



Collaboration Corvallis
PARKING AND TRAFFIC WORK GROUP



MINUTES

DATE	09/10/2013
FACILITATOR(S)	Steve Clark
MINUTES TAKEN BY	Digital Recording/ Transcribed by Conlin Skaar and JayLene Seeley
ATTENDEES	See below
GUEST SPEAKERS	Larry Roper, Chuck Yutzie, Steve Mitchell, John Sassaman, Mary Steckel, Noah Buckley, Brian Thorsness, Kate Peterson, Dan Larson, Brett Deedon, Hank Kemper
VISITORS OF THE COMMUNITY	None.

INTRODUCTIONS
<p>Eric Adams – Project Manager Gary Angelo – College Hill Neighborhood Association Rainier Farmer – OSU, Alternative Transportation Advisory Committee Jeff Davis – Benton Center of LBCC Steve Clark – OSU, University Marketing and Relations Brandon Trelstad – OSU Sustainability Stan Nudelman Larry Roper – OSU, Vice Provost of Student Affairs Chuck Yutzie – OSU, Department of Public Safety Steven Mitchell – Lieutenant of State Police on campus John Sassaman – Corvallis Police Department Mary Steckel – Corvallis Public Works Department Brian Thorsness – Executive Director of Campus Operations Noah Buckley – OSU, Director of Admissions Kate Peterson – OSU, Enrollment Management Dan Larson – OSU, University Housing and Dining Services Brett Deedon – ASOSU Hank Kemper – OSU Parking and Transit Services</p>

PUBLIC COMMENT
There were no public comments.

INTRODUCTION

Steve began with meeting minute approval and then moved on to introduce the goal of the meeting. The group had identified that they needed to get better feedback prior to making their recommendations. Due to the time and importance of the issues to which recommendations will be made, additional representation from the community was deemed to be helpful with the fine-tuning process. This would allow the steering committee to act on those recommendations in a more time-sensitive fashion.

PRESENTATION

Comment: Steve commented that the first goal Tonight, the group is looking for feedback from recommendations related to the concept of transportation system safety, commonly referred to as safety corridors. He addressed Mary and John and asked them if they had any comment to make about the recommendations and their thoughts on how the community in general can safely accommodate pedestrians, bicyclists, skateboarders, etc.

Comment: Mary commented that the issue that city staff had when looking at packet was making sure that there was some way to quantifiably measure what constitutes as a corridor in the city. On campus it is easier to identify and understand, but identifying what is a corridor off-campus is important for concentrating funding/resources on the areas with highest utilization and need.

Comment: John commented that there have and are different programs that look at Monroe and other north bound streets near the university for pedestrian and bicycle safety. However, there is no way to measure “near misses” on those streets where a car barely misses a pedestrian or bicyclist or other vehicle. Looking at the data that is kept, relating to accidents and collisions, it presents a skewed depiction of Monroe being a relatively unproblematic street. Nothing has been done to effectively funnel bicyclists/pedestrians into safer routes. Education might help to make it safer, and a byproduct of making personal property safer would be safer corridors for other bicyclists and pedestrians as well.

Comment: Steve asked Mary to give a brief overview of the city’s standards and methodology they use when working with property owners and vision obstructions.

Comment: Mary replied saying that there are two different programs concerned with this. One is the vision obstruction program which deals with intersections and visibility of bicyclists who are using the roadway as well. There are height restrictions and different standards based on obstructions and location of intersections/roads. The other is vegetation obstruction oriented and is geared toward keeping vegetation off of the sidewalk to make for a clear path. For the most part, these programs are complaint driven and obstructions are called in for response. Vision/vegetation obstructions are first made known to property owners and then responded to by the city if no action is taken by the owners.

Question: Eric asked about street lighting.

Response: Mary responded that they didn’t know about the standards at the time, but there are standards on where lighting is placed, how much lighting needs to be present, and what kind of lighting. They are also

maintained by complaint. Most of the street lights are maintained by electric companies who are notified by the city when there is a complaint.

Comment: John commented that city staff also frequently calls in problems with lights when they notice them.

