

Working Draft 6/4/96
Transportation Review Working Group Report

Executive Summary

Several changes are necessary to improve the transportation system at the University of Oregon. Among the most promising ideas are increasing car pooling, making parking at Autzen Stadium accessible via a People Mover (tram), appointing a half-time Transportation Coordinator, and bolstering the current programs designed to support use of alternatives to the automobile.

Introduction

A well-functioning transportation system is crucial for the campus community. It is important for campus appearance, interaction among campus entities, campus interaction with the community, safety, productivity, budgeting, and quality of life for everyone who uses the campus. A number of indicators suggest a relatively high level of dissatisfaction with the current transportation system on the University of Oregon campus. University Senate minutes, Senate Budget Committee discussions, commentary in the Oregon Daily Emerald and the Oregon Commentator, a consultant's survey of faculty, staff, and student traveling and parking opinions, and informal information gathering around campus all imply that the current system, however it is characterized, is not working satisfactorily for many members of the campus community. One measurable aspect of this situation is the shortage of parking spaces on campus. The number of parking permits sold has increased more rapidly than the supply of parking spaces. The number of parking permits also has grown more rapidly than the campus population. Although the university has done extraordinarily well in promoting the use of pedestrian ways, bicycles, and buses, the transportation system still requires additional improvements.

Recommendations

The Transportation Review Working Group has studied the transportation situation on campus, the Long Range Campus Development Plan as it relates to transportation, and BRW's Transportation System Analysis. The Group is acutely aware of cost considerations. It recommends several potentially cost-effective improvements in the transportation system, which collectively should improve user satisfaction and the effectiveness of usage of campus transportation systems:

I. INCREASE THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE WHO COME TO CAMPUS BY SOME MEANS OTHER THAN ONE PERSON ALONE IN A CAR.

Because promoting alternatives to automobile commuting is more cost effective than building new parking spaces, and because the limited amount of existing parking will be maximized for those who truly need it if more people come to campus in other ways, the university should continue the policy of

using parking-generated funds to support alternatives to the automobile (i.e., the LTD program, the bicycle program, and other programs that promote the use of alternatives to the automobile).

1. Promote car pooling.

- a. Many people claimed that their primary reason for not car pooling is lack of partners. LTD currently has a matching system for identifying potential car-pool partners, but that system is not widely understood or used by members of the campus community; therefore, members of the campus community need to be made aware of the matching service.
- b. Provide a guaranteed parking place (initially on 13th Avenue from Beech to University Streets) for people who arrive on campus in three-person (or more) car pools. Expand as demand increases.
- c. Provide a 50% reduction in the rate charged for car-pooling permits relative to single passenger permits. For example, a \$108 single-passenger permit would cost \$54 for a car-pool parking permit, which would presumably be shared by three people, each therefore contributing \$18. If four or five people share the permit, the cost per person is even less.

2. Encourage expanded use of the free LTD ridership program.

- a. Many people are not familiar with the extensive Park-and-Ride system of lots that university people can easily use in conjunction with the free LTD passes that members of the campus community already have. More information needs to be distributed regarding this option. LTD should consider adding Park-and-Ride locations in several key locations for transportation heading to the university, including Glenwood (for I-5 commuters) and River Road (for Santa Clara and 99N commuters).
- b. LTD plans to modify its service in several ways that are consistent with the BRW report. LTD will establish a downtown shuttle and some additional evening routes. It will also add an additional route between the university and west Eugene. It will add bicycle racks to all buses by the end of this summer. The campus community needs to be informed of these improvements in service.
- c. The university should appoint a liaison with LTD to improve coordination. LTD has shown a willingness to modify routes if adequate ridership demand exists. The most common argument for extending hours of service is ridership on the last bus of the day for a particular route. When the university has different evidence of demand for extended hours, it should share that evidence with LTD.

3. Improve the bicycle infrastructure and its support.

- a. Allocate space for and court a bike repair shop on (east) campus. Allow universal access to bicycle-repair tools and an air compressor.
- b. Publicize and sign campus bike routes better. Publish a bike map in the time schedule.
- c. Find ways to make affordable bicycles available to everyone in the campus community. Ask the city to hold bike auctions on campus. Encourage reputable vendors to sell used and affordable bikes at street fairs, and work with them to provide opportunities for campus community members to obtain bicycles.

