

13



CITY OF SACRAMENTO

CITY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
927 TENTH STREET SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
SUITE 300 TELEPHONE (916) 449-5604

MARTY VAN DUYN
PLANNING DIRECTOR

March 28, 1983

City Council
Sacramento, California

APPROVED
BY THE CITY COUNCIL

Honorable Members in Session:

APR 5 1983

SUBJECT: Trip Reduction Ordinance (M-610)

OFFICE OF THE
CITY CLERK

SUMMARY

Given that Sacramento is projected to experience substantial growth in the future, there is a need to encourage greater transit, ridesharing and bicycle usage at new developments to mitigate traffic and air quality impacts of new growth. The city endorsed adoption of this ordinance in the 1982 Air Quality Plan and approval and implementation of this ordinance is needed to demonstrate to EPA that the city is working towards attainment of the federal air quality standards to avoid imposition of funding sanctions. The proposed Trip Reduction Ordinance would impose minimal requirements upon major new developments which would facilitate use of alternative transportation methods.

The Trip Reduction Ordinance requires that all development projects that accommodate fifty or more workers post information on the benefits and services available for these alternative transportation methods provided by the City or another agency and to cooperate with Caltrans Sacramento Rideshare personnel for the distribution of ridesharing information and surveys. The full text of the draft ordinance is provided as Attachment I.

The proposed Trip Reduction Ordinance would also require a developer of a major office, commercial or industrial project which would accommodate 200 or more workers to prepare a Transportation Management Plan. The applicant may include one or more of the eleven trip reduction measures described in the ordinance within this plan. As an incentive to selecting measures which would require higher implementation costs, parking reductions would be offered, as described in a separate staff report. There are also federal and state tax deductions and credits available for implementation of these measures. Based on recent experience, it is anticipated that about ten projects per year would be affected by this Transportation Management Plan requirement. The ordinance is flexible enough to allow a developer to select measures which require only minimal cost and implementation efforts. This ordinance should not significantly increase the staff work load since practically all of the affected projects normally require zoning related entitlements.

The Planning and Community Development Committee at their February 23, 1983 meeting unanimously endorsed in concept adoption of the proposed ordinance. The Planning Commission and staff also recommend that the Council adopt the attached Trip Reduction Ordinance.

BACKGROUND

The proposed Trip Reduction Ordinance can probably be described as a "soft" ordinance, since it allows an affected developer to select trip reduction measures that only require minimal implementation costs and a short-term program commitment. However, the ordinance does require a developer to go through the process of evaluating the need for implementing traffic mitigation measures at the project site. It provides the opportunity for the Regional Transit District, the Caltrans Rideshare agency and staff to suggest which trip reduction measures are most appropriate for the proposed development. The Chamber of Commerce has also agreed to assist in this program by encouraging developers to do more than just token compliance. Therefore, with joint cooperation between public agencies and business groups, it is anticipated that the ordinance will be successful in gaining implementation of substantive trip reduction measures at all large new developments.

This program is envisioned as the first step toward working with developers to increase responsiveness towards mitigating traffic and air quality impacts associated with their developments. Based on discussions with representatives of the business community, it is a mutual goal to achieve a high level of success towards trip reductions without the need for a more stringent ordinance. Although Sacramento at present does not experience severe traffic congestion, the purpose of this ordinance is to establish a program which in the long-term will result in a more efficient use of our roadway system, thereby ensuring that new growth can be accommodated in the future.

The requirements included within this ordinance are already being met voluntarily by some of the larger developments due to traffic congestion impacts associated with such developments. For example, the recently approved Greenhaven office park proposes to provide preferential carpool parking, a Transportation Coordinator, showers and lockers for bicyclists, and the developer may request parking reductions for providing transit pass subsidies in the future. However, while some large developments are voluntarily complying with the proposed requirements, the ordinance is needed to ensure that all developments of the same magnitude are treated equally. For air quality improvement purposes, all large new developments should provide trip reduction measures even if traffic congestion is not a severe problem at a particular site.

Ordinance Requirements

Under the ordinance, all new non-residential developments that would accommodate 50 or more workers would be deemed a Minor Project and developments with an occupancy of 200 or more persons would be termed a Major Project. In order to determine how many workers could be expected, building occupancy standards have been developed based on Caltrans studies. An applicant will be allowed to submit information on the actual occupancy expected in-lieu of applying the occupancy standards included in the ordinance. These standards and the minimum building sizes for Minor and Major Projects are provided on the following page in Table 1.

Table 1

Building Occupancy Standards

<u>Type of Development</u>	<u>No. of Workers Per Square Foot</u>	<u>Minor Project Min. Bldg. Size Per 50 Workers (Square Feet)</u>	<u>Major Project Min. Bldg. Size Per 200 Workers (Square Feet)</u>
Office (exc. medical offices)	.0035	12,500	50,000
Hospital and Medical Offices	.0025	20,000	80,000
Industrial (non-warehousing)	.0020	25,000	100,000
Commercial	.0020	25,000	100,000
Industrial-Warehousing	.0010	50,000	200,000
Mixed/Multiple Uses	(1)	(1)	(1)

(1) The minimum building size for mixed or multiple use developments shall be calculated based on the proportion of the development devoted to each type of use.

The ordinance requires all Minor Projects to post information provided by the city or another agency on the benefits, facilities and services available for transit, ridesharing and bicycling commute methods. In addition, the property owner would have to cooperate with the Caltrans Rideshare agency or other authorized outreach agency to distribute information and transportation surveys. These requirements would be conditions for building permit approval.

Major Projects would need to obtain a Planning Director's permit, approval of which would require compliance with the above conditions and development of a Transportation Management Plan. The applicant would have to consider inclusion of one more of

the following trip reduction measures in his or her plan. There are certain restrictions for the use of these measures which are set forth in the attached ordinance.

- 1) Preferential Employee Carpool/Vanpool Parking
- 2) Transportation Coordinator
- 3) Transit Passenger Station
- 4) Bus/Light Rail Transit Station Subsidy
- 5) Transit Operating Subsidy
- 6) Transit Pass Subsidy
- 7) Buspool/Shuttle Bus Program
- 8) Vanpool Program
- 9) Parking Fees
- 10) Showers and Lockers
- 11) Flexible Work Hours

An applicant could also propose any other measure which potentially would result in some level of trip reduction. Depending upon which measure is selected, the plan would also have to include an implementation schedule and a proposed method of administering the plan. The plan and its related agreements would have to be recorded either as part of the project's CC&R's or separately in order to bind the conditions of the plan upon future property owners.