Question: Gary asked if PDL CDL are responsible for maintaining or erecting lights.

Response: Mary responded that they are responsible for erecting them, but then they come under the responsibility of the city who owns them. The power company, however, maintains them.

Question: Gary clarified, asking about putting in new lights in older, already developed corridors.

Response: Mary replied that the city would pay for it and the power company would put it up.

Question: Gary asked if there are designations for bicycle and pedestrian volumes. He argued that it probably would be over volume, and he wondered if there was any street design or something that would address that capacity.

Response: Mary responded that there is no threshold of non-car traffic that is considered when assessing improvements that she knows of. They do bicycle counts, but there is no threshold for bike traffic that requires response.

Comment: Gary commented that his concern was that students living in large housing complexes on the north side of campus have to get to campus. They could use transit if it is frequent enough/convenient, but they could overload the streets.

Comment: Mary replied to Gary saying she would take it back and ask about it.

Comment: Gray said he was interested in that.

Comment: Steve reminded the group to say their name prior to speaking. He commented about how the increased restriction on single passenger cars traveling to campus will increase alternative non-vehicular transportation methods and require more focus on safety. Identifying the key pathways and times of day they are used is good, but making the safety of these corridors/pathways to campus a primary goal can be achieved more easily if these become general public pathways, not just ones utilized by campus-goers. He realized that it might not be able to viable to make this a priority, but he asked if there is a way to improve perceived safety and connect this to off campus.

Comment: Mary responded that it depends on the resources mostly, but the city is open to the opportunities.

Comment: John commented that there is a lot to be gained from promotion especially. Putting the information out there, even from Kings to 10th street, you may be able to redirect some traffic. The opportunity of promotion is more feasible for funding, but street modification is more difficult.

Question: Steve commented that some streets have had safety modifications though parking allowance on one side only. Has there been consideration of doing this to other streets to improve safety, or blocking off some streets for parking to make other “alley” streets?

Response: John responded that there has to be the ability to get in and out of a street, and due to parking concerns, the city will probably not be interested in going that direction.

Comment: Mary explained that one of the reasons Monroe doesn't make it to the top 10 list is because people drive down it with a heightened sense of awareness. There is so much going on that you have to pay more attention. People drive extra slow and are maintain more awareness due to the narrow streets and high traffic. I don't think that there will be any overarching recommendation that the city will be on board with.

Question: Eric asked Mary and John if they were able to look at any of the bicycle/pedestrian assessments from other universities, just as part of a process of analyzing their approach.

Response: John replied he had briefly looked over them, specifically the Boulder one.

Comment: Mary commented that she hadn't since they seemed to be focused mainly on-campus.

Comment: Eric said that there were two that were linked and focused on campus, but there were two studies that looked more at the 5 mile radius around campus. The studies counted bicycles and pedestrians, looked at where the traffic was coming from and going to, and where potential conflict areas might be. They also conducted survey about problems or issues that are noticed on a daily basis. Eric said that he didn't feel that city staff and OSU had that level of understanding that those reports were able to gather. The information would inform better strategies to be made and would 1) make those modes of travel safer and 2) get more people to use them. The list of initial questions that were posed back to the group, how to measure these things, etc., is going to be done on a case to case basis. In particular to this community, looking at how things are functioning and what travel behaviors need to be identified related to pedestrians and cyclists in the area. Eric said that he didn't think that there was a fixed metric on how to assess this, but there is a qualitative process for getting to those answers.

Question: Stan asked if parking district goes through, how will that influence some of these traffic patterns, and should some of this analysis wait for these potential changes?

Response: Eric agreed with Stan's point and added that with the events that are in motion, the outcomes of any studies or assessments will be likely different afterwards.

Comment: Steve commented that one of the things that the group are trying to be measured on campus are trip modes more effectively, precisely, and routinely. To what extent around the campus that will be connected is up to the results. Assessment is good, but it requires management and adjustment. The fact that the group hopes to have changes within the community as far as how people park will affect behaviors to an extent that is unknown currently. Steve suggested that they move on to some university presentations. He asked who would go first.

