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Purpose

Lane Transit District (LTD) is a regional transit agency organized in 1970 under the laws of the state of Oregon to provide transit service in Lane County. The LTD service area is 4,700 square miles with a population of approximately 300,000 with the largest population located in the metropolitan area of Eugene and Springfield. Rural communities served include Coburg, Junction City, Veneta, Cottage Grove, Creswell, Lowell, Pleasant Hill, as well as portions of the county's unincorporated areas.

This survey instrument was designed and conducted to establish an understanding of community values and issues of greatest interest and concern to the communities within LTD’s full service area that would help inform two key projects:

- **Moving Ahead**: Lane Transit District and the City of Eugene are working in partnership in an effort called MovingAhead; a project that will consider a range of near-term transportation investments along five key corridors in Eugene: Highway 99, River Road, 30th Avenue to Lane Community College, Coburg Road and Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard. LTD, the City of Eugene, and other regional partners are looking at each corridor individually to understand what types of investments are needed for people using transit, biking, walking, and mobility devices to meet their transportation needs and support vibrant places.

- **Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA)**: The COA will involve a comprehensive, objective examination of LTD’s full range of mobility services. The primary goal of the COA is to facilitate a robust and focused community dialogue that leads to a clear statement of transit goals and priorities that LTD can then use to guide future transit planning and investment.

Both projects rely heavily on community participation – in the development of concepts and transit improvement scenarios and in the prioritizing of specific investment strategies. Key findings and core values obtained from this survey will be used to help guide the trade-offs analysis and the development of transit improvement scenarios.

The results from the survey have been separated and summarized by two categories of respondents: ‘All respondents,’ which includes the entire LTD service area, and ‘Eugene respondents,’ which more narrowly includes respondents within the City of Eugene. Results have been presented in this way to focus on the two projects described above – with Moving Ahead focused more on community values and issues of concern with the Eugene geographic boundary, and the COA process which is interested in values and issues across the entire LTD service area. The respective findings for these two groups are designated throughout the report by the following headers: ‘COA—All respondents’ and ‘MovingAhead—Eugene respondents’.
Methods

The online survey was conducted February 12-21, 2018.

The target population was residents from Lane Transit District’s service area. All participants (n=639) were recruited from Precision Sample’s online panel, including 389 Eugene residents.

The final sample is representative of the demographics of the area with regard to age, race/ethnicity, and income level, as reported in the 2016 American Community Survey. Therefore, the data is not weighted by these variables. Women were overrepresented in the sample, but the data was not weighted by gender because there was no significant difference in how women and men responded.

Figures in the report summarize responses for survey questions, and correlations identify whether there is a relationship between participant characteristics and their survey responses. The overall margin of error for this survey is +/- 3.9%. In other words, differences between groups of 3.9 percentage points or less are not substantively meaningful.

Statistical significance

Crosstab testing identified statistically significant relationships between characteristics of the respondents and their responses to survey questions. For example, crosstabs help answer the question, are younger respondents more likely to commute to or from work than older respondents? In other words, crosstabs tell us whether a correlation exists between two variables (e.g. age and commuting to/from work).

A crosstab test has two components: The Chi-square statistic indicates whether there is a statistically significant difference between groups of respondents (e.g. different age groups), and the coefficient (either Cramer’s V or Kendall’s Tau-C, depending on the nature of the variables) indicates the strength of association between two variables (e.g. age and commuting to/from work).

Only statistically significant relationships are reported. To achieve the statistical significance, correlations must have a 0.05 significance level (a 95 percent confidence level) and a coefficient of 0.17 or larger. Together, this criteria indicates a relatively strong relationship.

Crosstab results indicate whether one group is more or less likely to behave in a certain way than another group, but does not indicate causality. Put differently, a crosstab can tell us that younger respondents are more likely to commute to/from work than older respondents but does not say how much more likely that is. Furthermore, a crosstab does not tell us that age is the cause of commuting to/from work.
Key Findings

Values ranking:

• Participants ranked safety and health as the most important investments for transportation improvements. Livable communities and environmental stewardship/sustainability were ranked the second and third most important values, respectively.

• Three-fourths of respondents said they did not have additional values, other than those mentioned in the survey, about transportation improvements. Among the quarter of respondents who did suggest additional values to consider, cost and affordability came up most often.

• Participants considered access to all modes of travel for all people as the most important value for livable communities.

• Participants ranked eliminating transportation-related fatalities and injuries as the most important value for safety and health.

• Attracting a good workforce with quality public transit and planning for future residential and business growth were both top economic development values.

• Participants ranked efficient connections between travel methods as the most important value about transportation systems, followed closely by reliable bus service.

• Participants said that valuing public input and engaging the community in decision making are the most important values about community-based decision making.

Quality of travel in area:

• Participants, regardless of where they lived, were satisfied with the quality of travel in their neighborhood.

• Respondents as a group were more satisfied with the quality of travel in the Springfield area than Eugene-based respondents.

