

T&E COMMITTEE #2
October 13, 2016

MEMORANDUM

October 11, 2016

TO: Transportation, Infrastructure, Energy and Environment Committee
FROM: ^{Go} Glenn Orlin, Deputy Council Administrator
SUBJECT: Update – Transportation Management Task Force

For more than a year the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Work Group, headed by DOT but with representation from DPS, Planning, and Council staffs, have developed a detailed outline of a more comprehensive and consistently-applied approach for traffic mitigation agreements. The Work Group necessarily delved into other areas of TDM as well.

A summary of Work Group's findings and recommendations are on ©1-12. The key recommendations are to:

- require varying levels of TDM to all areas of the County except rural areas;
- establish a tiered system for applying TDM that responds to the variety and quality of local mobility options;
- apply TDM efforts to commercial and moderate-to-high density residential developments;
- establish NADMS goals where they do not currently exist;
- develop and adopt a TDM menu of required tools and strategies; and
- improve monitoring and reporting, and to strengthen enforcement mechanisms.

Implementing the Work Group's recommendations—many of which are yet to be fleshed out—likely will require legislation, budget actions, and SSP amendments. The Work Group met with several stakeholders from the development industry on October 5; a summary of their reaction is on ©13-14.

There is clearly much work left to do, but Council staff nevertheless is confident that, with the present momentum for change in this arena—and the budget to support it—much of this new approach could be initiated during FY18. **Council staff recommendation: Direct DOT and the Planning Board to develop the requisite legislation, budget requests, and SSP amendments over the next several months in time for transmittal to the Council for deliberation and (hopefully) action next spring and summer.**

MONTGOMERY COUNTY DEVELOPMENT-RELATED TDM PROCESS

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REVISIONS

October 2016

TDM Process Review Work Group

The Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) convened a diverse work group of Executive, Council and M-NCPPC staff to provide input regarding improvements to the process for Traffic Mitigation Agreements (TMAs) and other Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies used in the County. Nelson/Nygaard Consulting Associates facilitated the discussions, consolidated recommendations from the group and contributed information regarding best practices nationally. The objectives were to improve consistency and predictability in the development process while enhancing the ability to achieve the County's non-auto driver mode share (NADMS) and broader TDM goals.

After consideration of national best practices and alternatives for local application, the TDM Process Review Work Group ("Work Group") recommended consideration of a number of modifications to the development review and subdivision process with the goal of sustaining mobility in the County to support the economic strength of the County and the quality of life offered to residents and workers. Working with the consultants, MCDOT has incorporated the Work Group recommendations into a plan for revision of the process, as highlighted with additional recommendations (in ***bold italics***) below.

Summary of Key TDM Work Group Recommendations:

1. ***Expand Transportation Demand Management efforts to all areas of the County (excluding Agricultural Reserve areas)***
2. ***Establish a tiered system for applying TDM that responds to the variety and quality of local mobility options, using geographic units and/or boundaries already established in the County.***
3. ***Expand TDM efforts beyond commercial projects to include moderate-to-high density residential developments***
4. ***Establish project-specific mode share targets that help the County achieve Transportation Management District (TMD), area and/or Countywide goals***
5. ***Develop and adopt a TDM "menu" of required tools and strategies. The recommended menu or "toolbox" should provide both flexibility and consistency.***
6. ***Improve monitoring and reporting and strengthen enforcement mechanisms.***

After review of these alternatives, the Work Group determined that a hybrid approach was preferred – one that provided a flexible toolbox of expected measures combined with performance requirements to ensure the package of programs chosen delivered the required results. The following conceptual approaches are proposed:

Geographic Application

The current areas of application for TMAs, as established by County Code, are fairly narrow at present – limited only to projects within designated TMDs. It is recommended that the program be modified under the Code to apply to the whole of Montgomery County, excepting only areas within the designated Agricultural Reserve. The application of the program throughout the

County levels the playing field and reduces the possibility of leapfrog development or an incentive to develop just outside of established TMD boundaries.

Certain issues remain to be resolved. Subdivision regulations have been proposed which would allow for TMAgs outside of TMDs, which is a good start. However, non-motorized mode share goals do not currently exist in all portions of the County, particularly in less urbanized areas. Those goals need to be established.

