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Chapter Overview

Chapter Three is comprised of actions that implement the regional transportation policy framework set forth in Chapter Two and elements related to plan implementation that are required by federal and state legislation.

- **Part One: Capital Investment Actions** presents transportation system improvement (TSI) projects for motor vehicles, transit, bicycles, pedestrians, goods movement, and other modes that require significant capital investment.

- **Part Two: Financial Plan** describes total Capital Investment Action project costs, anticipated revenues from existing sources, the expected gap in revenues, potential yields from new revenue sources, factors to consider in determining project priorities, and the Financially Constrained RTP.

- **Part Three: Air Quality Conformity** follows the Financial Plan. This section summarizes the air quality conformity analysis required by federal legislation.

- **Part Four: Planning and Program Actions** presents a range of regionally significant planning, administrative, and support actions that might be used to implement RTP policies. The Planning and Program Actions are not adopted, meaning they are not binding or limiting to any implementing jurisdiction.

- **Part Five: Parking Management Plan** presents parking management strategies and demonstrates how the region will achieve the state requirement to reduce parking spaces per capita by 10 percent.
Part One: Capital Investment Actions

Capital Investment Actions are TSI projects for motor vehicles, transit, bicycles, pedestrians, goods movement, and other modes that require significant capital investment. Chapter Two TSI System-Wide Policy #1 Transportation Infrastructure Protection and Management calls for “…the protection and management of transportation facilities for all modes…in a way that sustains their long-term capacity and function.” This policy is combined with RTP policies and implementation actions for transportation demand management (TDM), land use, and transit. Its purpose is to guide the management of existing and future transportation infrastructure in ways that will reduce the need to construct new roadway capacity improvements. The effects of these management policies and implementation actions on travel demand have been included in the RTP technical analysis that was conducted to identify existing and future transportation system needs. As a result, the Capital Investment Actions Project Lists reflect the RTP’s balanced approach to long-range transportation planning. The projects selected for inclusion as Financially Constrained Capital Investment Actions establish a network of facilities that meet overall transportation needs for the planning period.

Summary of Needs Analysis

Transportation needs for the Central Lane area were assessed using standard methods typically employed in regional transportation planning. The analysis of needs was based on population and employment growth forecasts consistent with statewide forecasts. The population and employment forecasts were used to establish overall demand for transportation.

In the development of the 2001 TransPlan, a wide range of strategies were identified to address this demand, including land use, TDM, and TSI strategies. Different combinations of these strategies were formulated as alternative plan concepts and tested using a computer-based travel-forecasting model. The alternative plan concepts ranged from a Base Case consisting of trends to an alternative designed to meet the vehicle miles traveled reduction targets of the Transportation Planning Rule. These strategies are reflected in this Regional Transportation Plan.

The alternatives development and evaluation included consideration of state and local needs consistent with the Oregon Transportation Plan, Metro Plan, and state and local improvement programs. Surveys were conducted to provide data on travel behavior and input on a wide range of alternative strategies.

Transportation needs associated with the movement of goods and services were identified as part of the technical analysis and public involvement process. Commercial vehicle movements on the regional transportation network were estimated using the regional travel-forecasting model. The segments of the national highway system within the MPO area were used as part of this analysis.

The needs of the transportation disadvantaged are assessed under a separate planning process leading to the development of the Metro-Area Paratransit Plan. This plan has been adopted by the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG), the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Planning...
Organization (MPO), and Lane Transit District (LTD). Strategies and recommendations in this plan are consistent with the RTP update. Implementation of this plan is carried out in coordination with implementation of the RTP through the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). The Paratransit plan provides strategies for improvements to the existing RideSource service. Amendments to the RTP will be made as necessary to maintain consistency between the two planning efforts.

**Capital Investment Action Implementation Process**

The Financially Constrained Capital Investment Action project lists will be adopted, making them legislatively binding. However, the specific timing, design, and financing provisions of the RTP’s recommended projects are not formally adopted. The project lists are not intended to serve as an exclusive long-range programming document in the manner of the MTIP, nor do they formally approve or commit any funding. Illustrative maps that illustrate the regional roadway, transit, and bicycle projects are included in Appendix A.

After a project has been identified as a Capital Investment Action in the RTP, the responsible agency begins the process of project refinement and programming. Programming refers to development of local agency capital improvement programs (CIPs), the Central Lane Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) at the regional level, and the Oregon Department of Transportation’s (ODOT) Six-Year Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Projects that use federal funds or that are regionally significant for air quality purposes must be included in the MTIP and the STIP. Some funding sources in the RTP are beyond immediate local control, such as state and federal funding. Local input into state and federal funding programs is advisory, and, therefore, the availability of funds for particular projects may not necessarily coincide with the RTP.

The CIP’s are approved by local and appointed officials on an annual basis. Public hearings are held prior to adoption to allow the public to comment on the proposed expenditures. Media advertisements, press releases, and notifying interested parties are used to inform the public about the CIP public hearings.

In the recent past, ODOT and the Oregon Transportation Commission have endeavored to place a higher degree of decision-making on state projects and policies at the local level. Local policy advice has been facilitated through the formation of Area Commissions on Transportation (ACT). These area commissions are chartered by the Oregon Transportation Commission and are meant to provide a more direct communication link between local communities and the OTC.

Local policy makers have discussed the formation of an ACT in Lane County, however, it was felt that much of the function of an ACT overlaps with existing processes used in Lane County for regional discussions. The process currently in place for prioritizing projects on a countywide basis, including projects adopted as part of the RTP is as follows:

1. MPC adopts Coburg-Eugene-Springfield metro area priorities based on TPC recommendation (prior to this meeting, MPC members optionally get direction on project priorities from their respective Boards and Councils).
2. MPC forwards metro priority list to the Lane County Board of County Commissioners with the understanding that the Board of County Commissioners will not reorder the metro priorities, only blend rural priorities into the list.

3. Lane County Public Works, on behalf of the Board of County Commissioners, sends notice to small cities, ports or other organizations explaining that the County will be assembling a county-wide ODOT STIP priority list and requesting input.

4. Small cities, etc. send project priorities to Lane County Public Works.

5. The Transportation Planning Committee (TPC) develops a “blended” rural and metro list for review. Lane County Public Works staff or small city administrators would represent the non-metro jurisdictions.

6. Lane County representatives take countywide priority list to MPC for review and discussion (prior to this meeting, MPC members optionally get direction on the countywide project priorities from their respective Boards and Councils).

7. The Board of County Commissioners adopts blended county-wide priority list.

8. One County Commissioner serves as the Lane County area representative at the ODOT Region 2 roundtable priority setting meeting. This representative may be one of the two Lane County representatives to MPC.

MTIP projects are prioritized by the Metropolitan Policy Committee following the process outlined above and adopted into the STIP. Federal public involvement guidelines state that there must be reasonable opportunity for public comment prior to approval. Media advertisements, press releases, and notifying interested parties are used to inform the public about the MTIP public hearings. ODOT conducts a public meeting in the Eugene-Springfield area to provide information and gather comments from the public prior to adoption of the STIP by the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC). The public is invited to make comments directly to the OTC prior to adoption.

Projects proposed for amendment into the RTP from local jurisdictions through local agency TSP or CIP processes are subject to the decision-making and public involvement processes of the respective agencies, as required by applicable federal, state and local requirements. The allocation of locally-controlled funding is decided by the policymakers of the individual jurisdiction, and not at the MPO policy level.

Project refinement and programming can vary depending on the complexity of the project. Depending upon the scope of the project, environmental analyses and public hearings may be needed. Engineering requirements and right-of-way needs vary depending on the type of project. After right-of-way is acquired and final plans and contract documents are prepared, construction can begin. Figure 5 describes the typical process taken between the time a transportation need is identified and when project construction is complete. Major projects (complex, higher cost projects such as many Added Freeway Lanes or New Arterial Links or Interchanges that require significant project refinement and a full environmental process), can take as long as ten years to complete (more if there are several project phases). Minor projects (simple, lower-cost projects such as many Urban Standards projects, New Collectors, or Studies
that require little project refinement and minimal environmental process) may be completed within two to five years.

While local jurisdictions vary in their public involvement process, each agency has developed a program for involving the citizens affected by transportation projects and provide opportunity for public input on project alternatives and design decisions. Depending on the size or impact of the project, the citizen involvement process for project implementation may include advisory committees, neighborhood meetings, open houses, mailings to affected property owners and interested parties, or public hearings.

Figure 4

Typical Process for Implementation of Roadway System Improvements

| Minor Investment | Simple lower cost projects such as Urban Standards projects or New Collectors, minimal project refinement, minimal environmental process required, regulatory permitting |
| Major Investment | Complex, higher cost projects such as New Arterial Links or Interchanges, significant project refinement, extensive public involvement, full environmental process required |
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Overview of Capital Investment Action Project Lists

The Capital Investment Actions are presented in five tables/lists:

1a. Financially Constrained Capital Investment Actions: Roadway Projects
1b. Illustrative Capital Investment Actions: Roadway Projects
2. Financially Constrained Capital Investment Actions: Transit Projects
3a. Financially Constrained Capital Investment Actions: Bicycle Projects
3b. Illustrative Capital Investment Actions: Bicycle Projects

Projects are listed in the MPO’s Regional Transportation Plan as part of a long-range planning effort. To meet state requirements, additional action by local agencies may be required prior to programming and proceeding with implementation of projects. Listing of projects in the RTP does not necessarily constitute fulfillment of the requirements of the Oregon Transportation Planning Rule.

Project Implementation Phases

The Roadway and Bicycle project lists are subdivided into Financially Constrained and Illustrative implementation phases. Illustrative projects are projects for which a need has been identified but for which the funding, at this time, is not reasonably expected to be available. The illustrative projects may fall within the plan horizon, or they may be projects anticipated beyond the plan horizon. These projects are not part of the financially constrained plan. However, these projects could be implemented if additional funding is identified.

As described in the Capital Investment Action Implementation Process on page 4, in all cases, inclusion of a project in a particular phase does not represent a commitment to complete the project during that phase. It is expected that some projects may be accelerated and others postponed due to changing conditions, funding availability, public input, or more detailed study performed during programming and budgeting processes.

The columns/fields of information common to each table are defined below.

**Column 1: Name**
The name of the Capital Investment Action helps to identify the location of the project. Most Capital Investment Actions are named after the roadway on which the project is located.

**Column 2: Geographic Limits**
The geographic limits define the geographic beginning and ending points of the project.

**Column 3: Description**
The description field provides a summary overview of each Capital Investment Action.

**Column 4: Jurisdiction**
Project jurisdictions shown in the RTP identify the agency or agencies that presently have responsibility for the street, highway, or bicycle facility; have indicated a commitment to assist in a project; or have an intergovernmental agreement to assume some responsibility for a road during the planning period.
In some cases, multiple jurisdictions are indicated if sections of a project are the responsibility of different agencies. In other cases, multiple jurisdictions are shown because changes in jurisdictional responsibility are expected or because more than one agency may participate in the project’s funding. Because project timing and financing is not binding, the jurisdictional listing does not represent a commitment by a particular agency to construct that project.

LTD is the lead agency in all transit projects and thus the Jurisdiction field is not provided on the Transit Projects lists.

**Column 5: Estimated Cost**
This field provides a determination of planning cost estimates. The estimated costs are not precise engineering estimates, but are used as planning estimates to assist in determining the financial impacts. Cost estimates are provided in 2007 dollars, consistent with revenue estimates used in the plan. Projects proposed for inclusion on a financially constrained project list must have up-to-date complete scope and cost estimate information available in order to be considered during the financial constraint process. ODOT cost estimates for the 2007 RTP update considered the project scope, current full-cost estimates for activities necessary to implement each project, adjusting cost estimates to reflect current 2007 dollars.

**Column 6: Length**
The project length is calculated in miles for roadway and bicycle projects. The project length is one of the factors used in determining the estimated cost. This field is not provided on the Transit Projects list.

**Column 7: Number**
The project number uniquely identifies each project. For roadway and bicycle projects, the project number facilitates locating the project on the maps for roadways and bicycles in Appendix A. The project numbers are based on eleven geographic districts:

- Projects 100-199 are located in District 1 (Central Eugene).
- Projects 200-299 are located in District 2 (Southeast Eugene).
- Projects 300-399 are located in District 3 (Southwest Eugene).
- Projects 400-499 are located in District 4 (Northwest Eugene-Bethel/Danebo).
- Projects 500-599 are located in District 5 (River Road/Santa Clara).
- Projects 600-699 are located in District 6 (Northeast Eugene-Willakenzie/Ferry Street Bridge).
- Projects 700-799 are located in District 7 (Northwest Springfield-Gateway/Hayden Bridge).
- Projects 800-899 are located in District 8 (Central Springfield).
- Projects 900-999 are located in District 9A (Central/East Springfield).
- Projects 0-99 are located in District 9B (East Springfield).
- Projects 1000-1099 are located in District 10 (Coburg).

In some instances, a roadway project is coordinated with an on-street bicycle project. Where the roadway project and the bicycle project are contiguous, the project numbers are identical.

The following map of Geographic Districts is useful for determining the geographic location of roadway and bicycle projects.
Figure 5
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Capital Investment Actions: Roadway Projects

The following project categories are included in the Capital Investment Action Roadway Projects list:

1. **New Arterial Link or Interchange** – These projects add new links or interchanges to the arterial or freeway systems in the region. Projects typically consist of any required right-of-way acquisition, general roadway construction, and addition of pedestrian and bicycle facilities either adjacent or parallel to the roadway.

2. **Added Freeway Lanes or Major Interchange Improvements** – These projects add capacity to existing freeways or freeway interchanges in the region. Projects typically consist of added freeway lanes or interchange reconstruction and expansion.

3. **Arterial Capacity Improvements** – These projects add capacity to existing arterials in the region. Projects typically consist of improvements to traffic control, the safety of the corridor, additional turn lanes, or reconstruction, including additional lanes.

4. **New Collectors** – All new collector projects will generally be constructed to the implementing jurisdiction’s urban standards.

5. **Urban Standards** – Projects with this description consist of rebuilding an existing roadway to upgrade it to urban standards, with curbs, sidewalks, and bicycle facilities.

6. **Study** – These types of projects are detailed studies that identify and offer solutions to specific problems related to multi-modal traffic flow and safety along the corridor. Improvements identified by these studies are expected to be added to the RTP project list through the amendment process.

The Capital Investment Action Roadway Projects are part of the regional roadway system. The regional roadway system is comprised of streets with a functional classification of arterial or collector. A map that shows functional classifications of the regional roadway system is provided in Appendix A. Functional classification is the process by which streets and highways are grouped into classes, or systems, according to the character of service they are intended to provide. Other criteria used to identify roadways that make up the regional roadway system include service and connection to regional facilities and the amount of existing and projected use by various modes.

Several major transportation corridors within the Central Lane MPO area require additional, corridor-level analyses to address existing and future capacity, safety, and operational problems over the next 20-30 years. In some cases, the costs of addressing anticipated problems on these corridors are included in the Capital Investment Action project lists, with the understanding that some of these projects are *placeholders* pending further study and public input. In other cases, the specific project-level solutions have not yet been proposed, so the project list includes only the estimated cost of the corridor study itself. Specific projects that are developed as a result of the corridor-level analyses will require an amendment to the RTP in order to be added to the Capital Investment Action project lists.
Many of the corridors that require further study are state facilities, while others are local jurisdiction facilities. While each corridor presents unique challenges, all of them have at least two or more of the following characteristics in common:

- Use as the means for cross-regional travel, often connecting to important regional attractions (shopping, airport, downtowns, freight transfer sites, etc.);
- High traffic volume and traffic congestion;
- Need for both short- and long-range investments;
- Issues requiring complex, multi-project, high-cost solutions;
- Project scale that may require major investment studies or environmental impact studies, including extensive public involvement; and
- Long lead times necessary before construction can begin.

