COLLEGE TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
Tuesday, April 2, 2024
7:00 PM
Hybrid Meeting (In-Person or via Zoom)

General Meeting Information
College Township offers both in-person and virtual meeting attendance for all public meetings. To attend in-person, meetings will be held at 1481 E. College Avenue, State College PA, 16801, 2nd floor meeting room. To attend virtually, please see the information below.

To Attend the LIVE Meeting Via Zoom on Computer or Smart Phone:
- Click here to REGISTER for the meeting via Zoom. Once registered, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the meeting.

To Attend the LIVE Meeting Via Phone:
- Dial: 1 (646) 558-8656  ● Meeting ID: 862 7222 5139  ● Passcode: 107370

*Click Here for detailed instructions on how to participate via zoom.

VIRTUAL PUBLIC COMMENTS: Please use the raised hand feature to participate. The moderator will recognize those with their hands raised (either by name or phone number).

WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENTS: For specific Planning Commission agenda items and for items not on the agenda, written public comments may be submitted in advance by emailing smeyers@collegetownship.org by noon the day of the meeting.

College Township is committed to making meetings accessible to everyone. If you require an accommodation or service to fully participate, please contact Jennifer Snyder at jsnyder@collegetownship.org or 814-231-3021.

CALL TO ORDER:

ZOOM MEETING PROTOCOL:

OPEN DISCUSSION (items NOT on the agenda):

CONSENT AGENDA:  CA-1  March 19, 2024 Meeting Minutes (Approval)

SPECIAL PRESENTATION:  SP-1  University Planned District Transportation Study Update (Discussion)

OLD BUSINESS:  OB-1  Workforce Housing Final Draft Ordinance (Discussion/Recommendation)

NEW BUSINESS:  None

REPORTS:  R-1  Council Report
    R-2  DPZ CoDesign Update

STAFF INFORMATIVES:  SI-1  Council Minutes

OTHER MATTERS:

ANNOUNCEMENTS:  Next regular meeting will be Tuesday, April 16, 2024 at 7:00pm
    Statement of Financial Interests – complete and return to Sharon Meyers ASAP

ADJOURNMENT:
CALL TO ORDER: Mr. Forziat called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ZOOM MEETING PROTOCOL: Mr. Forziat verified there were people present via Zoom, Ms. Schoch reviewed the Zoom meeting protocol.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Forziat verified Mr. Toumayants was excused.

OPEN DISCUSSION: None presented.

CONSENT AGENDA:

   CA-1  March 5, 2024 PC Meeting Minutes

   Mr. Darrah moved to approve the March 5, 2024 meeting minutes as written.
   Mr. Fenton seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

PLANS:

   P-1  Penn State – Inflatable Practice Air Supported Structure Land Development Plan

   Ms. Schoch gave a brief summary of the plan and introduced Mr. Mike Vaow the project manager from Stahl Sheaffer Engineering. Mr. Vaow gave a more detailed description of the project and invited questions and discussion.

   There was some discussion of what “temporary” means and potential noise created by the mechanical equipment to keep the dome inflated. Mr. Vaow is unsure of the noise level and stated the
dome will be raised in the fall and deflated in the spring. The dome is not to be used for NCAA sporting events but may be striped for lacrosse and/or field hockey. Mr. Forziat asked if there are facilities available for the players to use and if the structure will be used for summer camps. Mr. Vaow stated that there are restrooms available at Jeffrey Field and he is not aware of camps having access to the dome as it is considered temporary and will be deflated during summer months.

Mr. Forziat asked staff if there are any outstanding comments related to the plan. Ms. Schoch stated that there are a few remaining comments, however, none are detrimental to the plan and can be covered in the motion under the condition of comments addressed to the satisfaction of the Township Engineer.

Mr. Darrah moved to recommend Council approve the Indoor Practice Air Supported Structure Preliminary/Final Land Development Plan dated February 15, 2024 and last revised March 8, 2024 subject to the following conditions:

1. Within ninety (90) days from the date of approval by Council, all conditions must be satisfied, final signatures must be obtained and the plan must be recorded with the Centre County Recorder of Deeds Office. Failure to meet the ninety (90) day recordation time requirement will render the plan null and void.
2. Pay all outstanding review fees.
3. Address, to the satisfaction of the Township Engineer, any outstanding plan review comments.
4. Fully comply with College Township Code Section 180-12.
5. All conditions must be accepted in writing within seven (7) days from the date of the conditional approval letter from the Township Engineer.

Mr. Fenton seconded.
Motion carried unanimously.

P-2 Centre Hills Country Club Final Land Development Plan
Ms. Schoch introduced the plan and stated although the entire plan was submitted to College Township, we are only able to review and comment on the areas within the Township. This will limit discussion and comments to the private access, stormwater management, street lighting, and the sidewalk leading to the property. Ms. Schoch added State Collee Borough will be reviewing the Country Club plan in the near future at the following meetings, March 26, 2024 State College Borough Zoning Hearing Board, April 2, 2024 State College Borough Design Review Board, and April 3, 2024 State College Borough Planning Commission. Ms. Schoch noted a traffic impact study was determined unnecessary by both the project traffic engineer and the township traffic consultant. After a summary of the plan Ms. Schoch introduced Mr. Mark Torretti from Penn Terra Engineering to discuss the plan in further detail.

Mr. Torretti introduced himself and representatives present from the Country Club. He presented in more detail the plan, focusing on the area in College Township leading up to the property. Mr. Torretti added that a sidewalk will be constructed on one side of the private drive and a waiver will not be requested. There is currently a tree within the easement where the sidewalk is to be constructed and the plan is to remove and replace the tree elsewhere on the property.

Mr. Forziat reminded the Planning Commission comments are to be limited to topics within College Township which include the private access, stormwater, street lighting, and the sidewalk leading to the property. Mr. Fenton questioned the comment from staff about a storm pipe. Mr. Torretti stated that this will be addressed prior to recording. The Commission also discussed the harmony of lighting on Scenery Drive, screening along the private access drive, and existing easements.

Mr. Forziat opened the floor to public comment and reiterated comments should be kept to the areas within College Township and not the facilities within State College Borough. He added that topics within College Township purview are limited to the private access, stormwater management, street lighting, and the sidewalk leading to the property.
Ms. Krug-Johnston requested an overlay of the various easements and right-of-ways for the properties adjacent to the private drive. Such an overlay may portray the amount of property 442 Scenery Drive would lose should this plan be approved. Ms. Krug-Johnston added that she’s been living in a residence adjacent to the private drive and traffic has significantly increase since the opening of Brandywine Drive. This recent opening of the road will increase the routes people will be able to take to get to the property, thus increase traffic. Mr. Torretti offered, within the plan set there are some enlargements of the area with the area along the private drive. Mr. Torretti assured the resident that the sidewalk will be constructed within the designate easement which was in place prior to the home being built.

Mr. Nelson, a resident of Scenery Court stated as a bicyclist, this plan will change the character of the neighborhood. Traffic has already increased and will continue to increase incrementally, noise will increase incrementally, and service trucks for various deliveries will be dangerous for the children in the neighborhood. Mr. Forziat asked that Mr. Nelson also refer these comments to State College Borough.

Mr. Katancik asked if College Township will act as an advocate with State College Borough for the College Township residents. Mr. Forziat stated that the planners in the two municipalities will work together and make sure the access, lighting, etc. conforms to the Township ordinances as well as the connectivity to the Borough. Mr. Darrah suggested Mr. Katancik research the original Planned Residential Development (PRD), which would have included those easements and right-of-ways.

Ms. Krug-Johnston asked if the private country club is accessed by a private drive, why a sidewalk is needed. Ms. Schoch stated that the sidewalk is part of the College Township ordinance. Mr. Gabrovsek explained the ordinance by using Premiere Drive as an example of a private road with public access. Ms. Schoch suggested the residents attend the State College Borough meetings and gave the dates of each meeting again. Ms. Krug-Johnston asked that a decision be delayed until an overlay be provided to the Martin’s and Reeder’s to display how much property will be lost. Mr. Torretti offered to send the property owners adjacent to the private drive an enlargement of the right-of-ways and easements.

Mr. Darrah moved to recommend Council approve the Centre Hills Country Club Final Land Development Plan dated February 20, 2024 and last revised March 11, 2024 subject to the following conditions:

1. Within ninety (90) days from the date of approval by Council, all conditions must be satisfied, final signatures must be obtained and the plan must be recorded with the Centre County Recorder of Deeds Office. Failure to meet the ninety (90) day recordation time requirement will render the plan null and void.
2. Pay all outstanding review fees.
3. Address, to the satisfaction of the Township Engineer, any outstanding plan review comments.
4. Fully comply with College Township Code Section 180-12.
5. Post surety as approved by the Township Engineer prior to recordation.
6. Provide proof of NPDES approval.
7. Establish a road name for the Private Drive in order to have proper addressing in place prior to occupancy.
8. All conditions must be accepted in writing within seven (7) days from the date of the conditional approval letter from the Township Engineer.

Mr. Forziat seconded.

Motion carried with five voting for the motion and Ms. Khoury abstaining as her husband is a member of the Centre Hills Country Club.

At 8:10pm Mr. Forziat asked for a five minute recess.
8:16pm the March 19, 2024 College Township Planning Commission meeting reconvened.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

**OB-1  Workforce Housing**
Ms. Schoch introduced the topic and discussed the changes reflected in the draft ordinance due to the discussion during the previous Planning Commission meeting. The Commissioner’s discussed the height incentive and asked for the language to be consistent between the height in the townhome and multifamily section and the height in the planned residential development section.

There was also some discussion on the phasing section of the draft ordinance. Mr. Darrah added that the overall density of a certain development will trigger the Workforce Housing Ordinance not density within each phase of development. However, the developer will be required to construct the workforce housing units in each phase prior to receiving occupancy permits for the last 15% of market rate units.

Ultimately the Planning Commission would like to see a final draft before making a recommendation to Council. The changes to the ordinance based on the discussion from this meeting will be made and presented to the Planning Commission at their April 2, 2024 regularly scheduled meeting.

**NEW BUSINESS:** None presented.

**REPORTS:**

**R-1  Council Report**
Mr. Fenton gave a brief summary of the report submitted.

**STAFF INFORMATIVES:**

**SI-1  Council Approved Minutes**
No further discussion.

**SI-2  March EZP Update**
No further discussion.

**SI-3  Zoning Bulletins**
No further discussion.

**OTHER MATTERS:** None presented.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

Mr. Forziat announced the next regular meeting will be held on Tuesday, April 2, 2024 at 7:00 p.m., the next joint meeting with Council will be held on Tuesday, March 26, 2024 at 6:00pm with food and refreshments served at 5:00pm in the library, and the Statement of Financial Interests are to be completed and returned to Sharon Meyers as soon as possible.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Mr. Fenton moved to adjourn. Mr. Darrah seconded. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

**Draft**

Sharon E. Meyers
Senior Support Specialist – Engineering/Planning
To: College Township Planning Commission  
From: Lindsay K. Schoch, AICP | Principal Planner  
Date: March 29, 2024  
RE: University Planned District Transportation Study

Introduction:

Pursuant to Chapter 188 (University Planned District) Section 9 (District Plan Transportation Study):

“A district transportation study shall be submitted with application for of the District Plan and every 10th year following approval of the District Plan. The purpose of this transportation study is to generally identify the transportation impacts likely to result from projected development and activities within the district for a ten-year period.”

In February of 2024, McCormick Taylor, on behalf of Penn State University, provided municipalities who are a part of the University Planned District (UPD) with the updated UPD Transportation Study for review. Staff reviewed the materials and provided a letter with comments to Rob Watts. Staff felt it necessary for the Planning Commission and Council to hear a presentation on the updated Study, and since McCormick Taylor recently extended the comment period, both PC and Council have the opportunity to provide further comments.

Attachments:

Attached with this memo, please find the following:

- Penn State University – University Planned District Transportation Study Update (SP-1.a.)
- February 29, 2024 Memo to McCormick Taylor outlining staff comments (SP-1.b.)
- Penn State University – University Planned District Transportation Study Presentation (SP-1.c.)

What to Expect:

McCormick Taylor and a representative from PSU will be in attendance at the April 2 Planning Commission Meeting and April 4 Council meeting to present a high-level overview of the UPD Transportation Study Update.

Requested Action:

Review the materials provided with this memo and hear the presentation on April 2. Consider any comments you may have and provide that feedback during the meetings.
Penn State University
2023 University Planned District Transportation Study Update

PRELIMINARY FINAL REPORT
January 22, 2024

Completed for:
Penn State University

Submitted by:
McCORMICK TAYLOR
329 Innovation Boulevard, Suite 116
State College, Pennsylvania 16803
Executive Summary

The 2023 Penn State University Planned District (UPD) Transportation Study fulfills compliance and planning requirements of the UPD zoning ordinance—namely to submit a District Plan Transportation study for the 2023-2033 ten-year period. Previous UPD District Plan Transportation Study Updates were completed in 1994, 2001, and 2013.

The University Planned District

The UPD zone for Penn State’s University Park Campus comprises approximately 4,200 acres. Land development within the three UPD-adopting municipalities of State College Borough, College Township, and Patton Township is governed by the UPD Zoning Ordinance. The ordinance purpose states:

*The University Planned District is designed to promote the careful planning and orderly development of the University campus, consistent with the community development goals of the Centre Region and its member municipalities as described in the Centre Region Comprehensive Plan.*

The District Plan Transportation Study is to be prepared every tenth year to document travel trends and identify potential transportation effects of campus development projects within the district during the next ten-year period. The following requirements of the District Plan Update are noted:

- **Parking Area Identification and Projections** – Identify general size and location of parking areas within the sub-districts which are projected for use as parking areas within a 10-year period.
- **Traffic Assessment** – Existing transportation conditions for highway links and intersections serving the UPD must be described and the existing level of use analyzed. Potential transportation impacts of future parking development must be assessed for a 10-year period. Recommendations for potential system or service improvements in order to accommodate the projected transportation impacts of UPD development shall be included. When feasible, the study shall identify specific recommendations designed to reduce or avoid transportation impacts.
- **Internal Circulation and Facilities** – Describe existing and proposed internal roads for vehicular traffic; existing and proposed connections to the public street network; plans for street openings and closings, and possible impacts on the adjoining transportation system and adjoining zoning districts; existing and proposed facilities and accommodations for public transportation, pedestrian circulation, bicycle paths and other transportation methods.
- **Travel Demand Management** – Include a travel demand management analysis, addressing the manner in which various methods, such as promotion of ride sharing, pedestrian/bicycle improvements, and changes to on-campus and public transportation systems, will be utilized to reduce the number of single-occupancy vehicle trips associated with existing or future development under the District Plan.

Stakeholder Engagement & Outreach

The 2023 UPD Study benefited from a more broad and formalized stakeholder engagement and outreach effort. Internal Penn State teams provided guidance and direction to the work plan, while community engagement activities were conducted with broad participation from the campus community and the three UPD-adopting municipalities.

---

1. State College Borough Zoning Ordinance, University Planned District, Section 1201.a.
perspectives were better understood with engagement of external stakeholders, who participated in interviews and advised the study.

The UPD Project Management Team provided primary oversight and execution of the UPD Planning Process. The Team functioned as a highly engaged steering committee that participated in bi-weekly status meetings, provided day-to-day project direction, and reviewed project deliverables. The Team included Penn State staff and the lead consultant team members.

The UPD Executive Committee reviewed project direction and deliverables at key milestones. The Committee was comprised of Penn State’s senior leadership with responsibility for campus planning, properties, and the physical plant infrastructure.

Whereas previous UPD studies were largely an internal exercise, the 2023 UPD Update was informed by an outreach component that drew input from municipal, regional, and agency stakeholders through the UPD Advisory Committee.

The study incorporated two UPD Study Workshops at University Park. Each two-day workshop included field visits, data collection, and collaborative meetings with the Project Management Team and Advisory Committee. The first Discovery Workshop in December 2022 emphasized the collection of input and information on the current state of campus and community transportation. The second Network Design Workshop in March 2023 explored physical design of the University Park transportation system.

The study was informed by Stakeholder Interviews with additional Penn State staff and agency stakeholders who did not participate in the Advisory Committee. These included staff from State College Borough, College Township, and Patton Township (the UPD-adopting municipalities) as well as the PA Department of Transportation (PennDOT) Centre Regional Planning Agency (CRPA), Centre County Metropolitan Planning Organization (CCMPO), and Centre Area Transportation Authority (CATA).

**Parking Assessment**

Penn State’s Transportation Services department manages, enforces, and collects fees for more than 18,000 parking spaces within the UPD sub-districts. The department has roles in financing, maintaining, and managing surface and structured parking.

As part of the University Planned District (UPD) Ordinance, Penn State is required to prepare an annual Parking Projections Report. In the past, Penn State has prepared the Parking Projections Report as a submittal, that is separate from the ten-year UPD Transportation Study. However, for the 2023 UPD Study, Penn State identified an opportunity to integrate the Parking Projections Report into the full body of the UPD Study and modernize the methods that are used to monitor, calculate, and report parking supply, demand, and trends both to satisfy the external UPD requirements and to streamline the workflow and utility of the reporting activity internally. Consistent with previous parking projections report, the 2023 UPD study reports three years of parking history, one year of parking actuals, and five years of future parking projections.

The 2023 UPD study provides the following updates to this approach which satisfy elements of the codified parking projections requirements that we not previously addressed:

- Changes in UPD subdistrict boundaries affecting subdistricts 7, 8, and 11.
- Parking demand historical estimates (2019 to 2021) and projections (2023 to 2027) for staff, students (residents, commuters, and off-campus storage) and visitors.
  - Updates staff and student parking registration values to be aligned with parking software reports (for improved accuracy).
  - Updates the staff space assignment ratio from 1.10 to 1.25 to account for work from home and hybrid learning trends that have been heightened by the pandemic.
Penn State University Planned District Transportation Study

- Updates visitor parking demand to be 15 percent of the campus population based on parking facility counts and comparable estimations at peer universities.

- Parking supply historical actual counts (2019 to 2021) and projections (2023 to 2027) for each sub-district. Quantifies total parking supply with the following available filters:
  - Within/Outside UPD Study Area.
  - By municipality (State College Borough, College Township, and Patton Township).
  - By UPD subdistrict.
  - By user type (faculty/staff, resident storage, commuter, transient/visitor).
  - By space type (ADA, service, delivery).

- List of planned projects (2019 to 2023) in each subdistrict that affect the temporary and permanent supply of parking.

*Based on the 2023 projections, total parking supply for permit or visitor use (17,679 spaces) exceeds the projected University parking demand (15,771). This indicates that all University-generated parking needs can be accommodated within the UPD parking supply. Demand is projected to remain below the available UPD parking supply through and beyond 2027.*

**Curb Space Management**

With the advent of transportation network companies (TNCs) and direct delivery, the “curb space” along streets has become an area of transportation conflict both on the street and on the adjacent street space (i.e., bike lanes, transit stops, sidewalk, store fronts, etc.). Based on an analysis of TNC data, the University Park streets in need of curb space management are along Shortlidge Road, Pollock Road and Bigler Road. Likely nearby destinations are the Hetzel Union Building (HUB) and Thomas Building (classrooms).

Curb space management strategies aim to reduce conflict by establishing policies, street design templates, and other controls for the most intensive demand areas. Currently, Penn State does not have a curb space management policy or plan and would benefit from the following:

- Establishment of a plan that would include an inventory of the physical curb spaces, investigation of demand data, design templates for areas with different needs, and updated policies about the intent and use of the curb space on campus.
- Regulation of campus curb space should engage users (Uber, Lyft, Doordash, etc.) to inform them of new policies and explore the use of geofencing for the designated space. Regular contact with the most frequent users should be maintained to relay feedback and updates to the curb space policy, designations, and geography.
- Enforcement of campus curb space should engage University police and engage existing channels of communication for receiving feedback for the regular discussions with providers and users.

**Baseline Transportation Analysis**

The baseline transportation analysis looks at data collected in 2022 specifically for the UPD study as well as data reported in recent University-sponsored studies. The analysis responds to the UPD requirement for an assessment of the transportation “level-of-use”. While the ordinance implies a focus on vehicular traffic, the UPD Study recognizes the multi-modal nature of the campus transportation system and presents level-of-use for vehicular, transit, pedestrian, bike, and emerging “micromobility” modes.

**Vehicle Mode**

Vehicular mode traffic encompasses motorized passenger vehicles (cars), transit buses, and other University service and delivery vehicles that function primarily on the street system. A transportation data collection
The count locations were selected to match previous UPD studies so that comparisons could be made. The following trends and findings are noted:

- **Reductions in vehicle traffic since 2011 were broad and consistent across the network.** The downward momentum in vehicular traffic reductions noted between 2000 and 2011 was sustained to 2022. Reductions in traffic access and circulating on campus are attributed to Penn State’s sustained commitment to travel demand management programs, the post COVID trend toward work-from-home policies, delivery-to-home for goods and services, ongoing social-distancing habits, and economic factors related to inflation and elevated vehicle fuel prices.

- **Increases in vehicle traffic seem related to streets and corridors with significant new land development activity.** Significant traffic increases (i.e., more than 5 percent over 2011 counts) were noted on only two roadways—Fox Hollow Road (related to new student housing in Toftrees and other growth in Patton and Benner Townships) and White Course Drive (related to the West Campus Parking Structure). Other minor increases were noted during the peak hours along University Drive and College Avenue.

- **Reductions in vehicle traffic since 2011 are evident throughout the day.** While traffic increased on a handful of streets, the 2022 vehicular volumes were lower than the 2011 volumes during all hours of the day at both Campus Gateway and On-Campus locations.

- **Reductions in daily traffic exceed commuter peak reductions on a percentage basis.** This trend suggests that peak hour employee/commuter vehicle trips have reduced more slowly than vehicle trips for other purposes, which tend to be discretionary and occur outside the peaks.

- **Road construction in the Atherton Street Corridor likely impacted traffic volumes on Atherton Street and other streets on the west side of campus.** Regardless, the broad traffic reductions elsewhere in the network suggest that some degree of traffic reduction has occurred on Atherton Street between 2011 and 2022.

- **The 2022 traffic data provided a reliable measure of traffic volumes and trends.** The 2022 data were validated against independent data collected by PennDOT both before and after the COVID-pandemic. The comparison showed consistency in the direction of change (increasing or decreasing) with some degree of variation in the volume change.

**Transit Mode**

Documentation of the transit mode in the 2023 UPD Transportation Study is summarized from the University’s Transit Services Study prepared by Whitman Requardt and Associates, dated August 2022 with edits finalized in January 2023.

Transit at the University Park Campus encompasses transit bus services contracted through the Centre Area Transportation Authority (CATA) and shuttle services provided directly by Penn State Transportation Services. Summaries on transit ridership and volume data summaries that respond to the UPD requirements for reporting the existing “level of use” for campus transportation facilities.

Campus transit services are important for PSU’s continued success with CATA providing twelve buses for the Loop and Link routes and PSU Transportation Services operating four shuttle buses. While the service is particularly effective and well-utilized, the Transit Services Study found additional efficiencies and proposes operational changes to optimize under-performing routes and segments.
The Transit Services Study provided the following conclusions about transit service and future needs:

1. There will be continued demand for improved campus transit service resulting from projected 1% annual non-resident student growth.
2. New downtown housing will continue to increase demand on the Blue and White Loops.
3. There is increasing ridership demand between the commuter parking lots on the east side of campus and the new West Deck. Suspension of the Green Link service between the commuter lots and central campus because of a lack of bus operators will result in overcrowding and missed classes for some students.
4. CATA Loop / Link routes are very productive except for the Blue Loop and Red Link between 5 a.m. to 7 a.m. and the Red Link service to Innovation Park.
5. The Campus Shuttle Beaver Avenue route is unproductive and should be repurposed.
6. The current “hybrid” service contracting approach—with CATA owning and operating the Loop/Link and Penn State owning and operating the Campus Shuttle—remains the most cost-effective for the foreseeable future.

The Transit Services Study recommendations include the following key changes:

1. Affirm the current partnership with CATA for negotiating Penn State’s services and costs. The partnership may be enhanced with Penn State supporting and participating in CATA policy making. Meanwhile, Penn State and CATA would collaborate and cost-share on technology updates and integration (i.e., fare payment methods/vendors, vehicle location systems, data services, app development, etc.).
2. Revise the current commuter parking price structure by increasing permit costs to revise commuter parking pricing (up).
3. Each year, optimize shuttle routes, stops, and timing based on an analysis of ridership data.
4. Optimize or truncate under-performing routes.
   - Sustain the Blue and White Loop routes and service, with enhancements that respond to increasing downtown housing and demand for trips to/from the campus.
   - Permanently discontinue Green Link service.
   - Truncate the Red Link at the Bryce Jordan Center Commuter Lots while increasing service to West Campus/West Deck via the Red Link and/or Campus Shuttles.
   - Repurpose the Beaver Avenue Campus Shuttle to serve Innovation Park and to replace service previously offered by the Red Link.
   - Work with transportation network companies (Uber, Lyft) to establish more cost effective, demand-responsive evening and weekend services.

**Pedestrian Mode**

The pedestrian mode encompasses travel via walking and other mobility-assistance devices (wheelchairs, electric carts, etc.) that utilize sidewalks and pathway networks. This section summarizes pedestrian crossing data collected in 2022 at campus intersections and other significant road crossing locations. These data summaries respond to the UPD requirements for reporting the existing “level of use” for campus transportation facilities. The following trends and findings are noted:

- **Penn State’s Guiding Principles for Campus Planning** establish the primacy of the pedestrian mode. Accommodation of all pedestrian users with diverse levels of ability or disability is a priority for Penn State.
- **The concentration of pedestrian crossings at intersections and mid-block crossings during class change intervals and other travel peaks creates intense disruption to other modes.** The intensity of pedestrian travel observed at University Park rivals the most urban places in the United States.
States. Pedestrians are, by far, the largest user group, and the proverbial “mob mentality” likely creates disregard for other street users.

- **Based on data from the AM and PM Peak Travel periods, pedestrian travel on campus has increased substantially during the last ten years.** The pedestrian volume and crossing data support feedback from the UPD study stakeholders about escalating mode conflict on campus. AM peak pedestrian activity has more than doubled and PM peak activity has increased by about 20 percent since the previous UPD Study.

- **Prior to the COVID-pandemic, reportable pedestrian crashes (i.e., where one or more pedestrians were injured) were occurring at a rate of 12 to 13 per year and were concentrated in the Fall and Spring Semester months.** Based on a spatial analysis of pedestrian-involved crashes, safety improvement strategies should be targeted to specific roadway segments and intersections where crash experience is noted.

### Bicycle Mode

*Documentation of the bicycle mode in the 2023 UPD Transportation Study is a summary based on the Penn State University Park Bicycle Master Plan prepared by Nelson Nygaard, dated October 2023.*

In 2022, Penn State University undertook a planning process that created the Penn State University Park Bicycle Master Plan. The resulting plan is based on observed biking conditions and analyses of demographic, crash, and bike travel trends. The bike planning process also engaged campus stakeholders through a series of on-campus “pop-up” engagement events and an online survey.

The study notes an increase in the use of bicycles for accessing and traveling on campus. Penn State’s investments in the campus cycling experience and cycling culture are also evident through the University’s Bicycle Master Plan effort, creating a shared micromobility partnership with Spin, integrating the Bike Den into the West Parking Deck, and expanding bicycle parking and commuter amenities. As a result, Penn State was designated a bronze-level Bicycle Friendly University in 2012 and reached gold level in 2022.

However, the off-street campus environment is still largely pedestrian-oriented, and some narrow campus paths do not provide enough space for accommodating the high pedestrian volumes when shared with bike riders. Meanwhile, street space is also constrained, and only a few campus streets are configured with dedicated bike facilities.

Based on observations on campus, stakeholder interviews, and pop-up engagement events, the two main issues for the University to tackle in the next phase of bikeway development are:

1. Deconflict the bike, pedestrian, and vehicle modes by providing dedicated spaces for each mode.
2. Partner with road owners to improve the safety of people biking at major campus entry points.

Existing biking facilities and operating conditions are likely a deterrent to attracting new bike riders. To address the concerns related to the physical biking network, the Bicycle Master Plan proposes a program of high priority Keystone Projects that add bike facilities to existing campus streets and create a cohesive off-street network of pathways to serve the highest demand areas of campus. The plan also identifies secondary Supporting Projects that serve lower demand areas and enhance connectivity of the campus network to the surrounding community networks.

Funding for the Bicycle Master Plan Projects has not yet been identified, but the master plan identifies a variety of funding streams and implementation strategies for building out the network. Regardless, many projects are envisioned to start as low-cost “pilot” projects for the purpose of testing before they are formalized into the campus transportation system.
Micromobility & Emerging Modes

Micromobility refers to a variety of personal mobility vehicles that are an emerging form of travel that are exceptionally popular in urban environments and college campus communities where short trips are prevalent. Vehicles include e-scooters, motorized pedal cycles (mopeds), motorized scooters (Vespa), Segways, e-bikes, and traditional pedal cycles. Micromobility represents an opportunity to extend transportation access and opportunities to people who do not have access to a car or transit service.

However, not only are micro-mode vehicles still evolving, but there are many questions about where and how the current range of vehicles "fit" into the transportation network. On the University Park Campus, the fast diversification of micro-modes has created spatial tension with other traditional modes and has escalated safety concerns about user behavior, vehicle speed differentials, and the lack of defined networks that can support the emerging modes. Finally, guidance and strategies for safely integrating micro-modes into campus environments are also emerging but are behind-the-curve.

PennDOT definitions and regulations for micro-mobility are well-established for certain devices, but there are gray areas for certain newer devices—e.g., electric skateboards, electric roller skates, and hoverboards.

Policies and regulations from four (4) peer universities—Maryland, Rutgers, Arkansas, and Texas A&M—were reviewed for ideas and issues that can be adopted into Penn State’s approach and techniques. E-scooters and e-bikes seem to receive the greatest attention in regulations, and determining where and how these vehicles may operate and park are prominent in the policies and regulations.

Additionally, the Penn State Vehicle Code was reviewed to determine the applicability to the Penn State roadways. The PA Vehicle Code (Title 75) is applicable to “highways,” which by definition also includes “a roadway open to the use of the public for vehicular travel on grounds of a college or university or public or private school or public or historical park.” As such, any roadway that is open for public vehicular travel on University grounds is governed by the Vehicle Code and the associated code chapter that pertains to micromobility (Chapter 35 Special Vehicles and Pedestrians). State code provides the broadest guidance on the use of pedal cycles (human-powered or electrical assisted) but has not yet developed guidance for emerging forms of micromobility. Penn State may use Chapter 35 of the State Code as the foundation for micromobility programming and enforcement and then create or update University policies (such as the SY16 Regulations for Bicycles and Personal Mobility Devices) that provide additional regulations and prohibitions (as long as they do not conflict with State Code).

With the range of micro-modes already in use at University Park, Penn State desires strategies and policies that are informed by state regulations and can work in the University Park Campus environment with a minimal need for enforcement. This includes policy, spatial, operational, and enforcement considerations, as follows:

• Better definitions, classifications, and specific regulations for anticipated micromobility devices.
• Flexibility in instituting, evaluating, and then adjusting regulations.
• Continue tapping relationships with other universities and develop new ones with micro-mode providers when considering new policies and adjusting current regulations.
• Clarify parking regulations and designated parking areas for micro-modes.
• Develop dedicated space (or space shared only with wheeled vehicles).
• Establish public charging locations, likely in coordination with parking.
• Establish/revise fine structures for improper parking and usage.
• Ban sidewalk use entirely.
• Allow only University-owned devices on campus, which provides greater operational control.
• Establish spatial (geofencing) or time-of-day use restrictions.
• Provide incentives to commuters for training classes, helmet use, and good rider history.
Future Development Assumptions and Impact

This section of the UPD Study responds to the ordinance requirement for an assessment of transportation impacts of the University’s Capital Plans and other priority development projects. Additional off-campus projects that are sponsored by municipalities or PennDOT/MPO were also identified. The potential impact of the University projects was assessed according to features that tend to add trip-making or change travel patterns—parking, added floor area, employment, visitors, and changes in access. Then, the traffic impact for each project was categorized as None, Nominal, Possible, or Likely to describe the degree of traffic impact and the type of traffic study that would be expected with land development.

For the next ten-year period, 50 discrete University projects in the UPD were identified that are or will become locatable projects that will add new facilities or renovate, change, expand existing ones. Only two (2) projects—the Applied Research Laboratory Master Plan at Innovation Park and the West Campus Multi-Modal Connector—are considered “Likely” to have traffic impacts that reach the level of requiring a detailed traffic study. These projects include significant new parking facilities, new buildings, or changes in campus access. Six (6) projects—mostly those that are early in the feasibility study and design stages—were identified as having “Possible” traffic impact, largely because the traffic impact and need for studies could not be determined until the project scale and scope are better defined. For the remaining projects, traffic impact has either already been addressed or was identified as “None” or “Nominal” traffic impact, and traffic studies should not be a factor in project development. Taken all together, the anticipated transportation impact is commensurate with the strategic philosophy and intent of the previous and current Capital Plan, which are decidedly maintenance-centric.

Transportation Demand Management

Transportation demand management (TDM) is defined as a set of strategies that help manage traveler demand while maximizing traveler choices. A successful TDM program will:

- Seek to understand the ways people travel want and need to travel.
- Identify strategies to reduce single occupancy vehicle (SOV) trips.
- Influence travelers to use alternative modes of transportation such as biking or transit.

At Penn State University, TDM is overseen by Transportation Services with a Sustainable Transportation Program Coordinator and Program Assistant tasked with strategic planning and day-to-day operations. Various other departments support the planning, deployment, and operations of TDM programs.

Penn State’s TDM approach is broad-based and multi-layered, addressing the traditional modes of travel individually while also fostering innovation for new modes and ideas that cross modal boundaries. This approach includes longstanding, mature programs alongside those that are being steadily improved and others that are untested or planned and have potential for addressing a gap or emerging modes. Approximately 25 TDM “programs” can be discretely labeled, but Penn State’s layered approach integrates direct-serving programs with others—such as the Loop/Link transit service and Campus Shuttle—to enable and strengthen the success of others.

Compared to peer institutions with developed TDM programs (Maryland, UNC-Chapel Hill, and Virginia Tech), Penn State’s programs are more numerous and diversified, reflecting Penn State’s position of leadership in the area of campus TDM. Regardless, additional programs and more effective methods for implementing and developing current programs were identified, including new ideas for the post-COVID pandemic world that incentivize active transportation modes, restructure parking permit programs, and format transit services to be more demand responsive.
# Table of Contents

**Chapter 1. Background & Purpose** ................................................................. 1

1.1. The University Planned District ................................................................. 1

1.2. Requirements for the District Plan Transportation Study ......................... 1

1.3. History of UPD Transportation Studies ...................................................... 3

1.4. The 2023 UPD District Plan Transportation Update .................................... 3

   Study Area Identification ........................................................................... 3

   Facilities and Systems Analyzed ............................................................... 4

**Chapter 2. Stakeholder Partnerships & Outreach** ........................................... 5

2.1. Stakeholder Partnerships ........................................................................... 5

   Project Management Team (PMT) ............................................................. 5

   Executive Committee .............................................................................. 5

   Advisory Committee ............................................................................ 6

2.2. Workshops ............................................................................................... 7

   Discovery Workshop – December 2022 ................................................... 7

   Network Solutions Workshop – March 2023 ............................................ 7

2.3. Interviews ................................................................................................ 7

   Key Findings ............................................................................................. 8

   Common Themes: .................................................................................... 8

   Solutions .................................................................................................. 9

**Chapter 3. Parking Assessment** .................................................................... 10

3.1. Introduction ............................................................................................. 10

3.2. Comparison to 2013 UPD Study and Prior Parking Projection Report Methodology ... 11

3.3. Parking Supply ....................................................................................... 14

3.4. Parking Demand .................................................................................... 18

3.5. Parking Projections – Supply vs. Demand ................................................. 18

3.6. Curb Space Management ..................................................................... 22

   Current Curb Space Environment .......................................................... 22

   Conflicts and Competing Uses .............................................................. 23

   Key Curb Space Locations .................................................................. 23

   Peer Review and State of the Practice .................................................... 25

   Curbside Opportunities and Recommendations .................................... 25
# Chapter 4. Baseline Transportation Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1. Vehicular Mode</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus-Wide Daily Traffic</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Gateway Trends</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Campus Traffic</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Period Traffic</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark Intersections – Regional Level-of-Use</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Intersections – Campus Access Level-of-Use</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Campus Intersections – Campus Circulation Level-of-Use</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Mode Summary</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation of UPD Traffic Volume Trends</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2. Transit Mode (Transit Services Study Synopsis)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Network – Defining the Network</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loop and Link Service</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Shuttle</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Evaluation</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance by Day of Week</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU Campus Shuttle Evaluation</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Conditions</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Recommendations</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Mode Summary</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3. Pedestrian Mode</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding Principles for Campus Planning</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pedestrian Network</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Accommodation &amp; Accessibility</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Access Committee</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Level of Use</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022 AM Travel Peak Hour</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022 PM Travel Peak Hour</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022 Pedestrian Peak Hour</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparisons of 2011 and 2022 Pedestrian Crossing Volumes</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Mode Summary</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5. Future Development Assumptions and Impact ................................................................. 76

5.1. Background and Purpose ...................................................................................................... 76

5.2. Ten-Year UPD Development Assumptions .......................................................................... 77

5.3. University Projects ............................................................................................................... 77

University Capital Planning ......................................................................................................... 77
2018-2023 Capital Plan ................................................................................................................. 84
2023-2028 Capital Plan .................................................................................................................. 84
2029-2033 Capital Plan .................................................................................................................. 85
Projects and Transportation Impact Assessment ........................................................................... 85
Anticipated Transportation Impact ............................................................................................... 86
Chapter 6. Transportation Demand Management

6.1. Introduction

6.2. University Park Mode Share

6.3. Summary of Current TDM Programs

6.4. TDM Program Usage

6.5. University Transportation Projects not within the UPD

6.6. MPO and PennDOT Projects

Penn State University Planned District Transportation Study

Transportation Impacts in the UPD ................................................................. 87
UPD Traffic Impact Study Triggers ................................................................. 87
Project-Level Impact Evaluations ................................................................. 87
  Projects with LIKELY Traffic Impact ........................................................... 87
  Projects with POSSIBLE Traffic Impact ..................................................... 91

5.4. University Transportation Projects not within the UPD ......................... 93
5.5. Municipal Projects .................................................................................. 95
  Patton Township ......................................................................................... 95
  Ferguson Township ..................................................................................... 96
  State College Borough ............................................................................... 96
  College Township ....................................................................................... 101
5.6. MPO and PennDOT Projects ................................................................. 102
6.5. Other Demand Management Tools .......................................................... 114
    Event Scheduling Program ...................................................................... 114
    RideOn .................................................................................................. 114
    Flexible/Occasional Use Parking Permit .................................................. 115

6.6. Peer Institution Review .......................................................................... 115
    Virginia Tech ....................................................................................... 115
    UNC – Chapel Hill ............................................................................. 115
    University of Maryland ........................................................................ 115

6.7. Future TDM Opportunities .................................................................... 117

Chapter 7. Synthesis & Conclusion ................................................................. 118

References ................................................................................................. 119
Chapter 1.
Background & Purpose

1.1. The University Planned District

The University Planned District (UPD) for Penn State's University Park Campus comprises approximately 4,200 acres, which is divided into 13 sub-districts (Figure 1.1). All land within the UPD is owned by Penn State University. Land development within the UPD-adopting municipalities of State College Borough, College Township, and Patton Township is governed by the UPD Zoning Ordinance. UPD Sub-Districts extend into Ferguson and Benner Township, which are non-UPD-adopting municipalities, and the UPD designation is superseded by the underlying municipal zoning.