Work Group Recommendation for NADMS Goals:

- ***Include NADMS goals in Subdivision Staging Policy (SSP) transportation recommendations for all Policy Areas except Green.***
- ***Use current master plan/sector plan NADMS goals for a 10-year time frame, where available.***
- ***As a starting point for areas where NADMS goals do not currently exist, use Planning Board assumptions shown in the SSP Appendix (data based on the most recent Journey to Work of the American Community Survey in the U.S. Census) for NADMS and add 5 percent. For example, the draft SSP shows that the Olney Policy Area has NADMS for residential trips of 35.7% and 23.7% for office trips – so the NADMS goals for Olney should be 40.7% for residential trips and 28.7% for office trips.***

Tiered Requirements by Geographic Area or Project Type

Although it is appropriate that TMAgs be required across the County, it is recognized that the County is not homogeneous in land use context and level of transit services. For that reason, it is recommended that a tiered system be established to determine the appropriate level of transportation demand management expected and achievable in areas with very different context and/or of projects with different intensities of impact.

The Work Group recommended that three tiers of TDM requirement be established.

The Work Group recommends using the same geographic classifications for TDM as for the SSP.

These three tiers then would be:

1. ***High Mode Choice (HMC) Areas (SSP: Red)***– These are defined to include areas with transit services operating in exclusive rights-of-way, which due to higher speed and reliability are able to attract a higher level of fixed investment from prospective developers. They are comprised of the Metro Station Policy Areas (MSPAs) defined in the 2016 Subdivision Staging Policy recommendations as the “Red” areas. These high-choice areas include some established Transportation Management Districts but may include additional designated areas that provide other modal options.

Work Group Recommendation: All areas designated as “Red” in the SSP should be TMDs. However not all TMDs should be Red. Thus Glenmont and Wheaton (which are designated “Red”) would need to have TMDs created by Council resolution. Wheaton could be established as a TMD in the near-term. The timing for creation of the Glenmont TMD would relate to level of development.

2. Moderate Mode Choice (MMC) Areas (SSP: Orange)– The Work Group recommended these areas be those with some level of transit service, although service may not necessarily be frequent. Moderate Mode Choice areas would include corridor cities, town centers, and emerging Transit Oriented Development (TOD) areas as well as Bicycle Pedestrian Priority Areas (BiPPAs) and Urban Road Code Areas as defined by the SSP.

Work Group Recommendation: Define these areas as all the “Orange” areas designated in the SSP.

3. Limited Mode Choice (LMC) Areas (SSP: Yellow)– These are areas of the County that may not have distinct centers or modal hubs that would support a variety of mode options to meet commuting or other travel needs.

Work Group Recommendation: Define these areas as the “Yellow” areas designated in the SSP – but LMC areas could also include the “Green” areas when proposed for new development of the types to be included in the requirements for TMAgs/TDM strategies.

Exemptions from TDM Program Requirements

The following types of development projects should not be required to participate in TDM program efforts, regardless of in what geographic area they are located:

- Single Family Detached Residential Projects

Single family detached residential developments are unique. Sustainable management and delivery of the TDM programs are generally difficult in these projects given the diffuse ownership structure and lack of a common management oversight. Consistent monitoring and enforcement is nearly impossible. For this reason, it is recommended that developments of single family detached properties should not be required to develop or deliver a formalized transportation demand management program or enter into a TMAg. These projects should, however, be reviewed with a keen eye and required to build into their physical infrastructure TDM-supportive features such as bicycle parking, transit-supportive amenities, connected and walkable networks, and low stress bicycle accommodation.

- Projects that generate fewer than 50 Peak Hour Person Trips

Since the new SSP guidelines call for basing Traffic Impact Analysis for LATR on Person Trips rather than Vehicle Trips – and since projects generating fewer than 50 Peak Hour Person Trips would be exempt from LATR analysis – the Work Group recommended that Projects generating fewer than 50 Peak Hour Person Trips that are exempt from LATR likewise be exempt from requirements to do a TDM plan.

For example, a 20,000 sq. ft. office building would be expected to hold approximately 100 employees. If half of those employees commute to work during the peak hour, they would generate 50 Peak Hour Person Trips. Projects of that and similar size would be the smallest ones where a TDM Plan would be required.

- Religious Institutions and similar non-profit places of public assembly

It is part of public policy to encourage churches, other places of worship, and community-based non-profit organizations to maintain locations within the County's urban centers and where those without access to private autos can still readily access those service providers.

