



Lane Area Commission on Transportation

2080 Laura Street; Springfield, OR 97477



# Meeting Agenda

July 10, 2024

5:30 – 7:30 PM

**This meeting will be conducted by videoconference only**  
(there is no in-person option)

**To join the meeting from your computer, tablet or smartphone:**  
<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/88646485216?pwd=RjJnVWtMNnFuK0pXQVp4dFBKeXl2Zz09>  
**To dial in using your phone:**  
+1 (669) 900-6833      Meeting ID: 886 4648 5216      Passcode: 525130

## Meeting highlights

- **Finalize talking points for upcoming meeting with the JCT**
- **Establish a committee to review the LaneACT Bylaws**

*Note: Times listed are approximate. Items may be considered at any time or in any order at the discretion of the Chair and members of the Commission, in order to conduct business efficiently. Individuals interested in a particular item are advised to arrive at the start of the meeting.*

- 1. Call to order** (welcome and introductions) **Quorum = 16** **5:30**
- 2. Joint Committee on Transportation – talking points** **5:35**  
**Action requested:** Agree on messaging for meeting with the Oregon Legislature Joint Committee on Transportation (JCT) on July 17.  
**Presenters:** Steering Committee – Shelly Clark, Keith Weiss, Vidal Francis.  
**Attachments:** Summary memo and other documents (page 3)
- 3. LaneACT Bylaws Committee – member recruitment** **7:15**  
**Action requested:** Identify members who are interested in serving on a committee to review and recommend revisions to the LaneACT Bylaws.  
**Presenter:** Shelly Clark – LaneACT Chair  
**Attachment:** Summary memo (page 24)

#### 4. Future meetings and topics

7:25

**Summary:** Refer to the list of future meetings and topics (attached).

**Presenter:** Bill Johnston – LaneACT staff

**Additional attachments** and other information (for information only)

- Future meetings and topics (page 25)
- LaneACT member roster (page 27)

#### Upcoming meetings

- July 17 (Wednesday) – Joint Committee on Transportation (JCT) meeting in Eugene
- **Summer recess – no LaneACT meeting in August**
- August 21 (Wednesday) – Steering Committee (9:00 – 10:00)
- September 11 (Wednesday) – LaneACT (5:30 – 7:30)

*Meeting materials are posted at [www.LaneACT.org](http://www.LaneACT.org) prior to each meeting. To be included on the email notification list, contact Anais Mathez at [anais.mathez@3j-consulting.com](mailto:anais.mathez@3j-consulting.com)*

*Mailing address: 2080 Laura St; Springfield, OR 97477*

## Agenda Item 2

# Joint Committee on Transportation – talking points

### **Presenters**

LaneACT Steering Committee – Shelly Clark, Keith Weiss, Vidal Francis

### **Action requested**

Agree on messaging for the upcoming meeting with the JCT.

### **Summary**

The LaneACT Chair and Vice Chair will be participating in a discussion with the Oregon Legislature Joint Committee on Transportation (JCT) when they meet in Eugene on July 17.

The LaneACT needs to finalize a list of talking points to guide the Chair and Vice Chair in their discussion.

At the previous meeting on June 12, the members discussed a draft list of talking points prepared by staff. Staff has revised the talking points based on the comments received.

Attached to this summary are the revised talking points. The topic headings are explained in a separate document. A summary of the comments from members is also included.

Also attached are example talking points and other messaging from the League of Oregon Cities (LOC), the Oregon MPO Consortium (OMPOC) and other interest groups.

It is not clear from the LaneACT Bylaws that talking points like this need to be formally approved by the members. If there is not a quorum of members present at the July 10 meeting, the Chair and Vice Chair will consider the discussion that occurs at the meeting, with whoever is present, to represent the opinions of the LaneACT as a whole.

### **Attachments**

- A. LaneACT talking points (revised) and supporting documents (8 pages) [PDF page 4]
- B. Examples from OMPOC, LOC and AOC (7 pages) [PDF page 12]
- C. Examples from OTA and Move Oregon Forward (5 pages) [PDF page 19]

## LaneACT talking points (revised)

Included in this attachment are the following documents:

1. **Talking points** (3 pages) – Incorporates changes suggested by the members at the previous meeting on June 12. Includes a few talking points from other organizations, and a few references to the LaneACT Area Strategies Report (2022).
2. **Topics** (2 pages) – In response to comments received at the previous meeting, staff has redefined the topic headings. This document explains the changes.
3. **Comments from members** (2 pages) – Summarizes comments from members who suggested refinements to the draft talking points discussed at the previous meeting.

## Talking points

The following is a revised version of the LaneACT talking points. It incorporates changes suggested by the members at the previous meeting on June 12. Refer to Attachment A.3

The topic headings have been redefined and reorganized as described in Attachment A.2. These topics are similar to the topics the League of Oregon Cities (LOC), the Oregon MPO Consortium (OMPOC) and other interest groups are using for their messaging. Refer to the documents included in Attachments B and C.

In addition to incorporating changes suggested by the members, LaneACT staff has also incorporated a few talking points from LOC and OMPOC. The members may or may not want to borrow additional ideas from these documents or other documents. LaneACT staff has also added a few references to the LaneACT Area Strategies Report (2022).

Note that these are talking points for the LaneACT Chair and Vice Chair to present verbally at the meeting. The LaneACT will not be providing any written documents to the JCT. It may not be appropriate to include too much detail. It is not necessary to duplicate every LOC or OMPOC comment. The LaneACT members may not fully agree with all their comments.

### 1. Maintenance and operations

- The LaneACT understands that funding is limited and agrees that highway maintenance agency operations <sup>1</sup> should be the top priority for the Legislature in developing a transportation funding bill for 2025.
- The public needs to be better educated on this topic. They need to understand why there is a funding deficit, the problems this is creating, and the options available to correct the situation. The public needs to be a partner in the solution. They won't support additional taxes and fees if they don't understand what a dire situation the state is in.
- The LaneACT suggests that the Legislature, the Governor, and influential individuals, engage with the public to explain that the current level of transportation funding is not adequate to meet the state's needs.
- This outreach effort should emphasize that providing more funding for ODOT maintenance and operations benefits local governments. The state and local systems are interrelated.

---

<sup>1</sup> Agency operations includes DMV, Weight Mile Stations, Safety Inspections, Contracting, and IT Functions.

