

TransPlan Chapter 2: Policy Element

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	2
Part One: <i>TransPlan</i> Goals.....	3
Goal #1: Integrated Transportation and Land Use System.....	3
Goal #2: Transportation System Characteristics.....	3
Part Two: <i>TransPlan</i> Objectives.....	5
Objective #1: Accessibility and Mobility.....	5
Objective #2: Safety.....	5
Objective #3: Environment.....	6
Objective #4: Economic Vitality.....	6
Objective #5: Public Involvement.....	7
Objective #6: Coordination/Efficiency.....	7
Objective #7: Policy Implementation.....	8
Part Three: <i>TransPlan</i> Policies.....	9
Consolidated List of <i>TransPlan</i> Policies.....	10
Land Use Policies.....	13
Transportation Demand Management Policies.....	19
Transportation System Improvements: System-Wide Policies.....	22
Transportation System Improvements: Roadway Policies.....	25
Transportation System Improvements: Transit Policies.....	28
Transportation System Improvements: Bicycle Policies.....	31
Transportation System Improvements: Pedestrian Policies.....	34
Transportation System Improvements: Goods Movement Policies.....	36
Transportation System Improvements: Other Modes Policies.....	37
Finance Policies.....	39

Introduction

The *TransPlan* policy element guides transportation system planning in the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area. A basic assumption in the development of the *TransPlan* policy element is that transportation systems do more than meet travel demand; they have a significant effect on the physical and socioeconomic characteristics of the areas they serve. Transportation planning must be viewed in terms of regional and community goals and values such as protection of the environment, impact on the regional economy, and maintaining the quality of life that area residents enjoy.

The *TransPlan* policy element consists of the following components:

- ♦ Goals (2),
- ♦ Objectives (7), and
- ♦ Policies (37).

The *TransPlan* policy element is consistent with the region's overall policy framework for regional planning as set forth in the *Metro Plan*.

⇒ **The *TransPlan* goals and policies will be adopted and incorporated by amendment into the *Metro Plan*.**

Part One: *TransPlan* Goals

Consistent with the *Metro Plan*, the following definition is used for *TransPlan* goals:

Broad statement of philosophy that describes the hopes of the people of the community for the future of the community. A goal may never be completely attainable but it is used as a point towards which to strive.

Goal #1: Integrated Transportation and Land Use System

Provide an integrated transportation and land use system that supports choices in modes of travel and development patterns that will reduce reliance on the auto and enhance livability, economic opportunity, and the quality of life.

Definition/Intent: This goal recognizes the need to integrate transportation and land use planning to enhance livability, economic opportunity, and quality of life. Integration supports transportation-efficient development patterns and choices in transportation modes that reduce reliance on the auto.

Reference: Developed by *TransPlan* update stakeholders; based in part on *Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) (1992) Goal 3*.

Goal #2: Transportation System Characteristics

Enhance the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area's quality of life and economic opportunity by providing a transportation system that is:

- a) Balanced,
- b) Accessible,
- c) Efficient,
- d) Safe,
- e) Interconnected,
- f) Environmentally responsible,
- g) Supportive of responsible and sustainable development,
- h) Responsive to community needs and neighborhood impacts, and
- i) Economically viable and financially stable.

Definition/Intent: The goal is to provide an overall transportation system that provides for all of these needs. Transportation decisions on specific facilities and services will require balancing some characteristics with others.

- a) A **balanced** transportation system is one that provides a range of transportation options and takes advantage of the inherent efficiencies of each mode.
- b) An **accessible** transportation system is one that serves all areas of the community and offers both residents and visitors convenient and reliable transportation options.

- c) An **efficient** transportation system is one that is fast and economic for the user, maximizes the mobility available through existing facilities, and leverages as much benefit as possible from new transportation facilities.
- d) A **safe** transportation system is one that is designed, built, and operated to minimize risk of harm to people and property and allows people to feel confident and secure in and around all modes of travel.
- e) An **interconnected** transportation system is one that provides for ease of transfer between different modes of travel, such as auto to bus or bicycle to rail.
- f) An **environmentally responsible** transportation system is one that reduces transportation-related environmental impact and energy consumption.
- g) A transportation system that is **supportive of responsible and sustainable development** integrates transportation and land use planning in support of transportation-efficient development.
- h) A transportation system that is **responsive to community needs and neighborhood impacts** is flexible and adaptable, and addresses transportation-related impacts in residential areas.
- i) An **economically viable** and **financially stable** transportation system is one that is cost efficient; financially feasible; and has sufficient, ongoing financial support to ensure transportation system investments can be operated and maintained as desired.

Reference: Based on OTP (1992) Goals 1 and 3 and stakeholders' input.

Part Two: *TransPlan* Objectives

Consistent with the *Metro Plan*, the following definition is used for *TransPlan* objectives:

An objective is an attainable target that the community attempts to reach in striving to meet a goal. An objective may also be considered as an intermediate point that will help fulfill the overall goal.

Objective #1: Accessibility and Mobility

Provide adequate levels of accessibility and mobility for the efficient movement of people, goods, and services within the region.

Definition/Intent: **Accessibility** refers to physical proximity and ease of reaching destinations throughout the urban metropolitan area. This objective supports the need for multimodal accessibility to employment, shopping, other commerce, medical care, housing, and leisure, including adequate public transit access for people who are transportation disadvantaged. This objective also supports the need for improved access for tourists to destinations. **Mobility** is the ease with which a person is able to travel from place to place. It can be measured in terms of travel time.

Access and mobility are provided at different levels on different classes of transportation facilities. For example, a local street has a high level of accessibility for adjacent residences and businesses, with a low level of mobility for non-local traffic. An arterial street has a lower level of accessibility, with a higher level of mobility for through movement of travelers. Local jurisdictions will determine what constitutes adequate levels of accessibility and mobility and what is efficient movement of people, goods, and services within the region.

Reference: Based on OTP (1992) Policy 1C; *Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century* (TEA 21) Metropolitan Planning Factor E.

Objective #2: Safety

Improve transportation system safety through design, operations and maintenance, system improvements, support facilities, public information, and law enforcement efforts.

Definition/Intent: *TransPlan* Goal 2 sets forth safety as a key characteristic of the desired transportation system. This objective supports the need for taking a comprehensive approach to building, operating, and regulating the transportation system so that travelers feel safe and secure.

Reference: Based on OTP (1992) Policy 1G; TEA 21 Metropolitan Planning Factor B.

Objective #3: Environment

Provide transportation systems that are environmentally responsible.

Definition/Intent: This objective places a priority on fulfilling the need to protect the region's natural environment and conserving energy in all aspects of transportation planning processes. The primary intent of this objective can be met through compliance with all federal and state regulations relevant to environmental impact and consideration of applicable environmental impact analyses and practicable mitigation measures in transportation decision-making processes. Significant benefits can be achieved from coordinating the environmental process with the transportation planning process, such as early identification of issues and resources, development of alternatives that avoid or minimize impacts early in the project development process, and more rapid project delivery.

The region's need to reduce transportation-related energy consumption can be met through increased use of transit, telecommuting, zero-emissions vehicles, ridesharing, bicycles and walking, and through increased efficiency of the transportation network to diminish delay and corresponding fuel consumption.

Reference: Based on OTP (1992) Policy 1D; TEA 21 Metropolitan Planning Factor D; Statewide Planning Goal 5: Open Spaces, Scenic, and Historic Areas, and Natural Resources; Goal 6: Air, Water, and Land Resources Quality.

Objective #4: Economic Vitality

Support transportation strategies that improve the economic vitality of the region and enhance economic opportunity.

Definition/Intent: The region's economy is highly dependent upon its transportation system for the circulation of goods, services, and passengers. An efficient transportation system promotes new business and encourages existing business. It also supports freight movement and intermodal transfer points within the region.

The transportation system needs to serve economic development interests; however, those interests have to be balanced with the need to maintain a high quality of life, which itself contributes to the region's comparative advantage as a place to conduct business.

Reference: Based on OTP (1992) Goal 3; Statewide Planning Goal 9: Economic Development; TEA 21 Metropolitan Planning Factor A.

Objective #5: Public Involvement

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

Definition/Intent: This objective supports the need for early and continuing public participation in transportation planning, programming, and implementation. It also supports a proactive public involvement process that provides complete information, timely public notice, and full public access to key decisions. To understand and support *TransPlan* policies, residents need reliable information and opportunities to participate in the further development and implementation of the plan. Achievement of this objective ensures compliance with state and federal requirements for public involvement, including those set forth in the Statewide Planning Goal 1 and TEA 21.

Reference: Based on OTP (1992) Policy 4N; TEA 21 Public Involvement Requirements; Statewide Planning Goal 1: Citizen Involvement.

Objective #6: Coordination/Efficiency

Coordinate among agencies to facilitate efficient planning, design, operation, and maintenance of transportation facilities and programs.

Definition/Intent: The primary intent of this objective is to ensure that public agencies involved with the region's transportation coordinate to meet the need for efficiency. A second aspect of this objective is to support opportunities for coordination between the public and private sectors, which results in transportation efficiencies. Although the infrastructure for the transportation system of the 21st century is largely in place, the system must be managed more efficiently as it is used more intensively. This objective supports the research, evaluation, and implementation of innovative management practices, land use patterns, and new technologies.