CHUCK YUTZIE – SAFETY CORRIDORS

Chuck passed out a campus map of the lighted corridors and safety phones on campus to all attendees. The map was posted online and showed the 23 blue emergency phones, 18 on campus and 5 in the parking structure. They open a line of communication until they are reset. They are hoping to add a motion capture system to the units as well. Most of the activations are false alarms. The safety corridors are currently called lighted night routes. There are on the main corridors to and from each side of campus.

Question: Steve asked if these are well utilized, or do they seek the fastest route?

Response: Chuck responded that it depends on the situation. If an underage drinker is coming back to their dorm after a party, then they will not be using the lighted corridor. Most people going to and from the library at night will use these.

Question: Steve asked if there were any improvements to the lighted corridors on campus or with connectivity off campus that Chuck would like to achieve if money/priority was not a barrier.

Response: Chuck responded that people who had to leave the best lighted paths to get to their destination might not have the best lighted access to those locations.

Comment: Steve Mitchel responded to Steve's question about the improvements would be to improve lighting along the routes. It doesn't have to be putting in new fixtures, but increasing visibility would be a priority. Installing cameras on the blue light phones would also be a worthwhile endeavor.

Question: Steve asked if LED lights would contribute to greater illumination.

Response: Chuck replied that it is one of the projects that optical shops is looking at. It is a resource issue to some extent, however.

Comment: Mary interjected that the waste water treatment plant is trying a wide, downward, white-beam light that is much brighter than normal yellow ones and provides much better visibility. She said that she would get the name of the lights to the group later, but the problem is still expense.

Question: Steve asked if the city or university able to replace lights as they burn out with LEDs or is it required to do an entire area. Could an area/corridor be converted or is there more to it?

Response: Chuck replied that that was part of the conversation that is being explored currently. In some cases it is a simple light bulb swap, but in some cases there have to be other modifications made.

Comment: Mary said that in the city it is a little more complex because if they don't own the lights, they don't have control over what bulbs get put in. They were just able to recently get the mercury out of the lighting system, and any other improvements to lighting are not a priority for the electric companies maintaining due to

the cost. She also mentioned that replacing a whole string of lights isn't always necessary, but replacing whole parts of the lights fixtures usually are.

Question: Gary asked who owns the (inaudible) walking routes within the university.

Response: Chuck said he thought it was safety committee. They do a walk once a term and determine what is are the most used routes and how the lighting looks.

Comment: Gary said, given the groups goals for shifting parking to Reser, there seemed to be some poor lighting around the parking lots. There were testimonies from students that were gathered earlier about how they don't use certain lots because they lack sufficient lighting and didn't feel safe. Reser and along 30th street were specifically identified. To facilitate the use of these southern lots, appropriate lighting must be in place. He recommended that they need to look current parking lots and assess the lighted routes from those areas.

Comment: Chuck commented that one of the things he brought was a document titled "campus at night". To Gary's point, there is a lighted corridor that is down by LaSells and 26th. The challenge is being able to possibly explore running down 30th street, the other side of Reser, too.

Comment: Gary said he assumed Ralph Miller lane would be included, too.

Comment: Chuck affirmed Gary.

Question: Jeff said, in the context of the OSU discussion, he has started getting reports of supporting crime and paid particular attention to the area around them. He thinks there is a correlation between perceived safety and alternative transportation use. He asked if there was a way to look at the crime prevalence and the areas where they occur and light up those areas based on those findings.

Response: Steve Mitchell replied that there is a yearly publications put out by public safety that itemizes and breaks down each building on campus and call responded too. It isn't plotted on a map, but it is well documented.

Question: Steve asked Brian if there were any thoughts about steps he would recommend for the work group and steering committee to evaluate. He noted that Gary made the relationship between parking priority locations and strategies associated with associated with variable pricing.

Response: Brian responded that some of the things they are working on currently in terms of the corridors is having the Landscape department go down these corridors and identify vegetation that could impair vision or be unsafe. He commented that there should be better marketing about the way people get to campus. In talking with his staff, an incentive program for riding the bus or carpooling needs to be part of the methodology.

Question: Steve asked if Grant had any suggestions from a student's perspective.

