



PORTLAND BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION

1120 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 800 Portland, OR 97204 503.823.5185

Fax 503.823.7576 TTY 503.823.6868 www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation

Steve Novick Commissioner Leah Treat Director

TSP Stage 2 Update Discussion Draft - October 2015: Public Feedback on Section 14: TDM Objectives and Code

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>Service Delivery: This is a hard question to answer. Ideally, the option with the lowest overhead cost would be chosen, and that information isn't easily available.</p>	Garlynn Woodsong	We intend to discuss TDM service delivery options in more detail with stakeholders in 2016.	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p>Fees: TDM shouldn't necessarily be a financial burden on new development, especially new development that is trying to do the right thing (i.e. provide little or no auto parking, plentiful bicycle parking, in a transit-rich location, in a green building, etc.). Therefore, it would make sense to charge as little as possible up-front, and make later fees negotiable based on the merits of the individual project relative to objective standards. That is, understanding that much development is on spec and does not produce revenue until it is leased out or sold off, and fully occupied, as many costs as possible should be deferred and made payable out of income generated by the operating development, rather than loaded as an up-front cost on the spec developer.</p>	Garlynn Woodsong	Good points. We are evaluating the up front and ongoing options, as well as a mix of the two.	Email/ TEG facilitator

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>Pre-Approved TDM Plan content: This is critical. Many developers will not be experts in TDM. To the degree that the City can provide guidance, and the option to select from a menu of options, this would be vastly preferable to making the developer propose the TDM package. If a developer has TDM expertise and wishes to propose an alternative TDM package, on the other hand, there should be a fairly simple pathway to do so, one that does not include excessive additional fees or review times.</p>	Garlynn Woodsong	Thank you; this option is referenced in the Proposed Draft.	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p>Auto Ownership Target: Yes, a new auto ownership target should be established, one that provides flexibility for individual residents to be free to choose to own multiple automobiles, if they have the ability to pay the additional related costs, and yet ensures a clear pathway to attaining citywide community goals. The proposed unbundling of parking, combined with parking maximums, and clear regulation & pricing of on-street parking, would seem to provide some good levers towards attaining this goal.</p>	Garlynn Woodsong	Thank you; we agree.	Email/ TEG facilitator
<p>Section 14: Transportation Demand Management: I suspect folks often tune out when TDM is discussed as it is offered as the panacea without much substance. TDM is going to have to be aggressive and creative to put a dent in the transportation needs conversation. It is too bad that the development of a solid TDM program is lagging behind the balance of the TSP update - though there are some studies that plug in nicely to this effort. While parking management is a key part of a comprehensive TDM strategy - it carries a negative connotation. TDM needs to be cast in a more affirmative light - offering improved personal; health, enhanced community "livability" and convenient and safe mobility choices for all. The table listing and describing TDM strategies is a good one. I had trouble following the application of this framework. Who is to be required to submit a TDM plan? I suppose Figure 11 is getting to that... What incentives are available to pool (small) employers and institutions to promote and secure collective TDM incentives?</p>	Phil Selinger	We agree on the importance of framing the positive results of TDM programs, and appreciate your support for a strong program. On page 4 of Section 14 we clarified what types of development are proposed to provide what types of TDM plans (custom or pre-approved).	Email/ TEG facilitator

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>If we have big goals about non-SOV travel, the multimodal infrastructure should be a requirement, not an option. Right now the transportation impact mitigation is very auto-centric.</p>	<p>Oct. TEG mtg</p>	<p>To meet our performance targets we will need both more multimodal infrastructure and the TDM incentives to use the infrastructure. Expanding TDM plan requirements would complement our proposal to expand level of service (LOS) to incent developers to provide multimodal infrastructure. Expanding TDM requirements would also incent higher use of new public-sector multimodal investments through the major projects and citywide programs in the TSP.</p>	<p>Oct. TEG meeting notes</p>
<p>Trying to reach the community through a TMA is a good way to employ those TDM measures to reach your performance targets</p>	<p>Oct. TEG mtg</p>	<p>Encouraging TMA expansion is one option that we will explore for TDM service delivery.</p>	<p>Oct. TEG meeting notes</p>
<p>Is there a way to expand TDM to old buildings switching over to new management?</p>	<p>Oct. TEG mtg</p>	<p>Showing that we can use TDM on new projects is an important first step in that direction.</p>	<p>Oct. TEG meeting notes</p>
<p>Two general comments: 1) Page 6 has two tables. It's not clear what the incentives are for or paid to whom. Are they transit subsidies?</p>	<p>Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC</p>	<p>The tables are now on page 16 of Section 14. Yes, the incentive amounts are for transit subsidies paid to residents (first table) or employees (second table).</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>2) On page 11, I would say that marketing should be to all tenants, not just those who do not own cars. It's always a possibility that marketing could lead someone to abandon their motor vehicle.</p>	<p>Jeanne Harrison, informal comments from NWDA TC</p>	<p>The "marketing" referenced here is for new tenants and the desire to attract no-car tenants to multi-family buildings with little or no parking.</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>I would like to explore the potential role for TMA's or other organizations in delivering services. That would also require a look at what kind of City staff support might be available to help establish these groups and what funding they might be able to draw on for their work. As to fees I'd like to see a one-time fee if I could be certain PBOT wouldn't end up cutting the positions of those who do the ongoing monitoring. An auto ownership target would be nice, but it seems a great deal of monitoring would be required.</p>	<p>Linda Nettekoven</p>	<p>We intend to discuss TDM service delivery options in more detail with stakeholders in 2016.</p>	<p>Email</p>