Fee for Service/Incentives for Compliance

The TDM program currently provides certain services and assistance to commercial and, in some cases, high density residential development projects within TMDs, and on a limited basis to major commercial developments outside TMDs. The Work Group recommended that a basic level of TDM education, awareness and services should be offered throughout the County to support the Countywide effort to reduce traffic impacts and achieve TDM goals.

Under the proposed system discussed in the Work Group, developments would pay into a countywide TDM fund commensurate with their mode choice area designation. Such a tiered fee would require some level of administrative tracking versus a general tax.

- Areas within designated TMDs would continue to have the existing TMD fee apply, and would retain their existing programming and attention.
- Adding participation by areas outside TMDs will level the playing field between TMD and non-TMD locations and the associated requirements. It will also provide the pooled resources necessary to provide more effective TDM services and support to the non-TMD portions of the County, which represent a much larger geographic area.

Currently TMD fees are applied only to commercial developments first occupied after the fees were adopted in 2006. The Work Group recommended consideration be given to assessing TMD fees on multi-unit residential projects as well, and potentially to existing development that was in place prior to adoption of the fees, since all projects – new or existing – benefit from the TDM efforts in those areas.

Work Group Recommendation:

- ***Red areas/HMC/TMDs – Fees should apply to all development, regardless of when completed (i.e., both those completed prior to 2006 and those built/occupied after that). Fees should apply to residential multi-unit and townhome projects, as well as commercial development.***
- ***Orange areas/MMC – Fees should apply to commercial, multi-unit residential and townhomes. Fees should be set at a level to cover staff and marketing of TDM programs and services. Consider 50% of TMD fee.***
- ***Yellow areas/LMC – Fees should be set lower commensurate with lower level of TDM services. Consider 25% of TMD fee.***

Projects will have the option of providing their own TDM program to achieve NADMS and other TDM goals, or participating in the County's programs. Projects not wishing to provide their own TDM program may be required to pay a separate fee for service to have the County TDM program concurrently provide TDM services to the payee's property.

Targets and Thresholds

The new SSP draft recommends a peak hour 50-person trip threshold to trigger Local Area Transportation Review studies. In parallel, the new TDM program would utilize that same 50-

person trip threshold to determine whether a project must submit a TDM plan/strategy and participate in ongoing monitoring requirements.

Work Group Recommendation: Every development project required to have LATR analysis must have a TMAg, including developments in the Red/HMC areas that exceed the 50 Peak Hour Person Trip threshold (consistent with pending revision of SSP recommendations).

It is appropriate that projects each have an independent performance requirement for their development. These independent targets should roll up into a larger NADMS goal for the general area. Failure to successfully meet and maintain the target would trigger a requirement to revisit and revise the adopted TDM measures.

Each existing TMD, as a transit-rich area, already has designated Non-Auto Driver Mode Share targets. Every new project is expected to contribute positively to the overall goal. However, with few exceptions, projects currently are not actually required to achieve a certain NADMS goal or any other specific TDM goals for their project itself.

Under the proposed TDM program, newly established *High Mode Choice Areas* will have goals and targets set for them just as with the existing TMDs, and all new (and perhaps existing) development projects over a given size will be required to achieve the goals and targets.

Universal, area-wide goals also will be set for *Moderate Mode Choice Areas*. While existing projects within these areas should strive to meet these goals, new projects proposed in the area may be required to achieve a higher level of Non-Auto Driver trips in order to ensure the target is met for the whole area.

Targets may not be established for *Limited Mode Choice Areas* but rather basic standards of mode choice support and encouragement must be demonstrated and a good faith effort made.

Toolbox of TDM Measures – Appendix A

Appendix A presents a sample of TDM measures considered potentially suitable for Montgomery County by Nelson/Nygaard. The required measures in the toolbox would need to be scaled appropriately to the *High, Moderate* and *Limited Mode Choice Areas*. Some elements will be common across all areas such as parking management techniques and informational elements. High Mode Choice Areas will have more robust requirements that are reduced in the lower mode choice areas. The toolbox would be flexible regarding adding components as they become available and their efficacy is evaluated.

The final toolbox or “menu” may include default/required measures together with comparable options that could be swapped out for the default measure. Like a well-balanced meal, the required TDM programs may outline the basic components but permit applicants to choose the specific measure (for example a healthy meal may include a protein, two vegetables and a fruit but diners may choose what individual components best suit their taste – and for developers, best suit their project type, context and “travel consumers.”)

