University/Community Research Working Document

Summary of Findings:

(**= Newer items)

1 Transportation, Traffic, and Parking 3
1.1 Existing Transportation Demand Management measures at OSU 3
1.2 Comparator Institution Information** 3
1.3 Multiple strategy approach to town-gown parking problems: Moorhead, MN 14
1.4 Policy prohibiting freshmen from bringing cars to college: Stanford Univ. 4
1.5 Outreach to parents--sample guideline language discouraging students from bringing cars to campus: Univ. of Oregon, Univ. of Michigan, Univ. of Wisconsin 4
1.6 Online carpool finding program integrated with Facebook: Univ. of Wisconsin-LaCrosse/LaCrosse, WI 5
1.7 Compounding fines/graduated parking fines** 5
1.8 Incentivizing bicycle commuting: Univ. of California San Diego 5
1.9 Creating a bicycle-friendly campus: UC Davis/City of Davis 6
1.10 Campus bike rental programs: Univ. of New Hampshire; St. Lawrence Univ. 6
1.11 Give free bicycles to car-free students: Ripon College/Ripon, WI 7
1.12 Campus Bicycle Facilities Best Practices 7
1.13 Campus Parking Master Plan from town-gown collaboration: Smith College/Northampton, MA 7
1.14 Decreasing traffic/parking congestion at a growing university: Univ. of Washington/Seattle, WA 8
1.15 Parking pay stations with adaptive prices + residential parking districts: Seattle, WA 8
1.16 Parking Benefit Districts: Boulder, CO; Santa Cruz, CA; Univ. of Arizona/Tucson, AZ 9
1.17 Extensive TDM program: Stanford Univ. 9
1.18 Faculty and Staff-focused TDM program: Cornell Univ./Ithaca, NY 10
1.19 Case study: Town and gown transit integrated into one system, campus parking demand goes down: Univ. of Illinois Urbana-Champaign 11
1.20 Incentives for faculty, staff, and students not driving alone: Univ. North Carolina/Chapel Hill, NC 11
1.21 Improved parking violation detection through design standards: Univ. of Florida/Gainesville, FL 11
1.22 Survey of campus parking management strategies 12
1.23 Campus Bicycle Planning and Program Development Best Practices 13
1.24 Evaluating performance in campus transit, parking, and TDM: North Carolina State University Peer University Benchmarking Study 14
1.25 In-vehicle parking meters: Univ. of Oregon, Univ. of Wisconsin 14
2 Housing, Zoning, and Density 15
2.1 Limits on number of unrelated individuals per DU: Colorado State Univ./Fort Collins, CO; Univ. of Georgia/Athens, GA; Univ. of Florida/Gainesville, FL 15
2.2 Restricting proportion of rentals in town per block + reducing number of unrelated adults per DU: Winona State Univ./ Winona, MN 16
2.3 Require registration of rental units: Various cities 16
2.4 Town requiring gown to provide 100% of housing needed for undergraduates: Georgetown/Washington D.C. 17
2.5 Zoning that does not require parking: Berkeley, CA 18
2.6 Public-private partnership to build student housing: UC Davis 18
2.7 Town-gown collaborative process during university expansion: NYU/ Greenwich Village. 19
3 Livability, Noise, and Nuisances 19
3.1 University/City-sponsored mediation program: Colorado State Univ./Fort Collins, CO; Univ. of Vermont/Burlington, VT; Cal Poly/San Luis Obispo 19
3.2 Students as ambassadors to the community: Ohio State University/Columbus, OH 20

3.3 Livability Court for noise and quality of life issues: College of Charleston/Charleston, SC ** 20
3.4 Educating students on municipal codes, preventing nuisances: Univ. of Vermont/Burlington, VT 20
3.5 Formalizing town-gown collaboration: Various Cities** 21
3.6 Conduct outreach to homeowners & non-student residents: Univ. of Oregon/Eugene, OR 22
3.7 Improving town-gown relations through dinner parties: Northwestern Univ./Evanston, IL 22
3.8 Hotline for neighbors and students to report off-campus problems: SUNY Albany/Albany, NY; Univ. of Oregon/Eugene, OR 22
3.9 Unruly Gathering Ordinance: Tucson, AZ 23
3.10 Creating more restrictive noise ordinances: Cornell Univ./Ithaca NY 23
3.11 Building social capital + reducing crime using “broken window” theory: Penn/Philadelphia, PA. 23
3.12 Residential Rental Restriction Overlay District: Michigan State Univ./East Lansing, MI 23
3.13 Community-based problem solving for nuisances: Towson University/Towson, MD .. 24
3.14 Design that reduces conflicts between campus buildings and neighborhoods: Georgetown/Washington D.C. 24
3.15 Charge landlords inspection fees for complaints: Michigan State Univ./East Lansing, MI 24
3.16 Charge landlords reimbursement for police calls for repeated violations: Penn State/Ferguson Township PA; Bloomsburg Univ./Bloomsburg, PA 24
3.17 Saving municipal court time for common student violations: Texas A&M/College Station, TX 25
3.18 Noise abatement class for off-campus students: Texas A&M/College Station, TX 25
3.19 Host Responsibilities of Parties in Residential Areas Ordinance: San Marcos, TX 25
4 Other Resources 26
4.1 Community-Based Social Marketing: Guidebook for changing Transportation Behaviors 26
4.2 Clearinghouse of transportation behavior change links 26
4.3 Ways to increase density without changing character of single-family unit neighborhoods 26
4.4 Graduated density zoning 26
4.5 Factors associated with bicycle ownership and use 26
4.6 Best practices for encouraging biking 27
4.7 Helpful metrics for campus transportation planning 27
4.8 Market-based pricing for parking/Donald Shoup 28
4.9 Online Public Participation models for Collaboration 28
4.10 Example University/City MOU: Cornell University and the City of Ithaca 28
5 Code Examples 34
5.1 Current City of Corvallis codes pertaining to nuisances: 34
5.2 City of Berkeley Car-Free Overlay Zone 36
5.3 Gainesville, FL Residential Parking Code 36
5.4 Fort Collins "3-Unrelated" Ordinance 37
5.5 Tucson Unruly Gathering Ordinance 39
5.6 Ferguson Township Police Reimbursement Ordinance 43
5.7 Town of Bloomsburg Ordinance Police Reimbursement Ordinance 45
5.8 San Marcos, TX “Host Responsibilities of Parties in Residential Areas” Ordinance ... 47

1 Transportation, Traffic, and Parking

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) was a recurring theme in best practices research on traffic and parking issues. Cost effectiveness was repeatedly cited as a reason for using TDM rather than creating more parking, particularly when building structured parking is an option. OSU does have some TDM measures already in place, but comparing research results and case studies with existing TDM measures at OSU reveal opportunities for additional action, including:

- Discouraging incoming students from bringing cars to Corvallis by using more decisive wording than is currently in the parent handbook
- Expanding incentives for faculty, staff, and students who decide to not commute alone by car
- Marketing/incentivizing car-free living, especially to students
- Monitoring OSU bicycle facilities, collecting data, and conducting program evaluation in order to identify areas for improvement

1.1 Existing Transportation Demand Management measures at OSU

- OSU already has taken many TDM measures, including:
  - Car sharing using Enterprise WeCar.
  - An electronic ridematching and carpooling system
  - Agreements with the City of Corvallis and the City of Albany for prepaid rides on Corvallis Transit System, the Linn-Benton Loop, the Philomath Connection and Albany Transit System
  - Access to a local pedicab service that provides human-powered rides in and around campus
  - A campus shuttle that is free to all riders
  - Telecommuting options and compressed work schedules
  - An emergency ride home program
  - Preferential parking for vanpools, and partnerships with organizations that provide carpool ridematching and vanpool services
  - A physical development plan, the OSU Master Plan, that requires dense growth within existing campus boundaries, enabling students to walk between classes with the 10 minutes allocated between classes
  - Secure bicycle parking and showers
- *"Transportation-Sustainability-Oregon State University" Oregon State University website. http://oregonstate.edu/sustainability/transportation Accessed 11-2-11.*

1.2 Comparator Institution Information

- Of OSU's comparator institutions (UC Davis, Iowa State University, Penn State, Texas A & M, Cal Poly, Colorado State University, Purdue, Michigan State, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, and Cornell University.), Penn State and Michigan State require freshmen to live in on-campus housing.
- Michigan State does not allow freshmen to have vehicles on campus.
- Iowa State allows students living in residence hall to bring a vehicle to campus, but does not allow students who live within the Ames city limits to use campus parking lots during the week.

1.3 Policy prohibiting freshmen from bringing cars to college: Stanford Univ.

- *Parking Information—Resident students. Stanford University website. http://transportation.stanford.edu/parking_info/ResidentStudent.shtml#frosh (Accessed 11/3/11).*
- Freshmen are not allowed to bring cars to campus their entire first year, due to limited space on the Stanford campus, and due to the rationale that freshmen need cars the least. Freshmen are required to live on campus their first years, and jobs, food, and social activities are all available on campus. This policy is also intended to discourage students from bringing cars in subsequent years.
- Waivers are available in cases of compelling need.
- To help support going car-free, the university has an extensive TDM program. See section 1.16

1.4 Outreach to parents--sample guideline language discouraging students from bringing cars to campus: Univ. of Oregon, Univ. of Michigan, Univ. of Wisconsin

- *Parents: Frequently Asked Questions - Office of Admissions. University of Oregon website. http://admissions.uoregon.edu/parents/FAQ/Atmosphere/#_atmosphere6 (Accessed 11/18/11).* Emphasis added.
    - "Should my student bring a car to campus?
    - The UO has made a commitment to maintaining green space on campus. Therefore, general parking is limited. Because the campus is conveniently arranged, most students walk or ride bikes to campus. It takes just about 10 minutes to walk from one end of campus to the other--if you don't stop to talk with friends! And since student IDs allow students to ride the bus for free, your child can take advantage of Eugene's excellent transit system to get around town.
    - Most students manage very well without a car; in fact, with parking at a premium, **having a car is more often a hindrance than help**. And since the UO is a residential campus, most students decide to spend their weekends here because of the wide variety of activities and social life available, as well as the frequent need for some library time.
    - Some students who live in the residence halls choose to bring their cars to campus. These students are able to purchase a special parking permit that allows them to park their cars in a lot near their residence hall. Parking spaces are limited, however, and permits do not guarantee a parking space."
    - Same message goes out to parent association, student newsletters, during campus tours, student orientation, email communication to student renters. Seamless with the message, repeated as frequently as possible. (per Greg Rikhoff)
- *MParents: Parking and Transportation: Student Life. University of Michigan website. http://parents.umich.edu/studentlife/pts.php (Accessed 11/18/11)*
    - "The preferred method of transportation on campus is walking or bicycling. If your son or daughter brings a bike to campus, encourage him or her to register the bike with City Hall, purchase a "U-lock," and remember to lock the bike at all times. Bike racks are easily accessible at nearly every campus building.
    - The University and the city of Ann Arbor offer excellent public transportation options for students. The U-M operates a free bus service for the campus community. […]
    - Parking for students at the University of Michigan is extremely limited, **and the University recommends that students leave their cars at home.** With the easy availability of free buses on campus and in the city of Ann Arbor, most

students find that bringing cars to campus is not usually necessary, and often not worth the expense and the effort."

- *Parent Program: Transportation and Parking. University of Wisconsin website. http://www.parent.wisc.edu/transParking.html (Accessed 11/18/11)*
    - "Students find that the fastest, easiest, and most economical ways to get around Campus are by walking, biking, or riding the bus. **Students are not encouraged to bring a car to campus** due to limited parking space and high costs. Encourage your student to use one of these methods for getting around campus."
- Current language from OSU's parents' guide: *More FAQ's: OSU Parents & Family. Oregon State University website). http://oregonstate.edu/parents/morefaq#Q19 (Accessed 11/28/11)*
    - "Will my student need a car?
    - The residence halls and buildings on campus are all located within walking distance. Corvallis has bike lanes everywhere and free city bus service for OSU students, **so having a car is not absolutely necessary**."

1.5 Online carpool finding program integrated with Facebook: Univ. of Wisconsin-LaCrosse/LaCrosse, WI

- *Lang, KJ. "Students look at alternatives to campus-area parking woes." LaCrosse Tribune. Dec. 6, 2009. http://lacrossetribune.com/news/local/article_60060cca-e219-11de-a94c-001cc4c002e0.html (Accessed 11/10/11).*
- *http://public.zimride.com/*
- Parking shortage on campus sparked use of carpools among UW students.
- Zimride interfaces with Facebook, so students can "meet" before carpooling. Typically used for out of town trips. Users can form online communities, helping to address trust issues that may arise with other carpooling systems.
- **Oregon has similar program developing, which may be worth marketing to students: Drive Less Connect, http://drivelessconnect.com/**

*1.6 Compounding fines/graduated parking fines***

- *Shoup, Donald. The High Cost of Free Parking, p. 687-689.*
- Way of keeping enforcement revenues in line with costs, and target drivers who disproportionately abuse the system.
- Giving warning on first (minor) offense can help build goodwill between the community and violators
- For repeat violators, graduated fines deter and raise more revenue.
- Graduated fines have been shown to reduce total citations, with the most reduction coming from repeat offenders.
- Eugene, OR compounds fines--i.e. a driver can get multiple citations in one day for leaving a car too long in a parking district.
- Downside: Alone do not compel people to pay fines. Need boot, other penalty to get drivers to pay.

1.7 Incentivizing bicycle commuting: Univ. of California San Diego

- *How to Participate in the Pedal Club. UCSD website. http://blink.ucsd.edu/facilities/transportation/commuting/solutions/pedal.html#How-do-I-participate? (Accessed 11/10/11).*

- UC San Diego Pedal Club consists of faculty, staff, and off-campus students who commit to cycling to UCSD for most commutes, and who have registered their bicycle with the State of California
- Members receive:
    - occasional use permit, allowing 10 days of parking per quarter,
    - discount at campus bike shop,
    - free shower access at gym,
    - waived Zipcar application fee and discounted use,
    - access to emergency ride home.