## 2. Safety

- Safety is a priority for the LaneACT. The LaneACT Area Strategies Report (2022) identifies the following desired outcome (p.4): Transportation facilities and services are designed, managed, and maintained with the safety and security of users being paramount.
- The LaneACT agrees with others that, along with maintenance and operations, safety should be a top priority for the Legislature in developing a transportation funding bill for 2025.

## 3. Transition to road user fee

Road user fees are an alternative to the gas tax for generating revenues. Drivers are assessed a fee based on “vehicle miles traveled” (VMT). Advocates argue that road user fees more accurately (and equitably) reflect the actual impact of vehicles on the roads (wear and tear).

- There is not complete agreement among the LaneACT members that this is a good idea. Some members are concerned it could create a disincentive for people to buy electric vehicles.
- Some members support road user fees but they are concerned about how long this may take to implement. For the time being, they support increasing the gas tax to address the immediate funding challenges. The gas tax is imperfect but it’s the only (or at least most significant) source of funding we have.

## 4. Other revenue sources

The State Highway Fund is currently funded with revenue from fuel taxes (gasoline and diesel), motor carrier fees (weight-mile tax), and DMV fees (vehicle registration, title, and license fees).

- The LaneACT agrees with ODOT and others that the state needs a more diverse range of revenue sources to fund the transportation system.
- Additional sources of revenue that ODOT and others have suggested include:
  - Increasing the gas tax, motor carrier fees, and DMV fees
  - Road user fees (discussed in the previous section)
  - EV registration fees (either in addition to or instead of road user fees)
  - Allocating funds from the General Fund for ODOT maintenance and operations
- The LaneACT encourages the Legislature, with input from policy experts, to discuss and consider these and other sources of revenue to provide more stable funding for ODOT maintenance and operations.
- The LaneACT supports indexing all revenue sources to inflation.

- Revenues from the gas tax, motor carrier fees, and DMV fees are currently shared between ODOT (50%), counties (30%), and cities (20%). Some LaneACT members have expressed concerns about a proposal being advanced by some to change the distribution to provide a larger portion to ODOT. Lane County and the cities represented on the LaneACT are opposed to this proposal. They have maintenance and operation needs too.

#### **5. More funding for public transportation**

- The LaneACT encourages investment in all modes of transportation, to meet the needs of all users.
- The LaneACT agrees with others who support providing additional funding for public transportation. This could include additional funding provided by the Legislature to supplement the revenues generated by the payroll tax authorized in HB 2017.
- The LaneACT also encourages more funding for pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, especially facilities that serve (connect to) bus and transit stops.

#### **6. Finish projects funded in HB 2017**

- The LaneACT understands that additional funding is required to complete the projects that were identified and funded in HB 2017.
- Some LaneACT members have expressed concerns about directing more statewide funding to major projects in the Portland area. Other members recognize the need to eliminate the bottlenecks in Portland that adversely affect freight movement and other travel throughout the state. There is not a consensus on this topic.

#### **7. Seismic and climate change resiliency on key routes**

- The LaneACT encourages investment in the transportation system to ensure that major routes remain operational in aftermath of a catastrophic earthquake or tsunami. This is a desired outcome stated in the LaneACT Area Strategy Report (2022).
- The LaneACT Area Strategy Report also encourages investment to ensure that transportation facilities are designed to mitigate the impacts of climate change.

## Topics

The LaneACT topic headings have been revised to be consistent with the topics identified in a guidance document for developing a transportation funding package prepared by the JCT in February.<sup>1</sup> The previous version of the draft LaneACT talking points were organized around the goals for the statewide meetings described in a different JCT document.<sup>2</sup>

LaneACT staff recommends using topic headings that are consistent with the topics identified by the JCT. This will help the LaneACT Chair and Vice be better prepared to discuss the topics the JCT wants to discuss. This is the approach the League of Oregon Cities (LOC), the Oregon Consortium of MPOs (OMPOC), and other interest groups are using for their messaging. (Refer to Attachments B and C.)

Below are the topic headings LaneACT staff recommends. Some additional text is provided describing the topic and explaining the wording.

The revised LaneACT topics are similar to the topics the LOC and others are using to organize their talking points. They all deviated some from the wording used by the JCT. This is in part because the JCT topics are not clearly worded or defined.

The topics are listed in order of importance to the LaneACT, as perceived by staff. The members may or may not want to reorder the topics. It may not matter. The topics are somewhat independent of each other. The JCT may be interested in feedback on all the topics, without concern for priority.

### **1. Maintenance and operations**

The JCT clarifies (in the guidance document) that this includes maintaining roadways and operating the agency (ODOT). Agency operations includes DMV, Weight Mile Stations, Safety Inspections, Contracting, and IT Functions.

### **2. Safety**

The JCT clarifies that this includes all modes of transportation, including bike/ped/rolling, public transit, Safe Routes to School, and motor vehicles on streets.

---

<sup>1</sup> Draft document prepared by the Joint Committee on Transportation (JCT), released in February 2024, titled: "Multimodal Transportation Beginning Conversation Document, 2024-2025." Refer to page 18 of 24.

<sup>2</sup> Joint Committee on Transportation draft memo dated in April 26 titled: "State Transportation Conversations Across Rural and Urban Communities for 2025 Package."



### **3. Transition to road user fee**

The JCT refers to this as “equity considerations.” LOC focused their response on transitioning to a road user fee based on “vehicle miles traveled” (VMT). OMPOC’s response includes the need to identify other funding sources.

### **4. Other revenue sources**

LaneACT staff recommends separating this discussion from the discussion of road user fees. (Refer to the previous topic.) The JCT may want to discuss the road user fee separately.

### **5. More funding for public transportation**

The JCT refers to “multimodal components that need investment.” LOC and others interpret this to mean more funding for public transportation. This could also be interpreted to mean more funding for pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, especially facilities that serve (connect to) bus and transit stops.

### **6. Finish projects funded in HB 2017**

The JCT refers to “finishing ODOT projects that have received major investments” through HB 2017 (in 2017). They provide a list of specific projects including Rose Quarter, I-5 Bridge, and I-205. They also refer to the urban arterials (jurisdictional transfers) and transportation planning projects described in HB 2017.

### **7. Seismic and climate change resiliency on key routes**

The JCT refers to “investment in reliable transportation options with climate and resiliency goals.” LOC interprets this to mean seismic resiliency. (Neither AOC or OMPOC address seismic resiliency.) LaneACT staff interprets this to mean both seismic and climate change resiliency. The JCT could also be referring to providing multimodal alternatives to support climate goals. This is already addressed in the public transportation topic.

