



<b>MEETING:</b>	<b>TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMITTEE</b>		
<b>DATE:</b>	<b>Thursday, March 21<sup>st</sup></b>		
<b>TIME:</b>	<b>10:00am – 12:00pm</b>		
<b>LOCATION:</b>	<b>Remote via Zoom/phone</b>		
<b>CONTACT PERSON:</b>	<b>Paul Thompson, 541-682-4405</b>		
<b>INFORMATION:</b>	<b><a href="tel:+16699009128">+1 (669) 900-9128</a></b>	<b>Meeting ID: 873 1071 4268</b>	<b>Passcode: 432711</b>

## **TPC AGENDA**

- |   |            |
|---|------------|
| 1. Call to order, introductions, agenda review  | 5 minutes  |
| 2. Comments from the public   | 15 minutes |
| 3. Safe Lane Coalition Report   | 5 minutes  |
| 4. Transportation Options Update  | 10 minutes |
| 5. 2024 Public Participation Plan Draft   | 10 minutes |
| 6. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Project Changes   | 10 minutes |
| 7. Redistribution Funding Proposals   | 10 minutes |
| 8. Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Funding<br>- <i>Action Required: Recommend Off-the-Top Funding Amounts</i>                  | 10 minutes |
| 9. Update to Oregon Highway Plan<br>- <i>Discussion Only</i>  | 10 minutes |
| 10. Oregon Legislature Joint Transportation Committee Roadshow Visit and<br>Project Priorities for 2025<br>- <i>Discussion Only</i> | 10 minutes |
| 11. Regional Transportation Plan update   | 15 minutes |





March 14, 2024

To: Transportation Planning Committee  
From: Daniel Callister  
Subject: Draft 2024 Public Participation Plan

**Action Requested:** Request Public Hearing; Approve Release of Draft for Public Review

### **Issue Statement**

Central Lane MPO staff has prepared a draft Public Participation Plan (PPP) to replace the current plan adopted in 2015.

### **Discussion**

Federal law requires MPOs to develop and use a documented participation plan that provides interested parties with reasonable opportunities to be involved in the metropolitan transportation planning process<sup>1</sup>. This plan has been developed to replace the 2015 plan and includes updated policy language and procedures, as well as tools, strategies, and evaluation methods.

The plan is divided into four chapters. Chapter 1 provides baseline information about who the MPO is and what the PPP is and how it was developed. Chapter 2 presents the MPO's participation goal, objectives, and policies. Chapter 3 describes tools and strategies for participation, as well as specifying the tools to be utilized for each of the MPO's key work products, with more specific detail about the development of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). Chapter 4 describes how the public involvement tools will be evaluated for effectiveness and updated as needed. Several appendices are included documenting public comments and how those influenced the plan development, a report of the results of the 2023 public participation survey, and additional tools for participation.

### **Summary of Changes from the 2015 Plan**

In addition to updated information and references to documents, regulations, and other resources, the 2024 plan includes more detailed documentation of the MPO's public involvement procedures, particularly for the RTP and MTIP, and consultation with federal land management agencies. The plan has been augmented to include tools and

---

<sup>1</sup> [23 CFR 450.316](#)

strategies that incorporate social media and other virtual means of engagement. More substantive changes are listed below, including changes to policy language:

#### Goal, Objectives, and Policies

- Policy 1.2 was to hold public meetings, when feasible, “at a site convenient” to citizens and other interested parties. That has been expanded now to specify holding public meetings at a convenient time and location.
- Policy 1.6 a reference to the defunct KeepUsMoving.info has been removed.
- Policy 2.6 “Schedule meetings and hearings of the MPO policy board ... to allow the best opportunity for attendance by the public.” The word “attendance” has been replaced by “participation”.
- Policy 3.1 “Evaluate the response to public involvement techniques including analysis of the region’s population, income, language preference, ethnic status, and other demographic factors. Periodically, adjust strategies to improve performance, not to exceed four years between evaluations.” The words “not to exceed four years between evaluations” have been removed. Instead, the evaluation and adjustment are recommended, in Ch.4, to be every four years.
- Policy 3.2 “Review the [PPP] periodically, not to exceed four years, and adopt revisions as necessary...” The words “not to exceed four years” have been removed. Instead, this review is recommended, in Ch.4, to be every four years.

#### Core Public Involvement Tools and Key Work Products

- Speakers’ Bureau is no longer identified as a core tool.
- References to the defunct LaneVoices tool are removed throughout the plan.
- The Web Notice core tool has been significantly expanded to incorporate the use of social media.
- Table 1 Summary Table of Public Involvement has been revised to more accurately reflect the use of outreach and participation tools for the MPO’s key work products. Revisions are based on updated policies and procedures since the 2015 plan.

#### Evaluation

- Measures specific to the Speakers’ Bureau have been removed.
- Measures have been added to evaluate the effectiveness of social media use.
- Methods are added for use of social media to meet objectives.

#### Addressing Federal Corrective Actions

In 2023 CLMPO received a quadrennial thorough evaluation, conducted by FHWA and FTA representatives, of its transportation planning process and adherence to federal requirements. The evaluation report includes the following two corrective actions and one recommendation relevant to the PPP:

*To meet the requirements of 23 CFR 450.316, CLMPO must update the 2015 Public Participation Plan (PPP) by January 2025 to specifically address the following requirements:*

*Per 23 CFR 450.316(1), revise procedures to more accurately document current public involvement procedures that will be used as part of the 2050 RTP as well as other public processes. These procedures must be reviewed periodically to ensure they remain current and result in an effective and open public process.*

*Per 23 CFR 450.316(d), include procedures in the PPP for involving and consulting with federal land management agencies, that manage land in the MPA, in the development of the RTP and TIP.*

*The Federal Team recommends that, although no tribal lands are located within the metropolitan planning area, CLMPO should expand documentation of the process to coordinate with tribal governments.*

To address these, the PPP is anticipated to be adopted in 2024, before the January 2025 deadline. The 2024 plan has been updated to more accurately document the public involvement procedures that will be used as part of future RTP and MTIP processes, see section titled “Product-Specific Public Outreach Strategy”. Table 1 has been updated to reflect procedures more accurately for both the RTP and MTIP. Evaluation measures for the effectiveness of these procedures have been updated to reflect new platforms and tools and will be reviewed periodically.

Documentation of procedures for involving and consulting both with federal land management agencies and with tribal governments in the development of the RTP and MTIP is provided in the 2024 plan. Specific and relevant contacts at Bureau of Land Management have been confirmed, consulted with, and were added to the MPO’s notification lists. MPO also consulted with contacts representing the US Army Corps of Engineers and US Forest Service who both manage lands outside of, but near the MPO’s boundaries. Specific and relevant contacts at Confederated Tribes of the Grande Ronde, of Siletz Indians, and of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians have been consulted, and were added to the MPO’s notification lists.

### **Citizen’s Guide**

Staff are working on a Citizen’s Guide to Transportation Planning for publication later this year. This public-friendly resource is designed to help lay persons understand why, when, and how to get involved in the regional transportation decision-making process. The Guide complements and supports the objectives of the PPP. It will replace a similar guide published by the MPO in 2006.

### **Public Involvement**

Public involvement during the development of this plan has been extensive and is documented in Chapter 1 of the draft. Plan adoption will follow the procedures laid out in the current PPP, including a 45-day public comment period, upon TPC or MPC approval. A public hearing at MPC will take place and be accompanied by a staff presentation of the draft plan. Upon completion of the public comment period, comments received and committee direction will guide any necessary revisions for a final draft to be recommended by TPC for MPC adoption.

**Action Requested:** Request Public Hearing; Approve Release of Draft for Public Review

### **Attachments:**

1 – Draft 2024 Public Participation Plan



# Public Participation Plan

**DRAFT**

Central Lane  
Metropolitan Planning Organization



2024

*Intentionally left blank*

*upon adoption, INSERT AGENCY PAGE*



*Intentionally left blank*

*upon adoption, INSERT RESOLUTION*

*Intentionally left blank*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Preface.....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>Chapter 1: Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Who is the MPO? .....	1
Overview of the Public Participation Plan .....	1
Map 1 – Central Lane MPO Planning Area .....	2
Purpose of the Public Participation Plan .....	2
Decision-Making Authority .....	2
Policy Framework.....	3
Who Are the Publics to be Reached? .....	3
Public Participation Process for the Development of this Plan .....	4
<b>Chapter 2: Goal, Objectives, and Policies .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Chapter 3: Providing Input.....</b>	<b>13</b>
Central Lane MPO’s Key Work Products.....	13
Core Public Involvement Tools .....	14
Getting the Word Out About Upcoming Public Involvement Events .....	16
Table 1 – Summary Table of Public Involvement .....	17
Product-Specific Public Outreach Strategy .....	18
Public Involvement Funding .....	20
<b>Chapter 4: Evaluation .....</b>	<b>21</b>
Table 2 - Evaluating Public Involvement Tools .....	21
<b>Appendix A.....</b>	<b>23</b>
List of Transportation Acronyms.....	25
Transportation Glossary.....	29
<b>Appendix B.....</b>	<b>43</b>
Summary of Comments and How they Influenced this Plan .....	45
Documentation of Comments and Input Received .....	50
Public Participation Survey – Report of Results.....	59
<b>Appendix C.....</b>	<b>69</b>
Participation Tools .....	71
Information Tools.....	77
<b>Appendix D .....</b>	<b>83</b>
Consistency with Federal and State Regulations.....	85
Addressing Federal Regulations.....	87
Relevant Excerpts from Federal and State Regulations and Policies .....	93

*Intentionally left blank*

## Preface

“Good morning, transportation thinkers and doers!” Carleen Reilly addressed the Metropolitan Policy Committee on a February morning at the Springfield Justice Center. “In 15 years, I rarely commented except on topics of particular importance.” A resident of the River Road neighborhood, Carleen had spoken to the committee before. Today she told them how her friend, Irene Ferguson, had been struck by a vehicle and killed three weeks earlier as she was walking on Hunsaker Lane. “Please put safety first, last, and always” Carleen said as she prompted the committee to “...prepare a rapid-response package of temporary safety measures that can be rolled out immediately,” providing specific ideas for how that might be done. She expressed appreciation to City and County staff that have been receptive to her pleas but added “we can do better.” Her testimony was personal and direct.

Carleen was back again next month, this time thanking the committee for its response. Various jurisdictions had rallied with safety actions that boded well. Lane County staff had been exploring safety engineering solutions. The Safe Lane Coalition had been raising awareness of pedestrian safety in the neighborhood. Lane Transit District was willing to memorialize Irene Ferguson near the new Santa Clara Transit Station. City of Eugene staff had been working with the state to reduce speed limits. Two months later the committee approved an expedited funding proposal from Lane County for \$600,000 to implement temporary safety measures on Hunsaker Lane.

This story illustrates the value of public participation and the important role that members of the public, elected officials, and public agencies have in the planning process. Public involvement incorporates public concerns, needs, and values into governmental decision-making. It is two-way communication, with the overall goal of making better decisions that have public support. Not everyone’s input is going to result in action the way Carleen’s did, there are a lot of contributing factors to the story above, but everyone’s voice is important. The processes detailed in this Public Participation Plan help ensure that regional transportation planning decisions are made through collaborative, representative, and informed engagement with the public and all interested parties.

**Note to the Reader:**

Are you an interested citizen wondering how to get involved?

- See our [Citizen's Guide](#), an easy-to-read brochure about regional transportation planning and how to get involved, including tips for commenting.
- Click on: [MPO Basics](#), a two-page fact sheet introducing the MPO and its work.
- Click on: [www.theMPO.org](http://www.theMPO.org) to learn more about what we do.
- Follow the MPO on [Facebook](#) and [Twitter](#).
- Click [here](#) to receive email notifications of public involvement opportunities.



# Chapter 1: Introduction

This chapter introduces the Public Participation Plan (PPP or “the Plan”), explains the need and purpose for the plan, describes the decision-making authority, addresses consistency with state and federal regulations, lists the target audiences to be reached, and describes the public involvement that took place in the development and adoption of this plan. Chapter 2 contains goals, objectives, and policies. Chapter 3 describes the MPO’s core public involvement tools and outreach strategies for the MPO’s key products. Chapter 4 describes the evaluation process and measures.

**Chapter 1:** Overview, Purpose, MPO Structure, and Regulations

**Chapter 2:** Goals, Objectives, Policies

**Chapter 3:** Tools and Strategies

**Chapter 4:** Evaluation Processes and Measures

## **Who is the MPO?**

MPO stands for Metropolitan Planning Organization. Lane Council of Governments is the Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization (Central Lane MPO, CLMPO, or “the MPO”), the lead agency for regional transportation planning and distributing federal transportation dollars for the Central Lane County area, which consists of Coburg, Eugene, and Springfield within their urban growth boundaries, and portions of unincorporated Lane County (refer to Map 1). The MPO works with Lane County, the cities of Coburg, Eugene, and Springfield, as well as Lane Transit District and state and federal agencies to plan the regional transportation system.

## **Overview of the Public Participation Plan**

The Public Participation Plan is an adopted MPO document. The purpose of the plan is to ensure broad public involvement during the development, review, and refinement of regional transportation programs. The goal is two-way communication with citizens, open decision-making, and responsiveness to citizen input.


Public involvement incorporates public concerns, needs, and values into governmental decision-making, with the overall goal of making better decisions that have public support. Public involvement goes beyond just informing the public, although that is an essential component. Public involvement also includes two-way communication that solicits the public’s ideas, issues, and concerns.

Federal legislation requires an MPO to develop and implement a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive transportation planning process.<sup>1</sup> MPOs are required to use a public participation plan that is developed in consultation with all interested parties and provides reasonable opportunities for all interested parties to comment on all aspects of the MPO transportation planning process.

---

<sup>1</sup> These and other regulations that guided the development of this plan are included in Appendix D.

**Map 1 – Central Lane MPO Planning Area**



### **Purpose of the Public Participation Plan**

The purpose of the plan is twofold. The first is to ensure that all MPO regional transportation plans, programs, and projects include adequate public participation prior to action by the Metropolitan Policy Committee. The intent is to involve the public early on in the transportation planning process and to include public participation opportunities beyond formal hearings of the MPC. The second purpose of the plan is to explain and describe how the public can be involved in the transportation planning process.

### **Decision-Making Authority**

The Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) is Central Lane MPO's decision-making body. The Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) Board delegated its decision-making authority for the MPO to MPC, which is comprised of elected officials from Coburg, Eugene, Lane County, and Springfield, and representatives from the Lane Transit District and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT). The MPO brings recommendations on regional transportation programs and issues to MPC for adoption or approval. Prior to acting on these recommendations, MPC releases products for public review, holds a public hearing, and considers comments received.<sup>2</sup> MPC has delegated some decision-making authority to the Transportation Planning Committee (TPC), which consists of staff representatives from each of the MPC partner agencies. Although the decisions made by

---

<sup>2</sup> Chapter 3 describes the public involvement for each of the MPO's key products.

TPC are mostly administrative in nature, public involvement still plays a critical role. Decisions made by the MPO's committees have a substantial effect on the region's transportation systems.

### **Policy Framework**

Transportation is one of the key contributors to the Eugene-Springfield region's quality of life and economic viability. Generally, the need for transportation stems from our need to access goods, services, and other people within and beyond the region. The ease by which we are able to get from home to school, to a job, to medical services, to shopping and back again is dependent upon the efficiency and effectiveness of the region's transportation system.

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is an adopted document that contains a broad set of goals, objectives, and performance targets to guide transportation planning in the metropolitan area that are consistent with state and federal law. A basic assumption in the RTP is that transportation systems do more than meet travel demand; they have a significant effect on the physical and socioeconomic characteristics of the areas they serve, including public health and safety. Transportation planning must be viewed in terms of regional and community goals and values such as protection of the environment, effect on the regional economy, and maintaining the quality of life that area residents enjoy.

The goals and objectives in the RTP are consistent with the region's overall policy framework for regional planning as set forth in the comprehensive plans adopted by Lane County, and the cities of Coburg, Eugene, and Springfield.

The consistency of the MPOs public involvement process with applicable Federal and State regulations is documented in Appendix D.

### **Who Are the Publics to be Reached?**

The MPO actively seeks input from those most directly affected by transportation planning actions and also conducts a broader outreach campaign to the general public. Public involvement includes outreach to:

- General public
- Directly affected public
- Elected officials
- Advocacy groups (e.g., neighborhood groups, Chambers of Commerce, homeowner's associations, public interest groups for bicycle use and pedestrians, housing advocates, civil rights groups, and senior citizen organizations)
- Underserved communities such as people with disabilities, children and youth, elderly, low-income, and racial and ethnic minorities
- Non-English speaking public
- Affected public agency staff (e.g., U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Bureau of Land Management, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development, Lane Regional Air Protection

Agency, Oregon Department of Transportation, Lane Transit District, and public works departments of MPO partners)

- Providers and users of private transportation services (e.g., taxis, shuttle buses, limousines, and van pools)
- Providers and users of public transportation services (e.g., bus, airlines, and train)
- Freight shippers, providers, and users of freight transportation services—via rail, air, and highway routes
- Tribal government representatives
- The business community (e.g., retail, services, aggregate industry, etc.)
- Emergency service providers and users
- Other interested parties

Mailed or emailed outreach uses distribution lists comprised of interested parties, affected groups, and underserved communities in the list above. On an ongoing basis, the MPO updates its distribution list content and software and continually looks for opportunities to enhance the email distribution list, including input from MPO partners. This will make the lists easier to tailor for specific outreach needs.

The MPO seeks participation and comment from all segments of the public. Chapter 3 (Providing Input) describes techniques to encourage the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the MPO decision-making process. (See the MPO Title VI Plan for additional information related to public involvement.)

### **Public Participation Process for the Development of this Plan**

This section provides a chronological summary of how the public, advocacy groups, government agencies, and others were involved and consulted during the development and adoption of this Public Participation Plan. To see specifically how input was used to influence this plan, refer to Appendix B. All MPC and TPC meetings are open to the public and any presentations, hearings, or actions related to the plan were included in the respective meeting agendas, published along with supporting materials in advance of the meetings, noticed and posted on the LCOG and MPO websites, and emailed to our distribution lists, which were greatly expanded during the plan's development.

#### **June 1, 2023 – Presentation to MPC of the 2015 Plan**

Staff received direction from MPC regarding the update to this plan. Goals and objectives were reviewed and MPC agreed that these were an excellent foundation that would not require much if any update but agreed that many of the MPO's outreach strategies could benefit from revision. MPC recognized how much communication has changed as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and encouraged staff to incorporate some new tools and strategies that have become more broadly adopted and accepted, especially involving utilization of social media and other virtual platforms, as well as increasing efforts to involve Title VI communities in public decisions.

July 20, 2023 – TPC review and discussion of the plan’s goals and objectives

TPC agreed that the goals and objectives would require little update, but that there were opportunities to augment some of the policies that underlay the objectives, especially to expand efforts to reach Title VI communities. Making improvements to the MPO’s website to more clearly show funding investments would be beneficial. Rob Zako of B.E.S.T. submitted written comments on the update of the plan, asking the MPO to do a better job informing the public about planned program projects, that the RTP and MTIP did not adequately inform the public.

October 19, 2023 – TPC reviews and refines survey questions and format.

Staff developed a draft survey to be published online and promoted through various methods. Purpose of the survey is to understand what elements of the MPO’s work are most important to members of the public, what are the barriers to public participation, and what methods of involvement and outreach would be most effective. TPC reviewed the draft and helped refine the survey into a more useful tool.

November 2, 2023 – MPC presentation of USDOT’s review of the plan

Presented at MPC were the results the MPO’s quadrennial federal certification review, conducted by USDOT. The report directed Central Lane MPO to more accurately document public involvement procedures to be used for the next RTP update and other public processes, and to document the MPO’s procedures for involving and consulting with federal land management agencies (FLMA). It was also recommended by USDOT that, although no tribal lands are located within the metropolitan planning area, Central Lane MPO should expand documentation of the process to coordinate with tribal governments.

November 6 through December 16, 2023 – Online survey

The online survey was provided in both English and Spanish, and asked 16 questions including 9 demographic questions, that would help inform the update to the plan. A total of 191 survey responses were received. With a 95% confidence level and a margin of error of 6.95%, the results may be assumed to be representative of the MPO population for the purposes of the plan update. The survey was promoted on the LCOG and MPO website homepages, the MPO email distribution list, posted and then boosted through paid advertising on Facebook and Twitter, and printed on 150 colorful and attractive 11” x 17” posters, which were distributed throughout downtown Eugene, downtown Springfield, and on the University of Oregon campus. The survey was incentivized with 5 randomly selected respondents each receiving a \$50 gift card to a local grocery store of their choice.

November 6 through 20, 2023 – Interviews with Title VI and other community representatives

Concurrent with the online survey, a list of contacts was compiled for interviews seeking input from those who are able to offer valuable insight on behalf of Title VI communities in the area (including non-profit organizations, advocacy groups, and others). See Appendix B for more information. These interviews resulted in valuable input for the

update of the plan and also helped build relationships with these groups, helping to foster future involvement.

December 7, 2023 – Progress update to MPC and presentation of preliminary survey results

It was noted in the presentation that Springfield residents were being underrepresented in the responses received by that time. Springfield staff, then offered their cooperation in further promoting the survey in their community, which resulted in an increase in the percentage of respondents from Springfield.

December 8, 2023 – Youth outreach

The Lane Youth Transportation Advisory Council (LYTAC) consists of members aged 13-19 that meet on a monthly basis to coordinate and discuss transportation issues in the Eugene-Springfield area. This group was given a quick overview of the survey and asked to complete it and share the link with their friends and on their social networks. This resulted in a noticeable increase in the number of young survey respondents.

February 22, 2024 – Virtual open house

LCOG hosted an online open house from 12:00pm to 1:00pm on Thursday, February 22. The open house consisted of question and answer sessions and two staff presentations discussing the plan and its update as well as an overview of the results of the online survey.

February 22, 2024 – In-person open house

LCOG hosted an in-person open house from 5:00pm to 6:00pm on Thursday, February 22 held in the publicly accessible and centrally located LCOG offices in downtown Eugene. The open house consisted of question and answer sessions and a staff presentation discussing the plan and its update as well as an overview of the results of the online survey. LCOG provided refreshments. Both the online and the in-person open houses were promoted on the LCOG and MPO website homepages, the MPO email distribution list, posted and then boosted through paid advertising on Facebook and Twitter, and printed on 150 colorful and attractive 11" x 17" posters, which were distributed throughout downtown Eugene, downtown Springfield, and on the University of Oregon campus. Comments were recorded and compiled (see Appendix B).

March 21, 2024 – Draft plan presented at TPC.

[pending] Approved by TPC to be released for public comment and a public hearing requested at MPC.

[pending] Public comment period is open for 45-days. The draft plan is published on the MPO website. The public comment opportunity and public hearing are noticed on the website, emailed to the MPO distribution list, and advertised on social media during this period.

[pending] MPC conducts a public hearing. Staff present the draft plan and feedback is provided.

[pending] TPC review of comments and feedback on the draft plan received to date and offer direction on finalization of the draft.

[pending] TPC recommends MPC adoption of final draft plan. This is TPC's final review following the completion of the 45-day public comment period, after the draft has been revised considering comments received and input from TPC and MPC.

[pending] MPC adoption of the final 2024 Public Participation Plan



## Chapter 2: Goal, Objectives, and Policies

This chapter defines the goals, objectives and policies that govern the implementation of public involvement for MPO transportation planning. These document the commitment on the part of the MPO to pursue courses of action that will ensure effective and continuing public involvement. To see how public input has influenced this chapter, refer to Appendix B. The suite of techniques that may be called upon to implement the policies are discussed in Chapter 3 and Appendix C.

### Goal: Citizen Involvement in Regional Transportation Issues

**Establish widespread understanding and support for regional transportation programs through development of an environment in which citizens, agencies and other interested parties in the metropolitan area are actively involved in meaningful and effective dialogue.**

Definition/Intent: Transportation infrastructure and services exert a large effect on the community through land use, mobility of citizens and goods, and expenditure of large amounts of public funds. Decisions made at all levels of government (city, county, state, and federal) are often coordinated by the MPO in resolving issues and developing infrastructure in the region. The process can be quite complex, and timelines can vary from 1 to 20 years. Citizens who are educated and knowledgeable about transportation issues are better able to provide guidance on the relative importance and priorities of proposed transportation system changes. Further, an effective two-way communication between policymakers and the public will enhance the credibility of plans and will lead to both citizen and legislative support of proposed programs. An effective public involvement process also will ensure that no one group of citizens is adversely affected.

**References:** Based on United States Congress (USC) Chapter 53, Section 5303, Code of Federal Regulations (23 CFR 450.316), Title VI of the Civil Rights ACT of 1964, Oregon Transportation Plan Goals 6.2 and 6.4, Statewide Planning Goals 1 and 12, Oregon Public Meetings Law, and the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

**Objective 1:** Provide citizens with information to increase their awareness of transportation issues, encourage their involvement in resolving the issues, and assist them in making informed transportation choices.

Definition/Intent: This objective supports and stresses the need for early and continuing public participation in transportation planning, programming, and implementation. It also supports a proactive public involvement process that provides complete information, timely public notice, and full public access to key decisions. To understand and support transportation policies, residents need reliable information and opportunities to participate in the further development and implementation of the various plans. Achievement of this objective ensures compliance with federal requirements and also

makes the MPO process consistent with Statewide Planning Goal 1 (Citizen Involvement). This objective is a part of the MPO Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

**Policy 1.1:** Ensure that information describing transportation planning processes is readily and publicly accessible. Make available contact information, calendars, announcements, meeting agendas, publications, and work products online, at the MPO office, at public libraries, and, upon request, by mail. Translation tools are available on the MPO website and translation of key public involvement products is available upon request.

**Policy 1.2:** Hold public meetings, when feasible, at a time and location convenient to citizens and other interested parties potentially affected by a transportation planning action. Have staff available to provide general and project-specific information at a central location at the request of community groups.

**Policy 1.3:** Ensure that broad cross-sections of the public, including traditionally underserved households such as minority, non-English speaking, and low-income, are notified when opportunities for public input are approaching. Maintain a minimum contact list and expand that list to include specific target audiences, when appropriate to the planning action. Use a facilitator or translators, as needed, to ensure that all populations have a voice.

**Policy 1.4:** Provide adequate public notice of opportunities for public involvement. Publish and update a timeline with clearly indicated decision points, priority actions, and milestones of each MPO transportation planning activity for which public input is desired. Make this timeline available both on the website and, upon request, by mail or email to a list of interested parties. Explain the basis for decisions, such as criteria or policies. Public notice shall be made as far in advance as feasible in each situation.

**Policy 1.5:** Inform the public and other interested parties whenever feasible through web notices and an electronic email database of opportunities for public participation in transportation planning activities of other city, county, or state agencies that affect regional transportation planning. Use visualization techniques such as an interactive map on the MPO website to describe plans and programs, and demonstrate the relationship among projects, plans, and regional transportation planning.

**Policy 1.6:** Maintain updated information about MPO programs and projects through a website that is coordinated with other MPO partners.

**Objective 2:** Ensure that the decisions made in the MPO transportation planning programs are consultative and are clearly explained and documented in a manner accessible to all interested public.

**Definition/Intent:** This objective expresses the intent to foster a meaningful public process in which citizens' input is considered along with staff recommendations. The process by which public input is given and accepted will be defined and provide reasonable time to allow for consideration by the public. The decision-making process will be transparent in that staff will respond to all public comments, and the reasons for the decisions will be clearly explained and documented. The intent of this objective is that the process exceeds the requirements of the Oregon Public Meetings Law.

**Policy 2.1:** Solicit citizen input through public hearings, public meetings, and through written, email, or faxed communication submitted during public review and comment periods.

**Policy 2.2:** Give explicit consideration of all significant written and oral comments gathered through the public involvement process and interagency consultation. Make this testimony and response publicly available in a timely fashion to inform and provide opportunities for further citizen response. For the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP), include a summary, analysis, and report in the final plans. Provide a time period between the end of the public comment period and the meeting at which the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) makes a decision on the product sufficient for input to be discussed and revisions to be made prior to adoption.

**Policy 2.3:** Comments received from the public during a formal public comment period will be forwarded to the MPO policy board.

**Policy 2.4:** Comments addressed to the MPO received outside a formal public comment period will be reviewed by staff, who will respond as appropriate. These comments will be posted to the MPO website and notice will be provided to the MPO policy board and/or the Transportation Planning Committee (TPC).

**Policy 2.5:** All meetings of the MPO policy board and the Transportation Planning Committee (TPC) are open to the public. Make available to the public all records pertaining to the decisions made by these bodies through the MPO website; by mail upon request (at cost); or, when appropriate, for review in public buildings such as public libraries, city and county planning offices, Chambers of Commerce, and recreation centers.

**Policy 2.6:** Schedule meetings and hearings of the MPO policy board and Transportation Planning Committee (TPC) to allow the best opportunity for participation by the public.

**Objective 3:** Ensure that the public involvement process provides full and open access to MPO decision-making.

**Definition/Intent:** This objective expresses the need to ensure that the methods and techniques used to involve the public in regional transportation planning issues are effective in that all groups of citizens and, in particular, those who may be affected by the proposed actions, are represented during the planning process. This objective recognizes that different techniques are needed to reach different groups of citizens, and that techniques currently used to promote and encourage citizen involvement may not always work. By tracking various performance measures the best techniques for attracting and involving citizens can be determined.

**Policy 3.1:** Evaluate the response to public involvement techniques including analysis of the region's population, income, language preference, ethnic status, and other demographic factors. Periodically, adjust strategies to improve performance.

**Policy 3.2:** Review the Public Participation Plan (PPP) periodically and adopt revisions as necessary. A 45-day comment period shall be provided before adoption or revision of the plan. Provide public notice as far in advance as feasible in each situation.

**Policy 3.3:** Ensure the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the MPO decision-making process.

- a. Seek participation and comment from all segments of the public. In accordance with the federal transportation act, "provide citizens, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation, representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the transportation plan using the participation plan developed under §450.316(a)."
- b. Encourage citizens to provide new information and articulate priorities.
- c. Help citizens understand tradeoffs so that they may debate the merits of alternatives.
- d. Convey information about transportation planning in language and in a context that is understandable to the lay citizen.
- e. Keep acronyms and abbreviations to a minimum in information prepared for the public.

- f. Provide understandable background information to help citizens understand the tiers of transportation planning and how they can best be engaged in planning the regional system.
- g. Define the role of regional planning in identifying regional priorities, obtaining federal funding, and facilitating project sharing between jurisdictions.
- h. Include in the design of public forums methods that enable people with disabilities to provide input, including assistance in completing such written items as comment forms, evaluation forms, and surveys.

## Chapter 3: Providing Input

This chapter describes the core public participation opportunities for the MPO's key work products. Included in this chapter are descriptions of the core public involvement opportunities and an explanation of the process for developing a public participation strategy for each key product. Table 1, Summary Table of Public Involvement, indicates which core public outreach and participation tools the MPO will use for each key product. Coburg, Eugene, Lane Transit District, Lane County, and Springfield each follow their own public involvement processes when developing or updating local plans.