Reasons for and means of travel:

• Travel for everyday life, such as for shopping or errands, is the top reason participants traveled within the Eugene-Springfield area. Visiting friends or family and commuting to and from work came in as the second and third most common reasons for travel, respectively.

• Driving alone was the most common way participants traveled in the Eugene-Springfield area in the last seven days, but about half of all participants carpooled and over one-third said they walked (for non-recreational purposes).

• The majority of respondents were not familiar with the MovingAhead project. However, people who used modes of transportation other than driving alone (e.g. biking for non-recreational purposes or public transit) tended to be more familiar with the project than respondents who drive alone.

Eugene-specific:

• Overall, there were few meaningful differences between Eugene respondents and the overall respondents.
Values Ranking Results
Please rank the following values about *livable communities* from most important (1) to least important (3) in regard to investments for transportation improvements.

- Participants considered access to all modes of travel for all people as the most important value for livable communities.
- Neighborhoods supporting the ability to meet needs without the use of a car and reducing or eliminating economic disparities among neighborhoods ranked second or third most important values, respectively.

### All respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Rank Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to all modes of travel for all people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods that support the ability to meet needs without the use of a car</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce or eliminate economic disparities among neighborhoods</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Eugene respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Rank Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to all modes of travel for all people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods that support the ability to meet needs without the use of a car</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce or eliminate economic disparities among neighborhoods</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please rank the following values about safety and health from most important (1) to least important (3) in regard to investments for transportation improvements.

- Participants ranked eliminating transportation-related fatalities and injuries as the most important value for safety and health, followed closely by establishing safe routes to school.
- Increasing multi-mode travel came in as the third most important safety and health value.
- Those who are somewhat or very familiar with the MovingAhead project tend to rank increasing walking, biking, and transit as more important.

### All respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Rank Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate transportation-related fatalities and injuries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Rank Distribution" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish safe routes to school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Rank Distribution" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase walking, biking, and transit use</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Rank Distribution" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Eugene respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Rank Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate transportation-related fatalities and injuries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Rank Distribution" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish safe routes to school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Rank Distribution" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase walking, biking, and transit use</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Rank Distribution" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please rank the following values about economic development/economic benefit from most important (1) to least important (3) in regard to investments for transportation improvements.

- Participants ranked economic development values very closely. By slim margins, their priorities were: attracting a good workforce by having quality public transit, planning for future growth, and supporting redevelopment in key areas through investments in transportation.

### All respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Rank Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be a community that attracts a good workforce where quality public transit is a selling point</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for future residential and business growth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation that supports redevelopment opportunities along key corridors and commercial areas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Eugene respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Rank Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be a community that attracts a good workforce where quality public transit is a selling point</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for future residential and business growth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation that supports redevelopment opportunities along key corridors and commercial areas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please rank the following values about *transportation systems/facilities* from most important (1) to least important (3) in regard to investments for transportation improvements.

- Participants ranked efficient connections between travel methods as the most important value about transportation systems, followed closely by reliable bus service.
- Having attractive and comfortable transportation systems and facilities came in third place. However, car sharing users were more likely to rate this item as the most important value.

### All respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Rank Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficient connections between travel methods (car, bus, biking, walking, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Rank Distribution" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus is reliable; runs on schedule</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Rank Distribution" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive and comfortable transportation systems and facilities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Rank Distribution" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Eugene respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Rank Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficient connections between travel methods (car, bus, biking, walking, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Rank Distribution" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus is reliable; runs on schedule</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Rank Distribution" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive and comfortable transportation systems and facilities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Rank Distribution" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please rank the following values about *community-based decision making* from most important (1) to least important (3) in regard to investments for transportation improvements.

- Participants said that valuing public input and engaging the community in decision making are the most important values about community-based decision making.
- Ensuring everyone has access to pertinent information came in third place.

### All respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Rank Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public input is highly valued</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Rank Distribution" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community is engaged in transportation decision making</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Rank Distribution" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone has access to pertinent transportation information</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Rank Distribution" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Eugene respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Rank Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public input is highly valued</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Rank Distribution" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community is engaged in transportation decision making</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Rank Distribution" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone has access to pertinent transportation information</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Rank Distribution" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Please rank the following values about *environmental stewardship/sustainability* from most important (1) to least important (3) in regard to investments for transportation improvements.**

- Participants said that protecting water and air quality was the most important value for environmental stewardship.
- Preserving the natural environment and reducing greenhouse gases/combatting climate change were ranked the second and third most important values, respectively.

### All respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Rank Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protect water and air quality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve the natural environment (trees, wetlands, etc.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce greenhouse gases/climate change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Eugene respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Rank Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protect water and air quality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve the natural environment (trees, wetlands, etc.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce greenhouse gases/climate change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please rank the following from most important (1) to least important (6) when you think about investments for transportation improvements.

- Participants ranked safety and health and livable communities as the most and second-most important investments for transportation improvements, respectively. They ranked other values similarly to one another.
- Community-based decision making was identified as the least important investment for transportation improvements.

