

AGENDA
Urban Renewal Advisory Committee Meeting
City Hall
211 Second Street

Thursday, June 17, 2021
*****5:30 p.m.*****

The City of Hood River is taking steps to limit exposure and spread of COVID-19 (novel coronavirus). In support of state and federal guidelines for social distancing, the City of Hood River will hold this meeting by using Zoom Conferencing.

Please use the following phone number or video link:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84295422480>

(253) 215-8782

Meeting ID: 842 9542 2480

Members of the Urban Renewal Advisory Committee and City staff will participate by telephone or computer, they will not be on site at City Hall during the meeting. The audio recording of the meeting will be posted shortly after the meeting on the City's website. Please check the City's website for the most current status of planned public meetings.

<https://cityofhoodriver.gov/administration/meetings/>

I CALL TO ORDER

II BUSINESS FROM THE AUDIENCE

The Urban Renewal Advisory Committee encourages community members to talk about issues important to them. If you wish to speak during "Business from the Audience", there are two options to choose from:

1. Submit written comments to the City Recorder at j.gray@cityofhoodriver.gov by Thursday, June 17 no later than 12 noon in order to distribute to the URAC in one packet for review by 3pm. All comments will be added to the record.

2. To address Council during Business for the Audience, email the request (name of speaker and topic) to j.gray@cityofhoodriver.gov by Thursday, June 17 no later than 12 noon. Please specify the topic your testimony addresses. Testimony will go in order of requests received. Attendees that have registered will be unmuted by the IT Administrator for 3 minutes to address URAC. Public comment will be by audio only. At the Chairs discretion, public comments may be received prior to a specific topic of relevance during the meeting.

III AGENDA ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS

IV	APPROVAL OF MINUTES – May 20, 2021	Pages 3-10
V	URBAN RENEWAL ADMINISTRATOR 1. Heights Streetscape and Parking Update	Pages 11-15
VI	ITEMS FROM MEMBERS	
VII	ADJOURN	

NOTE: All public meeting locations are accessible. Please let the City Recorder know if you will need any special accommodations to attend the meeting. Call (541) 387-5212 for more information. OREGON RELAY SERVICE 1-800-735-2900

Urban Renewal Advisory Committee Meeting

Regular Meeting

May 20, 2021

Present: Chair Jack Trumbull, Vice Chair Pat McAllister, Tina Lassen, Abby Capovilla, Amanda Goeke, Clint Harris

Staff: Planning Director Dustin Nilsen, Jonathan Skloven-Gill

Absent: Joshua Chandler

I CALL TO ORDER – Trumbull opened the meeting at 6:00 p.m.

II BUSINESS FROM THE AUDIENCE

III AGENDA ADDITIONS

IV APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion: To approve the meeting minutes of January 21, 2021 as written.

First: McAllister

Second: Lassen

Discussion: None

Vote: Motion passed unanimously

V URBAN RENEWAL ADMINISTRATOR

1. Heights Urban Renewal Phase 1 Updates

Purpose of the Meeting:

As we continue to collect input and analyze data, one of the primary purposes of the May 20th meeting is to not only share the results to date but gather Committee input as it represents a valuable source of information and on the ground experience of businesses and other community stakeholders. Compiling this input with other stakeholder and public input already collected staff will prepare an update for the Urban Renewal Agency Board on June 14th to summarize work and findings from Phase 1 of the project.

Survey and Input Materials:

Enclosed as part of the May 20th URAC agenda packet you will find a summary of the Phase One public survey, current stakeholder interview findings, as well a memo on the emerging goals of the project.

A short overview of the key findings and themes emerging from the surveys and interviews find that “The preliminary project goals most important to survey participants are related to slowing traffic, creating safe streets and intersections for all users, and promoting a livable community through street improvements that support access to local businesses”.

Additional input highlighted other common themes that are further detailed in the summary. These include objectives such as Preserve the Area as a Local Destination, Slow Down Traffic, Make Crossing Streets Safer, Improve Connections to Neighborhoods and Schools, Improve Bicycle Connections and Amenities, Build on the Area's Character and History, and Manage On-Street Parking.

Request

Staff requests that the URAC review the materials and provide input that will help inform the Board as it evaluates the emerging project goals and next Phases of concept design and development.