Response: Grant replied that lighting has come up as an issue for students every year, with problems being identified on campus streets as well as off campus streets like Monroe.

Question: Steve asked Grant if he thought that promoting priority corridors would be something that would be welcoming and beneficial to students and visitors. We are avoiding calling these “safe routes”.

Response: Grant replied that he felt there might be some benefit to it, but it also might not have any easily noticeable effect. He does think that better lighting will be a good step towards a safer campus, however.

Comment: Stan felt that if there were properly lit corridors, people will utilize them more. He suggested that, despite costs, they should replace lights as they burn out with LED lights. Looking at the area around Reser, he commented that it was poorly lit and required more lit corridors if parking there is to be encouraged.

Comment: Brandon said there should be a reassessment of what the amounts reflect since there has been lots of development in in the target areas and it might not be reflected in the data. He also commented that they should include engineering standards in this new assessment to better define what a lighted corridor needs to be effective. He suggested that, before making any expensive upgrades, utilizing engineering standards would be beneficial.

Comment: Jeff commented that when referencing engineering standards you have to keep in mind city ordinances and tolerances of excessive lighting. By increasing lighting in one area you could create another problem by having too much light exposure – especially with off campus property.

Comment: Mary agreed with Jeff and brought up that, even with vegetation, you have competing interests with the community to have natural areas vs. well lit/pruned areas.

Comment: Stan commented that it is not as much as a problem on the university, but potentially the further you get from campus and into the community it could be more problematic.

Comment: Mary suggested that 30th street is an example of a corridor that has many well-loved trees and poor visibility. People on campus would probably have problems with conservatively pruning that area.

Question: Steve asked if Dan had any perspective to add from a housing point of view.

Response: Dan responded with two opinions. One was about how lighting, while providing more safe passage, would potentially result in more dissatisfied students in housing due to light exposure into their rooms at night. The other was regarding consideration of where students who live on campus park and how they are often walking from these lots at 2am.

Question: Gary asked who defines where the blue security phones go.

Response: Chuck responded that it is up to the president and provost to determine placement.

Question: Gary commented that in several cases the lights are dispersed across the campus off of lighted routes and asked why that was.

Response: Chuck responded that some of the lights were historically placed by director Jack Rogers, and the idea was you could see one light from the position of another.

Comment: Erin commented that, starting about 15 years ago, the women’s center advisory board would provide input on the placement of blue phones.

Comment: Steve thanked everyone for the input and said that if any recommendations are made they would be shared with the group before presentation to the steering committee.

Comment: Mary thanked the group and commented that the discussion was helpful for clarifying specific details.

PARKING MANAGEMENT

Steve introduced the next conversation about parking management. They had discussed many items previously including parking districts, variable priced parking, and improved shuttle. The group was looking to get input related to remote parking lots and assessing freshmen car restriction. He introduced the represented departments on campus and asked if anyone would like to share their thoughts first.

Comment: Larry began by saying all students do not have the same life situations or are coming from the same circumstances. As a result, anything done in attempt to affect student behavior, even just altering their path of travel, requires recognizing a variety of student situations and need. There are a very wide range of reasons that a student brings a vehicle to campus, condition of cars, and financial situations that influence a student’s choice to bring a car to campus.

Comment: Steve clarified that the consideration is for first-year students not all students.

Comment: Larry continued saying that even first-year students still have a broad range of needs or situations that should be kept in mind when developing a policy that affects them.

Comment: Dan talked about recent conversations he had with his live-on staff and got information from them on why students bring vehicles to campus. There was a variety of reasons, and many have jobs that they work on the weekends or want to keep for the summer. Even those who work locally reported that public transit didn’t always match their working schedule or location. There are a lot of students who travel home for family farm or other family obligations. Dan said that students are told there is little need for a car given the access to transportation programs and services on campus, but the perception of personal control is very important to many students. There isn’t a true assessment on why residents use their vehicles or what they brought them for, but an assessment tool was added to the next check in process. In addition to reminding students that they don’t need a vehicle, they will be asked if they will be purchasing a permit for any vehicles they want to bring and why they will be bringing one. Specific results on why students are bringing their vehicles should be coming soon from these assessments. In terms of student impact, from UHDS’ point of view, the more restricted the students become, the lower satisfaction with their OSU experience will be.