The Policy Committee has agreed to the concepts for and intended use of the Public Participation Plan. The plan is primarily intended as a tool to demonstrate to the federal regulators that the MPO is meeting minimum federal requirements for public involvement for key MPO products. The Citizen's Guide is an outreach tool to provide the public with basic information on the MPO process and how to get involved.<sup>3</sup>

### **Central Lane MPO's Key Work Products**

The work products listed in Table 1 are briefly described below. These key work products are those that involve the most rigorous outreach and engagement efforts and are most influential in guiding or directing regional transportation planning and decision making.

#### **Air Quality Conformity Determination**

A determination of conformity of the RTP or MTIP with the requirements of the Clean Air Act and Amendments.

#### **Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program**

The four-year, fiscally constrained implementation program of the RTP, it includes all federally funded transportation work in the MPO.

#### **Project Selection and Allocation of Discretionary Federal Funds**

The process for prioritization of projects and programs for use of the MPO's discretionary federal funds.

#### **Public Participation Plan**

A Plan that defines a process for providing the public and all interested parties with reasonable opportunities to be involved in the metropolitan transportation planning process.

#### **Regional Transportation Plan**

A long-range (20-year) plan that establishes goals and priorities that guide regional transportation decisions in the MPO.

---

<sup>3</sup> This resource is available via [www.thempo.org](http://www.thempo.org).

#### Title VI Plan

Establishes the MPO's role in addressing the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, prohibiting discrimination, and documents compliance.

#### Unified Planning Work Program

The annually updated program of the MPO's budgeted work.

### **Core Public Involvement Tools**

The MPO gathers public comment on each key work product and forwards the comment to the MPC for consideration as part of the decision-making process. Table 1 describes the products and shows the core public outreach and participation tools for each key work product and some of the special work products of the Central Lane MPO. The core techniques form the framework for public involvement for each key MPO product.

#### Web Notice

General or project-specific websites offer an opportunity for public input that is flexible and not staff intensive. The general MPO website provides background information about the MPO, its activities, the transportation planning process, and opportunities for the public to become involved. Project-specific websites can be used to display extensive information about individual projects, such as major MPO activities like the RTP. These sites are used when project information is too extensive to be included on the MPO website.

Social media is an effective and interactive form of web notice. Social media sites such as Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter allow the MPO to notify and engage the community in a manner that is inexpensive, convenient, and effective. It can be utilized to engage community members who might not otherwise get involved. According to a Central Lane MPO survey in 2023, social media is the most effective method for letting people know about opportunities to provide input (See Appendix B). Staff regularly post to these social media, providing ongoing management and monitoring of the participation. Judicious use of the MPO's social media will help keep this tool an informative and valuable resource for outreach.

#### Notice to Interested Parties

There are a few different types of notices. An introductory notice explains the agency process for applications, participation, etc. It may also explain a review process for the corrective action process and the opportunities for public participation in that process. A notice of decision presents the agency decisions regarding projects, processes, or modifications to incorporate changes such as a corrective action remedy.

The MPO's distribution lists include a wide range of individuals, community organizations, and relevant agencies that are considered when developing project specific public



participation and outreach strategies. The MPO connects with organizations, agencies, and individuals in many ways to continually enhance their involvement in many aspects of the transportation program and systems throughout the metropolitan area.

#### Public Comment Period

A formal public comment period for submission of written comment via mail, email, or fax, is held prior to the adoption of the transportation plan or program or to the adoption of amendments to the plan or program. Table 1 indicates which key MPO products have a public comment period, which is 45 days for the Public Participation Plan and generally is 30 days for the other key MPO products. MPC can decide to also expedite or extend the public review period depending on the circumstances. Advanced notice of the public review period will be issued through a notice to interested parties, and a notice on the MPO website. The MPO may post notices of these opportunities through additional methods, such as social media.

Following is a list of tips for providing effective public comments:<sup>4</sup>

- If commenting in person, be sure to arrive early. Some settings require those wishing to comment to sign in before the meeting starts.
- Follow directions provided. A time limit may exist for each in-person commenter (maybe only a couple minutes). Ensure that you're able to convey your views concisely. Practice beforehand and time yourself.
- Be respectful to officials, staff, other commenters, and attendees. Avoid the use of profanity or personal threats.
- Be concise but support your claims. Explain your views as clearly as possible, and why you agree or disagree.
- Identify the plan or specific issue in your subject line or as you introduce yourself if providing comments in person.
- Understand the document or issue you are commenting on. If you have difficulty understanding it, please reach out to the staff person named in the document. Describe that difficulty in your comments, along with the clarification you received.
- Base your comments on sound reasoning, scientific evidence, and/or how you will be impacted by the agency's proposal.
- The comment process is not a vote – one well-supported comment is often more informative to the agency than a thousand form letters.
- Make sure to submit your comments before the comment period deadline.

#### Metropolitan Policy Committee Public Hearing

Public hearings are elected official meetings held to receive public testimony and typically consist of a formal staff presentation followed by a period for formal public comment.

---

<sup>4</sup> adapted for Central Lane MPO from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) website  
<https://www.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>

Each person who wants to provide testimony is given an opportunity to do so, although the chair may limit the time each person has to testify. Citizens testifying have the option of also submitting their comments in writing. MPC holds public hearings prior to the adoption or amendment of the key MPO work products. All comments received are part of the public record on the decision and are provided to the MPC in full or summary prior to action by the committee, along with the staff response. Public hearings are open to the public and are subject to the Oregon Public Meetings Law. Notice of the time, date, location, and agenda is provided through notice to the interested parties and posting on the MPO website. Some tips for testifying effectively at a Central Lane MPO public hearing are provided in the Citizen's Guide booklet on the MPO website.

### **Getting the Word Out About Upcoming Public Involvement Events**

The MPO uses the following ways to get the word out about upcoming public comment periods and public hearings. Those interested can sign up to receive email notices of public participation events on the MPO website, sign-up sheets at public hearings, or by submitting a request.

The public can find out about upcoming events through:

- Central Lane MPO website ([www.theMPO.org](http://www.theMPO.org))
- Lane Council of Governments website ([www.LCOG.org](http://www.LCOG.org))
- Central Lane MPO on Facebook ([www.facebook.com/CentralLaneMPO](https://www.facebook.com/CentralLaneMPO))
- Central Lane MPO on Twitter ([www.twitter.com/CentralLaneMPO](https://www.twitter.com/CentralLaneMPO))
- Joining the Central Lane MPO [email distribution list](#)
- Sign-up sheets at MPO public hearings
- Media notices with the date, time, location, and agenda topics of all MPO public meetings are provided to the local media including TV, news radio, newspapers, and others.

**Table 1 – Summary Table of Public Involvement**

	MPO Work Product	Description	Decision-Making Process	Basic Public Outreach and Participation Tools			
				Public Comment Period	MPC Public Hearing	Notice to Interested Parties	Web Notice
Key MPO Work Products	Air Quality Conformity Determination (AQCD)	Demonstration of conformity with national air quality standards (required for RTP and TIP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopted by MPC with RTP and TIP</li> </ul>	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)	4-year schedule of projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopted every 3 years by MPC</li> </ul>	✓	✓	✓	✓
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amended periodically by MPC and TPC</li> </ul>	✓	Varies	Varies	✓
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual listing of obligated projects</li> </ul>			✓	✓
	Project Selection and Allocation of MPO Discretionary Federal Funds	MPO process to assign federal dollars to priority projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Typically approved every 3 years by MPC</li> </ul>	✓	✓	✓	✓
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Periodic minor approvals by MPC or TPC</li> </ul>	✓	Varies	Varies	✓
	Public Participation Plan (PPP)	Policy and procedure for MPO public involvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Updates are adopted by MPC as needed</li> </ul>	✓	✓	✓	✓
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amended as needed</li> </ul>	Varies	Varies	✓	✓
	Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)	20-year long-range plan with policies, priorities, targets, and projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopted every 3 to 5 years by MPC</li> </ul>	✓	✓	✓	✓
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amended as needed</li> </ul>	✓	✓	✓	✓
Other Work Products	Title VI Plan	Addresses applicable provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Updates (as needed) are adopted by MPC</li> </ul>	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)	Annual work program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopted annually by MPC</li> </ul>	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Setting Priorities for Statewide Transportation Improvement Program and other state funding programs	MPO priorities for projects on state system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopted by MPC as needed</li> </ul>	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Special Projects	Examples include review of state policies and plans, refinement plans, corridor studies, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MPO reviews and provides feedback to state agencies as needed</li> </ul>	Varies	Varies	✓	✓

✓ Indicates required public involvement

MPC = Metropolitan Policy Committee, TPC = Transportation Planning Committee

### **Product-Specific Public Outreach Strategy**

A specific public outreach strategy can be developed for the update of each work product that includes details, such as location and timing, about the core public participation tools for the specific update. Any additional tools, as appropriate and affordable, can be identified at this time. Realizing that the MPO region is widely diverse, the public outreach strategy is tailored to the unique aspects of the process depending on the geographic scope, the type of projects included, the characteristics of affected communities, and the level of public interest. The intent is to provide public notice as far in advance of MPC decisions as feasible in each situation to give citizens as much time as possible to provide well-thought out comments. The MPO's distribution lists include a wide range of individuals, community organizations, and relevant agencies that are considered when developing project-specific public participation and outreach strategies.

While the public participation strategies for the RTP and MTIP are determined early in the stages of their respective development, and will include additional tools beyond these, the following components will always be included:

#### **Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)**

- Made readily accessible online for public review
- Public comment period of at least 30-days\*
- MPC public hearing
- Timely notice to interested parties
- Web notice

#### **Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP)**

- Made readily accessible online for public review
- Public comment period of at least 30-days\*
- MPC public hearing
- Timely notice to interested parties
- Web notice

\*Additional opportunity for public comment will be provided if the final RTP or MTIP differ significantly from the version that was made available for public comment by the MPO and raises new material issues that interested parties could not reasonably have foreseen from the public involvement efforts. Additionally, when significant comments are received on the draft RTP or MTIP (including the financial plans) as a result of the participation process or the interagency consultation for air quality conformity, a summary, analysis, and report on the disposition of comments shall be made as part of the final RTP or MTIP.

In developing the RTP and MTIP, the MPO consults and coordinates with the State and other agencies and officials responsible for planning activities in the region that are affected by transportation (such as housing, economic development, tourism, natural disaster mitigation, environmental protection, airport, freight industry) and strive to coordinate its planning process with these planning activities, where practicable.

The MPO develops the RTP and MTIP with due consideration of other related planning activities within the metropolitan area, and the process provides for the design and delivery of transportation services within the area that are provided by recipients of assistance under Title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53,<sup>5</sup> government agencies and non-profit organizations that receive non-USDOT Federal assistance to provide non-emergency transportation services, and recipients of assistance under 23 U.S.C. 201-204.<sup>6</sup>

#### Tribal Government Consultation

The United States government's relationship with Tribal governments is set forth in the Constitution of the United States, treaties, statutes, judicial decisions, and Executive Orders and Presidential memorandums. Therefore, to the greatest extent practicable and to the extent permitted by law, Central Lane MPO consults with tribal governments prior to taking actions that have substantial direct impact on federally recognized tribal governments, including development and significant amendments to the RTP and MTIP. To ensure that the rights of sovereign tribal governments are fully respected, all such consultations are to be open and candid so that tribal governments may evaluate for themselves the potential impact of relevant proposals.

Although there are no Federally recognized Indian Tribal Lands within the MPO boundaries, Central Lane MPO recognizes the importance of inviting the participation of members of the public and tribal representatives that can offer additional perspectives that might otherwise be missed. Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians and the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians are each contacted during the RTP and MTIP update period to determine their interest in participating in the update, the extent they would like to participate and the means of receiving information and commenting on the draft documents. In addition to these groups, Central Lane MPO has also reached out to the University of Oregon Tribal Government Relations and Lane Community College Native American Student Program for consultation and coordination as planning products are developed.

#### Federal Land Management Agency Consultation

Federal law requires MPOs to appropriately involve the Federal land management agencies (FLMAs) in the development of the RTP and MTIP when Federal public lands are included in the MPO boundaries. Central Lane MPO includes lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM); these consist of a handful of wetland parcels near the MPO's southwestern boundary, adjacent to Highway 126, and portions of two forested parcels on the extreme eastern boundary of the MPO, south of Highway 126, which are Oregon and California Railroad Revested Lands. Representatives of the BLM's Northwestern Oregon District Office, which oversees these properties, were contacted, and involved as part of the development of this Public Participation Plan and are consulted during the development of the RTP and MTIP.

---

<sup>5</sup> Public transportation

<sup>6</sup> Federal lands and tribal transportation programs, federal lands access program

Some lands in the area surrounding, but outside of, the MPO are managed by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE manages lands within 0.3 miles from the MPO's western boundary) and the United States Forest Service (USFS manages lands within 12 miles from the MPO's eastern boundary). The MPO maintains a list of appropriate, confirmed, contacts at the BLM, USACE, and USFS and includes these agencies in notifications related to the development of key MPO products.

Additional tools that the MPO has utilized in the development of the RTP and/or MTIP include public open house events, community meetings, tabling events, press releases, listening sessions, social media postings, surveys, public-friendly fact sheets and other visual media, mailers, targeted outreach to Spanish-speaking community, maintenance of a stakeholder database, and others.

In 2024 the MPO launched its online interactive electronic Transportation Improvement Program (eTIP). This is a public online resource for real-time, up to date MTIP project information in a simple, accessible, and user-friendly interface. Promotion and utilization of this tool for outreach associated with the regular and on-going MTIP amendment process helps provide valuable information to the public and other stakeholders. Utilization of the eTIP directly supports Policies 1.5 and 1.6. of this plan. A link to this tool can be found on the MPO website.

Appendix C describes a wide array of public involvement tools that could be used to design a public outreach strategy. The IAP2 Public Participation Spectrum is included in Appendix C as a framework for designing the public outreach strategy that considers the public participation goal and the promise to the public for each public outreach tool. IAP2 stands for International Association of Public Participation. It is a professional organization for public involvement specialists.

### **Public Involvement Funding**

The public involvement budget for the key MPO products listed in Table 1 is based on federal funds that the MPO receives. The amount of these funds can vary from year to year and the outreach and participation budget for a specific product depends on the nature of the particular update. Budgeting for MPO public involvement takes place as part of the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), which is updated annually and approved by MPC.

## Chapter 4: Evaluation

This chapter deals with evaluation—objective ways to measure whether the public outreach and participation tools meet the objectives under the goals identified in Chapter 2. Establishing evaluation measures and performance objectives provides a framework for assessing the effectiveness of public participation activities. The evaluation provides information to use in improving the public involvement program, such as discontinuing activities that are ineffective, modifying activities, and adding new activities to the MPO program. As per Policy 3.1 and 3.2, the Public Participation Plan and the response to the MPO’s public involvement techniques will be reviewed for effectiveness and adjusted periodically (recommended to be every four years) using the measures identified in this chapter. Initial baseline information will need to be gathered to enable measurement of the performance objectives.

Table 1 in Chapter 3 identifies the core public outreach and participation tools for key MPO products. Table 2 includes evaluation measures and performance objectives for the public outreach and participation tools shown in Table 1. The third column in Table 2 identifies methods to meet the performance objectives and identifies ways to improve the plan to meet the goals identified in Chapter 2. Appendix C includes an expanded list of public participation and information tools that can be used by the MPO to design a public involvement strategy for the update of each key product.

Evaluation is an integral part of the public involvement activity after completion of the activity, at milestones during an activity, or periodically for ongoing activities. The design of the evaluation should fit the activity. For small, informal activities, the evaluation can occur at the staff team level by noting what worked well and what should be done differently next time. Evaluation questions can be incorporated into public comment forms distributed at events, such as public workshops. Surveys are a way to get evaluation feedback on either an event or an ongoing program from a targeted or randomly selected group. Surveys can be conducted using a statistically valid method or can be more informal questions posed to gather a sounding from the public. Surveys can be conducted in person, by phone, mail, or email, but the MPO learned through their 2023 survey that the public is most comfortable providing input through online surveys or questionnaires, and that method is strongly encouraged.

*Intentionally left blank*



**Table 2 - Evaluating Public Involvement Tools**

<b>Core Public Participation Tool</b>	<b>Evaluation Measurement</b>	<b>Performance Objective</b>	<b>Methods to Meet Objective</b>	<b>Relevant Objective from Ch. 2</b>
Notice to Interested Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of persons on distribution list</li> <li>• Number of groups on the list representing traditionally underserved communities</li> <li>• Cost (i.e., dollars spent/FTE)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase number of subscribers</li> <li>• Improve outreach to traditionally underserved communities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MPO publications, postings, flyers, to include link to join the email notification list</li> <li>• Marketing/information campaign</li> <li>• Include organizations and agencies that work with Title VI protected populations</li> <li>• Tailor notices to engage different segments of the public</li> </ul>	1, 2, 3
Public Comment Period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of comments received</li> <li>• Number of changes in draft document that resulted from comment received</li> <li>• Number of participants from underserved communities</li> <li>• Cost (i.e., dollars spent/FTE)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase number of responses</li> <li>• Improve quality of the comments</li> <li>• Increase participation of underserved communities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Diversify advertising methods, including social media boosting to targeted demographics</li> <li>• Actively monitor and respond to comments as appropriate</li> <li>• Ensure that public comment tools are easily accessible and translatable for different segments of the public</li> </ul>	1, 2, 3
MPC Public Hearing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of testifiers</li> <li>• Number of attendees (excluding committee, staff, and presenters)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase number of different testifiers</li> <li>• Increase numbers in the audience</li> <li>• Increase the quality of the comments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Diversify advertising</li> <li>• Produce fact sheet with involvement opportunities</li> <li>• Produce fact sheet with tips on testifying and commenting</li> </ul>	1, 2, 3

**Table 2 - Evaluating Public Involvement Tools (continued)**

<b>Core Public Participation Tool</b>	<b>Evaluation Measurement</b>	<b>Performance Objective</b>	<b>Methods to Meet Objective</b>	<b>Relevant Objective from Ch. 2</b>
Web Notice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of website visitors</li> <li>• Number of social media users reached</li> <li>• Number of social media post interactions</li> <li>• Number of social media subscribers/followers</li> <li>• Dollars spent promoting social media posts</li> <li>• Number of comments received</li> <li>• Cost (i.e., dollars spent/FTE)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase number of online visitors</li> <li>• Make the MPO better known to the public</li> <li>• Increase the reach of the MPO's social media</li> <li>• Increase the number of public comments received</li> <li>• Improve the quality of engagement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include MPO website and social media links in MPO web notices</li> <li>• Maintain an active presence on social media with regular and informative postings</li> <li>• Use other public participation tools (e.g., fact sheets) to increase the use of the website</li> <li>• Ensure translation features are available and visible</li> <li>• Provide content of regional interest in a simplified manner</li> <li>• Actively monitor and respond to comments as appropriate</li> </ul>	1, 2, 3

## Appendix A

-List of Transportation Acronyms

-Transportation Glossary



*Intentionally left blank*

### **List of Transportation Acronyms (a selected list)**

**3-C** – Continuing, Comprehensive and Cooperative planning process

**3R** – Resurfacing, Restoring, and Rehabilitating

**(A)ADT** – (Annual) Average Daily Traffic

**AASHTO** – American Association of State Highway & Transportation Officials

**ACT** – Area Commission on Transportation

**ADA** – Americans with Disabilities Act

**AMPO** – Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations

**APA** – American Planning Association

**APTA** – American Public Transportation Association

**AQCD** – Air Quality Conformity Determination

**BIL** – Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (see also IIJA), Act of 2021

**BLM** – Bureau of Land Management

**BMCS** – Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety

**BMP** – Best Management Practice

**BMS** – Bridge Management System

**BRT** – Bus Rapid Transit

**CAA(A)** – Clean Air Act & Amendments

**CAC** – Citizen Advisory Committee

**CFR** – Code of Federal Regulations

**CIP** – Capital Improvement Program (or Plan)

**CMAQ** – Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program

**CMP** – Congestion Management Process (or Plan)

**CN** – Construction project phase

**COG** – Council of Governments

**CRP** – Carbon Reduction (funding) Program

**DEIS** – Draft Environment Impact Statement

**DEQ** – Department of Environmental Quality

**DLCD** – Department of Land Conservation and Development

**DOT** – Department of Transportation

**EIS** – Environmental Impact Statement

**EJ** – Environmental Justice

**EMME/2** – Multimodal Equilibrium/Equilibre Multimodal (transportation model)

**EPA** – Environmental Protection Agency

**eTIP** – Electronic Transportation Improvement Program (CLMPO's online TIP)

**FAA** – Federal Aviation Administration

**FAST-Act** – Fixing America’s Surface Transportation, Act of 2016

**FEIS** – Final Environmental Impact Statement

**FHWA** – Federal Highway Administration

**FLMA** – Federal Land Management Agency

**FRA** – Federal Railroad Administration

**FTA** – Federal Transit Administration

**(F)FY** – (Federal) Fiscal Year (October 1 – September 30)

**GIS** – Geographic Information Systems

**GHG** – Greenhouse Gas

**HCM** – Highway Capacity Manual

**HIP** – Highway Infrastructure (funding) Program

**HOV** – High Occupancy Vehicle

**HPMS** – Highway Performance Monitoring Systems

**HSR** – High Speed Rail

**IGA** – Intergovernmental Agreement

**IHS** – Interstate Highway System

**IIJA** – Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (see also BIL), of 2021

**I/M** – Inspection and Maintenance

**ISTEA** – Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency, Act of 1991

**ITS** – Intelligent Transportation Systems

**JARC** – Job Access and Reverse Commute

**LaneACT** – Lane (County) Area Commission on Transportation

**LCDC** – Land Conservation and Development Commission

**LOS** – Level of Service (traffic flow rating)

**LRAPA** – Lane Regional Air Protection Agency

**LRT** – Light Rail Transit

**LRTP** – Long-Range Transportation Plan (or RTP)

**LTD** – Lane Transit District

**LUAM** – Land Use Allocation Model

**LYTAC** – Lane Youth Transportation Advisory Council

**MAP-21** – Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, Act of 2012

**MOA** – Memorandum of Agreement

**MOU** – Memorandum of Understanding

**MOVES** – Motor Vehicle Emission Simulator

**MPA** – Metropolitan Planning Area

**MPC** – Metropolitan Policy Committee

**MPO** – Metropolitan Planning Organization

**MTP** – Metropolitan Transportation Plan (aka RTP or LRTP)

**MTIP** – Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program  
**MUTCD** – Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices

**NAAQS** – National Ambient Air Quality Standards  
**NEPA** – National Environmental Policy Act of 1969  
**NHS** – National Highway System  
**NHTSA** – National Highway Traffic Safety Administration  
**NOx** – Nitrogen Oxides

**O&M** – Operations and Maintenance  
**ODOT** – Oregon Department of Transportation  
**OHP** – Oregon Highway Plan  
**OM&P** – Operations, Maintenance and Preservation  
**OMPOC** – Oregon MPO Consortium  
**ORFS** – Oregon Roads Finance Committee  
**OTC** – Oregon Transportation Commission  
**OTIA** – Oregon Transportation Investment Act  
**OTP** – Oregon Transportation Plan  
**OTREC** – Oregon Transportation Research and Education Consortium (at PSU)

**PBPP** – Performance-Based Planning and Programming  
**PCR** – Pavement Condition Rating  
**PE** – Preliminary Engineering  
**PL** – Planning Funds or the Planning phase of a project  
**PM** – Particulate Matter pollutants, measured in microns (PM2.5 or PM10)  
**POP** – Program of Projects (for transit agencies)  
**PPP** – Public Participation Plan  
**PS&E** – Plans, Specifications, and Estimates

**RAC** – (Lane County) Roads Advisory Committee  
**RFP** – Request for Proposal  
**ROW** – Right-of-Way, or right-of-way acquisition project phase  
**RR** – Railroad  
**RTP** – Regional Transportation Plan (aka MTP or LRTP)

**SAFETEA-LU** – Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act – a Legacy for Users, Act of 2005  
**SDC** – System Development Charge  
**SHTF** – State Highway Trust Fund  
**SIP** – State Implementation Plan (for air quality)  
**SLTC** – Safe Lane Transportation Coalition  
**SOV** – Single Occupancy Vehicle  
**SPR** – State Planning and Research funds  
**STA** – Special Transportation Area

**STBG(U)** – Surface Transportation Block Grant funding program (for Urbanized areas)  
**STIP** – Statewide Transportation Improvement Program

**TA** – Transportation Alternatives funding program (aka TAP)  
**TAC** – Technical Advisory Committee  
**TASC** – CLMPO’s Technical Advisory Subcommittee to TPC  
**TAZ** – Traffic Analysis Zone  
**TCM** – Transportation Control Measure (for air quality)  
**TDM** – Transportation Demand Management  
**TDP** – Transit Development Program  
**TEA-21** – Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, Act of 1998  
**TIFIA** – Transportation Infrastructure Finance & Innovation Act of 1998  
**TIP** – Transportation Improvement Program (e.g., MTIP and STIP)  
**TMA** – Transportation Management Area  
**TMSF** – Transportation Management System Fee  
**TO** – Transportation Options  
**TOD** – Transit Oriented Development  
**TOAC** – CLMPO’s Transportation Options Advisory Committee  
**TPAU** – ODOT’s Transportation Planning Analysis Unit  
**TPC** – CLMPO’s Transportation Planning Committee  
**TPR** – Transportation Planning Rule (Oregon)  
**TSP** – Transportation System Plan  
**TUF** – Transportation Utility Fee

**UGB** – Urban Growth Boundary  
**UPWP** – Unified Planning Work Program  
**UR** – Utility Relocation (infrastructure project phase)  
**USDOT** – United States Department of Transportation

**V/C** – Volume to Capacity  
**VMT** – Vehicle Miles Traveled  
**VOCs** – Volatile Organic Compounds



## **Transportation Glossary**

**Air Quality Conformity Determination (AQCD)** – In response to the Clean Air Act, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has established health-based National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for six air pollutants. A conformity determination is a finding that the projects in a plan or program do not adversely impact air quality.

**Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)** - Federal civil rights legislation for persons with disabilities, signed into law in 1990 that prohibits discrimination specifically in the areas of employment, public accommodation, public services, telecommunications, and transportation. Transportation requirements include the provision of “comparable paratransit service” that is equivalent to general public fixed-route service for persons who are unable to use regular bus service due to a disability.

**Arterial Street** - A class of street serving major traffic movements (high speed, high volume) for travel between major points.

**Attainment Area** - An area considered to have air quality that meets or exceeds the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) health standards used in the Clean Air Act. Nonattainment areas are areas considered not to have met these standards for designated pollutants. An area may be an attainment area for one pollutant and a nonattainment area for others.

**Board of County Commissioners (BCC)** - Five elected officials who are the Lane County decision-makers.

**Capacity** - A transportation facility’s ability to accommodate a moving stream of people or vehicles in a given time period. The maximum rate of flow at which persons or vehicles can be reasonably expected to traverse a point or uniform segment of a lane or roadway during a specified time period under prevailing roadway, traffic, and control conditions; usually expressed as vehicles per hour or persons per hour.

**Capital Improvement Program (CIP)** - A plan for future capital infrastructure and program expenditures which identifies each capital project, its anticipated start and completion, and allocates existing funds and known revenue sources for a given period of time. Each local government has a CIP.

**Carbon Monoxide (CO)** - A colorless, odorless, tasteless gas formed in large part by incomplete combustion of fuel. Human activities (i.e., transportation or industrial processes) are largely the source for CO contamination. Local sources of carbon monoxide include automobiles, wood stoves, and industrial processes.

**Categorical Exclusions (CE)** - Documents prepared under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for federal actions that do not have a significant human and natural environmental effect.

**Clean Air Act (CAA)** - Federal statutes established by the United States Congress which set the nation's air quality goals and the process for achieving those goals. The original Clean Air Act was passed in 1963, but the national air pollution control program is actually based on the 1970 version of the law. The 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments are the most far-reaching revisions of the 1970 law.

**Clean Water Act (CWA)** - Federal law regulating the quality of the waters of the United States. Amendments to the CWA in 1987 require local jurisdictions to develop stormwater management plans for the control of municipal nonpoint source pollution.

**Comprehensive Plan** - An official document adopted by a local government that describes the general, long-range policies on how the community's future development should occur. A local comprehensive plan must comply with Oregon state land use planning goals.

**Congestion** - A condition under which the number of vehicles using a facility is great enough to cause reduced speeds and increased travel times.

**Congestion Management Process (CMP)** - Systematic process for managing congestion. Provides information on transportation system performance and finds alternative ways to alleviate congestion and enhance the mobility of people and goods, to levels that meet state and local needs.

**Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)** - A categorical Federal-aid funding program created with the ISTEA (1991). Directs funding to projects that contribute to meeting national air quality standards. CMAQ funds generally may not be used for projects that result in the construction of new capacity available to SOVs (single-occupant vehicles).

**Criteria Pollutants** - Air pollutants for which there are National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) that have been established by the Environmental Protection Agency to protect the public health and welfare from their known adverse effects. There are additional standards set by the State of Oregon. Communities are required to test the air continually for those criteria pollutants which appear to merit testing, based on historical data and trends, and population. In the Eugene-Springfield area, the Lane Regional Air Protection Agency (LRAPA) is responsible for monitoring these air pollutants.

**Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)** - The state department that administers Oregon's statewide land use program. Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) is the appointed policy board that guides DLCD.

**Department of Transportation (DOT)** - When used alone, indicates U.S. Department of Transportation. In conjunction with a place name, indicates state, city, or county transportation agency (e.g., Oregon Department of Transportation).

**Emissions Budget** - The part of the State Implementation Plan (SIP) that identifies the allowable emissions levels, mandated by the NAAQS, for certain pollutants emitted from mobile, stationary, and area sources. The emissions levels are used for meeting emission reduction milestones, attainment, or maintenance demonstrations.

**Environmental Assessments (EA)** - Prepared for federal actions under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) where it is not clearly known how significant the environmental impact might be.

**Environmental Impact Statements (EIS)** - Prepared for federal actions that have a significant effect on the human and natural environment. These are disclosure documents prepared under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) that provide a full description of the proposed project, the existing environment, and analysis of the anticipated beneficial and adverse environmental effects of all reasonable alternatives. There are various stages – Draft EIS and Final EIS.

**Environmental Justice (EJ)** - Environmental justice assures that services and benefits allow for meaningful participation and are fairly distributed to avoid discrimination.

**Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)** - The federal regulatory agency responsible for administering and enforcing federal environmental laws, including the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, and others. EPA is the source agency of air quality control regulations affecting transportation.

**Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)** - A branch of the U.S. Department of Transportation that administers the Federal-Aid Highway Program, providing financial assistance to states to construct and improve highways, urban and rural roads, and bridges. The FHWA also administers the Federal Lands Highway Program, including survey, design, and construction of forest highway system roads, parkways and park roads, Indian reservation roads, defense access roads, and other Federal lands roads.

