



# 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](http://www.oregon.gov/LCD)



October 23, 2009

TO: Land Conservation and Development Commission

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

SUBJECT: **Agenda Item 9, November 5–6, 2009 LCDC Commission Meeting**

## **EUGENE-SPRINGFIELD TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN UPDATE WORK PLAN STATUS REPORT**

### **I. AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY**

In October 2008, the commission approved a work plan for the cities of Eugene, Springfield and Coburg and Lane County for preparation and adoption of an updated regional transportation system plan (RTSP) in compliance with the requirements of the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). In approving the work plan, which extends to 2013, the commission requested that the cities “check in” annually with the commission to review progress in carrying out the approved work plan.

#### **A. Type of Action and Commission Role**

The report is informational and intended to advise the commission about the status of work related to preparation of an updated regional transportation system plan for the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area. No commission action is recommended at this time. The commission is generally responsible for monitoring work of local governments to prepare plans in compliance with statewide planning goals. In addition, the work to be reviewed relates to development of urban growth boundaries for the respective cities, which the commission may subsequently review.

#### **B. Staff Contact Information**

For additional information about this agenda item please contact Bob Cortright at 503-373-0050 ext. 241, or by e-mail at [bob.cortright@state.or.us](mailto:bob.cortright@state.or.us) or Ed Moore at 971-239-9453 or by e-mail at [ed.w.moore@state.or.us](mailto:ed.w.moore@state.or.us).

## **II. RECOMMENDATION**

Eugene and Springfield submitted a generalized report on performance measure and nodal development just as this report was being finalized. The report does not appear to include the reporting on progress meeting housing and employment within nodes that was supposed to be done earlier this year. As a result, the director recommends the commission schedule an additional “check in” to review progress in carrying out the approved work plan at the commission’s March 2010 meeting.

This additional check in should:

- Provide updated information on adopted performance measures as called for in the approved work plan; and
- Report on implementation of nodal development is integrated into local work to comply with Goal 14, including calculation of land needs and implementing efficiency measures to reduce the need for urban land.

## **III. BACKGROUND**

### **A. History of Action**

In October 2008, the commission approved the four year work plan proposed by Eugene, Springfield, Coburg and Lane County — the four local governments that are included in the Central Lane metropolitan area — to prepare an updated RTSP in compliance with requirements of the TPR. A copy of the approved work plan is included in Attachment A to the staff report.

The key element in the work plan relates to implementation of the region’s adopted standard for complying with the TPR. The locally developed and adopted standard — included in the existing RTSP, titled TransPlan, and approved by LCDC in May 2001 — is a multi-part standard 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 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 standards 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 4<sup>th</sup>, 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

Timely progress in implementing the nodal development strategy has been a key issue for the department and commission since the alternative measure was approved.

In 2001, 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 2,000 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.

In November 2007, the region adopted an update to its federally required Regional Transportation Plan (the 2031 Central Lane MPO Regional Transportation Plan, or RTP). The RTP includes 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 Central Lane MPO 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, in fact, “nodal” in character.

In October 2008, the department’s staff report to the commission outlined importance of completing the performance measures assessment in a timely fashion to inform the related UGB work and a subsequent transportation plan update (Attachment B, pp. 17–18). The commission’s approval of the work program also included a condition of approval that the reports assess progress in meeting benchmarks for 2005 and 2010.

More detailed information on relevant requirements in the TPR and the status of the area’s RTSP is included in the department’s October 2008 report, which is included as Attachment B to this report.

## **B. Major Legal and Policy Issues**

***1. Transportation Planning Rule Compliance.*** Through the TPR, the commission has put emphasis on integration of land use and transportation planning in metropolitan areas to expand transportation options and reduce reliance on the automobile. This is accomplished primarily through locally developed performance measures or standards for accomplishing changes to land use and expanding transportation options. The process established in the rule anticipates that implementation will occur over time; that benchmarks will be used to monitor progress; and that plan updates will, as appropriate, consider and incorporate additional efforts to achieve the adopted targets.

In the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area, a major update of the federally required RTP has already occurred without the benefit of detailed assessment of progress in meeting benchmarks, or consideration of additional efforts that might be undertaken to implement the nodal development strategy. Without this assessment, it is not possible to determine whether the region's adopted targets have been or will be met. Continued delay in completing this assessment makes it unlikely that the performance measures will be fully or effectively considered in subsequent transportation and land use planning work in the region.

**2. *Integration of TPR Work with Related Urban Planning.*** Eugene and Springfield are in the process of conducting major studies to support developing separate and updated UGBs as provided in HB 3337. For each city, this involves preparing estimates of future land needs for housing and employment that extend beyond the timeframe provided in the existing Metro-area plan. Because the nodal development strategy sets specific targets for employment and housing, it is important that the two efforts be closely coordinated, and, in particular, that estimates of future land needs incorporate and reflect adopted targets for nodal development.

A key feature of the nodal development strategy is that a significant part of the areas new housing (23 percent) and employment (45 percent) will be accommodated in nodes in the form of mixed use development. Significantly, the five-year benchmarks for meeting these targets anticipate that nodal development will “ramp up” over time as plans are changed, new investments are made and as the market for higher density mixed use development in the region matures. Consequently, targets for the first five-year period are low, and targets for succeeding five year intervals are higher.

Additional information on relevant policy issues is included in the department's October 2008 report, which is included as Attachment B to this report.

#### **IV. WORK PLAN STATUS**

The table below outlines status of work to date on major milestones in the commission-approved work plan through 2009. A copy of the full work plan for the MPO — which extends through 2013 — is included as Attachment A to this report, and ODOT's is in Attachment C.