## Comments from members

The following is a summary of the comments from members who suggested refinements to the talking points that were discussed at the June 12 LaneACT meeting. The time indicated in the [reference] is the time on the video recording. The topic number refers to the revised LaneACT talking points presented in Attachment A.1. It indicates where or how the comment was incorporated, in the revised talking points.

1. If we use the JCT goal statements (for the JCT meeting), Goal 3 (focus on maintenance, operations, and safety) should be the top priority. [Shelly Clark at 1:03:02. Topics 1 and 2.]
2. We can ignore Goal 1 (build public understanding of funding challenges and potential new funding sources). That's the JCT's goal, not the LaneACT's goal. We should strengthen Goal 2 (build legislative understanding of statewide transportation needs and shared priorities.) We should explain (to the public?) that providing more funding for ODOT operations & maintenance also benefits local governments. The state and local systems are interrelated. [Lucy Vinis at 1:05:13. Topic 1.]
3. The LaneACT should provide specific suggestions for increasing revenues, to provide a stable source of funding for ODOT operations & maintenance. The LaneACT's response should be consistent with the Oregon MPO Consortium (OMPOC) and League of Oregon Cities (LOC) talking points. [Paul Thompson at 1:06:38. Topic 4.]
4. The LaneACT should say something about the need for public education. The following is some suggested text: "The LaneACT suggests that the Legislature, the Governor, and influential individuals, engage with the public to explain that the current level of transportation funding is not adequate to meet the state's needs. The public needs to be better educated on this topic. They need to understand why there is a funding deficit, the problems this is creating, and the options available to correct the situation. The public needs to be a partner in the solution. They won't support additional taxes and fees if they don't understand what a dire situation the state is in." [Keith Weiss at 1:08:38. Topic 1.]
5. The LaneACT should support a gas tax increase, indexed to inflation, with some guidelines specifying how it should be allocated. The gas tax is imperfect but it's the only existing source of funding we have right now. [Rob Zako at 1:12:15. Topics 3 and 4.]
6. The LaneACT could recommend amending the statutes to allow general funds to be used to subsidize maintenance budget shortfalls. [Vidal Francis at 1:49:40. Topic 4.]

7. An additional sentence or two should be added noting that the state highway trust fund (funded with revenues from the fuel tax, weight-mile tax, and vehicle registration, title, and license fees) are the main source of funding for ODOT operations and maintenance. It should also be noted that these revenues are shared between ODOT, counties, and cities (50/30/20). A statement should be included supporting the need to raise and index these revenue sources, but opposing the proposal being advanced by some that the distribution of the revenues be changed to provide a larger portion to ODOT. The counties and cities have operation and maintenance needs too. [Paul Thompson at 1:50:14. Topic 4.]
8. There was considerable discussion about the need to tax electric vehicles. Not everyone agreed that this was a good idea. Some members were concerned that this could be a disincentive for people to buy electric vehicles. [Various member comments at 1:53:00. Topic 3.]
9. The LaneACT should say something about providing more funding for other modes of transportation (bicycles, pedestrians, public transportation). [Megan Shull at 1:54:31. Topic 5.]
10. Rob Zako spoke again in support of the gas tax, emphasizing that it's a revenue source that exists today. There may be other sources of revenue in the future, but probably not within the next year. The LaneACT should focus on what is realistically achievable in the short term. [Rob Zako at 1:55:50. Topic 3.]
11. The LaneACT should say something in support of land use planning. Transportation and land use are interrelated. Compact development requires less infrastructure to serve. [Cathy Engebretson at 1:57:26]

Comment: This is an important relationship. However, the JCT's focus at this time is limited to transportation funding. Others are continuing to advocate for land use planning. In response to direction from the Governor in 2020, LCDC updated the Transportation Planning Rules in 2023 to advance the state's climate goals, adopted by the Legislature in 2007.

## **Examples from LOC, AOC and OMPOC**

Included in this attachment are the talking points developed by the League of Oregon Cities (LOC), the Association of Oregon Counties (AOC), and the Oregon MPO Consortium (OMPOC). These documents were provided by LaneACT member Paul Thompson who represents the Central Lane MPO.

### Included documents

1. League of Oregon Cities – messaging for discussions with JCT (2 pages)
2. Association of Oregon Counties – suggested talking points (2 pages)
3. OMPOC messaging for OR Joint Committee on Transportation Roadshow (2 pages)

## Why is it essential that the 2025 legislature increase funding for transportation?

**Oregon’s legislature made significant progress in 2017** with the passage of HB 2017, a groundbreaking, all-encompassing, multimodal transportation package in the state’s history. This substantial \$5.3 billion funding package was instrumental in providing critical funding for local and state investments and addressing investment needs in key transportation corridors.

As the Oregon legislature approaches the 2025 legislative session, it's crucial to maintain the momentum of the past seven years. However, we face significant challenges, including project cost escalation due to an 80% increase in the National Highway Construction Cost Index. The decline of the gas tax, the state’s primary revenue source, is eroding the scale of investments, hindering the completion of key projects in HB 2017.

**If the State Legislature Fails to Pass** a transportation package during the 2025 session, it risks the ability to complete critical project investments and further loss of local government transportation investments.

**Use Your Local Stories to Highlight the Investments** made over the last 7-years and the challenges that remain. Each city has a story worth connecting with the Committee members, and by sharing those local stories, you will drive the message home that can continue with transportation investments in the future.

- What does street safety look like for your community?
- Do you have a new transit or inter-community shuttle service in place?
- Are roads in constant need of improvement?
- Was there a critical transportation project in HB 2017 that needs to be completed?

**There are Fundamental Elements** that must be considered when building a transportation package in 2025. There needs to be a focus on returning to the basics and fundamental investment in Oregon’s entire transportation system. These include:

- 1) **Core Operations and Maintenance** of Oregon’s transportation system cannot be ignored, or existing local and state infrastructure will continue to fail and create more expensive repairs without a stable, significant investment in state and local government facilities.
  - State and local governments are not keeping up with the continued decline in street conditions, even with increased investments over the last seven years.