The following corridors are anticipated to require further study and major investments:

- Interstate 5
- Interstate 105/Oregon 126 (Eugene-Springfield Highway)
- Beltline Road (Highway 99 to Interstate 5)
- Main Street/McKenzie Highway (20th Street to 70th Street)
- McVay Highway (Franklin Boulevard to 30th Avenue interchange)
- Franklin Boulevard (Glenwood section)
- West 11th Avenue (Beltline to Chambers)
- Coburg Road (Crescent to Oakway)
- 18th Avenue (Bertelsen to Agate)
- Southeast Eugene corridor (Willamette, Amazon Parkway, Patterson/Hilyard, from 13th to 33rd Avenue)
- Beltline Road/Pioneer Parkway (Beltline to Hayden Bridge Road)
- Ferry Street Bridge (long-range capacity needs)
- South Bank Street Improvements (Mill Street to Hilyard Street)
- West Eugene Transportation Improvements

In the case of the West 11th Avenue and Coburg Road corridors (items #7 and #8), studies are proposed to address access, safety, and operational problems. In the case of 18th Avenue and the Southeast Eugene corridors (items #9 and #10), studies are proposed to address major capacity issues, as well as safety, access, and operational problems. In the case of Interstate 5 (item #1), a comprehensive study of I-5 interchanges from the interchange with I-105 south to the interchange with Highway 58 is proposed to address major capacity, safety, access and operational problems. The extent of further study that each corridor requires will depend on the level of analysis completed to date, the level of specificity of any proposed solutions, and the level of environmental analysis required for a project to proceed. Examples of typical studies prepared prior to construction of a system improvement include the Beltline/I-5 refinement study, the Ferry Street Bridge Study and the Jasper Extension design study.
## RTP Table 1a-Financially Constrained Capital Investment Actions: Roadway Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Geographic Limits</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Category: New Arterial Link or Interchange</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Straub Parkway</td>
<td>57th Street to Jasper Road@ Brand S Rd</td>
<td>Phase 1: Construct 2-lane arterial between 57th St and Mt Vernon; construct turn lanes at intersections. Improve RR crossing at Jasper Rd.</td>
<td>Lane County, Springfield</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Straub Parkway</td>
<td>57th Street to Jasper Road@ Brand S Rd</td>
<td>Phase 2: Widen to 4-lane plus a median</td>
<td>Lane County, Springfield</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centennial Boulevard/Industrial Avenue</td>
<td>28th Street to 35th Street</td>
<td>Construct 3-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$3,715,000</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene-Springfield Highway (SR-126)</td>
<td>at Main Street</td>
<td>Construct interchange</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$50,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene-Springfield Highway (SR-126)</td>
<td>at 52nd Street</td>
<td>Construct interchange</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Category Sub-Total**  $103,715,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Geographic Limits</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delta/ Beltline Interchange</td>
<td>Interim/safety improvements; replace/revise existing ramps; widen Delta Highway bridge to 5 lanes</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$7,850,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 @ Beltline Highway</td>
<td>Reconstruct interchange and I-5, upgrade Beltline Road East to 5 lane urban facility, and construct I-5 bike and pedestrian bridge.</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$100,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>606</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 @ City of Coburg interchange (Phase 1)</td>
<td>Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$22,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Eugene Transportation Improvements</td>
<td>Improve capacity across Willamette River within N. Eugene Area</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$51,292,000</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>506</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Category Sub-Total**  
$181,142,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Geographic Limits</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42nd Street</td>
<td>@ Marcola Road</td>
<td>Traffic control improvements</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$248,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42nd Street at Highway 126</td>
<td>42nd st/Hwy 126</td>
<td>Traffic control improvements</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beltline Highway</td>
<td>River Rd to Coburg Rd</td>
<td>D-STIP Development Work</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beltline Highway</td>
<td>@ Coburg Road</td>
<td>Construct ramp and signal improvements</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$4,100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centennial Boulevard</td>
<td>@ 21st Street</td>
<td>Traffic control improvements</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$248,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centennial Boulevard</td>
<td>Prescott Lane to Mill Street</td>
<td>Reconstruct section to 4-5 lanes</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$1,238,000</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centennial Boulevard</td>
<td>@ 28th Street</td>
<td>Traffic control improvements</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$248,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene-Springfield Highway (SR-126)</td>
<td>@ Mohawk Boulevard Interchange</td>
<td>Add lanes on ramps</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$310,000</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Street</td>
<td>@ Harlow Road</td>
<td>Intersection improvements</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$2,910,000</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway/ Beltline Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>International Way to Postal Way</td>
<td>Improve intersections and realign Gateway</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenwood Blvd</td>
<td>Franklin Blvd to I-5</td>
<td>Upgrade to 3 to 5 lane urban facility</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$1,890,000</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlow Road</td>
<td>@ Pheasant Boulevard</td>
<td>Traffic control improvements</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$248,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>@ 48th Street</td>
<td>Traffic control improvements</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$248,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>@ Mountaingate Drive</td>
<td>Traffic control improvements</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$248,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q Street</td>
<td>@ Pioneer Parkway</td>
<td>Traffic control improvements</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$248,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q Street Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>Intersection of Q Street and 5th</td>
<td>Intersection improvements</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>828</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Category: Arterial Capacity Improvements**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Geographic Limits</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S 42nd Street at Daisy Street</td>
<td>S. 42nd St/ Daisy Street</td>
<td>Traffic control improvements</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. 11th Avenue</td>
<td>Green Hill Road to Terry</td>
<td>Upgrade to 5-lane urban facility</td>
<td>ODOT, Eugene</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Category Sub-Total**  
$51,084,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Geographic Limits</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19th Avenue</td>
<td>Glenwood Boulevard to Henderson Avenue</td>
<td>2-3 lane collector</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th Street</td>
<td>Hayden Bridge Road to Yolanda Avenue</td>
<td>Extend existing street as 2-lane collector</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$1,103,000</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37th Street</td>
<td>Ambleisde Drive to Marcola Road</td>
<td>Extend existing street as 2-lane collector per Local Street Plan.</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$2,106,000</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48th Street</td>
<td>Aster Street to Daisy Street</td>
<td>Extend existing street as 2 lane collector</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$371,000</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54th Street</td>
<td>Main Street to Daisy Street</td>
<td>New 2-lane collector</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$936,000</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79th Street</td>
<td>Thurston Road to Main Street</td>
<td>New 2 to 3-lane collector</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$1,238,000</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avengale Dr</td>
<td>Gilham to County Farm Road @ Wildish Lane</td>
<td>New neighborhood collector</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$2,921,000</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colton Way</td>
<td>Avalon Street to Roosevelt Ext (Future Collector F)</td>
<td>New neighborhood collector</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$5,572,000</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Collector C1</td>
<td>Linda Lane - Bob Straub Parkway</td>
<td>New 2 to 3-lane urban collector</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$1,672,000</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Collector C2</td>
<td>Jasper Road - Mountaingate</td>
<td>New 2 to 3-lane urban collector</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$4,346,000</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Collector C3</td>
<td>Bob Straub Parkway - East Natron</td>
<td>New 2 to 3-lane urban collector</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$2,340,000</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Collector C4</td>
<td>East-west in Mid-Natron site</td>
<td>New 2 to 3-lane urban collector</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$2,006,000</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Collector C5</td>
<td>Loop Rd in South Natron Site</td>
<td>New 2 to 3-lane urban collector</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$3,343,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Collector C6</td>
<td>Mt Vernon Road - Bob Straub Parkway</td>
<td>New 2 to 3-lane urban collector</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$3,343,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Collector C7</td>
<td>North-south in mid-Natron site</td>
<td>New 2 to 3-lane urban collector</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$1,872,000</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Collector J</td>
<td>Awbrey Lane to Enid Road</td>
<td>New major collector</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$3,338,000</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Geographic Limits</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glacier Drive</td>
<td>48th Street to 55th Street</td>
<td>Develop new, 2-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$2,278,000</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenwood Boulevard Extension</td>
<td>I-5 to Laurel Hill Drive</td>
<td>New collector</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$3,176,000</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haviture Way/ Heath Dr (Future Collector O)</td>
<td>Barger Drive to Excalibur Lane</td>
<td>New neighborhood collector</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$540,000</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyacinth Street</td>
<td>Brotherton Avenue to Argon Avenue</td>
<td>New neighborhood collector</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$1,391,000</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy Extension (Future Collector H)</td>
<td>Avalon Street to Royal Avenue</td>
<td>New major collector</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$3,594,000</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKenzie-Gateway Loop collector</td>
<td>MLK Jr. Parkway to Beltline/Baldy View/Deadmond Ferry</td>
<td>Collector loop to serve McKenzie/Gateway area</td>
<td>Private Funding, Springfield</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountainaite Drive</td>
<td>Forest Ridge to Mt Vernon Road</td>
<td>New 3-lane collector</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$3,009,000</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Vernon Road</td>
<td>Weyerhaeuser Haul Rd to Mountainaite Drive</td>
<td>Extend existing street as 2-lane collector</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$669,000</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Gateway Collector</td>
<td>Sports Way to International Way</td>
<td>Collector to serve Campus Industrial parcels</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Glenwood Collector</td>
<td>Franklin Blvd/McVay north and south to Franklin Blvd.</td>
<td>Collector to serve Glenwood redevelopment area</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt Extension (Future Collector F)</td>
<td>Royal Avenue to Terry Street</td>
<td>New major collector</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$4,520,000</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Street</td>
<td>31st Street to Marcola Road</td>
<td>New 2 to 3-lane collector</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$2,173,000</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. 13th Avenue (Future Collector E)</td>
<td>Bertelsen Road to Bailey Hill Road</td>
<td>New major collector</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$4,172,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda Avenue</td>
<td>31st Street to 34th Street</td>
<td>Extend existing street as 2-lane collector</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$669,000</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Category Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$74,198,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Geographic Limits</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st Street</td>
<td>D Street to Main Street</td>
<td>Upgrade to urban facility</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th Street</td>
<td>Centennial Boulevard to Main Street</td>
<td>Widen, provide sidewalks and bike lanes; provide intersection and signal improvements at Main Street</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st Street</td>
<td>Hayden Bridge Road to U Street</td>
<td>Upgrade to 2 to 3-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35th Street</td>
<td>Olympic Street to Commercial Avenue</td>
<td>Upgrade to 3-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$1,139,000</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42nd Street</td>
<td>Marcola Road to Railroad Tracks</td>
<td>Reconstruct to 3-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$2,551,000</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48th Street</td>
<td>G Street to Main Street</td>
<td>Upgrade to 2-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$892,000</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52nd Street</td>
<td>Eugene-Springfield Highway (SR 126) to G Street</td>
<td>Upgrade to 2-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$371,000</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69th Street</td>
<td>Thurston Road to Main Street</td>
<td>Widen on east side of roadway</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$1,040,000</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79th Street</td>
<td>Main Street to Glacier Drive</td>
<td>Upgrade to 2 lane urban facility</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$1,511,000</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agate Street</td>
<td>31st Avenue to Black Oak Road</td>
<td>Upgrade to 2-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$905,000</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspen Street</td>
<td>Centennial Boulevard to West D Street</td>
<td>Reconstruct to 2 to 3-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Lane County, Springfield</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey Hill Road</td>
<td>Bertelsen to UGB</td>
<td>Upgrade to urban facility</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$3,962,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldy View Lane</td>
<td>Deadmondt Ferry Road to the end of dedicated right-of-way</td>
<td>Upgrade to urban standards</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$520,000</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertelsen Road</td>
<td>18th Avenue to Bailey Hill Road</td>
<td>Upgrade to 2 to 3-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$2,369,000</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel Drive</td>
<td>Highway 99 to Roosevelt Blvd</td>
<td>Upgrade to 2-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$7,386,000</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Street</td>
<td>35th Street to 42nd Street</td>
<td>Upgrade to 3-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Geographic Limits</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Farm Road</td>
<td>West-to-East Section</td>
<td>Upgrade to 2-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Lane County, Eugene</td>
<td>$2,418,000</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Farm Road</td>
<td>North-to-South Section</td>
<td>Upgrade to 3-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Lane County, Eugene</td>
<td>$3,078,000</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadmond Ferry Road</td>
<td>Baldy View Lane to McKenzie River</td>
<td>Upgrade to urban standards</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$1,356,000</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Street Overlay (Coburg)</td>
<td>Locust Street to Pearl Street</td>
<td>Overlay pavement</td>
<td>Coburg</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillard Road</td>
<td>E. Amazon Drive to UGB</td>
<td>Upgrade to urban facility</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$7,021,000</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Avenue</td>
<td>Division Place to River Avenue</td>
<td>Upgrade to 2 to 3-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$2,658,000</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmira Road</td>
<td>Bertelsen Road to Highway 99</td>
<td>Upgrade to 2-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$4,195,000</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Hollow Road</td>
<td>Donald Street to UGB (Christensen Road)</td>
<td>Upgrade to 2-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Eugene, Lane County</td>
<td>$4,402,000</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Street</td>
<td>48th Street to 52nd Street</td>
<td>Upgrade to 2-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$576,000</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game Farm Road North</td>
<td>Eugene City Limits to Interstate 5</td>
<td>Upgrade to 2 to 3-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$1,435,000</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game Farm Road South</td>
<td>Beltline Road to Harlow Road</td>
<td>Upgrade to 2-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$4,200,000</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodpasture Island Road</td>
<td>Delta Highway to Happy Lane</td>
<td>Upgrade to 2-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$511,000</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Hill Road</td>
<td>Airport Road to Barger Drive</td>
<td>Rural widening and intersection modifications</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Hill Road</td>
<td>Barger Drive to West 11th Avenue</td>
<td>Upgrade to 2 to 3-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Lane County, Eugene</td>
<td>$8,400,000</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden Bridge Road / 23rd St</td>
<td>Yolanda Avenue to Marcola Road</td>
<td>Reconstruct to 2-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$5,200,000</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunsaker Lane / Beaver Street</td>
<td>River Road to Division Avenue</td>
<td>Upgrade to 2-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$3,300,000</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving Road</td>
<td>425 ft E of Prairie Rd to 100 ft W of Golf Course Rd</td>
<td>At grade rail safety project and urban standards</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeppesen Acres Road</td>
<td>Gilham Road to Providence Street</td>
<td>Upgrade to 2-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$1,423,000</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Geographic Limits</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Street</td>
<td>Old Laura Street to Scotts Glen Drive</td>
<td>Widen to 3-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Lane County, Springfield</td>
<td>$991,000</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locust Street Improvements (Coburg)</td>
<td>Willamette Street to Diamond Street</td>
<td>Overlay pavement, provide street widening with the right-of-way and correct drainage problems</td>
<td>Coburg</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Street</td>
<td>Roosevelt Boulevard to Elmira Road</td>
<td>Upgrade to 2-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$675,000</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Avenue</td>
<td>Green Hill Road to Terry Street</td>
<td>Upgrade to 3-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$7,512,000</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 28th Street</td>
<td>Main Street to Millrace</td>
<td>Upgrade to 2 to 3-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$2,477,000</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 42nd Street</td>
<td>Main Street to Mt Vernon Road</td>
<td>Reconstruct to 2 to 3-lane urban facility; curbs, sidewalks and bike lanes</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$3,300,000</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Willamette</td>
<td>Spencer Crest Drive to UGB</td>
<td>Upgrade to urban facility</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$495,000</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit Avenue</td>
<td>Fairmount to Floral Hill Dr.</td>
<td>Upgrade to urban facility</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$1,854,000</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurston Road</td>
<td>72nd Street to UGB</td>
<td>Upgrade to urban facility</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$1,511,000</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Duyn Road</td>
<td>Western Drive to Harlow Road</td>
<td>Reconstruct to 2-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$579,000</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkes Drive</td>
<td>River Road to River Loop 1</td>
<td>Upgrade to 3-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$2,700,000</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Creek Road</td>
<td>W. 18th Avenue to UGB</td>
<td>Upgrade to 2-lane urban facility</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$2,457,000</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Category Sub-Total**: $109,190,000
### Project Category: Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Geographic Limits</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18th Avenue</td>
<td>Bertelsen Road to Agate Street</td>
<td>Corridor study to determine safety and capacity improvements</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$310,000</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beltline Highway</td>
<td>Roosevelt Boulevard to W. 11th Ave</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers Street</td>
<td>8th Avenue to 18th Avenue</td>
<td>Corridor Study to Determine Improvements</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$310,000</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coburg Road</td>
<td>Crescent Avenue to Oakway Road</td>
<td>Access management/safety-operational study</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$124,000</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene-Springfield Hwy.</td>
<td>I-5 to Main</td>
<td>Facility Plan</td>
<td>ODOT, Springfield</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Blvd.</td>
<td>Jenkins Lane to Mcvay Hwy</td>
<td>Facility Plan</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Interchange Study</td>
<td>I-105 to Highway 58</td>
<td>Comprehensive study of I-5</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St. and 52nd St./Hwy 126 Int.</td>
<td>52nd to Main</td>
<td>Interchange Plans</td>
<td>ODOT, Springfield</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street/Highway 126</td>
<td>I-5 to UGB</td>
<td>Access management plan</td>
<td>Springfield, ODOT</td>
<td>$124,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 11th Avenue</td>
<td>Green Hill Road to Willamette Street</td>
<td>Corridor study to determine safety and capacity improvements</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette Street/Amazon Parkway/Patterson Street/Hilyard Street</td>
<td>13th Avenue to 33rd Avenue</td>
<td>Corridor study to determine improvements</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Category Sub-Total** $6,218,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>GeographicLimits</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>EstimatedCost</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Nodal Development Infrastructure Funding</td>
<td>Various Locations</td>
<td>Differential Nodal Development Infrastructure Cost*</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Various Locations</td>
<td>Planning for implementation of nodal development zoning</td>
<td>Eugene, Springfield</td>
<td>$6,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Category Sub-Total**  
$8,700,000

**Financially Constrained Roadway Projects**  
$534,247,000
## RTP Table 1b-Illustrative

### Capital Investment Actions: Roadway Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Geographic Limits</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Category: New Arterial Link or Interchange</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver Street Arterial</td>
<td>Hunsaker Lane to Wilkes Drive</td>
<td>R.O.W Acquisition. General construction.</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Straub Parkway</td>
<td>@ Jasper Rd and UP Mainline</td>
<td>Construct grade-separation over Jasper Rd and UP Mainline</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Avenue</td>
<td>Beaver Street to Delta Highway</td>
<td>Construct new bridge with up to 4 lanes over the Willamette River</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$28,000,000</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving Road @ NW Expressway</td>
<td>Gansborough entrance to Prairie Road</td>
<td>Construct overpass over NW Expressway and railroad. Signalize access on north side.</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Category Sub-Total** $50,000,000
## Project Category: Added Freeway Lanes or Major Interchange Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Geographic Limits</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beltline Highway</td>
<td>Roosevelt Boulevard to W. 11th Ave</td>
<td>Continue widening to 4 lanes; new RR Xing, grade separation @ Roosevelt and turn lanes on West 11th Ave (ODOT: West 11th North City Limits Stage 3)</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$21,050,000</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene-Springfield Highway (SR-126)</td>
<td>Pioneer Parkway/ Q Street</td>
<td>Interchange improvements</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$18,574,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene-Springfield Highway (SR-126)</td>
<td>I-5 to Mohawk Boulevard</td>
<td>Widen to 6 lanes</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$24,919,000</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-105</td>
<td>Washington/ Jefferson Street Bridge</td>
<td>Add lane to NB on-ramp from 6th Ave, extend third NB lane over bridge to Delta Highway exit ramp</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$7,188,000</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-105</td>
<td>Washington/ Jefferson Street Bridge</td>
<td>Add lane to 6th Ave. off-ramp</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$5,325,000</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-105</td>
<td>Coburg Road to I-5</td>
<td>Widen to 6 lanes</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$14,664,000</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-105</td>
<td>Delta Highway to Coburg Road</td>
<td>Widen to 6 lanes</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$11,405,000</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>@ City of Coburg interchange (Phase 2)</td>
<td>Interchange improvements</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$19,500,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>@ Willamette River/ Franklin Boulevard Interchange</td>
<td>Interchange reconstruction to create one full interchange to improve operations and safety, reconstruct ramps and bridges to modern standards, and provide for 6 lanes on I-5.</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$30,956,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>30th Avenue/McVay Highway</td>
<td>Interchange reconstruction to improve operations and safety, reconstruct ramps and bridges to modern standards, and provide for 6 lanes on I-5.</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$18,574,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>@ Glenwood Interchange</td>
<td>Reconfigure interchange, address weaving, provide 6 lanes on freeway</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$12,383,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>I-105 to Highway 58 (Goshen)</td>
<td>Widen remaining sections to 6 lanes</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$43,339,000</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Category Sub-Total** $227,877,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Geographic Limits</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Blvd.</td>
<td>Jenkins Drive to Mill St.</td>
<td>Upgrade to urban facility</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$6,191,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 99</td>
<td>Roosevelt Boulevard to Garfield Street</td>
<td>Upgrade to urban facility</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$6,136,000</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasper Road</td>
<td>S. 42nd Street to Bob Straub Parkway</td>
<td>Upgrade to 2 to 3-lane urban facility; intersection improvement at 42nd Street and Jasper Road</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$6,501,000</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McVay Highway</td>
<td>I-5 to Franklin Boulevard</td>
<td>Upgrade to 3-lane urban facility; intersection improvements at I-5 and Franklin Boulevard</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$8,049,000</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Category Sub-Total**  
$26,877,000

**Illustrative Roadway Projects**  
$304,754,000
Capital Investment Actions: Transit Projects

The following project categories are included in the Capital Investment Action Transit Projects list:

1. Buses and Bus Maintenance - These projects include new buses for expansion of service, replacement buses, expansion of bus maintenance facilities, and bus components such as radios, automated passenger counters, and fareboxes.