Question: Steve asked Dan if he anticipated doing this survey every year.

Response: Dan replied that he thought they would if there was some visible trend. He also suggested that looking at a mid-year assessment might be beneficial as well. He commented that about 90% of new students bring bikes to campus, but most are locked up outside and are unused.

Comment: Gary commented that doing an assessment on a quarterly basis was discussed previously, and is one of the things that the group was looking at from a recommendation standpoint.

Comment: Dan suggested that each term should refer to mid-term in order to catch the most student's on-campus as possible.

Comment: Kate added that there are students who register a car to and realize they don't need it and don't bring it to campus. The number of registered vehicles doesn't necessarily reflect how many cars are actually on campus. It's important to find out which of those students who registered their cars actually brought them to campus. When admissions staff do their sessions across the state, the representatives discourage bringing cars to campus and present information about alternative transportation. She said that the enrollment plan for OSU update about 2 years ago, with an emphasis on developing the learning experience for undergraduate students. The plan is looking at what experiences really promote student growth including diversifying the student population from different geographies, lifestyles, and educational backgrounds. Something that has really changed in the last several years is the increasing number of students qualifying/applying for financial aid. About 21,000 students are receiving financial aid currently, which is associated with family income/the ability of the families to afford college. She asked that this large population of students who are barely affording college be kept in mind when making recommendations about anything that could result in increased cost to students – even costs as low as \$30 can be significant.

Question: Steve asked Kate if she had research that could indicate how many students worked while attending OSU.

Response: Kate replied that they don't have reliable information since survey response rate is low. Nationally we know that there are more students relying on part time employment than previously. There is also a significant number of students in Oregon who have multiple jobs while attending school. The Hispanic population is significant in Oregon and they often work during school attendance due to cultural expectations to help send money to their families back home.

Comment: Gary commented that in the first year survey they get an indication of how many intend to work or are going to.

Comment: Steve commented that when the economic study with Eco Northwest two years ago, there were about 7600 part time employees on campus (student or staff).

Comment: Larry brought up that that only includes paid employment, not volunteer employment or internships. Including that, the number is much higher.

Question: Steve asked if there was any idea on how many students participate in internships.

Response: Larry replied that they had some numbers, but they were scattered.

Response: Kate also replied that they could get the numbers to the committee.

Comment: Steve thanked Kate.

Comment: Noah commented that he had a couple of thoughts on the recommendations about assessment. One is, in admissions, they need to assess if having parking or not entice or scare people away and what the impact would be. They don't want to scare people off before there is even a change, and they have to keep that in mind for when prospective students are looking at colleges. The other was a suggestion about trying to get information about the impact of such a policy from the chamber of commerce and businesses that rely on students in some way.

Question: Steve asked for Brett's student perspective.

Response: Brett replied that he thought this assessment piece on how first year students utilize the campus to determine whether or not a first year car ban would be beneficial to the students is a wasteful effort. He strongly believes that the ban itself would in no way be of benefit to the student population. As a student from an agricultural background, as discussed earlier, he thinks that it fairly clear that the strong agricultural emphasis on campus, both historically and researched based, speaks against the ban. He felt that the committee would be better off investigating remote parking options instead.

Question: Steve asked Brian and Hank about their thoughts on assessment of a first year car ban and remote lots.

Response: Brian replied that his daughter worked during her first year and needed her car on campus to make a living. The remote parking concept is something that we are starting to explore. Starting to identify the resources in the neighborhoods and looking at some kind of shuttle system to allow us access to remote parking has also begun. The Benton County Fairgrounds have been looked at and measures to make it a secure, safe, and viable option are being delved into right now.

Comment: Hank commented that the idea of remote parking seems the most reasonable. They are looking at lots to get full or joint utility on. An incentive to get people to use these lots and shuttle into campus is going to be the hard part. Trying to find the balance to service the transient and stable students is also a challenge.