**Federal Transit Administration (FTA)** - A branch of the U.S. Department of Transportation that is the principal source of federal financial assistance to America's communities for planning, development, and improvement of public or mass transportation systems. FTA provides leadership, technical assistance, and financial resources for safe, technologically advanced public transportation to enhance mobility and accessibility, to improve the nation's communities and natural environment, and to strengthen the national economy.

**Financial Planning** - The process of defining and evaluating funding sources, sharing the information, and deciding how to allocate the funds.

**Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)** - A statement prepared under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) indicating that a project was found to have no significant impacts on the quality of the human environment and for which an environmental statement will therefore not be prepared.

**Fine Particulates** - Particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size (PM<sub>2.5</sub>). A micron is one millionth of a meter. See “Particulate matter” below.

**Fiscal or Financial Constraint** - Making sure that a given program or project can reasonably expect to receive funding within the time allotted for its implementation.

**Formula Capital Grants** - Federal transit funds for transit operators; allocation of funds overseen by FTA.

**Geographic Information System (GIS)** - Computerized data management system designed to capture, store, retrieve, analyze, and display geographically referenced information.

**Goals** - A desired result or purpose. In planning, a goal is a broad statement of philosophy that describes the hopes of the people of the community for the future of the community. A goal may never be completely attainable, but it is used as a point toward which the community may strive.

**High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV)** - Vehicles carrying two or more people. The number that constitutes an HOV for the purposes of HOV highway lanes may be designated differently by different transportation agencies.

**Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) of 2021** – Also known as the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL), this is the multi-year federal transportation legislation authorizing federal funds for surface transportation programs.

**Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)** - The application of advanced technologies to improve the efficiency and safety of transportation systems.

**Interim Benchmarks** - Transportation System Plans (TSP) required by the Transportation Planning Rule must include interim benchmarks for use in evaluating progress at 5-year intervals. Where interim benchmarks are not met, the TSP must be amended to include new or additional efforts.

**Intermodal** - The ability to connect, and the connections between, modes of transportation.

**Joint Planning Commissions Committee (JPCC)** - Comprised of two planning commissioners from each of the cities of Eugene and Springfield, and from Lane County. The JPCC is designated in the Eugene-Springfield Metro Plan as the public involvement body for that plan.

**Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC)** - A seven-member commission of volunteer citizens established by Senate Bill 100 in 1973 to develop and administer Oregon's statewide planning goals. The commission sets and guides policy for the administrative department, DLCD.

**Land Use** - Refers to the manner in which portions of land or the structures on them are used (e.g., commercial, residential, retail, industrial, etc.).

**Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA)** - A board established by the state legislature in 1979 to hear and decide on contested land-use cases.

**Lane Council of Governments (LCOG)** - LCOG is a voluntary association of local governments in Lane County, Oregon. Dedicated to solving area-wide problems, LCOG helps area cities, Lane County, educational districts, and special-purpose districts reach their common goals. LCOG serves as the MPO for Central Lane County as designated by the Governor in 1974.

**Lane Regional Air Protection Agency (LRAPA)** - The local agency formed through an intergovernmental agreement between Lane County and the cities of Eugene, Springfield, Cottage Grove, and Oakridge. LRAPA is responsible for restoring and maintaining the ambient air quality of Lane County. DEQ cedes air pollution regulation to LRAPA in this area.

**Lane Transit District (LTD)** - The transit agency serving the Central Lane Transportation Management Area.

**Lane Youth Transportation Advisory Council (LYTAC)** - A partnership of the Safe Routes to School (SRTS) program and the Central Lane MPO, this council includes members aged 13-19 representing the school districts in the MPO area. The council discuss issues and strategies to support better transportation for people of all ages.

**Level of Service (LOS)** - A rating of how well a unit of transportation supply (e.g., street, intersection, bikeway, etc.) serves its current or projected demand. LOS A = free flow condition (32 percent of capacity); B = reasonably free flow conditions (51 percent); C = operation stable but becoming more critical (75 percent); D = lower speed range of stable flow (92 percent); E = unstable flow (100 percent); F = forced flow; >100 percent of capacity, stop and go operation.

**Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)** - See **Regional Transportation Plan**.

**Maintenance Area** - Maintenance area is any geographic region of the United States previously designated nonattainment pursuant to the Clean Air Act (CAA) Amendments of 1990 and subsequently redesignated to attainment subject to the requirement to develop a maintenance plan under section 175A of the CAA, as amended.

**Maintenance Plan** - A program of air pollution emission control measures associated with state and federal requirements which are designed to ensure that an area remains in attainment with an ambient air standard.

**Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC)** - An intergovernmental policy group that comprises representatives from Coburg, Eugene, and Springfield councils, Oregon Department of Transportation, Lane County Board of Commissioners, and the Lane Transit District Board of Directors. MPC has been delegated certain responsibilities by the Lane Council of Governments Board of Directors to provide policy guidance on the transportation planning process in the metropolitan area.

**Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)** - Regional policy body, required in urbanized areas with populations over 50,000, and designated by local officials and the governor of the state. Responsible, in cooperation with the state and other transportation providers, for carrying out the metropolitan transportation planning requirements of federal highway and transit legislation. Lane Council of Governments serves as the MPO in the central Lane area as designated by the governor in 1974.

**Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP)** - See **Transportation Improvement Program**.

**Mitigation** - Means to avoid, minimize, rectify, or reduce an impact, and in some cases, to compensate for an impact.

**Mobile Source** - The mobile source-related pollutants are carbon monoxide (CO), hydrocarbons (HC), nitrogen oxides (NOx), and particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5).

**Mode** - A specific form of transportation, such as by automobile, bus, rail, or walking.

**Multimodal** - A trip involving several types of transportation, such as both rail and bus.

**National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)** - Federal standards that set allowable concentrations and exposure limits for various pollutants. The EPA developed the standards in response to a requirement of the Clean Air Act (CAA). Air quality standards have been established for the following six criteria pollutants: ozone (or smog), carbon monoxide, particulate matter, nitrogen dioxide, lead, and sulfur dioxide.

**National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA)** - An established national environmental policy (1969) requiring that any project using federal funding or requiring federal approval, including transportation projects, examine the effects of proposed and alternative choices on the environment before a federal decision is made.

**Non-Attainment** - Any geographic area that has not met the requirements for clean air as set out in the Clean Air Act of 1990. An area can at the same time be classified as in attainment for one or more air pollutants and as a non-attainment area for another air pollutant.

**Objective** - An attainable target that the community attempts to reach during the process of striving to meet a goal. An objective may also be considered as an intermediate point that will help fulfill the overall goal.

**Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)** – The state agency that manages the highway system within Oregon. ODOT’s mission is to provide a safe, efficient transportation system that supports economic opportunity and livable communities for Oregonians. ODOT is the administrative agency that responds to policy set by the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC).

**Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC)** - Establishes state transportation policy and guides the planning, development, and management of a statewide integrated transportation network. The governor appoints five commissioners, ensuring that different geographic regions of the state are represented. One member must live east of the Cascade Range; no more than three can belong to one political party.

**Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP)** - The comprehensive, long-range plan for a multimodal transportation system for the state, which encompasses economic efficiency, orderly economic development, safety, and environmental quality.

**Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>)** - Ozone is a colorless gas with a sweet odor. Ozone is not a direct emission from transportation sources. It is a secondary pollutant formed when VOCs and NO<sub>x</sub> combine in the presence of sunlight. Ozone is associated with smog or haze conditions. Although the ozone in the upper atmosphere protects us from harmful ultraviolet rays, ground-level ozone produces an unhealthy environment in which to live. Ozone is created by human and natural sources.

**Paratransit** - Alternative known as “special or specialized” transportation which often includes flexibly scheduled and routed transportation services. These services use low capacity vehicles such as vans to operate within normal urban transit corridors or rural areas. Services usually cater to the needs of persons whom standard mass transit services would serve with difficulty, or not at all. Common patrons are the elderly and persons with disabilities.

**Particulate Matter (PM10 and PM2.5)** - Particulate matter consists of airborne solid particles and liquid droplets. Particulate matter may be in the form of fly ash, soot, dust, fog, fumes, etc. These particles are classified as “coarse” if they are smaller than 10 microns, or “fine” if they are smaller than 2.5 microns. Coarse airborne particles are produced during grinding operations or from the physical disturbance of dust by natural air turbulence processes, such as wind. Fine particles can be a by-product of fossil fuel combustion, such as diesel and bus engines.

**Performance Measures** - Indicators of how well the transportation system is performing with regard to such things as average speed, reliability of travel, and accident rates. Used as feedback in the decision-making process.

**Planning Funds (PL)** - Primary source of federal (FHWA) funding for metropolitan planning.

**Policy** - A statement adopted as part of a plan to provide a specific course of action moving the community towards attainment of its goals. Due to budget constraints and other activities, all policies cannot be implemented at the same time. Generally, those with metropolitan-wide implications should receive priority consideration.

**Project Development** - The phase a proposed project undergoes once it has been through the planning process. The project development phase is a more detailed analysis of a proposed project’s social, economic, and environmental impacts and various project alternatives. What comes from the project development phase is a decision reached through negotiation among all affected parties, including the public. After a proposal has successfully passed the project development phase, it may move to preliminary engineering, design, and construction.

**Public Facility Plan (PFP)** - A plan required by state law for any city with an urban growth boundary encompassing a population greater than 2,500. A plan outlining the wastewater, water, and transportation facilities needed to serve such an urbanized area.

**Public Hearing** - A formal event held prior to a decision that gathers community comments and positions from all interested parties for public record and input into decisions.

**Public Participation Plan (PPP)** – Sometimes referred to as the Public Involvement Plan (PIP), it’s a plan that describes the MPO’s public involvement goals and objectives, and methods of involving the public in transportation decisions.

**Public Meeting** - A formal or informal event designed for a specific issue or community group where information is presented and input from community residents is received.



**Public Participation** - The active and meaningful involvement of the public in the development of transportation plans and programs.

**Record of Decision (ROD)** - A concise decision document for an environmental impact statement, prepared under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) that states the decision (selected alternative or choice), other alternatives considered, and mitigation adopted for the selected alternative or choice.

**Refinement Plan** - Refinement plans are a detailed examination of the service needs and land use issues relevant to a particular area. Refinements to the Metro Plan include specific neighborhood plans, community plans, or special purpose plans (such as water, wastewater, or transportation plans).

**Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)** - A document resulting from regional or statewide collaboration and consensus on a region or state's transportation system and serving as the defining vision for the region's or state's transportation systems and services. In metropolitan areas, the plan indicates all of the transportation improvements scheduled for funding over a minimum of the next 20 years.

**Right-of-Way (ROW)** - Public space legally established for the use of pedestrians, vehicles or utilities. Right-of-way typically includes the street, sidewalk, and buffer strip areas.

**Safe Routes to School (SRTS)** – Program coordinated through the MPO that provides outreach and education to students, promoting and encouraging safe walking and biking to and from school.

**Short-term Capital Project** - Projects identified as short-range needs are expected to be needed within 5 years.

**Smart Growth** - A set of policies and programs design to protect, preserve, and economically develop established communities and valuable natural and cultural resources.

**Sources** - Refers to the origin of air contaminants. Can be point (coming from a defined site) or non-point (coming from many diffuse sources). Stationary sources include relatively large, fixed facilities such as power plants, chemical process industries, and petroleum refineries. Area sources are small, stationary, non-transportation sources that collectively contribute to air pollution, and include such sources as dry cleaners and bakeries, surface coating operations, home furnaces, and crop burning. Mobile sources include on-road vehicles such as cars, trucks, and buses; and off-road sources such as trains, ships, airplanes, boats, lawn mowers, and construction equipment.

**Sprawl** - Urban form that connotatively depicts the movement of people from the central city to the suburbs. Concerns associated with sprawl include loss of farmland and open

space due to low-density land development, increased public service costs, and environmental degradation as well as other concerns associated with transportation.

**Stakeholders** - Individuals and organizations involved in or affected by the transportation planning process. They include federal/state/local officials, MPOs, transit operators, freight companies, shippers, and the general public.

**State Infrastructure Bank (SIB)** - A revolving fund mechanism for financing a wide variety of highway and transit projects through loans and credit enhancement. SIBs are designed to complement traditional federal-aid highway and transit grants by providing states increased flexibility for financing infrastructure investments.

**State Implementation Plan (SIP)** - A plan mandated by the Clean Air Act (CAA) that contains procedures to monitor, control, maintain, and enforce compliance with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). In Central Lane Transportation Management Area (TMA), the MPO is responsible for producing the Central Lane SIP for carbon monoxide; LRAPA produces the Lane County SIP for particulate matter (PM) 10. The state is responsible for incorporating each plan into the overall SIP.

**State Planning and Research Funds (SP&R, SPR)** - Primary source of funding for statewide long-range planning.

**Statewide Transportation Plan (STP)** - The official statewide intermodal transportation plan that is developed through the statewide transportation planning process.

**Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)** - Prepared by the state DOTs, the STIP is a staged, multiyear listing of projects proposed for federal, state, and local funding encompassing the entire state. It is a compilation of the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Programs (MTIP) prepared for the metropolitan areas, as well as project information for the non-metropolitan areas of the state and for transportation between cities. An MTIP must be incorporated into the STIP before MTIP projects can be funded by the state or the federal government.

**Surface Transportation Program (STP)** - Federal-aid highway funding program that funds a broad range of surface transportation capital needs, including many roads, transit, sea and airport access, vanpool, bike, and pedestrian facilities.

**Telecommuting** - Communicating electronically (by telephone, computer, fax, etc.) with an office, either from home or from another site, instead of traveling to it physically.

**Title VI** - Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination in any program receiving federal assistance.

**Transportation Conformity** - Process to assess the compliance of any transportation plan, program, or project with air quality implementation plans. The conformity process is defined by the Clean Air Act (CAA), and conformity of the RTP and MTIP is documented in an Air Quality Conformity Determination (AQCD) for each of those products.

**Transportation Control Measures (TCM)** - Transportation strategies that affect traffic patterns or reduce vehicle use to reduce air pollutant emissions. These may include high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes, provision of bicycle facilities, ridesharing, telecommuting, etc. Such actions may be included in a State Implementation Plan (SIP), if needed, to demonstrate attainment of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS).

**Transportation Corridor** - Major or high volume routes for moving people, goods, and services from one point to another. They may serve many transportation modes or be for a single mode such as an air corridor.

**Transportation Demand Management (TDM)** - “Demand-based” techniques which are designed to change travel behavior in order to improve the performance of transportation facilities and to reduce the need for additional road capacity. Methods include the use of alternative modes, ridesharing and vanpool programs, and trip-reduction programs and/or ordinances.

**Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)** - A staged, multiyear (typically three to five years) listing of surface transportation projects proposed for federal, state, and local funding within a metropolitan area. MPOs are required to prepare a TIP as a short-range programming document to complement its long-range transportation plan. TIPs contain projects with committed funds over a multiyear period (one to three years). Also known as a Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) in MPO areas.

**Transportation Management Area (TMA)** - All urbanized areas over 200,000 in population, and any other area that requests such designation. The MPO is responsible for coordinating transportation planning with a TMA.

**Transportation Needs** - These are estimates of the movement of people and goods that are consistent with an acknowledged comprehensive plan and the requirements of the Transportation Planning Rule. Needs are typically based on projections of future travel demands resulting from a continuation of current trends as modified by policy objectives, including those expressed in the Transportation Planning Rule, especially those for avoiding principal reliance on any one mode of transportation.

**Transportation Options (TO)** – Programs that promote forms of transportation as alternatives to the use of single-occupant automobiles (sometimes referred to as “transportation alternatives”). Examples include rail, transit, carpool, bicycle, and walking.

**Transportation Planning** - A collaborative process of examining demographic characteristics and travel patterns for a given area. This process shows how these characteristics will change over a given period of time and evaluates alternatives for the transportation system of the area and the most expeditious use of local, state, and federal transportation funding. Long-range planning is typically done over a period of 20 years; short-range programming of specific projects usually covers a period of 3 to 5 years.

**Transportation Planning Committee (TPC)** - A Central Lane MPO committee of technical staff from the public works and planning departments of Coburg, Eugene, Springfield, Lane County, Lane Transit District, LCOG, and ODOT. The committee provides technical expertise and recommendations to the policy board, MPC.

**Transportation Planning Rule (TPR)** - A state planning administrative rule, adopted by the Land Conservation and Development Commission in 1991 to implement Statewide Planning Goal 12, Transportation. The TPR requires metropolitan areas to show measurable progress towards reducing dependence on automobiles.

**Transportation System Management (TSM)** - The techniques for increasing the efficiency, safety, capacity, or level of service of the existing transportation system without increasing its size. Examples include traffic signal improvements, traffic control devices including installing medians and parking removal, channelization, access management, ramp metering, and restriping for high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes.

**Transportation Systems Plan** - A plan for one or more transportation facilities that are planned, developed, operated, and maintained in a coordinated manner to supply continuity of movement between modes, and within and between geographic and jurisdictional areas. Usually, a plan produced by a local government (e.g., City of Coburg, Lane County, etc.)

**Travel Mode** - The means of transportation used, such as automobile, bus, bicycle, or by foot.

**Trust Fund** - A fund credited with receipts that are held in trust by the government and earmarked by law for use in carrying out specific purposes and programs in accordance with an agreement or a statute.

**Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)** - The management plan for the (metropolitan) planning program. Its purpose is to coordinate the planning activities of all participants in the planning process.

**Urban Growth Boundary (UGB)** - A site-specific line in the Metro Plan that separates existing and future urban development from rural lands. Urban levels and densities of development, complete with urban levels of services, are planned within the UGB. A requirement of the state land use planning program.

**Urbanized Area** - Area that contains a city of 50,000 or more population plus incorporated surrounding areas meeting size or density criteria as defined by the U.S. Census.

**Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT)** - The sum of distances traveled by all motor vehicles in a specified region. A requirement of the state Transportation Planning Rule is reducing vehicle miles traveled per capita.

*Intentionally left blank*

## Appendix B

### PUBLIC COMMENTS

- Summary of Comments and How these Resulted in Changes
- Public Comments and Input
- Report on Results of the Public Participation Survey



*Intentionally left blank*



## **Summary of Comments and How they Influenced this Plan**

Through the MPO's various outreach and engagement efforts during the development of the Public Participation Plan, many comments were received expressing the belief or concern that their input won't be considered anyway, that what they think doesn't matter to planners and won't make a difference. The survey results indicate that this belief is a common barrier to participation. This appendix is intended to illustrate how the comments and input received through the MPO's outreach efforts have resulted in specific changes and revisions to the content of the plan that impact how the MPO engages and collaborates with the public in its decision-making processes.

Presented on the following pages are many of the key takeaways or common themes from the comments and other input received during the plan development (underlined text) and the specific changes to the document that resulted from that feedback.

Many comments were received identifying accessibility as a barrier. The survey results show that providing options that are quicker and more accessible would remove barriers to participation.

Added links to the MPO's social media on the first pages of the plan in a highlighted box with a few other links and resources for people interested in getting involved and wanting to know how.

Quick Response Code (QR code) has been added to the plan as a tool that can be utilized to increase accessibility and convenience of participation. Several survey respondents specifically identified the QR code on the survey posters as effective toward their participation in that outreach effort.

Policy 1.2 was to hold public meetings at a site convenient to citizens and other interested parties. That has been expanded now to specify holding public meetings at a convenient time as well.

Policy 2.6 says to schedule meetings and hearings to allow best opportunity for attendance by the public. The word "attendance" has been replaced with "participation".

Expanded the description of surveys as an instrument for participation and feedback, particularly the use of online surveys, which are accessible and can be completed on the participant's own time and at their own convenience.

Outreach for the MTIP now incorporates utilization of the MPO's new electronic Transportation Improvement Program (eTIP), an online tool that provides the public with an accessible and user-friendly interface for real-time, up-to-date project information. This information, previously available as a monthly updated large format spreadsheet, can now be accessed via smartphone from anywhere at any time.

Tabling at Events has been added to the toolkit for public engagement. This is one way the MPO can meet members of the public where they are and provide an opportunity to solicit input in a format that may be more convenient to some than attending a formal public hearing.

The survey results show social media is the most effective method for letting people know about opportunities to provide input.

Added links to the MPO's social media on the first page of the plan in a highlighted box with a few other links and resources for people interested in getting involved and wanting to know how.

The now defunct LaneVoices online engagement tool has been removed as a core public involvement tool and a paragraph has been added describing how social media can be utilized for effective involvement.

Web Notice evaluation measures were added specific to social media including number of users reached, number of users interacted, and dollars spent boosting (promoting) social media posts.

A number of commenters expressed difficulty accessing or interpreting some of the MPO's work products, which can be fairly technical in nature, including the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

The plan includes a "Citizen's Guide" which helps explain in a simple and public-friendly way what an MPO is, does, and some of its work products.

The plan describes, and provides a link to, the MPO's new eTIP web-based tool that presents the projects of the MPO's TIP in a simple, public-friendly online interface that can be accessed via mobile device. The eTIP provides search features to help you locate a project or learn about what projects are near you, with project information that is updated daily.

Survey results show fewest people comfortable providing oral testimony at a virtual public meeting.

Policy 2.6 – wording was changed to read "Schedule meetings and hearings of the MPO policy board and Transportation Planning Committee (TPC) to allow the best opportunity for *participation* by the public." Rather than "...*attendance* by the public."

A link to the "Citizen's Guide" is included in the plan and published on the MPO website that provides training and helpful tips to members of the public and other interested parties that wish to offer testimony at a public hearing.

Several comments from the survey and from the open-house questionnaire identify the problem of not knowing when input is being solicited. The survey results show that not hearing about opportunities to participate is a leading barrier to participation.

Added links to the MPO's social media on the first page of the plan in a highlighted box with a few other links and resources for people interested in getting involved and wanting to know how.

Added Central Lane MPO's social media as core public outreach tools and included links to those pages in the document. Provided a link in the document to sign up for the MPO's email distribution list.

Evaluation – Notice to Interested Parties – to increase the number of persons on the distribution list, to this section was added the method of including a link to join the email notification list as part of MPO publications, postings, and flyers.

General unfamiliarity with the MPO and its work was something expressed in many of the comments we received.

The Citizen's Guide brochure, last published in 2006, has been updated for 2024, published online, and linked to in the plan as a resource to inform the public about what the MPO is and does, and how the public can be involved in regional transportation planning decisions.

A link to an easy-to-read two-page fact sheet about Central Lane MPO and its work, has been added to the introduction of the plan as a resource to help the public familiarize itself with the agency.

To help the MPO become better recognized as an agency, the MPO will diversity advertising, publish fact sheets with helpful, simple, public-friendly information, tailor notices to engage different segments of the public, and maintain an active presence on social media with regular and informative postings. These have each been included as methods to achieve the plan's performance objectives.

Web Notice evaluation measures were added specific to social media including number of users reached, number of users interacted, and dollars spent boosting (promoting) social media posts.

Tabling at Events has been added to the toolkit for public engagement. Although these are in-person interfaces, they are an effective method of introducing members of the public to the MPO and its work and especially for getting the word out about specific opportunities for engagement that they might otherwise not learn about.

Survey results show that the MPO issues relating to the RTP and the MTIP are of most interest to the public.

Added language more specific to RTP and MTIP outreach, and articulated core tools and strategies to be part of the development of these two products.

Regular maintenance of the RTP stakeholder database has been added as a valuable tool for outreach and engagement.

Outreach for the MTIP now incorporates utilization of the MPO's new electronic Transportation Improvement Program (eTIP), an online tool that provides the public with an accessible and user-friendly interface for real-time, up-to-date project information.

Online methods of communication including social media and email are favored over printed or in-person communication.

Added links to the MPO's social media on the first page of the plan in a highlighted box with a few other links and resources for people interested in getting involved and wanting to know how.

Speakers' Bureau has been removed as a core public participation tool and instead, the Web Notice tool has been augmented to reflect greater utilization of online and digital communication methods. The Speakers' Bureau remains in the MPO's toolkit as a potentially effective method of outreach under certain circumstances and for certain audiences.

In the Evaluation section, methods to meet the Web Notice evaluation objectives were revised to remove the defunct LaneVoices outreach tool with links to social media and the MPO website to accompany web notices.

The online survey offered respondents a chance to win a \$50 gift card to a local grocery store. Many who responded to the survey commented that incentivizing participation was a good idea and the MPO should include that more in their outreach efforts.

"Incentives" has been added to the plan as a specific tool that can be effective for expanding participation.

Public are most comfortable providing input through online surveys or questionnaires, but many comments pointed out that there is value lost in such non-interactive forms of communication.

The evaluation section identifies surveys as a useful tool for evaluating the effectiveness of the public participation plan. Expanded the description of surveys as an instrument for participation and feedback, particularly the use of online surveys, which are accessible and can be completed on the participant's own time and at their own convenience.

Tabling at Events has been added to the toolkit for public engagement. These in-person interfaces are an effective method of introducing members of the public to the MPO and its work and provide a casual setting for real-time conversation and interaction.

The elderly and people with disabilities may prefer to participate through direct engagement in smaller settings.

Tabling at Events has been added to the toolkit for public engagement. These in-person interfaces are an effective method of introducing members of the public to the MPO and its work and provide a casual, small group or one-on-one setting for real-time conversation and interaction.

Holding MPO public meetings in a strictly virtual format may be presenting a barrier to public participation that could possibly be counter-balanced by increased efforts to notify the public of opportunities for online written comment submittal.

To improve the effectiveness of public comment periods (including public hearings) a method was added to the evaluation element to “diversify advertising methods, including social media boosting to targeted demographics.” It is anticipated that more online written comments will be received by increasing the awareness of these opportunities among social media users.

Added links to the MPO’s social media on the first pages of the plan in a highlighted box with a few other links and resources for people interested in getting involved and wanting to know how.

Tabling at Events has been added to the toolkit for public engagement. Although these are in-person interfaces, they are an effective method of introducing members of the public to the MPO and its work and especially for getting the word out about specific opportunities for engagement that they might otherwise not learn about, and for soliciting input in a format that may be less intimidating to some than at a formal public hearing.

Many commenters wanted the MPO to work harder to engage more diverse groups of people, and especially those that are traditionally under-represented in public decision-making processes.

Chapter 3 (Providing Input) describes techniques to encourage the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the MPO decision-making process, and references the MPO’s recently adopted Title VI Plan, which includes additional information related to public involvement specifically geared toward the under-represented.

The public participation process documentation for the development and approval of this plan describes how Title VI communities and other traditionally under-represented segments of the population were targeted for outreach and engagement through phone calls to advocacy groups, targeted emails, presentations at groups meetings, Spanish translations of materials, and other methods.

Policy 1.2 was to hold public meetings “at a site convenient” to citizens and other interested parties. That has been expanded now to specify holding public meetings at a convenient time as well.

## **Documentation of Comments and Input Received**

Presented here is the input from members of the public and other stakeholders solicited during the development of the Public Participation Plan (PPP). The goal of the MPO's outreach and engagement efforts has been to be able to create a plan that is based on up-to-date interests, sentiment, and preferences from a complete spectrum of the public, Title VI protected communities, stakeholders, public agencies, advocacy groups, and others. Various efforts to collect this information resulted in a great deal of input in various formats including emails, telephone transcripts, online survey responses, testimony at public meetings, in-person communication, questionnaire responses, conversations in virtual and in-person open house forums, and others.

### **Public Participation Plan Open House Comments**

---

#### **Questionnaire Answers:**

Questionnaire answers are directly transcribed.

1. *Many people who heard about this open house and were able to come, chose not to come anyway. Why did you choose to come?*
  - Support for friend/loyalty – personal ties.
  - For me, knowing that there were people coming with me, and encouragement from a vested community member brought me.
  - I'm a planner, so it's a little bit my job. But also good public participation is important.
2. *What do you think are the biggest barriers keeping people from participating more fully in public decision-making processes?*
  - Financial incentives, time, belief in fragmental relationship between individuals and their communities or that their voice matters.
  - Knowing where to access the places where comments are made, as well as in-person opportunities. May be a lack of conversation happening around the PPP?
  - In general, or at the MPO level? For the MPO, I think most people have absolutely no clue it exists or what it does. And since the MPO is not itself actually building projects, there aren't as many opportunities for folks to see the work being done. So obscurity is one barrier. Information overload is another. It's hard enough to get folks to engage when the project you're proposing is on their street, let alone at a regional plan level.
3. *Do you have any suggestions for how public agencies can engage the community more effectively?*
  - Proving (however that is) that underserved economically depressed individuals' voices matter. Offer financial incentives. Keep trying!! Become known as a friend of your

communities (especially marginalized), partner with them by hosting/partaking in community-oriented events.

- I am a strong proponent of making things as accessible as possible. Having clear directions as to where the information exists and how to navigate it.
- If I did, I could probably go on the road as consultant and make millions. One opportunity area I see is our continued shift into online methods of engagement, either through surveys like this one or virtual forums. Right now, I see a lack of interaction opportunities in these engagement sessions that may be off putting to folks who don't feel comfortable speaking up or typing up an essay. I'm not sure that readily available software platforms are super supportive of this, but Zoom at least lets you poll the audience and then share those results back. Even if these poll results aren't significant, it lets audiences build at least some shared relationship with the speaker(s) and each other. Just one example of interaction opportunities.

4. *Do you have any other comments related to the update of the Public Participation Plan?*

- I'm interested in how social media is being utilized, and what research is being done to best use that resource?
- I enjoy the Douglas Adams quote/reference at the beginning of the current plan. Not sure it is as relevant to upcoming generations, but excellent none the less.

**Summary of In-Person Oral Feedback:**

*What is your biggest barrier for participating?*

- How to do it at all – where/how/when.
- Accessibility, time – quick and painless. Have incentives is a great way to bring in people.

*General Comments*

- Videos of barebone topics, such as social media reels. Hot on the algorithms!
- How do you get people to start having the conversations to get folks in the room? If I know people will be there, I want to be there too.
- Branding: LCOG/CLMPO isn't known. Public events to build up familiarity – show up in the community. It's difficult to recognize who you are.

*Questions asked of staff:*

- Q: Community didn't feel up for commenting on the online format, has there been any encouragement/training for Zoom communication?
- Q: What is the turnout at online meetings?
- Q: Were the turnouts at in-person meetings noticeably bigger?

**In-Person Activity Notes:**

Activity notes are directly transcribed.

#### *Objective 1:*

- Policy 1.3: What specifically has this looked like? How are these underserved households being reached?
- Policy 1.6: Main thought – interested in how social media is involved with this.

#### *Objective 2:*

- Policy 2.2: “Explicit” and “Significant” are highlighted as words needing clarification. Where is this documented? What has this looked like in the past?
- Overall: Main thought, where am I going to see the testimonies and comments? How am I learning that the updates have happened?

#### *Objective 3:*

- Overall: Is there an order to the three objectives? Seems #3 might sequentially belong earlier.

#### **Input from Virtual Open-House:**

Virtual comments are not directly transcribed but summarized.

- How was the survey distributed, and did that have an impact on the way people identified the way they want to be reached?
- Why now, in terms of the update to the plan? Certainly, it’s great to update them, but you know, frequently it’s decades, as opposed to a decade. So, was it just the results of covid and that shifting landscapes, or were there other triggers to update now?
- Feedback regarding TPC agenda for public access, only option is to call in by phone.