2. Bus Rapid Transit - These projects include the planning, engineering, and construction of the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) corridors.

3. Stops and Stations - These projects include transit stations, Park-and-Ride lots, bus shelters, and other passenger boarding improvements.

The Capital Investment Action Transit Projects are integrated with the Planning and Program Actions for transit that implement the proposed BRT system. See page 87 for a description of the Bus Rapid Transit Implementation Process.
### RTP Table 2a-Financially Constrained Capital Investment Actions: Transit Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Geographic Limits</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Category: Buses and Bus Maintenance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Purchases</td>
<td></td>
<td>New &amp; replacement buses</td>
<td>Lane Transit District</td>
<td>$64,000,000</td>
<td>1110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Category Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$64,000,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Category: Bus Rapid Transit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT BusPlus</td>
<td>5 corridors totaling 30 miles</td>
<td>Express bus progressive corridor enhancement</td>
<td>Lane Transit District</td>
<td>$60,000,000</td>
<td>1117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Rapid Transit (EmX)</td>
<td>5 corridors totaling 30 miles</td>
<td>Express bus corridor</td>
<td>Lane Transit District</td>
<td>$180,000,000</td>
<td>1115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Category Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$240,000,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Category: General Stops and Stations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Park and Ride Lots</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Park-and-Ride lots along major corridors</td>
<td>Lane Transit District</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>1105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Boarding Improvements</td>
<td>Various locations</td>
<td>Pads, Benches &amp; Shelters</td>
<td>Lane Transit District</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Category Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$10,000,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Geographic Limits</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Category: Nodal Development Transit System Investment**

| Stations | 4 at various locations | Transfer station | Lane Transit District | $6,000,000 | 1300 |

**Project Category Sub-Total**

$6,000,000

**Total Capital Projects: Transit Projects**

$320,000,000
## RTP Table 2b-Illustrative

### Capital Investment Actions: Transit Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Geographic Limits</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus Rapid Transit (EmX)</td>
<td>Gateway- Beltline Hwy- W.11th-30th-I5- Springfield Station</td>
<td>Express bus corridor</td>
<td>Lane Transit District</td>
<td>$96,000,000</td>
<td>1116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Category Sub-Total**

$96,000,000

**Total Capital Projects: Transit Projects**

$96,000,000
Capital Investment Actions: Bicycle Projects

The Capital Investment Action Bicycle Project Lists are organized by project status – Programmed, Unprogrammed, or Future. The following project categories are included in the lists:

1. **Multi-Use Paths Without Road Project** – These projects will be constructed independent of a Roadway Project.

2. **Multi-Use Paths With Road Project** – These projects are new off-road facilities designated for non-motorized, bicycle, and pedestrian use only. The project number provided refers to the associated Roadway Project.

3. **On-Street Lanes or Routes With Road Project** – These bicycle projects will be constructed in conjunction with a Roadway Project. The project number provided refers to the associated Roadway Project.

4. **On-Street Lanes or Routes Without Road Project** – These projects consist of adding a striped bike lane to the roadway or adding *Bicycle Route* signs along the designated corridor. Projects in this category will be constructed independent of a Roadway Project.

For many bicycle projects, a $0 shows in the Estimated Cost field. These bicycle projects may require no capital expenditure because they can be implemented with operating funds or they are planned for construction as part of a roadway project. Thus, the cost estimates are included as part of the roadway project cost estimate.
## RTP Table 3a-Financially Constrained Capital Investment Actions: Bicycle Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Geographic Limits</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Category: Multi-Use Paths Without Road Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Avenue</td>
<td>Garfield Street to Chambers Street</td>
<td>Route, Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$189,000</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avalon Street (A)</td>
<td>Candlelight Drive to Beltline Path</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path/Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beltline Path</td>
<td>Roosevelt Boulevard to W. 11th Avenue</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booth Kelly Road</td>
<td>28th Street to Weyerhauser Truck Road</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$303,000</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Gully Extension</td>
<td>Mill Street to 8th Street</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Willamalane, Springfield</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Connector</td>
<td>Fern Ridge Path to Commerce Street</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path and Bridges</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Ponds Path</td>
<td>Goodpasture Island Rd (N-S section) to Robin Hood Lane</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path and Bridge</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$3,600,000</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWEB Path Extension West</td>
<td>East of Pioneer Parkway to Laura St</td>
<td>Multi-Use path</td>
<td>Willamalane</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenwood Riverfront Park Path</td>
<td>I-5 to Springfield Bridges</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Springfield, Willamalane</td>
<td>$2,651,500</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKenzie River Path</td>
<td>42nd Street to 52nd Street</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path and Striped Lane</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$3,244,000</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Geographic Limits</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Fork Willamette River Loop Path</td>
<td>South 2nd Street to Clearwater Park: Phase 1 - MF Will. R, Dorris Ranch to Clearwater Park; Phase 2 - Clearwater Park to S. 32nd St; Phase 3 - S. 32nd St to S. 28th St; Phase 4 - S. 28th St. to S. 2nd St.</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Willamalane, Springfield</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLK Parkway/Peace-Health Path multi-use path</td>
<td>Riverbend Drive to Deadmond Ferry Rd.</td>
<td>Construct new multi-use path</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moe Mountain Path</td>
<td>V Street to Marcola Rd</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Willamalane</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace-Health Master Plan multi-use path</td>
<td>Riverbend Loop Road to Baldyview/ Deadmond Ferry intersection</td>
<td>Construct new multi-use path</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q Street Channel</td>
<td>Centennial Loop to Garden Way Path</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$1,118,000</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bank Trail</td>
<td>Autzen Connector to Rail underpass</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$5,770,000</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Boulevard (B)</td>
<td>29th Avenue to 30th Avenue</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield - Mt. Pisgah Connector</td>
<td>Jasper Road to Buford Park Road</td>
<td>Route, Multi-Use Path, Bridge</td>
<td>Willamalane, Springfield</td>
<td>$3,780,000</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurston Hills Ridgeline Trail</td>
<td>Potato Hill Loop to 79th</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Willamalane</td>
<td>$1,120,000</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley River Connector (B)</td>
<td>Valley River Way to North Bank Trail</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$167,000</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bank Trail</td>
<td>Formac to approx. 1000ft north of Owosso Bridge</td>
<td>Construct new concrete multi-use path for Riverbank trail system</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$1,950,000</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Geographic Limits</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland Park Path</td>
<td>Fillmore Street to Taylor Street</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$295,000</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Category Sub-Total**

$33,957,500
### Project Category: Multi-Use Paths With Road Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Geographic Limits</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Bike Bridge</td>
<td>Willakenzie Road to Postal Way</td>
<td>Bridge (part of roadway project 606)</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Path</td>
<td>Chad Drive to Harlow Road</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path (part of roadway project 606)</td>
<td>ODOT, Eugene</td>
<td>$748,000</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Category Sub-Total**  $748,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Geographic Limits</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19th Avenue</td>
<td>Glenwood Boulevard to Henderson Avenue</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st Street</td>
<td>D Street to Main Street</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th Street</td>
<td>Centennial Boulevard to Main Street</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st Street</td>
<td>Hayden Bridge to U Street</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35th Street</td>
<td>Olympic Street to Commercial Avenue</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37th Street</td>
<td>Ambleside Drive to Marcola Road</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42nd Street</td>
<td>Marcola Road to Railroad Tracks</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48th Street</td>
<td>Aster Street to Daisy Street</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51st / 52nd Street</td>
<td>High Banks Road to Main Street</td>
<td>Route, Striped Lane</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79th Street</td>
<td>Main Street to Glacier Drive</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspen Street</td>
<td>Menlo Loop to West D Street</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Lane County, Springfield</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beltline Road East</td>
<td>Gateway Street to Hutton Street</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Springfield, ODOT</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertelsen Road</td>
<td>18th Avenue to Bailey Hill Road</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Geographic Limits</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel Drive</td>
<td>Highway 99 to Roosevelt Blvd</td>
<td>Striped Lane or Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Straub Parkway</td>
<td>57th Street to Jasper Road@ Brand S Rd</td>
<td>Phase 2: Striped lane inside city limits; 6' shoulders outside</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Straub Parkway</td>
<td>57th Street to Jasper Road@ Brand S Rd</td>
<td>Phase 1: Striped lane inside city limits; 6' shoulders outside</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Street</td>
<td>35th Street to 42nd Street</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Farm Road</td>
<td>North-to-South section</td>
<td>Striped lane</td>
<td>Lane County, Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Farm Road</td>
<td>West-to-East section</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Lane County, Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillard Road</td>
<td>E. Amazon Drive to UGB</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$706,000</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmira Road</td>
<td>Bertelsen Road to Highway 99</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Hollow Road</td>
<td>Donald Street to Cline Road</td>
<td>Striped Lane, shoulders</td>
<td>Eugene, Lane County</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game Farm Road North</td>
<td>Eugene City Limits to Interstate 5</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game Farm Road South</td>
<td>Beltline Road to Harlow Road</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glacier Drive</td>
<td>48th Street to 57th Street</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenwood Boulevard</td>
<td>Glenwood Drive to Judkins Road</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodpasture Island</td>
<td>Delta Highway to Happy Lane</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Geographic Limits</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Hill Road</td>
<td>Barger Drive to West 11th Avenue</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Lane County, Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Hill Road</td>
<td>Airport Road to Barger Drive</td>
<td>Shoulder</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haviture Way/Heath Dr (Future Collector O)</td>
<td>Barger Drive to Excalibur Lane</td>
<td>Striped Lane or Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden Bridge Road / 23rd St</td>
<td>Yolanda Avenue to Marcola Road</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunsaker Lane / Beaver Street</td>
<td>River Road to Division Avenue</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving Road</td>
<td>425 ft E of Prairie Rd to 100 ft W of Golf Course Rd</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasper Road (B)</td>
<td>Mt. Vernon Road to UGB South</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Street</td>
<td>Old Laura Street to Scotts Glen Drive</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Lane County, Springfield</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy Extension (Future Collector H)</td>
<td>Avalon Street to Royal Avenue</td>
<td>Striped Lane or Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Street</td>
<td>Roosevelt Boulevard to Elmira Road</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Avenue</td>
<td>Green Hill Road to Terry Street</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 28th Street</td>
<td>Main Street to Millrace</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 42nd Street</td>
<td>Main Street to Jasper Road</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Geographic Limits</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit Street</td>
<td>Fairmount Boulevard to Floral Hill Drive</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Duyn Road</td>
<td>Western Drive to Harlow Road</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. 11th Avenue</td>
<td>Green Hill Road to Terry Street</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>ODOT, Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkes Drive</td>
<td>River Road to River Loop 1</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Category Sub-Total**

$706,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Geographic Limits</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11th Avenue</td>
<td>Chambers Street to Lincoln Street</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th Avenue</td>
<td>Chambers Street to Lawrence Street</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Avenue</td>
<td>Bertelsen Road to Seneca Road</td>
<td>Striped Lane or Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th Avenue</td>
<td>Chambers Street to Jefferson Street</td>
<td>Striped Lane or Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$74,000</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th Street</td>
<td>Centennial Boulevard to Olympic Street</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29th Avenue</td>
<td>Portland Street to Pearl Street</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$111,000</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Avenue</td>
<td>Polk Street to Van Buren Street</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th Avenue / Amazon Parkway</td>
<td>Agate Street to 29th Avenue</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$654,000</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33rd Avenue</td>
<td>Willamette Street to Hilyard Street</td>
<td>Striped Lane or Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Street</td>
<td>Centennial Boulevard to G Street</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66th Street</td>
<td>Thurston Road to Main Street</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Avenue</td>
<td>Bailey Hill Road to McKinley Street</td>
<td>Striped Lane or Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Geographic Limits</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Street</td>
<td>I-5 Ramp to Floral Hill Drive</td>
<td>Striped Lane or Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey Hill Road</td>
<td>5th Avenue to W. 7th Avenue</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candlelight Drive / Danebo Avenue</td>
<td>Barger Avenue to Royal Avenue</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers Street</td>
<td>24th Avenue to 28th Avenue</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Drive / Debrick Road</td>
<td>Cal Young Road to Willagillespie Road</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Street</td>
<td>39th Avenue to Fox Hollow Road</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald Street / 29th Avenue</td>
<td>24th Avenue to Laurelwood Golf Course and University Street</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWEB Path Extension / 35th-37th Street</td>
<td>Bike Path to Ambleside</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Blvd.</td>
<td>Brooklyn to Willamette River</td>
<td>Striped Lane or Multi-use Path</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Street</td>
<td>5th Street to 28th Street</td>
<td>Striped Lane or Route</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield Street</td>
<td>Roosevelt Boulevard to 14th Avenue</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$163,000</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilham Road</td>
<td>Torr Avenue to Ayers Road</td>
<td>Striped Lane or Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Gardens</td>
<td>Jessen Drive to Barger Drive</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Geographic Limits</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Hill Road</td>
<td>W. 11th Avenue to Crow Road</td>
<td>Striped Lane/Shoulder</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove Street</td>
<td>Silver Lane to Howard Avenue</td>
<td>Striped Lane or Route</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Street</td>
<td>3rd Avenue to 5th Avenue</td>
<td>Striped Lane or Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilliard Lane</td>
<td>N. Park Avenue to W. Bank Trail</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horn Lane</td>
<td>Lake Drive to River Road</td>
<td>Striped Lane or Route</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Avenue</td>
<td>River Road to N. Park Avenue</td>
<td>Striped Lane or Route</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy Street</td>
<td>67th Street to 70th Street</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinsrow Avenue</td>
<td>Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard to Commons Drive</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Drive / Horn Ln/ N. Park Avenue</td>
<td>Howard Road to Northwest Expressway</td>
<td>Striped Lane or Route</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeview/ Parkview</td>
<td>Gilham Road to County Farm Road</td>
<td>Striped Lane or Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Street / Lawrence Street</td>
<td>5th Avenue to 18th Avenue</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley Street</td>
<td>5th Avenue to 7th Avenue</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McVay Highway</td>
<td>I-5 to 30th Avenue</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$141,000</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Street</td>
<td>10th Avenue to 15th Avenue</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$495,000</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Geographic Limits</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Street</td>
<td>Fairview Drive to S. A Street</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minda Drive / Sally Way</td>
<td>Norkenzie Road to Norwood Street</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. 36th Street</td>
<td>Commercial Street to Main Street</td>
<td>Striped Lane or Route</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$124,000</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Park Avenue</td>
<td>Maxwell Road to Horn Lane</td>
<td>Striped Lane or Route</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nugget, 15th, 17th, 19th in Glenwood</td>
<td></td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic Street (A)</td>
<td>Mohawk Boulevard to 21st Street</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk Street</td>
<td>6th Avenue to 24th Avenue</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$495,000</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie Road</td>
<td>Maxwell Road to Highway 99</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow Drive</td>
<td>Centennial Boulevard to West D Street</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 67th Street</td>
<td>Ivy Street to Main Street</td>
<td>Striped Lane or Route</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 70th Street</td>
<td>Main Street to Ivy Street</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$142,000</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seavey Loop Road / Franklin Boulevard</td>
<td>Coast Fork of Willamette River to I-5</td>
<td>Route or Shoulder</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca Road</td>
<td>7th Place to W. 11th Avenue</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Geographic Limits</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Lane</td>
<td>Grove Street to River Road</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Boulevard (A)</td>
<td>Fairmount Boulevard to 29th Avenue</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandy Turn / Lariat Meadows</td>
<td>Oakway Road to Coburg Road</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurston Road</td>
<td>Billings Road to Highway 126</td>
<td>Route or Shoulder</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torr Avenue</td>
<td>Gilham Road to Wildish Lane</td>
<td>Striped Lane or Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Street</td>
<td>24th Avenue to 28th Avenue</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley River Way (A)</td>
<td>Valley River Drive to Valley River Connector</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$248,000</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Duyn Road / Bogart Road</td>
<td>Willakenzie Road to Western Drive</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. 11th Avenue</td>
<td>Danebo Avenue to Chambers Street</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Eugene, ODOT</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Avenue</td>
<td>15th Avenue to Fairmount Boulevard</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette Street</td>
<td>18th Avenue to 32nd Avenue</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda Avenue</td>
<td>23rd Street to 31st Street</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>784</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Category Sub-Total** $9,147,000

**Financially Constrained Bikeway Projects** $44,558,500
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Geographic Limits</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16th Avenue Connector</td>
<td>Fern Ridge Path to Jefferson Street</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Street Path</td>
<td>Laurel Hill Park to 30th Avenue</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deertrail Path</td>
<td>29th Avenue to Sundance Street</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path, Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Highway Path</td>
<td>Delta Ponds to Willagillespie School</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$2,129,000</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fern Ridge Path #3</td>
<td>Royal Avenue to Fern Ridge Reservoir</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Eugene, Lane County</td>
<td>$6,891,000</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game Bird Park Path</td>
<td>Flamingo Avenue to N. Cloverleaf Loop</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Willamalane</td>
<td>$619,000</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessen Path</td>
<td>Green Hill Road to Beltline Road</td>
<td>Multi Use Path</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$3,400,000</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKenzie-Gateway Path</td>
<td>Game Farm Road S. to Deadmond Ferry Road</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadowview Bike Path</td>
<td>Meadowview School to Fern Ridge Path</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCS Channel Path</td>
<td>Guy Lee Park</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Willamalane</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bank Trail (B)</td>
<td>Springfield Bridges to Seavey Loop Road</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$3,071,000</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hills Trail</td>
<td>Bailey Hill Road to Willamette Street</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$10,200,000</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Amazon Path</td>
<td>Hilyard Street to Canyon Drive</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$3,700,000</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Geographic Limits</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bank Trail (B)</td>
<td>Hileman Co. Park to Beltline Highway</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette McKenzie Trail</td>
<td>Beltline Road to Armitage Park</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Eugene, Lane County</td>
<td>$9,300,000</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Category Sub-Total** $53,150,000
### Project Category: On-Street Lanes or Routes With Road Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Geographic Limits</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beaver Street Arterial</td>
<td>Hunsaker Lane to Wilkes Drive</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Avenue</td>
<td>Beaver Street to Delta Highway</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Lane County</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Blvd.</td>
<td>Jenkins Drive to Mill St.</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McVay Highway</td>
<td>I-5 to Franklin Boulevard</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>ODOT</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Category Sub-Total**

$0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Geographic Limits</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bethel Connector</td>
<td>Rikhoff to Park Avenue</td>
<td>Multi-Use Path</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway / Franklin Boulevard</td>
<td>Mill Street to East of I-5</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson / Washington</td>
<td>5th Avenue to 13th Avenue</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$124,000</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Street</td>
<td>18th Avenue to 28th Avenue</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$295,000</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Street</td>
<td>13th Avenue to 18th Avenue</td>
<td>Striped Lane</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Street / 27th Avenue</td>
<td>Willamette Street to 29th Avenue</td>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spyglass Drive</td>
<td>Cal Young Road to Oakway Road</td>
<td>Route, Accessway</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>$192,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>684</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Category Sub-Total**  
$836,000

**Illustrative Bicycle Projects**  
$53,986,000
Part Two: Financial Plan

This section provides the Financial Plan for the RTP. It presents:

- A summary of the federal regulations for financial constraint,
- A summary of future cost and revenue estimate methodologies,
- Forecasts of revenue from existing sources,
- An assessment of the revenue shortfall,
- A list of strategies to address the shortfall, and
- Development of the Constrained Plan.