Nilsen introduced Elisabeth Betz Klein Associates, Nathan Polanski MIG and Alex Dupey MIG

Polanski stated tonight they will talk about preliminary project goals, take committee feedback and refine as needed. They would then take them to the Agency. They would be looking for approval from the Agency to move forward with Phase II.

Dupey stated the goals for this evening are twofold. One, is to update the committee on the public engagement results and results from stakeholder meetings. Dupey stated they want to discuss this more because they would like to do more business outreach, as part of the stakeholder meetings. They would like to take a majority of time this evening looking at vision and goals. Part of that was from the original meeting they had with the Urban Renewal Agency Board (URAC) and Urban Renewal Advisory Committee (URAC), in February. They would like to discuss more about those outcomes. The goal for tonight is to come to an agreement on project goals moving forward. These need to be approved by URAC before moving forward with Phase II. These will give them a structure on how they will develop the concepts moving into the next phase.

Polanski reviewed what has been happening during Phase I (public outreach with the survey and stakeholder meetings). The plan is to present preliminary goals to the URAB on June 14 based on Phase I outreach. They had a very productive online survey. In the three weeks it was available, they received 344 total responses. No responses in Spanish were received. They will work on additional outreach strategies, to make sure they get a broad representation of the community. Polanski noted they had great participation from the two stakeholder meetings, facilitated by The Next Door. They will keep that in mind, as they move forward.

Key takeaways from the online survey were slowing traffic, creating safe streets and intersections, promoting a livable community, supporting access to local businesses and improve safety for people driving, walking, and biking.

Online Survey – Walking: improve safety and visibility at crosswalks crossing (east and west) 12th and 13th, reduce the speed of traffic and add street elements and enhance existing sidewalks.

Online Survey – Bicycling: improve east and west connections (Pine/Taylor and A/Wilson), provide safe, comfortable places to bike, design intersections to reduce conflicts.

Online Survey – Driving: improve intersections, provide improvements to slow traffic.

Online Survey – Economic Development: improve access to businesses, maintain and improve view of businesses, highlight local character and branding, sustainable design and unifying elements.

Polanski did an overview on stakeholder meetings. The first two meets were with Latinos en Accion and the Latino businesses, with the help of The Next Door. There was a meeting with the Landmarks Review Board. They provided great insight on the history of the area and there were community

members that spoke about the historical development of the infrastructure and street network. There was good discussion within that group. They also met with community members of the upper valley, as well as community organization and businesses.

Polanski stated they had one participant at the business stakeholder meeting that is the new director of Visit Hood River. They would like to know how they can get more business owners to join the conversation. Things they would like to hear from businesses: how do they get their deliveries, how does it happen, how are people accessing their businesses, how are their alleys used, and impacts on their parking. There are things that are going to inform the concepts they are looking at. They would like to at a minimum, deliver a letter to business and property owners along the Heights corridor, requesting their feedback.

Polanski asked for thoughts from the group. Dupey stated they want to understand key issues for business that did not attend stakeholder meetings. They feel it is the missing piece right now. They want to do their best to get as much input before they create a recommended concept. It is important to get the information during this early stage, to understand issues.

McAlister suggested reaching out to businesses to the south of the Heights, because that's their main corridor as well.

Harris added he has been surveying some of his delivery drivers that have large trucks that come down 12th street. He believes those viewpoints are valid and deliveries that go downtown. He has about 4-5 deliveries that use large trucks. Polanski asked Harris to send his contact list to Nilsen.

Goeke stated as a business owner in the Heights, she is not sure what other businesses were contacted. She believes direct contacting is the best and not relying on third parties to make contact. She is happy to speak with other business owners to inform them about that is happening. Workshops and surveys have been going on so long, she feels people are less engaged because they have sent their responses in the past and nothing has happened. She understands the process, but others are not involved so they do not understand. She believes a personal connection is a good way to get involvement.

Dupey appreciates Goeke's offer to help. The goal is to get as much input as they can before moving forward.

Lassen suggested reaching out to the school district if they have not been involved. Polanski said they have been involved informally. The school district is involved with the Safe Routes to School project that is running parallel with this project. Polanski stated they have been coordinating with the Safe Routes to School project team. Polanski added they have also been in contact with Columbia Area Transit. CAT will be sending them routes, vehicles specs, and turning movements that will inform them for design work.

