

Appendix B: Summary of Member Reporting on TDM Strategies

Summary of Member Reports

Summaries below were prepared by Jason Valerius of MSA Professional Services, Inc., May 10, 2017.

Overview

The members of the LAPC Policy Board are seeking viable transportation demand management (TDM) strategies that will reduce the need for new and expanded highways as growth continues across the region, consistent with Coulee Vision 2050. The Board asked its members to report back on current conditions, policies, programs and improvement opportunities and scheduled a series of three discussions on topics that affect demand for highway capacity:

- Land use, development regulation, bike and pedestrian facilities (February)
- Parking (March)
- Transit and carpooling (April)

Member jurisdictions were provided worksheets for each topic (which are attached at the end of this summary) and they were asked to present at the corresponding meeting of the Board with responses to the worksheet questions. Some of the presenters brought materials or offered slide presentations – these are available for review on the LAPC website, as noted in this summary. Note that some members did not participate in these activities at all, including two communities served by MTU transit: The Town of Campbell and the City of La Crescent.

This summary is organized by the three major topics, and then within each topic by community. The content of this summary reflects the content of the members' reports – some were more extensive than others. The most important component of the discussions was the identification of things that each jurisdiction can do themselves, locally, that could help manage demand for highway capacity, especially during peak AM and PM commuting hours. Those “opportunities to support TDM in the next few years” are bolded.

A general takeaway from these presentations is the observation that the resources, level of effort, user demand and political will to manage transportation demand is heavily concentrated within the City of La Crosse, including not just the City and its departments and agencies but also major employers and institutions. Collaborations between the City of La Crosse and high travel demand destinations within the City likely hold the most promise for

substantive progress. However, there are things that every member jurisdiction can do to contribute to this effort, and collaborations among the members are important to the long-term success of this effort, especially to get more people using transit in the most congested travel corridors.

Land Use and Development Regulation

This discussion included a review of relevant plans and ordinances addressing land use, ordinances, and bike and pedestrian facilities. Several of these reports were given at the March meeting.

Process

Policy Board members were asked to complete a Land Use and Development Regulation Worksheet and report the results to the Board at its February 15, 2017 meeting.

The questions asked were:

- 1) CV2050 encourages infill development that enables the more efficient use of existing infrastructure and enables more people to live within walking distance of shopping and employment opportunities. (“Infill” is development, and typically redevelopment, on sites within an existing urbanized area that need little or no new streets or pipes to other infrastructure to support the new development.)
 - a. Identify any specific policies in your comprehensive plan that encourage infill development and redevelopment.
 - b. Identify any incentives or programs your community offers to facilitate redevelopment and infill development.
 - c. Describe infill development projects approved in your community during the past 2-3 years.
- 2) CV2050 encourages mixed-use development, as a strategy to promote efficient land use, and encourages communities to actively advocate for such development.
 - a. Identify any specific policies in your comprehensive plan that encourage mixed-use development.
 - b. Describe how mixed-use development is handled in your zoning ordinance.
 - c. Describe any programs or incentives your community offers to encourage mixed-use development, such as TIF assistance.
 - d. Describe any mixed-use projects approved in your community in the past 2-3 years.

- 3) CV2050 encourages boundary agreements among neighboring jurisdictions, especially to facilitate limited urban development in Towns (instead of lower-density, more dispersed development).
 - a. Describe any boundary agreements adopted or in progress. Note any policies in those agreements that may limit urban sprawl.
- 4) CV2050 seeks ubiquitous bike and pedestrian facilities.
 - a. Does your community have a bike and pedestrian plan? If yes, when was it last updated?
 - b. Does your community have a complete streets policy, or otherwise require safe biking and walking facilities on collector and arterial streets?
 - c. What do you require for safe pedestrian routes on local streets, within your land division ordinance?
 - d. Does your community require bike parking? If yes, in what districts or circumstances?
- 5) Identify one specific thing your community could change in the next two years to encourage more compact development, especially infill or mixed-use development.
- 6) Identify one specific thing your community could change in the next two years to encourage more ubiquitous bike and pedestrian facilities.