Question: Steve asked if anyone has thought about the opportunity to provide remote parking to students who live in close proximity to yet officially off of campus.

Response: Brandon replied that they had been approached about the somewhat controversial developments around campus and the potential to, in a way, subsidize a shuttle system to these new developments.

Question: Stan commented that, if the decision was made to implement the ban, there would be exceptions. He asked if there was any indication that the ban would negatively impact student enrollment.

Response: Noah responded that it is a real possibility that student enrollment would see negative effects since new students would see it as an unnecessary revocation of their freedom. There would be families who would also be uncomfortable with the transportation separation from their child. The other schools that are doing this are in very different positions than OSU. Many of them are in urban situations and have much higher application numbers and aren't really comparable institutions.

Comment: Stan began commenting that even if there was remote parking options there might be a separation issue.

Comment: Noah interjected that he believes the remote lot parking would alleviate that separation anxiety of the families and would be an acceptable alternative to the students.

Comment: Brett commented that in discussion with his family about the issue, they said that OSU wouldn't have become an option if he couldn't have had a car during his first year. It's a fairly real concern for parents, and the fact is that OSU is a traditionally agricultural college and Corvallis is a small town compared to many of the bigger cities in the Willamette Valley. There are some public transportation options for students in the Willamette Valley, but more rural areas of Oregon or elsewhere can become difficult to access.

Question: Jeff commented that he appreciated Brett's directness, but he said that the need to reduce car use is important for improving the other issues that the committee has identified as problematic. He asked if there was a way to, instead of looking at it from a banning perspective, there was a way to provide incentive for reducing car use among first years.

Response: Dan responded that he thought there was and he was surprised that Brandon hadn't thought of it. He thought that coming at the issue from a positive, educational direction will be met with similar results and a much better reception. That way, the student who doesn't really need to bring their car will see the benefits as minimal and generally make the decision to not bring their car to campus. Education about available options that don't require bringing a car will be very beneficial to assisting students who are unfamiliar with alternatives.

Response: Brandon responded that the deadline to provide UHDS with print educational materials for distribution was the next day. There were informational pamphlets regarding rental cars, ride sharing, general alternative transportation options, and one for a sustainability event. He commented that they can get more aggressive with them, however. The group had talked about parking prices a bit and he mentioned that other schools focus on staff parking and control other parking with incentive use. Even a small monetary incentive could be enough to sway some folks and get their attention. Utilizing almost a checklist like approach might also work, asking if people need cars for specified items.

Response: Steve noted that it may be a good idea to explore with PEBB a walking or bike riding incentive. They provide an incentive to join health clubs. I think there are other incentive possibilities that are there to explore.

Comment: Thank you all for coming.

FURTHER DISCUSSION - CORRIDORS

Comment: Let's discuss the concept of corridors. Eric is showing the recommendations originally considered within the document you received by email along with concerns and questions by City staff. We discussed creating an assessment around safety corridors and there was some push back from people about what we call something. Assessment of consistent pedestrian lighting, design and maintenance of landscape along primary corridors, accessibility, alignment and liability along primary routes, ability for community safety officers to expediently access primary corridors and the frequency of their presence. Signage along primary corridors. Continuity of safety measures on primary corridors to and throughout the campus.

Rainier commented: Looking at those, the one's that I am going to piggyback on – the statement that Dan made – is that done properly, they really don't need signage as they are obvious from the lighting. Signage is a cost burden that is not necessary.

Stan commented that he would add to presence of consistent lighting in particular consider replacement with LED lighting. We are not saying they should, but asking for consideration. LED is cost effective. Gary made a suggestion at looking at new student housing developments. Are we thinking about safety in traveling back and forth to campus?

Gary commented that to capture both the general and specific in terms of the parking issue, he thinks the assessment needs to define how best to coordinate with the current and projected parking strategy to make sure there are accessible lighted corridors (with specific emphasis on Reser, the parking garage and any new large parking facilities in the plans).

Comment Stan: I was going to add motion camera detectors. We realize it will cost money but I thought it was a very interesting consideration.

Comment Steve: What we did not hear from City staff was overwhelming interest or ability to evaluate or invest in improvements. I am a firm believer that transit only works if people know where transit stops and people have the ability to get to those stops. How do we address this matter as it relates to the community?

