

Bellevue Transportation Management Program (TMP) Requirements

Online Open House Summary

The City of Bellevue hosted an online open house from July 21 through August 24, 2016. The open house aimed to:

- Provide information about current TMP requirements
- Present key issues identified in the TMP code review process and solicit feedback on how to address these options
- Indicate potential options for TMP code revisions and solicit feedback about these options.

Outreach

The target audience for the online open house was managers of TMP-affected buildings as well others with some direct involvement with TMPs, including developers of buildings affected by TMP requirements, owners of such buildings and persons working to implement TMPs at buildings in Bellevue. Notice of the online open house was initially sent by email to persons who are involved with implementing current TMPs in Bellevue (58 names) and to persons who City records show were involved with permits for large development projects in Bellevue since Jan 1, 2012 (186 names). Two reminder notices were sent to these contacts over the span of the month the open house was active.

Local chapters of two professional organizations, the National Association of Industrial & Office Properties (NAIOP) and the Building Owners & Managers Association (BOMA), were also contacted and asked to pass word of the open house to their members. The NAIOP chapter included notice of the open house in an e-newsletter; it is unclear whether the BOMA chapter did any communication about the open house.

The Bellevue Downtown Association forwarded notice of the open house to members for whom it was relevant. Several weeks into the open house, notice was sent to persons involved with implementing Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) programs at 57 worksites in Bellevue affected by state and city CTR requirements (which apply to large employers). One reminder notice was sent as a follow up to these contacts.

All communications included messaging that encouraged recipients to pass the open house link on to others involved with TMP development or implementation in Bellevue. Notice of the open house was also posted on the [City's TMP webpage](#) and on the rotating banner of the City's [Choose Your Way Bellevue](#) website.

Participation

- Site visits: 181
- Site users (unique individuals): 118
- Average time on site: 5 min 23 sec
- Survey responses: 20

Survey Results

Key Issues

Current code requires specific activities at buildings with TMP agreements. This makes it clear what is expected of building managers and sets a consistent baseline for all buildings. An alternative approach would be to allow more flexible options for TMP implementation, so that building managers could choose activities they feel fit best with their specific building, taking into account the location, tenant mix, and other factors. In the absence of specific requirements, it may be necessary for the City to do additional monitoring and engagement with building managers to ensure there is a baseline of effective measures in place.

1. Should the City code continue to specify particular implementation activities at TMP buildings, or should building managers be allowed flexibility in which activities to choose for their building?

The City should continue to specify particular implementation activities at TMP sites	0	0%
The City should allow building managers as much flexibility as possible in selecting implementation activities at TMP sites.	13	65.0%
The City should strike a balance between requiring a minimum baseline set of activities and allow flexibility in what is selected for additional activities.	7	35.0%
Don't know	0	0%

2. Please elaborate on your choice.

Building managers will have the most thorough knowledge of the unique challenges facing their building. For this reason it makes sense that they be the ultimate decision maker in regards to implementing any TMP activities at their site.

Building users and demographic of tenants requires a broader set of tools for TMP implementation. New technology - phone apps that track bus lines/schedules, sharing economy that created uber, lyft, and zip cars, are implementation strategies that are now available to building managers that didn't exist ten years ago. The required TMP boards in buildings is fast becoming a relic of a bygone era.

Each building has unique transportation needs. The managers are best suited and more likely to come up with a plan that actually works for their building.

I think there should be a balance between a minimum baseline so the most important/vital aspects are implemented, but also provide flexibility to building managers for additional activities, as well as flexibility in identifying which activities make the most sense at given TMP buildings given the variables of building size, tenant mix, location and proximity.

It seems too restrictive to set very specific goals. This is especially true given that the types of buildings downtown vary so much. What works for an apartment tower may not be the same as an office tower or hotel.

Provide a menu of built in or programmatic options and allow building managers to select from that menu or provide alternative pathways for compliance.

