

DRAFT
TPR Work Group Meeting Summary
August 2, 2005 9:00 - 12:00
ODOT Training Center, Suite C

Attendees: Mike Montero (Montero & Associates); Rob Zako (1000 Friends of Oregon); Gary Cardwell (NW Container Services); Helen Burns Sharp (City of Albany); Scott Bricker (Bicycle Transportation Alliance); Marianne Fitzgerald (DEQ); Andy Back (Washington County); Scott Pemble (Clackamas County); Tom Schwetz (Lane County Council of Governments); Ann Glaze (Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee); Bonnie Heitsch (DOJ)

Guests, Staff and Consultants: Justin Klure (Dept. of Energy); Jeanne Lawson, Consultant; Frank Angelo, Consultant; Mark Greenfield, Consultant; Craig Greenleaf, ODOT; Jerri Bohard, ODOT; Anna Russo, ODOT; Bob Sherman, ODOT; Sharon Kautz, ODOT

Welcome and Introductions – Jeanne Lawson

We welcome Rob Zako from 1000 Friends of Oregon to the Work Group. At the beginning of this process 1000 Friends of Oregon had been invited to send a member to participate in the Work Group, but due to other commitments, they had declined.

Review Role of Work Group and Discuss Today's Agenda – Jeanne Lawson

Jeanne Lawson - The purpose of the TPR Work Group is to provide advice to the OTC/LCDC TPR Subcommittee, with focus on specific issues the subcommittee directed the Work Group to address. We have gone through and there have been various questions posed to the group. The group represents a variety of interests, and the hope is we can find consensus on issues that can then be forwarded to the Subcommittee.

Bob Cortright - When we started this process a number of issues were identified by Frank Angelo's stakeholder interviews the Commission and the Subcommittee asked the Work Group to address. The decisions reached here will go forward to the Subcommittee for review, and then will be forwarded on for rulemaking.

Jeanne Lawson - We will be addressing a variety of issues today, with the primary purpose being the discussion of the Purpose Statement.

Update of July 19 TPR Subcommittee Meeting – Frank Angelo

Issues addressed by the Subcommittee:

- Amendments to 0070: Provisions for transportation improvements on rural lands. Staff had submitted revised language on 0070 as well as amendments to Division 4 to make the amendments to 0070 conforming. We pulled the requirements for exceptions for transportation facilities on rural lands entirely into 0070 and made the appropriate references in Division 4. Mark Greenfield did a presentation on the proposed amendments. Subcommittee has accepted the recommendation, and they will be forwarded to LCDC for possible rulemaking.

Rob Zako – 1000 Friends had chosen not to be in this process until now, but in light of some new information, 1000 Friends will have some comments to the LCDC, realizing the Subcommittee has signed off on those.

- Purpose Statement: Considerable discussion on revisions to the purpose statement. Presented the side-by-side version to the subcommittee. The subcommittee felt the proposed revisions to the purpose were not representative of a major policy shift, and have referred the purpose statement back to the work group for more discussion and with specific requests for the work group to identify where you feel any intent or policy shifts have occurred.

Jeanne Lawson – The tenor of the subcommittee was that the revisions looked okay. They did not see any policy shift, it looks consistent. Yes, the charge was to address reduced reliance and readability, so if you feel there is a policy shift, show us where it is and give us ideas on how to address that.

- MPO Presentation by Bob Cortright. There was also a meeting of the MPOs, July 27 on the issues Bob had identified during his review of the MPO status November 04. We indicated we would get back to the subcommittee at their next meeting with specific recommendations that emerged from the July 27 meeting. Bob Cortright will touch on this later in today's agenda.
- TPR Guidelines: The process charts for 0060 were presented to the subcommittee. These are sort of the first step in preparing some guidelines that identify implementation steps for the amendments that were made and adopted by LCDC in March for Section 0060.