In identifying or allowing the application of alternative programs or services, the County must also consider the cost to provide the alternatives making up that program. Ideally that cost would be approximately comparable across various projects on a per unit basis (e.g., cost per square foot, housing unit, or trip generated/reduced). However, where gaps between existing NADMS and NADMS goals are greater, costs for achievement may also be greater. The County must also consider context to ensure that alternative program selections have the area infrastructure necessary to support their success and effectiveness. Determination of whether measures are

required or optional, and what cost basis should be used to ensure equity, will be made at a later date in conjunction with further discussion with stakeholders and other parties.

Monitoring and Reporting

At present, measurement and reporting on specific activities is conducted primarily by the properties themselves utilizing online reporting templates developed and provided by the County. The County conducts an annual Commuter Survey to determine overall area NADMS, and can determine NADMS for specific properties, but does not have the resources to survey every property every year. Currently the County does not have the capacity nor resources to conduct monitoring and reporting on all aspects of TMAg with properties on a regular basis.

The requirement for monitoring and reporting may vary across the tiers of modal choice opportunity areas.

- Projects in *Limited* (LMC) or *Moderate Mode Choice* (MMC) areas would be required to demonstrate that they are doing what they said they would do. These areas may not have specific NADMS targets. But even if the decision is made to establish NADMS targets for MMC areas, individual projects may not be required to achieve those targets. Therefore, the properties themselves would not be held to specific numerical targets or measures of effectiveness. They would simply need to show that they are providing the services, programs and amenities as committed to and agreed upon.
- Projects in *High Mode Choice* (HMC) areas need to have more active monitoring, not just a certification of action as with the lower tier areas. These projects will be held to a property-specific performance target. TDM plans approved for these areas must be actually monitored for effectiveness and must be modified if properties are not achieving the expected level of effectiveness. It is not enough to simply do what was agreed upon. Programs must be effective or they must be altered.

Several alternatives for monitoring were discussed by the Work Group and in subsequent discussions within MCDOT:

1. Monitoring could be done by the County, with expanded staff capacity.
2. Projects could be tasked to self-report following an established data collection methodology and certification.
3. The County could designate and certify third party contractors to complete monitoring (as is done in Arlington County, VA). These vendors may be contracted directly by the property, or properties could pay the County for regular monitoring. The County may then aggregate properties requiring monitoring in that particular year, bundle and contract under one effort, likely enabling reduced cost for monitoring associated with this economy of scale.

Performance Security: Projects in the HMC/Red areas, and projects with specific goals in the other areas, will be required to provide some type of security for their commitments. This may take the form of a bond or letter of credit. In most cases, the letter of credit must be in effect for up to 12 years. Alternatively, projects may choose to make an up-front payment if they anticipate they may not be able to securitize the project for the whole monitoring period. The security and/or payment will be scaled to project size. These provisions require further discussion.

Work Group Recommendation:

***Adopt two types of monitoring: Self-Directed and County-Directed
Both types must be based on valid and reliable determination of NADMS, thus
requiring improved methods of data collection with regard to commuting choices.***

Self-Directed

- ***Project/Developer will monitor based on approved data collection and analysis protocol, conducted with an approved vendor. (MCDOT will establish criteria for vendor approval.)***
- ***Project/Developer will submit bi-annually a report on accomplishing the NADMS goal.***
- ***If NADMS goal is met, then project is in compliance.***
- ***If NADMS goal is not met, a remediation plan must be developed by the Project/Developer and approved by MCDOT within three months.***
- ***Implementation of the remediation plan must commence within three months of MCDOT approval.***
- ***A new monitoring report must be submitted within one year of implementation of remediation.***
- ***County reserves the right to monitor achievement independently of Project owner***

County-Directed

- ***MCDOT will establish toolbox of TDM measures appropriate for each Mode Choice geography (Red/HMC; Orange/MMC; Yellow/LMC)***
- ***Project/Developer will have options to choose among choices with certain elements optional and others required.***
- ***Project/Developer is responsible to implement the approved plan***
- ***County responsible for monitoring and reporting on achievement of NADMS***
- ***Failure to achieve NADMS goal will require a remediation plan developed by MCDOT with Project/Developer cooperation and assistance.***
- ***County's role is to establish a toolbox of measures appropriate to each geographic area. Implementation costs of those measures will be the responsibility of the developer/owner.***

Enforcement and Corrective Action

The TDM program will be enforced through both regulation and penalties. Additional research and work is necessary to determine the available remedies, though penalties may be contingent on the flexibility of the final instituted program. For instance, if a property follows a compulsory set of measures, but does not reach specified goals, a penalty may not be appropriate. However, if a property chooses to design their own program, and that program proves to be ineffective, then a penalty may be in order.

