



# Oregon

Theodore R. Kulongoski, Governor

Department of Land Conservation and Development

635 Capitol Street, Suite 150

Salem, OR 97301-2540

(503) 373-0050

Fax (503) 378-5518

www.lcd.state.or.us



## NOTICE OF ADOPTED AMENDMENT

04/15/2009

**TO:** Subscribers to Notice of Adopted Plan  
or Land Use Regulation Amendments

**FROM:** Larry French, Plan Amendment Program Specialist

**SUBJECT:** City of Springfield Plan Amendment  
DLCD File Number 008-08

The Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) received the attached notice of adoption. A Copy of the adopted plan amendment is available for review at the DLCD office in Salem and the local government office.

Appeal Procedures\*

**DLCD ACKNOWLEDGMENT or DEADLINE TO APPEAL:** Wednesday, April 29, 2009

This amendment was submitted to DLCD for review prior to adoption. Pursuant to ORS 197.830(2)(b) only persons who participated in the local government proceedings leading to adoption of the amendment are eligible to appeal this decision to the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA).

If you wish to appeal, you must file a notice of intent to appeal with the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) no later than 21 days from the date the decision was mailed to you by the local government. If you have questions, check with the local government to determine the appeal deadline. Copies of the notice of intent to appeal must be served upon the local government and others who received written notice of the final decision from the local government. The notice of intent to appeal must be served and filed in the form and manner prescribed by LUBA, (OAR Chapter 661, Division 10). Please call LUBA at 503-373-1265, if you have questions about appeal procedures.


**\*NOTE:** THE APPEAL DEADLINE IS BASED UPON THE DATE THE DECISION WAS MAILED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENT. A DECISION MAY HAVE BEEN MAILED TO YOU ON A DIFFERENT DATE THAT IT WAS MAILED TO DLCD. AS A RESULT, YOUR APPEAL DEADLINE MAY BE EARLIER THAN THE ABOVE DATE SPECIFIED.

**Cc:** Greg Mott, City of Springfield  
Gloria Gardiner, DLCD Urban Planning Specialist  
Bill Holmstrom, DLCD Transportation Planner  
Ed Moore, DLCD Regional Representative

<paa> YA

# Notice of Adoption

**THIS FORM MUST BE MAILED TO DLCD  
WITHIN 5 WORKING DAYS AFTER THE FINAL DECISION  
PER ORS 197.610, OAR CHAPTER 660 - DIVISION 18**



Jurisdiction: **City of Springfield**

Local file number: **LRP 2008-00013**

Date of Adoption: **4/6/2009**

Date Mailed: **4/8/2009**

Was a Notice of Proposed Amendment (Form 1) mailed to DLCD? **Yes** Date: 10/15/2008

- Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment
- Land Use Regulation Amendment
- New Land Use Regulation
- Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment
- Zoning Map Amendment
- Other:

Summarize the adopted amendment. Do not use technical terms. Do not write "See Attached".

Moved to highway interchange improvement projects from the unfunded, future project list to the financially constrained project list in the comprehensive plan and the transportation system plan. These same changes were duplicated on maps showing unfunded project location and maps showing financially constrained project location.

Does the Adoption differ from proposal? No, no explanation is necessary

Plan Map Changed from: **unfunded**

to: **financially constrained**

Zone Map Changed from: **N/A**

to: **N/A**

Location: **OR125@52nd; OR126@Main Street**

Acres Involved: **0**

Specify Density: Previous: **N/a**

New: **N/A**

Applicable statewide planning goals:

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19

Was an Exception Adopted?  YES  NO

Did DLCD receive a Notice of Proposed Amendment...

45-days prior to first evidentiary hearing?

Yes  No

If no, do the statewide planning goals apply?

Yes  No

If no, did Emergency Circumstances require immediate adoption?

Yes  No

---

**DLCD file No.** \_\_\_\_\_

Please list all affected State or Federal Agencies, Local Governments or Special Districts:

ODOT, CITY OF EUGENE, LANE COUNTY

---

Local Contact: **Greg Mott**

Phone: (541) 726-3774 Extension: 3774

Address: **225 Fifth Street**

Fax Number: **541-726-3689**

City: **Springfield**

Zip: **97477-**

E-mail Address: **gmott@ci.springfield.or.us**

---

## **ADOPTION SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS**

This form **must be mailed** to DLCD **within 5 working days after the final decision**  
per ORS 197.610, OAR Chapter 660 - Division 18.

1. Send this Form and TWO Complete Copies (documents and maps) of the Adopted Amendment to:  

**ATTENTION: PLAN AMENDMENT SPECIALIST  
DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT  
635 CAPITOL STREET NE, SUITE 150  
SALEM, OREGON 97301-2540**
2. Electronic Submittals: At least **one** hard copy must be sent by mail or in person, but you may also submit an electronic copy, by either email or FTP. You may connect to this address to FTP proposals and adoptions: **webserver.lcd.state.or.us**. To obtain our Username and password for FTP, call Mara Ulloa at 503-373-0050 extension 238, or by emailing **mara.ulloa@state.or.us**.
3. Please Note: Adopted materials must be sent to DLCD not later than **FIVE (5) working days** following the date of the final decision on the amendment.
4. Submittal of this Notice of Adoption must include the text of the amendment plus adopted findings and supplementary information.
5. The deadline to appeal will not be extended if you submit this notice of adoption within five working days of the final decision. Appeals to LUBA may be filed within **TWENTY-ONE (21) days** of the date, the Notice of Adoption is sent to DLCD.
6. In addition to sending the Notice of Adoption to DLCD, you must notify persons who participated in the local hearing and requested notice of the final decision.
7. **Need More Copies?** You can now access these forms online at **http://www.lcd.state.or.us/**. Please print on **8-1/2x11 green paper only**. You may also call the DLCD Office at (503) 373-0050; or Fax your request to: (503) 378-5518; or Email your request to **mara.ulloa@state.or.us** - ATTENTION: PLAN AMENDMENT SPECIALIST.

