



DLCD

Department of
Land Conservation
& Development

RAC 1 Meeting Notes

Transportation Planning Rulemaking – 2026

Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development

August 24, 2026

The meeting of the Rulemaking Advisory Committee was held online at 1:00pm on Friday, July 17, 2026.

Video of this meeting is [available on the DLCD YouTube channel](#).

Advisory Committee members present: Sarah Adams, Anne Catlin, Kelly Clarke (alternate), Wade Elliott, Kim Ellis (alternate), Bill Graupp, Julie Hanson, Eric Hesse, Rob Inerfeld, Steve Kelley, Brock Nation, Nicole Stingh, Karen Swirsky, Paige West

Staff present: Theresa Conley (ODOT), Matt Crall, Elliott Eastman, Bill Holmstrom, Adam Marl, Cody Meyer, Casaria Taylor, Kevin Young

Gathering and Welcome

[2:28] DLCD staff opened the meeting, provided a brief technical overview of the meeting software, and introduced themselves.

Matt Crall welcomed and thanked the committee on behalf of the director, then reviewed the meeting agenda.

Introductions and Rulemaking Overview

[5:33] Matt Crall reviewed the meeting agenda.

[6:27] The members of the advisory committee introduced themselves.

[13:23] Matt Crall reviewed the [rulemaking charge](#) from the commission, and the role and responsibilities of the advisory committee.

TPR Implementation Update

[16:58] Cody Meyer provided an update to the advisory committee on the state's progress in providing support to local governments to implement the Transportation Planning Rules and Metropolitan Greenhouse Gas Reduction Rules.

[22:38] An advisory committee member brought forward a concern that the existing rules require updated transportation system plans to be adopted by 2029. Staff agreed to review the issue and bring it back to the advisory committee.

Rule 0210 Presentation and Discussion

[25:44] Bill Holmstrom presented an overview of [OAR 660-012-0210](#). This presentation included a background of the rule and the staff recommendation to repeal the rule.

[37:54] Cody Meyer opened up the meeting for comments and questions from the committee.

[38:15] An advisory committee member asked about the location of potential developments near the periphery of the community. Bill Holmstrom responded.

[40:12] The advisory committee member followed up with a question about transit provision in climate-friendly areas, particularly in peripheral areas. Bill Holmstrom responded.

[43:04] An advisory committee member said that the proposed approach appeared to be reasonable. Bill Holmstrom responded.

[45:02] The advisory committee member followed up with a statement on how their city is coordinating with Metro on vehicle miles traveled (VMT) issues.

[45:47] An advisory committee member asked a question about how [OAR 660-012-0060](#) applies, and how the proposed repeal of [OAR 660-012-0210](#) would affect this. The committee member also asked about any potential

analysis or projects that may have not been approved if this rule had been in effect. Bill Holmstrom responded.

[52:20] An advisory committee member noted that other rules are in place to help reduce capacity-increasing transportation projects. The advisory committee member noted that their city was supportive of the proposed repeal. Bill Holmstrom and Cody Meyer responded.

[57:18] An advisory committee member noted they were in favor of repealing the rule due to the effect of deterring jurisdictions from using certain tools, and the potential for learning from unintended consequences in California.

[58:24] An advisory committee member noted support of repealing the rule due to other provisions of division 12 meeting the desired objectives.

[59:04] An advisory committee member brought up a concern with the definition of “vehicle miles traveled” in the division. Staff agreed to consider the concern and bring it back to the advisory committee at the next meeting.

[1:02:13] An advisory committee member asked about time on the agenda to discuss the issue with the concern about the definition. Staff responded that the present meeting would focus on items that are on the agenda, and the second meeting would include a response and opportunity to discuss the items brought up in the first meeting.

Break

[1:04:00] The committee took a short break.

Other Amendments Presentation and Discussion

[1:04:12] Cody Meyer introduced the next part of the meeting to discuss other [proposed amendments](#), based on input received from the advisory committee. Bill Holmstrom began to present on the selected amendments.

Item 34

[1:05:19] Bill Holmstrom presented an overview of item 34, which would make a change to how jurisdictions making major reports describe any needed corrective actions.

[1:11:07] An advisory committee member noted support of the proposed amendment.

[1:11:40] An advisory committee member asked if it could be clearer that a single corrective action could cover more than one missed target.

[1:12:15] Cody Meyer and Bill Holmstrom responded that they understood the concern. Staff agreed they would return with updated proposed language to be responsive to the concern and clearer about the department's intent.

[1:13:55] An advisory committee member suggested wording the paragraph to respond to the concern.

[1:14:20] An advisory committee member provided additional comment on ensuring the rule language was clear. Bill Holmstrom agreed.

Item 26

[1:15:50] Bill Holmstrom presented an overview of item 26, which would make a change to a requirement for parking garages. The requirement only applies to cities with a population over 200,000 or more, and requires that parts of certain parking garages be designed to be converted to other uses if desired in the future.

[1:19:23] An advisory committee member raised a concern that the text of the rule could be applied to buildings that are not parking structures.

[1:20:16] An advisory committee member noted support of the proposed amendment.

[1:21:11] An advisory committee member asked a question about the wording of the amendment related to "may" versus "must." Bill Holmstrom responded to the question. Another advisory committee member responded to the question as well.

[1:23:19] An advisory committee member asked a question about parking garages in certain circumstances. Bill Holmstrom responded to the question.

[1:25:23] An advisory committee member followed up on a part of the concern having to do with sloped sites. Bill Holmstrom and another advisory committee member responded.

Item 25

[1:28:53] Bill Holmstrom noted that item 25 would remove a conflicting provision from the rules. The provision has to do with parking maximums within a certain distance of transit.

[1:29:46] An advisory committee member was curious about the actual conflicting provision. Bill Holmstrom and Cody Meyer noted they could look into the background of the item and bring it back to the advisory committee.

Item 23

[1:30:27] Bill Holmstrom described the proposed change in item 23, which would clarify that updates to transportation system plans (TSPs) would not trigger the required analysis in [OAR 660-012-0325](#).

[1:31:24] An advisory committee member asked a question about how highway impacts would be considered as part of a TSP update. Bill Holmstrom responded.

[1:33:02] An advisory committee member noted a concern that a small TSP amendment could potentially be used to circumvent the requirements in rule 0325 in a way that would not otherwise be intended. Cody Meyer and Bill Holmstrom followed up with some questions.

Item 27

[1:36:22] Bill Holmstrom described item 27, an update to a reference document.

Item 28

[1:37:15] Bill Holmstrom described item 28, which would provide some more flexibility for local governments to use safety inventory data in their TSPs.

Item 37

[1:38:29] Bill Holmstrom described item 37, which would repeal [OAR 660-044-0060](#). This is a requirement for Metro to report progress, which is now duplicated by requirements in [OAR 660-012-0900](#).

[1:39:55] An advisory committee member went back to item 28 and asked a question about the purpose of the original requirement. Bill Holmstrom responded.

Review and Closing

[1:41:50] Cody Meyer thanked the advisory committee for their time and contributions to the meeting. Cody Meyer went over the date for the next advisory committee meeting, and the remaining rulemaking schedule.

[1:42:57] An advisory committee member noted that they would not be able to attend the next advisory committee meeting. The advisory committee member hoped to be able to receive information about potential changes and additional topics brought forward to the advisory committee. Cody Meyer responded that it would be possible.

[1:44:26] Matt Crall closed the meeting and thanked everyone on the advisory committee.