

City of Alexandria, Virginia

MEMORANDUM

DATE: FEBRUARY 24, 2023

TO: CHAIR MACEK AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

THROUGH: KARL MORITZ, DIRECTOR; DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & ZONING

FROM: KATYE NORTH, DIVISION CHIEF OF MOBILITY SERVICES,
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL
SERVICES

SUBJECT: TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PLAN (TMP) UPDATE

At the December 6, 2022 Planning Commission meeting, the Commission deferred the changes to the Transportation Management Plan (TMP) program and provided staff with specific comments on items to address. Below is a summary of the comments and staff's response.

1. Appropriate outreach to small TMPs (including those with under 100 units) and large TMPs to provide more assurance that existing participants understand the program changes going forward and how those may or may not impact them. Please provide a list and meeting dates of the communities you have met with going forward.

Staff met with NAIOP multiple times, conducted outreach to the TMP coordinators across the City, and had numerous conversations with individuals to answer site specific questions. Since the December meeting and to address concerns of the Planning Commission, staff held a webinar in January for existing TMP coordinators to provide an overview of the changes. A copy of the webinar has been posted online and shared with TMP coordinators who were not able to attend the live webinar. More information about the TMP update can be found online at the GO Alex webpage – www.alexandriava.gov/GOAlex. Additionally, staff worked diligently this winter to update the contact information for as many TMPs as possible to ensure information was being provided and input requested. See Attachments 1 and 3 for details about outreach that has been done for existing TMPs.

In general, the feedback from both NAIOP and the TMP coordinators was very positive and in support of these changes. There were many questions about how the existing TMPs would change, but after discussions with staff, most felt like their questions had been answered. Key topics of discussion focused on the fees and credits, how the 30-year payment requirement would be measured, how existing TMPs could opt into the Policy, how TMPs with existing shuttles are treated and how the City will use the funding. The policy has been updated to address as many of these concerns as possible, and the changes are noted throughout the questions below.

2. A policy revision that addresses the special situation of shuttle services currently being provided through old TMPs. Staff reported approximately 8 such instances. PC concern is for premature elimination of shuttle services where there is no adequate public transit substitute available.

Older TMPs, such as Carlyle, Cameron Station, Mark Center, and Potomac Yard, included specific conditions requiring the provision of a shuttle service from the development to a nearby Metro station. However, more recent TMPs have not included specific conditions requiring a shuttle service. Instead, staff has recommended TMP funds be used to support bus service and encourage more ridership on these existing routes. With the City's significant investment in DASH and the planning and implementation related to the Alexandria Transit Vision Plan and New DASH Network, more residents and employees are and will be served by bus. In some cases, shuttle service is redundant with a nearby DASH or Metrobus line.

Under the new TMP Policy, existing TMPs that opt into the new program could eliminate the shuttle requirement since this is no longer a requirement for newer TMPs. While staff still recommends shifting funding for shuttles to other TMP programs and projects, the impact on existing shuttle users does need to be considered to ensure people using the shuttle do not change to SOV trips. As part of the application process for opting into the Policy, staff will require further review existing shuttle service and work with the TMP Coordinator to develop an outreach plan prior to ending shuttle service. In addition, if staff determines that the shuttle provides a necessary transportation service that is not otherwise provided by current public transportation service, the City may elect to use the TMP Fund to provide a shuttle or similar service. Details have been added to the Existing TMPs section of the Policy and the Zoning Text Amendment.

3. The impact of voluntary sunsetting of old TMPs through administrative conversion to the new program, when the old TMP covers DSUPs approved over a long period of time, and some very recently. The duration of the old TMP does not necessarily reflect the duration of the commitment from each DSUP, and PC did not anticipate recent approved DSUPs being able to abandon TMP obligations so quickly.

Staff has updated the text amendment language to reflect a new approach for multi-phased developments that may span many years or decades. Under this approach, the 30-year funding obligation would be assessed for each phase, rather than just the first phase. Any development with more than one final site plan will be treated as a multi-phase development. The 30 years will be measured from the date of Certificate of Occupancy for each phase. See Attachment 2 for a hypothetical example. Additional information has been added to the Policy under the Existing TMPs section.