ORDINANCE NO. 6240

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE EUGENE-SPRINGFIELD METROPOLITAN AREA GENERAL PLAN (*METRO PLAN*) AND THE EUGENE-SPRINGFIELD TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN (*TRANSPLAN*) BY REMOVING PROJECT #27 OR126/MAIN STREET AND PROJECT #30 OR126/52<sup>ND</sup> STREET FROM TABLE 1b AND MAP – APPENDIX A IN CHAPTER 3 OF *TRANSPLAN* AND CONSISTENT WITH POLICY F.9 OF THE *METRO PLAN*; AND PLACE THESE SAME PROJECTS IN TABLE 1a AND MAP – APPENDIX A IN CHAPTER 3 OF *TRANSPLAN* AND CONSISTENT WITH POLICY F.9 OF THE *METRO PLAN*; AND ADOPTING A SEVERABILITY CLAUSE.

WHEREAS, Chapter IV of the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan (*Metro Plan*) sets forth procedures for amendment of the *Metro Plan*, which for Springfield are implemented by the provisions of Chapter 5 of the Springfield Development Code; and

WHEREAS, the *Metro Plan* identifies the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area Transportation Plan (*TransPlan*) as a special purpose functional plan which forms the basis for the Transportation Element of the *Metro Plan* and is therefore subject to the same amendment procedures as the *Metro Plan*; and

WHEREAS, the *TransPlan* serves the goals, objectives and policies of the *Metro Plan* by addressing a variety of transportation issues and includes project lists and maps identifying financially constrained roadway projects and future roadway projects; and

WHEREAS, the federal Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area was updated in November, 2007; and

WHEREAS, state law requires *TransPlan* to be consistent with the RTP, including the list of regionally significant roadway projects; and

WHEREAS, the recently updated RTP includes a financially constrained project list that includes Project #27 OR126/Main Street and Project #30 OR126/52<sup>nd</sup> Street; and

WHEREAS, the current *TransPlan* adopted in 1986 and amended in 1989, 1992 and 2001, and which still shows Project #27 OR126/Main Street and Project #30 OR126/52<sup>nd</sup> Street on the future roadway projects list, is in need of amendment to comply with state law requiring consistency between the federal RTP and the local transportation system plan; and

WHEREAS, amendments of the project lists in *TransPlan* require simultaneous amendment of the same project lists in the *Metro Plan* as described by Policy F.9, Chapter III, of the *Metro Plan*; and

WHEREAS, following a public hearing of the Springfield Planning Commission on February 3, 2009, the Springfield Planning Commission recommended amendments to the project lists and maps in *TransPlan* and the *Metro Plan* (File LRP 2008-00013) consistent with the status of those same projects in the federal RTP, to the Springfield City Council; and

Ordinance No. 6240 amending the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan and *TransPlan* to delete Project #27 OR126/Main Street and Project #30 OR126/52<sup>nd</sup> Street from the Future Roadway Project List and Map and add Project #27 OR126/Main Street and Project #30 OR126/52<sup>nd</sup> Street to the Financially Constrained 20-Year Capital Investment Actions Roadway Projects List and Map; and Adopting a Severability Clause.

WHEREAS, the City Council has conducted a public hearing and is now ready to take action based upon the above recommendations and the evidence and testimony already in the record as well as the evidence and testimony presented at the public hearing held in the matter of adopting amendments to the project lists and maps in *TransPlan* and the *Metro Plan*.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Common Council of the City of Springfield does ordain as follows:

Section 1. The "Transportation Element" (Chapter III, Section F) of the *Metro Plan* is hereby amended as follows: Delete Project #27 OR126/Main Street and Project #30 OR126/52<sup>nd</sup> Street from Table 1b Future Projects List and map Future Roadway Projects Map, Appendix A; add Project #27 OR126/Main Street and Project #30 OR126/52<sup>nd</sup> Street to Table 1a Financially Constrained 20-Year Capital Investment Actions Roadway Projects List and map Financially Constrained Roadway Map, Appendix A, consistent with Policy F.9. Project timing and estimated costs are not adopted as policy.

Section 2. Chapter III of *TransPlan* is hereby amended as follows: Delete Project #27 OR126/Main Street and Project #30 OR126/52<sup>nd</sup> Street from Table 1b Future Projects List and map Future Roadway Projects Map, Appendix A; add Project #27 OR126/Main Street and Project #30 OR126/52<sup>nd</sup> Street to Table 1a Financially Constrained 20-Year Capital Investment Actions Roadway Projects List and map Financially Constrained Roadway Map, Appendix A. Project timing and estimated costs are not adopted as policy.

Section 3. The Springfield City Council adopts the Legislative Findings set forth in the attached Exhibit "A" in support of this action.

Section 4. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or portion of this Ordinance is for any reason held invalid or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, such portion shall be deemed a separate, distinct and independent provision and such holding shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions hereof.


Adopted by the Common Council of the City of Springfield this 6th day of April, 2009 by a vote of 6 in favor 0 against.

Approved by the <sup>Council President</sup> ~~Mayor~~ of the City of Springfield this 6th day of April, 2009.



Mayor Council President

ATTEST:



City Recorder

REVIEWED & APPROVED  
AS TO FORM

Jones J Leahy  
3/2/09

Ordinance No. 6240 amending the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan and *TransPlan* to delete Project #27 OR126/Main Street and Project #30 OR126/52<sup>nd</sup> Street from the Future Roadway Project List and Map and add Project #27 OR126/Main Street and Project #30 OR126/52<sup>nd</sup> Street to the Financially Constrained 20-Year Capital Investment Actions Roadway Projects List and Map; and Adopting a Severability Clause.

Staff report and findings of compliance with the *Metro Plan* and Statewide Goals, Oregon Revised Statutes and Oregon Administrative Rules to Adopt Text and Map Revisions to the Eugene-Springfield Transportation System Plan (*TransPlan*) to move the OR126/52<sup>nd</sup> Street Intersection and the OR126/Main Street Intersection projects to the financially constrained list in *TransPlan*. These same changes will be made simultaneously to the *Metro Plan* as that document includes the maps and project lists found in *TransPlan*.

Springfield File: LRP 2008-00013 Amend *TransPlan* to move the OR126/52<sup>nd</sup> Street Intersection and the OR126/Main Street Intersection projects to the financially constrained list in *TransPlan* (Projects 30 and 27 deleted from Table 1b and added to Table 1a; remove the same two projects from the Future Roadway Projects Map and place them on the Financially Constrained Roadway Map, both of which are found in Appendix A of *TransPlan*).

