

**City of Alexandria
Transportation Management Plan
Special Use Permit Program
Review**

Final Report
April 2008

Prepared for:
City of Alexandria, VA and
Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments

Prepared by:
Nelson | Nygaard
consulting associates

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
Existing Conditions	1
Best Practices.....	2
Stakeholder Focus Groups.....	3
Analysis and Conclusions – Program Recommendations	4
DETAILED SUMMARY OF TASKS.....	6
Task 1 – Review Existing Program Conditions	6
Task 2 – Best Practices Review	13
Task 3 – Stakeholder Focus Groups	37
Task 4 – Analysis and Conclusions	49
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS.....	58
Policy Goals.....	58
Program Structure and Implementation – Consolidation and Options	58
Program Focus – Emphasize Results over Process.....	58
Non-Compliance Enforcement.....	59

Table of Figures

Figure 1: Annual TMP/SUP Funding	11
Figure 2: Initial List of Peer Programs	14
Figure 3: Final List of Peer Programs.....	14
Figure 4: Arlington's TDM Program Matrix.....	25
Figure 5: Employer TMP's	33
Figure 6: Performance Review	37
Figure 7: Consolidation Model Alternatives for Existing and New TMP's	54

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In December, 2007 the City of Alexandria, with funding provided by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments initiated a four-month review of the City of Alexandria's Transportation Management Plan Special Use Permit (TMPSUP) program. The project consisted of four major tasks:

- Review of Existing Conditions
- Review of Best Practices
- Focus Group Discussions
- Analysis and Conclusions

Following is a summary of the results of these tasks.

Existing Conditions

The review of existing TMPSUP program conditions was largely based on documents, data, and other information provided by the City of Alexandria to the Project Team, including:

- The program's originating ordinance in the City Code;
- Sample TMP's; and
- Reports and surveys including Semi-Annual Fund Reports, Residential and Commercial Surveys, and TMP Annual Reports.

Program Summary

- The program is one of the oldest in the country – in effect for over 20 years.
- The program covers all land uses.
- The program is triggered based on proposed development for aggregate usable square footage of:
 - 50,000 or more for commercial and/or professional office uses;
 - 40,000 or more for retail sales uses;
 - 150,000 or more for industrial uses; or
 - 250 or more for residential uses.

Developments that reach the requirement thresholds outlined above must receive an approved TMP/SUP before it can receive a building permit. Applications for the TMP/SUP must include: general information on the nature and ownership of the proposed development; a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) of the proposed use; and a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) designed to mitigate any negative impacts projected in the TIS.

TMP's are further required to include a number of key program elements:

- Production of annual reports summarizing TMP activities and funding;
- Annual surveys capturing tenant transportation behavior; and
- TMP Fund maintenance, contributions, and administration.

Key Issues

Existing program conditions identified as key issues to be addressed through the study included:

- Residential Participation – especially the “disconnect” between the developer that enters into the TMP contract and the eventual building owners that are bound by it without having given their explicit consent;
- TMP Funds and contribution levels;
- Ensuring that TMP contributions are spent appropriately and effectively; and
- The site-specific focus of TMP’s vs. incorporation into districts.

Best Practices

The next major task was a review of long-standing, effective programs similar in scope, nature, and intention to the TMPSUP. Neighboring Arlington County, Virginia and Montgomery County, Maryland provided two regional examples of such programs that have gained wide-spread attention and praise. Additionally, programs established by the City of Cambridge, Massachusetts were reviewed.

Available literature was reviewed to provide an introduction to each program, while interviews were conducted with key program staff to identify practices specifically instructive to the situation in Alexandria. The following are the three standout practices identified during this review.

Arlington County – Voluntary, Incentivized Participation

The voluntary, incentivized participation approach utilized by Arlington County, known as the Site Plan Review Process, provides a unique strength to its program in the form of increased leverage. Developers enter into the program in order to receive highly-valued density bonuses for their projects; this provides the County leverage to seek appropriately aggressive TDM concessions. That roughly 90% of development in recent years has gone through the Site Plan Review process indicates that this leverage has allowed the County to achieve progressive levels of TDM commitments while encouraging high levels of development directed toward its transit corridors.

Montgomery County – District Focus

Montgomery County’s emphasis on mitigating vehicular congestion at the district level provides a useful example of “right-sizing” as a program’s focus. By concentrating on key commercial corridors at high levels of congestion-risk, the County’s program allows it to expend its resources where success is most critical. At the same time, district-wide performance targets broaden the focus beyond individual sites, and reinforce the most critical measure of success – district level congestion mitigation.

Cambridge – Residential Inclusion

Cambridge’s A19 process represents a direct attempt to include residential development in the City’s traffic mitigation efforts. This process has revealed challenges for incorporating traditionally commute-oriented strategies at residential sites. Effective

inclusion of such sites has been shown to require creative solutions in identifying strategies for a new kind of participant.

Stakeholder Focus Groups

For the next task, Nelson\Nygaard led a series of interviews and focus group discussions with stakeholders involved with the City's TMPSUP program, including:

- City of Alexandria Department of Transportation and Environmental Services staff;
- City of Alexandria Department of Planning and Zoning staff;
- City of Alexandria City Attorney's office
- Real estate developers with TMPSUP experience and/ or their attorneys;
- Representatives from commercial and office developments with on-going TMPSUP obligations; and
- Representatives from residential developments with on-going TMPSUP obligations.

Combined, these interviews and focus group discussions provided a spectrum of feedback from the perspectives of program administrators and participants regarding current program structure and function – as well as how the program could better serve its stated goals, and perhaps whether those goals remain appropriate. Key findings include:

Generally developers view the program benignly, feeling at worst it is a necessary evil. It was specifically stated that the program was appreciated for not being an anti-development program. It was also clear that Alexandria is a sufficiently attractive real estate market to make it worth the added obligations of the program. Some developers were finding that within the local real estate market, it has become possible to sell the program's obligations as a "green" amenity to prospective tenants.

Current non-residential development participants have had a wide range of experiences with the program. Some have found that the program guided them toward developing programs and services that their tenants have come to value — to the point that the program managers fund these programs beyond their TMP obligations and would continue them regardless of continued TMP obligations. Others expressed the need for more guidance from the City on what is expected of them beyond annual reports and surveys. Difficulties seem particularly significant where buildings have had a high rate of turnover in management.

City staff involved in the program expressed strong optimism for the program's potential to be more effective. Interest in consolidating TMP's into TMP districts was particularly keen. Among staff, however there were different views about whether the program should focus on performance measures or compliance with current funding and implementation obligations. The City Attorney's staff noted particular interest in broadening current compliance measures to better match consequences to levels of non-compliance.

Residential development tenants expressed strong opposition to their program obligations. Opposition was expressed over both the financial obligations and the time and labor commitments required to administer their own TMP's. Further frustration was also expressed over the difficulty in finding appropriate ways to invest their TMP funds – noting a consistent disconnect between what residents were interested in funding and what the City found appropriate. Many stated that it was futile to attempt to reduce driving rates where they lived, citing the relative affluence and/or age of residents, distance to transit, or location of primary employment sites.

Analysis and Conclusions – Program Recommendations

Nelson\Nygaard analyzed all task findings to identify a comprehensive set of recommended program improvements. Key recommendations include:

Policy Goals

It is recommended that the City broaden its TMPSUP program goals and objectives to include reduced VMT and the many benefits tied to the current official goal of reducing VMT and peak congestion conditions, such as:

- Environmental benefits: improved air quality, reduced carbon emissions, reduced noise pollution;
- Improved roadway conditions: shorter travel times on local roads (for transit and private vehicles), fewer barriers to walking and biking, and reduced roadway wear and tear;
- Livability: improving the attractiveness of Alexandria as a Smart Growth community; and
- Social-Capital: community-building benefits of increased walking, biking, carpooling, and transit use.

This broadening of program goals and objectives would expand opportunities for quantifying program achievements, while underscoring the rationale for including residential developments in the program.

Program Structure and Implementation – Consolidation and Program Options

It is recommended that the City facilitate TMP consolidation by offering various TMP models and options to better fit the variety of affected developments. The recommended process can be summed up in three steps:

1. All new TMP's are organized into TMP Districts (non-residential uses), or a pay-only model (residential uses) that directly supports consolidated TMP Districts.
2. Develop program options to better fit conditions of each existing TMP development – TMP District, TMA, or pay-only.
3. Attract existing TMP's into a consolidated or a pay-only model.

Program Focus – Emphasize Results over Process

It is recommended that the City shift from its current focus on program processes (setting funding levels, ensuring compliance with surveying and investment requirements at each TMP) to mandating outcomes (setting broad performance targets on the District/TMA level). To do so, the City should identify specific performance targets for each TMP District and TMA. Meeting these targets then becomes the primary compliance focus for the City.

TMP District staff and TMA administrators would then be freed to set funding, investment, survey, and reporting obligations for each participant as means for achieving performance targets – increasing obligations for under-performers and decreasing obligations for high-achievers. With such a change, participants will gain autonomy while the City gains accountability — as well as improved, goal-oriented program performance.

Non-Compliance Enforcement

Focusing on performance measures and targets, along with effective consolidation, will address many identified compliance enforcement issues and offer the following improvements for the City’s compliance efforts:

- Consolidation of compliance monitoring responsibilities via monitoring all program activities through the TMP District staff;
- Single-source of information for participants on both compliance requirements and non-compliance responses (TMP District staff or TMA); and
- Reduced compliance measures as the primary area of compliance becomes explicit targets.

Consolidation and accountability also add a number of new compliance tools, including:

- Performance accountability as TMP District staff will be able to adjust annual TMP plans to reflect prior-year compliance levels. For instance, a TMP District can require an employer that failed to submit an acceptable volume of completed surveys to hire an outside firm to either complete surveys or conduct driveway counts in the following year’s TMP plan.
- The TMA which would essentially be extended on credit. The potential dissolution of any TMA becomes the main incentive for participants’ compliance.

A table summarizing recommendations and the issues and opportunities identified during the TMPSUP review that they address is provided as an appendix to this report.

DETAILED SUMMARY OF TASKS

The following sections provide a detailed summary of each project task, including a more detailed review of all final recommendations, beginning with the review of existing program conditions.

Task I – Review Existing Program Conditions

Implemented as Ordinance No. 3204, the Transportation Management Plan Special Use Permit (TMP/SUP) program was enacted by the Alexandria City Council on May 16, 1987 and is now part of the *Alexandria Zoning Code* (Chapter 6, Title 7). The ordinance requires that proposed office, retail, residential, and industrial development projects which meet certain square footage thresholds submit a special use permit application including a Traffic Impact Study and a Transportation Management Plan.

All special use permit applications are considered by the Planning Commission and the City Council, with the City Council making final decision whether to approve the application. Any project requiring a Transportation Management Plan must receive a TMP/SUP before the project can proceed. Site plans and TMP/SUP applications must be submitted concurrently.

Purpose

The primary purpose of the TMP/SUP ordinance is to “**reduce peak traffic congestion resulting from development within the City.**”¹ The goals of the TMP are to:

- Reduce the proportion of single occupancy vehicle (SOV) trips;
- Increase the use of carpools, vanpools, and mass transit during the peak hour; and
- Spread the number of SOV trips outside of the peak hour.

The City’s administrators believe that traffic impacts must be mitigated to maintain the City’s attractiveness as a place to live and work. In this way, the TMP ordinance serves to maintain the viability of the city’s commercial centers and growth areas. Although the ordinance cannot directly address regional traffic problems, it can potentially have an important effect in mitigating localized traffic impacts. And, should the TMP ordinance be emulated and implemented by other jurisdictions, it can potentially contribute toward a regional approach to solving traffic congestion.²

TMP/SUP Triggers

Development proposals which include any of the following thresholds trigger the TMP/SUP process:

- Any individual building, structure, or complex of structures, with aggregate usable square footage of:

¹ City of Alexandria, “Administrative Guidelines Ordinance No. 3204”

² Ibid

- 50,000 or more for commercial and/or professional office uses;
- 40,000 or more for retail sales uses;
- 150,000 or more for industrial uses; or
- 250 or more for residential uses.
- Mixed-use buildings, if any building contains any of the uses listed above which cross the size threshold for that use.

Buildings constructed, or receiving final site plan approval, prior to May 16, 1987 are exempt from program requirements, unless expansion subsequent to this date results in developments that cross the above detailed thresholds.

Application

Developments that reach the requirement thresholds outlined above must receive an approved TMP/SUP before it can receive a building permit. Applications for the TMP/SUP must include: general information on the nature and ownership of the proposed development; a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) of the proposed use; and a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) designed to mitigate any negative impacts projected in the TIS.

The Traffic Impact Study

The extent of the TIS will vary depending on the location of the site and the size and nature of the project. The TMP must be prepared by a qualified transportation planner or traffic engineer, and may include some or all of the following elements, to be determined by the City:

- The streets and intersections to be included in the study;
- The adequacy of available traffic and turning movement counts and the need for additional data;
- The time period of the study (i.e., morning or evening peak period or both);
- The approximate trip generation rates of the proposed use;
- The directional distribution of the traffic generated by the proposed use;
- The modal split and vehicle occupancy assumption to be utilized in the study;
- The trends in the growth of traffic in the area but not generated by the proposed use;
- The transportation management programs operated by the city or other governmental units in the area of the proposed use, as well as the transportation management programs proposed for the area, to be considered in the study;
- The nature and level of public transit that will service the site of the proposed use;
- The years to be covered by the study;
- The intersection level of service analytical technique to be utilized in the study; and

- The identification of citizen and neighborhood associations whose membership will be proximately affected by the traffic and related impacts of the proposed use.³

Typical actions conducted for the TIS include:

- A field reconnaissance of site access opportunities and constraints;
- AM and PM peak traffic counts at key off-site intersections;
- Analysis of existing peak hour levels of service;
- Estimation of AM and PM peak hour trips generated by proposed development;
- Projection and analysis of key intersection levels of service, with and without proposed development; and
- Identification of road improvements required to accommodate projected demand.
- Compliance with the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) Traffic Impact Analysis Regulations which impose a fee based on the distance of the property line to a State maintained highway and the size of a project.

The Transportation Management Plan

The TMP is provided in narrative form and contains specific details and supporting documentation to ensure that the use will comply with the provisions of the TMP/SUP program. The TMP must be prepared by a qualified transportation planner or traffic engineer and must include a description of procedures to:

- Establish transportation activities to persuade SOV riders to switch to public transportation. These activities should be measured against a TMP percentage goal which is determined by demographic data and factors in the site's distance to Metro stations.
- Establish a fund to finance the transportation activities. The fund is calculated on an annual rate per unit or square foot and increases every year as per the Consumer Price Index (CPI) of the United States;
- Biannual fund reports should be submitted to the City's Office of Transit Services and Programs (OTS&P), detailing the expenses incurred and submitting supporting documentation;
- Restrict parking spaces to carpools and vanpool vehicles;
- Register carpool and vanpool vehicles with the City's OTS&P;
- Manage and supervise on-site parking facilities proposed for the use;
- Enforce the parking management aspects of the TMP; and
- Appoint a transportation coordinator for the proposed use to:
 - Administer its TMP and coordinate its activities with the (OTS&P);
 - Distribute, display and promote literature on regional transportation services;
 - Conduct and submit annual transportation surveys; and
 - Prepare and submit annual reports that discuss activities conducted during the year pursuant to the TMP and the effect of these activities in

³ City of Alexandria, Zoning Ordinance Article 11-700, 1997.

reducing traffic and related impacts of the use. The report should also include the activities planned for the coming year.