#### **Comments from the Public Participation Survey**

---

Survey respondents were asked to open-write respond to the question, “do you have any suggestions for how to make public engagement more effective”. Below are the responses received.

“Accessibility.”

“Add notations to work vehicles and uniforms.”

“Any broadcasting on local podcasts or radios would be helpful to me.”

“Be more active in communicating to residents.”

“Clarify how input will be used up front and how feedback will influence outcome, circle back to share how input was incorporated.”

“Close the loop by reporting back on how individual input was used in making the decision whether the input is reflected in the decision or not. That does not mean statistical counts. The



people who show up are not representative. Their power should be limited to the quality of their advice and their ability to persuade. How popular their ideas are will obviously be a consideration for elected officials. But that is a much bigger issue than how popular it was with other people in the room.”

“Communicating in ways that make people feel like their engagement/involvement has purpose. Ex: giving the space to express ideas along with how those ideas will be seen and implemented.”

“Community outreach available to come to clubhouse community centers to engage and provide information.”

“Consider incorporating interactive elements like live polls, Q&A sessions, and open forums to encourage participation. Utilizing social media platforms for announcements and discussions can also engage a wider audience. Additionally, offering incentives such as community recognition or small rewards for active participants may boost involvement.”

“Dial back the bureaucratic nonsense.”

“Engage with the school districts.”

“Find out what people think is important and talk about that.”

“Find ways to allow more diverse groups of people to participate, such as people with disabilities, low income/unhoused, BIPOC, and LGBTQ individuals. These populations have often been ignored in policy making decisions and are most impacted by changes in transportation.”

“Flyers in the mail.”

“For youth, having resources eg. Posters, website information, cards, etc that give information on participation. These could be located at specific club meetings (like key club or eco club) for those who are interested.”

“Have as many opportunities via different ways as possible to get the word out. Most people just don’t know what’s going on until it hits their pocketbook.”

“Hold public meetings at Campbell Community Center and at Willamalane Park and Recreation District buildings.”

“Honesty, truth, and reason. Introduce the question, listen, then spend millions of dollars. Not plan behind closed doors, pretend to listen, think it’s only the government that matters.”

“Honor the public engagement already done like RR-SC neighborhood plan.”

“I believe that being able to have community meetings that are accessible and diverse are key. Age diversity, aware of barriers to conversation. The input of every community member is important. I think interviews are valuable too.”

“I got my information through the PPPM email newsletter at the University of Oregon. This is the best way for me as a student to find out about community events (email newsletters).”

"I like the flyers around town."

"I personally have never seen anything about community engagement with LCOG regarding the MPO in any capacity after I started working here. I think periodically sending out mailers or emails to known addresses that have consented to communications would be a great start and/or offering more opportunities for people to learn about and sign up for mailing/emailing listservs."

"I saw the poster for this at a coffee shop. This worked well. I was willing to open the survey because of the potential prize of \$50."

"I think convenience is key. QR code surveys (like this one) are easily accessible and quickly finished."

"I think one (element) of making public engagement more effective is having a prize, like this, or just making it (something) people know about and will see a difference if they actually participate."

"I think that this survey was a very good first step."

"I think the suggested ideas are great. I would like to see public notifications about issues such as via news media and posted meetings for in person participation."

"I've always felt more compelled to take a survey or respond to a question when it's phrased in a way that makes it personal. "What do YOU want the future of x to be" is much more intriguing than "What should the future of x be"."

"Incentivize participation."

"Incentivize the public to learn about engagement opportunities and the value of the engagement."

"It seems out of touch and stuffy, if there is a way to make the important issues more flashy I think people will be more interested in participating. That or pay them. Not necessarily direct payments but a tax credit would be a way to get people to understand things that are important need participation. Plus, if you offer it as a tax credit and people don't take advantage of the credit you can point that fact out when they later complain about taxes."

"Just try! At present, it really doesn't feel like public input is desired."

"Make it clear how these decisions will affect a variety of people in their daily lives and make engagement accessible for a variety of schedules and abilities."

"Make your website approachable with specific projects, compared to other MPOs, such as (lists an MPO). Use Mastodon, instead of Xtwitter, Facebook, and other corporate social media."

"More grassroot opportunities."

"More help for those in need."

“More high-quality visuals at public meetings, workshops, and online surveys. Architects are so good at these, but visuals are often lacking in the public sector.”

“More incentives (i.e money and prizes).”

“More transparency in decision making processes and the bias of constituents.”

“Mostly just making regular posts on social media, and mailings. I’m a widowed parent who works full time at 6:45 am and then I caregive for my dad until he goes to sleep between 10 and midnight.”

“Offer incentives, like prizes, recognition, refreshments, etc.”

“Offer incentives. E.g gift certificates; attend Latino event and Spanish Mass at St. Mary’s and St. Alice Church – these are very large gatherings.”

“Open door meetings that can be attended online, in-person, or on phone that can be watched later if one can’t attend.”

“Open houses and a variety of locations.”

“Pay us for our time. A raffle is not pay.”

“Posting more information about your goal and the work being done to reach it and why.”

“Promote in an effective (manner) that public engagement actually makes a difference.”

“Public bus sharing between cities may result in less air pollution.”

“Reach out more through more varied ways: local radio, public radio, news...”

“Recognize that local newspapers/TV/radio no longer exist in this area (except for the Eugene Weekly and KLCC). If you want people to become engaged, you’ll need to engage them where they are now.”

“Representation, inclusion, and diversity. Making engagement highly accessible to all socio-economic gradients, cultures, people.”

“That’s tough. More flyers. Add in the weekly with QR code. Civic engagement.”

“The general public needs to understand how decisions are made. We seem to have a multi-layered, multi-step transportation planning process that is fairly opaque even to me and I have a planning degree and a law degree, e.g, what are the steps? What stage are we at? What has already been decided? What issues are being decided at this step? When is the deadline? Where do I send comments?”

“The idea of using videos for information is very compelling to me! I like having information given to me through direct communication and sometimes don’t have the time or ability to make it to in-person events. Having a video to watch with the content discussed at those events would be very useful in the face of my busy lifestyle.”

“This is hard to answer because I don’t even know what this group does.”

“TV spots.”

“Visibility is EVERYTHING. If I don’t see you, to me, you don’t exist. I need to see you, to see people at events, to see flyers, to see ads in the paper, to see a presence at major gathering places like parks and the LTD bus station or the Eugene Library, I need to see something from a distance that catches my eye and brings me in because if I don’t, I have no place to start. Establishing that baseline is extremely important for my generation (18-21 year olds) because many of us can’t afford to have things like streaming services that offer us local news because most of us can’t afford to live in the first place. A monthly cable subscription to watch the local news would cost me more than my monthly bus pass to commute to and from work, it’s just not practical. I need you to be accessible. This flyer I saw outside of Books with Pictures to take this survey was literally my first and only indication that (the) MPO existed and even cared about my input.”

“We can try to be direct with whoever might be interested, such as information on how to find us or contact us with a variety of other means that we can figure out if needed.”

“Would be nice to engage!”

“Yes. I frequently encourage my neighbors to participate in a myriad of issues effecting our area. There is a feeling their comments are not considered, their concerns are not listened to, and decisions are made that benefit political campaign donors, and not the people that actually live and work in an area.”

## Personal Interviews

---

Presented below are responses to a few questions asked of individuals as part of a targeted outreach effort to better understand the needs and barriers of certain specific segments of the population (including the elderly, disabled, LGBTQ+, and survivors of domestic violence) whose voice might not have been well-represented through the MPO’s other efforts. Questions are shown in bold, with responses below.

### **What barriers keep people with disabilities from participating more fully in the public decision-making process?**

(Disabled, Elderly) “I find myself inundated with so much information that day to day gets in the way of deep dives into long detail. I don’t have time for this other thing, not knowing what, where, when so I can see if I can and if it is relevant. I know my day to day makes a difference, but I hesitate to pull away from that when I am not clear that “this thing” will.”

(LGBTQ+) “-Not knowing how to get involved -Not knowing which agency would be most appropriate to interact with on a specific issue -Lack of understanding of the issues or not having

enough information -Feeling that decisions are made behind closed doors -Meeting locations or times are not convenient to schedule”

(Survivors of Domestic Violence) “Are you even listening and considering our population? Are you asking the correct people to be at the table? You are going to people who are available – which isn’t necessarily the people who need to be talked to. For member to recognize their voice wants to be heard they need to be paid for their time. -Not having time to participate - Thinking that input doesn’t matter -Not feeling the issues are applicable to me/my interest - Feeling that decisions are made behind closed doors”

**Which methods would be most effective for letting members of the community your organization works know about opportunities to provide input?**

(Disabled, Elderly) “E list mailings cue me into things that I may have impact on, Face to face or virtual meetings that I can do from my desk during regular business hours that are offered a few different times in case a priority item is on the table.”

(LGBTQ+) “-Websites (the MPO, City, County, LTD, ODOT, etc.) -Social Media -Flyers posted at key local locations (shops, buses, bulletin boards, parks, etc.) -Radio advertisement -Brochures and Fact Sheets -E-Subscription Lists -Public Meetings/Open Houses -Surveys/Tell Us Portal - Workshops”

(Survivors of Domestic Violence) “Social Media, verses the paper methods. Change media dependent on demographics and locations. -Social Media -Videos/Visualizations”

**How are members of the community your organization works for most comfortable providing input on issues?**

(Disabled, Elderly) “In most cases the people we support and those who are their advocates would be most comfortable in a limited setting, we could host a small group to gain the perspectives (for example).”

(LGBTQ+) “-Submitting written comments via mail/email (template provided, please) - Responding to printed paper surveys or questionnaires -Responding to online or digital surveys or questionnaires”

(Survivors of Domestic Violence) “Ask them directly, specifically through text and writing, not over the phone but ask the individual/group more directly, not as generalized (ex. Questionnaires) -Submitting written comments via mail/email.”

**Do you have any suggestions for how to make public engagement more effective for members of the community your organization works with?**

(Disabled, Elderly) “Direct engagement with people who experience I/DD in a smaller setting is the best approach, I realize that those who are gathering information are busy too and “town Hall” is a good approach for people with big voices, the quiet and underserved would be more likely to participate in a smaller setting.”

(Survivors of Domestic Violence) “-Identify interacting people, have them meet with marginalized groups alone, leave biased and experienced people out of it (they’re often looking for a specific answer). -Solution that represents adequate needs, actually listen to the people you’re asking.”

### **Other Comments Received**

---

Comments received through other methods are presented in the following pages. These include testimony offered at public hearings, comments submitted as part of a public comment period, and comments provided to the MPO outside of a formal comment period.

*[insert B.E.S.T. comment of 7/20/23]*

*[insert comments and testimony received through the plan adoption process]*

## **Public Participation Survey – Report of Results**

The public participation survey was conducted from November 6 through December 15, 2023. The survey was conducted to receive input from the public regarding preferences in outreach methods as well as perceived barriers to participation. The survey was distributed in English and Spanish.

Participation outcomes included:

- 191 survey responses (189 English, 2 Spanish)
- Statistically valid results (95% confidence, 7% margin of error)<sup>7</sup>
- Outreach to MPO distribution list
- Facebook posts with paid advertising providing a link to the survey
- Instagram posts promoting and providing a link to the survey
- University of Oregon email and in-class announcements to students
- University of Oregon LiveMove in-club announcements
- 150 printed posters distributed in downtown Eugene and Springfield, and UO campus

### **Key Feedback and Takeaways**

The survey and the associated outreach to promote it proved to be an effective method of reaching the public and of collecting valuable information useful for the update of the Public Participation Plan. The public, generally, recognize the value of participating in public decision-making processes, but often aren't aware when those opportunities are taking place, nor how to participate. The Long-Range Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the four-year Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) are the MPO products of most interest to the public. Extra outreach and engagement during the development and implementation of these two products, done effectively, are likely to yield positive results.

Public engagement could be improved by providing options for participation that are accessible and quick. Utilizing online tools such as social media (especially Facebook and Instagram) and email is a much more effective means of letting people know about opportunities for public input than through printed or in-person engagement. The public is most comfortable submitting comments through means of a survey or questionnaire that can be completed online and are least comfortable offering oral testimony at a virtual public meeting such as the virtual meetings which have been default format for MPO committees since the COVID-19 pandemic. If this survey exercise is to be repeated in the future, additional effort may be necessary to better represent men, people under the age of 18, and people who live, work, or go to school in Springfield.

---

<sup>7</sup> Based on Eugene-Springfield urbanized area population reported by 2020 US Census

## **Introduction**

An online survey titled “Public Participation Survey” was distributed between November 6 and December 15, 2023. The survey asked participants about:

- Participation in public agencies
- MPO issues the participant would be interested in being informed about
- Barriers to participation
- Effective methods of communication
- Avenues for providing input on issues
- Social media usage
- Demographics

189 English survey responses and 2 Spanish responses were received for a total of 191 responses. The survey was publicized digitally through the official MPO and LCOG website “Community News” sections, on Lane Council of Governments Facebook and Instagram accounts, as well as through the MPO’s email distribution list (370 recipients). Paid advertising to boost Facebook post reached 3,660 individuals within the MPO boundaries.

150 printed posters advertising and linking to the survey (with a printed QR code) were distributed in downtown Eugene, downtown Springfield, and on the University of Oregon campus. Staff conducted targeted outreach through email and personal telephone interviews with 42 local organizations that work closely with Title VI communities within the MPO boundaries.

Younger audiences were targeted through University of Oregon email lists for the Public Policy, Planning, and Management program and the Environmental Sciences program and in-class announcements. Other specialized university student targeting included announcements made in the student club “LiveMove”.

The survey was incentivized with five randomly selected respondents receiving a \$50 gift card to a local grocery store of their choice. The survey also resulted in the addition of 164 new addresses to the MPO’s email distribution list for notifications of future public involvement opportunities. A summary of the survey results is presented on the following pages.



## **Involvement, Interest in Issues, Barriers to Participation**

**Question 1: Have you ever provided input to the MPO or another public agency as part of a public decision-making process?**


More than a third of those who responded to this question reported that they have participated in a public decision-making process by providing input. This suggests the survey was an effective means of reaching members of the public whose input has not been captured through previous outreach efforts.

**35% Have provided input**

**65% Have never provided input**


**Question 2: Which MPO issues are you most interested in being informed about? (select all that apply)**

Respondents are most interested in the MPO issues that focus around two of the MPO's principal work products; the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The political representation of the MPO bodies was of minimal interest.



Question 3: What barriers keep you from participating more fully in public decision-making processes? (select all that apply)


Most respondents (71%) identified not knowing about opportunities to participate as a barrier keeping them from participating more fully. This was by far the most common barrier identified. Not knowing how to get involved, and not having time to participate were each identified by nearly half of respondents as barriers. With the exception of language (2%), not feeling that the issues are applicable (7%) was the least common barrier identified. This suggests that improved outreach and information dissemination approaches could make a considerable difference in removing barriers to participation, and that the public recognize that decisions made through a public process are important and applicable to them.



## **Communication**


### **Question 4: Which method would be most effective for letting you know about opportunities to provide input? (select your top three)**

Respondents revealed a clear preference for internet-based notification methods, with social media (45%) being the most commonly identified method. Printed media including mailings and flyers were identified as being relatively effective as well. Methods associated with in-person engagement such as information tables, workshops, on-site tours, stakeholder interviews and direct consultation were among the methods least commonly identified as effective. Other methods suggested by respondents included roundtable discussions with other community members, public service announcements on YouTube or podcasts, and direct text messages.




**Question 5: How are you most comfortable providing input on issues? (*select only one*)**

Approximately half of respondents (51%) are most comfortable providing input by means of an online or digital survey or questionnaire. It must be pointed out, however, that this survey was provided exclusively online which may be self-selecting for respondents that feel comfortable providing input by such means. A quarter of respondents (25%) are most comfortable submitting written comments either via mail or email. Respondents were more comfortable providing oral comments at an in-person public meeting (8%) than at a virtual public meeting (4%).



**Question 6: What social media sites do you use most frequently? (*select up to three*)**


By far the most frequently used social media sites among respondents are Facebook/Meta (57%) and Instagram (49%). It must be pointed out that the survey was advertised heavily through the MPO's Facebook and Instagram, but not through other the social media listed, which likely self-selected for respondents that frequently engage with Facebook and Instagram. Nevertheless, this question is helpful in identifying which additional social media may be most effective for expanding outreach (TikTok and Reddit, for example). Others specified include Threads, LinkedIn, YouTube, Mastodon, Slashdot, and Discord.



## Demographics

### Question 7: What is your age?

There were more respondents (20%) aged 65 and over than in any other age category. US Census (ACS 2022 1-year estimate)<sup>8</sup> reports that persons aged 65 and over represent 19.3% of the population of the Eugene Urbanized Area. Adults between the ages of 25 and 34 were the second most reported age category. The results under-represent those aged 17 and under (5% compared to the 17% census estimate).




### Question 8: Are you of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin?

US Census (ACS 2022 1-year estimate) reports that Hispanic or Latino persons represent 11.5% of the population of the Eugene Urbanized Area. Responses suggest that Hispanic or Latino persons are represented proportionally in the survey results.

**11% Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin      89% Not Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin**

### Question 9: What is your race? (select all that apply)


Respondents most commonly reported their race as White only (82.2%). The graph below presents all other responses. Hispanic or Latino is the second most (8%) represented race among respondents. According to 2022 census estimates, 81.1% of Eugene's and 82.4% of Springfield's populations identify as "White alone".



<sup>8</sup> Source: <https://censusreporter.org/profiles/40000US28117-eugene-or-urban-area/> on February 16, 2024  
Central Lane MPO Public Participation Plan DRAFT  
2024


Question 10: How many people live in your household? This is the number of individuals (including yourself) that occupy your housing unit and are related to you by birth, marriage, or adoption.

Two-person households was the most common response (37%) among respondents. Roughly 60% of respondents belong to either a one- or two-person household, and no respondents reported belonging to a household of six or more people. US Census (ACS 2022 1-year estimate) reports 2.3 persons per household in the Eugene Urbanized Area. Questions 10 and 11 were necessary to calculate household poverty.



Question 11: What is your annual household income?

US Census (ACS 2022 1-year estimate) reports a median household income of \$63,496 in the Eugene Urbanized Area. Survey responses suggest that households with incomes greater than \$60,300 are underrepresented in this dataset. Questions 10 and 11 were necessary to calculate household poverty.



Households in poverty was not a question asked directly on the survey but is calculated based on what respondents reported as their household size and their annual household income. The results were then compared against the 2022 weighted average poverty threshold published by the U.S. Census Bureau.<sup>9</sup>

Of respondents, 17.3% were living in a household in poverty. US Census (ACS 2022 1-year estimate) reports a poverty rate of 16.4% for the Eugene urbanized area. Respondents represented a slightly greater (less than 1%) proportion of people living in households of poverty than would have been expected from a purely representative sample.

### **17.3% Household in Poverty 83.7% Household Not in Poverty**

Question 12: Do you have a disability? For this survey, disability means serious difficulty with either hearing, vision, cognition, ambulation, self-care, or independent living.


The US Census (ACS 5-year 2017-2021 estimate) reports that 16.84% of persons in the Eugene urbanized area have a disability.

**18.2% Have a Disability**

**81.8% Do Not Have a Disability**

Question 13: Which most accurately describes you? (select one)

More respondents are most accurately described as “Woman” (49%) than the other alternatives provided. Among the options, “Man” most accurately describes 38% of respondents.




<sup>9</sup> 2023 Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic Supplement (CPS ASEC).

Question 14: Select any MPO jurisdictions in which you currently live, work, or go to school.  
(select all that apply)

The purpose of this question was to better understand which MPO jurisdictions respondents may be most interested or concerned with. The majority (79%) of respondents reported living, working and/or going to school in Eugene. It can be assumed, therefore, that among respondents, MPO issues affecting City of Eugene are of most interest or concern.

The US Census (ACS 2022 1-year estimate) reports that 66% percent of the MPO population lives within Eugene city limits, 23% percent in Springfield, 0.6% in Coburg, and 11% in unincorporated Lane County. While we wouldn't expect responses to mirror the population (the question is asking more than that), the responses suggest that this survey dataset may underrepresent people that live, work, or go to school in Springfield or Lane County. There is likely a degree of reporting error taking place, however.<sup>10</sup>



<sup>10</sup> For example, some respondents that live or work technically outside city limits may have selected Eugene because they have a Eugene address, they identify as living in Eugene, or they may not know they don't live in Eugene.



## Appendix C

-Public Involvement Tools for Participation

-Public Involvement Tools for Information



*Intentionally left blank*

## **Tools for Participation and for Information**

This appendix of the Public Participation Plan lists public involvement tools, separating them into two categories—participation tools and information tools. The list of tools describes the core public involvement tools that the MPO uses for the key MPO products (summarized in Table 1, Chapter 3 of the plan) and other optional tools which the MPO may use to design a public outreach strategy for a specific update of a key product.

The IAP2 Public Participation Spectrum is included in this appendix as a framework for designing a public outreach strategy that considers the public participation goal and the promise to the public for each public outreach tool. IAP2 stands for International Association of Public Participation. It is a professional association for public involvement specialists.

---

### **Participation Tools**

#### **Availability Sessions/Open Houses**

Availability sessions and open houses are informal meetings in a public location where people can talk to involved officials on a one-to-one basis. The meetings allow citizens to ask questions and express their concerns directly to project staff. This type of gathering is helpful in accommodating individual schedules. Citizens can find out more about all sides of a permitting issue through conversations with agency officials, facility staff, and representatives of involved interest groups and civic organizations.

#### **Citizen Advisory Committee**

A local Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) may be formed for MPO planning activities, either as a standing committee to be used on an ongoing basis or an ad hoc committee for a specific plan or study. The CAC provides input from citizens representing potentially affected areas or special interest groups and may make recommendations to the elected officials.

#### **Comment Form**

Comment forms are often used to solicit public comment on specific issues presented at a workshop, open house, or other public meeting or hearing. For example, a comment form may ask for comments on specific alignment alternatives considered during a corridor study or may ask for a person's general feelings about any aspect of transportation.

#### **Contact Person or Office**

This is a designated staff member who is responsible for responding to questions and inquiries from the public and the media. The MPO may distribute lists of contact persons who are responsible for answering questions in certain topic areas.

**Focus Groups**

Focus groups involve an invited group of participants interacting with an experienced moderator. The focus group consists of screened participants, usually selected randomly from a targeted group or groups. The focus group provides qualitative feedback from the community. The MPO may want to consider focus groups to gauge public opinion before controversial activities or processes.

**Incentives**

Providing incentives for input or participation can be an effective tool for expanding outreach. While there may sometimes be restrictions on how this can be done, offering a simple incentive such as a chance to win a \$50 gift card to a local grocery store for participating in an online survey, or advertising that refreshments will be served at a public open house, can increase participation.

**Informal Meetings with Other Stakeholders**

Informal meetings are meetings the MPO may attend or host with individual stakeholder groups that have particular interest in an activity. Informal meetings allow interested citizens and local officials to discuss issues and concerns. Staff responsible for the facility receives first-hand information from interested community members, special interest groups, and elected officials, while citizens have the opportunity to ask questions and explore topics of interest regarding a project in question.

**Public Comment Period**

These are designated time periods in which citizens can formally review and comment on the agency's or facility's proposed course of action or decision. Comment periods for MPO activity is generally at least 30 days.

**Public Hearings**

These are public meetings used to solicit public comment on a project or issue being considered by the MPO. Hearings provide a formal setting for citizens to provide comments to the MPO or other decision-making body. They are recorded and transcribed for the record. All the major MPO activities, such as the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program and the Regional Transportation Plan, require a public hearing as part of the adoption process.

**Public Information Meetings**

The public information meeting is sometimes used after the close of the formal public comment period. The agency uses the comments received during the comment period as a gauge to indicate whether a public information meeting is needed. The meeting starts with all the players briefly explaining their role and process. Then, the meeting is opened for questions and comments from the audience, with staff on hand to provide answers. The success of a meeting like this depends on structure—an active, neutral, facilitator calls on those who wish to speak and keeps the meeting on track, making sure that all

attendees are subject to the same rules of conduct. A court reporter produces transcripts that become part of the official record of the application and are kept on file.

### **Public Meetings**

Public meetings are less formal than public hearings. The purpose of the meeting is to share information and discuss issues, not to make decisions. Due to their openness and flexibility, public meetings are preferable to hearings as a forum for discussing complex or detailed issues. Public meetings can be especially useful for allowing discussion before a public hearing and can be scheduled immediately before the hearing. Comments made during a public meeting do not become part of the official administrative record as they do during a hearing. Public meetings provide two-way communication, with community members asking questions and the permitting agency providing responses. Public meetings are open to everyone.

### **Public Outreach Strategy**

A public outreach strategy is developed for the update of each specific work product. It includes details, such as location and timing, about the core public involvement tools for the specific update as well as any additional tools, if appropriate and affordable. The public outreach strategy will be tailored to the unique aspects of the process, depending on the geographic scope, scale of the product update (e.g., major or minor), the type of projects included, the characteristics of affected communities, and the level of public interest.

### **Public Participation Plan**

A Public Participation Plan, sometimes called a public involvement plan, is an adopted document that directs the MPO regarding the core public involvement tools to use when developing the key MPO products. The purpose of the plan is to provide broad public participation during the development, review, and refinement of regional transportation programs.

### **Public Participation Spectrum**

The Spectrum of Public Participation (illustrated in Figure 1) was developed by the International Association of Public Participation (IAP2) to help clarify the role of the public in planning and decision-making, and how much influence the community has over planning or decision-making processes. It identifies five levels of public participation. The further to the right on the Spectrum, the more influence the community has over decisions, and each level can be appropriate depending on the context. The spectrum can be utilized as a valuable tool to help guide effective engagement in public planning.

**Figure 1: IAP2 Public Participation Spectrum**

---- Increasing impact on the decision ---->

	<b>Inform</b>	<b>Consult</b>	<b>Involve</b>	<b>Collaborate</b>	<b>Empower</b>
<b>Public Participation Goal</b>	To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives, opportunities and/or solutions.	To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decisions.	To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.	To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution.	To place final decision making in the hands of the public.
<b>Promise to the Public</b>	We will keep you informed.	We will keep you informed, listen to and acknowledge concerns and aspirations, and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.	We will work with you to ensure that your concerns and aspirations are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.	We will look to you for advice and innovation in formulating solutions and incorporate your advice and recommendations into the decisions to the maximum extent possible.	We will implement what you decide.

Copyright IAP2, used with permission

## Public Workshops

Workshops are seminars or gatherings of small groups of people, usually between 10 and 30, led by a small number of specialists with technical expertise in a specific area and may involve a site visit. In workshops, participants typically discuss a specific project or design where citizens comment on proposed response actions and receive information on the technical issues associated with the project. Experts may be invited to explain certain aspects of the project. Workshops may help to improve public understanding and to prevent or correct misconceptions. Workshops also may identify citizen concerns and encourage public input.

## Question and Answer Session

These sessions make knowledgeable staff available to stakeholders to discuss activities, projects, or issues. Question and answer sessions typically accompany a presentation, briefing, or meeting. Anyone at the event who needs more information will have the opportunity to speak with officials after the event. These sessions can be informal or formal.

## Quick Response Code

Known by the abbreviated term “QR code”, these are small designs consisting of black squares arranged in a square grid on a white background, which can be read by an imaging device, such as a camera. They can be utilized to quickly direct people (via a smartphone) to an online webpage, document, image, etc. Including a QR code on printed materials

linking to relevant content can be an effective tool for information dissemination. QR codes can be utilized to improve the effectiveness of many of the other tools in this toolkit, especially those involving printed materials.

### **Small Group Meetings**

Meetings with small groups that have an interest in projects such as planning studies. Meetings could be with homeowners or neighborhood groups, civic groups, special interest groups, or other groups of affected or interested parties. The meetings generally include a presentation by staff followed by a question/answer period. Staff follows up on questions and comments by responding back to the group and documenting the comments through meeting notes.

### **Speakers' Bureau Presentations**

This tool involves assembling and training a group of speakers available to make presentations upon request to committees, civic or interest groups, and other organizations. The speakers are primarily staff but may also include stakeholders and public officials. The format usually consists of a presentation, informational handouts, distribution of comment forms, and a discussion period. These presentations can be used for ongoing communication with key interested parties and part of concentrated outreach for large projects such as the update of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

### **Stakeholder and Community Interviews**

Stakeholder and community interviews are informal, face-to-face or telephone interviews held with local residents, elected officials, community groups, and other individuals to acquire information on citizen concerns and attitudes about a facility. The interviews may be conducted by facility staff, a citizen advisory committee, other volunteers, or public interest groups as part of the community assessment.

### **Surveys, Questionnaires, and Telephone Polls**

Surveys are used when very specific input from the public is desired. A survey can be used to ask very specific questions such as whether a person supports a specific alignment in a corridor study. Surveys may be either oral, printed, or digital, shared in person, by mail, or through electronic methods, and distributed either to specific segments of the community or to representative samples. Informal surveys can be a short questionnaire on the comment sheet, verbal at the sign-up table, or even asking meeting attendees a few questions to gauge the group's sentiment on an issue.

### **Symposiums**

The symposium is an intense, half to full day, in depth session or series of sessions with an invited group of participants who represent a comprehensive cross-section of the community who have a vital interest in the project or process. A series of symposiums is a way to achieve sustained public involvement over the course of a long project. The symposium expedites the exchange of information amongst interest groups, public officials, and staff. The format consists of in depth presentations of technical material

followed by discussion groups. The small group work can be designed to focus on a variety of things, such as brainstorming and ranking issues, or providing input on plan concepts and direction.

### **Task Force**

The task force is comprised of invited participants with a high level of knowledge about transportation planning and a willingness to commit to what is usually an extended meeting or series of meetings. The work of the task force is in depth and often technical in nature. The task force requires a high level of involvement on the part of both participants and staff but provides more extensive and in depth input than possible with outreach techniques that target the general public.

### **Technical Advisory Committee**

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) is a way to involve professionals other than staff who have particular expertise that enables them to provide input on the technical aspects of a study or planning activity. The TAC brings a citizen perspective to staff's technical function, broadening the perspective and helping to ensure the consideration of a wide array of interpretations and alternatives. The TAC generally is convened on an ad hoc basis for a specific project.

### **Town Hall Meetings**

These meeting formats are more informal than, for example board meetings, and open communication between the public and members of the representative organization. The main purpose of a town hall meeting is to develop open communication between the members and those individuals who control the organization or committee.

### **Visual Preference Survey**

The visual preference survey involves many citizens in a unique, interactive manner. Participants rate images of development and facilities based on their initial reaction. A primary goal of this technique is to offer “regular citizens” a way to participate by evaluating the desirable and undesirable physical, visual, and spatial features of transportation systems and development.

### **Webcasting**

Webcasting is a way of utilizing internet technology allowing an audience to choose from a list of news items and hear streaming audio and video presentations. This technique can be used to broadcast public meetings, integrate animated graphics to help explain a concept, or add text to an audio presentation. These techniques are also beneficial for those who are sight or hearing impaired.

