



December 30, 2021

To: Metropolitan Policy Committee

From: Paul Thompson and Kelly Clarke

Subject: MPC 6.a: Central Lane MPO 2045 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and  
Congestion Management Process (CMP)

**Action Recommended:** Approve Resolution 2022-01 adopting the Central Lane MPO 2045 RTP and CMP.

### **Background and Discussion**

Regional long-range transportation planning is guided by federal requirements. Per 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 450.300, the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is to carry out a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive performance-based multimodal transportation planning process, including the development of a long-range Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RTP must encourage and promote the safe and efficient development, management, and operation of surface transportation systems to serve the mobility needs of people and freight. This includes accessible pedestrian walkways, bicycle transportation facilities, and intermodal facilities that support intercity transportation. The RTP must foster economic growth and development and take into consideration resiliency needs, while minimizing transportation-related fuel consumption and air pollution.

This agenda item is to adopt the Central Lane MPO's 2045 RTP. This RTP update reflects a 2019/20 base year with a 2045 planning horizon. The draft 2045 RTP complies with federal requirements resulting from the MAP-21/FAST Act. It is a 25-year planning document covering jurisdictions within the MPO area: Coburg, Eugene, Springfield and Lane County as well as the Lane Transit District, and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT). The 2045 RTP establishes regional goals and objectives, includes a compilation of transportation projects from locally adopted plans, and a funding forecast. To meet federal requirements, this RTP is developed with a performance based planning and programming framework which will serve to track progress towards regional goals over time.

Attachment 1 provides a summary of the major changes from the 2040 RTP to this 2045 RTP that were made to meet regulatory requirements as well as a summary of the draft 2045 RTP chapters.

The MPC held public hearings on the full draft of the RTP and its attachments at its November 4, 2021 and December 6, 2021 meetings. The public comment period on the draft was open October 29, 2021 through December 10, 2021. Public comment received during the hearings and through public comment channels as well as Central Lane MPO staff responses are provided in full in Attachment 2.

The MPC's advisory Transportation Policy Committee (TPC), at its December 16, 2021 meeting, unanimously recommended adoption of the 2045 RTP.

**Requested Actions**

- Approve Resolution 2022-01 adopting Central Lane MPO RTP and CMP.

**Attachments**

1. Summary of major changes from the 2040 RTP to the Draft 2045 RTP and summary of Draft 2045 RTP chapters
2. Summary of public comments and staff responses
3. Resolution 2022-01
4. Draft 2045 Regional Transportation Plan and Attachments (CMP is Attachment B)

ATTACHMENT 1  
SUMMARY OF MAJOR CHANGES FROM THE 2040 RTP TO THE 2045 RTP  
AND SUMMARY OF DRAFT 2045 RTP CHAPTERS

A summary of the major changes from the 2040 RTP to this 2045 RTP that were made to meet regulatory requirements include:

- **The RTP must be based on the latest available estimates and assumptions for population, land use, travel, employment, congestion, and economic activity.** This RTP is based upon estimates and assumptions provided by multiple sources including Portland State University (population) and the Oregon Employment Department (employment and economic activity) as well as local and state adopted plans (land use, travel, congestion, economic activity). With Oregon's statewide land use planning program, the RTP's compliance with this federal requirement looks different than in most other states. The land use, travel, congestion, and economic activity in the RTP are a reflection of local Comprehensive Plans, Land Use Plans, and Transportation System Plans. Existing conditions are based upon the region's current land use, travel, congestion, and economic activity. Future assumptions for land use, travel, congestion, and economic activity are based upon the plans and policies adopted by the Cities of Coburg, Eugene, Springfield, Lane County, Lane Transit District, and ODOT. In RTPs outside of Oregon, land use planning is not as centralized or consistent across jurisdictions; leaving MPOs to take on more of the estimation and assumption around these local level conditions; including developing the transportation project list.
- **The RTP must be consistent with transportation projects in adopted local, regional, and state plans, at a minimum including projects planned over the RTP's planning horizon that anticipate the use of federal funds and/or are regionally significant.** Again, in Oregon and the CLMPO, the difference is that the RTP's project list supports and is consistent with local and state adopted plans and does not have the flexibility to deviate.
- **The RTP must address the two new federal planning factors: 1) Improve the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reduce or mitigate stormwater impacts of surface transportation; and 2) Enhance travel and tourism.** CLMPO staff prepared white papers (Appendix C and Appendix D) addressing these two new planning factors; including what they mean to an RTP and strategies to integrate them. Each of the RTP's goals has associated objectives that provide actionable ways to achieve the goal, performance measures to measure progress, and its connection to the federal planning factors. Chapter 6 also has extensive coverage of system resiliency, reliability, and the reduction/mitigation of stormwater impacts.
- **The RTP must establish Goals and Objectives and address a new requirement to develop a Performance Based Planning and Programming (PBPP) framework.** This is the RTP's foundation, as it establishes how we