- Additional state funding is needed to invest in a transportation system that can efficiently and safely move people, goods, and services.
- 2) **Transportation Safety Remains** top of mind for local governments. With additional state and local investments, local governments will make progress in addressing core safety investments to improve crossings and minimize conflicts between transportation options. There have been too many transportation-related deaths across Oregon, and we fear without a significant multi-modal investment in safety, the public will face risks that could be avoided.
  - 3) **Finish Projects in HB 2017.** 43 projects across Oregon were part of the commitments made in 2017. The scale of these investments was historic in scope and resulted from a significant bipartisan effort, but not all have been completed. These projects must be completed because they remain critical for all of Oregon's communities.
    - If these projects are not completed, we risk losing the public's confidence in the legislature's ability to deliver on commitments.
    - Now is not the time to go back. It's time to press on and deliver a funding package that can complete these long-term investments.
  - 4) **Additional Transit Funding** is critical to connecting communities. One of the most significant investments made in HB 2017 was an annual infusion of transit funding to build capacity and create inter-community connections. We must continue this investment, focusing on underserved communities and those without public transit options, and consider funding to support core operations and maintenance.
  - 5) **Start The Transition to Road User Fee** to reduce the continued erosion of buying power with the gas tax and stabilize revenue for transportation investments. This will allow a fee structure based on the true impact of vehicles on Oregon's transportation infrastructure.

**Additional priorities beyond stabilizing funding for basic transportation services:**

- **Funding for safety improvements on the most dangerous arterials**
- **Addressing seismic resiliency on key routes**

## Association of Oregon Counties – suggested talking points

[County Logo]

Co-Chairs Gorsek and McLain, and Members of the Joint Committee on Transportation,

On behalf of [Name] County, we would like to welcome you to our community.

Thank you for the opportunity to share our county's priorities on sustainable transportation revenue that supports a safe, functional, and efficient, statewide multimodal transportation system now and for years to come.

Oregon counties are responsible for the largest share of Oregon's public road system, with over 32,000 miles and over 4,000 bridges. [Name] County owns and maintains [#miles] road miles and [#countybridges] bridges. This includes [#miles] miles in poor or fair condition, [#countybridges] bridges in poor or fair condition, and [#countybridges] heavy-truck-weight restricted bridges.

Counties, like our city and state partners, count on the State Highway Fund. This fund is crucial for safety improvements and maintaining critical infrastructure that all Oregonians depend on — roads, bridges, sidewalks, bike paths, traffic signals, culverts, and fish passages. Counties partner with the state to support a safe and reliable multimodal transportation system that connects Oregonians and our economy. We respectfully ask this committee to uphold the, long standing, 50-30-20 State Highway Fund distribution formula that efficiently supports Oregon's cities, counties, and highways.

Over the last 30 years, our federal partners have abandoned funding Oregon's rural roads. Dwindling timber harvest receipts that historically supported county road budgets left a gap that has never fully been remedied. Comparative budget information e.g. In \_\_\_\_ (Year) we received \_\_\_\_ (high point in USFS Timber Harvest Payments) and now we would be lucky to receive \_\_\_\_ (last year's USFS Timber Harvest Estimate).] [Name] County depends on shared revenues from the State Highway Fund to bridge this gap.

Today, inflation, shrinking fuel consumption, and limited local tax bases, have required counties to defer needed safety improvements and routine maintenance work, resulting in a lower standard of quality and safety for the existing road system. Highway construction cost inflation has more than doubled our costs, while revenue has grown by less than half since 2017.

[NAME] County depends on the State Highway Fund 50-30-20 allocation shares to fund critical capital improvements, such as [ROAD NAME, ROAD NAME, and ROAD NAME], and maintain [NUMBER] miles of road in need of preservation, maintenance, and safety improvements.

House Bill 2017, Oregon's historic transportation funding package helped many counties maintain services and preserve our roads. Smaller rural counties particularly rely on the Small County Allotment Program to keep all Oregonians connected. We respectfully ask this committee to support a commensurate increase to the Small County Allotment Program in any new transportation package.

Unfortunately, the additional funding in House Bill 2017, at the time was only estimated to cover less than *half* of the projected need to improve and maintain the county road system to a safe and adequate condition.

**[[NAME] County has many unmet needs, such as [PROJECT, PROJECT, and PROJECT].**

While counties have several local revenue raising options available such as local gas taxes, vehicle registration fees, or service districts, most county tax bases are too small to meet the operational, maintenance, and enhancement needs of our road system. We respectfully ask this committee to expand local options for counties to raise revenue and lift current preemptions.

Counties are thankful for the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the legislature's concerted effort to work with local governments to find collaborative solutions to the state's impending budget deficit. Our partnership with ODOT and the legislature on House Bill 2101 Surface Transportation Block Grant Fund Exchange Program is an efficient model of collaboration that we look forward to continuing.

As work continues to develop the 2025 Transportation Package we ask that you partner with counties, support the largest share of Oregon's public road system, and uphold the 50-30-20 funding formula that unites Oregon's cities, counties, and highways.

For more information on **[Name]** County's road, bridge, and transportation priorities, please see the attached County Road Priorities brief.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

**[NAMES]**  
**[SIGNATURES]**



# OREGON METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION CONSORTIUM (OMPOC)

Messaging for OR Joint Committee on Transportation Roadshow  
May, 2024

At its May 24, 2024 meeting, OMPOC prioritized the following fundamental elements to be messaged by OMPOC members to the JCT and local legislators throughout their transportation roadshow:

- 1) **Core Operations and Maintenance.** Oregon's transportation system is underfunded. If this continues, existing local and state infrastructure will fail, requiring more expensive repairs or even more expensive rebuilds. We must invest in the system we have to ensure it is safe, resilient, and reliable. A stable, significant investment in state and local transportation facilities will help address this situation.
- 2) **Transportation Safety.** Traffic fatalities and serious injuries have continued to rise in the last few years. Increasing investments in safety improvements that minimize conflicts between transportation modes, such as ADA compliant pedestrian crossings and adequate bike infrastructure, are necessary to make Oregon communities safer.

Over the last five years, some areas in Oregon have been facing significant increases in the loss of life along roadways. These include fatal vehicular crashes, bike crashes, and those involving pedestrians. From our view, more funding available for investment in safety projects will make a difference.

- 3) **Diversify and index a full range of transportation revenue sources.** The gas tax buying power has been significantly reduced. We must stop this continued erosion and stabilize revenue for transportation investments.