The last part of the meeting was devoted to the three issues that emerged from the last TPR Work Group meeting:

- Reasonably Likely Project List
- Zone Changes in Conformance with Comprehensive Plans.
- Quasi Judicial Amendments to Transportation System Plan

Subcommittee was briefed on these three topics. The subcommittee directed us not to consider these items any further as part of this phase of the review of the TPR.

Informational item: Final amendments to Section 0050 which deal with project development. The subcommittee accepted the amendments to 0050 and has forwarded them to LCDC for consideration.

Helen Burns Sharp – Was there any discussion on the ½ mile rule?

Craig Greenleaf – Because many of the concerns had been coming from Metro and Metro area jurisdictions, Metro staff, Region 1 staff and TDD staff met with Metro and explored the relationship between interchange area management plan work and Section 0060, trying to assess whether there were certain of the listed interchanges that were of particular concern. Exchanged thoughts on how to undertake that work and have indicated our interest in trying to get that work underway within the limits of staff capacity and financial resources.

Helen Burns Sharp – Would this also be true for non-Metro interchanges?

Craig Greenleaf – Yes. The commission identified a number of interchanges across the state we felt were priority interchanges to take a specific look at. We have undertaken the work to do interchange area management plans with respect to a number of these.

Frank Angelo – We did have the opportunity to talk to two committees at Metro, MPAC and TPAC, where we presented the ½ mile rule and the process charts.

Coordination with DEQ – Frank Angelo

We had an opportunity to meet with Marianne and Justin on the purpose statement, and some suggested revisions on their part, which will be brought up in the discussion of the purpose statement today.

Purpose Statement – Frank Angelo

We were asked to do a side-by-side comparison of the original purpose statement and the revised purpose statement. You will find it in your packet as a July 25 Angelo/Eaton memo.

In the interviews I did with the stakeholders, the term “reduced reliance on the automobile” was an issue raised as being of concern, and possibly being perceived by smaller jurisdictions as an obstacle in the preparation of their Transportation System Plans. The issue of reduced reliance also came up in Bob’s reviews with the MPOs.

In March when LCDC adopted the amendments to 0060 they directed the Joint Subcommittee to consider the issue of reduced reliance in the purpose statement. We have proposed some revisions to the purpose statement that we believe retain the existing policy and intent, while providing clarification and improving readability; brought into

the purpose statement some of the elements that were missing in the original purpose statement that are contained in the body of the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR); and tried to establish and clarify the hierarchy the TPR establishes for MPO planning expectations in non-MPO areas.

Jeanne Lawson – We pointedly asked the subcommittee, because the issue of reduced reliance and the concerns around that could be seen as a policy shift, how would you address that? The question that was posed to them was, “Is this a policy shift around reduced reliance, or are we trying to restructure the language in such a way that it does not automatically incite those negative responses?” The subcommittee was clear that they did not want to shift away from the goal underlying reduced reliance.

The question to you today is going to be if you have concerns, where is the policy shift?

Schedule Briefing – Bob Cortright

The next meeting of the Joint OTC/LCDC Subcommittee is scheduled for Sept. 23. Then we will brief LCDC on the TPR amendments at their meeting in Bend. The following week, the end of September, we anticipate scheduling two commission hearings, one at the Nov 30/Dec 1 meeting in Medford. LCDC likes to do the adoptions in two phases so they have time to consider the issues. We would tentatively schedule for the commission to consider the amendments for adoption at their January meeting (no date yet).

Overview of the Side-by-Side Purpose Statement

Craig Greenleaf – The discussions we had with DEQ are of a little more global treatment of the issue. If we go through this a sentence at a time, we are going to miss the overarching issue that DEQ wanted to bring to the table.

Frank Angelo – You have in your packet the side-by-side purposes statement matrix in the July 25 memo. The proposed language is in the left column, the existing language is in the center column, and we have provided some commentary in the right column.

