



Oregon

Theodore R. Kulongoski, Governor

Department of Land Conservation and Development

635 Capitol Street, Suite 150

Salem, OR 97301-2540

(503) 373-0050

Fax (503) 378-5518

www.oregon.gov/LCD



October 2, 2008

TO: Land Conservation and Development Commission

FROM: Richard Whitman, Director
Robert Cortright, Transportation Planning Coordinator

SUBJECT: **Agenda Item 9, October 15-17, 2008 LCDC Commission Meeting**

EUGENE-SPRINGFIELD TRANSPORTATION PLANNING RULE WORK PLAN REVIEW AND APPROVAL

I. AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

The cities of Eugene and Springfield and Lane County are requesting Commission approval of a work plan to complete an updated regional transportation system plan (RTSP) in compliance with the requirements of the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). Commission approval is required because preparation and adoption of the updated RTSP will extend beyond the one-year deadline allowed for such updates in the TPR.

Commission approval would result in adoption of an updated RTSP by the affected local governments in 2013. Additional time is necessary to coordinate development of an updated RTSP with other regional planning activity, notably development of separate comprehensive plan, transportation system plans, and urban growth boundaries for Eugene and Springfield and consideration of possible urban growth boundary amendments consistent with Goal 14.

The department recommends approval of the work plan with conditions requiring Eugene and Springfield to complete reporting on TPR related benchmarks and performance measures.

A. Type of Action and Commission Role

OAR 660-012-0016(2)(b) authorizes the Commission to approve a work program for completion of RTSP updates. The Commission's decision is not directed or constrained by the rule.

B. Staff Contact Information

For additional information about this agenda item please contact Bob Cortright at 503-373-0050, ext. 241, or by email bob.cortright@state.or.us.

II. RECOMMENDATION

The director recommends, based on the information contained in this report, that the Commission approve the attached work plan (Attachment B) for completion and adoption of an updated RTSP as provided in the TPR (OAR 660-012-0016(2)(b)).

III. BACKGROUND

A. History of Action

The TPR requires metropolitan areas to adopt update RTSPs and update them at five year intervals in coordination with federally-required regional transportation plans. The Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) – which includes the Eugene-Springfield urban area – adopted an updated Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to meet federal requirements in November 2007. Under the TPR, the cities are otherwise required to adopt an updated RTSP within one year of that date unless the commission approves a work plan for a longer period of time.

The distinction between an RTP and an RTSP is explained further later in this report. The work plan before the Commission addresses update of the RTSP.

In November 2007, local staff advised the department that amendments to the RTSP (locally called “TransPlan”) to comply with the TPR would not be accomplished within one year. Since that time, department staff has been working with local staff to prepare a work plan itemizing tasks necessary to complete an updated RTSP in compliance with applicable TPR requirements. On September 15, 2007, Lane County, Eugene and Springfield reviewed and approved the proposed work plan for submittal to the Commission. (The proposed work plan is included as Attachment B. Attachment C includes a detailed outline that shows how the proposed work plan relates to and is integrated with other local and MPO planning activities.) The proposed work plan and schedule calls for adoption of an updated RTSP by 2013.

In May 2008, the Commission received a similar request from Metro to approve a work plan for completing an updated state version of the Metro 2035 Regional Transportation Plan to comply with the TPR. The Commission approved a work plan for Metro, which extends through 2010.

B. Major Legal and Policy Issues

1. Coordination of Federal and State Required Regional Transportation Planning. Regional transportation planning within MPOs is guided by federal and state laws. Federal transportation law requires formation of MPOs – designated by the governor and made up of local officials – to prepare a coordinated long-range transportation plan – a regional transportation plan. The content and process for development and adoption of such plans is directed by federal law and regulations.

The TPR requires cities and counties within MPOs to adopt a regional transportation system plan or RTSP. The RTSP must comply with relevant portions of the TPR, and must be consistent with the applicable statewide plans (such as the Oregon Highway Plan). In addition, once adopted, the RTSP provides a framework for local transportation system plans (TSPs).

In most respects, federal and state requirements call for the same product – a long-range transportation plan that includes a network of planned transportation facilities, services and improvements that is coordinated with other relevant plans and policies, including those related to land use. A key difference is how plans are adopted and their legal effect. Federally required plans are adopted by the MPO board – made up primarily of local elected officials. While the resulting plan must be consistent with relevant federal requirements; adoption of an RTP is not a land use decision under Oregon law. RTSPs are adopted by local governments as comprehensive plan amendments; and are, consequently, land use decisions that must comply with the TPR and other applicable statewide planning goals and rules.

In 2006, the Commission amended the TPR to specifically address coordination of TPR-required planning with federally required planning in MPOs. The objective of the amendment is to coordinate and integrate planning to avoid duplication of effort in meeting state and federal requirements. Overall, the rule calls for metropolitan areas to “insofar as possible” use a single coordinated process to develop plans to meet state and federal requirements.