This should include establishing a fee structure based on the true impact of vehicles on Oregon's transportation infrastructure. We support a discussion of both state and local revenue sources including, but not limited to, those listed below. All must be indexed to inflation:

- a. Transition to road user fee
- b. Electric Vehicle registration fee
- c. Studded tire fee
- d. City gas tax
- e. County registration fee at the cap
- f. Maintain current funding distribution allocations

- 4) **Finish Projects in HB 2017.** There are 43 projects across Oregon that were part of the commitments made in 2017. The scale of these investments was historic in scope and resulted from a significant bipartisan effort, but not all have been completed. These projects must be completed because they remain critical for all communities in Oregon; particularly the Interstate Bridge, and I-5 Rose Quarter.

If these projects are not completed, bottlenecks and economic impacts will only worsen. We also risk losing the public's confidence in the legislature's ability to deliver on commitments.

Now is not the time to go back. It's time to press on and deliver a funding package that can complete these long-term investments.

- 5) **Additional Transit Funding.** Transit is critical to connecting communities. One of the most significant investments made in HB 2017 was an annual infusion of transit funding to build capacity and create inter-community connections. We must continue this investment with a focus on underserved communities, and inter-community transit investment. Funding to support core transit operations and maintenance is critical to maintaining a complete and safe system that is compelling and efficient for people to use.

## **Examples from OTA and Move Oregon Forward**

Included in this attachment is the messaging developed by the Oregon Transit Association (OTA) and Move Oregon Forward, a special interest advocacy group. These documents were provided by LaneACT member Rob Zako who represents environmental and land use interests.

### Included documents

1. Oregon Transit Association – flyer advocating for more STIF funding (2 pages)
2. Move Oregon Forward – flyer advocating for their interests (2 pages)



## Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund

The Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund (STIF), created by House Bill 2017 during the 2017 Legislative Session, strategically transformed the public transit landscape through investments in new services, capital, equipment, technology, and infrastructure. **It is the only consistent state funding source for transit operations.**

**Investments from the STIF Program make transportation in Oregon more equitable and affordable by supporting reduced-fare programs, expanding service coverage, and increasing service frequency to low-income communities.**

The program has advanced greenhouse gas emission reduction efforts by funding the transition to low-emission vehicles, with 80 new low- or no-emission vehicles. The STIF Program has also assisted transit providers in responding to multiple natural disasters and public health crises. STIF-supported transit providers have delivered meals to older adults; provided free rides to vaccination sites; enabled evacuations during the wildfires; and have acted as mobile cooling centers during the heatwaves for low-income communities.



STIF is primarily funded by proceeds from a payroll tax in addition to identification card fees, non-highway gas taxes, and cigarette taxes. From 2019 to 2023, STIF has invested over \$435 million into new services, capital, equipment, technology, and infrastructure. STIF has also leveraged \$158.9 million in local and federal funds.

## STIF Provides Accessible & Equitable Public Transit



**Transit providers take people to and from work, get students to school on time and assist older adults, persons with disabilities and veterans make it to doctor appointments, sometimes in cities away from where they live.** They help urban riders get to Trail Blazer games and rural riders to reach shopping centers in the next town. They make it affordable to commute from Gresham to downtown Portland or from Hermiston to Umatilla. They make college campuses more accessible for students in cities throughout the state. They enable older adults to connect with families and friends to avoid isolation.

**Transit providers and drivers are heroes.** They jumped in to evacuate people from approaching wildfires and distributed food during the pandemic.

**Transit providers are innovators.** They make it easier for rural residents to travel between communities, not just to the local market or clinic. Transit providers are in the fight to combat climate change. They are investing in hybrid and electric vehicles that will cut carbon emissions. They monitor their routes for efficiency and maximum ridership. They work with developers and businesses to provide service that doesn't require driving a car.

**Transit providers promote equity.** With free or reduced fares, they make ridership more affordable and accessible. With frequent route reviews, they provide enhanced services for underserved communities, including veterans and people with disabilities.



## What STIF Has Accomplished from 2019 to 2023



### ADDING ROUTES

Rogue Valley Transportation District in Medford expanded routes and service allowing more seniors, people with disabilities, and veterans to get to vital services and healthcare.

**38.9 MILLION NEW RIDES  
ACROSS THE STATE**



### IMPROVING EQUITABLE ACCESS

Ride Connection in Multnomah, Washington, and Clackamas Counties provides door-to-door services for adults and people with disabilities as well as low-income individuals. Their Community Connector Shuttles run in outlying areas underserved by traditional public transit.

**STIF IMPROVES TRANSIT FOR  
LOW-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS,  
SENIORS, & PEOPLE WITH  
DISABILITIES**



### EXPANDING ACCESS

Students in Lincoln County receive hands-on rider training and free student passes. This helped reduce absenteeism and improved student access to after school activities, internships, and jobs.

**79,881 STUDENTS HAVE ACCESS  
TO FREE OR REDUCED FARES**



### EXPANDING SERVICE HOURS

The addition of later evening and weekend service by Cherriots in Marion and Polk Counties has allowed its 3.2 million annual riders access to jobs, necessary services like groceries and prescriptions, and school at Chemeketa Community College.

**3.07 MILLION ADDITIONAL  
HOURS OF BUS SERVICE**



### REDUCING EMISSIONS

TriMet in Multnomah, Washington, and Clackamas Counties has purchased 24 electric buses with funding from the Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund — and these first zero-emission buses are running in predominately low-income and minority communities.

**309 NEW TRANSIT VEHICLES  
INCLUDING 80 LOW OR NO  
EMISSION VEHICLES**



### FILLING SERVICE GAPS

The Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund has invested \$29.7 million in extending intercommunity services to new communities, expanding schedules, and enhancing travel frequency.

**THROUGH STIF, LOCAL  
PROVIDERS FUNDED \$14.6  
MILLION TO STABILIZE  
INTERCOMMUNITY ROUTES**

## Additional Investments in STIF Will Move More People Across Oregon

Long-term investments require long-term financial commitments. Just as the cost of maintaining our roads has increased due to inflation in recent years, so too has the cost of providing transit service. Oregon's transit providers need additional funding to maintain and expand service in our communities.