expect the transportation system to meet our needs to move for work, personal needs, and play. This framework sets the regional transportation system's goals; objectives which provide direction on achieving the goals; and measures to evaluate progress. At the regional planning level, it is the most influential component in how federal funds are spent. The draft 2045 RTP's goals are a response to the feedback and direction we received through public outreach and from MPC. The Goal themes are: Transportation Choices; Safety, Security, and Resiliency; Healthy People and Environment; Equity; Economic Vitality; Reliability and Efficiency; and System Asset Preservation. Per direction from MPC, climate change is addressed in the Healthy People and Environment goal; which explicitly states "*The regional transportation system provides safe and comfortable travel options that support active and healthy living and protect and preserve biological, water, cultural and historic resources. Lower-polluting transportation options are encouraged, and transportation greenhouse gas emissions are reduced.*"

Projects in the RTP are a compilation of projects from the region's adopted plans; though many have been on regional lists for many years, they will remain in the RTP until they are completed or removed from local, regional, or state adopted plans. The RTP categorizes projects by the main travel mode. With these broad categories, the automobile mode is the recipient of the largest share of regional funds through 2045. However, projects categorized as auto almost always have multimodal designs with a focus on safety and other modes and supporting outcomes across multiple goals including Safety, Security, and Resiliency; Economic Vitality; Reliability and Efficiency; and System Asset Preservation. Categorizing projects in this way often overstates the projected financial investment in the roadway system, and underestimates the investment in other modes.

The PBPP applies performance management principles to transportation system policy and investment decisions:

- It is a system-level, data-driven process to identify strategies and investments and provides a link between management and long-range decisions about policies and investments.
- Regional long-range planning helps to define key goals and objectives. Connecting performance measures to goals and objectives through analysis help us to understand how are plans, if fully implemented, work towards achieving our goals.
- It is not intended to indicate flaws with regional plans but to give us a data-driven structure that will help to move us in the right direction; influence local project selection in adopted plans; and track progress over time.
- Federal legislation has established the objectives-driven, performance-based approach to planning for operations with such measures as travel time reliability and bridge condition.

- CLMPO has expanded the objectives-driven, performance-based approach for operations to other goal areas with the intent of building a comprehensive performance-based planning process.

The PBPP framework does not end at the RTP; it extends to the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP); which is the MPO program to allocate federal funds through a competitive grant application process. The projects selected through this process must demonstrate their consistency with the RTP's goals and objectives. This is another step in the project selection process that the public and MPC have the power to influence. Historically, federal funds allocated through the CLMPO have primarily supported bicycle, pedestrian, and transit projects as well as safety and system preservation over projects that will increase auto capacity.

#### Summary of Draft 2045 RTP Chapters:

##### **Chapter 1: Setting the Stage**

- Provides context for the RTP as a federally required document.
- Summarizes the RTP's public outreach including an online open house; a bilingual survey distributed by Downtown Languages; a travel barriers and benefits survey; discussions with regional advisory groups and committees; outreach to local community organizations; collaboration and coordination with the CLMPO's regional, state, and federal partners, and MPC feedback and public comment.
- Provides an overview of the region's multi-modal transportation system.

##### **Chapter 2: Goals, Objectives and Performance Measures**

- Establishes the RTP's
  - Goals – States a desired outcome toward which actions are focused to make progress toward a long-term vision.
  - Objectives – An attainable target that the community attempts to reach in striving to meet a goal. An objective may also be considered as an intermediate point that will help fulfill the overall goal.
  - Performance Measures – Predetermined indicators monitored during the life of the RTP as a method of evaluating the plan's effectiveness. To provide numerical targets needed to assess plan progression, benchmarks are established for each performance measure at five-year intervals.
- Underlines the importance of this being the CLMPO's first RTP to have a performance-based planning and programming framework and ties the local and federal performance measures to which goals they will help the region to monitor and track progress toward.
- Public input and direction from the MPC guided the development of the goals, objectives and performance measures; many of which are new to the CLMPO's RTP.

- Introduces the Congestion Management Process.

### **Chapter 3: Regional Assessment**

- Contains a summary of the region's activity centers as well as current and trending population and employment growth, demographics, and travel behavior. Given the timing of this RTP update, data for each of these key indicators is from 2018 or 2019. As such it is not representative of COVID-19 impacts. Future RTPs will have available data for us to incorporate and begin to evaluate those impacts and trends.