1.8 Creating a bicycle-friendly campus: UC Davis/City of Davis

- *Toor, Will and Havlick, Spenser. Transportation & Sustainable Campus Communities: Issues, Examples, Solutions. Island Press, Washington, 2004.*
- In 1996, 60% of students and 20% of staff and faculty biked to campus. 15,000-18,000 bikes were on campus each day.
- Students receive discounts on locks, cables, lights, reflectors, and helmets, funded by bike licenses ($8 for three years, $4 for renewal) and bike auctions (of 300 abandoned bikes left on racks each year). Adding in federal, state and local grants, plus fines and forfeitures, bicycle services has $40,000-50,000 budget per year.
- PT student staff patrol campus to enforce registration and parking.
- Student Health Center sponsors bike education classes
- Associated Students of UCD Bike Barn is full-service bike repair shop with tools on loan for cyclist to do own repairs.
- Finding car parking during inclement weather can be an issue; faculty and staff can purchase temporary parking permits, allowing 12 days over six month period. Controversy over whether and how much to charge for temporary permits--too high, and users get upset, thinking they should be rewarded for biking most of the time. Too low, and parking becomes problematic during bad weather.
- Bike program complemented by transit service--faculty, staff and students who do not have a parking permit get transit & emergency ride home perks.
- Student-run Unitrans runs routes throughout campus and for a $24.50/quarter fee, is fare-free for students and anyone with a UC Davis parking permit, plus City of Davis employees.
- Carpools and vanpools incentivized.
- Despite TDM measures, parking shortages remain. New 1,500-space parking structure planned for 2005, accompanied by four-year phased rate increase on parking to offset the debt obligation.

1.9 Campus bike rental programs: Univ. of New Hampshire; St. Lawrence Univ.

- *Programs - Bike Program. University of New Hampshire website. http://www.unh.edu/transportation/programs/bikeprogram.htm (Accessed 11/16/11)*
- UNH Cat Cycle program allows faculty, staff, and students to borrow bikes and combination lock for free for up to one week. Fines for damage, overdue return.
- Program has waiting list of users
- *Green Bikes Program: St. Lawrence University Green Pages. St. Lawrence University website. http://www.stlawu.edu/green/green-bikes (Accessed 11/18/11).*
- Students, faculty and staff may check out bikes for 24 hours. Users given lock and offered helmet. Users responsible for any damage done to bikes.

1.10 Give free bicycles to car-free students: Ripon College/Ripon, WI

- *Ripon College: Velorution Project: The Pledge. Ripon College website. http://www.ripon.edu/velorution/bike.html (Accessed 11/18/11)*
- The first 200 incoming freshmen who sign a pledge saying they will not bring a car to the college receive a free bicycle, agreeing to use it as their sole means of wheeled transportation on campus and the community.
- Program begun in 2007, when number of parking permit applications exceeded the number available. City also imposed street parking restrictions.
- Program funded by friends of the college, trustees, and alumni.

1.11 Campus Bicycle Facilities Best Practices

- *Toor, Will and Havlick, Spenser. Transportation & Sustainable Campus Communities: Issues, Examples, Solutions. Island Press, Washington, 2004.*
- Bike paths/bike lanes
- Dismount zones on campus to reduce pedestrian/cyclist conflicts
- Signage for route identification, directional signs, traffic control etc.
- A bicycle service station--for bike storage, repair, equipment sales, possibly bike rental
- Bicycle rack on bus fleet
- Bicycle path separation from campus roadways
- Roadways striped for bicycle lanes to give motorists the optical illusion of a narrower street
- Striped or painted bicycle climbing lanes on hills
- Bike rental systems (e.g. yellow bikes)
- Zero-interest loan programs for students to buy bicycles
- Grade-separated crossings on busy roadways
- Showers and bike storage space on campus
- Spark competition by giving awards to colleges/departments within univ. with the highest per capita of ped/bike commuters
- Roundabouts at busy ped/bike crossings; design to calm traffic
- Full-time campus pedestrian and bicycle facilities coordinator on campus to organize and market programs
- Bike path and sidewalk maintenance program with cost sharing between town and college
- Bike to work/walk to work day monthly or annually

1.12 Campus Parking Master Plan from town-gown collaboration: Smith College/Northampton, MA

- *Fuss & O'Neill. Campus Parking Master Plan, Smith College, Northampton, Massachusetts. Feb. 8, 2007.*
- Plan prompted by past studies noting need to discourage spillover parking, create pedestrian-friendly campus.
- Recommended actions include:
    - Parking Management (Pricing & Parking Permitting; Residential Permit Parking Program; TDM Coordinator Role; Parking Monitoring, Coordination, Enforcement)
    - Transit Utilization (Encourage Public Transit Use; Park & Ride)
    - Ridesharing (Ride Share Incentive Programs; Emergency Ride Home Program)

  - Other Actions (Car Share (Zipcar) Program, Parking Cash Out Program, TDM Marketing, Bike Sharing Program, Bike Incentive Programs, Housing On or Near Campus)
- Specific steps to reduce spillover parking include considering a residential permit parking program and enforcing the Smith policy that all cars on campus (staff, faculty, students, visitors) must be registered with the Public Safety Office and display a Smith ID tag.

1.13 Decreasing traffic/parking congestion at a growing university: Univ. of Washington/Seattle, WA

- *Tools of Change. http://www.toolsofchange.com/en/case-studies/detail/123 (Accessed 11/4/11).*
- *UW:FS:Commuter Services: U-PASS Student. University of Washington website.*
- *https://www.washington.edu/facilities/transportation/commuterservices/u-pass/student (Accessed 11/29/11)*
- *Toor, Will and Havlick, Spenser. Transportation & Sustainable Campus Communities: Issues, Examples, Solutions. Island Press, Washington, 2004. p.129.*
- Challenge: Cap traffic to and from campus and cause no net increase in parking in surrounding neighborhoods while a new university development plan increases the number of faculty, staff and students, and decreases number of parking spaces.
- Solution: UPASS program. Benefits for students include:
  - Unlimited rides on local county's (King) and three neighboring counties' (Pierce, Snohomish, Kitsap) bus, train, light rail, streetcar and water taxi systems
  - Discounted carpool parking
  - Vanpool fare credits
  - Low membership rate for Zipcar
  - Discounts and special offers at more than 40 local merchants
  - Discounts on helmets, lights, pedometers and more at student health center
- Result: Within three weeks of implementation, morning trips decreased by 15% and afternoon trips by 9%. Driving alone lost 10% mode share. Ten-year goals of the transportation management plan were met. According to 2001 report, 30% of trips to the university were by bike or foot; these modes take less than 1% of the transportation budget.
- [Interesting anecdotal detail: For students, the UPASS program is opt-out rather than opt-in. Stickers come automatically with the quarter's registration documents and require an extra step to receive refund.]

1.14 Parking pay stations with adaptive prices + residential parking districts: Seattle, WA

- *SDOT - Parking in Seattle. http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/parking/parkingtypes.htm (Accessed 12/9/11)*
- Multiple Seattle neighborhoods have pay stations--multi-space paid parking devices that print stickers for display, indicating how long the driver may park. There are also absolute time limits (e.g. 2 hours max) for how long a car may park.
- These are typically located on main commercial arterial streets.
- Different neighborhoods have different rates, which are re-evaluated and adjusted annually, aimed getting prices to a level where there are one to two open spaces per block face throughout the day.
- Prices range from $1 (further-flung residential areas) to $4 (central business district) per hour.

- Seattle also has residential parking permits, covering most central neighborhoods of densities higher than single-family units. Prices range from $0 to $65, with no apparent maximum per address.
- For comparison, Corvallis currently has 3 parking districts, allowing 2 hours of parking, 8-5 weekdays. Permits cost $15 per year, with a maximum of three permits per resident address. Non-permit holders may only park once per day for 2 hours maximum.

1.15 Parking Benefit Districts: Boulder, CO; Santa Cruz, CA; Univ. of Arizona/Tucson, AZ

- *Shoup, Donald. The High Cost of Free Parking.*
- Compromise between free curb parking, which leads to overuse, and permit parking, which leads to underuse: Give residents parking permits. Allow nonresidents to park in district for fair market price; revenue generated from parking goes into service improvements in the district.
- Precedent in California policy of allowing solo drivers to pay extra to drive in HOV lanes. Revenue is generated and the HOV lane is more efficiently used as long as solo drivers see a benefit in paying.
- Early examples:
    - Boulder, CO has Neighborhoods Permit Parking zones. Residents can get permits for $12/year, nonresidents can get a Commuter Permit for $312/year. Sales monitored so that there are not too many permits per block.
    - Santa Cruz, CA charges residents in districts adjacent to downtown $20/year, and nonresidents $240/year. Permits only valid Monday-Friday, 6am-8pm
    - Tucson residents pay $2.50/year, nonresidents $200-400/year--prices being the highest on the blocks nearest the University of Arizona, and decreasing further from the university.

1.16 Extensive TDM program: Stanford Univ.

- *Alternative Transportation: Summary of Programs. Stanford University website. http://transportation.stanford.edu/alt_transportation/Programs.shtml (Accessed 11/16/11)*
- Parking cash-out. $23.50 per month for faculty, staff or students who do not live in university housing and do not commute by driving.
- Carpooling:
    - Reserved parking spaces for all carpools/vanpools
    - Complimentary daily parking passes for carpoolers
    - Vanpool subsidies
    - Online Stanford Ridematching Service
- Commuter buddy program--matches experienced transit and bike riders with inexperienced riders. Commute Buddies get gift certificate for volunteering.
- Pretax payroll deduction for transit passes, Caltrain parking, and commuter checks
- Refer-a-friend program--$50 to person who referred new member. Both people must stay in program for three months, other restrictions apply
- Emergency Ride Home
- Up to $96 a year in Zipcar driving credit
- Up to 12 free hourly car rental vouchers (through Enterprise Rent-a-Car)
- Ability to purchase up to eight daily permits per month, and have them mailed to your home
- Free, comprehensive campus shuttle system, open to the public
    - Connects with local transit and Caltrain (as well as shopping and dining options)
    - Midnight Express--night safety service

    - Automated Transportation Management System, with real-time schedules viewable on the web
- Bicycle Program
    - Bicycle registration
    - Free bike rental and folding-bike promotion (limited time and restrictions apply)
    - Complimentary Mid-Peninsula Bike Map, as well as city and county bike maps
    - Clothes and bike locker rental/shower information and maps
    - Safety education program
    - Dorm bike safety road show
    - Commute planning/cycling information
    - Bike light giveaways
- Vehicle Rentals
    - Hourly, half-day, and full-day car rental (through on-campus Enterprise Rent-A-Car office) available to faculty, staff, and students 18 years of age and older
    - Self-service, on-demand car sharing program with Zipcar
- Charter Bus Services
    - Group transportation services (conferences, teams, events, student activities, etc.)
    - On- or off-campus destinations
    - Online reservation system
- Parking Program
    - Parking permit fees
    - Short-term parking options--Coin-metered spaces, one-day visitor permits. Higher rates than commuter parking
    - Residential parking program--students living on campus may only park there.
    - No freshman cars (see section 1.3)
    - Special event planning--Conferences can provide special permits to conference guests allowing parking in specific lots. Requires advance reservation.
- Electric vehicle charging stations
- Extensive outreach information for new undergraduates
- Interactive commute planning assistance--uses Google Map data to provide customized route for user-entered addresses and selected mode (e.g. bicycle, bus, foot etc.)

1.17 Faculty and Staff-focused TDM program: Cornell Univ./Ithaca, NY

- *Toor, Will and Havlick, Spenser. Transportation & Sustainable Campus Communities: Issues, Examples, Solutions. Island Press, Washington, 2004.*
- Focused on faculty and staff because during a period of growth at the university, demand for parking among students remained stable, but rose for faculty and staff.
- In lieu of semester parking permit, TDM program participants receive free transit pass for both city and county buses, and subsidized passes for out-of-county commuters, free book of one-day parking permits.
- Program also includes emergency ride home, night safety shuttles, campus to downtown express lunchtime bus service.
- Carpoolers receive discounts and/or rebates on parking.
- Thirty day trial period for TDM program, during which time a person can quit and get their parking permit back.
- Parking Hardship Review Board assists people who cannot afford parking fees and cannot use alternatives.
- Result: 26% decline in vehicles brought to campus each day. First year cost savings were exceeded by roughly 20%. Cost of the TDM program end up being 1/3 lower and participation was double. Savings after a decade were in the millions.

- Implemented in 1991; as of 2002, 37% of faculty participated.

1.18 Case study: Town and gown transit integrated into one system, campus parking demand goes down: Univ. of Illinois Urbana-Champaign

- *Moriarty, J.A., R. Patton, and W. Volk. 1991. The I System: A Campus and Community Bus System for the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana. Transportation Research Record 1297. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.*
- (Adapted from article abstract) The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign transportation system, called the "I System," integrates a new system of circulating campus bus routes with the existing regular routes of the local transit district.
- Both the campus and community routes are operated by the Champaign-Urbana Mass Transit District (CUMTD).
- The I System is jointly funded by a mandatory student transportation fee, the University of Illinois Parking Division, and State of Illinois transit operating assistance.
- The primary component of the I System is that a valid student identification card becomes an unlimited access bus pass for both the system of new campus routes and the regular community-wide bus routes. This integrated system helps to combat congestion and parking problems by intercepting off-campus trips at the point of origin and providing access to dispersed university activity centers, in turn reducing the need for an automobile both for commuter trips to campus and intracampus trips.
- The results of the I System have been impressive; ridership for the CUMTD has approximately doubled to 5.4 million passenger trips per year. Because of the success of the I System and complementary Transportation System Management measures, demand for campus parking has been reduced by 1,000 spaces. Consequently, $5 million worth of new parking garage construction has been postponed.

1.19 Incentives for faculty, staff, and students not driving alone: Univ. North Carolina/Chapel Hill, NC

- *UNC Chapel Hill Police. UNC website. http://www.dps.unc.edu/Transit/gettingtowork/CAP/cap.cfm (Accessed 11/10/11)*
- Commuter Alternative Program enrolls university constituents to be members, who must use any mode but driving alone.
- Members receive 12 1-day parking permits, Zipcar discounts, discounts/benefits from local merchants, access to Zimride, emergency ride back service, and entries into raffles.

1.20 Improved parking violation detection through design standards: Univ. of Florida/Gainesville, FL

- *Frierson, Jack S. "How Are Local Governments Responding to Student Rental Problems in University Towns in the United States, Canada, and England?". The Georgia Journal of International and Comparative Law. 33. L. 497. Winter 2005*
- *Gainesville, Fla., Code of Ordinances § 30- 56(c)(4) (1999)*
- Parking designs amended in residential neighborhoods; require homes to have permanent driveways and parking area boundaries, making detection of parking violations easier. Code in section 5.3.

