

CAL POLY MASTER PLAN UPDATE
MASTER PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
CIRCULATION AND TRANSPORTATION

DRAFT MEETING NOTES

Meeting #2
November 14, 2014

Members/Attendees:

Mathew Austin	Student (ASI)
Jessica Berry, AICP	Transportation Planner, SLOCOG
Tim Bochum	Deputy Director, Public Works, City of San Luis Obispo
David Braun	Faculty, Electrical Engineering
Cindy Campbell*	Associate Director, University Policy
Doug Cerf	Interim Associate Dean, Orfalea College of Business
Bill Hockensmith	Director, University Store
Kimberley Mastako	Faculty, CENG
Eric Meyer	Community Member (County of SLO Planning Commissioner)
Emilie Morse	Student (ASI)
Mark Rawson, AIA	Community Member (Copeland Properties)
William Riggs	Faculty, City and Regional Planning
Stacey Rucas	Faculty, Social Sciences
Geoff Straw	Executive Director, RTA
Stuart Styles*	Faculty, CAFES
Jay Thompson*	Public Affairs
Francis Villablanca	Faculty, CSM

Michael Multari, Facilitator
Sam Gross, MCRP, CRP 552 Studio

*Absent

MEETING NOTES:

1. Introductions
 - William Riggs was introduced as the chair of the committee.
2. Review of Notes from October 24 Meeting
 - No changes were made to the draft meeting notes.
3. Status of Data Requests
 - Hard copies of the following were distributed: current master plan diagram; map of concentric circles emanating from the campus core. The Bicycle Circulation and Safety Plan had been separately e-mailed. Staff was still working on finding parking utilization and accident data.
4. Update on the Process
 - The on-campus open house on November 5 attracted almost 200 people. Another open house is scheduled for November 15 in downtown SLO. Summaries of the results will be forthcoming.
5. Discussion Questions: What are the trends in transportation planning and practices? What changes should the Master Plan anticipate with regard to technology and behavior?

- Intra-campus transportation. The university faces the “last mile” problem – once people are near the campus, how will they get on to and about the campus itself? Currently, the primary modes are walking and bicycles, although some people may drive from one part of campus to another. Rather than prohibit cars altogether in the campus core, perhaps especially congested areas could be “cordoned” off and drivers would be charged to enter those areas...the greater the congestion, the greater the charge.

Other future options might include a jitney or a Personal Rapid Transit system. This may be especially important to connect on-campus residential areas to the academic core and if future parking is located farther from the core.

Another key issue is how to treat bicycle circulation: should cyclists expect to arrive, park and then walk or should they expect to cycle directly to their on-campus destinations? The on-campus routes should be evaluated; particularly, California is a primary entrance, but the best (most direct, flattest) route to the central campus is not developed. E-bikes are going to be the “next big thing” in active transportation and this may be a mitigation for SLO’s and Cal Poly’s hilly terrain.

- External transportation: commuters. Transit is an important mode for commuting, but routes that take the buses through the heart of campus are inefficient...is the best practice to drive through the campus? Alternatively, can we design the campus and bus routes so that the stops are at strategic locations at the edge of campus and thus avoid the problems of taking buses cross-campus?

Will Cal Poly support a countywide transportation sales tax increase?

Regarding cars, several changes are coming including shared or fractional ownership, self-driving vehicles, casual carpooling, and new forms of ride-sharing. Can Cal Poly facilitate carpooling with pickup-drop off sites off campus? The campus has a stake in an efficient community transportation network. For example, the Bicycle Safety Trail needs more funding to reach its potential. The university’s contributing to projects like this would be more cost effective than funding new parking structures.

- External transportation – out of area travel. Two topics were emphasized: Amtrak is a limited option, especially in the northbound direction; ridesharing needs to be improved. In the latter case, there is no official rideshare program for this purpose operated by the university although informal options such as a rideshare Facebook page seems to be utilized.
- Parking. Dynamic parking will allow for changes in space pricing, permit types, and real-time info about space availability. Strategic parking locations away from the campus core could be facilitated by reducing uncertainty about availability, reliable intra-campus services and better wayfinding, Technologies such as License Plate Recognition could make parking most cost effective than using employees for enforcement.
- More on transit. Another problem is that transit operations end in the evening and are reduced on weekends. Where does Cal Poly stand in regard to funding active and public transportation improvements? Would students be willing to pay a fee for improved transit?
- Cars and first year students. An option worth re-visiting is a formal policy to prohibit freshmen from having cars on campus. One unintended consequence, however, is that many will still bring cars and simply park them off campus, exacerbating problems in nearby neighborhoods. A more sophisticated strategy than a simple prohibition seems called for.

- Off campus transportation issues. Several specific suggestions were offered: extending the Bicycle Safety Trail over the freeway; repairing the Class 1 bike path on Highland; safer crossing of Santa Rosa near Foothill and bicycle/pedestrian routes that avoid the congestion on Foothill and California (informal paths are used by some); better signal phasing at Santa Rosa/Foothill and Santa Rosa/Highland.
 - Pending societal changes. Several changes affecting transportation were discussed: new technologies for ridesharing and carpooling; moving to a “complete streets” (multi-modal) view of roads; changes in the demographics of the student body such that cost-based transportation decisions may be increasingly important; increased utilization of on-line courses and telecommuting for staff; transportation decisions driven by ethical considerations (e.g. greenhouse gas emissions); the need for infrastructure to support new technologies such as e-bikes, charging stations and zip cars. We may be seeing “self-driving houses” in the future, too!
 - Student Success Fees. The issue of student success fees is coming back to the Board of Trustees early next year; students have a say in what these fees are used for and perhaps improved transportation and greater environmental sustainability may be supported.
6. Additional data request: are there longitudinal studies of mode splits?
7. Next meeting. The next meeting will be December 5. The topics are the following questions posed by the committee at the first meeting:
- A. Circulation system for the campus core: 1) Should the design and operation of the campus core circulation system further reduce (or simply eliminate) car traffic (notably, on North Perimeter and University)? 2) Does that mean closing streets to vehicular traffic (except for emergency, delivery, handicapped access and, possibly, transit/shuttle) or re-designing streets to a more multi-modal and pedestrian-friendly configuration? 3) Should a connection between Highland (or California) and Grand/Perimeter be moved farther north (on either side of the creek) rather than the current route through the campus core? 4) What are the implications of these changes to off campus residential areas?
- B. (This relates to A, above): Should there be a modal hierarchy within the campus circulation system?
- C. What are the criteria for determining “appropriate” locations, amounts and purposes of parking?

NOTE: Room change for next meeting.

The next meeting of Circulation and Transportation Master Plan Advisory Committee will be held December 5, 8-10 am, UU 216.