### **Chapter 4: Financial Framework**

- Provides the RTP's financially constrained funding forecast. Federal law requires the planned transportation investments in the RTP to be financially constrained based on a reasonably foreseeable forecast of future revenues. Like most plans, there are more projects than anticipated revenue. Plans, programs, and projects that are reasonably anticipated to be funded with available revenues through 2045 are listed in the RTP's Project list in Chapter 5. Plans, programs, and projects that are not reasonably anticipated to be funded with available revenues through 2045 are listed in the RTP's Illustrative project list in Appendix J.
- Lists federal, state, and local revenue sources that are anticipated to be available throughout the RTP's 2045 planning horizon.
- Describes possible strategies to address anticipated revenue shortfall.

### **Chapter 5: Regional Projects**

- Provides the range of transportation plans, programs, and projects needed to meet the needs of the region's people and freight through 2045.
- Draws the connection between the RTP and local plans including CLMPO's partners' Transportation System Plans (TSPs). The vast majority of projects in the RTP are also in these local plans as the RTP is set up to support local and state efforts.
- Highlights the regional priority to maintain and preserve the existing transportation system; protecting the significant investments already made.
- Prioritizes safety, equity, economic vitality, and support of bicycle, public transportation (transit), and pedestrian modes of travel.
- Introduces planning projects including:
  1. Development of a regional Active Transportation Plan. The intent is to address some of the public comments received through the RTP process but outside of the RTP scope and create a more regional approach towards bicycle and pedestrian connections and terminology.
  2. A planning effort, potentially led by the CLMPO, to identify and prioritize a regionally accepted and catalogued network of Regional Emergency Transportation Routes that provide connectivity to critical infrastructure, essential facilities, Statewide Lifeline Routes, population centers, and vulnerable communities. The intent is to enhance the region's resiliency in the face of seismic activity, and potentially other natural hazards.

**Chapter 6: Measuring Plan Outcomes**

- Reports the comprehensive evaluation of the RTP's performance using the regional and federal performance measures. The performance-based planning and programming framework establishes an effective way to understand the consequences and benefits of investment and programming decisions.
- Presents the analysis for each of the regional performance measures and indicates the projected outcomes of implementing the RTP's fiscally constrained project list.
- Explains some of the limitations the CLMPO staff experienced in implementing this framework and analyzing the measures. Most notably that regional efforts in the CLMPO focus heavily on programmatic efforts like the Safe Lane Coalition and Transportation Options as well as localized projects that are not captured in a regional travel model. These efforts have the potential to produce positive outcomes and to steer the region towards our goals but are difficult to quantify and measure, especially through 2045. Future RTP efforts will continue to evaluate the measures and to explore other tools to help us quantify them.

**Chapter 7: The Future of the Region**

- Concludes the RTP and identifies trends that may influence future planning efforts.

## ATTACHMENT 2 SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS AND STAFF RESPONSES

MPC held a public hearing for the draft documents during their November 4, 2021 meeting. The following table summarizes the comments heard and staff responses.

| Comment  | Response   |
|--|--|
| Timeline is too short. The public comment period must be longer.   | Public comment period is extended to December 10 <sup>th</sup> . MPC will hold a second public hearing December 2 <sup>nd</sup> . Please refer to RTP Appendices E and F for details on the public outreach conducted throughout the development of the draft plan.  |
| Why is the Randy Pape Beltline on the fiscally constrained project list?   | This project is on the RTP list to be consistent with adopted State plans.   |
| The Main Street Safety Project should be included.   | Springfield has not adopted this yet.  |
| Why are the Interchanges on I-5 and Highway 126 still on the list?   | These projects are on the RTP list to be consistent with adopted State plans.  |
| The RTP proposes that more dollars are spent to benefit drivers. More dollars should be allocated towards active transportation modes. Too much reliance on autos. | The projects on the project lists are categorized by their main travel mode. However, they almost always have multimodal designs with a focus on safety and support outcomes across multiple goals and multiple modes. Categorizing projects in this way often overstates the projected financial investment in the roadway system, and underestimates the investment in other modes.        |
| Who are we building Bus Rapid Transit and EmX for and where will they be?  | Lane Transit District's planning projects will determine the outcomes of these routes and will include substantial public outreach.  |
| Need to invest more in bicycle and pedestrian modes.   | Historically, federal funds allocated by the MPO have primarily funded bicycle, pedestrian, and transit modes at a higher rate than projects that would increase automobile capacity. This RTP's goals and objectives will direct funds in a similar direction. Implementing these funding priorities in the MPO's funding program (MTIP) is where the actual investment decisions are made. |
| Mode share does not seem to be moving in the right direction.  | Staff have identified limitations in analyzing mode share with the current tools available. A regional travel model does not reflect the local level bicycle and pedestrian projects; nor the transportation options programs that our region is committed to and that make a difference in mode share shift. Staff will be seeking better tools for this analysis in                        |



