

**TDM Implementation in Campus and Institutional Zones  
Stakeholder Meeting – May 31, 2017**

*Meeting Notes – Submitted by Steve Hoyt-McBeth, PBOT*

Present

Public: Jen Massa Smith, Providence; Jack Orchard, Ball Janik/Legacy; Jeanne Harrison, Northwest District Association; Steve Abel, Stoel Rives/Lewis and Clark; Townsend Angell, Reed College; Jim Parker, Laurelhurst Neighborhood Association

City staff: Bob Haley, PBOT; Eric Engstrom, BPS; Steve Kountz, BPS; John Cole, BPS; Scott Cohen, PBOT; Mark Moffett, BDS; Barry Manning, BPS; Taylor Phillip, PBOT, Steve Hoyt-McBeth, PBOT

- I. Background
  - a. Project Goals
    - i. Provide mobility for residents, employees, visitors, and students
    - ii. Provide framework that allows campuses and institutions to grow
    - iii. Protect adjacent neighborhoods
    - iv. Further the City's climate and TSP goals
  - b. Campus Institution Zone Update - Transportation Elements
    - i. Type II approval, rather than Type III
    - ii. Provides option of TDM / multimodal strategies as mitigations
    - iii. Specific tie of Institution's Mode Split to TSP Performance Targets
  - c. Triggers for TDM Plan
    - i. Expiration of Conditional Use Master Plan
    - ii. Year 2023
    - iii. Increases net building area by more than 20,000 square feet
    - iv. Increases the number of parking spaces by more than four
  - d. TDM Plan Elements
    - i. Compliance with:
      1. Neighborhood engagement requirements
      2. Commute Mode Survey reporting requirements (2 year increments)
    - ii. Mode split trend relative to Performance Targets
      1. Adopted by the City Council in the Transportation System Plan\* (non-drive alone rates)

a. Central City:	87%
b. Inner Neighborhoods:	71%
c. Western Neighborhoods:	65%
d. Eastern Neighborhoods:	65%
e. Industrial and River:	55%
      2. Interim performance targets calculated using a straight-line method
    - iii. Creation and adherence to TDM plan composed of most effective TDM strategies
  - e. Enforcement penalties based on lack of execution, not mode split performance
  - f. Baseline Plan: Approved TDM Plans are the baseline for plan updates & evaluation
  - g. Alternate Performance Targets: Provides option for "individualized" targets (17.106.020)

**TDM Implementation in Campus and Institutional Zones**  
**Stakeholder Meeting – May 31, 2017**

- i. Availability / viability of optional modes
    - ii. Current TDM strategies
    - iii. Unique travel characteristics and needs
    - iv. Best / current practice in Portland or elsewhere
  - h. Common Themes
    - i. Issues & Concerns from Institutions
      - 1. Evaluation of TDM plans should be “clear and objective”
      - 2. TDM requirements should allow flexibility in how the goals are reached
      - 3. Existing (successful) TDM plans should be the starting point for any updates
      - 4. Performance targets should reflect unique needs and circumstances
      - 5. Specific strategies (i.e., parking pricing) should not be mandated
    - ii. Objectives
      - 1. Clarify the requirements in Code
      - 2. Improve predictability and objectivity of TDM plan evaluation
      - 3. Improve effectiveness of TDM to help accommodate growth
- II. TDM Overview (Scott Cohen, PBOT)
  - a. Strategies to encourage more efficient use of transportation system by reducing individual driving trips
    - i. Education, outreach, financial incentives, and pricing to choose other modes, share rides, travel outside peak times, and telecommute,
  - b. Managing parking supply and demand is a key element
  - c. Case Study – Seattle Children’s Hospital
    - i. Outside Central City
    - ii. Strong TDM incentive package
    - iii. Priced parking for employees
    - iv. SOV rate dropped from 50% to 38%, 2030 goal is 30%
- III. Project Objectives
  - a. Council Direction: Clarify administrative process for TDM requirements in the CI Zone
    - i. Evaluation guidance for Campus Institutional zone mode split trends
    - ii. Evaluation guidance for evaluating “current practices” in existing local Campus Institutional zone TDM plans to assist in adaptation...”
  - b. In other words, determine:
    - i. How is PBOT going to evaluate TDM Plans?
    - ii. What will PBOT do if an Institution is not meeting its mode split targets?
    - iii. How will PBOT determine when to qualify for Alternate Performance Targets?
    - iv. How will multimodal investments by C/I impact TDM plan evaluation?
  - c. Published TDM Plan guidance, including:
    - i. TDM Plan Templates
    - ii. Preferred structure and components of a TDM Plan
    - iii. Process for consideration for Alternate Performance Targets
    - iv. Determining the eligibility of student trips

