

# Master Plan Committee (MPC) Minutes 7/24/2023

<https://www.fm.colostate.edu/mpc/>

## Voting Members:

Tamara Alexander, Tom Biedscheid, Dave Bradford, Steve Cottingham, Nicholas DeSalvo, Christa Johnson, Donna Reiser, Emily Seems, Brendan Hanlon, Mari Strombom

## Ex Officio:

Tracey Abel, Gargi Duttgupta, Ashraf Fouad, Brian Grube, David Hansen, Jessica Kramer, Angela Nielsen, Mike Rush, Julia Innes, Jillian Zucosky

## Presenters:

Aaron Fodge (Parking & Transportation Services - PTS), Jeremiah Simpson (Kimley Horn), Jamie Gaskill (PTS)

## Transportation Demand Master Plan - Findings & Recommendations (Presentation)

2023 TDM Master Plan Update Webpage: <https://pts.colostate.edu/tdm-plan/>

- [TDM Plan Executive Summary Final Draft](#)
- [TDM Master Plan Full Report Final Draft](#)

After reading either draft copy, please take the following [TDM Master Plan Survey](#) to provide us with valuable feedback.

1. TDM Plan
  - a. Pandemic impacted CSU transportation system
    - i. Some students sequestered in residence halls
    - ii. Lost opportunities to talk to incoming students during orientation
    - iii. Nation-wide driver shortage for transit – impacting frequency of transit and caused loss in ridership during and coming out of pandemic
  - b. New Leadership – Aspirations for student population growth, driver for TDM plan
    - i. Predicted growth has an impact on transportation
  - c. Opportunity to improve transportation with new developments
    - i. With infrastructure or programming to provide access and mobility
  - d. Second MAX corridor – West Elizabeth bus rapid transit corridor nearing design completion
    - i. Connection with Foothills Campus, the Main Campus transit center, and original MAX to provide efficiencies
  - e. University to adopt Vision Zero principles – Sept. 2023
    - i. Enact during campus safety month
2. MPC Action Items
  - a. Read TDMP for details

- b. Consider possible Master plan impacts as strategies – what might impacts be over next 10 years?
  - c. Adopt mode split targets – how we get students and employees to travel by different modes of transportation?
  - d. Support submission to formal master plan update next year
- 3. What is TDM?
  - a. Transportation Demand Management – strategies that improve transportation across the network
  - b. One of many subplans that feed up to the master plan
  - c. Committed to advance this forward, ahead of the master plan update
- 4. How does TDM plan benefit CSU?
  - a. The plan is flexible, designed to react to new buildings coming (what is the impact of those buildings on transportation?), evaluate how to maximize travel options to the area or new bldg.? How to reduce barriers to safety, mobility, and general access to campus?
  - b. 10-year plan
  - c. Approaches include:
    - i. Safety and education
    - ii. Infrastructure improvements
    - iii. Incentives for travel
    - iv. Flexible work-related arrangements
  - d. Align investments on main campus and all Fort Collins campuses
  - e. This goes to master plan update to start next year
- 5. CSU Technical Advisory Committee includes:
  - a. PTS
  - b. Facilities Management
  - c. CSU Geospatial Centroid – for analyses shared with the consultant
  - d. Numerous stakeholder engagements and data provided by depts across university
- 6. Budget & Timeline
  - a. Project budget \$175,000
    - i. Awarded \$60,000 planning grant from CDOT to offset some costs of the plan
  - b. 10-month process (Oct 2022- July 2023)
  - c. Went through existing conditions to understand investments in last ten years - provided starting point for self-evaluation
  - d. Compared to peer institutions
  - e. Synthesized and analyzed feedback from stakeholders engagement
- 7. Plan components
  - a. Infrastructure mapping: Main, South, West, and Foothills campuses
  - b. Mode split targets through 2023
  - c. Made assumptions: campus growth rate, on-campus beds, need to know number of vehicles on campus and how that affects the transportation system
- 8. Stakeholder Outreach
  - a. Over 3,500 stakeholders on campus and in city
  - b. 3-phased approach