|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | preparation for the next RTP update.  |
| Are the interchange projects on Highway 126 necessary?   | These projects are on the RTP list to be consistent with adopted local plans.   |
| Equity and needs of non-white males should be better addressed.  | Equity is a goal of this Plan. The Environmental Analysis provides analysis of the region's communities that have been historically underrepresented and strategies to mitigate.  |
| The draft says we address climate change but it does not seem to. Lives can be saved by addressing climate change.   | Reducing transportation related greenhouse gas emissions is integrated into the RTP goals and the RTP supports reducing vehicle miles traveled by automobiles; utilizing technology to manage the current system, building out the active transportation network, and increasing investments in the region's Transportation Options and Safe Routes to School programs and activities. The GHG performance measure supports local climate action planning efforts and will evolve with state and federal legislation. |
| Funding sources going through major shifts, state does not have matching requirements. We will need to rethink what ranking systems mean moving forward. Gas tax going away, need to look at new payment structure | The financial framework chapter lists federal, state, and local revenue sources that are anticipated throughout the RTP's 2045 horizon. It is understood that shifts will occur as they historically have.  |
| Economic and business shifts – working from home, for example, will have major implications on downtown economic development as well as mode share, demand modeling, etc. This plan does not consider this.        | This RTP acknowledges these shifts as emerging trends to follow and supports ongoing regional transportation demand management efforts.   |
| We are coming into an era where planning cycles need to be accelerated, not slowed. The days of 20 year plans are coming to an end. LCOG needs to take a hard look at how they can speed it up.                    | CLMPO's Transportation Improvement Program and the local jurisdiction's Capital Improvement Programs provide the 5 to 6 year, or short term, program for capital improvements and programs anticipated given anticipated revenues over this planning period. Projects moved to these programs come from the adopted 20-year plans.  |
| Put self into 2045, if all plans come through, do they achieve our goals? Looking at plan, no they do not get us there.  | As was acknowledged during the November 4 <sup>th</sup> MPC discussion, local and regional plans are starting to make the shift to planning for a future that achieves goals such as equity and addressing climate change. This RTP is also a step in that direction, and will continue to evolve as it meets it's requirement to be consistent with the local and  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | regional plans.  |
| As we think about investments to the transportation system, think about development patterns. Think about policies for housing that are integrated with transportation. | This RTP is based on adopted plans and policies. Land use and housing policies are developed at the local level. |

*Response to public comment from Better Eugene-Springfield Transportation (BEST) received December 1, 2021 (BEST Memo Attached):*

- As BEST notes, the draft RTP has “good goals and objectives reflecting regional needs.” However, BEST goes on to state that “it is unclear how projects advance those goals.” It is the intention of federal MPOs to provide a long-range (20+ year) overview of a region’s transportation needs and identify gaps in funding and performance-based planning outcomes that should be addressed to achieve the region’s long-term goals. In most areas of the country, without Oregon’s state and local 20-year land use and transportation planning requirements, the RTP serves to guide shorter term local plans towards long term goals. In Oregon, with long range transportation plans required in metropolitan areas at both the federal and state level, it is always an iterative process to have consistency across plans.

The federal RTP is *required* to be consistent with the *current* adopted local, regional, and state plans at the time the RTP is adopted. At this point in time the draft RTP presented for adoption reflects the projects in the current local plans of the MPO’s members. With the draft RTP presenting a new set of Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures, under an entirely new Performance Based Planning and Programming framework, and with the RTP reflecting current projects in local plans, it is to be expected that there may be a gap in the expected outcomes. But that is part of the role of an RTP, to integrate local plans in a region and see what outcomes result, and then set Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures to guide changes in local and regional plans, programs, and investments to achieve better outcomes. And, as the 4-year update cycle for the RTP comes around (or sooner, via amendments to the RTP or an earlier update), the MPO’s continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive planning role will reflect changes in the local plans in future iterations of the RTP.

MPO staff are entirely open to continuous community input to the region’s RTP following adoption of the 2045 RTP. *How* that happens is something that will require careful consideration by the MPO member jurisdictions, since many of them will also be embarking on updates to their local transportation (and other) plans in 2022.

Finally, while MPO staff understands BEST’s desire to take a closer look at certain individual projects in the RTP, we caution against placing any proactive “restraints” on future funding decisions in the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program. We are also unclear as to what it means when BEST

suggests putting certain RTP projects “on hold.” As a 24-year long range plan, most projects in the RTP are, in reality, in a holding pattern until their time, and funding, come. In the context of the MTIP, which at most programs funds four (4) years in the future, what does it mean to “put on hold projects not planned until 2030” as suggested?