Harris suggested posting QR codes in the Heights to help gather input. It is an immediate action/response, rather than someone having to remember to do it later. Nilsen suggested having it direct the public to the website page. Even through the survey is closed, that is a place where people can still make comments.

Stakeholder meetings: preserve the area as a local destination, slow down traffic, make street crossing safer, improve connections to neighborhoods and schools, improve bicycle connections and amenities, build on the area's character and history, manager on-street parking.

Dupey reviewed the seven Heights Urban Renewal Plan Goals. These goals are very broad. In February, they did an exercise to talk about how the goals apply to this project. They used those goals within the survey and tied them to the project level. The online survey included a series of seven refined goals from the kickoff meeting. One; what was most important from those goals. Two; how should those goals be framed for this project specifically. As they get into Phase II, they will start to develop an evaluation criterion for assessing how each of these concepts can live to each of these pieces. As they started with broad concepts, they have refined them to be specific to the Heights Streets Scape Plan. They will take the recommendations to the URAC on June 14. Everything that the Advisory Committee has done early on to adopt the Urban Renewal Plan, is still within this project. They have just refined it to be specific for this area being discussed. The first four goals were the highest priority for the community. The underline text to the goals is what has been added, based on input that was collected. They realized there were site gaps in the original statement.

Dupey read through the goals with explanation.

Project Goal 1: Preserve and promote a livable community through streetscape improvements that balance safety and access for walking and biking with parking needs to supply access to businesses and future mixed-use development. **Priority Community Goal.**

Project Goal 2: Create an identity for the Heights that reflect diverse culture and history of the area and as destination for residents. **Priority Community Goal**

Project Goal 3: Create streets and gatherings spaces that provide safe comfortable places for people walking and biking along and across the corridor and that connects area recreation and commercial destination and neighborhoods. **Priority Community Goal**

Project Goal 4: Calm traffic and improve intersections to improve safety for people driving, walking, and biking. **Priority Community Goal**

Dupey noted the remaining three goals are important but not identified as priority goals. They will still need to be addressed.

Project Goal 5: Support existing and future development by maintain and improving utility infrastructure as part of the streetscape project.

Project Goal 6: Engaging local residents and businesses, the school district, and those that use the corridor to provide input in the streetscape project.

Project Goal 7: Provide locations for people to gather, to stop and rest.

Discussion on goals.

Harris stated the goals appear to be what the Advisory Committee wanted and in the correct order. He would say Goal 1 is more the overarching goal that incorporates the rest of the goals.

Trumbull asked about parking. The walkability study that was done a few years ago suggested backend parking on one side of 12th and 13th and creating a bike lane on the other side. He has never seen a reflection on the parking that would be lost or gained. There was also discussion about turning the east and west streets between 12th and 13th one way, and having backend parking on those. The

idea was to increase parking but establish a bike lane in the Heights. He asked if they have that metric.

Polanski stated they do not but from the stakeholder meetings, what came up was the need for some sort of parking usage evaluation. Not a full-blown study. They do feel there needs to be something to set that baseline existing condition number. They are headed into the direction to do something. Related to proposed confirmations, as they develop concepts, they will need to think about presenting parking in that manner. A meeting they will have in a couple of months will be the information design process jurisdictional; understanding of how this process will move forward. They have reached out to ODOT to get preliminary questions asked, to help facilitate that meeting. Angel parking would require a deviation on the State highway.

Lassen feels this has become an issue of pro-parking, versus anti-parking. She thinks it would be good if this project could reflect the idea of expanding the thought process on how to handle parking. Expanding how they talk about parking is important.

Discussion Project Goal 2: Create an identity for the Heights that reflect diverse culture and history of the area and as destination for residents.

Lassen stated locals are really concerned if they make the Heights more attractive, the tourist will come. Right now, it is more of a local's area. The Latino community is also concerned if this happens, they will get priced out of the area.

McAllister has heard those concern too. Useability for the locals is what this is about.

Trumbull believes it good that it's listed as a goal and its vague enough.

Discussion Project Goal 3: Create streets and gatherings spaces that provide safe comfortable places for people walking and biking along and across the corridor and that connects area recreation and commercial destination and neighborhoods.