Since there is no consistent usage of all large buildings, flexibility is necessary. For instance, we are not in downtown Bellevue, and are open long hours with varying work schedules. Our employees commute from multiple directions, making carpooling difficult, if not impossible. However, the majority of the traffic to and from our building is our customers. We have implemented some creative (van service) measures for them -- another reason to allow flexibility of building managers.

The 1st option is inflexible and basically treats every building the same. Buildings are like snowflakes or people, unique. Since every building is unique and faces its own sets of challenges it would be best to treat them that way and allow building managers to pick and choose what works for them. You don't even really need to do any more monitoring or engagement than you already do. You could spend the same amount of time as before and the results would most likely still be better . The only downside is your employees would have to think a little more critically.

The second option is chosen because every building in the CBD is different. Different clientele and needs. For instance, a building that is leased by a large company should work with and add to/and enhance their CTR efforts.

Yes, the end outcome is most important. But what assurance would Bellevue have that the building managers truly want to achieve the desired outcome? If given flexibility, will they do all they could to achieve the desired outcome. Or just enough to appear that they're giving a good faith effort. If Bellevue and the building manager agree that a particular implementation activity would not make a meaningful contribution to achieving the desired outcome, exempt them from that implementation activity.

Designating a trip reduction target ties TMPs to their intended purpose of reducing the impact of new buildings on the transportation system. However, shifting to a trip reduction target requires resources to conduct commute surveys to track performance. Current code requires trip reduction targets only at office buildings in Downtown Bellevue.

3. Should more buildings have targets for trip reduction?

Yes, performance targets should be more broadly used at TMP buildings.	6	31.6%
No, performance targets should not be extended beyond their current use at office buildings in Downtown Bellevue.	12	63.2%
Don't know	1	5.3%

4. Please elaborate on your choice.

I believe the current targets are on target. The percentage of increase in non-SOV has been steady.
I don't like the idea of performance targets. Is there a reward or punishment for meeting the targets? Some buildings would have a much easier time at it than others. That said, gathering data is critical to finding out what works and what doesn't. There is just no reason to link taking performance surveys with implementing trip reduction targets. Surveys and performance tracking should happen regardless.
If we have not meant the current goals, we should focus on fixing what we have. Expanding a program that does not work is not a good idea. Fix it the program then think about expanding it.
Provide forum for building managers to report TMP information.
See above. Our situation in NE Bellevue varies widely from the buildings of downtown Bellevue.
The trip reduction target is an awful idea. A waste of time money and effort for everyone involved.
Without performance targets and measurements, how do you know what is being done is working?

City code currently requires TMP agreements at multifamily residential projects of 100 or more units. The only requirement for these sites is to post information regarding transit and ridesharing. Feedback to date suggests there continues to be value in posting information (which may be presented via signs, printed materials or an electronic display).

5. Should residential land uses continue to be subject to TMP requirements?

Yes, posting information is useful and should continue to be required at sites with 100 or more units.	14	73.7%
Yes, posting information is useful, but should only be required at very large sites, with more than 200 units.	4	21.1%
Posting information should not be required at residential sites.	1	5.3%

6. Please elaborate on your choice.

I agree information is always good. We must remember the way people communicate and get their information has changed since the smart phone. My kids have phone apps for everything from bus routes, shopping, uber ect. A list of website and apps seems to me to be the most effective plan.
I agree that posting information is useful and beneficial, although I'm unsure why postings shouldn't be heavily emphasized, if not required, at residential buildings with less than 100 units. I also think it would be beneficial in buildings with 200 units or more to have ORCA sign-ups on site or through the building management.
Information is valuable. Residents should have information readily available so that they know their choices.
Information posting is always helpful to tenants no matter how large the building.
Most residents use their phones to get information. Paper postings get very little use and shouldn't be required (unless in a senior development). Most buildings with 100 or more units incorporate resident websites which can be used to encourage alternative transportation choices.
Mostly redundant if this is done at both home and work.
Seems like very low cost to post some signs or rider info. If there's some value, seems like very little cost for a perceived benefit.
There should also be more strict measures taken as they are with office buildings. You should work on trip reduction at peoples homes and work place. This will cause a more dramatic effect in the goal being achieved.

