteria and collectively supported funding all of them. He said different priorities were represented among ACT members and while there were different opinions on the order of projects, members agreed they could support the list and it had a certain geographic balance.

Mr. Thompson stressed that the ACT supported all six projects and he felt it was likely that the first five projects could be funded. He said the MPO had initially placed the Moe Mountain project above the River to Ridges project, but when the expensive Territorial Highway project was withdrawn the Rivers to Ridges project was moved up because it could possibly fit within the 100 percent list if a higher level of funding was available; the Moe Mountain project was less likely to fit within that list.

10. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFO SHARING

Mr. Grier said ACT members would be receiving invitations to the GTVP Lane County Regional Forum and urged them to attend in lieu of a January 2016 ACT meeting.

Ms. Wylie commended Mr. Grier for his service as the LaneACT chair.

a. Chair Grier Report on November 19th Work Session with Oregon Transportation Commission

Mr. Grier reported that transportation funding was the main topic of discussion, particularly the legislature's deadlock over state funding and the dire condition of roads and bridges with no solution to improving infrastructure in sight. He said all interests needed to work together to develop a transportation funding package and the GTVP forum was a step in that process. He appreciated the opportunity to serve as the ACT's chair.

b. Legislative Update

Mr. Thompson said the new transportation legislation–the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act–was a fully-funded five-year bill. He said while it did not establish sustainable transportation funding in the future, it did provide stable funding for existing programs, in most cases with modest annual increases. He said performance measures had not changed and a new freight program to address freight movement throughout the country had been added, although most of its funding was targeted towards freight on the highway system. Another new program was alternative funding to states under a competitive grant program to demonstrate alternatives to the gas tax as a revenue source for transportation.

c. ODOT Update - *Connect*Oregon - how many applications received

Mr. Reesor announced that Ms. Brindle's duties had been expanded to include management of Area 4 in addition to management of Area 5. He expected that *Connect*Oregon applications come to the ACT at its March or April meeting for ranking.

Mr. Thompson said that *Connect*Oregon applications totaled $91 million in requests, which was about twice the available funding. He said five projects had been received from the LaneACT's area:

- Eugene: airport improvements - $550,000
- Junction City: 6th Street ADA improvements - $200,000
- Eugene: bike parking - $110,000
- Florence: Siuslaw Estuary Trail - $490,000
- Lane Transit District: new Santa Clara transit station and park and ride - $3.5 million

d. Sharing

Mr. Leiken announced that the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan had been released for public comment and the comment period would remain open through February 18th, 2016, with the OTC scheduled to adopt the plan in May 2016. He said the plan was a multi-modal approach to transportation. He said the price of oil was likely to remain low through 2018-19; it was essential to find an alternative source of funding for transportation as the gas tax was not sustainable.

Ms. Syrett announced that the Eugene City Council had adopted a Vision Zero policy for engineering and traffic enforcement. She said zero traffic fatalities was an aspirational goal, but she was receiving very positive feedback from the community.

Mr. Thompson announced that Denise Walters of LCOG would now be staffing the LaneACT on a permanent basis.

The next LaneACT meeting was scheduled for February 10, 2016.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)