Work Group Recommendation:

- ***NADMS goals for each Project must be achieved within five years of approval of TDM plan***

- ***Failure to meet NADMS goals will incur penalties/liquidated damages. These will be proportionate to the shortfall***
- ***Penalty level should relate to the cost of achieving the goal for Policy Area.***
- ***Penalty is assessed annually until goal is achieved.***

Instruments for Implementation

Currently TDM programs for new development projects are implemented using the Development Review process, with recommendations made by MCDOT/Commuter Services for incorporation into conditions of approval by Planning Board. Recommendations made at that level are generally broad and do not delve into more specific details of the program and commitment. At present, these details for individual projects are expressed through the Traffic Mitigation Agreement (TMAG).

The Work Group recommends actions to move away from individually negotiated agreements for programs and into more consistent requirements incorporated into the County Code, specifically Section 42A-25. While the standard “required” measures may be able to be clearly articulated as additions to the County Code, higher-level TDM measures/strategies tailored to a specific project may still require individualized TMAGs. However, a level of standardization and basic elements required should be established to reduce the amount of negotiation necessary for these agreements.

TDM requirements will continue to be inter-related with SSP categories. Ensuring the currency and consistency of the TDM requirements may require regular re-examination of the provisions of future adopted Subdivision Staging Policies. An implementation deadline is currently undetermined, but should be given near-term consideration.

Work Group Recommendation:

- ***Incorporate standard TDM requirements into County Code and/or SSP provisions, based upon geographic location***
- ***Permit individualized arrangements for specific projects through TMAGs, selecting from Toolbox of options to achieve goals, coupled with Performance Security measures as appropriate based upon geographic location***

Appendix A
 Transportation Demand Management
 Sample Toolbox/Menu of Options

	High Mode Choice Area	Moderate Mode Choice Area	Limited Mode Choice Area
PARKING			
<u>Maximum parking limits:</u> Transit-oriented residential and office developments in Montgomery County exhibit lower parking demand than required by the county's parking requirements by being in a location where residents and workers have multiple transportation options. As a result, residential and commercial developments in parking lot districts or reduced parking areas have maximum parking limits. High minimum parking limits undermine the performance of TDM programs and encourage more driving. Providing a maximum parking limit in high mode choice areas can eliminate underused parking and create incentives to use other transit modes.	X		
<u>Eliminating minimum parking requirements:</u> Parking minimums can make it difficult to provide a compact, walkable urban environment, whether by forcing different buildings and uses to spread out or by making development projects on smaller lots infeasible. Some cities have eliminated minimum parking requirements in order to encourage appropriate development and allow the market to determine parking needs.	X		
<u>In-lieu fees or ad valorem tax:</u> Montgomery County currently requires a minimum number of parking spaces in Parking Lot Districts; if the property owner provides fewer than the requirement, they must pay an ad valorem tax to the PLD to contribute to shared public parking facilities. This encourages developers to build less parking while taking advantage of existing parking infrastructure.	X		
<u>Unbundled parking:</u> Renters or homebuyers in Montgomery County pay for parking in new housing, whether they use it or not. This can add costs to what is already an expensive housing market, particularly in areas where residents have multiple transportation options and may not need a car. Separating the cost of parking from housing can reduce housing costs while providing an additional incentive to take advantage of modes other than driving. Similar benefits accrue when parking for office and some other commercial space is unbundled from tenant leases. f	X	X	X
<u>Unassigned parking:</u> Currently, the county's zoning code requires that all developments provide assigned parking spaces for different uses (such as a building with apartments and retail), which can often duplicate parking resources. Different users may require parking at different times; for instance, office workers may park during the day, while residents could use the same spaces at night. Allowing unassigned parking between building uses could take advantage of varying parking demand throughout the day while reducing the need to build additional parking.	X	X	X