The Commission specifically amended the requirements for plan updates and reporting on benchmarks so that they would synchronize state timelines with federally required updates. The intended result is that state and federally required plan updates should be prepared at the same time, using the same information and processes.

Federal requirements for preparation of RTPs include coordination requirements that are very similar to those in the TPR. In particular, federal rules direct that MPO plans be consistent with state and local land use plans and policies.

2. Status of Regional Transportation Planning in Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area.

The Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area’s approach to addressing state and federal requirements has changed over the last ten years. In 2001, following a multiyear process, the two cities and Lane County adopted TransPlan to serve as the both the federal RTP and the state RTSP.

Starting in 2004, the MPO has undertaken to amend and update the federally required RTP separately from the state required RTSP. The result, following adoption of the 2007 Central Lane Regional Transportation Plan is that the region now has two separate plans: the 2007 RTP that addresses federal requirements, and the preexisting 2001 TransPlan that addresses state requirements.

Key differences between two plans are as follows:

- The updated RTP used a planning horizon of 2031; TransPlan is current through 2015.

- The RTP does not include the West Eugene Parkway as a planned improvement; TransPlan does.
- The RTP does not address the status of TransPlan benchmarks and has been amended to delete benchmarks and performance measures required by the TPR.
- The RTP list of financially constrained transportation projects has been amended to include two major interchange projects on Highway 126 in Springfield that are not included in TransPlan's fiscally constrained project list.

3. Key Local Planning Issues. Preparation and adoption of an updated RTSP is a key element in regional efforts to comply with the TPR. The current effort involves preparation of a major update to the 2001 TransPlan, which currently serves as the regional transportation system plan. The region's update will address several significant issues:

- Develop a new framework for regional transportation planning reflecting HB 3337 which results in separate UGBs for Eugene and Springfield
- Report on progress in addressing adopted benchmarks and performance measures related to TPR compliance
- Incorporate the City of Coburg in the updated RTSP
- Make the state RTSP and the federal RTP consistent with one another
- Coordinate with development and adoption of updated plans for Eugene and Springfield to 2030 and beyond

4. TPR Compliance. A key element in RTSPs for metropolitan areas is the adoption of standards and actions that significantly increase the availability and convenience of alternative modes of transportation and that reduce reliance on the automobile.

Eugene-Springfield's adopted standard – included in TransPlan and approved by LCDC in May 2001 – is a multi-part standard based in large part on implementation of the region's nodal development strategy. The strategy includes designation of a series of mixed use centers, implementation of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and other supporting transit and bicycle system improvements. The locally developed standard sets the following targets:

- 74 miles of priority bike lanes
- 2000 acres in nodal development designations
- 23% of new housing units in nodes
- 45% of new employment within nodes

The approved standard includes benchmarks to be met at five year intervals which are outlined in the chart included in Table 7 from TransPlan:

Table 7
Alternative TPR Performance Measures for the Eugene-Springfield MPO
 (approved by LCDC on May 4th, 2001)

Measure	Key Plan Element	Plan Implementation or Travel/Market Response	1995	2005	2010	2015
% Non-Auto Trips	Alternative Modes	Travel Response	14.43% Walk=8.93% Bike=3.68% Bus=1.83%	15%	16%	17% Walk=10% Bike=4% Bus=3%
% Transit Mode Share on Congested Corridors	Transit	Travel Response	5.8% 5.9% in 1999	6.8%	8.0%	10.0%
Priority Bikeway Miles	Bicycle	Plan Implementation		15 miles	45 miles	74 miles
Acres of zoned nodal development	Nodal Development	Plan Implementation		1,000 acres	1,500 acres	2,000 acres zoned for nodal development
% of dwelling units built in nodes	Nodal Development	Market Response		2.5% 5.6%	14.5% 20.4%	23.3% of new Dus
% of New "Total" Employment in Nodes	Nodal Development	Market Response		10% 18.1%	25% 32.6	45%
Internal VMT			2,305,779			3,224,037
VMT/Capita			11			10.9

In approving this standard, the Commission expressed concern that the cities move quickly to implement the nodal development strategy. The Commission was concerned that much of the land identified for nodal development was not appropriately planned and zoned and that interim development could undermine implementation of nodal development. Consequently, the Commission asked the local governments to accelerate identification and zoning of nodes and to report on progress the following year.

In 2002, Eugene and Springfield reported on the status of local efforts to select areas for nodal development. The cities reported they had identified nodes including more than 2000 acres of nodal development. While this met the target, the department and commission asked that the cities do additional analysis to assess whether the identified nodes include sufficient developable

and redevelopable land to meet regional targets for housing and employment in nodes. (According to city estimates, the identified nodes included only about 700 acres of vacant or redevelopable land.) The department noted that, depending on the outcome of this analysis it might be necessary for local governments to identify additional lands or nodal development to meet the adopted targets.