The new section (1) is an articulation of the purpose of the TPR, separating some of the purpose statements into (a) through (j), which we believe are all contained in the purpose statement, it is just a matter of formatting. The revised language does contain the language the existing purpose to promote the development of safe, convenient and economic transportation systems. If there is any substantive difference, it would be in the linkage of land use and transportation planning, which we have tried to highlight in the new proposed purpose statement. The language in and of it self remains consistent with the TPR.

Going through (a) through (j), we have highlighted and pulled out as individual statements the purposes, rather than having them as part of a single paragraph.

1(a) through (e): Except for the elimination of the term “reduced reliance on the automobile” language in the proposed purpose statement, there is little substantive difference between the proposed and existing statements.

1(e) brings in the topic of freight movement.

1(f) and (g) basically are restatements of existing elements of the purpose statement or are brought forward from the body of the TPR.

Gary Cardwell – Vehicular is defined as what?

Frank Angelo – Broadly defined as all modes of road transportation: autos, trucks, buses.

Gary Cardwell – I think we would want to be broader than that. We have barges going down the Columbia River that have the potential of knocking the interstate bridge out.

Bob Cortright – The goal is broad in terms of the modes to be addressed. Do you start with the breadth of the rule and work down, or do you look at the detail of what the requirements of the rule direct local governments to do. They certainly consider ports and rail, but do less direct planning for those than they do for roads and vehicular traffic.

Rob Zako – 1(e) freight “movement” or “mobility”.

Frank Angelo – 1(i) and (j) are consistent with the existing purpose statement. We have added the concept of transportation plan consistency that was identified in the later section of the TPR. 1(i) adds a specific reference to “transportation service providers”.

Section 2 gets into where we are making the identification of the extent of planning, the hierarchy discussion and making more of a distinction between requirement in MPO areas and non-MPO areas. In effect this is a new section. It expands on the existing on the existing TPR and tries to clarify that larger jurisdictions are required by the TPR to conduct more detailed transportation planning activities and analysis than smaller jurisdictions.

2(a) talks about the level of planning outside of MPO areas. The level of planning required by the TPR is less.

Section 3 is basically the same, adding the term “transportation service providers” to clarify what kind of coordination does occur during the planning process.

The subcommittee did ask the work group to consider the revised purpose statement and identify where you feel policy shifts have occurred, or any specific language you would like to suggest, and we will report back to the subcommittee at their September meeting.

Jeanne – Are there people here who do not feel there are policy shifts? Mike, Helen, Gary.

Rob Zako – Breaking the purpose statement up into different parts reveals the structure of the purpose much better. That is a step forward and is helpful. A side effect of doing that is it makes the purpose clearer and calls into questions some things. For us the question is not whether the intent has shifted, the question is whether it is the right intent.

Scott Pemble – I agree with what Rob just said. I have been hung up on this comment about spending a lot of time debating if we have stepped over the line, as opposed to having a conversation about does it make good sense.

Bob Cortright – The language is different. It says it differently than the existing purpose statement. The subcommittee's question to you was, is this a significant difference that is not an accurate expression of what the policy is or should be?

Scott Bricker – What is appropriate, to go down into the rule and pull up a bunch of things that are already there, or to go up into the goal. (Goal 12)

Andy Back – Legally, what role is the purpose statement? It seems like its role is when you amend other parts of the rule, you have to make findings that it is consistent with the purpose statement, and maybe that is its only role. It also has a symbolic role, a public information role.

Scott Bricker – On the legal issue, have there been any LUBA cases or LCDC decisions that have used the current purpose statement as a decision making point.

Bonnie Heitsch – I think typically a purpose plays more of a public information role, what is the rule trying to accomplish? Where it becomes more critical is when there is language within the rule that may be unclear.

Mark Greenfield – I agree. With regard to Scott Bricker's question, to the best of my recollection this issue has never come up in an opinion.