In sum:

- Local governments have completed initial tasks that make amendments to the existing RTSP so that the adopted state and federal regional plans are consistent with one another.
- Local government staff and ODOT have been working on a detailed work program for preparation of the regional TSP and local TSPs for the individual cities.
- Preparing reports on performance measures appears to be incomplete and behind schedule. The department has been in contact with local staff and understands that work is in progress, but we have not received any draft reports.

<i>Eugene-Springfield Regional Transportation System Plan Update Status October 2009</i>	
<i>Work Plan Milestones</i>	<i>Status</i>
<b>Last Quarter 2008</b>	
<p><b>Post-Acknowledgement Plan Amendment (PAPA):</b> Finalize schedule and responsible parties for initiation/participation/co-adoption, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Remove completed projects</li> <li>- Remove West Eugene Parkway</li> <li>- Move ODOT projects from Illustrative to Financially Constrained list for consistency with RTP</li> <li>- Adjust plan horizon</li> </ul>	<u>Completed.</u>
<p><b>Regional Transportation System Plan (RTSP)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continue RTSP framework discussion</li> <li>- Create definition of regional system</li> <li>- Agree on geographic boundary</li> <li>- Determine relationship to or method of incorporation within other plans</li> </ul>	<u>Appears to be substantially complete.</u> Local governments and ODOT have developed a detailed outline of a work plan for preparation of an updated TSP.
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quarter 2009</b>	
<p><b>PAPA Adoption(s)</b> Appropriate jurisdictions to amend TransPlan to achieve RTP-TSP consistency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Remove completed projects</li> <li>- Remove West Eugene Parkway</li> <li>- Move ODOT projects from Illustrative to Financially Constrained list for consistency with November 2007 RTP project list</li> <li>- Adjust plan horizon</li> </ul>	<u>Completed.</u>
<p><b>Performance Measures</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Assess existing performance measures in TransPlan</li> <li>- Estimate Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)/capita for 2004, 2015, and 2031</li> <li>- Confirm vehicle trip reduction requirements and determine relationship between RTSP and TSPs in meeting the requirements</li> <li>- Undertake additional performance measure assessment and reporting at city level</li> <li>- Complete reporting on TransPlan benchmarks for 2005, including qualitative discussion about nodal implementation</li> </ul>	<u>Appears to be incomplete.</u> Eugene and Springfield staffs have indicated that they are preparing this information but nothing has been submitted to the department. Proposed ODOT work program indicates nodal performance reporting is scheduled for February 2010.

<b>2<sup>nd</sup> QUARTER 2009</b>	
<b>Performance Measures</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Begin development of Performance Measure position paper</li> <li>- Identify potential additional actions/procedures for successful performance measure implementation</li> </ul>	<u>Incomplete.</u> The department has not received any information related to this work plan task. Proposed ODOT work program appears to schedule this work for April 2010.
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> QUARTER 2009</b>	
<b>Regional Transportation System Plan (RTSP)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Draft RTSP structural and policy framework based upon elected official discussions and public input</li> <li>- Begin developing RTSP policy language</li> </ul>	<u>Partially complete.</u> Discussions on setting structure for RTSP structure are underway with elected officials. Not clear whether work on RTSP policy language has begun.
<b>Public Involvement</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Publish transportation work outcomes to date for public comment as appropriate</li> <li>- Seek public comment on regional transportation framework</li> </ul>	
<b>4<sup>th</sup> QUARTER 2009</b>	
<b>Performance Measures</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consider and develop adjustments to performance and/or implementation measures to achieve benchmarks</li> <li>- Consider modified benchmarks and performance measures for the extended planning period</li> </ul>	<u>Incomplete.</u> This work depends on completion of previous tasks. Given status of work on other tasks, it appears that this work will not be completed until 2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter of 2010 at the earliest.

**V. DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION**

No formal action by the commission is necessary at this time. The department recommends that the commission direct department staff to schedule an additional check in with local governments at the commission’s March 2010 meeting, at which local governments would be requested to provide an updated report on progress in completing performance measures work.

**ATTACHMENTS**

- A. Approved Regional Transportation Work Plan, September 8, 2008, two pages
- B. October 2, 2008 Staff Report, eight pages
- C. ODOT RTSP Work Plan, October 20, 2009 Update, 26 pages

**4<sup>th</sup> QUARTER 2008**

---

**Transportation Work Plan**

- October 1: Submit draft to LCDC
- October 16: LCDC Meeting

**Post-Acknowledgement Plan Amendment (PAPA)**

- Finalize schedule and responsible parties for initiation/participation/co-adoption, including:
  - Remove completed projects
  - Remove West Eugene Parkway
  - Move ODOT projects from Illustrative to Financially Constrained list for consistency with RTP
  - Adjust plan horizon

**Regional Transportation System Plan (RTSP)**

- Continue RTSP framework discussion
- Create definition of regional system
- Agree on geographic boundary
- Determine relationship to or method of incorporation within other plans

**Public Involvement**

- Develop multi-agency public involvement plan
- Determine public outreach components
- Identify public outreach schedule relative to work schedule

**1<sup>st</sup> QUARTER 2009**

---

**PAPA Adoption(s)**

- Appropriate jurisdictions to amend TransPlan to achieve RTP-TSP consistency
  - Remove completed projects
  - Remove West Eugene Parkway
  - Move ODOT projects from Illustrative to Financially Constrained list for consistency with November 2007 RTP project list
  - Adjust plan horizon

**Performance Measures**

- Assess existing performance measures in TransPlan
- Estimate Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)/capita for 2004, 2015, and 2031
- Confirm vehicle trip reduction requirements and determine relationship between RTSP and TSPs in meeting the requirements
- Undertake additional performance measure assessment and reporting at city level
- Complete reporting on TransPlan benchmarks for 2005, including qualitative discussion about nodal implementation

**2<sup>nd</sup> QUARTER 2009**

---

**Performance Measures**

- Begin development of Performance Measure position paper
- Identify potential additional actions/procedures for successful performance measure implementation