The TMP is further required to include a combination of some or all of the following elements:

- **Ride-sharing incentive programs** which may include activities to encourage and assist the formation of car, van, and bus pools. These can include: cash payments or subsidies, preferential parking charges and/or location, and other analogous incentive programs.
- Establish a carshare program with Zipcar. The TMP fund would reimburse a percentage in usage fees or pay for subsequent annual fees, given that the City of Alexandria already pays for the first time membership and application fees.
- **Public transit incentive programs** which may include:
 - Providing shuttle services connecting to public transit stops and providing midday and evening services to non-driving employees/tenants;
 - Subsidizing transit services;
 - Constructing transit shelters and amenities;
 - Constructing transit stations and related facilities;
 - Dedicating land for transit facilities;
 - Providing transit fare media subsidies and marketing programs; or
 - Providing other analogous incentive programs.
- **Funding for Recommended improvements in public transit** which serves the site of the proposed use.
- **Bicycle and pedestrian incentive measures** which may include the provision of bicycle parking and storage facilities, the construction and extension of bicycle paths and pedestrian walkways, the provision of shower and locker facilities and similar incentive features.
- In the case of office and industrial uses, **variable work hour**, telework, or **flex time**, programs under which employees working at the proposed use will stagger their work hours in order to reduce the amount of peak period traffic to/from the use which would otherwise occur.
- **Measures to reduce the reliance on single-occupancy vehicles** which may include:
 - Parking fees to discourage single-occupancy vehicles;
 - Time and other access restrictions to parking spaces in on-site parking facilities; or
 - Programs to support and encourage the utilization of alternative transportation modes.
- **Use and accessory use design options** which reduce reliance on single-occupancy vehicles such as the provision of less parking area than that required under the provisions of this ordinance, shared parking arrangements, the incorporation of residential units (in the case of proposed commercial uses) and other analogous design features.
- **Any other** technique or combination of techniques capable of reducing the traffic and related impacts of the proposed use.

- **Demonstration** that reasonable and practicable actions will be taken in conjunction with, and over the life of, the use which will produce a significant reduction in the traffic and related impacts of the use.

Approvals and Compliance

The City will approve an application for a special use permit if it determines that the applicant's TMP:

- Is in accord with the requirements of the TMP/SUP; and
- Together with any amendments deemed appropriate by council, demonstrates that reasonable and practicable actions will be taken that will produce a significant reduction in the traffic and transportation impacts of the use.

Any TMP/SUP granted by the City, unless revoked or expired, runs with the land and remains mandatory and binding upon the applicant, all owners of the land and all occupants and upon all of their heirs, successors and assigns. Any use authorized by a special use permit must be operated in conformity with such permit, and failure to so operate can be deemed grounds for revocation of such permit, after notice and hearing, by the city council. The City may attach conditions and requirements to the permit as it deems necessary to ensure that the TMP for the proposed use will be fully and continuously implemented throughout the life of the proposed use, unless revised or rescinded by City.

TMP Products and Establishing Performance Measures

One of the basic requirements of the program is conducting annual mode share surveys among tenants at each development subject to TMP/SUP conditions. This annual accumulation of mode split data represents a wealth of opportunities to track the effectiveness of the TMP/SUP program in general, as well as specific strategies implemented at each site. Yearly, systematic collection, analysis, and review of this data from each site will allow the City to track changes and shifts in transportation behavior at each site, within the program, and across the city — a vital performance measure for this program. Without this level of comprehensive analysis the City will be left only with “snapshots” of travel behavior at isolated sites.

TMP Funds

Tenants and/or owners of each site are required to contribute to, and manage, a fund for implementing their site's TMP measures. Figure 1 summarizes current levels of annual contribution, by land use.

Figure 1: Annual TMP/SUP Funding⁴

Use	Projects	Square Feet	Share %	Annual Funding	Share %
Office	16	7,143,266	63.6	\$1,129,836.74	47%
Office/ Retail	3	612,985	5.5	\$59,418.50	2%
Retail	16	2,845,999	25.3	\$290,243.94	12%
Warehouse	1	260,733	2.3	\$35,981.15	1%
Industrial	1	346,194	3.1	\$0.00	0%
Residential	30	13,312	0.1	\$810,157.01	34%
Hotel	3	NA	NA	\$73,500.00	3%
Day Care	1	4,500	0.0	\$450.00	0%
All	71	11,226,989	100%	\$2,399,587.34	100%

TMP Process Observations

The following sections present general observations about the current TMP process following a review of the following approved TMP's:

- Avalon at Cameron Court (1996);
- Mark Center (2004); and
- Madison Mixed Use Development (2007).

These issues raised by these observations are further explored in the analysis and conclusions deliverable of this study.

Common Strategies/Tactics

Common requirements among these TMP's include:

- Employing a manager/ coordinator for the plan to control its funds and promote its objectives;
- Contribution of funds – as stipulated by formulas based on development scale;
- Annual surveys – documenting resident/ tenant transportation behavior;
- Administering a ride-sharing program; and
- Annual reports – documenting TMP activities and assessing their effectiveness in addressing TMP objectives.

Targets

Within the last two years the City has been incorporating mode split targets in all TMP documents. From the list above, the Madison Mixed Use Development TMP was approved by Council on January 12, 2008 and has a target of no less than 50% non-single-occupant-vehicle (non-SOV) mode share. Such a target provides a clear basis upon which the effectiveness of future TMP activities can be measured.

⁴ City of Alexandria, Office of Transit Services and Programs

Non-Binding Commitments

Some of the commitments contained in these TMP's are obscured by non-binding language:

- "This TMP has been designed to be flexible and responsive to the inputs of these annual evaluations in prescribing... strategies and tactics to be implemented..."
- "Participating with other projects... and the City of Alexandria in the mutually agreed upon cooperative planning and implementation of TMP programs and activities..."
- "As dictated by demand, up to five (5) percent of the new parking spaces... will be reserved... for carpools and vanpools."
- "The... Company will, to the extent practicable..."

There also seems to be minimal to no direct reference to results of the Traffic Impact Study, which neglects stated aims of the TMP/SUP program.

Fund Control

Each TMP commits the property owners to contribute to a TMP fund, which is in turn to be used only to fund TMP strategies and tactics. There appears to currently be no specified process for ensuring that any funds are applied to strategies for meeting aims of the program or individual TMP's.

Each fund remains under the control of the participating development. One exception can be found in the Madison Mixed Use Development TMP, which states under the heading of "District Transit Management Program":

"As the area near the Braddock Road Metro Small Area redevelops, the City hopes to organize a District Transit Management Program in the area. The Madison development is expected to be part of this group when the group is organized."

The cited District Transit Management Program has yet to be established and implemented. The City, however, is including this concept in all new TMP's.

Format

It is our understanding that the format incorporated in the Madison TMP is a standardized format that has been in use for approximately two years. This format appears to be one which presents information clearly and is easily used by the City and the TMP holder. Other TMP's reviewed used a variety of formats, inconsistencies between which made review of these TMP's more difficult.

Task 2 – Best Practices Review

Project Context

The following review of Best Practices for mandatory, municipally administered Transportation Demand Management programs is conducted for the benefit of the City of Alexandria's Transportation Management Plan Special Use Permit program (TMPSUP). Implemented as Ordinance No. 3204, this program was enacted by the Alexandria City Council on May 16, 1987 in order to reduce the level of traffic congestion generated during peak commute times.

The ordinance requires that office, retail, residential, and industrial projects which meet certain square footage thresholds submit a special use permit application which must include a Traffic Impact Statement and a Transportation Management Plan that outlines strategies for mitigating the project's impact on peak traffic conditions.

Objectives of Best Practice Review

The purpose of the Best Practice Review, like that of the overall project, is to identify means by which the current program can become more effective in meeting its traffic reduction objectives and the City's quality of life goals. Specifically, the following review is intended to provide examples of successful program activities and achievements that may be reproducible within an improved TMPSUP program.

In addition to identifying general best practices, the City indicated that the review should address specific program areas that present unique challenges and/or opportunities for the TMPSUP. These include:

- Focusing on land uses at the development stage, in comparison to programs that focus on established land uses;
- Inclusion of residential developments – less common among programs focused on reducing “peak-hour” traffic and presents its own challenges and opportunities;
- Ensuring that TMP contributions are spent on implementing approved strategies;
- Advantages of one-time contribution payments versus annual fees;
- Specifying travel targets for TMP participants; and
- Organizing participants and their program activities into districts versus preserving individual autonomy of each development.

Selection of Best Practice Cities

Below is a brief summary of the process used to select “Best Practice” cities for the review.

Initial List (7)

Figure 2 identifies the initial set of trip reduction programs reviewed for selection.

Figure 2: Initial List of Peer Programs

Location	Name of Program/s
San Francisco, CA	Transit Impact Development Fee
Cambridge, MA	Parking & Transportation Demand Management Program and Article 19 – Project Special Review Permits
Arlington, VA	Site Plan Review Process
Seattle, WA	Commuter Trip Reduction Program
Montgomery County, MD	Transportation Management Districts
Bellevue, WA	"Commuter Trip Reduction Program" and "Growth and Transportation Efficiency Center"
Boulder, CO	Go Boulder

San Francisco’s impact fee was decided to be too narrowly focused to provide much useful information – beyond serving as an example of a development fee that directly funds broad transit improvements. The legality of such fees varies from state to state, limiting the applicability of many of the strategy’s details to Alexandria.

The City of Cambridge provides two useful case studies for the City of Alexandria in its Parking and Transportation Demand Management Program and its Article 19 – Project Special Review Permit Program. The first covers existing developments that add any amount of on-site parking while the second addresses new development by anticipating and requiring the mitigation of traffic impacts.

Arlington County’s Site Plan Review provides another useful program for the review. Not only is it recognized nationally as a Best Practice for municipal traffic reduction programs, its location proximate to the City of Alexandria provides useful contextual comparability. Arlington’s program also shares Alexandria’s focus on new development.

Successful programs in Boulder, Colorado as well as Seattle and Bellvue, Washington, were also considered for the following review. It was decided, however that the Transportation Management Districts Program in Montgomery, County, Maryland would provide a more useful comparison due to its regional proximity. Additionally, the organization of the program into four cohesive districts addressed the City’s interest in this concept of combining program resources to maximize benefits.

Final List

Figure 3 presents the final set of peer programs to be reviewed and the key program components that are anticipated to provide useful comparison for specific components of the Alexandria program.

Figure 3: Final List of Peer Programs

Location	Key Comparable Component/s
Cambridge, MA	Focus on New Development, Inclusion of Residential Uses
Arlington, VA	Focus on New Development, Inclusion of Residential Uses
Montgomery County, MD	Transportation Management Districts, Targets

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS



Background

The City of Cambridge established a Vehicle Trip Reduction Ordinance (VTRO) in 1992 to reduce overall auto trip impacts in the city. Out of this ordinance, the City has developed two new programs, one to mandate TDM participation at existing developments and one to cover new development projects — the City's Parking and Transportation Demand Management (PTDM) ordinance and its Article 19 process (A19), respectively.

The PTDM enjoys widespread support among the city council, city planners, the business community, and the public. This is most clearly evident by the Cambridge City Council's September 11, 2006 vote to eliminate the program's sunset clause in order to expand the positive impact of the program. The A19 program is newer and has just recently begun to affect residential developments.

Vehicle Trip Reduction Ordinance

In 1992, the Cambridge City Council passed the Vehicle Trip Reduction Ordinance as part of an effort to address community concerns about increasing traffic congestion and environmental pollution. The ordinance required the City government to begin implementing Transportation Demand Management strategies such as transit subsidies and bicycle parking that would reduce vehicle trips by City staff. The most significant

effort was led by the Environmental and Transportation Planning Division of the City's Community Development Department, which also began working cooperatively with citizens, businesses, and institutions in Cambridge and the Boston area to implement similar TDM benefits for their employees.

Parking & Transportation Demand Management (PTDM) Ordinance

In 1998, a formalized, mandated TDM program for businesses in Cambridge was approved by the City Council with the passage of the PTDM Ordinance (Section 10.18 of the *Cambridge Municipal Code*).

Participation Trigger

The PTDM Ordinance is triggered when any landowner in the City of Cambridge seeks any increase in the amount of off-street parking they maintain for non-residential uses. All landowners are required to register their parking with the City's Traffic, Parking & Transportation Department (TPTD) which has maintained a comprehensive inventory of all off-street parking facilities in Cambridge since 1971. The Director of TPTD determines if a building permit or parking license to increase registered parking has triggered the PTDM Ordinance and if so, sends notification to the landowner.

Compliance

Compliance with PTDM requires approval of a PTDM plan by a PTDM Planning Officer. Parking facilities with a total of 5 to 19 spaces are considered "small projects" and must implement three unique TDM measures from a toolbox of suggested TDM measures (see Appendix) – as a one-time implementation with no required monitoring or performance targets.

The list of specific measures is not documented in the ordinance, but is rather maintained and updated by the Planning Officer. Commonly implemented measures include:

- subsidized transit passes;
- information kiosks;
- bike racks;
- bike showers;
- car-sharing spaces;
- carpool spaces; and
- a guaranteed ride home program.

Projects that create facilities of 20 or more parking spaces are considered "large projects" and are subject to greater implementation and reporting requirements. Most significantly, most projects must commit to reducing their percentage of drive-alone trips by 10% from 1990 levels for the census tract in which the site is located. To achieve this goal, landowners must prepare an aggressive package of TDM measures under the guidance of the Planning Officer.

Typical plans include many of the small project measures listed above as well as:

- Membership in a Transportation Management Association (TMA);

- Market-rate parking fees;
- Employee transportation accounts;
- On-site transportation coordinators;
- Commuter awareness events;
- Shuttles to transit;
- Transit shelters;
- Bike stations; or
- Tele-commute programs.

Each plan must also include a detailed monitoring program to determine the mode shares of all persons who may use the subject parking facility. Programs typically include annual or biennial employee surveys, parking utilization counts, and driveway counts — each of which are compared to a base-year set of observations.

All small or large project plans must be approved or rejected by the PTDM Planning Officer within 90 days of their submittal. If a plan is rejected, the landowner cannot receive a permit to expand their parking facility.

Large projects that are subject to monitoring must implement additional, more aggressive TDM measures if they fail to meet the mode split goal of a 10% drive-alone-rate reduction from 1990 levels for the census tract in which the site is located.

Administration and Enforcement

If a landowner fails to comply with the PTDM, the TPTD Director may take enforcement action until the landowner complies. Enforcement can consist of a fine of \$10 per day for every parking space in the facility or even physical closure of the subject facility. Landowners are directed to work with the City's PTDM Planning Officer who is appointed by the City Manager and works in the Community Development Department. The Planning Officer provides guidance to landowners, approves final PTDM plans, and reviews and approves any required monitoring reports.

Compliance has been very high and consistent. To date, non-compliance penalties have not been used. Survey return success has been aided by the fact that the State requires a number of annual surveys from employers. As a result, employers tend to have already implemented effective strategies for surveying, including contracting out for the services.

Performance Measures

The fixed 10% target reduction in drive-alone commute rates is the primary performance measure for the program. A secondary measure of the program's impact is its own growth in terms of how many developments enter into PTDM agreements.

Performance to Date

The PTDM Ordinance has been very successful for Cambridge. Nearly 100 large projects have resulted in detailed monitoring plans — and dozens of small project landowners have implemented one-time TDM measures. The regular monitoring

requirement for large projects has demonstrated much success. Over 85-percent of the monitored businesses have met or exceeded their mode split goal. The average drive-alone mode split for monitored businesses by 2004 had dropped from 68% to 55%, removing an estimated 7,000 vehicle trips from Cambridge roads each day.

The ordinance is notable for both its impact on new developments and popularity. It enjoys widespread support among the city council, city planners, the business community, and the public. The original ordinance contained a sunset clause for the ordinance, which was lobbied for by the business community which feared the implications of TDM on the cost of business. After two renewals, the sunset clause has been eliminated in the latest version of the ordinance, so PTDM is now a permanent policy.⁵

Developers who originally received the ordinance with skepticism found that employees support the transit benefits program and that it has become an effective marketing tool to attract prospective employees.

Success stories include the Technology Square development which sought to double its office and research campus from 1M square feet to 2.6M square feet and add over 600 new parking spaces. During preparation of its PTDM plan, the developer cut back the parking expansion by over 200 spaces and was able to commit to a drive-alone rate of 50 percent. Within one-year, the project exceeded this goal, and was operating at only 40 percent drive-alone by year two. A smaller development with 220,000 square feet of office space and 220 parking spaces committed to a 56 percent drive-alone mode split in 2002, and has been performing at less than 48 percent since.

Funding

Program participants fund their own mitigation activities, but are not required to contribute to the overall cost of program administration.