### All respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Rank Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety and health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livable communities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental stewardship/sustainability</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development/ economic benefit</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient, reliable, and attractive transport systems/facilities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based decision making</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Eugene respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Rank Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety and health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livable communities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental stewardship/sustainability</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development/ economic benefit</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient, reliable, and attractive transport systems/facilities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based decision making</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlations of ranking investments for transportation improvements

COA—All respondents

- Public transit users were more likely to rate efficient, reliable, and attractive transportation systems as the most important value.
- Car sharing users rated community-based decision making more highly than non-users.
- Bike users were more likely to rank livable communities as the most important value.

MovingAhead—Eugene respondents

- Hispanic residents of Eugene were more likely to rank environmental stewardship/sustainability as their 2nd or 3rd choice.
- Respondents who did NOT drive a single-occupancy vehicle in the last seven days were more likely to rank:
  - Community-based decision making first
  - Safety and health last (6th place)
- Respondents who did NOT carpool were more likely to rank efficient, reliable, and attractive transportation last (5th or 6th place).
- Respondents who did NOT use public transit were more likely to rank safety and health as the most important (1st place) value.
- Respondents who walked for non-recreational purposes were more likely to rank efficient, reliable, and attractive transportation as less important (4th or 5th place).
Do you think there are values, other than those already mentioned in this survey, that are important in regard to improving transportation in the Eugene-Springfield area?

• About a quarter of participants (24% among all respondents, 26% among Eugene residents) said there were other values important for improving transportation in the area.

COA—All Respondents
N = 639

- Yes: 24%
- No: 76%

MovingAhead—Eugene Residents
N = 389

- Yes: 26%
- No: 74%
What values, other than those already mentioned, do you think are important in regard to improving transportation in the Eugene-Springfield area?

- When asked about additional values that were important for improving transportation in the Eugene-Springfield area, participants mentioned **cost and affordability** most often.
- Concerns about high transportation fees and increasing costs of living were common.
  - “Safer ways to travel for women and children at night. Cheaper bus rates so they are not out walking the streets when they cannot afford a taxi or bus fare.”
- Others worried about how costs of improvements would unduly affect public budgets and tax money usage.
  - “Keeping the community livable. We moved from Seattle where it no longer made financial sense to live there. I think it’s important to make community improvements while still making the city affordable.”
- Additional topics included **accessibility concerns**, **system design and connectivity**, and **road maintenance**.
  - “A system that reaches outside of the city core.”
  - “LTD needs to have multiple hubs instead of everything having to transfer downtown and better nighttime schedules for retail employees.”
  - “Better routing, better lighting at night.”
  - “Keeping existing roads and paths repaired, and markings painted. Neither is done frequently enough.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Values</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost and affordability</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility concerns (including expanding service outside the core and serving the homeless population)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System design and connectivity</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous comments</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road maintenance, lighting, or signage</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-mode travel and integrated public transit</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion management concerns</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-focused suggestions</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness and safety of transit facilities</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments unrelated to transportation</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit reliability</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Traveling in the Area
How would you rate the quality of travel in your neighborhood area?

- Participants, regardless of where they lived, were satisfied with the quality of travel in their neighborhood.
- 77% of all respondents rated the quality of travel in their neighborhood as good (52%) or excellent (25%), compared to 79% of respondents in Eugene who rated the quality of travel in their neighborhood as good (55%) or excellent (24%).
- 5% of all respondents and 3% of Eugene respondents rated the quality of travel as poor.
- There was not a meaningful difference between Eugene residents and other participants in terms of how they rated the quality of travel in their neighborhood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COA—All respondents</th>
<th>MovingAhead—Eugene respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlations of quality of travel in the neighborhood

COA—All respondents

• Reported the quality of travel was excellent:
  – Respondents who drove a single-occupancy vehicle in the last seven days were more likely to rate the quality of travel in their neighborhood as excellent.
• Reported the quality of travel was good:
  – Respondents who drove a single-occupancy vehicle in the last seven days were more likely to rate the quality of travel in their neighborhood as good.
  – Respondents who commuted to and from work in the last seven days were more likely to rate the quality of travel in their neighborhood as good.
• Reported the quality of travel was fair:
  – Respondents who commuted to and from work in the last seven days were more likely to rate the quality of travel in their neighborhood as fair.
• Reported the quality of travel was poor:
  – Respondents who did NOT drive a single-occupancy vehicle in the last seven days were more likely to rate the quality of travel in their neighborhood as poor.
How would you rate the quality of travel in the Eugene area?