The UPD Ordinance purpose and intent states:

*The University Planned District is designed to promote the careful planning and orderly development of the University campus, consistent with the community development goals of the Centre Region and its member municipalities as described in the Centre Region Comprehensive Plan.*

1.2. Requirements for the District Plan Transportation Study

The District Plan Transportation Study (a.k.a., UPD Transportation Study) is a planning requirement unique to the UPD Zoning Ordinance. The study is to be prepared every tenth year to document travel trends and identify potential transportation effects of land development and transportation projects within the district during the next ten-year period. The following requirements of the District Plan Update are noted:

- **Parking Area Identification and Projections** – Identify general size and location of parking areas within the sub-districts which are projected for use as parking areas within a 10-year period.
- **Traffic Assessment** – Identify the transportation systems to be studied. Existing transportation conditions for highway links and intersections serving the UPD must be described and the existing level of use analyzed. Potential transportation impacts of future parking development must be assessed for a ten-year period. Recommendations for potential system or service improvements in order to accommodate the projected transportation impacts of UPD development shall be included. When feasible, the study shall identify specific recommendations designed to reduce or avoid impacts created by campus development on existing and future residential neighborhoods.
- **Internal Circulation and Facilities** – Describe existing and proposed internal roads for vehicular traffic; existing and proposed connections to the public street network; plans for street openings and closings, and possible impacts on the adjoining transportation system and adjoining zoning districts; existing and proposed facilities and accommodations for public transportation, pedestrian circulation, bicycle paths and other transportation methods.
- **Travel Demand Management** – Include a travel demand management analysis, addressing the manner in which various methods, such as promotion of ride sharing, pedestrian/bicycle improvements, and changes to on-campus and public transportation systems, will be utilized to reduce the number of single-occupancy vehicle trips associated with future development.

---

2 State College Borough Zoning Ordinance, University Planned District, Section 1201.a.
3 State College Borough, Zoning Ordinance, University Planned District, Section 1209.
Figure 1.1. The University Park Planned District and Transportation Study Area
1.3. History of UPD Transportation Studies

Previous UPD Transportation Studies and Updates were completed in 1994, 2001, and 2013.

The 1994 University Planned District Master Plan Traffic Study was completed by Travers Associates in two parts. Part A provided an update to Penn State’s 1988 Master Transportation Plan, and Part B provided a technical traffic study of the Master Plan Supplement update. The traffic study was largely a technical vehicle-focused forecasting and analysis activity conducted with the Quick Response System, Version 2 (QRS-II) software. The model reported performance of intersections and street links according to level-of-service letter grades, based on methods from the Highway Capacity Manual. The study also provided mapping of the UPD study area and street, bike, and pedestrian networks, as envisioned by the Master Plan update.

The 2001 Penn State Phase 1 Transportation Study was completed by McCormick Taylor following adoption of the 1999 University Park Master Plan (by JJR Incorporated) and 1999 Transportation Demand Management Plan (by BRW). The Phase 1 Study included a large data collection program and served as the ten-year UPD Transportation Study Update. It also provided a technical traffic analysis of certain street networking ideas recommended in the 1999 Master Plan. While the study was vehicle-focused, it contained a substantial section evaluating the transportation effects of transit recommendations from the Demand Management Plan.

The 2013 University Planned District Transportation Study Update was completed by McCormick Taylor specifically as the ordinance-required ten-year transportation study. The 2013 Study expanded the transportation “level-of-use” analysis to encompass the multi-modal nature of University Park’s transportation system, including vehicle, transit, bike, and pedestrian modes. One key study goal was the determination of the “mode share” for the major modes serving campus. A data collection program to match the Phase 1 Study was conducted in 2011 to support the mode share analysis, and backward-looking comparisons to the 2000 data were made to check progress toward reducing vehicular travel demand for the campus.

1.4. The 2023 UPD District Plan Transportation Update

This report provides the ten-year UPD District Plan Transportation Study Update to fulfill the UPD Zoning Ordinance requirements. To match with the previous 2001 and 2013 UPD Studies, this 2023 Update includes baseline transportation data collected in 2022 and looks out to a Horizon Year of 2032, for the purposes of evaluating the transportation effects of the University’s land development assumptions.

The 2023 Update looks back at level-of-use changes since the 2000 and 2011 data collection points, and also presents a forward-looking element to 2032. It presents an integrated multi-modal perspective, including new and emerging micro-mobility, curb-space management, and transportation network companies. The study is also informed by a more extensive outreach component that engaged local and regional transportation experts and stakeholders. As such this update is intended to meet and exceed the UPD ordinance requirements as a resource for the UPD-adopting municipalities.

Study Area Identification

While the Study Area for the UPD Transportation Study includes the entire zoned district, transportation analysis typically focuses on the most transportation-intensive areas of the University, including most
parts of UPD Sub-Districts 4, 5, 6 and 9 in State College Borough and College Township (orange boundary). This encompasses the traditional “Core Campus” and developing “West Campus”.

**Facilities and Systems Analyzed**

This update assesses the “level-of-use” of the following transportation facilities and system elements within this Study Area:

*Roadway Network System* – The roadway system encompasses the network of state, municipal, and University roadways within the Study Area that functions as a traffic-carrying network. Some but not all driveways, access roadways, parking lots, and service areas were also investigated.

*CATA Transit System* – CATA operates the Loop, Link, and Regional Route public transit systems in the urbanized area of Centre County, with service generally focused in the Centre Region municipalities, but also in Bellefonte and Spring and Benner Townships. The University contracts with CATA to provide the Loop and Link services, and CATA’s Regional Routes link to the University Park Campus and downtown State College as the primary hub of regional service.

*University Park Shuttle Systems* – The University operates shuttle systems that supplement transit services provided by CATA. Some of these shuttle routes extend beyond the Study Area but have significant transportation effects within the Study Area.

*Pedestrian & Bicycle Systems* – The pedestrian and bicycle facilities include crossings, gateways, shared-use paths, bike lanes, bike parks, and intermodal elements that support non-motorized travel. This investigation focuses on the transportation effects of these modes within the Study Area, as a connected element of the larger regional system.
Chapter 2. Stakeholder Partnerships & Outreach

2.1. Stakeholder Partnerships

In order to hear multiple perspectives and better understand transportation in the University Planned District, outreach to municipal, regional, and agency stakeholders was conducted through meetings, interviews, and workshops held during development of the UPD Transportation Study.

Project Management Team

The Project Management Team (PMT) was established to provide primary oversight and execution of the UPD Planning Process. The Team functioned as a highly engaged steering committee that participated in bi-weekly status meetings, provided day-to-day project direction, and reviewed project deliverables. The Team included Penn State staff and the lead consultant team members (Table 2.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kurt Coduti</td>
<td>Penn State University</td>
<td>Penn State Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Sullivan</td>
<td>Penn State University</td>
<td>University Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert DeMayo*</td>
<td>Penn State University</td>
<td>Director of Transportation Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Ward</td>
<td>Penn State University</td>
<td>Associate/Interim Director of Transportation Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Samba</td>
<td>Kimley Horn</td>
<td>Consultant Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Saunders</td>
<td>Toole Design Group</td>
<td>Consultant Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Watts</td>
<td>McCormick Taylor</td>
<td>Consultant Team Project Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Departed Penn State prior to adoption of the 2023 UPD Transportation Study.

Executive Committee

The Executive Committee (Table 2.2) was comprised of Penn State’s senior leadership with responsibility for campus planning, properties, and the physical plant infrastructure. The Executive Committee reviewed project direction and deliverables at key milestones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Sitzabee</td>
<td>Vice President of Facilities Management and Planning, Chief Facilities Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Watson</td>
<td>Director of Planning, Design, and Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Snyder</td>
<td>Associate Vice President for Auxiliary &amp; Business Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt Coduti</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Sullivan</td>
<td>University Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert DeMayo*</td>
<td>Director of Transportation Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Ward</td>
<td>Interim Director of Transportation Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Departed Penn State prior to adoption of the 2023 UPD Transportation Study.
Advisory Committee

The Advisory Committee (Table 2.3) included stakeholders from across the Penn State Community plus regional and agency professionals with roles and expertise in transportation planning.

Table 2.3. Advisory Committee Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herb Combs</td>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
<td>Associate Athletic Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Zajac</td>
<td>Police &amp; Public Safety</td>
<td>Deputy Chief of Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Flynn</td>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Properties</td>
<td>Landscape Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke Anderson</td>
<td>Transportation Services</td>
<td>Parking Operations Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Thomas</td>
<td>Transportation Services</td>
<td>Special Projects Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Ward</td>
<td>Transportation Services</td>
<td>Associate/Interim Director of Transportation Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adway Das</td>
<td>Student Transportation Committee</td>
<td>Penn State Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Reynolds</td>
<td>Student Transportation Committee</td>
<td>Penn State Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwayne Witmer</td>
<td>University Access Committee</td>
<td>Facilities Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Raab</td>
<td>Risk Management</td>
<td>Director of Risk Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meghan Hoskins</td>
<td>Sustainability Institute</td>
<td>Analysis and Planning Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Smith</td>
<td>Buildings and Grounds</td>
<td>Senior Manager, Building Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Murnyak</td>
<td>PennDOT District 2-0</td>
<td>Portfolio Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Patterson</td>
<td>OPP Stores - Central Distribution/Freight</td>
<td>Inventory Control &amp; Distribution Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Sullivan</td>
<td>Office of Physical Plant</td>
<td>University Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt Coduti</td>
<td>Office of Physical Plant</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert DeMayo</td>
<td>Transportation Services</td>
<td>Director of Transportation Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Saylor</td>
<td>Centre County MPO</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Kausch</td>
<td>Centre County MPO/ CATA</td>
<td>Transit Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Andisheh Ranjbari</td>
<td>University Faculty</td>
<td>Asst. Professor, Civil &amp; Environmental Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Xianbiao Hu</td>
<td>University Faculty</td>
<td>Asst. Professor, Civil &amp; Environmental Engineering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Notes:
* Departed Penn State prior to adoption of the 2023 UPD Transportation Study.
** Regional/agency participants
CATA – Centre Area Transportation Authority
CRPA – Centre Regional Planning Agency
2.2. Workshops

The study incorporated two UPD Study Workshops at University Park. Each two-day workshop included field visits, data collection, and collaborative meetings with the Project Management Team and Advisory Committee.

**Discovery Workshop – December 2022**

The two-day Discovery Workshop was held over December 5-6, 2022, with meetings held at the Steam Services Building. Figure 2.1 provides an overview of the Workshop Itinerary. The workshop emphasized the collection of input and information on the current state of campus and community transportation. During the Workshop, the consultant team conducted most of the Stakeholder Interviews and met with the Advisory Committee and Project Management Team. Meetings included "sketch map" sessions where issues, concerns, and ideas were recorded. The consultant team organized and facilitated a walking tour of campus, and several members of the Project Management Team and Advisory Committee participated.

**Network Solutions Workshop – March 2023**

The two-day Network Design Workshop was held over March 27-28, 2023 and explored physical design ideas for the University Park Campus transportation system. Meetings were again held at the Steam Services Building. Figure 2.2 provides an overview of the Workshop Itinerary. With the background provided during the Discovery Workshop, the consultant team facilitated "Come and See" Design Sessions to envision future campus transportation scenarios. The consultant team then facilitated a "network design session" with the Project Management Team to imagine network options that could become part of the Network Management Approach. The Team developed three options, and one of the three was selected to represent the Network Management Approach.

2.3. Interviews

The study was informed by Stakeholder Interviews that engaged additional Penn State staff and agency stakeholders who did not participate in the Advisory Committee or other project teams. Stakeholders included staff from State College Borough, College Township, and Patton Township (the UPD-adopting municipalities) as well as the PA Department of Transportation (PennDOT), Centre Regional Planning Agency (CRPA), Centre County Metropolitan Planning Organization (CCMPO), and Centre Area Transportation Authority (CATA).

The interviews were conducted during or soon after the Discovery Workshop. Seven (7) interview sessions were conducted, organized by transportation topic and/or jurisdiction (Table 2.4).
### Table 2.4. Stakeholder Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Interviewer</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability / ADA</td>
<td>Kristin Saunders (T)</td>
<td>December 6, 2022</td>
<td>In-person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brittany Sink (T)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Services</td>
<td>Kristin Saunders (T)</td>
<td>December 6, 2022</td>
<td>In-person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brittany Sink (T)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patton / College Townships</td>
<td>Kristin Saunders (T)</td>
<td>December 6, 2022</td>
<td>In-person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rob Watts (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State College / PSU</td>
<td>Brittany Sink (T)</td>
<td>December 6, 2022</td>
<td>In-person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Samba (K)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Physical Plant</td>
<td>Kristin Saunders (T)</td>
<td>December 6, 2022</td>
<td>In-person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brittany Sink (T)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner Agencies</td>
<td>Kristin Saunders (T)</td>
<td>December 16, 2022</td>
<td>Virtual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Samba (K)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rob Watts (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics and Recreation</td>
<td>Kristin Saunders (T)</td>
<td>December 20, 2022</td>
<td>Virtual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table Notes:**
Interviewer: (T) Toole Design Group; (K) Kimley-Horn; (M) McCormick Taylor

### Key Findings

The following is a summary of the overlap in mission, concern, or need among the interviewed stakeholders. These areas should be considered in ongoing University transportation planning.

**Common Themes:**

- Class dismissal causes gridlock on campus for drivers at a few key intersections.
  - The overarching "yield to pedestrians" rule and high volume of pedestrians overwhelms crosswalks, sidewalks, and intersections during class changes.
  - Driving, biking, and walking habits increase in aggression due to the congestion.
  - The congestion delays buses and shuttles.
  - Pedestrians are prone to assuming a pedestrian-only environment and this causes conflict at campus roadway crossings and when they leave campus.
  - Bikes must share the road because sidewalks are too congested.

- People are not aware the campus shuttle can be used by anyone.
  - You do not need to be faculty or staff to use the shuttles.
  - Where they stop and their route is unclear to many.
  - The shuttle often does not come to a full stop unless they are approached.

- Some modes do not have dedicated accommodations on campus.
  - Roads do not have capacity for bikes or scooters. Sidewalks do not have capacity for bikes or scooters.
  - Campus-maintenance vehicles may not use state roads. Campus-maintenance vehicles may not use campus sidewalks.

- Places where bikes and cars, cars and pedestrians, pedestrians and bikes interact are uncomfortable without organization or adequate space.
  - Bikes coming up behind left-turning vehicles waiting for pedestrians to cross must choose which side to pass on.
Inconsistent bike facility standards and lack of clarity contribute to misuse.
Bike facilities terminating or only providing one-direction travel contributes to confusion with other modes.
Pathways wide enough to accommodate pedestrians and bikes or for bikes to pass pedestrians intermittently may be needed.

- Topography, stairs, connectivity, and building placement influence how bikes and pedestrians can move across campus.
  - Bikes cannot use routes with stairs.
  - Pedestrians cannot walk where there is no sidewalk or service roads.
  - Bikes and pedestrians will cross the street where a perpendicular sidewalk or driveway meets a street, and crosswalks would generally be appropriate.

**Solutions**

Interviewees offered ideas and potential solutions based on the themes and concerns discussed:

- Consider one-way vehicle and bus circulation on campus (deconflict).
- Build a one-stop hub for transit-choice information (transportation choice).
- Develop campus-wide mobility goals (vision unity).
- Add more off-campus to campus bicycling connections (sustainability).
- Provide more and reliable bus lines to affordable housing locations off campus (equity).
- Continue trend to move parking to exterior (deconflict).
- Improve and streamline connections between modes (transportation choice).

The project team was also informed of barriers that will need to be addressed when the plan is garnering support or proposing modifications:

- Set road layout, old growth trees, and utilities (steam tunnels).
- Historic buildings and campus aesthetic delays and sometimes limits bike facility design.
- Topography (inclines, walls, and stairs).
- Parking administration is complex and slow change may be a barrier to solutions such as dedicated space for all modes.
Chapter 3.
Parking Assessment

3.1. Introduction

Penn State’s Transportation Services department manages, enforces, and collects fees for more than 18,000 parking spaces within the UPD sub-districts. The department has roles in financing, maintaining, and managing surface and structured parking. The successful execution of this responsibility and a well-managed parking system is of critical importance to the Penn State community; it allows for the safe, efficient, and convenient access of student, faculty, staff, and visitors; it allows for a right-sized approach to accommodating parking demand while moving the Penn State, incrementally, towards a more sustainable future; and it provides a structure to capitalize on university-wide athletic events that generate tens of thousands of short-term campus visitors each year.

Efficient and well-managed parking at Penn State is also of significant interest to the boroughs and townships near the University Park Campus. A well-managed Penn State parking system satisfies the university parking demand within its own boundaries, without creating undue impacts to the streets and neighborhoods of surrounding communities.

As part of the University Planned District (UPD) Ordinance, State College Borough, College Township, and Patton Township codified requirements for Penn State to prepare a Parking Projections Report, annually, and to prepare a District Plan Transportation Study every 10 years. The UPD code language in the State College Borough⁴, College Township⁵, and Patton Township⁶ ordinances is nearly identical, as follows:

- **Parking Projections Report.** The applicant shall furnish a Parking Projections Report with the application for District Plan approval which shall show the manner in which the parking standards⁷ in this section have been derived and applied. The Parking Projections Report shall indicate the current numbers of parking spaces for each category of parking users⁸, a three-year projection of the number of parking spaces for each category of parking users, the methodology utilized to determine the number of spaces required (based upon demand history), and a narrative description of the assumptions and rationale upon which the methodology and current and projected number of a parking spaces are based. Every year following the approval of the District Plan, the applicant shall submit an updated Parking Projections Report in accordance with this subsection for review by the Centre Regional Planning Commission (CRPC). The parking standards set forth therein shall then become applicable to the District Plan and Narrative.

- **District Plan Transportation Study.** A district transportation study shall be submitted with the application for approval of the District Plan, and every 10th year following approval of the District Plan. The purpose of the transportation study is to generally identify the transportation impacts likely to result from projected development and activities within the District for a ten-year period.

---

⁴ State College Borough, University Planned District, https://ecode360.com/32910964#32910964
⁵ College Township, University Planned District, https://ecode360.com/10704992#10704992
⁶ Patton Township, University Planned District, https://ecode360.com/6633586#6633586
⁷ Standards for the number of parking spaces to be provided shall be determined by historical demand for each parking user category and computed utilizing a formula that specifies the number of parking spaces to be provided for the number of persons within each category.
⁸ Parking user categories include: 1) Students residing within the UPD; 2) Students who commute from a residence outside the UPD; 3) Employees; and 4) Visitors.
The transportation study shall include the following:
  o Parking Area Identification and Projections. Transportation impacts within the UPD will principally arise from the location and size of parking areas within the district. The transportation study, therefore, must identify existing parking areas, and the general size and location of areas within each subdistrict which are projected for use as parking areas within a ten-year period.

Historically, Penn State has prepared the Parking Projections Report as a separate submittal, even within a UPD Transportation Study year. For the 2023 UPD Study, Penn State identified an opportunity to integrate the Parking Projections Report into the UPD Study and modernize the methods that are used to monitor, calculate, and report parking supply, demand, and trends both to satisfy the external UPD requirements and to streamline the workflow and utility of the reporting activity internally.

### 3.2. Comparison to 2013 UPD Study and Prior Parking Projection Report Methodology

The 2013 UPD Study addressed parking in the following ways:

- Identified investments, transportation projects, and development activities that would occur over the next year and alter the supply of parking.
- Provided a map and list showing parking infrastructure investments over the preceding 10 years.
- Summarized estimated event parking demand (referenced from a separate University study).
- Summarized existing and potential parking related Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs.

The most recent Parking Projections Report (dated September 2022) consisted of a set of data summaries as shown in Figure 3.1 and Figure 3.2. The report included the following information:

- Parking demand historic estimates\(^9\) (2017 to 2021) and projections (2022 to 2026) for staff, students (residents, commuters, and off-campus storage) and visitors.
- Parking supply actuals\(^10\) (2019 to 2021) and projections (2022 to 2026) for each sub-district.
- List of planned projects (2019 to 2025) in each subdistrict that affect the supply of parking.

The 2023 UPD study provides the following updates to the previous parking projections report approach to satisfy elements of the codified parking projections requirements that were not previously addressed:

- Updates to the UPD subdistrict boundaries primarily impacting subdistricts 7, 8, and 11.
- Parking demand historical estimates (2019 to 2021) and projections (2023 to 2027) for staff, students (residents, commuters, and off-campus storage) and visitors
  - Updates staff and student parking registration values to be aligned with parking software reports (for improved accuracy).
  - Updates the staff space assignment ratio from 1.10 to 1.25 to account for work from home and hybrid learning trends that have been heightened by the pandemic.
  - Updates visitor parking demand to be 15 percent of the campus population based on parking facility counts and comparable estimations at peer universities.

---

\(^9\) “Historic estimates” refer to the space demand calculations for years prior to the current parking projection report.

\(^10\) “Actuals” refer to parking supply that has been manually verified with a parking count or similar process.
Figure 3.1. Parking Demand (2022 Parking Projections Report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Historic Estimates</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>17137</td>
<td>16777</td>
<td>17037</td>
<td>20251</td>
<td>20063</td>
<td>20264</td>
<td>20466</td>
<td>20671</td>
<td>20878</td>
<td>21086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>10909</td>
<td>11131</td>
<td>11400</td>
<td>9993</td>
<td>11563</td>
<td>11679</td>
<td>11795</td>
<td>11913</td>
<td>12033</td>
<td>12153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Rate</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Assignment Ratio</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Demand</td>
<td>9917</td>
<td>10119</td>
<td>10364</td>
<td>9085</td>
<td>10512</td>
<td>10617</td>
<td>10723</td>
<td>10830</td>
<td>10939</td>
<td>11048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student -- Commuter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-resident enrollment</td>
<td>32011</td>
<td>31691</td>
<td>31804</td>
<td>35461</td>
<td>32587</td>
<td>32913</td>
<td>33242</td>
<td>33574</td>
<td>33910</td>
<td>34249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>5011</td>
<td>5298</td>
<td>5760</td>
<td>3101</td>
<td>2850</td>
<td>5924</td>
<td>5984</td>
<td>6043</td>
<td>6104</td>
<td>6165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Rate</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Assignment Ratio</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Demand</td>
<td>2506</td>
<td>2649</td>
<td>2880</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>1425</td>
<td>2962</td>
<td>2992</td>
<td>3022</td>
<td>3052</td>
<td>3082</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student -- Resident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Enrollment</td>
<td>14599</td>
<td>14579</td>
<td>14919</td>
<td>10440</td>
<td>14343</td>
<td>13800</td>
<td>14000</td>
<td>14000</td>
<td>14000</td>
<td>14000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>1792</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>1333</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Rate</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Assignment Ratio</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Demand</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>1792</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>1333</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td>1723</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student -- Off Campus Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Demand</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly/Metered Space Available</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>411</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Permits Sold</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Advance Sales</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Conf. Permits</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Demand</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>411</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Demand</td>
<td>15998</td>
<td>16463</td>
<td>16753</td>
<td>13387</td>
<td>15276</td>
<td>17625</td>
<td>17054</td>
<td>17191</td>
<td>17330</td>
<td>17469</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- Staff Employment = from University Budget Factbook.  (Full Time + Park Time + Casual Non-Student) - (Graduate Assistants).
- Staff Demand = (Employment X Registration Rate) / Assignment Ratio
- Student Commuter Demand = (Commuter Enrollment X Registration Rate) / Assignment Ratio
- Student Resident Demand = (Housing Occupancy X Registration Rate / Assignment Ratio
- Visitor Demand = Assigned Visitor Spaces + Average Daily Permits
- Total Supply = existing inventory + Proposed Construction - Anticipated Losses

Staff Employment: Assume 1% growth thru 2023.
Student Commuter: Assume 1% growth thru 2023.
Hours/Metered Space Available: Increase due to less meters, able to track visitor usage.
### Figure 3.2. Sub-District Parking Supply and Planned Projects (2022 Parking Projections Report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Supply by Sub District</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub District 2</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub District 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub District 4</td>
<td>1229</td>
<td>1229</td>
<td>2372</td>
<td>2372</td>
<td>2372</td>
<td>2372</td>
<td>2372</td>
<td>2372</td>
<td>2372</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub District 5</td>
<td>8928</td>
<td>9121</td>
<td>9007</td>
<td>8933</td>
<td>8909</td>
<td>8933</td>
<td>8841</td>
<td>8841</td>
<td>8841</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub District 6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub District 7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub District 8</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub District 9</td>
<td>5408</td>
<td>5283</td>
<td>5288</td>
<td>5338</td>
<td>5338</td>
<td>5338</td>
<td>5338</td>
<td>5338</td>
<td>5338</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub District 10</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub District 11</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>948</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub District 14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub District 15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub District 16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub District Total</td>
<td>17593</td>
<td>17661</td>
<td>18646</td>
<td>18622</td>
<td>18598</td>
<td>18622</td>
<td>18530</td>
<td>18530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planned Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D-4 West Deck Construction</td>
<td>+1658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-4 Red A Leonard North &amp; South (Deck)</td>
<td>-289</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-4 Red A IST Construction</td>
<td>-299</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-4 Red A Golf Constraction</td>
<td>-216</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-5 BA Reber</td>
<td>-92</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-5 BC Boucke Construction</td>
<td>+114</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-5 BB Offline Construction</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>+24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-5 OHF Forest Resources Temp Building</td>
<td>+101</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-5 Green B Ford - new Oswald Tower</td>
<td>-74</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-5 RJ Pow erplant</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-5 Red D Rec Hall</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-5 YG Fenske Demo &amp; Rebuild</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-5 L82 Tenor Hall</td>
<td>+23</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-5 L82 Geary</td>
<td>+21</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-5 L82 Sproul</td>
<td>+48</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-5 YE Ferguson (Henning Done)</td>
<td>+35</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-5 YT Redifer Commons</td>
<td>+23</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-5 Silver G (convert from 42)</td>
<td>+38</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-5 Lot 42 (reductionnow Silver G)</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-7 New Art Museum</td>
<td>Preliminary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preliminary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-7 Arboretum</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-9 Orange A Katz (Add HCP)</td>
<td>+05</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-9 Orange F EALR/Lasch</td>
<td>-125</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>+50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-11 Does not include OPP and Fleet Reserved/Gated spaces (492)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Updated 9/6/22
- Parking supply historical actual counts (2019 to 2021) and projections (2023 to 2027) for each sub-district. Quantifies total parking supply with the following available filters:
  - Within/Outside UPD Study Area.
  - By municipality (State College Borough, College Township, and Patton Township).
  - By UPD subdistrict.
  - By user type (faculty/staff, resident storage, commuter, transient/visitor).
  - By space type (ADA, service, delivery).

- List of planned projects (2019 to 2023) in each subdistrict that affect the temporary and permanent supply of parking.

Consistent with previous parking projections report, the 2023 UPD study reports three years of parking history, one year of parking actuals, and five years of future parking projections. Plus, the year in which the report is submitted is considered the first future projection year given that potential changes in supply by the end of the current year have not all been reconciled at the time of report submission.

### 3.3. Parking Supply

**Table 3-1** below shows the parking supply actuals in 2019, 2020, and in 2021 with projections through 2027. The parking supply in this table includes all space types in the UPD sub-districts (inclusive of permit, visitor, service, and delivery spaces).

Projected supply in future years is calculated by applying the temporary and permanent parking impacts from known activities and development projects as shown in **Table 3-2**. Approximately 160 parking spaces will be taken offline by 2027.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supply by Sub District11</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th></th>
<th>Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub District 2</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub District 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub District 4</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>2,372</td>
<td>2,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub District 5</td>
<td>8,928</td>
<td>9,121</td>
<td>9,007</td>
<td>8,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub District 6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub District 7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub District 8</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>1,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub District 9</td>
<td>5,408</td>
<td>5,283</td>
<td>5,288</td>
<td>5,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub District 10</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub District 11</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub District 14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub District 15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub District 16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub District Total -- adjusted for gains/losses</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,593</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,661</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,646</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,584</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 It should be noted that Subdistrict 1 no longer exists and Subdistricts 3, 15, and 16 have no parking areas.
Penn State confirms the supply of parking with the UPD sub-districts by performing periodic manual in-person and GIS-assisted parking space counts. Penn State maintains a GIS base map that contains information about each parking area, such as number of ADA spaces, service spaces, and delivery spaces and any observations that were made during the count.

Penn State also has an Online Map that overlays known construction projects with parking supply. This map provides clarity about which user types (Faculty/Staff, Student, Visitor, Service/Delivery) are allowed in which parking areas and how the primary user may change after peak weekday hours.

The 2023 UPD study used both the GIS base map and PSU Online Map to confirm the total parking supply, space type, and the available permit supply. Table 3.3 shows the available permit or visitor parking supply by sub-district and user type. It should be noted that the available permit supply does not include service or delivery spaces. Table 3.4 shows the total supply categorized by ADA spaces, service, and delivery spaces.

---

### Table 3.2. Temporary and Permanent Parking Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Project</th>
<th>Temporary Impact</th>
<th>Permanent Impact</th>
<th>Impact Start Date</th>
<th>Impact End Date</th>
<th>Complete Closure?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Corl St Closure</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>Sep-22</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown 11 Grubb Construction</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-60</td>
<td>Jan-23</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red A Golf Construction</td>
<td>-216</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Jan-20</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red A IST Construction</td>
<td>-299</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Jan-20</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red A Machine Construction</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>May-22</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow A Construction</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>Aug-22</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red A Leonard North &amp; South (Deck)</td>
<td>-289</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Jan-19</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown A Electrical Construction</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Aug-22</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown C Construction</td>
<td>-122</td>
<td>Jan-22</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown E Sparks Construction Impact</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Jan-23</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green B Ford - new Oswald Tower</td>
<td>-60</td>
<td>Aug-22</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green C Construction North</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Jan-23</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green C Construction South</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Jan-23</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 42 (reduction now Silver G)</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Jan-23</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 81 McElwain Construction</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Jan-23</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 82 Geary Construction</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>Jan-22</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red J South Construction</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Aug-22</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver B Impacts</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Mar-23</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President House Construction</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>Jan-23</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange O Water Treatment Impacts</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Jan-23</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange O Field Maintenance Impacts</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Jan-23</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Field Loading Impacts</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Jan-23</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 25 Construction</td>
<td>-49</td>
<td>May-22</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange F EALR/Lasch</td>
<td>-126</td>
<td>Jun-22</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Special Services Construction</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>Jan-23</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.3. Parking Supply Summary by District and User

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARKING SUPPLY SUMMARY</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subdistrict 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Permit Supply (during year)</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Storage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdistrict 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Permit Supply (during year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Storage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdistrict 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Permit Supply (during year)</td>
<td>2,248</td>
<td>1,872</td>
<td>2,176</td>
<td>2,176</td>
<td>2,176</td>
<td>2,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>1,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Storage</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdistrict 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Permit Supply (during year)</td>
<td>8,378</td>
<td>7,897</td>
<td>8,346</td>
<td>8,346</td>
<td>8,443</td>
<td>8,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>4,804</td>
<td>4,393</td>
<td>4,759</td>
<td>4,759</td>
<td>4,806</td>
<td>4,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Storage</td>
<td>2,653</td>
<td>2,599</td>
<td>2,646</td>
<td>2,646</td>
<td>2,646</td>
<td>2,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdistrict 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Permit Supply (during year)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Storage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdistrict 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Permit Supply (during year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdistrict 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Permit Supply (during year)</td>
<td>1,574</td>
<td>1,574</td>
<td>1,574</td>
<td>1,574</td>
<td>1,574</td>
<td>1,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>1,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Storage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdistrict 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Permit Supply (during year)</td>
<td>5,336</td>
<td>5,328</td>
<td>5,338</td>
<td>5,398</td>
<td>5,363</td>
<td>5,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>1,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Storage</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>3,140</td>
<td>3,140</td>
<td>3,140</td>
<td>3,140</td>
<td>3,140</td>
<td>3,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>1,077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.3. Parking Supply Summary by District and User (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARKING SUPPLY SUMMARY</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subdistrict 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Permit Supply (during year)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Storage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdistrict 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Permit Supply (during year)</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Storage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdistrict 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Permit Supply (during year)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Storage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdistrict 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Permit Supply (during year)</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Storage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdistrict 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Permit Supply (during year)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Storage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4. Parking Supply Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supply Count (2022)</th>
<th>2023 Report PARKING SUPPLY SUMMARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SPACES (at start of year)</td>
<td>19,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA SPACES</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE SPACES</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELIVERY SPACES</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Construction Impacts</td>
<td>(115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Construction Impacts (at end of year)</td>
<td>(76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available Permit Parking(^{12}) (at end of year)</td>
<td>18,584</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{12}\) Total Available Permit Parking = TOTAL SPACES – SERVICE SPACES – DELIVERY SPACES - Permanent Construction Impacts.
3.4. Parking Demand

Table 3.5 provides a full breakdown of parking demand. Table 3.6 provides a comparison of the historic and projected parking demand estimates as reported in three different parking projection report years: 2018 (included because it had a demand calculation for 2013, the prior UPD transportation study year); 2022 (included because it is the most recent year); and 2023 (included because it is the current year). The total estimated parking demand is well below previous estimates for 2022; the impact of the pandemic on employment numbers and the growing flexibility of work from home and non-traditional work hours have contributed to a significant reduction in staff parking demand (by over 2,400 spaces).

It is noteworthy that student registration rates for parking permits have increased. This correlates to declining transit use and reduced participation in transportation demand management programs coming out of the COVID-pandemic.

The values presented in Table 3.6 were derived as follows:

- University Faculty and Staff employment from the University Budget Book / Fall Data Digest
- Student enrollment numbers of from Housing Services
- Registered parking permits from the University’s parking and permit inventory software
- Space Assignment Ratio – Percentage value reflects the planned efficiency of parking turnover (aimed to minimize empty or underutilized parking spaces). Historically this number has been 110 percent for faculty staff, 200 percent for student commuters, and 100 percent for student residents. Based on the parking analysis in the 2023 UPD Study:
  - The faculty/staff value was updated to 125 percent to account for increased flexibility, work from home, and hybrid learning that has been heightened post-pandemic.
  - The student commuter value of 200 percent was retained as appropriate because student schedules allow for flexibility and most student commuters do not park on campus every day during parking peak hours (7:30am to 4:00pm).
  - The student resident value of 100 percent was also retained as appropriate because residents are not likely to leave campus or move their vehicles during the day.

- Space Demand (On-Campus) = (Student Enrollment * Registration Rate) / (Space Assignment Ratio)
- Space Demand (Off-Campus) – Estimate for off campus storage based on permits sold and a space demand estimate for visitors based on a visitor to campus population ratio of 15 percent.

3.5. Parking Projections – Supply vs. Demand

The University deploys specific strategies to allocate and assign parking such that capacity is efficiently used and managed. Based on the 2023 parking projections, total supply for permit or visitor use (17,679 spaces) exceeds the projected parking demand (15,771). This indicates that, generally, all of the University’s parking needs can be accommodated within the available UPD sub-district parking supply. Demand is projected to remain below the available parking supply through and beyond 2027, as presented in Table 3.7.

The updates to the approach to monitor and prepare the Parking Projections Report demonstrate a better alignment with the code requirements, reflect new trends in parking and campus travel behavior habits, and provide additional transparency that allow external partners to understand and recognize the adequacy of Penn State’s parking supply.
Table 3.5. Parking Demand Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Demand</td>
<td>15,998</td>
<td>16,463</td>
<td>16,753</td>
<td>13,387</td>
<td>15,276</td>
<td>15,861</td>
<td>15,771</td>
<td>15,928</td>
<td>16,087</td>
<td>16,248</td>
<td>16,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>17,137</td>
<td>16,777</td>
<td>17,037</td>
<td>20,251</td>
<td>20,063</td>
<td>19,947</td>
<td>20,146</td>
<td>20,348</td>
<td>20,551</td>
<td>20,757</td>
<td>20,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>10,909</td>
<td>11,131</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>9,993</td>
<td>11,563</td>
<td>10,285</td>
<td>10,388</td>
<td>10,492</td>
<td>10,597</td>
<td>10,703</td>
<td>10,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Rate</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment Ratio</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Demand</td>
<td>9,917</td>
<td>10,119</td>
<td>10,364</td>
<td>9,085</td>
<td>10,512</td>
<td>8,228</td>
<td>8,310</td>
<td>8,393</td>
<td>8,477</td>
<td>8,562</td>
<td>8,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student -- Commuter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-resident enrollment</td>
<td>32,011</td>
<td>31,691</td>
<td>31,804</td>
<td>35,461</td>
<td>32,587</td>
<td>33,789</td>
<td>34,127</td>
<td>34,468</td>
<td>34,813</td>
<td>35,161</td>
<td>35,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>5,011</td>
<td>5,298</td>
<td>5,760</td>
<td>3,101</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>6,573</td>
<td>6,143</td>
<td>6,204</td>
<td>6,266</td>
<td>6,329</td>
<td>6,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Rate</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment Ratio</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Demand</td>
<td>2,506</td>
<td>2,649</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>1,551</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>3,287</td>
<td>3,071</td>
<td>3,102</td>
<td>3,133</td>
<td>3,164</td>
<td>3,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student -- Resident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Enrollment</td>
<td>14,599</td>
<td>14,579</td>
<td>14,919</td>
<td>10,440</td>
<td>14,343</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>14,140</td>
<td>14,281</td>
<td>14,424</td>
<td>14,568</td>
<td>14,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>1,792</td>
<td>1,723</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>1,723</td>
<td>2,222</td>
<td>2,244</td>
<td>2,267</td>
<td>2,289</td>
<td>2,312</td>
<td>2,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Rate</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment Ratio</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Demand</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>1,792</td>
<td>1,723</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>1,723</td>
<td>2,222</td>
<td>2,244</td>
<td>2,267</td>
<td>2,289</td>
<td>2,312</td>
<td>2,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student -- Off Campus Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Demand</td>
<td>1,205</td>
<td>1,205</td>
<td>1,205</td>
<td>1,205</td>
<td>1,205</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td>1,137</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>1,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors/ Transient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Demand</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>1,070</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.6. Parking Demand Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Demand</strong></td>
<td>15,222</td>
<td>18,665</td>
<td>17,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>16,703</td>
<td>20,658</td>
<td>20,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>9,816</td>
<td>11,514</td>
<td>11,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Rate</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Assignment Ratio</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td>110%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Space Demand</strong></td>
<td>8,924</td>
<td>10,467</td>
<td>10,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student -- Commuter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-resident enrollment</td>
<td>31,376</td>
<td>36,174</td>
<td>32,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>5,782</td>
<td>6,511</td>
<td>5,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Rate</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Assignment Ratio</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>200%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Space Demand</strong></td>
<td>2,891</td>
<td>3,256</td>
<td>2,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student -- Resident</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Enrollment</td>
<td>14,808</td>
<td>13,800</td>
<td>13,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>2,172</td>
<td>1,723</td>
<td>1,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Rate</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Assignment Ratio</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Space Demand</strong></td>
<td>2,172</td>
<td>1,723</td>
<td>1,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student -- Off Campus Storage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Demand</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>1,205</td>
<td>1,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visitors/Transient</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Demand</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.7. 2023 Parking Projections Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subdistrict</th>
<th>Total Available Permit Parking</th>
<th>Faculty/Staff</th>
<th>Resident Storage</th>
<th>Commuter</th>
<th>Transient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,248</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8,378</td>
<td>4,804</td>
<td>2,653</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,574</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5,336</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3,140</td>
<td>1,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,580</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supply</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,584</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,554</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,101</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,533</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,902</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demand</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,861</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,228</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,222</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,287</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,020</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Supply</th>
<th>Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>17,679</td>
<td>15,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>18,482</td>
<td>15,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>18,542</td>
<td>16,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>18,604</td>
<td>16,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>18,604</td>
<td>16,410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6. Curb Space Management

Curb space management (a.k.a., curbside management) is the practice of collecting data on and documenting existing curb space to optimize, allocate, and manage the facilities to improve mobility, safety, and access for a variety of users. Curb space uses can include, but are not limited to, parking and/or vehicle storage, transportation network companies (TNCs) like Uber and Lyft, transit, pedestrians, bicyclists, and micromobility users, service vehicles, emergency services, local businesses, and streetscapes, parklets, and green infrastructure (Figure 3.3).