Relationship between Developer/Owner and Building Occupants

Since the City has no authority under the Zoning Ordinance to require that trip reduction measures be implemented by the employers or tenants of a development, the Transportation Management Plan requirement has been imposed upon developers. The ordinance does not specify how the developer should implement the long-term measures selected in terms of whether the property management personnel will take the lead or whether the plan requirements will be passed on to the tenants of the building through lease agreements. If the developer knows who the tenants will be, the plan can be designed based on consultation with the affected employers. If the project is being developed on a speculative basis, the applicant can select facility type or one-time subsidy measures in order to avoid the necessity of transferring long-term program obligations upon prospective buyers. The ordinance allows such flexibility in implementation and also allows the developer or property owner in the future to substitute measures included in the original plan.

Ordinance Administration

In order to assist the developer in deciding which trip reduction measures to select and to reduce staff time associated with answering questions and researching which types of measures are the most appropriate for a particular project; a handbook will be prepared and distributed to all affected applicants. The development of this handbook and printing costs are included in the EPA grant that paid for development of this ordinance.

The Transportation Management Plan requirement would be processed as a Planning Director's Permit to avoid the cost and time delays associated with a public hearing. However, out of the anticipated ten projects per year that are expected to be affected by this ordinance, almost all of them would typically request some type of entitlement that requires a public hearing. If a public hearing is required for another purpose, the Transportation Management Plan could also be considered as part of the public hearing process. It is anticipated that staff review of a submitted plan would take between one and four hours. As a result, the proposed fee will be \$100 based on an average review period. In the future, the property owner can request a modification of the approved plan. The proposed fee for such a plan modification is proposed as \$50. Once the ordinance is approved staff will prepare the necessary resolutions to establish these processing fees.

Ordinance Enforcement

The ordinance does not require that the workers at an affected development change their commute habits. Likewise, the developer or employer would not be required to achieve a certain level of trip reduction. The purpose of the ordinance is to provide incentives and facilities to make transit, ridesharing and bicycling usage a more attractive commute method. The ordinance would be enforced based upon the city's existing enforcement procedure. In order to determine ordinance compliance and the effectiveness of the trip reduction measures, it is anticipated that staff will conduct periodic surveys in the future. Since a property owner can request plan modifications, an owner who refuses to continue implementation of a particular measure can select another measure and thereby avoid penalties for non-compliance with the Zoning Ordinance.

Implementation Costs

The costs of implementing trip reduction measures varies widely depending upon the measure selected, the number of workers affected, the duration of the program and the developer's ability to realize off-setting savings. Examples of low-cost measures include preferential carpool/vanpool parking, transportation coordinator, transit passenger shelter, and flexible work hours. The showers and lockers measure could be described as a medium cost option. Higher cost measures include the transit pass subsidy and the buspool/shuttle bus program measures. The light rail transit station, transit operating subsidy, and the vanpool program measures could range as either low or high cost measures depending upon the level of subsidy proposed by the applicant. The parking fee measure would generate revenues and could off-set the implementation costs associated with other measures.

Some of these trip reduction measures will qualify for federal and state tax benefits, however, only employers of the workers at the site can qualify. Therefore, if the developer decides to pass on the implementation costs of these measures, the tenants of the development can use these tax benefits to off-set such costs.

The developer can off-set the implementation costs associated with some of these trip reduction measures by requesting parking reductions as allowed in a separate ordinance. All of the eleven measures except the preferential carpool/vanpool parking and the transportation coordinator measures are eligible for some level of parking reduction. In addition to allowing reduced parking construction costs, the land area saved could be used to increase the size of the development, thereby generating additional lease revenues.

Proposed County Ordinance

At the Planning and Community Development Committee meeting, some concern was expressed about the fact that the proposed County Trip Reduction Ordinance differs from the City's version. The County Ordinance would require developers to implement facility-type trip reduction measures such as bus shelters, carpool/vanpool parking and showers and lockers. Larger developments may be required to prepare a transportation management plan which would only have to include facility measures, but the developer at his option could include program measures such as a Transportation Coordinator. The County's ordinance would limit the flexibility of a developer in terms of the selection of which trip reduction measures would be most appropriate for the particular development in terms of whether transit, ridesharing or bicycling should be emphasized. If the Council so desires, the Draft City Trip Reduction Ordinance could be amended to mandate that bus shelters, carpool/vanpool parking and showers and lockers be provided by all major projects, in addition to the transportation management plan requirement in order to provide consistency between the City and County versions of the ordinance. However, staff does not agree with deletion of program type measures from the menu of actions that the developer can select from in preparation of his transportation management plan. Program type measures are generally more effective in terms of achieving reductions in single occupant automobile trips. As a result, program measures are allowed greater parking reduction trade-offs if they are selected.

The County is also proposing to require that all existing businesses employing 100 or more persons must pass out information, provide ridesharing matching services, and appoint a Transportation Coordinator. The City also has the authority to adopt such a regulation to affect existing employers as part of a City Code provision. If the Council wishes, staff will report back on the costs and effects of such a regulation.

CONCLUSION

The proposed Trip Reduction Ordinance is a reasonable means by which the city can attempt to mitigate traffic and air quality impacts of all large new developments. The ordinance is not a panacea for our transportation and air quality problems, but over time, it will increasingly help in addressing those problems. It will help

reduce future traffic congestion and air pollution levels, promote efficient land use, reduce the amount of land devoted to vehicular use and parking, and reduce the need to spend scarce public dollars on transportation system improvements.

The ordinance allows flexibility in selecting trip reduction methods and would involve the imposition of penalties only for failure to make a good faith effort to implement the self-designed program. The ordinance should be viewed as the first step working with developers to increase responsiveness towards mitigating traffic and air quality impacts associated with their developments. The effectiveness of this ordinance, as well as the related parking reduction ordinance, will be evaluated over the next two years. If this ordinance does not prove to be very effective, the Council may wish to consider strengthening it in the future.