Much of the financial plan analysis presented here was conducted for the major update of the RTP completed in 2002. The following sections describe both this prior work as well as the minor updates to the financial plan analysis implemented for the 2004 and 2007 RTP updates.

Forecasts of state and federal modernization revenue sources are developed cooperatively by a statewide working group consisting of ODOT staff and representatives from all Oregon MPOs. These forecasts have most recently been updated in 2006-2007 to reflect SAFETEA-LU and are the basis of the financial forecasts used in the 2007 update of the RTP.

Forecasts of local modernization (or “systems improvements”) and all operations, maintenance and preservation (OM&P) revenues for the 2007 RTP update are based on an extension of the financial model used for the 2002 RTP, adjusted for the new time frame and for inflation.

Federal Regulations for Financial Constraint

Federal legislation sets forth guidelines that seek to ensure that the needs identified in the RTP are balanced with resources expected to be available over the planning period. Guidelines in the federal Safe Accountable Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act - A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) state that the RTP must include:

A financial plan that demonstrates how the adopted long-range transportation plan can be implemented, indicates resources from public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be made available to carry out the plan, and recommends any additional financing strategies for needed projects and programs.
Furthermore:

The financial plan may include, for illustrative purposes, additional projects that would be included in the adopted long-range transportation plan if reasonable additional resources beyond those identified in the financial plan were available. For the purpose of developing the long-range transportation plan, the metropolitan planning organization and State shall cooperatively develop estimates of funds that will be available to support plan implementation.

Transportation costs can be viewed in many different ways, by jurisdiction, by mode, and by expenditure. Table 4 summarizes costs and revenues by transportation system (roadway, transit, and bicycle and pedestrian), by expenditure (OM&P and capital improvements), and by jurisdiction.

**Future Cost and Revenue Estimate Methodologies**

The estimation of future costs and revenues was guided by several sources. The Oregon Roads Finance Study (ORFS) estimated transportation system needs at the state level in 1993, and provided unit costs for the estimation of O&M, preservation, and capital needs for this region. ODOT developed *Financial Assumptions for the Development of Metropolitan Transportation Plans* in 1995 (updated in 2000 and 2006), providing estimates of future federal and state revenues. ODOT is continuously working with a statewide task force of MPO representatives to develop updated revenue forecasts.

**Roadway System Costs**

Roadway costs were divided into three categories:

1. Operations and Maintenance,
2. Preservation, and
3. Modernization.

O&M generally includes activities necessary to keep the transportation system safe and in repair. Preservation activities generally extend the useful life of a facility, and are larger in cost and scope than O&M. Modernization consists of major capital improvements that bring facilities to urban standards, or add capacity.

For the purpose of estimating operations and maintenance costs, the roadway system inventories were summarized in lane miles by functional class and pavement type. O&M unit costs from the ORFS were applied to these inventories. The unit costs were adjusted for inflation to reflect 2007 unit costs, and increased by 9 percent to account for administration costs.

With respect to preservation costs, jurisdictions coordinated condition-rating criteria so the categories were similar throughout the area. The percentages of the system in need of resurfacing or reconstruction were applied to system totals by functional class in centerline miles. This yielded an estimate of current preservation need for the 2002 TransPlan. For the
2004 and 2007 RTP updates, the preservation estimate has been updated, adjusting for inflation and extending the planning horizon.

To estimate modernization costs, data from Eugene, Springfield, and Lane County public works departments and the ORFS were used as the bases for developing unit cost assumptions for roadway improvement projects. Specific project scope cost estimates were also developed for many individual projects – all of the ODOT projects on the financially constrained roadway capital improvements list have cost estimates developed specifically for each project as part of the 2007 update of the RTP. These ODOT cost estimates considered the project scope, current full-cost estimates for activities necessary to implement each project, adjusting cost estimates to reflect current 2007 dollars and more. In the future, projects proposed for inclusion on a financially constrained project list must have up-to-date complete scope and cost estimate information available in order to be considered during the financial constraint process.

Proposed projects have been categorized according to facility type and project type. Actual construction cost data for a range of projects, as well as current unit cost assumptions, were obtained from local jurisdictions. These data were analyzed and average per-lane-mile unit costs were calculated for various facility/project types. This information was supplemented through direct conversation with local transportation officials regarding recent costs for smaller-scale projects such as traffic signals, intersection improvements, long-range capacity studies, etc.

Where project-specific cost analysis data were available from more detailed studies (i.e., I-5/Beltline Highway) these cost estimates were entered directly into the project database.

Total financially constrained roadway costs for the planning horizon through Fiscal Year 2031 are estimated to be approximately $1.81 billion. For details about which capital projects have been included in this total, see the Capital Investment Action project lists beginning on page 14.

Roadway System Revenues

Federal and state revenue projections were provided by ODOT in a document titled Financial Assumptions for the Development of Metropolitan Transportation Plans in 1995 (updated most recently in 2006). Most of the revenue projections of federal and state funds used in the RTP are based on the projections provided in this document. The RTP financial analysis is based on the latest ODOT projections available. Other local roadway revenue estimates were developed by an interjurisdictional staff team.

The estimate of State Highway Trust Fund revenues is based on the assumptions that the state gas tax would increase an average of 1.00¢ per gallon per year beginning July 1, 2005, and that the TPR requirements for reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita would not be met. There is a further assumption that the biennial state vehicle registration fee would increase $15 every 8 years beginning July 1, 2009.

Lane County staff provided the estimate of federal forest receipts in 2002. In the 2004 update, the revenue was assumed to continue at federal guarantee levels through 2007. For this 2007 update of the RTP, the most likely scenario is a four year extension of the guarantee legislation, with declining funding percentages of 90, 80, 70, and 40 percent. Beyond that, it appears that
the federal timber payment guarantee legislation will be eliminated. This assumption sets some direction for the next four years, but there is little clarity on what will happen after that. Lane County is experiencing upward pressure on expenses with flat or declining revenues. Major changes in County revenue strategies and spending priorities will likely be needed to re-balance County Road Fund finances. The County-City Partnership payments were terminated in fiscal year 2006-07. Lane County’s budgets for OM&P, as well as modernization, will be revised at the next plan update. For this update, text changes have been added that discuss the need for new revenues and reduced service levels.

Some revenues such as assessments and systems development charges (SDCs) may only be used for capital projects. These two revenues sources fund most of the city collector and arterial roadway projects that involve urban standards. Other revenues are flexible and may be used for any road-related purpose including O&M and capital projects. Revenues are summarized with the costs in Table 4.

**Transit System Costs and Revenues**

Transit system finances are largely independent of other transportation systems, and are therefore analyzed separately. Revenues and expenses are consistent with LTD’s long-range financial plan. The capital costs and revenues are consistent with the long-range capital plan. Assumptions about grant revenue amounts are significantly different than they are in the Capital Plan as they have been reduced to cover only the first phase of the BRT project.

**Transit System Costs**

Transit capital cost estimates are based on the assumptions that the BRT project will proceed with primary focus on the development of an east-west pilot corridor, that Park-and-Ride facilities will be added on major corridors as the need is identified and suitable sites are selected, and that fleet expansion and vehicle replacement will continue at a rate determined by service level needs.

Transit costs include the first phase of the BRT project, which is currently estimated to cost between $18 and $30 million. BRT includes many potential elements that will need to be carefully reviewed and evaluated. Until this engineering work is completed and decisions are made on the extent and timing of the long-term development of the BRT corridors, it is very difficult to provide a more accurate cost estimate for the BRT system.

**Transit System Revenues**

Transit revenue estimates are based on assumptions that overall federal grant funds in support of capital projects will increase, that fare revenue will continue to increase as it has over the last two years, and that payroll tax receipts will increase over the planning horizon due to growth in employment and wages.

It is anticipated that discretionary federal grant funds will pay for up to 80 percent of the capital cost of the BRT system. This expectation is consistent with the District’s previous success in obtaining federal funds. During the past ten years, the District has been awarded discretionary federal funds for a new downtown Eugene transit station ($9 million), a new downtown Springfield transit station ($5 million) and bus rapid transit planning and construction funds ($11
In addition, there is considerable enthusiasm at the federal level for LTD’s BRT project, as it is seen as a low-cost and effective alternative to light-rail. This enthusiasm should translate into funding support, as evidenced in the proposed transportation reauthorization bill which includes a “Small Starts” funding category within the federal 5309 discretionary program. This new category is being proposed to allow smaller projects, like BRT, to better compete for federal discretionary funding. Therefore this revenue source meets the legal requirement that it is reasonably expected to exist.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian System Costs and Revenues**

The RTP bicycle element estimates costs for bicycle projects that are independent of the road projects such as multiple-use paths and bridges and new on-street paths that do not happen to coincide with a roadway project. On-street bicycle lanes comprise a majority of the bicycle facilities recommended in the RTP and will for the most part be funded as a component of future roadway improvements or reconstruction. Signing designated bicycle routes is relatively inexpensive and is normally funded under the roadway maintenance budget.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian System Costs**

Almost $45 million in bike projects have been identified in the fiscally constrained RTP. Most of the cost is in multiple use path, or bridge projects. Costs have also been estimated for other road-related bike projects that have not been included in road project costs.

Additional path, bridge, or connector projects have been designated in the RTP as being future projects, meaning that they are either strictly for recreational use, that land use activities such as active gravel mining currently do not allow them to be built, or that funds have not yet been identified for their completion. However, many of these projects could be built within the RTP planning horizon if additional funding sources emerge.

OM&P of the bike and pedestrian system within the road right-of-way is included in the costs for the street and highway system. There currently is no dedicated source of revenue or other special revenues for this work. A transportation utility fee (or transportation system maintenance fee) could be used to provide revenues for the OM&P of the off-street system.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian System Revenues**

**Federal Funding**

Currently under SAFETEA-LU, 10 percent of Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds allocated to the state must be used for transportation enhancement activities, including construction of facilities for bicycles and pedestrians. SAFETEA-LU’s predecessor, TEA 21, has been the primary funding source for off-street projects built in the Eugene-Springfield area since its authorization in 1998. A major issue for local jurisdictions is identifying the required local match.

**State Funding**

State funding for bikeways is primarily limited to money from the ODOT Highway Fund. This funding is used mainly for adding bicycle lanes to existing and new streets. These funds may also be used for bicycle projects that are independent of other road construction as long as the
project is within highway right-of-way. Highway Funds cannot be spent on paths in parks or anywhere else outside the highway, road, or street right-of-way.

Recently, ODOT funded independent bikeway projects in conjunction with highway modernization projects, including the Beltline path from Royal Avenue to Highway 99. It is expected that ODOT will finance the construction of the bike paths associated with later phases of Beltline and the West Eugene Parkway. It is also expected that ODOT will participate in the construction of the planned I-5 path and bike bridge.

Other Funding
Although State Highway Fund and SAFETEA-LU money provides the basic funding source for bikeways, local jurisdictions may also provide revenues from local sources such as general funds, park district funds, special bond levies, and systems development charges, as well as through the local road construction and maintenance budget.

Flexibility of Federal Surface Transportation Revenues
Federal STP funds are not restricted to roadway projects. They have been used in this region for TDM, bike, and transit projects. Local jurisdictions have the authority to allocate some of these revenues to local projects.

Assessment of Revenue Shortfall
The level of transportation needs and the amount of revenues available to pay for the needs depend on several key factors such as the amount of congestion the region is willing to accept, and the timing and allocation of resources among the various components of the system. Figure 6 illustrates some of the interrelationships among key factors contributing to the RTP’s financial constraint. In the process of making decisions on the package of transportation investments contained in the RTP, it is important to consider the tradeoffs that can arise from changes in individual factors. A discussion of these factors and tradeoffs and a description of the revenue shortfall under the RTP assumptions follows.

Factors That Affect the Revenue Shortfall
As presented, transportation improvements necessary to support the land use pattern established in the Eugene-Springfield Metro Plan and the Coburg comprehensive plan arise from several sources. Population and employment growth and existing travel behavior contribute to a growth in transportation demand. Increased demand necessitates adding to the existing system (road, bus, bike, and pedestrian) through specific system improvements. The need for system improvements is also affected by: deficiencies in the existing system, decisions about system standards (such as level of service/congestion and pavement condition) to be provided on the region’s transportation facilities, and the level and effectiveness of strategies like TDM measures, investments in alternative modes, future land use patterns, and the timing of projects.
Figure 6

Key Factors That Affect Financial Constraint
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System improvement needs can also be affected by the requirement to meet national air quality standards and the VMT per capita targets specified in the state’s TPR. In some cases, where an improvement reduces congestion, air quality can be improved. An improvement that has the affect of significantly increasing the number of vehicle trips can cause a decrease in air quality. Overall, the Central Lane area is expected to experience improved air quality over the next 20 years. In isolation, major system improvements can appear to have the affect of increasing VMT per capita. These factors were considered in the technical analysis and identification of transportation system needs.

In addition to system improvements, the plan must also consider the resources required to adequately operate, maintain, and preserve the existing and future transportation system. The need for ongoing O&M applies to all parts of the overall system including roadways, transit vehicles, bikeways, and sidewalks. The level of O&M need is affected by the general size of the system, and the function of the roadway system (freeway, arterial, collector).

The level of roadway system preservation needs is affected by roadway preservation standards. The goal in the Central Lane area is to maintain, through OM&P activities, a level of 80 percent of the system miles rated at fair or better condition. Adequately funding OM&P needs avoids the much higher costs associated with reconstruction of the system.

The combination of system improvement costs and the costs of OM&P activities represents the total costs required to meet future transportation needs in the region. The region’s ability to provide for these needs is constrained by the revenues reasonably expected to be available over the 20-year planning period.

The revenue shortfall can be addressed through the establishment of priorities or the development of additional revenue sources.

**Conclusions About the Revenue Shortfall**

The following conclusions are drawn from current analysis of the revenue shortfall:

1) Eugene and Springfield have the ability to fund most of their collector and arterial roadway projects involving upgrades to urban standards through the combined use of assessments and SDCs.

2) Eugene and Springfield may have more difficulty finding resources for new facilities (e.g., Booth Kelly Road).

3) The local cities have a significant shortfall in resources for OM&P of the current roadway system.

4) Lane County's current policy calls for the use of available resources for the OM&P of the current roadway system first, but reductions in federal timber guarantee funding (either immediate or delayed by four years if pending legislation is approved) will mean that a shortfall in OM&P will develop without increases in revenues or reduced service levels and costs.
5) Lane County has projected a shortfall in modernization funding in about 2006. The Lane County Capital Improvement Program (CIP) has been reduced drastically in scope. Modernization funding levels will depend on congressional action on federal timber receipt issues, legislative action on the state-wide gas tax, development of local revenue sources, and priority-setting by the County Board of Commissioners. In this 2007 RTP update, Lane County has moved several large projects to the illustrative project list as a first response to reduced modernization funding.

6) ODOT lacks resources for modernization and OM&P, and a significant amount of the identified needs are on the ODOT arterial system, including the freeways.

7) LTD has projected sufficient resources to maintain the current transit service level and expects to be successful in obtaining federal resources to implement the BRT system.

8) There are no existing transportation resources for the OM&P of the off-street bike system outside of the public right-of-way.

9) Recent history indicates that federal enhancement resources should be reasonably available for the majority of the planned off-street bike path modernization projects.

Strategies to Address Revenue Shortfall
As described at the beginning of the financial plan, the RTP is required to be constrained by revenue “reasonably expected to be made available” (federal requirement) and demonstrate its ability to support the land use pattern present in the local comprehensive plans. The revenue shortfalls identified above can be addressed through either one of two primary means: a prioritization of needs (and the resulting movement of low-priority unfunded needs to a future project list), or the development of new revenue sources. This section presents possible strategies to address the anticipated revenue shortfall, suggesting factors to consider in establishing priorities and outlining the range of new revenue sources.

1. Increased Federal and State Taxes and Fees
Develop a united front to support state and federal efforts to develop additional transportation resources and obtain an equitable share of those resources for the metro area.