Reference: Based on *TransPlan* 1986 Policy PC3; OTP (1992) Policy 1B; Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) 660-12-050(2); TEA 21 Metropolitan Planning Factors F and G; Statewide Planning Goal 11: Public Facilities and Services.

Objective #7: Policy Implementation

Implement a range of actions as determined by local governments, including land use, demand management, and system improvement strategies, to carry out transportation policies.

Definition/Intent: This objective supports the integration of land use, system improvements, and demand management strategies to meet the region's transportation needs. The region will continue to implement these three types of strategies and reliance on any one type of strategy will be avoided. This objective supports the need to prioritize implementation actions necessary to carry out the overall policy framework set forth in the *Metro Plan*. The range of *TransPlan* implementation actions provides local governments with the flexibility needed to implement the regional policies. Due to limited resources, not all *TransPlan* policies and implementation actions will be implemented simultaneously.

Reference: Based on *TransPlan* 1986 Planning and Coordination Policy section.

Part Three: *TransPlan* Policies

Consistent with the *Metro Plan*, the following definition is used for *TransPlan* policies:

A policy is a statement adopted as part of *TransPlan* to provide a consistent course of action, moving the community towards attainment of its goals.

The *TransPlan* policies presented in this chapter are structured in the following categories:

1. Land Use
2. Transportation Demand Management
3. Transportation System Improvements
 - a) System-Wide
 - b) Roadways
 - c) Transit
 - d) Bicycle
 - e) Pedestrian
 - f) Goods Movement
 - g) Other Modes
4. Finance

A consolidated list of *TransPlan* policies is followed by expanded policy sections. Each section includes *Findings* that provide the factual basis for the policies. The policy *Definition/Intent* statements provide explanations for the policy statement, but do not represent adopted policy.

The *TransPlan* policies are direction statements that guide present and future decisions on how the goals will be achieved. The transportation policies represent an integrated and balanced approach to transportation planning in the Eugene-Springfield area. This integration was developed by considering the interaction among land use, demand management, and transportation system improvements strategies. Consistent with requirements in the state TPR, *TransPlan* policies support a coordinated network of transportation facilities adequate to serve state, regional, and local transportation needs. The policies are applicable to the entire Eugene-Springfield region and can be applied in a variety of ways, using a range of specific actions. Implementation actions are set forth in Chapter Three. These actions provide individual jurisdictions with the flexibility to implement *TransPlan* policies using methods most suitable to a particular circumstance. It is important to note that policy implementation is limited by considerations such as fiscal constraint and identification of competing concerns.

Not all *TransPlan* policies will apply to a specific transportation-related decision. For a decision where conformance with adopted policy is required, policies in *TransPlan* and other elements of the *Metro Plan* will be examined to determine which policies are relevant and can be applied. In the event that the application of policies leads to the identification of policies that support varying positions, decision makers will work to achieve a balance of all applicable policies. Whereas goals are timeless, some policies will expire as they are implemented. Amendments and future updates of *TransPlan* will ensure that policies are current.

Consolidated List of *TransPlan* Policies

Land Use Policies

Land Use Policy #1: Nodal Development

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

Land Use Policy #2: Support for Nodal Development

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

Land Use Policy #3: Transit-Supportive Land Use Patterns

Provide for transit-supportive land use patterns and development, including higher intensity, transit-oriented development along major transit corridors and near transit stations; medium- and high-density residential development within ¼ mile of transit stations, major transit corridors, employment centers, and downtown areas; and development and redevelopment in designated areas that are or could be well served by existing or planned transit.

Land Use Policy #4: Multi-Modal Improvements in New Development

Require improvements that encourage transit, bicycles, and pedestrians in new commercial, public, mixed-use, and multi-unit residential development.

Land Use Policy #5: Implementation of Nodal Development

Within three years of *TransPlan* adoption, apply the ND, Nodal Development designation to areas selected by each jurisdiction, adopt and apply measures to protect designated nodes from incompatible development and adopt a schedule for completion of nodal plans and implementing ordinances.

TDM Policies

TDM Policy #1: TDM Program Development

Expand existing TDM programs and develop new TDM programs. Establish TDM bench marks and if the benchmarks are not achieved, mandatory programs may be established.

TDM Policy #2: Parking Management

Increase the use of motor vehicle parking management strategies in selected areas throughout the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area.

TDM Policy #3: Congestion Management

Implement TDM strategies to manage demand at congested locations.

TSI System-Wide Policies

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

Protect and manage existing and future transportation infrastructure.

TSI System-Wide Policy #2: Intermodal Connectivity

Develop or promote intermodal linkages for connectivity and ease of transfer among all transportation modes.

TSI System-Wide Policy #3: Corridor Preservation

Preserve corridors, such as rail rights-of-way, private roads, and easements of regional significance, that are identified for future transportation-related uses.

TSI System-Wide Policy #4: Neighborhood Livability

Support transportation strategies that enhance neighborhood livability.

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

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

TSI Roadway Policies

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

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

TSI Roadway Policy #2: Motor Vehicle Level of Service

1. Use motor vehicle level of service standards to maintain acceptable and reliable performance on the roadway system. These standards shall be used for:
 - a. Identifying capacity deficiencies on the roadway system.
 - b. Evaluating the impacts on roadways of amendments to transportation plans, acknowledged comprehensive plans and land-use regulations, pursuant to the TPR (OAR 660-12-0060).
 - c. Evaluating development applications for consistency with the land-use regulations of the applicable local government jurisdiction.
2. Acceptable and reliable performance is defined by the following levels of service under peak hour traffic conditions: Level of Service E within Eugene's Central Area Transportation Study (CATS) area, and Level of Service D elsewhere.
3. Performance standards from the Oregon Highway Plan shall be applied on state facilities in the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area.

In some cases, the level of service on a facility may be substandard. The local government jurisdiction may find that transportation system improvements to bring performance up to standard within the planning horizon may not be feasible, and safety will not be compromised, and broader community goals would be better served by allowing a substandard level of service. The limitation on the feasibility of a transportation system improvement may arise from severe constraints including but not limited to environmental conditions, lack of public agency financial resources, or land use constraint factors. It is not the intent of TSI Roadway Policy #2: Motor Vehicle Level of Service to require deferral of development in such cases. The intent is to defer motor vehicle capacity increasing transportation system improvements until existing constraints can be overcome or develop an alternative mix of strategies (such as: land use measures, TDM, short-term safety improvements) to address the problem.

TSI Roadway Policy #3: Coordinated Roadway Network

In conjunction with the overall transportation system, recognizing the needs of other transportation modes, promote or develop a regional roadway system that

meets combined needs for travel through, within, and outside the region.

TSI Roadway Policy #4: Access Management

Manage the roadway system to preserve safety and operational efficiency by adopting regulations to manage access to roadways and applying these regulations to decisions related to approving new or modified access to the roadway system.

TSI Transit Policies

TSI Transit Policy #1: Transit Improvements

Improve transit service and facilities to increase the system's accessibility, attractiveness, and convenience for all users, including the transportation disadvantaged population.

TSI Transit Policy #2: Bus Rapid Transit

Establish a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system composed of frequent, fast transit service along major corridors and neighborhood feeder service that connects with the corridor service and with activity centers, if the system is shown to increase transit mode split along BRT corridors, if local governments demonstrate support, and if financing for the system is feasible.

TSI Transit Policy #3: Transit/High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Priority

Implement traffic management strategies and other actions, where appropriate and practical, that give priority to transit and other HOVs.

TSI Transit Policy #4: Park-and-Ride Facilities

Expand the Park-and-Ride system within the metropolitan area and nearby communities.

TSI Bicycle Policies

TSI Bicycle Policy #1: Bikeway System and Support Facilities

Construct and improve the region's bikeway system and provide bicycle system support facilities for both new development and redevelopment/expansion.

TSI Bicycle Policy #2: Bikeways on Arterials and Collectors

Require bikeways along new and reconstructed arterial and major collector streets.

TSI Bicycle Policy #3: Bikeway Connections to New Development

Require bikeways to connect new development with nearby neighborhood activity centers and major destinations.

TSI Bicycle Policy #4: Implementation of Priority Bikeway Miles

Give funding priority (ideally within the first 3 to 5 years after adoption of TransPlan subject to available

funding) to stand-alone bikeway projects that are included in the definition of “Priority Bikeway Miles” and that increase the use of alternative modes.

TSI Pedestrian Policies

TSI Pedestrian Policy #1: Pedestrian

Environment

Provide for a pedestrian environment that is well integrated with adjacent land uses and is designed to enhance the safety, comfort, and convenience of walking.

TSI Pedestrian Policy #2: Continuous and Direct Routes

Provide for a continuous pedestrian network with reasonably direct travel routes between destination points.

TSI Pedestrian Policy #3: Sidewalks

Construct sidewalks along urban area arterial and collector roadways, except freeways.

TSI Goods Movement Policies

TSI Goods Movement Policy #1: Freight

Efficiency

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

TSI Other Modes Policies

TSI Other Modes Policy #1: Eugene Airport

Support public investment in the Eugene Airport as a regional facility and provide land use controls that limit incompatible development within the airport environs. Continue to use the Eugene Airport Master Plan as the guide for improvements of facilities and services at the airport.