Comment Stan: This is very complex. If you do nothing – and we building 3000 bedrooms on the north side – anyone traveling to campus will find their way. The major corridors will get overloaded. If you overload a particular corridor – example: 29th Street – with so many bicycles, they are going to off into the neighborhoods. How do we deal with that?

Brandon: I would ask – unlike automobile traffic – what are the negative impacts of having somebody walk down the sidewalk?

Gary responded: That's not the issue. It is a safety issue. If you think about Campus Crest for example. 900 beds. Which by state law could potentially be 1800 residents – if all of those people don't use cars and they are using bicycles – they are not all going to go down Harrison. Where are they going to go?

Brandon: It seems like there was interest by Mary at least in taking it on a case-by-case basis. OSU infrastructure is somewhat limited. Take a few of the primary corridors and work with the City on safety etc. OSU work

happens first and then we approach the City on key points. There may not be an engineering standard to refer, but sort of best practices. It sounds like it has happened to other institutions as well.

Comment Steve: There is something we learned tonight that I was unaware of and that is the responsibility of the utilities in terms of ownership. To Brandon's point, if we were to imagine that there were specific areas maybe we should ask PP&L to visit with us about their policies and procedures.

Stan commented that he agrees with three things Brandon said: I don't see a problem with lots of people walking and I don't see a problem with lots of people with bikes. The Netherlands convinced me of that. However, I don't see the City doing any kind of assessment. If we can identify certain corridors we may get them onboard.

Question for Eric Adams: Is it possible to print this overlay onto the larger project map and show transit stops.

Eric: It shouldn't be too difficult to do that.

Comment Steve: We could then identify where buses do stop around the campus and we might see if we are missing something like connecting Reser. The reason I bring this up is that I am reminded more and more that the number of people finding it extremely expensive to live close to campus and we are seeing more employees and students living further away.

Eric: We don't meet again until October 9th and we intend to hopefully finalize this set of recommendations then. Then we will move on to the topic of TDM and what strategies you will focus on under that topic.

Comment Steve: If we can complete our work at the next meeting on corridors and first year assessment – what are our thoughts about that change? Some assessments are already underway. My thought is that we utilize our next meeting as a fresh approach on these items. We still need to get back to transportation safety as it relates to some of the developments occurring and being proposed around the university.

Comment Stan: I like the idea of taking this now with the safety corridors and extending it out to the immediate area in order that we can see that there are a bunch of people living here, how do we get from the safety corridor to that area. If we can get a map to show us that we may be able to get more specific with recommendations.

Eric commented: So far as the transit routes, there are stops along Monroe. The routes basically go along Monroe, up 29th, Kings, they come into Campus and run along Jefferson, 26th. I don't think there are any that run on 15th.

Brandon commented that there is a route that runs on 15th but only to Monroe. The 3 and 8 and possibly the 6 comes up 15 and turns right on Jefferson.

Eric continued for the most part they're Collector level streets or higher. Western as well.

Question by Gary: Is there a plan to sync these up? These two [maps/documents]? They have different data points on them. The blue lights are different. Why is that?

Brandon commented that one is most likely more updated than the other. One is much more recent.

Eric asked the committee if there were staff people they would like to come to the October 9th meeting to help inform the committee around TDM. Or is there a need for a more internal discussion before bringing others into the discussion.

Brandon commented that there is not a lot of staff dedicated to TDM. With Hank participating from a shuttle perspective, that would be good. In terms of transit perspective he felt it would be useful to have the City at the meeting because they really run the system. What work will be built upon at the next meeting?

Comment Steve: It's essential the university has already committed to continue investments and investment strategies in parking facilities. I think it is increasingly important during the construction occurring on campus that pathways are defined for people to get around. How we get people to something is just as important as when they get there, how they get around easily.

[end recording]

ADJOURNMENT	Meeting adjourned at <u>7:30</u> pm.
NEXT MEETING	The next meeting will be held on October 9, 2013, from 5:30-7:30pm at the Osborn Aquatic Center.