### **Website**

General or project-specific websites offer an opportunity for public input that is flexible and not staff intensive. The general MPO website provides background information about the MPO, its activities, the transportation planning process, and opportunities for the



public to become involved. Project-specific websites can be used to display extensive information about individual projects, such as major MPO activities like the Regional Transportation Plan. These sites are used when project information is too extensive to be included on the MPO site.

---

## **Information Tools**

### **Briefings**

Briefings can be used to inform key stakeholders about the status of a project or corrective action; to provide them with materials such as technical studies and engineering designs. These in-person sessions usually precede release of information to the media or occur before a public meeting. Briefing key stakeholders is particularly important if an upcoming action might result in political controversy.

### **Broadcast Announcements and Advertisements**

Notices for public meetings or other information can be broadcast over radio or another medium. Providing notice via a paid TV advertisement or over a local cable TV station can be an effective way to disseminate information (see Metro Television). Information should be limited to the facts (e.g., time, date, location of the meeting). Some local access cable TV stations run a text-based community bulletin board, which may provide a useful way to distribute information.

### **Database and Distribution Lists**

MPO staff maintains a master database of all contacts, both business and public, on a continuous basis. The database includes committee membership, mailing information, phone and fax numbers, and e-mail and internet addresses. Mailing lists are both important databases and essential communication tools. Mailing lists ensure that concerned community members receive relevant information. The database is used for maintaining up-to-date committee membership lists, interested parties, special interest groups, homeowner's association contacts, and the newsletter mailing list. Mailing lists typically include concerned residents, elected officials, appropriate federal, state, and local government contacts, local media, organized environmental groups, civic, religious and community organizations, and local businesses. The database will be used to establish and maintain a list of e-mail contacts for electronic meeting notification and announcements. The database is used to enhance other public involvement activities.

### **Direct Mailings**

Used to announce upcoming meetings or activities or to provide information to a specific area or group of people. Direct mailings can be postcards, letters, or fliers. An area may be targeted for a direct mailing because of potential impacts from a project. Groups are targeted that may have an interest in a specific issue, for example, avid cyclists may be targeted for greenways and trail projects. Mailings may announce project-specific

meetings, public hearings, workshops, open houses, corridor studies, small-area studies, other planning studies, new publications, special events, or major activities.

### **Display Ads**

These ads are used to promote meetings that are not regularly scheduled, such as public workshops for the TIP, project specific meetings, or public hearings. They are published in the local section of the newspaper to reach a larger audience than those that typically read legal ads.

### **Door-to-Door Canvassing**

Door-to-door canvassing is a way to collect and distribute information by calling on community members individually and directly. The MPO may consider using this tool to interact with the community in situations where public interest is very high or in other situations where direct contact with citizens is essential. During these interactions, canvassers can field questions about activities, discuss concerns, and provide fact sheets or other materials. Some citizens may want to find out more about the activity by signing up for mailing lists or by attending an upcoming event.

### **eTIP**

In 2024 the MPO launched its online interactive electronic Transportation Improvement Program (eTIP). This is a public online resource for real-time, up to date MTIP project information in a simple, accessible, and user-friendly interface. Promotion and utilization of this tool for outreach associated with the regular and on-going MTIP amendment process helps provide valuable information to the public and other stakeholders. A link to this tool can be found on the MPO website.

### **Email Address for the MPO**

The MPO has an email address ([mpo@lcog.org](mailto:mpo@lcog.org)) to make it easier for citizens to contact the MPO with questions, requests for documents or other information, and to make informal and formal comments. Staff monitors the inbox, responds, and follows up further as appropriate to the nature of the contact.

### **Email Announcements**

Meeting announcements and MPO information is e-mailed to interested persons that have signed up to receive notifications. The e-mail can provide updates or announcements about corridor studies, small-area studies, other planning studies, regular meetings, public comment periods, public hearings, workshops, open houses, recruitment to fill openings on a Citizen Advisory Committee, and other major MPO activities.

### **Exhibits, Displays, Signs, and Bulletin Boards**

A variety of exhibits and displays can provide general information, such as introducing a large project, or specific information, such as about proposed land use strategies. Locations for the displays include community workshops, public locations such as a city

hall or permit center, open houses, or similar events designed to attract the public. Signs can be a useful means of public notice, especially for residents and neighbors of the facility or planned facility. Use of QR codes that can provide virtual access to relevant documents, questionnaires, plans, or other information, is recommended for exhibits and other physical media displays.

### **Existing Newsletters and Free Publications**

Placing a notice in a newsletter distributed by a local government, a civic or community organization, neighborhood association, or in other free publication (e.g., a paper that highlights local or community activities) is a generally inexpensive way to target a specific audience or segment of the community. Local governments, planning commissions, zoning boards, or utilities often distribute regular newsletters. Newsletters distributed by civic, trade, agricultural, religious, or community organizations can also disseminate information to interested readers at low cost.

### **Fact Sheets or Brochures**

Fact sheets or brochures provide summary information regarding MPO policy, process, programs, and projects. Fact sheets can be distributed at public meetings, on the MPO website, at grocery stores during the after-work rush, and in public places such as libraries and community centers. Individuals and special interest groups can request fact sheets directly from the MPO staff office or download them from the MPO website. The fact sheet or brochure should be citizen-friendly, brief, easy to read and understand, written for an eighth grade reading level, use direct to-the-point language free of acronyms and jargon, and include liberal use of graphics to help deliver the message.

### **Legal Advertisements**

The Oregon Public Meetings Law and federal transportation planning regulations require advertisement of any public meeting where a decision could be made or that may be attended by more than one elected official. The MPO advertises meetings of the Metropolitan Policy Committee or any other meetings that meet the requirements in Oregon law. The ads include the time, place, and agenda for any regular, special, or emergency meeting, along with contact information.

### **Logo**

A logo representing the MPO is used to identify products and publications of the MPO. A logo helps the public become familiar with the different activities of the MPO by providing a means of recognizing MPO products. The logo should be used on all MPO publications; including those developed by consultants working on MPO sponsored projects.

### **Media Coverage and News Conference**

News conferences are information sessions are held for representatives of the news media and may be open to the general public. News conferences provide all interested local media and members of the public with accurate information concerning important developments during an MPO-regulated process.

### **Metro Television**

Lane Council of Governments maintains a public access cable channel. In addition to rolling message scripts, Metro Television also broadcasts select meetings, both live and pre-recorded, and short informative programs about departmental activities or projects of interest to the entire population. Information about meetings of the MPO policy board is provided to Metro Television to be included in scrolling announcements. Metro TV is a TV channel administered by Lane Council of Governments.

### **Newsletters**

Newsletters, hard copy, or e-mail can be used for ongoing communication or for an as-needed project-specific basis. Distribution can be general or targeted. The general mailing list includes interested parties, municipalities, media, and other agencies. Citizens are added to the general distribution list by their own request. The newsletter can be used to highlight major MPO projects or activities, inform the public of upcoming decisions to be made by the MPO or other agencies, promote regular and special meetings, alternatives being proposed in an area, planning studies, publications, and work products.

### **Newspaper Advertisements or Inserts**

Traditionally, public notices have often appeared as legal advertisements in the classified section of a newspaper. Display advertisements offer an advantage since they are larger, easier to read, and are more likely to be seen by the casual reader. Inserts stand out from other newspaper advertisements since they come as a “loose” section of the newspaper. Using texture or shapes works well to set an insert apart from other text or advertising.

### **Notice to Interested Parties**

There are a few different types of notices. An introductory notice explains the agency process for applications, participation, etc. It may also explain a review process or the corrective action process and the opportunities for public participation in that process. A notice of decision presents the agency decisions regarding projects, processes, or modifications to incorporate changes such as a corrective action remedy.

### **Overview Video**

An informational video describing a project or work product, its goals, and conveying the values, needs and priorities to address. Videos can be an effective outreach tool that can broaden engagement efforts and can easily be shared on social media.

### **Pre-Existing Stakeholder Meetings and Functions**

Permitting agencies, facilities, local governments, and environmental organizations, religious and civic groups may all hold meetings or other gatherings during a citizen involvement process. Some may be required by regulation and others may be informational meetings or discussions of important issues. Much can be learned about the views of other stakeholders by attending their meetings. Often, there are

opportunities to join in important discussions and provide information. Some groups will invite the guest organization to give a presentation or a briefing.

### **Posters and Flyers**

Posters and flyers are used to announce meetings and events and are displayed at public places such as city halls, libraries, the interior of buses, and community centers. They also may be inserted into another publication, such as a neighborhood newsletter. The announcement may contain a brief description of the purpose of the meeting, the time, location, and contact information. Posters and flyers may be used to reach a large audience that cannot be reached using direct mailings or newsletters.

### **Press Releases and Press Kits**

Press releases are statements that the MPO sends to the news media. They are used to publicize progress or key milestones in the MPO process. Press releases can effectively and quickly disseminate information to large numbers of people. They also may be used to announce public meetings, report the results of public meetings or studies, and describe how citizen concerns were considered in the permit decision or corrective action. Press kits consist of a packet of relevant information that your organization distributes to reporters, or it may be a collection of information shared via email or other digital means. The public information officer of an organization is often the lead staff for media contacts.

### **Public Service Announcements**

Radio and television stations often broadcast, without charge, a certain number of announcements on behalf of charities, government agencies, and community groups. In particular, they are likely to run announcements of public meetings, events, or other opportunities for the public to participate. One drawback with a public service announcement is that you have no guarantee that it will go on the air, and if it does, it may come at odd hours when fewer people are listening.

### **Response to Comments**

Often called a Comments and Response Summary, it documents, describes, or summarizes, and responds to the comments received during a formal public comment period. It may include staff recommendations to decision-makers for changing the draft project or document in response to the comment, and the reason for those changes. The response to comments should be written in a clear and understandable style so that it is easy for the community to understand the reasons for the final decision and how public comments were considered.

### **Tabling Events**

Staffing an information table at public events can be an effective method for sharing information and for helping to introduce the MPO and their work to the community. The audience at tabling events are typically members of the public that don't know much

about the MPO's current projects. This can be a great way to engage and notify the public of specific upcoming opportunities for participation.

#### **Presentations: Videos, PowerPoint, and Slide Shows**

Videos, PowerPoint presentations, and slide shows can be used as informational tools and to document public involvement events. They help improve public understanding of the issues associated with a permitting or corrective action. They can be broadcast on Metro Television, shown at public involvement events such as workshops, shown to citizen groups, be part of presentation to public officials, and used for speakers' bureau presentations. These graphic tools are an effective way to stretch staff resources in making presentations and help generate interest in the topic.

#### **Social Media**

Social media refers to an internet-based application in which individuals create, share, and exchange information through virtual communities and networks. Social media differs from traditional media in many ways, including quality, reach, frequency, usability, permanence, and immediacy. This form of outreach is ideal for disseminating concise and basic information to large and diverse audiences, for little cost. Social media platforms may be particularly effective in communicating with younger members of the public.

#### **Webcasting**

Webcasting is a way of utilizing internet technology allowing an audience to choose from a list of news items and hear streaming audio and video presentations. This technique can be used to broadcast public meetings, integrate animated graphics to help explain a concept, or add text to an audio presentation. These techniques are also beneficial for those who are sight or hearing impaired.

#### **Website Notice**

The agency website is continually maintained and updated by MPO staff. The site is used to promote regular and special meetings, planning studies, publications, and work products.

## Appendix D

-Consistency with Federal and State Regulations

-Addressing Federal Regulations for Interested Parties, Participation, and Consultation

-Relevant Excerpts from Federal and State Regulations and Policies



*Intentionally left blank*



## **Consistency with Federal and State Regulations**

Federal and state regulations require that a public involvement process be a part of any transportation planning program or project. Central Lane MPO's public involvement process complies with all applicable federal and state requirements.

### **Federal**

Under Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Department of Transportation (DOT) regulations (included later in this appendix), the public must be involved in transportation planning and decision-making at both the state and regional levels. The MPO is responsible for ensuring that the public is involved in regional planning programs and projects.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 requires that federal-aid recipients prevent discrimination in all programs, whether these programs are federally funded or not, on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, disability, age, and income status. Building on Title VI, a 1994 Executive Order directed federal-aid recipients to make environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high, and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations.

Central Lane MPO implements strategies that ensure that there are no barriers to citizen involvement and that minority and low-income populations are engaged in transportation decision-making. The RTP lists agencies and organizations throughout the metropolitan planning area that provide services to Title VI protected communities. These agencies and organizations enhance the public involvement techniques to engage all segments of the public. To learn more about how Central Lane MPO addresses these requirements, see the MPO's Title VI and Environmental Justice Plan available on the Central Lane MPO website.

### **State**

While the MPO transportation system planning process is not subject to the requirements of the statewide land use planning system, it is consistent with those requirements. The Transportation Planning Rule, which implements Statewide Planning Goal 12 (Transportation) requires the development of a citizen involvement program that ensures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process and requires regional transportation system planning to include a process for citizen involvement if the project development involves land use decision-making. See Statewide Planning Goals 1 and 12 later in this appendix.

The Oregon Public Meetings Law (included later in this appendix) requires that: all meetings of governing bodies covered by the law (which includes MPC) are open to the public; that the public be given notice of the time and place of the meetings; that meetings be accessible to everyone, including people with disabilities; and that minutes

be made available to the public within a reasonable time that indicate the substance of the deliberations, decisions, and reference any information upon which such decisions are made.

The MPO coordinates with the State in its planning process activities, including data collection, development of the RTP, the adoption of performance targets, and the cooperative process of developing the MTIP and STIP. The State relies on information, studies, and analyses provided by the MPO for portions of the transportation system located in the MPO area.

## **Addressing Federal Regulations**

### **TITLE 23 UNITED STATES CODE—HIGHWAYS**

#### **CHAPTER I—FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

\*\*\*The text in blue has been added by the MPO. It explains how each of the requirements of 23 CFR 450.316 have been met.

#### **Sec. 450.316 Interested parties, participation, and consultation.**

(a) The MPO shall develop and use a documented participation plan that defines a process for providing individuals, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, public ports, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation (including intercity bus operators, employer-based commuting programs, such as carpool program, vanpool program, transit benefit program, parking cash-out program, shuttle program, or telework program), representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with reasonable opportunities to be involved in the metropolitan transportation planning process.

(1) The MPO shall develop the participation plan in consultation with all interested parties and shall, at a minimum, describe explicit procedures, strategies, and desired outcomes for:

CLMPO's 2024 Public Participation Plan was developed following the plan's own Policy 3.3 "Ensure the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the MPO decision-making process." And 3.3(a) "Seek participation and comment from all segments of the public. In accordance with the federal transportation act , "provide citizens, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation, representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the transportation plan using the participation plan developed under §450.316(a)."

Extensive outreach efforts in the development of the plan are documented including those targeted toward Title VI protected populations. These included social media campaigns, Spanish translation services, poster distribution, utilization of QR codes, incentivized online survey, two open house events (one in-person, the other virtual), interviews with targeted advocacy groups, clubs, and organizations representing a wide variety of population segments, outreach and consultation with FLMAs, tribal representatives, groups representing housing, bike/ped, youth, elderly, LGBTQ+, and others.

(i) Providing adequate public notice of public participation activities and time for public review and comment at key decision points, including a reasonable opportunity to comment on the proposed metropolitan transportation plan and the TIP;

CLMPO's 2024 Public Participation Plan: This is addressed in the Product-Specific Public Outreach Strategy section both generally, and specifically for the RTP and the MTIP, including timely notice to interested parties (including FLMAs, tribal gov'ts, and others), web notice, social media postings, at least a 30-day public comment period, a public hearing, and materials readily accessible online for public review. The Citizen's Guide online publication of the CLMPO provides a public-friendly and easy to understand explanation of the regional planning process including when key decision points take place, when to provide input, and even tips on providing effective comments or testimony.

(ii) Providing timely notice and reasonable access to information about transportation issues and processes;

CLMPO's 2024 Public Participation Plan: The plan section titled "Getting the Word Out About Upcoming Public Involvement Events" Provides several avenues for the public to find out about opportunities to participate in the planning process. All public meetings are advertised on the MPO website with links to agendas and materials provided at least 1 week in advance. The 2024 plan update includes strategies for effective utilization of social media, QR codes, virtual platforms, and other tools to better engage and inform the public in a timely manner.

Policy 1.4: "Provide adequate public notice of opportunities for public involvement. Publish and update a timeline with clearly indicated decision points, priority actions, and milestones of each MPO transportation planning activity for which public input is desired. Make this timeline available both on the website and, upon request, by mail or email to a list of interested parties. Explain the basis for decisions, such as criteria or policies. Public notice shall be made as far in advance as feasible in each situation."

(iii) Employing visualization techniques to describe metropolitan transportation plans and TIPs;

CLMPO's 2024 Public Participation Plan: The Citizen's Guide online publication of the CLMPO provides a public-friendly and easy to understand explanation of the regional planning process including a colorful graphic illustrating how the RTP and TIP are created.

Policy 1.5: "Use visualization techniques such as an interactive map on the MPO website to describe plans and programs, and demonstrate the relationship among projects, plans, and regional transportation planning."

(iv) Making public information (technical information and meeting notices) available in electronically accessible formats and means, such as the World Wide Web;

CLMPO's 2024 Public Participation Plan: All public meetings are advertised on the MPO website with links to agendas and materials provided at least 1 week in advance. The 2024 plan update includes strategies for effective utilization of social media, QR codes, virtual platforms, and other tools to better engage and inform the public in a timely manner. The 2024 plan also introduces the online eTIP platform as an effective tool for providing the public with a simple and accessible means of looking up real-time project information and learning about what's happening in the region and in their neighborhood.

Policy 1.1: "Make available contact information, calendars, announcements, meeting agendas, publications, and work products online..."

Policy 1.6: "Maintain updated information about MPO programs and projects through a website..."

Policy 2.5: "Make available to the public all records pertaining to the decisions made by these bodies through the MPO website..."

(v) Holding any public meetings at convenient and accessible locations and times;

CLMPO 2024 Public Participation Plan: Policy 2.6 Schedule meetings and hearings of the MPO policy board and Transportation Planning Committee (TPC) to allow the best opportunity for participation by the public. The MPO utilizes technology to allow virtual (online) participation at many of its public

meetings. MPO Policy Board meetings are broadcast live through Metro TV (a service of LCOG) and are rebroadcast in the evenings.

Policy 1.2: “Hold public meetings, when feasible, at a time and location convenient to citizens and other interested parties potentially affected by a transportation planning action.”

Policy 2.6: “Schedule meetings and hearings of the MPO policy board and Transportation Planning Committee (TPC) to allow the best opportunity for participation by the public.”

(vi) Demonstrating explicit consideration and response to public input received during the development of the metropolitan transportation plan and the TIP;

CLMPO’s 2024 Public Participation Plan: Appendices include all comments received through the various outreach and engagement efforts, as well as a summary of key takeaways from input received and how that input resulted in changes to the plan. Both the current RTP (2045) and MTIP (2024-2027) specifically address public input received during the development of those documents and each provides a summary of input and a listing of comments as appropriate.

Policy 2.2: “Give explicit consideration of all significant written and oral comments gathered through the public involvement process and interagency consultation. Make this testimony and response publicly available in a timely fashion to inform and provide opportunities for further citizen response. For the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP), include a summary, analysis, and report in the final plans. Provide a time period between the end of the public comment period and the meeting at which the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) makes a decision on the product sufficient for input to be discussed and revisions to be made prior to adoption.”

(vii) Seeking out and considering the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems, such as low-income and minority households, who may face challenges accessing employment and other services;

CLMPO’s 2024 Public Participation Plan addresses specifically how outreach to Title VI and other traditionally underserved communities is carried out. Some of those efforts include targeted outreach to non-profit organizations and advocacy groups representing those populations, telephone interviews, Spanish translation of outreach materials, and other methods. The survey effort included collection of demographic information of respondents. This information suggests that the MPO’s efforts to reach out specifically to the elderly, disabled, non-English speaking, and racial minority populations were effective. Specific evaluation measures are included in the plan to continue to monitor effectiveness of these methods for considering the needs of the traditionally underserved.

Policy 1.3: “Ensure that broad cross-sections of the public, including traditionally underserved households such as minority, non-English speaking, and low-income, are notified when opportunities for public input are approaching. Maintain a minimum contact list and expand that list to include specific target audiences, when appropriate to the planning action. Use a facilitator or translators, as needed, to ensure that all populations have a voice.”

(viii) Providing an additional opportunity for public comment, if the final metropolitan transportation plan or TIP differs significantly from the version that was made available for public comment by the MPO and raises new material issues that interested parties could not reasonably have foreseen from the public involvement efforts;

CLMPO's 2024 Public Participation Plan mentions explicitly, in the Product-Specific Public Outreach Strategy section, that for both the RTP and MTIP, additional opportunity for public comment will be provided under the conditions mentioned above.

(ix) Coordinating with the statewide transportation planning public involvement and consultation processes under [subpart B of this part](#); and

CLMPO's 2024 Public Participation Plan: under the section titled "Consistency with Regulations", this is specifically addressed under the "State" subsection. The MPO coordinates with the State in its planning process activities, including data collection, development of the RTP, the adoption of performance targets, and the cooperative process of developing the MTIP and STIP. The State relies on information, studies, and analyses provided by the MPO for portions of the transportation system located in the MPO area.

(x) Periodically reviewing the effectiveness of the procedures and strategies contained in the participation plan to ensure a full and open participation process.

CLMPO's 2024 Public Participation Plan Evaluation chapter describes how evaluation of the plan is to take place periodically and is recommended every four years. Specific measures are identified for quantifying effectiveness of specified outreach tools. This section has been greatly expanded from previous plans.

Policy 3.1: "Evaluate the response to public involvement techniques including analysis of the region's population, income, language preference, ethnic status, and other demographic factors. Periodically, adjust strategies to improve performance."

Policy 3.2: "Review the Public Participation Plan (PPP) periodically and adopt revisions as necessary."

(2) When significant written and oral comments are received on the draft metropolitan transportation plan and TIP (including the financial plans) as a result of the participation process in this section or the interagency consultation process required under the EPA transportation conformity regulations ([40 CFR part 93, subpart A](#)), a summary, analysis, and report on the disposition of comments shall be made as part of the final metropolitan transportation plan and TIP.

CLMPO's 2024 Public Participation Plan explicitly states in the Product Specific Outreach Strategy section that "when significant comments are received on the draft RTP or MTIP (including the financial plans) as a result of the participation process or the interagency consultation for air quality conformity, a summary, analysis, and report on the disposition of comments shall be made as part of the final RTP or MTIP."

Policy 2.2: "Give explicit consideration of all significant written and oral comments gathered through the public involvement process and interagency consultation. Make this testimony and response publicly available in a timely fashion to inform and provide opportunities for further citizen response. For the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP), include a summary, analysis, and report in the final plans. Provide a time period between the end of the public comment period and the meeting at which the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) makes a decision on the product sufficient for input to be discussed and revisions to be made prior to adoption."

(3) A minimum public comment period of 45 calendar days shall be provided before the initial or revised participation plan is adopted by the MPO. Copies of the approved participation plan shall be provided to the FHWA and the FTA for informational purposes and shall be posted on the World Wide Web, to the maximum extent practicable.

CLMPO's 2024 Public Participation Plan, the MPO provides the approved plan to FHWA and FTA upon adoption by the MPO policy board. The plan will be posted to the MPO website and made publicly available as per Policy 1.1. The plan can be accessed on the MPO website [here](#).

Policy 1.1: "Ensure that information describing transportation planning processes is readily and publicly accessible. Make available ... publications, and work products online..."

Policy 3.2: "A 45-day comment period shall be provided before adoption or revision of the plan."

(b) In developing metropolitan transportation plans and TIPs, the MPO should consult with agencies and officials responsible for other planning activities within the MPA that are affected by transportation (including State and local planned growth, economic development, tourism, natural disaster risk reduction, environmental protection, airport operations, or freight movements) or coordinate its planning process (to the maximum extent practicable) with such planning activities. In addition, the MPO shall develop the metropolitan transportation plans and TIPs with due consideration of other related planning activities within the metropolitan area, and the process shall provide for the design and delivery of transportation services within the area that are provided by:

- (1) Recipients of assistance under title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53;
- (2) Governmental agencies and non-profit organizations (including representatives of the agencies and organizations) that receive Federal assistance from a source other than the U.S. Department of Transportation to provide non-emergency transportation services; and
- (3) Recipients of assistance under [23 U.S.C. 201–204](#).

CLMPO's 2024 Public Participation Plan explicitly addresses 23 CFR 450.316(b) in the Product-Specific Public Outreach Strategy section, confirming that this is the case with the development of the RTP and MTIP.

Policy 3.3: "Ensure the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the MPO decision-making process. (a) Seek participation and comment from all segments of the public. In accordance with the federal transportation act , "provide citizens, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation, representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the transportation plan using the participation plan developed under §450.316(a)."

(c) When the MPA includes Indian Tribal lands, the MPO shall appropriately involve the Indian Tribal government(s) in the development of the metropolitan transportation plan and the TIP.

CLMPO's 2024 Public Participation Plan addresses this directly in the "Tribal Government Consultation" section of the plan. Although there are no Federally recognized Indian Tribal Lands within the MPO boundaries, Central Lane MPO recognizes the importance of inviting the participation of members of the public and tribal representatives that can offer additional perspectives that might otherwise be missed. Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians and the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians are each contacted during the RTP and MTIP update period to determine their interest in participating in the update, the extent they would like to participate and the means of receiving information and commenting on the draft documents. In addition to these groups, Central Lane MPO has also reached out to the University of Oregon Tribal Government Relations and Lane Community College Native American Student Program for consultation and coordination as planning products are developed.

(d) When the MPA includes Federal public lands, the MPO shall appropriately involve the Federal land management agencies in the development of the metropolitan transportation plan and the TIP.

CLMPO's 2024 Public Participation Plan addresses this directly in the "Federal Land Management Agency Consultation" section of the plan. Central Lane MPO includes lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM); these consist of a handful of wetland parcels near the MPO's southwestern boundary, adjacent to Highway 126, and portions of two forested parcels on the extreme eastern boundary of the MPO, south of Highway 126, which are Oregon and California Railroad Revested Lands. Representatives of the BLM's Northwestern Oregon District Office, which oversees these properties, were contacted, and involved as part of the development of this Public Participation Plan and are consulted during the development of the RTP and MTIP.

Some lands in the area surrounding, but outside of, the MPO are managed by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE manages lands within 0.3 miles from the MPO's western boundary) and the United States Forest Service (USFS manages lands within 12 miles from the MPO's eastern boundary). The MPO maintains a list of appropriate, confirmed, contacts at the BLM, USACE, and USFS and includes these agencies in notifications related to the development of key MPO products.

(e) MPOs shall, to the extent practicable, develop a documented process(es) that outlines roles, responsibilities, and key decision points for consulting with other governments and agencies, as defined in [paragraphs \(b\), \(c\), and \(d\)](#) of this section, which may be included in the agreement(s) developed under [§ 450.314](#).

The MPO has developed a Metropolitan Planning Agreement that satisfies this requirement. It can be accessed on the MPO website [here](#).



## **Relevant Excerpts from Federal and State Regulations and Policies**

EXERPT FROM

### **TITLE 23 UNITED STATES CODE—HIGHWAYS CHAPTER I—FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

#### **Sec. 450.324 Development and content of the metropolitan transportation plan.**

(j) The MPO shall provide individuals, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, public ports, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation (including intercity bus operators, employer-based commuting programs, such as carpool program, vanpool program, transit benefit program, parking cashout program, shuttle program, or telework program), representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the transportation plan using the participation plan developed under [§ 450.316\(a\)](#).

(k) The MPO shall publish or otherwise make readily available the metropolitan transportation plan for public review, including (to the maximum extent practicable) in electronically accessible formats and means, such as the World Wide Web.

#### **Sec. 450.326 Development and content of the transportation improvement program (TIP).**

(b) The MPO shall provide all interested parties with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the proposed TIP as required by [§ 450.316\(a\)](#). In addition, in nonattainment area TMAs, the MPO shall provide at least one formal public meeting during the TIP development process, which should be addressed through the participation plan described in [§ 450.316\(a\)](#). In addition, the MPO shall publish or otherwise make readily available the TIP for public review, including (to the maximum extent practicable) in electronically accessible formats and means, such as the World Wide Web, as described in [§ 450.316\(a\)](#).

#### **Sec. 450.328 TIP revisions and relationship to the STIP.**

(a) An MPO may revise the TIP at any time under procedures agreed to by the cooperating parties consistent with the procedures established in this part for its development and approval. In nonattainment or maintenance areas for transportation-related pollutants, if a TIP amendment involves non-exempt projects (per [40 CFR part 93](#)), or is replaced with an updated TIP, the MPO and the FHWA and the FTA must make a new conformity determination. In all areas, changes that affect fiscal constraint must take place by amendment of the TIP. The MPO shall use public participation procedures consistent with [§ 450.316\(a\)](#) in revising the TIP, except that these procedures are not required for administrative modifications.

#### **Sec. 450.334 Annual listing of obligated projects.**

(c) The listing shall be published or otherwise made available in accordance with the MPO's public participation criteria for the TIP.

EXCERPT FROM

**CHAPTER 53 OF TITLE 49—UNITED STATES CODE**  
**AS AMENDED BY MOVING AHEAD FOR PROGRESS IN THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY**  
**SECTION 5303—METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING**  
**Subpart 6—Participation by Interested Parties**

**Sec. 5303 Metropolitan Transportation Planning**

(6) Participation by interested parties.—

(A) In general.—Each metropolitan planning organization shall provide citizens, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, public ports, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation (including intercity bus operators, employer-based commuting programs, such as a carpool program, vanpool program, transit benefit program, parking cash-out program, shuttle program, or telework program), representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, affordable housing organizations, and other interested parties with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the transportation plan.

(B) Contents of participation plan.—A participation plan—

- (i) shall be developed in consultation with all interested parties; and
- (ii) shall provide that all interested parties have reasonable opportunities to comment on the contents of the transportation plan.

(C) Methods.—In carrying out subparagraph (A), the metropolitan planning organization shall, to the maximum extent practicable—

- (i) hold any public meetings at convenient and accessible locations and times;
- (ii) employ visualization techniques to describe plans; and
- (iii) make public information available in electronically accessible format and means, such as the World Wide Web, as appropriate to afford reasonable opportunity for consideration of public information under subparagraph (A).

(D) Use of technology.—A metropolitan planning organization may use social media and other web-based tools—

- (i) to further encourage public participation; and
- (ii) to solicit public feedback during the transportation planning process.

EXCERPT FROM

**TITLE 23—HIGHWAYS**

**CHAPTER I—FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF  
TRANSPORTATION**

**PART 450—PLANNING ASSISTANCE AND STANDARDS**

**Subpart B—Statewide Transportation Planning and Programming**

**Sec. 450.210 Interested parties, public involvement, and consultation**

(a) In carrying out the statewide transportation planning process, including development of the long-range statewide transportation plan and the STIP, the State shall develop and use a documented public involvement process that provides opportunities for public review and comment at key decision points.