**3<sup>rd</sup> QUARTER 2009**

---

**Regional Transportation System Plan (RTSP)**

- Draft RTSP structural and policy framework based upon elected official discussions and public input
- Begin developing RTSP policy language

**Public Involvement**

- Publish transportation work outcomes to date for public comment as appropriate
- Seek public comment on regional transportation framework

**4<sup>th</sup> QUARTER 2009**

---

**Performance Measures**

- Consider and develop adjustments to performance and/or implementation measures to achieve benchmarks
- Consider modified benchmarks and performance measures for the extended planning period

**1<sup>ST</sup> QUARTER 2010 THROUGH 3<sup>RD</sup> QUARTER 2011**

---

*[Regional transportation planning progressing in coordination with long-range land use planning efforts]*

**4<sup>th</sup> QUARTER 2011**

---

**Regional Transportation System Plan (RTSP)**

- Policy develop based upon multi-jurisdictional elected official direction
- Components drafted for public comment
- Public outreach on RTSP framework

**2013**

---

**Regional Transportation System Plan (RTSP)**

- Take Action to meet RTSP requirements including multi-jurisdictional co-adoption actions
- Take action as necessary to eliminate TransPlan, including multi-jurisdictional co-adoption plans



# 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](http://www.oregon.gov/LCD)

## ***ATTACHMENT B***



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](mailto: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 4<sup>th</sup>, 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 1<sup>st</sup> through 4<sup>th</sup> 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.<sup>1</sup> This will also include developing benchmarks and performance measures for the extended planning period (likely 2031 or 2035).

---

<sup>1</sup> 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

## RTSP

STATUS AS OF 10/23/2009

## Milestone Status

Planning Project	Est Finish Date	Revised Finish Date	Actual Finish Date
<b>Joint Activities</b>			
Trans Work Plan to DLCD	1-Oct-08		1-Oct-08
LCDC Approval	16-Oct-08		16-Oct-08
PAPA Implementation Plan	3-Nov-08		3-Nov-08
<b>Point2Point Coordination - Fill gap between TransPlan &amp; RTSP</b>	<b>17-Aug-09</b>		
MPO LU Framework	1-Jan-10		
<b>RTSP Activities</b>			
<i>Management &amp; Coordination Program</i>			
Teamwork & Coordination	20-Aug-09		20-Aug-09
Critical Path	21-Sep-09		21-Sep-09
RTSP/RTP Schedule Update	21-Sep-09		21-Sep-09
Inputs to Eugene TSP	21-Sep-09		21-Sep-09
Resource Requirements	21-Sep-09		21-Sep-09
<i>Establish Boundary Conditions</i>			
Define Regional System	28-May-09		28-May-09
Geo Boundary	29-May-09		29-May-09
<b>Pop Analysis Safe Harbor/Lane Co</b>	<b>30-Sep-09</b>		
<b>What is Reg Planning?</b>	<b>16-Oct-09</b>		
<b>What is an RTSP?</b>	<b>16-Oct-09</b>		
<b>Definition of Terms</b>	<b>16-Oct-09</b>		
<i>Public Engagement</i>			
<b>Public Outreach Components</b>	<b>1-Oct-09</b>		
<b>Public Outreach Schedule</b>	<b>1-Oct-09</b>		
<b>PI Plan</b>	<b>22-Oct-09</b>		
<b>RTSP Decision Coordination</b>			
<b>Local vs Regional Decisions (E&amp;S)</b>	<b>16-Oct-09</b>		
<b>Coburg Involvement (LCOG)</b>	<b>16-Oct-09</b>		
<b>Method of Incorp in Other Plans (E,S,LTD)</b>	<b>16-Oct-09</b>		
<b>RTSP Decision Process</b>	<b>16-Oct-09</b>		
<b>County's role in RTSP (LCo)</b>	<b>16-Oct-09</b>		
Framework Structure			
<b>Tech Team recommend (Coord, Bnd Cond, PI, PM Baseline)</b>	<b>23-Nov-09</b>		

*Attachment C*

<b>Staff Review</b>	<b>21-Dec-09</b>		
Elected Official Review	18-Jan-10		
Public Review	15-Feb-10		
Draft RTSP Structure/Framework	15-Mar-10		

## Attachment C

Planning Project	Est Finish Date	Revised Finish Date	Actual Finish Date
<i>Ph 1 Perf Meas Baseline</i>			
Assess Existing/'05 TransPlan Benchmarks	30-Sep-08		30-Sep-08
VMT '04, '15, '31	30-Sep-08		30-Sep-08
Trip Reduction Requirements	1-Feb-10		
Agree to Requirements/Technical Methods	1-Feb-10		
Coord Trips with Local TSPs	1-Feb-10		
Agree how to meet requirements	1-Feb-10		
Nodal Performance Reporting	1-Feb-10		
Add'l Perf Meas @ City Level	1-Feb-10		
ID Potential Additional Actions for Perf Meas			
Major Trans Issues Springfield	16-Apr-10		
Risks of Eugene TSP	16-Apr-10		
Emerging Policies Addressed	16-Apr-10		
Regional LTD Issues	16-Apr-10		
Perf Measures Position Paper	16-Apr-10		
<i>Ph 2 Perf Meas Alts</i>			
Policy Development - Simplified roll up of Local?	4-Nov-11		
Perf Meas Adjustments	4-Nov-11		
ID New Impl Measures	4-Nov-11		
<i>Refine Reg Concepts</i>			
Fed/State Coordination Process Integration	2-Dec-11		
RTSP Lessons Learned	2-Dec-11		
Regional Facilities Form & Stds	2-Dec-11		
Other "rocks in the road"	2-Dec-11		
Modified PM Benchmarks	2-Dec-11		
<i>RTSP Document</i>			
Policy Direction	30-Dec-11		
Draft Components	27-Jan-12		
Outreach on Framework	24-Feb-12		
Draft Final Document	23-Mar-12		
RTSP Approval	1-Jan-13		
Take Action to Eliminate TransPlan	29-Jan-13		