- i. Phase 1: Over 30 presentations to students, staff, faculty, Fort Collins boards; tabling events for student input; met students where they were (pop up locations)
  - ii. Phase 2: Focus group work, able to ask questions of shift workers and how transportation is helping or hindering them with access to university; annual mode split survey (2/22-3/31), looked at incentives that would shift travel behavior or support
  - iii. Phase 3: Analyze and incorporate stakeholder feedback
- 9. Stakeholder outreach – key takeaways
  - a. Developed a charter (see slide 13 – right side of slide)
  - b. Heard from stakeholders on following:
    - i. Continue to improve infrastructure to support safety
      - 1. Separating bikes and pedestrians in congested areas
      - 2. Where motor vehicles are present, try to find infrastructure solutions that help make intersections safer
    - ii. Driver shortage and reluctance of transit drivers to go back to driving
    - iii. Greater transit frequency and expanded hours to meet rider needs
    - iv. More affordable and flexible parking permit options
    - v. Explain different modes of transportation better, make them feel intuitive and convenient, to help people get past the barrier for traveling in different ways
- 10. Performance Measures Dashboard
  - a. Mode split for this plan means the primary means a person is using to arrive at campus on their commute trip.
  - b. Mode split target means that originating commute trip. For example (see top right of slide 15):
    - i. Driving a car as single person – also known as Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV)
    - ii. Walking or rolling to campus
    - iii. Getting on bike trail or bike way
    - iv. Transit route
  - c. 2033 goals based on following factors:
    - i. Considered historical performance, predominately taken from split mode survey, including what were the high marks for when people got on a bus for their commute in the past?
    - ii. Market potential and capacity for some of the routes and infrastructure
    - iii. Performance of peer institutions – like UC Davis, Boise State, University of Michigan
    - iv. Campus Housing goals – growth adjustment for future enrollment
    - v. Stakeholder feedback on their willingness to use a mode or why people choose modes under existing conditions
    - vi. Vision Zero sustainability goals
- 11. Mode Split Targets
  - a. More bus ridership before pandemic, slow to return to transit
  - b. SOV (combined: staff, faculty, and students) have gone up since the pandemic occurred. 67% total between them all for 2023.

- i. Students have lower SOV rate – in 40-45% range
    - ii. Employee SOV rate 75%
  - c. Targets for 2025 and 2033 – try to bring SOV down to 50% over ten years. This reflects ambitious but achievable infrastructure, programs, and improvements through the city and Transfort.
  - d. Invest in modal choice that is convenient for all user groups – even rideshare which is a smaller group, but important to those who use it
- 12. Mode Split Change Factors
  - a. Looked at behaviors, such as:
    - i. Improvements on West Elizabeth corridor
    - ii. Propensity for recovered bus ridership through improved frequency (getting drivers hired and trained so routes can be reestablished).
    - iii. New off campus housing close to campus
    - iv. More on-campus housing
    - v. Menu of infrastructure and programmatic transportation improvement recommendations
    - vi. Peer universities' current reported transportation mode splits & goals
- 13. Impact on Parking Supply
  - a. 0.6% enrollment growth assumption - Assuming enrollment growth from 28,000 up to 29,660 over ten years, which drives the other dependent outputs on the table.
  - b. Seeing demand ration of .3 spaces per enrolled student (doesn't reflect all users such as employees).
  - c. 8500 parking demand vs 13,518 parking supply (stalls)
    - i. Surplus of spaces on campus, distributed over four different campuses
      - 1. Ex: Moby Arena parking lot, lots by South campus used for events, not used as much on regular basis
    - ii. Currently over supply of 5,000 parking spaces
  - d. Decreased need for parking over ten years.
- 14. Parking Implications
  - a. Placeholder projected student enrollment growth (0.6%)
  - b. 20% parking supply buffer to better accommodate large events & distributed campuses – remote campus parking will not be as utilized.
- 15. How do we get there?
  - a. There is a section devoted to each mode.
  - b. Navigational guide on how to read the plan, pay attention to the strategies listed in each section.
  - c. Chapter 3 - combined list with all strategies in one larger matrix.
- 16. TDMP Mode Split recommendations
  - a. Consider the mode split targets and get MPC feedback on if they feel appropriate and if what is presented is achievable.
  - b. Asking for SOV to go down to 50%.
  - c. Best SOV year was 59-60% (pre-pandemic)
  - d. Also tracking secondary mode in addition to primary mode.

