

**TPAC Meeting**  
**October 3, 2019 12:30 PM**  
**JR Howard 302**

*Attendees: Bonnie Davidoff, Andrea Dooley, David Ellis, Wendy Finch, Seneca Gray, Michel George, Ian Gadberry, Vanessa Holmgren, Esme Miller, Gena Perrine, Sherron Stonecypher*

*Members not in Attendance: Kurt Armstrong, Amy Dvorak, Donna Henderson, David Reese*

**Updates:**

- Some of the meetings will be recorded this year to ensure accurate notes as we are working with the City on a new City Masterplan and TDM
  - Ensure the notes accurately represent the sentiments of TPAC to their suggestions
  - Tapes will be destroyed once the process with the City is over
- St. Mark's property
  - LC has signed a 2 year lease for the St. Mark's property to ensure the College has access to the parking
    - Due to Zoning in that area, LC can only use the parking lot, cannot use the building as well
- Temporary parking at the Grad campus
  - Facilities staff installed gravel and striped in a portion of the area
    - To date we appear to have adequate parking
    - We have been monitoring this area, so far only one Wednesday was full
      - Will continue to monitor and report
- Parking counts are under way
  - Department will have this completed by October 15<sup>th</sup>
    - So far, observed an improvement on the situation
      - Instead of 15 cars parked in the fire lanes as in the past, observing 1 this year
    - Have had less complaints from Students/Staff/Faculty
    - Seeing a need to communicate with LC community that St. Mark's is available
      - Have ticketed cars parked illegally, but observed that St. Mark's is underutilized
- Parking in the surrounding neighborhoods
  - Received calls and emails from neighbors, who are very upset by LC people parking in their neighborhoods
    - This is not a new issue, however, there are more frequent reports of aggression on the student's part when confronted by the neighbors
  - The City requires that LC enforce the no neighborhood parking
    - Students/Staff/Faculty sign a contract with LC to observe all parking regulations as a part of our community

- This gives LC a contractual way to enforce
  - Michel will work with David Reese and Robin Holmes-Sullivan to draft a flyer regarding Policy on parking in the surrounding neighborhoods for our students
    - Will ask that repeat violators will be subject to a Student Conduct Process as well as ticketing
    - LC policies in neighborhood parking giving us a contractual right to cite/fine/discipline, etc.
  - Some of the violators are registered with Transportation and Parking
    - If Parking enforcements notices neighborhood violators that are not registered with T&P, will note the license plate number and do some backtracking work to find the student
- Parking Manager Position
  - Still open
  - Michel is speaking with David Reese over the requirements for this position
    - Original Job Description requires a lot of parking experience
      - Limits the amount of qualified applicants
- Makeup of the TPAC Committee
  - Need to include a Student Life member and a CAS student member
    - Once Robin Holmes-Sullivan is back, we should have an update on this
  - Would also like to invite Mark Duntley to be on this committee
    - Mark is the representative for LC Community Relations
      - Attends neighborhood meetings
      - Beneficial for the neighborhood and TPAC to have a better flow of communication
  - If any TPAC member has a suggestion for valuable possible members for TPAC, please email Michel

David Ellis speaks about upcoming City of Portland TIR/TDM filing:

- Current plan with the City is the Conditional Master Use Plan (CUMP)
  - Adopted by the City in the 70s or 80s for hospitals, public schools, and universities for land use and zoning unless the institution had a special deal like OHSU and PSU
  - This plan was for 10 years and expires in December of this year (2019)
    - Major issue we could have faced under this plan that it may have been difficult to receive a new Master Plan from the city
    - If we could not get a new plan, we would be unable to build anything new
    - This would never have meant that LC could have been forced off the property
  - Under current plan we can only add 4 more parking spaces before having to update our plan with the City
  - Existing CUMP requires that LC describe in detail what our plans are for the 10 years

