

**From:** ZAKO Rob (SMTP)  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 12, 2005 4:11 PM  
**To:** \*LCOG TPC  
**Subject:** Fwd: Single transportation plan for Central Lane MPO region?

Dear TPC,

Please distribute the message below (which is slightly edited from the original to correct typos) as part of the packet for MPC's June meeting. We believe these ideas will help MPC understand what the requirements are for different transportation plans and how these requirements might be met.

Thank you, Rob

----- Forwarded Message -----

**From:** Rob Zako <rob@friends.org>  
**Date:** Fri, 15 Apr 2005 14:44:58 -0700  
**To:** \*LCOG TPC <TPC@lane.cog.or.us>  
**Cc:** George Kloeppel <gkloeppel@lane.cog.or.us>, Bob Cortright <Bob.Cortright@state.or.us>  
**Subject:** Single transportation plan for Central Lane MPO region?

Dear TPC,

We are pleased by the direction set by MPC on Thursday to "pursue" a single transportation plan for the region.

In particular, as you know, the TPR requires a **REGIONAL** TSP for facilities of regional significance within the jurisdiction of the MPO, i.e., roughly Eugene, Springfield and Coburg:

[OAR 660-012-0015\(2\)](#)

MPOs and counties shall prepare and amend regional TSPs in compliance with this division. MPOs shall prepare regional TSPs for facilities of regional significance within their jurisdiction. Counties shall prepare regional TSPs for all other areas and facilities:

(a) Regional TSPs shall establish a system of transportation facilities and services adequate to meet identified regional transportation needs and shall be consistent with adopted elements of the state TSP;

(b) Where elements of the state TSP have not been adopted, the MPO or county shall coordinate the preparation of the regional TSP with ODOT to assure that state transportation needs are accommodated;

(c) Regional TSPs prepared by MPOs other than metropolitan service districts shall be adopted by the counties and cities within the jurisdiction of the MPO. Metropolitan service districts shall adopt a regional TSP for areas within their jurisdiction;

(d) Regional TSPs prepared by counties shall be adopted by the county.

Fortunately, the federal requirements similarly require a transportation plan for facilities of regional significance (and receiving federal funds) within the MPO area.

Thus it should be relatively straightforward to have a single transportation plan for the region -- including goals, objectives and policies; capital investment actions and funding strategies; other implementation strategies; and performance measures, including alternative performance measures to meet the TPR -- to satisfy federal and state requirements for a regional plan. Of

course, there is a federal but not a state requirement for a financial constraint. So the single plan could have a financially constrained list and a "future" or "illustrative" list.

This is essentially what was long done with TransPlan. The only recent significant change is the addition of Coburg to the MPO area. This necessitates adding facilities of regional significance (or that receive federal funding) into the regional plan. This is true to meet both federal and state requirements.

Mind you, we agree that the approach outlined above is certainly not the only approach nor is it required. We know that DLCD (Bob Cortright) agrees. The aim should be to satisfy the substance of the requirements, not necessarily to have plans bound in this form or that. We are not sure what FHWA's latest thinking is. We are only saying -- as MPC is saying -- that it would be simpler and less confusing to have one plan rather than two.

What this proposal does **NOT** address is the **LOCAL** TSPs for the cities of Eugene, Springfield and Coburg. The TPR requires local TSPs:

[OAR 660-012-0015\(3\)](#)

[Cities and counties shall prepare, adopt and amend local TSPs for lands within their planning jurisdiction in compliance with this division:](#)

[\(a\) Local TSPs shall establish a system of transportation facilities and services adequate to meet identified local transportation needs and shall be consistent with regional TSPs and adopted elements of the state TSP;](#)

[\(b\) Where the regional TSP or elements of the state TSP have not been adopted, the city or county shall coordinate the preparation of the local TSP with the regional transportation planning body and ODOT to assure that regional and state transportation needs are accommodated.](#)

One way to handle this requirement would be to have three chapters in the single transportation plan, one for each city, that includes facilities that aren't regional and aren't federally funded, in particular, collectors and other local streets. Each of these three chapters could be excluded from the RTP adopted by MPC but would need to be adopted only by the relevant cities.

Alternatively, each city could develop its own local TSP.

Or Eugene and Springfield could still have a single local TSP for the two cities, much as is done now.

But I think the simplest -- if not the only way -- to proceed and to ensure consistency between plans and requirements, would be to have a single transportation plan for the regional that meets all of these requirements.

Thanks, Rob

--

Rob Zako  
Transportation Advocate  
1000 Friends of Oregon  
1280-B East 28th Ave., Eugene, OR 97403-1616 (home office)  
(541) 343-5201 (home office)  
(541) 683-6333 (fax)  
rob@friends.org

Become an Oregon donor: <http://www.friends.org/support>

----- End of Forwarded Message -----