



**Rogue Valley
Metropolitan Planning Organization**

Regional Transportation Planning

Ashland • Central Point • Eagle Point • Jacksonville • Medford • Phoenix • Talent • White City
Jackson County • Rogue Valley Transportation District • Oregon Department of Transportation

DATE: July 8, 2009
TO: Technical Advisory Committee
FROM: Dan Moore and Eric Heesacker, Rogue Valley Council of Governments
SUBJECT: TDM Refinement Plan: Technical Memo 4 – Summary of TDM
Actions/Policies and Program Funding

I. Background

This document is Technical Memo #4 of twelve such memos written to supplement the update of the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Element of the 2009 - 2034 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RTP Update has been completed/approved. These memos are also designed with the intent to encourage local MPO jurisdictions to adopt TDM programs of their own in order to assist the MPO in its indentified quest to reduce reliance on the automobile.

The purpose of this Technical Memorandum is to summarize the TDM actions contained in Technical Memo #1 and will discuss proposed policies which are summarized in the recently adopted 2009 - 2034 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This memo will also contain information related to TDM funding, a history of which is contained in Technical Memorandum #3.

II. INTRODUCTION

As stated in the 2009 RTP, Oregon's requirements for TDM measures are contained in the Oregon Highway Plan's (OHP) Goal #4: "To optimize the overall efficiency and utility of the state highway system through the use of alternative modes and travel demand strategies."

Furthermore, the Oregon Transportation Planning Rule (OTPR) requires urban areas (the Medford/Ashland urban area: does not include Eagle Point) containing populations exceeding 25,000 (like the RVMPO) to address TDM in member jurisdictions' Transportation Systems Plans (TSPs). Because of these established goals at the state level, TDM strategies are thus a necessary part of transportation planning efforts contained in the 2009 RTP.

The first section of this memorandum will summarize RVMPO policies (as contained in the 2009 RTP) addressing TDM. Discussion of this is contained in the newly updated 2034 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP: Chapter 3, pg.7Goal 6, and Chapter 5.5, pgs. 1-12).

III. ANALYSIS:

A. TDM Policies of the RVMPO:

- Goal #6 of the 2009 RTP states:
- - Use incentives and other strategies to reduce reliance on single-occupant vehicles.
 - - Policies under this stated goal include:
 - 6-1: Support TDM strategies.
 - 6.2: Facilitate alternative parking strategies to encourage walking, bicycling, carpooling, and transit.
 - 6.3: Enhance bicycle and pedestrian systems.
 - 6.4: Support transit service.

Another RVMPO policy is for all MPO collectors/arterials to be improved with at least striped bikeways along roadway edges, within the confines of roadway pavement (as opposed to Class I bikeways which are dedicated pathways constructed as a separate entity from roadway pavement). Policy dictates that those collectors/arterials that are being modified/improved include these on-street bikeways as part of the improvement. Some local jurisdictions (Ashland and Medford) have been known to remove on-street parking to make way for bicycle lanes. Other local jurisdictions are encouraged to improve all collectors and arterials with on-street bike paths where existing roadway width can accommodate them. Along with other TDM strategies (see previously written TDM technical memos) reconstruction of roadways which contain on-street bike paths is one means of getting people out of their single occupancy vehicles (SOVs) to utilize other forms of transportation.

To further this concept, RVMPO policy could be expanded to make recommendations to each local jurisdiction to adopt all the above policies as part of their respective land use ordinances. For example, as TODs (Transit Oriented Developments) are proposed, it is RVMPO policy that these areas provide the greatest level of pedestrian accessibility possible. It is also intended that these areas be developed with the highest residential densities possible, and that these

areas contain employment centers. The intent of TOD development is to decrease vehicle miles travelled (VMT) in SOVs, as required by the State's Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). Provision of connectivity, provision of mixed uses, and provision of opportunity to foster multiple modes of travel are land use ordinance actions which can be utilized to promote TOD and/or "nodal" development.

In similar fashion, the above policies could be adopted into local TSPs to encourage the implementation of TDM measures which should serve to decrease reliance on the SOV.

This next section is a summary listing of those proposed TDM actions that were introduced in Technical Memorandum #1, and those actions contained on Pg.12 of Chapter 5.5 of the 2009 RTP. Some of these actions were proposed to facilitate implementation of Alternative Measures and Integrated Land Use and Transportation Plans (ILUTPs).

