



### Attachment 3 Public Comments Received on FY2008-09 UPWP

#### Background

At the date this memo was written, two written comments had been received on the Draft FY 2008-09 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) (Attached).

Any additional comments received between April 2 and April 6, the close of the public comment period, will be presented at the April 10 MPC meeting.

In his letter dated March 18, Rob Zako makes three recommendations:

1. Include language from the State of Oregon Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) in sections I.E.1(vi) and III.A.2 of the 2008-09 UPWP.
2. Change the statement on actions by the MPO with respect to climate change and greenhouse gas emissions in I.E.3(v) and I.E.4.
3. Complete an evaluation of FY2007-08 public involvement efforts prior to approving workplan items for FY2008-09.

#### Staff Response :

1. *The UPWP is a federal document that requires compliance with federal, not state, regulation. Staff does not recommend including state language in the UPWP document. That said, the UPWP does include a number of work items related to assisting local jurisdictions with development of their state-required Transportation System Plans, and the local Regional Transportation System Plan.*
2. *Staff recommends the language in section I.E.4 (page 9) be changed to incorporate several of Mr. Zako's recommendations, as well as explicitly schedule a policy discussion on this issue with the MPC in FY2008-09.*
3. *The CAC is currently completing their review of the MPO's FY2008-09 public involvement efforts and a report is expected back to the MPC within the next two months. Given the need to adopt the UPWP in time to allow necessary contracts with the state to be completed before the beginning of the fiscal year, and that any changes recommended by the CAC or desired by the MPC can be made at any time, staff does not recommend delaying adoption of the FY2008-09 UPWP.*

In her memorandum of March 24, Eleanor Mulder notes several deficiencies with the acronym list included in the MPC packet.

#### Staff Response:

*The acronym list has been updated to include the items identified by Ms. Mulder. Although she did not request it, staff recommends an acronym list be included in the UPWP document, and have included that recommendation on pages 51 and 52.*

#### Attachments:

Comments Received through noon, April 2.



## Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization

---

**From:** Rob Zako [rzako@efn.org]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 18, 2008 1:26 PM  
**To:** Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization  
**Cc:** \*LCOG MPO CAC  
**Subject:** Re: Public comment wanted on Unified Planning Work Program

**Attachments:** RZ-CLMPO-UPWP-20080318.pdf



RZ-CLMPO-UPWP-2  
 0080318.pdf (13...

Dear Central Lane MPO (and Transportation Citizens Advisory Committee),

Attached please find my specific recommendations for changes to the draft FY2008-2009 UPWP. These comments elaborate on my more general oral comments at the recent MPC meeting.

Thank you,  
 Rob

--

Rob Zako  
 rzako@efn.org  
 (541) 343-5201 (voice)  
 (541) 683-6333 (fax)  
 1280-B East 28th Ave., Eugene, OR 97403-1616

P.S. Speaking of public involvement and consistent with my comments in the attached memo, in my estimation the notice below would be unlikely to get anyone but one of the few "usual suspects" such as myself to respond. Yes, the notice below indicates that there is a public hearing on something or another and an opportunity to comment. But why in the world would a "soccer mom" or a "pickup dad" take time out of her or his busy life to provide comments on something called the "UPWP." What is this thing and what difference does it make? What choices are being considered, and what difference would one choice or another have on the average citizen.

As I indicate in my memo, if the investment of close to \$150,000 per year in public involvement is to be money well spent, then the MPO needs to do more to communicate to the public in a language that is understood and matters.

P.P.S. Starting to televise meetings might make a positive difference, as it is amazing how many people watch public meetings on community television. Once people start watching MPC meetings, they might begin to take a greater interest in its work.

> From: <mpo@lcog.org>  
 > Date: Fri, 7 Mar 2008 17:02:46 -0800 (PST)  
 > To: <rob@friends.org>  
 > Subject: Public comment wanted on Unified Planning Work Program  
 >  
 >  
 > Central Lane MPO Draft FY09 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)  
 >  
 > Public comment is invited!  
 >











