

FROM PRELIMINARY DRAFT MINUTES OF NOVEMBER, 2007 MPC MEETING

Mr. Zelenka expressed concern with insufficient linkage to land use plans and inadequate public involvement. **He asked staff to bring back, in cooperation with Eugene, Springfield and Lane County, a discussion of actions that had to be taken, deadlines and impacts on different jurisdictions and ways to improve public involvement.** He said the RTP contained hundreds of millions of dollars in projects and only a few people came to testify. **He also requested an analysis of how the projects in the plan matched with anticipated State resources over the next several funding cycles, as he felt the RTP did not match the reality of available funding.**

Mr. Zelenka also asked for an estimate of the costs associated with the list of planning activities and deadlines he requested earlier, along with an accounting of how the \$100,000 budgeted by LCOG for public involvement was spent.

Mr. Zelenka asked if updating TransPlan would require an update to the RTP. Mr. Vanderpool said the RTP must be updated at least every four years, but could be updated sooner if necessary.

Mr. Sorenson asked if adoption of the RTP triggered a requirement to update TransPlan within a one-year period. Mr. Vanderpool said the State Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) required one of three things to occur upon adoption of an RTP: 1) amend the local transportation system plans to be consistent with the RTP, or 2) issue a finding of consistency, or 3) enter into a work program agreement with the Department of Land Conservation and Development. He said local jurisdictions would determine which approach they would take. He said staff could report back to the MPC at its next meeting on discussions among local jurisdictions about next steps.

In response to a question from Mr. Sorenson, Mr. Vanderpool indicated that the two Springfield projects were moved from the illustrative to the financially constrained list in the RTP, but did not change their status in TransPlan as there was no concept of a financially constrained list in state plans. He said the projects' status was only being changed at the federal level, not the local level.

Mr. Sorenson questioned why the MPC should take action before it fully understood the implications of that action.

Mr. Vanderpool said that local jurisdictions had been meeting for the past year to discuss the implications for local planning processes and he doubted that those questions would be resolved by the next MPC meeting.