Hold a bicycle sales event at Hayward Field or a similar location. Lease bicycles for a nominal fee or deposit.

d. Identify and develop more and better bicycle storage facilities. Increase the amount of secure, dry bicycle storage.

e. Reexamine bicycle circulation infrastructure to identify improvements that will encourage bicycle use.

II. IMPLEMENT OTHER INSTITUTIONAL CHANGES THAT WILL IMPROVE THE CAMPUS TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM.

1. Cultivate transportation flexibility and diversity.

a. Promise a guaranteed ride to home, to a child's school, or to any local emergency site via reimbursed taxi or OPS vehicle, allowing flexibility in emergencies for people who rely on inflexible transportation (e.g., LTD).

b. Make daily parking passes available for occasional parkers at a fair rate that does not provide an incentive to buy an annual permit.

c. Urge departments to use the complete week for scheduling classes, not just the most popular time slots from 10:00 A.M. to 2:00 P.M. on Monday through Friday.

d. Encourage telecommuting and flex-time options for classified and management service employees where practical (e.g., four staggered ten-hour days).

2. Create a .5 FTE transportation coordinator with responsibilities to improve the transportation system:

a. Improve the flow of transportation information (e.g., see above I1a, I2a-c, I3b, etc.).

b. Monitor the transportation situation and recommend further changes as necessary.

c. Provide individual transportation counseling.

d. Coordinate implementation of the above recommendations.

3. Maximize the integrity of accounting for transportation funds.

III. INCREASE THE EFFICIENCY OF EXISTING PARKING.

1. Discourage overnight parking on core-campus lots. A student/user committee should develop constructive and acceptable solution proposals. This committee should include representatives from student housing and from the Oregon Daily Emerald, who have the responsibility of disseminating

accurate information. The work should be conducted in the context of all of the other changes that have been proposed in this document, and it should be completed during Fall Term 1996. Among the recommendations to discuss (Points a and b did not generate very much controversy at our public hearing on transportation held on May 9, 1996.) are the following:

- a. Users who park their cars overnight on core campus lots essentially have reserved spaces. They should pay the fee for a reserved space in the core campus parking area. Parking at Autzen Stadium as an alternative should be priced attractively (see 2b below).
- b. Freshmen should not be allowed to store cars overnight on the core campus.
- c. The number of permits sold should be limited. The committee could suggest a specific formula for limiting permits across the various groups.
- d. SOME overnight parking should be removed from the Bean lot to a place not on the core campus. Provide safe and frequent passage from that location to the core campus. Provide safe, secure bicycle parking, preferably covered and fenced.

All of the proposed solutions MUST address the issue of ensuring user safety.

2. Increase use of the 5000 parking spaces at Autzen Stadium.

- a. The university should obtain a People Mover (tram) and provide service between Autzen and Franklin Boulevard, preferably just across Franklin onto the main campus. The People Mover, which could operate on the existing footbridge, could also facilitate parking for McArthur Court events. (Implementation note: Survey people who drive to campus from areas likely to find this option attractive, and verify that it is attractive. Explore renting the People Mover initially.)
- b. Permits should be required to park at Autzen, but people who park there should receive a "reverse ticket," in which they have a small fee (e.g., \$.25) refunded to them via their pay check for each day their vehicle is parked at Autzen at, for example, 10:00 A.M.

3. Pool reserved spaces. The fee for reserved spaces also should be increased sharply because reserved spaces place the most demand on space availability. To increase availability at inner-campus lots during off-peak times, the availability and number of 24-hour reserve spaces should be reconsidered.

4. Graduated parking rates. Increase efficiency by providing a tiered rate structure charging significantly more for inner-campus parking than for peripheral areas.

IV. WHAT IF THE ABOVE PROPOSALS DO NOT WORK?

Unavoidable uncertainties will require periodic reevaluation of the transportation issue by the Campus Planning Committee. Thus, for example, if the above solutions prove to be implausible or ineffective, the plan to build a parking structure on the Alder Street "tennis courts" or on some other existing parking

lot should be reexamined, along with other possible means to ease transportation problems. This parking-structure option is expensive but was funded once, before the money was spent on other projects. Construction of a parking structure will require building political support both on campus and within the surrounding neighborhoods.

Transportation Review Working Group:

Lynn R. Kahle, Chair, Marketing

Kara Barrett, student

Richard Heinzkill, Library

Star Holmberg, American English Institute

Andrzej Proskurowski, Computer & Information Science

Eric Selker, Molecular Biology

Brad Shelton, Math

Return to [Transportation Systems Review Home Page](#)