TSI Other Modes Policy #2: High Speed Rail Corridor

Support provision of rail-related infrastructure improvements as part of the Cascadia High Speed Rail Corridor project.

TSI Other Modes Policy #3: Passenger Rail and Bus Facilities

Support improvements to the passenger rail station and inter-city bus terminals that enhance usability and convenience.

Finance Policies

Finance Policy #1: Adequate Funding

Support development of a stable and flexible transportation finance system that provides adequate resources for transportation needs identified in *TransPlan*.

Finance Policy #2: Operations, Maintenance, and Preservation

Operate and maintain transportation facilities in a way that reduces the need for more expensive future repair.

Finance Policy #3: Prioritization of State and Federal Revenue

Set priorities for investment of Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and federal revenues programmed in the region’s Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to address safety and major capacity problems on the region’s transportation system.

Finance Policy #4: New Development

Require that new development pay for its capacity impact on the transportation system.

Finance Policy #5: Short-Term Project Priorities

Consider and include among short-term project priorities, those facilities and improvements that support mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly nodal development and increased use of alternative modes.

Finance Policy #6: Eugene-Specific Finance Policy

The City of Eugene will maintain transportation performance and improve safety by improving system efficiency and management before adding capacity to the transportation system under Eugene’s jurisdiction.

Land Use Policies

TransPlan Land Use Policies encourage design and development of land use patterns that support the increased use of alternative modes of travel (e.g., transit, biking, walking, carpooling) and reduce the dependence on the automobile. Favorable impacts of implementing these policies with regard to improving transportation efficiency will be realized over a 40- to 50-year period. These policies support the fundamental principle of compact urban growth contained within the *Metro Plan* and Oregon Statewide Planning Goals.

Land Use Findings

1. The OTP, 1992, recognizes that Oregon's land use development patterns have tended to separate residential areas from employment and commercial centers, requiring people to drive almost everywhere they go; that the results have been increased congestion, air pollution, and sprawl in the metropolitan areas and diminished livability; that these auto-dependent land use patterns limit mobility and transportation choices; and that reliance on the automobile has led to increased congestion, travel distances, and travel times.
2. Studies annotated in the *Land Use Measures Task Force Report Bibliography* have found that land use development patterns have an impact on transportation choices; that separation of land uses and low-density residential and commercial development over large areas makes the distance between destinations too far apart for convenient travel by means other than a car; and that people who live in neighborhoods with grid pattern streets, nearby employment and shopping opportunities, and continuous access to sidewalks and convenient pedestrian crossings tend to make more walking and transit trips.
3. The *Oregon Highway Plan* (OHP) (January 1999) states that focusing growth on more compact development patterns can benefit transportation by: reducing local trips and travel on state highways; shortening the length of many vehicle trips; providing more opportunities to walk, bicycle, or use available transit services; increasing opportunities to develop transit, and reducing the number of vehicle trips to shop and do business.
4. OTP policies emphasize reducing reliance on the automobile and call for transportation systems that support mixed land uses, compact cities, and connections among various transportation modes to make walking, bicycling and the use of public transit easier. The OTP provides that the state will encourage and give preference to projects and grant proposals that support compact or infill development or mixed-use projects. The OTP also contains actions to promote the design and development of infrastructure and land use patterns that encourage alternatives to the single-occupant automobile.
5. The Oregon Transportation Planning Rule [OAR 660-012-0060 (1)(c,d)(5)] encourages plans to provide for mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly development based on information that documents the benefits of such development and the Land Conservation and Development

Commission's policy interest in encouraging such development to reduce reliance on the automobile. The rule [OAR 660-012-0045 (4)(a and e)] requires local governments to adopt land use regulations that allow transit-oriented developments on lands along transit routes and require major developments to provide either a transit stop on site or connection to a transit stop when the transit operator requires such an improvement. The rule [OAR 660-012-0045 (3)] also requires local governments to adopt land use regulations that provide for safe and convenient pedestrian and bicycle access within new developments and from these developments to adjacent residential areas and transit stops and to neighborhood activity centers.

6. A 24-member Citizen Task Force, representing a broad range of interests in the Eugene-Springfield area, created, evaluated, and refined the nodal development land use strategy over a seven-month period as part of the update of *TransPlan*. The Task Force intended the strategy to encourage development patterns that will support a multi-modal transportation system.
7. Nodal development is consistent with the policy direction of Policy 1B of the *Oregon Highway Plan* to coordinate land use and transportation decisions to efficiently use public infrastructure investments to:
 - ♦ Maintain the mobility and safety of the highway system,
 - ♦ Foster compact development patterns in communities,
 - ♦ Encourage the availability and use of transportation alternatives, and
 - ♦ Enhance livability and economic competitiveness.
8. Nodal development is consistent with the Special Transportation Area (STA) designation defined in the draft OHP. The designation is intended to guide planning and management decisions for state highway segments inside nodal development areas.
9. Nodal development supports the fundamental principles, goals, and policies of the adopted *Metro Plan* to achieve compact urban growth, increase residential densities, and encourage mixed-use developments in designated areas. The *Land Use Measures Strategies Document* found that nodal development also supports increased use of alternative modes of transportation and increased opportunities for people to live near their jobs and to make shorter trips for a variety of purposes.
10. Based on an analysis of the *Regional Travel Forecasting Model* results, an overall outcome of nodal development implementation will be that the percentage of person trips under one mile can be increased to approximately 15.9 percent of all trips; and, on a regional basis, that trip lengths will be slightly longer in 2015 than under existing conditions, but this will be offset, in part, by reduced trip lengths within nodal development areas.
11. Based on an analysis of the *Regional Travel Forecasting Model* results, investments in non-auto modes, particularly BRT, and implementation of nodal development strategies will improve transportation choices by helping to increase the percentage of non-auto trips from

14.1% to 17.0% by the year 2015. Increases in the percentage of households and workers with access to ten-minute transit service will result in a 49 percent increase in the percentage of trips taken by bus.

12. The *Market Demand Study for Nodal Development*, ECONorthwest and Leland Consulting Group, 1996, recommended that the public strategy for nodal development should be flexible and opportunistic and include use of financial incentives, targeted infrastructure investments, public-private partnerships, and an inviting administrative atmosphere.
13. During the public review of the nodal development strategy, many comments were received that identified the need for incentives for developers, builders, property owners, and neighborhoods to ensure that nodal developments would be built consistent with design guidelines. The type of support and incentives suggested ranged from public investments in infrastructure to technical assistance and economic incentives.

Land Use Policy #1: Nodal Development

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

Policy Definition/Intent: Nodal development supports mixed land uses in designated areas to increase opportunities for people to live near their jobs and to make shorter trips for a variety of purposes. Nodal development also supports the use of alternative modes of transportation. Each jurisdiction will select the most appropriate implementation actions to carry out this policy.

This policy refines and expands existing *Metro Plan* concepts and policy direction that provide for mixed-use development and higher average residential densities in certain areas of the Eugene-Springfield region. The nodal development strategy is consistent with the definition of STAs, included in the adopted OHP. STAs include central business districts, transit-oriented development areas, and other activity or business centers that emphasize non-auto travel.

This policy is not intended to limit the types of nodal development patterns. Nodal development areas may vary in the amount, type, and orientation of commercial, civic, and employment uses; building size; amount and types of residential uses; and commercial intensity. The nodes will be pedestrian-friendly environments with a mix of land uses, including public open spaces that are pedestrian-, transit-, and bicycle-oriented. Nodes will have commercial cores that contain a compatible mix of retail, office, employment, and civic uses. The amount and types of commercial and civic uses in the core should be consistent with the type of nodal development center. The core should be adjacent to a frequently serviced transit stop. Nodal development centers will include a mix of housing types that achieve at least an average density that is within the medium-density range for residential uses.

This policy supports the growth of downtown Eugene and Springfield as commercial, residential, civic, and employment centers. The intent of this policy is to support development of the downtowns as vital urban centers by encouraging a compatible mix of uses, including housing. In doing so, more people may choose to live near their jobs, accomplish more trip objectives without needing to travel away from the downtowns, and use transit for external trips.

This policy supports the growth and diversification of employment centers by allowing a mix of new commercial, governmental, and light industrial uses and, where appropriate, residential uses in close proximity.

Reference: Summary Description of Proposed Nodal Development Areas (August 1995); *Policy Makers' Decision Package for Draft Plan Direction* (Decision Package), November 1996, Strategy 1; *Metro Plan* Transportation Element Policy 2; Statewide Planning Goal 2: Land Use, Goal 10: Housing.

Land Use Policy #2: Support for Nodal Development

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

Policy Definition/Intent: The intent of this policy is to encourage nodal development through public support and incentives, recognizing that there is public benefit to the transportation and land use efficiencies of nodal development. Although a market exists for this type of development, nodal development is relatively new to this region and may involve more perceived risk than typical development. Many developers, builders, and lenders lack knowledge and experience with nodal development. Consequently, it is important that public bodies be supportive partners and help mitigate uncertainties and perceived risks. Examples of support include design guidelines, streamlined review processes, marketing assistance, and public infrastructure improvements.