B. TDM Actions:

- 1. Transit:** (as transit funding might allow)
 - Continue funding and promotion of the MPO's transit service, and provide connectivity to the bus system.
 - Provision of required infrastructure (bikeways and sidewalks) enhances connectivity which promotes use of non-SOV modes (such as transit).
 - Provide park/ride facilities near transit routes.
 - Improve pedestrian access to transit (as in TODs).
 - Support funding to ensure viability of transit service.
 - Ensure transit for disabled/elderly.
 - Provide transit shelters/bike racks in appropriate locations.
 - Review transit ridership and adjust routing accordingly. As in TODs , provide service within ¼ mile of all urban areas.
 - Reduce transit headways and expand service hours/days.
 - Establish bays on congested streets so that buses don't block traffic flow.

- Support transit use among major employers by encouraging the purchase of individual or subsidized group transit passes, having a bus shelter added nearby or other actions to reduce commuting trips.
- Encourage development of discount transit fare programs and shuttle services by even sponsors.

2. Actions related to Parking:

- Encourage lower minimum and maximum parking space standards and increase infill development and provide an option to decrease parking even further with the use of other TDM measures, such as: provision of attractive bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and provision of carpool spaces within ¼ mile of transit service.
- Designate some existing parking spaces for special use, such as designated spaces near building entrances as ‘carpool only’.
- Redesign on-street parking spaces as bike lanes or transit stops.
- Modify parking design standards that would require parking at the side or rear of buildings for better pedestrian access to entrances.
- Creation of park-and-ride lots and/or the support of shared parking agreements. Park-and-ride lots are usually constructed near transit stops or stations to accommodate riders’ needs to utilize public transit. Shared parking agreements relate to the use (for example) of a church parking lot which can be used by commuters during normal workdays. These items are both conducive to support through passage of appropriate land use ordinances.

3. Pedestrian and Bicycle Actions:

- Encourage the expansion regionally connected networks of off-street bicycle and pedestrian facilities (such as the Bear Creek Greenway) and facilitate minimal roadway crossings of these facilities.
- Encourage creation of a non-motorized route classification system.
- Plan for and build/maintain shared roadways for use by all modes.
- Use adoption of new land use standards which promote bicycle and pedestrian travel by requiring amenities that support these modes of travel, such as: bike racks, crosswalks/sidewalks, showers and locker facilities at worksites and at retail centers.

- Provide continuous and connected sidewalks in new development while discouraging construction of sidewalk segments.
- Some jurisdictions are promoting themselves as pedestrian/cycling friendly towns which provide off-street pathways, walking tours, and rental services for bicycles, Segways, and skates. The primary action which enhances the cycling/pedestrian activities is the provision of infrastructure for these activities so they may safely/comfortably occur.
- Prioritize all city/county TSP bicycle and pedestrian construction projects to be complete in the earlier phases of TSP implementation.
- Encourage developments with large footprints to have bicycle/pedestrian circulation plans.

4. Land Use Ordinance Actions:

- Adopt land use codes to facilitate construction of fewer parking spaces, more bicycle and pedestrian amenities/connectivity, and to provide connections to transit opportunity.
- Another kind of ordinance that is suggested for adoption is a Trip Reduction Ordinance (TRO). Such an ordinance exists in Portland, Oregon and is applicable to the area's largest employers. The goal is to require (through air quality mandates as an example) the larger employers to comply with the TRO by reducing trips made to the worksite by employees.

Incentives can be involved here, for both employers and employees. Those employers providing opportunities and amenities for bike riding to work (amenities could include provision of bike racks near the office doors; provision of showers and lockers at work; or, maybe late arrival/early departure times could be granted) are allowed to reduce the total number of vehicular trips going to/from the workplace each day. Fewer calculated trips means fewer emissions from the workplace and fewer emissions translates to higher compliance with the TRO.

Incentives for employees to comply with the TRO, which can be provided by the employer, include: car/vanpool parking spaces being located near the building's entrance; the opportunity to work flex time and staggered hours; the ability to utilize onsite facilities (locker, showers, etc.); provision of subsidized bus passes; and, provision of a 'guaranteed ride home' in the form of a company car should a carpooling employee have an emergency to attend to.

As these incentives are offered to and by employers/employees, the number of trips being taken to the workplace decreases. This decrease in trips is a natural result of people getting to/from work via modes of travel that do not create the emissions that the SOVs produce. A reduction in emissions by any employer translates to compliance with the TRO. Adoption of TROs into local land use ordinances is then another means to foster the reduction of SOV use here in the Rogue Valley.