When appropriate, the MPO believes that revisiting individual projects should start with the jurisdiction that “owns” the project (and, if appropriate, the MPO is fully willing to support those efforts in any way). Second, *all* MPC decisions on MPO funding of projects, programs, and planning should be made while considering the RTP’s long-range Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures, as well as public input relevant to the specific funding decision, and the context of the funding decision at that time.

For just one example, the recently passed Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) includes new and expanded MPO funding programs, the roll-out of which we do not yet fully understand (as we await federal regulations and guidance on those programs) and deciding now to restrain from funding certain investments in the MTIP may not fully account for new opportunities or requirements. Imposing a blanket restraint on certain categories of funding would seem to remove the possibility of full and open discussion of all funding opportunities as they become available or timely.

*Response to public comment from Better Eugene-Springfield Transportation (BEST) received December 10, 2021 (BEST Memo Attached):*

- The proposal contained in this public comment mixes project categories, mixes jurisdictions, and mixes funding sources. The RTP’s financial constraint considers jurisdictions, funding sources, and project categories. This particular suggestion by BEST ignores that the \$130M of state roadway projects may be reasonably expected to be funded by funding sources (such as state gas tax money) that may not be available (or are explicitly not available, such as state gas tax funds) to be used on the off-street, out of the ROW, path projects. Freeing up ~\$130M of state roadway funding does not translate to additional available funding for off-road path projects.
- The project lists are also generally prioritized by project type. All of the path/lane projects they suggest moving to the constrained list are local jurisdiction projects, prioritized by those jurisdictions against other local path/lane projects that they did place on the constrained lists, up to the funding they expect to have available. Even if the anticipated ODOT funding that would theoretically be freed up from moving those four roadway projects to the illustrative list could be used for the path projects, it is far from a given that it would be the priority for the use of those ODOT funds. We would have to enter a regional discussion about that, at a minimum.
- Making these changes to the RTP would require redoing the PMs and the AQCD, pushing adoption until at least February, if not March. MPC made it clear they want to avoid further delay in adopting this RTP.

*Response to public comment received prior to close of public comment period  
December 10, 2021:*