VOTE OF COMMISSION

At the February 3, 1983 meeting, the Planning Commission voted unanimously to endorse approval of the ordinance as set forth in Attachment I (8 ayes, 1 absent).

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning and Community Development Committee, the Planning Commission and staff recommend that the Council adopt the proposed Trip Reduction Ordinance as written. The Council may wish to amend the attached version of the ordinance to mandate that the bus shelter, carpool/vanpool parking and shower and locker measures be implemented in order to provide consistency with the County's draft version of this ordinance. If the Council wishes to impose the informational, ridesharing survey, and Transportation Coordinator requirements upon existing large employers consistent with the County's proposed regulation, staff should be directed to report back on this provision.

Respectfully submitted,

Marty Van Duyn
for Marty Van Duyn
Planning Director

FOR CITY COUNCIL INFORMATION:
WALTER J. SLIPE
CITY MANAGER

SP:lao
attachment
wp 1E
M-610

April 5, 1983
All Districts

SACRAMENTO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING DATE 2/3/83
 ITEM NO. 2 FILE NO. P-
 M- 610

- GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT
- COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENT
- REZONING
- SPECIAL PERMIT
- VARIANCE
- TENTATIVE MAP
- SUBDIVISION MODIFICATION
- ENVIRONMENTAL DET.
- OTHER TRIP REDUCTION
ORDINANCE

Recommendation LOCATION: CITY WIDE

- Favorable
- Unfavorable
- Petition
- Correspondence

NAME	PROPOSER'S Comments	ADDRESS
ROBERT DOYLE	SO. NAOMAS COMM. ASSOCIATION	
Tom Kelly	Chamber of Commerce (CARMICHAEL) SACRO, CA	
JOHN SHUMAN	STDA	
JUDY LAMAR	APCD	
STEVE SANDERS	CBCA 610 21 ST STREET SACRO, CA.	
NAME	OPPOSERS	ADDRESS
PETE DOUGLAS - CALTRANS		
LISA TRANKLEY	LUNG ASSOCIATION	

MOTION NO. _____

	YES	NO	MOTION	2ND
Augusta	✓			
Fong	✓			
Goodin	✓			
Holloway	✓			
Larson	✓			
Muraki	✓			
Silva	✓		✓	
Simpson	✓			✓
Hunter	ABSENT			

- MOTION:
- TO APPROVE
 - TO DENY
 - TO APPROVE SUBJECT TO COND. & BASED ON FINDINGS OF FACT IN STAFF REPORT
 - INTENT TO APPROVE SUBJ. TO COND. & BASED ON FINDINGS OF FACT DUE _____
 - TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL with amendments & FORWARD TO CITY COUNCIL
 - TO RATIFY NEGATIVE DECLARATION
 - TO CONTINUE TO _____ MEETING
 - OTHER _____

to be finished by CRE - back in two weeks

ORDINANCE NO. 83-039

ADOPTED BY THE SACRAMENTO CITY COUNCIL ON DATE OF

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE TITLE OF SECTION 6 AND ADDING SECTION 6-E AND SECTIONS 22-A-70 THROUGH 75 TO THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO, ORDINANCE NO. 2550, FOURTH SERIES, RELATING TO VEHICLE TRIP REDUCTION REGULATIONS

APPROVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL

APR 5 1983

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK

BE IT ENACTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO:

SECTION 1

The title of Section 6 of the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance of the City of Sacramento, Ordinance No. 2550, Fourth Series, is hereby amended to read as follows:

Section 6: OFF-STREET PARKING AND VEHICLE TRIP REDUCTION REGULATIONS

SECTION 2

Section 6-E of the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance of the City of Sacramento, Ordinance No. 2550, Fourth Series, is hereby added to read as follows:

E. TRIP REDUCTION REGULATIONS

1. Affected Developments. The provisions of Section E shall apply solely to the following types of projects:

a. Minor Projects. Any development proposal which is expected to be the primary place of business of between 50 and 199 full-time workers shall be deemed a Minor Project.

b. Major Projects. Any development proposal which is expected to be the primary place of business of 200 or more full-time workers shall be deemed a Major Project.

c. Expansion Projects. Any development which proposes structural expansion of 25% or more and which after such expansion will be the primary place of business of between 50 and 199 full-time workers shall be deemed a Minor Project. If after such expansion the development will be the primary place of business of 200 or more full-time workers, it shall be deemed a Major Project.

2. Exempt Projects. Temporary construction activities shall be exempt from the provisions of this Section 6-E.

3. Occupancy Calculation Methods.

(a) For the purpose of this Section 6-E, the following chart shall be used to estimate the total number of full-time workers expected to occupy a development.

<u>Type of Development</u>	<u>No. of Workers Per Gross Sq. Ft.</u>
Office (exc. medical offices)	.0035
Hospital and Medical Offices	.0025
Industrial (non-warehousing)	.0020
Commercial	.0020
Industrial-Warehousing	.0010
Mixed/Multiple Uses	The minimum building size for mixed or multiple use developments shall be calculated based on the proportion of the development devoted to each type of use.

(b) The applicant may submit information indicating the actual number of full-time workers that will occupy the development. Subject to approval by the Planning Director, these figures may be accepted in-lieu of using the above chart.