- Eugene residents were more satisfied with the quality of travel around Eugene than respondents overall.
- 67% of all respondents rated the quality of travel in the Eugene area as good (47%) or excellent (20%), compared to 73% of respondents in Eugene who rated the quality of travel in the Eugene area as good (51%) or excellent (22%).
- 6% of all respondents and 3% of Eugene respondents rated the quality of travel as poor.
- There was not a meaningful difference between Eugene residents and other participants in terms of how they rated the quality of travel around Eugene.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COA—All respondents</th>
<th>MovingAhead—Eugene respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlations of quality of travel in Eugene

**COA—All respondents**
- Rated the quality of travel in Eugene as excellent:
  - Respondents who **biked** or **walked** for non-recreational purposes in the last seven days were more likely to rate the quality of travel in Eugene as excellent.
  - Respondents who **used public transportation** in the last seven days were more likely to rate the quality of travel in Eugene as excellent.
  - Respondents who were **very familiar with the MovingAhead project** were more likely to rate the quality of travel in Eugene as excellent.

**MovingAhead—Eugene respondents**
- Rated the quality of travel in Eugene as good:
  - Respondents who **drove a single-occupancy vehicle** in the last seven days were more likely to rate the quality of travel in Eugene as good.
- Rate the quality of travel in Eugene as fair:
  - Respondents who **drove a single-occupancy vehicle** in the last seven days were also more likely to rate the quality of travel in Eugene as fair.

*No other statistically significant relationships to report.*
How would you rate the quality of travel in the Springfield area?

- All respondents as a group were more satisfied with the quality of travel in the Springfield area than were Eugene-based respondents.
- 60% of all respondents rated the quality of travel in the Springfield area as good (48%) or excellent (12%), compared to 56% of respondents in Eugene who rated the quality of travel in their neighborhood as good (45%) or excellent (11%).
- 6% of all respondents and 4% of Eugene respondents rated the quality of travel as poor.
- There was not a meaningful difference between Eugene residents and other participants in terms of how they rated the quality of travel around Springfield.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COA—All respondents</th>
<th>MovingAhead—Eugene respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>632</strong></td>
<td><strong>383</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlations of quality of travel in Springfield

MovingAhead—Eugene respondents

• Rated the quality of travel in Springfield as good:
  – Respondents who traveled to visit friends or family less in the last seven days were more likely to rate the quality of travel in Springfield as good.

No other statistically significant relationships to report
Why did you travel within the Eugene-Springfield area in the last seven days?

- Travel for everyday life, such as for shopping or errands, is the top reason participants traveled within the Eugene-Springfield area (81% among all respondents, 86% among Eugene respondents).
- About half of participants said they traveled to see friends or family in the last seven days (48% among all respondents, 47% among Eugene respondents).
- Commuting to and from work was another common reason for travel (42% among all respondents, 45% among Eugene respondents).
- Eugene residents were not so different from other respondents with respect to their reasons for traveling around the area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>COA—All respondents</th>
<th>MovingAhead—Eugene respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel for everyday life</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting friends or family</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute to and from work</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational activities</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical appointments</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute to and from school</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>634</strong></td>
<td><strong>384</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Other” includes travel to the airport and business-related travel.
Correlations of reasons for travel in the Eugene-Springfield area

COA—All respondents

• Commuted to and from work:
  – Respondents under 65 years old were more likely to have commuted to and from work.
  – Respondents who drove a single-occupancy vehicle or used a vanpool in the last seven days were more likely to have commuted to and from work.
  – Respondents from households earning over $35,000 per year, with 2 or more vehicles, or with at least one bicycle were more likely to have commuted to and from work.
  – Respondents who rated the quality of travel in the neighborhood as fair, good, or excellent were more likely to have commuted to and from work (respondents who rated it good were the most likely).

• Commuted to and from school:
  – Respondents in urban areas (respondents in rural areas were the least likely) were more likely to have commuted to and from school.
  – Respondents from households with more bicycles were more likely to have commuted to and from school.
  – Respondents who used car sharing services were more likely to have commuted to and from school.
  – Respondents who were more familiar with the MovingAhead project were more likely to have commuted to and from school.

• Traveled for recreational activities:
  – Respondents younger than 55 were more likely to have traveled for recreational activities.
  – Respondents from households with more bicycles were more likely to have traveled for recreational activities.
  – Respondents who walked for non-recreational purposes were more likely to have traveled for recreational activities.

• Visited friends or family:
  – Respondents who walked or biked for non-recreational purposes were more likely to have visited friends or family.
Correlations of reasons for travel in the Eugene-Springfield area

MovingAhead—Eugene respondents

• Commuted to and from work:
  – Respondents who drove a single-occupancy vehicle were more likely to have commuted to and from work.
  – Respondents from households with a motorized vehicle or earning over $35,000 per year were more likely to have commuted to and from work.

• Commuted to and from school:
  – Respondents who walked for non-recreational purposes in the last seven days were more likely to have commuted to and from school.
  – Respondents who were somewhat familiar with the MovingAhead project were more likely to have commuted to and from school.

• Traveled for recreational activities:
  – Respondents under 55 years old were more likely to have traveled for recreational activities.
  – Respondents who own a bicycle (respondents with 4 or bicycles were the most likely) were more likely to have traveled for recreational activities.
  – Respondents who walked for non-recreational purposes in the last seven days were more likely to have traveled for recreational activities.