Bob Cortright – The commission looks at the purpose statement as a public information device. When local officials and citizens are confronted with an administrative rule that is lengthy, they are asking themselves what do you really want us to do as we do our transportation plan. The other thing the commission uses it for is an informal benchmark. We have periodically amended the rule. The purpose statement provides a reference for our commission to look back and say what is it we were trying to accomplish or direct local governments to accomplish. It is not a legal standard the commission makes findings against.

Scott Bricker – You are putting it in context of the rule language underneath. How does it relate to Goal 12 itself?

Bob Cortright – I think any part interprets the goal, or at provides at least the commission’s impression of how the goal should be applied at the time it was adopted. In 1989-90 when we did the initial work that led to the adoption of the TPR the commission looked at the goal requirement “avoid principle reliance on any one mode of transportation”. What we found was we could not see much evidence of its implementation from local comprehensive plans. A large part of that was the fact that we as a department and a commission had not expressed any guidance about how that standard was to be met.

Rob Zako – Looking at other divisions for other goals my understanding is that some of the purpose statements quote the corresponding goal verbatim and others interpret them more generally. Whatever approach is taken, the purpose is reflecting or echoing the goal.

Bob Cortright – Some rules will implement a specific portion of a goal.

Scott Bricker – I think it is important to have the goal in front of us at all times. It is very clear in the first sentence of the goal that you are looking at all aspects of the transportation system, including the pipeline when developing plans.

Jeanne Lawson – You would like to have Goal 12 be a very visible part of the TPR, not just a reference stating it up front that this is about Goal 12.

Scott Bricker - I understand why people would be concerned with the term “reduced reliance on the automobile”, especially in small communities. Basically, the purpose statement is supposed to interpret the goal. The goal says in number 4, avoid principle reliance on one mode of transportation, which is different from what is currently said in the purpose statement. It this is in the goal, it seems like it has to happen. Just because you do not like it does not mean you just don’t do it. I am not advocating one size fits all. I feel we are moving away from interpreting the role instead of saying this is what the goal says, lets bring it up into a purpose statement.

Mark Greenfield – Just for clarification, I think it is important to point out that when we talk about the rule implementing the goal, it is not the purpose statement, it is the entire rule, all 30 pages of it are the discussion of how the rule is implemented. The purpose statement is really the key objectives. There is a balancing. If you look at the purpose statements of all the different rules that LCDC has, they do not necessarily repeat every word that is in the goal.

The second point, I think it is important to recognize that the existing TPR is LCDCs existing statement of how they interpret the goal from a policy standpoint. I think what you are saying, and what Rob said earlier, is perhaps LCDC should follow a different policy, and that maybe your disagreement is not with the words, but with the policy.

Marianne Fitzgerald – We met last week to try to figure out the common ground. The main area DEQ wanted to emphasize is Section 1(d) which talks about how land use and transportation planning benefits the environment and we do believe it has benefited the

environment in our major areas, and it continues to benefit the environment. We have not quite worked out the wording, but we do want to highlight this 1(d) and the climate change in the DEQ mission statement.

The second issue we raised was Section 2(a) metropolitan areas, and 2(b) everywhere else, thinking there was some third middle ground somewhere which are larger urban areas that are growing, and how we define that could be debated. Cities like Albany, Roseburg, Grants Pass and Coos Bay are all large growing urban areas, and if they are lumped together in 2(b), everything else, it seems they do not have much expected of them in terms of integrated transportation and land use planning. We recognize the rule has a 3-tier system so we need to work out language that better reflects that.

Craig Greenleaf – We understand and respect the points DEQ has raised in this process. My sense is, without elaborate revision to what is on the table, we can do a better job of reflecting the issues DEQ has brought to the board. It is important to reflect that in the ultimate purpose statement.

Bob Cortright – Air quality is a critical objective that this rulemaking supports. We are very clear about expectations for metropolitan areas. There is a second tier of areas where there are likely to be air quality problems. Do we need to do more in that second section of the rule to recognize those larger, but non-metropolitan areas?