Reference: Based on Decision Package, November 1996, Strategies 1 and 12; *Market Demand Study for Nodal Development*.

Land Use Policy #3: Transit-Supportive Land Use Patterns

Provide for transit-supportive land use patterns and development, including higher intensity, transit-oriented development along major transit corridors and near transit stations; medium- and high-density residential development within ¼ mile of transit stations, major transit corridors, employment centers, and downtown areas; and development and redevelopment in designated areas that are or could be well served by existing or planned transit.

Policy Definition/Intent: The intent of this policy is to encourage more concentrated development and higher density housing in locations that are or could be served by high levels of transit service. By doing so, transit will be more convenient for a greater number of businesses and people and, in turn, the higher levels of transit will be supported by more riders.

Reference: Based on *Metro Plan 1987* Transportation Policies 2c, 2f, and 2e; TPR 660-12-045(4)(g); Statewide Planning Goal 2: Land Use.

Land Use Policy #4: Multi-Modal Improvements in New Development

Require improvements that encourage transit, bicycles, and pedestrians in new commercial, public, mixed-use, and multi-unit residential development.

Policy Definition/Intent: This policy supports efforts to improve the convenience of using transit, biking, or walking to travel to, from, and within newly developed and redeveloped areas. This policy recognizes the importance of providing pedestrian and bikeway connections within the confines of individual developments to provide direct, safe, and convenient internal pedestrian and bicycle circulation. This policy supports implementation of code amendments, such as those made through the Transportation Rule Implementation Project (TRIP) in Eugene. Note that private industrial development is not covered under this policy.

Reference: Based on *Metro Plan 1987* Transportation Policy 5; Decision Package, November 1996; TPR 660-12-045(3)(b); Statewide Planning Goal 2: Land Use.

Land Use Policy #5: Implementation of Nodal Development

Within ~~one~~ three years of TransPlan adoption, apply the ND, Nodal Development designation to areas selected by each jurisdiction, adopt and apply ~~interim~~ measures to protect designated nodes from incompatible development and adopt a schedule for completion of nodal plans and implementing ordinances.

Policy Definition/Intent: This policy was added at the request of the Department of Land Conservation and Development Commission. The nodal development strategy anticipates a significant change in development patterns within proposed nodes. Development of these areas under existing plan designations and zoning provisions

could result in development patterns inconsistent with nodal development. This policy documents a commitment by the elected officials to apply the new /ND nodal development Metro Plan designation and new zoning regulations to priority nodal development areas within three years of TransPlan adoption, subject to available funding.

Reference: Based on DLCD testimony; Joint Adopting Official review.

Transportation Demand Management Policies

TransPlan transportation demand management (TDM) policies direct the development and implementation of actions that encourage the use of modes other than single-occupant vehicles to meet daily travel needs. The TDM policies support changes in travel behavior to reduce traffic congestion and the need for additional road capacity and parking and to support desired patterns of development.

TDM Findings

1. TDM addresses federal ISTEA and state TPR requirements to reduce reliance on the automobile, thus helping to postpone the need for expensive capital improvements. The need for TDM stems from an increasing demand for and a constrained supply of road capacity, created by the combined effects of an accelerated rate of population growth (41% projected increase from 1995 to 2015) and increasing highway construction and maintenance costs; for example, the City of Eugene increased the Transportation systems development charges by a total of 15 percent to account for inflation from 1993-1996.
2. The *Regional Travel Forecasting Model* revealed that average daily traffic on most major streets is growing by 2-3 percent per year. Based on *1994 Commuter Pack Survey* results, half of the local residents find roads are congested at various times of the day; and the vast majority finds roads are congested during morning and evening rush hours.
3. The *COMSIS TDM Strategy Evaluation Model*, used in August, 1997 to evaluate the impact of TDM strategies, found that vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and vehicle trips are reduced up to 3 percent by voluntary strategies (e.g., employer-paid bus pass program) and up to 10 percent by mandatory strategies (e.g., mandatory employer support); that requiring employers to increase the cost of employee parking is far more effective than reducing employee transit costs; and that a strong package of voluntary strategies has a greater impact on VMT and vehicle trips than a weak package of mandatory strategies.
4. Lane Transit District (LTD) system ridership has increased 53 percent since the first group pass program was implemented in 1987 with University of Oregon students and employees.
5. The OHP recognizes that TDM strategies can be implemented to reduce trips and impacts to major transportation facilities, such as freeway interchanges, postponing the need for investments in capacity-increasing projects.
6. The study, *An Evaluation of Pricing Policies for Addressing Transportation Problems* (ECONorthwest, July 1995), found that implementation of congestion pricing in the Eugene-Springfield area would be premature because the level of public acceptance is low and the costs of implementation are substantial; and that parking pricing is the only TDM pricing strategy that would be cost-effective during the 20-year planning period.

TDM Policy #1: TDM Program Development

Expand existing TDM programs and develop new TDM programs. Establish TDM bench marks and if the benchmarks are not achieved, mandatory programs may be established.

Policy Definition/Intent: This policy supports expansion and development of a broad spectrum of local and regional TDM programs at varying levels of implementation. TDM programs will focus on reducing trips for nonwork purposes, as well as for work commutes. Voluntary participation in TDM programs will be encouraged through marketing and incentives to target audiences, including the general public, developers, employers, employees, school administrators, and students. An adequate funding program must be developed to support implementation of TDM programs. This policy also supports the exploration of opportunities to establish a market-based, user-oriented approach to TDM through the use of transportation pricing measures.

Reference: *TransPlan* 1986, Policies AM3, AM7, TSM2; Decision Package, November 1996, Strategy 2; TPR 660-12-045(5)(b).

TDM Policy #2: Parking Management

Increase the use of motor vehicle parking management strategies in selected areas throughout the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area.

Policy Definition/Intent: Parking management strategies address both the supply and demand for vehicle parking. They contribute to balancing travel demand within the region among the various modes of transportation available. To promote parking equity in the region, consideration should be given to applying parking management strategies at a region-wide level, in addition to downtown centers.

Reference: *TransPlan* 1986 Parking Policy section; Decision Package, November 1996, Strategy 4; TPR 660-12-045(5)(c).

TDM Policy #3: Congestion Management

Implement TDM strategies to manage demand at congested locations.

Policy Definition/Intent: Encouraging the use of alternative modes will become more important as the region grows and traffic congestion levels increase. A variety of strategies can be employed to help maintain mobility in congested locations as the area develops. TDM strategies implemented to manage demand at congested locations will be coordinated with other types of congestion management strategies, such as access management. This policy supports selective application of mandatory TDM strategies to manage demand at congested locations. For example, local jurisdictions could be

allowed to require employers to designate an employee transportation coordinator and to implement programs that encourage employees to use alternative modes.

Reference: Based on Decision Package, November 1996, Strategy 2.

Transportation System Improvements: System-Wide Policies

The *TransPlan* Transportation System Improvement System-Wide Policies contain policy direction that is applicable to planning and implementation for all transportation system modes in the Eugene-Springfield area. In general, the transportation system improvement policies support choices in modes of travel and desired patterns of development through efficient use of the existing system infrastructure and design and implementation of appropriate system improvements.

TSI System-Wide Findings

1. The number of vehicles, VMT, and use of the automobile are all increasing while use of alternatives is decreasing. Between 1970 and 1990, the number of vehicles in Lane County increased by 83 percent, while the number of households increased by 62 percent. Between 1980 and 1990, VMT grew at a rate seven times that of the population growth. The *Regional Travel Forecasting Model* projects that, by the year 2015, without implementation of proposed *TransPlan* projects, non-commercial VMT will increase 52% while the percentage who bike will drop from 3.7% to 3.3%, walk from 8.9% to 7.9%, and the percentage who bus will increase only slightly from 1.8% to 1.9%.
2. The OHP recognizes that access management strategies can be implemented to reduce trips and impacts to major transportation facilities, such as freeway interchanges, and that communities with compact urban designs that incorporate a transportation network of arterials and collectors will reduce traffic impacts on state highways, postponing the need for investments in capacity-increasing projects.
3. *Oregon Highway Plan* (January 1999) policy supports investment in facilities that improve intermodal linkages as a cost-effective means to increase the efficient use of the existing transportation system.
4. Current literature and research speaks to the relationship between street design and travel behavior, finding that neighborhood impacts, such as through-traffic and speeding on neighborhood streets, are affected by street design. For example, research by Richard Dowling and Steven Colman reported in the article, *Effects of Increased Highway Capacity: Results of a Household Travel Behavior Survey*, 1998, found that drivers' number one preferred response to congestion was to find a faster route if the current one becomes congested; and Calthorpe and Duany/Platter-Zybecks and Anton Nelleson have found that the layout and design of buildings and streets will influence user behavior and that streets can be designed to reduce travel speeds and reduce cut-through trips.

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

Protect and manage existing and future transportation infrastructure.

Policy Definition/Intent: This policy calls for the protection and management of transportation facilities for all modes, within the limits of available funding, in a way that sustains their long-term capacity and function. Given the limited funding for future transportation projects and operations, maintenance and preservation activities, the need to protect and manage existing and future transportation investments and facilities is crucial. Strategies related to access management, TDM, and land use can be implemented to reduce trips and impacts to major transportation facilities, such as freeway interchanges, thereby postponing the need for investments in capacity-increasing projects.