This makes a lot more sense. Spend your efforts educating people about their options and let them make the choice. If people are still choosing to drive their own cars after you have shown them other options, then improve the damn options. Stop trying to force those less well off onto public transit. How do you like sitting for a couple hours next to someone who has not bathed in weeks?

You should just post this information at all residential projects. I would say you could find most of it on the internet, however people may not ever think to look for it, so might as well put it in their face.

Options

1. Do you think the TMP code requirements for new development should be:

Unchanged (Option 1)	0	0%
Revised (Option 2)	11	78.6%
Eliminated (Option 3)	3	21.4%

2. If you think the code should be revised, select the change(s) you prefer:

Note: Several people chose more than one category (14 individuals answered this question)

a. Revise code to fix elements that are dated, not working	4	28.6%
b. Revise, expand performance goals.	4	28.6%
c. Shift from prescriptive requirements to a flexible “menu of options” approach for implementation activities.	11	78.6%

3. Why do you prefer these change(s)?

Allow for maximum flexibility as not each building or scenario will be the same.

Flexibility is necessary since the flow of employees and customers to and from buildings varies so widely. Also, the location of buildings throughout Bellevue makes many situations unique and make hard and fast requirements impossible. In our case, we aren't in a central location. Employees often come from long distances and our company's long hours and varying schedules make carpooling extremely difficult. We have been creative in providing van service for nearby customers. We need flexibility.

Measurement is key to justifying the burden of regulations, to know what works and what doesn't work.

Need to reduce/remove parking requirements for all downtown projects/reduce for periphery based on location from downtown...will ultimately send trips to mass transit as parking will not be affordable.

New technology available to users to select transportation options. Building owners should focus on building less parking/charging for parking to get people to stop using their cars. This is the most effective tool to change public car driving behavior.

The Cons for Option 3 seem kind of suspect. Bullet 1: Conflicts with Bullet 2. Bullet 2: From reading about SEPA, sounds like it is already something that needs to be implemented regardless if TMP requirements are in effect or not. So this bullet point is trying to make it sound like Option 3 creates extra work for the city and developers when it doesn't. And wont SEPA provide the standard framework referred to in Bullet 1? Bullet 3: SEPA has to be followed anyways. No "extra" work is created by eliminating TMP. Bullet 4: Are these bullet points for real? Someone really doesn't want Option 3 to happen. How do less code provisions make the permitting process less predictable? Bullet 5: Well... You would only need to monitor and enforce buildings unlucky enough to be grandfathered into TMP code provisions. So how does this make things more difficult than what they already are? Bullet 6: This is the only bullet with any merit and it is basically speculation. If anything the studies you refer to earlier show that even buildings without TMP requirements have seen a drop in single occupancy ridership.

We have not met the goals likely due to structural changes in the way people move around. As the technology changes so does everything else. Options and flexibility we be far more effective.

While this may be difficult to implement initially, the potential payoff is the greatest out of all the choices listed here. In addition, it serves as a proving ground for all ideas by essentially turning each building into it's own little case study. This will highlight what works and what doesn't while providing numerous data points that can be used to pin point which TMP activities work at certain types of building.

a. need to be realistic (optimistic, but also realistic) and up-to-date with environmental trends b. traffic congestion exists throughout the City limits, therefore Plans should be developed for all key areas of congestion c. Property Owners and/or their Managers are (should be) more aware of the personality within buildings. I believe formulating a customized Plan for each building would be more effective.

4. Please offer any additional comments on the TMP options.

As technology advances does will the way people communicate, where they live and how they move around. TMP programs will need to be flexible so the people actually using the systems can actually benefit. People don't like to sit in traffic, if there are options, they will use them. Trying to heavily regulate these programs is likely counter productive and could be one of the major reasons why the goals were not met.

