



April 30, 2008

To: Metropolitan Policy Committee  
From: Andrea G. Riner  
Subject: Item 5.c: Information on Integration of TransPlan with RTP

**Action Recommended: Information and discussion only.**

**Background**

This memo is in response to the motion approved at the April 10, 2008 meeting of the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) directing the Transportation Planning Committee (TPC) to review the issue of one versus two plans and to report back to the MPC. The two plans reference TransPlan (the Eugene-Springfield Transportation System Plan, or TSP) and the Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO) Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The TSP was last adopted in July, 2002, the RTP was last adopted in November, 2007.

MPC has considered this topic previously, during the course of several meetings in 2005 and 2006. Much of that discussion was in response to a motion passed by MPC in April, 2005 directing a work plan item that results in a single document that revises both the Regional Transportation Plan and the Transportation System Plan. (For additional background, refer to this August, 2005 summary of the RTP and TSP requirements and interrelationships <http://www.lcog.org/meetings/mpc/082005/MPC4.dAttachment2comparisonofFedRTPandStTSPreqts.pdf> and this July, 2005 Oregon Department of Justice memo on "Discussion of issues associated with blending the federal regional planning process with the state regional planning process" <http://www.lcog.org/meetings/mpc/082005/MPC4.dAttachment1HeitschMemo.pdf>)

Outside of general research outlined in the Discussion below, the TPC has not had the opportunity to thoroughly revisit and review the issue of a combined document, primarily due to our focus on developing the transportation and land use planning timeline and the draft work plan for LCDC. MPO staff have scheduled the TPC and its subcommittee to address this issue during weekly meetings in May and will provide a status report to the MPC at the June 12, 2008 meeting.

**Discussion**

MPO staff conducted an overview of the materials and discussions that occurred during consideration of this topic in 2005/06. The most recent MPC agenda item to address this topic occurred at the March, 2006 MPC meeting. At that meeting, staff presented a summary of the discussion of two plans or one plan and noted that the issue is actually much broader than the coordination of those two documents. The overarching issue was one of clarity and understanding by the public, decision-makers, and staff of the multiple requirements, processes

and products that comprise transportation planning in the MPO area. It was pointed out during the 2005/06 discussions that education, understanding, involvement and cooperation at all of these levels is the goal.

The March, 2006 MPC agenda item moved from a summary of the discussion over the previous eight months to a proposal for moving toward a more understandable transportation planning process in the MPO area. That discussion then led to the implementation of “eMPO,” including a multi-phase work program across the jurisdictions toward an integrated and interactive electronic format for transportation planning information. The MPC discussion of eMPO resulted in direction to move forward with the first phase of that effort, focusing staff efforts on bringing clarity, accessibility, transparency and integration to the multiple documents and processes, rather than working specifically to combine TransPlan and the RTP. The first phase of the eMPO effort was completed recently with the new MPO web site, and includes new capabilities such as interactive mapping of the RTP projects, information for each project, self-managed interested party subscription lists, and access to all of the MPO’s documents. Future phases will further integrate other transportation planning documents from all jurisdictions and enhance public involvement information.

### **Conclusion**

Based on the comments received from the MPC and other stakeholders, the primary issue is not having two individual plans or one combined plan. Instead, this is seen as a recommended solution to an array of valid concerns regarding the following:

- General confusion about the similarities in and the differences between the two plans that contributes to increased frustration throughout the public involvement process;
- Real or perceived lack of integration of land use and transportation policies and goals at the local, state and federal levels; and
- Duplication of efforts and the inefficient use of limited public resources.

MPO staff request that the MPC continue to highlight and define these concerns over the coming months as we develop the planning framework for the Regional Transportation System Plan, and to provide the team with a set of expectations regarding improvements for public involvement, integration of land use and transportation efforts, and efficiencies. It will be the responsibility of the MPO staff team to develop a range of solutions to respond to these concerns, any of which may or may not be solved by changing the document format.

### **Action Recommended: Information and discussion only.**