Accomplishments (last period)

- 
- 

Planned - Next Period

## *Attachment C*

- 
- 

### Concerns/Issues

- ⇒ Issue/Concern Statement 1  
*Possible Solutions:*
- ⇒ Issue/Concern Statement 2  
*Possible Solutions:*
- ⇒ Issue/Concern Statement 3  
*Possible Solutions:*

**COBURG**

*STATUS AS OF 10/23/2009*

Milestone Status

<b>Planning Project</b>	<b>Est Finish Date</b>	<b>Revised Finish Date</b>	<b>Actual Finish Date</b>
<b>XVI. Coburg TSP</b>			
<i>Existing Conditions</i>			
XVI.P.1 Review Plans & Policies	26-Feb-10		
XVI.P.2 Evaluate Change Conditions	26-Feb-10		
XVI.LU.1 Existing Conditions	28-Apr-10		
<i>Future Needs</i>			
XVI.LU.2 Anticipated Development	28-Apr-10		
XVI.LU.3 Future 20 LU	28-Apr-10		
XVI.M.1 Update Model	28-Jun-10		
XVI.O.1 Mobility Stds	28-Sep-10		
XVI.O.2 Access Mgmt Stds	28-Sep-10		
XVI.O.3 Road Standards	28-Sep-10		
<i>Alts Analysis</i>			
XVI.E.1 CIP Project List	28-Feb-11		
XVI.E.2 Circulation Plan	28-Feb-11		
XVI.E.3 Geometric Conditions	28-Feb-11		
XVI.F.1 CIP Proj Est	28-Jun-11		
<i>Preferred Alt</i>			
XVI.F.2 Proj Priorities	28-Jun-11		
XVI.F.3 Update Funding Toolbox	28-Jun-11		
XVI.P.3 Final Plan	21-Dec-11		

Accomplishments (last period)

- 
- 

Planned - Next Period

- 
- 

Concerns/Issues

⇒ Issue/Concern Statement 1

## *Attachment C*

*Possible Solutions:*

⇒ Issue/Concern Statement 2

*Possible Solutions:*

⇒ Issue/Concern Statement 3

*Possible Solutions:*

## EUGENE

STATUS AS OF 10/23/2009

## Milestone Status

Planning Project	Est Finish Date	Revised Finish Date	Actual Finish Date
<b>VIII. ODOT Statewide Rail Study</b>			
VIII.M.6 Exp Eugene- Ashland	18-Dec-09		
VIII.O.2 Assess Future & Potential lines	18-Dec-09		
<b>XIII. Beltline (River to Coburg)</b>			
XIII.P.1 Establish Decision Structure	17-Aug-09		17-Aug-09
XIII.P.2 Confirm Problem Statement	17-Aug-09		17-Aug-09
XIII.P.3 Develop Goals & Obj	17-Aug-09		17-Aug-09
XIII.LU.1 Existing LU	17-Aug-09		17-Aug-09
XIII.LU.2 Future LU 2031	17-Aug-09		17-Aug-09
XIII.M.1 Current Travel Demand	17-Aug-09		17-Aug-09
XIII.M.2 Future 2031 Travel Demand	28-Aug-09		28-Aug-09
XIII.M.3 Confirm O&D Analysis	28-Aug-09		28-Aug-09
XIII.O.1 Current V/C	28-Sep-09		28-Sep-09
<b>XIII.O.2 Future V/C</b>	26-Oct-09		
<b>XIII.E.1 Develop Sys Alts</b>	9-Nov-09		
<b>XIII.O.3 Alternatives</b>	23-Nov-09		
XIII.E.2 Eval Alts	4-Jan-10		
XIII.E.3 Assess Short Term Concepts	1-Feb-10		
XIII.F.ID Phasing Strategies	1-Feb-10		
XIII.F.1 ID Funding Sources	3-Mar-10		
<b>Eugene Work Program Activities</b>			
<b>PAPA Implementation</b>			
<b>Remove Completed Projects</b>	9-Nov-09		
<b>Move ODOT Projects</b>	9-Nov-09		

*Attachment C*

<b>Adopt Plan Horizon</b>	<b>9-Nov-09</b>		
Remove WEP	12-Oct-12		
<b>Land Use Activities</b>			
<i>Current Land Use Inventory</i>			
<b>Comp Lands Assess</b>	<b>30-Jun-09</b>		
<b>Safe Harbor Population</b>	<b>28-Jul-09</b>		
<b>CLA Scenarios</b>	<b>2-Nov-09</b>		
<b>CLA Impl Policy</b>	<b>30-Nov-09</b>		
CLA Work Prog Plan	28-Jan-10		
<i>Policy Direction</i>			
<b>Razor Park</b>	<b>6-Nov-09</b>		
<b>Walnut Station</b>	<b>6-Nov-09</b>		
<b>Opportunity Siting</b>	<b>6-Nov-09</b>		
<b>Planning Project</b>	<b>Est Finish Date</b>	<b>Revised Finish Date</b>	<b>Actual Finish Date</b>
<b>Infill Stds</b>	<b>6-Nov-09</b>		
<b>South Hills Habitat Study</b>	<b>6-Nov-09</b>		
<b>Comp Plan</b>			
<i>Definition of Work Program</i>			
Finalize Work Program	26-May-10		
Secure Funding	23-Jun-10		
Proposals Solicited	30-Sep-10		
<i>LU Local Calibration</i>			
A. Mixed Use	30-Jun-10		
B. Opportunity Siting	30-Jun-10		
C. Infill Compat Standards	30-Jun-10		
D. Sustain Objectives	30-Jun-10		
E. WEC/WEEE	30-Jun-10		
<i>Community Engagement Plan</i>			
Dept Advisory Committee	28-Oct-10		
TAC Formed	28-Oct-10		
Website Created	28-Oct-10		
<i>Ph1 ID Alts</i>			
Perf Measures	28-Oct-10		
Models for Scenarios	25-Nov-10		
Scenarios Reviewed	23-Dec-10		
<i>Ph 2 Refine Alts</i>			
Scenarios Refined	28-Jan-11		
Publications Created,	11-Mar-11		
Website Update	8-Apr-11		
Community Workshops	20-May-		