Mike Montero – Section 1(f) is material to what Marianne is talking about. The areas like Redmond, Roseburg, Coos Bay, etc. represent on the ground opportunities to implement components of the rule, to preserve not only the region’s abilities to qualify for federal funding, but also to employ the kind of land uses and urban planning that Rob and Scott are talking about, to mitigate those impacts, particularly with regard to VMT for emissions. If that is flagged is here under (f) where it talks about protect, well protect how? Explicit to that is to have the air quality portion identified.

Andy Back – Suggested change. In (1) where it says “The purposes of this division are to coordinate and direct land use and transportation planning to:” we are proposing it be changed to “The purposes of this division are to direct transportation planning and coordinate land use and transportation planning to:” it is the “direct land use planning” we object to.

Rob Zako – Our issues are: (no copies to distribute)

1. Legal framework – what legal context does this rule exist in
2. Connection between land use and transportation – how are they coordinated or directed. (Goal 11)
3. The multiple modes listed in Goal 12, the reduced reliance language, and an area in Goal 12 talking about transportation disadvantaged, are not being reflected in the purpose statement. We are not talking about eliminating the words reduced reliance, we are talking more about balancing choices.
4. Transportation needs – 1(a) systems adequate to serve transportation needs. Goal 12 actually talks about considering needs, especially in the fiscally constrained world we

live in, it is an important issue of whether we are planning a system adequate to fill the need even if we cannot afford to build it, or are we considering what the needs are then looking at what we can afford to pay for. Can the TPR promise to have an adequate transportation system.

5. Safety – appears in 1(a) “safe, economic and convenient”. Vague terms.
6. Cost of transportation system.
7. Promoting economic development and the flow of goods and services – freight issues. How do we communicate this in the purpose statement?
8. Air, water and noise pollution.
9. Energy conservation, Goal 13 and global warming concerns. Missing in the revised purpose statement. (Input: Listed in (2)) Zako – should be listed in (1).
10. Social costs – minimizing adverse social costs. Same as promoting livability? Not reflected in the purpose statement.
11. Impacts on farm and forest lands, expanding UGBs and goal exceptions. I do not see it listed as part of (1). **Craig Greenleaf** – You think 1(h) does not adequately address that question?
12. Differences between different parts of the state and metro vs. urban areas, and having a hierarchy of different expectations. Our concern is in setting up a double and triple standard of saying in downtown metropolitan areas we are going to do all this multi-modal stuff, but everywhere else in the state people are going to drive. In some ways it is realistic. Intercity travel is missing, which is between rural areas. Should be statewide travel.
13. Hierarchy of plans and the coordination between governments. 1(a). Clarifying what the language means.

Jeanne Lawson – What I am hearing is among those issues you listed, there are some answers to the question of where do you see policy shift, and there are also some concerns that say with this purpose statement and the clarification, and the further thought we have given to the TPR based on reviewing the purpose statement, we see some other issues subcommittee should address.

Mike Montero – Suggestion in light of the limited time available, could we go around the table and if anyone has an issue let them raise it and we will vet it. For the ones that we do not have sufficient time to address, if they could be reduced to a matrix and get it to the work group, we would then have the time to think through it, so if we do have another meeting we will be prepared.

Jeanne Lawson – If we can leave today with a clear understanding of where people have concerns, and have discussed the issue of reduced reliance, and schedule a follow up meeting so you will have time to think through the issues. We will agree that we will not be raising new issues at that time, recognizing the time limits.

Round Table on Purpose Statement Issues or Policy Shifts

Gary Cardwell – Vehicular definition in 1(b) and (c). We need to broaden that beyond highways.

Marianne Fitzgerald – Highlight the importance of integrated transportation and land use planning to environmental protection; concern about the three tiers; and the issue of transportation disadvantaged.

Tom Schwetz – I like the proposed statement as is.