| Comment   | Response  |
|---|---|
| <p>I began reviewing this document in early November. With many other planning processes going on at the state and local level, I was relieved to see that the deadline for comments was delayed to Dec 10th. However, I also noticed when I resumed my review early this month that the draft document was altered in ways that were not documented in any way I could find. As it requires more than an afternoon to review a 200+ page document, I'd appreciate if, in future planning processes, changes are documented when drafts are updated in the midst of a comment period so people who have already begun reviewing could determine where they need to redo their work.</p>   | <p>The documents were not updated during the public comment period.</p>   |
| <p>This plan represents a major improvement over the previous plan in terms of the specificity and definition of its goals. If anything, though, this plan is overly-specific in its goals and objectives, making it hard to track, on the one hand, all of the objectives tied to a goal, and making it obvious, on the other hand, when goals and objectives contradict each other (such as Healthy People and Environment's "support active and healthy living and protect and preserve biological, water, cultural, and historic resources" being negated by System Asset Preservation's preserving the existing assets that are discouraging active and healthy living and degrading natural, cultural and historic resources). The measures included in this plan are also a major improvement over the last plan, which was vague about how the plan would be measured. This plan's measures have room for improvement, though, most specifically in how they mostly lack clear targets (e.g. reducing vehicle miles traveled supports the plan's goals to a point, but that point is clearly somewhere above zero).</p> | <p>Noted</p>  |
| <p>One thing that is concerning about the future of this plan is that it is "an update to the CLMPO's 2040 RTP" (p 2) yet it is completely</p>  | <p>Federal legislation and requirements changed since the previous RTP's adoption. This RTP was the first to fall under the</p> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>unlike the earlier document in form, goals, even in scope (the earlier document covered land use, which is largely unaddressed in this plan). In 3 years there will be another plan, will it retain the same measures or will it be another complete revision? How will the measures and their outcomes be communicated to the agencies that developed the projects being evaluated by the plan?</p>   | <p>requirements to create a performance based planning and programming framework. Measures are intended to establish a tracking mechanism to monitor performance and are intended to be consistent through upcoming RTP updates, though will be reviewed through future RTP updates. CLMPO staff will develop a dashboard online to display the performance measures publicly and will communicate progress to MPC regularly.</p>   |
| <p>Intercity transit isn't really addressed in this plan. I'd like to see objectives added or clarified under, for example, goals 1 &amp; 5 that make clear that frequent, fast, reliable, and affordable multimodal intercity transportation options are necessary. Specifically, existing intercity rail links should be improved in terms of speed, frequency and reliability. It could also be noted that CLMPO should support ODOT's passenger rail planning efforts, or go further and urge ODOT to put their plans into practice. Also, a measure indicating access to intercity transit facilities would be helpful -- it's long past time for regional entities to actively engage in coordinating intercity transit services.</p>   | <p>Intercity bus routes and intercity passenger intermodal facilities are addressed in Chapter 1. Goal 1 Objective states "Support regional travel and tourism with a multimodal transportation system, including passenger rail and intercommunity transit access, that provides visitors and tourists with travel options to access regional destinations." This will provide the direction to support ODOT passenger rail planning efforts and to urge ODOT to put plans into practice. Future updates have the opportunity to consider an intercity specific measure.</p> |
| <p>The objectives listed under Goal 1: Transportation Choices largely tend to aim to extend to everyone the basic multimodal menu that is today only available to a few in the region. Yet two of the performance measures are (presumably vehicle) Miles Traveled and Mode Share, with the implication that satisfying these objectives will result in a reduction in vehicle miles traveled and mode share for driving alone. There is no evidence for, and decades of experience all over the world against, the notion that simply providing a basic level of multimodal options will encourage people to use those options over driving alone. Instead, it's necessary to provide a premium level of multimodal options before people will choose to use those options in significant numbers. As such, the objectives should be strengthened to, for example, "Develop a multimodal transportation system that allows all to access employment, education, and services more conveniently by biking, walking, or transit than by driving alone." Or, more simply: "biking, walking, and taking transit should be more convenient than driving</p> | <p>Goal 1 states "People throughout the region have access to affordable, healthy, active, and shared transportation options that safely and conveniently connect them with their destinations while reducing reliance on driving alone and minimizing transportation-related pollution." Objectives are intended to guide the region towards achieving this goal. Safety and convenience are vital to making this happen and are supported by the RTP's other goals and objectives.</p>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>alone."</p>   |  |
| <p>The "Regional Pedestrian Network" (Figure 10) is outdated (for example, it's missing the Roosevelt Path extension to almost Hwy 99), inaccurate (for example, there is a Shared Use Path depicted to the east of, and parallel to, Hwy 99 between Roosevelt and 7th Ave that is roughly where a railroad track is in reality) and lacking useful scale and context. The "Regional Bikeway Network" (Figure 11) includes streets that do not contain separated bike infrastructure (for example, Monroe St), therefore in fact exclude bikes by forcing them to avoid cars. The "Regional Trail Network" (Figure 12) is useless for transportation planning purposes because it doesn't distinguish between facilities that exclude either bikes or pedestrians, making it impossible to use to plan for either mode. If the Plan wishes to present a useful assessment of "Current Regional Pedestrian and Bicycle Networks" it should present data showing the amount of bike/ped infrastructure compared to automotive infrastructure, the quality of bike/ped infrastructure (many sidewalks and bike lanes in the region are really just glorified gutters), and where bike/ped activity is high. The lack of attention shown to measuring the amount and quality of bike/ped facilities is an indication of the lack of consideration for bike/ped as modes, despite Goal 1.</p> | <p>Thank you for this note. CLMPO staff are aware of and have noted the data limitations and have included development of an Active Transportation Plan as a project that will stem from this RTP. One of the primary components of the development of a regional Active Transportation Plan is a deeper dive into the regional bicycle and pedestrian data.</p> |