*Attachment C*

	11		
Compiled Results	1-Jul-11		
<i>Ph3 Preferred Alts</i>			
Reports Plan Comm/CC	25-Aug-11		
Scenarios Refined	20-Oct-11		
Scenarios Reviewed by ACs	17-Nov-11		
<i>Comp Plan Adoption</i>			
Draft Comp Plan for Review	27-Jan-12		
Planning Comm Hearing	24-Feb-12		
Plan Comm Deliberation	23-Mar-12		
City Council Hearing	20-Apr-12		
City Council Deliberation	18-May-12		
Adoption	15-Jun-12		
<b>TSP Definition</b>			
Scope TSP & PI Plan	28-Jul-09		28-Jul-09
RFP Solicitation	8-Sep-09		8-Sep-09
ID Resource Needs	8-Sep-09		8-Sep-09
<b>Planning Project</b>	<b>Est Finish Date</b>	<b>Revised Finish Date</b>	<b>Actual Finish Date</b>
<b>Eugene TSP</b>			
Phase One - Identify Existing And Future Needs			
<b>Notice to Proceed: Phase 1</b>	<b>30-Oct-09</b>		
Task 1 - Evaluate Existing Conditions	8-Mar-10		
Task 2 - Evaluation of Future Conditions	13-Aug-10		
Land Use/Transportation Coordination Meetings	6-Apr-10		
Prepare Future Land Use Base Scenario	12-Mar-10		
Prepare Two Alternate Land Use Scenarios	26-Mar-10		
Prepare LCOG Modeling Request	16-Apr-10		
Coordinate with LCOG on Traffic Modeling	2-Jun-10		
Conduct Future (2035) Traffic Analysis	2-Jul-10		
TM 2 Future Conditions Analysis (Draft)	23-Jul-10		
TM 2 Future Conditions Analysis (Final)	13-Aug-10		
Phase Two - Develop Performance Measures And Identify Alternatives			
Notice to Proceed: Phase 2	6-Sep-10		
Task 3 - Develop Decision-Making Framework	31-Dec-10		
Develop Project Goals, Objectives, Performance Measures	29-Oct-10		

*Attachment C*

Develop Decision-Making Structure	3-Dec-10		
TM 3 Evaluation Framework (Draft)	31-Dec-10		
TM 3 Evaluation Framework (Final)	24-Dec-10		
Task 4 - Identify Alternatives	4-Feb-11		
Identify Potential Roadway Concepts	4-Feb-11		
Coordinate with TGM Team on Potential Bicycle and Pedestrian Concepts	4-Feb-11		
Coordinate with TGM Team on Potential Transit Concepts	4-Feb-11		
Identify Potential Highway Concepts	4-Feb-11		
Identify Potential Air, Rail, Water, and Pipeline Concepts (as appropriate)	4-Feb-11		
Phase Three - Evaluate Alternatives And Prepare Recommendations			
Task 5 - Evaluate and Select Alternatives	7-Oct-11		
Evaluate Concepts and Summarize Findings	25-Feb-11		
Refine Concepts - Round 1	26-Apr-11		
Refine Concepts - Round 2	28-Jun-11		
Refine Concepts - Round 3	2-Aug-11		
Identify Draft Recommendations (All but highway)	2-Aug-11		
TM 4 Evaluation of Concepts and Preferred Alternative (Draft)	16-Sep-11		
TM 4 Evaluation of Concepts and Preferred Alternative (Final)	7-Oct-11		
Task 6 - Prepare Modal Plans	25-Nov-11		

## Attachment C

Planning Project	Est Finish Date	Revised Finish Date	Actual Finish Date
<b>II.Ped/Bike Master Plan</b>			
<b>II.P.1 08 Strategic Plan</b>	<b>6-Nov-09</b>		
<b>II.O.1 Bike/ped counts</b>	<b>27-Nov-09</b>		
<b>II.M.1 Non-motor Model Update</b>	<b>25-Dec-09</b>		
II.M.2 Non-motor Current	5-Feb-10		
II.M.3 Non-motor Future	5-Feb-10		
II.O.2 Bike/ped analysis	5-Mar-10		
II.E.1 Best P & Des. Tool Box	28-Apr-10		
II.E.2 Develop Network Concepts	23-Jul-10		
II.E.3 Develop Design Stds	22-Oct-10		
II.E.4 ID Project List	21-Jan-11		
II.P.2 Final Plan Adoption	17-Jun-11		
Adoption	17-Jun-11		
<b>I. West 11th Ave Trans Corridor</b>			
<b>I.E.3 Coord design with EMX</b>	<b>11-Dec-09</b>		
<b>I.F.1 ID fuunding for impr</b>	<b>11-Dec-09</b>		
<b>West Eugene Collaborative</b>	31-Mar-09		31-Mar-09

Accomplishments (last period)