Curb space is used by different groups, including pedestrians, bicyclists, micromobility users, commuters, service and delivery drivers, and rideshare and transit users, in a variety of ways on Penn State’s campus. Successful curb space management can aid in creating a more balanced transportation system by creating and designating space for all users along travel corridors, which in turn reduces conflicts, improves safety, and increases accessibility to promote a healthier campus.

Current Curb Space Environment

Existing curb space uses on campus include service and delivery zones, loading zones, informal pick-up and drop-off areas, and pedestrian zones. The service and delivery zones on campus consist of allocated spaces in parking lots and, in some cases, along the curb that provide designated space for drivers. The University currently implements loading zones to allocate space for faculty and staff. These zones are subject to a 15-minute loading period in any parking lot. TNCs, which are rideshare services such as Uber and Lyft, currently operate within and around campus in an informal manner. Pick-up and drop-off locations are currently not regulated by the University/OPP.

---

Figure 3.3. Potential Curb Space Functions

Curb space is used by different groups, including pedestrians, bicyclists, micromobility users, commuters, service and delivery drivers, and rideshare and transit users, in a variety of ways on Penn State’s campus. Successful curb space management can aid in creating a more balanced transportation system by creating and designating space for all users along travel corridors, which in turn reduces conflicts, improves safety, and increases accessibility to promote a healthier campus.

**Current Curb Space Environment**

Existing curb space uses on campus include service and delivery zones, loading zones, informal pick-up and drop-off areas, and pedestrian zones. The service and delivery zones on campus consist of allocated spaces in parking lots and, in some cases, along the curb that provide designated space for drivers. The University currently implements loading zones to allocate space for faculty and staff. These zones are subject to a 15-minute loading period in any parking lot. TNCs, which are rideshare services such as Uber and Lyft, currently operate within and around campus in an informal manner. Pick-up and drop-off locations are currently not regulated by the University/OPP.

---

13 Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), [https://www.ite.org/technical-resources/topics/complete-streets/curbside-management-resources](https://www.ite.org/technical-resources/topics/complete-streets/curbside-management-resources).
Conflicts and Competing Uses

Curb space management strategies can be effective in reducing conflict areas in travel ways, improve first- and last-mile relationships between TNCs, existing transit, and active transportation systems. Shared transitional space between the roadway and sidewalk can and does create conflicts between drivers and active transportation users.

At University Park, there are conflicts with the designated delivery and service zones, loading zones, and pick-up and drop-off zones. While there are existing designated delivery and service zones, enforcement of these zones and the time limit is a challenge for OPP. Delivery service providers, which include UPS, FedEx, and Pepsi, often incorrectly use the curbside space during their stops instead of using the designated delivery spaces that the campus has provided. Primary service space constraints on campus exist at Old Main and Rec Hall. Currently, University parking enforcement does not have the capacity to regularly enforce curbside use. TNCs using the curb space for pick-up and drop-off services often forces cyclists and vehicles to travel into other lanes to avoid the independent vehicle.

Key Curb Space Locations

Figure 3.4 portrays data extracted from the nationwide personal travel simulations prepared by Replica. The graphic identifies areas with according to trip destination associated with rideshare services— including transportation network companies like Uber and Lyft. While these are not the only curb space users on the campus, anecdotal information indicates that they are a significant contributor to curb space use and street operations problems during pick-up and drop-off. The data was used as a starting point for identifying and putting into perspective the current curb space demand.

---

14 Replica data, Rideshare Services Data as accessed by license, August 2023, [https://www.replicahq.com/](https://www.replicahq.com/).
Using rideshare demand from Replica as a surrogate for curb space demand, the most intensive campus streets in need of curb space management are along Shortlidge Road, Pollock Road and Bigler Road. Likely nearby destinations are the Hetzel Union Building (HUB) and Thomas Building (classrooms).

**Figure 3.5. Delivery and Services Parking Space Locations within the UPD**

**Table 3.8. Delivery and Service Parking Spaces by UPD Subdistrict**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UPD Subdistrict</th>
<th>Delivery Spaces</th>
<th>Service Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer Review and State of the Practice

Designating space for deliveries, creating loading/unloading zones, formalizing drop-off zones, and creating more commercial spaces are all practices that have been and are currently being used at peer universities. Several of the peer institutions—including Ohio State University (OSU), Colorado State University (CSU), and University of Utah (Utah)—have integrated rideshare strategies with parking and curb space management. These peer institutions have successfully created incentive-based rideshare programs throughout their campuses via partnerships with Lyft and Uber. These partnerships include creating designated pick-up and drop-off locations (a.k.a., geofencing) on campus to better manage the curb space.

Curbside Opportunities and Recommendations

Curb space management strategies aim to reduce conflict by establishing policies, street design templates, and other controls for the most intensive demand areas. Currently, TNCs like Uber and Lyft are operating on-campus and in the adjacent municipalities. Penn State does not currently have a formalized curb space management policy or plan but would benefit from creating one.

There are both opportunities and challenges in partnerships and cooperation with TNCs, like Uber and Lyft. For a geofence to work, both need the geofenced boundaries to be set to ensure compliance in their apps. Plus, maintenance and coordination of physical signage for wayfinding and placemaking at the geofenced zones is needed to tell users that they are in the correct place for rideshare pick-up/drop-off. Formalizing TNC zones as part of the defined curb space (signage, painted curb treatments, etc.) improve safety, reduce conflicts, and increase mobility for a variety of users.

Additional opportunities include:

- Leveraging curbside functions based on the day and time.
- Automated enforcement.
- Creating "Flex Zones" — flexible areas designed to accommodate different right-of-way functions along segments of the roadway.
  - This can include combining commercial and passenger loading areas, conversion of a peak-period travel lane to off-peak parking or loading, or converting on-street parking to parklets, loading zones, and curb extensions.
- Relocating loading and delivery zones.
- Demand based pricing and priority parking programs.
- Bus bulbs, curb extensions, and parklets.
- Shuttle and transit management.
- Bicycle and shared mobility device storage.

Recommendations include:

- Establishment of a plan that would include an inventory of the physical curb spaces, investigation of demand data, design templates for areas with different needs, and updated policies about the intent and use of the curb space on campus.
- Regulation of campus curb space should engage users (Uber, Lyft, Doordash, etc.) to inform them of new policies and explore the use of geo fencing for the designated space. Regular contact with the most frequent users should be maintained to relay feedback and updates to the curb space policy, designations, and geography.
- Enforcement of campus curb space should engage University police and engage existing channels of communication for receiving feedback for the regular discussions with providers and users.
Chapter 4.
Baseline Transportation Analysis

The analysis of transportation data collected in 2022 demonstrates the baseline condition and level-of-use of the transportation system in the vicinity of the University Park campus. The following five (5) subsections detail the major travel modes serving the campus:

Section 4.1 – Vehicular Mode (Pages 26-40)
Section 4.2 – Transit Mode (Pages 41-48)
Section 4.3 – Pedestrian Mode (Pages 48-55)
Section 4.4 – Bike Mode (Pages 55-65)
Section 4.5 – Micromobility & Emerging Modes (Pages 65-75)

4.1. Vehicular Mode

Vehicular mode traffic encompasses motorized passenger vehicles (cars), transit buses, and other University service and delivery vehicles that function primarily on the street system. Transit vehicles, as motorized traffic, are counted as vehicular traffic for the purposes of analyzing “level-of-use”. Section 4.2 provides a more operational perspective on transit routes, stops, ridership, and system performance.

The collected vehicular traffic data and analysis respond to the UPD requirements for reporting the “level of use” for vehicular traffic. The evaluations of 2022 vehicular volumes include backward-looking comparisons to the data collected for previous 2011 and 2000 UPD studies, for a perspective on the University’s progress toward the intent and purposes of the UPD. Namely, to manage and reduce personal vehicular traffic, avoid adverse community traffic impacts (congestion, crashes), and implement successful travel demand management programs.

Data Collection

Transportation data collection (a.k.a., traffic counting) was completed during the week of November 28, 2022 to December 2, 2022 when Penn State University and the local public schools were in full-session. These dates were selected in coordination with PennDOT to minimize data quality impacts from the Atherton Street Improvement Project. Construction operations were scaled back in advance of the Thanksgiving Holiday, and only limited “as needed” work was performed after Thanksgiving. Based the construction planning information, the data collection conducted as follows:

- **Monday and Tuesday, November 28 and 29, 2022** – Sewer line installation and base restoration work required lane closures at the College Avenue/Atherton Street intersection. No data were collected on College Avenue or Atherton Street during these dates. Instead, data was collected at locations on the eastern side of campus.
- **Wednesday and Thursday, November 30 and December 1, 2022** – Work was planned for the Westerly Parkway/Atherton Street intersection. Data collection on College Avenue and Atherton Street (deferred from earlier in the week) was conducted during these dates.

McCormick Taylor contracted with Imperial Traffic Data Collection (ITDC) to perform the data collection program at 47 locations using video count technology (Miovision). Many locations were the same as previous UPD studies, with additional locations added in new development areas (West Campus, etc.).
At 12 of the locations, video data were collected continuously for 24-hours, to obtain both daily and peak period traffic data. At the remaining 35 locations, 12-hours were collected from 6:30 AM to 6:30 PM, spanning the morning and evening commuter peaks, daytime traffic activity. The data identified vehicles by class (motorcycles, cars, buses, single-unit trucks, and heavy trucks) and counted bicycles on the road and pedestrians and bicycles crossing the road. Observations of vehicle queueing (stacking) were recorded at intersections where vehicle congestion is common.

For the purposes of the UPD study, the 47 data collection locations were placed into groups, according to their place in the network and the nature of traffic carried.

**Benchmark, Gateway, and Primary intersection locations that coincide with those studied in the 2001 and 2013 UPD studies.** Data from these locations serve as indicators of system-wide and historical changes in traffic volumes and patterns. In UPD terms, these counts describe the overall “level of use” of the transportation system.

**Eight (8) Benchmark Locations:**
1. Atherton Street & Park Avenue (Q)
2. University Drive & WB College Avenue Ramps (Q)
3. Atherton Street & College Avenue (Q)
4. University Drive & EB College Avenue Ramps (Q)
5. Atherton Street & Beaver Avenue (Q)
6. Park Avenue & Porter Road/Fox Hollow Road (*Q)
7. University Drive & Park Avenue (*Q)
8. College Avenue & Porter Road

**Ten (10) Campus Gateway Locations:**
1. Atherton Street & Curtin Road (*Q)
2. Park Avenue & Bigler Road (*Q)
3. Atherton Street & White Course Drive (Q)
4. University Drive & Curtin Road
5. Park Avenue & Fischer Road
6. University Drive & Hastings Road (*)
7. Park Avenue and Allen Road (Q)
8. College Avenue & Burrowes Road (*Q)
9. Park Avenue and Shortlidge Road (*)
10. College Avenue & Shortlidge Road (*Q)

**Nine (9) Primary On-Campus Locations:**
1. Curtin Road & Burrowes Road
2. Pollock Road & Burrowes Road
3. Curtin Road & Allen Road (*)
4. Pollock Road & Shortlidge Road
5. Curtin Road & Shortlidge Road
6. Pollock Road & Bigler Road (*)
7. Curtin Road & Bigler Road (*)
8. Bigler Road & Hastings Road/McKean Road
9. Curtin Road & Porter Road (*)

**Targeted locations that parallel the 10-year Campus Development Plan and Scenario-Oriented Analysis.** These locations were identified by the Project Management Team and provide context for assessing the transportation effects of the Campus Development Plan.

**Twenty (20) Targeted Locations**
1. Park Avenue & Stadium West Driveway
2. Curtin Road & Commuter Drive
3. University Drive & Dauer Drive
4. Commuter Drive & Dauer Drive
5. Porter Road & Dauer Drive
6. Porter Road & Hastings Road
7. College Avenue & Buckhout Street
8. Atherton Street & Railroad Avenue
9. College Avenue & Barnard Street
10. Barnard Street & Railroad Avenue
11. Park Avenue & Softball Park
12. Curtin Road & IM Building/Wagner Building
13. Park Avenue & East Halls Driveway
14. Bigler Road & East Deck Egress
15. Allen Road & Fischer Road
16. Pollock Road & Henderson Road
17. Curtin Road Crossing @ Transit Center
18. Curtin Road Crossing @ Forum Building
19. Burrowes Road & Steam Road
20. University Drive Crossing @ Stadium West

**Location Notes**
- * = 24-hour count location
- Q = Queue observations
- # = Roadway crossing
Campus-Wide Daily Traffic

Figure 4.1 illustrates the 2011 daily traffic volumes (24-hour, two-way totals) collected for the previous UPD Study. Gradations of traffic volume are indicated by the box size and outline color. The lowest volumes have a black outline, middle range volumes in orange, and the highest volumes in red. As expected, the highest volumes were recorded on the peripheral arterial streets (Atherton Street, Park Avenue, University Drive). The lowest volumes were recorded on certain gateway streets on the north side of campus (Allen Road and Shortlidge Road) and peripheral streets to the east (Porter Road and Curtin Road). Middle range volumes were recorded within the core of campus, where volume is relatively balanced across the primary on-campus streets. This indicates an efficient network where traffic is distributed and is not likely to overwhelm the street capacity at any particular point.

Figure 4.2 illustrates the 2022 daily traffic volumes with the percent change since 2011, by roadway corridor. Where a corridor had two or more counts, the percentage reflects data from all count locations. The following significant trends were noted:

- Overall, reductions in daily traffic were noted for the on-campus corridors and the immediate surrounding community streets, including Atherton Street, Park Avenue, and University Drive.
- The reduction on Atherton Street was likely influenced by construction work on the Atherton Street Improvement Project. Drivers were in the habit of avoiding this section of Atherton Street during Fall 2022 when lane closures caused significant travel delay. The decrease on Curtin Road between Atherton Street and Burrowes Road is likely related to Atherton Street.
- In general, traffic volume reductions on the east side of campus (University Drive, Park Avenue) were lower than on the west side of campus and in the range of 10-20 percent.
- A moderate increase on Fox Hollow Road north of Park Avenue is likely associated with new student housing in the Toftrees planned community in Patton Township. Between 2011 and 2022, 1,714 new student housing beds were added in The Station, The Valley, The View, and The Grove housing complexes along Toftrees Avenue, which connects directly to Fox Hollow Road.
- The significant reduction on Porter Road south of Curtin Road reflects reduced use of commuter parking adjacent to the Bryce Jordan Center. During and following the COVID-pandemic, Penn State Transportation Services staff implemented parking policy changes that permitted more student and commuter parking in more central lots and decks that were underutilized.
- On-campus roadways experienced consistent vehicle traffic reductions of 20-30 percent between 2011 and 2022.
Figure 4.1. Total 2011 Daily Traffic Volume by Location
Figure 4.2. Total 2022 Daily Traffic Volume by Location, with Volume Change (2011-2022)
Daily traffic trends for volume and hourly variation were evaluated using samples of data from 2000, 2011, and 2022 at the locations noted in Figure 2. Two different sets of locations were evaluated:

- **Campus Gateway Locations** – These nine (9) locations (*) were sampled around the edges of Core Campus to reflect the dynamics of traffic accessing the campus.
- **On-Campus Locations** – These three (3) locations (#) were sampled within the Core Campus to reflect the traffic dynamics of circulating and cross-campus traffic.

### Campus Gateway Trends

**Figure 4.3** illustrates the total volume of daily traffic at the nine gateway locations and the trend from 2000 to 2011 to 2022. Traffic volumes have been decreasing since 2000. Traffic data collected in 2022 demonstrates a 21 percent decrease since 2011 and a 24 percent decrease since 2000.

**Figure 4.4** illustrates the hourly variation in traffic volumes by hour throughout the day at the nine gateway locations. Volume data from 2022 (yellow) is compared to volumes for the same nine locations observed in 2011 (green) and 2000 (blue). The general shapes of all three curves are consistent in the tails with discernable spikes in the AM, Midday, and PM hours. The daily peak is around 5:00 PM. However, the hourly volumes were much more similar between 2000 and 2011. In 2022, the hourly volumes were noticeably lower.

---

**Figure 4.3. Total Daily Traffic on Campus Gateway Streets, 2000 vs. 2011 vs. 2022**

**Figure 4.4. Intra-Day Hourly Variations in Traffic Volume on Campus Gateway Streets, 2000 vs. 2011 vs. 2022**
**On-Campus Traffic**

**Figure 4.5** illustrates the total daily traffic observed at three on-campus locations and the trend in traffic volume from 2000 to 2022. The 30 percent increase in traffic between 2000 and 2011 reflects the count locations and the impact of the Shortlidge Road Closure (2005). This change shifted traffic from Shortlidge Road to Pollock Road and Bigler Road and resulted in significant volume increases on both streets. Volumes on Curtin Road increased from 2000 to 2011 then decreased from 2011 to 2022. Overall, On-Campus volumes decreased by about 4 percent between 2000 and 2022.

**Figure 4.6** illustrates the hourly variation in traffic volumes by hour throughout the day at the three on-campus locations. Volume data from 2022 (yellow) is compared to volumes for the same nine locations observed in 2011 (green) and 2000 (blue).

Interestingly the hourly volumes and curve shapes were similar for 2022 and 2000, with 2011 volumes being noticeably higher. The general shapes of all three curves are consistent in the tails with volumes rising throughout the day to the daily peak around 5:00 PM. Otherwise, the AM and Midday peaks are more muted at the on-campus locations, and during the daytime hours (7:00 AM to 5:00 PM), the curves each have unique hourly trends, with spikes and valleys often in distinctly different hours of the day.
Peak Period Traffic

The following sections examine vehicular traffic level-of-use during the peak traffic periods—typically between 6:00 AM to 9:00 AM for the AM peak period, and 3:00 PM to 6:00 PM for the PM peak period. For this evaluation, the peak periods were selected to be two hours long—including the peak hour and 30 minutes before and after the peak hour. The two-hour AM and PM peak period traffic volumes were summarized by intersection, and the intersections were divided into the following categories to evaluate level-of-use trends:

- Benchmark Intersections
- Gateway Intersections
- Primary On-Campus Intersections

The evaluation looks at each category separately, then provides an evaluation of “Total Campus Access,” as a comprehensive measure of motorized traffic accessing the University Park Campus.

**Benchmark Intersections – Regional Level-of-Use**

The following eight intersections were designated as Benchmark Intersections for sampling the regional level-of-use for the transportation network. They are along the edges of the University Park Campus, and traffic reflects a mix of University and community travel activity. The level-of-use at these locations provide a community perspective on traffic activity and changes over time.

5. Atherton Street & Park Avenue
6. Atherton Street & College Avenue
7. Atherton Street & Beaver Avenue
8. University Drive & Park Avenue
9. University Drive & College Avenue WB Ramps
10. University Drive & College Avenue EB Ramps
11. Porter Road/Fox Hollow Road & Park Avenue
12. Porter Road & College Avenue

The bar graphs in Figure 4.9 provide side-by-side comparisons of the 2000, 2011 and 2022 traffic data collected at the Benchmark Intersections during the AM and PM peak periods.

Overall, a net volume decreases of about 14 percent was observed during the 2022 AM peak period from 2011, and a decrease of about 18 percent was observed during the PM peak period, which translates to a net decrease of about 3,500 vehicles in the AM and 6,600 vehicles in the PM. Taking the AM and PM Peak Period volumes together, the composite peak period traffic volumes decreased by approximately 16 percent between 2011 and 2022.

The volume decrease was not uniform across all of the benchmark locations. The group of intersections along Atherton Street (west of the campus core) experienced a combined decrease of 22 percent in the AM and 21 percent in the PM. Intersections east of the campus core (Park Avenue and College Avenue) were more stable, with volumes increased at one intersection. However, overall these intersections also experienced a combined decrease of 8 percent in the AM and 15 percent in the PM. The one location that experienced an increase was the University Drive/College Avenue Ramps interchange, comprised of the University Drive and College Avenue Ramps Eastbound (EB) and Westbound (WB). AM peak period traffic increased by about 6 percent, while volumes decreased during the PM peak. The increase during the AM peak may be associated with the 3,518 new student housing beds in Downtown State College. The vehicular route to the commuter parking lots near Beaver Stadium runs through these intersections. Traffic diverted from Atherton Street to avoid the construction zones may also contribute to the increases.
**Figure 4.9. Peak Hour Vehicular Traffic at Benchmark Intersections, 2000 & 2011 vs. 2022**
Gateway Intersections – Campus Access Level-of-Use

The following nine intersections were designated as Gateway Intersections for sampling the level-of-use associated specifically with access to the core of the University Park Campus. They link the surrounding community streets to the University-owned campus network. The traffic accessing campus provide a gauge for traffic activity changes associated exclusively with the University Park Campus.

1. Atherton Street & Curtin Road
2. Fischer Road & Park Avenue
3. Burrowes Road & College Avenue
4. Allen Road & Park Avenue
5. Shortlidge Road & Park Avenue
6. Bigler Road & Park Avenue
7. Shortlidge Road & College Avenue
8. University Drive & Curtin Road
9. University Drive & Hastings Road

The bar graphs in Figure 4.10 provide side-by-side comparisons of the 2000, 2011 and 2022 traffic data collected at the Gateway Intersections during the AM and PM peak periods. The volumes only include vehicles entering or exiting the campus.

Overall, a net volume decrease of about 14 percent was observed in the 2022 AM peak period from 2011 and a net decrease of about 12 percent was observed in the PM peak period. Taking the AM and PM Peak Period volumes together, the composite peak period traffic volumes decreased by approximately 11 percent between 2011 and 2022. Again, the local trend toward decreased traffic activity is consistent with trends at larger geographic levels. The decreasing traffic trends are consistent with the Benchmark Intersections. Both the Gateway and Benchmark intersections saw a similar decrease in traffic activity during the AM peak period (on a percentage basis), but a greater percentage decrease was observed at the Benchmark Intersections during the PM peak period. This difference between the Gateways and Benchmarks indicates that, while much of the traffic reduction in the system can be attributed to the University, a portion is associated with other community and regional influences.

The volume changes were not uniform across all intersections. In the AM peak period, most intersections experienced a decrease in traffic volume, ranging from a 6 to 30 percent. However, for the intersection of University Drive and Hastings Road, an increase of 12 percent was observed. This increase is likely related to the increased student housing in the downtown area, similar to the increase observed at the University Drive/College Avenue interchange. Most of the Gateway intersections also saw a decrease in volume during the PM peak period, ranging from a 11 percent decrease to a 22 percent decrease. However, in the PM peak there were two intersections that experienced an increase in traffic volumes. The PM peak increase at Fisher Road/Park Avenue (+28 percent), while large as a percentage was relatively small in total volume (about 80 vehicles). This location mostly carries traffic to/from the Nittany Parking Deck. The PM peak increase at Bigler Road at Park Avenue (+12 percent) amounted to about 130 vehicles, likely associated with the East Parking Deck.
Figure 4.10. Peak Hour Vehicular Traffic Accessing Core Campus by Gateway, 2000 & 2011 vs. 2022
On-Campus Intersections – Campus Circulation Level-of-Use

The following eleven intersections were designated as Primary On-Campus Intersections for sampling the level-of-use internal to the University Park Campus roadway system. They are exclusively within the University-owned roadway network, and the total traffic volumes are an indicator of internal traffic activity within the University Park Campus.

1. Burrowes Road & Curtin Road
2. Burrowes Road & Pollock Road
3. Allen Road & Fischer Road
4. Allen Road & Curtin Road
5. Shortlidge Road & Curtin Road
6. Shortlidge Road & Pollock Road
7. Bigler Road & Curtin Road
8. Bigler Road & Pollock Road
9. Bigler Road & Hasting Road/McKean Road

The bar graphs in Figure 4.12 provide side-by-side comparisons of the 2000, 2011, and 2022 vehicular traffic counted at the Primary On-Campus Intersections during the AM and PM peak periods.

Overall, a net volume decrease of about 13 percent was observed in the AM peak period and a net decrease of about 14 percent was observed in the PM peak period. Taking the AM and PM Peak Period volumes together, the composite peak period traffic volumes decreased by approximately 14 percent between 2011 and 2022. Between 2011 and 2022, all except one of the intersections experienced decreases in volumes. The increase at the Burrowes Road/Curtin Road intersection (+39 percent) appears to be an outlier that may indicate an issue in the 2011 count. The 2022 volumes are consistent with adjacent intersections.
Figure 4.12. Vehicular Traffic at Primary On-Campus Intersections, 2000 & 2011 vs. 2022
Vehicle Mode Summary

- **Reductions in vehicle traffic since 2011 were broad and consistent across the network.**

  The downward momentum in vehicular traffic reductions noted between 2000 and 2011 was sustained to 2022. Reductions in traffic access and circulating on campus are attributed to:

  o Penn State’s commitment to sustaining and expanding travel demand management (TDM) strategies—particularly investments that shift travel away from single-occupant, personal vehicles and incentivize alternative modes.
  o Macro trends toward remote work enabled by technology and employer practices that emerged during and following the COVID-pandemic. Penn State’s formalization of “work-from-home” policies allow employees to eliminate daily trips to campus.
  o Online and delivery-to-home services (goods, tele-medicine, etc.) that were created and expanded during and following the COVID-pandemic.
  o Ongoing social-distancing and separation for personal health protection, which results in minimizing discretionary trip-making to crowded places.
  o Economic factors related to inflation and elevated vehicle fuel prices, which tend to suppress discretionary trip-making.

**IMPACT OF ATHERTON STREET CONSTRUCTION** – Ongoing road work in the Atherton Street Corridor likely impacted traffic volumes on Atherton Street and other streets on the west side of campus in November and December 2022. Regardless, the broad traffic reductions elsewhere in the network suggest reductions on Atherton Street as well.

- **Increases in vehicle traffic seem related to streets and corridors with significant new land development activity.**

  Significant traffic increases (i.e., more than 5 percent over 2011 counts) were noted on only two roadways:

  o The increase on Fox Hollow Road (daily traffic analysis) reflects 1,714 new student housing beds in The Station, Valley, View, and Grove along Toftrees Avenue. Residential and commercial growth in Patton and Benner Township are also likely contributors.
  o The increase at the Atherton Street/White Course Drive intersection (peak hour gateway analysis) reflects consolidation of employee and visitor parking into the West Campus Parking Deck and building construction activity on West Campus.

Other small increases are limited to a few intersections, and the increase is only evident during the AM or PM peak hour. For instance, the increases at the University Drive/College Avenue intersections and the University Drive/Hastings Road intersection during the AM peak, are likely associated with the 3,518 new student housing beds in Downtown State College. The vehicular route to the commuter parking lots near Beaver Stadium runs through these intersections.

- **Reductions in vehicle traffic since 2011 are evident throughout the day.**

  While traffic increased on a few streets, the 2022 vehicular traffic volumes were lower than the 2011 volumes during all hours of the day for both Campus Gateway and On-Campus locations.

- **Reductions in daily traffic exceed commuter peak reductions on a percentage basis.**

  This trend suggests that employee/commuter vehicle trips are being reduced more slowly than vehicle trips for other purposes. However, this trend may also be affected by the count dates.
The amount of On-Campus vehicular traffic activity in November 2022 dropped off quickly after 7:00 PM, whereas significant traffic activity in April 2011 extended past 9:00 PM.

Validation of UPD Traffic Volume Trends

Daily traffic data collected independently by PennDOT and made available through the Traffic Information Repository website (TIRe) was extracted to validate the traffic volume trends on state-owned roadways near the University Park Campus. Table 4.3 summarizes the daily traffic volumes from PennDOT at four locations where post-COVID counts after January 2022 were available AND UPD counts were available for comparison. To screen out construction-related impacts of the Atherton Street Improvement Project, counts from 2016 and earlier were selected.

Table 4.3. PennDOT Traffic Data Summary and Comparison to UPD Traffic Volume Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>PennDOT Traffic Data</th>
<th>PennDOT Data Trend</th>
<th>UPD Data Trend (2011-2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily Traffic Volume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-COVID</td>
<td>Post-COVID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Avenue Btw Porter Road &amp; Orchard Road</td>
<td>17,118 W, 9/26/12</td>
<td>13,911 T, 3/29/22</td>
<td>-18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Drive Btw Curtin Road &amp; Hastings Road</td>
<td>14,840 W, 11/16/16</td>
<td>13,055 W, 10/05/22</td>
<td>-12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atherton Street Btw Park Avenue &amp; College Avenue</td>
<td>27,044 R, 11/07/13</td>
<td>21,753 W, 10/05/22</td>
<td>-19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Hollow Road Btw Toftrees Avenue &amp; Big Hollow Road</td>
<td>9,553 T, 11/15/16</td>
<td>10,040 T, 3/29/22</td>
<td>+5.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Day of the week notation: T = Tuesday; W = Wednesday, R = Thursday

The following observations are noted on the comparison of UPD and PennDOT traffic data:

- According to the comparison PennDOT and UPD data trends, there is general consistency in the corridor trends (whether increasing or decreasing), with some variation in the degree of the traffic volume change.
- The trends for Park Avenue and University Drive are remarkably similar, although the PennDOT count data from March and October 2022, respectively, was consistently higher than the UPD data collected in November 2022.
- For Atherton Street, the UPD data shows a larger decrease for 2011 to 2022, vs. 2013 to 2022 for the PennDOT data. However, the data from November 2022 for the UPD study (20,458) generally agrees with the PennDOT data from October 2022 (21,753), which provides assurance on the accuracy of the 2022 counts.
- For Fox Hollow Road, the UPD data shows a larger increase for 2011 to 2022, vs. 2016 to 2022 for the PennDOT data. It is likely that the larger time span in the UPD data accounts for the difference. The data from November 2022 for the UPD study (10,925) generally agrees with the PennDOT data from March 2022 (10,040).

17 Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT), Traffic Information Repository (TIRe), https://gis.penndot.gov/TIRe, as accessed February 2023.
4.2. Transit Mode (Transit Services Study Synopsis)

The following synopsis is a summary of the University’s Transit Services Study prepared by Whitman Requardt and Associates, dated August 2022 with edits finalized in January 2023.

Transit at the University Park Campus encompasses transit bus services contracted through the Centre Area Transportation Authority (CATA) and shuttle services provided directly by Penn State Transportation Services. Summaries on transit ridership and volume data summaries that respond to the UPD requirements for reporting the existing “level of use” for campus transportation facilities.

Campus transit services are important for PSU’s continued success with CATA providing twelve buses for the Loop / Link routes and PSU Transportation Services operating four shuttle buses. While the service is particularly effective and well-utilized, the Transit Services Study found additional efficiencies and proposes operational changes to optimize under-performing routes and segments.

Transit Network – Defining the Network

Loop and Link Service

The University Park on-campus transit services are operated with a hybrid service model where PSU Transportation Services operates two campus shuttle routes with four peak shuttle buses and CATA operates four campus Loop / Link routes with 12 peak full sized transit buses. The Blue Loop, White Loop, Red Link, and Green Link routes are depicted in Figure 4.13.

---

18 Centre Area Transportation Authority, www.CATABUS.com. As presented in the Penn State University Park Transit Services Study, August 2022, Figure 8, page 12.
Annual ridership on CATABUS Campus Service comprises almost half of CATA’s total Campus and Community annual ridership combined (Table 4.4). The total fiscal year ridership for Campus Service decreased by almost 11% from FY15 to FY19, while non-campus CATABUS Community Service decreased by 14% during the same time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>Change FY15 to FY19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue Loop</td>
<td>1,301,065</td>
<td>1,313,548</td>
<td>1,284,067</td>
<td>1,191,527</td>
<td>1,200,106</td>
<td>-13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Loop</td>
<td>1,536,435</td>
<td>1,394,150</td>
<td>1,332,075</td>
<td>1,350,914</td>
<td>1,406,509</td>
<td>-7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Link</td>
<td>437,641</td>
<td>419,419</td>
<td>430,173</td>
<td>366,991</td>
<td>379,919</td>
<td>-13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Link</td>
<td>206,655</td>
<td>194,107</td>
<td>101,067</td>
<td>194,284</td>
<td>195,751</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Total</td>
<td>3,562,685</td>
<td>3,321,217</td>
<td>3,239,186</td>
<td>3,103,716</td>
<td>3,192,235</td>
<td>-10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Campus</td>
<td>3,760,650</td>
<td>3,734,111</td>
<td>3,674,029</td>
<td>3,401,335</td>
<td>3,230,944</td>
<td>-14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATA Total</td>
<td>7,323,544</td>
<td>7,055,328</td>
<td>6,814,107</td>
<td>6,504,751</td>
<td>6,413,239</td>
<td>-12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus % of Total</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.4. CATABUS Ridership**

**Campus Shuttle**

As shown in Figure 4.14, the Campus Shuttle via College Avenue operates a clockwise route every 15 minutes from Downtown through campus while the Campus Shuttle via Beaver Avenue operates a counterclockwise route every 20 minutes. The services are important for inter-campus travel as they connect facilities not served by the CATA Loop / Link routes including the Physical Plant, Ag Research, Dairy Barns, Law School and the future Palmer Museum with central campus and downtown.

**Figure 4.14. Campus Shuttle, Spring 2022**
Service Evaluation

The WRA Transit Services Study performed a service evaluation of ridership, boardings at bus stops, route length, headway, employment areas, and major transfer points of the Loop and Link and Shuttle Service Routes identified in Figure 4.15, based on recent data collected by CATA.

![Figure 4.15. All Campus Transit Systems & Routes, Spring 2022](image)

**Performance by Day of Week**

Table 4.5 presents the Loop / Link service performance by day of the week based on school in session periods. The table compares Fall 2019 and Fall 2021 ridership, cost per ride and rides per revenue hour. On weekdays the White Loop has the highest ridership. The Red Link has the lowest performance as measured by rides, rides per revenue hour and cost per ride. On Saturdays and Sundays the Red Link has very low ridership for a college community.

---

21 Penn State University Park Transit Services Study, August 2022, Figure 20, page 21.
PSU Campus Shuttle Evaluation

Two PSU Campus Shuttle routes operate from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. weekdays while school is in session. Campus Shuttle ridership for the July to December period from 2019 through 2021 is compared in Table 4.6. The COVID-19 pandemic during the Fall 2020 and 2021 greatly affected ridership and productivity in terms of rides per revenue hour and cost per ride. During the Fall of 2022, ridership is expected to return to the 2019 level.

Table 4.6. Campus Shuttle Evaluation – Fall Semester 2019 to 2021 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year - July to December</th>
<th>College Avenue</th>
<th>Beaver Avenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Daily Rides</td>
<td>Daily Revenue Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

22. *Penn State University Park Transit Services Study, August 2022, Table 17, page 26.

23. *Penn State University Park Transit Services Study, August 2022, Table 18, page 27.
Future Conditions

Composition and Population Through 2025 the total population of University Park is anticipated to grow by just over 4% or by approximately 1% annually. Population projections were not available beyond the fall of 2025. Figure 4.16 illustrates the breakdown of planned growth between faculty/staff and students through 2025.

![Figure 4.16. Total Campus Population, 2021-2025](image)

Service Recommendations

The WRA Study recommended two service enhancements beginning with the Fall 2023 Semester. The Red Link is recommended to be truncated at the commuter lots to increase the number of trips and passenger capacity through campus between the West Deck and commuter lots as shown in Figure 4.17. This change replaces the need to re-start the Green Link which was recommended to be permanently discontinued.

The Beaver Avenue Campus Shuttle would be repurposed as shown in Figure 4.18 as the Innovation Park Campus Shuttle. It would operate three buses from 7 a.m. until 8 p.m. and replace the portion of the current Red Link that provides service to Innovation Park. A Lyft Ride Smart zone is proposed for trips between central campus and Innovation Park during evenings and weekends. The WRA resulting projection of service hours is depicted in Table 4.7.

---

24 Penn State University Park Transit Services Study, August 2022, Figure 27, page 28.
Figure 4.17. Proposed Red Link, Fall 2023 25

Figure 4.18. Proposed Innovation Park Campus Shuttle, Fall 2023 26

25 Penn State University Park Transit Services Study, August 2022, Figure 32, page 34.
26 Penn State University Park Transit Services Study, August 2022, Figure 33, page 35.
Transit Mode Summary

The Transit Services Study included these findings relating to demand and transit routes:

1. There will be continued demand for improved campus transit service resulting from projected 1% annual non-resident student growth.
2. New downtown housing will continue to increase demand on Blue / White Loops.
3. There is increasing ridership demand between the commuter parking lots on the east side of campus and the new West Deck. CATA’s suspension of the Green Link service between the commuter lots and central campus because of a lack of bus operators will result in overcrowding and missed classes for some students.
4. CATA Loop / Link routes are very productive except for the Blue Loop and Red Link between 5 a.m. to 7 a.m. and the Red Link service to Innovation Park.
5. The Campus Shuttle Beaver Avenue route is unproductive and should be repurposed.

The Transit Service Study recommended the following key transit services changes:

1. Affirm the current partnership with CATA for negotiating Penn State’s services and costs. The partnership may be enhanced with Penn State supporting and participating in CATA policy making. Meanwhile, Penn State and CATA would collaborate and cost-share on technology updates and integration (i.e., fare payment methods/vendors, vehicle location systems, data services, app development, etc.).
2. Revise the current commuter parking price structure by increasing permit costs to Revise commuter parking pricing (up).
3. Each year, optimize shuttle routes, stops, and timing based on an analysis of ridership data.
4. Optimize or truncate under-performing routes.

