

## **Sustainability 2028 Planning Workshop: Transportation**

October 1, 2019, 2:00pm-4:00pm

### **Meeting Notes**

Recorded by Elias Platte-Bermeo

### **Meeting Attendees**

Mark Ewalt, Ellen Dux, Farris Sukkar, Elias Platte-Bermeo, Martin Howell, Seth Strongin, Nathaniel Hyman, Nichelle Mitchell-Huizar, Kyle Konis, Tony Mazza, Shawn Chavira, Jeremy Kagan, Jacqueline Torres, Nina Harvey, Wendy Wood, Dan Mazmanian, Peniel Park, Laura Pearson

### **Meeting Agenda**

1. Introduction
  - a. Back-end work on many transportation initiatives has been underway for a number of years, which will expedite the Transportation planning process
  - b. The goal of this session is to discuss specific initiatives
2. Overview of 2028 Sustainability Planning Process
  - a. Goals of business unit meetings vs. SSC workshops
    - i. Unit meetings are for SMEs to discuss what we're already doing and Tier 1 goals. This will provide a baseline for discussion.
    - ii. Full SSC meetings will surface ideas and goals for all verticals; taking what comes out of the unit meetings and expanding and contracting on the ideas
  - b. Stakeholder roles and responsibilities
    - i. Each person represents a constituency and should bring information back to their respective groups
  - c. Targets vs. Initiatives
    - i. Targets set the overall sustainability ambitions for USC. Initiatives are the actual projects that will help USC fulfill those ambitions
      1. These are inherently interconnected; without initiatives as the pathway to meet our goals, the target is essentially useless, and vice versa
    - ii. Definitions of Tiers - copy definitions from last week's notes
      1. Tier 1: "Finish what we've started" - complete or expand existing projects and programs on campus.
      2. Tier 2: "2028 Plan Interim Targets" - additional initiatives focused mainly on campus that will help achieve interim goals of the 2028 plan. These will be discussed today, along with a very broad discussion of projects and costing

3. Tier 3: “Final Targets” - additional initiatives, some that may include financing mechanisms and off site projects that will help achieve the final targets. All projects that make up the final targets may not be known for the 2028 Plan
  - a. Relates most to carbon, electricity, and water (carbon offsets, rainwater capture, etc.). There likely won't be many Tier 3 transportation projects

### 3. Transportation

- a. Approach diagram and organizational structure
  - i. 4 Wedges of the Pie
    1. Transportation Infrastructure
    2. Transportation Demand Management
    3. Alternatives Modes of Transportation
    4. Zero Emission Fleet
  - ii. Jeremy Kagan asked which universities are leading the way in these areas
    1. Jacqueline believes Stanford is at the forefront, largely because they started planning for sustainable transportation in 2002
  - iii. Mark reiterated that the tiered system of framing goals was created to convey this process to senior administration.
  - iv. Jacqueline pointed out that, in an ideal world, a city or university would utilize all 4 wedges of the pie; they are not necessarily meant to be looked at individually
- b. Overview of proposed transportation targets
  - i. **Goal #1: Provide sustainable transportation infrastructure to support alternative and emerging modes of transport by 2025**
    1. Peer University examples:
      - a. Stanford: cycling circle
      - b. UCSB: 10 miles of bike lanes
      - c. UCLA: solar charging for electric vehicles
      - d. University of Michigan: autonomous shuttles
    2. Dan Mazmanian asked whether costing on our spreadsheet is listed as price relative to “business as usual” spending
      - a. Spreadsheet costing is based on dollars spent on similar projects, eg. from near-peer universities
      - b. Rough Order of Magnitude costing will begin later in the semester after these preliminary prices have been run through senior administration

- c. Actual “business case” costing will be conducted in the spring by the project “owner” business units.
3. Dan Mazmanian asked if ARUP has a “student willingness to pay” model and if we will price what the costs of transportation initiatives will ultimately be for users.
  - a. Transportation Department has relationships with groups that are incorporating these types of models, but the department is currently in the very early stages of exploring them
  - b. OoS committed to getting in touch with the faculty member Dan recommended to explore this further.
4. Kyle Konis is concerned that we may be framing costs that will be required for code compliance as dollars spent on sustainability initiatives, since these dollars will need to be spent regardless of the initiatives laid out in the 2028 Plan
  - a. Wendy Wood asked if we plan to stage costing.
  - b. Framing of costs will be fine-tuned by the time numbers are ready to be shared with senior administration and made public
5. Mark wants the group to be cognizant of the fact that, until we consider price of parking as part of TDM, other programs and incentives may not be as effective as they could be.
6. Kyle is surprised to see that 10 Year Capital Plans for the University involve new parking structure developments
  - a. Tony pointed out that there truly isn’t anywhere to build more parking lots on UPC, and there is also excess infrastructure, with 500 unused parking spaces at the Shrine building
  - b. Demographics of HSC make it difficult to not have parking lots. For example, this campus relies on many shift workers and the hospital pays for parking passes which incentivizes driving.
7. Since USC Transportation reinstated the transit subsidy program, 150 employee parking passes have been returned
8. Kyle believes the accounting for pricing of initiatives should incorporate the cost avoided by NOT building parking lots
9. Tony has discussed with architecture firms potential plans to convert parking lots to housing units, which could be devoted to students