- 
- 

Planned - Next Period

- 
- 

Concerns/Issues

⇒ Issue/Concern Statement 1

*Possible Solutions:*

⇒ Issue/Concern Statement 2

*Possible Solutions:*

## *Attachment C*

⇒ Issue/Concern Statement 3  
*Possible Solutions:*

**LANE COUNTY**  
*STATUS AS OF 10/23/2009*

Milestone Status

<b>Planning Project</b>	<b>Est Finish Date</b>	<b>Revised Finish Date</b>	<b>Actual Finish Date</b>
<b>Lane Co Activities</b>			
<i>Population Forecast</i>			
Ph2 Pop Forecast	31-Mar-09		31-Mar-09
Ph 3 Pop Forecast - Adoption	30-Sep-09		
<i>PAPA Implementation</i>			
E-Remove Completed Projects	30-Nov-09		
E-Move ODOT Projects	30-Nov-09		
E-Adopt Plan Horizon	30-Nov-09		
S - Remove completed proj	17-Jun-11		
S- Move ODOT Projects	17-Jun-11		
S- Adopt Plan Horizon	17-Jun-11		
E-Remove WEP	12-Oct-12		
<i>Land Use Activity</i>			
ID Rural Reserve Concepts	28-Oct-08		28-Oct-08
HB 3337 Impl Measures	22-Apr-10		
Co-Adopt Eugene Comp Plan	15-Jun-12		
<b>Transportation Actions</b>			
Adopt Springfield TSP	2-Dec-11		
Co-Adopt Eugene TSP	9-Jul-13		

Accomplishments (last period)

- 
- 

Planned - Next Period

- 
- 

Concerns/Issues

⇒ Issue/Concern Statement 1

*Possible Solutions:*

⇒ Issue/Concern Statement 2

*Possible Solutions:*

## *Attachment C*

⇒ Issue/Concern Statement 3  
*Possible Solutions:*

**LCOG**

*STATUS AS OF 10/23/2009*

Milestone Status

<b>Planning Project</b>	<b>Est Finish Date</b>	<b>Revised Finish Date</b>	<b>Actual Finish Date</b>
<b>LCOG Activities</b>			
<b>2035 RTP</b>			
Develop RTP Delivery Plan	28-Oct-08		28-Oct-08
Define Relationship Other Plans	16-Oct-09		16-Oct-09
2035 LU Framework MPO Approved			
Existing LU	28-Jan-11		
Future 2035 LU	1-Apr-11		
Draft RTP			
Reg'l Policy Set - Ch 2 of Current RTP, 38 Policies	31-Dec-10		
TDM Element	31-Dec-10		
Environmental Element	31-Dec-10		
Transit Element	31-Dec-10		
Prepare Draft RTP Document			
Draft 2035 Proj List	1-Apr-11		
Air Conformity Anal	1-Jul-11		
Draft Complete	1-Jul-11		
Revenue Forecasts	30-Sep-11		
Public Involvement Process	30-Sep-11		
2035 RTP Adopted	3-Oct-11		
Federal Approval	31-Oct-11		
<b>State GHG Regulations/Dependancies</b>			
HB 2186 Direction	31-Dec-09		
HB 2001 Modeling Capabilities - Metro Tool Implementation	31-Dec-13		
HB 2001 Scenario Development (LCOG Implementation)	17-Jun-14		

Accomplishments (last period)

- 
- 

Planned - Next Period

-

## *Attachment C*

•

### Concerns/Issues

⇒ Issue/Concern Statement 1

*Possible Solutions:*

⇒ Issue/Concern Statement 2

*Possible Solutions:*

⇒ Issue/Concern Statement 3

*Possible Solutions:*

## LTD

STATUS AS OF 10/23/2009

## Milestone Status

Planning Project	Est Finish Date	Revised Finish Date	Actual Finish Date
<b>LTD Related Projects</b>			
<b>VII. LTD Long Range Plan</b>			
<b>VII.P.1 Existing Policy Framework</b>	<b>28-Oct-09</b>		
<b>VII.P.4 Design Stds</b>	<b>28-Oct-09</b>		
<b>VII.P.5 Guidelines</b>	<b>28-Oct-09</b>		
<b>VII.P.6 Reg. System Map</b>	<b>28-Oct-09</b>		
<b>VII.LU.1 Current LU</b>	<b>28-Dec-09</b>		
<b>VII.LU.2 Future 2031 LU</b>	<b>28-Dec-09</b>		
<b>VII.LU.3 2031 LU Alternative</b>	<b>28-Dec-09</b>		
VII.M.1 Current ridership	26-Feb-10		
VII.M.2 2031 Base Case	26-Mar-10		
VII.O.1 Current Service Levels	26-Mar-10		
VII.P.2 Ridership Scenarios	23-Apr-10		
VII.P.3 LOS Studies	23-Apr-10		
VII.O.2 Alt Future Service levels	28-Jun-10		
VII.M.3 2031 Alts.	26-Jul-10		
VII.O.3 Infrastructure Needs	27-Aug-10		
VII.O.4 Ops Needs Forecasts	27-Aug-10		
VII.F.1 Revenue Forecast	24-Sep-10		
VII.F.2 Cost Est CIP	28-Oct-10		
VII.F.3 Cost Est Ops	28-Oct-10		
VII.F.4 Gap Analysis	26-Nov-10		
VII.F.5 Financial Strategy	28-Dec-10		
Local Adoption	30-Jun-11		
<b>X1. Point2Point Strat Plan</b>			
XI.P.1 Investment Strategy	26-Nov-10		
XI.P.2 Policy Framework/Perf Meas	28-Dec-10		
<b>X. West Eugene EmX Ext.</b>	14-Jan-11		
X.P.1 Decision Structure	17-Aug-09		
X.P.2 Purpose & Need	17-Aug-09		
<i>X.P.3 Tech Reports</i>			
<i>Land Use Tech Report</i>			
X.LU.1 Existing Conditions	29-Jan-10		
X.LU.2 Future LU - Impacts of	26-Feb-10		