### Additional investments in the STIF will:

- **Make transportation more equitable and affordable** by supporting reduced-fare program, expanding service coverage, and increasing service frequency to low-income communities.
- **Produce Climate Friendly Outcomes** with the investment of zero-emission electric vehicles and busses, and partnerships that strengthen pedestrian and bike transportation.
- **Ensure improved transportation access** for Oregonians living in newly constructed housing on the edges of urban areas, and it allows people to age in place with independence and dignity.
- **Maximizing transit's contribution to economic growth** while achieving the state's climate, safety and equity targets.
- **Allow Transit to support affordable housing, economic development, and other essential state priorities.**



**Safe. Clean. Fair. Accountable. Transportation for a thriving Oregon.**

Healthy, affordable, and thriving communities run on their transportation: streets that youth can cross safely to school, where older adults can get their daily exercise, people using mobility devices can get everywhere they need to go, and transit gets you there and back on time. **As Oregon considers changing how we fund our transportation system, we need to ensure that every dollar delivers on our climate and air quality goals while expanding safe, financially sustainable, and well-maintained transportation choices for all Oregonians.**

Our campaign is powered by active transportation, climate, and environmental justice organizations from across the state. We are working together to pass forward-thinking legislation in 2025 and beyond that helps to benefit every Oregonian in rural and urban communities. Join us!



## OUR 2025 PRIORITIES

### Safety First

*We envision a transportation system that puts safety first. That means eliminating serious injuries and deaths; investing in protections for the most vulnerable road users; reducing our vehicle miles traveled (VMT), air pollution, and other hidden costs to public health; and protecting our environment now and for future generations.*

We support legislative action that prioritizes investments in safe networks for walking, biking, and rolling. **This includes increased funding for jurisdictional transfer of “orphan highways” and currently oversubscribed safety and mobility programs, such as:**

- Safe Routes to School infrastructure
- Great Streets
- Oregon Community Paths

## Climate Forward

*We are committed to creating the greenest transportation system possible for Oregon. By expanding access to clean transportation options for every community and context, we will reduce our transportation system's contribution to climate change, ease congestion, and help non-drivers stay connected—all at the same time, and leaving no one behind.*

We support legislative action that:

- Invests in and integrates transportation, housing, and land use planning initiatives that reduce emissions by providing compact, mixed-use neighborhoods supported by safe and accessible networks for walking, rolling, and transit
- Substantially expands funding for affordable, practical public transit and paratransit options across the state
- Expands incentives and education to make ownership, sharing, charging, and use of electric micromobility and electric light/medium/heavy-duty vehicles affordable, accessible, and safe

## Fair and Sustainable Funding

*We must update and diversify how we fund our transportation system as the gas tax declines and major project funding plans remain in limbo. Our funding solutions must be designed to explicitly incentivize and invest in a greener and safer transportation system, deliver real value for our dollars, and share costs equitably.*

We support legislative action to develop and advance a revenue strategy that:

- Right-sizes existing revenue streams and/or indexes them to inflation
- Diversifies our revenue sources to invest in maintenance, safety, and mobility first
- Better aligns both our future revenue **and current spending** with Oregon's climate, housing, equity, employment, and transportation goals and the needs of communities statewide

## Accountability and Transparency

*We advocate for accountable and transparent institutions that involve diverse voices in decision-making at every level, where people most impacted by a decision have real power to shape it. We see a disconnect today between our institutions' stated goals and where they actually put their money. To meet climate and safety targets, and to retain the public's trust, Oregon must close this gap.*

We are pursuing just, equitable, and responsive transportation governance that follows through on its promises. We support legislative action to:

- Enable the Oregon Transportation Commission to be more representative and independently staffed
- Establish a fix-it-first policy to fund statewide maintenance and safety programs before investing in expanded roads
- Align investments, planning, and future transportation projects with established safety, climate, and mobility goals, including appropriate Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)-reduction targets

## Agenda Item 3

**LaneACT Bylaws Committee – member recruitment****Presenter**

Shelly Clark – LaneACT Chair

**Action requested**

Identify members who are interested in serving on a committee to review and recommend revisions to the LaneACT Bylaws.

**Summary**

The LaneACT Steering Committee is initiating the effort to review and update the LaneACT Bylaws. This task is identified in the LaneACT 2024-25 Work Plan (Section 5.B).

Members who have an interest in this topic are invited to serve on a special, limited duration *LaneACT Bylaws Committee*. The purpose of the committee is to review and recommend revisions to the LaneACT Bylaws.

The LaneACT Bylaws (Section V.C) authorize the LaneACT to form temporary *ad hoc* (as needed) committees to focus on specific topics. Committees may develop options and make recommendations, but they are not authorized to make decisions. Formal policy decisions must be made by the LaneACT (all voting members).

This will be an involved effort. Updating the bylaws of any commission or committee is complicated. It can also be contentious. Members may have different opinions about what needs to be changed, how it should be changed, and the specific wording.

The LaneACT Bylaws Committee will probably need to meet at least three times. The LaneACT will require an additional two meetings (or more) to review, revise if necessary, and approve the committee's recommendations.

The objective for this discussion, at the July 10 LaneACT meeting, is simply to identify members who would like to serve on the committee. There will be a follow up discussion at the September 11 LaneACT meeting. The LaneACT Chair will describe the scope of the update, process, and timeframe. Members will be invited to provide input to inform the committee's work. The LaneACT Chair will appoint one of the committee members to chair the committee.

The first committee meeting will occur in September. LaneACT staff will prepare one or more discussion papers to help frame the committee's discussions.

**Attachments**

(none)



## Future meetings and topics

updated June 28, 2024

This document is updated monthly by LaneACT staff based on input provided by the Steering Committee.

### July 10, 2024

- **JCT talking points** – Finalize talking points for July 17 meeting with the Oregon Legislature Joint Committee on Transportation (JCT)
- **LaneACT Bylaws Committee** – Identify members interested in serving on a review committee.
- **Not on agenda** – A special Region 2 Review Committee (Super ACT) will meet on July 10 to review and rank the Connect Oregon funding proposals in Region 2.
- **Not on agenda** – The OTC will be meeting in Florence on July 31 and August 1

### August 14, 2024

- **Summer recess** (no LaneACT meeting)

### September 11, 2024

- **ODOT Investment Priority Areas** – 30 min; Alex Bettinardi – ODOT Policy, Data & Analysis Division
- **LaneACT Bylaws Committee** – 30 minutes; Shelly Clark – LaneACT Chair
  - This is a follow up to the July 10 discussion. The Chair will describe the scope of the update, process, and timeframe. Members will be invited to provide preliminary input to inform the committee's work.
- **(reserved)** – other topic to be determined
- **Not on agenda** – The LaneACT Bylaws Committee will meet in September.