A19 and the Project Special Review Permit

The success of the PTDM program, though significant, was limited in its impact on overall traffic generation by the program's narrow focus — existing land uses for which parking expansions were sought. Throughout the 1990's, Cambridge residents continued to oppose the overall level of local traffic growth due to rapid development within the city, especially in East Cambridge. Eventually, citizens demanded a halt on development, eventually settling for the Interim Planning Overlay Petition (IPOP) that sought detailed traffic review of new developments along with impact thresholds and mitigation requirements.

The IPOP became formalized as Article 19 of the City's zoning ordinance. While the City's PTDM did not require participation from residential developments, the only exclusion in A19 was for university housing.

⁵ Section 10.18.090

1. Intent of A19

The intent of A19 is to establish traffic and urban design standards for development projects likely to have significant impact on abutting properties and the surrounding urban environment.

To realize this intent, A19 codifies the city's urban design objectives and establishes detailed building and site development standards to (1) regulate new building construction in the city's commercial and high density residential areas; (2) establish standards by which significant adverse traffic impacts can be measured; and (3) establish procedures by which individual proposals can be reviewed by the Planning Board, city staff and the general public before a building permit is issued.

2. Traffic Impact Review

The Planning Board assesses the impact of the vehicular traffic, and pedestrian and bicycle circulation expected to be generated by a proposed development project. The procedures and requirements are intended to encourage applicants to adopt a development program that reduces the number of single occupancy vehicles coming to the site.

Such a program is also expected to encourage pedestrian and bicycle access to the site and throughout the neighboring district, while reducing potential negative impacts of the vehicles coming to the site on abutting properties. While the review focuses especially on the impacts affecting abutting properties and the immediate environment, the impacts on streets and locations more distant from the site, and on transit and bus facilities serving the site, are also assessed.

3. Project Special Review Permit

To ensure that new construction or changes of use in existing buildings do not impose substantial adverse impacts on city traffic, a special permit process was established as part of A19.

a. Participation Threshold

A Project Special Review Permit (PSRP) is required for new building construction based on the gross floor area (GFA) and nature of the proposed project, as stipulated within the ordinance (see Appendix). In an existing building, the PRSP shall be required where the total GFA of a new use or uses on a lot exceeds the threshold limits set forth for new developments.

b. Application

An application for the PSRP is made to the City Planning Board. The application must consist of the following materials:

- Planning Board Special Permit Application Form. The application shall include all required plans and narrative statements. The site plan and other plans, elevations, and drawings shall clearly show:
 - The access and egress points for all forms of travel to the site;
 - The location of adjacent bus and transit stops;

- The schematic design of proposed mechanical equipment; and
- The architectural screening treatment proposed for that mechanical equipment.
- Traffic Study. This must include a geographic and functional scope determined by the Traffic, Parking and Transportation Department (TPTD) to be appropriate to the location of the project. In general, the study must review intersections where the project will have significant and measurable impact.

The TPTD must issue a certification to the applicant within twenty-one (21) days of its submission that the traffic study has been done in a complete and reliable manner. Where that certification is denied, the applicant may revise the information in the traffic study and resubmit it; a certification of the revised study must be issued or denied by the TPTD within fourteen (14) days of the resubmission of material.

Based on guidelines established by TPTD, the traffic study must include a narrative discussion of:

- The nature and quantity of vehicles traveling to the site including, in addition to passenger cars, service, delivery and other commercial vehicles;
- The likely impact of such vehicular traffic on abutters, abutting streets, and nearby residential streets, including on-street parking behavior;
- The physical nature of pedestrian and bicycle access to the site and the quantity of movements anticipated for each;
- An analysis of the crash history at intersections within the study area; and
- Parking and transportation demand management measures proposed to ameliorate any adverse traffic impacts identified in the study.

Additional elements of the Application (not related to traffic) include:

- A Tree Study;
- An Urban Design Objectives Narrative;
- A Sewer Service Infrastructure Narrative;
- A Water Service Infrastructure Narrative; and
- A Noise Mitigation Narrative.

c. Approvals Evaluation

The Planning Board only grants the special permit if it finds that the project will have no substantial adverse impact on city traffic within the study area as analyzed in the Traffic Impact Review. In determining whether a proposal has substantial adverse impacts on city traffic the Planning Board assesses the following indicators:

- Project vehicle trip generation: weekdays and weekends for a twenty-four hour period, and A.M. and P.M. peak vehicle trips generated;
- Change in level of service at identified signalized intersections;
- Increased trip volume on residential streets;
- Increase of length of vehicle queues at identified signalized intersections; and
- Lack of sufficient pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

When one or more of the indicators is exceeded, it is indicative of potentially substantial adverse impact on city traffic. In making its findings, however, the Planning Board considers the mitigation efforts proposed, their anticipated effectiveness, and other supplemental information that identifies circumstances or actions that will result in a reduction in adverse traffic impacts.

Such mitigation efforts and actions can include, but are not limited to:

- Transportation Demand Management plans;
- Roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities improvements;
- Measures to reduce traffic on residential streets; and
- Measures undertaken to improve safety for pedestrians and vehicles, particularly at intersections identified in the Traffic Study as having a history of high crash rates.

The precise numerical values that indicate potentially substantial adverse impacts for each of these indicators are revised periodically from time to time by the City Planning Board in consultation with the TPTD, and published and made available to all applicants.

4. Results

Around 2002, several large residential developments were proposed. This was the first real test of applying the new program's requirements to residential development, which was met with much resistance. Residential developers claimed they were fulfilling an official City goal by providing more housing, and so shouldn't be treated like commercial developers. However, traffic studies of the projected impacts of large residential developments were not easily dismissed — and the new legislation has been upheld.

Residential Implementation – A New Challenge

Residential projects tend not to trigger the primary VTRO criteria — peak-hour trip generation — as much as they do secondary criteria such as daily trip rates. Therefore, unlike commercial developments, impacts were not as clear for peak-hour intersections. Impacts on overall daily trip volumes, by contrast, are not as easy to quantify, nor as immediately noticeable. For instance, a large residential development may not significantly impact nearby intersections at any one hour of the day, though it produces a significant amount of trips throughout the day.

TDM Measures for Residential Developments

The most effective measures among commercial developments caused much debate and resistance among residential developers — contributions to the transit shuttles, subsidized transit passes, and ongoing, annual monitoring. These measures required on-going financial commitments, which were deemed to be unsustainable by some homeowners' associations.

Cambridge's zoning prevents unbundling (assessing a fee for parking distinct from rental fees or home purchases), so pricing parking is not an available tool for residential developments. Bike & pedestrian measures have been frequently implemented —

racks, sidewalks, paths, bigger elevators, etc. Other TDM toolbox measures that have been used include car-sharing, electric charging stations, posting transit information in lobbies and on websites, and on-site transportation coordinators (provided by the management office).

ARLINGTON COUNTY'S TDM PROGRAM FOR SITE PLAN DEVELOPMENT



Background

Arlington County's coordinated policy approach to land use and transportation planning has allowed it to grow rapidly over the last 30 years without major expansions in the highway network and minimal traffic growth. In that time, nearly 18,000 residential units, 14 million square feet of office space, 1.5 million square feet of retail, and 1,218 hotel rooms have been built just in the area served by the county's Orange-Line Metrorail corridor – Rosslyn, Courthouse, Clarendon, Virginia Square, and Ballston stations. Other major development areas include the Jefferson Davis and Columbia Pike Corridors. Today, the County contains more than 46 million square feet of office and retail space – more than downtown Dallas, Denver, or Seattle⁶

⁶ Patrick Siegman, "City of Pasadena Traffic Reduction Strategies Study – Appendix A: Case Studies, 2007

As intense as this development has been, it has generated only modest levels of traffic growth. Year 2000 U.S. Census data show that almost half of Orange-line corridor residents ride transit to work. Traffic counts from 1997 to 2004 show that while office and residential square footage increased by 17.5% and 21.5% respectively, traffic along the Rosslyn-Ballston corridor grew by only 2.3%.⁷ Surveys at large apartment buildings have shown peak hour auto trip generation rates of one trip per 5.9 units, far below the standard in the Institute of Transportation Engineers' Trip Generation Manual.

The resulting economic prosperity has been remarkable, including the lowest property tax rate among the major cities and towns in northern Virginia and a AAA bond rating. The county's Metrorail corridors provide 50% of the County's tax base — on only 7% of the land. The County also enjoys far lower vacancy rates and higher lease and sale prices, compared to other regional locations.

The TDM Program for Site Plan Development

Arlington County's TDM Program for Site Plan Development is an Arlington County Commuter Services (ACCS) program adopted by the County Board in 1990. This program was the product of a joint task force of the Arlington County Planning and Transportation Commissions, and an outgrowth of the comprehensive site-plan review process headed by the Arlington County Department of Community Planning, Housing and Development (DCPHD).

Arlington's TDM policy focuses on workplace commuter travel and looks to reduce peak hour work travel by achieving a reduction of single occupant vehicle trips. Its objectives are consistent with, and help support, those of the County's Master Transportation Plan, including achievement of major street and intersection level of service goals.

The key program requirements include:

- A TDM plan for each development consistent with the TDM Matrix (see Figure 4);
- A standard site plan condition to implement the TDM Matrix;
- In-building parking provisions that extend preference to vanpools, carpools, and bicycles;
- The encouragement of travel to and from the work place by modes of other than single occupant automobile through various educational and incentive measures;
- Coordination and cooperation on such measures among employers, building owners, and management companies. The county has one central transportation management agency (TMA), Arlington Transportation Partners, that serves this function for most developments⁸; and
- Arlington County using its roles as developer of public buildings and as employer to encourage TDM practices.

⁷ Ibid

⁸ The county's second TMA, the recently formed, Potomac Yards TMA, was established exclusively to assist in the implementation, coordination, and monitoring of TDM's generated among developments within a single, large development area in southern Arlington County.

The Matrix

Recommended County TDM programs are set forth in the TDM matrix (see Figure 4). However, upon providing clear and convincing evidence that particular elements of the TDM matrix may be inappropriate for a particular project, the developer may propose substitution of other elements which provide equivalent value.

No Site Plan TDM Program is expected to incorporate all the strategies outlined in the matrix. Rather, the matrix provides a framework of options from which the County will help developers identify appropriate actions for their project. In doing so, the County distinguishes the intensity of the strategies, matching them with the assessed impact of different developments on the transportation system. The greater the impact, the more intense the mitigation measures in the approved Site Plan will be. The categories and density thresholds are described in the matrix below and through the following context codes:

Matrix Land Use Category Codes

- A. Development plan is consistent with the General Land Use Plan (GLUP), and no traffic problems are projected related to the development and its surroundings.
- B. Development plan is consistent with the GLUP, however, traffic problems are projected related to the development and its surroundings.
- C. A GLUP amendment is requested for a non-conforming development plan, no traffic problems are projected however.
- D. A GLUP amendment is requested, and traffic problems are projected.

Figure 4: Arlington's TDM Program Matrix

Strategies		Land Use Category			
		A	B	C	D
Rideshare Marketing	Information dissemination				
	Distribute/ Display	X	X	X	X
	Employee Surveys	X	X	X	X
	Operate Vanpools		X		X
	Subsidize Vanpools				
	Match State Subsidies			X	X
	Double Match State Subsidies				X
	Backup, Reserve Maintenance Vehicle				X
	Employee Transportation Coordinator				
	Part-Time	**	X	X	
	Full-Time				X
	On-Site Ride Matching				X
	Transit Store or TMA Contribution				
	\$7,970/ Year	**	X		
	\$15,947/ Year			X	
\$23,911/ Year				X	
Locate/ Operate Transit Store				X	
Emergency Ride Home		***	***	X	
Parking Management	Unlimited Reserved Rideshare Parking	X	X	X	X
	Market Rates for SOV Parking	X	X	X	X
	Outsource Parking Management ⁹		X	X	X
	Reserved Vanpool Parking Space	X	X	X	X
	One-Half Market Rate	X		X	
	Free		X		X
	Variable Rate for Carpools (2+ Employees)				
	Market Rate	X			
	One-Half Market Rate		X	X	
Free				X	
Transit Programs	Contribute to Employer Bus Shuttle				
	\$7,970/ Year	**	*	*	*
	\$15,947/ Year	***	**	**	**
	\$23,911/ Year		***	***	***
	Operate Employer Bus Shuttle				X
	Fare Media Subsidy				
	25-50 Percent		X		
50-75 Percent			X		
75+ Percent				X	
On-Site Cons	Bike Lockers, Racks	X	X	X	X
	Shower Facilities	X	X	X	X
	Van Accessible Garage	X	X	X	X

⁹ To ensure that parking rates will reflect true market conditions in a competitive environment, lease agreements with parking garage operators are encouraged. Although a set number of spaces may be reserved for a tenant, the cost of an individual parking space is not controlled by the tenant and subsidies are prevented from being passed along to specific persons.

Strategies		Land Use Category			
		A	B	C	D
struction	Off-Street Delivery/ Loading	X	X	X	X
	Roadway Improvements	X	X	X	X
Off-Site Construction	Pedestrian Systems	X	X	X	X
	Direct Metro Connections				
	Existing Knockout Panels	X	X	X	X
	New Connections			X	X
	Intersection Improvements			X	X
	New Facility Construction				X
	New Metrorail Station				X
Employee Policies	Flex Time	X	X	X	X
	Telecommuting	X	X	X	X
	Trip Generation Restrictions		X		X
	Transportation Management Organization	X	X	X	X
Monitoring & Compliance ¹⁰	Contribution				
	\$1,000/ Year	**	*	*	*
	\$5,000/ Year	***	**	**	**
	\$10,000/ Year		***	***	***
	Performance Guarantees				X
	Zoning Compliance Fines	X	X	X	X
Contingent Phasing			X	X	

- * If GFA is less than 100,000 SF
- ** If GFA is 100,000 - 200,000 SF
- *** If GFA is more than 200,000 SF

The DCPHD reviews submitted site plan proposals to assess transportation impacts and opportunities. Reviews incorporate an assessment of site characteristics, proposed land-uses, a traffic impact analysis (TIA) report, and a proposed parking plan (see “Parking Report and Charge Summary” template in Appendix). The ACCS then helps the developer identify site-specific strategies and prepare a TDM plan. Each TDM strategy is selected to mitigate the transportation impacts of the site on a case-by-case basis.

Developers can obtain further assistance in implementing their TDM plan requirements by contacting the County’s primary TMA – Arlington Transportation Partners (ATP), a division of ACCS – or the County’s TDM planner.

Participation

Participation in the Site Plan Review process is voluntary, but incentivized through density bonuses. Each zoning district permits a certain type and level of development "by-right." Beyond this, certain districts provide public review processes for a special exception by "site plan" that allows for greater flexibility in use, density, and form of development. The key to the success of the Site Plan Review Process is that additional

¹⁰ To date, approved Site Plans have no required either Contribution - to offset monitoring and compliance costs - nor Performance Guarantees.

development potential serves as an incentive to developers to seek a special exception by site plan and participate in the process.

To date, the density bonuses have been significant enough to attract the majority of new development projects into the process. By framing incentives in terms of added project density, the Site Plan Review Process supports the County's objective of concentrating development around transit stations.

Implementation

The developer must follow conditions outlined in the final approved site plan in order to receive a building permit and to continue to be in compliance with the property's existing zoning. While entering the site plan approval process is voluntary, once approvals are received, TDM conditions run for the life of the building, regardless of ownership, and guide all future decisions regarding development on the property.

The developer of an approved site plan property must implement the TDM program and obtain approval from the County before gaining the first Certificate of Occupancy. At this time the developer will prepare a property TDM Report. Subsequent to the first approval, the property owner will re-submit the property's TDM Report on the anniversary of the approval of the first Certificate of Occupancy.

Common components of site plan implementation include:

- Ridesharing promotion;
- Parking management;
- Transit promotion;
- On-site construction measures;
- Mutually agreed off-site provisions or contributions;
- Lease agreements ; and
- Monitoring and compliance

Common Strategies

Some of the most common strategies used today include:

- Conducting an employee transportation survey, provided free by ATP;
- Attending a free, ATP-sponsored employer workshop or seminar;
- Posting commuter information in a company newsletter, on a central bulletin board, internal e-mail system, or website;
- Installing a permanent display case, stocked with commuter information tailored to the specific worksite, in a central area;
- Hosting an on-site transportation event for employees;
- Providing preferred parking spaces for carpools and vanpools;
- Implementing an informal teleworking program;
- Installing bicycle and/or shower facilities to encourage bicycle and pedestrian commuting; and
- Offering employees flextime, compressed work week, or job sharing options.