	High Mode Choice Area	Moderate Mode Choice Area	Limited Mode Choice Area
BICYCLING			
<u>Bicycle access improvements:</u> Ensuring safe, easy bicycle access to a property can encourage occupants and visitors to bike there instead of driving. This means providing multiple entrances for people on foot or bike and, on larger sites, publicly-accessible paths through the site. Building entrances should face pathways or streets, not parking lots. Montgomery County already allows developers to contribute to closing gaps in the bicycle network, whether through a fee or by constructing the improvement themselves.	X	X	X
<u>Secure bicycle parking:</u> Adequate bicycle parking gives bicyclists the same reliability that drivers expect at sites where parking is provided. Secure, indoor bicycle parking such as a bike room or bike lockers adds an additional level of security for building occupants seeking long-term parking. Today, developers in CR and some other zones are already required to provide on-site bicycle parking, usually in the form of bike racks.	X	X	X
<u>On-site bicycle repair facilities:</u> Like secure bicycle parking, on-site bicycle repair facilities make bicycling a more reliable transportation mode for occupants and visitors and reduce barriers to owning and maintaining a bike. They also keep bicycles in circulation, ensuring that people who come and go from the site by bike will continue to do so unimpeded by repair issues.	X	X	X
<u>Participation in County bikeshare:</u> Private entities such as developers or property managers can sponsor an on-site bike share station that is part of the County bikeshare program, creating connectivity with a larger system in the County and the region. This creates an incentive for residents or workers to bike to and from the property, particularly for short trips or "first mile/last-mile" connections. Incentives for bikeshare use can also be provided to tenants, employees, residents etc. using membership sponsorship programs available in the region.	X	X	
<u>Private individual bicycle share:</u> Developers or property managers can sponsor a bikeshare program within an individual site for round trips or within a network of bikesharing "pods" available to residents or employees affiliated with a particular developer or company. This is particularly geared towards short trips, such as meetings or running errands, as well as exercise and tourism. It generally does not result in as robust or flexible a system as the County bikeshare system but could be used for developments outside the County's bikeshare service areas.	X		X
<u>Private bicycle loan programs:</u> Like a private individual bikeshare program, properties can provide bikes to rent or borrow for a set period of time, but only for round trips. Borrowers may be provided a helmet and lock and be required to return the bike within a set period of time.	X		
VEHICLE SHARING SERVICES			
<u>Fleet-based car share:</u> Fleet-based car share operators (like Zipcar) maintain a fleet of cars at set locations. Property managers or developers can provide spaces for car sharing vehicles on their site for their occupants or the general public to use. Montgomery County offers provision of car sharing spaces as an option for developers in the CR zone seeking additional density. Developers/property managers can incentivize one-way car share use by providing dedicated spaces on their property for them, and/or offering discounted or free passes to users.	X	X	X
<u>One-way car share:</u> One-way car sharing programs (like car2go) enable users to pick up and drop off vehicles within a set "home area," typically a municipal boundary. One-way car sharing programs allow users to mix-and-match transportation options, for instance taking transit to a location and using a car share vehicle for the return trip. They reduce the barriers to using other modes of transportation. In DC, car2go vehicles can park on street or within specific private parking facilities for free. Developers/property managers can incentivize one-way car share use by providing dedicated spaces on their property for them and/or offering discounted or free passes to users.	X		X