Reference: TPR 660-12-045(2), TPR 660-12-060 (Plan and Land Use Regulation Amendments); OTP (1992) Policy 1B; ISTEA Section 450.316(a) Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Planning Factor 4.

TSI System-Wide Policy #2: Intermodal Connectivity

Develop or promote intermodal linkages for connectivity and ease of transfer among all transportation modes.

Policy Definition/Intent: An intermodal transportation system is one that includes all forms of transportation in a unified, connected manner. An intermodal trip is one that involves two or more modes between the trip origin and destination. Intermodal linkages are the transfer points along the way, such as Park-and-Ride lots. In transit, intermodal transfers allow providers to serve a greater segment of the population. For freight, intermodal transfers allow shippers to take advantage of the economies of each mode, such as truck and rail, to achieve the most cost-effective and timely deliveries of goods.

Reference: Based on OTP (1992) Policy 1F.

TSI System-Wide Policy #3: Corridor Preservation

Preserve corridors, such as rail rights-of-way, private roads, and easements of regional significance, that are identified for future transportation-related uses.

Policy Definition/Intent: This policy supports the preservation of corridors not in public ownership that connect existing streets or paths or provide alternate routes to existing streets or paths.

Reference: Based on OTP (1992) Action 1B.4; ISTEA Section 450.316(a) MPO Planning Factor 10.

TSI System-Wide Policy #4: Neighborhood Livability

Support transportation strategies that enhance neighborhood livability.

Definition/Intent: Transportation-related impacts on neighborhood livability include excessive intrusion of regional vehicle movement on local residential streets, excessive vehicle speeds, and excessive traffic noise. Strategies aimed at improving flow on arterials, such as access management measures, may draw traffic from neighborhood streets that, based on travel characteristics, should be properly using the arterial.

Local governments will implement strategies to address neighborhood traffic impacts, but personal attitudes and behavior are the major factors in determining how residents travel around the region and the impact this travel has on neighborhoods. Choosing to shop locally, walking or cycling children to school, riding the bus to work, combining trips, driving slowly on residential streets, and avoiding short cuts through neighborhoods are examples of how individuals can help to reduce neighborhood traffic impacts.

Reference: Based on *TransPlan* 1986 Policy LU5; OTP (1992) Policy 1D.

TSI System-Wide Policy #5: TransPlan Project Lists

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

Definition/Intent: This policy defines the adopted portions of the *TransPlan* 20-year Capital Investment Action project lists. Consistent with the requirements of Goal 11, Administrative Rule OAR660, Division 11. This policy was added to make it clear that the project lists in *TransPlan*, along with the policies in *TransPlan*, are adopted by ordinance as part of Metro Plan. An adopted project list is a requirement of the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) (OAR 660-012-0020). The fiscally constrained project list identifies projects as being of higher priority than those on the future project lists. The TPR is structured so that issues not considered at the plan level are addressed during the Project Development Phase. OAR 660-012-0050 Transportation Project Development addresses the concerns raised here. Many of the details of the projects are not known at this time and will be addressed during the Project Development phase of project implementation. The Project Development Process contains specific requirements for public involvement, notice, and findings of compliance with applicable land use and environmental rules.

Reference: This policy was added after Draft *TransPlan* Planning Commission review based on advice from legal counsel.

Transportation System Improvements: Roadway Policies

TransPlan Roadway Policies are relevant to the region's roadway system, which is comprised of arterial and collector streets. The policies refer to a multi-modal roadway system with infrastructure that serves the needs of all modes. The automobile continues to be the dominant form of passenger travel and much of the region's roadway system was designed to accommodate increasing automobile use. However, roadways serve the transit system and most modern roadways are built to serve bicycle and pedestrian travel. Roadways also play a role in the movement of freight and are the backbone of commerce in the region. In serving these varied needs, the region must continue to move towards a multi-modal roadway system that responds to the needs of all forms and purposes of travel.

TSI Roadway Findings

1. The *Regional Travel Forecasting Model* forecasted increased traffic congestion on roadways over the next 20 years, ranging from almost two to over four times the existing congestion levels.
2. Level of service (LOS) standards are a nationally accepted means for measuring the performance of roadway facilities. LOS analysis methods are standardized through the Transportation Research Board's *Highway Capacity Manual*.
3. The OHP establishes performance standards for all state highways in Oregon. OAR 660-012-0015 requires coordination of transportation system plans with the state.

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

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

Policy Definition/Intent: This policy supports the design and construction of systems and facilities that accommodate multiple modes. It also supports consideration of the needs of emergency vehicles in the design and construction of system improvements.

Reference: Based on OTP (1992) Policy 1A; TEA 21 Metropolitan Planning Factors F and G.

TSI Roadway Policy #2: Motor Vehicle Level of Service

1. Use motor vehicle level of service standards to maintain acceptable and reliable performance on the roadway system. These standards shall be used for:
 - a. Identifying capacity deficiencies on the roadway system.
 - b. Evaluating the impacts on roadways of amendments to transportation plans, acknowledged comprehensive plans and land-use regulations, pursuant to the TPR (OAR 660-12-0060).
 - c. Evaluating development applications for consistency with the land-use regulations of the applicable local government jurisdiction.
2. Acceptable and reliable performance is defined by the following levels of service under peak hour traffic conditions: Level of Service E within Eugene’s Central Area Transportation Study (CATS) area, and Level of Service D elsewhere.
3. Performance standards from the OHP shall be applied on state facilities in the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area.

In some cases, the level of service on a facility may be substandard. The local government jurisdiction may find that transportation system improvements to bring performance up to standard within the planning horizon may not be feasible, and safety will not be compromised, and broader community goals would be better served by allowing a substandard level of service. The limitation on the feasibility of a transportation system improvement may arise from severe constraints including but not limited to environmental conditions, lack of public agency financial resources, or land use constraint factors. It is not the intent of TSI Roadway Policy #2: Motor Vehicle Level of Service to require deferral of development in such cases. The intent is to defer motor vehicle capacity increasing transportation system improvements until existing constraints can be overcome or develop an alternative mix of strategies (such as: land use measures, TDM, short-term safety improvements) to address the problem.

Policy Definition/Intent: *Level of service* is a concept that is used to assess roadway system performance and to describe operational conditions from the perspective of motorists. Detailed descriptions of LOS and its application are provided in Appendix B.

The policy sets standards for acceptable levels of roadway performance (LOS) and supports maintaining a system of streets to meet those standards. By defining acceptable levels of service, the policy provides direction for identifying roadway system deficiencies. It does not, however, determine what actions should be taken to address deficiencies. Such actions are guided by the full range of *TransPlan* policies including policies on Land Use, TDM, Transportation System Improvements (TSI), and Transit.

For state highways, performance standards contained in the adopted Oregon Highway Plan are used to evaluate the need for roadway capacity improvements.

Reference: *TransPlan* 1986 Plan Assumptions. Additions to policy based on advice from legal council.

TSI Roadway Policy #3: Coordinated Roadway Network

In conjunction with the overall transportation system, recognizing the needs of other transportation modes, promote or develop a regional roadway system that meets combined needs for travel through, within, and outside the region.

Policy Definition/Intent: The regional roadway system must meet the travel needs of motorists, transit users, bicyclists, pedestrians, and commercial vehicles. Characteristics of such a roadway system include adequate capacity and connections to roads entering the region. *TransPlan* roadways will be coordinated with the Lane County Transportation System Plan (TSP) roadways and ODOT corridor studies. All roadway system improvements will also be consistent with other adopted policies in *TransPlan*.

Reference: Based on TPR 660-12-020; TEA 21 Metropolitan Planning Factor E.

TSI Roadway Policy #4: Access Management

Manage the roadway system to preserve safety and operational efficiency by adopting regulations to manage access to roadways and applying these regulations to decisions related to approving new or modified access to the roadway system.

Policy Definition/Intent: Access management is balancing access to developed land while ensuring movement of traffic in a safe and efficient manner. This policy supports local access management ordinances called for in the TPR.

The TPR (OAR 660-012-0045 (2)) states: “Local governments shall adopt land use or subdivision ordinance regulations, consistent with applicable federal and state requirements, to protect transportation facilities, corridors, and sites for their identified functions. Such regulations shall include:

(a) Access control measures, for example, driveway and public road spacing, median control and signal spacing standards, which are consistent with the functional classification of roads and consistent with limiting development on rural lands to rural uses and densities;”

These regulations are adopted by individual jurisdictions. ODOT has adopted Access Management policies and regulations in the recently adopted Oregon Highway Plan. To varying degrees, Eugene, Springfield, and Lane County address access management in current land use codes.

Reference: Joint Adopting Official review.

Transportation System Improvements: Transit Policies

The *TransPlan* transit policies are designed to support improvement of the transit system to make it a more viable transportation alternative for a greater segment of the population. The policies focus on enhancements to the convenience of the transit system through improved facilities, more frequent service, and faster service. These policies are also intended to create a transit system that supports and is integrated with planned land use patterns.