4. Development Standards.

a. Minor Project. The property owner of every Minor Project shall:

- (1) Post information provided by the city or other designated agency which describes the benefits of transit, ridesharing and bicycling as commute methods and which describes facilities, services, schedules, rates, and other pertinent information relevant to such transportation options; and
- (2) Coordinate with Caltrans Sacramento Rideshare personnel or other authorized ridesharing outreach agency for the distribution of information and transportation surveys to the workers within the development on an annual basis.

b. Major Project. Every Major Project shall be required to obtain a Planning Director's permit, approval of which shall be conditioned upon compliance with the following provisions:

- (1) Comply with the regulations applicable to Minor Projects as specified in Section 6-E-4-a.
- (2) Prepare and implement a Transportation Management Plan designed to achieve a reduction in the number of vehicle trips that would otherwise be generated by the development. The Plan shall consider inclusion of the following measures. The measures to be included in the Plan shall be selected by the applicant; however, the Planning Director may deny the applicant the right to utilize a particular measure(s) if the standards specified for each measure(s) are not met. In addition to the list of selected measures, the Plan shall also describe an implementation schedule for each measure and the proposed methods of administering the Plan. After approval by the Planning Director, the Plan shall be binding upon the property owner and any successors in interest. The Plan obligations shall either be included in the covenants, conditions and restrictions prepared for the development and recorded as part of that document, or separately recorded. The filing fee for this permit shall be in an amount specified by resolution of the City Council. At any time after the original Plan has been approved, the property owner may request modification of the Plan by filing an application and a processing fee, in the amount specified by resolution of the City Council.
 - (A) Preferential Employee Carpool/Vanpool Parking Spaces. The applicant may designate at least 10% of the required employee vehicle parking spaces as "Carpool/Vanpool Only". Such spaces shall be located near building entrances, in a covered or shaded area, or other preferential location. If parking fees are imposed, a more favorable parking rate for carpools and vanpools shall be offered. The administration and enforcement of this preferential parking program shall be the responsibility of the property owner.
 - (B) Transportation Coordinator. The applicant may designate a person or persons to act as the liason with providers of transit, ridesharing and bicycling information and services. The responsibility of the designated Transportation Coordinator(s) shall be to distribute information and otherwise assist interested workers of the development in their attempts to utilize transit, ridesharing and bicycling as their primary commute method.

- (C) Transit Passenger Shelter. If the proposed development is located along a major arterial that is an existing or designated transit route and a finding is made by the Sacramento Regional Transit District or other transit agency serving the site that a passenger shelter is needed in the vicinity of the development, the applicant may agree to construct or pay for the construction of such a shelter on or adjacent to the subject property. The design, maintenance, liability, and ownership of the shelter and other applicable provisions shall be set forth within an agreement between the applicant and the District or other appropriate transit agency.
- (D) Bus/Light Rail Transit Station Subsidy. If the proposed development is located within 1,320 feet of an existing or designated bus transit center or light rail transit station, the applicant may agree to pay all or part of the cost of land, construction and/or maintenance of either that center/station or another center/station within the transit system. The amount of funds, payment arrangements, use of the funds, and other applicable provisions shall be set forth within an agreement between the property owner and either the Sacramento Regional Transit District or other appropriate transit agency.
- (E) Transit Operating Subsidy. If the proposed development is located within 1,320 feet of an existing or designated bus route or light rail transit station, the applicant may agree to pay a one-time transit operating cost subsidy to the Sacramento Regional Transit District or other transit agency serving the site. The amount of funds, payment arrangements, use of the funds, and other applicable provisions shall be specified within an agreement between the property owner and the District or other appropriate transit agency.
- (F) Transit Pass Subsidy. The applicant may provide a 50 to 100 percent monthly transit pass subsidy for the benefit of persons who utilize transit services as their primary commute method to the subject property. This measure may be utilized only if the proposed development is located within 1,320 feet of an existing or designated transit route and the Sacramento Regional Transit District or other transit agency serving the site determines that the transit services provided along the adjacent transit route(s) have the capacity to accommodate additional transit riders. The applicant shall specify the total amount of subsidy, the number of passes to be subsidized, and the period of time that the subsidy program will be in effect. The property owner shall enter into an agreement with the District or other appropriate transit agency specifying these and other relevant provisions.

- (G) Buspool/Shuttle Bus Program. The applicant may establish and subsidize all or part of a buspool or shuttle bus service operated either individually or by contract with a public or private transit agency. The service shall transport workers from park-and-ride lots, transit stops or other designated locations to the project site during the morning (7 a.m. to 9 a.m.) and afternoon (4 p.m. to 6 p.m.) peak commute periods. There must be at least one bus operating within the morning and afternoon peak commute period. The applicant shall specify the level of services to be provided, the number of workers that are anticipated to utilize this service, the duration of the program, and the amount of user fees to be charged over the life of the program.
- (H) Vanpool Program. The applicant may offer to purchase, lease, or otherwise subsidize the capital and/or operating costs of one or more vanpools used by the workers of the development. The applicant shall specify the type and level of vanpool assistance to be provided throughout the duration of the program, the number of vans to be subsidized, the number of anticipated vanpool participants, and the period of time that the vanpool program will be in effect.
- (I) Parking Fees. The applicant may impose a monthly parking fee for some or all of the workers of the development whose primary commute method is by a single occupant motor vehicle if the Planning Director determines that such a program will not create adverse parking impacts to adjacent developments. The applicant shall specify the amount of parking fees to be imposed throughout the duration of the program, the number of workers that are anticipated to be required to pay the fees, and the period of time that this program will be in effect.
- (J) Showers and Lockers. The applicant may provide shower and locker facilities for the workers of the development to encourage bicycle commuting. The applicant shall specify the number of and location of such facilities and whether user fees will be imposed.
- (K) Flexible Work Hours. If the property owner will be the sole occupant of the building, (s)he may provide that a majority of the workers within the development who utilize ridesharing, transit, or bicycling as their primary commute method will be given the right to alter the normal daily working hours of 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. by a minimum of one-half hour. In the event the property owner sells the

building or is no longer the sole occupant of the building, the successors in interest and the new lessees must either agree to abide by this work hour policy or request a plan amendment and implement an alternative trip reduction measure.

- (L) Any other program designed by the applicant which will potentially result in some level of trip reduction, subject to the approval of the Planning Director.
- (3) The Planning Director may waive the Transportation Management Plan if (s)he finds that said compliance would create an undue hardship on the affected development as a result of special or peculiar operating characteristics.

5. Off-Street Vehicle Parking Reductions. Any development project which is required to comply with the provisions of Section 6-E-4-b shall be eligible for a reduction in the amount of required parking pursuant to Section 6-F.