---

27 Penn State University Park Transit Services Study, August 2022, Table 22, page 35.
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- Sustain the Blue and White Loop routes and service, with enhancements that respond to increasing downtown housing and demand for trips to/from the campus.
- Permanently discontinue Green Link service.
- Truncate the Red Link at the Bryce Jordan Center Commuter Lots while increasing service to West Campus/West Deck via the Red Link and/or Campus Shuttles.
- Repurpose the Beaver Avenue Campus Shuttle to serve Innovation Park and to replace service previously offered by the Red Link.
- Work with transportation network companies (Uber, Lyft) to establish more cost effective, demand-responsive evening and weekend services.

4.3. Pedestrian Mode

The pedestrian mode encompasses travel via walking and other mobility-assistance devices (wheelchairs, electric carts, etc.) that utilize sidewalks and pathway networks. This section summarizes pedestrian crossing data collected in 2022 at campus intersections and other significant road crossing locations. These data summaries respond to the UPD requirements for reporting the existing “level of use” for campus transportation facilities.

Guiding Principles for Campus Planning

Penn State’s Guiding Principles for Campus Planning\(^{28}\) include 52 statements that establish planning direction for University Park with a rationale of the values that are foundational to the built environment. Nine of the 52 statements directly address the pedestrian mode, as follows:

**Campus Character**
- Advance the ideal of a pedestrian centered campus by maintaining and improving the major pedestrian and open space corridors and in the campus core.

**Vibrant and Student Centered Campus**
- Maintain and expand coherent, efficient, and safe network of walkways. Connect all destinations on campus.
- Maintain and enhance pedestrian-friendly campus streets (comfortable, attractive, and safe).
- Provide accessible routes throughout campus and into all buildings.

**Multi-Modal Transportation, Circulation, and Parking**
- Provide accommodations for pedestrians, bicycles, and transit to enhance the pedestrian-centered campus experience of the academic core.
- Provide appropriate accommodations for emergency vehicles, service access, and those with enhanced mobility needs.
- Locate the majority of parking resources at the campus perimeter with dependable and comfortable transit service and bicycle accommodations to promote a pedestrian-oriented campus.
- Provide separation of vehicle and pedestrian traffic where major conflicts exist to enhance personal safety.

These principles clearly establish the primacy of pedestrian transportation at University Park, where the pedestrian mode is fundamental for access to most on-campus facilities. According to surveys conducted

\(^{28}\) Penn State University, Guiding Principles for Campus Planning, [https://www.opp.psu.edu/planningdesignconstruction/campus-planning-resources/university-park-plans-and-studies](https://www.opp.psu.edu/planningdesignconstruction/campus-planning-resources/university-park-plans-and-studies), as accessed Spring 2023.
The Pedestrian Network

Penn State maintains an extensive system of sidewalks, pathways, and connecting pedestrian facilities appropriate for travel within the compact and densely built environment present at University Park. Penn State maintains an inventory of pedestrian facilities that covers all of the University’s properties, including the 16 UPD zones.

The University’s formalized pedestrian transportation network encompasses mostly outdoor built facilities according to the seven sub-types listed in Table 4.8. Taken together across all of the UPD zones, these facilities cover about 70 acres—approximately 1.8% percent of the total UPD. However, about 62 acres of the pedestrian facilities are found in the most transportation intensive parts of the University Park Campus (a.k.a., the Campus Core). In this area, they occupy more than 5 percent of the total land area.

Table 4.8. Pedestrian Network Characteristics by Sub-Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrian Facility Sub-Type</th>
<th>Total Coverage Area (Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All UPD Zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Land Area</td>
<td>3846.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>66.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steps &amp; Ramps</td>
<td>1.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patio</td>
<td>0.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loading Dock</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Entrance</td>
<td>0.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza</td>
<td>1.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Pedestrian Facility Area</td>
<td>69.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of TOTAL Land Area</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pedestrian Accommodation & Accessibility

Accommodating pedestrian users with diverse levels of ability or disability is a priority for Penn State University that received emphasis in the early 1990s with passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act. Titles II and III of the Act set minimum standards for accessibility and removal of barriers to provide public accommodations for disabled persons. In 1994, Penn State adopted a Transitional Plan that identified initiatives, policies, and implementation projects necessary achieve a fully compliant and accessible campus.

University Access Committee

As part of the Transitional Plan, Penn State created the University Access Committee (UAC) with the goal to “continually monitor accessibility at Penn State and to recommend corrective actions when necessary”. The UAC continues to meet bi-monthly and addresses needs emerging from new construction, renovation, changes in the use of buildings, and changes in walkways and accessible paths of travel. The UAC review process involves obtaining and evaluation and analysis, preliminary cost estimates, prioritizing projects, and recommending the implementation and funding of projects. UAC members represent the

---

20 Penn State University, Office of Physical Plant, 2023.
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major University operations impacted by ADA access, including those directly involved in maintaining and operating the campus transportation systems—Office of Physical Plant, Transportation Services, Student Affairs, Facilities Coordinators, and Intercollegiate Athletics.

Pedestrian Level of Use

Counts of pedestrian crossings were collected in November and December 2022 at roadway intersections and other significant crossing locations during the UPD Transportation Study data collection program. Crossing activity for these locations was summarized and mapped for three different hours of the day corresponding to peak travel conditions on the transportation network. Figures 4.19, 4.20, and 4.21 illustrate the crossing activity. Note that the scales of the three figures are the same to allow cross-comparisons of the number of crossings.

2022 AM Travel Peak Hour

Figure 4.19 illustrates pedestrian crossing activity during the AM Travel Peak, which was identified as the hour between 7:00 AM and 10:00 AM when total travel activity was at its peak, considering both vehicles and pedestrian crossings. Comparing all three peaks, crossings at most intersections are lowest during the AM Peak. The highest crossing locations are at the Curtin Road Transit Center and Shortlidge Road/Curtin Road intersection.

2022 PM Travel Peak Hour

Figure 4.20 illustrates pedestrian crossing activity during the PM Travel Peak, which was identified as the hour between 3:00 PM and 6:00 PM when total travel activity was at its peak, considering both vehicles and pedestrian crossings. Crossings during the PM Peak are highest at locations near the Hetzel Union Building (HUB) and along College Avenue at Shortlidge Road and Burrowes Road, likely reflecting travel to apartment complexes and commercial/restaurants in the Downtown.

2022 Pedestrian Peak Hour

Figure 4.21 illustrates pedestrian crossing activity during the Pedestrian Peak, which was identified as the hour during the day when pedestrian crossing activity was at its maximum, regardless of the vehicle volumes present. This peak typically occurred in the middle of the day, between 11:00 AM and 3:00 PM, and these peaks often align with class change intervals. However, certain exceptions were noted where other transportation dynamics were more influential. For instance, the Pedestrian Peak on pathways along Curtin Road to/from the Commuter Lots were noted in the 4:00 PM hour, just before the PM Travel Peak Hour.

During the Pedestrian Peak Hour, the “concentration” of pedestrian travel in a shorter period—such as a class change interval—can be further quantified by comparing the volume of crossings counted during one hour with the volume during the peak 15-minute period. Table 4.9 compares the Pedestrian Peak Hour Volume with the Pedestrian Peak 15-minute flow rates at eight of the highest volume on-campus locations. The Concentration is calculated as the Peak 15-Minute Volume divided by the Peak Hour Volume and indicates how much of the Peak Hour Volume occurs within the most intensive travel period within the hour. Where and when Concentrations are high, pedestrians cross for a short time at a rate that will be more disruptive to other modes than the volume alone might indicate.
Table 4.9. 2022 Pedestrian Crossing Intensity – Hourly Volume vs. Flow Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Peak Hour Volume (A) (Crossings/Hour)</th>
<th>Peak 15-min Volume (B) (Crossings/15-min)</th>
<th>Concentration (B/A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curtin Road Transit Center</td>
<td>2,258</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtin Road @ Forum Building</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtin Road @ Shortlidge Road</td>
<td>1,828</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtin Road @ Bigler Road</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigler Road @ Geary Hall</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollock Road @ Burrowes Road</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollock Road @ Henderson Drive</td>
<td>2,445</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollock Road @ Shortlidge Road</td>
<td>1,692</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparisons of 2011 and 2022 Pedestrian Crossing Volumes

Table 4.10 provides comparisons between the pedestrian crossing counts at a sample of On-Campus and Gateway intersections during the 2011 and 2011 AM and PM Travel Peak Hours. Substantial increases in pedestrian crossing traffic are noted at most intersections between 2011 and 2022, with crossings more that doubling during the AM Travel Peak. A more modest 20 percent increase was observed during the PM Travel Peak. A Pedestrian Peak comparison was not possible, because counts of the 2011 pedestrian peak were not completed.

Table 4.10. Comparison of 2011 and 2022 Pedestrian Crossing Volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>AM Travel Peak</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>PM Travel Peak</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Avenue/Allen Road</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>+ 126%</td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>- 29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Avenue/Bigler Road</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>+ 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>+ 165%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtin Road/Allen Road</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>+ 84%</td>
<td></td>
<td>232</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>+ 91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtin Road/Shortlidge Road</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>+ 266%</td>
<td></td>
<td>262</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>+ 174%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtin Road/Bigler Road</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>+ 4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>732</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>+ 26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtin Road/University Drive</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>+ 122%</td>
<td></td>
<td>426</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>+ 9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollock Road/Burrowes Road</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>+ 91%</td>
<td></td>
<td>482</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>- 12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollock Road/Shortlidge Road</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>+ 300%</td>
<td></td>
<td>407</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>+ 184%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Avenue/Burrowes Road</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>+ 223%</td>
<td></td>
<td>721</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>+ 45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Avenue/Shortlidge Road</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>+ 62%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>- 42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Totals and Change</td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>5,178</td>
<td>+ 133%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,422</td>
<td>6,539</td>
<td>+ 21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.20. 2022 PM Travel Peak Hour Pedestrian Crossings
Figure 4.21. 2022 Class Change Peak Hour Pedestrian Crossings
Pedestrian Mode Summary

- **Penn State’s Guiding Principles for Campus Planning** establish the primacy of the pedestrian mode. Accommodation of all pedestrian users with diverse levels of ability or disability is a priority for Penn State.

  Accommodations for pedestrians and enhancement of the existing pedestrian-oriented built environment are cornerstone principles underlying campus development decisions. Effective and accessible pedestrian facilities are needed to carry the bulk of daily trips on and across the University Park Campus. According to surveys conducted by the Penn State Office of Sustainability, the transit mode is second only to walking as the commute mode used by students and second to personal vehicle for faculty/staff.

- **The number of pedestrian crossings at high activity locations can exceed 1,000 per hour during the AM and PM Peak Travel periods.**

- **The number of pedestrian crossings at high activity locations can exceed 2,000 per hour during the Pedestrian Peak periods.**

- **The concentration of pedestrian crossings during class change intervals and other pedestrian peak periods intensifies the disruption to other modes and makes the pedestrian volume feel larger during those periods.**

  Crossing volumes at these levels along with the extra concentrated impact during peak periods would rival many of the most urban places in the United State for intensity of pedestrian travel. Crossings at these rates inevitably disrupt travel by other modes of travel using the street system. Pedestrians are, by far, the largest user group, and the proverbial “mob mentality” likely creates disregard for other street users.

- **Based on data from the AM and PM Peak Travel periods, pedestrian travel on campus has increased substantially since 2011.**

  The pedestrian volume and crossing data support feedback from the UPD study stakeholders about escalating mode conflict on campus. AM peak pedestrian activity as more than doubled and PM peak activity has increased by about 20 percent since 2011.

**4.4. Bicycle Mode (Bicycle Master Plan Synopsis)**

The following synopsis was developed based on UPD stakeholder interviews and a summarization of the Penn State University Park Bicycle Master Plan prepared by Nelson Nygaard, dated October 2023.

In 2022, Penn State University undertook a planning process that created the Penn State University Park Bicycle Master Plan. The resulting plan is based on observed biking conditions and analyses of bike travel and demographic trends. The bike planning process also engaged campus stakeholders through a series of on-campus “pop-up” engagement events and an online survey.

During the last 15 years, Penn State has progressively improved the campus cycling experience an cycling culture through the University’s bicycle master planning effort, creating a shared micromobility partnership with Spin, integrating the Bike Den into the West Parking Deck, and expanding bicycle parking and commuter amenities. Thanks to the combination of these and other efforts, Penn State was designated a bronze-level Bicycle Friendly University in 2012 and reached gold level in 2022.
The Penn State UPD process is bringing all the modal plans across campus together. The process kicked off with a workshop, site visits, and a series of group interviews with various campus stakeholders to develop an understanding of the state of biking at Penn State.

That work resulted in the following observations about the comfort, convenience, and built environment for bicycling on campus and in the surrounding area. Together, these findings highlight the tension between the University’s goals for bicycling on campus and existing campus conditions—in particular, the competition for space among travel modes and the lack of dedicated cycling infrastructure on campus.

**What people think about biking to and on campus**

Through different projects in 2022, including an online transportation survey, pop-up public outreach, and interviews, Penn State stakeholders, including students, faculty, and staff were invited to share their thoughts about moving around the Penn State campus.

Within campus, most people get around without a car and conflicts between people riding bikes, on scooters, and walking are on everyone’s mind. The most frequently mentioned theme among faculty and graduate/post-doc students was making biking safer and easier on campus. Comments about the conflict between bicycles and scooters on sidewalks were also a common theme among staff and undergraduate students. The most common feedback involved concerns about personal safety, followed by challenges and costs of using Spin, conflicts between pedestrians and bicyclists, difficulty identifying Spin parking and dismount zones, a lack of clarity as to where biking is allowed on campus/clarity of the Limited Bike Zone, Spin bikes taking up too much bike parking space, and concerns with cyclist behavior expressed by transit operators.

Bikes generally share the roadway with cars on campus because walkways are busy with pedestrians. However, some of the existing street layouts do not dedicate space for cycling, creating an environment uncomfortable for many cyclists and resulting in risky behaviors and conflict. Further, streets do not access all locations on campus, forcing bikes to use walkways and creating conflicts with pedestrians.

Topography, stairs, connectivity, and building placement influence how bikes can move across campus. Penn State University sits on a hill and many pathways include staircases, which people biking cannot use. Cyclists also cross streets where convenient, such as places where an intersecting sidewalk or driveway ramps down to meet a street, often in the absence of a designated crosswalk across main streets. This has the effect of crossings occurring at many seemingly random places along campus streets.

Inconsistent bike facility design across campus is evidently a source of confusion for users and likely leads to misuse of the system. At the same time, implementing consistent facilities within the historic Core Campus must be balanced with other campus planning principles, according to the space available. In large part, the spatial requirements and changes necessary to impose by the current nationally recognized bikeway design standards on the historic campus fabric of streets and built space would severely denigrate the character of the Core Campus, as well as undermine the longstanding Campus Design Goals for a pedestrian-oriented environment. Penn State University may be better served by creating their own set of bikeway design standards that fit in the campus context.

**Desired biking facilities and intersection improvements.**

Opportunities identified by stakeholders include a need for improved bike lanes and paths, a need for more bike lanes and paths, and a need for better connections to existing trails/bike infrastructure and destinations.

Conflict points between bicyclists and other users create uncertainty and lead to confusion and misuse of existing spaces. Stakeholders reported that this chaos is one reason they choose not to bike to campus.
The interactions among pedestrians, bikes, and motor vehicles feel uncomfortable to many bike riders. Examples include:

- Left-turning vehicles are essentially trapped in large flows of pedestrians and bikes during class change. This creates confusion at intersections for people on bikes.
- Bike facilities terminate with no direction of where to go next.
- Bike facilities only go in one direction.
- Pathways are not wide enough to accommodate pedestrians and bikes or for bikes to pass pedestrians, even intermittently.

Identified concern areas between bicycles and other modes included:

- Shortlidge Road between Curtin Road and College Avenue
- Pollock Road between Allen Street and Shortlidge Road
- College Avenue between Atherton Street and Shortlidge Road
- Atherton Street between Park Avenue and White Course Drive
- Park Avenue and Bigler Road

Other locations of concern for bicycle riders included:

- Areas near the Library
- Park Avenue
- Atherton Street
- Curtin Road from Burrowes Road to Porter Road
- Burrowes Road from Curtin Road to College Avenue
- Pollock Road from Burrowes Road to Bigler Avenue.

Stakeholders generally requested biking facilities and connections on the following streets:

- Park Avenue from Atherton Street to Houserville
- Curtin Road from Burrowes Road to Porter Road
- Pollock Road from Burrowes Road to Bigler Road
- College Avenue from Burrowes Road to Houserville/Lemont Area
- Allen Street from Pollock Road to Beaver Avenue

Stakeholders most frequently expressed desire for intersection improvement at the following locations:

- Park Avenue and Atherton Street
- Park Avenue and Burrowes Road
- College Avenue and Allen Street
- West Campus Drive/Railroad Avenue and Atherton Street
- Pollock Road and Shortlidge Road
- Pollock Road and Burrowes Road/Fraser Street
- Curtin Road and Bigler Road

Bike parking primarily follows the pattern of existing rack locations with the highest concentration near HUB-Robeson Center, the Library, and Nittany Deck areas. Insufficient parking was most notable near athletic facilities and commuter parking lots in the northern part of campus, the area around East Deck and the Agriculture and Business buildings, and along the edge of campus on College Avenue.
The Current Bicycle Network at Penn State.

The existing campus bicycle network consists largely of on-street shared roadways and paths shared with pedestrians. Penn State makes a distinction between walkways (where cycling is allowed, and space is shared with pedestrians) and sidewalks (where use is limited to pedestrians and cycling is not allowed) which can be confusing for users of all modes. Walkways are often wider than sidewalks, but there is no other clear distinction between them. They are constructed of similar materials and intersect with each other without signage or definition. Ultimately, because of a lack of designated cycling space and high pedestrian volumes, cyclists are left to navigate a gray area between drivers, who often expect cyclists to ride on the sidewalk, and pedestrians who do not expect to see bicycles on campus walkways.

Dedicated bicycle lanes are few on or adjacent to campus and exist largely near Beaver Stadium on Curtin and Fox Hollow Roads. Core campus has roughly 3.25 miles of bike lanes, 6.95 miles of shared use paths, and a further 7.27 miles of identified bike-friendly routes. Routes to neighborhoods adjacent to the core campus are limited to “bike friendly routes” without dedicated infrastructure. See Figure 4.22.

Figure 4.22. Biking Infrastructure at Penn State. Source: Penn State Bike Master Plan

University Park Campus definitions:

Walkways – Internal campus paths where cycling is allowed and space is shared with pedestrians.

Sidewalks – Paths that border streets and where use is limited to pedestrians. Bike riding on sidewalks is not allowed.
The Penn State University Park Bicycle Master Plan identifies a strong need for more bicycle facilities and infrastructure and notes that bicycle safety is perceived as a problem by bicyclists as well as users of other modes. Bicyclists also identified the need for better biking connections to and from campus.

**Bicycling Comfort**

As part of the Penn State Bicycle Master Plan, streets within the core campus were evaluated for comfort using a Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (BLTS) analysis. BLTS produces a value on a scale of 1 to 4 where 1 indicates the most comfortable conditions suitable for all ages and abilities to cycle and 4 is the least comfortable and most stressful.

BLTS was determined by evaluating factors including: the presence and width of bicycle lanes, number of vehicular travel lanes, speed limits, frequency of bike lane blockages, presence of on-street parking, presence of a marked center lane, and presence of a median.

Most streets within the campus core score a BLTS of 1 or 2 indicating a stress level generally comfortable for most users (Figure 4.23). The exceptions are wider arterial roadways near campus including Atherton Street, College Avenue, and University Drive—each of which have a BLTS of 4 and portions of Park Avenue which have a BLTS score of 3.

![Bike Level of Traffic Stress Analysis](image)

*Figure 4.23. Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress Analysis*  
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31 Penn State University Park Bicycle Master Plan Map Atlas, Draft October 2022, Bicycling Comfort (Bicycle Level of Stress).
Demand for Bicycling

The Penn State Bicycle Master Plan analyzed demand for biking on and near campus using the following factors: presence of student housing, employee home locations, relative classroom activity, Spin ridership patterns, key buildings and major intermodal parking lots, and number of bike racks. Several variations on the demand model were run to visualize how different inputs affected overall biking demand.

In each variation of the model, whether weighted based on campus priorities or unweighted, higher demand was identified in areas around residence halls and core campus facilities such as the Library and HUB-Robeson Center with some moderate demand noted in residential areas below College Avenue. When either bike racks, Spin ridership, or both inputs were removed from the model, demand increased in areas below College Avenue while remaining high around residence halls and campus facilities.

The variations of the demand model together demonstrate significant cycling demand in residential areas near campus, emphasizing the need for safe, comfortable, and convenient connections for cyclists between campus and adjacent neighborhoods (see Figure 4.24).

Figure 4.24. Composite Biking Demand (All inputs, No weighting) 32
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32 Penn State University Park Bicycle Master Plan Map Atlas, Draft October 2022, Composite Bike Demand (All inputs, No weights).
Observed Bicycle Usage

Bicycle usage was observed, and bicycle counts were collected in April 2022 at intersections around the core campus (see Figure 4.25). Bicyclists were often observed riding on sidewalks to avoid motor vehicle traffic, especially where motor vehicle volumes were higher and bicycle infrastructure was absent.

The intersection of Pollock Road and Burrowes Road had the highest cycling activity of the intersections studied. Generally, transitions from on-street to or from off-street paths occurred at major internal nodes and intersections at the campus edge. On-street biking appears to be preferred on minor internal campus streets such as Curtin Road and Shortlidge Road.

![Figure 4.25. Peak Hour Intersection Movements](image)
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33 Penn State University Park Bicycle Master Plan Map Atlas, Draft October 2022, Intersection Flows.
The Future of Cycling at Penn State.

The proposed future of the cycling network at Penn State is distilled from two documents—the Centre Region Bike Plan (2015) and the University Park Bicycle Master Plan (near-final as of this writing).

Getting to University Park

The Centre Region Council of Governments (COG) developed its 2015 Centre Region Bike Plan to identify, among other components, regional bike facility needs in the State College/Centre Region of Pennsylvania. The Plan overlaid each identified corridor on a map of existing and proposed municipal level bike infrastructure. Where overlap between an identified corridor and existing or proposed municipal bicycle infrastructure was observed, bike corridors were modified to only show areas not currently identified by municipalities. Further adjustments to the bounds of each corridor were made at a workshop held by the COG Transportation and Land Use (TLU) Committee. The plan allows municipalities the flexibility to implement the plan based on local priorities. Corridors identified for further study which connect to the Penn State campus include:

- College Avenue/Calder Alley/Beaver Avenue Corridor – Buckhout Street to High Street
- Park Avenue – North Atherton Street to Bigler Road
- Allen Street – Foster Avenue to College Avenue
- University Drive – East College Avenue to South Atherton Street
- State Route 26 East College Avenue – High Street to State Route 150
- Rocky Top Lane – Curtin Street to Big Hollow Road
- Big Hollow Road – Rocky Top Lane to Innovation Park and Services Road
- North Atherton Street Study Area – Valley Vista Drive to Route 26 College Avenue

Getting around University Park

The bicycle network proposed in the Penn State Bicycle Master Plan focuses on facilities that close existing gaps in the network, particularly in areas where higher biking demand exists. The proposed network also seeks to improve existing facilities and intersections to create low stress user experiences. Lastly, the plan identifies areas in need of bicycle supporting amenities such as bike parking, shade, signage, and commuter facilities.

The proposed bicycle network increases dedicated infrastructure for cycling while also delineating space on existing paths to convey space more clearly for bicycles.

The proposed network is based on the analysis of existing usage patterns and gaps, analysis of travel demand to, from, and within campus, feedback from stakeholders, feasibility, and consideration of perceived safety concerns.

The plan prioritizes ten “Keystone Projects” that build to the network illustrated in Figure 4.26. Each individual project includes recommendations for short-term interventions to improve biking conditions on campus today as well as longer-term projects involving built infrastructure such as curbs and widened rights-of-way to support bicyclists on campus. The plan also contains suggested projects of lower priority designed to serve lower demand links but that will, once built, reinforce network completeness and support the Keystone Projects.

College-Park Connector

The project proposes using an existing concrete path as a shared-use path running from College Avenue to Park Avenue. The goal of the project is to better link the very high bike and pedestrian demand area downtown with core campus. Short-term implementation calls for signs and markings, removal of pedestrian only and bike detour signage, and a painted crossing at Curtin Road. Long-term suggested
improvements include enhanced crossings, and selected path widening, and a more direct route through the Palmer Museum of Art complex when that area is repurposed.

**Bike Lanes on Burrowes Road**

This project envisions a painted bike lane in each direction along Burrowes Road which today has a single climbing bike lane in the uphill direction. Long-term suggestions include raising the bike lanes to sidewalk level for enhanced separation from motor vehicles.

![Proposed Keystone Projects](image)

**Figure 4.26. Proposed Keystone Projects**

**Pollock Road and Gateway Enhancements**

"The Pollock Road project recommends marking a two-way bikeway to clarify usage along the north curb of the roadway in what is a high demand biking area. It further recommends adding stencils or striping in the short term to better clarify where and when Pollock Road is closed to general through traffic during the daytime. In the long term, the plan recommends rebuilding the Pollock Road intersections with Burrowes Road and Shortridge Road with gateway type treatments. The timing and implementation of bicycle-related changes—particularly changes to the Pollock Road gatehouses and intersections—would be coordinated with work on the Osmond Building Project."

---

34 Penn State University Park Bicycle Master Plan, October 2023, Figure 6, Page 4.
Westgate Connector

The Westgate Connector project includes marking a bikeway along the eastern edge of the building and adding wayfinding to the trail network along the paths coming out of the building. In the long term the plan recommends seeking opportunities to widen paths and enhance intersections leading to the Westgate Connector.

Curtin Road Pathway

This project includes formalizing the northern sidewalk as a multi-use path. In the long-term the project recommends redeveloping this edge to provide a separated bikeway.

Academic-Athletic Connector

This connector project includes signs and markings on existing pathways and crossings between University Drive and the proposed College-Park Connector. Long-term plan recommendations are to widen paths as projects develop, and create separated biking and walking paths where possible.

Bike Lanes on Shortlidge Road and Gateway Enhancements

This project includes short-term installation of painted bike lanes on both curbs of Shortlidge and the installation of wayfinding signs at trail intersections. In the long-term the project includes rebuilding Shortlidge Road north of Science Drive to add raised bike lanes along the east curb, rebuild curbs and enhanced crossings at both ends of the Shortlidge Mall.

Residential Connector

The Residential Connector project includes a signed and striped path along the existing pathway between the North and East Residence Halls with appropriate intersection markings. In the long-term, paths less than 12 feet wide should be widened.

College Avenue – Collaborate Rebuild

This project is a longer term effort requiring collaboration between various property owners along the corridor. Ultimately, the project is a vision of a rebuilt campus edge with a dedicated two-way biking facility or multi-use path connecting downtown, campus and off-campus student housing.

University Drive Upgrades

This project includes installing marking on existing paths to clarify pedestrian and bicycle spaces in the short-term. In the long term the plan recommends building infrastructure on University Drive north of Curtin Road, and protected bike intersections at the University Drive intersections with Hastings Road, Curtin Road, and Park Avenue.

Bicycle Mode Summary

Penn State has continued developing its culture around bicycling on campus, having achieved gold status as a Bicycle Friendly University in 2022. While pedestrians dominate on campus, the University is working towards a future that accommodates pedestrians and bicyclists, providing new, dedicated infrastructure for cycling and improved shared use paths on campus.

On the Penn State campus, similar to many college campuses, pedestrian volumes are higher than almost any other location. They are unmatched by any other mode. While the high-quality walking environment and community of pedestrians are at the heart of what makes the Penn State campus so inviting, the narrow campus paths do not provide enough space for accommodating the high pedestrian volumes when shared with bike riders.
Based on observations on campus, stakeholder interviews, and pop-up engagement events, the two main issues for the University to tackle in the next phase of bikeway development are:

1. Deconflict the bike riders, pedestrians, and vehicles on campus by providing dedicated spaces for each mode.
2. Partner with road owners to improve the safety of people biking to campus at major gateways.

The University should carry forward efforts identified in the University Park Bicycle Master Plan, since existing biking facilities and operating conditions may be a deterrent to attracting additional bike riders. To address the concerns related to the physical biking network, the Bicycle Master Plan proposes a number of high priority Keystone Projects that add bike facilities to existing campus streets and create a cohesive off-street network of pathways to serve the highest demand areas of campus. The plan also identifies secondary Supporting Projects that serve lower demand areas and enhance connectivity of the campus network to the surrounding community networks. Expanding use of the bicycle mode would contribute significantly to Penn State’s goals for becoming emissions-free by 2035.\(^{35}\)

While the University has not yet identified a funding stream for the Bicycle Master Plan’s projects, the master plan identifies a variety of funding streams and implementation strategies for building out the network. Many projects could be implemented initially as low-cost “pilot” projects (via pavement markings, signage, etc.) that can be evaluated in the field under real conditions—before they are formalized and integrated into campus street renewal projects. Piloting the projects is a critical step, to confirm the operational feasibility and gather user input on the changes.

### 4.5. Micromobility & Emerging Modes

Micromobility refers to a variety of personal mobility vehicles that are an emerging form of travel. Ownership and use of these devices—primarily manual electric-motor assisted wheeled vehicles—has skyrocketed in recent years and the devices themselves are exceptionally popular in urban environments or dense college campus communities where short trips are prevalent.

In the US, bike share programs have existed at scale since 2008. Shared e-scooters launched in the US in late 2017 and quickly grew to nearly half of all shared micromobility trips. In 2018, 85,000 e-scooters were deployed nationwide, vs. 57,000 station-based bikes. In the US, e-scooters accounted for 38.5 million trips, compared with 36.5 million station-based bike share trips and 9 million dockless bike share trips.\(^{36}\)

To those attempting to address transportation equity, micromobility represents an opportunity to extend access and opportunities to people who, due to income, availability, or other circumstances, do not have access to a car or transit service. Micromobility, however, is still evolving with many questions about where and how it “fits” into the transportation network. On the University Park Campus, the fast diversification of micro-modes has created spatial tension with other traditional modes and has escalated safety concerns about user behavior, vehicle speed differentials, and the lack of defined networks that can support the emerging modes. Guidance and strategies for effectively incorporating micro-modes into campus environments are also emerging but are behind-the-curve. Policies are frequently reactionary, quickly outdated, or overly reliant on enforcement until the proper network can be designated or built.


Overview of Micromobility

The range of micromobility vehicles is extremely varied. Per the Pennsylvania Vehicle Code, the following definitions are provided:

- **Electric personal assistive mobility device or EPAMD** – A self-balancing, two non-tandem-wheeled device designed to transport only one person with an electric propulsion system.
- **Motor-driven cycle** - A motorcycle or motor scooter, with a motor producing up to five brake horsepower.
- **Motorized pedalcycle** – A motor-driven cycle equipped with operable pedals, a motor rated no more than 1.5 brake horsepower, a cylinder capacity not exceeding 50 cubic centimeters, an automatic transmission, and a maximum design speed of no more than 25 miles per hour or an electric motor-driven cycle equipped with operable pedals and a comparable transmission and speed threshold as motor-driven types.
- **Pedalcycle** – A vehicle propelled solely by human-powered pedals. The term does not apply to traditional “tricycles” that are sized and designed for children 6 years of age and younger.
- **Pedalcycle with electric assist** – A vehicle weighing not more than 100 pounds with two or three wheels more than 11 inches in diameter, with an electric motor system rated at not more than 750 watts and equipped with operable pedals and capable of a speed not more than 20 miles per hour on a level surface when powered by the motor source only. The term does not include a device specifically designed for use by persons with disabilities.

It is noted that the PA Vehicle Code does not include a specific definition of *micromobility*. However, PennDOT’s Active Mobility Plan recognizes that these vehicles represent the next evolution of mobility options and recommends their integration into the long-term planning and design of our neighborhoods and streets.

To this end, PennDOT has published fact sheets to summarize the laws and regulations that apply to different major types of low-speed, micromobility vehicles (Figure 4.28). However, it is notable that this still excludes electric skateboards, electric roller skates, and hoverboards—as well as other devices that are seen on streets and college campuses (see Figure 4.27). Comparable diagrams of micromobility devices from Pedbikeinfo.org (site owned by USDOT/FHWA) and the Sierra Club are provided in Figure 4.29 and Figure 4.30, respectively. In Penn State circles, the term “pseudo-vehicles” has been applied to encompass the range of non-traditional micro-vehicles that are appearing on the campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>MIN AGE</th>
<th>LICENSE</th>
<th>REGISTRATION</th>
<th>INSURANCE</th>
<th>HELMET</th>
<th>PASSENGER</th>
<th>LIGHTS</th>
<th>MAX CAPABLE SPEED</th>
<th>RIDE ON SIDEWALK</th>
<th>RIDE ON BIKE LANE</th>
<th>POSSIBLE DUI</th>
<th>PA VEHICLE CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRIC SCOOTER</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>§ 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOTORIZED PEDALCYCLE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, under 21</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>§ 102, § 3523(e), § 1714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>§ 102, § 3525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOTOR SCOOTER</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Class M/Class C if &gt;50 cc, Class A if &lt;50 cc</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, under 21</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Up to 5 brake horsepower</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>§ 102, § 3523(e), § 3581-3583, § 3703 (c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>§ 102, § 3525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEGWAY</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, under 12</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>§ 102, § 3514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>§ 102, § 3501 et seq., § 3802, § 1547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-BIKE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yes, not in business district</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>§ 102, § 3514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>§ 102, § 3501 et seq., § 3802, § 1547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICYCLE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, under 12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes, not in business district</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>§ 102, § 3514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>§ 102, § 3501 et seq., § 3802, § 1547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can operate only on private property. Electric scooters, like electric skateboards and electric unicycles, cannot be legally operated on public roadways.

Has operable pedals. Design speed of no more than 25 mph. Gas - motor rated 1.5 brake horsepower or less, has an automatic transmission. Electric - powered by an electric battery.

Is a motor-driven cycle. Motor shall not exceed five brake horsepower.

Is an electric personal assistive mobility device. An electric, self-balancing, two-nontandem-wheeled device. Lighting must be used when operating between sunset and sunrise. A Segway is allowed on sidewalks unless a municipality prohibits it.

Is a pedalcycle with electric assist. Weighs less than 100 pounds. Motor not more than 750 watts. Has operable pedals. Not capable going faster than 20 mph on a level surface when powered by the motor source only. Lighting must be used when operating between sunset and sunrise.

Is a pedalcycle. Is moved solely by human-powered pedals. Lighting must be used when operating between sunset and sunrise.
### Figure 4.29. Common Micromobility Devices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device</th>
<th>Class 1</th>
<th>Class 2</th>
<th>Class 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedal assist (pedelec)</td>
<td>Throttle assist</td>
<td>Pedal assist (pedelec) at higher speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example brands</td>
<td>Shared: Bird, Lime, and many others</td>
<td>Shared: Lime, Mobike, Ofo, Pace, Spin, and many others</td>
<td>Owned: Several bike brands (less common than Class 1 and 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned: Inboard Glider, Segway 9Bot</td>
<td>Owned: Most major bike brands; multiple passenger versions include Organic Transit (ELF) and Yuba</td>
<td>Owned: Several major brands; multiple passenger versions include Better Bike (PEBL), and Podride</td>
<td>Owned: Boosted, Inboard, Mellow Boards, Metroboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Typically &lt; 50 lbs; multiple passenger versions near 200 lbs</td>
<td>Typically &lt; 100 lbs</td>
<td>Typically &lt; 100 lbs; multiple passenger versions near 200 lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupants</td>
<td>Single rider</td>
<td>Usually a single rider; some cargo e-bikes or bike cars designed for multiple riders</td>
<td>Typically designed for single riders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power supply</td>
<td>Electric motor typically &lt; 750 watts</td>
<td>Electric motor typically &lt; 750 watts</td>
<td>Electric motor typically &lt; 750 watts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product speed</td>
<td>20 MPH or less; some cities apply additional speed restrictions</td>
<td>20 MPH or less</td>
<td>28 MPH or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating space</td>
<td>Varies by place; some cities restrict in crowded places</td>
<td>Varies by place; usually allowed on bike transportation facilities and paths</td>
<td>Varies by place; some States restrict access on bike paths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulated by</td>
<td>Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC), for personally owned devices</td>
<td>CPSC (only for personally owned devices)</td>
<td>CPSC (only for personally owned devices)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36
Micromobility in the PA Vehicle Code

While the Pennsylvania State Vehicle Code does not define micromobility it does include applicable requirements, rules, and regulations that speak to vehicles that are typically categorized with micromobility devices. First, a review was conducted to verify that that state vehicle code was applicable to the Penn State roadways. The Vehicle Code (Title 75) is applicable to “highways,” which by definition also includes “a roadway open to the use of the public for vehicular travel on grounds of a college or university or public or private school or public or historical park.” As such, any roadway that is open for public vehicular travel on the University grounds is governed by the Vehicle Code and the associated code chapter that pertains to micromobility (Chapter 35 Special Vehicles and Pedestrians). State code provides the broadest guidance on the use of pedalcycles (human-powered or electrical assisted) but has not yet developed guidance for emerging forms of micromobility. Penn State may use Chapter 35 of the State Code as the foundation for micromobility programming and enforcement.
Benefits to Penn State Users

Micromobility offers many benefits that would be attractive to students, faculty and staff at Penn State. As noted in the PennDOT Active Mobility Plan, micromobility offers the following key benefits:

- Provides more mobility choices
- Offers last mile and first mile connections
- Reduces traffic congestion
- Mitigates various forms of pollution
- Reduces transportation costs
- Improves efficiency of transportation networks
- Provides options for those who cannot afford to buy and maintain a vehicle
- Offers accessible mobility options for persons of all ages, abilities, and skill levels

Additional benefits that are unlocked by micromobility include:

- **Health Improvement** ... Micromobility vehicles encourage physical activity and contribute to improved public health by offering an active alternative to sedentary modes of transportation.
- **Flexibility** ... Micromobility vehicles offer flexibility in terms of routes and schedules, allowing users to travel where and when they want.
- **Reliability** ... Micromobility vehicles are often reliable and serve as a dependable mode of transportation.
- **Congestion and Parking Relief** ... Micromobility vehicles can alleviate traffic congestion and reduce the demand for traditional parking spaces, optimizing the use of urban space.

Common and Unique Challenges in the University Park Environment

There are many concerns with micromobility devices in the University Park Campus environment that stem from the fact that the campus was not designed for them. Nor is space readily available to create dedicated facilities for these vehicles. The likely outcome is that they must share space the street space with cars, bikes, and people. The number one concern with these shared transportation spaces is safety—particularly the increased potential for collisions among vehicles moving at significantly different speeds. As a real-world illustration, Austin (Texas) Public Health and the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) found that e-scooter use resulted in 20 injuries per 100,000 trips, 1/3 of injuries were sustained by riders on their first e-scooter ride, 48% of injuries were to the head, and more than 1/3 reported that excessive speed contributed to their injury.