TSI Transit Findings

1. The *1990 U.S. Census of Population* reported that about 10 percent of all households in the Eugene-Springfield area did not own a vehicle; these residents have limited transportation choices.
2. Transit services are particularly important to the transportation disadvantaged population: persons who are limited in meeting their travel needs because of age, income, location, physical or mental disability, or other reasons. The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requires fixed-route systems like LTD to provide a comparable level of service to the elderly and persons with disabilities who are unable to successfully use the local bus service. LTD's *Americans with Disabilities Act Paratransit Plan, 1994-1995 Update*, January 18, 1995, was found to be in full compliance with the ADA by the Federal Transit Administration.
3. The role of urban public transit in meeting trip needs has increased within the metropolitan area since 1970. In 1971, there were 2,260 LTD passenger trips on a weekday and, in 1995, ridership had increased to 20,000 per day, or 1.8% of all metropolitan trips. The *Regional Travel Forecasting Model* forecasts transit use to increase to 2.7% of trips by 2015 with proposed *TransPlan* projects and policy implementation.
4. The *Urban Rail Feasibility Study Eugene/Springfield Area* (July 1995) concluded that projected 2015 ridership for an urban rail system was too low to be competitive with other cities seeking federal rail transit funding; and that BRT could significantly improve transit service for substantially less capital investment and lower operational costs than urban rail.
5. OHP policy supports investment in Park-and-Ride facilities as a cost-effective means to increase the efficient use of the existing transportation system.

TSI Transit Policy #1: Transit Improvements

Improve transit service and facilities to increase the system's accessibility, attractiveness, and convenience for all users, including the transportation disadvantaged population.

Policy Definition/Intent: Continued improvements to the transit system, including enhancements to the existing transit service, exploration of transit fare alternatives that increase ridership and new and improved transit facilities for passengers, will make

transit a more attractive transportation alternative and encourage increased use of transit. This policy also supports maintaining existing facilities in good condition.

Reference: Based on TEA 21 Metropolitan Planning Factor C.

TSI Transit Policy #2: Bus Rapid Transit

Establish a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system composed of frequent, fast transit service along major corridors and neighborhood feeder service that connects with the corridor service and with activity centers, if the system is shown to increase transit mode split along BRT corridors, if local governments demonstrate support, and if financing for the system is feasible.

Policy Definition/Intent: BRT is, in essence, the use of buses to emulate the positive characteristics of a rail system, but at a fraction of the cost of a rail system. The BRT system will include:

- Exclusive busways along the majority of each corridor,
- Faster boarding through low-floor, multiple door vehicles,
- Minimum ten minute frequency during peak hours,
- Increased convenience and comfort,
- Limited stops,
- Improved travel time through reduction of impact from normal traffic congestion through bus priority treatment
- A connected system of BRT corridor and neighborhood routes

BRT, when combined with other system improvement, land use, and demand management strategies, is expected to increase the share of riders who use public transportation. BRT is also expected to help the region maintain conformity with federal air quality standards. BRT, combined with nodal development, is a key strategy in the regions compliance with alternative performance measures for the Transportation Planning Rule. Commitment by the region to full system build out of BRT within 20 years is essential to meeting the alternative performance measures. The full system will include 61 miles of BRT corridor service. The majority of each corridor will include exclusive busways. When funding or traffic conditions restrict implementation of exclusive busways within a corridor, priority should be given to improvements providing the greatest benefit to travel timesavings. The BRT strategy will be implemented to the extent that planning and engineering studies show that the system would increase the use of transit, is supported by the community, and can be funded. As BRT is implemented, LTD, Springfield, Eugene, Lane County, and ODOT will consider neighborhood impacts when designing elements of specific segments.

Reference: Based on Decision Package, November 1996, Strategy 5; TEA 21 Metropolitan Planning Factor C.

TSI Transit Policy #3: Transit/High-Occupancy Vehicle Priority

Implement traffic management strategies and other actions, where appropriate and practical, that give priority to transit and other HOVs.

Policy Definition/Intent: Various traffic management techniques, such as transit signal priority, bus queue jumpers, and exclusive bus lanes, can be used to improve transit travel time, reduce operating costs, and make transit a more attractive transportation alternative. Implementation of priority treatment for transit and other HOVs must not impair bicycle and pedestrian mobility. Local jurisdictions will determine when and where it is appropriate to give priority to transit and HOVs.

Reference: Based on *TransPlan* 1986 Policy TSM3, AM2.

TSI Transit Policy #4: Park-and-Ride Facilities

Expand the Park-and-Ride system within the metropolitan area and nearby communities.

Policy Definition/Intent: Park-and-Ride lots provide access to the transit system for people who cannot conveniently access the bus system on foot. Common reasons for using Park-and-Ride lots are that there is no bus service near a person's home, the nearby service is not convenient, or a car is needed before or after the bus trip (such as to drop a child off at day care). Regular Park-and-Ride users are almost always commuters (to work or to school) who use the service daily. The destination of Park-and-Ride customers is almost always to a location where parking is expensive and/or in short supply. Increased use of the Park-and-Ride system will reduce traffic congestion and parking demand in the city centers and other intensely developed areas. Expansion of the Park-and-Ride system in outlying communities will be consistent with the Lane County TSP and small city TSPs.

Reference: *TransPlan* 1986 Policy AM5, IC2.

Transportation System Improvements: Bicycle Policies

The *TransPlan* bicycle policies address the need to improve the region's bicycle system and associated facilities to increase the choice of modes available for travel in the region. The policies are focused on directing bicycle system improvements, such as expansion of the existing regional network, the provision of safety improvements, and the addition of adequate support facilities. The policies also respond to the region's need to comply with federal and state requirements that call for a greater emphasis on the use of alternative modes of transportation, including bicycles.

TSI Bicycle Findings

1. In 1995, there were 126 miles of bikeways in the metropolitan area. Implementation of proposed *TransPlan* projects would approximately double the lane miles for bicycles.

Over the past 20 years, Eugene and Springfield have built an extensive bikeway system. The focus over the next 20 years is on the construction of "Priority Bikeway Projects" which consist of those projects that are along an essential core route on which the overall system depends, fill in a critical gap in the existing bicycle system, or overcome a barrier where no other nearby existing or programmed bikeway alternatives exist, or significantly improve bicycle users safety in a given corridor.

2. OAR 660-012-0045 (3) requires local governments to adopt land use regulations to require bikeways along new and reconstructed arterial and major collector streets and to connect new development with nearby neighborhood activity centers and major destinations.

TSI Bicycle Policy #1: Bikeway System and Support Facilities

Construct and improve the region's bikeway system and provide bicycle system support facilities for both new development and redevelopment/expansion.

Policy Definition/Intent: Over the past 20 years, local jurisdictions have invested in a system of designated bikeways that provide access to many regional destinations. This policy supports the continued construction of bikeway facilities that provide regional connectivity and access to neighborhoods, schools, and parks, as well as recreational, retail, and employment areas. The bicycle projects included in *TransPlan* are significant components of the regional bikeway system because they fill gaps in the existing system, provide access to neighborhoods or activity centers, improve overall system safety, or overcome significant barriers, such as rivers and highways.

Bikeways include multiple-use paths, striped lanes or shoulders, and signed routes on local streets. All streets in the metropolitan area should be designed to safely accommodate bicyclists. If a street cannot safely accommodate bicycle travel and reconstruction is not feasible, an alternate parallel bikeway should be designated. This

policy also supports the construction of multiple-use bicycle/pedestrian paths along the Willamette River within the Willamette River Greenway and along the McKenzie River and other major drainageways where practicable. Land use activities along these corridors should be done in a manner that allows the possibility of future bikeway construction.

In conjunction with bikeway system improvements, adequate bicycle system support facilities should be provided, including secure bicycle parking areas (e.g., covered racks, cages, and lockers), signage, and lighting. In particular, bicycle support facilities should be provided at government offices, downtowns, employment areas, shopping centers, parks, libraries, athletic stadiums, and schools, and along heavily used bikeways.

Reference: Based on TPR 660-12-045(3 and 6).

TSI Bicycle Policy #2: Bikeways on Arterials and Collectors

Require bikeways along new and reconstructed arterial and major collector streets.

Policy Definition/Intent: In compliance with the TPR, this policy requires the provision of bikeways, normally bike lanes, on arterial and major collector streets. Bicycle lanes can be provided on existing streets through the reallocation of road space, including narrowing motor vehicle travel lanes and removing on-street parking. In special cases, circumstances such as safety issues or physical limitations may prevent the provision of on-street bike lanes. In these cases, alternate parallel routes shall be provided as part of the same project to ensure access to residences and services found on the collector and arterial streets.

The 1999 Eugene Arterial and Collector Street Plan (ACSP) describes the public involvement process in the design of Eugene projects, including adding bicycle lanes to existing streets (pp. 44-45). When bike lanes are proposed to be added to existing streets, staff would work with residents, property owners and the neighborhood association to conduct a design charrette or similar process for citizen input. Various options would be evaluated for implementing the bike lanes while enhancing the maximum amount of on-street parking, and addressing other city and neighborhood goals. Design standards in the ACSP would be used as desirable guidelines –for example, width of bicycle lanes and parking areas, etc. The process would focus on reaching consensus on optimum design for safety, mobility and livability.