• Visited friends or family:
  – Respondents who own a bicycle (respondents with 4 or more bicycles were the most likely) were more likely to have visited friends or family.
  – Respondents from households earning $25,000 to less than $50,000 per year or $150,000 to less than $200,000 per year were more likely to have visited friends or family.
  – Respondents who walked for non-recreational purposes in the last seven days were more likely to have visited friends or family.

• Traveled to medical appointments:
  – Respondents aged 55 to 64 (those under 25 were the least likely) were more likely to have traveled to medical appointments.
  – Respondents who own 2 vehicles or less were more likely to have traveled to medical appointments.
Please select all of the methods you used to travel in the Eugene-Springfield area in the last seven days.

- Driving alone was the most common way participants traveled in the Eugene-Springfield area in the last seven days (70% among all respondents, 72% among Eugene residents).
- Over half of all participants carpooled (57% among all respondents, 53% among Eugene residents), and over one-third said they walked for non-recreational purposes (34% among all respondents, 38% among Eugene residents).
- Eugene residents were not so different from other respondents with respect to their travel modes around the area with the exception of transit use (slightly lower among Eugene residents).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>COA—All respondents</th>
<th>MovingAhead—Eugene respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-occupant vehicle</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk (non-recreational)</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transit or school bus</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle (non-recreational)</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car sharing service</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanpool</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>634</strong></td>
<td><strong>384</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Other” includes RideSource van, golf cart, and motorized wheelchair.
Correlations of methods of travel in the Eugene-Springfield area

COA—All respondents (I)

• Drove in a single-occupancy vehicle in the last seven days:
  – Respondents who **commuted to and from work** in the last seven days were more likely to have driven in a single-occupancy vehicle in the last seven days.
  – Respondents who **did NOT drive carpool or use public transit or a school bus** in the last seven days were more likely to have driven in a single-occupancy vehicle in the last seven days.
  – Respondents who **rated the quality of travel in their neighborhood fair or good** were more likely to have driven in a single-occupancy vehicle in the last seven days.

• Carpooled in the last seven days:
  – Respondents who were **under 45 years old** were more likely to have carpooled in the last seven days.
  – Respondents from **households with more vehicles** were more likely to have carpooled in the last seven days.
  – Respondents who **did NOT drive a single-occupancy vehicle** in the last seven days were more likely to have carpooled in the last seven days.

• Used public transit or a school bus in the last seven days:
  – Respondents who were **younger than 55 years old** were more likely to have used public transit or a school bus in the last seven days.
  – Respondents from **households with fewer vehicles** were more likely to have used public transit or a school bus in the last seven days.
  – Respondents who **biked or walked for non-recreational purposes** in the last seven days were more likely to have used public transit or a school bus in the last seven days.
  – Respondents who **did NOT drive a single-occupancy vehicle** in the last seven days were more likely to have used public transit or a school bus in the last seven days.
  – Respondents who **rated the quality of travel in the neighborhood good, or excellent** (respondents who rated it excellent were the most likely) were more likely to have used public transit or a school bus in the last seven days.
  – Respondents who were **more familiar with the MovingAhead project** were more likely to have used public transit or a school bus in the last seven days.
Correlations of methods of travel in the Eugene-Springfield area

COA—All respondents (II)

- Biked for non-recreational purposes in the last seven days:
  - Respondents in urban areas were more likely to have biked for non-recreational purposes in the last seven days (respondents in rural areas were the least likely to say this).
  - Respondents who walked for non-recreational purposes or used a vanpool, a motorcycle, car sharing services, public transit, or a school bus in the last seven days were more likely to have biked for non-recreational purposes in the last seven days.
  - Respondents who were more familiar with the MovingAhead project were more likely to have biked for non-recreational purposes in the last seven days.

- Vanpooled in the last seven days:
  - Respondents who were urban respondents were more likely to have vanpooled in the last seven days.
  - Respondents who biked for non-recreational purposes or used car sharing services in the last seven days were more likely to have vanpooled in the last seven days.
  - Respondents who were more familiar with the MovingAhead project were more likely to have vanpooled in the last seven days.

- Used a motorcycle in the last seven days:
  - Respondents who biked for non-recreational purposes or used car sharing services in the last seven days were more likely to have used a motorcycle in the last seven days.

- Walked for non-recreational purposes in the last seven days:
  - Respondents in urban or suburban areas were more likely to have walked for non-recreational purposes in the last seven days.
  - Respondents from households without a vehicle were more likely to have walked for non-recreational purposes in the last seven days.
  - Respondents who traveled to participate in recreational activities or visit friends and family were more likely to have walked for non-recreational purposes in the last seven days.
  - Respondents who biked for non-recreational purposes or used public transit in the last seven days were more likely to have walked for non-recreational purposes in the last seven days.
Correlations of methods of travel in the Eugene-Springfield area

COA—All respondents (III)

- Used car sharing in the last seven days:
  - Respondents who commuted to and from school were more likely to have used car sharing in the last seven days.
  - Respondents who biked for non-recreational purposes, vanpoled, or used a motorcycle in the last seven days were more likely to have used car sharing in the last seven days.
  - Respondents who were more familiar with the MovingAhead project were more likely to have used car sharing in the last seven days.
Correlations of methods of travel in the Eugene-Springfield area

MovingAhead—Eugene respondents (I)

- Traveled using a single-occupancy vehicle:
  - Respondents older than 45 years old were more likely to have traveled using a single-occupancy vehicle.
  - Respondents from a household with at least one motorized vehicle were more likely to have traveled using a single-occupancy vehicle.
  - Respondents who rated the quality of travel in Eugene fair or good were more likely to have traveled using a single-occupancy vehicle.