Collisions and their severity are a function of the speed differentials among and between micromobility devices and other street users. Some devices may operate at speeds higher than people can walk or propel a traditional pedal cycle. Meanwhile, they are often much slower than prevailing motorized vehicle traffic—placing them in disharmony with users on both the sidewalk and street, from a speed perspective.

And because these devices are new, policies, regulations, and guidelines either do not exist or have been hastily prepared without full consideration for the use and impact of these vehicles. Similarly, because these vehicles seem to change size, format, speed, and orientation on a continual basis, polices are always behind the curve of new device development.

Spatial challenges revolve around device parking, storage, and management of charging infrastructure. While the vehicles are smaller and demand less space when parked, the number of vehicles and their spatial needs are not

---


easy to predict or regulate at every location. Campuses are often adapting after the modes are in use, and in this responsive mode, accommodating them can be ad-hoc or designated in areas not intended for this function. Service and safety challenges also extend to vehicle charging policies (i.e., energy infrastructure capacity, battery safety), with justifiable concern about lithium batteries.

Environmental and geographical conditions also come into play in the northeastern United States. Reliable, year-round use of these devices is a challenge, with many of these devices not particularly suited for travel over snow or ice events. Plus, with electric, battery-powered devices, cold conditions are known to adversely impact battery life, severely limiting their operable range. The geography/topography of State College could also present challenges related to power needed on hills and longevity of the battery for day-long use.

**How Micromobility is Regulated**

There are three broad strategies that can be deployed to regulate micromobility on college campuses:

- **Permissive** – Very few regulations beyond standard bicycle regulations or DOT regulations.
- **Restrictive** – Extensive regulation or full restriction (e.g., no scooters allowed on campus); may include night-riding bans, caps on numbers of devices, lock-to or other parking requirements, and geographical restrictions.
- **Mixed** – Combination of permissive and restrictive regulations by zone (geofencing) or certain times of the day.

Table 4.11 compares the degree of regulation among different U.S. urban areas, with an estimate of micromobility use for different modes and an estimate of overall micromobility usage.

At University Park, micromobility devices are loosely regulated in a mixed fashion by existing policy, mostly referencing **SY16 Regulations for Bicycles / Skateboards / Scooters / In-Line Skates / Roller Skates / Electric Personal Assistive Mobility Devices**. Relevant sections from SY16 are as follows:

- **Bicycles shall be ridden on approved bicycle routes and campus roads only. Riders must walk their bicycle at all other places. Specifically, bicycles shall not be ridden on sidewalks or on any pedestrian path in the limited bicycle zone, bounded by Fraser Road, Curtin Road, Shortlidge Road, and Pollock Road.**
- **Bicycles may be ridden on malls and pedestrian paths, other than those on central campus, given that the rider exercises due caution and yields to pedestrians. The operator of bicycles on malls and roadways must ride with regard for the safety of pedestrians and property and shall yield to pedestrians.**
- **SY16 Regulations for Bicycles / Skateboards / Scooters / In-Line Skates / Roller Skates / Electric Personal Assistive Mobility Devices**
  - The use of skateboards and skateboard-like devices on campus property is prohibited.
  - Roller skates, in-line skates, scooters (excluding medical), sleds, hoverboards, and similar coasting devices are not vehicles and are prohibited in roadways. Persons on such devices are pedestrians for traffic control purposes.
  - Persons may coast or ride upon roller skates, in-line skates, scooters, or hoverboards on sidewalks provided they yield the right-of-way to pedestrians on foot and follow traffic rules at intersections.

The Penn State policy defines rules and regulations for bicycles, mopeds, skateboards, scooters, in-line skates, roller skates and electric personal assistive mobility devices apply to all persons operating any such mode of transportation on University property. The policy defines a limited bicycle zone; defines the applicable e-bike size, power, and speed ratings; fully prohibits the use of skateboards and skateboard-like devices, and prohibits the uses of roller skates, in-line skates, scooters (excluding medical), sleds, hoverboards, and similar coasting devices in roadways. The last substantive update to SY16 was made in May 2019 (before the COVID pandemic), and the policy may be due for review and update to address travel conditions that exist on campus today, including micromobility and the emerging challenges.
### Table 4.11. Comparison of Micromobility Regulation and Impact among U.S. Urban Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Degree of Regulation</th>
<th>Micromobility Penetration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>Medium (4.5k scooters, 1k e-bikes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, TX</td>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>Very High (~10k devices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, MA**</td>
<td>Ban</td>
<td>Temporary Ban, low bike share outside of the city (Lime pulled out in 2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>High (~10k devices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, OH**</td>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, CA</td>
<td>Ban</td>
<td>None (Jump/Lime pulled out)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington DC**</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>High (10k e-scooters, 4k e-bikes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>Medium (3k e-scooters, 600 e-bikes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>Unknown, no dockless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>High (37k devices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis, TN</td>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>Medium (Lime leaves Bolt joins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis, MN</td>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville, TN</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans, LA</td>
<td>Ban</td>
<td>State ban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City, NY**</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>Low (3k e-scooters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark, NJ**</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>Low (2k e-scooters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA**</td>
<td>Ban</td>
<td>State ban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh, NC</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>Low (750 e-scooters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Region, CA</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio, TX</td>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>Medium (6.4k e-scooters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Permissive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose, CA</td>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>Pilot program</td>
<td>Medium (5k devices)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table Notes:**
** Notation and highlight indicates urban areas in the Northeastern United States.

---

Peer Universities

The policies and regulations used by a sample of peer universities were investigated to see how they manage their micromobility systems and benchmark Penn State’s approach and techniques.

Texas A&M University

The university has a three-year partnership with Veo44 to provide seated e-scooters and pedal bikes. The most popular personal devices on the campus were seated scooters. As noted on the university's Transportation Services website under University Bikes & Wheels Regulations:

*Micromobility is defined as lightweight vehicles such as bicycles, scooters, boards, etc. with drive systems which may be electric only, electric assist, or analog. Micromobility may be personally owned, borrowed, leased, or rented. When you ride a bicycle or other personal mobility device on a roadway and/or within the Texas A&M University campus, you are a driver. You must follow state laws, give signals, obey stop signs and yield right of way-just as car drivers do. Laws and regulations are designed for the safety of all campus users.*45

The University Bikes & Wheels Regulations webpage is organized into Registration and Use Requirements, Operation Regulations, Parking Regulations, and Transportation Services Enforcement. These and other university rules and regulations include the following:

- All micromobility devices brought to campus must be registered and comply with safety standards.
- Micromobility devices equipped with an electric motor exceeding 750 Watts or 1 horsepower are prohibited for use on campus.
- Scooters may only be operated in areas where bicycle traffic is allowed.
- Scooters should be operated at a low speed in the presence of pedestrians and pedestrians always have the right of way.
- Scooters should be parked at bike racks only.
- Electric devices with installed or removable lithium batteries are not allowed to be used, stored, or charged in any university buildings or facilities due to the significant fire hazard posed by these devices. This includes on-campus housing.

**No micromobility user on university property, including sidewalks, bike paths, and shared use paths should exceed a speed that is reasonable and prudent.** Users must consider the number of pedestrians or other micromobility present, visibility, traffic, weather, and surface conditions that exist at the time, or take action that endangers property or the safety of any person.

University of Arkansas

The university owns and operates a scooter share program that generates 5,000 to 8,000 scooter trips per day. The most popular mobility device is standing scooters. The following rules, regulations, and policies are noted on the university’s website:46

- Scooters can be ridden anywhere bicycles are allowed, including streets and paved trails.
- Riding is permitted on most sidewalks, riders must yield to pedestrians and use extra caution at crosswalks and driveways. No riding on sidewalks that abut a building face.
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Using a cellphone, headphones, earbuds or any similar device that impairs hearing is prohibited while riding a scooter.

E-Scooters are programed with a maximum speed of 15 MPH and will automatically slow to 6 MPH in designated “slow zones” (see Figure 4.31). 47

Park scooters neatly at a Scooter Corrals.

Any person operating an electric motorized scooter upon a roadway at less than the normal and reasonable speed of traffic shall ride in the right-hand lane of the roadway.

No person shall operate electric motorized scooters in university buildings or charge an electric scooter on university property.

University of Maryland

The university partners with both Veo to provide stand up e-scooters and e-bikes. The university’s most popular personal devices are standing scooters, pedal-assist e-bikes, and throttle-assist e-bikes. Per the university’s website: 48

- Maryland State Law regulates e-scooters under the same code that regulates standard bicycles. This means that e-scooters must be operated on the road and follow all traffic laws
- e-Scooters may not be operated:
  - On sidewalks or in crosswalks
  - Within campus parking garages
  - In an unsafe manner. This includes wearing earbuds or headphones while riding, acrobatic riding, distracted riding or more than one rider per vehicle.

- Bikes and scooters should generally be used on roads. However, sidewalks can be used when necessary. If you must use a sidewalk, dismount your scooter/bike and walk.

Rutgers University

The university partners with both Veo and Bird to provide various micromobility devices. The university’s most popular personal devices are standing scooters. Per the university’s website: 49

- Scooters are not allowed on sidewalks and are subject to municipal fines.
- Return scooters to bike racks or check the Veo app for designated parking areas. Report improperly parked scooters on the app.

---

47 University of Arkansas, e-Scooter Slow Zone, [https://safety.uark.edu/eScooter-slow-zone-campus.pdf](https://safety.uark.edu/eScooter-slow-zone-campus.pdf), as accessed August 2023.
48 University of Maryland, Transportation Services, [https://transportation.umd.edu/safety-starts-you](https://transportation.umd.edu/safety-starts-you), as accessed August 2023.
49 University of Rutgers, Parking & Transportation Services, [https://ipo.rutgers.edu/dots/scooters](https://ipo.rutgers.edu/dots/scooters), as accessed August 2023.
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- State Law:
  - The motorized scooter may only have a maximum speed capability of no more than 15 mph.
  - Motorized bicycles, or mopeds, are low-speed, two-wheeled vehicles with pedals, intended for limited use on public roadways. Moped drivers may not exceed 25 mph, must follow all traffic signs and signals and drive on the right side of the road with the flow of traffic.

**Strategies and Recommendations for University Park**

With the range of micro-modes already in use at University Park, Penn State is developing policies that are informed by existing state regulations and can work in the University Park Campus environment. This includes policy, spatial, operational, and enforcement considerations, as follows:

- Better definitions, classifications, and specific regulations for each type of micromobility devices.
- Flexibility in instituting, evaluating, and then adjusting regulations.
- Developing relationships with other universities and micro-mode providers themselves are beneficial when considering new policies and adjusting current regulations.
- Clarify parking regulations and designated parking areas for micro-modes.
- Develop dedicated space (or space shared only with wheeled vehicles).
- Establish public charging locations, likely in coordination with parking.
- Establish/revise fine structures for improper parking and usage.
- Ban sidewalk use entirely.
- Allow only University-owned micro-modes on campus, providing greater operational control.
- Establish spatial (geofencing) or time-of-day use restrictions.
- Provide incentives to commuters for training classes, helmet use, and good rider history.

Penn State has already pursued and implemented several of these considerations via their E-Bike partnership. These include time-of-day restrictions, speed limited areas, and dedicated parking.

The University also hopes to implement a similar approach to other micro modes—particularly standing scooters. However, there are limitations in what can be accomplished under the current PA Vehicle Code. That is, standing scooters remain illegal on Pennsylvania’s public roads, which encompasses (by Vehicle Code definition) streets traversing university campuses. Pilot programs allowing electric scooters within the cities of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh were conducted during the last few years, and lessons learned are being studied. However, those pilot programs expired in July 2023, and as of this writing, the anticipated legislation to amend the Vehicle Code and address electric scooters has not yet been enacted. It is not clear when this issue will be taken up by the State Transportation Committee and General Assembly.
Chapter 5.  
Future Development Assumptions and Impact

5.1. Background and Purpose

The text of the University Planned District (UPD) Ordinance states:

*A district transportation study shall be submitted with the application for approval of the District Plan, and every 10th year following approval of the District Plan. The purpose of the transportation study is to generally identify the transportation impacts likely to result from projected development and activities within the District for a 10-year period.*

Therefore, this chapter identifies the University-funded development and activities projected within the UPD over the next ten-year period (2023-2033), as assembled from the following sources:

- University Park Five-Year Capital Plan, 2018-2023
- University Park Five Year Capital Plan, 2024-2028
- Interviews with Penn State's Office of Physical Plant staff, conducted in March 2023
- University Park Roadway Preservation Program, 2020-2040
- University Park Utilities Maintenance Program, 2022-2025

In addition to the University-funded projects, improvement plans developed by other agencies were reviewed to identify projects near the University Park Campus that may change the transportation system or otherwise influence travel activity at the University Park Campus.

- Centre County Metropolitan Planning Organization Transportation Improvement Program
- PennDOT Twelve Year Program (TYP)
- State College Borough Capital Plan
- College Township Capital Plan
- Patton Township Capital Plan
- Ferguson Township Capital Plan

The Ten-Year UPD Development Assumptions compiles projects from all of these University and Agency programs as planning-level information for the University Planned District Transportation Study.

For the University Projects, transportation impact is also addressed. The project descriptions focus on characteristics that are common drivers of trip-making and travel patterns—e.g., floor area, employment, visitors, parking, etc. From this information, the Future Year UPD Transportation Assessment states the Anticipated Transportation Impact during the next ten-year period can be assessed.

The Assumptions provide a concise overview and planning-level information to frame the discussion of transportation at the University Park Campus. However, the Assumptions are neither a commitment by the Pennsylvania State University nor an expectation of PennDOT or any municipality to build any particular project, design, or location. The Assumptions are not intended as an exhaustive catalog of projects or a limitation on projects that may be imagined, developed, or implemented within the next ten years. And the Anticipated Transportation Impact is a snapshot based on the University’s most current information from the project development process. The Assumptions are subject to change as funding for certain projects is accelerated or delayed and feasibility, scope, and cost are clarified.
5.2. Ten-Year UPD Development Assumptions

Projects from the University’s Capital Plans along with other projects anticipated within the next 10 Years were compiled together into the Ten-Year UPD Development Assumptions. Figure 5.1 provides a composite map of University, Municipal and PennDOT/MPO projects. The map is followed by “exhibit” tables that are keyed to the mapping and supply project details.

**University Projects** (50) are identified blue and purple colors and are keyed to Exhibit 5.1 (4 pages). These projects are drawn from the University’s Capital Plans and are described in Section 5.3.

**Municipal Projects** (10) are identified in green colors and are keyed to Exhibit 5.2. These projects are drawn from municipal plans and are described in Section 5.4.

**PennDOT/MPO Projects** (2) are identified in red colors and are keyed to Exhibit 5.3. These projects are drawn from the MPO and PennDOT project programs and are described in Section 5.5.

5.3. University Projects

**University Capital Planning**

Penn State University is in the practice of adopting 5-year Capital Plans that address identification of strategic rationale, key needs, specific projects, and anticipated funding. The Capital Plans provided breakdowns of funding sources, distribution of funds to university units, and significant projects. Line-items may be used to account for campus-wide renewals, as well as building and infrastructure maintenance and enhancements. The current UPD Transportation Study is being conducted at a time that overlaps with both the 2018-2023 and 2024-2028 Capital Plans.

The Capital Plans typically divide projects and initiatives into two broad categories. Education and General Initiatives address the following:

- **Systems Renewal** includes internal building systems, such as automation, electrical, plumbing, elevators, envelopes, hazardous material abatement, HVAC, interiors and accessibility, life safety.
- **Major Construction and Renovation** projects encompass more comprehensive building projects that may construct new facilities or expand/replace existing buildings.
- **Infrastructure** projects maintain, repair, update, and rebuild the primary campus systems outside of the buildings themselves, including utilities, steam lines, streets/sidewalks, etc.
- **Demolition** involves the removal of facilities, including some that will be replaced in the future and others that will be removed without replacement.

**Self-Supporting Units** work cooperatively with the University staff in planning and developing projects that are funded through their own revenues and fees:

- **Auxiliary and Business Services** operates and maintains the housing operations, campus dining commons, general stores, information technology, marketing, accounting, safety, transportation services, and the Bryce Jordan Center.
- **Intercollegiate Athletics** operates Penn State’s varsity athletics programs and associated facilities and venues, which includes the All-Sports Museum and Penn State Golf Courses.
- **Applied Research Laboratory** performs collaborative externally funded research and development activities that capitalize on the expertise of the University’s faculty, staff, and students. Research focuses on defense, national security, economic competitiveness, and quality of life.
- **University Park Airport** operates all air-side aspects of the airport in coordination with the University Park Airport Authority, which handles the terminal and ground transportation.
Figure 5.1. University Park Campus Ten-Year Development Assumptions
## EDUCATION & GENERAL INITIATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Anticipated Completion Date</th>
<th>Master Plan, Study, or Program</th>
<th>Capital Plan</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Anticipated Net Change</th>
<th>Transportation Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering, West 2</td>
<td>May 2023</td>
<td>College of Engineering Master Plan</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Addressed via Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State Art Museum at the Arboretum</td>
<td>June 2023</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Architecture Master Plan</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Addressed via Memo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Reclamation Facility Reconstruction</td>
<td>December 2023</td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Addressed via Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering, West 1</td>
<td>March 2024</td>
<td>College of Engineering Master Plan</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Addressed via Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Resources Laboratory Demolition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Welch Liberal Arts Building</td>
<td>October 2024</td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Addressed via Memo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Management Facility</td>
<td>June 2024</td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Sciences Building Renovation</td>
<td>December 2024</td>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition of Oswald Tower</td>
<td>Spring 2025</td>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackett Building Renovation</td>
<td>December 2026</td>
<td>College of Engineering Master Plan</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition of Hammond Building &amp; Engineering Units</td>
<td>Spring 2027</td>
<td>College of Engineering Master Plan</td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osmond/Physics Building Renovation &amp; Expansion</td>
<td>June 2027</td>
<td>Eberly College of Science Master Plan</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Addressed via Memo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Diagnostic Laboratory Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisenhower Auditorium Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter Building Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boucke Building Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson Building Renovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Palmer Museum of Art Repurpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition of Benedict, Beecher-Dock &amp; Gardeners Houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EXHIBIT 5.1. University Projects & Transportation Impact Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Anticipated Completion Date</th>
<th>Master Plan, Study, or Program</th>
<th>Capital Plan</th>
<th>Current Status August 2023</th>
<th>Anticipated Net Change</th>
<th>Anticipated Transportation Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EDUCATION &amp; GENERAL INITIATIVES (continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>PlantWorks Greenhouse &amp; Headhouse Replacement</td>
<td>Significant updates to the plant science infrastructure on campus, starting with a fully re-imagined greenhouse and headhouse facilities. The project envisions a new, modern, multi-story facility that consolidates growth chambers that are currently scattered around campus into new USDA APHIS-compliant facilities. These would be integrated with the headhouse, laboratories, instructional and collaboration spaces, and faculty and research offices. The facility may also house public-facing spaces for museums and tours. A new loading area and loading dock would be added. Site evaluation and selection is part of the feasibility study and may recommend one or multiple sites.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Eberly College of Science Master Plan</td>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Hostler Building Renovations</td>
<td>Primary systems replacement, building modifications to address functional building systems and improve efficiency.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Eberly College of Science Master Plan</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Old Main Renovations</td>
<td>Primary systems replacement, building modifications to address functional building systems and improve efficiency.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Wellness Center (White Building)</td>
<td>Potential new home for fitness and health services at the campus core. Project is primarily a programming effort to better determine the use of the proposed building, the needed floor area, and cost of expansion/renovation. Coordination between Student Affairs, ICA, and Academics (due to current use of classrooms by the Kinesiology Department) is recommended to determine the appropriate mix of programs to maximize the utility of this building and site.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Student Affairs Facilities Master Plan</td>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>HUB Replacement/Expansion</td>
<td>Project seeks to maintain the current array of student life programming, dining, events, and student organizations. Project is primarily a programming effort to evaluate the future of dining in the facility (maintain, grow, or shrink). Look for further opportunities to deconsolidate student-facing staff offices to other locations in order to maximize space for student-facing programs.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Student Affairs Facilities Master Plan</td>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>INFRASTRUCTURE &amp; UTILITIES PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Commuter Drive Sidewalk Addition</td>
<td>Add concrete sidewalk on the west side of Commuter Drive from Dauer Drive to Curtin Road. Lighting upgrades are integrated with the project.</td>
<td>August 2023</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Campus Pedestrian Lighting Upgrades</td>
<td>The project will replace, update, and add overhead roadway and pedestrian crossing lighting along Porter Road, Rigler Road, Pollock Road, Shortridge Road, and College Avenue.</td>
<td>August 2023</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>University Drive Enhanced Pedestrian Crossing</td>
<td>The project will install a pedestrian crossing at University Drive just north of Dauer Drive. The crossing would be ADA-compliant with new markings, lighting, and a user-activated rectangular rapid flashing beacon mounted overhead on mast arms.</td>
<td>July 2024</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>East Campus Thermal Storage Tank</td>
<td>The project will establish a new thermal energy storage complex at a site (to be determined) on East Campus, generally located in the long-term student parking lot near Hastings Road. The project is expected to reduce approximately 125 parking spaces, which may or may not be replaced in the University parking supply.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>West Campus Multi-Modal Connection</td>
<td>New transportation facility/connection between the West Campus Parking Structure and College Avenue at Buckhout Street. The connection concept was initially evaluated in the DRAFT West Campus Parking Structure Transportation Impact Study (2018) but was removed from the project as a bulk vehicular connection to address community concerns. The connection may have future merit as a multi-modal link (transit, bike, ped only) with rights-of-way from CATA for using the link. The connection could also be opened as a future vehicular link, with additional study, agreement with the adjacent municipalities, and appropriate network design to address community concerns.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>West Campus Parking Structure Transportation Impact Study (2018)</td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Penn State University Park Bicycle Master Plan - Priority Network</td>
<td>Implementation of Priority Keystone Projects from the Penn State Bike Plan. Priority projects enhance existing campus streets and add pathways to address the highest demand areas and route connectivity. The plan also identifies Secondary Supporting Projects that serve lower demand areas and would enhance connectivity of the overall network. Implementation is on hold awaiting funding.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Penn State University Park Bicycle Master Plan (2023)</td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>University Park Airport Taxiway &amp; Runway Rehabilitation Projects</td>
<td>Expansion of taxiways (currently in construction), rehabilitation of the runway (design), and upgrades to the cargo apron (concept) are major projects that are currently moving forward. The APA is also participating in the DOD Airport Land Development Zone Program (ALDP), with the purpose of accelerating development activity on land and in vacant buildings owned by airports. The most recent airport master plan was completed in 2006 but is due for an update, in light of COVID-pandemic impacts and changes in the airline industry.</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>University Park Airport Master Plan</td>
<td>Design/Construction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EXHIBIT 5.1. University Projects & Transportation Impact Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Anticipated Completion Date</th>
<th>Master Plan, Study, or Program</th>
<th>Capital Plan</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Anticipated Net Change</th>
<th>Anticipated Transportation Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RESIDENCE HALLS PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>East Residence Halls Renovations Phases 1a, 1b, 2, 3a, 3b</td>
<td>Renovation of residence halls except Hastings. Stone and Snyder Halls includes new/more efficient building systems, climate-control, updated furniture and living spaces, improvements to building aesthetics, ADA access, landscaping, etc. Maintains the current number of student beds.</td>
<td>August 2023</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>East Residence Halls Renovations Phase 2c</td>
<td>Renovation of Hastings, Stone and Snyder Halls including new/more efficient building systems, climate-control, updated furniture and living spaces, improvements to building aesthetics, ADA access, landscaping, etc. Maintains the current number of student beds.</td>
<td>August 2024</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Pollock Halls Renovations Phases 3a, 3b, 3c, and 3d</td>
<td>Renovation of Funster, Pomer, Shattuck, Shrader, Woll, and Prime halls including new/more efficient building systems, climate-control, updated furniture and living spaces, improvements to building aesthetics, ADA access, landscaping, etc. Maintains the current number of student beds. Progressive completion of phases 3a-3d from July 2016 to July 2019.</td>
<td>July 2029</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Architect Selection</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Pollock Halls Renovations Phase 4a</td>
<td>Renovation of Mifflin and Haveth Halls including new/more efficient building systems, climate-control, updated furniture and living spaces, improvements to building aesthetics, ADA access, landscaping, etc. Maintains the current number of student beds.</td>
<td>December 2029</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Architect Selection</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS PROJECTS |                             |                             |                             |                               |              |               |                      |                                   |
| 36 | Field Hockey Stadium Renovation/Expansion | The project would increase capacity of the venue to 1,200, incorporating an upper level press box, broadcast booth and multi-purpose hospitality area, as well as new field storage. Improvements would also include home and visiting team dressing areas, press/TV facilities, locker room space for officials, ticket office, public restrooms and concession areas. | October 2023 | Penn State Athletics Facilities Master Plan | ✓ | Construction | ✓ | ✅ | - | - | - | Nominal |
| 37 | Holuba Hall, Lash Football Building & Nittany Outdoor Football Practice Fields Renovation | Renovations to address functional building systems, efficiency, and facility capabilities—e.g., lighting, technical and staff capabilities, climate control, accessibility, etc. Lash Building Renovation includes revisions to office and meeting space and expansion/enclosure of the building's patio as an alternative venue for facility guests and events. | December 2023 | Penn State Athletics Facilities Master Plan | ✓ | Construction | - | - | - | - | - | Nominal |
| 38 | Plyometric Hill Training Facility | Project will add a plyometric training facility for ICA, sited on the slope between University Drive and the Bryce Jordan Center. Outdoor facility would be closed to the general public and would include facilities for jumping and hill climbing. | December 2023 | Construction | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | None |

| 39 | East Area Locker Room Renovation | From Store: Diving for Athletics and Athletics support space | Move=Training Table from Pollock to new facility | June 2024 | Design | - | - | - | - | - | - | Nominal |

| 40 | Greenberg Indoor Sports Complex (GISC) Renovation/Expansion | The GSC Training Table Renovation and Addition project involves the renovation of the existing first floor laboratory space into a training table and the renovation of the existing ground floor office space into a weight and athletic training space. The project also involves new entry addition and stucco modifications to accommodate a loading dock along with parking lot reduction and site plaza modifications. | August 2025 | Design | ✓ | ✅ | - | - | - | - | - | Nominal |

| 41 | Jeffrey Field | Renovations would add new and existing field locker facilities, start-up seats for fans with covered sitting on the west side, concessions and restrooms, a video board, media facilities, and new lighting throughout. Seating capacity would be increased to 4,000 upon completion. | October 2025 | Penn State Athletics Facilities Master Plan | ✓ | Design | ✓ | ✅ | - | - | - | Nominal |

| 42 | Indoor Practice Facility | New $5,000,000 square foot indoor practice facility, similar to Holuba Hall, would be attached to the East Locker Rooms or Center for Excellence, providing practice space for the baseball, softball, men's and women's golf, lacrosse and soccer programs, as well as indoor workout space for all 33 sports. The venue may also host selected Penn State sports camps and other events. To be completed in coordination with Jeffrey Field. | October 2025 | Penn State Athletics Facilities Master Plan | ✓ | Design | ✓ | ✅ | - | - | - | Nominal |

| 43 | Beaver Stadium Renovations | The renovations would improve the quality of fan amenities, establish the seating capacity, preserve and enhance the iconic nature of the stadium, utilize existing stadium assets, preserve and enhance the tailgating experience and provide premium amenities. Renovation projects are likely to extend to the surrounding transportation and parking infrastructure, including bus parking enhancements and comprehensive updates. The first phase includes approximately $30 million of $70 million total. | August 2027 (Phase 1) | Penn State Athletics Facilities Master Plan | ✓ | Design | ✓ | - | - | - | - | Possible |

| 44 | ICA Practice & Training Facility | Potential site for a new ICA facility, possibly including indoor practice space, training rooms, meeting rooms, and offices for coaches and trainers. Funding not yet identified. 300 to 400 existing parking spaces in the BCC parking lot may be reduced/improved. | TBD | Concept | ✓ | ✅ | - | - | - | - | - | Nominal |

| 45 | Medlar Field at Lubrano Park Renovations & Addition | Renovations and addition to the existing facility to make the ballpark/Professional Development League (PDL) complaint for the State College Spikes. Project includes upgrades for both the Spikes and Penn State baseball programs. | TBD | Design | ✓ | ✅ | - | - | - | - | - | Nominal |
### EXHIBIT 5.1. University Projects & Transportation Impact Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Anticipated Completion Date</th>
<th>Master Plan, Study, or Program</th>
<th>Capital Plan</th>
<th>Current Status August 2023</th>
<th>Anticipated Net Change</th>
<th>Anticipated Transportation Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS PROJECTS (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Center of Excellence</td>
<td>New 450,000 square foot hub for Penn State student athletes, staff, and coaches. Would replace the East Area Locker Room building. Facility would centralize services and other resources for student-athletes and would house locker rooms and coaches’ offices for the field hockey and men’s and women’s lacrosse, soccer, and tennis programs. Project on hold, with East Locker Room Renovation satisfying current needs.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Penn State Athletics Facilities Master Plan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>↑ - - -</td>
<td>Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Natatorium Replacement</td>
<td>New 130,000 square foot facility would replace the existing Natatorium, likely on a different site. Would include a 10-lane, 50-meter competition pool, a separate lap pool with campus recreation programming capability, and diving well. Complex would have facilities for men’s and women’s swimming and diving teams, seating for approximately 2,000 spectators, and campus community locker rooms. Project on hold awaiting funding.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Penn State Athletics Facilities Master Plan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>↑ ↑ - -</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Indoor Tennis Training Facility</td>
<td>New 100,000 square foot complex with 10 courts; facilities for men’s and women’s tennis teams. Campus recreation space, seating for 500 spectators, and a pro shop. Project on hold awaiting funding.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Penn State Athletics Facilities Master Plan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>↑ ↑ - -</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>APPLIED RESEARCH LABORATORY PROJECTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>ARL IB-01</td>
<td>Create 126,000 SF secure interdisciplinary hub for ARL research at Innovation Park. Project expected to be coordinated and concurrent with ARL Main Laboratory Renovation. Building layout and function will evolve with final scope of the ARL Main Laboratory Renovations.</td>
<td>June 2026</td>
<td>ARL Facility Master Plan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑</td>
<td>Addressed via Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Applied Research Laboratory Replacement &amp; Consolidation</td>
<td>50-year master plan to build 1.2 million SF at Innovation Park. Project development requires change in Regional Growth Boundary as part of municipal approval. The initial building in the master plan (ARL IB-01) would be built within the existing Innovation Park boundary.</td>
<td>50 Years</td>
<td>ARL Facility Master Plan</td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>↑ ↑ ↑ ↑</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>ARL Main Laboratory Renovation</td>
<td>Renovation of the Main Laboratory building; update functional building systems, improve efficiency, and modernize certain spaces. Project may include vacating; reducing, and/or demolishing certain portions of the building. Building may be vacated/demolished entirely (without immediate replacement) once ARL functions move to new facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>ARL Facility Master Plan</td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>↑ - - -</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OTHER CAMPUS ACTIVITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Nittany Lion Inn Re-Opening</td>
<td>In July 2022, the Penn State Board of Trustees approved a purchasing agreement and lease with the Scholar Hotel Group, a private entity that will lease and operate both the Nittany Lion Inn and Penn State Hotel and Conference Center. The re-opening of the Nittany Lion Inn as a hotel is planned for Fall 2023. The Penn State has and will remain open.</td>
<td>September 2023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Awaiting Occupancy</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EXHIBIT 5.2. Municipal Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Anticipated Completion</th>
<th>Master Plan, Study, or Program</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PATTON TOWNSHIP</strong></td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Oakwood Bicycle/Pedestrian Path, Benjamin Court to Bellefonte Central Rail Trail</td>
<td>The plan identifies the proposed Oakwood Bicycle/Pedestrian Path from Benjamin Court to Bellefonte Central Rail Trail (BCKRT) in the Penn State Arboretum Lands. The proposed alignment starts in Patton Township at Oakwood Avenue and follow an existing path through the Village Square neighborhood. Where the path currently ends at Benjamin Court, an extension would extend between the Village Square and Heritage Oaks properties into College Township and the Penn State Arboretum lands and access to the existing Bellefonte Central Rail Trail, generally following an existing dirt pathway along a fence-row.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Bike/Pedestrian Path Plan, 2020-2029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **FERGUSON TOWNSHIP** | 02 | Blue Course Drive/Clincoln Avenue Shared Use Path Connection | The Northland Area Mobility Study, completed by Ferguson Township in 2019, recommends connecting the existing shared use path west of Atherton Street to the McKee Street Path on the eastern end of Clinton Avenue. The project would address the “missing link” in bicycle and pedestrian facilities through this area that was identified in the Centre Region Bike Plan. | TBD | Northland Area Mobility Study | Concept |

| **STATE COLLEGE BOROUGH** | 03 | West End Revitalization | Envisioning changes in the character, density, and transportation connections in the Borough’s West End adjacent to Penn State’s West Campus. | TBD | State College Downtown Master Plan | Concept |
| 04 | Allen Street Transit Center Relocation | A concept “alternative” for the Allen Street Transit Center envisions relocating the transit center west of Allen Street. The University may be supportive of the transit relocation to improve aesthetics by removing buses from the viewshed in front of Old Main. | TBD | State College Downtown Master Plan | Concept |
| 05 | College Avenue & Allen Street Intersection Reconfiguration | Catalyst Project concept for College Avenue at Allen Street, which seeks to make a more attractive and safer intersection. To help manage the current grade different between the campus and intersection levels, the intersection would be raised to sidewalk level and curbs removed, in favor of decorative bollards and stamped concrete pavement. Vehicular lanes would be narrowed and crosswalks made more prominent to express a more pedestrian-oriented feel. | TBD | State College Downtown Master Plan | Concept |
| 06 | Allen Street Promenade | Envisons various special event configurations for Allen Street between College Avenue and Beaver Avenue, where the street is temporarily converted to a “pedestrian mall”. The plan suggests permanently closing the link to vehicular traffic. | TBD | State College Downtown Master Plan | Concept |
| 07 | College Avenue Streetscape | Envisions a streetscape design that expresses the “town and gown” character on either side of College Avenue. The plan implements the highest level of design between Garner Street/Shirley Road and Atherton Street, with adjacent sections using a similar aesthetic, but with less extensive changes. A Catalyst Project is proposed at the Allen Street intersection. | TBD | State College Downtown Master Plan | Concept |
| 08 | College Avenue & High Street Intersection Reconfiguration | Envisions a reconfiguration of the intersection to allow direct access to the University Park Campus at a more traditional grid-network intersection. A University utility vault on the north side of College Avenue is a significant impediment to implementation. | TBD | State College Downtown Master Plan | Concept |
| 09 | College Avenue Signal Coordination and Interconnection Updates | Green Light Go Grant funded project to improve signal communications systems, hardware, and coordinated signal timing for the College Avenue Corridor. | 2024 | Next Gen. Connectivity and Mobility Plan | Design |

| **Next Generation Connectivity and Mobility Plan (Projects TBD)** | Topics to be addressed include traffic calming, curb management & parking, micromobility, access to public transit, and capital projects that support multimodal activity. The plan is ongoing, and due date, public comments and surveys have been conducted. Plan completion and recommendations are anticipated by August 2023. | August 2023 (Study) | Study |

| **COLLEGE TOWNSHIP** | 10 | East College Avenue Pedestrian Path | Listed as the first Priority Investment Corridor, and indicates that the corridor would extend from Elmwood Street into State College Borough and connecting with the University Park Campus. Based on interviews with Penn State and College Township staff, the routing of a pedestrian facility would be along East College Avenue to Porter Road. Then the facility could cross into State College Borough just west of Porter Road and follow the vacated former alignment of College Avenue along the hillside, north of the existing road. This would likely place the connection through the student storage parking areas east of University Drive, with the nexus point at the Hastings Road intersection. | TBD | Pedestrian Facilities Master Plan | Concept |

### EXHIBIT 5.3. MPO & PennDOT Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Anticipated Completion</th>
<th>Master Plan, Study, or Program</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MPO Transportation Improvement Program</strong></td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Atherton Street Improvement Project (SR 3014)</td>
<td>Ongoing, multi-year project to reconstruct Atherton Street along much of its length. Improvements will address roadway, drainage, water and sewer utilities, curb, sidewalks, accessible crossings, traffic signals, and other grading and roadbed needs. The northern parts of the project in Patton and Ferguson Townships were completed during and prior to the COVID-19 pandemic in 2018 through 2021. Work in State College Borough adjacent to Penn State University and the State College Downtown is ongoing and should continue through 2024. The southern parts of the project in College and Harris Townships are expected to progress after 2024.</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>Park Avenue Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Park Avenue Widening (SR 3007)</td>
<td>The project is listed as the first “Highway Project for Future Consideration” in Centre County MPO’s 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). Such a project does not have funding identified within the 25-year long range planning horizon. However, it has been included as an aspirational priority in the LRTP since the early 2000s. The Park Avenue Master Plan was completed in 2007, and envisions a widening Park Avenue to a five-lane cross-section between Orchard Road and Bigler Road. The project would also integrate bicycle and pedestrian facilities, consistent with PennDOT and FWP commitments to the Complete Street approach. The Master Plan included roadway sections that reflected the University Park Campus design aesthetics.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Park Avenue Master Plan</td>
<td>Concept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2018-2023 Capital Plan

The Penn State Board of Trustees approved the 2018-2023 Capital Plan in mid-September 2017. The strategic philosophy of the $3.8 billion plan was addressing the backlog of deferred maintenance while building for future needs. Factors driving the prioritization of projects included functional obsolescence, program impact, and academic accreditation requirements.

At the University Park Campus, the plan allocated about $1.9 billion for projects and facilities within the UPD planning zone (Table 5.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Category</th>
<th>$ (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education and General</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Renewal</td>
<td>$ 95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Construction &amp; Renovation</td>
<td>$ 1,053.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Supporting Units</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary &amp; Business Services</td>
<td>$ 224.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
<td>$ 440.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Research Laboratory</td>
<td>$ 50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total – University Park</strong></td>
<td>$ 1,864.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2023-2028 Capital Plan

The Penn State Board of Trustees approved the 2024-2028 Capital Plan in early May 2023. The $2.2 billion plan is characterized as “maintenance-centric” and focuses on system renewals, life-cycle value, and reduced administrative burden at University Park and Commonwealth Campuses. The major projects progress strategic priorities and master plans that are in progress and address deferred projects from the former capital plan.

At the University Park Campus, the plan allocates about $1.94 billion for projects and facilities within the UPD planning zone (Table 5.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Category</th>
<th>$ (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education and General</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Renewal</td>
<td>$ 188.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Construction &amp; Renovation</td>
<td>$ 449.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>$ 80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>$ 27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Supporting Units</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary &amp; Business Services</td>
<td>$ 356.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
<td>$ 700.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Research Laboratory</td>
<td>$ 133.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total – University Park</strong></td>
<td>$ 1,936.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2029-2033 Capital Plan

It is expected that the Penn State Board of Trustees will approve the next 5-year capital plan for 2029-2033 as the previous plan nears completion. However, specific projects for this plan are not known at this time. The University’s Master Plan and Unit Plans identify projects that anticipate campus needs and may be developed for construction in the 2029-2033 timeframe. As such, for the purposes of the UPD Transportation Study, several projects are slotted in the 2029-2033 timeframe so that they may be considered in the 10-Year Development Plan, but these projects and their advancement to construction should be treated as uncertain.