Reference: Based on *TransPlan* 1986 Policy I7; TPR 660-12-045(3)(b)(B); OTP Policy 2D, Action 2D.1, Eugene ACSP.

TSI Bicycle Policy #3: Bikeway Connections to New Development

Require bikeways to connect new development with nearby neighborhood activity centers and major destinations.

Policy Definition/Intent: This policy recognizes the importance of providing bicycle connectivity between new development, neighborhood activity centers, and major destinations. When new development occurs, connectivity to the regional bikeway system must be provided. In cases where the existing or planned street network does not adequately provide bicycle connectivity, paved bikeways should be provided within residential developments and should extend to neighborhood activity centers or to an existing bikeway system within one-half mile of residential developments. Major destinations may include, but are not limited to, nodal development centers, schools, shopping centers, employment centers, transit stations, and parks. This policy does not imply that a developer would be required to provide bikeways through undeveloped adjoining properties.

Reference: Based on TPR 660-12-045(3)(b).

TSI Bicycle Policy #4: Implementation of Priority Bikeway Miles

Give funding priority (ideally within the first 3 to 5 years after adoption of TransPlan subject to available funding) to stand-alone bikeway projects that are included in the definition of “Priority Bikeway Miles” and that increase the use of alternative modes.

Policy Definition/Intent: This policy supports consideration and programming of stand-alone “priority bikeway miles” bikeway facilities in the first 3-5 years following adoption of TransPlan. Stand-alone bike projects are those listed in TransPlan not associated with roadway projects (Multi-Use Paths Without Road Projects and On-Street Lanes or Routes Without Roadway Projects.)

A key alternative measure for demonstrating reduced reliance on the auto is the building of Priority Bikeway Miles. Priority bikeway projects consist of those projects that:

- ♦ Are along an essential core route on which the overall bicycle system depends; and
- ♦ Fill in a critical gap in the existing bicycle system; or
- ♦ Overcome a barrier where no other nearby existing or programmed bikeway alternatives exist (e.g., river, major street, highway); or
- ♦ Significantly improves bicycle users’ safety in a given corridor.

The intent of this policy is to maximize the impact of bicycle projects in TransPlan by implementing the most important bike projects early in the period following adoption of TransPlan. This policy also provides additional policy direction in support of Finance Policy #5: Short-Term Project Priorities.

Reference: Based on TPR 660-12-0040(2)(d). Also see Finance Policy #5.
TransPlan

Transportation System Improvements: Pedestrian Policies

Walking is still the most important mode of travel. All trips, whether by car, bus, or bike, involve at least two pedestrian trips: one at the beginning and one at the end. Without pedestrian facilities, the transportation system could not function. Pedestrian facilities are critical to provide access to neighborhood destinations, including schools, parks, recreation, and shopping. The *TransPlan* pedestrian policies focus on closing gaps and improving the quality of the pedestrian system in the region. These policies are closely related to *TransPlan* land use policies that support pedestrian-oriented design.

TSI Pedestrian Findings

1. OAR 660-012-0045 (3) requires local governments to adopt land use regulations to provide for a pedestrian environment that is well integrated with adjacent land uses and designed to enhance the safety, comfort, and convenience of walking; a continuous pedestrian network with reasonably direct travel routes between destination points; and sidewalks along urban arterial and collector roadways, except freeways.

TSI Pedestrian Policy #1: Pedestrian Environment

Provide for a pedestrian environment that is well integrated with adjacent land uses and is designed to enhance the safety, comfort, and convenience of walking.

Policy Definition/Intent: This policy supports the provision of pedestrian connections between adjacent land uses, improved pedestrian access to transit stops and stations, safe and convenient pedestrian street crossings, and pedestrian amenities, including lighting. In more developed areas, such as downtowns, pedestrian design features improve the accessibility of destinations.

Reference: Based on TPR 660-12-045.

TSI Pedestrian Policy #2: Continuous and Direct Routes

Provide for a continuous pedestrian network with reasonably direct travel routes between destination points.

Policy Definition/Intent: This policy supports an active program to develop pedestrian pathways (e.g., sidewalks), especially in proximity to major activity centers. A continuous pedestrian network is free of gaps and deadends and overcomes physical barriers that inhibit walking. Direct routes between destination points are important because out-of-direction travel discourages walking. “Reasonably direct” means either a route that does not deviate unnecessarily from a straight line or a route that does not involve a significant amount of out-of-direction travel for likely users.

Reference: Based on TPR 660-12-045(3)(d)(B).

TSI Pedestrian Policy #3: Sidewalks

Construct sidewalks along urban area arterial and collector roadways, except freeways.

Policy Definition/Intent: This policy supports the construction of sidewalks during roadway construction or reconstruction, as well as the prioritized retrofitting of corner sidewalks with curb ramps, and infill of missing sidewalk sections. Specific design standards for sidewalks along collectors and arterials and local street sidewalk policies and requirements are established by local jurisdictions.

Reference: Based on TPR 660-12-045(3)(b)(B).

Transportation System Improvements: Goods Movement Policies

TransPlan supports the integration of goods movement considerations into the regional transportation planning process. Goods movement of all types makes a significant contribution to the region's economy and wealth and contributes to residents' quality of life. Truck routes, rail corridors, aviation facilities, and pipelines must all function cohesively if the region's goods movement system is to operate efficiently. There are no maritime port or navigation facilities in the *TransPlan* study area. The region seeks to maintain and enhance its competitive advantage in freight distribution through efficient use of a flexible, seamless, and multi-modal transportation network that offers competitive choices for freight movement. Goods movement is directly supported by TSI System-Wide and TSI Roadway policies.

TSI Goods Movement Findings

1. The OTP recognizes that goods movement of all types makes a significant contribution to the region's economy and wealth and contributes to residents' quality of life. OTP Policy 3A promotes a balanced freight transportation system that takes advantage of the inherent efficiencies of each mode.
2. There are no maritime port or navigation facilities in the metropolitan area.
3. Goods movement is directly supported by system-wide and roadway transportation system improvements.

TSI Goods Movement Policy #1: Freight Efficiency

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

Policy Definition/Intent: This policy supports a high degree of mobility for goods movement within and through the region in freight transportation corridors and high-quality access between freight transportation corridors and the region's markets, inter-modal facilities, and industrial developments. This policy supports the development of collaborative strategies between public agencies and freight transportation providers to improve the efficiency of roadway, rail, air, and pipeline goods movement.

Reference: Based on OTP (1992) Policy 3A; TEA 21 Metropolitan Planning Factor E.

Transportation System Improvements: Other Modes Policies

This section sets forth policy for other modes, including air, rail, and inter-city bus service. Collaboration between the public and private sectors is imperative for effective implementation of policies that directly impact private transportation providers. These other modes are supported by the TSI System-Wide policies.

TSI Other Modes Findings

1. The Eugene Airport is located outside the urban growth boundary (UGB) to protect it from incompatible development as well as to reduce airport-related impacts on development within the UGB. The area of the Airport designated Airport Operations in the *Eugene Airport Master Plan* receives municipal water, wastewater, fire, and police services.
2. The *Pacific Northwest High Speed Rail Southern Terminus Study*, Wilbur Smith Associates, 1995, found that rail-related infrastructure improvements needed along the corridor include improved signals, grade crossings, track, and depots. These improvements are important to the success of high speed rail because Eugene-Springfield is the southern terminus to the high speed rail corridor.
3. OTP Policy 1F provides for a transportation system with connectivity among modes within and between urban areas, with ease of transfer among modes and between local and state transportation systems.

TSI Other Modes Policy #1: Eugene Airport

Support public investment in the Eugene Airport as a regional facility and provide land use controls that limit incompatible development within the airport environs. Continue to use the *Eugene Airport Master Plan* as the guide for improvements of facilities and services at the airport.

Policy Definition/Intent: The Eugene Airport/Mahlon Sweet Field is the major airport that provides commercial passenger, cargo, mail, and general aviation services to the metropolitan area. This airport also provides major services to Lane County residents outside of the metropolitan area. The airport is located outside the urban growth boundary (UGB), to protect the airport from incompatible development or development that would have incompatible operational characteristics, as well as to reduce airport-related impacts on development within the airport environs.

Reference: Based on TPR 660-12-045(2)(c); *Metro Plan 1987 Transportation Element Policies 8-17*.

TSI Other Modes Policy #2: High Speed Rail Corridor

Support provision of rail-related infrastructure improvements as part of the Cascadia High Speed Rail Corridor project.

Policy Definition/Intent: This policy demonstrates local jurisdiction support for improvements to the passenger rail system. High speed rail corridor development is a cooperative effort involving the states of Oregon and Washington, the Province of British Columbia, and Burlington Northern Railroad, Southern Pacific Railroad, and Amtrak. Rail-related infrastructure improvements needed along the corridor include improved signals, grade crossings, track, and depots. As the corridor's southern terminus, the provision of a station and train servicing facilities and connections to other transportation modes are issues for the Eugene-Springfield region that contribute to the overall success of the corridor.

Reference: *Pacific Northwest High Speed Rail Southern Terminus Study*, July 1995.

TSI Other Modes Policy #3: Passenger Rail and Bus Facilities

Support improvements to the passenger rail station and inter-city bus terminals that enhance usability and convenience.