- Carpooled:
  - Respondents younger than 45 years old were more likely to have carpooled.
  - Women were more likely to have carpooled.
  - Respondents from a household with at least one motorized vehicle were more likely to have carpooled.

- Used transit or a school bus:
  - Respondents younger than 55 years old were more likely to have used transit or a school bus.
  - Respondents who own 1 vehicle or do not own a vehicle (respondents without a vehicle were the most likely) were more likely to have used transit or a school bus.
  - Respondents who did NOT drive a single-occupancy vehicle in the last seven days were more likely to have used transit or a school bus.
  - Respondents who biked or walked for non-recreational purposes, or used a taxi in the last seven days were more likely to have used transit or a school bus.
  - Respondents who were very familiar with the MovingAhead project were more likely to have used transit or a school bus.
Correlations of methods of travel in the Eugene-Springfield area

MovingAhead—Eugene respondents (II)

- Walked for non-recreational purposes:
  - Respondents who biked for non-recreational purposes or used public transit or a school bus in the last seven days were more likely to have walked for non-recreational purposes.
  - Respondents who were from households with fewer motorized vehicles (respondents without a vehicle were the most likely) were more likely to have walked for non-recreational purpose.

- Biked for non-recreational purposes:
  - Respondents who own 1-3 bikes were more likely to have biked for non-recreational purposes.
  - Respondents who walked for non-recreational purposes, used public transit or a school bus, or took a taxi in the last seven days were more likely to have biked for non-recreational purposes.
  - Respondents who were familiar with the MovingAhead project were more likely to have biked for non-recreational purposes.

- Took a taxi:
  - Respondents who biked for non-recreational purposes or used public transit or a school bus in the last seven days were more likely to have taken a taxi.
How familiar are you with the MovingAhead project?

- The majority of respondents were not familiar with the MovingAhead project (80% among all respondents, 83% among Eugene residents).
- 5% of participants said they were very familiar with MovingAhead (5% among all respondents and Eugene residents).
- There was not a meaningful difference between Eugene residents and other participants in terms of their familiarity with MovingAhead.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COA—All respondents</th>
<th>MovingAhead—Eugene respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very familiar</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat familiar</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all familiar</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>609</strong></td>
<td><strong>362</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlations of familiarity with MovingAhead

**COA—All respondents**
- **Very familiar with MovingAhead:**
  - Respondents who *vanpooled, biked for non-recreational purposes, used car sharing, or took public transit or a school bus* in the last seven days were more likely to be very familiar with MovingAhead.
  - Respondents who *rated the quality of travel in Eugene excellent* were more likely to be very familiar with MovingAhead.

  Somewhat familiar with MovingAhead:
  - Respondents who *vanpooled, biked for non-recreational purposes, used car sharing, or took public transit or the school bus* in the last seven days were more likely to be somewhat familiar with MovingAhead.
  - Respondents who *rated the quality of travel in Eugene good or excellent* were more likely to be somewhat familiar with MovingAhead.

  *No other statistically significant relationships to report.*

**MovingAhead—Eugene respondents**
- **Very familiar with the MovingAhead:**
  - Respondents who *used public transit or a school bus* in the last seven days were more likely to be very familiar with the MovingAhead.
  - Respondents who *biked for non-recreational purposes* in the last seven days were more likely to be very familiar with the MovingAhead.

  Somewhat familiar with the MovingAhead:
  - Respondents who *biked for non-recreational purposes* in the last seven days were more likely to be somewhat familiar with the MovingAhead.

  *No other statistically significant relationships to report.*
Appendix A: Demographics, COA—All Respondents

Gender
• Male: 28%
• Female: 72%
• Other: 0.5%

Age
• 18-24: 12%
• 25-34: 23%
• 35-44: 18%
• 45-54: 13%
• 55-64: 19%
• 65-74: 13%
• 75+: 2%

Ethnicity
• Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish: 12%

Race
• American Indian or Alaska Native: 2%
• Asian/Asian American: 2%
• Black/African American: 2%
• Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander: 0.3%
• White: 92%
• Other race or combination of races: 1%

Household Income
• Less than $25,000: 24%
• $25,000 – less than $35,000: 17%
• $35,000 - less than $50,000: 19%
• $50,000 - less than $75,000: 20%
• $75,000 – less than $100,000: 9%
• $100,000 - less than $150,000: 8%
• $150,000 - less than $200,000: 2%
• $200,000 or more: 1%