More intensive TDM strategies include:

- Starting a formal telework program;
- Instituting a tax-free transit benefits program, either employer-sponsored or through pre-tax payroll deduction;
- Developing a commuting incentive program for those who carpool, bicycle or walk to work;
- Providing an employee/customer shuttle to local transit stations or other service areas;
- Supplementing the regional Guaranteed Ride Home program with an additional employer-sponsored service;
- Implementing a parking fee for solo drivers (for employers who previously offered free parking);
- Offering free or reduced-price parking for carpools and vanpools (where a fee previously existed);
- Starting business-sponsored or subsidized vanpools; and
- Implementing an active Air Quality Action Days program.

Monitoring and Compliance

The County's TDM planner is assigned to cover TDM compliance and monitoring (see compliance checklist in Appendix). Staff for these tasks has increased along with the number of properties with Site Plan review obligations.

For Category D projects, developers can be required to provide a performance guarantee to assure continuing performance. To date this option has not been used by the County for any project.

Performance Measures

The Arlington TDM program seeks to achieve the following results, which may be employed as evaluators of the success of the program:

1. Maintain pre-construction peak hour levels of service at major intersections.
2. Limit single occupancy vehicle trips generated by development.
3. Reduce vehicle-generated air pollution.
4. Maximize transportation alternatives while minimizing single occupancy travel.
5. Utilize transportation facilities efficiently.
6. Encourage efficient, cost effective modes of transportation that focus on moving people, not vehicles.
7. Improve transit information and dissemination so people will be able to make the most efficient and friendly use of the system.
8. Utilize public transportation effectively and efficiently, through improved system information, frequencies, routing, connections, transfers; innovative technologies are encouraged.
9. Configure mass transportation to provide access to, through, and around employment centers.
10. Encourage innovative technologies that move people between home and work the most efficient and effective way.

11. Maximize convenience of inter-modal transfers between the commuter rail system and feeder/distributor systems.
12. Encourage group riding and shared parking arrangements through parking management plans.
13. Minimize or eliminate barriers to group riding.
14. Review transportation management plans during the site development process.

Performance

Arlington's TDM initiatives have successfully evolved and expanded since authorization of the original policy in 1990. Today, over 110 site plans have been approved by the County board with TDM plans and ACCS now includes a ten-person sales team that serves 600 businesses. Ninety percent of all development is now conducted through the Site Plan review program - almost all of the remaining 10% consists of either single-family homes or small, town home developments.

Funding

The most fundamental obstacle to long-term operation of the TDM program is a lack of funding. Currently, no dedicated funding is available for ACCS; instead programs rely upon state and federal grants. Unlike most other civic functions performed by Arlington, TDM programs have no financial backing from the County. This leaves this important function in a precarious position, especially in its potential for continued growth. Recent changes that have brought improved financial security for the program include: indexing contribution increases to inflation (as indicated by the Consumer Price Index) and expanding the obligation for Transit Store/TMA contributions from 10 years to 30 years.

The key opportunity for the County continues to be the level of development demand. This has allowed the County to extract substantial civic improvements from private developers without slowing development activity. In fact, over time, the public investments secured by the program increase development demand by contributing to the distinct mobility environment that makes Arlington County a uniquely desirable place to live, work, and visit.

MONTGOMERY COUNTY'S TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT DISTRICTS



Background

Montgomery County Commuter Services (MCCS), a section of the Division of Transit Services in Montgomery County's Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPWT), provides free commuter assistance to county employers and employees through education and promotional outreach services, as well as incentive programs and a transit store.¹¹

Beginning in the late 1980's, Montgomery County established Transportation Management Districts (TMD's) to provide concentrated services to encourage the use of transit and other commuting options in the County's major business districts — Downtown Bethesda, North Bethesda, Friendship Heights, and Downtown Silver Spring. A dedicated TMD staff was assigned to each district, to focus efforts in these areas.

The TMD Program

The County has four broad goals for its TMD's:

- Reduce traffic congestion;
- Increase transportation capacity;
- Reduce air and noise pollution; and
- Promote bicycle and pedestrian access.

¹¹ These are physical stores although online fare media sales are also available - http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/cittmpl.asp?url=/apps/dpwt/fare_media/index.asp.

On November 26, 2002, the County Council passed legislation mandating that employers with 25 or more full- or part-time employees located within a TMD actively work with their TMD's staff to reduce drive-alone commute trip rates. At a minimum, these employers are required to:

- Designate a TMP Coordinator to serve the company's employees;
- Implement a Traffic Mitigation Plan (TMP) – developed in consultation with TMD staff;
- Submit an Annual Report of Activities; and
- Participate in the County's Annual Commuter Survey.

1. The Traffic Mitigation Plan

MCCS and its contractors assist County employers in developing a Traffic Mitigation Plan (TMP) designed to reduce the rates at which their employees drive alone to work (see sample TMP in Appendix). Each TMP is reviewed by the TMD staff and the Advisory Committee for that TMD which recommends approval or changes. The Director of DPWT has final approval authority.

2. Annual Report of Activities

Once a year, employers are asked to summarize the activities they have undertaken to implement their plans. Employers who successfully encourage "Better Ways to Work" (used as the program's tag line) are eligible for local and national recognition and awards.

3. Annual Commuter Survey

Employers receive annual Commuter Surveys from Commuter Services for distribution to their employees. Employers are required to circulate the Commuter Surveys to their employees within 45 days for their completion. The completed Annual Commuter Surveys are submitted to each Employer's TMD. All surveys are conducted in the spring (see sample survey in Appendix).

These surveys are used to track employee commuting patterns in the TMD and to monitor progress toward reaching any commuting goals set in the County's Annual Growth Policy. They help DPWT determine what changes to programs and services are necessary. Employers are asked to make a good faith effort to achieve an 80% response rate from their employees.

The County assists employers in reaching the target response rate by supporting the efforts of the company's TMP Coordinator in getting a survey into every employee's hand. The TBC is the contact person at that employment site with whom MCCS and its contractors work to provide services and the person who is asked to distribute the survey. Surveys are available in hard copy format or online, distributed through the company email system. The County also provides detailed instructions, flyers, and prize drawings for participants who take the survey. If requested, TMD staff will hand out surveys at company-sponsored events and provide refreshments and additional prize drawings for participants.

4. Common TMP Strategies

- Designate contact person for employee transportation information (TBC);
- Distribute information on transit/pooling/other commute alternatives to employees on a regular basis;
- Commute information/alternatives presentations to employees at worksite by TMD staff;
- Information on commuting alternatives provided to new employees (orientation materials and presentations available from TMD staff);
- Attendance at free TMD-sponsored meetings/workshops permitted for TBC to learn about new services;
- Ozone Action Days participation (regional program to alert people to dangerous air quality days);
- Guaranteed Ride Home Promotion (free regional program offering emergency rides);
- Permanent display area for TMD-provided bus schedules and other transportation information;
- Provide ADA transportation options information ;
- Tax-free monthly transit subsidies provided to employees (County subsidies and State commuter Tax credit may be available);
- Transit passes/tokens offered for purchase at worksite (at full or reduced price);
- Pre-tax payroll deduction for transit costs;
- Transit/pedestrian amenities at worksite, e.g. sidewalks, benches, etc.;
- Bike amenities at worksite - racks, lockers, and/ or showers (TMD may be able to supply);
- Employee carpool matching service;
- Free or reduced rate parking for car/vanpools offered to employees;
- Preferred location and/or reserved parking for car/vanpools offered to employees;
- Alternative work schedules: Flex Time, Compressed Work Week; and
- Telecommute, telework, and job-sharing.

Compliance

The basic steps for compliance among qualifying employers include:

1. Contact TMD Staff for assistance in customizing an effective TMP.
2. Submit TMP to DPWT — DPWT reviews submitted TMP. Upon successful review, DPWT issues confirmation of approval.
3. Work with TMD Staff and employees to actively implement and promote the strategies that are included in approved TMP.
4. Participate in the Annual Commuter Survey.
5. Submit an annual “Report of Activities” documenting results of TMP implementation.

To date, compliance rates have been very high – estimated by one TMD administrator to be about 95%.¹² There are very few non-compliant companies in any of the TMD’s.

¹² Jim Carlson, Planning Specialist, Montgomery County Commuter Services

Those few will probably face fines in the near future. Failure to comply is a misdemeanor under County Code.

The County sets an 80% survey-response rate target in order to effectively measure the program’s performance. While this is a goal which many employers do not reach, most produce response rates significant enough to effectively track program performance. For some agreements, the TMD’s conduct their own mode split surveys, usually through driveway counts at the employment site.

Enforcement

An employer or owner that does not submit a traffic mitigation plan or provide survey data within 30 days after a second notice has committed a Class C violation. Continued non-compliance can result in fines.

To date, the County has not invoked any non-compliance penalties though enforcement efforts are being undertaken. There are no penalties for failing to achieve established survey-response rate targets.

Performance Measures

In addition to the broad goals set out for established TMD’s, commuting goals are identified for each district, stated as the percentage of participant-commuters not driving to work during peak times – tracked by the County as “non-auto driver mode share” (NADMS). Current NADMS targets for each TMD are as follows:

- Bethesda: 37%;
- North Bethesda: 39%;
- Friendship Heights: 39%; and
- Silver Spring: 46% (50% for new development¹³).

While there are no individual NADMS targets established for participants, these targets serve as effective performance measures for the overall program.

Performance

Each TMD has active TMP’s from dozens of area employers, see Figure 5.

Figure 5: Employer TMP’s

TMD	Participants	
	Required	Voluntary
Bethesda	121	10
North Bethesda	141	6
Friendship Heights	26	2
Silver Spring	63	18

¹³ Established developments in Silver Spring are grandfathered at 46% in order to allow the County to maintain and update ambitious NADMS targets for new development in this transit-rich location.

All TMD's have achieved or exceeded their NADMS target, according to the latest processed survey data (2006).¹⁴

Funding – County

A variety of funding structures have been established to support TMD efforts. The Bethesda and North Bethesda TMD's are primarily funded from parking revenues: parking meter payments, parking violation revenue, monthly permits for public parking lots, and In-Lieu of Parking development fees. For the Bethesda TMD, revenues from the Bethesda Parking Lot District facilities (including lots and garages) are used to support TMD expenses as well as other types of transportation costs. In the North Bethesda TMD, the County installed more than 800 parking meters to manage its parking system which also generates revenue for TMD activities.¹⁵

Silver Spring TMD is eligible to receive net revenue from the Silver Spring Parking Lot District when available, though net revenue is not always generated there. The TMD's in Silver Spring and Friendship Heights are supported by other sources, including developer fees and funds from the County's general operating budget. Friendship Heights is the only TMD that does not receive any parking revenue, as there are no County parking facilities in Friendship Heights.

Around 2005, the County began assessing an annual fee for most new projects within TMD's. These revenues are collected by the County and allocated to traffic mitigation actions — identified in coordination with TMD staff and the TMD Advisory Committees. The fee is currently set at \$.10/SF for all commercial uses. There is enabling legislation for applying a fee of up to \$60 per unit for multi-family residential development, but the County has chosen not to implement this strategy. The fee is assessed upon use and occupancy of the development.

Developments deemed to produce significant increases in traffic may also be required to produce a Traffic Mitigation Agreement, which outlines measures they will take to mitigate their project's traffic impacts.

This policy may soon be changing significantly with the recent adoption of a new County growth policy. This policy will likely increase the frequency with which Traffic Mitigation Agreements are required. In addition, developers usually are required to pay the cost of driveway counts and similar monitoring required as part of their development approval.

Funding – Participants

Participants must bear the cost of the specific strategies they implement as part of their TMP. However, MCCS and its contractors provide assistance to all County employers, including those mandated to participate in the TMD program. Free services provided include:

¹⁴ Carlson, Montgomery County Commuter Services

¹⁵ "Opportunities for Sustainable TMA Funding", UrbanTrans Consultants, Inc., December, 2004.

- Transportation Benefits Plans — How to design a suitable plan, while boosting productivity and morale;
- Transit Subsidies and Tax Credits — How commuter benefits can lower taxes for employers and employees;
- Public Transportation — Information on routes, fares, schedules, and where to buy transit passes, including pre-tax Metrochek and other discounts;
- Carpools/Vanpools — Free assistance in forming or joining a carpool;
- Parking — Information on free/discount parking for carpools/vanpools and park-and-ride lots;
- Biking/Walking — Help with rental lockers, commuting routes, and other amenities;
- Guaranteed Ride Home — Free rides home in cases of emergency or unscheduled overtime;
- Teleworking/Alternative Work Schedules — How to design a program tailored to specific needs;
- Car Sharing — Programs that provide 24/7 access to a vehicle, available at Metro stations;
- Accessible Transportation — Freedom of mobility for those with special needs;
- HOV Lanes Information — Where, when, and how to access them;
- Customized Seminars and Presentations — For setting up a commuting benefits program that works for each business; and
- Commuter Information/ Marketing Materials — Fact sheets, posters, flyers, exhibits fairs.

CONCLUSIONS

A number of common and standout practices can be identified within these program reviews which are applicable to Alexandria.

1. Common Practices

- Program Focus

The programs all share the TMPSUP's focus on SOV, or drive-alone, commute rates during peak hours. In addition, both the City of Cambridge and Arlington County have explicitly led by example by implementing TDM programs and commuter benefits covering their own employees.
- Targets

The setting of specific performance targets is a strategy common to all three locations reviewed above. The target is, however, articulated in different ways in each. In Cambridge, the same target is set for all PTDM participants – reducing drive-alone rates by 10%. In Arlington, specific targets are assigned to each development, based on constraints and opportunities specific to each. Montgomery County's approach — assigning distinct non-SOV commute targets for each of its four TMD districts — reflects a focus on key, high-congestion corridors.

- Key Compliance Action – Surveys
The completion, collection, and review of annual employee surveys form a cornerstone of compliance for each program. These surveys are critical to assessing performance measures for each program reviewed. Consistent and effective survey completion and return is also critical to year-to-year amendments and improvements to individual mitigation plans in each location. These provide direct quantitative evidence on the impact of individual strategies as well as qualitative assessments of current and potential mitigation measures.
- Support
Both Arlington and Montgomery counties provide a high level of support to program participants, especially to employers that seek their services. Dedicated County staff provide assistance in drafting effective mitigation plans and the implementation of their strategies. Compliance monitoring and assistance appears to be particularly robust in Arlington County.
- Focus on Parking
Cambridge and Arlington each explicitly recognize the impact of on-site parking policies, especially at the workplace, on traffic mitigation. Cambridge's PTDM program is triggered specifically by expansions of on-site parking inventories. Arlington County requires an approved "parking program" that combines costs for SOV parking and preferential treatment of bicycle and rideshare vehicle parking. This reveals a common understanding of the direct link between parking policy and travel choice at the workplace.

2. Standout Practices

- Arlington County – Voluntary, Incentivized Participation
The voluntary, incentivized participation approach utilized by Arlington County provides a unique strength to its program in the form of increased leverage. According to John Durham, the County's TDM Planner, the fact that developers enter into the program of their own volition in order to receive highly-valued density bonuses for their projects, gives the County leverage to seek appropriately aggressive TDM concessions. That roughly 90% of development in recent years has gone through the County's Site Review process indicates that this leverage has allowed the County to achieve progressive levels of TDM commitments while encouraging high levels of development directed toward its transit corridors.
- Montgomery County – District Focus
Montgomery County's emphasis on mitigating congestion at the district level provides a useful example of "right-sizing" a program's focus. By concentrating on key commercial corridors at high levels of congestion-risk, the County's program allows it to expend its resources where success is most

critical. At the same time, district-wide performance targets broaden the focus beyond individual sites, and reinforce the most critical measure of success – district level congestion mitigation.