1.21 Survey of campus parking management strategies

- *Todd Litman APA Zoning Practice 6.09*
- Typical strategies include:
    - Permits
    - Meters
    - Cash-out program
    - Prohibitive policy for freshmen
    - Eligibility based on residential location
- Lowering management costs and increasing motorist convenience:
    - Accepting a variety of payment types (coins, bills, debit and credit cards, telephone, online)
    - Do not require motorists to predict how long they will park and only charge for the number of minutes a space is actually used.
- See also VTPI's Campus Transport Management page: http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm5.htm
- *Toor, Will and Havlick, Spenser. Transportation & Sustainable Campus Communities: Issues, Examples, Solutions. Island Press, Washington, 2004. (Chapter 2).*
- Possible TDM Actions
    - *Transportation allowance*—provide allowance to commuters, let them choose their own transportation mode
    - *Carsharing*
    - *Commuter clubs*—similar model to airline miles; club members receive points for using alternative transportation, which can be redeemed for cash or prizes
    - *Free transit passes*
    - *Free bicycle accessories*
    - *Guaranteed ride home*
    - *Parking cash out*
    - *Taxation incentives*—promote benefit of pre-tax allocation of alternative transportation expenses
    - *Vanpool empty seat subsidy*—as vanpool members fluctuate, subsidies keep the cost consistent for remaining members
    - *Vanpool subsidy*
    - *Bike checkout program*
    - *Parking fees*
    - *Clustered parking*
    - *Incidental use parking*
    - *Parking management*—includes residential and commercial parking permits, shared use parking, time restrictions and others
    - *Parking maximums*
    - *Preferential parking*—for carpoolers and vanpoolers
    - *Unbundled parking leases*—separate university housing parking and building leases, offer transportation allowance instead
    - *Bicycling, bikes on buses marketing/promotion*
    - *Bicycle rider's guide*
    - *Bicycle users' group*
    - *Bike station, with secured/covered parking*
    - *Bike to work day/week*
    - *Carpool/vanpool/transit promotion*
    - *TDM marketing*—may include flyers, brochures, posters, or targeted email messages to encourage transportation alternatives
    - *Transit riders' guide*
    - *Advanced traveler information systems*—e.g. bus stop kiosks showing when the next bus will arrive, online ride matching
    - *Student or employee transportation coordinator*
- Possible TDM funding sources

- *Student fees*
- *Parking revenues*
- *Parking fines*
- *Transportation impact fee*
- *Campus general fund*
- *User fees*—e.g. bike registration
- *Federal enhancement funds*
- *Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds*—available in areas that do not meet air quality standards
- *Local and regional partnerships*—between university and surrounding community. E.g. university could donate right-of-way, city could pay for construction
- *Public/private partnerships*

1.22 Campus Bicycle Planning and Program Development Best Practices

- *Alta Planning + Design. Best Practices in Campus Bicycle Planning and Program Development. [White paper]. Available at: http://www.altaplanning.com/App_Content/files/Perspectives_Campus%20Bicycle%20Planning_ALTA.pdf*
- Campus bicycle master plans should:
  - be consistent with other planning documents (e.g. long-range development plans, campus master plans)
  - establish seamless links with existing and proposed bikeways in neighboring areas
  - be developed in coordinating with multiple campus departments (e.g. transportation, planning, police, facilities management)
  - have enough resources dedicated to their implementation to be successful
- Recommended that universities designate a liaison to work with city on bikeway planning. Collaboration can help efforts like grant application.
- NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide contains innovative design best practices, more useful than standard design manuals.
- Parking best practices:
  - Adopt bike rack standard, allowing a bike frame and one or both wheels to be locked with a U-lock, and to support the bicycle in at least two places.
  - Make racks a uniform design and color for easy identification by cyclists.
  - Assess bicycle parking demand and establish minimum bicycle parking requirements for new building construction.
  - Monitor bike rack use and add racks if demand increases
  - Provide long-term bike parking for inclement weather, extra security, and/or when parking is needed for longer periods.
  - Consider providing high-capacity bike parking in a central campus location along with amenities like bike repair facilities
- Consider a bike-sharing program
- Complement design improvements with a bike program:
  - Education on biking laws & safety
  - Encouragement through a campus bicycle advocacy community, bicycle culture
  - Enforcement promoting safety for cyclists, other non-motorized transportation
  - Evaluation and Planning
- Collect data on bicycling-activity rates, bicycle-related crashes, bicycle thefts. Can be accomplished through counts at specified checkpoints, bicycle parking utilization count, online survey, and or automated counters.
- Apply to be a League of American Bicyclists "Bicycle Friendly University"--application process is educational, shows room for improvement, and gives benchmark for progress.

(OSU is not currently rated; UO and PSU both have silver level awards. Peer institutions UC Davis, Cornell, and U of IL Urbana-Champaign are rated. Corvallis is a gold-level "Bicycle Friendly City")

1.23 Evaluating performance in campus transit, parking, and TDM: North Carolina State University Peer University Benchmarking Study

- *Yasukochi, Emily. "North Carolina State University Peer University Benchmarking Study: Transit, Parking, and Transportation Demand Management". North Carolina State University Transportation. March 29, 2007.*
- North Carolina State Univ. conducted study comparing own transportation systems to 16 other institutions, including 10 peer institutions.
- Compared universities' performance on metrics for: 1) Transit (cost efficiency; service effectiveness; cost effectiveness); 2) Parking (several financial indicators, supply); and 3) TDM to create customized recommendations for NCSU
- Provided basis for recommendations on how to increase transit ridership, make changes to number parking permits sold, make the campus more bicycle-friendly, and implement a car-sharing program.

1.24 In-vehicle parking meters: Univ. of Oregon, Univ. of Wisconsin

- *Shoup, Donald. Parking on a Smart Campus. California Policy Options 2005, Daniel Mitchell (ed.), Los Angeles: UCLA School of Public Affairs, 2005, pp. 117-149.*

1.25 Case Study: Multiple strategy approach to town-gown parking problems: Moorhead, MN

- In response to parking congestion and unclear standards for parking, city changed code and created program to reduce parking demand
- Created University Overlay Zoning District for neighborhoods close to universities:
    - Would require one off-street space per renter or bedroom, whichever is greater
    - Would allow 20' driveway
- Requires rentals to be registered. New rentals will need to be in compliance with code changes before receiving registration.
- Single-family units could only be rented if they provide adequate off-street parking for all renters. All properties would have to come into compliance.
- Off-street parking areas with three or more spaces will be visually screened (e.g. in garage or with trees)
- Introduces permit parking on selected city streets. Annual fee, two permits per single-family unit allowed. Pushes university commuters away from on-street spaces to lots
- Car demand management program includes:
    - Web-based carpool matching system for students
    - "Guaranteed Ride Home" vouchers
    - Car-sharing program

2 Housing, Zoning, and Density

2.1 Limits on number of unrelated individuals per DU: Colorado State Univ./Fort Collins, CO; Univ. of Georgia/Athens, GA; Univ. of Florida/Gainesville, FL

- *Three Unrelated—Student Legal Services. Colorado State University website. http://sls.colostate.edu/three-unrelated (Accessed 11/3/11)*
- No more than three unrelated individuals may live in the same dwelling unit. Exception for owner-occupied housing
- Violation enforced on a complaint basis; neighbors who observe the property and/or talk to tenants can fill out a "zoning investigation form"; then city staff mail a notice to the property owner, giving 30 days to correct violations
- Municipal code and details in section 5.4

- *Frierson, Jack S. "How Are Local Governments Responding to Student Rental Problems in University Towns in the United States, Canada, and England?". The Georgia Journal of International and Comparative Law. 33. L. 497. Winter 2005*
- Definition of Family Ordinance. Enacted in 1991, amended in 2001.
- Prohibits more than two unrelated occupants from living in single-family neighborhoods. Prohibits families from sharing DU with more than one unrelated person
- Applies both to owner-occupied and renter-occupied homes.
- Widely ignored because of lax enforcement, until enactment of Rental Regulation Ordinance in 2003. Required landlords and tenants to sign form, acknowledging ordinances on renting, ensure occupancy is in compliance with Definition of Family Ordinance.
- In 2004, Rental Regulation Ordinance declared unconstitutional, in violation of 4th and 5th amendments. Definition of Family Ordinance challenged for invading privacy, but upheld.
- Article author considers too restrictive. Ordinance imposes high cost to moderate-income homeowners who would like to rent out rooms to make mortgage payments.

- *Frierson, Jack S. "How Are Local Governments Responding to Student Rental Problems in University Towns in the United States, Canada, and England?". The Georgia Journal of International and Comparative Law. 33. L. 497. Winter 2005*
- Gainesville Landlord Permit Ordinance
- Three unrelated occupants may share a single-family residence
- Landlords must obtain landlord permit; must certify that they have provided tenants with:
    - Copies of Florida statutes on residential tenancies
    - the Gainesville Landlord Permit Ordinance
    - the city's quality-of-life ordinances
    - pamphlet on city guidelines for rentals in residential neighborhoods.
- Landlords must pursue all lawful remedies to terminate rental agreements with repeat violators. Holds landlords as well as tenants accountable.
- Ordinance also requires city to assign points to landlord's rental property permit for repeated warnings and quality of life violations. Six points or more in a twelve month period subjects landlord permit to revocation.
- Makes landlords of students rentals analogous to bar owners--must manage the behavior of persons on their premises to keep their business license.

2.2 Restricting proportion of rentals in town per block + reducing number of unrelated adults per DU: Winona State Univ./ Winona, MN

- *Voerding, Brian. "City Council to vote on 30 percent rental cap". WinonaDailyNews.com. Dec. 5, 2005*
- *Voerding, Brian. "Council to consider rental cap under proposal". WinonaDailyNews.com. May 4, 2007.*
- *Sommerhauser, Mark. "City task force: Some areas need relief from 30 percent rule". WinonaDailyNews.com. Jun. 17, 2009*
- *Kass, Duncan. "Five years in, city says 30 percent rental rule is working". WinonaDailyNews.com. Jul. 19, 2010.*
- Requires license to create rental property
- Limits rental housing to 30% per block, grandfathering in existing rentals, in response to outcry over conversion of single family homes to rental properties
- Number of unrelated adults allowed to live together reduced from 5 to 3
- Increases off-street parking requirements, limits use of backyards for parking
- Variances allowed; in 2007 decision-making changed from Board of Adjustment to City Council. Zero variances granted as of 2010
- Four years after initial implementation, task force assembled to revisit rules. Rule imposed hardship on some homeowners who wanted to create a rental
- Spread out rentals through city, pushed rentals further from campus
- More mid-range priced homes available to families
- Some homeowners obtained rental licenses while keeping DU owner-occupied, in order to further lower proportion of rentals on block.

2.3 Require registration of rental units: Various cities

Nearly all of Corvallis' comparator cities require some kind of accountability for rental properties, whether requiring an affidavit confirming the number of occupants in the unit, or regular inspection and certification by the local authorities.

In a survey of other cities with major universities, the City of Urbana, IL found that most of its selected comparator cities (also college towns) have a licensing or registration programs, and that most charge fees for either rental registration, rental inspections or both. Comparator cities average 5.5 FT and 2 PT staff and had populations ranging from 22,000-115,000. Most had a separate schedule of fees for single-family, duplex, small, and large apartment buildings. (http://urbanaillinois.us/sites/default/files/attachments/FAQ.pdf)

Basics:
Municipalities requiring inspection typically review for compliance with basic health and safety codes (i.e. item found in the International Property Maintenance Code). Licenses are ordinarily issued for a limited duration (e.g. 2-4 years) after which the property must be re-inspected in order to continue to be rented. Rental licensing generally applies to small rental units, not big apartment complexes (for which different rules apply). Most municipalities' stated purpose for licensing is the desire to have safe, healthy housing, but a few mention preventing blight and nuisances, preserving character, and neighborhood stability. Another frequently cited reason for licensing is a need to identify the owner of the property quickly should a problem arise.

Owner occupied housing where rooms are rented out may or may not be exempt--there are examples of both in other cities. Rental licenses are not usually transferrable to new owners. Nearly all cities with programs require local agents (i.e. if the property owner lives more than a specified distance away, someone in the area must be designated to take responsibility.)

Revocations:

- State College, PA has a points system to determine revocation: Violations assigned 1-3 points each are tracked for a floating 12 month period. 1 point violations include property maintenance code offenses, 2 point violations include alcohol-related and nuisance offenses, and 3 point violations include drug offenses and assault. When 5 or more points accumulate, a notice is sent to the property owner; when 10 or more points accumulate, permits are suspended. There is an appeals process following suspension. The first suspension is for six months; subsequent suspensions are for a year. Self-reported complaints/requests for assistance do not count toward the point total. Landlords may request a stay of suspension after evicting tenants.
- Burnsville, MN (bedroom community/suburb of Twin Cities) has a three strikes and you're out rule--three instances of disorderly conduct and the license holder must evict the tenants. If they do not, this is a violation by the license holder.
- Other cities may take away landlords' rights to apply for additional licenses for a set period of time if they have had too many licenses revoked previously (e.g. in Minneapolis, two revocations removes the privilege of applying for new rental licenses for five years)

Cost:

- Fees for rental licenses generally range from $50-100, but can be much higher for large multi-unit buildings. Multifamily buildings of over five units often have a lower per unit rate.
- Some cities charge a fee assessed for the conversion of an owner-occupied unit to rental unit: Minneapolis, MN charges a $1000 conversion fee, charged when a single family dwelling is being converted to a first time rental.

Enforcement/accountability:

- Sugar Land, TX (suburb of Houston) fines owners of unlicensed rental properties up to $500/day each day the unit is rented without a license, and shuts off water service to unlicensed rentals.
- Several cities publish lists of rental properties.
- Some cities limit the number of rental licenses that can exist by making properties deed restricted, not allowing the property to be rented.
- Winona MN, and East Lansing MI have ordinances restricting how many properties may be rentals in a given space (e.g. per block or per neighborhood)
- In nearly all cities surveyed, when a rental property is sold, the license expires on the date of sale.