4. Ensure the staff report and policy are clear on which aspects of the new TMP requirement sunset after 30 years (such as the payments) and which do not (such as the TMP coordinator role). Are there other elements that do not sunset, or is this the only one?

The Policy has been updated to clarify which requirements sunset after 30 years and which do not. Specifically, language has been added to the following sections:

- Payments – language added noting the payment requirement would end after 30 years, but other obligations of the TMP program will continue.
- Coordinator – language added noting a development is expected to maintain a coordinator for the life of the building(s) to continue serving as a point of contact for the City for surveys, disbursement of information, event programming, and other activities as necessary to administer the Citywide TMP program.
- Evaluation and Survey of TMP – language added noting the development may be surveyed even after the TMP payment obligation has been satisfied and that staff will coordinate with the designated coordinator before any survey activity occurs.

5. The use of the 30/70 split of funding from the TMP fund payments - PC interest in ensuring that priority is given first to spending money from a TMP contribution on geographic transportation projects which are reasonably nearby developments with contributing TMPs (suggested language in Go Alex Fund section of policy: “Inasmuch as possible, the City will aim to fund citywide transportation projects that are proximate to developments that have paid into the fund”). If this is difficult to do, staff should discuss why in the staff report and provide some additional description around how the funding in the new city centralized approach will be prioritized for investment.

Thirty percent (30%) of the TMP funding would be allocated for Neighborhood Projects and Programs, which will be further sub-allocated by planning areas. For example, for a development in the Beauregard planning area that had an annual TMP contribution of \$10,000, \$7,000 would be allocated for Citywide Projects and Programs, and \$3,000 would be allocated for projects within the Beauregard planning area. In the annual report and work plan presented to the Transportation Commission for review and approval, staff will identify fund balances for both citywide and neighborhood specific balances. The annual work plan will recommend both Citywide projects and neighborhood projects based on available funding. Prioritization of the neighborhood projects may consider impacts or benefits to developments that have provided funding. Additionally, the proposed language suggested by the Planning Commission above has been added to the Policy under the Neighborhood Projects and Programs section.

Please provide the approximate percentage of the funds that will be used for City administrative charges. What happens if there is an 80/20 split with only 20 percent going to the City. What is the use of these funds and how will it impact the portion of the City where the development exists?

Regarding the percentage of funds that will be used for City administrative charges, the intent is for the bulk of funding allocated to Citywide projects and programs to be used for these and not administrative charges. A portion of this fund will be needed to conduct surveys since the City will taking over this measurement. At this time, staff does not have a specific scope or estimate for this work since we do not know how many new developments will choose to opt into the new program. Depending on the amount of funding coming into the City and number of projects to be implemented, staff time to manage and implement these projects could be included. Over the first year as existing developments opt in, staff will have an opportunity to better understand the budget for this program and allocate resources to specific parts of the program. The Transportation Commission will review the proposed budget and work plan annually and can

make recommendations about the allocation of funding for administrative charges during that process.

6. Please document meetings with NAIOP and the feedback from these meetings.

See Attachment 3 for dates and details about the NAIOP meetings.

7. Please define how you quantify a “consistent, good-faith effort” and the measurements used.

In working with developments that choose to manage their own TMP, the Policy references that developments must demonstrate a consistent good faith effort. The intent is to ensure a development is actively managing its TMP and communicating and coordinating with City staff on a regular basis about their program. The following specific measurements have been added to the Policy to further clarify the intent of this statement:

- responding to staff requests within 5 business days (this means acknowledging receipt of the request and identifying how it will be addressed)
- providing semi-annual progress & fund balance reports
- meeting with staff on a semi-annual basis (unless a different schedule is agreed to by staff)

8. How will you assure that surveys are measuring transit users since we are seeing only a specific population answering our surveys as noted in Alex West.

Staff will use a variety of methods to survey trips at developments, including in the field trip surveys (i.e. interviews with people leaving and entering the building about their travel mode), transit data for boardings at nearby transit stops, and Streetlight data (anonymized cell phone data that can distinguish travel modes). As the City continues to expand communication methods overall, we may also modify some of these survey methods to incorporate new options and best practices that have had successful results.

9. Clarify the specific Consumer Price Index series used to escalate fees in the text of the policy (for example, “Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U), U.S. city average”)

The current Zoning Ordinance references the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U). The Policy has been updated to specifically reference CPI-U.