Feedback Results

La Crosse County

Relevant current conditions, practices and policies:

- ⇒ All 18 municipalities have comprehensive plans, the County has a plan (2008, update in progress), MRRPC has a plan (2015), and LAPC has Coulee Vision 2050 (CV2050)
- ⇒ The County plan features goals consistent with CV2050
- ⇒ The zoning and subdivision actions of Wisconsin communities must be consistent with their plans
- ⇒ Planned growth areas represent a 121-year supply, based on long-term regional housing growth projections
- ⇒ Working on intergovernmental cooperation, including boundary agreements and the Extraterritorial Joint Review of development plans.

Opportunities to support TDM in the next few years:

- ⇒ Amend plans - reduce capacity for low density development/ SOV's (hard to achieve)

- ⇒ Promote dense transit-oriented development
- ⇒ Continue collaborative planning
- ⇒ Traditional Neighborhood Revitalization
- ⇒ Promote interconnected trail systems for recreation and commuting
- ⇒ Promote Regional Transit e.g. SMRT (reduce downtown parking)
- ⇒ Lead by example
 - Employee Parking Policy/ Ride Share/ Transit Pass
 - Master Plan for County Farm
 - Participate in Boundary Agreement work

Town of Onalaska

Opportunities to support TDM in the next few years:

- ⇒ Update comprehensive plan (lasted updated 2008) and revisit minimum lot size requirements to discuss allowing or encouraging smaller lots
- ⇒ Have few trails but can continue working to complete the Sand Lake Road trail north of Hwy OT.

Town of Medary

Relevant current conditions, practices and policies:

- ⇒ Comprehensive Plan encourages infill and redevelopment, especially along Hwy 16
- ⇒ Have a few planned mixed-use areas
- ⇒ New rural development is possible, but no pressure or projects at this time
- ⇒ Working with City of Onalaska on a boundary agreement
- ⇒ Have no plans or policies regarding safe bike or pedestrian routes in the Town, and this has come up for discussion in recent plats

Opportunities to support TDM in the next few years:

- ⇒ No intention for more compact development
- ⇒ Would like to work on ped and bike safety along County Road FA atop the bluff

Town of Shelby

Relevant current conditions, practices and policies:

- ⇒ Working on a boundary agreement with the City of La Crosse
- ⇒ Working on a trail to Goose Island

Opportunities to support TDM in the next few years:

- ⇒ Interest in a trail through the Hwy 14 corridor
- ⇒ Update the comprehensive plan (with policies consistent with CV2050)
- ⇒ Trail construction, including the Hwy 35 corridor

Village of Holmen

Relevant current conditions, practices and policies:

- ⇒ Rapid growth – new subdivisions, new multifamily projects, street improvements, and stoplights
- ⇒ Many CV2050 goals in the Village's 2016 comprehensive plan update
- ⇒ Mixed use development is enabled through PUD and overlay zones
- ⇒ TIF 3 is focused on infill development
- ⇒ Boundary agreements with the City of Onalaska and Town of Onalaska, and with the Town of Holland (in progress)
- ⇒ Have a bike plan, promoting a trail system, and working on a new trail along Sand Lake Road

Opportunities to support TDM in the next few years:

- ⇒ Could consider an active village role in redevelopment projects (e.g. TIF funding)
- ⇒ Complete Sand Lake Road trail, Hwy 35 trail

City of Onalaska

Relevant current conditions, practices and policies:

- ⇒ Comprehensive plan includes four policies that encourage infill in central part of City and Downtown, and three encouraging mixed-use development.
- ⇒ Zoning ordinance allows for mixed use
- ⇒ Seeing 16-19 infill development projects per year
- ⇒ Have two boundary agreements, and soon hopefully a third, with the Town of Medary
- ⇒ No bike/ped plan at this time

Opportunities to support TDM in the next few years:

- ⇒ Revise zoning ordinance to further encourage mixed use development
- ⇒ Facilitate the Great River Landing project to spur further development in that area
- ⇒ Renew Bike Friendly Community designation to highlight facility needs
- ⇒ Work on connecting paths, e.g. to Holmen and north of Eagle Bluff Elementary