## Applicant

City of Springfield

## Nature of the Application

The proposed amendment would concurrently amend *TransPlan* and the *Metro Plan* to:

- 1) Remove the OR126/Main and OR126/52<sup>nd</sup> Street intersection projects from *TransPlan* Chapter 3: Table 1b entitled "Future (Beyond 20-Years) Capital Investment Actions: Roadway Projects", and from the corresponding Future Roadway Projects Map (Appendix A); and,
- 2) Add the OR126/Main and OR126/52<sup>nd</sup> Street intersection projects to *TransPlan* Chapter 3: Table 1a entitled "Financially Constrained 20-Year Capital Investment Actions" and to the corresponding Financially-Constrained Roadway Projects Map (Appendix A).

The proposed amendments move the two projects to the Financially Constrained List in *TransPlan*<sup>1</sup> consistent with their status on the financially constrained project list in the federal Regional

---

<sup>1</sup> The requirement for financial constraint applies only to the federal RTP; state law does not include this requirement for regional or local transportation system plans. The project lists in *TransPlan* do differentiate between future (unfunded) and constrained (funded) because *TransPlan* formerly doubled as both the federal RTP and the state transportation system plan. In 2001 the MPO adopted the RTP separately from *TransPlan* thereby removing the need for federal standards remaining in *TransPlan*. Eugene, Springfield and Lane County did not undertake the amendment process to "de-federalize" *TransPlan* because the addition of Coburg within the MPO in

Transportation Plan (RTP Map: Exhibit G) and in compliance with OAR 660-012-0016(2) (a-b): *“When an MPO adopts or amends a regional transportation plan that relates to compliance with this division, the affected local governments shall review the adopted plan or amendment and either: (a) Make a finding that the proposed regional transportation plan amendment or update is consistent with the applicable provisions of adopted regional and local transportation system plan and comprehensive plan and compliant with applicable provisions of this division; or (b) Adopt amendments to the relevant regional or local transportation system plans consistent with one another and compliant with applicable provisions of this division.”*

## Background

The OR126/52<sup>nd</sup> Street and the OR126/Main Street Intersection Improvement Projects have been included in *TransPlan* since 1986 (See Exhibit A: OR 126 at Main Street Interchange Improvements). OR 126 is a critically important, limited access expressway that allows through movements of freight and passenger vehicles to by-pass 8 miles of local access urban uses along Main Street; this is an indispensable, irreplaceable facility. The intersection at Main Street is a highly traveled crossroads that provides the only west bound option for motorized vehicles originating east of 58<sup>th</sup> Street and destined for Springfield, Eugene and I-5. The intersection at 52<sup>nd</sup> is the only signalized, at-grade facility on this limited access expressway and is prone to delay and vehicular conflicts.

Specific planning for these two projects has been underway since 2001 as part of the OR 126 Expressway Management Plan (EMP). Two elements of this EMP are attached to this report as a demonstration of the reasons why these projects are a priority for ODOT and the City of Springfield: the Draft OR 126 EMP Phase 2 Problem Statements; and Memorandum 4.2: Existing Conditions Traffic Operations (Exhibits B and C). Both of these documents identify current safety and operational issues at both interchanges and forecast worsening conditions as the surrounding vacant land within Springfield's urban growth boundary develops at permitted, planned densities. The Jasper-Natron mixed use nodes are identified as development that is “expected to increase traffic at the intersection and surrounding area” in spite of the reduced vehicle trips associated with nodal development.

The draft Problem Statement projects a volume over capacity ratio (v/c) exceeding 1.0 at both intersections by 2025 if no action is undertaken. The Oregon Highway Plan sets a v/c of .80 for its facilities and this performance standard has already been exceeded at Or126/Main intersection; therefore capacity improvements will be required for both of these facilities in order to operate within state standards.

In November, 2007 the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) adopted an update to the federal RTP (See Exhibit F). Among other changes, this update moved the OR126/52<sup>nd</sup> Street Interchange Project and the OR126/Main Street Interchange Project from the Illustrative Project List (beyond 20-years) to the Financially Constrained 20-Year Capital Investment Actions List. These were not the only changes made to the RTP; the planning horizon was adjusted out to the year 2031; several projects were added in Eugene; and the boundary of the Plan was increased to include Coburg (Exhibit E). The state determined that these changes were sufficient to trigger OAR 660-012-0016 and require this metropolitan area to amend the state-mandated transportation system plan (*TransPlan*) to be consistent with the RTP.

---

2004 meant a much more substantial update of *TransPlan* would be required. The update of *TransPlan* was delayed in anticipation of the much larger work tasks necessary to achieve consistency with the 2007 RTP update (See Exhibit E).

The cities of Eugene and Springfield and Lane County could not complete all of these required amendments within one year as specified in OAR 660-012-0016(2) (b), therefore the state imposed the following provision of the rule: "amendments shall be initiated no later than 30 days from the adoption of the RTP amendment or update and shall be adopted no later than one year from the adoption of the RTP amendment or update or according to a work plan approved by the commission." The cities of Eugene and Springfield and Lane County submitted this required work plan to the Land Conservation and Development Commission in September for consideration at their October 16, 2008 meeting. The work program included, as a first step, the following Post-acknowledgment Plan Amendments (PAPAs): Remove completed projects; remove WEP; move ODOT projects from Illustrative to Financially Constrained list for consistency with RTP; adjust plan horizon. The Commission approved the work program without modification to these four PAPAs (See Exhibit D).

## Applicable Standards and Procedures

### Metro Plan Amendment Criteria

Section 5.14-110 of the Springfield Development Code provides that *Metro Plan* amendments shall be made in accordance with the standards contained in Chapter IV of the *Metro Plan* and the provisions of this code.

This application involves site specific amendments to *TransPlan*, a special purpose functional plan, which forms the basis for the Transportation Element of the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area General Plan.

The *Metro Plan* Amendment is a "Type II" amendment as defined in the Springfield Development Code at SDC 5.14-115, because it:

- a) involves a site specific transportation improvement project;
- b) does not change the *Metro Plan* Urban Growth Boundary;
- c) does not change the *Metro Plan* jurisdictional boundary;
- d) does not require a goal exception,
- e) does not include a non-site-specific amendment of the *Metro Plan* text.