- Give square footage of new structures
  - Give allocations on structures (i.e. x square footage for residence, y square footage for offices, z square footage for parking lots etc.)
  - Detail location of each new structure, this cannot be moved around
- Transition to the Traffic Impact Review Plan (TIR)
  - Although the current CUMP plan does not expire until December, LC will be filing earlier
    - This is due to our need for Residence Halls and Parking
  - Once LC files the TIR, we will be in limbo as that will negate the CUMP
    - This will be in effect until the TIR is completed and reviewed by the City
    - We are on track to file in early November 2019
  - New Zoning and Use with TIR for universities, public schools, and hospitals
    - Classification will be in 2 zones, urban and rural
      - LC will be in the rural zone
  - Review concessions that LC receives from the City will be more lenient than under the CUMP
    - Will need a 10 year plan with square footage and allocation of structure
    - Will not need a detail location
  - Must comply with all City codes rather than negotiating with the City for each structure we build
  - Should be less expensive and less intrusive to implement than the CUMP was
  - Currently, we have permission under the CUMP to build a parking structure by the Tennis Dome
    - LC is keeping this in the TIR application
    - May not actually build this structure
      - Large expense
      - Cannot easily change this if another need raises in the future
  - When we file for the TIR, we will attach our new Transportation Demand Management Plan (TDM)
    - Currently in negotiations with PBOT to finalize this
    - Must meet certain criteria of their codes
      - Our current plan already meets these requirements
      - Would like to make them better to get PBOT's support, which would make getting the TIR from the Planning Department easier
- Comprehensive Land Use Planning (CLU)
  - The City of Portland must get this plan re-acknowledged by the State every 20 years
  - The City just went through this process to set the plan through 2035
    - Plan must satisfy State that the City has planned adequately for the population increase through 2035 responsibly
    - The City had 3 options to choose from for their focus on how to meet the State's requirements
      - Increase funding for road improvements and expansion

- Expand public transportation
  - Reduce people's use of cars
    - This is the option that the City took
    - Plan to develop better public transportation with TriMet
    - Promoting walking, biking, and carpooling
  - This is the standard that LC must use to get our new TDM approved
- Transportation Demand Management Plan (TDM)
  - Current strategies already employed by LC to reduce driving of vehicles
    - TriMet subsidizing of passes by the college
    - LC provides bike sharing through Zagster
    - Provide showers on site for people who bike to LC
    - The Pios shuttle
    - LC tickets parking violators that park in the surrounding neighborhood
    - Charge for parking on campus
  - Single Occupancy Vehicles (SOV)
    - Under the City's CLU, universities, public schools, and hospitals will need to reduce their SOVs to their respective institutions to 35% of their population by 2035
      - The last survey that LC performed, showed that we are at 70%
      - Must cut this in half by 2035
      - Current studies show that even with all the strategies that LC employs, we will struggle to meet this goal
        - City's response is that we must try
        - We have informally asked the City to change the number to 40% rather than the 35%
          - So far, the City will not support this
          - LC will continue to push for this
  - TDM Survey
    - Performed every 2 years
    - Need 75% or higher of Staff/Faculty to participate in answering how and why we choose the way we commute to campus
    - Gives the City the information they need to calculate our SOV number
      - Historically has only gotten Staff/Faculty data
      - This is the first year that students/3<sup>rd</sup> party vendors/food workers/custodial employees will be allowed to take part in the data
        - The 70% SOV figure has been generated with using data from ONLY the Staff and Faculty
        - Adding in the new groups should cut this figure down
          - Will increase the sample size by approximately 1600 individuals, if all participate
          - Will make achieving the 35% rate for the SOV a little better

- Students especially take advantage of the transportation alternatives that LC provides
  - Currently underway, should have results by mid-November
    - Currently developing a way to impress upon the student population the urgency of participation in this survey
      - Will need to cooperation of representatives from the 3 campuses to generate their interest
      - Although this part is not required by the City, we could like to capture about 50% of the students to get a meaningful, statistically significant sample size
    - The Staff/Faculty surveys are already under way via Denise King
      - Will need to capture 75% of this group per the City
- Pios Shuttle
  - Robin Holmes-Sullivan will be putting together focus groups to study the effectiveness of this Shuttle
    - Will look at who uses this service
    - Seek to gather info about the stops that are currently in use and also gather info on alternative stops that may be wanted
  - The College looked at acquiring 2 electric vans as part of a grant
    - Currently, unable to find a manufacture of this vehicle in this country
  - We are considering a Dynamic Shuttle Model, however, we need data from Student Life Survey
    - We would Potentially run 2 or 3 smaller vans/vehicles
    - Would run these on alternative routes based on demand
    - Continue to run the larger shuttle, but only at peak busy times
- Carpooling
  - Needs much improvement
    - We have carpool parking spots, but these are not fully utilized
    - Will explore apps to help people find each other for carpooling
    - The City will require more carpool spaces, so LC needs to develop strategies to increase carpooling
- PBOT suggestions on new strategies for LC to employ
  - TPAC would like to gather the LC community's reaction to their proposals of additional plans to add to our TDM to lessen our SOV
    - LC will always keep in mind that our campus must be competitive with other schools and not limit our students by becoming a no cars on campus institution
    - Although LC has implemented many strategies, more must be done to reach the 70% SOV
      - Even including Students and vendors, our numbers would be in the 50-55% range