- **Cambridge - Residential Inclusion**
Cambridge’s A19 process represents a direct attempt to include residential development in the City’s traffic mitigation efforts. This process has revealed challenges for incorporating traditionally commute-oriented strategies at residential sites. Effective inclusion of such sites has been shown to require creative solutions in identifying strategies for a new kind of participant.

3. **Performance and Achievements**

Figure 6 provides a summary of the key achievements from each of the reviewed locations, in terms of the volume of participation and key performance measures.

Figure 6: Performance Review

Performance Review		
Location	Participating Sites	Key Achievements
Cambridge, MA	100+	Bike commuting up 35% between 1990-2000
Arlington County, VA	110+	High levels of development with minimal increases in traffic
Montgomery County, MD	350+	All district performance targets achieved

Task 3 – Stakeholder Focus Groups

On Tuesday, February 19th, Nelson\Nygaard led a series of interviews and focus group discussions with stakeholders involved with the City’s TMPSUP program, including:

- City of Alexandria Department of Transportation and Environmental Services staff;
- City of Alexandria Department of Planning and Zoning staff;
- City of Alexandria City Attorney’s office
- Real estate developers with TMPSUP experience and/ or their attorneys;
- Representatives from commercial and office developments with on-going TMPSUP obligations; and
- Representatives from residential developments with on-going TMPSUP obligations.

Combined, these interviews and focus group discussions provide a spectrum of feedback from the perspectives of program administrators and participants regarding current program structure and function – as well as how the program could be better serving its stated goals, and perhaps whether those goals remain appropriate.

An interview guide (provided as an Appendix to this report) was developed with the City to provide a general outline of suggested questions and areas of inquiry. The intent of the interviews, however, was to foster an open-ended discussion with all interviewees.

Input received during these meetings is summarized below, organized in the order in which they occurred.

Summary of Discussion with Developers and Developers' Representatives

General Comments on the Program

- The study is a good idea. A “fresh set of eyes” to review the program is needed after 20+ years.
- One of the strengths of the program from the beginning is that it is not “just another technique for stopping development”. The City has remained faithful to this and has not rejected any project based on the TMPSUP process.
- Over the years, more requirements have been added: TMP Coordinator, posting materials in a central location, etc. This has increased a “boiler plate” feel to many TMP's.
- One participant stated that that he had gone through the process many, many times and the program has gotten “stale” to a certain extent. The intended accomplishments and effects have become lost in the process – or are not communicated to participants effectively.

Comments on Program Components

- The TIS is useful and necessary.
- One participant suggested that the terms used in the TIS – letter grades assigned to distinct levels of vehicle service – can be misleading. It was suggested that levels of service be stated as “seconds of delay” for vehicles at intersections. “The word ‘Fail’ feeds anti-development sentiments.”

Comments on Program Effectiveness

- Required actions are often hard to enforce.
- It was noted that some citizens have a strong desire for the program to be effectively and uniformly enforced, and complain when they perceive that a particular development is not living up to its obligations.
- Participation at commercial and office buildings is “a lot” more effective.
- The threshold for residential uses (development of 250 or more units) does shape projects as developers seek to avoid having to participate. However, it means there are several large projects just under the threshold.
- TMP Coordinators and Shuttles were identified as some of the more effective TMP strategies overall.
- Effective measures for residential uses include providing information and, to a lesser degree, shuttles.
- Cameron Station is a good example of a residential development with an effective shuttle. The Metrorail station is not close enough to be a real amenity without the shuttle. The distance is short enough, however, that the shuttle bridges the gap and attracts Metrorail trips from those that would otherwise drive.

Comments on Developer Buy-In

- As long as the developer understands the (TMPSUP) program, they tend to “buy in” to its value. Up-front information early in the development process is a key to achieving this result.
- Most developers have accepted the program as a “necessary evil” and “just another obligation” – the cost of doing business in a desirable market.
- Developers are aware of the program, but it is not generally brought up by the City until the end of the application process, so it feels like an afterthought.
- Developers do not perceive value in having a TMP attached to their development. Some, however, have effectively used their development’s TMP as part of a “green” marketing strategy. This is generally more effective for rental residential projects.

Comments on Program Process

- The TMPSUP process has always been smooth. There is very little public feedback or input.
- Developers have very little understanding of the implementation process for their developments. This happens after the developer has turned the development over to a home owners association or management company.
- There needs to be improved coordination between the TIS and the TMP. At best, the TIS informs the TMP as it is intended to do. Many times this does not appear to happen and the TMP is not used as a tool to address issues identified in the TIS. Preferably, the two would have an iterative relationship where the TIS and the TMP inform each other – TMP measures, for example, would be taken into account in a revised TIS.
- One developer noted parking reductions specifically as something that is not taken into account during the TMPSUP process. He suggested that such important demand management factors should inform the TIS and be accepted as a component of the TMP.

Comments on Compliance

- The City has been very hands-off in compliance and monitoring.
- “We didn’t really do a whole lot with it other than maintain a fund.”
- Some projects lack a “central” public space for posting TMP information (i.e., lower-density residential development without common areas.
- For residential developments especially, finding someone available and willing to administer the TMP is often an issue. “No one wants to do it.” Sometimes it’s a matter of a development’s size. “If it’s big enough for a management office or company, they take care of it.”
- While administering the TMP is an unwanted burden for some developments, the idea of a consolidated, district-focused fund is not likely to be appealing. The property-owners like self-control over the money. Developments will seek to pool their resources on their own if they see an advantage in it. Requirements to do so would be resisted.

- Suggestion – Management companies that administer TMP's would be a good source for identifying the challenges and advantages of consolidating TMP administration.

Comments on Public Perception

- “The public does not care about it.”
- The public cares about parking and traffic. But they do not “buy” that the program reduces traffic.
- Citizens do pay attention to the TIS, because present impacts they can relate to.

Current Annual Fee vs. One-Time Fee

- All were opposed to the one-time fee concept.
- Upfront costs would hurt sales of owner-residential particularly.
- The annual fee structure provides more flexibility. For example, administrators can increase contributions to pay for one-time planned actions.

Comparison to other TDM Programs

- Generally, the Alexandria program was viewed favorably compared to other, similar programs. The flexibility of the Alexandria model was specifically noted as strength.
- “I like the give and take.”

Summary

In general, the attendees of this focus group were supportive of the program and its administration. While some of the obligations of the program are clearly viewed as, at best, “necessary evils”, the program is clearly not viewed as an “anti-development” program.

Opportunities Identified

- Promotion and conspicuous support of the program on the part of the City would reinforce it as a high priority component of development in Alexandria. There is clear indication that marketing the benefits of properties with TMP obligations to potential tenants is feasible and getting more so as current trends favoring “green” amenities continue.
- There was some skepticism as to whether participants would accept consolidation into a district TMP or TMA, in return for being relieved of administrative obligations. If this were an option for existing TMP’s, however, some may find it attractive.
- Creating an iterative process in which the TIS informs the TMP while the final TMP in turn is factored into a revised TIS would reward developers’ efforts to address demand management in their projects.

Constraints Identified

- Information and promotion. The program is often an afterthought in the development, sales and leasing, and occupancy process. Often parties involved only deal with the SUP terms toward the end.
- TMP administration. Identifying someone to volunteer to administer their program, especially at smaller residential developments, is a common challenge.
- Disconnect between the TIS and the TMP.

Commercial & Office Development Representatives Group

General Program Comments

- Transfer of responsibilities is often not smooth. One manager noted that her firm recently purchased a property with an active TMP. The previous management company had been neglecting its TMP obligations and her company had to develop a compliance plan from scratch with little experience with the program.
- The other attendee noted a high level of success at the development he manages – the Alexandria Technology Center (ATC). The primary TMP component noted was a shuttle running between the complex and the King Street VRE and Metrorail stations. Operating details of the service include:
 - Peak-only service – three hours in the morning and three in the afternoon;
 - Free service for employees of contributing tenants;
 - Cooperative service arrangements with other locations; and
 - Potential expansion into lunchtime service to respond to tenant demand.

- This TMP has effectively absorbed a number of other TMP's within the service area of its shuttles. The ATC manager has accepted arrangements where other property-managers contribute some of their TMP funds to ATC in return for expanded shuttle service to their sites. These smaller locations could not support a shuttle service on their own. Such arrangements currently include residential developments – a key advantage of which is adding passengers on “return-trip” buses that would otherwise be running empty.

Additional ATC Comments

- The ATC management is currently examining providing car-sharing. Many tenants make midday trips to the pentagon and the motor-pool does not always have enough vehicles. Car-share vehicles could serve as a back-up to the motor-pool, allowing more employees to leave their cars at home.
- All parking is charged – with exemptions for military.
- While the TMP administrator does not like being forced to pay into the TMP fund, he acknowledging that:
 - He spends more on TMP activities than his TMPSUP requires in order to provide value-added services such as the shuttles;
 - There is “no question” that the shuttles add sufficient value to the property;
 - The shuttles would be continued even if the TMP went away;
 - The shuttles reduce SOV-commuting; and
 - “You can’t argue with the ridership”

Comments on Impact of Local Traffic Congestion

- The only problem is traffic. “We (the shuttles) get stuck in the same mess as everybody else.”
- Tenant-employees looking to avoid local traffic (in the “valley” especially) will park two Metrorail stations away and ride to King Street in order to take the ATC shuttle.

Comments on other Commercial and Office TMP Experiences

- The Winkler TMP seems to be enjoying success.
- Neither participant was aware of any particular struggles with the program among office and commercial buildings.

Summary

This focus group highlighted many of the potential benefits of effective TMP consolidation, including:

- More effective shuttle operations – more participants means more potential riders and more service coverage;
- Economies of scale – increasing access to, and the effectiveness and coverage of, employer-based shuttles without each site having to have a critical mass of employees;

- Incorporation of Residential Uses – these uses in particular struggle with means for investing their often modest TMP funds effectively; and
- Ridership – overall as well as reverse-peak trips as more types of land uses are incorporated.

The ATC TMP has effectively absorbed others based on points of mutual self-interest. The centralization of administration and the economies of scale that this has provided to all participants appear to be a significant and appreciated benefit.

On the other hand, this discussion also highlighted the potential for inaction when the program is not embraced by participants as well as the challenges of “handing off” TMP’s during transitions in ownership and/ or management.

Opportunities Identified

- Consolidation could address issues of continuing the TMP when property or management is transferred.
- TMP strategies benefit from economies of scale under effective consolidation.
- With effective consolidation, smaller TMP’s appear more than happy to delegate administrative control.

Constraints Identified

- Transitioning TMP administration when property or management is transferred.

City Attorney’s Representative

General Program Comments

- The City Attorney’s office’s interaction with the program occurs “as needed” rather than a part of standard program administration. Such interaction with the program comes in two contexts:
 - Enforcement – enforcing compliance with TMP obligations; and
 - Interpretation – defining compliance options and parameters.
- Overall, interaction occurs about a once-per-month.
- Once the attorneys get involved, compliance soon follows. At most, one “zoning ticket” is enough to get compliance.

Comments on Areas for Improvement

- Enforcement – There should be more enforcement options. Currently, the main option is zoning tickets, which have a daily monetary scale that – when exhausted – triggers a court procedure for revoking a development permit. It was expressed that measures that fell between the zoning ticket and permit revocation would be useful in better matching levels of enforcement to levels of non-compliance.
- Flexibility – Making changes to the SUP to adjust to changing circumstances should be easier. For example: a residential development that is required to

promote transit use, but has become a highly-affluent community is a common cause of unspent money – the people living there today are not likely to shift trips to transit. Administrative modification of approved SUPs should be allowed under such circumstances.

- Suggestion – A five-year schedule for revisiting approved SUPs, at which point administrative modifications can be made.
- Suggestion – Create hard triggers for enforcement actions. Move away from “personal judgments” on when to take legal recourse.
- Suggestion – Online surveys may be more effective for residential uses – mailbox surveys often feel “invasive” and get instinctively thrown out with the junk mail.

Summary

This interview highlighted the opportunity to improve enforcement in three ways:

- Providing more enforcement options;
- Creating “hard triggers” for enforcement actions that relieve City staff of making personal judgments on when to take legal action; and
- Allowing “administrative” modifications to approved TMP’s, perhaps on a fixed schedule of every five years – such as a five-year review period to allow City staff to review and update TMPs in accordance with what has worked as well as evolving opportunities and constraints.

City Agency Group

General Program Comments

- TMP’s are approved in perpetuity. Eventually TMP terms become out of date with current standards.
- Enforcement should be formalized. By contrast, the current system relies upon repeated attempts at correspondence before legal action is taken.
- There is no capacity to set performance standards and/or penalties.
- “It’s results that we need to be measuring.”

Comments on Consolidation Options

- What is the right size and forum for managing a TMP?
- Some developments are definitely too small.
- Creating a transportation management district system is key.
- Tie contribution levels to costs of meeting TMP obligations or meeting performance measures/mode shift targets.
- “Districting” will have to be voluntary (among existing TMP participants). Approved SUPs can only be amended when initiated by the development.

City vs. Third-Party Management of District TMP’s

- The City could provide a list of approved TMP managers. Ensuring that developments could not simply put someone in that would approve inappropriate use of TMP funds.

- With either city management or third party management, there should be a single clearinghouse for program information and benefits.
- The City already has a TDM Coordinator.
- The City must maintain control.
- If participants are held accountable for meeting performance measures – does the City need to control how funds are spent?
- “We have TMP’s that want to simply pay and be done. “

Reports and Surveys

- A lot of useful information is gathered through the program, but it is not coming in consistently and it is not being utilized fully.
- Surveys should ask more questions about the effectiveness of each program – how well is program and benefits information being distributed, for example.
- Suggestion – Offer rewards or recognition for highly-compliant participants: a “Best Place to Work for Commuters” type of award, for example.

Summary

This focus group discussion highlighted a key opportunity for the program and its interest in consolidating site-based TMP’s into district TMP. This opportunity comes in the form of a trade-off: Giving up control for the sake of gaining accountability.

The current system focuses on setting required funding levels and approving how the money is spent. The result that many TMP’s simply collect revenue without implementing any demand management strategies is recognized by most parties as a failure for the program. Shifting the emphasis to setting performance measures would allow the City to focus on results rather than process, while providing participants with more control to decide how to achieve them.

There is a strong reluctance, however, on the part of some City staff to relinquish fund control to participants that have historically shown an eagerness to spend funds on projects unrelated to program goals and objectives.

Residential Development Representatives Group

General Program Comments

- The discussion among this group was characterized by a nearly universal rejection of the program’s value and applicability to their own development or residential developments in general. Many members of this group expressed a strong desire to be removed from the program entirely – “Set us Free! Let us go!”
- Frustration is especially high among participants at developments that, post-construction, have divided into multiple, distinct housing associations. While the terms of the SUP bind each to original TMP obligations, the division has created many associations that, if constructed separately, would not have been obliged to seek an SUP. The small size of these associations further

- reduces the effectiveness of potential TMP strategies such as shuttles and car-sharing.
- There was also an expression of frustration that, unless buyers read the fine print of their contract, they are typically unaware of the TMP obligations that come with their homes. When pressed, most acknowledged that this did not result in unexpected expenses, but rather the unexpected fact that some of the known expenses went into a TMP fund. Nonetheless it was expressed that such a commitment to the TMP represented developers “selling our rights away” and a “tax” that they did not support.
 - The other most common sentiment expressed was a sense of futility in identifying uses for TMP funds that would both meet the terms of the SUP and have a meaningful impact on trip rates at their development. Most expressed that either the size of their fund and their development or the demographics of their community undermined any attempts to shift trips away from single occupancy vehicles.
 - Participants expressed frustration that attempts to spend funds on efforts such as bus shelters were complicated by regulations that make them responsible for maintaining the shelter – a punishment in a sense for good intentions.
 - Statements of sympathy with the program’s original intentions were made. These statements were verified by a number of additional comments regarding frustration over the level of development being allowed by the City – and the resulting impacts on local traffic and the environment.
 - “We aren’t causing the traffic. It’s all this new development.”