2.4 Town requiring gown to provide 100% of housing needed for undergraduates: Georgetown/Washington D.C.

- *Editorial. Washington Post. http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/its-dc-vs-georgetown-in-urban-planning/2011/10/21/gIQAPkFcAM_story.html (Accessed 11/7/11)*
- *http://www.gwhatchet.com/2011/06/13/neighbors-ask-georgetown-to-house-all-students-on-campus/ (Accessed 11/7/11)*
- *Editorial. Washington Post.http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/its-dc-vs-georgetown-in-urban-planning/2011/10/21/gIQAPkFcAM_story.html (Accessed 11/7/11)*
- Due to the rate of conversion of rowhouses from owner-occupied to rentals, as well as quality of life issues, a group of Georgetown university neighbors has asked the D.C. Office of Planning to impose strict housing and enrollment requirements.
- The proposal would put a cap of 6,652 undergraduates on the university, only 636 more students that it has now. 100% of undergraduates would have to live in campus housing by fall of 2016.
- Not yet implemented

2.5 Zoning that does not require parking: Berkeley, CA

- *Southside Plan - DSS 13 Zoning - R-S - City of Berkeley, CA. City of Berkeley. http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/contentdisplay.aspx?id=430 (Accessed 11/7/11)*
- *Southside Plan - DSS 4 Land Use and Housing Element. City of Berkeley, CA. http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/contentdisplay.aspx?id=438 (Accessed 11/7/11)*
- Areas zoned R-S in Berkeley are not required to provide any off-street parking, must provide 1 bicycle parking space per 2,000 sf of gross commercial space.
- Residents are not entitled to receive parking permits.
- Language pertaining to parking in section 5.2

2.6 Public-private partnership to build student housing: UC Davis

- *Welcome - UC Davis West Village. University of California Davis. http://westvillage.ucdavis.edu/ (Accessed 11/8/11)*
- *Parker, Clifton and Kerlin, Kat. "UC Davis West Village: A visionary model for 21st century living". UC Davis Magazine. Winter 2012.*
- *Shaw, Michael. "UC Davis signs lease for West Village project". Sacramento Business Journal. Sept. 5, 2008. Available at: http://www.bizjournals.com/sacramento/stories/2008/09/01/daily44.html*
- *"Judge dismisses UC Davis neighborhood lawsuit" Jul. 1, 2004. Available at: http://www.bizjournals.com/sacramento/stories/2004/06/28/daily33.html*
- *Coleman, Jennifer. "Universities dangle housing incentive to faculty recruits". San Mateo Daily Journal. Jan, 17, 2006.*
- Below-market rate homes for sale and student residences on UC Davis land, next to campus. Aimed at faculty, staff and students. Prompted by lack of affordable housing in Davis.
- Many green features planned: Net-zero energy community, on-site biodigester
- Funded via public-private partnership, including federal and state grant money to study zero-net energy systems
- UC Davis signed ground lease with West Village Community Partnership LLC, a joint venture of the two developers, Urban Villages of Denver and Carmel Partners of San Francisco.
- As of January 2012, 800 students, faculty, and staff live in 315 apartments. First phase; roughly one-third of planned project.
- Complex also contains 42,500 sf of commercial space, recreation center and "village square"
- Completed project will house 3,000 faculty staff and students. Future phases will include single family homes.
- **Funding**:
    - $300 million budget. Project is public-private partnership between UC Davis and the West Village Community Partnership, LLC, a joint venture of two real estate firms (Carmel Partners of San Francisco, CA & Urban Villages of Denver, CO)
    - Developer has a 65-year ground lease with the university for the project.
    - Grant funding for investigating feasibility of energy initiative from US Dept. of Energy's Community Renewable Energy Deployment program, California Public Utility Commission's California Solar Initiative, and California Energy Commission's PIER Renewable-Based Energy Secure Community program.
    - Zero net energy feasibility studies & planning: PG&E, Chevron Energy Solutions, Energy + Environmental Engineering and Davis Energy Group.
- Sued in 2004 by "West Davis Neighbors", who contended that the EIR and Long Range Development Plan were inadequate. Suit dropped.
- Similar PPPs have proven to be helpful recruitment tools for young professors for whom affordable housing is difficult to come by.

2.7 Town-gown collaborative process during university expansion: NYU/ Greenwich Village.

- *Arenson, Karen W. "With Doors Open to Neighbors, N.Y.U. Shapes Plan for Growth". New York Times. Jul. 2, 2007.*
- NYU estimated needing 6 million more sf over the next 25 years.
- Holding open houses, planning meetings with neighbors.
- Uncovered tools not previously considered, e.g. instead of expanding university footprint, scheduling rooms more efficiently, having more general use rooms, creating branch campuses elsewhere.

3 Livability, Noise, and Nuisances

Best practices research suggests, and local law enforcement confirm that education, dialogue, and a focus on prevention are much more effective at reducing conflict and are more cost-effective than imposing stricter penalties.

Corvallis is actually the source of many best practices. In particular, the Greek Liaison program was recognized nationally by other universities for its success. The Corvallis Police Department also does extensive outreach to Greek houses, athletics teams, and at OSU student orientations. Unfortunately, local enforcement capability is not keeping pace with the expansion of students into residential neighborhoods, which is becoming a new source of conflict.

3.1 University/City-sponsored mediation program: Colorado State Univ./Fort Collins, CO; Univ. of Vermont/Burlington, VT; Cal Poly/San Luis Obispo

- *About CLP – Off Campus Life. Colorado State University website. http://www.ocssral.colostate.edu/history (Accessed 11/3/11).*
- The City of Fort Collins and Colorado State Univ. jointly fund a Community Liaison position that implements programs to help town-gown relations. Since being established in 2001, the position has created programs to educate incoming students on local ordinances, dispose of unwanted furniture in a positive way, and support positive relationships between students and residents in other ways.
- *The Center for Student Ethics & Standards: University of Vermont. http://www.uvm.edu/cses/?Page=offcampus.html (Accessed 12/5/11).*
- *Duncan, Bruce and Hadwen, Brooke. "Mediation case study: From burnt bridges to good neighbors--transforming off campus neighbor relations through mediation and dialog". In Restorative Justice on the College Campus: Promoting Student Growth and Responsibility, and Reawakening the Spirit of Campus Community. David R. Karpand Thom Allena eds. Charles C. Thomas. Springfield. 2004*
- Burlington Community Support Program through police department "helps people create their own solutions to conflicts (using conciliation, mediation, or other alternative dispute resolution strategies) in ways that let them repair relationships and build community." Deals with off-campus town-gown conflicts.
- Forum for parties who otherwise would never have had direct contact.
- In this case study, conflict between residents, landlord, and student tenants had caused several police calls and citations, threats by the residents to the landlord, and ill will between the residents and students.
- During mediation, mediators communicated 1) residents' negative experience with students and past tenants, 2) the importance of taking an active role in developing a positive relationship with neighbors, and 3) their rights and responsibilities in relation to their landlord, as tenants.

- All brainstormed ways to reduce noise and improve relations. Students thought of several specific ideas to demonstrate goodwill, such as offering to shovel snow and help with yard clean-up for their neighbor.
- Result was that students were more mindful of noise at parties; on the one occasion it was a problem, the neighbor called the students directly and the problem was resolved. The students and neighbor had more contact, and there was more goodwill in general.
- Key: All parties wanted the same thing--an enjoyable living experience.

- *SLO Solutions - A free service to San Luis Obispo residents. http://www.creativemediation.net/slo-solutions/index.html (Accessed 1/23/12)*
- SLO Solutions funded by City of San Luis Obispo, Cal Poly, Cuesta College, and Creative Mediation offering mediation, conflict coaching, and training in communication and conflict resolution.
- Aimed at landlord/tenant, neighbor, and roommate conflicts.
- Services are free.

3.2 Students as ambassadors to the community: Ohio State University/Columbus, OH

- *Community Ambassador program: offcampus.osu.edu. Ohio State University. http://offcampus.osu.edu/off-campus-community/ (Accessed 11/7/11)*
- OSU students serve as resources and points of contact for fellow students in off-campus housing.
- Aimed at helping to build community among off-campus students and their neighbors
- Inform students of their rights and responsibilities, hold community events throughout the year (e.g. cook-outs, pumpkin carving)

3.3 Livability Court for noise and quality of life issues: College of Charleston/Charleston, SC **

- *City of Charleston, SC>>Municipal Court. City of Charleston website. http://www.charleston-sc.gov/dept/content.aspx?nid=703 (Accessed 12/5/11).*
- *Ferrell, Adam. "College's relationship with neighbors evolving". The Post and Courier. Feb. 12, 2004. P. B1.*
- *Hawkes, Jeff. "A cop whose beat is nothing but a nuisance". Intelligencer Journal (Lancaster, PA). Feb. 20, 2004. P.B-1.*
- City of Charleston has dedicated municipal court for livability issues. Neighbors are asked to try and resolve situations among themselves first, and if that does not work to gather and document as much evidence as possible to take to courts.
- Livability Court has two days a month reserved on court calendar.
- Mission Statement: To create a system that effectively enforces applicable ordinances to improve the livability and quality of life of all City of Charleston residents, while being fair and just to the accused and to promote an environment that is receptive to tourism and historic preservation.
- One police officer dedicated to investigating quality of life problems, and educating/charging violators.
- Program considered success by Charleston city council. "Word spreads fast when students spend the night in jail after going to Livability Court for being too loud."

3.4 Educating students on municipal codes, preventing nuisances: Univ. of Vermont/Burlington, VT

- *The Center for Student Ethics & Standards: University of Vermont.*
- *http://www.uvm.edu/cses/?Page=offcampus.html (Accessed 12/5/11)*

- *Off-Campus Living Survival Guide. Available at:*
- *http://www.uvm.edu/~stdcmrel/pdfs/offcampuslivingsurvivalguide2011.pdf*
- Off-campus Living Survival Guide created by Univ. of VT Community Coalition, made up of several university offices, plus the Burlington PD, Code Enforcement Office, City Attorney's Office, and Community & Economic Development Office.
- Addresses how to find off-campus housing, landlord-tenant information, personal safety, and local laws.
- Details commonly broken laws in plain language.
- Distributed door-to-door and in workshops for students transitioning to off-campus housing.

*3.5 Formalizing town-gown collaboration: Various Cities***

- *Rikhoff, Greg. Interview by Robin Proebsting. Jan. 24, 2012.*
- *Community Relations--Government and Community Relations. http://gcr.uoregon.edu/community-relations (Accessed Feb. 2, 2012)*
- Formalized structure for bring town and gown leaders together, regularly, led by trained mediator/facilitator (Director of Community Relations of UO). This position has no peer at most universities.
- Every other month, Community Relations Office sends out newsletter to community. Lists upcoming events (e.g. basketball games) their expected attendance, plus other potential annoyances (amplification, lights, traffic). Also lists class schedule (e.g. winter term starting). Some events called out for "significant impact" e.g. major football games. Being looped into university activities, getting advance warning of when there will be disruptions greatly helps town-gown relations.

- *TownGown World: Town and Gown University Communities. http://www.towngownworld.com/bestpractice/bestpracticeprograms.html (Accessed 11/7/11)*
- Established with mission to bring together the town, university and downtown. All work together to address issues related to cleanliness, safety, and parking.
- “In 2004, the University recognized its commitment to downtown in a formal way, becoming a founding partner of the Chapel Hill Downtown Partnership. The Partnership is made up of the Town of Chapel Hill, the University and the business and property owners. All three groups fund the Partnership and appoint members to sit on the board.
- Still young organizationally, the Partnership is beginning to see results. Cleanliness, parking and safety were three early concerns of merchants. In response, the town has upped its police presence and hired a downtown groundskeeper. The University offered one of its parking lots for a very successful valet parking service for nighttime diners. With some of the basic issues under control, the Partnership is beginning to tackle the business mix, marketing and promotions and the physical appearance of the public and private spaces.”
- Have hired consultant to create 5-8 yr development plan: http://www.downtownchapelhill.com/development-framework-action/
- *Community and Volunteering: Clark University. Clark University website. http://www.clarku.edu/community/upp/ (Accessed 11/18/11)*
- Partnership of university, local residents, businesses, and churches=>Main South Community Development Corporation (MSCDC) to revitalize neighborhood. Now University Park Partnership.

- Focuses on four major areas of urban redevelopment:
    - Housing and physical rehabilitation
    - Education
    - Economic development

    - And social and recreational activities for neighborhood residents
- Emphasis on helping "declining urban neighborhoods"

3.6 Conduct outreach to homeowners & non-student residents: Univ. of Oregon/Eugene, OR

- *Rikhoff, Greg. Interview by Robin Proebsting. Jan. 24, 2012.*
- *Community Relations--Government and Community Relations. http://gcr.uoregon.edu/community-relations (Accessed Feb. 2, 2012)*
- Office of Community Relations creates publications aimed at **both** homeowners/residents and students, explaining how to be a good neighbors, how to report off-campus student behavior incidents.
- All Community Relations publications ask for feedback & suggestions for improvement from readers
- Publications encourage homeowners/residents to welcome new student neighbors, invite them over, or exchange phone numbers; to share expectations about noise and quiet hours; and to demonstrate neighborliness.
- Hotline & Eugene PD number are included, providing channels for complaints.

3.7 Improving town-gown relations through dinner parties: Northwestern Univ./Evanston, IL

- *A Town/Gown Event for Evanston Residents and Northwestern University Students: City of Evanston. City of Evanston website. http://www.cityofevanston.org/news/2011/09/a-towngown-event-for-evanston-residents-and-northwestern-university-students/ (Accessed 11/18/11)*
- At invitation of Evanston mayor and local organization PeaceAble Cities, Evanston households host 2-3 Northwestern students on a given evening (in 2011, date was Oct. 6th)
- Resident hosts register online, organization sends the names and email addresses of students to be hosted. Hosts contact students directly and offer to help with transportation.

3.8 Hotline for neighbors and students to report off-campus problems: SUNY Albany/Albany, NY; Univ. of Oregon/Eugene, OR

- *University Students and Staff Observe 20 Years of Building Strong Relations with Albany City. State University of New York University at Albany website. http://www.albany.edu/news/12828.php (Accessed 11/7/11)*
- SUNY Albany began program in early 1990s to improve student-resident relations.
- Programs include:
    - distributing door tags with information (e.g. "Arrests & Fines for Having a Party") and brochures;
    - meetings with the state alcohol control board, local police department, DA's office, and dept. of state and student groups to combat underage drinking; and
    - the "Off-Campus Hotline" for residents and students to report behavior problems and concerns. The university, police, and appropriate city office respond as needed to calls.

- *"Tips for Campus Neighbors: Steps to address and report off-campus student behavior Fall 2011". Available at*

http://gcr.uoregon.edu/sites/all/files/gcr/uploads/steps%20to%20report%20off%20campus%20incidents_0.pdf

- UO has email "hotline", which it encourages neighbors to use, whether or not they are sure UO students are involved.
- UO offices document incidents, track patterns, and respond as frequently as possible, by contacting students, sharing university expectations for behavior, and encouraging positive behavior. UO staff also make themselves available at community meetings to discuss incidents, as well as collaborate with the Eugene PD.

3.9 Unruly Gathering Ordinance: Tucson, AZ

- *NPC Law Library: Tucson AZ Noise Ordinance. http://www.nonoise.org/lawlib/cities/tucson.htm (Accessed 11/7/11).*
- Prohibits loud gatherings of five or more people.
- Full text in section 5.5

3.10 Creating more restrictive noise ordinances: Cornell Univ./Ithaca NY

- *Horowitz, Daniel. "Noise and Its Discontents". The Cornell Daily Sun. May 5, 2010. http://cornellsun.com/node/42740 (Accessed 12/5/11).*
- Based on opinion piece, but cites statistics on noise complaints. Criticizes the City of Ithaca Noise Ordinance, which expanded the definition of the noise violation to include sounds that can be heard “25 feet or more from the source”, a Cornell student writes: "In 2004,[...] 1199 noise complaints were filed. After the passage of the [City of Ithaca Noise Ordinance], the number of complaints plunged all the way down to 1180 in 2005. By 2006, noise complaints had hit a three-year low of 1051. Unfortunately for advocates of the ordinance, however, the most recent data indicates that 1242 complaints were filed in 2008, and [in 2009] complaints reached an all-time high of 1375.