The 2031 Central Lane MPO Regional Transportation Plan, adopted in November 2007, provides updated estimates on the three “transportation” performance measures – transit mode share, non-auto trip percentage, and priority bikeway miles for the horizon year 2031. (The 2031 CLMPO RTP did not estimate nodal development implementation or provide estimates for the interim progress.) In March 2008, MPO staff provided an initial report on progress on housing and employment in nodal development areas through 2005. Raw data shows that housing and employment in nodes is close to or exceeds benchmarks for 2005. However, much of the housing and employment is in *potential* nodes – areas that have not yet been planned or zoned for nodal development. Consequently, more analysis by city staff is needed to determine whether the development that occurred in these areas is “nodal” in character.

IV. ANALYSIS

The period of time requested to complete this update is substantial. The proposed schedule extends beyond the next benchmark and plan update periods (2010 and 2011). While the department is concerned about the amount of time requested, we believe it is warranted because of the unique circumstances in this metropolitan area.

Regional planning in the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area is in transition. The long-standing arrangement based upon a single regional land use plan is in the process of being replaced by separate but coordinated plans for each city. This affects land use and transportation plans, and means additional time and resources will be needed to prepare an updated RTSP.

The department’s primary interest in this update is that local governments implement the locally developed, commission-approved goals for reducing reliance on the automobile in a timely way. This is important because progress in meeting benchmarks is supposed to be a major factor guiding plan updates, and should result in identification and evaluation of additional actions to be included in the updated RTSP to meet the performance measures. Work related to benchmarks and performance measures is especially important for this update for several reasons:

- Evaluation of progress in meeting 2005 benchmarks is not yet complete.
- Analysis to date shows that most of the housing and employment counted as “nodal” has occurred in potential or proposed nodes – i.e., on lands that are not currently planned or zoned for nodal development. Additional analysis is needed to determine whether this development is, in fact, nodal in character.
- The proposed work plan extends past the next benchmark period (2010), and benchmarks for 2010 call for accelerated progress in implementation of nodal development.

- Expected outcomes in the 2031 RTP falls short of meeting the adopted 2015 performance measures for transit mode share, non-auto travel, and priority bikeway miles.
- The cities are also considering possible UGB expansions over this same period of time; work on performance measures related to nodal development needs to be integrated and coordinated with related Goal 14 analysis. (TransPlan targets for nodal development needs to be factored into Goal 14 housing and land needs analysis.)
- Performance measures and benchmarks will need to be extended to match the extended planning period, and measures need to be developed to cover the expanded metropolitan area, that now includes the City of Coburg.

It is particularly important that this update evaluate progress in meeting the 2010 benchmarks. As noted above, TransPlan benchmarks anticipate much more nodal development will occur in between 2005 and 2010 than has occurred through 2005. Since this plan update will not be completed until 2013, it is logical that progress during the 2005-2010 period be considered during this update, and not deferred to a subsequent update.

V. COMMISSION OPTIONS

The Commission may:

1. Approve or disapprove of Eugene, Springfield and Lane County's proposed work plan for preparation and adoption of the updated regional transportation system plan; or
2. Request further information from the department or local governments before acting on the request.

VI. DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION AND DRAFT MOTION

The department recommends that the Commission support the director's recommendation and accept the request from Eugene, Springfield and Lane County for the Commission to proposed work plan for preparation and adoption of an updated RTSP in compliance with the TPR.

The department recommends that the Commission approve the proposed work plan included in Attachment B with the following condition:

In the performance measure work scheduled for the 1st through 4th quarters 2009 the cities will assess progress in meeting benchmarks for 2005 and 2010 and shall, as necessary, identify and evaluate additional measures to meet TransPlan's TPR Performance Standards.¹ This will also include developing benchmarks and performance measures for the extended planning period (likely 2031 or 2035).

¹ See Table 7 above "Alternative TPR Performance Measures for the Eugene-Springfield MPO"

Proposed Motion: I move that the Commission approve the request from Eugene, Springfield and Lane County to approve the proposed work plan for preparation and adoption of an updated regional transportation system plan to comply with the Transportation Planning Rule as set forth in Attachment B with the condition recommended in the department's staff report.

Alternative Motion (1): I move that the Commission approve the request from Eugene, Springfield and Lane County to approve the proposed work plan for preparation and adoption of an updated regional transportation system plan to comply with the Transportation Planning Rule as set forth in Attachment B.

Alternative Motion (2): I move that the Commission deny the request from Eugene, Springfield and Lane County to approve the proposed work plan for preparation and adoption of an updated regional transportation system plan to comply with the Transportation Planning Rule as set forth in Attachment B because [findings].

Alternative Motion (3): I move that the Commission approve the request from Eugene, Springfield and Lane County to approve the proposed work plan for preparation and adoption of an updated regional transportation system plan to comply with the Transportation Planning Rule as set forth in Attachment B modified as follows: * * *

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Transmittal Letter from Local Planning Directors, September 29, 2008
- B. Regional Transportation Work Plan, September 8, 2008, 2 pages
- C. Joint Elected Officials Meeting Packet, September 15, 2008, 13 pages