## *Attachment C*

BRT Alts			
X.LU.4 Environ Impacts	26-Mar-10		
X.LU.3 Potential Econ Devel/Nodal Dev	23-Apr-10		
<i>Transportation Tech Report</i>			
X.E.1 BRT Design Criteria	17-Aug-09		17-Aug-09
<b>Planning Project</b>	<b>Est Finish Date</b>	<b>Revised Finish Date</b>	<b>Actual Finish Date</b>
X.E.2 Devel Alts	17-Aug-09		17-Aug-09
<b>X.M.1 Pop &amp; Emp</b>	<b>31-Dec-09</b>		
<b>X.M.2 Current/Future Travel</b>	<b>31-Dec-09</b>		
<b>X.O.1 Current &amp; Future LOS</b>	<b>31-Dec-09</b>		
<b>X.M.3 BRT Future Ridership</b>	<b>31-Dec-09</b>		
<b>X.O.2 Alt Analysis LOS</b>	<b>31-Dec-09</b>		
X.M.4 Econ Devel/Nodal Devel	26-Mar-10		
X.O.3 B/C Analysis	23-Apr-10		
X.O.4 Revenue/Hrs of Ops	23-Apr-10		
X.E.3 ID impacts & assess Alts	23-Apr-10		
X.E.4 Clarification of 30%	21-May-10		
X.P.4 DEIS	2-Jul-10		
X.P.5 Public Hearing/Comments	27-Aug-10		
X.P.6 Response to Comments	24-Sep-10		
X.P.7 Selection of Preferred	19-Nov-10		
X.F.1 Planning Cost Est	17-Dec-10		
X.F.2 ID Funding Sources	14-Jan-11		
West E EmX ROD	4-Jul-11		

Accomplishments (last period)

- 
- 

Planned - Next Period

- 
- 

Concerns/Issues

⇒ Issue/Concern Statement 1

*Possible Solutions:*

⇒ Issue/Concern Statement 2

*Possible Solutions:*

## *Attachment C*

⇒ Issue/Concern Statement 3  
*Possible Solutions:*

# SPRINGFIELD

STATUS AS OF 10/23/2009

## Milestone Status

Planning Project	Est Finish Date	Revised Finish Date	Actual Finish Date
<b>Springfield Related Projects</b>			
<b>III. Franklin Blvd</b>			
III.LU.1 Coord with Glenwood	2-Nov-09		
III.M.1 Coord with Glenwood	30-Nov-09		
III.P.2 NEPA Scope Prep	25-Dec-09		
III.F.1 Track & update Costs	26-Nov-10		
III.P.1 Alignment Approval - Council	28-Dec-10		
<b>V. IGAPs Ph 3</b>			
V.P.1 Problem Statement	1-Apr-09		1-Apr-09
V.LU.1 Existing LU	30-Oct-09		
V.LU.2 Future 2031 LU	27-Nov-09		
V.M.1 Current Volumes	27-Nov-09		
V.M.2 Future 2031 Volumes	25-Dec-09		
V.M.3 Intch Alts	22-Jan-10		
V.M.4 Remodel Alts for LU	22-Jan-10		
V.O.1 Existing Conditions	28-Apr-10		
V.O.2 Future 2031 Forecast	28-Apr-10		
V.E.1 Multi-modal Intch Alts	26-May-10		
V.O.3 Intch Alts (6) - 2 locations	23-Jun-10		
V.E.2 Planning Cost Est	28-Jul-10		
V.E.3 Local Modified Concepts	28-Jul-10		
V.P.2 Future Phase - IAMP/NEPA	3-Nov-10		
V.F.1 ID Funding for CIP	28-Dec-10		

*Attachment C*

<b>VI. Jasper Natron Plan</b>			
<i>Phase 1 Alt Analysis</i>			
VI.M.2 Model Update	28-Jul-10		
VI.M.1 TIA For Plan	25-Aug-10		
VI.O.1 Current LOS	21-Dec-10		
VI.O.2 Future LOS	11-Jan-11		
VI.O.3 Needed System Impr	1-Feb-11		
VI.E.1 Sys Improve Alt	22-Feb-11		
VI.F.1 Planning Cost Est	1-Mar-11		
VI.E.2 Approve Sys Alt	15-Mar-11		
VI.F.2 ID funding sources	12-Apr-11		
<i>Phase 2 Annex and Adopt</i>			
VI.LU.1 Original Plan	7-Sep-11		
VI.LU.2 Plan for Adoption	5-Oct-11		
VI.P.1 Metro Plan Coord	28-Feb-12		
<b>Planning Project</b>	<b>Est Finish Date</b>	<b>Revised Finish Date</b>	<b>Actual Finish Date</b>
VI.P.2 Road Jurisdiction to Spr	28-Feb-12		
VI.P.3 Annexation	28-Feb-12		
VI.P.4 Street Adoption	27-Mar-12		
VI.P.5 Adopt Nodes	27-Mar-12		
<b>IX. OR 126 EMP - Ph 3 Alts Analysis</b>			
IX.P.1 Review Policy Concepts	17-Aug-09		17-Aug-09
IX.P.2 Existing Standards	17-Aug-09		17-Aug-09
IX.P.3 Est Evaluation Framework	17-Aug-09		17-Aug-09
IX.LU.1 Current LU	17-Aug-09		17-Aug-09
IX.LU.2 Future 2031 Base LU	17-Aug-09		17-Aug-09
IX.LU.3 ID prelim LU mgmt Policies	17-Aug-		17-Aug-