SECTION 3

Sections 22-A-70, 71, 72, 73, 74 and 75 of the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance of the City of Sacramento, Ordinance No. 2550, Fourth Series, are hereby added to read as follows:

- 70. Buspool/Shuttle Bus: Sixteen or more preassembled and prepaid subscribers commuting on a daily basis to and from work following a relatively fixed route and schedule by means of a vehicle with a seating arrangement designed to carry more than fifteen adult passengers.
- 71. Carpool: Two or more persons commuting on a regular basis to and from work by means of a vehicle with a seating arrangement designed to carry less than eight adult passengers.
- 72. Ridesharing: Travel by any mode other than the single occupant motor vehicle or public transit including but not limited to carpooling, vanpooling, public or private buspooling, and taxipool.
- 73. Taxipool: A type of service which a public or private taxi operator provides daily commuter service for a group of preassembled subscribers on a prepaid or daily-fare basis, following a relatively fixed route and schedule.
- 74. Transit: Transportation service operated by a public or private agency for use by the general public that utilizes buses or railcars, following a fixed route and schedule with a seating capacity of sixteen or more persons.

75. Vanpool: Eight or more preassembled and prepaid subscribers commuting on a daily basis to and from work by means of a vehicle with a seating arrangement designed to carry eight to fifteen adult passengers.

DATE PASSED FOR PUBLICATION: March 29, 1983

DATE ENACTED:

DATE EFFECTIVE: ~~March 29, 1983~~

MAYOR

ATTEST:

CITY CLERK

M-610
SP:lao
3.28.83 wp 1D

AMERICAN  LUNG ASSOCIATION
of SACRAMENTO-EMIGRANT TRAILS

Lung Association Testimony on Proposed Ridesharing Ordinance
City Planning Commission
February 3, 1983

Transportation surveys show that the automobile meets as high as 97% of our transportation needs in Sacramento today. Our city's dependence on the automobile is only slowly changing. Economic, energy, and environmental constraints of the future, however, will require that we adapt to alternative modes of transportation. Consider the following sobering projections:

--The City of Sacramento is expected to experience a significant increase in employment and population growth over the next 20 years which will result in a projected doubling of existing peak hour traffic volumes;

--In spite of the recent decline in gasoline prices, the cost of energy, in all forms, will be much more expensive in the future and supply interruptions could occur;

--Most of Sacramento's air pollution is attributable to the automobile; to attain federal clean air standards by 1987, vehicle miles traveled must be reduced by 40%.

It is clear that to accommodate the changes of the future yet preserve the quality of life that makes Sacramento such a desirable place to live, the City must take steps now to facilitate the transition from the automobile to other diverse means of transportation. The Lung Association supports the proposed trip reduction ordinance as such a step.

We question, however, whether the ordinance is sufficiently stringent to accomplish the trip reductions desirable in even the near future. First, we are concerned that the ordinance will not ensure that developers of major projects

(continued)

We care about every breath you take!

will provide the physical facilities necessary to significantly reduce the number of single occupant automobile trips. The least expensive and disruptive means of ensuring that these facilities are built is to require their construction during the development of a project. While we support the flexibility of the ordinance which provides developers a list of options, we suggest that some of the measures proposed as options should instead be mandatory for all major projects. Specifically, an applicant should be required to designate a transportation coordinator and provide preferential employee carpool/vanpool parking spaces and bicycle parking facilities. These measures are relatively inexpensive and are not unduly burdensome. Also, while we are not proposing that an applicant be required to allow employees flexible work hours, neither should the applicant be relieved of the responsibility of mitigating the impacts of a project merely by guaranteeing flexible hours. Measures such as designating a transportation coordinator, providing preferential parking and allowing flexible hours should not have to compete with options such as constructing a transit passenger shelter or providing a light rail transit station subsidy. While the number of allowable parking reductions proposed may provide some incentive for applicants to choose the more capital-intensive projects, the need for these projects is great enough that greater incentive is needed. This incentive could be provided by reducing the number of options the ordinance offers.

Making these measures mandatory would also address another concern of ours, whether the ordinance sufficiently encourages employers to do their share in fostering greater employee participation in ridesharing, transit, and bicycling commute methods. An ordinance cannot guarantee that employers will make such a good faith effort; however, an ordinance can encourage a continuing employee commitment to ridesharing by guaranteeing access to a transportation coordinator, preferential parking spaces, and bicycle parking facilities.

Finally, the discussion of the planning staff attached to the draft ordinance

states that the ordinance should be viewed as a first step, and that the effectiveness of the ordinance will be evaluated over the next two years. It then suggests that if the ordinance does not prove very effective, the City Council may wish to consider strengthening it in the future. The discussion, however, does not define any criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of the ordinance. The Planning Commission, therefore, should set a goal for the ordinance to accomplish in terms of number of trip reductions or physical facilities constructed, or some other appropriate criteria. Without such a goal, it will be difficult in the future to objectively evaluate whether the ordinance has in fact been effective and to justify either strengthening or not strengthening the ordinance.

In conclusion, the Lung Association commends the City Planning Department for recognizing the economic, energy, and environmental constraints of the future and for proposing this ordinance to address Sacramento's future interests and needs. And while we support the proposed ordinance, we believe it should be strengthened by requiring all major projects to designate a transportation coordinator and to provide parking facilities for bicycles and preferential parking for carpools and vanpools.

SACRAMENTO TRANSPORTATION COALITION

909 12th Street, Sacramento, CA 95814 • (916) 444-LUNG

MEMO TO: Members of the Sacramento City Planning Commission

FROM: The Sacramento Transportation Coalition

RE: The Proposed Ridesharing Ordinance

The Sacramento Transportation Coalition wishes to commend the planning staff for their extensive efforts in preparing the proposed ridesharing ordinance.

As we look toward a future of increasing population and densities on the one hand, and limited public and private resources to deal with these increases on the other, it becomes obvious we will have to focus on making the best possible use of the resources we have.

Ridesharing, whether by bus, van, or car, is the most efficient use of our transportation resources. An effective ridesharing program will benefit mobility, air quality, and economic development in Sacramento. The ordinance points in the direction of such a program.

We do have some concerns with the ordinance however. First, the ordinance combines three separate elements of ridesharing support measures which might better be separated. These include the development of facilities, various educational activities, and financial support.

In terms of facilities for ridesharing, it is important that such facilities be built into major developments initially by the developer. While the ordinance lists such facilities as options, there is no guarantee the developer will select any of these options. We feel the ordinance should be strengthened in this area. We support to concept of providing incentives to developers who provide the facilities.