(1) The State's public involvement process at a minimum shall:

(i) Establish early and continuous public involvement opportunities that provide timely information about transportation issues and decision making processes to individuals, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, public ports, freight shippers, private providers of transportation (including intercity bus operators), representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, providers of freight transportation services, and other interested parties;

(ii) Provide reasonable public access to technical and policy information used in the development of the long-range statewide transportation plan and the STIP;

(iii) Provide adequate public notice of public involvement activities and time for public review and comment at key decision points, including a reasonable opportunity to comment on the proposed long-range statewide transportation plan and STIP;

(iv) To the maximum extent practicable, ensure that public meetings are held at convenient and accessible locations and times;

(v) To the maximum extent practicable, use visualization techniques to describe the proposed long-range statewide transportation plan and supporting studies;

(vi) To the maximum extent practicable, make public information available in electronically accessible format and means, such as the World Wide Web, as appropriate to afford reasonable opportunity for consideration of public information;

(vii) Demonstrate explicit consideration and response to public input during the development of the long-range statewide transportation plan and STIP;

(viii) Include a process for seeking out and considering the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems, such as low-income and minority households, who may face challenges accessing employment and other services; and

(ix) Provide for the periodic review of the effectiveness of the public involvement process to ensure that the process provides full and open access to all interested parties and revise the process, as appropriate.

(2) The State shall provide for public comment on existing and proposed processes for public involvement in the development of the long-range statewide transportation plan and the STIP. At a minimum, the State shall allow 45 calendar days for public review and written comment before the procedures and any major revisions to existing procedures are adopted. The State shall provide copies of the approved public involvement process document(s) to the FHWA and the FTA for informational purposes.

(3) With respect to the setting of targets, nothing in this part precludes a State from considering comments made as part of the State's public involvement process.

(b) The State shall provide for nonmetropolitan local official participation in the development of the long-range statewide transportation plan and the STIP. The State shall have a documented process(es) for cooperating with nonmetropolitan local officials representing units of general purpose local government and/or local officials with responsibility for transportation that is separate and discrete from the public involvement process and provides an opportunity for their participation in the development of the long-range statewide transportation plan and the STIP. Although the FHWA and the FTA shall not review or approve this cooperative process(es), the State shall provide copies of the process document(s) to the FHWA and the FTA for informational purposes.

(1) At least once every 5 years, the State shall review and solicit comments from nonmetropolitan local officials and other interested parties for a period of not less than 60 calendar days regarding the effectiveness of the cooperative process and any proposed changes. The State shall direct a specific request for comments to the State association of counties, State municipal league, regional planning agencies, or directly to nonmetropolitan local officials.

(2) The State, at its discretion, is responsible for determining whether to adopt any proposed changes. If a proposed change is not adopted, the State shall make publicly available its reasons for not accepting the proposed change, including notification to nonmetropolitan local officials or their associations.

(c) For each area of the State under the jurisdiction of an Indian Tribal government, the State shall develop the long-range statewide transportation plan and STIP in consultation with the Tribal government and the Secretary of the Interior. States shall, to the extent practicable, develop a documented process(es) that outlines roles, responsibilities, and key decision points for consulting with Indian Tribal governments and Department of the Interior in the development of the long-range statewide transportation plan and the STIP.

(d) To carry out the transportation planning process required by this section, a Governor may establish and designate RTPOs to enhance the planning, coordination, and implementation of the long-range statewide transportation plan and STIP, with an emphasis on addressing the needs of nonmetropolitan areas of the State. In order to be treated as an RTPO for purposes of this Part, any existing regional planning organization must be established and designated as an RTPO under this section.

(1) Where established, an RTPO shall be a multijurisdictional organization of nonmetropolitan local officials or their designees who volunteer for such organization and representatives of local transportation systems who volunteer for such organization.

(2) An RTPO shall establish, at a minimum:

(i) A policy committee, the majority of which shall consist of nonmetropolitan local officials, or their designees, and, as appropriate, additional representatives from the State, private business, transportation service providers, economic development practitioners, and the public in the region; and

(ii) A fiscal and administrative agent, such as an existing regional planning and development organization, to provide professional planning, management, and administrative support.

(3) The duties of an RTPO shall include:

(i) Developing and maintaining, in cooperation with the State, regional long-range multimodal transportation plans;

(ii) Developing a regional TIP for consideration by the State;

(iii) Fostering the coordination of local planning, land use, and economic development plans with State, regional, and local transportation plans and programs;

(iv) Providing technical assistance to local officials;

(v) Participating in national, multistate, and State policy and planning development processes to ensure the regional and local input of nonmetropolitan areas;

(vi) Providing a forum for public participation in the statewide and regional transportation planning processes;

(vii) Considering and sharing plans and programs with neighboring RTPOs, MPOs, and, where appropriate, Indian Tribal Governments; and

(viii) Conducting other duties, as necessary, to support and enhance the statewide planning process under [§ 450.206](#).

(4) If a State chooses not to establish or designate an RTPO, the State shall consult with affected

EXCERPT FROM

**OREGON ADMINISTRATIVE RULES**

**Chapter 660 Division 12<sup>11</sup>**

**Land Conservation and Development Department**

**Statewide Planning Goal 12: Transportation**

660-012-0050

Transportation Project Development

(2) Regional TSPs shall provide for coordinated project development among affected local governments. The process shall include:

(a) Designation of a lead agency to prepare and coordinate project development;

(b) A process for citizen involvement, including public notice and hearing, if project development involves land use decision-making. The process shall include notice to affected transportation facility and service providers, MPOs, and ODOT;

...

---

<sup>11</sup> See the complete OAR language for Statewide Planning Goal 12 [here](#)

**OREGON ADMINISTRATIVE RULES**  
**Chapter 660 Division 15**  
**Oregon's Statewide Planning Goals and Guidelines**

**Statewide Planning Goal 1: Citizen Involvement**

660-015-0000(1)

To develop a citizen involvement program that insures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process.

The governing body charged with preparing and adopting a comprehensive plan shall adopt and publicize a program for citizen involvement that clearly defines the procedures by which the general public will be involved in the ongoing land-use planning process.

The citizen involvement program shall be appropriate to the scale of the planning effort. The program shall provide for continuity of citizen participation and of information that enables citizens to identify and comprehend the issues.

Federal, state and regional agencies, and special- purpose districts shall coordinate their planning efforts with the affected governing bodies and make use of existing local citizen involvement programs established by counties and cities.

The citizen involvement program shall incorporate the following components:

Citizen Involvement - To provide for widespread citizen involvement.

Communication - To assure effective two-way communication with citizens.

Citizen Influence - To provide the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process.

Technical Information - To assure that technical information is available in an understandable form.

Feedback Mechanisms - To assure that citizens will receive a response from policy-makers.

Financial Support - To insure funding for the citizen involvement program.

EXERPT FROM

## **OREGON TRANSPORTATION PLAN, 2023**

### **5.1 Oregon Transportation Plan Policy Framework**

#### **Center Equity**

Transportation decisions have disproportionately impacted certain communities and populations, leading to disparities in access to and the safety of the transportation system. These decisions have also affected neighborhoods, economic development, and air quality for generations. The OTP identifies these issues and sheds light on the need to address disparities. OTP policies focus on creating a more equitable transportation system and outcomes, such as increasing access to travel options and reducing travel costs. The OTP calls for the removal of barriers to access and participation in making decisions, ensuring that diverse voices and broad perspectives are engaged in each phase of decision making.

#### **6.2 Goal: Social Equity**

Improve access to safe and affordable transportation for all, recognizing the unmet mobility needs of people who have been systemically excluded and underserved. Create an equitable and transparent engagement and communications decision-making structure that builds public trust.

Objective SE.1 Recognize past harms and remove barriers to inclusion and opportunity.

Policy SE.1.1 Acknowledge the role of Oregon’s history in altering the landscape, traditions, communities, and trajectory-of-prosperity for Indigenous people, federally recognized Tribes, and nations, and — through collaboration — elevate the quality of transportation for Indigenous people and Tribal governments.

Strategy SE.1.1.1 Consult with all of Oregon’s nine federally recognized Tribes to develop formal agreements to explicitly address benefits and burdens of transportation policies and investment priorities upon Tribal communities. Do this in coordination with established engagement channels.

Strategy SE.1.1.2 Ensure emerging technology issues, in particular, are understood and addressed when consulting with Oregon’s federally recognized Tribes.

Policy SE.1.2 Document the impact of past decisions on current inequities and develop restorative strategies to shape future investments.

Strategy SE.1.2.1 Identify partnerships and resources to document harm that resulted from past transportation decisions.

Strategy SE.1.2.2 Develop a statewide approach to equity mapping as a resource for prioritizing transportation decisions.

Strategy SE.1.2.3 Use data to craft strategies that address harm for communities negatively impacted by past decisions.

Policy SE.1.3 Understand and reflect the perspectives and diversity of Oregon within decision-making structures.

Strategy SE.1.3.1 Seek direct input regarding each community’s unique cultural experiences and acknowledge how they impact their transportation needs, access, and options.



Strategy SE.1.3.2 Recruit and manage transportation agencies' employees, advisory committees, review boards, task forces, and other decision-making entities so that they reflect the intersecting identities and diversity of the communities they serve.

Policy SE.1.4 Improve access for transportation-vulnerable people with a focus on systemically excluded or underserved populations (populations with high numbers of BIPOC, Oregon's nine federally recognized Tribes, people experiencing low income, people living with one or more disabilities, seniors, youth, and rural residents).

Strategy SE.1.4.1 Identify communities underserved by walking, rolling, biking, transit, and micromobility travel options and areas where transit service levels are low.

Strategy SE.1.4.2 Prioritize investments for systemically excluded and underserved populations to reduce disparities in access to economic, recreation, and social destinations.

Objective SE.2 Make decisions through processes that are transparent, inclusive, and engaging to all people affected by the transportation system.

Policy SE.2.2 Inform and empower partners, particularly communities who have been systemically excluded or underserved, about opportunities and actions to influence open decision making.

Strategy SE.2.2.1 Communicate information and impacts to the public and partners in a clear and timely manner.

Strategy SE.2.2.2 Provide equitable access to information for communities across the state, considering communication platforms and information sources that are culturally responsive and accessible to all.

Strategy SE.2.2.3 Be inclusive, transparent, and clear about how equity tools (e.g., equity indices, frameworks, and processes) change decisions and influence outcomes.

#### **6.4 Goal: Stewardship of Public Resources**

Guided by open, data-driven decision-making processes, secure sufficient and reliable revenue for transportation funding and invest public resources to achieve a resilient and sustainable multimodal transportation system.

Objective SP.5 Conduct decision making and public involvement in a transparent and open manner.

Policy SP.5.1 Make decisions through transparent processes that are inclusive, engaging, and supported by data and analysis.

Strategy SP.5.1.1 Promote open data policies that enhance transparency and public trust.

Strategy SP.5.1.2 Use both demographic analysis and partner input to aid decision making.

Strategy SP.5.1.3 Systematically collect up-to-date transportation data that can be reasonably and appropriately acquired and managed for data-driven evaluation of programs and investments and support decision making.

Strategy SP.5.1.4 Provide data and project information to partners and the public in a usable and easily accessible way.

Policy SP.5.2 Define an open decision-making process based on accountability, transparency, and communication, and make clear how public input influences decision making.

Strategy SP.5.2.1 For each decision-making process, define the appropriate level of public involvement (e.g., inform, consult, involve, collaborate, or empower).

Strategy SP.5.2.2 Build capacity for public engagement within communities by building relationships with and investing in community-based organizations.

Strategy SP.5.2.3 Offer compensation to participants in public engagement processes to add the perspectives and voices of those who are otherwise unable to participate.

## STIP PUBLIC PARTICIPATION POLICIES

The Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) establishes the following policy and core implementation actions to assist in meeting state and federal public participation requirements for statewide planning processes and the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) development.

The OTC and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) are dedicated to the goal of developing an integrated, balanced, multimodal statewide transportation system that moves people, goods and services safely and efficiently throughout the state. Achieving this goal requires a unified transportation plan that incorporates general policies and addresses specific needs. In pursuit of this goal, ODOT has made a substantial commitment to planning and research. It is through this planning effort that future transportation needs will be met most effectively and efficiently.

The products of this planning effort are the statewide long-range transportation plan (the Oregon Transportation Plan and its supplemental plans) and the statewide transportation improvement program (the STIP).

In order to encourage public involvement in the development and major revision of Oregon's statewide long-range transportation plan and statewide transportation improvement program, ODOT is committed to providing public involvement processes which are "proactive and provide complete information, timely public notice, full public access to key decisions, and opportunities for early and continuing involvement." (*Statewide Planning; Metropolitan Planning 23 CFR 450.210(a)*)

### PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROCEDURES

ODOT will abide by all applicable state and federal laws in implementing its public involvement processes for the development and major revision of the statewide long range transportation plan and statewide transportation improvement program.

ODOT will follow the requirements of the Oregon Public Meetings Law (ORS 192.610 to 192.690) for all advisory committees appointed by or reporting to the OTC.

ODOT will maintain a broad based, statewide list of stakeholders—individuals and organizations who are interested in or affected by transportation decisions—including representatives of Indian tribal governments in Oregon and organizations that reach those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems.

ODOT will provide these stakeholders with timely information about transportation issues and adequate notice of key decision points leading to the development or major revision of the statewide long-range transportation plan and statewide transportation improvement program.

ODOT will provide reasonable public access as required by the Oregon Public Records Law (ORS 192.420 to 192.505) to technical and policy information used in the development or major revision of the statewide long-range transportation plan and statewide transportation improvement program. (Charges will be assessed per ODOT, Administrative Instruction #5).

ODOT will provide a 45-day public review of the proposed statewide long-range transportation plan, a 45-day public review of the proposed statewide transportation improvement program, and a 45-day public review of a major revision of either document following adoption of the plan or program by the OTC.

ODOT will provide statewide opportunities for public comment on the proposed statewide long-range transportation plan and proposed statewide transportation improvement program by scheduling at least two public meetings in each of ODOT's five regions prior to adoption of the plan or program by the OTC.

ODOT will work with metropolitan planning organizations to coordinate public involvement for the statewide long-range transportation plan and statewide transportation improvement program with public involvement for the metropolitan plan and transportation improvement program.

ODOT will consider all public comment on the proposed statewide long-range transportation plan and proposed statewide transportation improvement program prior to adoption of the plan or program by the OTC.

ODOT will publish and distribute the adopted statewide long-range transportation plan and statewide transportation improvement program.

ODOT will coordinate public involvement for the statewide long-range transportation plan and statewide transportation improvement program with public involvement for project development.

ODOT will submit the proposed public involvement policies and procedures contained in this document to a 45-day public review before their adoption by the OTC, and will submit a major revision of the adopted document to a 45-day public review.

ODOT will publish and distribute the adopted public involvement policies and procedures.

ODOT will review periodically the effectiveness of the public involvement policies and procedures.

EXCERPT FROM

## OREGON REVISED STATUTES

### Chapter 192 — Public and Private Records; Public Reports and Meetings 2023 Edition

#### PUBLIC MEETINGS

**192.610 Definitions for ORS 192.610 to 192.690.** As used in ORS 192.610 to 192.690:

- (1) “Convening” means gathering in a physical location; using electronic, video or telephonic technology to be able to communicate contemporaneously among participants; using serial electronic written communication among participants; or using an intermediary to communicate among participants.
- (2) “Decision” means any determination, action, vote or final disposition upon a motion, proposal, resolution, order, ordinance or measure on which a vote of a governing body is required, at any meeting at which a quorum is present.
- (3) “Deliberation” means discussion or communication that is part of a decision-making process.
- (4) “Executive session” means any meeting or part of a meeting of a governing body which is closed to certain persons for deliberation on certain matters.
- (5) “Governing body” means the members of any public body which consists of two or more members, with the authority to make decisions for or recommendations to a public body on policy or administration.
- (6) “Public body” means the state, any regional council, county, city or district, or any municipal or public corporation, or any board, department, commission, council, bureau, committee or subcommittee or advisory group or any other agency thereof.
- (7) “Meeting” means the convening of a governing body of a public body for which a quorum is required in order to make a decision or to deliberate toward a decision on any matter. “Meeting” does not include any on-site inspection of any project or program or the attendance of members of a governing body at any national, regional or state association to which the public body or the members belong. [1973 c.172 §2; 1979 c.644 §1; 2023 c.417 §1]

**192.620 Policy.** The Oregon form of government requires an informed public aware of the deliberations and decisions of governing bodies and the information upon which such decisions were made. It is the intent of ORS 192.610 to 192.705 that decisions of governing bodies be arrived at openly. [1973 c.172 §1]

**192.630 Meetings of governing body to be open to public; location of meetings; accommodation for person with disability; interpreters.**

- (1) All meetings of the governing body of a public body shall be open to the public and all persons shall be permitted to attend any meeting except as otherwise provided by ORS 192.610 to 192.705.
- (2) A quorum of a governing body may not meet in private for the purpose of deciding on or deliberating toward a decision on any matter except as otherwise provided by ORS 192.610 to 192.705.
- (3) A governing body may not hold a meeting at any place where discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, age or disability is practiced. However, the fact that organizations with restricted membership hold meetings at the place does not restrict its use by a public body if use of the place by a restricted membership organization is not the primary purpose of the place or its predominant use.

(4)(a) Meetings of the governing body of a public body shall be held:

(A) Within the geographic boundaries over which the public body has jurisdiction;

(B) At the administrative headquarters of the public body;

(C) At the nearest practical location; or

(D) If the public body is a state, county, city or special district entity, within Indian country of a federally recognized Oregon Indian tribe that is within the geographic boundaries of this state. For purposes of this subparagraph, "Indian country" has the meaning given that term in 18 U.S.C. 1151.

(b) Training sessions may be held outside the jurisdiction as long as no deliberations toward a decision are involved.

(c) A joint meeting of two or more governing bodies or of one or more governing bodies and the elected officials of one or more federally recognized Oregon Indian tribes shall be held within the geographic boundaries over which one of the participating public bodies or one of the Oregon Indian tribes has jurisdiction or at the nearest practical location.

(d) Meetings may be held in locations other than those described in this subsection in the event of an actual emergency necessitating immediate action.

(5)(a) It is discrimination on the basis of disability for a governing body of a public body to meet in a place inaccessible to persons with disabilities, or, upon request of a person who is deaf or hard of hearing, to fail to make a good faith effort to have an interpreter for persons who are deaf or hard of hearing provided at a regularly scheduled meeting. The sole remedy for discrimination on the basis of disability shall be as provided in ORS 192.680.

(b) The person requesting the interpreter shall give the governing body at least 48 hours' notice of the request for an interpreter, shall provide the name of the requester, sign language preference and any other relevant information the governing body may request.

(c) If a meeting is held upon less than 48 hours' notice, reasonable effort shall be made to have an interpreter present, but the requirement for an interpreter does not apply to emergency meetings.

(d) If certification of interpreters occurs under state or federal law, the Oregon Health Authority or other state or local agency shall try to refer only certified interpreters to governing bodies for purposes of this subsection.

(e) As used in this subsection, "good faith effort" includes, but is not limited to, contacting the department or other state or local agency that maintains a list of qualified interpreters and arranging for the referral of one or more qualified interpreters to provide interpreter services. [1973 c.172 §3; 1979 c.644 §2; 1989 c.1019 §1; 1995 c.626 §1; 2003 c.14 §95; 2005 c.663 §12; 2007 c.70 §52; 2007 c.100 §21; 2009 c.595 §173; 2017 c.482 §1; 2019 c.286 §1; 2021 c.367 §12]

**192.640 Public notice required; special notice for executive sessions, special or emergency meetings.**

(1) The governing body of a public body shall provide for and give public notice, reasonably calculated to give actual notice to interested persons including news media which have requested notice, of the time and place for holding regular meetings. The notice shall also include a list of the principal subjects anticipated to be considered at the meeting, but this requirement shall not limit the ability of a governing body to consider additional subjects.

(2) If an executive session only will be held, the notice shall be given to the members of the governing body, to the general public and to news media which have requested notice, stating the specific provision of law authorizing the executive session.

(3) No special meeting shall be held without at least 24 hours' notice to the members of the governing body, the news media which have requested notice and the general public. In case of an actual emergency, a meeting may be held upon such notice as is appropriate to the circumstances, but the minutes for such a meeting shall describe the emergency justifying less than 24 hours' notice. [1973 c.172 §4; 1979 c.644 §3; 1981 c.182 §1]

**192.650 Recording or written minutes required; content; fees.**

(1) The governing body of a public body shall provide for the sound, video or digital recording or the taking of written minutes of all its meetings. Neither a full transcript nor a full recording of the meeting is required, except as otherwise provided by law, but the written minutes or recording must give a true reflection of the matters discussed at the meeting and the views of the participants. All minutes or recordings shall be available to the public within a reasonable time after the meeting, and shall include at least the following information:

(a) All members of the governing body present;

(b) All motions, proposals, resolutions, orders, ordinances and measures proposed and their disposition;

(c) The results of all votes and, except for public bodies consisting of more than 25 members unless requested by a member of that body, the vote of each member by name;

(d) The substance of any discussion on any matter; and

(e) Subject to ORS 192.311 to 192.478 relating to public records, a reference to any document discussed at the meeting.

(2) Minutes of executive sessions shall be kept in accordance with subsection (1) of this section. However, the minutes of a hearing held under ORS 332.061 shall contain only the material not excluded under ORS 332.061 (2). Instead of written minutes, a record of any executive session may be kept in the form of a sound or video tape or digital recording, which need not be transcribed unless otherwise provided by law. If the disclosure of certain material is inconsistent with the purpose for which a meeting under ORS 192.660 is authorized to be held, that material may be excluded from disclosure. However, excluded materials are authorized to be examined privately by a court in any legal action and the court shall determine their admissibility.

(3) A reference in minutes or a recording to a document discussed at a meeting of a governing body of a public body does not affect the status of the document under ORS 192.311 to 192.478.

(4) A public body may charge a person a fee under ORS 192.324 for the preparation of a transcript from a recording. [1973 c.172 §5; 1975 c.664 §1; 1979 c.644 §4; 1999 c.59 §44; 2003 c.803 §14]

**192.660 Executive sessions permitted on certain matters; procedures; news media representatives' attendance; limits.**

(1) ORS 192.610 to 192.705 do not prevent the governing body of a public body from holding executive session during a regular, special or emergency meeting, after the presiding officer has identified the authorization under ORS 192.610 to 192.705 for holding the executive session.

**192.670 Meetings by means of telephonic or electronic communication.**

(1) Any meeting, including an executive session, of a governing body of a public body which is held through the use of telephone or other electronic communication shall be conducted in accordance with ORS 192.610 to 192.705.

(2) When telephone or other electronic means of communication is used and the meeting is not an executive session, the governing body of the public body shall make available to the public at least one place where, or at least one electronic means by which, the public can listen to the communication at the time it occurs. A place provided may be a place where no member of the governing body of the public body is present.

(3) All meetings held by a governing body of a public body, excluding executive sessions, must provide to members of the general public, to the extent reasonably possible, an opportunity to:

(a) Access and attend the meeting by telephone, video or other electronic or virtual means;

(b) If in-person oral testimony is allowed, submit during the meeting oral testimony by telephone, video or other electronic or virtual means; and

(c) If in-person written testimony is allowed, submit written testimony, including by electronic mail or other electronic means, so that the governing body is able to consider the submitted testimony in a timely manner.

(4) The provisions of subsection (3) of this section:

(a) Apply to hearings under ORS 197.797, 215.402 to 215.438 and 215.700 to 215.780 regardless of whether a governing body or governing body's designee, including a hearings officer, conducts the hearing; and

(b) Do not apply to contested case hearings under ORS chapter 183. [1973 c.172 §7; 1979 c.361 §1; 2011 c.272 §2; 2021 c.228 §1]



Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Project Changes  
Transportation Planning Committee (TPC) – Central Lane MPO  
March 21, 2024

*It is proposed that TPC recommend the following changes to the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC).*

[none]

*TPC is authorized to formally approve the following proposed changes. Approval is contingent upon completion of the public review period as specified in the individual descriptions. Changes approved by TPC will be forwarded to MPC for their information only.*

**Project Name:** NW Oregon 2024-2027 ADA curb ramp design, phase 1 & phase 2

**Applicant:** ODOT

**STIP Key Number:** 22985 (phase 1), 23029 (phase 2)

**Description:** Design for future construction of curb ramps to meet compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.

**Funding:** \$22,000,000 phase 1 (Surface Transportation Block Grant); \$10,710,000 phase 2 (GARVEE ADA)

**Proposed Changes:** Split \$2,710,000 total funding from phase 2 (fund reserve, KN23029) to increase preliminary engineering phase of phase 1 (KN22985).

**Notes on Changes:** These projects include work location(s) in Springfield, but the majority of the projects' scopes are outside of the MPO boundaries.

**Action:** These changes are requested by ODOT. CLMPO approved the original project scope for inclusion in the TIP. Any changes must be approved by the MPO upon consideration of the federal requirements of [Title 23 U.S.C. 450.326](#). MPO approval signifies that this project is consistent with the [goals and objectives](#) of the MPO's Regional Transportation Plan and meets the federal requirements for inclusion in the TIP.

**Public review period:** March 1, 2024 – March 15, 2024

**Project Name:** Northwest Oregon curve warning upgrades (2027)

**Applicant:** ODOT

**STIP Key Number:** 22728

**Description:** Complete design to install warning signs at curves on various highway segments to aid in reducing vehicle collisions.

**Funding:** \$1,351,310 (Surface Transportation Block Grant, Highway Safety Improvement Program)

**Proposed Changes:** Adding new project to the CLMPO TIP.

**Notes on Changes:** This is an existing project in the Statewide program, but scope is being added to the project that includes locations in the Central Lane MPO. Of the 566 locations in the amended project, roughly 100 are within the MPO's boundaries.

**Action:** These changes are requested by ODOT. CLMPO approval signifies that this project is consistent with the [goals and objectives](#) of the MPO's Regional Transportation Plan and that the project meets the federal requirements of [Title 23 U.S.C. 450.326](#) for inclusion in the TIP.

**Public review period:** March 11, 2024 – March 25, 2024

[Curve Warning Locations](#) (CLMPO locations are at the bottom)

[Map of Mainline Locations](#) (highest potential of moving forward to construction)

*MPC has authorized MPO staff to approve certain types of project changes. The following proposals were approved by MPO staff, or will be approved upon completion of the public review period (as necessary):*

[none]

-----

**Comments received:**

[none]



March 12, 2024

To: Transportation Planning Committee  
From: Daniel Callister  
Subject: Programming of Redistribution Funds

**Action Requested:** Recommend Funding Proposal to MPC

### **Issue Statement**

The Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) has received roughly \$1M of federal redistribution Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) funds and have reviewed proposals to utilize these funds. Transportation Planning Committee (TPC) is responsible for providing a funding recommendation to MPC.

### **Discussion**

The MPO's discretionary federal funds for transportation projects are programmed roughly every three years through a formal project solicitation process. The MPO occasionally receives unanticipated federal discretionary funding outside of the typical MTIP development process. These are referred to as "off-cycle" funds, and usually are of a much smaller amount than the MPO's annual allocation.

Central Lane MPO has received \$1,049,387 of redistribution funding to be obligated to projects before the end of FFY 2025. An additional \$889k of federal funding has been reserved by the MPO for contingencies. Four funding proposals were submitted for consideration. A one-page summary of each of these is provided as Attachment 1. The proposals are:

- [8<sup>th</sup> Ave Streetscape and Bikeway](#) (City of Eugene)
- [River Rd at Irving Rd/Hunsaker Ln Safety Improvements](#) (City of Eugene)
- [Gilham Rd: Ayers Rd to Mirror Pond Wy Sidewalk/Safety](#) (Lane County)
- [Low/No-Emission Mini Street Sweeper Purchase](#) (City of Springfield) ([full app.](#))

Each of these proposals represent existing projects already funded in the MTIP. The one exception is the Mini Street Sweeper purchase proposal from City of Springfield.

The ultimate funding recommendation of TPC will be based on how well each project supports the regional primary funding considerations (as approved by MPC on May 5, 2022), the federal performance targets, air quality conformity, environmental justice, Title VI, and other considerations.

**Public Involvement**

TPC approved release of these proposals for public comment from February 15 to March 16, during which time a public hearing was held at MPC on March 7. TPC, having reviewed any comments received, is now requested to make a funding recommendation for MPC to consider. Final action is anticipated by MPC on April 4.

**Action Requested:** Recommend Funding Proposal to MPC

**Attachments:**

1 – Funding Request Summaries

## 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue Streetscape and Bikeway (Eugene)

### Project Visual:



Google Street View image of 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue before the streetscape and bikeway project. Image is taken immediately west of Oak Street, looking west.

### Project Description:

8<sup>th</sup> Avenue is a key connection in downtown Eugene, linking civic, commercial, and social venues downtown to the Riverbank Path and future amenities that will be developed as part of the EWEB Riverfront Master Plan.

To facilitate transportation between the riverfront and downtown, the street will be redesigned to better fit long-range land use goals and maximize mobility standards for all modes of transportation.

This project redesigns 8th Avenue between Lincoln Street and Mill Street to create a more multimodal street. The project will install protected bike lanes on both sides of the street, widen the existing sidewalk in select locations, relocate street trees, and convert 8th Avenue from a one-way street to a two-way street, convert 3 signals to all way stops, and install stormwater planters.

### Project Quick Facts

Location	8 <sup>th</sup> Avenue		
Project Limits (to/from)	Lincoln Street to Mill Street		
Length in feet	2,724 feet	<b>Estimated Project Cost</b>	
Functional Class	Local	Est. Total Project Cost	\$8,834,147
Completion/Purchase Year	2024	Federal Funds Requested	\$400,000

### Contact Information

Sponsoring Agency	City of Eugene		
Contact Name & Title	Rachael Love, Civil Engineer 2		
Contact e-mail	rlove@eugene-or.gov	Phone	541-682-5477

*For questions regarding the programming of CLMPO's discretionary federal funds contact Daniel Callister at (541) 666-9571 or dcallister@lcog.org*

## River Road at Irving Road/Hunsaker Lane (Eugene)

### Project Visual:



Google Street View image of the River Road, Irving Road, and Hunsaker Lane intersection before the project. Image is taken from River Road immediately north of the intersection, looking south.

### Project Description:

River Road at the intersection of Irving Road and Hunsaker Lane has a history of vehicle and bicycle crashes. The project seeks to improve safety for all road users by upgrading traffic signal hardware, building a protected intersection for cyclists, and adding left turn lanes on Irving Road approaches.

These safety upgrades will improve the connection to new walking and biking infrastructure on Hunsaker Lane and eventually the West Bank Path.