*Attachment C*

	09		09
IX.M.1 Future 2031 Travel Demand	17-Aug-09		17-Aug-09
IX.O.1 Update Current & Future	1-Sep-09		1-Sep-09
IX.O.2 Develop Access Mgmt Concepts	1-Sep-09		1-Sep-09
<b>IX.E.1 ID Alts &amp; Analysis</b>	<b>28-Oct-09</b>		
<b>IX.E.2 Est Costs</b>	<b>25-Nov-09</b>		
<b>IX.F.2 ID Phasing Plans</b>	<b>23-Dec-09</b>		
IX.F.1 ID Funding Sources	26-Feb-10		
<b>XII. OR 126 (Main) Safety Study</b>			
<b>XII.P.1 Existing Policy Framework</b>	<b>28-Oct-09</b>		
<b>XII.LU.1 Current LU</b>	<b>27-Nov-09</b>		
<b>XII.LU.2 Future 2031 LU</b>	<b>27-Nov-09</b>		
<b>XII.M.1 Current Conditions</b>	<b>27-Nov-09</b>		
<b>XII.O.1 Intersection Counts</b>	<b>25-Dec-09</b>		
XII.M.2 Future Travel Demand	22-Jan-10		
XII.O.2 Current Veh/Ped Demand	28-Jan-10		
XII.E.1 Geometric Conditions	28-Jan-10		
XII.E.2 Crash Analysis	28-Jan-10		
XII.O.3 Future Demand; 5, 10, 20 yr	19-Feb-10		
XII.E.3 Alts Analysis	25-Feb-10		
XII.P.2 Education Plan	26-Feb-10		
XII.P.3 Enforcement Plan	26-Feb-10		
XII.F.1 Cost/Benefit	25-Mar-10		
XII.F.2 Impl Plans	22-Apr-10		
XII.P.4 Plan Adoption	20-May-10		

*Attachment C*

<b>Springfield Work Program Activities</b>			
<b>PAPA Implementation</b>			
Initiate Plan Horizon	28-Oct-08		28-Oct-08
S-Remove completed proj	17-Jun-11		
S-Move ODOT Projects	17-Jun-11		
S-Adopt Plan Horizon	17-Jun-11		
<b>Planning Project</b>	<b>Est Finish Date</b>	<b>Revised Finish Date</b>	<b>Actual Finish Date</b>
<b>Land Use Activities</b>			
Buildable Lands	28-Oct-08		28-Oct-08
Safe Harbor Population	30-Sep-09		30-Sep-09
<b>HB 3337 Work</b>			
Comm/Indust Lands Inventory	30-Apr-09		30-Apr-09
Eco Opportunities Analy	30-Apr-09		30-Apr-09
Eco Development Strategy	30-Apr-09		30-Apr-09
Alt Analysis - Emp & Res Lands			
ID Study Area	31-Mar-09		31-Mar-09
Ag Soils & Exception Areas	31-Mar-09		31-Mar-09
Unbuildable Areas	31-Mar-09		31-Mar-09
Public Facilities Analysis	31-Mar-09		31-Mar-09
Transportation Analysis	31-Mar-09		31-Mar-09
<b>Land Needs Adjustment</b>	<b>28-Oct-09</b>		
<b>Implementation Actions</b>			
New Lands	28-Jan-10		
New UBG	25-Feb-10		

*Attachment C*

New Policies	25-Mar-10		
Outreach Process			
Public Outreach Strat	28-Jan-10		
Advisory Coord Formation	25-Feb-10		
Springfield UGB Adoption	25-Mar-10		
Gateway Area Mixed Use	22-Apr-10		
TSP Definition			
Scope TSP	28-Nov-08		28-Nov-08
ID Resource Needs	26-Dec-08		26-Dec-08
RFP Sollicitiation	20-Feb-09		1-Jun-09
<b>XV. Springfield TSP</b>			
<b>NTP</b>	<b>1-Nov-09</b>		
<i>Policy/Planning</i>			
<b>Web-based Surveys (3)</b>	<b>20-Dec-10</b>		
Community Workshop Plans	3-Jan-11		
SAC Meetings	25-Feb-11		
TAC Meetings (8)	7-Mar-11		
<i>Existing Conditions</i>			
<b>Project Instructions</b>	<b>27-Nov-09</b>		
<b>Project Kickoff Meeting</b>	<b>27-Nov-09</b>		
<b>Methods &amp; Assumptions</b>	<b>11-Dec-09</b>		
<b>Methods and Assumptions Meeting</b>	<b>25-Dec-09</b>		
<b>Plan and Policy Review</b>	<b>25-Dec-09</b>		
Existing Conditions & Deficiencies	29-Jan-10		
<i>Alternative Analysis</i>			
Evaluation Criteria & Framework	12-Mar-10		
<b>Planning Project</b>	<b>Est Finish</b>	<b>Revised Finish</b>	<b>Actual Finish</b>

*Attachment C*

	Date	Date	Date
Support for Transportation Model Revisions	12-Mar-10		
Future No-Build Transportation Conditions and Deficiencies	21-May-10		
Alternatives	2-Jul-10		
Future Build Transportation Conditions: TSP Alternatives	1-Oct-10		
<i>Prepare TSP</i>			
Alternatives Evaluation and Preferred Alternative	31-Dec-10		
CIP List and Cost Estimates	25-Mar-11		
Draft TSP	25-Mar-11		
Final TSP	20-May-11		
Amend TSP for LU Adjustments	17-Jun-11		
<b>Post TSP Trans Updates</b>			
ODOT Beltline IAMP Update	27-Jan-12		
IGAPs Update	27-Jan-12		
Jasper-Natron Update	27-Jan-12		
OR 126 EMP Update	27-Jan-12		

Accomplishments (last period)

- 
- 

Planned - Next Period

- 
- 

Concerns/Issues

⇒ Issue/Concern Statement 1

## *Attachment C*

*Possible Solutions:*

⇒ Issue/Concern Statement 2

*Possible Solutions:*

⇒ Issue/Concern Statement 3

*Possible Solutions:*