

**OREGON TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

**Minutes of the Regular Monthly Meeting  
December 21, 2011  
Salem, Oregon**

On Wednesday, December 21, 2011, at 8:00 a.m., the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) and Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) staff held a pre-meeting briefing session and reviewed the agenda in the PUC Small Hearing Room, at the Public Utility Commission (PUC) Building, 550 Capitol Street NE, Salem, Oregon. Highlights of the pre-meeting were:

A review of the agenda.

•

Director Garrett discussed a list of projects for which ODOT has applied for funds under six federal funding programs.

•

Director Garrett discussed the directive agency heads had received from the State COO for a hiring freeze through March 1, and other limitations he had initiated for reduction in administrative expenditures.

•

Director Garrett discussed the recent three-part series in the Oregonian about state expenditures for communications and outreach activities, contracting priorities and travel policies, and assured the commission that these programs are scrutinized and run by top-notch professional staff.

• • •

The regular monthly meeting began at 9:00 a.m. in the Main Hearing Room.

Notice of these meetings was made by press release of local and statewide media circulation throughout the state. Those attending part or all of the meetings included:

Commission Chair Pat Egan  
Commissioner Dave Lohman  
Commissioner Mark Frohnmayr  
Commissioner Tammy Baney  
Commissioner Mary Olson  
Director Matthew Garrett  
Chief of Staff Joan Plank

Interim Rail Division Administrator Betsy Imholt  
Region 1 Manager Jason Tell  
Region 2 Manager Sonny Chickering  
Region 3 Manager Frank Reading  
Region 4 Manager Bob Bryant  
Region 5 Manager Monte Grove  
Interim Commission Assistant Jacque Carlisle

Central Services Deputy Director Clyde Saiki  
Interim Deputy Director of Operations Jerri Bohard  
Communication Div. Administrator Patrick Cooney

• • •

Chair Egan called the meeting to order at 9:11 a.m.



Director's report highlights were:

The Motor Carrier Transportation Division has reached a key milestone in its quest to save money for the Highway Fund. Early this month, it passed the \$10.5 million mark in payments that its customers have made using Direct Payment, which means savings of about \$250,000 that would otherwise have been spent on bank transaction fees had credit cards been used.

As of mid-December, a total of 848 Trucking Online users have signed up for Direct Payment and chosen that method for 9,564 online payments totaling over \$10.5 million. The Motor Carrier Division will continue to pursue this as a cost efficiency, and its goal is to make Direct Payment the preferred way to pay for online transactions, thus reducing bank fees and keeping taxpayer dollars in the Oregon Highway Fund for use on our roads and bridges.



On December 7, 2011, ODOT staff held a six-hour hearing specific to the Columbia River Crossing Project (CRC). ODOT's goal for the hearing was threefold: to inform a joint legislative oversight committee; to build confidence in the technical and public processes used to deliver the work to date; and to cement the need for the project by showing the statewide implications and impacts, and establishing a baseline understanding of the project.

Staff spoke about the history of the project, which started in 1999 with businesses going to Governor Kitzhaber and Governor Locke, saying the situation was disadvantaging their economy and their ability to conduct business, from not only a local and regional standpoint, but also from a statewide and global standpoint. That effort ultimately led to the locally preferred alternative that is the Columbia River Crossing Project.

A major milestone was reached the day of the hearing when the Federal Highway and Federal Transit Administrations signed the Record of Decision on the project, which shows that the legal, technical, and outreach aspects of the NEPA process have been followed. This moves the project out of the planning and environmental stage, and positions it to engage in preconstruction and financing discussions.



Public comment was received from:

Washington State Transportation Commission Vice-Chair Phillip Parker said he came down to watch the meeting and to meet the commission.



The commission received an informational overview of the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) from Office of Civil Rights Manager Michael Cobb. (*Background materials in Director/Commission/History Center File, Salem.*)

Michael Cobb discussed some of the programs in OCR's three major areas:

- Workforce Development - diversify the workforce through the apprentice program and supportive services
- Small Business Development – promote disadvantaged and emerging small businesses
- State and Local Agency Program Compliance - through Title VI of the Civil Rights Act

The Office of Civil Rights is responsible for diverse workers, small and minority businesses, access to programs, and ensuring antidiscrimination compliance. To these ends, Civil Rights will continue agency-wide integration, implement a new disparity study, continue monitoring usage of apprentices and small business firms, and continue exploring new and innovative ways to grow small business firms in Oregon.