2. Accept Lower Level of Service
Establishing a set of needs within the limits of available resources can be accomplished by assigning a priority to specific projects or categories of projects. The major issues surrounding the level and priority of transportation system needs can be identified by assessing the tradeoffs that come with varying the acceptable level of congestion on roadways. A key policy tool in this discussion is level of service (LOS) standards. These standards are set to reflect the region’s willingness to accept a certain level of congestion on its roadway system. Generally, lowering LOS standards will have the effect of reducing the need for system improvements. Accepting increased congestion allows some system improvements to be postponed. Conversely, maintaining higher LOS will require more system improvements to reduce the amount of congestion. The table below highlights some of the tradeoffs associated with different levels of congestion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Choice</th>
<th>Impact on Standard</th>
<th>Potential Tradeoffs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accept More Congestion</strong></td>
<td>Lower Level of Service</td>
<td>Reduce system improvement costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce air quality in specific areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase hours of delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase vehicle operating costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase accidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase traffic infiltration into neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase use of alternative modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accept Less Congestion</strong></td>
<td>Raise Level of Service</td>
<td>Increase system improvement costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase air quality in specific areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce hours of delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce vehicle operating costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce accidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce traffic infiltration into neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce use of alternative modes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other policy tools exist that can affect congestion levels. This plan is based on the use of a range of land use, TDM, and TSI measures to address the issues associated with congestion. In the long run (beyond the 20-year planning horizon), land use measures implemented in the planning period can have an affect on congestion levels. TDM measures can be used in the short run to affect demand at specific locations, though voluntary measures can only contribute to a reduction in congestion, not provide the full solution.

Thus, the primary set of actions available to address congestion in the planning period are the system improvement actions described in other sections of this chapter. Development of system improvement priorities should be based on a consideration of some of the tradeoffs highlighted above. In particular, it will be important to identify which projects can be postponed without significant degradation to the roadway system’s LOS. These might include ODOT freeway projects, interchanges, or local projects without identified funding sources.

### 3. Special Road Funding Opportunities

Identify special road funding opportunities to take advantage of state and federal resources such as Immediate Opportunity Funds, federal demonstration grants, or state or federal economic development grants.

### 4. Stormwater Management

Establish a stormwater utility fee for the area between the city limits and the urban growth boundary (UGB) and apply user fee revenues to augment Lane County road fund expenditures on roadway drainage projects.

Use Eugene and Springfield stormwater SDCs for the eligible drainage component of Lane County road modernization projects within the UGB.
5. Transportation Utility Fee

A Transportation Utility Fee (TUF), or transportation system maintenance fee, is analogous to a stormwater user fee. Each developed property within an area is charged a monthly fee for their anticipated use of the transportation system. These fees are determined by a methodology that is usually based on the trip-making characteristics of the land use type and becomes a fixed fee for that user. The fees can be collected on water utility bills just as sanitary and stormwater fees are currently. The fees can be set to generate any amount of revenue but are typically designed to cover a portion of ongoing O&M or to pay for preservation activities. The revenue is flexible and may be used for any purpose reasonably related to use of the public-sector transportation system, including maintenance of off-street bike and pedestrian facilities. These fees are typically not used for capacity-increasing projects because they are paid by existing users of the system.

6. Increased Systems Development Charges

There are several potential revenue-enhancing revisions to the existing Coburg, Eugene and Springfield SDC methodologies and rate structures that could be explored.

The transportation SDC methodologies could be revised to include the impact on county arterials and collectors and to ensure that wherever possible, the combination of assessments and SDCs cover 100 percent of the costs of the local arterial and collector street projects. One estimate showed that such a revision in the Eugene-Springfield area would increase revenues by approximately $7.6 million over 20 years, increasing the transportation SDCs by about 21 percent.

The transportation SDC could also be expanded in the future to include capacity increasing transit facilities should transit revenues be insufficient to maintain the current level of service as growth occurs.

Another component that could be added to the local SDC rate structure would be one that addresses the local contributions Coburg, Eugene and Springfield make to state roadway projects. These local expenditures on state projects are not currently included in the calculation of the SDCs.

7. Transfer of Jurisdiction

A transfer of certain ODOT facilities to local jurisdictions in exchange for state assumption of locally owned segments of the National Highway System might allow for the use of local revenues (assessments and SDCs) on facilities that are unlikely to be improved by the state during the planning period.

Modernization projects could then be funded from a combination of assessments, transportation, and storm water SDCs and possible Lane County Road Fund contributions—revenue sources that are currently unavailable at the state level. However, in addition to handing over
responsibility for costs, a transfer of ODOT facilities would also result in a reduction in revenues to the local ODOT district office because those revenues are partly dependant on total lane miles within the district. This reduction in revenue would result in the ODOT system improvements line item still showing a shortfall.

8. Accept Lower Standards in Operations, Maintenance, and Preservation
The standards applied to the OM&P of the transportation system determine the need for transportation revenues. This strategy consists of revisiting those standards to determine whether or not they are in line with priorities. In addition to the LOS (congestion) standard discussed above, other OM&P standards could be changed. Two possible strategies of this type are to eliminate maintenance on local gravel roads or on unimproved streets (streets with a thin surface treatment). Eliminating maintenance on metro area gravel local roads would save an estimated $1.6 million over 20 years. Eliminating maintenance on unimproved local streets would save about $5.8 million over the same period.

9. Bond Measures
Property-tax based measures, including capital bonds and levies, may be used to fund transportation activities. Springfield recently included $2.8 million in street preservation projects in a bond levy. The City of Salem has used property-tax based serial levies a number of times in the past decade for preservation and modernization. Under Ballot Measure 50, capital bonds can be issued for a maximum of ten years and must be approved by the voters at a general election or with 50 percent turnout.

10. Regional Transportation Taxes
Eugene and Springfield currently impose local gas tax equivalents of 5¢ and 3¢ per gallon, respectively. Coburg currently imposes a local gas tax equivalent of 3¢ per gallon (non-diesel). Additional local or regional gas taxes and/or vehicle registration fees, or an increase in the existing tax, could be developed to fund the remainder of the gap in financing for the non-state road network. Each 1¢ of gas tax would generate about $1.2 million countywide. The current state tax is 24¢ and is shared among the state, counties, and cities. A simple gas tax does not include a comparable weight-mile tax for trucks, such as what the state currently has.

Motor vehicle registration fees may be imposed by counties with a county-wide vote. The registration fee may not exceed that of the state, currently $54 per two-year period for a passenger car. The funds must be shared with the cities within the county. Two or more counties may act jointly. A $15 vehicle registration fee in Lane County would generate about $5 million annually.

11. Bridge Tolls
Bridge tolls may be used to provide revenues for the construction of specific bridges. For example, tolls could be used to fund the construction of new river crossings. These tolls could be removed when construction has been paid in full, or could remain in place to fund OM&P of the bridge.
12. Broadened Assessment Practices

Under Oregon law, local improvement districts may be used to assess property owners for improvements that benefit the properties. Local agencies use local improvement districts to assess property owners for the initial street improvement resulting in a fully improved street, usually including, curbs, gutters, and sidewalks. Some jurisdictions have begun using improvement districts to assess property owners for preservation and reconstruction projects. Other jurisdictions are using them to fund ongoing O&M activities through an annual assessment. These may occur when streets need pavement overlays or when the street has reached the end of its useful life and needs to be reconstructed. The potential yield from this policy has not been estimated but potentially could fund a significant portion of the preservation needs. Remonstrance provisions in local codes may preclude the use of this tool unless property owners approve.

13. Postpone Project to Illustrative Projects List

Prioritize projects and postpone projects based on availability of revenue. Postponed projects would be moved to the appropriate illustrative project list within the RTP, pending availability of additional revenues.

Development of Constrained Plan

Table 4 shows that under current RTP assumptions about standards, priorities, and timing, the region faces a $715-740 million revenue shortfall over the planning horizon through Fiscal year 2031. The majority of the shortfall occurs in two areas—OM&P in general, and ODOT System Improvements.

To arrive at a financially constrained plan, a process was developed to consider the applicability of the various strategies to the individual line item revenue shortfalls shown in Table 4. The process included a determination of the regional priorities through the public review process and careful consideration by both inter-jurisdictional staff and policy groups of the applicability of individual strategies to each shortfall, among other steps. Not all of the strategies were considered appropriate for use (e.g., there was consensus that strategy #10 - Regional Transportation Taxes was not a viable local option and that the use of strategy #7 - Transfer of Jurisdiction would result in no net improvement in the cost/revenue picture). In most cases, packages of strategies were employed to address the shortfalls.

The Potential Strategies column in Table 4 shows the results of this process. Each line item revenue shortfall is addressed by one or more strategies. Where the Postpone Projects strategy is shown under System Improvements, the result is a movement of projects to the future projects list, thus removing the associated costs from the current plan.

Similar to the Postpone Projects strategy is the Accept Lower Pavement Condition Ratings strategy under OM&P. This strategy means that the overall pavement condition rating (PCR) standards will be lowered, resulting in a reduction in specific OM&P activities since the road
surfaces will be maintained at a lower level. This results in a smaller percent of the road surface having a *fair* or *better* rating at any one time and reduces OM&P costs.

Other strategies are also intended to either directly reduce costs or increase revenues, resulting in a financially constrained plan. Table 5 and the following text describe the specific application of the strategy packages and show the resulting financially constrained costs and revenues.
### TABLE 4
RTP COSTS & REVENUES and STRATEGIES
($ Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local (Coburg, Eugene, Lane County, Springfield) Components</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Shortfall</th>
<th>Potential Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operations, Maintenance &amp; Preservation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Operations, Maintenance &amp; Preservation</td>
<td>$372</td>
<td>$223</td>
<td>$149</td>
<td>Implement New Local Revenue Source(s), Accept Lower Pavement Condition Rating(s) (PCR), Reduce Operations &amp; Maintenance Service Levels, Add Reimbursement Component to Transportation System Development Charge(SDC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield Operations, Maintenance &amp; Preservation</td>
<td>$124</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>Implement New Local Revenue Source(s), Accept Lower PCR, Reduce Operations &amp; Maintenance Service Levels, Use Bonding for Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane County Operations, Maintenance &amp; Preservation</td>
<td>$139</td>
<td>$139</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>Shortfall has not been calculated in this update, but is expected as federal revenues decline and costs increase. Implement new local revenue sources, accept lower pavement condition ratings, reduce maintenance service levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal** $635 $452 $184

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>System Improvements</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Arterial/Collector System Improvements</td>
<td>$179</td>
<td>$179</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>No Shortfall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane County System Improvements</td>
<td>$105</td>
<td>$55</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>Postpone Projects to Illustrative List or Do Not Build</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal** $284 $234 $50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Bike System</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Bike/Ped Operations, Maintenance &amp; Preservation</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>Include in New Local Revenue Source(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Off-Street Bike System Improvements</td>
<td>$74</td>
<td>$22</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>Postpone Projects to Illustrative List or Do Not Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local On-street Bike (w/o Road) System Improvements</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>Postpone Projects to Illustrative List or Do Not Build</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal** $89 $37 $53

**Total** $1,009 $722 $287

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Lane Transit District (LTD)</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LTD Operations, Maintenance &amp; Preservation</td>
<td>$617</td>
<td>$617</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>Postpone Projects to Illustrative List and Pursue Additional Funding or Do Not Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTD System Improvements</td>
<td>$416</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $1,033 $937 $96

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODOT Operations, Maintenance &amp; Preservation</td>
<td>$311</td>
<td>$208</td>
<td>$103</td>
<td>Accept Lower Metropolitan Area PCRs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT Facility Planning Studies*</td>
<td>$3.6</td>
<td>$3.6</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>No Shortfall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT System Improvements</td>
<td>$549</td>
<td>$295-320</td>
<td>$229-254</td>
<td>Postpone Projects to Illustrative List or Do Not Build</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $864 $507-532 $332-357

**GRAND TOTAL** $2,905 $2,166-2,191 $715-740

All figures are rounded and are shown in 2007 dollars and are for the planning horizon through FY 2031.

*ODOT Facility Planning Studies are shown for information purposes only.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local (Coburg, Eugene, Lane County, Springfield) Components</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Shortfall</th>
<th>Comments on Constraint(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operations, Maintenance &amp; Preservation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Operations, Maintenance &amp; Preservation</td>
<td>$372</td>
<td>$372</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Implement new locally controlled source of revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield Operations, Maintenance &amp; Preservation</td>
<td>$121</td>
<td>$121</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Apply Combination of Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane County Operations, Maintenance &amp; Preservation</td>
<td>$139</td>
<td>$139</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>No Shortfall. Adjusted maintenance budget not calculated in this update, but budget will decline if revenues do not cover this amount or projected cost. Apply strategies shown in Table 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$632</td>
<td>$632</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Arterial/Collector System Improvements</td>
<td>$179</td>
<td>$179</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>No Shortfall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane County System Improvements</td>
<td>$55</td>
<td>$55</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Postpone Projects to Illustrative List or Do Not Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$234</td>
<td>$234</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bike System</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Bike/Ped Operations, Maintenance &amp; Preservation</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Include in New Local Revenue Source(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Off-Street Bike System Improvements</td>
<td>$22</td>
<td>$22</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Postpone Projects to Illustrative List or Do Not Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local On-street Bike (w/o Road) System Improvements</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Postpone Projects to Illustrative List or Do Not Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$37</td>
<td>$37</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$902</td>
<td>$902</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lane Transit District (LTD)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTD Operations, Maintenance &amp; Preservation</td>
<td>$617</td>
<td>$617</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>No Shortfall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTD System Improvements</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Postpone Projects to Illustrative List and Pursue Additional Funding or Do Not Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$937</td>
<td>$937</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT Operations, Maintenance &amp; Preservation</td>
<td>$208</td>
<td>$208</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Accept Lower Metropolitan Area PCRs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT Facility Planning Studies*</td>
<td>$3.6</td>
<td>$3.6</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>No Shortfall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODOT System Improvements</td>
<td>$292</td>
<td>$295-320</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Postpone Projects to Illustrative List or Do Not Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$503</td>
<td>$506-531</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$2,342</td>
<td>$2,345-2,370</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All figures are rounded and are shown in 2007 dollars and are for the planning horizon through FY 2031.

*ODOT Facility Planning Studies are shown for information purposes only.
The text below provides an expanded explanation of the specific strategies shown on each line item in Table 4.

**Operations, Maintenance & Preservation**

**Eugene**

- Increase revenues through a locally controlled source of revenue equitably tied to all users of the transportation system that would provide revenues that could be used to address OM&P needs. Revenues shall be set at a level that ensures that the improved roadway and bike system at least falls no further behind in its condition of repair. As needed to maintain system condition, the Eugene City Council shall adopt at least one revenue source such as:
  1. **Assessments**
     - Broadened assessment practices/local improvement district
     - Broadened use of system development charges
  2. **Property Taxes**
     - General obligation bonds backed by a property tax levy
     - Local option property tax levy
  3. **Excise Taxes**
     - Business tax on fuel distribution
     - Local option motor vehicle fuel tax
     - Parking tax
     - Carbon-based fuel tax
     - Motor vehicle excise tax
     - Vehicle registration fees
  4. **User/Utility Fees**
     - Transportation utility fee
     - Street improvement fee
     - Municipal sticker fee (local vehicle public parking permit)
     - Tolls
     - Fees to compensate for dedicated use of traffic lanes for transit purposes
     - Employer payroll tax

**Springfield**

- Implement a locally controlled source of revenue equitably tied to all users of the transportation system that would provide revenues that could be used to address OM&P needs.
- Decrease costs via acceptance of reductions in the PCR indicators by functional class.
- Lower overall operations and maintenance service levels.
Lane County

- Implement a locally controlled source of revenue, such as a local option gas tax or motor vehicle registration fee, that could be used to address OM&P needs.
- Decrease costs via acceptance of reductions in the PCR indicators by functional class.
- Lower overall operations and maintenance service levels.

Transit

- *No revenue shortfall*

ODOT

- Decrease costs via acceptance of reductions in the metropolitan area PCR indicators by functional class.

**System Improvements**

**Cities**

- *No revenue shortfall*

Lane County

- Decrease costs by postponing or not building projects, moving those projects to an illustrative project list. Consider implementation of transportation System Development Charges (SDC).

Transit

- Decrease costs by postponing or not building projects, moving those projects to an illustrative project list.

ODOT

- Decrease costs by postponing or not building projects, moving those projects to an illustrative project list.

**Bike System**

**Bike/Pedestrian OM&P**

- Increase revenues through the inclusion of bike/pedestrian OM&P in a new locally controlled source of revenue

**Local Off-Street Bike**

- Decrease costs by postponing or not building projects, moving those projects to an illustrative project list.

**Local On-Street Bike w/o Road**

- Decrease costs by postponing or not building projects, moving those projects to an illustrative project list.

**Application of Strategy Packages and Attainment of a Financially Constrained Plan**

For those line items that show revenue shortfalls in Table 4, application of the strategy packages described above results in elimination of the shortfalls. This action achieves a financially...
constrained plan as required, one that plans for projects within the constraint of available revenues. Specifically:

Operations, Maintenance & Preservation

Eugene
• A new locally controlled source of revenue will be implemented to generate revenue to cover the shortfall over the planning time horizon.

Springfield
• Overall maintenance service levels are assumed to decrease by an amount equal to 10 percent of the shortfall, or approximately $12 million.
• A new locally controlled source of revenue will be implemented to generate revenue to cover the remainder of the shortfall over the planning time horizon.

Lane County
• Overall maintenance service levels are assumed to decrease by an amount necessary to resolve the shortfall, once it is calculated.
• A new locally controlled source of revenue will be considered, and if implemented, will allow restoration of previous service levels for maintenance.

ODOT
• The district ODOT office will decrease costs via acceptance of reductions in the metropolitan area PCR indicators by functional class. The current PCR on state facilities in the metropolitan area is 98 percent fair or better. The State plan indicates the state-wide system goal over the planning horizon is a measure of 77 percent fair or better. Reducing the ODOT OM&P costs by the amount of the shortfall will still allow the district to meet the state standard over the planning horizon, although the road condition ratings will be lower than they currently are.

System Improvements

ODOT
• The district ODOT office will decrease costs by postponing or not building projects, moving those projects to an illustrative project list. Pending additional revenues, these projects may be moved to a financially constrained project list in the future.

Bike System

Bike/Pedestrian OM&P
• The revenue shortfall in this area will be addressed by the inclusion of bike/pedestrian OM&P in a new locally controlled source of revenue.

The above strategy packages will result in a financially constrained RTP over the planning horizon through Fiscal year 2031. Transit activities, local system improvements, and most bike and pedestrian projects are not financially constrained and can be funded at the full level projected. OM&P in the city and state systems will be reduced somewhat, but still meet applicable policy standards. The cities, and perhaps Lane County, will also implement a new
locally controlled source of revenue to raise additional OM&P revenues. State system improvement projects will be built on a priority basis as revenues allow, with the remaining unfunded improvement projects placed on a future projects list pending additional revenues.
Part Three: Regional Transportation Plan Amendment Process

This section outlines the process for amending the Regional Transportation Plan

Requirements

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) can be amended at any time consistent with CFR 450.322 – the federal guidelines on preparation of RTPs. Essentially, amendments must be shown to meet the same requirements as the original plan. These requirements include financial constraint, air quality conformity, and adequate public involvement.