- i. A lot of CSU employees and students have two modes of transportation which shows openness and willingness to try other modes.
  - e. Heard from stakeholders about changes due to weather (potentially solvable to provide better access):
    - i. If snowy, people with access to vehicle are more interested in driving to campus.
    - ii. Keeping bike ways plowed – a priority.
    - iii. Interest in transit if buses ran earlier or later.
- 17. Strategy Highlights (see appendix for more)
  - a. Prioritize investments in other modes. From a master plan standpoint, this means:
    - i. Prioritizing pedestrian and bike safety corridors and infrastructure to support those modes.
    - ii. Prioritizing what's need for transit
    - iii. Prioritizing pull outs at key locations for ride share or other purposes
  - b. Pursuing commuter management platform – centralized web and app based for selecting parking passes, bus route planning, and ride share or car pool matching programs. To have a more robust commuter management portal.
  - c. Adjusting pricing tiers.
  - d. Expanding transit routes and collaborating with Transfort to adjust and restore bus frequency
  - e. Innovative programs – universities assisted local transit agencies with commercial driver license trainer programs – for ex: UC Davis trains their own drivers
  - f. Campus circulator service – take on as CSU managed service
  - g. Adopt corridor improvements recommended by Toole Design Group
  - h. Prioritize Vision Zero problem areas to reduce serious crashes down to zero, address through infrastructure any problem areas on campus
  - i. Better connection with Foothills Campus and multiuse trails
  - j. Prioritize on-campus housing
  - k. Focus on 6 complete street corridors
  - l. There is an underutilized opportunity on rental fleet to decentralize management of the fleet into different blocks - available to different student groups and depts – as a trip option for those who may arrived on campus by bike or bus
- 18. Strategy Matrix
  - a. Available on two tables – organized by greatest impact by number of modes and objectives met, not organized by cost
  - b. Some potentially more expensive strategies may take longer to implement
- 19. Detailed Summary for Each Mode
  - a. For example: For walking mode (from 7% to 11%), what are the enabling strategies to allow it to happen?

## Transportation Demand Master Plan - Findings & Recommendations (Discussion)

1. Gargi Duttgupta writes in chat – “Enrollment - This is FTE headcount on campus - not total (inclusive of online and dual enrollment)”

- a. Steve Cottingham asks in chat, "How does using FTE account for PT students. Is that a significant number re transportation? Four .25 students coming to CSU for one class each might need four parking spots, not one FTE spot."
  - b. Gargi Duttgupta responds in chat, "I will defer to Jeremiah and the PTS group to confirm this, but I do believe they accounted for all in-person enrollment needs. Also per their findings, it is staff and faculty that count for 75% of parking needs"
  - c. Jeremiah Simpson – FTE enrollment number is reflective of the topline enrollment. Student time on campus is variable. When doing the count, they go back to survey data collected in the fall during a typical third week of classes, and what is the count of cars on campus at different times of day, reflected and scaled to that enrollment, and accounts for people enrolled and not on campus during that time or parked on campus with vehicles. Some of the variability is in that ratio. It's how they arrived at 0.3 per enrolled student. Ratio reflects that question about on campus presence.
2. Steve Cottingham asks – Is the faculty/staff SOV 50% or 75%?
    - a. Mode split survey says 75% of employees drive.
    - b. The blended (employees, students, affiliates) goal is 50% SOV in ten years.
    - c. Aaron Fodge – 70-80% of employees live in Fort Collins. CU Boulder focuses more on regional transit and carpooling because the local modes don't support their population as much. Our plans align well with how people travel today and where they live.
    - d. Gargi Duttgupta clarifies – 75% current employees drive SOV. 67% is the blended rate currently. 50% is the goal ten years out.
    - e. Aaron Fodge – Pre-covid the SOV rate would have had a much more of a gradual slope. The number of students driving went up during COVID with a drop in riding bikes and transit. Believes we can hit these targets as we move further away from pandemic realities.
  3. Steve Cottingham – Did you ask for feedback on the realism of these targets? How variable is the mode split during course of year (bad weather vs. good weather)? On average 67% people drive a vehicle to campus. How many of the 67% are employees vs students?
    - a. Yes, on average 67% people (employees and students combined) drive a vehicle to campus. 75% of the employees that responded to the survey drive as their primary mode, whereas students are in the forty percent range.
    - b. **ACTION (Aaron/Jamie):** Extrapolate from the weighted average, how many of the 67% are employees.
    - c. In February there is a seasonality difference with the bike numbers lower than in the fall and transit numbers a little higher than in the fall.
      - i. PTS does their survey around the university census. In February the university has published their numbers in terms of how many students enrolled or dropped out in December, how many came back. PTS also doesn't want to inflate the bike number, and it would be inflated in September if the split mode survey was done at that time. Largest number of SOV trips are when it is cold.
      - ii. Jeremiah Simpson says they look at the second or third week in the fall to drive a design day for infrastructure considerations, assuming there are seasonal variations in these percentages. Does not believe CSU would be under-supplied on parking, even ten years from now, even if there is a winter day when more