Mike Montero – (1) Being sensitive to the environmental protection for purposes of maintaining your qualification for federal funds. (2) In 2 (b) my suggestion would be wording that would be in a separate section, (c) where regions contemplate what their population projections going forward. When it is projected in the next census they be included as a future MPO candidate, and they come under a whole different section of rules. They are outside MPOs, but by the time the next census hits, they are no longer going to be outside the MPO. If you can see that coming, there should be a different level of analysis they should be contemplating.

Scott Pemble – I have no problems with it.

Helen Burns Sharp – I think the existing and proposed purpose statements are consistent.

Andy Back – I still only have the one comment about the direct land use.

Scott Bricker – Look up to Goal 12 as to down into the language; avoid principle reliance; 1(e) compared to #8 of the goal - movement of goods and services.

Rob Zako – Our top issue is the coordination between land use and transportation and making that consistent with Goal 11 which is where we get the language talking about public facilities and services supporting and guided by land uses. Transportation is a type of public facility service.

Ann Glaze – Overarching perspective as we are thinking about all the items on the list. The perception there is a change in policy even though there is or not, I am not sure all the wording is as clear as it could possibly be to reinforce the idea that this is not about changing policy. It is about cleaning up the language and improving the readability.

Scott Pemble – It would be helpful if we could take the proposed language we are trying to zero in on, and talk about reduced reliance, and how you would change the language to deal with your concern. 1(b) is where the focus is.

Scott Bricker – There is the preamble issue.

Jeanne Lawson – It is not that it was seen as a preamble, some people read it as a preamble because it was the first statement.

Scott Bricker – That would be a policy shift if it was not a preamble. 1(b) is the major place, however it is unclear to me because of the way things are structured. Later on in 2 there is discussion about it as it goes to metropolitan areas. I want to bring it up into 1(b).

Scott Pemble – In terms of the purpose statement, why 2 was _____ distinguish that we had different capabilities in the state. Are there other purposes for distinguishing, up above we have these things we want to look at as part of the purpose, then there is 2, how are we going to look at some of these things. Is there an explanation as to why 2 has been set out?

Mark Greenfield – It goes back to what our charge has been as staff, and that is to respond to issues that were raised by stakeholders and to stay consistent with existing policy. In terms of responding to the stakeholders, there was this concern that the general phrase “reduced reliance on the automobile” was too broad when applied to every jurisdiction of the state. When you actually looked at how existing policy applied that, it applied it to MPO areas.

What we did, and why some of the stuff is in 2 is because it does not necessarily apply to the entire state, whereas in 1, promoting and encouraging a variety of transportation choices, clearly does apply to the entire state. The provisions for improving and making more convenient bicycle and transportation are applicable for every community. The requirements in the existing rule to change your subdivision ordinances and your zoning ordinances to support those things applies to every community, whereas the requirements to do transit only apply to communities over 25,000. The requirements for TSM and TDM only apply to jurisdictions over 25,000. The requirements to change land use designations apply only to the Portland Metro area, although for all MPO areas they are asked to consider that. We felt in putting this together that in the top section we did not want to over reach, and start putting in language that may look like it applies to everybody, and instead we used paragraph 2 to say there are distinctions here, but we still want to achieve these policies of reduced reliance in larger jurisdictions.

Marianne Fitzgerald – What the current rule requirements specify down into the rule vs. what statement we want to make about the vision for communities in Oregon is what I think we should be considering in this purpose statement.

Scott Pemble – Following up on one of the optimal strategies is to take 2 out of the purposes statement and lower down in the rule distinguish the responsibilities for various types of planning organizations.

Frank Angelo – That is in the rule. Again the purpose statement was not intended to recite the rule. It was intended as an introduction to say here is what the rule intended to do and it needs to be read within the context of the entire rule. The hierarchy distinction we thought was important to pull up into the purpose so the reader would know the rule

itself does make distinctions between various size areas. The point about jurisdictions 25,000 and greater is a good point, and we need to be clearer on that in the purpose statement.