**TDM Implementation in Campus and Institutional Zones**  
**Stakeholder Meeting – May 31, 2017**

- v. Steps leading to enforcement action and requisite penalties for noncompliance
- IV. Approval Process – Custom Plan and TDM Plan Templates
  - a. Custom Plan
    - i. Designed by Institution
    - ii. Grounded in plan’s ability to meet Institution’s mode split targets (based on pattern area)
    - iii. If interim targets not met:
      - 1. Must include corrective actions
      - 2. These will become progressively more prescriptive if continue to miss targets
      - 3. Provides more flexibility to applicant, but more discretion to PBOT
    - iv. Plan evaluation criteria will include:
      - 1. Compliance with existing/legacy TDM Plan
      - 2. Performance to date (i.e., drive alone commute rate reduction)
      - 3. Research and best practice on efficacy of actions
  - b. TDM Plan Templates
    - i. 3 Plan Options
    - ii. Includes items implemented by Portland colleges, universities and hospitals:
      - 1. Transit benefits
      - 2. Bike incentives
      - 3. Priced and/or time budgeted parking
      - 4. Dedicated TDM staff
    - iii. TDM Plan Template A
      - 1. Charge at least \$75/month for parking for staff and \$50/month for students.
      - 2. Pre-tax transit passes available to all employees.
      - 3. Offer all employees and students information and participation in an encouragement event bi-annually.
      - 4. New employee transportation options orientation material.
      - 5. Plan is good for first 10 years of plan regardless of mode split.
    - iv. TDM Plan Template B – Required Menu (i.e., all)
      - 1. Provide at least 50% toward cost of transit pass.
      - 2. Require monthly parking pass (may be free) for employees and students.
      - 3. Issue parking fees with penalties on those without permits
      - 4. Plan is good for first 6 years of plan regardless of mode split\*
        - a. *Employees working swing and graveyard shifts exempt*
      - 5. If drive alone mode split hasn’t decreased by 10% in first 6 years, 1-2 additional actions must be added.
      - 6. Additionally, 1-2 items required from this menu
        - a. Universal Transit Pass program
        - b. Parking at \$75/month for staff and \$50/month for students

**TDM Implementation in Campus and Institutional Zones**  
**Stakeholder Meeting – May 31, 2017**

- c. Parking Cash Out (requires additional action)
      - d. Vanpool program (requires additional action)
      - e. Bike and walk incentive (requires additional action)
      - f. Add TDM Staff Person at least .5 FTE (requires additional action)
    - v. TDM Plan Template C
      - 1. Campus or institution has seen a 10% or greater reduction in drive alone commute trips for previous 10-year period, with no greater than 5% drive alone commute increase in past 5 years.
      - 2. Moving forward, must continue 1% decrease in drive alone commute rate per year (measured in four-year increments).
        - a. 1-2 additional actions required if not meeting drive alone commute reduction targets:
          - i. Universal Transit Pass program
          - ii. Parking at \$75/month for staff and \$50/month for students
          - iii. Parking Cash Out (requires additional action)
          - iv. Vanpool program (requires additional action)
          - v. Bike and walk incentive (requires additional action)
          - vi. Add TDM Staff Person at least .5 FTE (requires additional action)
- V. Questions and Discussion (Comments have not been confirmed by speaker)
  - a. Jack Orchard
    - i. TriMet needs to be included in the discussion
    - ii. Emanuel is not well served by transit lines
  - b. Follow up: Staff will invite to following meetings
  - c. Jeanne Harrison
    - i. Concur on TriMet being involved
      - 1. RE: request of TriMet for shuttle service/bus line between Good Sam and Legacy Emanuel
    - ii. How are neighbors being notified, not just by the institutions but by the City during the interim period?
  - d. Steve Abel
    - i. Templates would be a good resource
  - e. Unattributed
    - i. Templates need to be clear on the objectives of the actions
    - ii. TriMet service levels should be taken into consideration (e.g., Alternate Performance Targets)
- VI. Follow up for City
  - a. Clarity on what happens on plans up from 2016 -2022.
    - 1. What about plans that expire between 2016 – 2022? Which do they fall under?

**TDM Implementation in Campus and Institutional Zones  
Stakeholder Meeting – May 31, 2017**

2. Are plans that expire before the Comp Plan takes effect (before winter 2018) different than those after (after winter 2018)?
- b. Send out PPT presentation
  - c. Provide materials for comment two weeks prior to meeting