Option 2b is the poorest choice here. It tries to simplify a complex problem resulting in inefficiency and inflexibility.

Way to be fair and objective when writing out the Pros and Cons. I was really impressed, good to see bureaucracy in action. Why even bring up Option 3? It would be a historical event for any government department to admit it could be downsized to little ill effect. I know Option 3 won't happen. Please go with Option 2c, it has the highest upside.

While targets may be seen as good goals, they should not be requirements. All situations are different and frequent workforce changes need to be taken into consideration. If the targets are requirements, the oversight, especially with workforce changes/adjustments, seems a waste of time for City staff. Plus, we can only offer information and incentives to employees. We can't require that they change their transportation choices.

Comment

1. Do you have any other feedback to share?

August 24, 2016 Dear Mr. Ingram, This is in response to your email of July 22nd, concerning upcoming changes to the City's transportation management program. This is an important issue for the City. It is also an important issue for Kemper Development. A great deal of Kemper Development effort has gone into this subject, starting at least as far back as 1986 for Bellevue Place. The City's online open house was well done, informative, and raised valid issues. It is important to keep these programs in perspective, however. In spite of widespread transportation management programs at almost all levels of government, the changes in the Seattle urban area travel have been modest. Over the past 15 years (2000 through 2014), the changes for journey to work trips have been in the desired direction, but are small[1]:

- Drive alone: declined from 78.7% to 77.1%
- Carpooling: declined slightly from 11.5% to 11.1%
- Transit: increased from 10.0% to 11.8%

Therefore, while the programs have brought about changes consistent with program goals, the changes have been small and illustrate the difficulty of changing travel behavior. From a regional viewpoint, it is unlikely that commuters would have noticed these changes. If the costs are reasonable, transportation management is a step in the right direction, but is a very small part of dealing with our major travel congestion problems. Is there evidence that the actual benefits have exceeded the governmental and private sector costs? Up to now, the City's requirements have included a mix of specified actions for the building owner along with performance requirements. One or the other would be better. We prefer "performance" so long as:

- The performance goals are realistically achievable.

Determining such goals is no minor task. It will require research on elasticity of travel demand to changes in costs, transit availability, parking and other factors.

- Goals should recognize the starting point for a given building. For example, it's far easier for a building that starts at 80% single-occupant commuters to make a 5-point reduction to 75% than for a building starting at 65% to make a reduction to 60%. Lower shares are increasingly difficult.
- Goals should recognize potential effects of upcoming changes in the technology of urban travel? Examples include Uber-type ridesharing, and car sharing.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. James Hill Vice President, Kemper Development Company [1] Source: Census, American Community Survey, Seattle urban area, daily journey to work, 2000, 2014.

Can you please have the cops ticket people driving slow in the passing lane? I know it's part of Seattle culture and all for some reason, however traffic would be remarkably improved if that changed.

I don't believe there is going to be a significant reduction in number of trips unless there are more "park once" options for people coming from outside the City. A public parking structure with a downtown "hop-on/hop-off" circulator bus I think would be hugely beneficial for residents and employees in Downtown, and I think there are funding options (such as advertising and LIDs) that would keep cost of a circulator low. PLEASE do not waste any more dollars funding another parking study that will provide the same conclusions as every other parking study that's been done.

I feel like the person in charge of listing the options should be put on a different project. You should get someone a little better at twisting the truth, whoever wrote the Pros and Cons is awful at it.

2. Are you a: (select all that apply)

Note: Several people chose more than one category (15 individuals answered this question)

Building developer	4	26.7%
Building manager	7	46.7%
Owner/manager of a business in a large building	0	0%
Employee at a large building	1	6.7%
Bellevue resident	3	20.0%
Other – write in	6	40.0%

Other responses:

- ETC (2)
- Architect
- Education Manager for CRE Association
- Energy manager for company with multiple locations
- Owner/manager of business in a small building

3. If you would like to be added to our project mailing list, please provide your name and email address:

[Five individuals provided contact information]