### Project Quick Facts

Location	Intersection of River Road, Irving Road, and Hunsaker Lane		
Project Limits (to/from)	N/A		
Length in feet	100 feet	<b>Estimated Project Cost</b>	
Functional Class	Major arterial (River Road), minor arterial (Irving Road) and major collector (Hunsaker Lane)	Est. Total Project Cost	\$4,193,966
Completion/Purchase Year	2024	Federal Funds Requested	\$400,000

### Contact Information

Sponsoring Agency	City of Eugene		
Contact Name & Title	Jordan Vesper, Bridge Engineer		
Contact e-mail	Jvesper@eugene-or.gov	Phone	541-246-0019

*For questions regarding the programming of CLMPO's discretionary federal funds contact Daniel Callister at (541) 666-9571 or dcallister@lcog.org*

## Gilham Road: Ayers Road to Mirror Pond Way

### Project Visual:



### Project Description:

Gilham Road is currently in need of safe pedestrian facilities to allow people travel options aside from commuting by car. To respond to this need, continuous sidewalks are proposed for the segment of Gilham Road from Ayers Road to Don Juan Ave along its west side. Funding for this project will result in design and final construction of a sidewalk along this westerly portion of Gilham Road, between Ayers Road to Don Juan Ave. The segment of road proposed for improvements is in the northeast Eugene urban fringe area. Gilham Road is within Eugene's Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and terminates at the UGB at its north end. This segment remains outside Eugene city limits but runs adjacent to several residential areas that are annexed. Along the project area, approximately one half of the land abutting Gilham Road is annexed. Lane County's jurisdiction of Gilham Road begins north of the Gilham/Ayres Road intersection.

### Project Quick Facts

Location	Gilham Rd (Eugene)		
Project Limits (to/from)	Ayers Rd to Don Juan Ave		
Length in feet	1,414 feet	<b>Estimated Project Cost</b>	
Functional Class	Urban Minor, Urban Local	Est. Total Project Cost	\$ 2,862,549.35
Completion/Purchase Year	2025	Federal Funds Requested	<b>\$ 400,000</b>

### Contact Information

Sponsoring Agency	Lane County		
Contact Name & Title	Sasha Vartanian		
Contact e-mail	Sasha.Vartanian@lanecountyor.gov	Phone	541-682-6598

*For questions regarding the programming of CLMPO's discretionary federal funds contact Daniel Callister at (541) 666-9571 or dcallister@lcog.org*



**PROJECT SUMMARY**

Project No. \_\_\_\_\_

**City of Springfield – Low- or No-Emission Mini Street Sweeper Purchase****Project Visual:**

\*the shown model and manufacturer above is for reference only; Springfield will purchase a low- or no-emissions street sweeper.

**Project Description:**

The City of Springfield is actively adding new on-street bike lanes, separated facilities through Franklin Boulevard and planned Mill Street reconstruction, and have miles of multi-use paths throughout the city. However, cleaning and maintaining these facilities are often overlooked, specifically because the city does not have the proper equipment to keep these areas clean and free of debris. In order to continue encouragement of active transportation, the City of Springfield Operations Department has requested funding to purchase a low- or zero emissions street sweeper capable of maintaining our existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities as well as the planned future facilities.

**Project Quick Facts**

Location	City of Springfield		
Project Limits (to/from)	Springfield Jurisdiction		
Length in feet	n/a	<b>Estimated Project Cost</b>	
Functional Class	n/a	Est. Total Project Cost	\$350,000
Completion/Purchase Year	2025	Federal Funds Requested	<b>\$314,055</b>

**Contact Information**

Sponsoring Agency	City of Springfield		
Contact Name & Title	Andrew Larson, Senior Transportation Planner		
Contact e-mail	Alarson@springfield-or.gov	Phone	541-726-3661

*For questions regarding the programming of CLMPO's discretionary federal funds contact Daniel Callister at (541) 666-9571 or dcallister@lcog.org*





March 14, 2024

To: Transportation Planning Committee  
From: Ellen Currier  
Subject: Unified Planning Work Program Addendum

**Action Recommended:**

**UPWP Background**

Each year, the partner agencies of the MPO work with the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), the Federal Highway Administration, and the Federal Transit Administration to update and adopt a Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for transportation planning that covers a two-year period. The MPO updates this plan with an interim addendum the following year that identifies any changes to the work plan.

The UPWP for Fiscal Years 2024 and 2025 contains the following:

- Planning tasks in seven program areas authorized over the two-year period.
- Federally funded studies and all relevant state and local planning activities related to integrated transportation planning conducted without federal funds.
- Funding sources for each program area; and
- The agency or agencies responsible for each task or study.

The changes and updates to the UPWP included in this addendum are as follows:

- Updated Certification Review Findings from September 28, 2023.
- Updated Planning Project products and timelines
- Special Project review and updates.

The attached Unified Planning Work Program Addendum describes the MPO work plan and action items that are anticipated to occur within FY2025, and estimated timelines. The UPWP Addendum outlines the funding of those activities in FY2025.

**Funding**

The adoption of the UPWP also programs fiscal year 2025 Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) and Transportation Alternatives (TA) funding for the following programs.

1. STBG Regional Planning - \$813,552
2. STBG Regional TDM - \$334,336
3. TA and STBG SRTS- \$408,057
4. STBG e-tip licensing- \$21,366

**Developing the UPWP**

Staff and the partner agencies have been developing the UPWP addendum over the past few months. This work combined the results of ongoing MPO activities and discussions with partner agencies.

Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, and ODOT staff provided their annual review of the draft UPWP addendum on February 29, 2024 at a meeting with local transportation planning staff. From the comments received at this review, staff prepared the final UPWP included as Attachment 1.

**Requested Actions:** Release Draft UPWP Addendum for Public Review and Comment

**Attachment:** Draft UPWP Addendum




# UPWP

Unified Planning Work Program  
Interim Review and Update

## **ADDENDUM TO THE UPWP**

**March 2024**

Prepared by:  
**Lane Council of Governments**  
859 Willamette Street  
Eugene, OR 97401  
541-682-4283  
[www.lcog.org](http://www.lcog.org)



# March 2024

## Acknowledgements

### LOCAL AGENCIES


Lane Council of Governments  
City of Eugene  
City of Springfield  
City of Coburg  
Lane County  
Lane Transit District  
Lane Regional Air Protection Agency

### STATE AND FEDERAL AGENCIES

Oregon Department of Transportation  
Federal Highway Administration  
Federal Transit Administration

### METROPOLITAN POLICY COMMITTEE (MPC)

David Loveall, Lane County Commissioner  
Pat Farr, Lane County Commissioner  
Nancy Bell, City of Coburg Mayor  
Sean VanGordon, City of Springfield Mayor  
Steve Moe, City of Springfield Councilor  
Lucy Vinis, City of Eugene Mayor  
Randy Groves, City of Eugene City Councilor  
Kelly Sutherland, Lane Transit District Board Member  
Susan Cox, Lane Transit District Board Member  
Vidal Francis, Oregon Department of Transportation



# UPWP Addendum Table of Contents

<b>Section I: Overview of the UPWP</b>	<b>6</b>
INTRODUCTION	6
UPDATES TO THE ADOPTED UPWP	8
STATUS OF PLANNING DOCUMENTS	9
FEDERAL CERTIFICATION	10
<b>Section II</b>	<b>14</b>
UPWP WORK ELEMENTS	14
A. Regional Transportation Plan and Long-Range Planning	14
B. Programming and Implementation	14
C. Public Participation	15
D. Air Quality Planning (No change from adopted UPWP)	15
E. Transportation System Modeling and Data Maintenance	15
F. Transportation Options	16
G. Intergovernmental Coordination	16
<b>Section III: Funding</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>19</b>
Appendix A: Special Projects	20
Appendices B-H,	46
Appendix I	46

## Section I: Overview of the UPWP

### INTRODUCTION


The Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) is a federally required document describing the transportation planning activities to be undertaken in the Central Lane metropolitan area for a specific fiscal year or years. Development of the UPWP provides local agencies with an opportunity to identify transportation needs, objectives and products. The UPWP sets priorities for regional transportation planning activities that are responsive to the goals set by the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and the federal mandates of the current transportation funding bill within the guidelines set by the U.S. Department of Transportation.

In May 2023, the Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization (the MPO) adopted a UPWP covering a two-year period. The UPWP for Fiscal Years 2024 and 2025 contains the following:

- ☐ Planning tasks in seven program areas authorized over the two-year period.
- ☐ Federally funded studies and all relevant state and local planning activities related to integrated transportation planning conducted without federal funds.
- ☐ Funding sources for each program area; and
- ☐ The agency or agencies responsible for each task or study.




*The preparation of this report was financed in part by the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration. The opinions, findings and conclusions expressed in this report are not necessarily those of the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration.*



**UPDATES TO THE ADOPTED UPWP**

The following addendum to the adopted 2024 and 2025 UPWP describes changes to action items, additional action items that are anticipated to occur within FY 2025 and revisions to estimated timelines, as needed. The remaining work items outlined in the adopted UPWP are proposed to remain as adopted, unless otherwise modified herein. The adopted UPWP can be found at <http://www.thempo.org/359/Our-Work-Plan>.



## STATUS OF PLANNING DOCUMENTS

LCOG develops and maintains several federally mandated planning documents that guide regional work and investments. The plans, their current status and next update are:

LCOG Planning Documents	Current Status	Next Update
Unified Planning Work Program	FY 24-25 Adopted May 2023	FY24-25 UPWP addendum (this document, anticipated adoption May 2024)
Regional Transportation Plan and Air Quality Conformity Determination	Reviewed by MPC November and December 2021. Adopted January 2022.	Anticipated Adoption November 2025
Regional ITS Operations and Implementation Plan	Approved July 2021	2031 (10-year update schedule, per ODOT's guidance)
Title VI Plan	Approved November 2022 Annual Report October 2023	Next update will be in August 2025. Annual report October 2024.
Annual Listing of Obligated Projects	Adopted January 2023	Annually December or January of each year
Transportation Safety Action Plan	Approved April 6, 2017,	To be updated in 2024/25
Public Participation Plan	Approved October 1, 2015.	Anticipated Adoption March 2024
Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program and Air Quality Conformity Determination	FY24-27 MTIP adopted May 2023. AQCD adopted May 2023.	FY27-30 MTIP anticipated in 2026
Regional Transportation Options Plan	This plan has been integrated into the RTP and CMP and will be retired. RTP/CMP Adopted January 2022.	None.
Transportation Management Association Certification Review	Final Report received September 28, 2023	Next Review expected 2027

## FEDERAL CERTIFICATION

The MPO received its MPO Certification Review Final Report in September 28, 2023. This certification will remain in effect for a period of four years. The MPO, ODOT, and FHWA will be incorporating these corrections and recommendations into the CLMPO program. The following table lists corrective actions, recommendations, and commendations from the 2023 report.

Summary of 2023 CLMPO Planning Certification Review Planning Topic	Corrective Actions / Recommendations/ Commendations	Action Plan
Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) – 23 CFR 450.324	<p><b>Corrective Actions</b> None</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Federal Review Team recommends additional attention to re-enforcing the connection among plan goals, objectives, performance measures and project identification as part of the next RTP update.</li> <li>• The Federal Review Team recommends additional RTP financial plan improvements to include:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Expand detail on revenue assumptions to cover M&amp;O costs and integrate the analysis with capital projects to reflect all regional transportation investments in summarizing fiscal constraint.</li> <li>2) Provide more detail and justification on how the year of expenditure rate(s) were established for the short and long-term.</li> <li>3) Include additional discussion on advancing policy options to address funding shortfall and discuss consequences of not covering unfunded project needs.</li> </ol> </li> </ul> <p><b>Commendations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2045 RTP document is well written and formatted to communicate a significant amount of information and data to a broad audience. The use of icons to demonstrate the connection to plan goals throughout the document was a particularly effective way to orient the reader.</li> </ul>	The CLMPO is currently updating the MTP and will work with staff and policy board members to address the recommendations from the federal review team. The project team will place particular focus on articulating revenue assumptions and robust policy discussion around addressing funding gaps to meet regional planning goals.

Interested Parties, Participation, and Consultation – 23 CFR 450.316	<p><b>Corrective Actions</b></p> <p>To meet the requirements of 23 CFR 450.316, CLMPO must update the 2015 Public Participation Plan (PPP) by January 2025 to specifically address the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Per 23 CFR 450.316(1), revise procedures to more accurately document current public involvement procedures that will be used as part of the 2050 RTP as well as other public processes. These procedures must be reviewed periodically to ensure they remain current and result in an effective and open public process.</li> <li>• Per 23 CFR 450.316(d), include procedures in the PPP for involving and consulting with federal land management agencies, that manage land in the MPA, in the development of the RTP and TIP.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Federal Team recommends that, although no tribal lands are located within the metropolitan planning area, CLMPO should expand documentation of the process to coordinate with tribal governments.</li> </ul> <p><b>Commendations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Federal Review Team found that CLMPO uses effective public involvement practices, especially outreach to marginalized groups and young people via the Lane Youth Transportation Advisory Council. This is particularly commendable given that the RTP public input process needed to address limitations imposed by the COVID pandemic.</li> </ul>	<p>CLMPO is in the process of updating the Public Participation Plan and anticipates adoption by the end of fiscal year 2024. This plan update includes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) documentation of updated outreach procedures that have been implemented since 2020.</li> <li>2) Additional documentation and planning to address coordination and consultation with impacted federal agencies.</li> </ol> <p>CLMPO will address and include recommendations as time and scope allow.</p>
Congestion Management Process – 23 CFR 450.322	<p><b>Corrective Actions</b></p> <p>To fully meet the requirements of 23 CFR 450.322, CLMPO must update the CMP by January 2026 to specifically address the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Per 23 CFR 450.322(d)(5), document an implementation schedule including responsibilities for advancing CMP strategies and establish a link between the CMP, the RTP, and the TIP project prioritization and funding processes.</li> <li>• Per 23 CFR 450.322(d)(6), develop and implement a process for periodic assessment of the effectiveness of CMP strategies to achieve system-level effectiveness and ensure implemented strategies are addressing congestion as intended.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendations</b></p>	<p>The CLMPO is beginning the procurement process in FY24, Q3 for consultant service to support development of the CMP. This update will include federal requirements in the project scope to ensure the corrective actions are addressed and resolved.</p> <p>CLMPO will address and include recommendations as time and scope allow.</p>

	<p>The Federal Review Team recommends that CLMPO continue to update the CMP, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand definitions of key terms such as ‘travel time reliability’ and other transportation system data description terms,</li> <li>• Describe how selected CMP strategies are chosen in impact corridors, and</li> <li>• Use more modal ‘quality of service’ measures, such as transit, bike, and pedestrian.</li> </ul> <p><b>Commendations</b> None</p>	
<p>Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) – 23 CFR 450.326</p>	<p><b>Corrective Actions</b> None</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Federal Team recommends that the CLMPO MTIP provide better documentation of revenue assumptions in the financial plan, including more detail on M&amp;O costs and revenues, how the year-of-expenditure (YOE) rate was determined, and funding amounts by year for specific federal, state, and local funding sources.</li> <li>• The Federal Team recommends that CLMPO continue to establish a close connection between performance objectives, federal performance measure targets, and project prioritization as part of each new MTIP update.</li> </ul> <p><b>Commendations</b> None</p>	<p>CLMPO will address and include recommendations as time and scope allow.</p>
<p>Performance Based Planning and Programming – 23 CFR 450.306, 314, 324, 326</p>	<p><b>Corrective Actions</b> None</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Federal Team recommends that CLMPO, as part of the next RTP update, develop a system performance report evaluating the condition and performance of the transportation system with respect to the performance targets, including progress achieved in comparison to baseline data and how changes in regional policies and investments have impacted achievement of performance targets.</li> <li>• The Federal Team recommends additional improvements to fully develop the performance-based planning and programming element as part of the next</li> </ul>	<p>CLMPO will address and include recommendations as time and scope allow.</p>

	RTP update and new TIP, including more closely linking performance targets with investment priorities.  <b>Commendations</b> None	
--	--	--

### Process to Resolve Corrective Actions

The certification process provided clarification on the processes and procedures the resolution of corrective actions. FHWA and FTA will work closely with CLMPO, ODOT, and LTD to ensure expectations are understood, provide stewardship and technical assistance, and to assist in establishing a framework for the resolution of corrective actions and recommendations. CLMPO will ensure corrective actions are resolved by the due date identified in this certification report. This process includes:

- CLMPO develops a plan of action to include in their Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to address corrective actions by the due dates specified in this report.
- CLMPO forms a certification action team composed of local, state, and Federal partners, to assist in the successful resolution of corrective actions.
- ODOT monitors the achievement of the action plan and ensures CLMPO sufficiently addresses compliance issues by the identified deadline.
- ODOT sends a letter to FHWA and FTA indicating recommendation to close out the corrective actions.

## Section II.

### UPWP WORK ELEMENTS

#### A. Regional Transportation Plan and Long-Range Planning

##### Action Items

- Begin procurement process for consultant services to support plan development.
- Continue model and data development.
- Form Project Technical Advisory Committee.
- FHWA INVEST Tool development.

##### 1. Regional Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Plan

The Regional ITS plan was adopted in July 2021. Per ODOT's guidance, this plan will not be updated until 2031. The MPO will continue implementation of this plan during FY25.

##### 2. Performance Based Planning and Programming

- The MPO will work with ODOT and FHWA to adopt the *Assessing Performance of the National Highway System, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Measure*.

##### 3. Safety Planning

- The MPO will begin work to update data and analysis for Transportation Safety Action Plan.
- Continue coordination with Springfield safety planning work.

##### 4. Major Facility Studies (no change from adopted UPWP)

##### 5. Active Transportation Plan

- Draft scope for Active Transportation Plan as identified in adopted RTP.
- Begin Data Collection Phase for Active Transportation Plan

#### B. Programming and Implementation

##### Action Items

- a. State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) (No change from Adopted UPWP)
- b. Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP)
  - Implementation of eTIP platform
- c. Surface Transportation Block Grant Program Sub-allocation for Urbanized Areas (STBG-U) and other federal funds
  - Work with local agencies and ODOT to program reallocation funds.
- d. Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) (amendment in process)



**e. Planning Emphasis Area Updates**

- Continue to incorporate updated 2021 Planning Emphasis Areas into appropriate plans and programs. Document Planning Emphasis Areas in CLMPO planning documents as they are updated.
- Tackling the Climate Crisis, Transition to a Clean Energy Resilient Future
- Equity and Justice40 in Transportation Planning
- Complete Streets
- Public Involvement
- Strategic High Network (STRAHNET)/US Department of Defense Coordination
- Federal Land Management Agency (FLMA) Coordination
- Planning and Environmental Linkages
- Data in Transportation Planning

**C. Public Participation**

**1. Public Participation Program Refinement**

**FY25**

- Finalize and adopt new Public Participation Plan.

**2. Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 (No change to this section)**

**3. Title VI Program**

**FY25**

- Incorporate Planning Emphasis Area Equity and Justice40

**D. Air Quality Planning (No change from adopted UPWP)**

**E. Transportation System Modeling and Data Maintenance**

**Revised Action Items:**

**RTP TRAVEL MODEL UPDATE AND IMPLEMENTATION**

- The MPO begin transitioning modeling software from Emme to PTV Visum


## F. Transportation Options

### FY25

- GetThere campaign marketing materials and database maintenance. Implement statewide work on CarFree Oregon campaign.
- Continue development of regional large employer outreach campaign in collaboration with ODOT TO.

## G. Intergovernmental Coordination

**NOTE: No changes to this section.**



## Section III: Funding

## FY 2025 FUNDING

**DRAFT - SUBJECT TO CHANGE**  
**Central Lane MPO**  
**Unified Planning Work Program**  
**FY 2025 Funding**


SOURCE OF FUNDS									
1	2	3a	3b	3c	4	5			
FTA Sec 5303	LTD 5303 Match	FHWA PL	ODOT match for FHWA PL	FY 2025 2.5% SATO Set-Aside	Central Lane MPO STBG/TA	Local Match	UPWP Total		
<b>Core Work Elements</b>									
A	\$ 19,327	\$ 2,212	\$ 11,548		\$ 300,000	\$ 34,338	\$ 468,322		
B	\$ 23,192	\$ 2,654	\$ 4,442		\$ 50,000	\$ 5,723	\$ 124,818		
C	\$ 23,192	\$ 2,654	\$ 7,995		\$ 50,000	\$ 5,723	\$ 159,416		
D	\$ 11,596	\$ 1,327	\$ 1,777		\$ 20,000	\$ 2,289	\$ 52,512		
E	\$ 19,327	\$ 2,212	\$ 17,766		\$ 80,000	\$ 9,156	\$ 283,688		
F	\$ 12,895	\$ 1,476	\$ 3,553	\$ 16,330	\$ 90,000	\$ 10,301	\$ 165,600		
G	\$ 28,990	\$ 3,318	\$ 18,193		\$ 250,000	\$ 28,613	\$ 488,066		
H			\$ 2,568		\$ 70,000	\$ 8,012	\$ 103,012		
<b>Regional Funds</b>									
I					\$ 230,000	\$ 26,324	\$ 256,324		
J					\$ 300,000	\$ 34,336	\$ 334,336		
K					\$ 360,000	\$ 41,203	\$ 401,203		
L					\$ 19,172	\$ 2,194	\$ 21,366		
<b>Discrete Projects</b>									
M							\$ -		
N					\$ 30,000	\$ 3,434	\$ 33,434		
O					\$ 30,000	\$ 3,434	\$ 33,434		
P	\$ 50,000	\$ 5,723					\$ 55,723		
Q	\$ 20,000	\$ 2,289	\$ 17,946	\$ 2,054	\$ 30,000	\$ 3,434	\$ 75,723		
<b>TOTALS</b>									
	\$ 208,520	\$ 23,866	\$ 610,680	\$ 69,895	\$ 16,330	\$ 1,909,172	\$ 218,512	\$ 3,056,976	

**Funding amounts are estimates only, based on anticipated amounts.**


\* Tentative

1. These costs are for anticipated one-time requests from MPO partners for additional planning assistance from MPO staff.

SATO: Safe & Accessible Transportation Options. Funding set-aside off of the top of the MPO's PL funds.



## Appendices



## **Appendix A: Special Projects**

Coordination throughout the life of the transportation projects is vital to their success. The list below contains the special projects scheduled within this UPWP's timeframe.

### ***Mobility Management Strategy***

New technologies and trends are changing the way that residents of the region travel. These include transportation network companies, dockless bike share, dockless scooters, microtransit, and other micromobility solutions. The Mobility Management Strategy will allow LTD to better understand how it can provide mobility to district residents as these technologies continue to develop and emerge. LTD will be able to determine its role as a mobility manager in the region and which technologies and modes make sense for LTD to pursue.

**Lead Agency:** LTD

**Partner Agencies:** Lane County, City of Eugene, City of Springfield, ODOT, LCOG

**Current Status:** Underway

**Estimated Completion:** TBD

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$350,000

**Funding Source:** STIF

### ***Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA)***

The COA will involve a comprehensive assessment of LTD's range of mobility services. The primary objective of the project is to conduct a detailed assessment of transit performance across a range of factors (e.g., ridership, passenger miles traveled, on time performance). In addition, the analysis will consider changes in local and regional travel demand patterns, strategies to increase ridership and improve farebox recovery, and identify opportunities and challenges offered by new mobility options.

**Lead Agency:** LTD

**Partner Agencies:** ODOT, City of Springfield, City of Eugene, Lane County, ODOT, LCOG

**Current Status:** Project initiates in September 2022

**Estimated Completion:** 2025

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$745,000

**Funding Source:** Local

### ***RideSource Operations Analysis***

The RideSource Call Center (RSCC) has experienced significant changes in programs and models over the past 10 years. This comprehensive look includes a cost/benefit analysis, and recommendations of how LTD can best use its resources to provide value to our community to ensure we are moving forward strategically and intentionally.

**Lead Agency:** LTD

**Partner Agencies:** ODOT, Cities of Springfield, Eugene, Florence Lane County, LCOG

**Current Status:** Scoping

**Estimated Completion:** 2024

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$200,000

**Funding Source:** Local

### ***MovingAhead***

This project is a partnership between the City of Eugene and Lane Transit District to make five major corridors safer and more accessible for people walking, biking, using a mobility device and/or riding the bus. Eugene City Council and LTD's Board of Directors adopted a Locally Preferred Alternative which includes Enhanced Corridor investments along Highway 99, Coburg Road, and Martin Luther King Jr., Boulevard, and EmX investments on River Road. Next steps include implementation planning, identifying the most appropriate funding sources, and design refinement with community engagement.

**Lead Agencies:** City of Eugene, LTD

**Partner Agencies:** ODOT, Lane County, LCOG

**Current Status:** In progress

**Estimated Completion:** 2025

**Estimated Project Cost:** TBD

**Funding Source:** STP-U, Carbon Reduction Program

### ***Lane Transit District FY2025-FY2027 Strategic Business Plan***

LTD's Strategic Business Plan (SBP) bridges LTD's mission, vision, and values to our day-to-day operations. This agency-wide collaborative effort will help us focus on the most important outcomes to deliver and guide the agency over a three-year period. The SBP is updated on a 3-year cycle.

**Lead Agency:** Lane Transit District

**Partner Agencies:** Partner Agencies within the district

**Current Status:** Currently in Scoping.

**Estimated Completion:** 2024

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$250,000

**Funding Source:** Local

### ***LTD Community Outreach and Communications Assessment***

LTD is seeking to develop consistent engagement in the community and conduct ‘best in class’ public engagement. LTD will assess communications and outreach strategies on recent projects and then develop a Community Outreach and Communications Framework to guide engagement on future projects. Goals include getting consistent engagement from a variety of stakeholder groups, building community trust through transparent engagement processes, and building the community’s capacity for engaging in the difficult tradeoffs associated with public policy.

**Lead Agency:** Lane Transit District

**Partner Agencies:** Partner Agencies within the district

**Current Status:** Currently in Procurement

**Estimated Completion:** TBD

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$250,000

**Funding Source:** Local

### ***8th Avenue Streetscape and Bikeway***

From High Street to Lincoln Street, 8th Avenue is currently a one-way westbound street with a striped bike lane. This project will convert 8th Avenue to two-way street and add protected bike lanes from Lincoln Street to Mill Street (one block east of High Street).

**Lead Agency:** City of Eugene

**Partner Agencies:**

**Current Status:** Under construction

**Estimated Completion:** 2024

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$8,800,000

**Funding Source:** CMAQ, STBG, Transportation SDCs, local street bond, local share of state gas tax revenue

### ***Lincoln St: 5<sup>th</sup> Ave – 13<sup>th</sup> Ave (Eugene)***



Construct separated two-way bicycle facility on Lincoln Street between 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue with dedicated bike signals.

**Lead Agency:** City of Eugene

**Partner Agencies:**

**Current Status:** Project scoping

**Estimated Completion:** 2026

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$900,000 - \$1,000,000

**Funding Source:** Highway Safety Improvement Program, CMAQ, Transportation SDCs

### ***Division Ave Intersection Efficiencies (Eugene)***

This project includes the conceptual design phase of safety improvements to Division Avenue (between River Rd and around 400 feet SE of Lone Oak). Safety improvements are scoped to include: 2-3 roundabouts, protected bike facilities, and enhanced pedestrian crossings.

**Lead Agency:** City of Eugene

**Partner Agencies:**

**Current Status:** Planning

**Estimated Completion:** 2024

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$50,000

**Funding Source:** STBG

### ***18<sup>th</sup> Avenue at Hilyard (Eugene)***

Intersection improvements at 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Hilyard Street, including adding a bicycle-only signal phase, replacing ADA ramps, and striping improvements to promote safer travel for all modes.

**Lead Agency:** City of Eugene

**Partner Agencies:**

**Current Status:** Active Design

**Estimated Completion:** 2025

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$650,000

**Funding Source:** Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG), local share of state gas tax revenue

***West Bank Path Extension (Eugene)***

Extend West Bank shared-use path north from Hunsaker St. To Admiral St., add sidewalk to Admiral St., enhance crossings at River Loop and Wilkes Dr.

**Lead Agency:** City of Eugene

**Partner Agencies:**

**Current Status:** Planning

**Estimated Completion:** 2025

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$2,000,000

**Funding Source:** CMAQ, Transportation SDCs

***Bailey Hill Rd and Bertelsen Rd Roundabout (Eugene)***

Construct a roundabout with bike and pedestrian facilities at the intersection of Bailey Hill Rd. And Bertelsen Rd.

**Lead Agency:** City of Eugene

**Partner Agencies:**

**Current Status:** Preliminary Engineering

**Estimated Completion:** 2027

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$1,500,000

**Funding Source:** Highway Safety Improvement Program, STBG, local share of state gas tax revenue

***Berkeley Park Path (Eugene)***

Construct a shared-use path through Berkeley Park connecting Wilson Street to the Fern Ridge Path. The path will help improve access and safety for people walking and biking through the area.

**Lead Agency:** City of Eugene

**Partner Agencies:**

**Current Status:** Project Scoping

**Estimated Completion:** 2027

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$500,000 - \$600,000

**Funding Source:** Community Paths grant program, Transportation SDCs

***N Coburg Industrial Way (Coburg)***

Construct separated multi-use path from Sarah Lane Connector to Trail's End Park. 2" ACP inlay of N Coburg Industrial Way.

**Lead Agency:** City of Eugene

**Partner Agencies:** City of Coburg

**Current Status:** Engineering

**Estimated Completion:** 2025

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$900,000 - \$1,100,000

**Funding Source:** TBD

***Maxwell Road and Prairie Road (Eugene)***

This project will construct ADA access ramps, pedestrian countdown timers and APS, 6-foot-wide sidewalks, and crosswalks. Sidewalks will be extended on the south side of Maxwell Road from the bridge over the Union Pacific Railroad west to Prairie Road where an existing pedestrian crossing is available for people to access Prairie Road. Sidewalks will be added to Prairie Road from Maxwell Road to OR-99 and improved crossings will be developed at OR-99.

**Lead Agency:** City of Eugene

**Partner Agencies:** Lane County, ODOT Rail

**Current Status:** Preliminary Engineering/Right-of-Way

**Estimated Completion:** 2024

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$2,857,000

**Funding Source:** STBG, ODOT Rail Safety Funds, Transportation SDCs

***City of Eugene Signal Improvements (Eugene)***

Upgrade traffic signals at multiple intersections to improve traffic flow and vehicle safety.

**Lead Agency:** City of Eugene

**Partner Agencies:** ODOT

**Current Status:** Engineering

**Estimated Completion:** 2024

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$1,000,000 - \$1,200,000

**Funding Source:** Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), ODOT ARTS Program

***Hunsaker Lane: Daffodil Ct to Taito St (Eugene)***

This project will reconstruct Hunsaker Lane from approximately 500 feet east of River Road to Taito Street. Improvements will include adding curb, gutter, and sidewalk to both the north and south sides of the roadway. The roadway will be 34 feet wide to accommodate two travel lanes (one in each direction) and buffered bike lanes. This project will also include storm sewer improvements to an existing drainage ditch between Summer Lane and Yvonne.

**Lead Agency:** City of Eugene

**Partner Agencies:** Lane County

**Current Status:** Preliminary Engineering

**Estimated Completion:** 2025

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$3,283,000

**Funding Source:** CMAQ, Transportation SDCs

***River Rd at Irving Rd (Eugene)***

This Safety project will address crashes at the intersection area of River Rd. at Irving Rd. in Eugene. The project area extends approximately 500 feet in distance east and west of the River Rd. and Irving Rd. intersection. At the River Rd. /Irving Rd. intersection, the roadway to the west is named Irving Rd., and to the east, the name changes to Hunsaker Ln. The project will widen the roadway equally on Irving Rd./Hunsaker Ln. to add bike lanes and left turn lanes. The project will relocate or add sidewalk as needed. All signal poles at the intersection will be relocated back and out of the way along with any associated cabinets. Signal hardware will be upgraded along with phasing modifications and the addition of reflectorized back plates. A water quality treatment swale is proposed at the southeast quadrant of the intersection.