3.11 Building social capital + reducing crime using “broken window” theory: Penn/Philadelphia, PA

- *Peirce, Neil. "Community Building 101". Seattle Times. Jul. 30, 2007.*
- *University City District: Public Safety. http://www.universitycity.org/ucd_programs/public_safety (Accessed 11/7/11)*
- Penn helped repair windows, improve lighting, clean up graffiti and litter in sketchy University City neighborhood.
- Penn Safety Ambassadors patrol area; receive training in crime prevention, first aid. Help with car lock outs, homeless outreach; will walk community members to destination

3.12 Residential Rental Restriction Overlay District: Michigan State Univ./East Lansing, MI

- *FAQ. City of East Lansing website. http://www.cityofeastlansing.com/Home/Departments/PlanningDevelopment/ResidentialRentalRestrictionOverlayDistrict/FAQ/ (Accessed 11/7/11).*
- With signatures from 2/3 of neighborhood, residents can ask City Council to restrict rental licenses.
- 16 neighborhoods so far have done so.
- Properties with rental licenses grandfathered in, ones with licenses expired for 12 months lost their ability to be grandfathered in.

3.13 Community-based problem solving for nuisances: Towson University/Towson, MD

- *Ingraham, Loni. "Task force issues recommendations on co-existing with Towson college students in neighborhoods". Baltimore Sun. Aug. 2, 2011*
- *http://www.baltimoresun.com/explore/baltimorecounty/news/ph-tt-task-force-report-0803-20110801,0,5336804.story (Accessed 11/10/11).*
- Community task force developed strategies to address sources of town-gown friction, including:
    - Educating the public on how to file public nuisance complaints, and on how the police process them
    - Developing an online handbook and class curriculum for landlords explaining do's and don’ts
    - Strengthening lax code enforcement

3.14 Design that reduces conflicts between campus buildings and neighborhoods: Georgetown/Washington D.C.

- *Kleinrock, Steven and Courtenay, Roger. "Georgetown, Other Area Schools, Plan to Accommodate the Growth of Automobiles" in Cities and Cars: A Handbook of Best Practices. Kemp, Roger, ed. 2007*
- Control light pollution--smaller windows and landscaped buffer zone on sides of buildings facing public areas
- Set up agreements between university and neighbors to mitigate noise during evenings and weekends.
- Be mindful of noisy building elements during design phase, e.g. place building chillers in basement, place loading docks away from residential neighborhood.
- Make campus building massing compatible with surrounding buildings.

3.15 Charge landlords inspection fees for complaints: Michigan State Univ./East Lansing, MI

- *Frierson, Jack S. "How Are Local Governments Responding to Student Rental Problems in University Towns in the United States, Canada, and England?". The Georgia Journal of International and Comparative Law. 33. L. 497. Winter 2005*
- *Rental Housing Information. City of East Lansing website. http://www.cityofeastlansing.com/Home/Departments/CodeEnforcement/RentalHousingInformation/*
- Charge landlords separate fees for every inspection city officials make at rental properties, including investigations generated from a complaint

3.16 Charge landlords reimbursement for police calls for repeated violations: Penn State/Ferguson Township PA; Bloomsburg Univ./Bloomsburg, PA

- *Marini Davis, Laura. "Has Big Brother Moved Off-Campus? An Examination of College Communities' Responses to Unruly Student Behavior". Journal of Law & Education. Vol. 35, No. 2. April 2006. p. 153-197*
- *http://www.keystatepub.com/keystate-pdf/PA/Centre/Ferguson%20Township/Chapter%2010%20Health%20and%20Safety.pdf.*
- Police allowed to charge fee to any person violating any township ordinance or Commonwealth law for their service if it results in a conviction or plea.

- Police may also charge the owner, occupant, or lessee of the location that is the source of repeat calls for service.
- Article author contends there are grounds to challenge constitutionality
- Full text in section 5.6

- Bloomsburg, PA imposes fee after two responses by police to a private location.
- Owner of the property liable
- Fee amount decided by police chief.
- Article author contends there are grounds to challenge constitutionality
- Full text in section 5.7

- Corvallis has Special Response Fee (CMC 5.03.150), charging for each police response after having given warning. Fee is assigned to violator or violators, rather than property owners. Fee is total cost of response, including staff time and equipment.

3.17 Saving municipal court time for common student violations: Texas A&M/College Station, TX

- *Grosegbauer, Amanda. "College Station 101 brings common violations to audience attention". The Battalion Online. Mar. 1, 2010. http://www.thebatt.com/news/college-station-101-brings-common-violations-to-audience-attention-1.1187049 (Accessed. 11/10/11)*
- "College Station 101" course offered by community educates students on common violations and how to resolve them.
- Explains differences between pleas of "not guilty", "guilty", and "no contest"; how to handle tickets online or in person, saving both individuals' and court's time.
- Court offers "warrant amnesty" for minor violations, cutting down the number of arrests.
- Also sessions on noise, household/yard maintenance code enforcement. Majority of violations are traffic-related.
- Program appears to now be defunct.

3.18 Noise abatement class for off-campus students: Texas A&M/College Station, TX

- *Aggie Up! Noise Abatement Course. http://studentlifestudies.tamu.edu/sites/studentlifestudies.tamu.edu/files/results/full/145-full.pdf (Accessed 12/7/11)*
- Course developed by College Station PD and various Texas A&M offices, intended for use as a "diversion" course for first-time violators of College Station's noise/loud party ordinances.
- Study of results of class, comparing student perceptions before and after class found that students left with a better understanding of the relevant laws and their responsibilities in a neighborhood, and better understood how to host a safe party, and how to avoid legal problems.

3.19 Host Responsibilities of Parties in Residential Areas Ordinance: San Marcos, TX

- *Koch, Tyler et al. Living Among Aggies: Neighborhood Education and University Involvement. Texas A&M Student Government Association and Off-Campus Aggies.*

Available at: http://www.cstx.gov/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=3962 (Accessed 12/7/11)

- Publication intended to outline alternatives for addressing town-gown conflicts.
- College Station, TX considering using code from San Marcos, TX, assigning responsibility for loud parties on host, rather than citing all individuals named on the lease.
- Full text of San Marcos ordinance in section 5.8

4 Other Resources

Not best practices implemented by other college towns, but ideas that may be useful down the road.

4.1 Community-Based Social Marketing: Guidebook for changing Transportation Behaviors

- *Kassirer, J. & Lagarde, F. (2010). Changing transportation behaviours - A social marketing planning guide. Ottawa (Canada): Transport Canada.*

4.2 Clearinghouse of transportation behavior change links

- *Victoria Transportation Policy Institute: http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/tdm23.htm*

4.3 Ways to increase density without changing character of single-family unit neighborhoods

- Multi-unit housing designed to look like a large single family dwellings/McMansions ("big house" concept): http://www.humphreys.com/project_results.aspx?projectType=3&name=
- Accessory dwelling units http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/news/20060830A.asp

4.4 Graduated density zoning

- *Donald Shoup, APA Zoning Practice*
- Problem: Higher densities can be achieved with larger parcels, but current economic incentives discourage cooperation among land owners to assemble larger parcels
- Solution: Allow higher densities (=> higher land values) on larger parcels. Incentive to land owners becomes not to be left out
- Less conflict between land owners and new development because land owners will have cashed out and moved away.
- Appropriate tool only where the city wishes to upzone
- Article provides example from Simi Valley, CA

4.5 Factors associated with bicycle ownership and use

- *Handy, Susan et. al. "Factors associated with bicycle ownership and use: a study of six small U.S. cities". Transportation (2010) 37:967-985*
- Provides ideas for increasing bike ownership & ridership
- Data from Davis, Boulder, Eugene, Woodland, Chico & Turlock to determine what factors affect cycling. Important factors: 1) Liking to bike, 2) short distances to destinations, 3) network of off-street bike paths, 4) biking appears to be a safe activity.

4.6 Best practices for encouraging biking

- *Pucher, John and Buehler, Ralph. "Making Cycling Irresistible: Lessons from The Netherlands, Denmark and Germany". Transport Reviews, Vol. 28, No. 4, 495-528, July 2008.*
- Extensive systems of separate cycling facilities
    - Well-maintained, fully integrated paths, lanes and special bicycle streets in cities and surrounding regions
    - Fully coordinated system of colour-coded directional signs for bicyclists
    - Off-street short-cuts, such as mid-block connections and passages through dead-ends for cars
- Intersection modifications and priority traffic signals
    - Advance green lights for cyclists at most intersections
    - Advanced cyclist waiting positions (ahead of cars) fed by special bike lanes facilitate safer and quicker crossings and turns
    - Cyclist short-cuts to make right-hand turns before intersections and exemption from red traffic signals at T-intersections, thus increasing cyclist speed and safety
    - Bike paths turn into brightly coloured bike lanes when crossing intersections
    - Traffic signals are synchronized at cyclist speeds assuring consecutive green lights for cyclists (green wave)
    - Bollards with flashing lights along bike routes signal cyclists the right speed to reach the next intersection at a green light
- Traffic calming
    - Traffic calming of all residential neighbourhoods via speed limit (30 km/hr) and physical infrastructure deterrents for cars
    - Bicycle streets, narrow roads where bikes have absolute priority over cars
    - ‘Home Zones’ with 7 km/hr speed limit, where cars must yield to pedestrians and cyclists using the road
- Bike parking
    - Large supply of good bike parking throughout the city
    - Improved lighting and security of bike parking facilities often featuring guards, video-surveillance and priority parking for women
- Coordination with public transport
    - Extensive bike parking at all metro, suburban and regional train stations
    - ‘Call a Bike’ programmes: bikes can be rented by cell phone at transit stops, paid for by the minute and left at any busy intersection in the city
    - Bike rentals at most train stations
    - Deluxe bike parking garages at some train stations, with video-surveillance, special lighting, music, repair services and bike rentals
- Traffic education and training
    - Comprehensive cycling training courses for virtually all school children with test by traffic police
    - Special cycling training test tracks for children
    - Stringent training of motorists to respect pedestrians and cyclists and avoid hitting them
- Traffic laws
    - Special legal protection for children and elderly cyclists
    - Motorists assumed by law to be responsible for almost all crashes with cyclists
    - Strict enforcement of cyclist rights by police and courts

4.7 Helpful metrics for campus transportation planning

- Comparing costs of transportation between different institutions:
- *North Carolina State University Peer University Benchmarking Study: Transit, Parking, and Transportation Demand Management:*
- Transit

    - Cost Efficiency: Relationship between service inputs (labor, vehicles, fuel etc.) produce service outputs. Expressed in operating expense per vehicle hour.
    - Service effectiveness: Relationship between service outputs and service consumption. Expressed in passengers per vehicle hour.
    - Cost effectiveness: Relationship between service inputs and service consumption. Expressed via cost per passenger
    - Performance by metric tends to correlate to the ownership of the transportation system. Transit agencies have higher cost effectiveness than university operators or private contractor operators, due to economies of scale. Private contractors have the highest average service effectiveness.
- Parking
    - Parking revenue as a percentage of operating expense
    - Parking employee salaries as a percentage of operating expense
    - Ratio of university affiliate (students and employees) to university-managed parking spaces
    - Number of permits sold per available parking space
    - Number of permitted parking spaces for which each enforcement employee is responsible
- Comparing costs across modes:
- *University of Colorado TDM program:*
    - Marginal cost of accommodating one additional person through providing a parking space (debt service on parking lot/structure), versus shifting one person's travel to transit, walking, bicycling, or ridesharing

4.8 Market-based pricing for parking/Donald Shoup

- *Shoup, Donald. "Parking on a smart campus". In: California Policy Options. Daniel Mitchell (ed.), Los Angeles" UCLA School of Public Affairs, 2005, pp. 117-149.*

4.9 Online Public Participation models for Collaboration

- There are several products on the market to solicit public input, while avoiding the problems that typically come up at community meetings (conversation that is dominated by the loudest voices, participation limited to those who can physically be at the meeting). **Actively managed online forums** have the potential to get broader, better quality feedback.
- Two examples:
    - **www.mindmixer.com** Used by Fullerton, CA http://www.collegetownfullerton.com/
    - **www.peakdemocracy.com** Used by Ashland, OR http://www.ashland.or.us/Page.asp?NavID=13461

4.10 Example University/City MOU: Cornell University and the City of Ithaca

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN
THE CITY OF ITHACA AND CORNELL UNIVERSITY

October 5, 1995*
Amended October ____, 2003**

University/Community Research Working Document

PREAMBLE

This Memorandum of Understanding is entered into by the parties in mutual recognition that their futures are inextricably entwined. Cornell University and the community that now comprises the City of Ithaca have had a deep and on-going relationship for more than 130 years. Each depends upon and draws upon the strength of the other. The City and its neighboring municipal jurisdictions have provided a physical and social environment in which the University has flourished; the University, in turn, has been a principal economic and cultural force in the community.

As is true with many long-term relationships, the intensity and quality of the interaction between the City and the University have varied over time. Both parties have faced, and continue to face, significant fiscal and regulatory pressures from the outside, particularly from the state and federal governments. Both parties are similarly affected by changes in the local economy and beyond. These pressures make it all the more important that both parties understand and accommodate their respective interests in furtherance of the common good of the entire community.

This Memorandum of Understanding represents a determination on the part of the City and the University to pursue this objective and to build upon previous and existing agreements in a spirit of partnership, friendship and cooperation. It reflects our conviction that cultivating this spirit is essential for a productive and mutually supportive future.

The City of Ithaca recognizes that Cornell's ability to succeed as a leading national research university is essential for the long-term economic and social health of the City and its residents. Without question, the presence of Cornell enhances in many ways the quality of life in the City and in all of Tompkins County. Cornell faculty, students, and staff provide thousands of hours of voluntary services each year to various community and social service agencies in the City. As the largest employer in the City of Ithaca and in the county, Cornell's students, faculty, and staff contribute to the area's economic vitality; their local expenditures constitute a significant share of the sales tax revenue generated in the City and in Tompkins County, and the thousands of visitors attracted to our local community by virtue of the presence of the University make a like contribution. The capital construction and renovation programs of the University similarly play a major role in the enhancement of the local economy, with the prospect of tens of millions of dollars being spent locally over the next decade. The civic life of the community also has been enhanced through the participation of many University faculty and staff on City boards and commissions, and indeed on Common Council, as well as through the provision of continuing ad hoc advice and consultative services to this and other municipalities.

Cornell recognizes that its presence also creates demands in the community for municipal services, particularly in the area of fire protection. The City's police and fire services, its well-maintained streets and bridges, its many youth and recreational programs, its affordable housing initiatives, its extensive park system, and its attractive neighborhoods and civic centers all help to provide the healthy surrounding community environment necessary for Cornell's well-being. Cornell was among the first universities in the nation to make voluntary payments to its local municipality in support of public services, and it remains committed to doing so within the availability of its financial resources.