| <p>Table 2 on p 54, titled "TAM Plan Performance targets" isn't clear on what exactly is being targeted. The narrative indicates that it's related to the condition of an asset class; do the percentages indicate the amount of assets in bad repair? What are the baselines? I hope that the region's transit assets aren't in such poor repair that 10-40% being in good repair would represent an improvement. Also, if the target was the same for both years, why include both years on the table?</p>   | <p>Table 2. Oregon Tier II Group TAM Plan Performance Targets is displaying the statewide Transit Asset Management Plan targets for each of the asset types listed. Lane Transit District participates in contributing towards meeting these targets. The baseline conditions are not listed here.</p>   |
| <p>Figure 25 on page 69 -- why can't this actually show where jobs are located using an actual geographic unit such as census blocks? And use traditional cartographic features such as a legend? The purple blobs</p>   | <p>Thank you for this note. Figures 25 and 27 are intended as visual representations of employment densities. Employment data is sensitive and CLMPO staff chose to display it in a hot spot style of mapping.</p>   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>are too vague and impressionistic to convey meaningful information.</p> <p>Figure 27 on page 72 -- same as above.</p>  |   |
| <p>Page 73 -- are the four demographic elements that are used to determine a "Historically Excluded Community" the ones listed as examples on this page (e.g. income, race, age, and disability identification)? If not, which other elements are considered? What is the reason for choosing these elements? There are other communities besides these four that have been historically excluded, for example, the unemployed, the unhoused, the currently or formerly incarcerated, or people with mental health disorders. Why were additional communities not included in the consideration of historically excluded communities?</p> | <p>CLMPO follows federal Civil Rights Act of 1964 and other legislation that direct the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people which requires evaluating the impact of transportation investments on population groups that may be traditionally underserved or underrepresented, specifically: low-income communities, communities of color, elderly populations, and people with disabilities. CLMPO also monitors and considers unhoused individuals, age, and education as key elements.</p> |
| <p>Figure 28 on page 74 -- page 73 states that Figure 28 will show "Historically Excluded Communities" but the legend indicates "Socio-Economic Factors". Are these the same? If not, what is a Socio-Economic Factor?</p>  | <p>These are the same and Figure 28 will be updated to clarify.</p>   |
| <p>page 82 -- it appears that about 20% of the region's employees are commuting from outside of the MPO's region but nearby (i.e. the 52% of the 52,000 employees commuting from Lane County but outside the MPO region). As such, the MPO's jurisdiction doesn't appear to be the appropriate scale on which to be planning transportation improvements. I would appreciate if the plan addressed the impact of commuters from outside of the MPO's jurisdiction on its transportation system. This is especially relevant given the priority indicated in Appendix G for expanding transit service coverage.</p>                        | <p>The MPO scale is the federally required scale.</p>   |
| <p>page 99 -- it isn't clear how the 2020-2045 projected revenue total was calculated. The plan provides some detail on sources for projected costs in Table 17, but attributes revenues only to "existing federal state, and local source allocations and future private sources." This assumed sources of future revenue should be made clear so that the</p>   | <p>The revenue forecast is a planning level projection based on historic trends, current levels of funding, and an assessment of future funding sources and levels. It is intended as a reasonable outlook of funding for projects that may be reasonably funded within 25 years.</p>   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>public can assess how reasonable the projection is.</p>   |  |
| <p>p. 197 "Travel on Main Street (OR 126) east of Bob Straub and Main Street/A Street (including couplet) is projected to decrease..." -- is this referring to travel time?</p>  | <p>It is referring to transit travel time. CLMPO is clarifying this in the text.</p>   |
| <p>p. 206 Mode Share -- figure 54 does not show a decline in Single-Occupant Vehicle mode share -- 54% is indicated for baseline and future. Why, then, does page 208 indicate that the plan meets the intent of a measure described as "Percent of non-drive alone trips"? While the other data indicates an increase in the absolute number of non-drive alone trips, that isn't enough to satisfy the plan's goals and objectives.</p>  | <p>This data is representing the RTP's projects as assessed using the travel demand model are at least meeting the intent of the goals and objectives. The RTP's programs and local level projects are not part of this analysis because they are not as easy to quantify, though they do have a significant impact on the outcome of these measures.</p>  |
| <p>p.209 System Completeness -- since there appears to be an issue with data collection/availability with multimodal systems, it would be ideal to add a measure to the plan that would gauge the availability of multimodal data itself. For example, % of bike/ped facilities represented in data.</p>   | <p>Thank you for this note. CLMPO staff are aware of and have noted the data limitations and have included development of an Active Transportation Plan as a project that will stem from this RTP. One of the primary components of the development of a regional Active Transportation Plan is a deeper dive into the regional bicycle and pedestrian data and potential additional measures that would be possible to quantify with complete data.</p> |
| <p>p. 214 -- Access to Jobs: the Transit baseline here is unexpectedly high. While the region's jobs are relatively centralized, the transit system is characterized by low frequencies and a timed transfer route pattern. While I may not be the "average" household, I live and work within two miles of the Park Blocks, which I assume makes me somewhat favorably positioned for transit, yet my transit commute is 30-40 minutes (schedule + transfer time). Most bus routes have 30 minute frequencies, so I'd think it would be next to impossible for most people to get to their job on transit in 20 minutes except for maybe the ~30% of people who work downtown. Did the access to jobs model used here take frequency or transfer into account? If not, the model should be revised to better reflect the experience of the actual transit user. If the model is accurate, that is a strong argument for strengthening the "Transportation Choices" objectives; if most regional households can conveniently reach</p> | <p>This measure is reporting the number of households within ¼ mile of a transit stop. Time of commute is not a factor. The "Access to High Capacity Transit" measure is intended to capture time and quality of commute in proximity of households to a high capacity transit stop.</p>   |