Education is critical in promoting ridesharing and a motivated, knowledgeable ridesharing coordinator is key. As developments become occupied, such coordinators should be identified and trained. The ordinance lists a coordinator as an option. We feel more emphasis should be placed on the coordinator but question whether the developer or employer should take lead responsibility. Possibly the City should explore ways of approaching employers to identify coordinators. The Chamber of Commerce's voluntary approach might be particularly viable. The Chamber's approach has the extra advantage of reaching all major employers, not just those connected with new developments.

(continued)

Finally, the ordinance lists developer financial support to help defray ride-sharing operation costs as one of the options. The Transportation Coalition supports such contribution, but urges a cautionary note. Such contributions should not be considered as a substitute for the development of an ongoing local broadbased, source of financial support for meeting transit operating and highway maintenance costs.



SUMMARY OF TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSIONS
SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

February 3, 1983

The Chamber's Transportation Committee supports the need for effective programs to improve the air quality of the Sacramento Metropolitan Area.

In the past, the Chamber has supported development of light rail and mass transit facilities as a means of improving air quality. This year, the Chamber formed a transportation financing task force to seek long-term financing of adequate transportation facilities for the region.

The Committee believes the proposed ordinance does not give sufficient emphasis to the need for public education and public awareness to reduce trips and promote ridesharing.

The Committee and the Chamber would agree to take a leadership role in planning facilities within major new developments -- facilities which would promote use of mass transit and encourage ridesharing. In other cities, business has taken the lead role in implementing such programs.

The Committee, however, would not support complex, costly regulations which would discourage a potential employer from bringing new jobs into the Sacramento region.

The Committee believes the staff has underestimated the difficulty of effective enforcement of any ridesharing ordinance without a costly layer of additional personnel.

The proposed ordinance, in the Committee's view, does not address the need to meet ongoing maintenance and operating costs of the ridesharing effort. Ridesharing will not be effective unless it is part of a long-term, balanced approach to improving our basic transportation network.

The Committee supports the use of incentives to promote ridesharing -- preferred parking, preferential treatment for cars carrying two or more persons, park and ride facilities, computer ride-matching -- to mention the most widely used. Experience in other cities has shown that economic incentives well-organized public education are effective ways to encourage ridesharing -- far more effective, the Committee believes, than mandated programs.



M-610
13



CITY OF SACRAMENTO

CITY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
927 TENTH STREET SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
SUITE 300 TELEPHONE (916) 449-5604

MARTY VAN DUYN
PLANNING DIRECTOR

February 23, 1983

MEMORANDUM

TO: Lorraine Magana, City Clerk
FROM: Connie Petersen
SUBJECT: Request for Continuances per Staff's Request

Please continue the following items to be Passed For Publication on March 29 and hearing held April 5, 1983:

- M-610 Trip Reduction Ordinance
- M-718 Parking Reduction Ordinance
- M-717 Bicycle Parking Ordinance

cp

M-610



CITY OF SACRAMENTO

RECEIVED
CITY CLERKS OFFICE
CITY OF SACRAMENTO

FEB 9 2 29 PM '83

CITY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
927 TENTH STREET SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
SUITE 300 TELEPHONE (916) 449-5604

MARTY VAN DUYN
PLANNING DIRECTOR

February 8, 1983

MEMORANDUM

TO: Lorraine Magana, City Clerk
FROM: Connie Petersen
SUBJECT: Request to Set Public Hearings

HRG: 3-1-83
FCA: 3-8-83

- 1. P83-001 Tentative Map to divide 15.07+ acres into 54 single family lots in the R-1 zone for property located on the north side of Ehrhardt Avenue, 1,600+ east of Franklin Blvd. (D7)(APN: 117-131-18)

PLEASE SCHEDULE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS FOR THE MARCH 8 COUNCIL MEETING (PFP ON MARCH 1):

- 1. M-610 Trip Reduction Ordinance (D-A11)
- 2. M-718 Parking Reduction Ordinance (D-A11)
- 3. M-717 Bicycle Parking Ordinance (D-A11)

} PFP: 3-1-83
HRG: 3-8-83

cp

SACRAMENTO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING DATE 2/3/83
 ITEM NO. 2 FILE NO. P-
 M- 610

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT
 COMMUNITY PLAN AMENDMENT
 REZONING
 SPECIAL PERMIT
 VARIANCE

TENTATIVE MAP
 SUBDIVISION MODIFICATION
 ENVIRONMENTAL DET.
 OTHER TRIP REDUCTION
ORDINANCE

Recommendation LOCATION: CITY WIDE

Favorable
 Unfavorable Petition Correspondence

<u>NAME</u>	<u>PROPOSERS</u> <u>Comments</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>
ROBERT DOUGLE	SO. NADOMAS COMM. ASSOCIATION	
Tom Kelly	Chamber of Commerce (CARMCCHAEL) SACTO, CA	
JOHN SHUMAN	STDA	
JUDY LAMAR	APCD	
STEVE SANDERS	CBCA 610 21 ST STREET SACTO, CA.	

<u>NAME</u>	<u>OPPOSERS</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>
PETE DOUJANIN	CALTRANS	
LISA TRANKLEY	LUNG ASSOCIATION	

MOTION NO. _____

	YES	NO	MOTION	2ND
Augusta	✓			
Fong	✓			
Goodin	✓			
Holloway	✓			
Larson	✓			
Muraki	✓			
Silva	✓		✓	
Simpson	✓			✓
Hunter	ABSENT			

MOTION:

- TO APPROVE
- TO DENY
- TO APPROVE SUBJECT TO COND. & BASED ON FINDINGS OF FACT IN STAFF REPORT
- INTENT TO APPROVE SUBJ. TO COND. & BASED ON FINDINGS OF FACT DUE _____
- TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL (w/ amendments) & FORWARD TO CITY COUNCIL
- TO RATIFY NEGATIVE DECLARATION
- TO CONTINUE TO _____ MEETING
- OTHER _____

W do, provided by CPE - back in



CITY OF SACRAMENTO

#13
45-1983

CITY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
927 TENTH STREET
SUITE 300
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
TELEPHONE (916) 449-5604

MARTY VAN DUYN
PLANNING DIRECTOR

February 28, 1983

City Council
Sacramento, California

Honorable Members in Session:

SUBJECT: Ordinance amending the title of Section 6 and adding Section 6 and Sections 22-A-70 through 75 to the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance of the City of Sacramento, Ordinance No. 2550, fourth series, relating to vehicle trip reduction regulations. (M-610)

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE
CITY OF SACRAMENTO
MAR 23 4 45 PM '83

SUMMARY

This item is presented at this time for approval of publication of title pursuant to City Charter, Section 38.