**Lead Agency:** City of Eugene

**Partner Agencies:** Lane County

**Current Status:** Construction

**Estimated Completion:** 2024

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$4,200,000

**Funding Source:** ODOT ARTS Program, Local Funding

***Franklin Boulevard: A Partnership to Rebuild and Revive a Corridor (Eugene)***

The project will redesign Franklin Boulevard from an auto-focused state highway to a pleasant, multi-modal urban street that is safe for people walking, biking, riding the bus, using mobility

devices, and driving. The project will include the conversion of three signalized intersections to multilane roundabouts, the reduction of the roadway from six to four lanes, the reallocation of space for protected bicycle and pedestrian facilities and improved safety at traffic lane crossings, the addition of a second bus rapid transit lane, and conduits to accommodate future fiber optic cable installations.

**Lead Agency:** City of Eugene

**Partner Agencies:** City of Springfield, LTD

**Current Status:** Received FHWA NTP for PE phase

**Estimated Completion:** 2026

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$17,880,000 (Eugene – Component 2)

**Funding Source:** RAISE grant, Transportation SDCs, other local funds

### ***Amazon Creek Bridge at Bailey Hill Road (Eugene)***

The purpose of the project is to perform bridge seismic retrofits to the Bailey Hill Road bridge over the Amazon Creek. A Type, Size & Location report (TS&L), dated May 2020, was prepared for City under the federally funded Seismic Bridges (Eugene) project. This current project is to implement the seismic retrofit recommendations from the TS&L report for this structure.

**Lead Agency:** City of Eugene

**Partner Agencies:**

**Current Status:** Preliminary Engineering

**Estimated Completion:** 2024

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$884,000

**Funding Source:** STPBG

### ***Chambers St. Seismic Bridge Retrofits (Eugene)***

The purpose of the overall Project is to perform bridge seismic retrofits to the Chambers St. Bridge over the UPRR. A Type, Size & Location report (TS&L), dated May 2020, was prepared for Eugene under the federally funded Seismic Bridges (Eugene) project. This current project is to implement the seismic retrofit recommendations from the TS&L report for this structure.

**Lead Agency:** City of Eugene

**Partner Agencies:**

**Current Status:** Preliminary Engineering

**Estimated Completion:** 2024

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$2,200,356

**Funding Source:** STP-BG

***Ferry St. Over SPRR, 4<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> Aves (Eugene)***

Strengthen the existing bridge to maintain load rating for special hauling vehicles.

**Lead Agency:** City of Eugene

**Partner Agencies:**

**Current Status:** Preliminary Engineering

**Estimated Completion:** 2026

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$2,081,000

**Funding Source:** Local Bridge

***River Road-Santa Clara Pedestrian & Bicycle Bridge***

This project investigates the feasibility of constructing a pedestrian and bicycle bridge over Beltline Highway between River Road and Northwest Expressway. This study will further evaluate the location, costs, and impacts of a bicycle and pedestrian bridge linking Ruby Avenue, north of Beltline Highway, to either Grove Street, Sterling Drive, or Sterling Court, south of Beltline Highway.

**Lead Agency:** City of Eugene

**Partner Agencies:**

**Current Status:** Planning

**Estimated Completion:** 2024

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$700,000

**Funding Source:** CMAQ and TSDC funds

***Downtown Public Transportation and Shared Mobility Study***

Eugene's downtown area is changing in many ways: new housing is being built, a new Riverfront neighborhood is developing, and a new location for City Hall opens in 2024. This study will examine the best way for buses and shared mobility to serve Downtown, the Riverfront, and the new City Hall. The City of Eugene is partnering with Lane Transit District (LTD) to examine existing bus routes and look at which areas of Downtown and the Riverfront could be better served by public transportation. We will then develop several options to improve bus routes, add or change bus stops, or provide other forms of transportation. A

second phase of this study will go into further detail to look at how streets are prioritized in Downtown Eugene based on the outcomes of the transit and shared mobility study.

**Lead Agency:** City of Eugene

**Partner Agencies:** LTD

**Current Status:** In progress

**Estimated Completion:** 2024

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$125,000

**Funding Source:** STBG

### ***Franklin Boulevard Project, Phase 2 Design and Construction***

The City of Springfield received federal funding (RAISE Grant) in partnership with the City of Eugene to complete the design, right-of-way, and construction of the Mississippi roundabout. Bid award is planned for the end of 2024 and construction planned to be complete 2026. As funding becomes available, the City of Springfield intends to complete construction of the remaining phase(s) of Franklin Blvd improvements.

**Lead Agency:** City of Springfield

**Partner Agencies:** ODOT, LTD, City of Eugene

**Current Status:** 60% design complete, NEPA complete.

**Estimated Completion:** 2026

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$10.1 Million

**Funding Source:** RAISE grant, remainder TBD.

### ***42nd St Improvements***

The City of Springfield received \$12 million as identified in the 2017 Keep Oregon Moving statewide transportation funding package (HB2017) for key urban standards improvements on 42nd St. between the entrance to International Paper and Marcola Rd. Project intent is to improve turn movement options, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, drainage, and as possible, address improvements to the eastbound and westbound Oregon 126 freeway ramp terminals. Project must also interface with the 42nd Street Levee Modernization project adjacent to the east side of 42<sup>nd</sup> Street.

**Lead Agency:** City of Springfield

**Partner Agencies:** ODOT

**Current Status:** Awaiting design of the 42<sup>nd</sup> Street Levee Modernization to guide project design and cost estimates.

**Estimated Completion:** TBD

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$12,000,000

**Funding Source:** State transportation earmark dollars identified in HB 2017 and potentially federal funding.

It has been identified that there is a need for a preservation project to prolong the existing corridor's functionality while the larger levee project and full reconstruction are contemplated, and funding procured. The preservation project extends from International Paper to Marcola Road and includes a 2" overlay, ADA upgrades to existing curb ramps, striping, and signing.

**Lead Agency:** City of Springfield

**Partner Agencies:** ODOT

**Current Status:** Project in design and bid happening early 2024.

**Estimated Completion:** October 2024

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$1,750,000

**Funding Source:** Street capital funds

### ***Springfield Downtown Demonstration Project***

This catalytic project results in pedestrian scale decorative streetlights with LED light fixtures in Springfield's downtown. Decorative lights have been installed in portions of Springfield's downtown to improve safety, visibility, and aesthetics in the area and additional phases are planned as funding becomes available.

**Lead Agency:** City of Springfield

**Partner Agencies:** ODOT and SUB

**Current Status:** Phase 1 and Phase 2 completed. Phase 3 design in 2024.

**Estimated Completion:** 2025

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$1,164,000

**Funding Source:** ODOT BikePed Program

### ***Main Street/McVay Transit Study***

The purpose of the Main-McVay Transit Study is to evaluate the most promising transit options for the Main Street – McVay Highway Corridor as potential solutions to address growing concerns about safety, congestion, and quality of life that could be improved through transportation improvements.

**Local Agency:** LTD



**Partner Agencies:** City of Springfield, ODOT

**Current Status:** Starting in 2018, the Main-McVay Transit Study coordinated with the planning phase of the Main Street Safety Project to select a transit mode choice and transit alignment for Main Street. A transit recommendation of Enhanced Corridor and using the existing Route 11 alignment was incorporated into the draft Main Street Facility Plan. On 6/20/22, the Springfield City Council passed Resolution No. 2022-28 stating that the City Council will not proceed to a public hearing on the Main Street Facility Plan as recommended by the Springfield Planning Commission by Order dated 4/5/22.

Estimated Completion: 2023

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$1,500,000

**Funding Source:** FTA-5339

### ***Virginia-Daisy Bikeway Project***

The City of Springfield engaged the community in developing a design concept for Virginia Avenue and Daisy Street between S. 32<sup>nd</sup> St and Bob Straub Parkway, which was approved by City Council in November 2016. The project goal is to provide a safe and comfortable bicycle corridor that can be used by people of all ages and abilities. The corridor will serve as an east-west bike network option that will provide an alternative to Main Street. The project also strives to enhance the overall appeal of the corridor for all users and residents, improve pedestrian safety and usage, and provide traffic calming to emphasize safety and active transportation along the street.

**Lead Agencies:** City of Springfield

**Partner Agencies:** ODOT

**Current Status:** Improvements from S.42<sup>nd</sup> Pl. to S.51<sup>st</sup> Pl. were completed in 2020. S. 42<sup>nd</sup> St/Daisy St single-lane roundabout intersection horizontal design is complete and will move toward 30% design. Construction estimated to be complete 2025. The S.32<sup>nd</sup> St./Virginia Flashing crossing is currently in design.

Estimated Completion: October 2025

**Funding Source:** ODOT Bike/Ped Enhance Program, STP-U (Surface Transportation Planning – Urban), local funds. Secured funding for flashing crossing at S. 32<sup>nd</sup> St/Virginia Ave which is now in design. Construction planned to be complete in 2024.

**Estimated Project Cost:**

- S. 42<sup>nd</sup> Pl to S. 51<sup>st</sup> Pl actual cost \$1,300,000.
- S.42<sup>nd</sup>/Daisy Roundabout: \$990,000 (STBG Grant = \$888,327, Local Match (SDCs) = \$101,673)

- S.32<sup>nd</sup> St/Virginia Flashing crossing: \$350,000 (STGB Grant = \$314,055, Local Match = \$35,945)
- Remaining phases \$1,681,853

### ***Springfield Transportation System Plan***

A significant amount of transportation system planning work will need to be completed to serve our community's changing needs, update plans based on changing contexts, and to comply with state transportation planning requirements related to Climate Friendly and Equitable Communities (CFEC). The Springfield 2035 Transportation System Plan (TSP) must be updated in accordance with CFEC requirements to adequately plan roadway projects as well as incorporate elements of the bicycle and pedestrian planning work to begin in 2024. Springfield's work plan required by CFEC outlines work to begin in 2026/27 with project completion by 2030.

**Lead Agency:** City of Springfield

**Partner Agencies:** LTD, ODOT, Lane County

**Current Status:** Partially programmed *and projected to begin 2026/27*

**Estimated Completion:** 2030

**Estimated Project Cost:** TBD, Depending on scope of work.

**Funding Source:** \$300,000 CRP Y601 awarded, seeking additional funding

### ***Springfield Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan***

One of the recommendations in the 2035 Springfield Transportation System Plan (TSP) is to complete a Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan that builds off the TSP policy set and project list and further refines the implementation strategy to enhance walking and biking in Springfield.

**Lead Agency:** City of Springfield

**Partner Agencies:** LTD

**Current Status:** *Projected to be begin 2024.*

**Estimated Completion:** 2026

**Estimated Project Cost:** TBD

**Funding Source:** \$300,000 CRP Y601 awarded, additional funding may be required.

### ***Franklin Blvd (OR 225): Franklin Blvd (OR 126) to End of City Jurisdiction Design***

Franklin Boulevard (OR 225) is a primary north-south connection between I-5 and Franklin Blvd (OR 126). This project will develop a design concept that identifies right-of-way width, various elements such as bicycle, pedestrian, and stormwater needs, intersection layout, and potential realignment of an intersecting street. The project aims to improve connections, provide bike, pedestrian, and stormwater facilities, provide a safer facility for all modes, and help make the Glenwood area a vibrant place to live, work, and visit. Lane County is supporting the City of Springfield with delivering this federal aid design project.

**Lead Agency:** City of Springfield

**Partner Agencies:** Lane County

**Current Status:** Procuring a consultant.

**Estimated Completion:** 2024

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$800,000

**Funding Source:** STBG, HIP (pending IGA revision)

### ***Mill Street Reconstruct***

This project will design and reconstruct Mill Street from S. A Street to Centennial Boulevard in Springfield. The final project will replace the existing pot-hole laden street with a smooth pavement surface, make ADA ramp upgrades, incorporate modern storm water treatment, and complete the Springfield Transportation System Plan project PB-20 by restriping for bicycle facilities.

**Lead Agency:** City of Springfield

**Partner Agencies:** ODOT

**Current Status:** 90% design is complete.

**Estimated Completion:** 2025

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$17,006,740

**Funding Source:** STBG, local funds

### ***S. 28<sup>th</sup> Street Dust Mitigation***

The existing gravel road will be paved, and a multi-use path will be added on one side of the street to more safely accommodate people walking and biking. The sanitary sewer line was extended in 2022 as part of this project to help serve a recently expanded area of Springfield's urban growth boundary to accommodate future development.

**Lead Agency:** City of Springfield

**Partner Agencies:** ODOT, Lane County

**Current Status:** Project awarded to Emery & Sons Construction

**Estimated Completion:** Fall 2024

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$1,915,000

**Funding Source:** CMAQ, local funds

### ***Walking and Biking Network Improvements (Springfield)***

Addressing highest need locations for filling gaps in the walking and biking networks and near schools and the downtown corridor in Springfield to complete connections, reduce congestion and address safety. Project includes two portable temporary rapid flashing beacons, crossing on Mohawk Blvd south of I St, crossing on 5th St north of Q St, flashing beacons at Pioneer Parkway East and West at E St, at Thurston Rd at 69th St, and EWEB path crossing enhancements with refuge islands at 5th and 19th Streets, sidewalk rehabilitation at various locations.

**Lead Agency:** City of Springfield

**Partner Agencies:** ODOT

**Current Status:** Starting IGA and consultant RFP process.

**Estimated Completion:** 2027

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$4,359,394

**Funding Source:** HIP Z905, TA Y301, CRP Y601, CMAQ Y401, local funds

### ***Q Street Reconstruct***

Q Street from Pioneer Parkway East to 5<sup>th</sup> Street is a major urban collector in Springfield that requires reconstruction. This section of street has the highest needs in Springfield based on recent surface condition analyses. It serves busy commercial establishments including two grocery stores, restaurant businesses, and retail stores as well as provides access to a residential zone. This project also feeds into the onramp onto Hwy 126 Expressway. All facilities will be brought up to current standards including making ADA improvements and renewing bike lane striping. This will be used as the City's first Federal Certification test project.

This project was canceled at TPC on March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2023, and all funding was reallocated to Mill Street Reconstruction. Q Street is still a high priority for the City of Springfield and additional funding is being pursued.

**Lead Agency:** City of Springfield

**Partner Agencies:** ODOT

**Current Status:** additional funding required.

**Estimated Completion:** TBD

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$5,125,000

**Funding Source:** TBD

### ***Beltline Highway: Delta Highway to River Road Project***

ODOT completed the Beltline Highway: Coburg Road to River Road Facility Plan in 2014. Preliminary designs for the conceptual improvements recommended in the facility plan, along with an environmental study to assess the potential impacts, were completed in 2022. (Refer to STIP project 16223.) One of the projects identified in the facility plan, Delta Highway interchange improvements, was funded (in 2016) for design and construction. Construction was completed in 2022. (STIP project 19490.) A second phase of improvements to this interchange is funded for design (\$6M) but not construction (\$21M). (STIP project 22627.) Other projects identified in the facility plan are not yet funded for either design or construction.

**Lead Agency:** ODOT

**Partner Agencies:** Lane County, City of Eugene, LTD

**Current Status:** Phase 2 of the Delta Highway interchange improvements is funded for design but not construction. Other projects identified in the facility plan are not yet funded for either design or construction.

**Estimated Completion:** 2025 (Design)

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$6 M, \$21 M (construction)

**Funding Source:** Various state and federal funds.

### ***OR126: Eugene to Veneta NEPA study***

The Highway 126 Fern Ridge Corridor Plan was completed in 2012 to identify. It identifies improvements to address congestion and safety concerns along this 8-mile corridor, a portion of which (1 mile) is within the MPO boundary. Alternative solutions identified in the plan included turn lanes, bus pullouts, and widening the roadway to four lanes. Phase 2 of the planning process began in 2020. (Refer to STIP project 21231.) This The scope includes refining design concepts, evaluating potential impacts, selecting a locally preferred alternative, and preparing environmental (NEPA) documentation. This phase of the project will be completed in 2025.

**Lead Agency:** ODOT

**Partner Agencies:** Eugene, Lane County, City of Veneta

**Current Status:** Field work and the first phase of public involvement were completed in 2020. Design concepts were further developed and evaluated in 2021. Preliminary design and NEPA documentation will be completed in 2025. Funding has not been identified for final design or construction.

**Estimated Completion:** 2025

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$3 M

**Funding Source:** State and federal funds specified in Oregon HB 2017.

### ***Safe Lane Coalition***

The regional Safe Lane Coalition Program is a project that will focus on implementing recent regional safety planning efforts across jurisdictions. This collaborative program will focus on reducing fatal and severe injuries because of traffic collisions in Lane County.

**Lead Agency:** LCOG, Lane County

**Partner Agencies:** ODOT, City of Springfield, City of Eugene, City of Coburg, LTD, Lane County Public Health, BEST, Oregon Technology Association.

**Current Status:** Ongoing

**Estimated Completion:** Ongoing

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$150,000

**Funding Source:** ODOT TSD Funds, STBG

### ***Regional Safety Enhancements***

The Safe Lane Coalition is a partnership of local governments, nonprofits, and safety advocates that works to reduce fatal and severe crashes within the Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization. The Safe Lane Coalition has built a strong network of collaboration, and this project will expand these efforts with funding for implementation. This project funds the following projects, increased safety data analysis in the City of Springfield, educational marketing and outreach, tactical urbanism/ temporary safety installations and speed monitoring equipment, and continued support for the Safe Lane Coalition coordination.

**Lead Agency:** LCOG, City of Eugene, City of Springfield.

**Partner Agencies:** ODOT, LTD, Lane County, BEST

**Current Status:** Contracting

**Estimated Completion:** 2025

**Estimated Project Costs:** \$450,000

**Funding Source:** STBG

### ***LinkLane Transit Service***

Link Lane provides bus routes that connect communities within and beyond Lane County. The service is provided by Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) in partnership with the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians and is funded by Oregon's Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund.

**Lead Agency:** LCOG, Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians

**Partner Agencies:** ODOT, Lane Transit District, Lane County, City of Florence, City of Veneta, Mapleton, City of Cottage Grove

**Current Status:** Ongoing

**Estimated Completion:** Ongoing

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$2,000,000

**Funding Source:** ODOT, STIF Funds, FTA 5339

### ***Regional Bike Enhancements***

The Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization (CLMPO) Regional Bicycle Enhancement project supports regional bicycle improvements. The project supports secure bike locking in Eugene and bike parking in Springfield (including signage, striping, and bollards). The project will be implemented through contracts with the City of Eugene and City of Springfield.

**Lead Agency:** LCOG, City of Eugene, City of Springfield

**Partner Agencies:** ODOT

**Current Status:** Contracting

**Estimated Completion:** FY24

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$153,104

**Funding Source:** STBG

### ***Lane County Rural Safe Routes to School***

A partnership between Lane County and Lane Council of Governments to develop a Safe Routes to School program to serve school districts in rural Lane County. The program works to improve safety for students to walking and biking to school and encourage more walking and biking where safety is not a barrier. Traditionally underserved communities deserve particular attention, in part because they tend to have more pedestrian and bicyclist injuries.

**Lead Agency:** Lane County, LCOG

**Partner Agencies:** ODOT, School Districts

**Current Status:** Pilot (3 years of funding available)

**Estimated Completion:** Ongoing

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$300,000

**Funding Source:** ODOT Transportation Safety Division Funds

### ***30th Avenue Corridor Active Transportation Corridor Design***

30th Avenue has had more bicycle/pedestrian fatalities/serious injuries than any other road under Lane County jurisdiction. The objective of this project is to advance the design concept resulting from the 30<sup>th</sup> Avenue Active Transportation Plan with preliminary engineering. In 2018, MPO funds were awarded to develop the 30<sup>th</sup> Avenue Active Transportation Plan. The planning effort included technical analysis, public involvement, consideration of design alternatives, and selection of a preferred design alternative. The design concept identifies the high-level footprint of the project and the cross-sections. The preferred design alternative was selected based on safety priorities. People walking and biking will have a wider space that is separated and buffered from vehicle traffic. Intersections with higher crash rates will be designed to reduce the frequency and severity of crashes. Additional design work would enable a determination of needed right-of-way, environmental review and associated permit needs, stormwater management, traffic modeling, wildlife crossings, safety countermeasures, and construction cost estimate. The project location is on 30<sup>th</sup> Avenue, between Agate Street and McVay Highway. The design work is anticipated to be complete within two years.

**Lead Agency:** Lane County

**Partner Agencies:** City of Eugene, City of Springfield, ODOT, LTD, and Lane Community College

**Current Status:** Consultant and staff are currently developing design concepts for the corridor.

**Estimated Completion:** 2027

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$1,010,121

**Funding Source:** CMAQ



***Coburg Road and Game Farm Rd***

This project is focused on pavement preservation along sections of Coburg Road (MP 4.84 - 6.60) and Game Farm Road (MP 0.59 - 1.69) to slow structural decline, restriping road surface and bringing curb ramps to ADA compliance to enhance safe transportation facilities and operations.

**Lead Agency:** Lane County

**Partner Agencies:** City of Eugene

**Current Status:** Project is currently being designed.

**Estimated Completion:** 2024

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$2,182,000

**Funding Source:** STBG-U, Lane County

***Gilham Road Sidewalk and Safety Improvements***

Gilham Road, between Ayres Road and Sterling Park Place, was built as a rural roadway in the County with no sidewalks; however, the road is within the City of Eugene's UGB. The lack of sidewalks creates a safety issue for people, especially school children, walking on Gilham Road. This project will build sidewalks, bike lane, stormwater facilities, and improve the walkability of the neighborhood. The scope of the project has been adjusted and now terminates at Don Juan Avenue instead of Sterling Park Place.

**Lead Agency:** Lane County

**Partner Agencies:** City of Eugene

**Current Status:** Project has been phased due to the elevated construction cost estimate. Design for first phase of project is being completed.

**Estimated Completion:** 2024

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$1,849,322

**Funding Source:** CMAQ, STBG-U

***Laura Street: MP 0.12 to 0.34, Urban Standards***

Laura Street, between the Monta Loma Park and southern entrance of Oregon Neurology located on Hayden Bridge Way, is under Lane County jurisdiction. The road is located within the City of Springfield's Urban Growth Boundary, and the remaining segments of road are under City jurisdiction. The segment of Laura Street under County jurisdiction needs to be upgraded to urban standards to 1) create a road that provides safe facilities for all users of the road including those who walk and bike, 2) to improve pavement condition and avoid further costly pavement treatments, and 3) to facilitate the transfer of this segment of road from Lane County to the City of Springfield. Improvements that would bring this segment of Laura Street up to urban standards include sidewalks, curbs, stormwater treatment, and bike lanes. In addition to making this segment of road safer and more accessible to all users of the road, these improvements would allow for jurisdictional transfer from the County to the City, better aligning the needs and interests of residents with the resources of the city.

**Lead Agency:** Lane County

**Partner Agencies:** City of Springfield

**Current Status:** Project is currently being designed.

**Estimated Completion:** 2025

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$3,137,000

**Funding Source:** STBG-U

***Lane County Americans with Disabilities Act Transition Plan for the Public Right of Way***

The ADA Transition Plan provides direction for Lane County Public Works (LCPW) to remove accessibility barriers from pedestrian facilities within the County public right-of-way, including curb ramps, street crossings, and pedestrian-activated traffic signal systems. Lane County Public Works is committed to providing safe and equal access for persons with disabilities in our community. Many of these barriers have been identified within the MPO Boundary. Lane County works to identify a project every year to remove accessibility barriers from pedestrian facilities.

**Lead Agency:** Lane County

**Partner Agencies:** City of Eugene, City of Springfield, ODOT, LTD, and LCOG

**Current Status:** In progress

**Estimated Completion:** Annual program.

**Estimated Project Cost:** ~ \$250,000 annually.

**Funding Source:** Lane County

### ***Lane County Transportation Safety Action Plan (TSAP) Implementation***

The objective of this plan is to help reduce traffic fatalities and serious injuries on County roads, bridges, and paths. The plan identifies a wide range of safety challenges and strategies. Strategies include but are not limited to installing APS signals and other infrastructure improvements, to traffic calming and safety campaigns.

**Lead Agency:** Lane County

**Current Status:** The plan has been completed. Lane County exhausted implementation strategies and pursued additional funding via Safe Streets for All to update the TSAP.

**Estimated Completion:** TBD

**Estimated Project Cost:** TBD

**Funding Source:** TBD

### ***Airport Road Pavement Preservation: MP 0.63-1.52***

Airport Road is a critical facility that provides the surrounding region access to the Eugene Airport. Traffic loads over time have contributed to the deterioration of the pavement, prompting the need for pavement preservation treatment. Implementing this pavement preservation project will prevent more costly repairs in the future and support Lane County's Strategic Plan goal to maintain robust infrastructure. The project corridor intersects with Green Hill Road, a location with a notable crash history. The implementation of this project will also include safety improvements at the Green Hill Road intersection, including the reconfiguration of the Green Hill Road approach; the elimination of the right turn lane; and the addition of a receiving lane. Additional safety countermeasures will be evaluated for inclusion. The intention of these treatments is to reduce crash severity, in alignment with Lane County's Transportation Safety Action Plan.

**Lead Agency:** Lane County

**Current Status:** Not started.

**Estimated Completion:** 2027

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$1,112,000

**Funding Source:** STBG

### ***Clear Lake Road Pavement Preservation: MP 0.0-2.75***

Clear Lake Road is an important transportation corridor that provides access between Highway 99 to Territorial Highway and Fern Ridge Lake. Traffic loads over time have contributed to the deterioration of the pavement, prompting the need for pavement preservation treatment. Implementing this pavement preservation project will prevent more costly repairs in the future and support Lane County's Strategic Plan goal to maintain robust infrastructure. This project also seeks to improve the intersection of Clear Lake Road and Green Hill Road to address safety and operational issues. The current intersection promotes high speed and fails to accommodate bicycle traffic. Speed treatments and other safety countermeasures will be implemented to address these issues. Additionally, operational upgrades will be made to address maintenance needs, including rehabilitation of existing conduits and junction boxes; and a signal upgrade. The City of Eugene will provide additional funding to this project in order to build a left-turn pocket for a driveway for the future Golden Gardens sports complex. The driveway will be located on the south side of Clear Lake Road approximately 3,300 feet west of Hwy 99. The city's contribution will cover engineering, right of way and construction costs related to adding the left-turn pocket.

**Lead Agency:** Lane County

**Current Status:** Not started

**Estimated Completion:** 2027

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$2,454,000

**Funding Source:** STBG

### ***Wilkes Drive: River Road to River Loop 1***

The intent of this project is to bring Wilkes Drive up to urban standards. The outcome will be to better serve all users of the road and implement pavement preservation treatments to extend the service life of the road. Lane County also foreshadows this project being the conduit of jurisdictional transfer of the road to the City of Eugene. This road supports a vibrant neighborhood and leads to city parkland that is in the planning process to be developed into the Santa Clara Community Park. Additionally, Wilkes Drive provides access to Madison Middle School. The current cross-section of the road includes one auto-travel lane in each direction, with shoulders and a separated path that is used by many community members. Lane County will work closely with the City of Eugene staff in the development of the project to ensure the outcome meets City standards and future construction will lead to jurisdictional transfer. Staff will use an in-depth community engagement process to confirm the appropriate cross section of the road. Our plan is to have a clearly identified footprint and cross-section at the end of the Planning Phase to facilitate the needed environmental documentation and lead to a successful

Design Phase that meets community and City of Eugene expectations. The Design Phase will complete the environmental work and preliminary engineering to ensure the project is ready for construction. While no formal change has been made in the STIP, Lane County intends on transferring this project and associated funding to the City of Eugene.

**Lead Agency:** Lane County

**Current Status:** Not started

**Estimated Completion:** 2028

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$1,121,625

**Funding Source:** CMAQ

### ***Safe Streets for All***

The Lane County TSAP adopted by the Board of County Commissioners in 2017 does not meet the Action Plan requirements of the SS4A funding source to enable funding of either Supplemental Activities or Construction. This is due to deficiencies in timeline, location analysis, and equity impact assessments. This planning funding is to develop a rural-focused TSAP to enable Lane County to access future SS4A implementation funding and to achieve zero deaths on Lane County rural roads.

**Lead Agency:** Lane County

**Partner Agencies:**

**Current Status:** Ongoing

**Estimated Completion:** 2026

**Estimated Project Cost:** \$1,000,000


**Funding Source:** FHWA

## **Completed Projects**

Several significant local and regional projects have been completed over the last several years, including the following highlights:

- Completed construction Amazon Active Transportation Corridor in south Eugene which includes a two-way protected bikeway, three pedestrian and bicycle bridges, a bike signal, and the southward extension of the Amazon Path.
- Completed construction on 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue protected bikeway.
- Maintained Eugene bike share system PeaceHealth Rides through a transition in management and COVID-19 impacts.
- Springfield City Council and Lane County Commissioners jointly adopted the Springfield Transportation System Plan Implementation Project in early 2020, which included an amendment to the Springfield 2035 Transportation System Plan Project List and Figures and amendments to the Springfield Development Code.
- Springfield completed construction of Phase 1 of the Virginia-Daisy Bikeway Project.
- Seven flashing pedestrian crossings with refuge islands were installed along OR126B Main Street by the City of Springfield in partnership with the Oregon Department of Transportation.
- Springfield completed construction of two new enhanced crosswalks near schools and community activity centers (21st at H St rapid flashing beacon near Maple Elementary School and G St raised crossing in front of Two Rivers – Dos Rios Elementary School).
- The ODOT Beltline at Delta Highway interchange improvement project is under construction. It will be completed in 2021.
- The ODOT I-105 Bridge Preservation Project will be completed in early 2021.  
Lane Transit District FY2022-FY2024 Strategic Business Plan adopted by LTD Board on July 21, 2021.
- Lane County completed construction of the Howard Elementary - Maxwell Road and North Park Avenue project, which included pedestrian-activated crossings and sidewalk infill.
- Eugene completed the conceptual design phase of Franklin Boulevard. The design transforms Franklin Boulevard from an auto-oriented arterial to a multimodal boulevard.
- Eugene completed the South Bank Path Rehabilitation and Lighting project, rehabilitating the shared use path from the Downtown Riverfront to the Frohnmayer Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge.
- Eugene completed construction on the High Street Protected Bikeway, which provides a two-way protected bikeway on High Street from 5th Avenue to 19th Avenue.

- Eugene completed the design for the Beaver Hunsaker Corridor Plan, creating a shovel ready project from the recommendations in the Corridor Plan. The corridor plan addressed the need for improved bicycle/pedestrian access along the Hunsaker Lane Beaver Street corridor, from Division Avenue to River Road and from Beaver Street extending north to Wilkes Drive.



**Appendices B-H,**  
No changes to these sections.

**Appendix I** (removed - addressed in Section 1)