	High Mode Choice Area	Moderate Mode Choice Area	Limited Mode Choice Area
TRANSIT PASSES			
<p><u>Universal transit pass programs:</u> Transit pass programs can encourage the use of public transportation by reducing financial barriers to using transit or making transit comparable in price to the perceived value of free parking. In doing so, they can improve transportation access and reduce vehicle ownership rates, as well as the demand for parking, in turn reducing the carbon footprint of more intensive land uses. Universal transit passes, when implemented at a residential or commercial property, allow occupants unlimited use of all service within a system for a significant discount. The passes can be distributed by the property manager or employer to occupants. In some cases costs may be recouped from rent, HOA dues, or other fees. WMATA is currently testing a SelectPass program that allows unlimited transit use for a discounted price based on trip length (since Metro fares are set by distance).</p>	X		
<p><u>Discount transit pass programs:</u> Discounted passes are partially subsidized by a property manager or employer and sold to occupants at a lower rate. Like a universal pass, they may provide unlimited use of all regular transit service, and may be covered by rent, HOA dues, or other fees. This is an in-house program and property occupants can elect whether or not to purchase a pass.</p> <p>The County recently re-instituted their Fare\$hare transit subsidy matching program, which is designed to incentivize employers to offer discounted transit passes to their employees. The County pays half the cost of transit passes, up to \$100/month/employee for employers located in TMDs. Employers are also eligible for a State tax credit of 50% up to \$100/month/employee for their portion of any transit subsidy provided to employees.</p>	X		
<p><u>Guaranteed Ride Home:</u> Emergency ride home programs are commonly offered by employers to incentivize their workers to use transit, though they may also be offered in residential communities. They provide a subsidy that can either be set to a maximum value or number of trips for residents or workers to get home in an emergency by transit, taxi, or transportation network company (TNC) services such as Lyft or Uber. In the Washington region the Commuter Connections program of the Council of Governments provides a GRH program throughout the region. These programs are especially effective when traveling from a high mode choice area to a low mode choice area (such as from a suburban residential community to an urban job center, or a reverse commute from a transit-oriented residential community to a suburban job center).</p>	X	X	X

	High Mode Choice Area	Moderate Mode Choice Area	Limited Mode Choice Area
COORDINATION AND COMMUNICATION			
<u>Marketing and distribution of materials:</u> Apartment or office buildings generally experience turnover of occupants (tenants and/or employees) over a given period of time. They may face challenges in informing new residents or workers about transportation options. Property managers can place an information kiosk on the property or provide new occupants a transportation package with information about nearby transit and bicycle facilities, TDM programs such as transit passes, walking/biking groups, and rideshare matching. Marketing materials should convey the benefits of a car-free or car-light lifestyle. Not only do these materials educate occupants, but they make the property more attractive to residents or employers interested in transportation choices.	X	X	X
<u>On-site commute coordinator:</u> At apartment or office buildings, an on-site TDM coordinator can be an additional source of information for residents or workers who do not know about transportation options in the area, and reduce friction to those seeking alternatives to driving.	X	X	X
<u>Rideshare or ride-matching programs:</u> A trip coordinator can collect information from interested residents or workers about travel preferences and match them with partners with similar plans. This may be most effective with large-scale participation. Rideshare programs can reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips, particularly in areas with low mode choice. Commuter Services provides the local connection to the regional Commuter Connections ridesharing program and region-wide database of potential rideshare partners.	X	X	X
<u>Real-time transportation news and commuter alerts:</u> Provide occupants updated information on transit schedules, transit and bike maps, important service changes, and real-time transit arrivals. This can be in the form of an interactive, real time display of transit information and other options (such as a TransitScreen) in a prominent, highly-visible location. It can also be postings on static lobby or breakroom displays or similar information posted on the local website, e-distribution or listserv. This further reduces barriers to using multimodal transportation options, while improving the experience of using different options.	X	X	X
<u>Organized walk or bike groups:</u> Organized groups on a property- or neighborhood-level scale can promote pedestrian or bicycle travel, help people feel more comfortable with active transportation modes, and improve health and camaraderie. This may be most effective for suburban bike-to-work journeys, and can also be accompanied by safe cycling classes and other pedestrian and bicycle safety information.			X
<u>Wayfinding:</u> Provide signage for clear directions and walking or biking time to nearby destinations, such as transit stops, shopping and commercial districts, major employers, or public institutions such as schools or libraries. Wayfinding signage can make the area easier to navigate and encourage people to travel by foot or bike. Montgomery County already offers provision of wayfinding as an option for developers seeking extra density under the CR zone.	X		X

TMD/TMAg Recommendations:

Summary of Development Community Stakeholder Input – Meeting of 10/5/16

A work session with representatives of the development community on the draft recommendations from the interagency work group on development-related transportation demand management was held on October 5, 2016. A brief summary of the discussion is provided below.

Process: The development community is curious about how these ideas will be incorporated into the ongoing discussion of the Subdivision Staging Policy and is seeking clarity about how the TMAg requirements and expanded concepts for transportation demand management will be implemented.