Projects and Transportation Impact Assessment

The University is responsible for addressing the transportation needs of the campus by providing adequate parking and transportation infrastructure. When land is developed for new buildings, parking, or other transportation facilities, the University may be required to study and address the transportation impact of the development project. For the UPD zone (where the UPD zoning ordinance has been adopted), the ordinance requires traffic studies when the number of new trips generated by a project exceeds certain thresholds. The ordinance also provides for a waiver of the traffic study requirements.

For the benefit of municipal planning well in advance of a land development or transportation project, the UPD zoning ordinance requires completion of the University Planned District Transportation Study, which is to “identify the transportation impacts likely to result from the University’s development assumptions over the next ten-year period.”

Exhibit 5.1 lists the University Projects included in the Ten-Year Development Assumptions that are shown in Figure 5.1. The following information is given:

- **Map ID** – Identifier that keys to the Development Plan map.
- **Project** – Name of the Project.
- **Project Description** – Short description of the Project, giving the project intent/use and site characteristics on floor areas, parking, transportation access, etc.
- **Anticipated Completion** – Date when Project construction is anticipated to be complete.
- **Master Plan, Study, or Program Reference** – External plan, study, and program reference.
- **Capital Plan** – Indicates the Capital Plan that funds the Project. A check in the “2029-2033” column indicates that the Project is likely to occur within the 10-year horizon but is not in the 2018-2023 or 2024-2028 Capital Plan. Projects with no checks have been identified by the University but are at the beginning of project development.
- **Status** – Current status of the project, as of June 2023. The following terms are used:
  - *Concept* – Identified in master plan or study.
  - *Feasibility* – Study phase for identifying needs, purpose, and scope.
  - *Architect Selection* – Pending selection of a design team.
  - *Design* – In the design/land development process. Site has been identified.
  - *Construction* – Under construction and not occupied.
  - *Built* – Project completed and occupied or awaiting occupancy.
For the purpose of identifying likely transportation impact, Exhibit 5.1 also summarizes attributes of the project that are commonly used indicators of travel activity at land development sites. Based on this information, the likely traffic impact is classified.

**Net Change** – Indicates the estimated net change and direction (increase or decrease) for certain project attributes that tend to influence transportation activity. The following are referenced:

- **Floor Area** – Gross building floor area
- **Employ (Employment)** – Employees located in the building
- **Visitors** – Visitors accommodated or attracted to the building
- **Parking** – Parking spaces on the building site
- **Access** – Driveways and roadway connections to the site

**Transportation Impact** – A statement of the anticipated “degree” of transportation impact, as requested by the UPD ordinance. The following terms are used:

- **None** – Does not influence/impact transportation.
- **Nominal** – Does not directly influence/impact transportation (building renovation, replacements, small parking revisions/reductions, demolitions). Expected to require a descriptive evaluation to waive ordinance requirements for a traffic impact study (TIS).
- **Possible** – May directly influence/impact transportation (new buildings, building relocations, building expansions, projects that add parking). Expected to require a quantitative evaluation to clarify if the UPD ordinance requirements trigger a TIS.
- **Likely** – Expected to directly influence/impact transportation (new buildings with substantial parking, new parking facilities, new access/streets, street system revisions). Would require a traffic impact study, according to UPD ordinance requirements.

For projects entering or currently under construction, the following may apply if transportation impact has already been addressed:

- **Addressed via Study** – A traffic impact study was performed and approved.
- **Addressed via Memo** – A trip generation evaluation and request for exception from a traffic impact study was submitted and approved.

**Anticipated Transportation Impact**

The vast majority of the 50 University Projects listed in the Development Assumptions (Exhibit 5.1) for the next ten-year period are expected to have little or no transportation impact. The following break out of projects according to “anticipated transportation impact” is noted:

- The traffic impact for 7 of the projects (14%) has already been addressed via Study or Memo.
- The traffic impact for 35 of the projects (66%) is “None” or “Nominal”, indicating no perceptible transportation impact—outside of temporary impacts that may occur during construction. These projects include renovations, adding ancillary uses, and demolitions. Some projects may result in trip and travel activity reductions.
- The traffic impact for 6 of the projects (14%) is “Possible”, indicating that the project has some potential for generating impacts. These projects include building expansions, the addition of parking, new modal accommodations, and other operational changes.
- The traffic impact for 2 of the projects (4%) is “Likely”, with the project trigger a formal traffic impact study according to the UPD zoning. These projects include new buildings requiring new parking facilities, significant changes/expansions to existing buildings and parking facilities, and new/revised campus roadway connections.
Transportation Impacts in the UPD

The potential transportation impacts of University Projects are considered in the following section. Impacts are identified on a project-level, starting with transportation access to the development site and extending through the immediate vicinity. All travel modes are considered, and the evaluation anticipates issues that would be scoped into a traffic impact study (TIS). Strategies for addressing impacts are suggested for the most impactful projects where impacts are most apparent.

UPD Traffic Impact Study Triggers

The UPD ordinance states TIS triggers that are specifically tied to parking facilities—whether the addition or modification of parking facilities that would increase trip making. A TIS required “if the land development plan includes parking facilities which would generate 100 new vehicle trips (inbound or outbound) during the peak hour of vehicular traffic use of the parking facilities.” Throughout the development history of University Park under the UPD ordinance, the trigger has been interpreted to require a TIS only when both of the following conditions were met:

1. New parking is added OR the function of existing parking is modified, AND
2. The new or modified parking would produce 100 new vehicle trips (inbound or outbound) during the peak hour of vehicular traffic use of the parking facilities.

Project-Level Impact Evaluations

The Ten-Year Development Assumptions identifies 33 University Projects that are anticipated to have “None” or “Nominal” traffic impact. These projects are excluded from the project-level analysis because the scope of the project does not involve parking, does not have a direct impact on transportation, or has characteristics that reduce trip-making. The remaining 9 projects are anticipated to “likely” or “possibly” generate new traffic sufficient to create localized network impacts, and some may trigger the UPD ordinance requirements for additional planning or study.

Projects with LIKELY Traffic Impact

The following two (2) projects are known to possess a scale or development characteristics that are anticipated to “likely” have traffic impact and require a TIS. Map ID numbers are referenced to Figure 5.1 and Exhibit 5.1.

West Campus Multi-Modal Connection (Map ID #28)

This new transportation facility between the West Campus Parking Structure (a.k.a., West Deck) and College Avenue was evaluated in a Feasibility Study and initially proposed as the “Dual Access Scenario” in the DRAFT West Campus Parking Structure Transportation Impact Study (2018). The connection followed North Buckhout Street through the former O.W. Houts site and around the White Course Apartments to West Deck (Figure 5.2). The Dual Access Scenario was later removed from consideration, in favor of a single access via White Course Drive to Atherton Street. However, the second access remains a feasible option for access to the West Deck and West Campus, depending on municipal interest and the ability to demonstrate mitigation of traffic effects. The connection could be configured as a non-vehicular route (bike and pedestrian only), a transit link with bike and pedestrian accommodations, or a future vehicular link. Regardless, general vehicular traffic would not be permitted to “cut-through” the West Deck between Atherton Street and College Avenue.
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Figure 5.2. West Campus Parking Structure Dual Access Scenario with Traffic Distribution

- **Trip Generation & Modal Considerations** – The connection itself is not expected to increase total trip-making to/from West Campus. If the connection is configured as a pedestrian and bike link, it may attract non-motorized trips from other parallel facilities. If configured for transit-service, the route could carry CATA and Penn State Campus Shuttle vehicles, but volumes would be low—likely less than 10 per hour. If configured for general traffic to/from the West Deck, the distribution of traffic accessing the Deck would be impacted. With Dual Access, the split of traffic was estimated to be 65% on the east side (Atherton Street/White Course Drive) and 35% on the west side (College Avenue/Buckhout Street). Estimates were based on 2018 home address locations of permit holders to be assigned to West Deck following construction.

- **Potential Impacts & Solutions** – The proposed connection was removed from the West Campus Parking Structure TIS because of community concerns about drawing traffic through the Borough’s Holmes-Foster neighborhood. There were also divergent opinions about the feasibility of other alignments and the connection point on the western end. These issues would need to be addressed when/if the connector is reconsidered. A more robust and technical origin-destination study and traffic routing analysis may be required to resolve traffic-specific questions and objections. Based on the draft 2018 TIS that proposed the Dual Access Scenario, the shift in traffic would increase volumes on some streets while relieving traffic on others. The benefits/drawbacks of this traffic shift, agreement on the western connection point, and strategies for mitigating undesirable traffic impacts would be key outcomes from the study.
Applied Research Laboratory (ARL) Campus at Innovation Park (Map ID #46)
The project represents a 50-year “opportunity” plan for consolidating the varied functions of ARL at one cohesive campus location. The potential for 1.2 million square feet of laboratory and research office space at Innovation Park would replace ARL’s aging facilities and position ARL for growth over the next 50-plus years. Figure 5.3 illustrates the Master Plan and building massing on the site. As of this writing (August 2023), Penn State was engaged in discussions with College Township and the Centre Regional Planning Agency to determine the studies needed for approval of the master plan and a change in the Regional Growth Boundary.

- **Trip Generation** – Data from *Trip Generation, 11th Edition* as published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers was used to estimate the number of trips based on the 1.2 million square feet of new building space (see Table 5.3). Data for the ITE Lane Use Code #760, Research & Development Center was used.

**Table 5.3. Trip Generation Estimate, ARL Campus at Innovation Park**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITE Land Use data</th>
<th>Daily Traffic</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour Traffic</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour Traffic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Development Center (ITE Land Use Code #760) 1.2 million gross square feet</td>
<td>13,296</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>1,176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the proposed development (1.2 million square feet) is significantly larger than any of the sites sampled by ITE, the use Land Use Code 760 would be discouraged by ITE for the ARL site. It may be appropriate to base the trip generation on ITE data for employment or on parking space trip generation rates sampled at University Park for other projects.

**Figure 5.3. Applied Research Laboratory Campus, 50-Year Master Plan**

*Source: The Pennsylvania State University, 2023.*
The following would also be considered when assessing the “new” trip generation for the site:

- While the project proposes new construction in Innovation Park, the building space would represent both “new” space and replacement of existing facilities—albeit moved to the new location and vacating/demolishing the existing facilities. Traffic studies should make a distinction between replaced/relocated trips and new trips.

- Approximately 30% of the proposed new floor area would be built within the current Innovation Park Innovation Park Planned Research & Business Park district. Since the traffic impact associated with land development inside this district was evaluated and mitigated previously, those trips should be represented in a traffic study but treated differently than trips associated with the expansion plan.

**Modal Considerations** – Transit service changes implemented by Penn State in Fall 2023 should be reviewed as part of the ongoing master plan development, to discern when/if higher-capacity service is needed. In the future, travel demand and affinity between the University Park Core Campus and Innovation Park may justify the return of Red Link service to Innovation Park.

Internally, Innovation Boulevard has been built with sidewalks on both sides, but the low-density style and spacing among buildings accommodates parking areas, but could be seen as an impediment to walking within Innovation Park. Access to Innovation Park by walking is not conducive. Dedicated bike facilities (lanes or paths) are not present within Innovation Park, but a bikeable, grade-separated connection to the Core Campus does exist under I-99 near the ARL development area.

**Potential Impacts & Solutions** – The proposed development area in Innovation Park is adjacent to existing high-capacity vehicular infrastructure, including grade-separated interchanges at I-99 and the Innovation Park interchange system. Internally, Innovation Park is served by a 4-lane, boulevard-style spine road. Still, vehicular traffic impacts are anticipated, and studies of the ARL master plan traffic would likely address the following:

- Capacity of the Park Avenue/I-99 Ramp intersections – The Park Avenue intersections are controlled by traffic signals. Sight distance issues require restrictive left turn phasing at the signal nearest to Innovation Park, inducing congestion during the afternoon commuter traffic peak. With added traffic, left turn capacity and queueing issues are expected. Solutions may include adding turn lanes and modifying the I-99 ramps. A traffic and interchange design study might identify other ramp reconfiguration and signalization solutions, to resolve the left turn capacity issues. Interchange modifications that change ramp alignments would likely trigger the need for a Point of Access Study that meets state and federal requirements for limited access interchanges.

- Capacity of the Park Avenue Exit A/Innovation Boulevard Intersection – All traffic to the ARL development area would go through this intersection. The current all-way stop-control will likely have high delay and congested operation during peak traffic conditions. A traffic signal or roundabout and additional turn lanes may be justified.

- Driveways along Innovation Boulevard – With added traffic, left turns to and from the parking lot driveways along Innovation Boulevard may become congested during peak traffic conditions. Traffic signals or roundabouts and new turn lanes may be justified.
Projects with POSSIBLE Traffic Impact

The following seven (7) projects are in the early stages of development, making it difficult to accurately discern project scale and development characteristics. However, these projects are anticipated to “possibly” have traffic impact and require a TIS. Map ID numbers are referenced to Figure 5.1 and Exhibit 5.1.

Animal Diagnostics Laboratory Renovation (Map ID #13)

Penn State is conducting a feasibility study for a full-scale renovation of the existing facility. In addition to building layout, systems, and technology renewal, the site will be modified to better accommodate large vehicle access and parking will be expanded to meet the projected needs.

- **Trip Generation & Modal Considerations** – Trip generation increases would be related to the new parking built on the site. Providing access for larger vehicles would look at intersections and streets for appropriate turning radius and cartway width.

- **Potential Impacts & Solutions** – Only a small increase in parking is anticipated at the site, so no traffic operations or capacity impacts are expected with the project. However, the impact and needs of larger vehicles accessing and traveling along the University’s street system (Orchard Road, Wiley Lane, Pastureview Road) should be evaluated. Intersection turning radii, cartway widths, and shoulder widths should be evaluated with turning templates for the design vehicle sizes and frequency expected. An evaluation of trip generation should be submitted with the land development plans to determine the need for a TIS.

Demolition of Benedict, Beecher-Dock, and Gardner Houses (Map ID #19)

Project would remove the Benedict, Beecher-Dock, and Gardner Houses located along College Avenue near University Drive. All or part of the site may be converted to parking to replace parking reduced during other nearby projects.

- **Trip Generation & Modal Considerations** – A trip generation increase would only be projected if the project resulted in a net increase in the number of parking spaces on the site. The net change in the number of parking spaces should be tracked for the purposes of traffic impact, and the re-routing of trips to the added parking could be studied.

- **Potential Impacts & Solutions** – The net change in parking spaces may be negative or positive for this project, depending on the need to replace parking lost during other projects. An evaluation of trip generation should be submitted with the land development plans to determine the need for a TIS.

PlantWorks Greenhouse & Headhouse Replacement (Map ID #20)

The project would update and consolidate the plant science infrastructure on campus, including modern greenhouse and headhouse facilities. Laboratories, instructional/collaborative space, and faculty and research offices would be integrated into a new building—which may include museum and other public-facing functions. The project feasibility study to select a project scope and potential sites is ongoing.

- **Trip Generation & Modal Considerations** – New (added) trip generation for the site may be driven by new access, parking, and visitor trip-making—particularly if museum and public-facing uses are proposed.
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- **Potential Impacts & Solutions** – An evaluation of trip generation should be submitted with the land development plans to determine the need for a TIS.

**Penn State University Park Bicycle Master Plan – Priority Network (Map ID #29)**
The project implements the Priority Keystone Projects from the Penn State Bile Plan. Priority projects enhance existing campus streets and add pathways to address the highest demand areas and reate connectivity. The plan also identifies Secondary Supporting Projects that serve lower demand areas and would enhance connectivity of the overall network.

- **Trip Generation & Modal Considerations** – While the project would not generate new vehicular trips, it may encourage expanded use of bike and e-bike modes on campus.

- **Potential Impacts & Solutions** – Implementation of the bike plan would change the street design (cross-section) of certain on-campus streets and may escalate conflicts among pedestrian crossings and bicycle and vehicular movements at on-campus intersections. Impacts would be related to the degree of expanded bicycle use and how intersections are operated with the new bicycle facilities. The University should conduct a multi-modal operational sensitivity analysis of critical campus intersections to better understand the potential impacts before implementing the Bicycle Master Plan recommendations.

**Beaver Stadium Renovations (Map ID #39)**
Renovations would improve the quality of fan amenities, establish the seating capacity, preserve and enhance the iconic nature of the stadium, utilize existing stadium assets, preserve and enhance the tailgating experience and provide premium amenities. Renovation projects are likely to extend to the surrounding transportation and parking infrastructure, including RV parking enhancements and streetscape updates.

- **Trip Generation & Modal Considerations** – Beaver Stadium primarily serves the Penn State Football Program, which hosts 7 or 8 home football games each season. Vehicular traffic is actively managed on game-day, and Intercollegiate Athletics maintains its own traffic studies and patterns for use the key entering and exiting traffic periods. Past Improvements to the stadium have allowed it to house the All-Sports Museum and host special events (Mt. Nittany Room, etc.), and future improvements could add uses that generate daily traffic (i.e., non-event traffic). Additional parking and changes that revise access or allow new connections used by daily traffic could also change traffic volumes and patterns, which would be subject to traffic studies.

- **Potential Impacts & Solutions** – Traffic-related changes and impacts of the project will likely affect the streets and intersections immediately surrounding Beaver Stadium—particularly Park Avenue, University Drive, Porter Road, and Curtin Road. For instance, the University has considered opening a new access to the Stadium West Parking Lot along Curtin Road. While no increase in overall trip-making would occur with such a change, more traffic would use Curtin Road when accessing the parking lot, and less would use Park Avenue. The potential for cut-through traffic in the Stadium West Lot should also be considered. A traffic study would likely be required to demonstrate the traffic effects and adjust traffic signal timing.
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Intercollegiate Athletics Center of Excellence (Map ID #42)
The project proposes a new hub for Penn State student-athletes, staff, and coaches that would replace the existing East Area Locker Room building on the same site. The facility would centralize services and other resources for student-athletes and would house locker rooms and coaches' offices.

- Trip Generation & Modal Considerations – As a long-term concept, the site plan has yet to enter feasibility assessment, so the scale and full set of site uses has not been established. Trip generation would be based on added parking. The current conception reflects a decrease in parking to accommodate the building footprint, but previous conceptions allowed for parking increases or replacement of parking lost.

- Potential Impacts & Solutions – An evaluation of trip generation should be submitted with the land development plans to determine the need for a TIS.

5.4. University Transportation Projects not within the UPD

The University Park Airport (UNV)—now State College Regional Airport—is owned and operated by Penn State University as part of Auxiliary and Business Services. While the airport is not within the UPD, the following is presented for transportation context because trip-making activity at the airport is connected to the University Park Campus.

University Park Airport Master Plan (2015)
The University Park Airport Master Plan is a comprehensive plan for identifying “cost-effective solutions necessary to meet anticipated aviation demands and FAA safety standards.” Figure 5.13 illustrates the Conceptual Development Plan.\(^5\) The following features are noted:

- New Airport Terminal and Concourse Buildings
- Expansion of Aprons and Extensions of the Runway
- Land Acquisitions, including parcels on either end of the runway.
- Parking Expansion and Diversification, to accommodate growth and provide revenue.
- Land-Site Airport Traffic Circulation Changes
- Roadway Connections and Relocations
- Commercial Development Opportunities

Between 2015 and 2020, Penn State University and the Airport Authority advanced several projects outlined in the Development Plan, including a significant expansion of parking, reconfiguration of access in front of the terminal, and a taxiway rehabilitation. As of this writing, a feasibility study was underway for adding passenger boarding bridges.

The airport has also implemented parking pricing schemes and incentive programs, as well as cooperative arrangements with other transportation providers. Agreements with Uber and Lyft provide fee-based revenue for trips accessing the airport zone. An agreement with Fullington Trailways allows their patrons to use airport parking facilities. A new maintenance facility has been built to serve both rental cars and airport vehicles. Such relationships are seen as incrementally increasing and sustaining travel activity and revenue to the airport.

Roadway projects, including the connection to I-99 through Innovation Park, remain on the Metropolitan Planning Organization’s listing of Aspirational Projects but do not have funding identified in the next 20 years for design or construction. Such projects may be a candidate for discretionary “spike” funding that can be allocated by the PA Secretary of Transportation to high-profile projects of regional importance.

Unfortunately, the COVID-pandemic altered aviation demand, airline viability and the availability of workers in profound ways across the U.S., with airlines both “suspending” and eliminating service at airports, including UNV. Airports in small and mid-size markets, such as UNV, have been impacted the most. The demand for pilots, an aging regional jet fleet, and the airlines placing an emphasis on the large hub airports is a challenge for regional airports and their air service development efforts. There continues to be passenger demand within the UNV market area to support additional air service. However, the service is not coming back quickly or with the same hubs and connectivity as before. An update to the 2015 Sustainable Airport Master Plan is programmed for funding in federal fiscal year 2026. The update will include a review of the aviation demand forecasts for passengers and aircraft operations and identification of the capital development needs to meet forecasted demand.

The most pressing needs at the airport have to do with maintenance of the existing airport infrastructure—aprons, taxiways, and runway in particular. With this understanding, only maintenance-oriented projects are considered in the UPD 10-Year Development Plan, and these are not assumed to significantly change transportation demand at the airport.
5.5. Municipal Projects

The UPD zone and its constituent sub-districts have been designated in State College Borough, College Township, Patton Township (which have adopted the UPD zoning ordinance) as well as Ferguson Township (which have not adopted the UPD zoning). Benner Township is immediately adjacent to the UPD zone to the northeast and is home to the University Park Airport, but no UPD sub-districts are designated in Benner Township.

Since transportation facilities and issues often extend across one or more municipalities when land development or other infrastructure improvement projects are considered, the University seeks partnerships with these municipalities to implement transportation improvement projects, whether initiated by the municipality or University.

Exhibit 5.2 lists the ten (10) Municipal Projects included in the Ten-Year Development Assumptions that are shown in Figure 5.1. The following information is given:

- **Map ID** – Identifier that keys to the Development Plan map.
- **Project** – Name of the Project.
- **Project Description** – Short description of the Project, giving the project intent/use and site characteristics on floor areas, parking, transportation access, etc.
- **Anticipated Completion** – Date when Project construction is anticipated to be complete.
- **Master Plan, Study, or Program Reference** – External plan, study, and program reference.
- **Status** – Current status of the project, as of June 2023. The following terms are used:
  - *Concept* – Identified in master plan or study.
  - *Design* – In the design/land development process. Site has been identified.
  - *Construction* – Under construction and not occupied.
  - *Built* – Project completed and occupied or awaiting occupancy.

### Patton Township

**Parks and Bicycle/Pedestrian Path Plan, 2020-2029**

Patton Township adopted the Parks and Bicycle/Pedestrian Path Plan in October 2020 to unify the previously separate plans for parks and bicycle/pedestrian facilities. The plan introduction states the following regarding the plan purpose and objectives:

> The Parks Plan examines current and future needs for parks, recreation facilities, and

---

bicycle/pedestrian paths and makes recommendations for development, land acquisition, and design standards. It is the objective of the Township to provide recreational opportunities for all age groups, and skill levels throughout the year, and the Parks Plan provides the mechanism for meeting this objective.

The plan identifies the proposed Oakwood Bicycle/Pedestrian Path from Benjamin Court to Bellefonte Central Rail Trail (BCRT) in the Penn State Arboretum Lands. Figure 5.4 illustrates the proposed alignment of the pathway, starting in Patton Township at Oakwood Avenue and following an existing path through the Village Square neighborhood. Where the path currently ends at Benjamin Court, an extension would extend between Village Square and Heritage Oaks to the Penn State Arboretum lands and cross to the existing Bellefonte Central Rail-Trail.

Ferguson Township

Northland Area Mobility Study (2019) 52

The Northland Area Mobility Study provided a balanced evaluation of the various transportation modes serving the area surrounding the Northland Center commercial development (Figure 5.5). A major portion of the study was devoted to generating alternative solutions and design concepts for making bike and pedestrian connections along Blue Course Drive and Clinton Avenue and across Atherton Street to complete the bike network through the area. As the studies highest priority project, that study recommended a shared use path configuration that would connect the existing shared use path to the southwest along Blue Course Drive with the McKee Street Bike Path northeast of Atherton Street at the end of Clinton Avenue. The Township has not yet committed Capital Funds to the project.

State College Borough

State College Downtown Master Plan 53

The Downtown Master Plan was adopted by State College Borough in August 2013 as an update to the previous Downtown Vision and Strategic Plan for State College, which was completed in 2002. The following three primary goals were identified:

---

• Realize and market the downtown’s unique identity and distinct role within the larger community, its development potential for a sustainable future and specific implementation strategies that will achieve this vision.
• Establish the framework to create a most memorable, attractive and comfortable downtown core that aesthetically unites the College Avenue corridor.
• Consider public and private sector improvements that can attract a diverse range of users in order to expand the businesses and services that can be supported in downtown.

The expansive “Looking Forward” vision includes themes for Navigating and Connecting the [Downtown] District. A broad set of recommendations are associated with each theme, along with Focus and Catalyst projects that serve as initial phases toward plan implementation. The following recommendations have transportation implications in areas immediately adjacent to the University Park Campus and UPD zone:

**West End Revitalization** – Envisions changes in the character, density, and transportation connections in the Borough’s West End adjacent to Penn State’s West Campus. **Figure 5.6** shows the Master Plan concept and massing diagrams for the West End Urban Village.

![West End Revitalization Concept with Building Massing](image)

**College Avenue Streetscape** – Envisions a unified streetscape design that expresses the “town and gown” character on either side of College Avenue. The plan extends from High Street to Buckhout Street, with the most extensive work between Garner Street/Shortlidge Road and Atherton Street. **Figure 5.7** shows the Streetscape Concept in front of existing Hammond Building, between Fraser Street and Allen Street.
**Allen Street Transit Center Relocation** – A concept “alternative” for the Allen Street Transit Center suggests relocating the center west of Allen Street (see line sketch below the concept in Figure 5.7). This idea has been considered by University planners. With the transit stop in the next block, aesthetics and viewsheds in front of Old Main are improved. The project may also dovetail with redevelopment of the current Hammond Building site. However, that project is likely beyond the ten-year development horizon.

**Allen Street Promenade** – Envisions a brick paved streetscape from building face to building face across the full width of the street (Figure 5.8). The road surface would be raised to sidewalk level with delineation by bollards and other street furniture. The plan suggests permanently closing the Allen Street to vehicular traffic between College Avenue and Beaver Avenue.
College Avenue & Allen Street Intersection Reconfiguration – Figures 5.9 and 5.10 illustrate the intersection concept for College Avenue at Allen Street, which seeks to make a more attractive and safe intersection for pedestrians. To help manage the current grade difference between the campus and intersection levels, the intersection would be raised to sidewalk level and curbs removed. Decorative bollards and stamped concrete pavement would delineate the traveled way. Vehicular lanes would be narrowed and crosswalks made more prominent to express a more pedestrian-oriented feel.

Calder Way – Figure 5.10 shows a concept plan for Calder Way, which envisions the street as “a shared use space which is more friendly for pedestrians and bicyclists while maintaining vehicle access for emergency and essential services, deliveries, refuse and parking access.” The project is complicated by the confluence of utilities that run both above and below the Calder Way space. The Borough has announced plans to begin utility work in Summer 2023, with the first phase addressing Calder Way between South Faser Street and McAllister Street.
Figure 5.10. Calder Way Concept Plan, Fraser Street to Allen Street

College Avenue & High Street Intersection Reconfiguration – Figure 5.11 illustrates a concept for the College Avenue/High Street intersection that envisions a more traditional grid-network intersection that allows direct pedestrian access to campus at the intersection. The concept removes free flow vehicular movements and would warrant installation of a traffic signal. Strategies for narrowing College Avenue may be necessary to work around the existing utility vault on the north side of the intersection.

Portions of the Downtowns Master Plan have been implemented since 2013, with some parts of the plan implemented to different degrees or with significant deviations from what was envisioned. The State College Borough staff have indicated that the Master Plan is due for an update, and that work may be initiated in 2024.

Figure 5.11. College Avenue & High Street Intersection Reconfiguration
State College Next Generation Connectivity and Mobility Plan

State College Borough and Sustainable State College have undertaken the Next Generation Plan to explore traffic calming, curb management and parking, micromobility, access to public transit, and new capital projects that support multimodal activity, with the following objectives:

- Developing a safe, reliable, efficient, integrated, and connected multimodal system.
- Understanding existing transportation network challenges and opportunities.
- Integrating existing community plans, ordinances, and policies.
- Identifying and implementing capital improvement projects to support future development.
- The plan is ongoing with the following objectives:

The plan is ongoing. The Borough has conducted surveys to collect public input on the location and nature of transportation issues. Recommendations are anticipated by August 2023.

College Township

Walkable College Township, A Pedestrian Facilities Master Plan

College Township adopted their Pedestrian Facilities Master Plan in December 2022 with the following primary goal:

*To provide an interconnected, continuous, and well-maintained network of sidewalks, shared use paths and other related facilities that provides all users, regardless of age and ability, with safe and efficient access to numerous key destinations throughout College Township and the Centre Region.*

The plan identifies pedestrian facilities, creates a prioritization framework, and provides strategic implementation steps that integrate pedestrian planning into the Township’s ordinances and regular planning processes.

East College Avenue received the most public interest during the master plan outreach phase (see Figure 5.12) and is listed as the first Priority Investment Corridor. The corridor extends from Elmwood Street into State College Borough, connecting with the University Park Campus. Based on interviews with Penn State and College Township staff, the routing of a pedestrian facility would be along East College Avenue to Porter Road. Then the facility could cross into State College Borough just west of Porter Road.

---


and follow the vacated former alignment of College Avenue, north of the existing road. This would likely place the connection through the student storage parking areas east of University Drive, with the nexus point at the Hastings Road intersection.

The plan also identifies a “Core Pedestrian Facility” that extend toward the University property along Orchard Road and Puddintown Road. While this connection allows indirect access to the University via Orchard Road, a direct connection is inhibited by topography and slopes that are not conducive to a convenient connection directly east toward Beaver Stadium.

5.6. MPO and PennDOT Projects

The Centre County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is the local Pennsylvania Planning Partner that conducts transportation planning and administrates the transportation improvement program (TIP) for all of Centre County. This includes working with PennDOT to identify, prioritize, and administrate funding for maintenance and improvement of the state highway system.

The traditional Core of the University Park Campus is bounded by state-owned and maintained roadways. Exhibit 5.3 lists the two (2) Metropolitan Planning Organization and PennDOT Projects included in the Ten-Year Development Assumptions that are shown in Figure 5.1. The following information is given:

- **Map ID** – Identifier that keys to the Development Plan map.
- **Project** – Name of the Project.
- **Project Description** – Short description of the Project, giving the project intent/use and site characteristics on floor areas, parking, transportation access, etc.
- **Anticipated Completion** – Date when Project construction is anticipated to be complete.
- **Master Plan, Study, or Program Reference** – External plan, study, and program reference.
- **Status** – Current status of the project, as of June 2023. The following terms are used:
  - **Concept** – Identified in master plan or study.
  - **Design** – In the design/land development process. Site has been identified.
  - **Construction** – Under construction and not occupied.
  - **Built** – Project completed and occupied or awaiting occupancy.

The following sections identify current transportation planning and construction projects.

**Park Avenue Improvement Study (SR 3007)**

The project would widen Park Avenue to a five-lane cross-section between Orchard Road and Bigler Road. The project would also integrate bicycle and pedestrian facilities, consistent with PennDOT and FHWA commitments to the Complete Street approach. As part of the Master Plan, Penn State University had developed roadway typologies and sections that reflected the University Park Campus design aesthetics. Figure 5.14 illustrates the 5-lane cross-section with adjacent pedestrian and bicycle facilities. The improvement of Park Avenue is currently listed as the first “Highway Project for Future Consideration” in Centre County MPO’s 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).

Although the project has been included as an aspirational priority in the LRTP since the early 2000s, it does not have funding identified within the 25-year long range planning horizon.

---

56 Penn State Office of Physical Plant, Park Avenue Improvement Study, 2007,
Atherton Street Improvement Project (SR 3014)\textsuperscript{57}

This ongoing, multi-year project will reconstruct Atherton Street and renew and enhance the existing roadway, sidewalk, and pathway facilities along much of its length from Patton Township in the north to Harris Township in the south. As such, the project is not considered "capacity-adding" that would attract and accommodate additional vehicular traffic volume and have indirect traffic impact to the University Park Campus or State College Downtown. The northern parts of the project in Patton and Ferguson Townships were completed during and prior to the COVID-pandemic in 2018 through 2021. Work in State College Borough adjacent to Penn State University and the State College Downtown is ongoing and should continue through 2024. The southern parts of the project in College and Harris Townships are expected to progress after 2024.

\textbf{Figure 5.15} illustrates the active work zones in 2023 and 2024, when this UPD Transportation Update was prepared. During this period, construction activity is expected to be most active adjacent to the University Park Campus and through the State College Borough Downtown, from Curtin Road to Westerly Parkway. Some of the roadway and turn lane work adjacent to the University Park Campus between Curtin Road and White Course Drive was advanced in 2019 and 2020 as a coordinated project to address traffic impact associated with the West Campus Parking Structure.

\textsuperscript{57}Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT), South Atherton Street Project (ongoing), https://www.penndot.pa.gov/RegionalOffices/district-2/ConstructionsProjectsAndRoadwork/Pages/North-Atherton-Street-project.aspx, as accessed June 2023.
Chapter 6. 
Transportation Demand Management

6.1. Introduction

Transportation demand management (TDM) is defined as a set of strategies that help manage traveler demand while maximizing traveler choices. A successful TDM program will:

- Seek to understand the ways people travel want and need to travel
- Identify strategies to reduce single occupancy vehicle (SOV) trips
- Influence travelers to use alternative modes of transportation such as biking or transit

TDM programs are especially important on college campuses – the volume and density of people traveling to and through the same (or nearby) destinations with multiple times of peak concentration through a typical day put a tremendous strain on a campuses' mobility networks. Typically, college campuses also have limited parking supply and are space constrained with the priority to have the adequate facilities to fulfill the academic mission. This often means roadways, sidewalks, bicycle networks, and parking are necessarily limited in size and capacity in order to provide more room for the other vital campus infrastructure needs. Thus, it is critical to be able to get people (faculty/staff, students, visitors, and all other members of the campus population) to and from their destinations in a way that is safe and efficient. TDM programs are of high value in these environments because they seek to right-size and shape the demand to better align with the physical constraints of the campus.

At Penn State University, TDM programs are overseen by Transportation Services with a Sustainable Transportation Program Coordinator and Program Assistant tasked with strategic planning and day-to-day program operations. Various other departments are involved in or support the planning, deployment, and operations of TDM programs.

This modal profile will outline the previous and current TDM programs at PSU, upcoming planned TDM programs, a review of TDM programs at peer universities, and suggested recommendations for the continued strengthening of the TDM program at University Park.

6.2. University Park Mode Share

The University Park "mode share" estimates the proportion of travel that occurs on each mode. This context is useful to understand the current campus mode split and the population of campus users that could directly benefit from a diverse array of TDM options. Understanding the current mode split is also important as it might suggest the additional multimodal potential of the campus – i.e., how many more people could opt to make a daily or permanent travel behavior change from single occupancy vehicles to multimodal and active transportation modes. The Campus travel context has been built from a careful review of previous campus sampling and other data sources.

"[TDM] is about providing and encouraging a variety of accessible, viable, and sustainable transportation options for both commuting and on campus travel. By maximizing options and improving the convenience and efficiency of these travel choices, [PSU] wants to elevate these modes to the level of convenience and acceptance that is traditionally accorded to SOV travel. And with that, ultimately seeing a cultural and general mode-shift away from SOVs."

Cecily Zhu, Sustainable Transportation Program Coordinator
University Planned District (UPD) Study (2011)

A measurement of the mode share for the University Park Campus was developed from the traffic data collected in 2011. The methodology to develop the mode split consisted of analyzing AM and PM peak period data, bicycle, and pedestrian counts as well as transit ridership and vanpool data. Figure 6.1 shows the mode split of the campus at the time of the 2013 UPD. It is important to note that more than 66% of University Park trips are on modes that do not involve a personal automobile.

PSU Sustainability Institute (2018-19)

The Penn State University Sustainability Institute Transportation Dashboard includes mode share estimates for faculty, staff, and students based on survey samples taken in 2018-2019. The Dashboard categorizes travel for four (4) modes: SOV (single occupancy vehicles), CATA/Campus Shuttle, Walking/Biking/Other Zero Emissions, and Vanpool/Carpools.

Figures 6.2 displays the 2018-19 commute mode share for sampled for faculty/staff and students. This is the most recent survey conducted by Penn State, and it reflects pre-COVID-pandemic conditions.

---

While the mode share data collected in 2011 is composite for all transportation users, the survey used by the Sustainability Institute breaks out students and faculty/staff. Not unexpectedly, faculty and staff were four times more likely to use single occupancy vehicles compared to students.

### Mode Split Estimation

Mode share is an extremely useful measure for gauging the effectiveness of travel demand management programs. For the purposes of ongoing tracking and evaluation of the University Park Travel Demand Management Programs, it is recommended that Penn State's Transportation Services sustain their partnership with the Sustainability Institute to implement a consistent mode share survey on a biennial basis. The survey recurrence can inform periodic decisions about demand management programs and serve as ready data for future UPD Transportation Studies.

### Multimodal Potential

A multimodal potential analysis was performed to identify how much of the campus community had the potential to use active transportation modes in the trips to and from Penn State (see Table 6.1). The analysis is based on the reported home locations and the distance to campus when walking, biking, or taking transit. It is noted that the true multimodal potential would be based on a variety of other factors such as socioeconomic status, the availability of safe and complete networks, and schedule flexibilities. Acknowledging these caveats, the analysis suggests that high ceiling for the conversion of trips from single occupancy vehicles to active transportation modes.

#### Table 6.1. Sustainable Mode Participation Potential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Permit Holder Group</th>
<th>Source Notes</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Walking Distance</th>
<th>Biking Distance</th>
<th>Transit Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff Commuter FY 2020/2021 permit address data (1/4 mile accuracy)</td>
<td>6,740</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>2,651</td>
<td>3,046</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Commuter FY 2020/2021 permit address data (1/4 mile accuracy)</td>
<td>4,710</td>
<td>1,982</td>
<td>3,888</td>
<td>3,978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Full Time Employees October 2012 permit address data; Home within 15 miles of campus (1/10 mile accuracy)</td>
<td>10,248</td>
<td>2,156</td>
<td>5,948</td>
<td>6,527</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6.3. Summary of Current TDM Programs

Penn State University currently has a wide variety of TDM programs in place to help manage transportation access and parking on campus while maximizing sustainable traveler choices. By providing a multitude of options, the University is able to:

- Address the needs of multiple users with different needs, wants, and capabilities
- Provide flexibility in daily decision-making
- Encourage travelers to form lasting changes in the way they travel
The 2013 UPD analyzed the TDM programs in operation at that time and resulted in recommendations for future TDM program implementation over the 2013-2023 UPD period. Figure 6.3 outlines the TDM programs during the 2013 UPD Study. The previous UPD study and analysis serves as the foundation for the TDM program elements in place on the campus today.