In response to a question from Commissioner Baney, Michael Cobb explained what the apprenticeship, workforce training, and mentoring programs look like in the more rural parts of the state.

In response to a question from Chair Egan, Michael Cobb talked about outreach with the private sector and contractors in this community, particularly the work being done on the renovation of the Transportation Building and the Willamette Bridge construction project.



The commission considered approval of a request to amend the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) Policy 1F Revisions (Mobility Standards), addressing the recommendations of the Joint Subcommittee on the Transportation Planning Rule and OHP, and the requirements of Senate Bill 795 (2011 Legislative Session). The commission also considered approval of a request to adopt “Findings of Compliance with Statewide Planning Goals” for the OHP amendments. Planning Section Manager Erik Havig, and Principal Planner Michael Rock presented the requests. (*Background materials in Director/Commission/History Center File, Salem.*)

In April 2011, the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD), working with the OTC, formed a Joint Subcommittee on the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) and OHP in response to stakeholder concerns about TPR Section 0060 and OHP mobility standards. Commissioners Lohman and Olson served on this joint subcommittee along with three members of LCDC.

The joint subcommittee heard considerable testimony that the combination of TPR Section 0060 and OHP mobility standards is leading to unintended consequences, with two general themes frequently mentioned. One primary theme is that economic development, transportation, and land use objectives should be balanced better. Testimony indicated that the TPR and OHP in practice are giving precedence to transportation mobility. The other primary theme is that transportation requirements can make it more difficult to increase development intensities, especially within urban centers, which is contrary to statewide planning goals and many community objectives.

The 2011 Legislative Session also addressed the TPR and OHP through the passage of Senate Bill 795. This bill recognized the work of the joint subcommittee, and established timeline requirements to implement the subcommittee's recommendations. Senate Bill 795 requires the OTC to adopt changes to the OHP by January 1, 2012. The bill requires LCDC to adopt changes to the TPR by the same deadline.

ODOT staff considered input received during the joint subcommittee process and earlier stakeholder efforts to draft initial OHP Policy 1F revisions. Staff also provided draft materials to the TPR Rules Advisory Committee, appointed by LCDC, in an effort to coordinate the two work areas and collect broader input on the proposed OHP policy revisions. The OTC reviewed the draft revisions to OHP Policy 1F at its September 21, 2011, meeting and released the draft for public review and comment.

On December 9, 2011, LCDC approved and adopted changes to the TPR. These changes are substantial, and will change how we balance transportation and land use. One of the key changes helps developers and communities address economic development by dealing with mitigation differently. One of the sections now allows mitigation without doing highway infrastructure improvements. Other kinds of infrastructure improvements can be used as ways to mitigate, such as multimodal, transit, or bicycle/pedestrian. The other key change was the addition of three new sections to the TPR. The first section says that where we have an adopted and acknowledged Transportation System Plan and Comprehensive Plan, land use and zone changes don't need to go through the full TPR analysis if they are consistent with the two plans. The second section recognizes the importance of town centers and urban centers where density is critical to make sure there are good multimodal systems for transit, walking, and biking in downtown cores and centers. It creates an exemption area for mobility for multimodal, mixed-use areas (MMA). The third section adds a new exemption where local governments and communities can develop industrial land and job creation centers without doing all the transportation mitigation.

Michael Rock talked about updates to the Oregon Highway Plan. During the public review period, ODOT staff consulted with Area Commissions on Transportation (ACTs), OTC-appointed advisory committees, and other interested stakeholders through meetings, presentations and notification of public review information. The OTC also held a public hearing on November 16, 2011, to provide an additional opportunity for interested stakeholders to submit comments and to testify directly to the commission. The public comment period closed November 21, 2011, allowing staff to consider and

incorporate the feedback received and to prepare final policy revisions and supporting information for commission review and proposed action on December 21, 2011. This schedule is necessary for the commission and ODOT to meet the legislative deadlines established in SB 795.