### October 9, 2024

- **STIF Discretionary Grants** – 20 min; Cody Franz – ODOT Public Transportation Division
- **(reserved)** – other topic to be determined
- **(reserved)** – other topic to be determined
- **Not on agenda** – The LaneACT Bylaws Committee will meet in October.

### November 13, 2024

- **Appoint representative to the Aviation Review Committee** – consent item
- **Appoint officer nominating committee** – 15 minutes
- **Not on agenda** – The LaneACT Bylaws Committee will meet in November (if necessary).

**December 11, 2024**

- **Elect officers** – 30 minutes
- **LaneACT Bylaws Committee report** – 30 minutes; committee chair
  - The chair will present the recommendations of the committee (if they have completed their work).
  - The LaneACT will review and revise if necessary the committee recommendations. They may or may not adopt the new Bylaws. The review may require more than one meeting.
- **(reserved)** – other topic to be determined

**January 8, 2025**

- **Winter recess** (no meeting)

**February 12, 2025**

- **New officers seated** – The newly elected Chair and Vice Chair will conduct the meeting.
- **LaneACT Bylaws Committee report** (continued, if necessary) – 30 minutes; committee chair
  - The LaneACT will continue their review and refinement of the committee’s recommendations.
  - The LaneACT will adopt the new Bylaws, if there is consensus.
- **(reserved)** – other topic to be determined

## LaneACT member roster

updated June 2024

jurisdiction	member	email	phone	address	term start	term end
<b>Lane County</b>						
primary	Ryan Ceniga Commissioner	<a href="mailto:Ryan.Ceniga@lanecountyor.gov">Ryan.Ceniga@lanecountyor.gov</a>	541.682.4203	125 E 8th Ave; Eugene OR 97401		none
alternate	David Lovell Commissioner	<a href="mailto:David.Loveall@lanecountyor.gov">David.Loveall@lanecountyor.gov</a>				none
<b>Coburg</b>						
primary (1)	John Fox Councilor	<a href="mailto:councilorfox@ci.coburg.or.us">councilorfox@ci.coburg.or.us</a>	541.682.7850	PO Box 8316; Coburg OR 97408		none
primary (2)	Cathy Engebretson Councilor	<a href="mailto:councilorengebretson@ci.coburg.or.us">councilorengebretson@ci.coburg.or.us</a>	541.682.7850	PO Box 8316; Coburg OR 97408		none
alternate	Nancy Bell Mayor	<a href="mailto:mayor@ci.coburg.or.us">mayor@ci.coburg.or.us</a>	541.682.7850	PO Box 8316; Coburg OR 97408		none
<b>Cottage Grove</b>						
primary	Mike Fleck Councilor	<a href="mailto:councilorfleck@cottagegrove.org">councilorfleck@cottagegrove.org</a>		923 S U St; Cottage Grove OR 97424		none
alternate	Mike Sauerwein City Manager	<a href="mailto:msauerwein@cottagegrove.org">msauerwein@cottagegrove.org</a>	(541) 942-5501	400 E. Main St; Cottage Grove, OR 97424		none
<b>Creswell</b>						
primary	Shelly Clark Councilor	<a href="mailto:shclark@creswell-or.us">shclark@creswell-or.us</a>	541.895.2531	PO Box 276; Creswell OR 97426	01/01/2021	12/31/2024
alternate	Curtis Thomas City Planner	<a href="mailto:cthomas@creswell-or.us">cthomas@creswell-or.us</a>	541.895.2913	PO Box 276; Creswell OR 97426		none
<b>Dunes City</b>						
primary	Robert Orr Councilor	<a href="mailto:robertvorr@gmail.com">robertvorr@gmail.com</a>	541.997.3338	83541 Jensen Ln; Florence OR 97439		none
alternate	Jamie Mills City Recorder	<a href="mailto:recorder@dunescityor.com">recorder@dunescityor.com</a>	541.997.3338	PO Box 97; Westlake OR 97493		none
<b>Eugene</b>						
primary	Lucy Vinis Mayor	<a href="mailto:lvinis@eugene-or.gov">lvinis@eugene-or.gov</a>	541.682.8347	125 E 8th Ave; Eugene OR 97401		none
alternate	Alan Zelenka Councilor	<a href="mailto:alan.zelenka@ci.eugene.or.us">alan.zelenka@ci.eugene.or.us</a>	541.682.8343	125 E 8th Ave; Eugene OR 97401		none
<b>Florence</b>						
primary	Bill Meyer Councilor	<a href="mailto:bill.meyer@ci.florence.or.us">bill.meyer@ci.florence.or.us</a>	541.997.8237	250 Hwy 101; Florence OR 97439		none
alternate	Mike Miller Public Works Director	<a href="mailto:mike.miller@ci.florence.or.us">mike.miller@ci.florence.or.us</a>	541.997.4106	250 Hwy 101; Florence OR 97439		none
<b>Junction City</b>						
primary	Sidney Washburne Councilor	<a href="mailto:swashburne@cityofjc.com">swashburne@cityofjc.com</a>	541.998.2153	PO Box 250; Junction City OR 97448		none
alternate	Sandi Thomas Councilor	<a href="mailto:sthamas@cityofjc.com">sthamas@cityofjc.com</a>	541.998.2153	PO Box 250; Junction City OR 97448		none
<b>Lowell</b>						
primary	Don Bennett Mayor	<a href="mailto:donbennett47@q.com">donbennett47@q.com</a>	541.937.2312	540 Sunridge Ln; Lowell OR 97452		none
alternate	(vacant)					
<b>Oakridge</b>						
primary	Bryan Cutchen Mayor	<a href="mailto:mayor@ci.oakridge.or.us">mayor@ci.oakridge.or.us</a>	541.782.2258	PO Box 1410; Oakridge OR 97463		none
alternate	Rick Zylstra Planning Director	<a href="mailto:rickzylstra@ci.oakridge.or.us">rickzylstra@ci.oakridge.or.us</a>		PO Box 1410; Oakridge OR 97463		none
<b>Springfield</b>						
primary	Beth Blackwell Councilor	<a href="mailto:bblackwell@springfield-or.gov">bblackwell@springfield-or.gov</a>		225 5th St; Springfield OR 97477		none