BACKGROUND

Prior to publication of an item in a local paper to meet legal advertising requirements, the City Council must first pass the item for publication. The City Clerk then transmits the title of the item to the paper for publication and for advertising the meeting date.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the item be passed for publication of title and continued to April 5, 1983.

Respectfully submitted,

Marty Van Duyn
Marty Van Duyn
Planning Director

FOR CITY COUNCIL INFORMATION
WALTER J. SLIPE
CITY MANAGER

PASSED FOR
PUBLICATION
& CONTINUED
TO 4-5-83

MVD:cp
Attachment
M-610

March 29, 1983
D-A11

+

#13
4-5-1983

ORDINANCE NO.

ADOPTED BY THE SACRAMENTO CITY COUNCIL ON DATE OF

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE TITLE OF SECTION 6 AND ADDING SECTION 6-E AND SECTIONS 22-A-70 THROUGH 75 TO THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO, ORDINANCE NO. 2550, FOURTH SERIES, RELATING TO VEHICLE TRIP REDUCTION REGULATIONS

BE IT ENACTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO:

SECTION 1

The title of Section 6 of the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance of the City of Sacramento, Ordinance No. 2550, Fourth Series, is hereby amended to read as follows:

Section 6: OFF-STREET PARKING AND VEHICLE TRIP REDUCTION REGULATIONS

SECTION 2

Section 6-E of the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance of the City of Sacramento, Ordinance No. 2550, Fourth Series, is hereby added to read as follows:

E. TRIP REDUCTION REGULATIONS

1. Affected Developments. The provisions of Section E shall apply solely to the following types of projects:

a. Minor Projects. Any development proposal which is expected to be the primary place of business of between 50 and 199 full-time workers shall be deemed a Minor Project.

b. Major Projects. Any development proposal which is expected to be the primary place of business of 200 or more full-time workers shall be deemed a Major Project.

#13 +
451983

c. Expansion Projects. Any development which proposes structural expansion of 25% or more and which after such expansion will be the primary place of business of between 50 and 199 full-time workers shall be deemed a Minor Project. If after such expansion the development will be the primary place of business of 200 or more full-time workers, it shall be deemed a Major Project.

2. Exempt Projects. Temporary construction activities shall be exempt from the provisions of this Section 6-E.

3. Occupancy Calculation Methods.

(a) For the purpose of this Section 6-E, the following chart shall be used to estimate the total number of full-time workers expected to occupy a development.

<u>Type of Development</u>	<u>No. of Workers Per Gross Sq. Ft.</u>
Office (exc. medical offices)	.0035
Hospital and Medical Offices	.0025
Industrial (non-warehousing)	.0020
Commercial	.0020
Industrial-Warehousing	.0010
Mixed/Multiple Uses	The minimum building size for mixed or multiple use developments shall be calculated based on the proportion of the development devoted to each type of use.

(b) The applicant may submit information indicating the actual number of full-time workers that will occupy the development. Subject to approval by the Planning Director, these figures may be accepted in-lieu of using the above chart.

4. Development Standards.

a. Minor Project. The property owner of every Minor Project shall:

- (1) Post information provided by the city or other designated agency which describes the benefits of transit, ridesharing and bicycling as commute methods and which describes facilities, services, schedules, rates, and other pertinent information relevant to such transportation options; and
- (2) Coordinate with Caltrans Sacramento Rideshare personnel or other authorized ridesharing outreach agency for the distribution of information and transportation surveys to the workers within the development on an annual basis.

#13
45-1983

b. Major Project. Every Major Project shall be required to obtain a Planning Director's permit, approval of which shall be conditioned upon compliance with the following provisions:

- (1) Comply with the regulations applicable to Minor Projects as specified in Section 6-E-4-a.
- (2) Prepare and implement a Transportation Management Plan designed to achieve a reduction in the number of vehicle trips that would otherwise be generated by the development. The Plan shall consider inclusion of the following measures. The measures to be included in the Plan shall be selected by the applicant; however, the Planning Director may deny the applicant the right to utilize a particular measure(s) if the standards specified for each measure(s) are not met. In addition to the list of selected measures, the Plan shall also describe an implementation schedule for each measure and the proposed methods of administering the Plan. After approval by the Planning Director, the Plan shall be binding upon the property owner and any successors in interest. The Plan obligations shall either be included in the covenants, conditions and restrictions prepared for the development and recorded as part of that document, or separately recorded. The filing fee for this permit shall be in an amount specified by resolution of the City Council. At any time after the original Plan has been approved, the property owner may request modification of the Plan by filing an application and a processing fee, in the amount specified by resolution of the City Council.
 - (A) Preferential Employee Carpool/Vanpool Parking Spaces. The applicant may designate at least 10% of the required employee vehicle parking spaces as "Carpool/Vanpool Only". Such spaces shall be located near building entrances, in a covered or shaded area, or other preferential location. If parking fees are imposed, a more favorable parking rate for carpools and vanpools shall be offered. The administration and enforcement of this preferential parking program shall be the responsibility of the property owner.
 - (B) Transportation Coordinator. The applicant may designate a person or persons to act as the liason with providers of transit, ridesharing and bicycling information and services. The responsibility of the designated Transportation Coordinator(s) shall be to distribute information and otherwise assist interested workers of the development in their attempts to utilize transit ridesharing and bicycling as their primary commute method.

#13
4-5-1983

(C) Transit Passenger Shelter. If the proposed development is located along a major arterial that is an existing or designated transit route and a finding is made by the Sacramento Regional Transit District or other transit agency serving the site that a passenger shelter is needed in the vicinity of the development, the applicant may agree to construct or pay for the construction of such a shelter on or adjacent to the subject property. The design, maintenance, liability, and ownership of the shelter and other applicable provisions shall be set forth within an agreement between the applicant and the District or other appropriate transit agency.