Based on the comments received during the review period, staff made several changes to the draft policy:

- o added text clarifying that, while a lot of the changes are broadening policy considerations, we need to recognize that might have traffic impacts on the state highway system;
- o added text in several locations that better describes and defines the concept of mobility targets versus mobility standards;
- o added text that enhance current guidance documents to ensure coordination with jurisdictions that may be impacted by changes ODOT is working on that change mobility target expectations for an area;
- o changed policy to be consistent with the TPR;
- o new action 1F10 requires evaluation of impacts, success, and trouble spots from the revised policies;
- o raised Mobility Target Tables for areas inside urban growth boundaries.

Next steps include updating guidance documents, internal/external training and outreach, and legislative reporting required by Senate Bill 795.

Commissioner Lohman talked about some of the problems that occurred before the Transportation Planning Rule was put in place, problems faced today in terms of very expensive transportation projects. He said it might take another 20 years to know if the changes being made now will hit the right mark.

Commissioner Baney has concerns about unintended consequences and what it really means to have community understanding and collaboration. Elected officials will change over time, and agreements made with one official aren't guaranteed to carry over to another official. What conversations have taken place about capturing those agreements in writing about the potential unintended consequences with congestion increase, etc.? Erik Havig explained that the process is tailored for local government to adopt the terms as part of its comprehensive plan, and any changes or modifications to the plan would have to be brought back through the OTC for review and reassessment. Local government adopted documentation would state its expectations on how the community would grow and perform around transportation and economic development, that it has had the conversation about trade-offs, and that this is the direction local government chooses to go in partnership with ODOT.

Chair Egan said the opportunity to mitigate outside of the highway system has been mentioned and asked if there was an actual example or a hypothetical, and how that might play out. Erik said there wasn't an actual example, but a hypothetical would be a new development investing in transit, parallel routes, connecting roadways, or making connections for bicycles/pedestrians, instead of maxing out an individual intersection.

Those type investments might make moving around that community more effective, and be more efficient than trying to addresses all the impacts to a one location intersection, and intersections down the line that may have the same impacts.

Chair Egan asked how the changes would affect timeliness from the developer's standpoint. Erik Havig said it will take time to have conversations with all the communities to set expectations, but in the meantime, there will be opportunities to have discussions about specific changes, goals and objectives. In addition, the 2009 Legislature passed House Bill 3279 that linked to the Transportation Planning Rule, saying that if there was a good job creating opportunity, but the mobility issues could not be solved, there was another way to get there even if that broader conversation has not taken place. There are other tools to use dealing with land use changes, job creation, and economic development.

Commissioner Frohnmayer moved to approve adoption of the OHP 1F policy revisions (mobility standards) that address the recommendations of the Joint Subcommittee of the Transportation Planning Rule and OHP, and the requirements of Senate Bill 795. Commission members unanimously approved the motion.

Commissioner Olson moved to approve adoption of the Findings of Compliance with Oregon Statewide Planning Goals, and the staff report with the supporting information as its own findings, and supporting information for these planned amendments. Commission members unanimously approved the motion.



The commission received an informational presentation on the Forest Highway Program, including a summary of twelve projects recently approved for Forest Highway funding. (*Background materials in Director/Commission/History Center File, Salem.*)

Region 1 Manager Bob Bryant introduced Clara Conner and George Fekaris from the Federal Highway Administration, (FHWA), Western Federal Lands Division, and Jon Oshel from the Association of Oregon Counties (AOC). The Western Federal Lands (WFL) division of FHWA manages the Forest Highway Program. Highlights of the presentation on the Forest Highway Program were:

- WFL works on programs for Indian reservations, national parks, forests, and wildlife refuges in Montana, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, and Alaska.
- WFL provides stewardship and oversight, engineering services, transportation planning, and acts as a liaison between federal aid and the Federal Land Management Agency.
- The approximately 200 forest highways in Oregon cover 3800 miles of roadway.
- Oregon receives about \$20 million per year for the program, the largest forest highway program in the nation.
- Examples of programs in Oregon: Sunriver-Mt. Bachelor, Deschutes National Forest; Historic Columbia River Highway, Columbia Gorge National Scenic Area;

Agness-Illahe, Rogue Siskiyou National Forest; and U.S. 97 South Century Interchange, Deschutes National Forest.