Springfield is the "Home City" for the proposed amendment, as provided in SDC 5.14-115(D) because the subject site is east of I-5 and entirely within the city limits of Springfield.

The proposed *Metro Plan* Amendment does not have a regional impact, as defined in SDC 5.14-115(F) because the amendment:

- a) does not involve a change to a plan designation or a site location,
- b) does not significantly expand or decrease the residential, commercial or industrial growth potential within the City beyond that which is already planned for in *Metro Plan* and *TransPlan*,



c) does not have a demonstrable impact on the water, storm drainage, sanitary sewer, or transportation facilities of the City of Eugene or Lane County.

SDC 5.14-140 provides that, "To become effective, a *Metro Plan* Type II amendment inside the city limits must be approved by the Home City." The subject amendment is a site-specific Type II amendment involving land that is entirely within the city limits of the City of Springfield. Accordingly, it requires only approval by the governing body of the City of Springfield to become effective.

**STATEWIDE GOAL CONSISTENCY:**

Section 5.14-135 of the Springfield Development Code requires that, in reaching a decision on proposed *Metro Plan* amendments, the planning commission and city council shall adopt findings which demonstrate that the amendment is consistent with the relevant statewide planning goals; and that the amendment shall not make the *Metro Plan* internally inconsistent.

*TransPlan* is a special purpose functional plan which forms the basis for the Transportation Element of the *Metro Plan*. Demonstration of compliance with the statewide goals for this amendment which simply involves moving the two implementation projects in *TransPlan* from the Future List to the Financially Constrained List is address in a manner that explains why this action was not contrary to the goals.

The proposed amendments are consistent with applicable goals and interpretive rules as follows:

**GOAL 1 - CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT**

Springfield has an acknowledged citizen involvement program and an acknowledged process for securing citizen input on all proposed *Metro Plan* amendments. On October 15, 2008 notice of this proposed amendment was sent to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD). That notice included copies of the proposal previously approved by the Metropolitan Policy Committee for inclusion in the federal RTP in November, 2007, and a copy of the report that went to the Springfield City Council for the October 6, 2008 initiation of this amendment. The identical proposal was reviewed and approved by the Joint Elected Officials of Eugene, Springfield and Lane County on September 15, 2008 prior to being submitted to the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) in October as part of the proposed work program for the update of *TransPlan*. Each of these and activities and meetings were noticed and included opportunities for citizen involvement and comment. Mailed notice of this Planning Commission public hearing was sent to all property addresses and owner addresses within 300 feet of both interchanges on January 13, 2009, and published notice of the hearing was placed in the Eugene Register Guard on January 19, 2009.

## **GOAL 2 - LAND USE PLANNING**

Goal 2 requires that local comprehensive plans to be consistent with statewide land use goals; that local comprehensive plans are internally consistent; and that implementing ordinances are consistent with acknowledged comprehensive plans.

Both the OR 126/52<sup>nd</sup> Street and OR 126/Main Street interchange projects are located within the city limits of the City of Springfield. Adopting the proposed text and map amendments will not result in any change or conflict with the policies of *Metro Plan* or *TransPlan*. These projects are included on the *TransPlan* Capital Investment Actions Project List. This proposed amendment will move the two projects from the Future Investment Actions List to the Financially Constrained List in *Transplan* which means that they are anticipated to be constructed within the next 20-year time frame. These projects were initially included in *TransPlan* in 1986 as an integral component of the transportation system needed to support the population, employment and land uses *planned* for in the *Metro Plan*. These amendments will not expand or decrease the residential, commercial or industrial growth potential within the City beyond that which is already planned for in the *Metro Plan* and *TransPlan*; they are necessary to accommodate existing, planned UGB development.

## **GOAL 3 - AGRICULTURAL LANDS**

Adopting the proposed text and map amendments will not result in any change or conflict with the policies of the *Metro Plan* or *TransPlan* since these projects are already identified on the Capital Investment Actions Project List and are necessary to meet identified transportation system needs. Additionally, Goal 3 is inapplicable because it applies only to "rural" agricultural lands and the proposed projects are within an acknowledged urban growth boundary. (See OAR 660-15-000(3))

## **GOAL 4 - FOREST LANDS**

Adopting the proposed text and map amendments will not result in any change or conflict with the policies of the *Metro Plan* or *TransPlan* since these projects are already identified on the Capital Investment Actions Project List and are necessary to meet identified transportation system needs. Both project sites are located within Springfield's UGB therefore Goal 4 does not apply. (See OAR 660-06-0020)

## **GOAL 5 - OPEN SPACE, SCENIC AND HISTORIC AREAS, NATURAL RESOURCES**

Goal 5 requires local governments to protect a variety of open space, scenic, historic, and natural resource values. Goal 5 and its implementing rule, OAR 660 Division 16, require planning jurisdictions, at acknowledgment and as a part of periodic review, to

(1) identify such resources:

- (2) determine their quality, quantity, and location:
- (3) identify conflicting uses:
- (4) examine the economic, social, environmental, and energy (ESEE) consequences that could result from allowing, limiting, or prohibiting the conflicting uses, and
- (5) develop programs to resolve the conflicts.

Adopting the proposed text and map amendments will not result in any change or conflict with the policies of the *Metro Plan* or *TransPlan* since these projects are already identified on the Capital Investment Actions Project List and are necessary to meet identified transportation system needs. The proposed text amendments will not expand or decrease the residential, commercial or industrial growth potential within the City beyond that which is already planned for in the *Metro Plan* and *TransPlan*. There are no inventoried Goal 5 resources within the existing ODOT right of way therefore Goal 5 does not apply to this proposal. Any use of federal funds to construct improvements to these interchanges will require compliance with the provisions of NEPA; the NEPA process includes an assessment of actual and potential impacts on all identified natural resources in the vicinity of the project area.