- As mentioned previously, land use ordinances can be created which support the construction of park-and-ride lots near public transit stops. Additionally, shared parking agreements via ordinance adoption to facilitate shared parking agreements between (for example) churches which have large empty parking lots that can be utilized during weekdays by commuters as a place to meet and acquire rides with each other to workplaces, or concentrated employment centers.
- In the RVMPO there are jurisdictions opting for the land use alternative of transit-oriented development (TOD: see below). Transit funding permitting, a proposed action would be to provide more routes and more frequent service.
 - Implementation of Transit Oriented Development (TOD) standards is a land use action that can be taken to allow and/or require higher residential densities/accessibility to transit lines. A TOD is a master-planned area that contains high density residential development, mixed uses, commercial uses, and office uses. Designed as local “nodes” of activity, a TOD is an area (a district, not a site) which lends itself to transit, cycling, and pedestrian opportunities. TODs are located within ¼ mile of transit routes and developed with pedestrian access in mind. Many sidewalks are provided within a TOD, bikeways, and the opportunity for travel outside of the SOV. As they are typically developed within ¼ mile of a transit route, a TOD also serves as a great place to live if a bus ride to work is required.
 - As with TRO development, the proposed action here would be for local jurisdictions to adopt multi-use standards for new developments, especially for those developments located near downtowns and existing/proposed transit routes. Jurisdictions within the MPO are aware of the intent of the TPR, and federal requirements aimed at reducing reliance on SOVs and land use ordinances/regulations are encouraged to be modified to reflect that intent.

5. Developer/Employer/Educational Actions:

- Identify, assist, and encourage role models who use alternative transportation.
- Encourage developers to build higher density/multi-use buildings.
- Partner with city governments to encourage employers with more than 50 employees to adopt TDM strategies as part of company policy.
- Encourage use of staggered work hours by the valley's employers.
- Engage in public, government, and employer outreach to raise awareness about the use of TDM strategies/actions, including actively marketing to groups that have the greatest potential for reducing SOV trips.
- Provide public education at fairs, festivals, and other large-scale events.
- Facilitate meetings of the Rogue Valley Transportation Management Association (RVTMA) which works with local employers to reduce commutes.
- Encourage local governments and local employers to model TDM strategies related to work hours (staggered and/or flexed work hours/days, telecommuting) and ridesharing (carpools, vanpools, guaranteed ride home).

C. Funding:

Acquisition of funding for the implementation of any TDM programs will be initiated and monitored by the individual jurisdictions. While state law calls for inclusion of TDM programs in all state Transportation Systems Plans, it is up to the jurisdictions themselves to pay for these programs. The funding sources listed below were obtained from an online TDM Encyclopedia, updated in July of 2008 by the Victoria Transport Policy Institute at: <http://www.vtppi.org/tdm/tdm119.htm>.

- Parking Pricing
- Special Parking Taxes
- Road Pricing (tolls)
- Fuel Tax Increases/Surcharges
- Carbon Taxes (taxes on emissions)
- Dedicated Local/Regional Sales Taxes
- Transportation Impact Fees (TIF)

- Special Property Taxes
- Vehicle Impact Mitigation Fees
- Business/Employee Assessments
- Grants
- Congestion Pricing
- Special Funding for Transportation Problem Solving.

According to the same website, the best funding options are those that are: stable and predictable; considered to be equitable; supportive of TDM objectives (such as: reduction of reliance on single-occupant vehicle use, shift of travel to other modes, and shifting of travel to non-peak hours); and, they are relatively easy to monitor/administrate.

For purposes of this discussion, it should be noted that there is a difference in funding sources between TDM facilitation (the purpose of these initial TDM memos) and TDM implementation, which actually find TDM measures being utilized in variously intended ways. To facilitate a TDM program the grant approach would most likely be preferable. To implement a TDM program, and actually keep it going would require pricing/taxing schemes as listed above.

In conjunction with a discussion of TDM funding, there should be an equal discussion of costs associated with TDM program implementation. This is mentioned here only to say that costs associated with TDM implementation are examined in Technical Memo #8:

IV. CONCLUSION:

As detailed in this memo, there are TDM provisions in the currently adopted RTP. These provisions include policies and actions which can be taken to promote TDM measures. These actions have been addressed herein.