10. ARUP provided a list of proposed initiatives but stressed the importance of tying together the “Wedges of the Pie” to find the most holistic route to discourage SOVs coming to USC.
    - a. Currently, a USC Master Mobility Plan is in the process of being approved by cabinet.
  11. Mark pointed out that unless bikes are replacing SOVs, bikes and scooters are not a sustainability issue as much as a time-saving issue. Mark believes it is more impactful in terms of sustainability to look at increasing bike connectivity between USC’s campuses and the surrounding neighborhoods
  12. USC Transportation currently uses a geo-fence to ban e-scooters ending their rides on campus
    - a. Transportation is currently assessing different strategic partnerships with e-scooter companies
  13. Mark reiterated that in every study conducted since 2012, USC was found to have the highest density of alternative transportation options – and the most bikes – of any other location in the city, with many bike share stations, bus stations, metro stations, etc. There is not necessarily a need for new modes of alternative transportation.
- ii. **Goal #2: Implement programs that reduce SOVs to at most 30% by 2028**
1. ARUP provided types of programs USC could implement associated with each component of TDM strategies
  2. USC Village was required by the City of LA to have a Mobility Hub which is accessible to the local community and publicizes public transit information
    - a. This space is now vacant
    - b. Transportation wants to use this space to continue to provide public transit information to the campus and surrounding community in some form
  3. ARUP offered a list of potential initiatives. See ARUP slide deck.
  4. ARUP compiled a list of programs from near-peer universities in each area of TDM Strategy. See ARUP slide deck.
  5. Kyle proposed a moratorium on surface parking at USC
  6. Wendy asked if ARUP has outcome data from peer university projects

- a. ARUP reiterated that there is no uniform TDM response, so outcome data may not be quite useful in this process. Initiatives from peer universities cannot necessarily be understood individually but need to be kept as a group of strategies and therefore a group of outcomes
- iii. **Goal #3: Increase the percentage of all trips made by walking, biking, micro-mobility or transit to at least 45% (currently 33%) by 2028**
  - 1. Prior transit subsidy was a flat \$30 for commuters, and was not enough to change commuter behavior, so when it was discontinued riders already using public transit largely continued to use public transit
  - 2. ARUP pointed out that it will be important to promote alternative modes of transportation as opposed to creating new modes
  - 3. ARUP believes the goal of 45% is certainly attainable by 2028.
- iv. **Goal #4: Ensure that 100% of new vehicles for USC fleet are zero emissions by 2025. Full zero emissions transition complete by 2035**
  - 1. By 2040, most Southern California transit authorities will need to be zero emission
  - 2. The UC system has a goal of 100% clean electricity by 2025
  - 3. Before we can mandate that we purchase only zero emissions items, like fleet vehicles, we need to explore how to structure the governance of purchasing at USC, since there is currently no centralized body that can mandate a specific type of purchasing
    - a. University fleet includes buses, carts, etc. which are owned by many different departments, so there are decentralized purchasing bodies
  - 4. Without top-down instructions to embark on certain projects, we are simply negotiating between us and each stakeholder There are structural and financial pieces that will need to come together to change something as large and decentralized as purchasing at USC
    - a. Dan Mazmanian's working group is looking into how to restructure sustainability at the university, so the President will soon be making high-level decisions

that may have large implications for sustainability at USC

5. Dan Mazmaniam suggested expanding telecommuting and online classes offered as transportation initiatives. He would like ARUP to look into the diverse benefits that this could bring to USC
  - a. ARUP could also look into how corporations have utilized telecommuting, which might be a better point of comparison
6. ARUP proposed a set of initiatives. See ARUP slide deck.
7. Nathaniel asked whether there are tools to reduce the inequity in burden that would come to the USC community members from increased parking prices.
  - a. Mark pointed out that there are nuanced tools that could be on the table to eliminate inequity of initiatives pursued
- c. Review of transportation initiatives
  - i. Tier 1 initiatives
  - ii. Relation of initiatives to 2028 Sustainability Plan
  - iii. Tier 2 initiatives
4. Open Discussion
  - a. Brainstorming new initiatives/projects
    - i. It's important to remember that we are not taking these actions in isolation, but to instead show how they all fit together to achieve certain goals.
    - ii. Initiatives will go through a prioritization process to determine which ones will be put forward in the plan. This process will involve looking at economic and political feasibility, and will not overlook equity
    - iii. Nathaniel asked about rebates coming from EV charging infrastructure
      1. Up to 40 EV charging structures per parking structure are eligible for a one-time rebate, which cancels out the cost of the charging equipment, but the cost of infrastructure will still be paid by USC
    - iv. Kyle reiterated his concern that costs associated with getting USC to code compliance perhaps shouldn't be included in the costing for this plan, since it is alarming to see millions of dollars associated with "sustainability" and could be off-putting for our senior administration.

1. Ellen believes it is important to track different types of costs and instead simply outline where they would come from. We are far off from actually presenting total costing, so this will get worked out through this process.
2. Kyle wants to be sure that there is clarity in the way that costs are framed to the public