Craig Greenleaf – I have to object. 2 is responsive to the other issue Frank heard as he was doing interviews, around the stratification or expectation. We are trying to distinguish MPO and other jurisdictions and the issue of whether or not the 25,000 jurisdictions need to be more explicitly addressed as we lay those things out. A purpose statement that is a matrix does not work. What we are getting is a set of arguments about how jurisdictional scale matches to the list of considerations in 1. It does not work to put all of the content of the 30 pages of the rule into the purpose statement.

Scott Bricker – The intent of the goal is clear about avoiding principle reliance and I feel the phrase has been watered down, the policy intent has been changed. Even though it is in 2, it needs to be up front. Ways to clarify there is differentiation between community sizes.

Mike Montero – I think it adds total clarity. While it is not explicit in 1(b), it says clearly that they want to balance vehicular uses. That applies to everyone. All section 2 is doing is recognizing what is an artful piece of verbiage that will help MPO and non-MPO areas to collaboratively get to what you are talking about. It says to recognize with regard to all these up here, there are cities of various sizes, and there are practical limitations based on size and here is some guidance on what you should do. You want to have these multi-modal opportunities incorporated in the plan. However, inside MPO areas there are certain planning requirements, given your scope and size, that you are going to be required to do. Outside MPO areas they are still a good idea. Small communities that do not have a chance of having transit read that statement and what they see is that they are at a distinct disadvantage with regard to project selection.

If the purpose of this exercise we are going through is to have better, more comprehensive compliance with the rule, I think it does a much better job.

Rob Zako – I like the structure of 1. I understand the reason for having 2 and trying to explain the differences that are larger and smaller. However 2 seems to undercut 1, and runs on the way the original purpose statement did. In talking about reduced reliance there are three different versions, 1(b), 2(a) and 2(b) all of which differ from what Goal 12 says we are trying to do. It is confusing. What is the intent here? Sounds like what we are saying is it is really not feasible to avoid principal reliance upon any one mode of transportation everywhere in the state.

Craig Greenleaf –The states' judgment, which is reflected in the rule, differentiates between community scale to put heavier obligations on MPOs then on areas like Greenhorn and Elgin.

Rob Zako – I am not disagreeing with that, but maybe there is a way to be clearer. It seems like 2(a) and 2(b) are nuancing or modifying what 1(b) says.

Frank Angelo – That is not the intent. The intent is to highlight for the reader that as you read through the entire TPR, the rule does make this distinction between various sizes of jurisdictions and there is a certain level of planning that is required. It is not intended to repeat everything that is back in the rule.

Bob Cortright – Regarding coming forward with different language. There are clearly different statements about the reduced reliance requirement. Our perception is they move from the general in 1 to more specific articulations in 2, and not just talking about the planning work expected to be produced, but what is the expected outcome of that planning.

The reason the rule has the phrase “reduced reliance on the automobile” in it is because we do not know what “avoid principal reliance on any one mode” means.

BREAK

Jeanne Lawson – For those of you who felt this was an appropriate rewrite, based on what you have heard, has that affected your view of this and what is necessary?

Tom Schwetz – I supported the rewrite because it addressed a lot of the issues I have heard locally among the other MPOs specifically with respect to the language around reduced reliance. My view has not changed.

Scott Pemble – Still supports the rewrite.

Gary Cardwell – I view 1 as getting to the 75 yard line and 2 as how do I get the next 25 yards. Are we being redundant in 2? I think it works fine.

Ann Glaze – No change.

Andy Back – It is important to highlight the symbolic nature of reduced reliance for the decision makers. I am comfortable with the rewrite.

Jeanne Lawson – Staff will put out a revised purpose statement based on what they heard from DEQ and what we heard today by Friday, Aug 5. They would like to have any comments with specific proposed language changes by the following Friday, Aug. 12. Staff will combine in a memo/matrix or some user friendly format to you a week in advance of our next meeting that you can respond to at the next meeting.

Next meeting of the TPR Work Group is scheduled for Sept 9, 2005, 9:00-12:00.