Area
• Rural: 21%
• Suburban: 44%
• Urban: 34%

Field of Work
• Agriculture: 0.5%
• Architecture: 0.5%
• Arts: 3%
• Customer Service: 8%
• Education: 8%
• Finance: 2%
• Food Service: 4%
• Government: 2%
• Healthcare: 9%
• Hospitality and Tourism: 3%
• Human Services: 4%
• Information Technology: 2%
• Law: 0.3%
• Lobbying: 0.3%
• Manufacturing: 2%
• Marketing or Market Research: 1%
• Natural Resources: 0.3%
• Planning/Land Use: 0.3%
• Religious/Spiritual/Faith: 1%
• Retired: 18%
• Student: 5%
• Transportation or Transit: 1%
• None of the above: 26%

Number of motorized vehicles
• 0: 9%
• 1: 32%
• 2: 38%
• 3: 16%
• 4 or more: 5%

Number of bicycles
• 0: 27%
• 1: 20%
• 2: 32%
• 3: 12%
• 4 or more: 9%
Appendix B: Demographics, MovingAhead—Eugene Respondents

Gender
- Male: 28%
- Female: 71%
- Other: 0.5%

Age
- 18-24: 13%
- 25-34: 21%
- 35-44: 17%
- 45-54: 13%
- 55-64: 19%
- 65-74: 15%
- 75+: 3%

Ethnicity
- Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish: 14%

Race
- American Indian or Alaska Native: 2%
- Asian/Asian American: 2%
- Black/African American: 2%
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander: 0.5%
- White: 92%
- Other race/Combination of races: 1%

Household Income
- Less than $25,000: 25%
- $25,000 – less than $35,000: 18%
- $35,000 - less than $50,000: 16%
- $50,000 - less than $75,000: 19%
- $75,000 – less than $100,000: 9%
- $100,000 - less than $150,000: 9%
- $150,000 - less than $200,000: 2%
- $200,000 or more: 2%

Area
- Rural: 10%
- Suburban: 50%
- Urban: 41%

Field of Work
- Agriculture: 0.5%
- Architecture: 0.5%
- Arts: 4%
- Customer Service: 8%
- Education: 9%
- Finance: 2%
- Food Service: 5%
- Government: 2%
- Healthcare: 8%
- Hospitality and Tourism: 3%
- Human Services: 4%
- Information Technology: 2%
- Law: 0.3%
- Lobbying: 0.3%
- Manufacturing: 2%
- Marketing or Market Research: 1%
- Natural Resources: 1%
- Planning/Land Use: 0.3%
- Religious/Spiritual/Faith: 1%
- Retired: 18%
- Student: 6%
- Transportation or Transit: 1%
- None of the above: 23%

Number of motorized vehicles
- 0: 8%
- 1: 33%
- 2: 38%
- 3: 17%
- 4 or more: 5%

Number of bicycles
- 0: 29%
- 1: 21%
- 2: 30%
- 3: 11%
- 4 or more: 9%
Appendix C: Distribution of Respondents

LTD Community Values Survey
Zip Code Distribution
Base: all respondents (n = 634)
Survey Instrument

1. In which state do you currently live? *
   - Alabama
   - Alaska
   - Arizona
   - Arkansas
   - California
   - Colorado
   - Connecticut

2. What is your age? *
   - Under 18
   - 18 - 24
   - 25 - 34
   - 35 - 44
   - 45 - 54
   - 55 - 64
   - 65 - 74
   - 75+

3. How do you identify? *
   - Male
   - Female
   - Gender not listed here
Survey Instrument

4. What is your home zip code? *

97401
97402
97403
97404
97405
97408
97413
97424
97426
97431
97437
97438
97440
97452
97455
97475
97477
97478
97482
97487
97488
97489
None of the above

5. How would you rate the quality of travel in your neighborhood area? *

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- No opinion

6. How would you rate the quality of travel in the Eugene area? *

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- No opinion

7. How would you rate the quality of travel in the Springfield area? *

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- No opinion

8. Why did you travel within the Eugene-Springfield area in the last seven days? (Check all that apply)

Be sure to scroll down to read all of the items before answering.

- Commute to and from work
- Commute to and from school
- Travel for everyday life - shopping, errands, etc.
- Visiting friends or family
- Recreational activities
- Medical appointments
- Other - Write in ____________
Survey Instrument

9. Please select all of the methods you used to travel in the Eugene-Springfield area in the last seven days. (check all that apply)*
   - Single-occupant vehicle (no passengers other than the driver)
   - Carpool (two or more occupants)
   - Vanpool (group of commuters who ride to work together in a transit- or employee-owned vehicle)
   - Public transit or school bus
   - Motorcycle
   - Bicycle (for non-recreational purposes)
   - Walk (for non-recreational purposes)
   - Car-sharing service (such as Flex Car, Zipcar, Cali2Go)
   - Taxi
   - Other - Write in

10. When not at home, in which zip code do you spend most of your time? (select just one)
   Be sure to scroll down to read all of the items before answering.
   - 97401
   - 97402
   - 97403
   - 97404
   - 97405
   - 97408
   - 97413

11. How familiar are you with the Moving Ahead project?
   - Very familiar
   - Somewhat familiar
   - Not at all familiar

12. Please rank the following values about livable communities from most important (1) to least important (3) in regard to investments for transportation improvements. *
   - Be sure to scroll down to read all of the items before answering. If completing the survey on a tablet or a phone, just tap the items in your ranking order.