In general, amendments would be processed by staff to assess financial constraint, air quality conformity, and establish appropriate public involvement. Draft amendments would be considered by both the Transportation Planning Committee (TPC) and the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC). Recommendations from both committees would be forwarded to MPC for public hearing and final action. Typically, adoption of amendments would also require adoption of an updated air quality conformity determination. The existing state rule on air quality conformity requires that, with the exception of minor amendments, the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) be updated within six-months of updates to the RTP.

Categories of Amendments

Plan amendments would typically fall in to 4 categories:

a. Changes to the existing Financially Constraint project list – these changes could entail either dropping a project off the list or adding or reducing the level of funding assigned to a given project,

b. Addition of federally funded or regionally significant projects to the Financially Constraint project list – these changes would entail the addition of projects to the Constrained list from either the RTP Illustrative Project List or other sources,

c. Changes required to meet federal requirements – these changes would be in response to changes in federal requirements or could result from changes in federal funding (typically at points of reauthorization of federal transportation legislation). These changes could entail either changes to policy or projects.

d. Changes to local Transportation System Plans that need to be reflected in the RTP – these changes could be based upon changes in local comprehensive plans, or addition or deletion of federally-funded or regionally significant projects from the local TSP due to changes in local priorities.

Consistency between local Transportation System Plans and the Regional Transportation Plan

Local initiatives that prompt amendments to a local TSP commonly prompt amendments to the RTP. Changes in the RTP brought about by changes in federal or state requirements or by the addition of projects or policies can also lead to amendments to local TSPs. Differences between the federal and state requirements and timelines that govern the Regional Transportation Plan
Part Four: Air Quality Conformity

This section summarizes the air quality conformity analysis required by federal legislation.

Requirements

In nonattainment and maintenance areas, transportation plans and programs that are financed wholly or partly with federal funds are required to be in conformance with the transportation provisions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP) — the state-wide planning document that demonstrates how the state will attain the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Conformity with a SIP means conformity to a SIP’s purpose of eliminating or reducing the severity and number of violations of the NAAQS and achieving expeditious attainment of the standards. The Lane Council of Governments (LCOG), as the MPO for the Eugene-Springfield area, must make conformity determinations on the RTP and the MTIP to ensure they conform to the SIP. The Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration must also review the RTP and the MTIP and make a conformity determination in order for the projects contained in these documents to be eligible for federal funding or approvals.

The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 set the NAAQS for key pollutants, including ozone, \( \text{O}_3 \), carbon monoxide (CO), and particulate matter (PM\(_{10} \)). Areas that do not meet the NAAQS are designated in varying degrees of nonattainment, from marginal to extreme (depending on the pollutant). Nonattainment areas must submit air quality implementation plans and must integrate
transportation and air quality planning in order to meet the standards. The Eugene-Springfield region is designated as a maintenance area for CO and designated as a nonattainment area for PM\textsubscript{10}.

The region has successfully petitioned the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) that highway and off-highway vehicles are not significant emissions sources of PM\textsubscript{10}, and that transportation is therefore exempt from demonstrating area-wide conformity or from performing PM\textsubscript{10} hot spot analysis within the air quality management region.

Regional emissions analysis for CO is required for all transportation plans, programs, and projects located within the Central Area Transportation Study (CATS) boundary. The CATS boundary encompasses the greater downtown Eugene area and is bounded by 5\textsuperscript{th} Avenue on the north, 19\textsuperscript{th} Avenue on the south, Lincoln Street on the west, and Agate Street on the east. The RTP is considered to conform when the annual tons of CO are below the Eugene-Springfield area motor vehicle emissions budget for CO. The motor vehicle emissions budget was filed with EPA and published in the Federal Register, Vol. 58, No. 232, page 64163, December 6, 1993.

The federal EPA has adopted new standards for ozone and fine particulate (PM\textsubscript{2.5}) and based upon the existing LRAPA monitoring of these pollutants, this area is currently in attainment with these standards. Therefore, the RTP will not need to address these new standards. However, transportation plans, programs, and projects will continue to be subject to the existing carbon monoxide conformity rules in OAR 340-252.

**Analysis**

RTP conformity requires a technical analysis of the annual tons of CO generated by the transportation system. Based on the Capital Investment Actions project lists developed for the transportation system, an estimation of vehicle emissions of CO is calculated using the EPA’s recommended guidelines. The emissions for the planning year are compared with the emissions budget established in the area’s SIP.

The conformity analysis will be prepared based on a 24-year forecast (to 2031) of population, employment, and traffic. The analysis will use the RTP Financially Constrained Project Lists in development of the future year networks.

The formal conformity determination will be made as part of the MPO (i.e., MPC) adoption process.
Part Five: Planning and Program Actions

Planning and Program Actions represent a range of regionally significant planning, administrative, and support actions that might be used to implement RTP policies. Local jurisdictions will use their discretion to evaluate and prioritize Planning and Program Action implementation. The Planning and Program Actions are not adopted, meaning they are not binding or limiting to any implementing jurisdiction. Some Planning and Program Actions will lead to additional capital expenditures, others are examples of capital expenditures that might be implemented after further study. For example, a corridor study could lead to system improvements along the corridor. Planning and Program Actions are not subject to the same fiscal constraint requirements as the Capital Investment Actions. However, ongoing funding will be necessary to continue to implement actions such as the region’s TDM program. Planning and program actions are presented for the following categories:

1. Land use,
2. Transportation demand management,
3. Transportation system improvements
   a) System-Wide
   b) Roadways
   c) Transit
   d) Bicycles
   e) Pedestrian
   f) Goods Movement
   g) Other Modes

The Planning and Program Actions listed in this chapter represent a small portion of all transportation planning actions undertaken in the region. Jurisdictions within the region undertake a variety of activities beyond the Planning and Program Actions that implement the RTP policies. Many federal and state requirements that the region must comply with are not included as Planning and Program Actions, as is the case with many ongoing transportation planning programs.

The region’s Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), an annual report that sets priorities for local transportation planning activities, is a key listing of additional actions. The UPWP describes ongoing programs conducted by the region’s public agencies, including LCOG (Lane Regional Air Pollution Authority, LTD, ODOT, Lane County, and the cities of Coburg, Eugene and Springfield. The UPWP includes actions that the region is required to carry out due to federal and state requirements including those related to:

1. Surveillance, data maintenance, and modeling;
2. Long-range planning;
3. Short-range planning;
4. Refinement studies;
5. Programming;
6. Public involvement; and
7. Air quality.
Land Use Planning and Program Actions

This section provides recommended actions to implement transportation-related land use policies, including recommended approaches for implementing nodal development. The listed implementation actions respond to requirements contained in the state’s TPR, as well as the RTP land use policies. Roadway, transit, and bicycle projects listed in the Capital Investment Actions project lists will help to implement land use policies. Additional Capital Investment Actions may be identified and implemented on a case-by-case basis to support nodal development as deemed appropriate by local jurisdictions.

1. **Nodal Development** *(Reference TPR 660-12-045(4)(g) and (5)(a))*

   1.1. Prior to approving nodal development projects in designated areas, conduct a site analysis to evaluate infrastructure capacity, establish project boundaries, and ensure project compatibility with adjacent land uses.

   1.2. Amend zoning and development codes to remove barriers to nodal development in designated areas.

   1.3. Develop and apply a plan designation that allows development consistent with nodal development guidelines.

   1.4. Prepare specific area plans (or specific development plans) to determine how to achieve the density, mixed-use, and design objectives of nodal development.

   1.5. Develop an overlay zoning/development district for designated nodal development areas that includes guidelines and development or performance standards.

   1.6. Selectively change plan and zoning designations to allow a mix of uses and housing types at higher average densities in areas designated for nodal development.

   1.7. Amend zoning and development codes to add site, landscape, and architectural design objectives, standards, and guidelines for higher density, mixed-use development to ensure compatibility with surrounding uses.

   1.8. Require developers to dedicate land, or money in lieu thereof, for public spaces in nodal development areas.

   1.9. Apply site plan and design review procedures in designated nodal development areas.

   1.10. Provide economic incentives, such as density bonuses and transfers, reduced SDCs, and property tax exemptions, to encourage nodal development.

   1.11. Give priority to constructing and improving public facilities in areas designated for nodal development.

   1.12. Establish a streamlined, coordinated development review process for nodal development.

   1.13. Support public/private joint ventures and demonstration projects to provide successful local examples of nodal development.
1.14. Establish a marketing program that advertises and promotes developments that are consistent with nodal development guidelines.

2. **Transit-Supportive Land Use**

2.1. Designate areas along major transit corridors and near transit transfer stations for a mix of higher intensity commercial uses along with higher residential densities that achieve at least an average density within the medium-density range for residential uses. *(Reference TPR 660-12-045(4)(g))*

2.2. Amend zoning and development codes to add a transit-oriented development (TOD) district. *(Reference TPR 660-12-045(5)(a))*

2.3. Designate appropriate areas along major transit corridors and near transit transfer stations for TODs. *(Reference TPR 660-12-045(5)(a))*

2.4. Amend zoning and development codes to require all major new institutional and commercial development to provide facilities and access for transit, bicycles, and pedestrians. *(Reference TPR 660-12-045(4)(e) and (5)(d))*

2.5. Allow existing development to redevelop a portion of existing parking areas for transit-oriented uses, including bus stops and pullouts, bus shelters, Park-and-Ride stations, TODs, bicycle parking, and similar facilities, where appropriate. *(Reference TPR 660-12-045(4)(e) and (5)(d))*

3. **Transportation Impacts**

3.1. Establish a process for coordinated review of proposed land use decisions through intergovernmental agreements among local, regional, and state jurisdictions. *(Reference TPR 660-12-045(2)(d))*

3.2. Coordinate and collaborate with local jurisdictions and ODOT on review of proposed regional land use decisions that could significantly impact major regional transportation facilities. *(Reference TPR 660-12-045(2)(d))*

3.3. Coordinate and collaborate with ODOT on review of proposed local land use actions that could significantly impact state transportation facilities and systems. *(Reference TPR 660-12-045(2)(d))*

3.4. Refer land development proposals to appropriate local, regional, and state transportation agencies for review and comment on compatibility with and impact on transportation facilities, projects, and plans. *(Reference TPR 660-12-045(2)(d))*

3.5. Develop and apply conditions to approved developments when necessary to protect the functional capability of regional transportation facilities. *(Reference TPR 660-12-045(2)(e))*

3.6. Require traffic impact studies and mitigation measures where appropriate. *(Reference TPR 660-12-045(2)(e))*

3.7. Make certain that amendments to *Metro Plan* and land use regulations take into account the impact on regional transportation facilities and do not conflict with capacities and levels of service. *(Reference TPR 660-12-045(2)(g))*
Nodal Development Implementation Process

The Nodal Development Areas map included in Appendix A identifies areas in Eugene-Springfield that are considered to have potential for establishment of a nodal development land use pattern. Other potential areas may be identified in the future, and some of the identified areas may be considered unsuitable for nodal development upon further analysis or as a result of future land use changes in the area.

Property owners and developers are encouraged to consider following nodal development guidelines when developing or redeveloping parcels in these identified areas. When property owners and developers express interest in following nodal development guidelines in a designated area, local governments will provide assistance by identifying design/development objectives, guidelines, and standards; specifying any additional site analysis needed to establish project boundaries and related improvements; and generally facilitating project review and evaluation. In addition, local jurisdictions may initiate actions to establish nodal development land use patterns in these identified areas.

Approaches taken to establish nodal development land use patterns may need to be different for redevelopment, infill, and new growth areas. Implementation approaches adopted by each jurisdiction will likely include a combination of several methods and techniques. Actual development of an area consistent with nodal development patterns and the specific type of nodal development center will be based on further site analysis, owner/developer interest, and the support of individual jurisdictions. The process for establishing a nodal development area will include the following elements:

1. Confirm potential for nodal development based on established criteria;
2. Determine most appropriate type of nodal development pattern;
3. Identify needed public improvements;
4. Establish boundaries; and
5. Identify any potential conflicts with adjacent uses.

Establishment of new nodal developments will require an amendment to Metro Plan.

Nodal Development Implementation Schedule

Based on its review and approval of the 2002 TransPlan (RTP) Alternative Performance Measures for compliance with the TPR, LCDC adopted the following recommendations to provide guidance to local agencies in the development and implementation of TransPlan:

1. LCOG should amend TransPlan (the RTP) to include a schedule for implementation of the nodal development strategy. This schedule should incorporate the items listed below and the requirements for an “integrated land use and transportation plan” over the next three years.

2. Eugene and Springfield need to specify specific areas for nodal development within one year. TransPlan identifies approximately 50 areas as having potential for nodal development. Eugene and Springfield need to move quickly to pick
which of the 50 areas to designate as nodes and set general boundaries to guide subsequent detailed planning.

3. Eugene and Springfield need to adopt Metro Plan designations and zoning amendments for the specified nodes within two years after TransPlan adoption. Currently, most of the identified nodes are planned and zoned to allow continued auto-oriented development. This means inappropriate and poorly designed uses that could easily frustrate nodal development can be located in nodes. To be successful, nodes generally require a mix of mutually supportive pedestrian and transit-friendly uses and a good network of streets. If interim development includes inappropriate uses or is poorly laid out, the result could be to make a much larger area and perhaps a whole node unsuitable for nodal development.

4. Eugene, Springfield and Lane County need to review plan amendments and zone changes outside nodes to assure that they are consistent with the nodal development strategy. The success of nodal development strategy depends on attracting most of the higher density employment and residential development in nodes. Certain uses, such as neighborhood shopping centers are critical to the success of nodal development. Plan amendments to allow such uses outside of nodes undermine the nodal development strategy and hurt prospects for development in nodes.

The Integrated Land Use Transportation Plan referenced in the first recommendation is a requirement in the TPR (Section 0035(5)(c)) and includes the following elements:

(A) Changes to land use plan designations, densities, and design standards listed in 0035(2)(a)-(d) as follows:
   (a) Increasing residential densities and establishing minimum residential densities within one quarter mile of transit lines, major regional employment areas, and major regional retail shopping areas;
   (b) Increasing allowed densities in new commercial office and retail developments in designated community centers;
   (c) Designating lands for neighborhood shopping centers within convenient walking and cycling distance of residential areas;
   (d) Designating land uses to provide a better balance between jobs and housing considering:

(B) A transportation demand management plan that includes significant new transportation demand management measures;

(C) A public transit plan that includes a significant expansion in transit service;

(D) Policies to review and manage major roadway improvements to ensure that their effects are consistent with achieving the adopted strategy for reduced reliance on the automobile, including policies that provide for the following:
   (i) An assessment of whether improvements would result in development or travel that is inconsistent with what is expected in the plan;
   (ii) Consideration of alternative measures to meet transportation needs;
(iii) Adoption of measures to limit possible unintended effects on travel and land use patterns including access management, limitations on subsequent plan amendments, phasing of improvements, etc.

(For purposes of this section a “major roadway expansion” includes new arterial roads or streets and highways, the addition of travel lanes, and construction of interchanges to a limited access highway); and

(E) Plan and ordinance provisions that meet all other applicable requirements of this division.

Much of elements (B), (C), and (D) are addressed by components of the RTP. Other elements either are or will be addressed in subsequent implementation of the nodal development strategy.

The schedule for implementation of nodal development incorporating LCDC’s recommendations is outlined below. This schedule assumes funding available to carry out the tasks listed.

Table 6
Nodal Development Implementation and Integrated Land Use Transportation Plan Development Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Agency Responsible</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Specify specific areas for nodal development within one year</td>
<td>Eugene, Springfield</td>
<td>May 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Adopt Metro Plan designations and zoning amendments for the selected sites within two years after adoption of the RTP</td>
<td>Eugene, Springfield</td>
<td>September 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Review plan amendments and zone changes outside nodes to assure that they are consistent with the nodal development strategy</td>
<td>Eugene, Springfield, Lane County</td>
<td>As plan amendments and concurrent zone changes are submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Changes to land use plan designations, densities, and design standards listed in TPR Section 0035(2)(a)-(d). (If needed, in addition to work done through 2. Above)</td>
<td>Eugene, Springfield</td>
<td>September 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Policies to review and manage major roadway improvements to ensure that their effects are consistent with achieving the adopted strategy for reduced reliance on the automobile</td>
<td>Eugene, Springfield, Lane County</td>
<td>September 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Plan and ordinance provisions that meet all other applicable requirements of this division</td>
<td>Eugene, Springfield, Lane County</td>
<td>September 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transportation Demand Management Planning and Program Actions

TDM actions encourage the use of travel options other than single-occupant vehicles to achieve reductions in VMT and reduce reliance on the automobile.

Overview of Existing TDM Programs

TDM programs are implemented at various levels by local agencies. Ongoing TDM planning efforts include coordination by local jurisdiction staff subcommittee of the TPC, the TDM Advisory Committee. The committee’s purpose includes regional TDM project development; monitoring the performance and providing guidance of the regional TDM program; and educating local agency staff on current TDM programs in the region, state, and nationwide. In addition, LCOG provides technical analysis of the impacts of various TDM actions as part of the planning process.

LTD initially formalized a TDM program in Fall 1994, when it started a new program called Commuter Solutions. Since that time, the Commuter Solutions program has grown to a regional program in scope extending beyond the LTD service boundary. Commuter Solutions offers the region’s businesses, organizations, and educational institutions a comprehensive set of travel options programs and services for their employees, staff, and students. TDM strategies incorporated in the Commuter Solutions program include discounted group bus pass programs, parking management, a regional emergency ride home program, transit vouchers, ridesharing and vanpools, Park-and-Ride facilities, bicycling, walking, teleworking, and creative work scheduling. Commuter Solutions coordinates and implements these primary regional TDM programs, services, and projects. Commuter Solutions reports the progress and results of its work and effect on the region’s travel to the TDM Advisory Committee. Regional TDM programs and services are described below.