Comments on Program Relevance

- Some expressed a sense that the program had become irrelevant and that other programs were performing functions for which it was intended more effectively – employer-based transit vouchers or discounts are very common among residents, for example.
- Others noted that many of the residential developments had become very wealthy communities whose residents “will never take the bus.”
- Others noted that many of the developments are not at all near transit and therefore do not attract those that use transit.
- Many expressed that the programs intentions and benefits are unclear –
 - “No one knows what it’s for.”
 - “No one knows why they have to pay. “
- Suggestion – Requirement criteria for residential uses should be more context-sensitive, not just based on size.
- Suggestion – Broaden program goals to include environmental improvements.
- Suggestion – Create and distribute a “briefing booklet” on the program, its intentions, and benefits, as well as administrative guidance for TMP funds – use “plain English”
- Suggestion – Create an interactive website to guide TMP participants on administering and taking advantage of the program.

Comments on Administration Obligations

- Finding someone to manage the TMP is a constant struggle:
 - “No one wants to do it!”
 - “A lot of paperwork for something people just don’t use.”
 - “It costs more to run it, than the benefit we get out of it.”
- The City used to come to developments and suggest uses for TMP funds, but no longer does.

Comments on Administrative vs. Economic Hardship

- When asked which obligation, administrative or economic, was more of a burden, most agreed that, while both were unwanted, the economic obligation was more resented.
- When asked if being relieved of the administrative burden by pooling TMP contributions under the control of a centralized administrator – either the City or a third party – would offer an improvement, most strongly objected to giving up control of their money.
 - “I don’t want my money going anywhere else. I would rather see our fund grow to \$300,000 and just sit there.”
 - “I would rather deal with the administrative time and effort and control my own funds.”

Proposed TMP Fund Uses

There was ambiguity about Fund expenditures that have been proposed and rejected by the City versus expenditures that were never proposed, but seemed certain to be rejected. Many participants have given up on approaching the City with ideas for TMP Fund projects. This also appears to be due in large measure to a lack of understanding about demand management concepts as well as the City’s expectations.

Summary

This focus group discussion underscored the uniqueness of program constraints at residential developments. Many of the most consistent issues with program compliance and effectiveness exist within residential TMP’s including:

- Limitations of smaller-development TMP’s;
- Administration – administrators often lack understanding, not only of this particular program but demand-management concepts in general;
- High rates of turnover in administration – the impact of which is increased when administrators are reluctant, inexperienced volunteers.

In addition to these shared constraints, residential TMP’s carry their own unique constraints, including:

- Varied trip patterns – Compared to employment-oriented uses, residential developments tend to generate trips that are more scattered throughout the day; and

- Communication – Reaching out to people is much more difficult when they are at home than when they are at work. Residents tend to be very protective of their private time at home, and less responsive to TMP surveys and marketing materials.

Opportunities Identified

- Creating a “pay-only” option for residential uses may remove many of the barriers to effective TMP implementation identified. Shifting from volunteer administration to a TMA or City control; creating economies of scale between smaller TMP’s; using varied trip patterns at residential developments to supplement ridership on employment-centered shuttles; and leaving people alone at home.
- While resistance to consolidation appears strong, this resistance may be based on long-simmering resentments of the program’s obligations. A sharp focus on simply being relieved of these obligations may delay a willingness on the part of some to voluntarily consolidate with other TMP’s if mutually beneficial relationships can be identified and arranged. Such consolidation can be offered as optional to existing TMP’s, while a pay-only level of participation is established for new residential TMP’s.

Constraints Identified

- Ineffective TMP’s at small residential developments.
- Lack of clear definition of applicable TMP program elements.
- Disagreement with overall program goals.

Task 4 – Analysis and Conclusions

The following section summarizes recommendations for improvements to the City of Alexandria’s Transportation Plan Special Use Permit Program (TMPSUP). These recommendations were derived from analysis of findings from all previous project tasks — Existing Conditions Review, Best Practices Review, and Stakeholder Interviews. All recommendations are intended to assist the City of Alexandria in updating its program and improving the ability for it to serve its goals and intentions.

Recommendations are organized by program component, as follows:

- Policy Goals;
- Program Structure and Implementation;
- Program Focus; and
- Non-Compliance Enforcement.

Policy Goals

The primary purpose of the TMP/SUP ordinance is to “**reduce peak traffic congestion resulting from development within the City.**”¹⁶ The goals of the TMP are to:

- Reduce the proportion of single occupancy vehicle (SOV) trips;
- Increase the use of carpools, vanpools, and mass transit during the peak hour; and
- Spread the number of SOV trips outside of the peak hour.

The specificity of these goals and intentions is an opportunity to establish default performance measures up front in the program’s authorizing ordinance. The first recommendation is therefore to expand the goals of the program to recognize the spectrum of benefits that derive from reducing overall traffic congestion and SOV reliance as key program objectives. Whether formally incorporated in the ordinance, or merely officially recognized as key program objectives, these benefits should include at a minimum:

- Environmental benefits: improved air quality, reduced carbon emissions, reduced noise pollution;
- Improved roadway conditions: shorter travel times on local roads (for transit and private vehicles), fewer barriers to walking and biking, and reduced roadway wear and tear;
- Livability: improving the attractiveness of Alexandria as a Smart Growth community; and
- Social-Capital: community-building benefits of increased walking, biking, carpooling, and transit use.

Additionally, adding “reducing overall ‘Vehicle Miles Travelled’” as an explicit program goal would broaden options for quantifying program achievements, and underscore the rationale for including residential developments in the program.

¹⁶ City of Alexandria, “Administrative Guidelines Ordinance No. 3204”

Program Structure and Implementation – Consolidation

The City has indicated a strong interest in shifting to a consolidated approach to TMP participation. Conversely, many current participants have expressed reservations, some quite strongly, to such an approach. Nonetheless, the advantages of consolidation are significant enough to recommend that the City place all new developments and attract as many existing TMP's as possible into consolidated TMP's. Advantages of consolidation include:

- Economies of Scale for TMP Investments – larger, centrally-controlled funding and participant pools allow more efficient investments in mitigation strategies, from shuttle services to ride-share programs;
- Streamlined Administration – A limited number of administrators, organized into districts, presents the opportunity to reduce human resource redundancies, bring a new level of program focus, and arguably places administration in the hands of those most suited to understand its unique barriers and potential achievements;
- Provides Options – A district-based administration would allow the City to provide two new, viable TMP model options: participation in a Transportation Management Association (TMA); and a pay-only option for residential developments; and
- Improved Program Performance – A consolidated approach would allow for program investments to be concentrated in areas and among populations within each district that offer the greatest potential impact on overall program goals and objectives.

It is recommended that the City facilitate TMP consolidation by shifting away from its current single-model approach to all TMP's. Due to the different characteristics of residential and non-residential developments, and legal right of existing TMP's to refuse to consolidate, a range of consolidation strategies and participation options are outlined below.

Residential Developments

The current TMP approach requires each residential development to fund and implement its own program. Many residential developments rely on volunteers who contribute their valuable personal time for TMP administration – volunteers that are likely to have limited experience with, and possibly no natural affinity for, the program or mitigation concepts and aims in general. Others spend TMP funding to hire outside administrative support.

Furthermore, all residential TMP's suffer to some extent from barriers identified in the City of Cambridge (see Best Practices section above) as peculiar to residential developments – mainly that their trip generation impacts are not as easily quantified as are an employment destination's. This makes it difficult to identify mitigation strategies that address peak-congestion-oriented program goals effectively. As a result, identifying appropriate TMP investments has been a challenge for both residential TMP's and City staff. Such challenges are the likely reason that, among the three Best Practice peers

reviewed, only one has chosen to require residential participation – despite a second peer (Montgomery County) having the legal authority to do so.

Establishment of a “pay-only” TMP option would offer an opportunity to shift time and responsibility commitments from volunteers to professional, experienced district TMP staff, chosen specifically for their understanding and support of program aims and benefits. This pay-only model would also allow funding from residential developments to be consolidated and investments to be shifted to locations and populations where greater impact on program goals can be expected.

This pay-only option should be the standard model for new residential TMP’s to avoid the unique and chronic administrative issues which have created frustration in both participant-support for the program’s aims and the effectiveness of its implementation. For established residential TMP’s, shifting to the pay-only format must be offered as an option – open to all, any time they wish to switch over from their originally established TMP.

For all pay-only TMP’s, annual contribution levels can be set following the same process used for those choosing to continue under the traditional TMP model. Contribution levels, however, should be discounted for “pay-only” TMP’s to encourage existing TMP’s to opt in, and to reflect the efficiency gains offered by:

- Consolidating administration;
- Economies of scale resulting from consolidating TMP investments; and
- Performance improvements expected from shifting investments to populations and locations offering greater potential traffic and SOV-reliance impact.

While the loss of control over investment of TMP contributions may keep many existing residential TMP’s from opting into this model immediately, the savings in direct costs as well as time and labor offered by the pay-only option will become clearer over time. For TMP’s struggling to find investment opportunities, remaining in the traditional model will amount to paying for added administrative obligations and work. Holding onto funds for the sake of holding onto them will likely lose its appeal in time, especially with a cheaper and easier option waiting for them.

To further attract interest in this option, a good will gesture is proposed to permit existing TMP’s that opt into the pay-only model to spend any accrued TMP funds in any way they choose. This gesture is anticipated to be effective in attracting residential TMP’s into the new pay-only option as many interviewed in Task 3 stated that their TMP’s have accrued sizable funds — funds that would be theirs to spend as they see fit if they opt in. This would likely require a City Council-approved change to the TMP ordinance.

Non-Residential Consolidation – TMP Districts

Similar to the TMD District approach successfully implemented in Montgomery County (see Best Practices section above), it is recommended that the City of Alexandria establish TMP Districts across the city. The TMP Districts would cover the whole city, or

at least the parts of it within which TMP investments would likely be most effective. Districts would be defined strategically based on geography as well as land use commonalities and/or transportation synergies. The City would assign dedicated TMP District staff to assist each district individually. Such staff should be selected for:

- Significant understanding of traffic mitigation and transportation management concepts and strategies;
- Appropriate dedication to the value and potential of the program; and
- Demonstrable ability to market the program's benefits to Alexandria businesses.

The described TMP District staff would:

- Receive all monies collected from "pay-only" TMP's within their district;
- Receive modest administrative fees from all participating employers (optional);
- Operate as an extension of either the City's Transportation and Environmental Services or Planning and Zoning department — similar to the City of Cambridge — or as a newly created body — similar to Montgomery County's TMD Districts;
- Provide dedicated staff to support TMP-participating employers within district boundaries;
- Market the program's intents and benefits to all district employers, utilizing websites, printed materials, and on-site training and information sessions similar to Montgomery and Arlington counties;
- Establish appropriate, district-wide performance measures;
- Assist employers in identifying demand-management strategies for achieving performance measures;
- Have the administrative authority to require and approve or reject annual TMP implementation plans, and initiate non-compliance measures; and
- Collect, organize, and analyze all survey data to assist in tracking performance among districts and across the city.

Coordinating with the City's dedicated TMP staff member, employers with TMPSUP obligations would be required to:

- Develop annual implementation plans based on the terms of their SUP;
- Fund all implementation costs;
- Implement a set of basic program requirements similar to what is currently required: TMP Coordinator, annual employees surveys, annual reports, etc.

Each TMP District will be responsible for meeting its performance measures – as demonstrated through annual surveys and reports. Should measures not be met, each TMP District would rely upon surveys and reports to determine which TMP plans are under-performing and make appropriate adjustments in annual plan revisions. Like the Montgomery County and Arlington County programs, TMP District staff services would be offered to all employers to guide in the development of demand-management oriented commuter benefits.

A key improvement over the existing program would be that, each year, every TMP District participant would be required to implement an approved set of measures based on approved performance targets and previous-year performance.

Alternative Consolidation Model –Transportation Management Associations

The Potomac Yards TMA in Arlington County was established in lieu of the new development in Potomac Yards participating in the County’s official TMA – Arlington Transportation Partners. This option was intended to provide more autonomy to a large development, the developers of which had sought control over the spending of funds. The unique arrangement requires the independent Potomac Yards TMA to meet negotiated, annual performance measures specific to their area.

Under a similar arrangement in Alexandria, TMA’s could be established among individual TMP’s seeking more control or autonomy over their TMP investments. These independent TMA’s would:

- Negotiate locally-appropriate, TMA-wide performance measures with the appropriate TMP District;
- Operate in lieu of TMP District participation only so long as performance measures are achieved;
- Set and collect funding contributions from all participating employers; and
- Identify and fund demand-management and traffic mitigation strategies to achieve performance targets.

The TMA option should also be available for established residential developments choosing not to opt into the pay-only alternative, as well as new residential developments.

The City can set terms for each established TMA that define actions to be taken should performance targets not be achieved. For example, for each year that performance fails to meet or exceed targets, a TMA might be required to increase funding commitments by 15% for the subsequent year. Furthermore, should a TMA fail to meet performance measures within an established timeframe (five years for example), it could be dissolved. Optionally, failure to meet performance targets followed by a failure to meet increased funding obligations could result in immediate dissolution. Once dissolved, all residential participants would automatically shift to the pay-only model and all non-residential participants would automatically shift to the TMP District model.

Conversely, TMA’s that meet or exceed their targets are free to reduce funding commitment levels at their own discretion. This is a key aspect of their direct autonomy over their activities and investments, and a key incentive to attract traditional TMP’s into this alternative form of program consolidation.

Optional vs. Mandatory Consolidation

Due to differing regulations, mechanisms for consolidation must vary for new versus existing TMP’s. New TMP’s are at the discretion of the City and are therefore recommended to be brought into a consolidated TMP, as a participant in either a TMP

District or approved TMA. By contrast, an approved SUP can only be amended at the request of its holder; therefore, consolidation among existing TMP's must be voluntary.

The City can offer increased autonomy to TMP's that opt into TMP District or TMA participation by shifting the program's emphasis to performance measures rather than funding and investment controls (see below). As long as a District's performance targets are met (or substantially met) employers would be free to negotiate what TMP activities they will undertake each year, and on what they will expend their TMP investments.

The TMA option would provide even more autonomy compared to pay-only and TMP District options by allowing participants to select independent administrators of their choosing to collect funds, identify programs, and invest in strategies. This may be a popular solution for existing residential TMP's that would like to participate in nearby employer-based shuttle services – providing the employer service with return-trip riders and increased service funding.

As long as this option is tied directly to meeting performance measures (with the clear understanding that failure to do so will result in absorption into the default model for each participant), the City can afford to offer this level of autonomy as means of attracting existing TMP's into a more effective, consolidated program model. Stakeholders interviewed in Task 3 stated that such autonomy was highly desired among existing TMP participants. This benefit of consolidation is therefore anticipated to attract many existing TMP's into a consolidated TMP option.

Figure 7 summarizes the track that any TMP can take through the proposed consolidation process – essentially there is no option to return to a traditional TMP once one opts into either a pay-only or TMA alternative. This is key to eventually attracting all TMP's into either a TMP District or an approved TMA.

Figure 7: Consolidation Model Alternatives for Existing and New TMP's

TMP Type	TMP Model Options Available				Options Should TMA Fail		
	Pay Only	Remain in Existing TMP	TMP District	TMA	Pay Only	Return to Previous TMP	TMP District
Established Residential	X	X		X	X		
New Residential	X			X	X		
Est. Non-Residential		X	X	X			X
New Non-Residential			X	X			X

Program Focus – Performance Measures vs. Funding and Investment Control

Few changes to the existing program offer a greater chance to improve performance and generate participant and community buy-in than the City relinquishing direct control over funding levels and investments in return for setting quantifiable performance measures and targets. Two major advantages of such a trade off are:

- Accountability and Results – Each TMP participant is required to directly contribute to meeting overall program goals, as opposed to simply meeting funding and investment guidelines; and
- Improve TMP investment process – Both City staff and TMP participants have expressed frustration over the current implementation approvals process. A new focus on performance will:
 - Provide more flexibility to administrators;
 - Provide more autonomy to participants in identifying implementation options; and
 - Clarify what is expected of investments — that they directly impact measured performance.

Broad performance measures should be adopted that reflect stated program goals. Options include, but are not limited to:

- Peak-period SOV-commute rates/Peak-period non-SOV-commute rates;
- Transit commute rates (for transit-proximate sites or transit-rich areas); and/or
- SOV-commute rate reductions.

Tracking these measures across the city will provide Alexandria with clear information on the impact of the program. This information will be invaluable for communicating the benefits of the program to participants and the general population.