- WFL recently completed a 20-year Transportation Coordination Plan that links three sources for long-range planning: The Oregon Transportation Plan, forest plans, and county comprehensive and transportation system plans.
- Of the 34 project proposals submitted in 2011, 11 projects were selected for programming at a cost of \$60 million.

The U.S. Senate, through Map-21, has renewed a portion of Highway Trust Funds for public lands. There are significant changes though, and it is still unclear where the U.S. House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee is on these programs. Currently, there are programs specifically for public agency-owned roads, such as the National Park Service, Park Road Program. The funding is only for federally-owned roads. In contrast, the Forest Highway Program was set up to access forest lands.

Congress is looking at combining the two programs in terms of the agencies that would be able to avail themselves of the funding. One program would be the Federal Lands Transportation Access Program, and the other is the Federal Lands Transportation Program, which would expand the Park Road Program to other federal agencies.

The Access Program would be an extension of the Forest Highway Program to recognize all other federal agencies within the state, such as the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, the Army Corps of Engineers, and any other agency within the boundaries of the State of Oregon.

Chair Egan thanked the group for the presentation and suggested it be taken to legislative transportation committees as it is an integral part of Oregon's funding mix.



The commission considered approval of a request to adopt Oregon Administrative Rule 734-051, as a temporary rule to implement the requirements of Senate Bill 264. The rule will take effect on January 1, 2012. (*Background materials in Director/Commission/History Center File, Salem.*)

Region 4 Manager Bob Bryant and Access Management Engineer Harold Lasley presented the request. Harold Lasley began the presentation with a brief history of access management, and an overview of Oregon statute ORS 374 – Control of Access to Public Highways. Highlights of the presentation were:

- The statute authorizes ODOT to adopt rules and standards to control access to highways, issue permits with terms and conditions to protect public investment, and control entry to/exit from highways.
- The statute protects and limits 'right of access' of abutting property with a right to reasonable access, an appeal process, and a right to apply for relief when approach is removed.
- Right of access was defined.

## ADVANCE COPY ~ SUBJECT TO REVISION

- Reasonable access was defined.
- Remedy and appeals process.

Senate Bill 1024 directed ODOT, in cooperation with stakeholders, to develop proposed legislation to codify, clarify and bring consistency to issuance of access permits based on objective standards, with specific provisions to establish less stringent standards for highways with annual average daily traffic below 5000 vehicles, to develop clean and objective permit standards, and to develop proposed legislation to place that work into statute.

As directed by Senate Bill 1024, an Access Management Stakeholder Committee was formed in July 2010 to assist ODOT in looking at the issues that were creating problems for the development community under the current rule. The committee focus was on five major areas: reasonable access; objective standards; change of use; non-traversable medians; and a regional review process.

Senate Bill 264 made sweeping and fundamental changes to the statutes governing control of access to state highways. The changes in statute require a major overhaul of the existing access management administrative rules. Given the short timeframe between the bill becoming law in June 2011 and the effective date of January 1, 2012, the department is implementing temporary rules at this time. Permanent rules must be in place by June 30, 2012. The department will use the next six months to work with stakeholders to clarify and improve areas of the temporary rules that are of concern to stakeholders and ODOT, and have been flagged for future work.