- people choose to drive. Would need to make sure transit network can handle increase in ridership when weather is bad.
- iii. Students pay small portion of student fee toward trailer buses. On winter days when buses are overcrowding, Transfort has ability to call through dispatch for a trailer bus that can be flipped from route to route if transit is full and students are being left behind. This was a pre-pandemic reality for CSU. Has happened in the last year but not same frequency as pre-pandemic.
  - iv. The mode split survey is used for measurement of SOV percentage, but we do collect data throughout the year in multiple ways. For example, in the fall, there is a camera study that occurs. Through Kimley Horn, PTS hires a company that puts cameras at almost every intersection on campus, tracking turning movements by mode of transportation. Data used to look at the impact if a building was added. Can see peaks for morning midday and afternoon.
4. Tom Biedscheid – Appreciates the estimate and complexities on enrollment. The general enrollment management discussion is occurring with a new leader. The conversation is around more first year students, more international students, more transfer students, more nontraditional students. Can you disaggregate the data? Does it vary by student type? Trying to set target goals based on type of students and being intentional about recruiting students in particular areas, and if that might help long term with this planning too.
- a. Jeremiah Simpson – Not sure that they intentionally did commute preference by type of student. Might be available with deeper dive on commute survey. Got into interesting discussions during the small focus groups, heard stories from them. Have not mined the data to see the variations.
    - i. For example: international students talking about places they had come from with more mature and available transit systems. People coming from eastern Colorado and the expectation where they come from is that everyone drives, so coming to campus with a different expectation is a big change for them.
  - b. Aaron Fodge – for the mode split survey data, they utilize a statistically validated sample provided by the university every year. The consulting firm requests sample size based on employee populations and student enrollment. Employee response can disaggregate down to employee classification in statistically valid manner. Students hit the response target, but it takes work to get that response rate. Bringing it down by one more level, then would take more work and would probably need to increase sample size to get that number of respondents.
    - i. Important to continue to talk to students. People want to talk on this campus. Hosting listening sessions was/is a valuable way to learn more from students. The pop-ups worked well. For ex: situated student staff at library. As people come through door, the staff greeted them with a simple giveaway and asked for people to engage (between 50-200 students, depending on the engagement).
    - ii. You can glean some things from the mode split survey, but the audiences are particular. Where people live is a huge decision point. Making it affordable to live in Fort Collins, where shifting transportation expenses toward rent, then

- could probably have better predictor about how traveling to the university and what they need as students.
- iii. PTS does an orientation for international students, including a bike ride, during move-in week with full travel training. Listen to what challenges they are anticipating.
  - iv. Keep getting out and talking to people about what barriers exist and how to do better job of helping.
5. Donna Reiser, "What percentage of parking inventory are on main campus vs. south or foothills?"
- a. Jeremiah Simpson shares heat map of parking utilization. The bulk of parking supply and parking garages are on main campus with greater utilization on main campus. A couple of the lots are below 50% utilization. West and south campus have more available parking capacity. Foothills survey data not available, has not traditionally been surveyed. They do have inventory information for Foothills.
  - b. Brian Grube adds that 72% of parking is on main campus.
  - c. **ACTION (Jeremiah):** Confirm and get back to Donna with information.
6. Gargi Duttgupta – from a master planning perspective, while the pandemic has impacted transportation behavior in the last three years, the team made the assumption of 0.6 enrollment growth because numbers from 2014 onward were healthy and CSU had 3.2 enrollment growth in past. Based on enrollment projections, Gargi did not get a good sense if there are true projections for the graduate school enrollment. Seemed to be primarily focused on first year housing and undergraduate student population.
- a. Aaron Fodge – feels comfortable with growth rate projected. If guided differently by Administration, this is a tool that can help make predictions of spaces that might potentially be needed if we see more aggressive growth rate. The idea of capacity in general, at what point does CSU make decisions about hosting classes late in the evenings to distribute the load coming to campus. Have heard about those ideas over the year but have not heard a definitive statement. Antidotally, the campus often feels congested at class time changes. What does congested truly feel like and do we need to spread out the load of people during day to reduce that level of congestion?
7. Gargi Duttgupta asks committee what would work best for providing feedback.
- a. Aaron Fodge says that feedback can be provided through the online form and PTS can follow up to answer questions.
  - b. Calling the endorsement "Support submission of the TDMP" (as addendum to master plan). PTS is accepting comments through this week. Would like all public comments and feedback in by then. Stakeholders who engaged with PTS previously on this plan were emailed. Looking for endorsement from MPC that this reflects the university and unique goals and circumstances of 2023. This would be the guiding document for transportation. Would like it to be incorporated into other plans to help guide next master plan update for university.
  - c. Committee member responses in chat indicate that they would be fine responding by the end of this week.
    - i. **ACTION (Gargi):** Email reminder to MPC by end of week to send feedback, questions, or support.



## MPC engagement for future

1. Try to keep with regular monthly mtgs, to have discussions and re-engage. August mtg – start to do in person mtgs. Looking for feedback on MPC format, purpose, charge, etc.
  - a. Mari Strombom writes in chat, “I think in person might be helpful as we re-engage as a committee.”
2. Be mindful of – What is it that we are looking at when looking at subarea master plans? For example, the TDM or other subarea plans for the auxiliaries, for the individual colleges, for sustainability, for programmatic needs, etc. How are the subarea plans determined? What level of engagement do we need from the MPC?