![Figure 6.3. 2013 PSU TDM Programming](image)

Since the previous UPD study, Penn State has implemented several new programs to bolster sustainable transportation in and around campus, as highlighted in green on Figure 6.4.

![Figure 6.4. 2013-2022 PSU TDM Programming](image)

**Active during the 2013 UPD Transportation Study**

**General Programs**

**Operate a Limited Access Roadway Strategy** – A limited access roadway enhances pedestrian and bicycle safety by preventing vehicles from using the road. Penn State transformed Pollock Road into a
limited access roadway at University Park with two automated gates at either end. The limited access Pollock Road now supports significant pedestrian activity in the center of the Penn State Campus.

Rideshare Programs

Penn State encourages rideshare usage by posting general information about the programs and ways to become involved on their website.

Rideshare Matching Program – The rideshare matching program matches Penn State faculty and staff with other individuals who share the same commute. This program is operated through CATA and is free for faculty and staff. Participants may also use Emergency Ride Home services.

CATA Vanpool Program – The vanpool program encourages groups of seven or more commuters who share the same commute to form a vanpool. If approved, groups are given use of a CATA van for commute purposes. Vanpool users share the cost of fuel, but maintenance of the vehicle is handled by CATA. In 2013, vanpools were required to begin and end in the State College/Bellefonte areas. Participants also had access to Emergency Ride Home services.

Online Student Rideshare Program – The online student rideshare program matches students with other students who share the same commute. As of the 2013 UPD study, most students had identified that they were unfamiliar with the program.

Transit Programs

Ride for Five Program/Ride Pass – In 2013, Penn State offered a discounted bus pass program to full time employees who gave up their daytime parking permits. Ride for Five evolved into Ride Pass when full time graduate students were given access to the program. The monthly program price also increased from $5 to $21, with the remaining cost subsidized by the University. This program provided access to all CATA Bus Routes.

Library Building Employee Parking Pass – This program is offered to Penn State University employees working in CATO Park, including those working at the Library Annex and College of Engineering buildings.

Weekend and School Break Bus Service – Local bus services provide weekend and school break transportation for the university and the public to regional destinations in Central PA. Penn State does not manage this program, but it is advertised to university affiliates on the transportation services website.

Event Transit Service – Penn State University coordinates event transit services for football games and other large-scale events. During large attendance events, the University coordinates bus service through local vendors to operate a shuttle service from peripheral lots to the venue to reduce traffic congestion and parking demand. The program is not directly managed by the University but is supported and advertised by Penn State on the transportation services website.

Parking Programs

Conference Parking Permits – Penn State University provides conference organizers with parking permits upon request. These parking permits are separate from events permits and organizers are encouraged to request parking via email. Penn State advertises this program on a seasonal basis on the transportation services website.

Bicycle/Scooter Programs

Bicycle Master Plan – A bicycle master plan has been completed to recommend specific bicycle enhancements throughout the University Park campus. Bicycle improvements are geared towards people that use a bicycle on campus including students, faculty/staff, and employees. Penn State University may
also continue to invest in bicycle infrastructure and amenities such as bike racks, bike zones, and bikeshare.

**Initiated following the 2013 UPD**

**Carshare Program** – This program consists of a fleet of cars on campus that employees may use to conduct University business only. Employees may reserve vehicles through transportation services. Penn State advertises this program on their transportation services website. This program was implemented as part of a recommendation from the 2013 UPD study.

**RideSmart by Lyft** – The University has added a partnership with Lyft to give students a late-night transportation option through the **PSU RideSmart Program**. University Park students receive up to eight $10 Lyft credits when they order a Lyft within separately defined pick-up and drop-off zone identified in **Figure 6.5**. Lyft credits are only available for use Thursday through Saturday between 2am and 7am.

- **Pickup Service Area** (gray shading) – Off-campus between College Avenue, University Drive, Bellaire Avenue, Hamilton Avenue, and Buckhout Street
- **Drop-off Service Area** (pink shading) – On campus between Park Avenue, University Drive, College Avenue, and White Course Apartments

![Figure 6.5. University Subsidized Late-Night Lyft Zones](image)

**Bicycle/Scooter**

**Spin Bikeshare Program** – The University added the Spin bikeshare program to enable cycling options for those that don’t have a personal bicycle on campus. The initial launch of the program during the 2012-2013 school year consisted of 50 bikes through 8 campus locations. The bikeshare program was available to all university affiliates and was available on the University Park campus and in the neighboring

---

59 Penn State University, Transportation Services, Ride Smart by Lyft Programs, [https://transportation.psu.edu/lyft-programs](https://transportation.psu.edu/lyft-programs), as accessed August 2023.
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Borough of State College. Penn State students, employees, and local community members with limited incomes may apply for the Spin Access program, which provides discounted fares for those who qualify.

**The Bike Den** – The University created the BikeDen as a “free community-building space that aims to enhance the community and environment through the promotion of bicycle transportation and material stewardship.” The Bike Den aims to:

- Establish a welcoming space for people of all ability levels to connect and engage around biking
- Provide DIY Bike repair and maintenance learning opportunities
- Prevent usable bikes and bike parts from entering the waste stream

The Bike Den functions as a self-serve bike repair facility located in the West Parking Deck. While the Den does not directly affect travel demand, it is an excellent example of how Penn State invests in facilities and services that support and enable alternative travel modes. In this case, the facility provides tools and resources that keep pedal bikes in good repair for use in everyday travel.

Table 6.2 lists all the TDM programs detailed in the 2013 UPD study and their status as of 2022.

### 6.4. TDM Program Usage

This section of the modal profile includes a snapshot of the data and general trends of TDM program usage since the last UPD. TDM programing is broken out into the key categories of rideshare, transit, bicycle/scooter, and parking.

**Rideshare TDM Programs**

Usage information is available for the following rideshare programs:

**CATA Vanpool** - Prior to the COVID pandemic, there were as many as 34 vanpool programs operated by CATA. Currently, there are only 12 vanpools operating. Vanpools can operate from any location but must travel a minimum distance of 40 miles roundtrip. Through the COVID pandemic, the CATA Vanpool program lost as much as 95% of its Penn State vanpool users—which accounted for 70% of all CATA vanpool groups. Hybrid work schedules and the ability to work from home has made creating and sustaining a vanpool more challenging because those seeking a vanpool have difficulty finding other riders. In 2022 and 2023, vanpool group formation and ridership increased, but the totals have not recovered to pre-COVID numbers.

**Carshare Program** – The carshare program has been partially implemented, compared to the initial recommendation in 2013. The initial concept allowed all university affiliates to use a car for business or personal needs. The carshare program currently operates as a vehicle share for university employees only. Carshare was implemented in 2016 with 141 trips in the inaugural year. In 2018, before the COVID pandemic, there were as many as 1,343 carshare vehicle trips. During the pandemic, the primary vendor for carshare ceased operations, and the

**The COVID Pandemic’s Impact on University Park TDM Programs**

The COVID pandemic presented a unique challenge for University Park TDM efforts because of the significant disruption it had on the need for transportation. Some programs, like vanpools and transit, suffered large and sudden decreases in use that did not return post-pandemic with hybrid work and school schedules. Other TDM programs gained popularity, particularly the bikeshare program. As such, the historical data on program usage should be interpreted in the context of the COVID pandemic. Meanwhile, it should be understood that short-term data on emerging and updated programs was not yet available or useable at the time of the UPD Study. In general, program usage is increasing or stable for the currently offered menu of TDM options. As a rule, programs that are no longer effective are under review for changes or elimination so that resources can be shifted to successful programs or emerging ideas.
program was put on hold while the University identified a new vendor. As of this writing, Penn State’s search for a replacement carshare vendor was ongoing.

**Online Student Rideshare Program** – The online student rideshare program had 996 new student users in 2016 and grew to about 1,399 student users in 2019, before the COVID pandemic. During the pandemic, the primary vendor for carshare ceased operations. As such the program was put on hold while the University identified a new vendor. No post-pandemic usage statistics are available.

### Table 6.2. Summary of TDM Program Status, 2013 to 2022.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operate a Limited-Access Roadway Strategy for Core Campus</td>
<td>Existing Program</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park Event Scheduling System</td>
<td>Future Recommendation</td>
<td>To Be Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Access Management</td>
<td>Future Recommendation</td>
<td>Not Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RideOn</td>
<td>Not Included</td>
<td>To Be Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rideshare</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare Matching Program</td>
<td>Existing Program</td>
<td>Ongoing – under RideOn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanpool Program</td>
<td>Existing Program</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Student Rideshare Program</td>
<td>Existing Program</td>
<td>Ongoing – under RideOn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carshare Program</td>
<td>Future Recommendation</td>
<td>Searching for new vendor to replace Zipcar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State Ride Smart by Lyft</td>
<td>Not Included</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ride for Five/Ride Pass</td>
<td>Existing Program</td>
<td>Ongoing; Updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Building Employee Bus Pass</td>
<td>Existing Program</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend and School Break Bus Services</td>
<td>Existing Program</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Transit Service</td>
<td>Existing Program</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of Discounted Transit Pass Program (Ride for Five)</td>
<td>Future Recommendation</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Shuttle Services</td>
<td>Future Recommendation</td>
<td>Not Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Transit Access</td>
<td>Future Recommendation</td>
<td>Not Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Plan Bicycle Program</td>
<td>Existing Program</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikeshare Program</td>
<td>Future Recommendation</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking/Bicycling Zone</td>
<td>Future Recommendation</td>
<td>Not Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Parking Structure</td>
<td>Existing Program</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Parking Permits</td>
<td>Existing Program</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Parking Accommodations</td>
<td>Existing Program</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional-Use Parking Permits</td>
<td>Future Recommendation</td>
<td>To Be Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and Ride Facilities</td>
<td>Future Recommendation</td>
<td>Not formally implemented; Informal facilities have emerged.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rideshare Matching Program – Starting on January 1, 2023, the CATA vanpool program partnered with Commute with Enterprise and is expecting an increase in groups and ridership. In 2013, there were 1,023 users based on the previous UPD study. There is no recent data on employee rideshare participants due to switching vendors.

RideSmart by Lyft – Since the inception of this program in 2021, Lyft rides have grown by a factor of four and Lyft users have grown by a factor of three. The validates anecdotal observations of rideshare pick-up and drop-off dominating the curbside space. Figure 6.6 demonstrates the change in growth of users and rides between 2021 and 2022.

![Figure 6.6. Lyft RideSmart Program Use, 2021 to 2022](image)

Transit TDM Programs

Usage information is available for the following transit program:

**Ride For Five/Ride Pass** - During the 2013 UPD Study, the Ride for Five Program (now called Ride Pass) provided bus passes for full time faculty and staff at Penn State for $5 monthly. During the last iteration of the UPD study, it was recommended that Ride for Five expand to include graduate students. Since then, RidePass has evolved to include full time graduate students, and the monthly price has increased to $21, with the remaining cost subsidized by the University. An analysis from the 2013 UPD Study stated that 66% of faculty and staff parking permit holders lived within 1 mile of campus. An update to the analysis conducted as part of this UPD study indicates that nearly 20% of faculty and staff that live within 1 mile of campus hold a parking permit.

CATA regularly updates and optimizes routing to provide more direct connections and accessibility for its patrons. Changes taking place in fall 2023 include:

---
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- Establishing the Centre Area West microtransit zone services Park Forest, Science Park, Pine Grove Mills, some neighborhoods within State College Borough and the vicinity. It will operate Monday through Friday 6 a.m. to 8 p.m.
- Removing the CATA Bus XB Route serving Bellefonte due to extremely low ridership and growing use of CATAGO.
- Expanding the Bellefonte/Pleasant Gap CATAGO! microtransit zone will be expanded by one hour on Saturdays until 8 p.m.
- Modifying the Boalsburg CATAGO! microtransit zone’s boundaries
- Red Link service updates (driven by a University study) which eliminates stops at the Athletic Administration Building, Orchard Road, Mount Nittany Medical Center, Centre Medical Sciences Building, and Innovation Park and updates routing to run from the West Deck to the Jordan East parking lot. The updated route will operate from 6:45 a.m. to 11 p.m., Monday, through Friday, 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. Saturdays, and noon to 10 p.m. Sundays.

The periodic updates enhance the value of the Ridepass program and investment.

Bicycle TDM Programs

Usage information is available for the following bicycle/scooter programs:

Bikeshare – The growth of bikeshare and use of the Bike Den are shown in Figure 6.7. Bikeshare rides increased from 9,595 in 2019 (pre-pandemic) to 255,456 rides in 2022 (post-pandemic), indicating its popularity on-campus and viability for growth post-COVID. To date in 2023, The University’s Spin program has had over 410,000 trips. 75 percent of all trips start on the Penn State Campus, 23 percent of trips start in State College, with the remaining 2 percent starting in the other surrounding townships. With respect to destinations, 74 percent of all trips end on the Penn State Campus, 24 percent of trips end in State College, with the remaining 2 percent starting in the other surrounding townships. This suggests the attraction of bikeshare for making intra campus trips and short distance local trips.

Bike Den – The Bike Den has quickly increased their annual visitors by a factor of 5 since opening in 2021.

Upcoming TDM Program Improvements

The University is also in the process of launching a handful of new TDM programs. Most notably is the Penn State RideOn app that will allow Penn State affiliates to get information on and choose from a variety of transportation alternatives for their specific needs.

TDM Recommendations

Figure 6.8 displays the recommended TDM Programming between 2023 and 2032. Upon analysis of existing programs at Penn State, the programs outlined below are anticipated to support the travel demand of the University Park campus while providing users with their choice of mode.

---
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Event Scheduling Program

Through ongoing communication with the University, it was determined that a University Park Event Scheduling System is in operation — though with no formal application. The program provides a PSU affiliates the opportunity to find parking arrangements (including parking exceptions) for campus events. The program helps to manage campus parking on event days. Groups organizing events coordinate Events Parking to determine where their event goers will park, which allows Event Parking to better manage the demand and capacity of Penn State's parking facilities. Recently, Penn State Events Parking was able to manage two sporting events on the same evening. One with 15,000 attendees and one with 6,000 attendees. With a well-organized and planned parking system, Events Parking was able to develop and communicate a plan to spread traffic across campus and use presales to encourage parkers to park in available spaces, rather than overflowing the last 1000 cars arriving.

RideOn

RideOn is a free ridesharing platform that will allow Penn State affiliates to choose from a variety of transportation alternatives for their specific needs. The RideOn application will house several TDM programs within one application including a rideshare matching program, trip planning, and emergency ride home opportunities. Users can view commute options via carpool, transit or bike share and will be able to see live feeds for CATA buses and Spin Bikeshare. The application will have a staggered launch with the rideshare matching and trip planning components as well as commute track modules launching in Spring 2023. The carpool, parking and commuter challenge modules will launch in Summer/Fall 2023. While the app is available for download, the program is currently on hold due to staffing shortage.
Flexible/Occasional Use Parking Permit

Occasional use parking permits provide increased flexibility when choosing a mode of transportation. Users could choose an alternative mode of transportation, such as transit, but still have the option to park on campus when they need to. Such a permit would be a direct response to the work-from-home policies that have become a fixture for many University Park employees. Currently, Penn State does not offer an occasional use permit. University faculty, staff, and students must either purchase a monthly permit or pay the hourly rate in the commuter lot or the gated parking decks.

6.6. Peer Institution Review

While Penn State currently offers a wide variety of TDM programs, there are always opportunities to learn from other TDM successes and expand upon their current TDM offerings. The following sections include TDM programs from peer universities that should be considered for implementation at Penn State.

A review of peer institutions was completed to compare TDM programs offered at Penn State University and TDM programs offered at peer universities. This comparison highlights what Penn State is doing successfully with their TDM program while also highlighting opportunities for new investments in TDM programs based on successes at other universities. Table 6.2 summarizes three peer universities selected for this review: University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, Virginia Tech, and the University of Maryland. The table indicates programs in effect as of April 2023.

Virginia Tech

**Bike, Bus, and Walk Permits** – These permits are available to faculty, staff, and students who "use sustainable transportation methods as their primary means of commuting to campus." The permits are available for semester and summer use and provide users with up to 32 discounted daily parking permits per year. This permit is part of a suite of options for the Commuter Alternatives Program at Virginia Tech.

**Special Circumstances Parking Permits** – These permits are available for temporary or short-term parking due to emergencies and for loading and unloading. Additionally, Virginia Tech offers temporary medical disability permits for students with a mobility impairment lasting six weeks or less.

UNC – Chapel Hill

**Commuter Alternatives Program (CAP)** – The commuter alternative program “rewards faculty, staff, and students who choose to take the bus, join a rideshare, ride a bike or walk to campus.” CAP benefits include 1 free parking permit to use per month or semester, 20 free weeknight parking passes, and transit/vanpool subsidies.

**Zipcar Accessibility** – UNC employees and students have access to Zipcar, which is a car sharing service on campus. Cars are located throughout campus and are available for rent hourly or daily.

**Point-to-Point Transit** – A University-operated service providing on-demand and fixed route options to assist in getting around campus both after dark and during normal working hours.

University of Maryland

**Parking Bundle Packs** – Bundle Parking packs are sold to commuter students who drive to campus occasionally. A bundle pack consists of 10 one-day parking permits for designated campus parking lots.
### Table 6.2. Travel Demand Management Program Comparison with Peer Universities
Programs as of April 2023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TDM Program</th>
<th>Penn State University</th>
<th>UNC Chapel Hill</th>
<th>Virginia Tech Blacksburg</th>
<th>University of Maryland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operate a Limited-Access Roadway</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park Event Scheduling System</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rideshare</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare Matching Program</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanpool Program</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carshare Program</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare App Partnerships</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Bus Pass</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend and School Break Bus Services</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-demand transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Transit Service</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Transit Access</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Plan Bicycle Program</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Den</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikeshare Program</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Parking Structure</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Parking Accommodations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional-Use Parking Permits</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and Ride Facilities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.7. Future TDM Opportunities

This review of the current state of TDM suggests that it is a critical component to the campus transportation system. It both supports the multimodality desired by the campus community and reduces the single occupancy vehicle demand that would otherwise result in an overly congested transportation network. What is clear though, is that while Penn State offers a variety of TDM options, there is disparity in the awareness and usership of each program. This has been exacerbated by the COVID pandemic, during and after which many programs dropped to a fraction of the usership that they otherwise would have. This provides an opportunity and a catalyst for Penn State to reassess which TDM programs they could or should invest more energy and funding into, what TDM programs should be sunset, and what new TDM programs could be implemented on campus.
Chapter 7. Synthesis & Conclusion

This Update of the District Plan Transportation Study fulfills the UPD zoning ordinance requirements for the planning period from 2023 to 2033. The District Plan Transportation Study is a UPD ordinance requirement that is to be prepared every tenth year as a planning tool to document travel trends and identify potential transportation effects of projected development and activities within the UPD.

The UPD Transportation Study demonstrates that the University continues to manage its transportation effects and vehicular traffic through thoughtful Campus Design Principles, strategic land development, and significant investments in travel demand management. The transportation data collected in 2022 show continued reductions in vehicular traffic over the levels measured previously in 2011 and 2001. These reductions are also likely to reflect changing travel dynamics in the wake of the COVID-pandemic, resulting from widespread work-from-home policies and the advent of virtual substitutes for some trip purposes—everything from shopping to delivery of health care.

In many ways, the COVID pandemic marked an “inflection point” for travel behavior and the resulting mode usage and traffic trends surrounding the University. Trends like traffic reductions on the major community streets are welcomed, while some trends are not particularly desired, like the reduction in fixed-route transit usage. Other trends, like how to address unoccupied parking in Core Campus parking lots, have stirred discussions about updating parking policies and the permitting system.

On the opposite side of these vehicular and transit reductions, commensurate increases in walking, biking, and emerging micro-modes were also noted in the transportation data. While the increase validates many Campus Design Principles and contributes to many of Penn State’s sustainability and equity goals, the University Park Campus transportation space is limited and is becoming more saturated with more users and a diversifying set of transportation devices. The advent of micro-mobility is full of opportunity, but many of these new vehicle types do not fit in well on the University Park network with the other prevalent modes. Micro-modes operate too fast to safely mix with pedestrians on the sidewalk, but also too slow and without their own space to safely operate in the street. Plus, there would be hard choices to make, significant costs to bear, and trade-offs necessary to create new transportation space within the established campus development pattern. In short, the campus transportation space is constrained, and the current level of mode conflict is generating new forms of congestion and inefficiency on the network.

The maintenance-centric nature of the University’s Capital Plans and campus development projects are not expected to exacerbate the modal conflict in the UPD Study Area (Core and West Campus). If anything, the development of the College of Engineering on West Campus would help to deconflict the Core Campus space. The other major University development effort is at Innovation Park, and a significant effort to address regional transportation, connectivity, and growth in that area is underway.

Options for resolving and reducing mode conflict on campus are already being developed through this UPD Study and previous studies commissioned by Penn State. New infrastructure, operational strategies, policy changes, and new regulations are all in-play going forward. However, the Core Campus network is largely considered “mature” and major expansions and changes to the campus network (like those seen in the early 2000s) are not in favor for the next ten-year period. Operational and spot fixes hold promise for incrementally updating the network to address systemic safety and congestion concerns. The University Park Bicycle Master Plan, for instance, envisions street changes that can be implemented as low-cost projects during roadway renewal efforts. Meanwhile, the University recognizes the growing municipal-interest in advancing “edge-campus” transportation projects as collaborations with the University.
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To: McCormick Taylor  
329 Innovation Blvd. Ste. 116  
State College, PA 16803  
Attn: Rob Watts, P.E., and AICP  

From: Lindsay K. Schoch, AICP  

RE: Additional Township Staff Responses to the 2023 University Planned District Transportation Study Update  

Date: February 29, 2024 (Revised March 1, 2024)  

In addition to the Memo provided to you on February 26, please find below an additional comment College Township Staff would like you to incorporate into your records:  

College Township is aware of a Request for Qualifications for the construction of a 1,500-bed student housing project at Graduate Circle, located near University Drive and Hastings Road. The Township requests you include this development in the update to the UPD Transportation Study Update.  

The Township of College is in receipt of the Penn State University 2023 University Planned District Transportation Study Update. Thank you for the opportunity to review the 2023 University Planned District Transportation Study Update. As you are aware, Chapter 188 of the College Township Code houses the regulations for all developments in the University Planned District (UPD). Section 188-9 specifically requires the UPD Transportation Study be updated every ten (10) years.  

I commend your proactive approach in updating the study to ensure future developments in the UPD address parking, traffic, and other transportation-related improvements adequately. The Township had the opportunity to contribute to the study through the stakeholder interviews. Despite the existence and consultation of a Project Management Team, Executive Committee, and Advisory Committee, the stakeholder interview process was particularly productive. It enabled the Township to provide valuable feedback for your study.  

Please consider the following comments.  

- You note necessary changes in UPD Sub-Districts 7, 8, and 11. When the opportunity arises to change these boundaries, please contact Township Staff to discuss the rezoning process to change these boundaries.  
- We agree the Applied Research Laboratory Master Plan at Innovation Park, which will include new parking facilities, new buildings, and/or changes to access will require a more detailed Transportation Impact Study. In addition, the Township is appreciative of the University Projects and Transportation Impact Projections provided in the study.  
- The details found in the parking materials are adequate for the purposes of this update. It is now well-known this data exists for future planning efforts.
Service recommendations: “The Beaver Avenue Campus Shuttle would be repurposed as shown in Figure 4.18 as the Innovation Park Campus Shuttle. It would operate three buses from 7AM to 8PM and replace the portion of the current Red Link that provides services to Innovation Park.” A connection to Innovation Park is critical and should remain a linkage for users.

Please note that College Township is currently implementing the Dale Summit Area Plan in the Dale Summit area of College Township. Our implementation strategies include updating outdated, Euclidean Zoning to the more innovative form of Zoning, known as Form-Based Code. This effort has resulted in a zoning change to the Planned Research and Business Park District (PRBD), which encompasses Innovation Park. The Township included multi-family residential uses as a conditional use in this zoning district, so long as it is developed as a Planned Residential Development.
Penn State University
Planned District Transportation Study
2023 Update
College Township
University Planned District

Zoning classification in municipal ordinances
  • University-sensitive framework for land development

UPD-adopting municipalities
  • State College Borough, College & Patton Townships

District transportation study completed on 10-year intervals:
  • Campus parking area assessment
  • Campus traffic circulation and transportation facilities
  • Transportation system “level-of-use”
  • Travel demand management programs

“The University Planned District is designed to promote the careful planning and orderly development of the University campus, consistent with the community development goals … “
Campus Parking Assessment

- 2022 supply = 18,249 spaces
- **Total parking supply exceeds demand beyond 2027 ...**
  - 2,388 space surplus in 2022
  - 1,440 space surplus in 2027
- 2022 to 2027 trends ...
  - Supply decreasing
  - Demand increasing (1% per year)
- Distribution of surplus spaces varies across the UPD zones
Transit Services Study

- Optimize/truncate under-performing routes → Fall 2023
- Revise commuter parking price structure
- Annual data-driven optimization of shuttle routes, stops, and headways
University Park Bicycle Master Plan

- Serve the highest demand areas of campus
  - Add bike facilities to existing campus streets
  - Create a cohesive off-street network of pathways
- Secondary supporting projects complete the network in lower demand areas

Projects in the Keystone Network have the most impact for addressing demand and campus connectivity and rose in importance in outreach, especially amongst interested but concerned cyclists.
2022 Pedestrian Crossings, Class Change Peak
Micromobility & “Pseudo-Vehicles”

#1 Concern → Safety
- Speed and Space
- Too fast to operate in pedestrian space
- Too slow and vulnerable in vehicle space

Challenges in adapting the University Park street environment:
- Traditional network is long-established
- Pedestrian-centric campus design principles
- Limited street right of way
- Opportunities are constrained/expensive

What would you call this??
Vehicle Code and Low Speed Vehicles

- PA Vehicle Code applies on University Park streets
- Legal and regulatory backstop to University
- Vehicle Code changes under discussion (Pilot Programs)
- Current Vehicle Code is a barrier to scooter program implementation on campus
Future Development Assumptions & Impact

- Capital Plans are maintenance-centric
- 50 University projects identified and evaluated (next 10 years)
  - 42 none or nominal traffic impact
  - 6 possible traffic impact
  - 2 likely traffic impact
    - ARL Innovation Park
    - West Campus Connector
- 10 municipal projects identified
- 2 MPO/PennDOT projects identified
ARL Innovation Park Campus

• 1.2 million square feet
• Consolidate most ARL functions
• Reduce older buildings in Core Campus
• Transportation challenges
  • Innovation Boulevard intersections and driveways
  • Park Avenue/I-99 Interchange intersections
  • Transit service
  • Limited pedestrian access
West Campus Multimodal Connector

- West Deck was built anticipating a second access
- Path or roadway connection to West College Avenue
- Proposed in early DRAFT of West Deck TIS
- Transportation challenges
  - Community concern about cut-through traffic
  - Why not connect to Blue Course Drive?
  - Would transit use it?
Travel Demand Management

- Reduce single-occupant vehicle (SOV) trips
- Diversify transportation mode options
- 14 distinct TDM programs
  - Expand successful programs
  - Sunset underperforming programs

![Pie charts comparing travel modes for Faculty/Staff and Students]

- **Faculty/Staff**:
  - SOV: 65%
  - CATA/Campus Shuttle: 16%
  - Walk/Bike/Other: 16%
  - Vanpool/Carpool: 3%

- **Students**:
  - SOV: 52%
  - CATA/Campus Shuttle: 31%
  - Walk/Bike/Other: 17%
  - Vanpool/Carpool: 6%
Discussion & Questions

Neil Sullivan, University Planner
Pennsylvania State University
nsullivan@psu.edu

Robert Watts, Consultant Team Manager
McCormick Taylor
rjwatts@mccormicktaylor.com
To: College Township Planning Commission  
Thru: Adam Brumbaugh, Township Manager  
From: Lindsay K. Schoch, AICP | Principal Planner  
Date: March 29, 2024  

RE: Workforce Housing Ordinance – Final Draft Review

Introduction:

Included the Planning Commission’s (PC) April 2, 2024 packet is a fully revised Final Draft Workforce Housing Ordinance. Over the course of February and March the PC offered comments to staff, and, through the ongoing guidance of the PC, staff incorporated suggestions into the ordinance.

To assist in the easy identification of changes, any additions since March 5 are highlighted in **bold purple font**, additions since March 19 can be found in **bold orange font**.

What to Expect:

During the April 2 meeting, the PC should anticipate reviewing the Final Draft Ordinance, including the changes PC requested in late February and March, including the most recent comments the Planning Commission made at the March 19 meeting. If the Planning Commission is so inclined, a recommendation can be made, which will move the ordinance forward for Council’s consideration at their upcoming April 18 meeting, and eventually through the Public Hearing process, to enactment of the newly revised section in the Township Zoning Code.

Recommended Motion:

Move to recommend the April 2 version of the Workforce Housing Ordinance, with corrections as may be noted, to College Township Council for consideration and enactment.
COLLEGE TOWNSHIP
CENTRE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

ORDINANCE NO. O-24-_
AMENDMENT TO CHAPTER 200 – ZONING

AN ORDINANCE OF THE TOWNSHIP OF COLLEGE, CENTRE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA,
AMENDING CHAPTER 200 ARTICLE II §200-7 (DEFINITIONS) TO INCLUDE TERMS SPECIFIC TO
WORKFORCE HOUSING
AND
REPEALING AND REPLACING CHAPTER 200 ARTICLE VIII §200-38.4 (WORKFORCE HOUSING)
AND
AMENDING CHAPTER 180-16.1 (SIDEWALKS) REMOVING SECTION B(3), A REFERENCE TO
CHAPTER 200-38.4 WHICH HAS BEEN REMOVED.

GENERAL REFERENCES
Planned Residential Development – See Chapter 145
Subdivision and Land Development – See Chapter 180

Additions
Additions since March 5 PC Meeting
Additions since March 19 PC Meeting
+Deletions

PART 1

Chapter 200 Article II § 200-7 Definitions (the following definitions will be added and incorporated in
alphabetical order)

Affordable Housing
In general, housing for which the occupants are paying no more than 30 percent of their income
for gross housing costs, including utilities.

Area Median Income
The midpoint of a specific area’s income distribution, calculated on an annual basis by the
Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

Building Coverage
The percentage of the lot area that is covered by building area, which includes the total horizontal
area when viewed in plan.

Certification of Buyers
Regarding workforce housing, prior to the executing a purchase contract for any workforce unit,
the prospective buyer shall be certified as meeting income requirements for the specified unit.
Process involves ensuring the understanding of any deed restrictions, restrictive covenants, and/or
liens that are placed on the workforce housing unit to ensure long-term affordability.
Certification of Renters
Prior to renting a workforce housing unit, renters shall be certified as meeting income requirements. Some restrictions apply, such as the rental unit must be used as the principal place of residence, students enrolled in post-secondary program, college, or university are eligible if the student does not meeting the IRS definition of a dependent, and the student can be classified as an independent student.

Certificate of Occupancy
A document issued by a local government or building department that certifies a building’s compliance with applicable building codes and regulations and declares it suitable for occupancy. This certificate is typically required before a building or part of a building can be used or inhabited.

Consumer Price Index
Measures the average change overtime in the prices paid by urban consumers for a basket of goods and services. The CPI provides a way to track inflation by examining the price changes of a representative set of goods and services commonly purchased by households.

Cost Off-sets
Mechanisms or strategies used to balance financial burdens imposed by zoning requirements on property owners or developers. Used as zoning incentives, including increased density, reduced setbacks, height allowances, in exchange for features like affordable housing, public open space, or other community benefits.

Density
Measures the number of housing units per acre.

Density Calculation
Pertaining to workforce housing, to determine residential density: Density of a development containing residential dwelling units shall be equal to the number of proposed dwelling units divided by the gross site area inclusive of proposed rights-of-way or any other portion of the site to be dedicated to the Township or homeowners association; only those residences which meet the definition of applicable residential dwellings shall be used to calculate the total number of dwelling units in a development; and the residential density within a planned residential development shall not include areas devoted to nonresidential uses noted in Chapter 145 (Planned Residential Developments).

Fee-in-lieu
In the context of land use, typically refers to a financial arrangement where a developer or landowner pays a fee to a local government or relevant authority in lieu of providing certain required amenities or facilities on-site as part of a development project. Typically associated with land development regulations and zoning requirements.

Inclusionary Housing
Refers to strategies that mandate or incentivize the inclusion of affordable housing units within market-rate residential developments. The goal is to create mixed-income communities and prevent the segregation of socioeconomic groups.
Incentive
Something that encourages or motivates an individual to take a particular course of action or to behave in a certain way.

Mandatory
Regarding workforce housing, developments where the residential density is five or more dwelling units per acre, the provisions of workforce housing is required.

Market-rate Unit
A dwelling unit other than mobile homes as defined, which sells on the market at a price which is affordable to those households which make above 100% of the area median income.

Mean
Average obtained by summing values and dividing by the number of values.

Median
Middle value in an ordered dataset or the average of the two middle values in an even dataset.

Mode
Value(s) that occur most frequently in a dataset.

Nonresidential Use
Offices; medical and dental offices and clinics, excluding animal hospitals and veterinary offices; places of assembly; libraries, museums, art galleries and reading rooms; retail establishments for the sale and service of goods; eating and drinking establishments, excluding fast-food establishments; research, engineering or testing offices and laboratories; health clubs and athletic and recreational facilities; child and adult day-care centers.

Regulatory Relief
Refers to the easing or relaxing of certain zoning regulations or restrictions imposed by local governments on property use and development. To address housing shortages or promote affordable housing, municipalities may grant relief from certain zoning requirements for developers building affordable housing developments.

Occupancy (limit)
The number of individuals that can reside in a particular unit.

US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)
Established in 1965, HUD’s mission is to increase homeownership, support community development, and increase access to affordable housing free from discrimination. To fulfill this mission, HUD will embrace high standards of ethics, management and accountability and forge new partnerships – particularly with faith based and community organizations that leverage resources and improve HUD’s ability to be effective on the community level.

Workforce Housing Dwelling Unit
A dwelling unit which is affordable to those making up to 400% 120% of the Area Median Income (AMI).
PART 2

Chapter 200 Article VIII §200-38.4 Workforce Housing (the following is intended to replace the repealed ordinance §200-38.4 Workforce Housing in its entirety)


A. Intent. The intent of the workforce housing section of the zoning ordinance, as established by Township Council is:

(1) To recognize the importance of socioeconomic diversity in nurturing more inclusive and dynamic neighborhoods; and

(2) To facilitate the provision of affordable and attainable rental and owner-occupied workforce housing options within College Township; and

(3) To place a strong emphasis on crafting sustainable, enduring solutions to housing challenges, including the implementation of long-term affordability requirements; and

(4) To foster collaborative efforts with neighboring municipalities to establish regional consistency in workforce housing ordinances; and

(5) To promote private sector investments in affordable housing through partnerships between local government and private developers aimed at constructing affordable housing units; and

(6) To implement incentives to promote the creation and maintenance of workforce housing; and

(7) To safeguard rental and owner-occupied workforce housing options within the community, enabling individuals and families with moderate to middle incomes to reside proximate to their work places; and

(8) To continuously monitor the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Area Median Income (AMI), adjusting the AMI thresholds in the ordinance to accommodate annual increases or decreases.

B. Applicability. The regulations contained herein shall apply upon the designation of dwelling units as workforce housing and shall be applicable as follows:

(1) General. A developer of residential dwelling units shall receive regulatory relief from zoning of land regulations as an incentive for providing workforce housing dwelling units. Such relief shall be based upon the type and amount of dwelling units designated as workforce housing in accordance with the regulations contained in this section:

(2) Mandatory Requirement.

   (a) For those development where the residential density is five or more dwellings units per acre, the provision of workforce housing is required. A development which exceeds this density threshold
shall designated a percentage of its total dwelling units as workforce housing units in accordance with the minimum levels listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Density of Proposed Development</th>
<th>Percentage of Required Workforce Housing Units *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 to 5.99</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 6.99</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 7.99</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 to 8.99</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 to 9.99</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reflects a percentage of total number of dwelling units within a development that are to be designated as workforce housing. In case of a fraction, the required number of units shall be rounded to the next highest whole unit.

(b) Developers can exceed the minimum levels of mandatory workforce housing listed above and shall receive any additional incentives in accordance with the regulations below.

(c) Any residential development which proposed 10 or less dwelling units shall be exempt from this mandatory requirement.

(d) All workforce housing units within all the residential development including workforce housing developments, will have safe reasonable access via sidewalks, shared-use paths, or bike paths to parkland or open space located within or near the subject residential development.

(3) Calculation of Density. To determine the residential density, the following shall apply:

(a) Density of a development containing residential dwelling units shall be equal to the number of the proposed dwelling units divided by the gross site area inclusive of proposed rights-of-way or any Township of Homeowners Association.

(b) For the purposes of this section, only those residences which meet the definition of applicable residential dwellings in § 200-38.4C below, shall be used to calculate the total number of dwelling units within a development.

(c) The residential density within a planned residential development shall not include areas devoted to nonresidential uses as noted in § 145-17B.

C. **Incentives:** The incentives provided to a residential developer are on a per-dwelling unit basis unless otherwise noted within the regulations. The incentives offered below will differ depending on the type of dwelling that is being designated as workforce housing.

(1) Single-Family house and duplex. All single-family houses, duplexes and/or any structure containing two or less dwelling units in which at least one is designated as workforce housing shall be permitted to the following regulatory reductions:
(a) Minimum lot size and density: 5,000 square feet per dwelling unit or that permitted under existing zoning, whichever is less with one exception: In the Single-Family Residential Zoning District (R-1), only those lots two (2) acres or greater in size can be developed within multiple duplexes not to exceed a density of seven (7) dwelling units per acre. This calculation shall be inclusive of all land proposed for development including all proposed rights-of-way, parkland/open space areas, stormwater management facilities, and the like. [Amended 9-15-2016 by Ord. No. O-16-05]

(b) Minimum lot width: 40 feet per unit

(c) Maximum impervious coverage: 55%

(d) Side setback. The side yard setback for a lot containing workforce housing dwelling unit(s) may be reduced to seven (7) feet. Side yard setbacks may also be reduced to seven (7) feet for market-rate housing units. for those side yards that directly abut lots containing workforce housing dwelling units.

Parkland and open space requirements. The parkland and open space requirements of § 180-26B may be waived for dwelling units designated as workforce housing. Those subdivisions or land developments which thereby reduce the parkland and open space requirements by more than 50% shall only be permitted to do so under the following conditions:

No workforce housing unit shall be more than 1/4 mile from parkland or open space in or near the subject development as measured between the two closest points of property lines of the workforce housing unit and park or open space perimeter.

For the purposes of this Subsection B(1)(e) of § 200-38.4, parkland and open space shall be considered as that designated as "existing parks" or "recreation land owned by others" and available for public use. In addition, land owned by the State College Area School District may also be considered as parkland and open space if such land contains recreation facilities that can be used by the public.