Dupey stated there was a lot of conversation both through the survey and at stakeholder meeting that people live in this area. People want to be able to get to and from schools, parks but also get to businesses safely. It is the connectivity piece that the street scape would provide through better bike and pedestrian amenities. It is also a core series of connections that serves the broader community. With this goal, they took the higher level URA goal. They focused it into how the streetscape creates those connections and provides small gathering places along the streetscape.

Trumbull noted this goal is good. It falls in line with what they are trying to do. The group agreed.

Discussion Project Goal 4: Calm traffic and improve intersections to improve safety for people driving, walking, and biking.

Trumbull believes they need to include commerce. The calming of traffic is also for the businesses in the area and the businesses just beyond the focus area. They have also received push back from emergency response vehicles. They want to make sure they can get vehicles in and out of the hospital.

McAllister stated getting trucks to the larger businesses to the south, finding a harmonious connection to make the traffic safer but not implead the commercial traffic that is going through the

Heights every day. That is a very key component. Regarding first responders, whatever the new design is, there needs to be safe routes for them to make it to the emergency and hospital.

Lassen pointed out the entire City has one lane traffic, as well as the roads coming from the upper valley, except for the five block section of the Heights. She does not understand how the traffic counts will change in those five blocks. It seems to her that backups are more an issue of all the small intersections. She feels the whole issue of the road design is not so much the two-lane versus one-lane, it is just the fact there are the tight corners the trucks have to navigate. She believes Goal 4 is the whole crux of this design. The economy and dealing with the transportation design is going to be the two pieces. How are they going to balance the transportation corridor, with the fact that its cutting right through a commercial district and neighborhood. The biggest challenge for this project is finding a balance for both.

Trumbull said he has never thought about it or dissected it in the manner that Lassen did. Whatever they do in the corridor, they need to take into consideration they will need to continue it to the north and south corridor of the Heights. If bike lanes are placed in the five blocks, they will need to continue to the north and south.

McAllister has spoken with a lot of long-term residence when it was two-way traffic in Heights. He used to drive truck and he knows what it is like to maneuver around. When it is a two-lane one-way road, it is easier for truck to make the corners, then if they went back to a two-way system. They would have to make those corners again and not have as much turning room, thus being a more unsafe situation. Trucks are bigger, longer and carry more weight. It is a very safe thing, but they have to try to calm the traffic and make it safe for everyone. With the pandemic, the trucking situation is scary. Trying to get supplies in a timely manner is difficult. Places where trucks have difficulties, they lower it on delivery priority. If there is trouble getting into the Heights, they will turn around and not deliver until the weather gets better or road conditions approve. There needs to be a good balance.

Trumbull believes adding commerce to Goal 4 makes sense.

Discussion Project Goal 5: Support existing and future development by maintain and improving utility infrastructure as part of the streetscape project.

Dupey asked if there is anything else to consider in general for utility infrastructure within the project area.

Trumbull stated in the past, there was discussion of rerouting some of the utilities going through some of the alleyways between 12th and 13th Street, but they do not have alleyways that run all the way through. There has been discussion in the past but he does not believe it is feasible financially to underground all the utilities. They would exhaust all funds. It does need to be addressed. This is more than just about curb cuts and crosswalks.

Lassen agreed, she remembers undergrounding utilities was very popular in the public surveys a couple years ago.

Harris added the structure of the utility lines overhead are not in the road, they are on the sidewalks which take up sidewalk for ADA access, pedestrians, etc. It is not just eye disturbance, it is also traffic disturbance for pedestrians.

Discussion Project Goal 6: Engaging local residents and businesses, the school district, and those that use the corridor to provide input in the streetscape project.

Dupey stated this goal has been touched on with additional outreach to business. They will continue to reach out and do this through the project. They will be reviewing the public engagement plan to make sure they are not missing certain metrics. This goal is very important, but it is already a part of this project.

Polanski suggested adding “continuous input” in the goal as a reminder to do this thought out the project.

No other suggestions made.

Discussion Project Goal 7: Provide locations for people to gather, to stop and rest.

No changes were made to Goal 7.

Next steps:

The immediate next step is to continue the outreach to the businesses and expand. They want to make sure even if people do not receive feedback now, they have the opportunity in later phases of the project. They want to avoid hearing from people they were not contacted.

Polanski and Dupey will work on making the suggested changes to the goals to get them ready to present to URAB. From there, the final deliverable for Phase I is doing a summary for the Boards and receive approval to proceed with Phase II of the project.