Commuter Solutions Travel Options Programs and Services

Regional Outreach

The primary mission of the Commuter Solutions program is to offer the region viable travel options to single-occupancy vehicle travel. Its main audiences include employers, educational institutions, and organizations. Outreach methods include direct mail, business referrals, newsletter and media coverage, leads from local planning staff, public service campaigns, tax benefits and credits information, individualized marketing strategies, advertising, presentations, and telephone contact. The benefits, both to the individual and the business/organization, are magnified in the results the community receives from successful travel options programs. In addition, community wide use of travel options programs prolong the public investment in the region’s roadway infrastructure. For example, Commuter Solutions provides congestion mitigation strategies before, during, and after major regional transportation infrastructure construction projects.
Rideshare Services
When the Commuter Solutions program was created at LTD in 1994, funding was made available to install and operate a new carpool matching software program. In 2003, Commuter Solutions made a significant infrastructure investment and updated the rideshare services with RidePro3 software. With an on-line application, the software provides individual and group rideshare matching services. In addition, it has the capability to produce a comprehensive regional summary of emissions and VMT reduction as a result of ridesharing. Still in its infancy, Ridepro3 now has over 300 registrants.

Vanpool Matching Services and Support
Commuter Solutions provides assistance for any group of individual or employers wishing to form a vanpool. Vanpool participants are matched through the RidePro3 software with assistance and guidelines to help get the vanpool operational. Vanpools are cost effective to operate if the daily work commute is more than 20 miles and six or more individuals join the vanpool. In addition, Commuter Solutions assists in the coordination of the Valley VanPool service between Salem to Eugene and all major jurisdictions in between. Currently, Valley VanPool has over 100 participants.

Regional Emergency Ride Home Program
Commuter Solutions offers a regional Emergency Ride Home (ERH) program that offers free transportation in case of a family emergency or sudden illness for employees who use alternative modes of transportation for their work commute. Research has shown that the desire to have a vehicle at work in case of a family emergency is the main reason workers continue to drive alone. A taxi voucher is supplied to designated staff, and the voucher is signed for the employee needing the taxi ride. The taxi company then completes and signs the voucher, keeping a copy, and Commuter Solutions for the taxi ride. Employers participating in an ERH program are provided with four (4) emergency taxi rides per person, per year; however, actual usage has been minimal. Instead of using a taxi, some employers either provide a vehicle for the employee or allow a coworker to take the employee to his or her destination. For the employee who is considering riding the bus, carpooling, vanpooling, biking, or walking, the ERH program provides an answer to the question of, “what if?”

School Trip Management
In 2003, Commuter Solutions began an intensive school transportation management program, Smart Ways to School. The Oregon Department of Energy provided seed money to research the effectiveness of travel option programs aimed at reducing the energy consumption associated with the school commute. Currently in the research phase, the pilot Smart Ways to School program works with the region’s three largest school districts, Eugene 4J, Springfield, and Bethel. At present, participation includes approximately 11,000 students representing elementary, middle and high school populations. Interventions included promotion of escorted walking and cycling school groups, carpool matching service (SchoolPool), and a trial regional youth bus pass program aimed at high school students. Future direction of the program will
include involvement of the region’s traffic engineering for improved school pedestrian access and the health community to promote benefits of exercise for youth.

In addition to this, LTD currently sells 500 to 600 passes each month to Eugene 4J middle and high school students.

**Marketing**

Marketing the services provided by the Commuter Solutions program is critical to the success of the program. The region’s trip attractors and generators (e.g., the U of O, PeaceHealth, Gateway area) need to be informed of the services provided by Commuter Solutions and of the benefits received by participating; personally, locally, and globally. Marketing efforts include workshops, conferences, direct mail, telephone contact, news releases, newsletter articles, site visits, paid print advertising, group presentations, referrals, and public service announcements (television, radio, and print). Internal research, marketing, and incentive programs are conducted at participating work sites.

**Creative Work Weeks**

Commuter Solutions staff assists and helps educate employers and employees on creative work schedules that can result in reduced peak-hour travel demand. Creative work schedules are an effective congestion management strategy. Elements in the program include staggered work hours, compressed work weeks, and flextime. Encouraging an employer to consider on-site day care, food services, and shopping services also is promoted by Commuter Solutions program.

**Teleworking**

Teleworking is using telephones, computers, and other equipment to work at home, usually one to three days a week. Commuter Solutions offers information and referral services to businesses and individuals inquiring about telecommuting. Business and individual tax credit information also is available.

**Coordination with Transit**

**Group Pass Program**

Commuter Solutions program advertises LTD’s Group Bus Pass program that offers employers with at least 10 employees a discounted bus pass program called the Group Pass Program. Group Pass Program participants sign an annual contract with LTD, and photo identification for each employee is required. Transportation education fairs and employee surveys are conducted annually at each work site to maintain visibility and encourage increased participation in alternative modes programs. The total number of local area employees with group pass benefits is approximately 41,000.

**Commuter Club Program**

Commuter Solutions offers a transit voucher program called the Commuter Club. Businesses request transit vouchers from LTD to distribute to their employees who purchase monthly LTD
bus passes. The employee pays up to 50 percent of the cost of the bus pass, and the employer is
invoiced for the remaining amount. With the new federal transportation fringe benefit tax law,
costs for the purchase of transit passes or vouchers (up to a maximum of $60 per employee per
month) are a business expense, and the employee benefit is tax-free. LTD’s monthly adult bus
passes are only $35 (prices effective September 2004); therefore, an employer can purchase bus
passes for employees and not reach the maximum allowable expenditure under federal law.

Bicycle Commuting Programs
Programs and assistance are available to employers on how to facilitate the needs of bicycle
commuters as well as how to promote and encourage bicycling as an alternative to the solo auto
commute. Commuter Solutions works closely with the City of Eugene's Bicycle Coordinator and
with the City of Springfield's transportation planning staff to encourage safe bicycle access and
secure bicycle parking facilities. In addition, coordination with state bicycle safety groups, such
as the Bicycle Transportation Alliance, with the Smart Ways to School program assists in
promotion of youth bicycling.

Bicycles on Buses Program
LTD added bicycle racks to all LTD buses in June 1996. Bicycle racks on transit buses
encourage bicycle use in our community by meeting the needs of bicycle riders. Increased
bicycle use reduces the number of VMT in the area, is one of the cleanest and healthiest ways to
get around, and is rapidly becoming a way to get to work. LTD currently transports 20,464
bicycles monthly.

Bicycle Lockers Available
LTD has one prototype bicycle locker available at the Amazon Station. Bicycle riders need to
supply their own locks. Analysis will determine additional placement of lockers at other
locations. The current locker is well used by bicyclists using transit.

Parking
Parking Management
Parking Management and Transportation Management staff from the cities of Eugene and
Springfield and Commuter Solutions works closely on transportation management strategies to
encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation in our metropolitan area Commuter
Solutions works with local agencies to ensure that adequate carpool spaces are available in new
and upgraded parking lots and reviews development plans for transit access, bicycle and
pedestrian access, and parking needs. The City of Eugene also provides preferential carpool
spaces in its parking garages.

Park & Ride Program
LTD operates more than 25 Park & Ride locations throughout the area. Park & Ride lots are
conveniently located along 44 minor and major bus routes, and many locations are served by
express or direct bus service, limiting the travel time to destinations. Park & Ride lots also are popular meeting places for carpools and vanpools.

TDM Implementation Process
Funding for the Commuter Solutions program described above is primarily provided through two funding processes, the STIP and local MPO STP allocation with local match is provided by the jurisdictions of LTD, cities of Eugene and Springfield, Lane County, and LCOG. It is important to note that any rideshare activity does not require any local match. Commuter Solutions has STIP dollars programmed until 2009. Commuter Solutions currently receives an annual allocation of $340,000 in STP dollars through the local MPO STP allocation process.

TDM Planning and Program Actions
The success of TDM efforts is dependent upon the availability and quality of alternative mode infrastructure. Thus, TDM Planning and Program Actions should be closely coordinated with the transit and bicycle/pedestrian Capital Investment Actions.

1. TDM Programs and Services
   1.1. Require large employers (25 or more).
   1.2. Require state and local government agencies to implement TDM programs for their employees.
   1.3. Require employers of a certain size (25 or more) to develop TDM programs for employees.
   1.4. Require that large special events in the community, such as the Lane County Fair, sporting events, and concerts, provide transit shuttle service.
   1.5. Reduce required number of employees necessary for a group bus pass program to expand program.
   1.6. Evaluate potential impact of telecommunication technology applications to minimize future travel demand on the region’s infrastructure. Refine regional transportation modeling and forecasting appropriately.
   1.7. Evaluate various transportation system pricing strategies, appropriate applications, potential revenue-enhancing capabilities, institutional and legislative changes necessary for implementation, and public support programs. Transportation pricing measures can be applied to highly congested bridges and corridors where warranted by economic feasibility and to partially support financing of future infrastructure and transportation services.
   1.8. Establish Transportation Management Associations (TMA’s) in nodal developments, along BRT corridors, and highly congested areas. TMA's are voluntary or mandatory organizations of developers and/or employers in a particular subarea or impact zone, working together to solve transportation problems. TMA’s would interact with public agencies and Commuter Solutions to develop viable travel option programs. Commuter Solutions would promote and provide travel options strategies in that area.
   1.9. Develop regional policies in partnership with public school districts, private educational institutions, and youth recreational programs to reduce VMT’s associated with school commute or after-school activities.
1.10. Implement traffic calming measures on roads to encourage the use of alternative modes.
1.11. Implement dialog marketing (e.g., TravelSmart) throughout region’s appropriate neighborhood.
1.12. Build ridesharing program within region and target commuters outside the MPO with vanpooling.

2. **Educational and Awareness**

2.1. Develop a multimodal *Share the Road* public awareness campaign to foster increased courtesy and respect among all modes. Program elements could include public service announcements and installation of *Share the Road* signs at key locations.

2.2. Implement a public awareness campaign to alert people that they must yield to buses re-entering traffic.

2.3. Provide multi-modal information at LTD stations, Amtrak, and large regional trip generators and attractors.

2.4. Reinforce public understanding of the law concerning pedestrian rights-of-way, transit yield law, and school zone speed laws.

2.5. Promote enforcement of traffic laws that prohibit unlicensed and uninsured motorists from driving to increase safety and use of alternative modes.

2.6. Promote school trip management through education and monthly pass programs. Commuter Solution’s Smart Ways to School program developed a pilot regional youth bus pass program with assistance from LTD. LTD has a current reduced youth bus pass rate.

2.7. Promote car sharing. Car sharing is joint access to a fleet of vehicles located close to neighborhoods and businesses. Members pay for the hours and miles they drive. This provides a strong financial incentive to use alternative modes for most trips while having access to a vehicle when needed. Portland and Seattle have car sharing programs established.

2.8. Develop a comprehensive congestion mitigation program to assist public agencies and the public to reduce congestion during large infrastructure projects.

3. **Incentives**

3.1. Collaborate with bicycle shops to sponsor bicycle maintenance clinics, training rides, and other events and to offer discounts on bicycling gear to employees who commute by bicycle.

3.2. Provide incentives to employers who implement TDM programs for their employees. (Based on *TransPlan* 1986, Policy AM3, Policy PK5.)

3.3. Provide incentives, such as SDC credits or reductions in minimum auto parking requirements, to developers who construct bicycle support facilities such as lockers, changing rooms, shower facilities, and sheltered parking, beyond ordinance requirements.

4. **Parking Management:** For actions related to parking management, see Chapter 3, page 96.
Transportation System Improvements Planning and Program Actions

The TSI Planning and Program Actions are presented in the following categories:

1. System-Wide
2. Roadways
3. Transit
4. Bicycles
5. Pedestrian
6. Goods Movement
7. Other Modes

TSI System-Wide
This section provides Planning and Program Actions related to the transportation system as a whole.

1. Intermodal Linkages
   1.1. Evaluate the need for improved intermodal linkages.

2. System Efficiency
   2.1. Improve system efficiency without major additions in infrastructure through intersection modification, roadway modification, increased preservation efforts, restructuring area-wide transit service, and priority treatment for transit vehicles. (Based on TransPlan 1986 Policy TSM1.)

3. Right of Way
   3.1. Inventory, purchase, and improve private roads, rail rights-of-way, and easements of regional significance for public use and benefit. (Based on Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) Action 1B.4.)
   3.2. Obtain right-of-way or building setbacks to provide for future capacity in transportation corridors. (TransPlan 1986 Policy LU3.)

4. Standards
   4.1. Establish standards for minimum levels of service and system design for passengers and freight for all modes. (Based on OTP Action 1C.1.)

5. Environmental
   5.1. Regulate truck freight in sensitive environmental areas, such as Springfield’s drinking water protection zones. (Springfield staff)
   5.2. Retrofit existing transportation facilities to reduce environmental or social impacts (e.g., polluting runoff, noise).
6. Intelligent Transportation Systems
   6.1. Research, test, and implement as appropriate Intelligent Transportation Systems technology, including: arterial traffic signal and freeway-arterial interconnection programs, high-occupancy vehicles and transit enhancements, en-route trip guidance programs, automated support for TDM programs, and traffic incident response systems.

TSI Roadways
This section provides Planning and Program Actions related to the regional roadway system.

1. Access Management
   Access Management techniques can offer significant operational and safety benefits for arterial roadways. Access management has the potential to decrease accidents and to preserve mobility without large system expansions.
   1.1. Develop access management plans for key transportation facilities.
   1.2. Implement access management (access control) techniques, for example, driveway and public road spacing, median control, and signal spacing standards, that are consistent with the functional classification of roads and consistent with limiting development on rural lands to rural uses and densities. (Supported by TransPlan 1986 Policy LU1; TPR 660-12-045(2))

2. Neighborhood Traffic Calming
   2.1. Develop neighborhood traffic-calming plans.
   2.2. Implement traffic-calming techniques, such as restricted turn movements, traffic diverters, bulb-outs (landscaped or narrowed entrances), traffic circles or roundabouts, woonerfs, narrowed streets, truck restricted areas, and vehicle weight limitations. (Based on TransPlan 1986 Policy LU5.)

3. Design Considerations for all Modes
   3.1. Provide sidewalks on urban streets, including arterials, collectors, and local streets, and bridges. Sidewalk separation from the curb should be provided on arterial streets and major collectors. (TransPlan 1986 Policy I8; TPR 660-12-045 (3)(b)(B))
   3.2. Assign a higher priority to road projects that have a bicycle component.
   3.3. Limit or eliminate on-street auto parking when necessary for the safe and convenient movement of bicycles.
   3.4. Provide bicycle safety devices such as bicycle-proof drain grates, rubberized pads at railroad crossings, and appropriate signage in conjunction with reconstruction or new construction of the street system and in other areas as needed. (Based on TransPlan 1986 Policy AM4.)
   3.5. Evaluate the need to improve roadway access for fire/emergency medical services and transit vehicles in low-density areas, such as the Eugene South Hills. (South Hills Refinement Planning Committee Report, July 1997.)
   3.6. Evaluate the potential for construction of roundabouts at intersections.
TSI Transit

This section provides Planning and Program Actions related to transit service and facilities.

1. **Transit Service Improvements**
   1.1. Provide service every ten minutes along major corridors. (*TransPlan* 1986, Policy AM1.)
   1.2. Implement a shuttle that connects the downtown Eugene area with other major activity centers.
   1.3. Conduct feasibility studies on expanding transit service operations to nearby communities.
   1.4. Implement operating procedures and monitor design guidelines to minimize security and safety concerns at transit stops/stations and on vehicles.
   1.5. Acquire low-floor buses to improve and speed access by riders.
   1.6. Acquire smaller buses to serve neighborhoods on local streets and connect the neighborhood service with the corridor service at nearby land use nodes.
   1.7. Establish a prepaid fare system along the BRT corridors to speed rider boarding.

2. **Transit Facility Improvements**
   2.1. Construct transit stations in newly developed areas in the Eugene-Springfield area and in nearby communities. (Based on *Metro Plan* 1987 Transportation Policy 3.)
   2.2. Implement a transit signal priority system along major transit corridors. (Based on *TransPlan* 1986 Policy TSM3, AM2.)
   2.3. Support transit use through provision of bus stops, pullouts and shelters, optimum road geometrics, on-road parking restrictions, and similar facilities, as appropriate. (TPR 660-12-045(4)(a))
   2.4. Implement transit-priority techniques, such as exclusive bus lanes, restricted turn movements at appropriate intersections for all vehicles except buses, queue-jumpers, and separate access ramps, along major transit corridors. (Based on *TransPlan* 1986 Policy TSM3, AM2.) Give priority to transit/carpools during the peak hour at appropriate ramps to limited access facilities. (*TransPlan* 1986 Policy TSM3, AM2.)
   2.5. Provide transit facility improvements, such as shelters, benches, lighting, and transit schedule information, at major bus stops.
   2.6. Provide transit schedule information at all transit shelters.

3. **Park-and-Ride Facilities**
   3.1. Provide multiple Park-and-Ride facilities along major corridors and BRT corridors.
   3.2. Establish Park-and-Ride facilities in nearby communities for commuters into the metro area. (*TransPlan* 1986, Policy IC2.)
   3.3. Develop Park-and-Ride facilities that make use of existing public and private parking lots, where use by Park-and-Ride commuters complements existing parking use (e.g., churches or retail establishments with evening or weekend peak demand) (*TransPlan* 1986 Policy AM5.)
   3.4. Consider establishment of a Park-and-Ride facility at Autzen Stadium with a direct link to the University/Sacred Heart/Riverfront Research Park area.
**Bus Rapid Transit Implementation Process**

BRT is, in essence, using a bus system to emulate the positive characteristics of a light rail system. BRT can be implemented at a fraction of the cost of light rail, and can be implemented incrementally. In addition, BRT can lay the foundation for a future light rail system. The BRT system travel times are expected to be competitive with single-occupant vehicle travel times.

The BRT concept consists of high-frequency, fast transit service along major transportation corridors, with small bus service in neighborhoods that connects with the BRT corridor service and with nearby activity centers. The following are potential elements of a BRT system:

1. Exclusive bus lanes,
2. A bus guideway system,
3. Traffic signal priority for transit,
4. Low-floor buses for faster boarding,
5. Pre-paid fares for faster boarding,
6. Greater spacing between bus stops,
7. Improved stops and stations (shelters, lighting, information, etc.), and
8. Park-and-Ride lots along BRT corridors.

It should be noted that some of these elements, such as low-floor buses, signal priority, and Park-and-Ride system expansion, while part of a BRT system, would also be part of improvements that could be made to the existing LTD system, even if BRT were not pursued.