- LC is considering adding up to an additional 400 beds if the demand is there
- PBOT has 2 suggestions
  - Increase parking fees
    - City believes that there is a pain point where people will find another way to arrive at LC
    - Our response is if you charge enough, people will find another school or place of work
      - The contractual agreements limits how much the College can raise parking fees
    - A proposal that parking rates should be increased over a period of time to \$3 per day
    - City recommended that the College should consider charging for summer parking
      - LC noted that parking and traffic is lighter during the summer
      - Many of the Staff and Faculty work from home during the Summer
      - LC generates income during the summer by letting other groups rent our buildings
        - Want to keep this an attractive venue for people to book
        - Feel that asking them for parking fees may negatively impact these programs
  - Eliminate semester parking pass
    - City suggested that the College eliminate monthly parking passes and replace with daily purchasing of passes
      - LC is concerned that we could not compete as an employer for Staff/Faculty
      - Would eliminate the pre-tax payment
      - Would make for more inconvenience for parking
      - Would have to look into an app for paying to park at LC
        - Creates more cost of the institution
        - Would have to be sure that parking is available before the pass is purchased
    - LC could move to a Monthly Pass Parking Fee
      - Staff are already set up and billed like this
      - Could add a similar payment structure for students on their accounts
    - Suggest we run some internal scenarios
      - Could see what the possible implications of each suggestion

- Calculate the possible fee raise
    - Could look into Zoned Parking
      - Concern that this will not work due to the spread out nature of LC and the locations that the Staff/Faculty work
- Heat Map
  - LC and Reed colleges have made heat maps of their respective Staff/Faculty residences
    - Found that the percentage of LC and Reed employees are at the same percentage of using public transportation, yet Reed's SOV rate is much better than ours
      - 84% of LC employees live greater than 3 miles from campus with 64% living greater than 5 miles
      - 40% of Reed employees live within 3 miles from their campus
        - Can take advantage of walking or biking
    - City does not have this information yet
      - City has suggested that biking is LC's answer to the SOV issue
      - Heat map shows that for many, biking is not feasible
      - Many feel that the streets around campus are not safe enough to bike on
- Moving forward with the TDM/TIR filing
  - LC and PBOT have not agreed on the plan for the new TDM
    - LC will study the apps for parking
      - Will roll out with an app that will help in our current use of Daily Passes
    - LC will give on a few things
      - Most likely we will move to the Monthly Pass, rather than Semester
      - Will start researching and possible implementing the Dynamic Shuttle Model
        - LC will begin studying a shuttle stop near Taylors Ferry and Macadam
          - Could help with commuters from the Sellwood area
    - The TIR will go smoother with PBOT's support
      - However, LC has already implemented many strategies for reducing SOVs and the Planning Department will be looking at those as well
  - We are on track to file the TIR with the Planning Department by early November
    - The City will then need to decide if our application is complete
    - Once it has been deemed complete, it is a 30 day process

- This means we could have our TIR plan in hand as soon as Mid-December
  - If LC has to make any changes to have our application deemed as complete, would be a month or 2 after mid-December
- The TDM is currently being negotiated with PBOT
  - There is no approval process like there is with the TIR
- A positive take-away for our Transportation and Parking Department
  - The TIR/TDM process is asking for many of the policies and practices that T&P has been struggling to implement
  - This will make the entire institution support T&P to be compliant

Other Items: As we are planning for an early November date to turn in the application for our TIR an update will occur during the October 30<sup>th</sup> meeting.