OBJECTIVES

In furtherance of the partnership desired by the City and the University, both parties agree to pursue the following objectives:

1. A stable local governmental and economic environment that contributes to Cornell's ability to succeed as a leading national research university and to the City's ability to provide a high-quality physical, educational, social, and cultural environment.

2. A common understanding that the University is a dynamic and vibrant institution, whose instructional, research, and outreach missions will invariably change over time, requiring appropriate adjustments in the physical and operational characteristics of the campus.

3. A mutual recognition that restrictions on the University's ability to make appropriate adjustments in the physical and operational characteristics of the campus will inevitably place significant limits on the University's capacity to compete effectively in the national and international higher education marketplace and to provide economic, cultural, and financial support to the surrounding community.

4. A governmental environment that supports intelligent economic development initiatives, not only in the City but throughout Tompkins County, with the goal of encouraging the growth and diversity of local business and industry, thereby stimulating the expansion of local job opportunities and the sales and real estate tax bases.

5. A high-quality educational, cultural and social environment that seeks to meet the legitimate needs of the entire community, particularly its children and youth, and that constitutes an indispensable ingredient for the successful recruitment and retention of the University's faculty and staff.

6. A safe and secure community in which municipal fire and police services complement and support related activities already provided by the University itself and in which members of the University community respect the rights and legitimate expectations of their neighbors.

7. The continued development of carefully coordinated joint planning between the University and surrounding units of local government, typified by the nationally-recognized public transit activities that resulted from such endeavors in the recent past.

8. Recognition that the University's most important asset is intellectual, and that the application of faculty, student, and staff expertise to the resolution of municipal and community problems constitutes contributions of significant value.

UNDERTAKINGS

To secure these objectives, the City of Ithaca and Cornell University agree to the following provisions, both singly and jointly as the case may be:

1. The City of Ithaca and Cornell University pledge to conduct their affairs in a spirit of mutual recognition and support.

2. Not later than July 15, 1996, the University and the City will jointly appoint a Cornell-City of Ithaca permanent working group, comprising three executive officers of the University and the Mayor and two members of the City of Ithaca Common Council. Depending upon the particular issue, the working group may invite the head(s) of those operational units of the University and/or the City whom the working group determines appropriate.

a. The permanent working group will meet on a regular basis, and at least quarterly, with the goal of analyzing issues of common concern and making specific proposals for consideration by the respective decision-making bodies of the City and the University.

b. The subject matter for consideration by the permanent working group will include, but not be limited to, the provision of municipal fire and police services, public transit opportunities, the availability of affordable housing and its relationship to the presence of on-campus housing, the role of University community service programs, the availability of University facilities and programs to members of the public, the respective roles of the City and the University in the regulation of traffic and parking and in the maintenance and renovation of the surrounding infrastructure, and matters of common concern affecting zoning, land use, and the environment.

3. While Cornell University neither seeks nor expects any preferential treatment, it is mutually understood that the University is clearly entitled to be treated equitably in all its dealings with the City of Ithaca throughout the duration of this Memorandum of Understanding. Consequently, the City of Ithaca pledges its determination to review University applications for building permits and other municipal authorizations in a professional, expeditious, and cost-conscious manner consistent with applicable federal, state, and local law, and in a manner consistent with the mutual objectives delineated in this Memorandum of Understanding. In the event and to the extent the City of Ithaca takes any action or imposes any fee that, in Cornell University's sole judgment, is contrary to this paragraph 3 of this Memorandum of Understanding or subjects Cornell to inequitable financial burdens or arbitrary or discriminatory treatment, then Cornell University may reduce its forthcoming annual payments to the City of Ithaca by the amount Cornell has incurred in response to such action or fee. Before reducing its voluntary payments, however, Cornell University will provide the City of Ithaca 45 days notice of the amount it intends to reduce and the reasons therefore, so that University and City representatives will have sufficient opportunity to discuss such concerns during the "working group" sessions as provided in paragraph 2 of this Memorandum of Understanding.

4. The University agrees to continue its present commitment to exercise its purchasing power, to the extent practicable, to support the local economy.

5. The University will encourage and facilitate opportunities for members of its student body, faculty and staff to offer their voluntary and professional services to the City to the fullest extent possible.

6. The City of Ithaca acknowledges that in making voluntary monetary, material, and in-kind contributions to local municipalities, school districts, and community organizations, Cornell University neither intends to waive its tax-exempt status afforded by the laws of the State of New York nor to enter into a contractual arrangement for payments in lieu of taxes. The City further agrees that during the life of this Memorandum of Understanding it will take no step to seek a change in that status of the University, whether through judicial, legislative, or other means. The University acknowledges that nothing in this Memorandum of Understanding modifies the obligations of the City pursuant to federal, state, and local law.

7. The University pledges to continue its long-standing commitment to provide voluntary financial contributions to the City of Ithaca and agrees to support fire protection and other municipal services during the life of this Memorandum of Understanding according to the following schedule:

Year	Payments ($000)		
	Fire Services	Other Municipal Services	Total
1995-96	225	25	250
1996-97	250	50	300
1997-98	275	75	350
1998-99	300	100	400
1999-00	325	125	450

2000-01	375	175	550
2001-02	400	200	600
2002-03	425	225	650
2003-04	450	250	700
2004-05	475	275	750 1,000
2005-06	550	350	900 1,050
2006-07	575	375	950 1,075
2007-08	600	400	1,000 1,100
2008-09			*
2009-10			*
2010-11			*
2011-12			*
2012-13			*
2013-14			*
2014-15			*
2015-16			*
2016-17			*
2017-18			*
2018-19			*
2019-20			*
2020-21			*
2021-22			*
2022-23			*
2023-24			*

*Increased annually based upon Consumer Price Index (the United States Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index-
All U.S. Cities).

a. In addition to the above schedule of voluntary contributions, Cornell University is committed to providing the special additional sums of $250,000 in FY 2004-05, $150,000 in FY 2005-06, and $75,000 in FY 2006-07, in recognition and support of the City's economic development efforts during this same three year period, including but not limited to the following activities: the continuation of the City's current citywide retention and recruitment visitation program; continued technical and other liaison support to businesses requesting City assistance; continued participation in the Cornell University Office for Economic Development planning meetings; continued efforts to further develop the commercial centers of the City; and a continuation of the support provided for the Ithaca Downtown Partnership and Tompkins County Area Development. If the amount of funds devoted to the City's economic development activities, which this special additional contribution is intended to support, are reduced during this three year period, then the amount of the additional sums referenced above will be reduced by the same dollar amount.

b. In each calendar year, beginning with 1996, the University's contribution pursuant to this schedule shall be made not later than July 15.

c. In each calendar year, beginning with 1996, the City will report to the University by February 15 on the manner in which it has expended the University's contribution in the prior calendar year and the purposes for which it intends to expend such contribution in the current calendar year.

d. These voluntary contributions constitute the total voluntary financial obligation of the University to the City of Ithaca during the period of this Memorandum of Understanding.

8. This Memorandum of Understanding shall take effect immediately upon authorized approval of the respective governing bodies and shall remain in effect through June 30, 2024. Recognizing that the composition of their respective governing bodies (the City of Ithaca Common Council and the Cornell University Board of Trustees) will inevitably change over time, the parties pledge the good faith efforts of their institutions to secure the attainment of these provisions throughout the life of the Memorandum of Understanding. This Memorandum of Understanding is subject to cancellation upon written notice (with stated reasons) not less than six months prior to the start of the calendar year in which the proposed voluntary contribution is to be made.

SIGNATURE

In witness hereof, we have affixed our signatures on this day of , 2003.

Alan J. Cohen	Jeffrey S. Lehman
Mayor	President
City of Ithaca	Cornell University

5 Code Examples

5.1 Current City of Corvallis codes pertaining to nuisances:

Special Response, Chapter 5.03.150
1) When a police officer determines that one or more persons are engaged in an activity or conduct which violates the provisions of the Corvallis Criminal Code [Municipal Code Chapter 5.03] or the Criminal Code of Oregon, the police shall give written notice to one or more of the persons who are engaged in, or who are in control of, such activity or conduct that the activity or conduct must immediately cease.
2) Notice recipients shall be liable for a special response fee if a subsequent police response arising out of the activity or conduct is required within thirty (30) days following such notice. A special response fee will be charged to each person identified in subsection 5.03.150.020 of this Section. Separate fees shall be charged for each subsequent police response. The special response fee is defined as the total cost incurred by the City in connection with such response, including but not limited to, police officers, equipment, dispatch and supervisor time.

Section 5.03.150.020 Liability imposed.
1)Each person responsible for, or engaged in, activity or conduct requiring a subsequent police response as defined in subsection 5.03.150.010 of this Section shall be held jointly and severally liable for payment of the costs included in the special response fee. If any person responsible for, or engaged in, the activity or conduct is a minor, the minor's parent(s) or guardian(s) shall also be liable for such fee.

Loud Noise, Chapter 5.03.030.010
No person shall make, assist in making, continue, or cause to be made any unreasonably loud, disturbing, or unnecessary noise [...]

5.03.030.020.10 Sound communication devices, as follows:
Playing, using, or operating any radio, musical instrument, phonograph, television set, tape recorder, loud speaker, or other machine or device for the producing, reproducing, or amplification of sound in such a manner as to be plainly audible: within any dwelling unit which is not the source of the sound, between the hours of 10:00pm and 7:00am; or at a distance of 50 feet from the sources of the sound.
As used in this Section, "plainly audible" means any sound for which the information content of that sound id unambiguously communicated to the listener, such as, but not limited to, understandable spoken speech, comprehension of whether a voice is raised or normal, or comprehensible musical rhythm or vocal sounds.
This section does not prohibit the reasonable use of mechanical loud speakers or sound amplifiers in the course of public events for which a permit has been issued in accordance with Section 5.03.030.030.

Chronic Nuisance Property, Chapter 5.07
Definitions.
1) “Abate” means affirmative actions to remove, to stop, to prevent a nuisance including but not limited to:
a) Restricting or limiting noise, loitering, parking or access to the property, including posting the property with signs indicating such restrictions;
b) Closing the property for not less than ten days or more than six months; or
c) Entering premises for purposes of removing, compelling the removal or destruction of the structure, thing, substance, condition or property constituting a nuisance.
2) “Chronic nuisance property” means:

a) Property upon which the owner permits three or more separate incidents listed below to occur within any thirty-day period, or five or more separate incidents listed below within any ninety-day period, at least one of which separate incidents must have resulted in a citation or arrest;
b) Property, the use of which has a causal relation to three or more separate incidents listed below occurring within any thirty-day period, or five or more separate incidents listed below within any ninety-day period, at least one of which separate incidents must have resulted in a citation or arrest, and all of which occurred within one hundred feet of the boundary line of the subject property;
c) Any combination of separate incidents as specified in Section 5.07.030 2)a) or 2)b) which amounts to three or more separate incidents listed below occurring within any thirty-day period or five or more separate incidents listed below within any ninety-day period, at least one of which separate incidents must have resulted in a citation or arrest; or
d) For the purposes of 5.07.030 2), the following offenses shall constitute incidents which would support a finding of chronic nuisance property:
1] Disorderly conduct as defined in ORS 166.025 or CMC 5.03.080.020 and/or 5.03.080.050;
2]Discharge of a firearm in violation of ORS 166.220 or CMC 5.03.120.030;
3] Noise disturbance as defined in CMC 5.03.030.010 and 5.03.030.020;
4] Minor in possession of alcohol as defined in ORS 471.430 or CMC 5.03.040.010.03;
5]Public indecency as defined in ORS 163.465 or CMC 5.03.080.060;
6] Criminal mischief as defined in ORS 164.345 through ORS 164.365 or CMC 5.03.090.030;
7] Prostitution or related offenses as defined in ORS 167.007 through ORS 167.017;
8] Illegal gambling as defined in ORS 167.117 or ORS 167.122 through ORS 167.127;
9] Alcoholic liquor violations as defined in ORS Chapter 471.105 through 471.482 or CMC 5.03.040.010.02, 5.03.040.010.04, 5.03.040.010.08, and 5.03.040.010.10.
10] Possession, manufacture, or delivery of a controlled substance or related offenses as defined in ORS 167.203, ORS 475.005 through 475.285, or ORS 475.940 through 475.995;
11] Endangering the welfare of a minor as defined in ORS 163.575;
12] Harassment as defined in ORS 166.065 or CMC 5.03.080.030;
13] Assault as defined in ORS 163.160 through 163.185 or CMC 5.03.060.020;
14] Public consumption of alcohol as defined in CMC 5.03.040.010.06;
15] Offensive littering as defined in ORS 164.805 or CMC 5.03.110.010;
16] Menacing as defined in ORS 163.190, 166.155, and 166.165;
17] Reckless endangering as defined in ORS 163.195;
18] Begging as defined in CMC 5.03.080.150;
19] Public urination as defined in CMC 5.03.080.040;
20] Indecent exposure as defined in CMC 5.03.080.070;
21] Parking on lawns as defined in CMC 6.10.040.040.06;
22] Animal abuse, neglect, abandonment, or fighting, or dog fighting as defined in ORS 167.315 through 167.330, 167.340, 167.355, 167.365 or CMC 5.03.050.040.08 and 5.03.050.040.09; or
23] Animal noise as defined in CMC 5.03.050.020.05.

Minor in Possession of Alcohol (MIP) 5.03.040.010.03
2) No person under the age of 21 years shall attempt to purchase, purchase or acquire alcoholic liquor. Except when such minor is in a private residence accompanied by the parent or guardian of the minor and with such parent's or guardian's consent, no person under the age of 21 years shall have personal possession of alcoholic liquor.

Open Container/Consumption of Alcohol in Public
5.03.040.010.06 Consumption of alcoholic liquor, possession of open container of alcoholic liquor in public places prohibited.
1) Except as otherwise allowed by law, no person shall drink or consume any alcoholic liquor, or possess any open container of alcoholic liquor while in or upon any street, alley, public grounds, building, or place open and available to the general public, or while in a motor vehicle on premises open to the public.

5.2 City of Berkeley Car-Free Overlay Zone

Section _____.080 Parking -- Number of Spaces

A. The following provisions shall apply to properties within the R-S District:

1. No Off-street Parking Spaces shall be required for new Dwelling Units or Group Living Accommodation rooms, for the properties within the Car-Free overlay shown in the map titled "Southside Subareas Proposed Zoning".

For properties not included in the Car-Free Overlay, off street parking requirements shall be determined by the parking requirements of Section 23.D.40 (R-4).

B. Bicycle parking spaces shall be provided at the ratio of one (1) space per two thousand (2,000) square feet of gross floor area of commercial space, and in accordance with the requirements of Section 23E.28.070.