Polanski noted they are thinking about an optional meeting with both URAC and URAB, to talk about the design process and how ODOT will play into that. Discuss the concerns and limitations based on the project goals. They will use the goals as a filter mechanism to have that discussion. Will the design guidance standards allow this project to achieve its outcomes? If not, what do they think about that?

VI ITEMS FROM MEMBERS

There was discussion regarding the process of holding special meetings, if members of URAC wanted to meet in a group to go speak with businesses. Trumbull asked how much time is required to get a public announcement out regarding a special meeting. Nilsen confirmed it is 48 hours in advance and the public would need to be notified.

The next Urban Renewal Advisory Committee meeting is scheduled June 17, 2021.

VII ADJOURN – 7:36 p.m. by unanimous consent.

Jack Trumbull, Chair

Jennifer Gray, City Recorder

Approved by the Agency on _____



HOOD RIVER URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY

Urban Renewal Advisory Committee

211 2nd Street, Hood River, OR 97031 Phone: (541) 387-5214

DATE: June 17th, 2021
TO: Urban Renewal Advisory Committee
FROM: Dustin Nilsen, Planning Director
SUBJECT: Heights Streetscape and Parking Update

Purpose of the Meeting:

The purpose of this meeting is to receive committee input and a recommendation to include a project amendment completing a parking analysis and study as part of Phase 2 of the Heights Streetscape project.

Background

Over the next 12 months, the Urban Renewal Agency will develop a preferred streetscape plan for the Heights that guides infrastructure investments focused on improving transportation efficiency, safety, and community livability. The project is broken down into three phases. The primary deliverable of Phase One is the establishment of project goals informed by a review of the background work, community feedback, and stakeholder input. This stage is nearing its completion with final deliverables going to the Urban Renewal Agency Board in July.

The following is the list of project goals reviewed by the Advisory Committee and Board.

Project Goal 1: Preserve and promote a livable community through streetscape improvements that balance safety and access for people walking and biking with parking needs to support access to local businesses and future mixed-use development.

Project Goal 2: Create an identify for the Heights that reflects the diverse culture and history of the area and as destination for residents.

Project Goal 3: Create streets and gathering spaces that provide safe, comfortable places for people walking and biking along and across the corridor and that connects area recreation and commercial destinations and neighborhoods.

Project Goal 4: Calm traffic and improve intersections to improve safety for people driving, walking, and biking and supporting local businesses.

Project Goal 5: Support existing and future development by maintaining and improving utility infrastructure as part of the streetscape project.

Project Goal 6: Engage residents and businesses, the school district, and those that use the corridor to provide ongoing input in the streetscape project.

Project Goal 7: Provide locations for people to gather, to stop and rest.

Parking

While the goals above were broadly supported, it is also clear from outreach activities that parking will be a significant issue that must be addressed in any concept alternative. Changes to the district will almost invariably require altering parking configurations, locations, and potentially even capacity. In anticipation of this potential challenge, the project team has prepared a limited-scope parking study to be included as part of the Phase Two contract for Agency consideration. The Phase 2 contract amendment is included in the packet and will go to the Board as early as July to allow for parking counts that should be completed in the high traffic summer season.

Request

Staff requests that the URAC review the scope of the parking study and provide recommendations for Board consideration. If there are elements the Committee finds essential to the success of the project, which are currently not included in the study scope, staff requests input on possible amendments to be included.

Project Team Recommendation

Based on stakeholder feedback, the project team recommends that a parking analysis be included as part of the Heights Streetscape Project Phase 2.

Suggest Motion

I move to approve an amendment including a parking analysis in Phase 2 as presented.

Alternative Motion

I move to approve an amendment including a parking analysis in Phase 2 as amended.

Attachments

1. Draft Parking Analysis Scope

**Hood River Heights District – Urban Design and Engineering
Scope for Task 9 - Parking Study Amendment**

This scope describes tasks to support an evaluation of parking types and availability within the Heights District. The study will establish a baseline for existing and potential future parking usage. Findings will be used to understand impacts to parking for streetscape concepts being developed as part of the Heights District Streetscape Project. Our efforts will be focused on evaluating the parking demand associated with existing and future land uses within the Heights District and if there will be adequate parking (on-site and on-street) to serve it. This study does not include the development of strategies to mitigate parking supply deficiencies. For the purpose of this parking study, the study boundary will include 12th Street and 13th Street between May Street and Belmont Avenue/ Union Street, as well as all cross streets for a distance of approximately one block to the west of 13th Street and to the east of 12th Street (see Figure 1).