#### **GOAL 6 - AIR, WATER, AND LAND RESOURCES QUALITY**

Placing these two projects on the constrained list in *TransPlan* does not preempt actual construction from standards or rules in place at the time of construction: all new construction must comply with applicable state and federal air and water quality standards. Adopting the proposed text and map amendments will not result in any change or conflict with the policies of the *Metro Plan* or *TransPlan* since these projects are already identified on the Capital Investment Actions Project List and are necessary to meet identified transportation system needs to service the land uses identified in the *Metro Plan*. Further, these text amendments will not expand or decrease the residential, commercial or industrial growth potential within the City beyond that which is already planned for in the *Metro Plan* and *TransPlan*. The level and significance of environmental impacts resulting from the physical improvements at the 52nd Street/OR 126 intersection and Main Street/OR126 intersection will be further assessed in accordance with NEPA requirements. Air quality can be degraded by the degree of congestion that occurs at street intersections. The improvement of these interchanges will reduce congestion to levels (.80 v/c or less) that comply with Oregon Highway Plan standards. Improved level of service reduces congestion thereby reducing vehicular contributions to degraded air quality.

#### **GOAL 7 - AREAS SUBJECT TO NATURAL HAZARDS**

Goal 7 requires that development subject to damage or that could result in loss of life not be planned or located in known areas of natural hazards and disasters without appropriate safeguards. The goal also requires that plans be based on an inventory of known areas of natural disaster and hazards. Both sites are flat (not within areas subject to rapidly moving landslides) and outside mapped flood hazards zones (Zone A 100-year flood hazard). The level and significance of environmental impacts resulting from the physical improvements at the 52nd Street/OR 126 intersection and Main Street/OR126 intersection will be assessed in accordance

with NEPA requirements. All construction associated with these proposed projects will be designed to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations.

### **GOAL 8 - RECREATIONAL NEEDS**

Goal 8 requires local governments to plan and provide for the siting of necessary recreational facilities to “satisfy the recreational needs of the citizens of the state and visitors.” Adopting the proposed text and map amendments will not result in any change or conflict with the recreational land use policies of the *Metro Plan* or the Willamalane Park and Recreation Plan. There are no existing or planned park facilities nearby these two sites therefore construction at these two sites will not create a negative impact on the recreational needs of the community. These text amendments will not expand or decrease the residential, commercial or industrial growth potential within the City beyond that which is already planned for in the *Metro Plan* and *TransPlan*.

### **GOAL 9 - ECONOMY OF THE STATE**

Goal 9 requires local governments to provide adequate opportunities for a variety of economic activities vital to the health, welfare, and prosperity of Oregon’s citizens.

Adopting the proposed text and map amendments will not result in any change or conflict with the economic policies of *Metro Plan*. Further, these text amendments will not expand or decrease the residential, commercial or industrial growth potential within the City beyond that which is already planned for in the *Metro Plan* and *TransPlan*. The Oregon Transportation Plan recognizes that goods movement of all types makes a significant contribution to the region’s economy and wealth and contributes to residents’ quality of life. OR 126 is a designated Truck Route. As these facilities become more congested, freight movement is influenced negatively through delays and spent fuel. Successful development of the Jasper-Natron mixed-use site will rely on a transportation system that can efficiently accommodate the variety of trips coming and going from this area. The OR126/52<sup>nd</sup> Street and OR126/Main Street projects are identified on the *TransPlan* Capital Investment Actions Project List and will support economic development opportunities in the City.

### **GOAL 10 - HOUSING**

LCDC’s Housing Goal requires cities to maintain adequate supplies of buildable lands for needed housing to provide for the housing needs of citizens of the state. Adopting the proposed text and map amendments will not result in any change or conflict with the housing policies of the *Metro Plan*. These text amendments will not expand or decrease the residential growth potential within the City beyond that which is already planned for in the *Metro Plan* and *TransPlan*. However, as stated in the Background section of this report, the Jasper-Natron area is a large, undeveloped mixed-use site that is intended to provide a broad choice in housing type and density as well as commercial and office shopping and employment opportunities. The OR126/52<sup>nd</sup> Street and OR126/Main Street intersection projects are identified on the *TransPlan*

Capital Investment Actions Project List as necessary to service planned land uses including this important development site. Reducing congestion in the immediate vicinity of this future development will make it a more attractive place to live and work and will improve the quality of life for existing and future residents in East Springfield.

### **GOAL 11 - PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES**

This goal requires the provision of a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services. Goal 11 does not apply to these proposed text amendments, since these amendments will not result in any change or conflict with the Public Facilities and Services Plan, a functional plan of the *Metro Plan* that does not contain transportation system improvements. These text amendments will not expand or decrease the residential, commercial or industrial growth potential within the City beyond that which is already planned for in the *Metro Plan* and *TransPlan*.

### **GOAL 12 - TRANSPORTATION**

The Transportation Goal requires the city to plan and provide for "a safe, convenient, and economic transportation system." Goal 12 also sets out numerous requirements for the content of local transportation plans. Both the OR 126/52<sup>nd</sup> Street and OR 126/Main Street interchange projects are identified as implementation actions on the *TransPlan* Capital Investment Actions Project List. This proposed amendment will move the two projects from the Future Investment Actions List to the Financially Constrained List in *Transplan* consistent with the status of these same two projects in the federal RTP as adopted in November 2007. These projects were initially included in *TransPlan* in 1986 as an integral component of the planned transportation system needed to support the population, employment and land uses planned for in the *Metro Plan*. Adopting the proposed text and map amendments will not result in any change or conflict with the policies of the *Metro Plan* or *TransPlan*, nor is this action being taken in response to a land use amendment. The preliminary analysis of the current and future operational characteristics of these two interchanges, as documented in the OR 126 EMP, is continued substandard performance and ultimately (by 2025) congestion 20% in excess of ODOT's maximum standard. Adopting the proposed text and map amendments is consistent with all applicable provisions of OAR 660-012-0016; there are no provisions in OAR 660-012 that require financially constrained project lists.

### **GOAL 13 - ENERGY CONSERVATION**

The Energy Goal is a general planning goal that calls for land and uses developed on the land to be managed and controlled so as to maximize the conservation of all forms of energy, based upon sound economic principles. Adopting the proposed text and map amendments will not result in any change or conflict with the energy policies of the *Metro Plan*. Reducing congestion, which is one of the cornerstones of project need, will save energy and improve air quality. Both the OR 126/52<sup>nd</sup> Street and OR 126/Main Street interchange projects are identified as implementation actions on the *TransPlan* Capital Investment Actions Project List. The proposed

projects will be designed to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local energy regulations.