(D) Bus/Light Rail Transit Station Subsidy. If the proposed development is located within 1,320 feet of an existing or designated bus transit center or light rail transit station, the applicant may agree to pay all or part of the cost of land, construction and/or maintenance of either that center/station or another center/station within the transit system. The amount of funds, payment arrangements, use of the funds, and other applicable provisions shall be set forth within an agreement between the property owner and either the Sacramento Regional Transit District or the Sacramento Transit Development Agency.

(E) Transit Operating Subsidy. If the proposed development is located within 1,320 feet of an existing or designated bus route or light rail transit station, the applicant may agree to pay a one-time transit operating cost subsidy to the Sacramento Regional Transit District or other transit agency serving the site. The amount of funds, payment arrangements, use of the funds, and other applicable provisions shall be specified within an agreement between the property owner and the District or other appropriate transit agency.

(F) Transit Pass Subsidy. The applicant may provide a 50 to 100 percent monthly transit pass subsidy for the benefit of persons who utilize transit services as their primary commute method to the subject property. This measure may be utilized only if the proposed development is located within 1,320 feet of an existing or designated transit route and the Sacramento Regional Transit District or other transit agency serving the site determines that the transit services provided along the adjacent transit route(s) have the capacity to accommodate additional transit riders. The applicant shall specify the total amount of subsidy, the number of passes to be subsidized, and the period of time that the subsidy program will be in effect. The property owner shall enter into an agreement with the District or other appropriate transit agency specifying these and other relevant provisions.

- #13
45-1183
- (G) Buspool/Shuttle Bus Program. The applicant may establish and subsidize all or part of a buspool or shuttle bus service operated either individually or by contract with a public or private transit agency. The service shall transport workers from park-and-ride lots, transit stops or other designated locations to the project site during the morning (7 a.m. to 9 a.m.) and afternoon (4 p.m. to 6 p.m.) peak commute periods. There must be at least one bus operating within the morning and afternoon peak commute period. The applicant shall specify the level of services to be provided, the number of workers that are anticipated to utilize this service, the duration of the program, and the amount of user fees to be charged over the life of the program.
- (H) Vanpool Program. The applicant may offer to purchase, lease, or otherwise subsidize the capital and/or operating costs of one or more vanpools used by the workers of the development. The applicant shall specify the type and level of vanpool assistance to be provided throughout the duration of the program, the number of vans to be subsidized, the number of anticipated vanpool participants, and the period of time that the vanpool program will be in effect.
- (I) Parking Fees. The applicant may impose a monthly parking fee for some or all of the workers of the development whose primary commute method is by a single occupant motor vehicle if the Planning Director determines that such a program will not create adverse parking impacts to adjacent developments. The applicant shall specify the amount of parking fees to be imposed throughout the duration of the program, the number of workers that are anticipated to be required to pay the fees, and the period of time that this program will be in effect.
- (J) Showers and Lockers. The applicant may provide shower and locker facilities for the workers of the development to encourage bicycle commuting. The applicant shall specify the number of and location of such facilities and whether user fees will be imposed.
- (K) Flexible Work Hours. If the property owner will be the sole occupant of the building, (s)he may provide that a majority of the workers within the development who utilize ridesharing, transit, or bicycling as their primary commute method will be given the right to alter the normal daily working hours of 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. by a minimum of one-half hour. In the event the property owner sells the

building or is no longer the sole occupant of the building, the successors in interest and the new lessees must either agree to abide by this work hour policy or request a plan amendment and implement an alternative trip reduction measure.

X
#13
451983

(L) Any other program designed by the applicant which will potentially result in some level of trip reduction, subject to the approval of the Planning Director.

(3) The Planning Director may waive the Transportation Management Plan if (s)he finds that said compliance would create an undue hardship on the affected development as a result of special or peculiar operating characteristics.

5. Off-Street Vehicle Parking Reductions. Any development project which is required to comply with the provisions of Section 6-E-4-b shall be eligible for a reduction in the amount of required parking pursuant to Section 6-F.

SECTION 3

Sections 22-A-70, 71, 72, 73, 74 and 75 of the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance of the City of Sacramento, Ordinance No. 2550, Fourth Series, are hereby added to read as follows:

70. Buspool/Shuttle Bus: Sixteen or more preassembled and prepaid subscribers commuting on a daily basis to and from work following a relatively fixed route and schedule by means of a vehicle with a seating arrangement designed to carry more than fifteen adult passengers.
71. Carpool: Two or more persons commuting on a regular basis to and from work by means of a vehicle with a seating arrangement designed to carry less than eight adult passengers.
72. Ridesharing: Travel by any mode other than the single occupant motor vehicle or public transit including but not limited to carpooling, vanpooling, public or private buspooling, and taxipool.
73. Taxipool: A type of service which a public or private taxi operator provides daily commuter service for a group of preassembled subscribers on a prepaid or daily-fare basis, following a relatively fixed route and schedule.
74. Transit: Transportation service operated by a public or private agency for use by the general public that utilizes buses or railcars, following a fixed route and schedule with a seating capacity of sixteen or more persons.

75. Vanpool: Eight or more preassembled and prepaid subscribers commuting on a daily basis to and from work by means of a vehicle with a seating arrangement designed to carry eight to fifteen adult passengers.

#13
451183

DATE PASSED FOR PUBLICATION:

DATE ENACTED:

DATE EFFECTIVE:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

CITY CLERK

#13
4-5-1983

MEMORANDUM

TO: MARTY VAN DUYN, PLANNING DIRECTOR
FROM: LORRAINE MAGANA, CITY CLERK
SUBJECT: ITEMS NO. 13 - 15, COUNCIL
AGENDA OF APRIL 5, 1983
DATE: APRIL 6, 1983

On April 5, 1983, the Sacramento City Council adopted the following ordinances:

Ordinance 83-039 regarding Trip Reduction

Ordinance 83-040 regarding Parking Reduction

Ordinance 83-041 regarding Bicycle Parking

Attached, for your records, are fully certified copies of above referenced documents.

LM/emm