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)
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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
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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
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?
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