In addition, individual performance targets should be set and annually revisited for each District and TMA, based on the constraints and opportunities of individual developments, sites, and/or district areas. Options include, but are not limited to:

- Target SOV-, or non-SOV-, commute rates (as described in the Montgomery County TMD District approach in the Best Practices section above);
- Transit-commute rate target;
- SOV-commute rate reduction;
- Meeting either SOV-commute, non-SOV-commute, or transit-commute target based on a set “base-performance” year. For example, matching non-SOV commute rates for a development’s census tract as measured by a census (Cambridge’s PTDMP sets their standard target based on the 1990 census; see Best Practices section above).

Whatever measures are chosen, and whatever targets are set, focusing on performance rather than process will provide a number of benefits for the program, as indicated above. In addition, such an approach will allow the City to offer increased autonomy to participants as a trade-off for opting into TMP Consolidation. In addition, focusing on performance and accountability, along with consolidation, will also provide important new tools for improving compliance among active TMP participants.

Non-Compliance Enforcement

Compliance enforcement was identified as an area in need of improvement during Task 3 interviews by participants in both the Developers and the City Attorney’s meetings. Specifically, identification of a series of non-compliance “triggers” and the resulting

consequences was suggested to clarify what the City expects of TMP participants as well as consequences for non-compliance. It was also suggested that a broader range of non-compliance response options would allow the City's response options to better match various levels of non-compliance.

The review of compliance and enforcement issues during the Task 2 Review of Best Practices indicates that consolidating TMP's and focusing on performance measures will greatly simplify these issues for Alexandria and provide the following enforcement improvements:

- Consolidation of compliance monitoring;
- Single-source of information for participants on both compliance requirements and non-compliance responses; and
- Focus on accountability in annual TMP plans, including measures responding to a lack of "good faith" compliance efforts.

Consolidate Compliance Monitoring

The current approach requires the City to enforce compliance in both the funding of TMP's and the use of those funds to implement approved actions. This relies upon Transportation & Environmental Services staff to monitor compliance in terms of funding and completion of surveys and reports, while Planning & Zoning staff must identify implementation compliance – interpreting TMP funding proposals against SUP requirements. Monitoring all program activities through the TMP District staff, and a new focus on performance targets, would streamline this process.

The City's main compliance interest will be monitoring performance targets for each District and TMA. Within each District and TMA, reports, surveys, funding, and investments thus become tools for reaching and documenting these targets, rather than ends in themselves. Compliance with these obligations can be addressed at the level of annual TMP plan negotiations – increased obligations for poor performance, reduced obligations for high achievers. Should non-compliance rise to a level beyond such remediation, TMP District staff can initiate currently available non-compliance actions through the City Attorney's office.

Single Conduit for Compliance Information

The TMP District can also be an effective conduit for providing information on the enforcement process – the same TMP District staff negotiating annual TMP plans with each employer will also be responsible for identifying consequences for poor- or non-compliance – ensuring that all participants are aware of the various levels of response to a lack of cooperation.

From the project interviews, it appears rare that the City currently has to do more than send out a letter from the City Attorney's office in order to gain compliance from a non-participating or non-cooperative TMP. Should this fail, the issuance of a "zoning ticket" has proven to be effective in gaining compliance. The ability for a TMP District to inform members of the schedule of non-compliance responses, including details on the level of

non-compliance that will trigger them, can be expected to further prevent instances of non-compliance.

Added Tools

In addition to these broad, process-focused improvements in compliance monitoring, a number of specific compliance options are presented to focus on performance and accountability.

The TMP District

Consolidation into TMP Districts and TMA's provides one critical new enforcement tool – performance accountability. Simply put, TMP District staff will be able to adjust annual TMP plans to reflect prior-year compliance levels. For instance, a TMP District can require an employer that failed to submit an acceptable volume of completed surveys to hire an outside firm to either complete surveys or conduct driveway counts in the following year's TMP plan.

Should non-compliance continue, actions can be taken through the existing channels, such as involving the City Attorney's office. In this way, options will be sufficiently flexible to match non-compliance levels with appropriate remediation actions. It is also worth reiterating here that the TMP District approach provides the capacity to reward standout compliance efforts through reduced obligations.

The TMA

The TMA option is essentially extended on credit. As long as the developments involved collectively meet performance targets, the autonomy and local control offered by this model are retained. The potential dissolution of any TMA becomes the main incentive to ensure compliance. TMA administrators will have the ability to address smaller levels of non-compliance as part of their efforts to meet their performance targets – providing them with flexibility to address various levels of non-compliance similar to TMP District staff.

Pay-Only Option

For residential TMP's that remain with the traditional TMP model, non-compliance of a pre-determined level (i.e., two consecutive years of failing to provide surveys or invest funding) could result in the automatic conversion of that TMP to the pay-only model. This would likely require a City Council-approved change to the TMP ordinance.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Policy Goals

It is recommended that the City broaden its TMPSUP program goals and objectives to include reduced VMT and the many benefits tied to the current official goal of reducing VMT and peak congestion conditions, such as:

- Environmental benefits: improved air quality, reduced carbon emissions, reduced noise pollution;
- Improved roadway conditions: shorter travel times on local roads (for transit and private vehicles), fewer barriers to walking and biking, and reduced roadway wear and tear;
- Livability: improving the attractiveness of Alexandria as a Smart Growth community; and
- Social-Capital: community-building benefits of increased walking, biking, carpooling, and transit use.

This broadening of program goals and objectives would expand opportunities for quantifying program achievements, while underscoring the rationale for including residential developments in the program.

Program Structure and Implementation – Consolidation and Options

It is recommended that the City facilitate TMP consolidation by offering various TMP models and options to better fit the variety of affected developments. The recommended process can be summed up in three steps:

1. All new TMP's are organized into TMP Districts (non-residential uses), or a pay-only model (residential uses) that directly supports consolidated TMP Districts.
2. Develop program options to better fit conditions of each existing TMP development – TMP District, TMA, or pay-only.
3. Attract existing TMP's into a consolidated or a pay-only model.

Program Focus – Emphasize Results over Process

It is recommended that the City shift a focus on program processes (setting funding levels, ensuring compliance with surveying and investment requirements at each TMP) to mandating outcomes (setting broad performance targets on the District/ TMA level). To do so, the City should identify specific performance targets for each TMP District and TMA. Meeting these targets then becomes the primary compliance focus for the City.

TMP District staff and TMA administrators would then be freed to set funding, investment, survey, and reporting obligations for each participant as means for achieving performance targets – increasing obligations for under-performers and decreasing obligations for high-achievers. With such a change, participants will gain

autonomy while the City gains accountability — as well as improved, goal-oriented program performance.

Non-Compliance Enforcement

Focusing on performance measures and targets, along with effective consolidation, will address many identified compliance enforcement issues and offer the following improvements for the City's compliance efforts:

- Consolidation of compliance monitoring responsibilities via monitoring all program activities through the TMP District staff;
- Single-source of information for participants on both compliance requirements and non-compliance responses (TMP District staff or TMA); and
- Reduced compliance measures as the primary area of compliance becomes explicit targets.

Consolidation and accountability also add a number of new compliance tools, including:

- Performance accountability as TMP District staff will be able to adjust annual TMP plans to reflect prior-year compliance levels. For instance, a TMP District can require an employer that failed to submit an acceptable volume of completed surveys to hire an outside firm to either complete surveys or conduct driveway counts in the following year's TMP plan.
- The TMA which would essentially be extended on credit. The potential dissolution of any TMA becomes the main incentive for participants' compliance.

Appendix A:
Sample Plans and Supporting Documents
from Reviewed Peers

City of Cambridge –
PTDM: Small Project Plan

City of Cambridge Community Development Department

344 Broadway, Cambridge, MA 02139

Attn: PTDM Planning Officer

Tel: (617) 349-4673 Fax: (617) 349-4633 TTY: (617) 349-4621

Email: ptdm@cambridgema.gov <http://www.cambridgema.gov/~CDD/et/tdm/index.html>

Parking and Transportation Demand Management Small Project Plan

If project has a total (existing plus new) of 19 or fewer parking spaces, please attach Interdepartmental Parking Facility Approval form and provide the following information:

Property Owner:

Facility Address:

Contact Name :

Phone: Fax: Email:

Number of Spaces Requested:

Select at least three (3) Transportation Demand Management / Trip Reduction Measures:

Measure	Details
<input type="checkbox"/> MBTA pass subsidy (Must be at least 50%)	Amount of monthly subsidy:
<input type="checkbox"/> Charge drivers directly for cost of auto parking	Cost of parking charged directly to driver: Percentage of full cost:
<input type="checkbox"/> Subsidy for other modes	Amount of monthly subsidy (indicate mode):
<input type="checkbox"/> Shuttle service to nearby MBTA station	Station(s) served: Peak frequency:
<input type="checkbox"/> Reserved carpool parking program	Attach parking plan and application form for use of reserved spaces.
<input type="checkbox"/> Reduced rates for carpool parking	Cost of monthly parking for a carpool: Attach application needed to qualify for reduced rates.
<input type="checkbox"/> Bicycle racks	Should accommodate at least 2 bicycles.
<input type="checkbox"/> Other measures (attach additional details)	

OWNER SIGNATURE: _____ DATE: _____

FOR PTDM PLANNING OFFICER USE ONLY

APPROVED APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS (SEE ATTACHED) DENIED

SIGNED: _____ DATE: _____

City of Cambridge –
A19-Participation Thresholds

Thresholds Requiring Article 19 Participation - City of Cambridge Zoning Ordinance

Land Use Category	Threshold
Standard Threshold - All land uses but those listed below	50,000 SF
<i>Transportation Communication & Utility Uses</i>	
Bus or Railroad Station	Required
Auto Parking	150 Spaces
Freight Rail Terminal, Yard, Shop	50 Acres
Truck or Bus Terminal, Yard, Service or Storage, Parking	Required
<i>Institutional Uses</i>	
Religious Center	40,000 SF
Preschool, Day Care, Kindergarten	25,000 SF
Primary School/ Secondary School	40,000 SF
College/ University	150 New Parking Spaces, or 250 Relocated Parking Spaces
Vocational or Other School	40,000 SF
<i>Health Care Facilities</i>	
Hospital	35,000 SF
Infirmary	25,000 SF
Nursing Home	250 Beds
Clinic and Other Health Care Facilities	25,000
Social Service Facilities	40,000 SF
Public Parks, Playgrounds, Public Recreation Buildings	400 Acres
Cemetery	100 Acres
Other Institutional Uses	40,000 SF
Office and Laboratory Uses	25,000 SF
Retail Business and Consumer Service Establishments	25,000 SF
<i>Open Air or Drive-in Retail and Service</i>	
Greenhouse, Garden Supplies, Flower Shop, Produce Shop	25,000
Drive-Through Fast Food Restaurant	Required
Drive-Through Bank	Required
Other Drive-Through Retail	Required
Outdoor Amusement Park/ Sports Facility	300 Seats
Drive-In Theatre or Open Air Entertainment Venue	300 Seats
Automobile Sales	25,000 SF
Automobile Service - No Major Repairs	5 Fueling Positions
Car Wash	Required
Light Industry, Wholesale, Storage	25,000 SF

Arlington County –
TDM Site Plan Condition Checklist

TABLE III: TDM Site Plan Condition Checklist

<i>Checklist completed by</i>	<i>on Date</i>	Site Plan Required	Being Done	Not Done	Need Assistance
<u>A. Program Participation</u>					
1. Maintain an active membership in Arlington Transportation Partners (ATP).					
2. Designate and train the Property Transportation Coordinator (PTC).					
3. Facilitate development of Employee Transportation Coordinator (ETC).					
<u>B. Facilities and Improvements</u>					
4. Provide Transportation Kiosk or information display.					
5. Provide for bus stops improvement.					
6. Maintain existing bus stops during construction.					
7. Maintain an on-site business center (residential use only).					
8. Bicycle facilities: bike storage/parking facilities, guest parking and showers.					
<u>C. Parking Management Plan</u>					
9. Prepare a comprehensive parking management plan.					
10. Provide a Comprehensive Sign Plan for the property.					
11. Design for paratransit access at main entrance to building.					
12. Provide reserved spaces for carpoolers and vanpoolers (commercial use only)					
13. Establish market- rate pricing for SOV parking (commercial use only).					
14. Provide registered vanpools with free parking (commercial use only).					
15. Provide carpools with ½ off the rate for SOV parking (commercial use only).					
16. Depict area parking plan for the site and adjacent street frontage.					
17. Prohibit on-street loading during peak periods.					
<u>D. Promotions, Services, Policies</u>					
18. Provide a sustainable commute benefit program.					
19. Provide transit benefit for a six - month period (commercial use only).					
20. Provide SmarTrip cards.					
21. Provide website hotlinks to CommuterPage.com™.					
22. Distribute transit and ridesharing information:					
a. Participating in ATP staff programs.					
b. Provide New-resident or tenant commuter information package.					
c. Distribute transit and ridesharing information periodically.					
d. Participate in Ozone Action Days and similar activities.					
e. Reference adjacent metro stations in promotional materials.					
23. Encourage flexible work strategies to/from property.					
24. Encourage telecommuting (commercial use only).					
<u>E. Performance, Monitoring and Funding</u>					
25. Implement TDM plan.					
26. Submit an annual letter of performance to the County Manager.					
27. Conduct a transportation performance study.					
28. Provide annual Contributions to ACCS					

Arlington County –
Parking Report and Charge Summary

Montgomery County –
Sample Traffic Mitigation Plan

SAMPLE TRAFFIC MITIGATION PLAN

Company/Organization: Global Solutions, Inc.

Address: 5555 County Drive, Silver Spring MD 20910

Number of Full-time Employees: 300 Part-time Employees 0

Submitted by: Tom A. Jones Title President

Signature: _____ Date: May 1, 2003

Here's our plan to reduce gridlock in Montgomery County by offering the selected transportation benefits to our employees. In the first column, we've placed an *E* next to the strategies that we already have in place, and *N* next to the strategies that we will implement with this year's Traffic Mitigation Plan. In the last column, we've described our current or planned efforts.

E= Existing Strategy N= New Strategy * Required Strategy

	Traffic Mitigation Strategy	Employer Description
* E	Contact person designated to receive and distribute information	Ellen Davis, Human Resources Director 301-555-5555; edavis@globalsolutions.com We will notify the TMD in writing of any changes in this information
* E	Information on transit/pooling/other commute alternatives distributed/posted regularly (furnished by TMD)	Information on transportation services is posted in the employee break room.
* N	Facilitate TMD staff presentations to employees and HR/Adminstrative staff on commute information/alternatives on periodic basis	We hold an annual benefits seminar in the fall. We would like TMD Staff to attend to display information and answer employee questions.
* N	Guaranteed Ride Home Promotion (free regional program offering emergency rides)	We promote the Guaranteed Ride Home program to our employees. We provide brochures to employees with their monthly transit benefit.
* N	Annual Commuter Survey distributed to employees (short survey of transportation– supplied by TMD)	[Please describe your approach to gaining 80 percent participation from your employees] We will distribute survey to our employees via e-mail from our company president. We will also send an e-mail reminder.
* N	ADA information provided (transportation services for people with disabilities)	We will provide disabled employees with information on the regional Metro Access program and Montgomery County's Same Day Access program.
* N	Permanent display area for TMD-provided bus schedules and other transportation information	We plan to install a transit map and brochure racks in our employee break room.
* N	Compile information on yearly TMP activities and submit Annual Report	We will maintain a file on the promotion and implementation of the strategies selected above and include in our Annual Report to DPWT.
N	Attendance at free CSS-sponsored meetings/workshops permitted for designated contact person	Ms. Davis will be permitted to attend four such meetings per year.

