



760 SW Ninth Ave., Suite 3000
Portland, OR 97205
T. 503.224.3380
F. 503.220.2480
www.stoel.com

STEVEN W. ABEL
D. 503.294.9599
F. 503.220.2480
steve.abel@stoel.com

March 1, 2018

VIA EMAIL AND REGULAR MAIL
(steve.hoyt-mcbeth@portlandoregon.gov)

Steve Hoyt-McBeth
Active Transportation & Safety Division
Portland Bureau of Transportation
1120 SW 5th Avenue, Suite 800
Portland, OR 97204

Re: Campus Institutional Rulemaking

Dear Mr. Hoyt-McBeth:

Attached to this letter you will find comments delivered on behalf of Lewis & Clark College and Reed College (collectively, "Colleges").

Both Colleges appreciate the opportunity to continue to provide input to the City in its effort to prepare an administrative rule responsive to the requirements of Title 33 and Title 17. The Colleges stress that adopting an Administrative Rule which provides clear direction to applicants is important for the success of the City's effort to successfully implement the new Campus Institutional zoning regime.

Of course, the Colleges stand by to assist, in any way possible, to "get to final" with a rule that is satisfactory to the City and the institutions. Of course, we'd be happy to discuss any of these points with you, review any drafts, or assist in any way you deem appropriate.

We understand the hospital institutions will also be sending comments similar to these and support those comments.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "S. Abel", is written over the typed name.

Steven W. Abel

SWA:pjn

Enclosure

cc via email: David Ellis (Lewis & Clark)
Towny Angell (Reed College)
Gina Cole (LHS)

**Comments Submitted by Lewis & Clark College and Reed College
on Draft Administrative Rule and Procedures Guide
Transportation Demand Management (TDM) in Campus Institutional Zones**

- Global: The draft notes that the intent of the administrative rule is to provide guidance to the bureaus, applicants and the public in the implementation of Transportation Demand Management and Parking Demand Management requirements for Campus Institution zones, but it is unclear what clarity the guidance adds to the applicable code provisions. And, in some instances, the draft appears to introduce additional standards and ambiguity regarding the implementation of the applicable Title 17 and 33 code provisions.
- Where are the objective standards required by 33.266.410(B)(2)? The draft does not clarify the implementation of Title 33 and Title 17 provisions.
- IV.C: This section notes that the TDM plan includes “employees” and indicates that applicants “may choose to include students, visitors, and volunteers into their TDM.” May colleges opt to exclude students from the TDM plan?
- IV.I: This section states that “TDM Plan is described in Chapter 17.106 and goes on to provide that PBOT expects that every TDM Plan will include certain elements. However, these required elements do not align with the Required Elements of a Transportation and Parking Demand Management Plan set forth at section 17.106.020 of the code.
- IV.I: In addition, this section provides that PBOT expects that every TDM plan will include, among other things, “TDM encouragement.” What is TDM encouragement? This term is not defined elsewhere in the draft or in the applicable code provisions.
- V.A: Why repeat, in different words, the requirement of 33.150.060? Cross-referencing is the standard practice of City Code drafting. Cross-referencing helps eliminate ambiguity. Why is the City a mandatory participant in the neighborhood contact requirement?
- V.D: This section states that the approval criteria for a TDM Plan are listed in Chapter 33.852.110, but that code section is titled “Approval Criteria for Transportation Impact Reviews.”
- V.D.1: Again, this section references “TDM encouragement” but the term is undefined.
- V.D.2: This section provides that PBOT will consider the applicant’s mode split performance in the last 10 years. However, it is possible that this data may not be available. We suggest the following revision: “Applicant’s mode split performance in the past 10 years, to the extent available.”
- V.D.5: This section notes that, when evaluating the TDM plan, PBOT will consider the applicant’s “past efforts to communicate with the affected neighborhood and business

associates and accommodate their concerns.” However, this does not appear to flow from any applicable code provisions. How is this relevant to PBOT’s evaluation of the TDM plan? The code notes that if the site has an approved TDM plan, the submittal for an update should include demonstration of compliance with neighborhood engagement obligations. If that was the intent of this provision, we suggest that this be clarified in the draft.

- V.E: This section references code section 17.106.020.C4a, but the alternative performance targets are listed at 17.106.020.C4a-d.
- For colleges with Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plans approved through previous land use reviews, the code notes that the TDM Plan can serve as the basis of any subsequent updates, provided the applicant is in compliance with the plan. However, the code does not address how previous actions will influence the City’s review of the following required elements of the TDM Plan: (1) performance targets and (2) strategies likely to achieve the identified mode split and parking management performance strategies. Specifically, how will the institutions get credit for significant investments/actions taken over the last 20 years to reduce total trips, increase the use of transit, etc.?
- Under the revised code provisions, Transportation Impact Review (TIR) is required if the development increases the net building area on the campus by more than 20,000 or increases the number of parking spaces on the campus by more than 4. However, it is unclear what level of detail will be required when describing the proposed development. Section 33.852.105 provides that the TIR “must include proposed development, and may include possible future development anticipated for up to ten years.” Does this mean that the applicant could simply say “addition of 20,000 square feet to campus center” or “addition of 20 parking spaces”? Clarification is needed on the level of detail that will be required for purposes of the TIR.
- Section 17.106.020 specifies that TDM Plans must include an “Ongoing Participation and Adaptive Management Plan” that includes additional actions may be used to achieve the performance targets. What types of measures will institutions be required to include in this section? What are the limits? What if it is not practicable for the institution to reach the identified mode split because of location and/or the fact that it has already implemented most of the agreed-upon strategies for reducing single occupancy vehicle trips?