   1  2  3

   Neighborhoods that support the ability to meet needs without the use of a car
   Reduce or eliminate economic disparities among neighborhoods
   Access to all modes of travel for all people

13. Please rank the following values about safety and health from most important (1) to least important (3) in regard to investments for transportation improvements. *
   - Be sure to scroll down to read all of the items before answering. If completing the survey on a tablet or a phone, just tap the items in your ranking order.

   1  2  3

   Increase walking, biking, and transit use
   Eliminate transportation-related fatalities and injuries
   Establish safe routes to school
14. Please rank the following values about **economic development/economic benefit** from **most important** (1) to **least important** (3) in regard to investments for transportation improvements.*
   Be sure to scroll down to read all of the items before answering. If completing the survey on a tablet or a phone, just tap the items in your ranking order.

   Transportation that supports redevelopment opportunities along key corridors and commercial areas 1 2 3
   Plan for future residential and business growth 1 2 3
   Be a community that attracts a good workforce where quality public transit is a selling point 1 2 3

15. Please rank the following values about **transportation systems/facilities** from **most important** (1) to **least important** (3) in regard to investments for transportation improvements.*
   Be sure to scroll down to read all of the items before answering. If completing the survey on a tablet or a phone, just tap the items in your ranking order.

   Bus is reliable; runs on schedule 1 2 3
   Efficient connections between travel methods (car, bus, biking, walking, etc.) 1 2 3
   Attractive and comfortable transportation systems and facilities 1 2 3

16. Please rank the following values about **community-based decision making** from **most important** (1) to **least important** (3) in regard to investments for transportation improvements.*
   Be sure to scroll down to read all of the items before answering. If completing the survey on a tablet or a phone, just tap the items in your ranking order.

   Everyone has access to pertinent transportation information 1 2 3
   The community is engaged in transportation decision making 1 2 3
   Public input is highly valued 1 2 3

17. Please rank the following values about **environmental stewardship/sustainability** from **most important** (1) to **least important** (3) in regard to investments for transportation improvements.*
   Be sure to scroll down to read all of the items before answering. If completing the survey on a tablet or a phone, just tap the items in your ranking order.

   Reduce greenhouse gases/climate change 1 2 3
   Protect water and air quality 1 2 3
   Preserve the natural environment (trees, wetlands, etc.) 1 2 3
Survey Instrument

18. Please rank the following from Most Important (1) to Least Important (6) when you think about investments for transportation improvements. * Be sure to scroll down to read all of the items before answering. If completing the survey on a tablet or a phone, just tap the items in your ranking order.

   1  2  3  4  5  6

   Environmental stewardship/sustainability
   ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

   Livable communities
   ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

   Community-based decision making
   ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

   Safety and health
   ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

   Economic development/economic benefit
   ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

   Efficient, reliable, and attractive transportation systems/facilities
   ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

19. Do you think there are values, other than those already mentioned in this survey, that are important in regard to improving transportation in the Eugene-Springfield area? *
   ○ No
   ○ Yes

20. What values, other than those already mentioned, do you think are important in regard to improving transportation in the Eugene-Springfield area?

21. In which type of area do you live? *
   ○ Urban
   ○ Suburban
   ○ Rural

22. How many motorized vehicles does your household currently own or lease? *
   ○ 0
   ○ 1
   ○ 2
   ○ 3
   ○ 4 or more
Survey Instrument

23. How many bicycles does your household currently have? *
   - 0
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4 or more

24. Which of the following best characterizes your field of work? *
   Be sure to scroll down to read all of the items before answering.
   - Agriculture
   - Architecture
   - Arts
   - Customer Service
   - Education
   - Finance
   - Food Service
   - Government
   - Healthcare
   - Hospitality and Tourism
   - Human Services
   - Information Technology
   - Law
   - Lobbying
   - Manufacturing
   - Marketing or Market Research
   - Natural Resources
   - Planning/Land Use
   - Religious/Spiritual/Faith
   - Retired
   - Student
   - Transportation or Transit
   - None of the above

25. Are you of Hispanic or Latino origin? *
   - No
   - Yes

25. How do you identify? (choose just one) *
   - White or Caucasian
   - Black or African American
   - American Indian or Alaska Native
   - Asian or Asian-American
   - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   - Other race or combination of races (please specify)

27. What was your total household income (before taxes) for 2017?
   - Less than $25,000
   - $25,000 to less than $35,000
   - $35,000 to less than $50,000
   - $50,000 to less than $75,000
   - $75,000 to less than $100,000
   - $100,000 to less than $150,000
   - $150,000 to less than $200,000
   - $200,000 or more