Specific Questions about the Recommendations:

- Standardization and predictability are positive aspects of proposals.
- The development community commented that it is difficult to react to the framework presented without knowing more of the specific details, especially fees and penalties, and its relationship to other development laws and regulations.
- Some representatives of the development community commented that TMAgs are a useful tool resulting in benefits to projects. Also these requirements can help convince owners/managers of ongoing need to implement TDM strategies.
- There is some question about why we would expand TDM to entire County. If we need transit to achieve best results, why extend TDM efforts to areas of County not currently well-served by transit? And why charge fees to those projects?
- Representatives stated that some aspects of TDM & these recommendations go beyond developers' control. Developers could use all tools available and still not meet goal.
- There are some concerns about how these requirements are either translated to employer requirements or to unit owners in for-sale residential development (particularly townhouse and single family units).
- Participants mentioned that TDM strategies and developer commitments must be accompanied by corresponding public investments in infrastructure that promotes alternative transportation modes – e.g. bikeshare, BRT, and other walking and bicycling improvements. Implementation of these projects over time suggests the need for interim goals.
- Some representatives suggested that aggregate goals for TMD's seem more fair, rather than individual project goals. Aggregate goals promote collaboration among various owners, plus can use the structure of TMD to coordinate. It was also suggested to use aggregate goal for TMD, but if one property is meeting its goals and another is not, and therefore the aggregate goal is not being achieved, the property meeting its goals should still be permitted to proceed with further phases even if aggregate goal not being achieved.
- It was widely agreed that security-instrument requirements for TDM are off-putting, costly, difficult to implement. Alternatively, we should agree on the strategies to be implemented and agree to a process to revise the program if the goals are not being attained.

- Some suggested that we should not penalize developers if strategies agreed upon are not working. It would be preferable to use funds that would otherwise be paid by developer for penalties and have developer use these to implement additional strategies.
- Participants noted that technology is changing quickly and the toolbox needs to be easily updated to reflect evolving options. The toolbox useful as a way to identify strategies up-front, not late in the process. There is a need to be sure toolbox includes identifies the physical requirements of the program so they can be incorporated into site planning early.
- Participants suggested that a TDM budget for projects should be established and that programs can be updated or replaced within that budget. This would help provide more certainty for property owners.
- Participants suggested that there should be rewards for good performance in addition to, or instead of, penalties for poor performance. TMAgs can be good for their development re attracting tenants, employees, residents. Some suggested that we consider reducing incentives once goals are achieved.
- Others identified that the real incentive is being able to build project in timely fashion & not be subjected to added requirements. Also, participants noted that TDM can help offset other liabilities and associated payments -e.g. LATR fees.
- Generally, representatives indicated that the development community willing to collaborate on this, but much more certainty about the details is needed and costs need to be understood and controlled.

TDM Developer Stakeholders

TDM Developer Stakeholders		
Sign In Sheet		
Wednesday 10/5/16		
Name	Organization	Contact Information
Francine Waters	Lerner	fwaters@lerner.com
Ken Silverman	Col. Riemer	ken.silverman@montgomerycountymd.gov
Matthew Folden	MNCPPC	matthew.folden@montgomeryplanning.org
Scott Wallace	Linowes & Blocher	swallace@linowes-law.com
Rebecca Torma	DOT	rebecca.torma@gmail.com
Esther Bowring	DOT	esther.bowring@montgomerycountymd.gov
Ricky Hahn	VOB	rickyhahn@me.com
Hilary Goldfarb	Bozzuto	hgoldfarb@bozzuto.com
Kristen Blackmon	BTS	kblackmon@bethesda.org
Peggy Schwartz	NBTMD	pschwartz@nbtmd.org
Barbara Sears	L & B	bsears@linowes-law.com
Raquel Montenegro	Ballard Spahr	Montenegro@ballardspahr.com
Diane Jones	DPS	diane.jones@montgomerycountymd.gov
Frank Bossong	Rodgers Consulting	fbossong@rodgers.com
Brian Downie	Saul	brian.downie@bfsaul.com
Chris Ruhlen	Lerch, Early & Brewer	cmruhlen@lercheearly.com
Bill Kominers	Lerch, Early & Brewer	wkominers@lercheearly.com
Russell Provost	MNCPPC	russell.provost@montgomeryplanning.org
Gary Erenrich	MCDOT	gary.erenrich@montgomerycountymd.gov
Bob Dalrymple	L & B	bdalrymple@linowes-law.com
Dee Metz	Montgomery County	dee.metz@montgomerycountymd.gov