Project Flow

• May ‘18: Choices Report

• Jun-Aug ‘18: Community Engagement, Phase 1

• Jan ‘19: Scenarios Report

• Jan-Feb ‘19: Community Engagement, Phase 2

• Mar ‘19: **Board Direction** => Recommended Network

*We are about to be here*
High Coverage  (65% Ridership, 35% Coverage)

This conceptual network is designed to illustrate how transit services may be designed if the primary goal were to maximize geographic coverage.

Job Access: 0.6%
The average person can reach 0.6% less jobs in 45 minutes with this network compared with the existing network.

Frequent Service Coverage: 38%
38% of the population is within 1/2 mile of frequent service (<15 min) with this network compared with 22% using the existing network.
High Ridership (90% Ridership, 10% Coverage)

This conceptual network is designed to illustrate how transit services may be designed if the primary goal were to generate higher ridership.

This is not a proposal.

The average person can reach 14.4% more jobs in 45 minutes with this network compared with the existing network.

Frequent Service Coverage: 60%

60% of the population is within 1/2 mile of frequent service (≤15 min) with this network compared with 22% using the existing network.
Trade-Off: More Service vs. Lower Fares

• LTD is about to start receiving new STIF funds.

• Should we spend these new resources on increasing service, or on making it more affordable?
Community Engagement Process

• Stakeholder Forum

• Meetings with policy-makers

• Online Open House

• In-Person Events / Tabling
Stakeholder Forum Input
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### Online Open House

#### Ridership Coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More Service</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Lower Fares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### More Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Lower Fares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response Trends

• Limited differences between demographic groups.

• Frequent riders tend more strongly to Added Service

• Eugene residents tend slightly to Ridership (+9%)

• Low-income respondents tend slightly to Coverage (+7%)
Considering your options

• Community input appears to provide a clear direction on Added Service vs. Lower Fares.

• But opinion on Ridership vs. Coverage is divided.

• What are reasonable positions for the Board to take?
Option 1 – 65% Ridership

• Optimize the current system

• Maintain and (slightly) expand geographic coverage

• Limited change in travel times and job access

• Limited controversy

• Does not respond to the majority
Option 2 – 80 to 85 % Ridership

- Focus service on frequent corridors.
- Some areas lose service
- Significant improvements in travel times and job access
- More controversial
- Strikes a balance between different types of input