Policy Definition/Intent: This policy promotes the growth of inter-city bus and passenger rail facilities and services. Amtrak provides passenger rail service through the region and Greyhound is the primary provider of inter-city bus service. Intermodal connections play an important role in the usability and convenience of passenger rail and bus service.

Reference: Based on *TransPlan* 1986 Policy IC1; based on OTP (1992) Action 3B.2.

Finance Policies

The finance policies will guide the development and allocation of funding for transportation services, facilities, and projects. Characteristics of the desired transportation finance system include:

1. Incorporation of federal, state, local, and private funding;
2. Funding for operations and maintenance, preservation, and modernization of the transportation system for all transportation modes and jurisdictions;
3. Funding for incentives to implement the nodal development strategy;
4. Funding for the development, implementation, and operations of TDM programs;
5. Funding for efficient and effective system improvements (OTP Policy 4B);
6. Funding for the improvement of collector and arterial streets within the Eugene-Springfield UGB to urban standards;
7. Modernization and extension of the user pays concept to reflect the full costs and benefits of uses of the transportation system and to reinforce the relationship between the user fees and uses of the related revenues (OTP Policy 4C); and
8. Provision of equity among competing users, payers, beneficiaries, and providers of the transportation system (OTP Policy 4F).

A cost-effective transportation system will provide adequate levels of accessibility and mobility to users, while minimizing the overall cost of the system and therefore reducing the need for public investment. Certain situations require increased investments in one area to save a greater amount of capital cost in another area. However, *TransPlan* places emphasis on the preservation and efficient use of existing facilities as the preferred approach to provide an adequate transportation system.

Finance Findings

1. Transportation costs are rising while revenues are shrinking and this trend is expected to continue. The *1999 Oregon Highway Plan* estimated total 20-year highway needs of about \$29 billion, but projected revenues of only about \$14 billion.
2. *TransPlan* estimates that operations, maintenance, and preservation of the metropolitan transportation system will cost \$1.266 billion in 1997 dollars to maintain at current levels to the year 2021, while revenues for this purpose, including a regularly increasing state gas tax and federal forest receipts at current non-guaranteed levels after the guarantee expires, are estimated at \$1.031 billion, leaving a conservative estimated shortfall of about \$235 million over the planning period before the implementation of fiscal constraint strategies.
3. The projects proposed in *TransPlan* demonstrate that nearly all of the region's travel over the next 20 years will rely on existing streets, highways, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities, emphasizing the importance of preservation and maintenance of these facilities.

4. Historically, the State Highway Trust Fund (SHTF) and Federal Forest Receipts, significant sources of transportation revenues, have funded operations and maintenance and preservation of the regional transportation system. Currently, SHTF revenues are not increasing with inflation and Federal Forest Receipts are declining.
5. According to estimates prepared for the *TransPlan* Finance Committee, about 130 miles of roads (about 15 percent of the system) are currently in need of either resurfacing or reconstruction with an estimated cost of \$61 million in 1995 dollars.
6. Funding allocations of State cigarette tax revenues designated for special need transit services are guided by the Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee per ORS 391.800-391.830 and OAR 732-05, 732-10, 732-20 governing the Special Transportation Fund Program.
7. Currently, systems development charge (SDC) methodologies charge new development only for the city's portion of the arterial-collector system; metro area state and county facilities are excluded from the calculation of SDC rates; and assessments only partially fund projects that are improving existing facilities to urban standards.
8. Focus groups that convened during the *TransPlan* update process expressed the preference for mixed-use development to be encouraged and facilitated rather than required. Offering financial incentives and other support for nodal development is more in line with public preferences than regulatory measures.
9. Under the Transportation Efficiency Act (TEA 21), 10 percent of Surface Transportation Program funds allocated to the state must be used for transportation enhancement activities, including construction of facilities for bicycles and pedestrians, but a local match is required. State funding for bikeways is primarily limited to ODOT Highway Funds, which are used mainly for adding bicycle lanes to existing and new streets, but may be used for other bicycle projects in the right-of-way. Local jurisdictions may also fund bikeways through the local road construction and maintenance budget and from general funds, park district funds, special bond levies, and SDCs. Regarding transit, *TransPlan* anticipates that discretionary federal grant funds will pay for up to 80 percent of the capital cost of the BRT system, based on trends in federal funding for LTD capital projects over the last ten years.

Finance Policy #1: Adequate Funding

Support development of a stable and flexible transportation finance system that provides adequate resources for transportation needs identified in *TransPlan*.

Policy Definition/Intent: This policy supports development of a stable set of revenue sources to adequately fund the full range of regional transportation needs for all modes, including operations and maintenance, preservation, and modernization. This policy also supports the creation of funding for incentives to implement nodal development and funding for the development, implementation, and operation of TDM programs.

The current structure and level of transportation funding is inadequate to meet the needs of either the individual publicly funded modes of transportation or the system as a whole. Many transportation revenue sources are restricted to expenditure on particular types of projects either by mode or activity. Local jurisdictions may seek changes in current restrictions on transportation funding. The current shortfall in revenues available for road preservation activities is evidence of a mismatch between revenue availability and need.

Reference: Based on OTP (1992) Policy 4A; Decision Package, November 1996, Strategies 10, 13, and 14; *TransPlan* 1986 Policy I3 (Criteria C) and Street and Highway Element Category of Short-Range Need.

Finance Policy #2: Operations, Maintenance, and Preservation

Operate and maintain transportation facilities in a way that reduces the need for more expensive future repair.

Policy Definition/Intent: This policy emphasizes the importance of adequate resources to operate and maintain the existing transportation system at a level that avoids more costly reconstruction. Preservation and efficient use of existing facilities is preferred versus expanding the transportation system when there is a choice. The impact of this policy is limited by the fact that some transportation revenue sources are dedicated to modernization activities.

Nearly all of the region's travel during the next 20 years and beyond will rely on the existing system of streets, highways, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Therefore, it is critical to ensure that current and future funding and resource allocation decisions address the ongoing operation, maintenance, and preservation of this system. To minimize costs, it is important to maintain and preserve the system at a level such that at least 80 percent of the system's pavement condition is rated fair or better. If this happens, more expensive preservation activities, such as reconstruction of a facility, are postponed.

Reference: Based on *TransPlan* 1986 Policy I4; Decision Package, November 1996, Strategy 8; TEA 21 Metropolitan Planning Factor G.

Finance Policy #3: Prioritization of State and Federal Revenue

Set priorities for investment of Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and federal revenues programmed in the region's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to address safety and major capacity problems on the region's transportation system.

Policy Definition/Intent: This policy supports the development and application of a process for prioritizing regional system improvements funded by state and federal revenues. Safety and major capacity issues will be emphasized in this process. Local jurisdiction funding sources, including federal payments to the County road fund, are

allocated through local agency Capital Improvement Programs (CIPs) and are not subject to a regional prioritization process.

Reference: Based on *TransPlan* 1986 Policies I2, I3, and I13; TEA 21 Metropolitan Planning Factor F; Decision Package, November 1996, Strategy 11.

Finance Policy #4: New Development

Require that new development pay for its capacity impact on the transportation system.

Policy Definition/Intent: This policy supports expanding SDC methodologies to address new developments' impacts on state, county, and transit facilities. Currently, SDC methodologies adopted by the cities of Eugene and Springfield charge new development only for the City's portion of the arterial-collector system. Additional charges to mitigate onsite or adjacent impacts may be necessary.

Reference: Finance Committee.

Finance Policy #5: Short-Term Project Priorities

Consider and include among short-term project priorities, those facilities and improvements that support mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly nodal development and increased use of alternative modes.

Policy Definition/Intent: This policy supports consideration and programming of facilities and improvements that support nodal development and the increased use of alternative modes. Examples of such investments include funding incentives for implementation of nodal development, funding of TDM programs, and improvements made to the transit and bike systems.

Reference: Based on TPR 660-12-0040(2)(d).

Finance Policy #6: Eugene-Specific Finance Policy

The City of Eugene will maintain transportation performance and improve safety by improving system efficiency and management before adding capacity to the transportation system under Eugene's jurisdiction.

Policy Definition/Intent: Use the following priorities for developing the Eugene Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and Eugene projects for the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). Implement higher priority measures unless a lower priority measure is clearly more cost-effective or unless it clearly better supports safety, growth management, or other livability and economic viability considerations. Plans

must document the justification which supports using lower priority measures before higher priority measures. This policy does not apply to any other jurisdiction or agency.

1. Protect the existing system.
The highest priority is to preserve the functionality of the existing transportation system by means such as access management, comprehensive plans, transportation demand management, improved traffic operations, and alternative modes.
2. Improve the efficiency and capacity of existing transportation facilities.
The second priority is to make minor improvements to existing highway facilities such as widening highway shoulders or adding auxiliary lanes, providing better access for alternative modes (e.g., bike lanes, sidewalks, bus shelters), extending or connecting local streets, and making other off-system improvements.
3. Add capacity to the existing system.
The third priority is to make major improvements to existing transportation facilities such as adding general purpose lanes and making alignment corrections to accommodate legal-sized vehicles.
4. Add new facilities to the system.
The lowest priority is to add new transportation facilities such as a new roadway.

Reference: Eugene City Council action.