Occupants of residential projects within the Car Fee Overlay constructed after the effective date of this ordinance amendment shall not be entitled to receive parking permits under the Residential Permit Parking Program (RPP), under Section 14.08 of the BMC (Ordinance #5803 and #5908.

Any construction which results in the creation of ten thousand (10,000) square feet of new or additional commercial gross floor space shall satisfy the loading space requirements of Chapter 23E.32, except for the area covered by Section 23E.56.080.A and the following requirements:

a. Off-street loading spaces at the ratio of one (1) space for the first ten thousand (10,000) square feet of gross floor area of commercial space;

b. Off-street loading spaces at the ratio of one (1) space for each additional forty thousand (40,000) square feet of gross floor area of commercial space above the first ten thousand (10,000) square feet.

C. Residential buildings shall be allowed to remove parking spaces if found necessary by the Building Official to perform mandatory seismic strengthening.

5.3 Gainesville, FL Residential Parking Code

Section 30-56 (c)

(4) Off-street parking regulations in the context area and in any residential parking overlay district. The regulations and provisions of this section apply to any property that is in an RC, RSF-1, RSF-2, RSF-3, or RSF-4 zoning district, or that contains single family or two-family dwellings on property zoned planned development (PD), and is located within either the context area or a residential parking overlay district area as provided in section 30-56.1 of this Code. In these areas, off street parking shall be limited to the driveway parking area meeting the dimensional requirements below and leading from the permitted driveway connection to the enclosed parking space (garage or carport), plus two pullout spaces as described below. If there is no garage or carport, the driveway parking area must meet the dimensional requirements below and be able to provide parking and ingress or egress of vehicles.

a. The maximum width of the driveway parking area is the greater of 18 feet or the maximum width of the enclosed parking space.

b. Pullout spaces can be no more than nine feet wide and 16 feet long; must be covered with pavement, gravel, wood chips, bark mulch, or other erosion-preventing material clearly defining the pullout spaces; and must be contiguous to the driveway parking area.

c. Notwithstanding subsections a. and b., no more than 40 percent of front open space may be devoted to driveway parking area and pullout spaces.

d. Circular driveway parking areas meeting the above dimensional requirements are permitted provided the necessary driveway connections are provided; however only one pullout space is allowed with a circular driveway parking area.

e. Access to all driveway parking areas must be from an approved or existing legal driveway connection.

f. All unpaved driveway parking areas and pullout spaces must be covered with gravel, wood chips, bark mulch, or other erosion-preventing material clearly defining the driveway parking area, and have side borders of plants, pressure treated landscape timbers, railroad ties, pressure treated wood, composite "plastic wood", brick, concrete or similar border materials.

5.4 Fort Collins "3-Unrelated" Ordinance

What does the ordinance say?

The City of Fort Collins Land Use Code stipulates that any dwelling unit, renter- and owner-occupied alike, cannot be occupied by more than one family. There are three distinct types of "families" that are defined in the Code that are legally permitted to live in one dwelling as a single housekeeping unit. These are:

1. Any number of persons related biologically or through marriage, adoption, guardianship, legal custody, etc.

2. Any unrelated group of not more than 2 adults and their (biological or otherwise related as noted above) children.

3. Any unrelated group of not more than three persons.

This means that in most cases, if a rental dwelling unit is occupied by more than three persons, they MUST ALL be related to each other. Conversely, if they are not all related to each other, then such occupancy would be considered to be a zoning violation. The exception to this rule applies ONLY to owner-occupied dwelling units. City Code allows an owner-occupant who is a member of either of the three types of "legal families" defined above to rent rooms to two additional people, provided the owner obtains a Fort Collins "Home Occupation License" from the City Building & Zoning Department. Such licenses cost $10 and are valid for two years. Additionally, to qualify for the license, one off-street parking space must be provided for each additional person and any bedroom for that use must have an approved emergency escape window.

How are violations of the code enforced?

Violations of the code are enforced on a complaint basis and treated as being "non-observable" by City staff. This means that enforcement personnel cannot readily ascertain a violation or reasonable suspicion of a violation from a visual check of the property from the public street or

sidewalk. In order to pursue a violation successfully, the City must rely on neighbors, who can observe the property on a continuous and regular basis or who have had conversations with the tenants and are willing to complete a "zoning investigation form". This form can help provide City staff with a reasonable suspicion that a violation may indeed exist as well as a neighborhood resource who can provide additional information to aid in the investigation if necessary. Once the complaint has been received, the City will mail a notice of the alleged violation to the property owner, providing the owner with a 30-day compliance deadline to correct any "family" violation that may exist. Additionally, when there is reasonable suspicion of a violation, a staff person will visit the dwelling unit in question and attempt to interview one or more of the tenants. Examples of reasonable suspicion may be a log listing vehicles believed associated with the property over a 30 day period, a conversation between a neighbor and a tenant, or names listed on the outside of a mailbox. These names should be able to be seen from the public sidewalk or adjacent property. The City does not encourage or condone the use of trespass or other measures deemed illegal or harassing as a way of obtaining evidence to support a citizen complaint. For more information regarding enforcement of the ordinance or to obtain a "zoning investigation form", stop by the City's Zoning Department at 281 N. College Avenue or call 970-416-2745.

Enforcement outcomes.
It is important that the complainants understand what the outcomes of enforcement actions can be and what is necessary for successful enforcement. Once the City initiates action, one of the three following outcomes will result:

1. The owner admits to the violation and voluntarily corrects the problem either by the compliance date or by the date of an extension that is generally agreed upon between the City, the complainant, and the property owner; or

2. The owner denies that a violation exists; or

3. The owner or tenants admit to the violation but do not correct the violation by the deadline.

If the owner voluntarily corrects the situation, then no fines are assessed. If the owner denies that a violation exists, then it becomes necessary for the City to prove in the Municipal Court, beyond a reasonable doubt, that a violation does exist. Without an admission of guilt by a tenant or by the owner, such proof can be difficult to obtain, and successful enforcement may not result. If the owner or tenants have admitted to a violation but have ignored the deadline, then City staff will issue a Municipal Court summons. Since an admission of guilt has already been obtained, no additional evidence should be required. In such instances, and in instances where a trial results in a conviction, the OWller and/or tenants will be assessed a monetary [me and will be directed by the Court to correct the violation in order to avoid additional fines.

Enforcement statistics.
The following information is obtained from the Zoning Department's complaint data base and covers from January 1, 1997 to December 31, 2002:

- The City took formal action (meaning written, corrective notices sent) on a total of 766 zoning complaints. 60 of these actions were for more than 3 unrelated.

- The 60 complaints for more than 3 unrelated represents 7.8% of the total zoning complaints acted on during the time period, and amounts to about 10 actions per year.

- 7 of the 60 complaints (12%) resulted in court action. 6 of the 7 resulted in a fine and a mandate to correct the situation in order to avoid additional fines (They were all subsequently brought into compliance). The remaining 1 court action case was dismissed at the request of the homeowners association.

The other 53 complaints (88%) were resolved without the need for court action. (Some of these were
found to have been in compliance all along and the others voluntarily came into compliance). Mediation was involved in 2 of the 53 cases as a means of achieving a resolution.

FORT COLLINS MUNICIPAL CODE
5.1.2 Definitions.

Dwelling, multi-family shall mean a dwelling containing three (3) or more dwelling units, not including hotels, motels, fraternity houses and sorority houses and similar group accommodations.

Dwelling, single-family shall mean a dwelling containing no more than one (1) dwelling unit.

Dwelling, single-family attached shall mean a single-family dwelling attached to one (1) or more dwellings or buildings, with each dwelling located on its own separate lot.

Dwelling, single-family detached shall mean a single-family dwelling which is not attached to any other dwelling or building by any means, including mobile homes and manufactured housing situated on a permanent foundation.

Dwelling, two-family shall mean a dwelling containing two (2) dwelling units.

Dwelling unit shall mean one (1) or more rooms and a single kitchen and at least one (1) bathroom, designed, occupied or intended for occupancy as separate quarters for the exclusive use of a single family for living, cooking and sanitary purposes, located in a single-family, two-family or multi-family dwelling or mixed-use building.

Family shall mean an individual living alone, or either of the following groups living together as a single housekeeping unit and sharing common living, sleeping, cooking and eating facilities:
(1) any number of persons related by blood, marriage, adoption, guardianship or other duly authorized custodial relationship unless such number is otherwise specifically limited in this land Use Code; or
(2) any unrelated group of persons consisting of: a. not more than three (3) persons; or
b. not more than two (2) unrelated adults and their related children, if any.

5.5 Tucson Unruly Gathering Ordinance

NOISE ORDINANCE
ADOPTED BY THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL 5-6-96

ORDINANCE NO. 8683
RELATING TO CIVIL INFRACTIONS AND NUISANCES; ADDING NEW ARTICLE VIII TO CHAPTER 11 OF THE TUCSON CODE; MAKING IT A CIVIL INFRACTION TO CONDUCT LOUD OR UNRULY PARTIES, GATHERINGS, OR OTHER EVENTS RESULTING IN MULTIPLE POLICE RESPONSES; IMPOSING PENALTIES.

WHEREAS, due to inadequate supervision, some large gatherings of people, such as parties, frequently become loud and unruly to the point that they constitute a threat to the peace, health, safety, or general welfare of the public as a result of conduct such as one or more of the following: excessive noise, excessive traffic, obstruction of public streets by

crowds who have spilled over into public streets, public drunkenness, the service of alcohol to minors, fights, disturbances of the peace, and litter;

WHEREAS, the City of Tucson is required to make multiple responses to such unruly gatherings in order to restore and maintain the peace and protect public safety. Such gatherings are a burden on scarce city resources and can result in police responses to regular and emergency calls being delayed and police protection to the rest of the city being reduced, and;

WHEREAS, in order to discourage the occurrence of repeated loud and unruly gatherings, the persons responsible for the public nuisance created by these gatherings should be penalized.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL OF TUCSON, ARIZONA, AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The Tucson Code, Chapter 11, is hereby amended by adding new Article VIII to read as follows:

ARTICLE VIII. LOUD OR UNRULY GATHERINGS

Sec. 11-140. Loud or unruly gatherings-public nuisance.

It shall be a public nuisance to conduct a gathering of five (5) or more persons on any private property in a manner which constitutes a substantial disturbance of the quiet enjoyment of private or public property in a significant segment of a neighborhood, as a result of conduct constituting a violation of law.
Illustrative of such unlawful conduct is excessive noise or traffic, obstruction of public streets by crowds or vehicles, public drunkenness, the service of alcohol to minors, fights, disturbances of the peace, and litter.
A gathering constituting a public nuisance may be abated by all reasonable means including, but not limited to, an order requiring the gathering to be disbanded and citation and/or arrest of any law violators under any applicable ordinances and state statutes.

Sec. 11-141. Notice of unruly gathering-posting; mailing.

1. When the police department intervenes at a gathering which constitutes a nuisance under this ordinance, the premises at which such nuisance occurred shall be posted with a notice stating that the intervention of the police has been necessitated as a result of a public nuisance under this ordinance caused by an event at the premises, the date of the police intervention, and that any subsequent event within a sixty (60) day period therefrom on the same premises, which necessitates police intervention, shall result in the joint and several liability of any guests causing the public nuisance, or any persons who own or are residents of the property at which the public nuisance occurred, or who sponsored the event constituting the public nuisance as more fully set forth below.

2. The residents of such property shall be responsible for ensuring that such notice is not removed or defaced and it shall be a civil infraction carrying a penalty of a minimum, mandatory one hundred dollar ($100.00) fine in addition to any other penalties which may be due under this section if such notice is removed or defaced, provided however, that the residents of the premises or sponsor of the event, if present, shall be consulted as to the location in which such notice is posted in order to achieve both the security of the notice and its prominent display.

Sec. 11-142. Mailing of notice to property owner.

Notice of the intervention shall also be mailed to any property owner at the address shown on the Pima County property tax assessment records and shall advise the property owner that any subsequent such intervention within sixty (60) days on the same premises shall result in liability of the property owner for all penalties associated with such intervention as more particularly set forth below.

Sec. 11-143. Persons liable for a subsequent response to a gathering constituting a public nuisance.

If the police department is required to respond to a gathering constituting a public nuisance on the same premises more than once in any sixty (60) day period, the following persons shall be jointly and severally liable for civil fines as set forth below:

1. The person or persons who own the property where the gathering constituting the public nuisance took place, provided that notice has been mailed to the owner of the property as set forth herein and the gathering occurs at least two weeks after the mailing of such notice.
2. The person or persons residing on or otherwise in control of the property where such gathering took place.
3. The person or persons who organized or sponsored such gathering.
4. All persons attending such gathering who engage in any activity resulting in the public nuisance.
5. Nothing in this section shall be construed to impose liability on the resident or owners of the premises or sponsor of the gathering, for the conduct of persons who are present without the express or implied consent of the resident or sponsor, as long as the resident and sponsor have taken all steps reasonably necessary to exclude such uninvited participants from the premises, including landlords who are actively attempting to evict a tenant from the premises.
   Where an invited guest engages in conduct which the sponsor or resident could not reasonably foresee and the conduct is an isolated instance of a guest at the event violating the law which the sponsor is unable to reasonably control without the intervention of the police, the unlawful conduct of the individual guest shall not be attributable to the sponsor or resident for the purposes of determining whether the event constitutes a public nuisance under this section.

Sec. 11-144. Violation a Civil Infraction.

It shall be a civil infraction punishable as set forth herein when intervention at the same location to abate a gathering constituting a public nuisance occurs within a sixty (60) day period after the property was posted in accordance with Section 11-141.

1. For the first such intervention in a sixty (60) day period the fine shall be a minimum mandatory five hundred dollars ($500.00);
2. For the second such intervention in a sixty (60) day period the fine shall be a minimum mandatory one thousand dollars ($1,000.00);
3. For any further such responses in a sixty (60) day period the fine shall be a minimum mandatory one thousand five hundred dollars ($1,500.00) for each such further response;
4. The penalties that are provided herein shall be in addition to any other penalties imposed by law for particular violations of law committed during the course of an event which is a public nuisance under this ordinance; and
5. The court may also enter an order of abatement against a party found responsible for a violation of this Article pursuant to Chapter 8 of the Tucson Code.

Sec. 11-145. **Enforcement**.

The police department is authorized to enforce the provisions of the ordinance only in response to a complaint from a member of the public. However, this provision shall not be interpreted to necessarily require the appearance of the complaining member of the public in court before a violator may be found responsible.

SECTION 2section 2. If any provision of this ordinance, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is declared invalid, that invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of this ordinance which can be given effect without the invalid provisions or application, and to this end the provisions of this ordinance are severable.

SECTION 3. The various officers and employees are authorized and directed to perform all acts necessary or desirable to give effect to this ordinance.

SECTION 4. WHEREAS, it is necessary for the preservation of the peace, health and safety of the City of Tucson that this ordinance become immediately effective, an emergency is hereby declared to exist, and this ordinance shall become effective immediately upon its passage and adoption.