Sidewalk. The amount of sidewalks required pursuant to § 180-16.1 may be reduced in an amount equal to the total street frontage of all lots containing dwelling units defined as workforce housing units pursuant to the following:

NOTE: See also §§ 180-16, Streets, and 180-16.1, Sidewalks.

The reduction may take place anywhere within the subdivision or land development containing workforce housing units.

Any collector or arterial streets within the residential development should have a sidewalk on both sides of the street. All other streets (public or private) shall have a sidewalk on at least one side of the street.

Sidewalks shall provide access to any parkland, open space or school within or adjacent to the development.

In instances where a development of single-family houses and/or duplexes developed with multiple dwellings on a single lot in which the development contains workforce housing units, the reduction in sidewalks shall be calculated as follows:

The reduction in required sidewalk may be in an equal proportion to the percentage of the total proposed dwelling units which are designated as workforce housing.

Regardless of the amount of sidewalk permitted to be reduced as calculated above, a sidewalk shall be provided along an adjacent public street as noted above in § 200-38.4B(1)(f)(2) and (3).

The sidewalk reduction is not guaranteed upon the provision of workforce housing. Approval of such reduction by Council will be based upon ability to meet the conditions set forth § 200-38.4B(1)(f)(2) and (3).

NOTE: See §§ 180-16, Streets, and 180-16.1, Sidewalks.
(e) Additional Bonus. The reduced lot requirements noted in 200-38.4C(1)(a) through (d) may also be applied to market-rate housing units in addition to that of the designated workforce housing units based on the following rations or fractions thereof rounded to the nearest whole number:

[1] For every two workforce housing units which are affordable to those households with incomes between 80% and 120% of AMI, one market-rate housing unit shall be permitted to have the same similar lot requirements noted above in §200-38.4C(1)(a) through (d).

For every one workforce housing unit which is affordable to those households making less than or equal to 80% of AMI, one market-rate housing unit shall be permitted to have similar requirements noted above in ________

(f) Accessory Dwelling Units: Single-family houses designated as workforce housing may be permitted to contain accessory dwelling units pursuant to § 200-11A(1) If the accessory dwelling unit is to be rented, then the anticipated income from renting the accessory dwelling unit shall be included in calculating a household’s total income when certifying income of potential buyers of a workforce housing unit. When an Accessory Dwelling Unit is rented, either on a long-term basis or a short-term basis, the proper permitting is required through College Township and Centre Region Code. To ensure compliance and proof of Accessory Dwelling Unit gross rental income with proof of receipts is required.

(g) Waiver of Application Fee or Review Fees: Review Fees developed by in-house staff reviews for Subdivision and Land Development fees may be waived by College Township Council for development proposals containing workforce housing units. The request must contain information detailing how real actual costs will be reduced and how the savings will be passed on to the workforce housing units. The Township shall review the request and provide an answer to the developer within 30 days of receipt of the request.

Cost offsets. The Township may discount or defer municipal fees associated with the approval process of a subdivision/land development.

(2) Townhouse and multi-family units. All townhouses, multi-family units, and/or any other structure containing three or more dwelling units in which some or all are designated as workforce housing units shall be permitted to the following regulatory reductions:

(a) Maximum Impervious Coverage. The maximum impervious coverage for a development containing workforce housing units may be increased above that permitted in the zoning district by an amount equal to the total gross floor area of those units designated as workforce housing units. However, in no instance shall the impervious coverage exceed 55%, regardless of the number of workforce housing units.

Parkland and open space requirement. The parkland and open space requirements of § 180-26B shall be waived for all townhouse and multifamily dwelling units designated as workforce housing. Those subdivisions or land developments which thereby could reduce the parkland and open space requirements by more than 50% shall only be permitted to do so in the same manner as that allowed for single-family houses and duplexes as noted in § 200-38.4B(1)(e).

(b) Occupancy Limit. The occupancy of unrelated individuals as established in § 200-11Z may be increased from three to five individuals as follows:

[1] For each unit designated as workforce housing, one unit in the development may be permitted to have up to five unrelated individuals residing within it.
[2] The unit which is permitted to have the increased occupancy, as noted above, does not have to be designated as workforce housing and can be located anywhere within the residential development containing the workforce housing.

(c) Permitted Height. The permitted height of a building may be increased by 10 feet above that permitted in the zoning district regulations, if the building contains either two dwelling units or 10% of the total dwelling units, whichever is greater, are designated as workforce housing. The permitted height of a building may be increased beyond what is permitted in the underlying zoning district based upon the following:

1. When 5% - 7% workforce units are required pursuant to 200.38.4(B)(2)(a), the height may be increased 10’, up to a maximum of 45’.

2. 8% - 10% workforce units required pursuant to 200.38.4(B)(2)(a), the height may be increased 20’, up to a maximum of 55’

3. Non-residential commercial properties maximum height is 35’

(3) Planned Residential Developments. The workforce housing regulations herein are also applicable to planned residential developments as permitted in Chapter 145, Planned Residential Developments, with the following incentives:

(a) Maximum building coverage. The total ground floor area of all buildings and structures shall be permitted to exceed 30% of the total land area of the planned residential development in a manner equal to an increase of coverage by 1% for every 1% of total number of dwelling units which are designated as workforce housing. However, regardless of the number of dwellings designated as workforce housing, the total building coverage shall not exceed 40% of the total land area of a planned residential development.

(b) Maximum total impervious coverage. The maximum impervious surfaces shall be permitted to exceed 50% of the total area of the planned residential development in a manner equal to an increase of impervious coverage by 1% for every 1% of the total number of dwelling units which are designated as workforce housing. However, regardless of the number of dwellings designated as workforce housing, the total impervious coverage shall not exceed 60% of the total planned residential development.

(c) Permitted Height. The permitted height of a building may be increased by 10 feet above that permitted in the zoning district regulations, if the building contains either two dwelling units or 10% of the total dwelling units, whichever is greater, are designated as workforce housing. The permitted height of a building may be increased beyond what is permitted in the underlying zoning district based upon the following formula:

1. When 5% - 7% workforce units are proposed, the height may be increased up to a maximum of 40’, not to exceed a height of 75’.
Open space. The minimum amount of open space required in § 145-18A may be decreased below 30% of the total area of the planned residential development in a manner equal to a decrease of 1% for every 1% of the total number of dwelling units which are designated as workforce housing. However, regardless of the number of dwellings designated as workforce housing, the total open space required may not be decreased beyond 20% of the total area of the planned residential development.

(d) Additional bonus. The maximum amount of land devoted to nonresidential uses within a planned residential development shall be permitted to exceed 20% in a manner equal to an increase in nonresidential land by 1% for every 1% of the total number of dwelling units which are designated as workforce housing for households earning less than 80% of the area median income. However, regardless of the number of dwellings designated as such, the maximum area of land devoted to nonresidential uses shall not exceed 30%.

D. **Provision of workforce housing.** All workforce housing units proposed in a land development and/or subdivision are required to be built on site covered by such plan unless one of the following options enumerated below is utilized. In such instances, the developer shall continue to retain the incentives applied to on-site development for the number of workforce housing units being provided for under the options listed below:

**Fee in lieu.** An applicant may pay a fee in lieu of constructing some or all of the workforce housing units which it is receiving incentives for given the following regulations:

College Township Council shall establish by resolution the amount of the fee in lieu payment per unit, which shall be based on actual construction costs and inclusion of land purchase costs.

To determine the total fee in lieu payment, the per unit amount established by the Township shall be multiplied by the number of workforce housing units otherwise required to be constructed or as desired by the developer to be eligible for the incentives.

The Township shall be required to establish and administer a workforce housing fund into which all fee in lieu payments shall be deposited. The Township shall then be required to use such funds to further its mission of providing workforce housing as defined herein.

**Land donation.** Land within College Township may be donated to the Township or its designee in place of workforce housing dwelling units being built within a proposed development pursuant to the following:

The value of the land must be equal to or greater than the value of the fee in lieu payment noted above in Subsection D(1) to be calculated as follows:

The value of the land will be determined by an appraisal completed by a certified appraiser. Each party (developer and the Township) shall submit an appraisal.

If the lower appraised value is 90% or greater of the other appraisal, the two appraised values shall be averaged.

If the lower appraised value is less than 90% of the other appraisal, then each appraiser shall, within 15 days of notice from the Township, agree on a third appraiser, the cost of which is to be shared equally by the Township and the developer. Within 30 days of notice of his appointment, the third appraiser shall submit an appraisal. The middle of the three appraised values shall be used to determine the value of the land to be donated.
If both the Township and the developer agree, the requirement for the appraisal process above in whole or in part may be waived upon mutual agreement between the Township and the developer.

The land to be donated must meet all applicable zoning, land development and subdivision requirements to construct the desired type and amount of units.

The land donation must occur prior to the completion of the market-rate units. The certificate of occupancy will be withheld pursuant to the requirements of Subsection E(1) below until the land donation occurs.

1. Off-site development (new dwellings). Workforce housing units otherwise required to be constructed or as desired by the developer to be eligible for the incentives listed above may be constructed off site given the following regulations:

   a. Location. The dwelling units to be utilized to satisfy the workforce provisions shall be located within College Township.

   b. Number of. The total number of units provided off site shall be equal to those which would have been provided on site.

   c. Approval. The applicant must obtain off-site development plan approval from the Township at the same time the applicant obtains plan approval for the proposed market-rate units within the covered development. The off-site development plan must include, among other land development plan requirements, documentation of site control, necessary financing in place to complete the off-site development, architectural designs and elevations, and any other documentation deemed necessary by the Township to ensure compliance with the regulations contained herein.

   d. Each of the off-site dwellings designated as workforce housing shall meet all of the supplemental regulations stipulated in § 200-38.4E.

2. Existing dwellings. A developer may designate dwelling units which have already been constructed as workforce housing units to meet his obligation (whether voluntary or mandatory) to obtain the incentives listed in § 200-38.4C for a particular development. Such off-site, existing dwelling units shall meet the regulations listed above in § 200-38.4D(1) and the following additional regulations:

   a. The units must be inspected and rehabilitated to meet current building codes.

   b. The proposed dwellings to be designated as workforce housing units shall be considered market-rate units. Utilizing this provision shall result in the conversion of market-rate dwellings to income-restricted workforce housing dwelling units.

Credits for existing workforce housing. A developer of a new development may be given credit for previously built dwelling units which could be defined as workforce housing given the following regulations:

The existing dwelling units in which a developer is seeking credit shall not have previously been created or in any way developed utilizing the regulatory relief provided herein.

The developer shall only receive credit in whole or in part to relieve him of the mandatory obligation of providing workforce housing units as stipulated in § 200-38.4B(2). If the number of dwelling units being credited toward a developer's mandatory obligation is less than that required under § 200-38.4B(2), then the developer shall be required to provide workforce housing units equal to the difference of the credit and the mandatory requirement.
In order for a previously built dwelling unit(s) to be credited towards a development's workforce housing obligation, each credited unit must:

Have received its certificate of occupancy no more than five years prior to the date of the developer's submission of the new subdivision or land development plan; and

Be designated as workforce housing upon land development and/or subdivision approval of the development seeking said credits and therefore meet all workforce housing unit regulations stipulated in § 200-38.4D.

(3) Phasing. When a proposed development’s density triggers the requirements for workforce housing and is proposed in phases, the following shall apply:

(a) If the first constructed phase contains 50% or more non-residential uses, no workforce housing is required in that phase.

(b) Any construction of additional phases shall contain a number of workforce housing units equal to the percentage of total workforce housing units required in the entire development divided by the amount of land accounted for in the area of completed or under-construction phases.

(c) When a plan is phased, occupancy shall not be granted to the final 15 market-rate units until all required workforce housing units for active phases are complete.

College Township recognizes the importance of phased implementation to facilitate the development of workforce housing units, while managing costs and feasibility for developers over time.

The density calculation to establish workforce housing found in the table in section 200.38.4(B)(2)(a) also establishes phasing of workforce units. If the density of the proposed development is 10 or more, a minimum of 10% of the units are required workforce units. If Phase I includes 100 units, a minimum of 10% shall be workforce units; Phase II proposes 60 units, a minimum of 6 of those units are to be workforce units, Phase III proposes 20 units, a minimum of 2 units shall be workforce, and so on. If a phase proposes only commercial development, workforce housing requirements do not apply.

Developer shall submit a Phased Implementation Plan detailing how the requirements will be met in accordance with the code. The Implementation Plan is subject to review by the College Township Planning Commission, who then shall make a recommendation to College Township Council for their consideration.

The phased implementation plan may include provisions for flexibility in meeting the workforce housing requirements, subject to Planning Commission recommendation and Council approval.

E. Supplemental workforce housing regulations. In addition to the regulations above, all workforce housing units shall have the following requirements:

(1) Amenities. Workforce housing units may not differ from the market-rate units in a development with regard to interior amenities and gross floor area. provided that:

The differences, excluding differences related to building size differentials, are not apparent in the general exterior appearance of the development;

The gross floor area of the habitable space within workforce housing dwelling units is not less than the following minimum requirements:

One-bedroom: 750 square feet.
Two bedrooms: 1,000 square feet.
Three bedrooms: 1,200 square feet.
Four bedrooms: 1,400 square feet.

Five or more bedrooms: add an additional 150 square feet per additional bedroom.

(2) Timing of construction. Workforce housing units shall be made available for occupancy at approximately the same rate as the market units, except that certificates of occupancy for the last 15% of the market-rate units shall be withheld until certificates of occupancy have been issued for all of the workforce units.

Cost offsets. The Township may discount or defer municipal fees associated with the approval process of a subdivision/land development. Any developer of workforce units may submit a request for a discount or deferment of fees. The request must also contain information detailing how real costs will be reduced and how the savings will be passed on to the workforce housing units. The Township Council's decision on a discount or deferment of municipal fees will be based upon Council determining that such savings will be appropriate and directly proportionate to the reduction in unit sales or rental costs. The Township shall review the request and provide an answer to the developer within 30 days of receipt of the request.

(3) Certification of buyers. Prior to executing a purchase contract for any workforce unit, the prospective workforce unit buyer shall be certified as meeting income requirements for the specified unit by the Township or its designee. Developers and workforce housing unit buyers may execute only purchase agreements that are approved as to form by the Township or its designee. The purchase agreement shall include language attached as an addendum provided by the Township or its designee which shall require that an appropriate disclosure form be provided to and explained to the workforce housing unit buyer prior to execution of the contract. The disclosure form shall explain any deed restrictions, restrictive covenants, and/or liens that are placed on the workforce housing unit to ensure long-term affordability.

(a) In addition to the foregoing, if the workforce housing unit contains an Accessory Dwelling Unit, gross rental income with proof of receipts is required to certify buyers.

(4) Certification of renters. Prior to renting a workforce unit, the prospective renter shall be certified as meeting income requirements by the Township or its designee. The following limitations shall apply to the certification of renters:

(a) The rental unit must be used as the principal place of residence.

(b) Students enrolled in a post-secondary program, college or university are eligible only if they can meet the following two conditions:

[1] The student does not meet the Internal Revenue Service's definition of a "dependent," and

[2] The student can be classified as an "independent student" as defined by § 480(d) of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

(5) Ensuring affordability. To ensure that any unit created under this section of the Zoning Ordinance (rented or owner-occupied) remains affordable over time, the owner of said unit(s) shall be required to maintain affordability based upon a legally binding agreement with either the Township or its designee, to be recorded at the Centre County Recorder of Deeds. Said agreement shall include:
(a) The period for which the units shall remain affordable, which at a minimum shall be at least 30 years from the date of initial occupancy of a workforce housing unit;

(b) The process for certifying subsequent buyers of workforce housing dwelling units for the duration of the specified period of affordability;

(c) The level of affordability, including the amount of equity able to be recouped by the homeowner or owner of a rental property containing workforce housing units upon sale of the property; and

(d) A provision allowing the Township or its designee to first be offered the right to purchase a workforce housing unit prior to selling said unit without income restrictions if such sale is to occur after the affordability period noted above in § 200-38.4E(5)(a) with the following stipulations:

[1] The resale price which the Township or its designee shall pay the owner of the workforce housing unit(s) shall be no less than that calculated in § 200-38.4E(9) below;

[2] The Township or its designee shall be given a period of 90 days to execute a purchase agreement for said unit(s).

[3] Upon reaching the end of the ninety-day resale period or upon notice by the municipality or its designee that there is no interest in the workforce housing unit, the owner will be free to sell the unit.

(6) Calculation of rental prices. Workforce housing units which are to be rented shall have a rental price which is affordable to households which earn 65% or less of the area median income, with the exception of those housing units which have a rent-to-own option pursuant to § 200-38.4E(11). Affordability shall be determined as monthly housing expenses being no greater than 30% of the household gross monthly income based upon household size assumptions noted in § 200-38.4E(10). Monthly housing expenses shall be calculated as the sum total of the monthly rent, plus the current utility allowance per the Housing Authority of Centre County.

(7) Rental price increases. Annual rent increases shall be limited to the percentage increase in the median household income within the State College Metropolitan Statistical Area—Centre County pursuant to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Income Limits.

(8) Calculation of sales prices. Workforce housing units which are to be sold shall have a sale price which is affordable to households which earn 100%–120% or less of the area median income. Affordability shall be determined as monthly housing expenses being no greater than 30% of the household gross monthly income based upon household size assumptions. Monthly housing expenses shall be calculated as the sum total of the principal and interest of the mortgage plus all property taxes, homeowners' insurance, homeowners' association fees, and any other fees approved for inclusion by the Township.

(9) Resale value of workforce housing units. The resale value of a workforce housing unit(s) during the affordability period stipulated in § 200-38.4E(5)(a) shall be limited to the lowest of:

(a) The purchase price plus an increase based on the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index for the State College Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) for all urban consumers since the date of previous purchase; or

(b) The purchase price plus an increase, based on the percentage increase in the area median income since the date of purchase; or
(c) The purchase price plus an increase, based upon the compound average growth rate of Centre Region average house sale prices since the date of purchase; or

(d) The fair market value.

(10) Household size assumption. In calculating rent or sales price of a workforce housing unit, the following maximum relationship between unit size and assumed household size to determine income affordability shall apply:

(a) Efficiency units: one-person household.

(b) All other units: one plus number of bedrooms equal number of persons per household.

(11) Rent to own. Workforce housing units which are part of a rent-to-own program may be rented to households who earn more than 65%, but less than 100%, 120%, of the AMI subject to the following:

(a) The minimum duration of the initial term of a lease for renting the workforce housing unit shall be for no less than an initial 12 months followed by the ability to be annually renewed. In addition the duration of the lease may be shortened upon the tenant entering into an option to purchase the workforce housing unit.

(b) The owner of the workforce housing unit(s) must also enter into an agreement with the tenant of the rent-to-own unit which will specify the terms of the program.

(c) The rent-to-own agreement between the owner and the renter of the workforce housing unit shall include provisions for a percentage of the rent to be set aside and utilized towards the purchase of the unit by the renter.

(d) The rent-to-own agreement shall be provided to the Township for review to determine if the rent-to-own terms will lead to an acceptable number of renters succeeding in obtaining ownership of the workforce housing unit.

F. Administration. College Township and/or its designee shall ensure compliance with all regulations contained herein and/or Chapter 180, Subdivision of Land, and Chapter 200, Zoning. The developer shall draft and submit for approval a legally binding agreement which states the responsibilities of all entities involved with the ongoing administration, and marketing of, and compliance with these regulations upon approval of a development containing workforce housing units. College Township shall reserve the right to designate another legal entity for the purpose of administrative needs of this section of who should be a party in all legally binding agreements required in this section.
MEMORANDUM

To: College Township Planning Commission
From: Dustin Best, Council Chair
Re: Council Remand: Workforce Housing Ordinance
Date: November 16, 2023

OBJECTIVES:
As a practice, Township Staff provides Council with periodic reviews of both the interpretation and application of pertinent ordinances. This exercise is done to ensure these ordinances meet their desired intent and continue to be appropriate for current community development needs. The most recent ordinance to undergo such a review is Chapter 200 Zoning, Section 38.4, Workforce Housing Ordinance.

Ensuring that our workforce has access to affordable housing is a key policy of this Council. This ordinance’s application is intended to do so in a way that provides a meaningful impact on the community and economic development needs of both College Township and the Centre Region.

Council is appreciative of Planning Commission’s experience and expertise. As such, we are remanding the Workforce Housing Ordinance with the intent that Planning Commission will take their time and offer careful consideration on both the “why” and “how” behind the ordinance’s eventual application. Council is providing the following Objectives that are to be addressed during the development of any recommendations pertaining to the ordinance:

Objectives:

1) Ensure that current ordinance and any recommended revisions thereof are both consistent and upholding of the new Purpose and Intent Statements.

2) The current ordinance addresses development of both rental and owner-occupied workforce housing, but does not provide a clear distinction in terms of ordinance implementation between those two specific housing types.
   
   Evaluate and, where appropriate, provide recommendations on how to better provide for separate, but parallel, paths for development of rental and owner-occupied workforce housing units under the ordinance.

3) The Area Median Income (AMI) in the region has increased over the past two years, which has a direct impact on the development of units for the targeted demographic and overall implementation of the ordinance.

   Review the current AMI data and application of ranges within the Workforce Housing Ordinance to ensure that it is appropriately allowing for development of units for the targeted demographic in both the rental and owner-occupied paths.

4) When originally adopted, the ordinance was crafted to offer incentives in terms of reductions in open space requirements and necessary infrastructure to encourage development of workforce housing units. However, when the ordinance was amended to become inclusionary, the incentives remained without any revisions.

   Review the incentives outlined in the current ordinance and offer recommendations on whether those incentives should be altered given the ordinance’s inclusionary nature and goal to ensure that neighborhoods remain equitable in terms of basic amenities.

The balance of this remand letter will serve to provide Planning Commission additional context on the newly developed Purpose and Intent Statements and provide a recommended process to aid in completion of the Objectives.
PURPOSE & INTENT STATEMENTS:
While the intent was implied during the original passage of the Workforce Housing Ordinance in 2009 and its subsequent amendment, it is nevertheless notable that the current ordinance is lacking both a Purpose and Intent Statement.

As with the revisions to the Residential Rental Ordinance, College Township Council recently established the new Purpose and Intent Statements below for the Workforce Housing Ordinance:

**Purpose Statement:**
Consistent with College Township’s adopted Vision, Mission, and Goals Statements, the purpose of the Workforce Housing segment (Section 200.38.4) of the Zoning Ordinance is to establish and maintain housing affordability within College Township.

**Intent Statement:**
The Intent of the Workforce Housing segment (Section 200.38.4) of the Zoning Ordinance is to:

1) Recognize the importance of socioeconomic diversity in nurturing more inclusive and dynamic neighborhoods.
2) Facilitate the provision of affordable and attainable rental and owner-occupied workforce housing options within College Township.
3) Place a strong emphasis on crafting sustainable, enduring solutions to housing challenges, including the implementation of long-term affordability requirements.
4) Foster collaborative efforts with neighboring municipalities to establish regional consistency in workforce housing ordinances.
5) Promote private sector investments in affordable housing through partnerships between local government and private developers aimed at constructing affordable housing units.
6) Implement incentives to promote the creation and maintenance of workforce housing.
7) Safeguard rental and owner-occupied workforce housing options within the community, enabling individuals and families with moderate to middle incomes* to reside proximate to their workplaces.
   *Specific targeted ranges to be determined for both rental and owner-occupied options, but will likely fall somewhere between 65-120% AMI.
8) Continuously monitor the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Area Median Income (AMI), adjusting the AMI thresholds in the ordinance to accommodate annual increases or decreases.

RECOMMENDED PROCESS:
Recognizing the complexity of both the topic of this ordinance and the work being requested through this remand letter, Council suggests the following review tasks be undertaken prior to commencing work on the Objectives:

**Suggested tasks to be completed prior to ordinance evaluation:**

1) Review the Purpose and Intent Statements as developed by Council and seek clarification from Council as needed.
2) Review the specific terms and definitions applicable within the current ordinance and consider new definitions that should be incorporated.
3) Conduct a detailed review the “continuum of affordable housing” to fully understand the distinctions between attainable, affordable and workforce housing.
4) Review the various applications of Area Median Income (AMI) as it pertains to the respective segments of the continuum of housing. Please note that Council is targeting this ordinance toward development of units for the workforce or “missing middle” demographic.
5) Review the definition of “inclusionary” and how it applies to College Township’s Workforce Housing Ordinance.

SCHEDULE:
Upon completion of the recommended review tasks outlined above, Council requests that Planning Commission and staff begin working on the Objectives, as outlined on Page 1 of this letter, with the goal to provide recommendations on the Workforce Housing Ordinance prior to end of the first quarter of 2024.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
<th>Staff/Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                    | Interim Zoning Changes in Dale Summit             | Ordinance enacted.      | **Newly enacted code can be found here.**  
Zoning Ordinance update permitting Multi-family uses in the PRBD via Conditional Use                                                      | Staff        |
|                    | Interim Zoning Changes in Dale Summit             |                         |                                                                                                                                             |              |
| Week Ending        | Dale Summit Area Plan Preparation                 | Joint Meeting #1 Held   | **Provide any edits/changes to Plan to DPZ.**  
*If the Planning Commission or Council have identified any grammatical errors or other items in the Plan which you feel need attention, please send those to staff.* | Staff / PC / CTC |
| March 29, 2024     | Dale Summit Area Plan Preparation                 | Wednesday, January 24,  |                                                                                                                                             |              |
|                    |                                                   | 2024 C-NET Recording    |                                                                                                                                             |              |
|                    | Dale Summit Form Based Code Preparation           | Joint Meeting #2.       | **Coordinate with DPZ, regarding meeting logistics.**                                                                                     | Staff / PC / CTC |
|                    |                                                   | March 26, 2024 C-NET    |                                                                                                                                             |              |
|                    |                                                   | Recording               |                                                                                                                                             |              |
|                    | DPZ CoDesign                                      | Staff met with DPZ      | **Staff to work with Council on the preparation of a Remand Letter, which will outline a process to move forward with the review of the Form Based Code by the Planning Commission** | Staff / PC / CTC |
|                    |                                                   | prior to the Joint      |                                                                                                                                             |              |
|                    |                                                   | meeting. Discussed      |                                                                                                                                             |              |
|                    |                                                   | moving forward and      |                                                                                                                                             |              |
|                    |                                                   | prepared a timeline for |                                                                                                                                             |              |
|                    |                                                   | keeping on task.        |                                                                                                                                             |              |
COLLEGE TOWNSHIP COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, March 7, 2024
1481 E. College Avenue, State College PA 16801
Hybrid Meeting (In-Person or via Zoom)

ATTENDED BY –
COUNCIL:
L. Eric Bernier, Vice Chair
D. Richard Francke
Susan Trainor
Tracey Mariner

STAFF:
Adam T. Brumbaugh, Township Manager/Secretary
Don Franson, P.E., P.L.S., Township Engineer
Robert T. Long, Finance Director
Amy Kerner, P.E., Public Works Director
Lindsay Schoch, Principal Planner
Jennifer Snyder, CGA, Assistant Township Secretary

ABSENT:
Dustin Best, Chair

CALL TO ORDER: In the absence of Chair Dustin Best, Mr. L. Eric Bernier, Council Vice Chair, called to order the March 7, 2024, regular meeting of the College Township (CT) Council at 7:06 PM and led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

ANNOUNCEMENT: Chair Bernier announced that Council met in an Executive Session to discuss a personnel and legal matter.

PUBLIC OPEN DISCUSSION: No Open Discussion Items brought forward.

NEW AGENDA ITEMS: No New Agenda Items were added to the agenda.

SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS:

SP-1 Centre County Adult Services

Ms. Caitlin Gabriel, Housing Program Specialist, Centre County Office of Adult Services, offered a presentation to Council regarding the Point in Time Count, Housing Program Specialist changes, and Adult Services Program Updates.

Point in Time (PIT) is a count of sheltered and unsheltered people experiencing homelessness on a single night in January, typically during the third week. Ms. Gabriel offered that volunteers from nine agencies participated in the PIT count in 2024. She offered that when individuals experiencing homelessness are found, they have put together small care packages to offer to them. During the 2024 PIT count, they identified 14 individuals who may suffer from homelessness. The counts for shelter homelessness are still being processed.
Ms. Gabriel reported the outreach efforts by the CC Office of Adult Services. In 2023, 67 letters were sent to Municipalities, School Districts and agencies, to obtain leads and offer an explanation of Adult Services. A follow up email was sent to offer one on one meetings and to explain their services. College Township was one of three who responded and a presentation was scheduled.

Ms. Gabriel offered information regarding the changes to the role of Housing Program Specialist. As the Housing Program Specialist, she will no longer be doing direct client support. Clients can contact the main office or contact the Intake Specialist – Case Manager for support.

Ms. Gabriel offered an overview of the services offered through the Office of Adult Services including the Emergency Rental Assistance Program, Rental Assistance Program, Emergency Solutions Grant – Homelessness Prevention Program, Case Management, and the Whole Home Repair Program.

Council asked for clarification on ages of services. Adults aged 18 – 59 are served by the Office of Adult Services. Office of Aging serves those 60 and over and the Youth Service Bureau serves those under the age of 18.

REPORTS:

a. Manager’s Update

Mr. Adam Brumbaugh, Township Manager, offered the CT Water Authority discussed the Solar Power Purchase Agreement (SPPA) at their March 6, 2024, meeting. He added that the CTWA committed 50 % of their electricity to the SPPA. Final documents for the SPPA should be ready for signatures in late April or early May.

Mr. Brumbaugh also reported that no payment has been received to-date per the Township’s Solicitors letter from the Aspen Heights Partners. Mr. Brumbaugh offered that they are in discussions as to the next steps.

b. COG Regional, County, Liaisons Reports

CT Industrial Development Authority (CTIDA): Ms. Trainor reported the CTIDA met on February 21, 2024, and heard a new member orientation by Executive Director Ms. Keri Miller, Three new authority members were introduced, which makes a full complement on the Authority.

Centre County Metropolitan Planning Organization (CCMPO): Mr. Bernier reported the CCMPO Coordinating Committee met on February 27, 2024, and held officer election for 2024; heard an update on the State College Area Connector Project; CCPCDO Bridge Bundle; and major projects in Centre County. The CCMPO received the 2024 CCMPO Work plan and the 2023-2026 Centre County Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) revisions. Additional discussion took place regarding Electric Vehicle and Charging Infrastructure and the CCMPO Subcommittees for 2024.

Emergency Management Services Legislative Breakfast: Ms. Trainor attended the EMS Legislative Breakfast held on March 7, 2024. They discussed Centre LifeLink and their membership campaign. They are starting a workforce development initiative to start Jr. High and High School students thinking about careers in emergency services.

COG Facilities Committee: Mr. Bernier reported the COG Facilities Committee met on March 5, 2024, and discussed the 2025-2029 Capital Improvement and the Capital Improvement Plan Finance and Executive Committee requests. They also discussed Staff’s decision to delay the recruitment and hiring of a new Facilities Administrator until after a new COG Executive Director is in place.
COG Public Safety Committee: Ms. Trainer offered that Mr. Francke attended the Safety Committee meeting in her absence. He reported they met on February 27, and discussed the Fire Inspector/Firefighter position, reviewed future activities matrix, and received an update from COG Staff.

Mr. Brumbaugh added information about the Fire Inspectors/Firefighter job description which was reviewed by the COG Public Safety and Human Resource Committees and approved to go forward with recruitment. Mr. Brumbaugh added there have been some issues with the review of the job descriptions by the Labor Council. This will delay recruitment.

c. Staff/Planning Commission/Other Committees

Mr. Fenton, Planning Commission Liaison to Council offered that the PC met on March 5, 2024, and continued their discussion of Affordable Housing and offered recommended changes to the ordinance.

d. Diversity, Equity, Inclusion & Belonging (DEIB) Reports (Public Invited to Report)

Mr. Brumbaugh, Township Manager, offered the following are recognized in the month of March:

- National Nutrition Month
- National Kidney Month
- Women’s History Month
- March 4 - 8: National School Breakfast Week
- March 4: World Obesity Day
- March 8: International Women’s Day
- March 10 - 16: Sleep Awareness Week
- March 14: World Kidney Day
- March 15: World Sleep Day

CONSENT AGENDA:

CA-1 Minutes, Approval of
  a. February 15, 2024, Regular Meeting

CA-2 Correspondence, Receipt/Approval of
  a. Letter from Central PA 4th Fest, dated February 29, 2024, regarding contribution
  b. Letter from ClearWater Conservancy, dated February 23, 2024, regarding Watershed Cleanup Day 2024
  c. Email from Ned Brokloff, dated March 3, 2024, regarding resignation from Parks and Recreation Committee

CA-3 Action Item, Approval
  a. Resolution R-24-15 A203 Residential Rental Fee Schedule
  b. Resolution R-24-16 April as Safe Digging Month
  c. Reappointment to the Building and Housing Board of Appeals, Brain Walker, PE, (Three-Year Term, April 1, 2024 – March 30, 2027; Appointment to the Building and Housing Board of Appeals, Heather Fink, R.A. (Three-Year Term, April 1, 2024 – March 30, 2027)
  d. Letters of support to Federal Legislators regarding ClearWater Conservancy’s Community Conservation Center

Ms. Trainor made a motion to approve the March 7, 2024, Consent Agenda minus CA-3.d.
Ms. Mariner seconded the motion.
Motion carried unanimously.

Council offered that CA-3.d. was misplaced on the Consent Agenda. It should have been captured in section CA-2 correspondence; receipt of /approval of, and pulled to discuss before approving the requested support letters.

Mr. Francke made a motion to approve CA-3.d. and sending the support letters to federal legislators for ClearWater Conservancy’s Community Conservation Center. Ms. Trainor seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS:

OB-1 No Old Business items on the agenda

NEW BUSINESS:

NB-1 College Township Finance Report

Mr. Robert Long, Finance Director, offered a 2023 Year-End Finance Report. He introduced the Finance Department Staff, years of service and job title; the outside financial partners; and the tasks assigned to the Finance Department.

Mr. Long reported the General Fund revenue year-end actual vs. budget report shows $545,000 over the budgeted amount. The Township received $210,000 more over budget for Charges/Fees for Services and $215,000 more from Impact Fees. The General Fund expenditures year-end actual vs. budget reports $105,000 under budget.

In 2023, the Township collected $2,752,456 in Property Tax with $18,241 or .64% of assessed value being turned over to the Tax Claim Bureau. Lastly, Mr. Long shared the 2023 investment the Township made in equipment and infrastructure, the largest being for maintenance of vehicles and equipment which amounted to $582,000. The Pike Street Traffic Calming came in second at $448,000.

Mr. Brumbaugh thanked Mr. Long for his service to the Township and his leadership in the Finance Department. He added that the outstanding rate of collection for Property Tax is compliment to the residents and home owners of College Township.

NB-2 Memorandum of Understanding University Drive Pedestrian Signal

Mr. Don Franson, P.E., P.L.S., Township Engineer, offered that the Pennsylvania State University is seeking to install a mid-block pedestrian crossing at University Drive. The location is an area where there is a significant number of pedestrians crossing without the benefit of a designated crossing. For improved safety, PSU is proposing to install the crosswalk with Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFB).

Mr. Franson added that University Drive is not a Township owned roadway, however, CT will be responsible for the maintenance of the RRFB and associated facilities in perpetuity just as CT is responsible for traffic signals at University Drive. PSU will be responsible for the crossing, sidewalks, ADA ramps, electrical wiring, and pavement markings. The road itself is a PennDOT road and they are responsible for maintenance of the road.
Mr. Richard Manning, PSU Design Services, offered that a traffic pedestrian study met the warrant for a mid-block crossing. The timeline for construction is summer 2024.

A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between CT and PSU detailing the items each entity would be responsible for was reviewed by the Township Solicitor. Council is asked to approve and execute the MOU.

Mr. Francke made a motion to authorize the Township Manager to sign and execute the Memorandum of Understanding between College Township and Penn State University for the University Drive Mid-Block Pedestrian crossing and signal. Ms. Mariner seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

NB-3  Allowable Uses – General Industrial Zoning District (I-1)

Ms. Lindsay Schoch, AICP, Principal Planner, offered that in the past few weeks, Staff has been made aware of two uses in the General Industrial Zoning District which are not currently permitted; a church, which is classified as a Place of Assembly, and a boxing gym, which is classified as an Indoor Recreational Facility. Neither of these two uses conform to the current General Industrial Zoning District ordinance regulations. Staff contacted the property owner to inform them of the violations.

With the ongoing effort to change the zoning in the Dale Summit from Euclidean to Form Based Zoning, Staff considered these non-conforming uses and the opportunity this presents to allow these uses in the General Industrial Zoning District. These uses will most likely be permitted and acceptable in this area with the change to Form Based Zoning.

Staff reached out to the Township Solicitor regarding the matter. The Solicitor prepared a memo with his opinion outlining two options to consider. Option one, Council may remand to the PC with the intent to include Place of Assembly and Indoor Recreation Facility to the permitted use chart in the General Industrial (I-1) Zoning District or Option two, do nothing and allow the Zoning Officer to issue enforcement notices to the property owner. Once the property owners are notified of enforcement, the Township Solicitor may work with the property owner’s attorney to request a one-year continuance on scheduling a Zoning Hearing for a variance, which is what would be required to remedy the non-conforming use.

Mr. Gabrovsek, College Township Zoning Officer, offered that yet another owner of a property in the Industrial district contacted him with a zoning request change this past week. This property owner is in attendance via zoom. Mr. Gabrovsek offered that he discussed this at-length with the Solicitor. Should this issue be turned over for enforcement, Mr. Gabrovsek opined that he does not feel comfortable with any continuance past one-year should the owners apply for a Zoning Hearing.

Council discussed the cost associated with the two options presented. Staff clarified the process of enforcement and the Zoning Hearing Board. Council discussed the amenities that the Industrial District typically does not offer compared to other zoning districts, like sidewalks, street lights, etc., and how allowing these requested uses could potentially devalue other zoning districts.

After discussion, a consensus of Council opted to take no action. No action would require Mr. Gabrovsek to contact the building owner and start enforcement of the non-conformity in the Industrial District.

Ms. Sean Houts, College Township resident, property owner, asked that Council reconsider their position. He offered that there is underserved need in the sports community for buildings with high enough ceilings.
that are cost sensible. He opined this is an opportunity to connect the youth in sports to a sense of community.

**STAFF INFORMATIVES:** No *Staff Informatives* were pulled for discussion.

**OTHER MATTERS:**

Council was reminded of the Joint Meeting with the Planning Commission to take place on March 26 at 6:00 PM as the official Kick-Off of the Dale Summit Area Revitalization. The CCATO Annual Spring Convention will take place on Wednesday, March 27, 2024, at the Central Pennsylvania Institute of Technology at 5:00 PM.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Chair Bernier called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

    Ms. Mariner moved to adjourn the March 7, 2024, Regular College Township Council Meeting.
    Chair seconded the motion.

The March 7, 2024, Regular College Township Council Meeting was adjourned at 9:27 PM.

Respectfully Submitted By,

    Adam T. Brumbaugh

Adam T. Brumbaugh
Township Secretary