jurisdiction	member	email	phone	address	term start	term end
alternate	Sean VanGordon Mayor	<a href="mailto:svangordon@springfield-or.gov">svangordon@springfield-or.gov</a>		225 5th St; Springfield OR 97477		[ page break ]
<b>Veneta</b>						
primary	Keith Weiss Mayor	<a href="mailto:kweiss@ci.veneta.or.us">kweiss@ci.veneta.or.us</a>	541.935.2191	PO Box 458; Veneta OR 97487	01/01/2021	City Council term ends in Jan. 2024
alternate (1)	Alexa Bensen City Councilor	<a href="mailto:abenson@ci.veneta.or.us">abenson@ci.veneta.or.us</a>	541.935.2191	PO Box 458; Veneta OR 97487	appointed in February 2024	
alternate (2)	Matt Michel City Manager	<a href="mailto:mmichel@ci.veneta.or.us">mmichel@ci.veneta.or.us</a>	541.935.2191	PO Box 458; Veneta OR 97487	appointed in May 2024	
<b>Westfir</b>						
primary	D'Lynn Williams Mayor	<a href="mailto:mayor@ci.westfir.or.us">mayor@ci.westfir.or.us</a>		47365 1st St; Westfir OR 97492		none
alternate	(vacant)					
<b>Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw</b>						
primary	Doug Barrett	<a href="mailto:doug.barrett@ctclusi.org">doug.barrett@ctclusi.org</a>	541.888.7512	P.O. Box 2000; Florence OR 97439		none
alternate	Garrett Gray Planner	<a href="mailto:ggray@ctclusi.org">ggray@ctclusi.org</a>	541.888.9577	1245 Fulton Ave; Coos Bay OR 97420		none
<b>Port of Siuslaw</b>						
primary	Bill Meyer Commissioner	(see City of Florence)	(see Florence)	100 Harbor St; Florence OR 97439		none
alternate	David Huntington Manager	<a href="mailto:port@portofsiuslaw.com">port@portofsiuslaw.com</a>		100 Harbor St; Florence OR 97439		none
<b>Lane Transit District</b>						
primary	Heather Murphy Board Member	<a href="mailto:Heather.murphy@ltd.org">Heather.murphy@ltd.org</a>		PO Box 7070; Springfield OR 97475		none
alternate	Jameson Auten General Manager	<a href="mailto:jameson.auten@ltd.org">jameson.auten@ltd.org</a>		PO Box 7070; Springfield OR 97475		none
<b>ODOT Area Manager</b>						
primary	Vidal Francis Area 5 Manager	<a href="mailto:vidal.t.francis@odot.oregon.gov">vidal.t.francis@odot.oregon.gov</a>	541.726.5227	2080 Laura St; Springfield OR 97477		none
alternate	Bill Johnston Area 5 Planner	<a href="mailto:bill.w.johnston@odot.state.or.us">bill.w.johnston@odot.state.or.us</a>	541.747.1354	2080 Laura St; Springfield OR 97477		none
<b>Central Lane MPO</b>						
primary	Paul Thompson Transportation Manager	<a href="mailto:pthompson@lcoq.org">pthompson@lcoq.org</a>	541.682.4405	859 Willamette St Suite 500; Eugene OR 97401	2009	(no end date)
alternate	Brenda Wilson Executive Director	<a href="mailto:bwilson@lcoq.org">bwilson@lcoq.org</a>	541.682.4395	859 Willamette St Suite 500; Eugene OR 97401		(no end date)
<b>LC TrAC</b>						
primary	John Marshall	<a href="mailto:jmarshall47@gmail.com">jmarshall47@gmail.com</a>		(email only)		none
alternate	(vacant)					
<b>Highway 126 East</b>						
primary	Pete Petty (area resident)	<a href="mailto:ppetty541@aol.com">ppetty541@aol.com</a>		49460 McKenzie Hwy; Vida OR 97488		none
alternate	Charles Tannenbaum (area resident)	<a href="mailto:caroltan@q.com">caroltan@q.com</a>	541.736.8575	40882 McKenzie Hwy; Springfield OR 97478		none
<b>Designated representatives (special interest)</b>						
trucking	(vacant)					
rail	(vacant)					
bicycle & pedestrian	Megan Shull LCOG SRTS	<a href="mailto:mshull@lcoq.org">mshull@lcoq.org</a>	541.682.4023	859 Willamette St Suite 500; Eugene OR 97401	1/10/2024	01/10/2028
alternate	Jack Blashchishen Springfield Public School	<a href="mailto:jack.blashchishen@springfield.k12.or.us">jack.blashchishen@springfield.k12.or.us</a>	(541) 228.0699		1/10/2024	01/10/2028
environmental & land use	Rob Zako BEST	<a href="mailto:rob@best-oregon.org">rob@best-oregon.org</a>	541.606.0931		7/1/2023	06/30/2027
alternate	Brett Morgan 1000 Friends of Oregon	<a href="mailto:brett@friends.org">brett@friends.org</a>	503.497.1000 (ext 122)		06/30/2020	06/30/2024
<b>Other representatives (special interest)</b>						

jurisdiction	member	email	phone	address	term start	term end
disability community	Eugene Organ (area resident)	<a href="mailto:eorgan@comcast.net">eorgan@comcast.net</a>	541.683.6556	2850 Pearl St; Eugene OR 97405	07/14/2020	07/14/2024
aviation	Shelley Humble Creswell airport	<a href="mailto:shumble@creswell-or.us">shumble@creswell-or.us</a>	541.895.2913 (w) 541.953.9197 (c)	PO Box 276; Creswell OR 97405	07/14/2021	07/14/2025
micro-mobility	Brodie Hylton Cascadia Mobility	<a href="mailto:brodieh@cascadiamobility.org">brodieh@cascadiamobility.org</a>	503.481.0418	455 W 1st Ave; Eugene OR 97401	1/10/2024	1/10/2028
economic development	Tiffany Edwards Chamber of Commerce	<a href="mailto:tiffanye@eugenechamber.com">tiffanye@eugenechamber.com</a>	541.678.3370	1401 Willamette Street; Eugene OR 97401	1/10/2024	1/10/2028

**LaneACT member support staff**

(these individuals sometimes attend LaneACT meetings)

Jurisdiction	Support Staff	Email
Lane County	Becky Taylor	<a href="mailto:becky.taylor@lanecountyor.gov">becky.taylor@lanecountyor.gov</a>
Eugene	Rob Innerfeld	<a href="mailto:rob.inerfeld@ci.eugene.or.us">rob.inerfeld@ci.eugene.or.us</a>
Springfield	Drew Larson	<a href="mailto:alarson@springfield-or.gov">alarson@springfield-or.gov</a>