Public comment was received from:

Mark Whitlow, of Perkins Coie, spoke on behalf of the Regional Task Force and the International Council of Shopping Centers (ICSC). During his many years working access management, he recognized that the highway system is a precious asset that must be preserved. But also there was recognition of a deficit in attention to the needs of economic growth and development of properties on the highway. The balance between reasonable access and permitting has always been delicate and complicated. He thanked Director Garrett for recognizing the issue, and carrying the flag forward to try to achieve a better balance. Senate Bill 1024 is the vehicle to carry access management decision-making forward on some of the parking-lot issues. He requests further change to the temporary rule, Section 3020, for change of use application so it would relate to 'existing connections' to the highway, instead of the current 'existing legal approaches' to the highway, which robs the group of the benefit of the work it did coming up with the changed rules. Staff is working to identify how to change the language in the temporary rule, and he requests the changes could come back to the OTC for consideration next month. Chair Egan said the message had been received and flagged for the commission.

•

New Seasons Market Director for Development, and former Fred Meyer Real Estate Manager Don Forrest spoke from an applicant/retailer perspective. In today's economical climate, site selection is paramount in deciding where to invest money. He said Matt Garrett's outreach efforts have gone a long way toward changing the perception that Oregon is a difficult state to work with, and given the development community some clear and objective standards that encourage them to prioritize dollars in the State of Oregon. There is an opportunity in front of the commission and legislature to make some very substantial gains at this time, and he encourages the commission to use the oversight committee to bring forward those concepts.

Commissioner Lohman said we have to find a way to address unpermitted access points. This is an important issue for the state's economy, stability, and growth, and we have to take care not to go overboard and end up in a position where we can't fix problems because we don't have the money. The right balance is difficult.

Commissioner Baney asked what the process was to add language to temporary rules. DOJ attorney Bonnie Heitsch said once temporary rules are adopted, there is a 180-day period to adopt the permanent rules. Within that 180-day period, changes can be made to the temporary rules.

Commissioner Baney moved to approve the temporary rules. Commission members unanimously approved the motion.



The commission received the Oregon Rail Funding Task Force Report and Recommendations from Interim Rail Division Administrator Betsy Imholt. (*Background materials in Director/Commission/History Center File, Salem.*)

Betsy Imholt explained that the report is on a study that is the second step in a four-step process that started when the legislature allocated money to study the rail system in Oregon. It explains how the rail system is used in Oregon and its condition. The rail study showed several significant facts:

- 14 rail segments are identified as being at risk of abandonment
- 30 percent of Oregon's rail infrastructure has been lost since 1930
- 40 percent of the rail lines in Oregon can only operate at 10 miles per hour
- Freight demand is increasing, and will continue to increase by 80 percent between the year 2000 and the year 2030
- The infrastructure is deteriorating, and demand is increasing
- Funds for passenger rail from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) was the first, and only money ever made available for passenger rail.
- The total need assessed for passenger and freight rail is estimated between \$1.1 and \$3.5 billion.

Earlier this year the OTC created the Oregon Rail Funding Task Force to recommend a funding proposal for freight and passenger rail programs by December 31, 2011. Betsy

Imholt introduced the Task Force Co-Chairs, Port of Portland Director Bill Wyatt, and Allyn Ford from Roseburg Forest Products, and Cambridge System Data Technical Consultant Michael Fisher.

The task force held four meetings between April and November 2011 and developed three reports:

- Oregon Rail Needs and Potential Funding Sources Memo
- Oregon Potential Rail Funding Sources Technical Analysis
- Oregon Rail Funding Task Force Final Recommendation

Oregon's lack of dedicated, sustainable funding for rail investments is the number one challenge facing a viable rail system for both passenger and freight in Oregon. Without such funding, Oregon does not have revenue available for the required match for federal funds to improve passenger rail service, nor the substantial revenue to maintain or operate the infrastructure once built. Additionally, funds are needed to improve and expand the freight rail systems that are vital to Oregon businesses and the economy, and to reduce congestion, greenhouse gas emissions and highway maintenance costs.

Bill Wyatt discussed the final funding recommendations, which include five components: the creation of a special district, allocation of lottery proceeds, reallocation of railroad property taxes, a telephone access fee, and a rail investment tax credit. The task force estimates these sources will generate \$75-\$80 million annually for rail programs, and will encourage further private investment by freight railroad companies.

Allyn Ford spoke on his role representing rural parts of the state, and the issues facing these more freight orientated areas for which freight movement is critical to the survival of these rural communities. He stressed the need for immediate action now on the alternatives being presented, and the need for long-term commitment on the investments.