SAMPLE TRAFFIC MITIGATION PLAN

	<u>Traffic Mitigation Strategy</u>	<u>Employer Description</u>
E	Information on commuting alternatives provided to new employees (TMD can provide materials and/or attend orientations)	We inform new employees of our transit subsidy program and provide Metro pocket guide and Ride On route maps to assist them in transit planning.
	Free or reduced rate parking for car/vanpools offered to employees	
	Preferred location and/or reserved parking for car/vanpools offered to employees	
N	Bike amenities at worksite, such as racks, lockers, and showers (TMD may be able to supply)	We will arrange to have bike racks installed in our garage.
	Transit/pedestrian amenities at worksite, e.g. sidewalks, benches, etc.	
	Carpool matching for employees (as part of free region-wide matching program, or can be on-site only)	
N	Alternative work schedules: <input type="checkbox"/> Flex Time <input type="checkbox"/> Jobsharing <input type="checkbox"/> Compressed Work Week <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Telecommute/Teleworking	We allow teleworking for some employees in special circumstances. We would be interested in formalizing this program and making it available to more employees.
E	Tax-free monthly transit subsidies provided to employees, including Super Fare Share, Fare Share and Metrochek.	We participate in the Super Fare Share program. We joined in September 2000. Fifty employees currently participate in the program. We inform new employees about the subsidy at orientation.
N	Maryland State Commuter Tax Credit for employers	TMD Staff explained that we qualify for the State's 50 percent tax credit on our contributions to employees commuting costs up to \$30/month. We will apply for credit this tax year.
	Pre-tax payroll deduction for transit costs offered to employees (Saves employer & employee money)	
	Transit passes/tokens offered for purchase at worksite (at full or reduced price)	
	Subsidize employee parking and transit equally (if employee parking is currently subsidized, offer equal subsidy for transit costs)	
	Ozone Action Days participation (regional program to alert people to dangerous air quality days)	
	Other : Please Indicate	

Please attach to cover letter and submit to:

**Albert J. Genetti, Jr., Director, Department of Public Works and Transportation
c/o Sandra L. Brecher, Administrator, Montgomery County Commuter Services
8401 Colesville Road, Suite 150, Silver Spring MD 20910—301-565-5890 (fax)**

Montgomery County –
Sample Annual Commuter Survey

ANNUAL COMMUTER SURVEY

Please return completed survey **WITHIN 1 WEEK** to the person who gave it to you, **OR** send to:
MONTGOMERY COUNTY COMMUTER SERVICES, 8401 Colesville Road, Suite 150, Silver Spring, MD 20910



This survey is our yearly 'Snapshot' of Montgomery County Commuters.

Your employer is working with Montgomery County Commuter Services to improve our transportation system.

Your answers to this survey are very important!

Please complete this survey on a TUESDAY, WEDNESDAY or THURSDAY ONLY.

Regardless of how you currently get to work, please complete the survey!

Print Name & Phone Number for a chance to win a fabulous prize!



PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

Today's Date: _____

Company/Organization: _____

1. Did you work at your usual place of employment yesterday? Yes No
If no, please check one of the following, then skip to question 4.
 I was: Telecommuting On regular day off (non-compressed sch.) On leave (vacation, sick, maternity, etc.)
 On company business On compressed work week
2. What were your worksite arrival and departure times yesterday?
 Arrival: _____ am pm Departure: _____ am pm
3. How did you travel to work yesterday? If more than one mode, check only the final mode you used to reach your worksite. Do not check "walked" if you walked to or from your car, bus, train station, etc.
 Walked (as my only method from home to work)
 Drove Alone (do not check if you drove a motorcycle/moped)
 Carpool Driver Including you, how many persons were in the carpool? _____
 Carpool Passenger
 Vanpool Driver Including you, how many persons were in the vanpool? _____
 Vanpool Passenger
 Casual Carpool or Slug Passenger
 (I rode with someone with whom I do not have a regular carpool arrangement)
 Bus, Metrorail, Amtrak, MARC and/or VRE
 (includes drive, walk, or shuttle to bus stop, station, or park-and-ride lot)
 Bicycle (as my only method of travel to and from the worksite)
 Motorcycle/Moped (as my only method of travel to and from the worksite)
4. How far do you live from your worksite (in miles)?
 0 - 9.9 10 - 19.9 20 - 29.9 30 - 39.9 40 - 49.9 50 or more
5. What is your home zipcode? _____
6. If you drive alone to work, do YOU pay for some or all of your worksite parking? Yes No
 If YES, what is YOUR monthly cost for parking at your worksite?
 \$1-\$20 \$21-\$40 \$41-\$60 \$61-\$80 \$81-\$100 \$100+
 Does your EMPLOYER pay for some or all of your worksite parking? Yes No
 If YES, what is your EMPLOYER'S monthly cost for your parking space at your worksite?
 \$1-\$20 \$21-\$40 \$41-\$60 \$61-\$80 \$81-\$100 \$100+ Don't Know
7. If you commute by any means other than driving alone, how much per month does your employer reimburse of your commuting expenses? (bus, Metrorail, carpool/vanpool, Amtrak, MARC, VRE, bicycle or walking)?
 \$0-No Reimbursement \$1-\$20 \$21-\$40 \$41-\$60 \$61-\$80 \$81-\$100 \$100 +
8. If you usually drive alone to work, how likely would you be to switch to an alternative method (public transit, carpool, vanpool, bicycle) if you were offered the following? Select all that apply:

	VERY LIKELY	SOMEWHAT LIKELY	NOT VERY LIKELY	NOT AT ALL LIKELY
a. A guaranteed ride home in an emergency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Flextime or compressed schedule	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. A monthly transit allowance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. A monthly vanpool allowance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Free parking for carpool/vanpool	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Free assistance to find a carpool or vanpool	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Transit route and schedule information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Bicycle storage/shower facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

OVER PLEASE ➔

Your responses help to improve transportation in Montgomery County!

- New county-wide transportation options, including Ride-On, Metrobus/Metrorail, MARC, MTA/Eyre Bus and free downtown shuttles
- Express Bus Service from Germantown and Gaithersburg to Bethesda
- One-Stop Commuter Express Store in Downtown Silver Spring
- FARE SHARE & SUPER FARE SHARE Transit Subsidy programs

COMPLETE ONLY IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO RECEIVE FREE INFORMATION ON CARPOOLING, VANPOOLING, TRANSIT, THE GUARANTEED RIDE HOME (GRH) PROGRAM OR OTHER ALTERNATIVES TO DRIVING ALONE.

Name: _____

Home Address: _____

Number/Street

Apt. #

City

State

Zip

County

Name of Employer/Agency: _____

Work Address: _____

Number/Street

Apt. #

City

State

Zip

County

Work Phone Number: _____ Fax Number: _____

I start work at _____ a.m. I can arrive _____ minutes **before** and _____ minutes **after** my normal time.

I stop work at _____ p.m. I can arrive _____ minutes **before** and _____ minutes **after** my normal time.

PLEASE SEND ME THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION/SCHEDULES: *(check all that interest you)*

- Commuter Rail: MARC/VRE Metrorail Metrocheck MD Transit Guaranteed Ride Home program Metrobus
 Bicycling Park & Ride lots Local/commuter bus: Other (specify)

CAR/VANPOOL MATCHLIST. I can/prefer to be: *(check all that interest you)*

- Carpool: Driver Rider Alternate Driver Neither
Vanpool: Driver Rider Alternate Driver Neither

For a carpool/vanpool, please specify pickup location(s) : _____

List the closest landmark to your home *(i.e., mall, shopping center, school)* : _____

PLEASE ADD YOUR SUGGESTIONS AND COMMENTS ON HOW COMMUTER SERVICES CAN SERVE YOU BETTER:



CALL 301-770-POOL (7665)

COMMUTER SERVICES
8401 Colesville Road, Suite 150
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

Montgomery County – *Marketing Sample*

How Employers Implement TMPs



BETHESDA

“As a retail outlet with several shifts and employees who live all over the area, it’s difficult for us to coordinate carpools. We’ve found that the best way to inform employees about transit and other commuter services is through paycheck inserts, which they’re sure to see. The Transportation Management District has been tremendous — sending materials and helping us create our traffic mitigation plan. I would encourage any small business to call them for assistance in understanding the new law and meeting the requirements.”

STROSNIDERS
HARDWARE STORES
Bethesda • Potomac • Silver Spring
50th Anniversary - 1953 to 2003

—Stephen M. Smith, Comptroller,
Strosniders Hardware



NORTH BETHESDA

“The North Bethesda Transportation Management District sent samples of traffic mitigation plans so we would know exactly how to create one. They also made gave us suggestions on how to make sure that all levels of the corporation were involved. Our employees have responded very positively. They like having the information available to them so they can research different options. The most popular is the tax-free transit subsidy, which saves them a lot of money.”

SLS
Social & Health
Services Ltd.

—Wendy L. Mock, Human Resources Manager,
Social & Health Services, Ltd



SILVER SPRING

“Our employees are very excited about our transportation benefits program, and are eagerly anticipating the development of the new plan. We post all information on bulletin boards throughout the company, and invite comments and suggestions. The Silver Spring Transportation Management District (TMD) has been very helpful, providing us with advice and tips which would encourage our employees to consider alternate commute options, including more carpooling, telecommuting and bicycling. We are also promoting expansion of all the existing programs.”

MayaTech® Corporation

—Alfreda Thomas, MayaTech Corporation



FRIENDSHIP HEIGHTS

“Our employees especially like Super Fare Share, and so does the company. It’s a nice savings for us. We also post information on commuting alternatives on our bulletin board and have a dispensing unit in our lunchroom with handouts from the Transportation Management District. We’re very happy with the program, and we’re doing all we can to reduce traffic in Montgomery County.”

FDC REPORTS

—Jack Kilgallen, Facilities Management Manager,
F-D-C Reports, Inc.

 **Better Ways
To Work!** *Montgomery County
Commuter Services*



Go Montgomery!
Transportation Plan for Our Future



MTA
Maryland

Appendix B:

Stakeholder Interviews Guidelines

Appendix: TMP Study Task 3 – Questions for Interviews per Group

Interview - Planning & Zoning and Transportation & Environmental Services

Questions

1. What is your interaction/responsibility with the TMP process? Please describe your last experience with the process.
2. Are the following TMP elements providing the information necessary to assess their potential effectiveness in containing traffic?
 - a. Application
 - i. Traffic Impact Statement
 - ii. TMP
 - b. Compliance – How effective are the following reporting tools in measuring the goals of the TMP program?
 - i. Reports/Surveys
 - ii. Fund Reports
 - iii. Annual Reports
3. What are your general observations about the TMP process?
 - a. Is there enough funding for the prescribed transportation activities?
 - b. Is the TMP administration effective?
4. Enforcement –
 - a. Please describe the Zoning Violation procedures.
 - b. In your opinion, are there any other actions that could be taken to enforce the TMPs?
5. In your opinion, what aspect of the TMP program should be changed?
6. What are your suggestions for changing the TMP program?

Interview – City Attorney’s Office

Questions -

1. What is your interaction/responsibility with the TMP process?
2. What are your general observations about the TMP process? (both administrative and effectiveness)
3. What do you think about the following specific TMP elements:
 - a. Application
 - i. Traffic Impact Statement

- ii. TMP
 - b. Compliance and
 - i. Reports/Surveys
 - ii. Fund
 - iii. General Effects
 - c. Enforcement
 - i. Zoning Violation
4. In view of the general response that residents and businesses give to the plan, how would you consider modifying the ordinance to achieve the reduction in traffic envisioned by the City through the TMPs?
 5. Could a one-time TMP fee be assessed at the time of initial application for residential properties rather than a fee into perpetuity?
 7. Have you considered modifying the ordinance by collecting the TMP funds not being spent as agreed and establishing a city-wide TMP fund?
 7. In your opinion, what aspect of the TMP program should be changed?
 8. What are your suggestions for changing the TMP program?

Interview – Developers and Developers’ Attorneys

Questions

1. Is the TMP program effective in controlling traffic from new development?
2. Could you share any other programs for traffic control of new development known to you?
3. What is your experience with the TMP process?
4. What are your general observations about the TMP process?
 - a. Is there enough funding for the prescribed transportation activities?
 - b. Would you favor a one-time payment for new traffic generated by a new project?
5. In your opinion, what aspect of the TMP program should be changed?
6. What are your suggestions for changing the TMP program?

Interview – Office Buildings and Retail

Questions

1. What is your interaction/responsibility with the TMP process? Please describe your last experience with the process.
2. From your end, how effective are the following reporting tools in measuring the goals of the TMP program?
 - i. Reports/Surveys
 - ii. Fund Reports
 - iii. Annual Reports
3. What are your general observations about the TMP process?
 - a. Is there enough funding for the prescribed transportation activities?
 - b. Is the TMP administration effective?
4. Are you aware of the enforcement procedures for the TMPs?
5. In your opinion, what aspect of the TMP program should be changed?
6. What are your suggestions for changing the TMP program?

Interview – Residential Developments and Mixed Development

Questions

1. What is your interaction/responsibility with the TMP process?
2. What are your general observations about the TMP process?
 - a. Is there enough funding for the prescribed transportation activities?
 - b. Is the TMP administration effective?
3. Please describe your last experience with the process.
4. What transportation activities are in place in your site?
5. If there are no transportation activities, could you indicate the reason for that?
6. Please give your views with the reporting requirements (fund report, annual report and survey).
7. In your opinion, what aspect of the TMP program should be changed?
8. What are your suggestions for changing the TMP program?

Appendix C: Recommendations Summary Table

Appendix - Table of Recommendations

Issue Identified	Details - Strengths/ Constraints	Addressing Recommendations	How Addressed
Residential Participation	Resistance to participation/ obligation	Pay-Only option, TMA option	Provide options to current model
	Difficulty in finding effective administrator	Pay-Only option	No administration for residential developments
	Smaller development TMPs and TMPs away from transit have difficulty finding effective investments	TMA option	Professional administration via TMA
		Pay-Only option	Investment go directly to TMP District where impact is more probable
		Broadening Goals	More flexibility in investment approvals for remaining traditional TMPs
Site-Based TMPs	Lack Efficiencies of Scale	TMP Districts, TMA option, Pay-Only option	Pool resources for scale-efficient investments
	Difficulty in finding effective administrator	TMP Districts, TMA option, Pay-Only option	Administration is consolidated
	Smaller development TMPs and TMPs away from transit have difficulty finding effective investments	TMP Districts, TMA option, Pay-Only option	Pool resources for scale-efficient investments
		TMP Districts, TMA option, Pay-Only option	Shifts funds to help establish and meet performance measures within development's district, TMA area.
Consolidation	Economies of scale	TMP Districts, TMA option	Consolidation models
		Pay-Only option	Consolidation support, attrition of individual residential TMPs
	Supports performance focus	TMP Districts, TMA option	Goals set for TMD districts, TMAs
	Streamlined administration	TMP Districts, TMA option, Pay-Only option	Fewer administrators needed, administrators that believe in and can sell program benefits
Enforcement	City lacks levels of non-compliance responses	TMP Districts	Options to increase annual obligations for non-compliance, poor compliance Increased obligations can be set to match level of compliance issue
		TMA option	Option taken away if performance targets are consistently unmet.
		Pay-Only option	Reducing compliance to simple payment for least compliant types of TMPs Possible automatic conversion to pay-only model following chronic non-compliance
Investment of TMP funds	Funding obligations have been ineffective in ensuring mitigation investments, especially at residential TMPs	Pay-Only option	Investment shifted based on likely impact
		TMP Districts, TMA option	Pools resources for scale-efficient investments
		Performance focus	Focus on program goals rather than means
Performance Measures	Directly address program goals	Performance focus	Focus on program goals rather than means
		TMP Districts, TMA option	Allow target-setting based on specifics of individual areas - transit adjacency, mix of uses, etc.
		TMP Districts, TMA option, Pay-Only option	Avoids having to set performance measures for development with least obvious travel patterns and least concentrated traffic impacts. Shifts funds to help establish and meet performance measures within development's district, TMA area.
TMP Transition following Property Transfer	New management sometimes needs assistance in taking over active TMPs, particularly when previous management has been remiss	TMP District, Pay-Only option	TMP District staff is single source of program administration, enforcement, outreach and promotion. The Pay-Only option also may become attractive as condominium boards/ board members turnover
Marketing Program	Opportunity to better sell program benefits to participants and community	Broadening Goals	Communicate the spectrum of benefits from reducing overall traffic congestion and SOV reliance
		TMP Districts, TMA option	Professional administrators working directly with employer benefits coordinators to market commuter benefits of TMP investment options