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>The mandatory TDM elements are a good start. I'm still concerned that in some parts of the city where much development has already occurred, there needs to be a way to play catch up with those building owners. There has to be some way to mandate a TDM plan perhaps when a building changes hands?? or else commit to the inclusion of systematic education/outreach for those buildings (via Smart Trips?). If we are expecting our Centers/Corridors to absorb 50% of the new growth, we need to focus on existing buildings (perhaps through the association of building managers?) as well as new construction.</p>	Linda Nettekoven	<p>We agree that expanding TDM to new buildings will be important in achieving our goals. We are partially addressing the issue by recommending that residential parking programs include a fee to fund TDM for existing multi-family buildings.</p>	Email
<p>OHSU has some feedback regarding the proposed amendment to Section 14 of City of Portland's Transportation System Plan (the TDM amendment). Thank you for keeping us involved and updated on the process and let me know if you need any clarification regarding this round of feedback.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We want to ensure we're not asked to perform duplicative actions. We currently perform extensive monitoring in excess of what is required by the state and neighborhood agreements. Any City asks in this regard should acknowledge and be complimentary to current efforts without drawing resources from ongoing efforts. · In many ways our transportation programs are necessarily unique. Any City program should support this uniqueness and should avoid an extensive process of formal exceptions. • For aspects of the program operated at the bureau's discretion, we want to ensure the criteria for compliance is consistent year to year. • We ask that the cost of the program to organizations be minimized. Every dollar spent on fees is a dollar not directly invested into the program. • Any specific stipulations should only be made in context and with the input of the affected organizations. We request that PBOT form a stakeholder advisory committee to promulgate specific rules, and ask that OHSU be on that advisory committee. 	<p>John Landolfe, OHSU Transportation Options Coordinator</p>	<p>We agree with many of the points in this comment. We will continue stakeholder engagement in 2016.</p>	Email

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>The Portland Pedestrian Advisory Committee supports expanding Transportation Demand Management (TDM) requirements from campuses and institutions to mixed use zones and to employment sites within the Central City, as proposed by the Portland Bureau of Transportation as part of the Transportation System Plan update. TDM is a relatively quick, inexpensive, and effective strategy to increase walking, bicycling, and transit use in Portland. TDM is a critical strategy for managing traffic and parking demand. TDM is especially effective not only when combined with expanding pedestrian, bicycle, and transit infrastructure and service, but also when it includes disincentives to single-occupant auto use such as priced or restricted parking. We support key elements of the TDM proposal, including the requirement for residential and office buildings over a certain size threshold to provide residents and employees a “Mobility Incentive.” We support allowing employees and residents to choose how they want to use their Mobility Incentive, whether it’s for supporting walking, bicycling, or transit. We support the Incentive being substantive enough to change travel behaviors. The six month, \$600 incentive level seems reasonable, as does providing incentives to new residents and new employees over time.</p>	<p>Pedestrian Advisory Committee</p>	<p>Thank you; we agree.</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>Although, my employer does not offer any incentive for me to bike, I still think it's not a good idea to make employers to offer incentive. If the property manager are going to unbundle parking with the building and the city issue permits for street parking. The extra cost or cost saving potential should be enough to incentivize employers to encourage their employee to use alternate mode of transport. Besides, the big employers downtown are already offering one form of incentive or another to encourage transit or bikes.</p>	<p>Patrick Mok</p>	<p>We appreciate the comment. In 2016 we will engage stakeholders to determine whether building owners or employers would be responsible for providing TDM incentives and information to employees.</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>Forcing employer to offer incentive for employee to use alternate transport is like giving them a raise so that they can pay for the bus or bike. It should be up to the employee to see the cost saving by not need to buy a parking permit. It's redundant.</p>	<p>Patrick Mok</p>	<p>We appreciate the comment. In 2016 we will engage stakeholders to determine whether building owners or employers would be responsible for providing TDM incentives and information to employees.</p>	<p>Email</p>

TEG + Public Feedback	Commenter	Staff Response	Comment Source
<p>Section 14 TDM: Is there any way to require a TDM Plan when a mixed use building changes owners or undergoes a remodel (over a certain size or amount) in addition to requiring them when a new building is constructed?</p>	Linda Nettekoven	<p>We agree that expanding TDM to new buildings will be important in achieving our goals. We are partially addressing the issue by recommending that residential parking programs include a fee to fund TDM for existing multi-family buildings.</p>	Email