In addition to the updates to the Policy and proposed Zoning Text Amendment noted in the responses above, staff has also made some updates to the Policy to clarify intent and simplify text to reduce confusion. Except where noted in the response above, these updates do not change the original intent presented to the Planning Commission in December.

Attachment 1 – Outreach to Existing TMPs

January 13, 2022 – Annual TMP Summit – provided an overview of the proposed updates to the program

July 18, 2022 – Email to TMP Coordinators – Reminder to provide their fund report and update about the changes to the TMP program going to Planning Commission and City Council in the Fall

December 2, 2022 – Email to TMP Coordinators – Notifying them of the Planning Commission meeting and providing a link to the docket memo and policy

January 12, 2023 – Email to TMP Coordinators – Reminder about the update to the TMP Program and an invitation to attend a webinar about the changes

January 23, 2023 – Webinar – Online meeting for TMP Coordinators to learn about the changes to the TMP Program

Attachment 2 – Example of Multi-phase development and tracking

Five Block Development - DSUP approval in 2010

Phase	Certificate of Occupancy Date	30 years of annual payments required until
1	June 2013	2043
2	December 2014	2045
3	May 2015	2045
4	January 2017	2047
5	October 2017	2048

Note: For the purposes of determining the first year of assessment, this assessment will be made for any development that obtains a Certificate of Occupancy prior to July 1.

Attachment 3 – NAIOP meetings

September 15, 2021

T&ES staff introduced updating the TMP program, presented some initial ideas for consideration, and asked for some initial feedback on shifting management to the City, upfront payments, and other options to reduce the TMP payment. The group seemed generally supportive of updating the program and noted they would provide more substantive comments once more details about the potential changes were provided.

November 17, 2021

T&ES staff provide more specific details about thresholds for when a development could manage their own TMP, potential options for reducing a TMP rate, and potential uses for the City managed TMP fund. Specific feedback included:

- Support for flexibility to be able to pay into a City fund or manage it themselves
- Support for early payments
- Some question about the 70/30 split and how the citywide projects benefit specific areas and developments that pay into the fund.
- Regarding the credit for being within an Enhanced Transit Area, consider not being eligible for the credit if the max parking is provided.
- Still need incentives for reduced parking
- Developers will want projects to be near their developments

NAIOP suggested forming a small working group to discuss the specific changes to the program in more detail.

December 17, 2021

A working group of NAIOP met with staff to discuss the proposed changes in more detail. At this meeting, the group discussed each of the credits that have been proposed and made suggestions. Some specific feedback included:

- Discussion about only 5% credit for paying into the City fund; however, it was noted that there is mutual benefit to both the developer and the City for this option and therefore 5% seemed reasonable.
- Regarding the credit for developing within an Enhanced Transit Area, some discussion about rewarding developments that provide less parking than the minimum; however, the group noted some issues with aligning that with the Zoning Ordinance requirements for parking and suggested it could be considered if there were future updates to the parking requirements.
- Regarding the credit for Capital Improvements, some discussion about the right percentage to use for value of improvements and what could be considered in this credit.
- Regarding the payment plans, some questions about how inflation would be handled and a mix of opinions on whether developers will want to pay upfront.
- Regarding the Allocation of the Fund, suggestion to change narrative to local (which could be by small area plan), citywide, and equity emphasis areas.
- Suggestion to list delinquent TMPs in an Annual Report as a way to get better compliance.

January 19, 2022

T&ES staff provided the full NAIOP group with an update about the discussion with the working group meeting in December and discussed the next steps moving forward, which included getting input from the TMP coordinators at the TMP summit and drafting the ordinance. NAIOP noted they would want to review the specifics of the ordinance once drafted.

June 28, 2022

Staff emailed NAIOP with an update about the updated program and explained the delay in moving forward was related to internal coordination on the SUP process and a decision to eliminate the SUP application with this policy.

September 21, 2022

T&ES staff provided NAIOP with an update on the proposed update to the program and discussed the change to eliminate the SUP application with this policy. Staff heard some support for removing the SUP requirement and shifting to a Policy. There were also comments about the upfront payment and feeling that larger developments probably would not use that option. The group also asked about accountability for using the funding and how it would help their individual projects.