#### **GOAL 14 - URBANIZATION**

The subject sites are within the Metro Area UGB and within the city limits of Springfield therefore Goal 14 has no direct applicability to this proposal. Adopting the proposed text and map amendments will not result in any change or conflict with the urbanization policies of the *Metro Plan*. These projects are identified implementation actions, necessary to meet the transportation system needs of the planned land uses in the *Metro Plan*. These text amendments will not expand or decrease the residential, commercial or industrial growth potential within the City beyond that which is already planned for in the *Metro Plan* and *TransPlan*.

#### **GOAL 15 - WILLAMETTE RIVER GREENWAY**

This goal is inapplicable because the subject sites are more than a mile from the nearest segment of the Willamette River Greenway boundary.

#### **GOALS 16-19 - COASTAL GOALS**

These goals do not apply to the City of Springfield.

#### **METRO PLAN CONSISTENCY**

The proposed amendment is consistent with applicable *Metro Plan* policies and objectives for the same reasons that it is consistent with the corresponding goals that those policies and objectives are designed to implement. Both the OR 126/52<sup>nd</sup> Street and OR 126/Main Street interchange projects are identified as implementation actions on the *TransPlan* Capital Investment Actions Project Lists. This proposed amendment will move the two projects from the Future Investment Actions List to the Financially Constrained List in *TransPlan* which is consistent with the status of these two projects in the federal RTP. These projects were initially included in *TransPlan* in 1986 and are an integral component of the planned transportation system designed to support the population, employment and land uses planned for in the *Metro Plan*. In addition, the proposal is consistent with the following provisions of the *Metro Plan* and *TransPlan*:

*The Metro Plan sets forth general planning policies and land use allocations and serves as the basis for the coordinated development of programs concerning the use and conservation of physical resources, furtherance of assets, and development or redevelopment of the metropolitan area.*

*The Metro Plan is intended to designate a sufficient amount of urbanizable land to accommodate the need for further urban expansion, taking into account the growth policy of the area to*

accommodate a population of 286,000 within the UGB by the year 2015. The Metro Plan also identifies the major public facilities required to meet the land use needs designated within the UGB. Page I-1

**These projects will modernize an existing asset (OR 126) of irreplaceable significance; these projects are necessary for the future development of Thurston and Jasper-Natron, two areas that represent the single largest remaining residential inventory in Springfield's UGB.**

*More specifically, the Metro Plan provides the overall framework for the following planning functions. The Metro Plan:*

- 1. Guides all governments and agencies in the metropolitan area in development and implementing their own activities which relate to the public planning process.*
- 2. Establishes the policy basis for a general, coordinated, long-range approach among affected agencies for the provision of the facilities and services needed in the metropolitan area.*
- 3. Makes planning information available to assist citizens to better understand the basis for public and private planning decisions and encourages their participation in the planning process.*
- 4. Proves the public with general guidelines for individual planning decisions. Reference to supplemental planning documents of a more localized scope, including neighborhood refinement plans, is advisable when applying the Metro Plan to specific parcels of land or individual tax lots.*
- 5. Assist citizens in measuring the progress of the community and its officials in achieving the Metro Plan's goals and objectives.*
- 6. Provides continuity in the planning process over an extended period of time.*
- 7. Establishes a means for consistent and coordinated planning decisions by all public agencies and across jurisdictional lines.*
- 8. Serves as a general planning framework to be augmented, as needed, by more detailed planning programs to meet the specific needs of the various local governments.*
- 9. Provides a basis for public decisions for specific issues when it is determined that the Metro Plan, without refinement, contains a sufficient level of information and policy direction.*
- 10. Recognizes the social and economic effects of physical planning policies and decisions.*
- 11. Identifies the major transportation, wastewater, stormwater, and water projects needed to serve a future UGB population of 286,000. Page I-2*

**The responses to compliance with Goals 1, 2, 9, 10, 12 and 14 preceding these citations are equally applicable to the Metro Plan's framework functions.**

*Metropolitan Goals:*

*Growth Management*

1. *Use urban, urbanizable, and rural lands efficiently.*
2. *Encourage orderly and efficient conversion of land from rural to urban uses in response to urban needs, taking into account metropolitan and statewide goals.*
3. *Protect rural lands best suited for non-urban uses from incompatible urban encroachment.*

#### *Residential Land Use and Housing*

1. *Provide viable residential communities so all residents can choose sound, affordable housing that meets individual needs.*

#### *Economic*

1. *Broaden, improve, and diversify the metropolitan economy while maintaining or enhancing the environment.*

#### *Transportation*

1. *Provide an integrated transportation and land use system that supports choices in modes of travel and development patterns that will reduce reliance on the automobile and enhance livability, economic opportunity, and quality of life.*
2. *Enhance the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area's quality of life and economic opportunity by providing a transportation system that is:*

*Balanced*

*Accessible*

*Efficient*

*Safe*

*Interconnected*

*Environmentally responsible*

*Supportive of responsible and sustainable development*

*Responsive to community needs and neighborhood impacts and*

*Economically viable and financially stable*

Page II-B-2

The responses to compliance with Goals 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 14 preceding these citations are applicable to these Metropolitan Goals. Two tremendously important facilities on the state's system in this region, and integral to Springfield's successful economic and housing priorities are currently experiencing safety and operational difficulties. Future development of planned residential and mixed-use centers within Springfield's UGB are projected to create periods of congestion well in excess of the state's standard for operational level of service. Additionally, the effects of this circumstance, if not corrected,



will diminish the economic vitality and livability associated with an efficient transportation system. Although modernization of existing roadways is only a part of an integrated land use and transportation plan, there is no substitute or viable alternative for freight and through movements in this part of Springfield, particularly where the largest vacant development site in the city awaits development as a mixed-use center.

