

University of Pittsburgh
Institutional Master Plan
Public Meeting No. 3
April 16, 2019
MEETING MINUTES

PRESENTERS

Ron Leibow
Nat Grier (VHB)

DOCUMENTED NOTES

1. Is Parking/TIS limited to the boundary of the study, i.e. Bates Street?
 - a. Yes, because the IMP does not anticipate or control change beyond /not within University's control
2. Will construction on Hill include competition (athletic) venues? Increased spectators?
 - a. New Lacrosse field
 - b. Cap is a replacement
3. What is the ability for the University to address traffic issues beyond the study limits?
 - a. Enhancement – neighborhood enhancement strategies
 - b. Multiple entities dealing with different areas and issues
 - c. IMP documents impact of development on existing conditions
4. Concern of growth at 1% year over year and pressure placed on neighborhood parking and walking
 - a. Process to police illegal parking?
 - b. Forum to discuss, process to identify solutions through dialogue
5. Intersection 31 to 33 back up not identified as even minor congestion –resident experience contradicts and expanded 28 through 35 resident experiences significant congestions and it is not reflected
 - a. Will recheck data
6. Seems problem may not be students but faculty/staff. Does study include UPMC?
 - a. All of those people/trips are being counted
 - b. UPMC/hospital unique with visitors who are not familiar with city routes, so they are a 3rd population
 - c. Vehicular path is not well marked
 - d. Vehicular comprehensive wayfinding will follow 1st priority of pedestrian wayfinding
7. Add disability access to “curb” management dialogue
8. Is the University leveraging partnership with shuttle service?
 - a. Community access to shuttle TBD
9. Shuttle service and transportation details and (recommended) solutions not in the IMP/presentation
 - a. Presentation too general
 - b. Analysis of routes/shuttles needed even though shuttles extend beyond TIS boundary

- c. Mobility section must be included in IMP and needs community input
10. Neighborhood Enhancement section of IMP needs to identify and recognize negative externalities
11. Bus route 71A service used to be limited to Oakland only – 71C or 71A may serve Oakland and not continue downtown
12. How is 2% SOV vs 98% walking student arrival calculated?
 - a. Survey and permits
 - b. Just because walking doesn't mean the students don't have cars
 - c. Compare traffic counts during to break time

ADDITIONAL NOTES

- Does the analysis track people outside of the EMI district? It does not
- CORRECTION: Indoor track will have 1,500 spectator seating
- During basketball games, Bates Street backs up to Bouquet Street.
- Better traffic management for events at the Pete.
- Report data after confirmed? Will in final report.
- Need to address existing parking conditions in the neighborhood; study residential parking; number of city permits issued to students.
- (Q) Student housing development should keep up with enrollment. Housing numbers new construction will be confirmed.
- There are negative externalities that come with the shuttle system and they need addressed.
- (Q) Confirm how the 97% of students that do not drive get to campus? Will confirm.
- Traffic study should be considered in between semesters too.
- The no net new parking commitment does not help and may increase parking in the neighborhood.
- (Q) The Port Authority circulator stopped because of Pitt shuttle? Needs confirmed.