Michael Fisher discussed the analysis process used to develop the recommendations.

Commissioner Lohman said he hoped Bill and Allyn would continue with the task force and move it forward to the next step.

Commissioner Frohnmayer commented that he was impressed with the thoroughness of the options looked at across the board, and said it might be worth articulating an idealized package, and then a short-term, realistic short list of how to move forward on specific items in the very near term.

Commissioner Olson asked if there was any thought that the Class 1 lines would invest in the short lines, based on a tax credit concept in which the Class 1 lines get a tax credit, but the money has to be used on the short lines? Bill Wyatt said that question might better be asked of the major railroads, but said that following the post-deregulation period railroads took a hard look at their networks and made hard

judgments about where they could make money and where they couldn't, resulting in short lines. The Class 1 lines would more likely be interested in the welfare of a short line to a much greater extent if there is some kind of long-term and sustainable business opportunity there.

Commissioner Frohnmayer asked for more information on rail interchange facilities. Is there a sense of how much could be saved, in terms of road maintenance and how much freight could be shipped to the rails, if those facilities were in place? Betsy Imholt said the facilities are one piece of the equation, but getting deals among the companies to allow the moves, also needs to happen.

Public comments were received from:

Mike McCauley from the League of Oregon Cities (LOC) suggested the principle that resources not be taken from one government to be used by another government. The special district proposal in the recommendations will do just that. We need to adhere to a principal that says, yes we have problems, but we don't solve those problems by taking resources from one governmental unit, for a decision based on the priorities of another government unit.

•

Ann Hanus of the Association of Oregon Counties (AOC) said the AOC recognizes the significant and important role that freight plays. If we don't have the ability to move products to compete effectively, it will continue to have an adverse effect on counties. At the same time, AOC recognizes that there are no easy solutions, and hopes the report will contribute to the conversation with the NonHighway Transportation Funding Workgroup. As counties, AOC noted its concern about several of the different funding options. The creation of a special district will cause compression. Allocating railroad property taxes would hit county general funds, which would impact public safety funding, public health, other services, and also impact cities, schools, and other special districts. Lastly, she urged the OTC to refer the study to the NonHighway Transportation Workgroup.

•

Lana Butterfield, Executive Director of the Oregon Rail Users League, (ORULE), said ORULE has not taken a position yet. It will meet on February 22, 2012, to discuss the Rail Funding Task Force. However, it wanted to restate that rail does not have a permanent funding stream, but it is a vitally important part of Oregon's economic backbone.

Chair Egan closed the discussion by saying that we need to focus on articulating the benefits of making those investments over time.



The commission continued discussion of the 2012-2013 Oregon Transportation Commission Work Plan. (*Background materials in Director/Commission/History Center File, Salem.*)

Interim Deputy Director of Operations Jerri Bohard gave a brief history of the OTC Work Plan. In September 2011, the OTC received a status report on the 2010-2011 OTC Work Plan. In October 2011, the OTC heard presentations on future trends that could affect departments of transportation, and from the former PennDOT director about some of its initiatives around Pennsylvania's livability initiative and changes made due to financial constraints. Staff presented the financial issues facing the agency, as well as the conditions of a number of the state's transportation assets.

Based on that discussion, staff developed the draft 2012-2013 OTC Work Plan for the commission's November meeting. Area Commissions on Transportation (ACTs) and the ODOT Advisory Committee chair members who attended the meeting received a copy of the work plan for review and comments.

Jerri Bohard reviewed the three categories of the work plan: work plan items; monitoring items; and ongoing work. Highlights of the resulting discussion were:

- Clarification of the framework is needed. Some items may need to change categories.
- On the fiscal side, Les Brodie will bring fiscal information that will help frame where we are, help in outreach to constituents, and shape future discussions.
- Being able to articulate the benefits of a given project as it moves along, will help get future buy-in.
- There will be significant changes and adjustment in ODOT's way of doing business. How will this be captured to see if the intended results are achieved? How will these course corrections be monitored?
- How will the governor's principle regarding jurisdictional transfers play out?
- There are some elements of the transportation system that are super long range. If we don't proactively begin to address them in the short term, they become catastrophic problems by the time two decades pass.
- Page 13 addresses partner and stakeholder relationships. We need to continue to engage on a routine basis the ACTs and other local governments and business leaders.
- The ACTs need to be engaged more deeply than in the past.