### *Residential Land Supply and Demand*

#### *Policies*

*A.10 Promote higher residential density inside the UGB that utilizes existing infrastructure, improves the efficiency of public services and facilities, and conserves rural resource lands outside the UGB.*

*A.11 Generally locate higher density residential development near employment or commercial services, in proximity to major transportation systems or within transportation-efficient nodes.*

*A.12 Coordinate higher density residential development with the provision of adequate infrastructure and services, open space, and other urban amenities.*

*A.22 Expand opportunities for a mix of uses in newly developing areas and existing neighborhoods through local zoning and development regulations.*

*A.35 Coordinate local residential land use and housing planning with other elements of this plan, including public facilities and services, and other local plans, to ensure consistency among policies. Pages III-A-7 through III-A-13*

The success of the Jasper-Natron mixed-use nodal development as well as the remaining vacant residential land in Thurston are dependent upon a safe and efficient transportation system comprised of all modes of transportation. Even adding the presence of an expanded Emx transit system and additional employment opportunities at Jasper-Natron, new trips from within Springfield as well as those originating outside the plan area will rely on these two interchanges for access and through movement. Operating at a level of service in excess of the maximum standard established by ODOT is inconsistent with these *Metro Plan* policies; modernization to accommodate trips at a level of service of .80 v/c or less promotes the implementation of these *Metro Plan* policies.

### *Economic Element*

*B.6 Increase the amount of undeveloped land zoned for light industrial and commercial uses correlating the effective supply in terms of suitability and availability with the projections of demand.*

*B.18 Encourage the development of transportation facilities which would improve access to industrial and commercial areas and improve freight movement capabilities by implementing the policies and projects in the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area Transportation Plan (TransPlan) and the Eugene Airport Master Plan.*

*B.22 Review local ordinances and revise them to promote greater flexibility for promoting appropriate commercial development in residential neighborhoods.*

*B.23 Provide for limited mixing of office, commercial, and industrial uses under procedures which clearly define the conditions under which such uses shall be permitted and which: (a) preserve the suitability of the affected areas for their primary uses; (b) assure compatibility; and (c) consider the potential for increased traffic congestion. Pages III-B-4 through III-B-6*

The Jasper-Natron development area is slated for nodal development overlay district designation in at least two locations and possibly a third. This designation is intended to promote walkable communities within which a variety of housing types and densities are available; a variety of commercial goods and services are available; additional non-retail employment opportunities are available; a major transit facility is present; and includes a series of interconnected bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Notwithstanding these techniques at reducing use of and reliance on automobiles, auto trips will be generated where none currently exist (vacant land). These trips will rely heavily upon the OR 126 @ Main interchange and to a lesser degree, on the OR 126 @ 52<sup>nd</sup> interchange. If these two facilities are operating at unacceptable levels of service, the development of Jasper-Natron will certainly be delayed thereby influencing land supply needlessly to the detriment of Springfield's citizens.

### *Transportation Element*

*F.1 Apply the nodal development strategy in areas selected by each jurisdiction that have identified potential for this type of transportation-efficient land use pattern.*

*F.3 Provide for transit-oriented development along major transit corridors and near transit stations; medium- and high-density residential development within ¼ mile of transit stations, major transit corridors, employment centers, and downtown areas; and*

*development and redevelopment in designated areas that are or could be well served by existing or planned transit.*

*F.9 Adopt by reference, as part of the Metro Plan, the 20-Year Capital Investment Actions project lists contained in TransPlan. Project timing and estimated costs are not adopted as policy.*

*F.10 Protect and manage existing and future transportation infrastructure.*

*F.13 Support transportation strategies that enhance neighborhood livability.*

*F.14 Address the mobility and safety needs of motorists, transit users, bicyclists, pedestrians, and the needs of emergency vehicles when planning and constructing roadway system improvements.*

*F.15 Motor vehicle level of service policy:*

- a. Use motor vehicle level of service standards to maintain acceptable and reliable performance on the roadway system. These standards shall be used for:
  - (1) Identifying capacity deficiencies on the roadway system.*
  - (2) Evaluating the impacts on roadways of amendments to transportation plans, acknowledged comprehensive plans and land-use regulations, pursuant to the TPR (OAR 660-012-0060)*
  - (3) Evaluating development applications for consistency with the land-use regulations of the applicable local government jurisdiction.**
- b. Acceptable and reliable performance is defined by the following levels of service under peak hour traffic conditions: LOS E within Eugene's Central Area Transportation Study (CATS) area, and LOS D elsewhere.*
- c. Performance standards from the OHP shall be applied on state facilities in the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area.*

*F.16 Promote or develop a regional roadway system that meets combined needs for travel through, within, and outside the region.*

*F.29 Support reasonable and reliable travel times for freight/goods movement in the Eugene-Springfield region.*

*F.35 Set priorities for investment of ODOT and federal revenues programmed in the region's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to address safety and major capacity problems on the region's transportation system. Pages III-F-4 through III-F-13*

**The two projects are critical to the transportation system that supports all land uses in East Springfield and all freight and passenger trips which originate from outside the Metro Plan**

boundaries. OR 126 @ Main Street frequently experiences LOS F and is projected to worsen by 2025. This service level does not comply with the *Metro Plan's* LOS D nor does it comply with ODOT's service level of .80 v/c. Such substandard condition will delay, and may prevent the development of the Jasper-Natron mixed-use node, a land use pattern that supports a variety of housing by type, density and price range; neighborhood appropriate commercial and employment uses; presence of alternative modes of travel; and a more compact urban form. Modernization of these two interchanges (ultimately) will reduce congestion and improve air quality in and around highly developed neighborhoods thus improving at least two elements that are essential to livability.

*TransPlan*

*Land Use Policy #1: Nodal Development*

*Apply the nodal development strategy in areas selected by each jurisdiction that have identified potential for this type of transportation-efficient land use pattern.*

*Land Use Policy #2: Support for Nodal Development*

*Support application of the nodal development strategy in designated areas through information, technical incentives.*

*TSI System-Wide Policy #1: Transportation Infrastructure Protection and Management*

*Protect and manage existing and future transportation infrastructure.*

*TSI System-Wide Policy #4: Neighborhood Livability*

*Support transportation strategies that enhance neighborhood livability.*

*TSI System-Wide Policy #5: TransPlan Project Lists*

*Adopt by reference as part of the Metro Plan the 20-Year Capital Investment Actions project lists contained in TransPlan. Project timing and estimated costs are not adopted as policy.*

*TSI Roadway Policy #1: Mobility and Safety for all Modes*

*Address the mobility and safety needs of motorists, transit users, bicyclists, pedestrians, and the needs of emergency vehicles when planning and constructing roadway system improvements.*