The following is the text of notices used to post information about violations or possible violations.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC NUISANCE

PURSUANT TO TUCSON CODE, "#Sec. 11-140">SEC. 11-140, AS A
RESULT OF A PRIOR DISTURBANCE AT THESE PREMISES,

THE NEXT DISTURBANCE WILL RESULT IN CIVIL PENALTIES IMPOSED UPON ALL PARTICIPANTS AND SPONSORS OF THE EVENT, AND ALL PROPERTY OWNERS OF THE PREMISES.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT, pursuant to Tucson Code Sec. 11-140 on (blank) , 199 , at (blank) a.m./p.m., the Tucson Police Department found that a public nuisance caused by a disturbance of the public peace and/or threat to public safety occurred at the premises located at _____ .
If there is a subsequent event on these premises which constitutes such a public nuisance and necessitates the intervention of the Police Department on or before _____, (count 60 days from date of first police intervention) every participant in and sponsor of such event, and the owner of the premises, shall be jointly and severally liable for the civil penalties connected with this response as set forth in the Tucson Code, Chapter 11, Article VIII.

(Signature of Officer issuing notice)

(Name of Officer)

(Date posted)

5.6 Ferguson Township Police Reimbursement Ordinance

Reimbursement for Unnecessary Non-Routine Police Services
§10-501. Definitions.
As used in this Part, the following terms shall have the meanings indicated unless a different meaning clearly appears from the context:
Actor - a person violating any ordinance of the Township of Ferguson and/or any laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and/or those laws, rules and regulations designated as the Pennsylvania Crimes Code Pa.C.S.A., Title 18, and Title 35, Chapter 6, in their entirety.
Request for response - any communication to the Township of Ferguson or County 911 Dispatch Center or to the police or other entity, indicating the possibility or existence of the occurrence of a crime or other emergency situation warranting immediate action by the police.
Requestor - any person, tenant, resident, business organization, non-profit organization, charitable institution, agent, servant, or employee who makes a request for response.
Response - any request for response which causes the Township of Ferguson Police Department to utilize its communications systems, motor vehicles and/or personnel to arrive at any place designated by the requestor.
(*Ord. 794*, 6/3/2002, §2)
§10-502. Imposition of Costs and Expenses - Fees.
1. Any requestor who makes a request for response which causes a response and subsequently results in the withdrawing of charges initiated as a result of the response or any requestor who unreasonably makes multiple requests for response may be charged the cost of the response(s) as set forth in §10-503 of this Part.
2. If it is determined that any actor has violated any ordinance of the Township of Ferguson or any law of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, said actor may be

charged the cost of the response as provided at §10-503 of this Part. A determination that an actor has violated any Township ordinance or any State law shall be established upon proof of any of the following:

A. An adjudication of guilty after a bench trial before any judge of the Court of Common Pleas of Centre County.

B. An adjudication of guilty by any Centre County District Justice.

C. A conviction by a jury after trial.

D. An actor's guilty plea.

E. An actor's plea of nolo contendre.

F. An actor's plea of no contest.

G. An actor's agreement to a disposition without verdict such as probation without verdict.

H. An adjudication, determination, or consent agreement regarding a juvenile under the Pennsylvania Juvenile Act.

3. A person who is responsible for a response to an incident of a summary nature may be issued a warning and advised of the consequences for additional responses. If an additional response or responses for additional violation(s) within a 90-day period are required, then the person or persons responsible may be subject to reimbursement fees for not only the subsequent response(s) but also for the initial response.

4. In the case of a specific location which becomes a source of repeated calls for service, the owner, occupant or lessee responsible for such a location, who has been properly forewarned, may be considered responsible for the repeated calls to that location and will be subject to payment of the same costs and expenses as requestors under subsection .1 or actors under subsection .2.

5. Nothing in this Part is to be construed to infer that any person acting in good faith who initiates a request for response which turns out to be unfounded or unnecessary is liable under this Section.

6. Moreover, any person who unknowingly or unintentionally necessitates a request for response and who voluntarily resolves the nuisance shall be issued a warning and advised of consequences. Subsequent responses for the same or similar offense(s) within a 90-day period may result in the actor being invoiced for all responses, including the first.

(*Ord. 794*, 6/3/2002, §2)

§10-503. Fees.

Upon the occurrence of any of the events set forth at subsections .1 through .4 of §10-502, and if liability is not excused by §§10-502.5 or 10-502.6 of this Part, the requestor or actor in question shall pay to the Township of Ferguson the fee set forth in the Ferguson Township reimbursement costs resolution on file at the Ferguson Township municipal building. The fee set forth in said resolution may be adjusted by further resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Ferguson Township. The requestor or actor shall also be responsible for paying to the Township any incidental costs, fees or expenses relating to any such response that are not set forth in the Ferguson Township reimbursement costs resolution.

(*Ord. 794*, 6/3/2002, §2)

§10-504. Collection of Fees.

1. The Ferguson Township Police Department shall provide an invoice to those individuals creating the requirement of a police response and/or any actor or perpetrator as set forth in §10-502 of this Part pursuant to the schedule of charges set forth in Appendix "A"[2] of this Part, said amount being the hourly rate indicated thereon plus any incidental costs, fees or expenses.

2. The invoice as designated above shall be provided by the Ferguson Township Police Department within 30 days of the date of the police response or determination

as set forth in this Part. Thereafter, payment shall be made to Ferguson Township for the aforesaid invoice within 30 days of the date of the invoice.
3. If a person who receives an invoice from the Ferguson Township Police Department shall fail to pay the same within 30 days after receipt of said invoice, the Township of Ferguson is authorized to file a civil action and/or an action for a municipal lien against the invoiced party. Notwithstanding the foregoing, Ferguson Township, by and through its Police Department, may request any court having competent jurisdiction over a requestor or actor to make restitution to Ferguson Township of said invoiced amount.
4. Interest on the unpaid balance of any invoices for any fees shall carry an interest rate of 6% per annum on the unpaid balance. In addition, the Township of Ferguson may assess attorney's fees, costs and expenses associated with the collection of any fees authorized by this Part.
(*Ord. 794*, 6/3/2002, §2)

5.7 Town of Bloomsburg Ordinance Police Reimbursement Ordinance

PART 6
DISORDERLY GATHERINGS
§6-601. Purpose and Intent
The Town Council of the Town of Bloomsburg finds and determines as follows:
A. That certain private properties require a disproportionate amount of police service with many calls requiring response to maintain order and public peace and safety and to stop public disturbances at parties or other social events so that there is less police personnel and resources available for other locations, emergencies and duties within the Town of Bloomsburg, thereby placing a disproportionate and unfair burden upon the residents of the Town of Bloomsburg.
B. That the host of a disorderly party or other social event and those persons attending such party or event should be held criminally responsible for any public disturbances or other acts of disorderly conduct thereat.
C. That owners of private properties derive a benefit from the aforesaid police service.
D. That owners of private properties have a responsibility to manage their properties to minimize required police service to maintain order and public peace and safety and to stop public disturbances, to minimize the burden upon the residents of the Town of Bloomsburg and to promote the health, safety and welfare of the public in general.
E. That owners of private properties can minimize required police service to maintain order and public peace and safety and to stop public disturbances by diligent and strict management and regulations of their properties.
F. That assessment of police service costs as provided in this Part is reasonable and will have a deterrent effect and encourage more responsible management of private properties.
G. That it is not the intent of this Part to discourage or suppress calls or requests for police service, but rather to encourage and stimulate diligent and strict management and regulation of private properties by the owner thereof and to promote the health, safety and welfare of the residents of the Town of Bloomsburg.
§6-602. Definitions
As used in this Part, the following terms shall have the following meanings unless the context clearly indicates that a different meaning is intended:
DISORDERLY GATHERING—a gathering at which any public disturbance occurs.

GATHERING—a party or event involving a group of persons who have assembled or are assembling for a social occasion or activity on private property.

HOST—the person who owns, leases or is otherwise in possession and control of the private property where the gathering takes place and/or who organized, sponsored, conducted, hosted or permitted such gathering, invited persons to attend such gathering or was otherwise in charge of such gathering.

OWNERS - the person, persons, corporation or other entity who holds record title to the private property.

POLICE SERVICE COSTS - the cost to the Town of Bloomsburg for police services rendered in responding to a call at a disorderly gathering or otherwise maintaining order and public peace and safety and stopping public disturbances at a disorderly gathering including, but not limited to, the salaries and other compensation of police officers, appropriate administrative costs allocable thereto, prorated costs of equipment, the cost of repairing damaged Town of Bloomsburg equipment and property, and the cost of any medical treatment of injured police officers. This cost shall either be fixed from time to time by the Town Council of the Town of Bloomsburg, based upon the average cost for a typical police response or be determined on a case-by-case basis by the Chief of Police.

PRIVATE PROPERTY—any land, building or other structure, including single and multifamily dwellings and commercial and industrial buildings not owned by a public entity.

PUBLIC DISTURBANCE(S)—any act by a host or those persons attending a gathering involving public drunkenness, consumption of an alcoholic beverage in public, the serving of alcoholic beverages to minors, public urination or defecation, the unlawful deposit of trash or litter on public or private property, damage to or destruction of public or private property, the obstruction of public roads, streets, highways or sidewalks, interference with emergency or police services, unreasonable noise, use of profane or obscene language or gestures, indecent exposure, fighting or quarreling, or any other act defined as disruptive conduct by the Town of Bloomsburg's Code of Ordinances or any other conduct which otherwise disturbs, annoys, injures or endangers the health. safety or welfare of the residents of the Town of Bloomsburg residing in the neighborhood or vicinity of the gathering.

PUBLIC ENTITY—any Federal, State or local government, school district or agency, or authority created or organized thereby.

PUBLIC PROPERTY—any land, building or other structure owned by a public entity.

§6-603. Violation

No host or person attending a gathering shall commit any act of public disturbance. No host shall hold, conduct or have a gathering where any act of public disturbance occurs or continue a gathering where any act of public disturbance has occurred or is occurring.

§6-604. Arrest of Violators

In addition to the right to file a citation against violators under and pursuant to the Pennsylvania Rules of Criminal Procedure, police officers may also arrest a host or person attending a gathering who violates §6-603 of this Part, provided that the police

officer views the public disturbance and in the case of the host, the host is in attendance at the gathering at the time of such public disturbance, although nothing herein shall prevent a host from being cited for violation of §6-603, whether or not any person attending the gathering is arrested or cited for a violation.

§6-605. Penalties

Any host or person who violates §6-603 of this Part shall be guilty of the offense of disorderly gathering and upon conviction thereof in a summary proceeding be sentenced to pay a fine of not more than $1,000 and/or be imprisoned for a period not to exceed 90 days.

§6-606. Owners Required to Pay Police Service Costs

An owner is required to pay police service costs to maintain order and public peace and safety and to stop public disturbances for each response by the police to a disorderly gathering in excess of one response during any 30-day period of time.

§6-607. Notice to Owners of Police Service Costs

Whenever the police are called to respond to a disorderly gathering for the purpose of maintaining order and public peace and safety and stop ping public disturbances, the Chief of Police or his duly authorized designee shall notify the owner of the private property where the disorderly gathering took place and also the agent of such property if the owner has designated an "agent" in accordance with the Town of Bloomsburg's Regulated Rental Unit Occupancy Ordinance, by regular mail at the last known address of such owner and operator, that the police were called to respond to a disorderly gathering at the owner's property for the purpose of maintaining order and public peace and safety and stopping public disturbances and that if the police are again called to respond to a disorderly gathering at such property within 30 days after their initial response, such owner shall be required to pay police service costs to the Town of Bloomsburg for such responses.

§6-608. Collection of Police Service Costs

After the second response to a disorderly gathering within 30 days as provided in §6-607 of this Part, the Chief of Police or his duly authorized designee shall notify the Town of Bloomsburg Treasurer, in writing, of the name and address of the owner of the private property where the disorderly gathering took place, the dates of the initial and subsequent response(s) and the total amount of police service costs incurred for or during such responses. The Town of Bloomsburg Treasurer or his/her duly authorized designee shall then bill the owner for the said amount, which shall be due and payable to the Town of Bloomsburg within 30 days of such billing.

§6-609. Failure to Pay Police Service Costs

Any police service costs which have not been paid within 30 days of the billing therefore may be collected, together with a penalty of 10% thereof and interest at the rate of 10% per annum added thereto, by civil action against the owner and/or may be imposed or assessed against the owner's private property as a municipal claim as provided by law.

5.8 San Marcos, TX "Host Responsibilities of Parties in Residential Areas" Ordinance

ARTICLE 6. HOST RESPONSIBILITIES OF PARTIES IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS
In this article:

Host means a person who invites or allows others to gather or remain at his residence, or at a residence he has a lawful right to occupy, for a party.
Party means a planned or unplanned gathering of people.
Residence means a dwelling unit in an apartment, townhouse, duplex or other multi-family residential structure, or a single-family residence. Residence includes the entire premises of a residence, including the residence building, garage, carport, driveway and yard, and adjacent common areas, parking areas, sidewalks and streets.
Residential area means an area:
(1) That is within a residential zoning district; or
(2) Within which, in a one-block area, a majority of the buildings are designed or used for residential purposes, such as one-family or two-family dwellings, apartments, townhomes and condominiums.
Unlawful level of noise has the same meaning as "unreasonable noise" in Section 42.01 of the Texas Penal Code. (Ord. No. 2002-23, § 1, 3-25-02; Ord. No. 2003-29, § 1, 5-28-03)

Sec. 34.702. Responsibilities of hosts.
(a) It is unlawful for a host to fail:
(1) To advise his guests that streets and driveways cannot be blocked by vehicles of persons attending the host's party;
(2) To ensure that noise from the host's party does not reach an unlawful level; (3) To ensure that litter related to the host's party is properly disposed of by 10:00 a.m. of the day after the party started; or,
(4) To ensure that any alcoholic beverages provided or served at the host's party are controlled in a manner that ensures the alcoholic beverage laws are not violated.
(b) It is not a defense to prosecution for violations of any law or ordinance that a security officer or officers who were hired for a party failed to properly fulfill the host's duties in subsection (a) of this section.
(c) It is prima facie evidence that the host violated subsection (a)
(1) if the police warn the host that vehicles of persons attending the host's party are blocking streets and driveways and that these vehicles need to be moved, and the vehicles are not moved within a reasonable time. (Ord. No. 2002-23, § 1, 3-25-02; Ord. No. 2003-29, § 2, 5-28-03)

Sec. 34.703. Enforcement of other laws. Nothing in this division affects a peace officer's authority to enforce other laws such as disorderly conduct, littering, parking and alcohol-related offenses against persons who violate those laws.
(Ord. No. 2002-23, § 1, 3-25-02)