|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>most regional jobs via transit, yet transit mode share is only around 3%, it seems that objectives should be reaching for multimodal systems that not only exist but are as good or better than driving alone.</p>   |   |
| <p>p. 216 Access to Transit -- this measure is lacking a future year outcome.</p>   | <p>This performance measure is reported during the current year only, as specific locations of future transit stops is not known at this time.</p>  |
| <p>p. 217 Access to High-Capacity Transit -- this measure is lacking a future year outcome.</p>   | <p>This performance measure is reported during the current year only, as specific locations of future transit stops is not known at this time.</p>  |
| <p>p. 221 Transportation Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions -- while the measure developed appears to be met under the plan, it isn't clear how the actions listed, which almost exclusively involve measuring and projecting emissions, actually contribute to reducing transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Given that the other performance measures indicate that vehicle miles traveled, congestion, and delay will all increase will mode share will remain basically identical, a measure that actually measured the impact of proposed projects on greenhouse gas emissions would undoubtedly not meet the plan's intent. Nonetheless, I must urge you to add a measure that actually does estimate greenhouse gas emissions. At the very least, measuring something like electric passenger/transit vehicle adoption would provide a sense of progress or not on one aspect of transportation emissions.</p> | <p>For this RTP, the "Transportation Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions" measure is "Support local and state efforts to reduce transportation related GHG emissions." Local efforts towards meeting this measure include the City of Eugene's Climate Recovery Ordinance, Lane Transit District's Climate Action Policy, Lane County's Climate Action Plan, the Central Lane Scenario Plan, and a regional focus on supporting travel by public transportation transit, biking, walking, and shared occupancy vehicles. Thank you for the urge to include a measure that estimates greenhouse gas emissions. CLMPO is participating in efforts that may lead to the ability to do so at a regional level.</p> |
| <p>I recommend the construction of a protected bikeway along the South side of Howard Avenue, to connect the West Bank River Path to North Park Avenue. This would route along Copping Street to East Howard Avenue, along East Howard Avenue to River Road, across River Road through a HAWK crosswalk, South on River Road to Howard Avenue, then West on Howard Avenue to North Park Avenue.</p> <p>All streets connecting to Howard Avenue from the South should be terminated at Howard Avenue, with only bike/ped connections to Howard Avenue. Vehicle traffic to the obstructed streets can be served from Horn Lane and Maclay Drive/N. Park Avenue. The bikeway should be separated</p>   | <p>Thank you for this recommendation. CLMPO staff have shared this with the City of Eugene staff for as the City of Eugene is the controlling jurisdiction for these road corridors.</p>  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>from Howard Avenue by concrete dividers (Jersey barriers) with openings allowing bike/ped access to cross-streets and crosswalks across Howard Avenue.</p> <p>This would increase walkability/bikeability in this underserved corridor, allow safe passage to children attending schools in the area, which at present have no safe way to get to school other than by car or bus.</p>   |  |
| <p>We urge staff research the feasibility of changing 11th &amp; 13th Avenues to two way traffic and submitting information to Council. This change would calm traffic improve, improve safety, encourage walking and cycling and unite the neighborhood. Roundabouts at major intersections would help with the above features as well as greatly reducing air pollution caused by gas engines idling at traffic lights and stop signs.</p>  | <p>Thank you for this recommendation. CLMPO staff have shared this with the City of Eugene staff for as the City of Eugene is the controlling jurisdiction for these road corridors.</p> |
| <p>I feel that the City of Eugene should investigate the potential of turning 11th &amp; 13th Avenues into two-way streets. This would potentially reduce traffic speeds, increase safety, promote biking &amp; walking, increase shopping at local businesses, etc.</p> <p>Investigation of the potential for this should proceed immediately to initiate the planning process should this idea prove feasible. Next steps would be soliciting public comment, engineering studies, soliciting bids to prepare budgets, budgeting, funding, soliciting final bids, &amp; final construction.</p> | <p>Thank you for this recommendation. CLMPO staff have shared this with the City of Eugene staff for as the City of Eugene is the controlling jurisdiction for these road corridors.</p> |
| <p>Dear Metropolitan Policy Committee,<br/>As I see it, the proposed Regional Transportation Plan has worthy goals and objectives which look great on paper. However, the plan is actually outdated business as usual and does not adequately support our community's current climate and safety goals.</p> <p>Please take a hard look at the proposal to update and reprioritize projects and also include critical funding for active transportation. Clearly, above all, the RTP needs to address climate change and improve safety.</p>   | <p>Noted</p>   |
| <p>Dear MPC,<br/>I am writing to express my disappointment in</p>   | <p>Noted</p>   |

the proposed Regional Transportation Plan. The plan should be making our infrastructure safer, more equitable, and in line with climate change goals.

The planned projects fall short of the RTP's own goals. I urge the committee to review the plan and make changes. Better Eugene-Springfield Transportation (BEST) has made suggestions that would help the plan deliver better transportation outcomes and address safety, multi-modal transportation options, and climate change objectives.

Please revise the list of projects to ensure that the plan is serving the community for years to come.