## *TSI Roadway Policy #2: Motor Vehicle Level of Service (LOS)*

1. *Use motor vehicle level of service standards to maintain acceptable and reliable performance on the roadway system. These standards shall be used for:*
  - a. *Identifying capacity deficiencies on the roadway system.*
  - b. *Evaluating the impacts on the roadways of amendments to transportation plans, acknowledged comprehensive plans and land-use regulations, pursuant to the TPR (OAR) 660-012-0060*
  - c. *Evaluating development applications for consistency with the land-use regulations of the applicable local government jurisdiction.*
2. *Acceptable and reliable performance is defined by the following levels of service under peak hour traffic conditions: Level of Service E within Eugene's Central area Transportation Study (CATS) area; and Level of Service D elsewhere.*
3. *Performance standards from the Oregon Highway Plan shall be applied on state facilities in the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area.*

## *Finance Policy #3: Prioritization of State and Federal Revenue*

*Set priorities for investment of Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and federal revenues programmed in the region's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to address safety and major capacity problems on the region's transportation system."*<sup>2</sup> Pages 10-12, Chapter 2

## **CONCLUSION**

The proposed amendments meet all applicable standards and criteria in the Springfield Development Code, Chapter 5, Section 5.14-135. State law does not require state-mandated regional or local transportation plans to distinguish projects based on financial constraint; this is strictly a federal requirement for MPOs when adopting, updating or amending federal regional transportation plans. *TransPlan* has served as both the federal RTP and the state transportation system plan since at least 1986. In 2001 the MPO adopted *TransPlan* as the RTP and the elected officials of Springfield, Eugene and Lane County adopted *TransPlan* as a functional plan to the *Metro Plan*; however, this latter action occurred without removing the federal standards that had always co-habited *TransPlan*. This audit/edit was deferred to a later date to coincide with future

---

<sup>2</sup> Financial constraint is a requirement of the federal RTP and is defined as: "Financially constrained or Fiscal constraint means that the metropolitan transportation plan, TIP, and STIP includes sufficient financial information for demonstrating that projects in the metropolitan transportation plan, TIP and STIP can be implemented using committed, available, or reasonably available revenue sources, with reasonable assurance that the federally supported transportation system is being adequately operated and maintained." (CFR 450.104 Definitions)

triennial updates of the RTP. It is only as a result of this deferral circumstance, not Oregon Administrative Rule, which has led to the need to undertake this amendment to *TransPlan*. Notwithstanding this situation, the proposed amendments are consistent with the provisions in the Springfield Development Code and policies in the *Metro Plan* and *TransPlan* for *Metro Plan* amendment.

BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION  
OF THE  
CITY OF SPRINGFIELD

REQUEST FOR AMENDMENT OF THE	]	File LRP 2008-00013
EUGENE-SPRINGFIELD METROPOLITAN	]	RECOMMENDATION
AREA GENERAL PLAN AND TRANSPLAN,	]	TO THE SPRINGFIELD
ADDING PROJECT #27 AND #30 TO TABLE 1a	]	CITY COUNCIL
FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED 20-YEAR	]	
CAPITAL INVESTMENT ACTIONS AND TO	]	
MAP FINANCIALLY-CONSTRAINED ROADWAY	]	
PROJECTS IN APPENDIX A; AND REMOVING	]	
THESE SAME PROJECTS FROM TABLE 1b AND	]	
MAP FUTURE ROADWAY PROJECTS FROM	]	
APPENDIX A		

NATURE OF THE APPLICATION

This proposal moves two transportation facilities improvement projects from the future list to the financially constrained list in the Metropolitan Area General Plan (Metro Plan) and the Metropolitan Area Transportation System Plan (TransPlan). These amendments are consistent with the same amendments adopted into the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) in November, 2007. Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 660-012-0016(2) requires consistency between these plans:

*“When an MPO adopts or amends a regional transportation plan that relates to compliance with this division, the affected local governments shall review the adopted plan or amendment and either: (a) Make a finding that the proposed regional transportation plan amendment or update is consistent with the applicable provisions of adopted regional and local transportation system plan and comprehensive plan and compliant with applicable provisions of this division; or (b) Adopt amendments to the relevant regional or local transportation system plans consistent with one another and compliant with applicable provisions of this division.”*

The commitment to achieve this required consistency was affirmed, respectively, on September 15, 2008 by the joint elected officials of Springfield, Eugene and Lane County; and on October 16, 2008 by the Land Conservation and Development Commission when both groups approved the TransPlan update work program which specifically identifies these projects for inclusion on the financially constrained list in TransPlan and the Metro Plan.

1. The application was initiated by the Springfield City Council on October 6, 2008.
2. Notice of this proposed action was sent to the Department of Land Conservation and Development on October 15, 2008 in accordance with the provisions of ORS 197.610.
3. Timely and sufficient notice of the public hearing, pursuant to Chapter 5, Section 5.2-115 of the Springfield Development Code, has been provided.
4. On February 3, 2009 the Springfield Planning Commission held a public hearing accepting testimony and evidence on these proposed amendments to the Metro Plan and TransPlan (File LRP 2008-00013) . At the conclusion of this meeting, the Springfield Planning Commission forwarded a recommendation of approval to the Springfield City Council. The staff notes and recommendation of the Development Services Department staff, together with the testimony and submittals entered into the record of this hearing by staff from the Land Conservation and Development Department and the Oregon Department of Transportation have been considered and are part of the record of this proceeding.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of all the evidence included in this record, the proposed amendment application, File LRP 2008-00013 is consistent with the criteria of Chapter 5, Section 5.14-135 of the Springfield Development Code. This general finding is supported by the specific findings of fact and conclusions in the attached staff report.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Commission hereby recommends the City Council approve and adopt File LRP 2008-00013 amending the Metro Plan and TransPlan by placing Project #27 – Oregon 126 at Main Street and Project #30 - Oregon 126 at 52<sup>nd</sup> Street onto Table 1a the Financially Constrained 20-Year Capital Investment Actions list and onto the financially Constrained Roadway Projects Map found in Appendix A; and remove these same two projects from Table 1b the Future Capital Investment Actions Roadway Projects and from the Future Roadway Projects Map found in Appendix A.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Planning Commission Chairperson

ATTEST:

AYES: 7  
NAYS: 0  
ABSENT: 0  
ABSTAIN: 0