Jerri Bohard said a draft of the work plan should be ready for the commission by January or February.

Chair Egan closed the discussion by setting a place holder relative to federal and state legislative action. As a planning matter, we need to anticipate what may come in March.



The commission considered approval of the Consent Calendar. (*Background materials in Director/Commission/History Center File, Salem.*)

1. Approve minutes from the November 16, 2011, meeting in Silverton.
2. Confirm the next two commission meeting dates:
  - Wednesday, January 25, 2012, in Keizer
  - Wednesday, February 15, 2011, in Salem
3. Adopt a resolution for authority to acquire real property by purchase, condemnation, agreement or donation.
4. Approve the following Oregon Administrative Rules:
  - a. Amendment of 731, division 35 relating to ConnectOregon grant and loan program.
  - b. Amendment of 731, divisions 146 through 149 relating to procurement.
  - c. Adoption of 734-005-0005 through 0015 relating to Oregon Coordinate Systems.
  - d. Amendment of 734-020-0005 and 0055 relating to adoption of 2009 Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).
  - e. Adoption of 734-026-0010 through 0045 relating to fallen public safety officer roadside memorial signs.
  - f. Repeal of 735-001-0030, 735-016-0080, 735-050-0090 and 735-064-0085 relating to removal of four obsolete or unnecessary DMV rules on various subjects.
  - g. Amendment of 735-030-0330 relating to low emission vehicle safety standards.
  - h. Amendment of 735-040-0030 relating to disabled veteran registration plates.
  - i. Amendment of 735-062-0005 through 735-070-0110 relating to Social Security Number requirements.
  - j. Amendment of 735, divisions 62, 74 and 76 relating to At-Risk Driver program.
  - k. Amendment of 735-064-0220 and 735-072-0035 updating conviction tables for driver offenses.
  - l. Amendment of 735-152-0000 to 0060 relating to vehicle dismantlers.
  - m. Amendment of 740-055-0010 relating to legibility of highway use tax reports.
  - n. Amendment of 740-100-0100 relating to maximum fine schedule for motor carriers.
5. Approve a request to cancel two Interstate Maintenance projects: Interstate 84: Rowena – U.S. 97 Interchange West and Interstate 84: Rowena – U.S. 97 Interchange (East Unit) from the 2010-2013 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).
6. Approve a request to amend the 2010-2013 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) to add the Interstate 84: Rowena Bluff Rockfall project, which was included in the 2008-2011 STIP as a developmental project. The majority of the

funding for construction is made up of savings from the Preliminary Engineering phase of the original project, with the difference to come from Region 4 Operations limitation. The estimated project cost is \$765,000.

7. Approve a request to amend the 2010-2013 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) to add the construction phase for the U.S. 101 Business: Lewis and Clark River Bridge project. The increase will be funded with a portion of the 2013 State Bridge Program. The estimated project cost is \$2,800,000.
8. Approve a request to amend the 2010-2013 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) to add the Oregon 99W: Newbury Street and Vermont Street Bridge Rehabilitation project. The increase will be funded with a portion of the 2013 State Bridge Program. The estimated cost of this project is \$5,513,000.
9. Approve a request to amend the 2010-2013 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) to change the scope for the U.S. 26: West Humbug Creek Bridge project from bridge "repair" to "replacement." The increase will be funded with a portion of the 2013 Bridge Program. The estimated cost of this project is \$2,507,000.

Commissioner Baney moved to approve the Consent Calendar. Commission members unanimously approved the motion.

• • •

Chair Egan adjourned the meeting at 2:20 p.m.

• • •

---

Pat Egan, Chair

---

Tammy Baney, Member

---

David Lohman, Member

---

Mark Frohnmayr, Member

---

Mary Olson, Member

---

Roxanne Van Hess, Commission Support