Task 9.1 – Parking and Land Use Inventory

Assemble an inventory of all on-street and on-site parking stalls in the study boundary. Specifically, inventory on-street parking on the following street segments:

- 12th Street between May Street and Union Street
- 13th Street between May Street and Belmont Avenue
- June Street between 12th Street and 11th Street
- Taylor Street from the Jackson Park boundary (approximately 280 feet west of 13th Street) to 12th Street
- Pine Street from 12th Street to 11th Street
- C Street from 14th Street to 12th Street
- Hull Street from 12th Street to approximately 280 feet east of 12th Street
- B Street from 14th Street to 12th Street
- A Street/ Wilson Street from 14th Street to 11th Street
- Belmont Avenue/ Union Street from 14th Street to 11th Street



Figure 1: Parking Study Boundary

The on-street parking inventory must include descriptions of any signed restrictions on use (e.g., time limits, vehicle types).

The on-site parking inventory will include a count of the number of parking stalls on properties within the study boundary, with the exception of those developed with a single-family residence.

The zoning and existing land uses of all properties within the study area boundary will be documented to support sensitivity testing that compares observed parking demand to parking demand potential under current and future conditions.

Task 9.2 – Parking Occupancy Data Collection

Collect on-street and on-site parking occupancy counts during the following time periods:

- On one weekday between the hours of: 7:00 AM and 9:00 AM; 11:00 AM and 1:00 PM; 4:00 PM and 6:00 PM
- On one Saturday between the hours of 9:00 AM and 3:00 PM

As summer is assumed to be the peak month of travel activity in Hood River, the parking occupancy counts are to be collected in June, July, or August if feasible. Occupancy counts must be taken on an hourly basis to determine existing parking availability throughout the day.

Task 9.3 – Parking Demand Analysis

Estimate hourly parking generation potential for properties within the study boundary under current and future conditions using industry standard parking rates from the Parking Generation Manual, 5th edition, and Shared Parking, 3rd edition. Estimates of current parking generation potential will be based on current land uses present. Estimates of future parking generation potential will be based on a future land use scenario that reflects reasonable levels and types of new development and redevelopment, to be determined through coordination with City staff. Forecast parking demand will be separated out into commercial (non-residential) and residential categories.

Compare the actual weekday and weekend hourly parking demands observed to the calculated demands for current and future conditions to establish a reasonable range of expected parking demands within the study boundary. Compare this range of parking demands to the available on-street and on-site parking to identify areas under or over capacity, assessing both the sufficiency of the overall supply of parking as well as the convenience of parking.

Task 9.4 – Parking Study Reporting

Document the procedures used for this study and present the findings in a draft Hood River Heights District Parking Study white paper and provide the draft for review and comment by the City. Incorporate City comments into a final white paper.

Provide a brief PowerPoint slide deck presenting the findings of the Hood River Heights District Parking Study white paper and present the findings at one meeting.

e s t i m a t e d p r o j e c t c o s t

Hood River Heights District Corridor Study Amendment for Parking Study



Team fee breakdown

2021-06-04

MIG		Subconsultant DKS	
<i>Project Manager</i>		Subconsultant Totals	
<i>Hours @</i>	\$210		

9 Parking Study				Hours	Fee
9.1	Parking and Land Use Inventory			47	\$6,930
	Desktop Inventories	1	\$210	27	\$4,080
	Field Verification of Inventories			20	\$2,850
9.2	Parking Occupancy and Data Collection			87	\$10,745
	Weekday Data Collection			52	\$6,365
	Weekend Data Collection			35	\$4,380
9.3	Parking Demand Analysis			59	\$10,460
	Current parking demand calcs	2	\$420	18	\$3,200
	Develop future land use scenario	2	\$420	20	\$3,480
	Future parking demand calcs			21	\$3,780
9.4	Parking Study Reporting			54	\$9,040
	Draft Report and meeting	4	\$840	41	\$6,700
	Final Report	1	\$210	13	\$2,340
Professional Time Subtotal		10	\$2,100	247	\$37,175