Specific determination of which of the BRT elements are used and where they are used will require a significant amount of research and analysis. The research will include consideration of impacts on transit ridership, traffic flow, cost, the environment, and land uses. Also to be investigated are funding sources to pay for the improvements.

The BRT system would be implemented on a corridor-by-corridor basis. The first corridor will be an east/west line between Springfield and Eugene along Main Street, Franklin Boulevard, and West 11<sup>th</sup>/13<sup>th</sup>/18<sup>th</sup>. This corridor was selected based on an analysis of several factors, including transit ridership, car and bus travel times, population, employment, and coordination with planned nodal development.

The research and analysis process will include community involvement, with an emphasis on encouraging participation by those who work, live, or travel along the pilot corridor. There will also be extensive participation by technical staff from appropriate jurisdictions. The BRT improvements will not be implemented without the approval of both the LTD Board of Directors and the policy board with jurisdiction over the road under consideration.
**TSI Bicycles**

This section provides Planning and Program Actions related to the regional bicycle system and support facilities.

1. **Bicycle System Improvements**
   1.1. Acquire land at market value, or secure dedications of land or access easements for bikeways in connection with utility rights-of-way, drainage ditches, rivers, rail lines, and other corridors. (Based on TransPlan 1986 Policy LU9.)
   1.2. Retrofit local streets that are designated bicycle routes with bicycle-friendly traffic-calming devices such as traffic circles, curb extensions, and diverters that allow through movements for bicyclists.
   1.3. Improve safety and convenience of bicycle-pedestrian crossings at major streets.

2. **Bicycle System Support Facilities**
   2.1. Improve lighting and signage on off-street, multi-use paths and install adequate lighting and signage at street or bike path intersections or other segments of the bicycle system where significant numbers of bike-bike, bike-pedestrian, or bike-motor vehicle conflicts occur.
   2.2. Provide bicycle parking facilities at all new multi-family residential developments of four or more units; new retail, office, and institutional developments; public facilities; regional activity centers; public events; and all transit transfer stations and Park-and-Ride lots. (TransPlan 1986 Policy PK4; TPR 660-12-045(3)(a))
   2.3. Modify development regulations for new construction and major renovation projects to mandate the provision of showers and bicycle storage facilities in public buildings with at least 50 employees.
   2.4. Design and place a series of *you are here* bicycle system maps at major destinations and other strategic locations along the bicycle system.
   2.5. Place bicycle route signage along designated routes in the metro area.

3. **Bicycle Safety**
   3.1. Work with the state Legislature to add a non-motorized portion to the State Motor Vehicle test that includes questions on appropriate behavior of motorized vehicles towards bicyclists and pedestrians.
   3.2. Work with public school districts to educate students about improving bicycle skills, increasing the observance of traffic laws and enhancing safety. Specific techniques include bicycle safety rodeos and transportation safety assemblies designed to teach safe riding habits and rules of the road to young cyclists.
   3.3. Establish and publicize a *Close Call* hot line to better identify high hazard locations and to pinpoint violations that lead to accidents.
   3.4. Work with local higher education institutions (e.g., University of Oregon, Lane Community College) to provide materials and instruction on bicycle safety to incoming students.
   3.5. Collaborate with LTD to develop a training session, including a video, for LTD drivers. The focus of the training would be on sharing the road with cyclists.
3.6. Produce a video to educate bicyclists that commit traffic violations. The focus of
the video would be on cyclists’ rights and responsibilities.
3.7. Advise local school districts on ways to include bicycle education and awareness
in driver education classes and testing and advise private driver training
businesses on ways to include bicycle education and awareness in courses.
3.8. Adopt maintenance procedures for the bikeway system to ensure good pavement
condition; visible striping and signage marking the route; and safe lanes
unobstructed by leaves, gravel, and debris.

4. Bicycle Planning
4.1. Develop a process for assessing all planned and proposed bicycle projects to
better determine their scope, feasibility, and cost.
4.2. Develop a bicycle transportation forecasting model.
4.3. Establish a comprehensive data collection system to: develop and regularly
update a database of bicycle safety and use data; monitor bicycle and pedestrian
accidents and injuries with local jurisdictions and health care facilities; conduct
annual or seasonal bicycle counts along selected bikeways; and monitor pavement
condition of bike lanes and paths.
4.4. Conduct a bicycle parking study that inventories existing structures and identifies
the types and desired locations of additional structures.

TSI Pedestrian
This section provides Planning and Program Actions related to the pedestrian system and support
facilities. The pedestrian actions will be implemented in large part through TSP land use actions
and local jurisdiction design standards that support pedestrian-oriented design. Pedestrian
actions will also be implemented through construction and reconstruction of roadways and small
improvement projects.

1. Pedestrian System Improvements
1.1. Establish priorities for expenditure on routine, ongoing repair, and reconstruction
of existing sidewalks and construction of new sidewalks. (Based on TransPlan
1986 Policy I5.)
1.2. Develop a plan for prioritized construction of sidewalk segments to fill gaps in
the existing system of urban area roadways. (Based on TransPlan 1986 Policy
I5.) Develop a plan for prioritized retrofitting of all corner sidewalks with curb
ramps. (Based on TransPlan 1986 Policy AM4.)
1.3. Install audio/tactile pedestrian signal systems in areas with large elderly and
disabled populations. Provide pedestrian push buttons (with visual wait signal) at
intersections. (Based on TransPlan 1986 Policy AM4.)
1.4. Evaluate the need for new or improved treatments of pedestrian street crossings,
such as small curb radii, taking into account the type of pedestrian facility,
pedestrian volume, vehicle traffic, crossing distance, sight distance, accident data,
and related factors.
1.5. Identify pedestrian use paths, determine which ones provide needed connectivity, and ensure their continued viability (e.g., north end of Friendly Street through the Lane County Fairgrounds to 13th Avenue and Monroe).

1.6. Require that on-site pedestrian systems connect with adjoining properties and the external pedestrian system. (TPR 660-12-045(4)(b)(B))

1.7. Require developers to provide adequate internal pedestrian circulation facilities within new subdivisions, multi-family developments, planned developments, shopping centers, and commercial districts. This can be accomplished through clustering buildings, constructing paved accessways and walkways and other techniques. (Reference TPR 660-12-045 (3)(b,e))

1.8. Provide paved pedestrian walkways between new commercial and residential developments and neighborhood activity centers (e.g., schools, parks, shopping areas, transit stops, and employment centers) and adjacent residential areas and transit stops and neighborhood activity centers within one-half mile of the development. Specific measures include constructing walkways between cul-de-sacs and adjacent roads, providing walkways between buildings, and providing direct access between adjacent uses. (Based on TransPlan 1986 Policy LU6; TPR 660-12-045 (3)(b,c,d,e))

1.9. Provide convenient pedestrian access to transit at new retail, office, and institutional buildings at or near major transit stops. This shall be accomplished by providing walkways between building entrances and streets adjoining the site and providing pedestrian connections from the on-site circulation system to adjoining properties. (TPR 660-12-045(4)(b))

1.10. Retrofit existing streets to be safer and friendlier for pedestrians (e.g., curb extensions, center refuge medians).

2. Pedestrian System Support Facilities
   2.1. Require landscaped areas (planting strips) along sidewalks.
   2.2. Require street furniture, such as benches.
   2.3. Require lighting.

TSI Goods Movement
This section provides Planning and Program Actions related to goods movement. The Goods Movement and Intermodal Facilities Map in Appendix A shows the locations of bus and passenger rail service terminals, public use airports, mainline and branchline railroads and railroad facilities, and major regional pipelines and terminals. There are no port facilities in the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area.

ODOT has the responsibility for developing the intermodal management system in the Eugene-Springfield area as part of the SAFETEA-LU planning guidelines. ODOT is focusing its efforts on the links between various modes of freight transportation. Examples of intermodal links are roadways between freight intermodal facilities and the National Highway System facilities. The metropolitan planning process should continue to support ODOT’s planning and implementation actions.
1. **Goods Movement Planning**
   1.1. Establish a freight task force (or freight planning committee) with members drawn from the freight-transport industry, local businesses, and other interested parties. Members should include senior public and private sector officials with decision-making authority.
   1.2. Conduct a regional freight study to develop a thorough understanding of regional goods movement issues, needed data, travel patterns, and existing and future needs. The logistics requirements of major regional companies should be analyzed to identify the types of transportation on which they are most dependent, and to assess both deficiencies and opportunities. Freight mobility performance measures that are attentive to daily system reliability and the logistics needs of manufacturers and businesses should be developed.
   1.3. Develop a database on freight movement and enhance the region’s freight-travel modeling capability.
   1.4. Study the feasibility of establishing a port authority to coordinate rail/truck intermodal goods movement.
   1.5. Support actions that encourage goods movement by rail.
   1.6. Encourage public and private partnerships to improve freight mobility.

2. **Goods Movement System Improvements**
   2.1. Correct existing safety deficiencies on the freight network related to: roadway geometry and traffic controls; at-grade railroad crossings; truck traffic in neighborhoods; congestion on interchanges and hill climbs; and hazardous materials movement.
   2.2. Identify priority freight projects. Review CIPs, including TIP, to ensure that the priority projects are included. Coordinate the scheduling of projects in the TIP and various capital budgets with related private projects.

**TSI Other Modes**

This section provides Planning and Program Actions related to other modes, including air, rail, and inter-city bus service.

1. **Airport**
   1.1. Develop plans to ensure that future air transportation capacity needs are met.

2. **Rail System Improvements**
   2.1. Purchase the Amtrak station site in downtown Eugene to preserve as the future high speed rail terminal.
   2.2. Plan for future high-speed rail train servicing facilities.

3. **Inter-City Bus Service**
   3.1. Support private sector efforts to improve inter-city bus terminals and service.
Part Six: Parking Management Plan

This plan discusses Capital Investment Actions and presents Planning and Program Actions related to parking management that meet the parking requirements of the TPR, while maintaining a parking supply that supports the economic health of the community. Parking management needs to be looked at regionally, while providing jurisdictional flexibility.

Parking management strategies are an important part of an integrated set of implementation actions that support nodal development, system improvements, and demand management. A vast supply of free and subsidized parking can encourage automobile use over transit use. A limited, rather than abundant supply of parking can encourage use of non-auto modes, especially transit. There is also a direct relationship between the price of parking and the use of public transit.

Parking management strategies address both the supply and demand for vehicle parking. They contribute to balancing travel demand with the region among the various modes of transportation available. Parking management strategies are effective in increasing the use of alternative modes, especially when combined with other TDM strategies. Supportive TDM programs include carpool/vanpool programs, preferential parking and reserved spaces for carpooling, and parking pricing.

TPR Requirements for Parking Space Reduction

The TPR requires a parking plan that achieves a 10 percent reduction in the number of parking spaces per capita in the metropolitan area over the 20-year planning period. For the Eugene-Springfield region, the TPR reduction goal is .514. If the level of parking density (spaces per developed acre) remains constant and land development and population forecasts are accurate, then the level of parking spaces per capita will be reduced by more than the 10 percent reduction required by the TPR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone/Plan Designation</th>
<th>1995 Total Spaces</th>
<th>2015 Total Spaces</th>
<th>2015 TPR Goal Total Spaces</th>
<th>1995 Spaces Per Capita</th>
<th>2015 Spaces Per Capita</th>
<th>2015 TPR Goal Spaces Per Capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>51,259</td>
<td>57,865</td>
<td>61,618</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>27,622</td>
<td>30,200</td>
<td>33,205</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>48,692</td>
<td>49,067</td>
<td>58,534</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127,573</td>
<td>137,132</td>
<td>153,357</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>.514</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capital Investment Actions

Capital Investment Actions that support non-auto modes have an indirect impact on parking needs by lowering the demand for spaces in higher density areas. For example, Park-and-Ride facilities can contribute to lowering the demand for parking in downtown areas. Transit Capital
Investment Actions call for the establishment of Park-and-Ride facilities throughout the Eugene-Springfield area.

Planning and Program Actions
RTP policy supports increased use of motor vehicle parking management strategies in selected areas throughout the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area.

TDM Policy #2: Parking Management
Increase the use of motor vehicle parking management strategies in selected areas throughout the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area.

The City of Eugene established policy that made specific recommendations regarding parking reduction with the Eugene city limits through the adoption of the CATS and the Transportation rule Implementation Project (TRIP). CATS recommended a range of parking policies and TRIP refined and implemented several of these strategies.

1. Supply Strategies
   1.1. Establish maximum allotments for parking. (TPR 660-12-045(5)(c))
   1.2. Increase the use of Park-and-Ride lots to reduce parking demand in the city centers and other intensely developed areas.
   1.3. Allow parking exemptions.
   1.4. Lower or eliminate minimum parking requirements. (*TransPlan* 1986 Policy PK3; TPR 660-12-045(5)(c))
   1.5. Encourage construction of parking structures rather than surface parking.
   1.6. Expand the number of carpool/vanpool parking spaces in City-owned lots and provide financial incentives to use those spaces.

2. Demand Strategies
   2.1. Provide incentives, such as employer payroll tax reductions and automobile parking requirement reductions, to employers who implement preferential parking for carpools and vanpools in new developments with designated employee parking areas.
   2.2. Shift free parking areas to paid parking where appropriate.
   2.3. Encourage employers to charge fair market prices for employee parking. (*TransPlan* 1986 Policy PK6.)
   2.4. Provide preferential parking for carpools and vanpools in new developments with designated employee parking areas. (TPR 660-12-045(4)(d))
   2.5. Manage overflow parking impacts in residential areas through residential parking permit programs. (Based on *TransPlan* 1986 Policy PK7.)
   2.6. Encourage adherence to parking regulations by expanding enforcement programs and increasing parking fines. (*TransPlan* 1986 Policy PK9.)
   2.7. Establish shorter time limits on parking in high demand areas, such as on-street parking near employment centers. (*TransPlan* 1986 Policy PK8.)
Part Seven: Intelligent Transportation System Operations and Implementation Plan

In early 2003, ODOT commissioned the development of the Regional Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Operations & Implementation Plan for the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area. The final plan was presented to MPC in November 2003 and represents a collective effort by the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), Lane County, the City of Eugene, the City of Springfield, the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG), and the Lane Transit District (LTD). This plan outlines the deployment of ITS projects, which include advanced technologies and management techniques, to improve the safety and efficiency of the transportation system over the long term. It is also consistent with similar efforts in other regions and statewide to ensure the ITS strategies utilized are integrated and complementary. The Executive Summary of the Final Report is provided in Appendix G.

Overview of Intelligent Transportation Systems

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) involve the application of advanced technologies and proven management techniques to solve transportation problems, enhance safety, provide services to travelers, and assist transportation system operators in implementing suitable traffic management strategies. ITS focuses on increasing the efficiency of existing transportation infrastructure, which enhances the overall system performance and reduces the need to add capacity (e.g., travel lanes). Efficiency is achieved by providing services and information to travelers so they can (and will) make better travel decisions and to transportation system operators so they can better manage the system.

ITS applications provide a viable opportunity for improving the safety and efficiency of the surface transportation system in the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area. These applications help improve transportation system operations by performing a function more quickly or reliably or by providing a service that was not previously available. In effect, ITS improves the mobility of people and goods on the existing roadways and also provides the potential for substantial savings on future construction, particularly of highways. It is often easy to overlook the importance of investing in operations, but it is necessary to ensure that the traveling public makes safe and efficient use of existing roadways.

ITS Projects

The ITS Operations and Implementation Plan identified several potential ITS projects. Table 5 in Appendix G summarizes the details for each of the proposed ITS projects. Figure 1 in Appendix G provides the location of proposed projects. These projects would be implemented primarily as part of existing projects or as funding becomes available.

The following information is provided for each project:

- Project Number (for reference)
- Project Title
- Project Description
- Priority (High, Medium, or Low)
The project numbers are used for reference purposes only and do not indicate any type of priority. Within this table, the projects are described under one of the following six applicable categories:

- Travel & Traffic Management (TM)
- Communications (CO)
- Public Transportation Management (PTM)
- Emergency Management (EM)
- Information Management (IM)
- Maintenance & Construction Management (MC)

**ITS Planning and Program Actions**

To successfully implement the proposed ITS plan, the following steps are necessary:

**ITS Program Continuation**

The continuation of the ITS steering committee is possibly the most important item for the successful implementation of the ITS plan. This group should include the key stakeholders from the planning process and should be organized as a new subcommittee to the Transportation Planning Committee (TPC). This group will initiate the steps outlined in this plan, plan projects that fit agencies’ needs, pursue Federal funding opportunities, and monitor/report progress and effectiveness. In addition, a representative from this ITS subcommittee should report current status of the plan implementation at least annually at the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC).

**Deploy “Early Winner” Projects**

Another key to the success of ITS in Eugene-Springfield will depend on the deployment of “early winner” projects. A potential “early winner” project includes the deployment of field devices (closed circuit television cameras, count stations, variable message signs, and ramp meters) on Beltline Highway to support regional freeway management and traveler information. This project would also support the current Statewide implementation of the 511 traveler information telephone number by providing real-time information from these field devices.

**Incorporate the ITS Plan in the RTP Update Process**

The ITS Steering Committee plans to incorporate this ITS Plan in the upcoming Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update process. The ITS devices and communications infrastructure identified in this plan should be installed on corridors concurrently with traditional transportation construction and maintenance projects. This approach will minimize reconstruction, save time and money, and result in the modernization of the regional transportation system. Where applicable, relationships to currently planned regional projects have been identified in Table 5.
In addition, the data collection, analysis, operational techniques and information sharing developed through the projects in this plan can become key elements of other regional efforts.

**Do Not Overlook Future Needs if They Fit With Current Opportunities**

The region should pursue a flexible approach to implementing the plan. Opportunities may become present in early years to implement elements of the plan identified for later deployment. These opportunities may be possible due to other funding sources, coordination with roadway construction, coordination with local agency/private initiatives and/or transit priorities. These opportunities should be seized when appropriate.

**Define a Revenue Stream**

The Central Lane MPO Area will need to define a revenue stream for construction, operations and maintenance. The ITS Operations and Implementation Plan provides the basis for the funding and identifies opportunities for regional coordination and cost-sharing. The region must dedicate funding sources to implement each increment of the 20-year plan. In addition to the traditional funding sources, other non-traditional sources for funding such as grants from non-profit agencies should be considered. The Central Lane MPO Area will need an on-going commitment to operations and maintenance of the equipment and software to maximize the benefits of the ITS program. The ITS elements proposed within this program require consistent staffing for effective system operation, as well as requiring trained staff to do routine maintenance.