City of La Crosse

Relevant current conditions, practices and policies: Land Use

- ⇒ Many plans and policies that encourage infill, including no off-street parking requirements downtown, unified development code with flexible zoning to facilitate infill and mixed use, a downtown plan (City Vision 2020), Transportation Vision Plan, and others
- ⇒ A menu of incentive programs to encourage redevelopment and reinvestment in existing housing, including TIF districts (12 active), a loan program for upper floor renovations, housing rehab funds and programs from CDBG monies
- ⇒ DNR and WEDC grant programs
- ⇒ Many housing infill projects throughout the City, numerous downtown projects, including new mixed-use development
- ⇒ Using partnerships and creativity to achieve difficult infill projects Bike and pedestrian
- ⇒ 28 miles on-street bike lanes, 21 miles off-street trails
- ⇒ More people bike to work (3.7%) and walk to work (8.6%) here than the national averages, and fewer drive alone
- ⇒ 60% of streets have sidewalk on at least one side

Opportunities to support TDM in the next few years:

- ⇒ Explore use of TID in a linear fashion to promote investment along transit routes
- ⇒ Amend the zoning ordinance to allow density bonuses as a reward for successful land assembly in certain more challenging areas
- ⇒ Traffic signal synchronization with DOT funding
- ⇒ Support the completion of bike/ped facilities as part of larger DOT projects.
- ⇒ Implement the bike/ped plan
- ⇒ Complete the path to Shelby through the Hwy 14/61 corridor

Parking

This discussion included a review of parking facilities, regulation, costs and fees. Several businesses and schools reported on their practices as well.

Process

Policy Board members were asked to complete a Parking Worksheet and report the results to the Board at its March 15, 2017 meeting.

The questions asked of municipalities were:

- 1) Does your community charge for the use of on-street parking? If yes, describe where (in general terms) and how much?
- 2) Does your community have off-street public parking, excluding parking for municipal facilities? If yes, do you charge for use of that parking? When and how much?
- 3) Please estimate your annual costs and annual revenues, if any, associated with off-street parking.
- 4) Please describe your off-street parking requirements. Offer some specific examples. How much parking do you require for:
 - a. An apartment complex in a multifamily district with ten 2-bedroom apartments
 - b. A 15,000 SF office building
 - c. A 60,000 SF retail building
- 5) In your opinion, how do your off-street parking requirements compare to what the private sector wants? Higher? Lower? About right? And how do your requirements compare to typical use of that parking?
- 6) Do you have a downtown zoning district that does not require the provision of off-street parking? If yes, describe how parking needs are met downtown.
- 7) Describe other issues you have encountered and/or programs you have developed to manage the cost and supply of parking.
- 8) What is one thing you could change in the next two years to transfer more of the cost of public parking to those who use the parking? Are you willing to do this?

The questions asked of schools and businesses were:

- 1) Do you have private, off-street parking for staff and/or customer use?
 - a. If yes, approximately how many spaces?
 - b. If yes, do you charge for parking? When and how much?

- 2) Please estimate your total annual costs and revenues, if any, associated with off-street parking. If you pay property taxes, please include an estimate of that cost for parking.
- 3) Do staff or customers incur costs for off-site parking? If so, describe any subsidies or reimbursements of those costs by your organization.
- 4) Describe any programs or incentives for which your organization has spent money to reduce your parking demand, as an alternative to providing more parking.
- 5) Describe other issues you have encountered and/or programs you have developed to manage the cost and supply of parking
- 6) What is one thing you could do (or the City could do) to transfer more of the cost of parking to those who use it? Are you willing to do this?

Feedback Results

La Crosse County

Opportunities to support TDM in the next few years:

- ⇒ Be clear about public subsidy for all types of transportation, including the subsidy of parking
- ⇒ Charge people the actual cost of parking (consider the cost of the new downtown ramp, estimated at \$317 per spot per month)

Town of Onalaska

Relevant current conditions, practices and policies:

- ⇒ Not much on-street parking in the town
- ⇒ Town hall is the only City parking lot

Town of Medary

Relevant current conditions, practices and policies:

- ⇒ No Town expenditure on parking
- ⇒ Parking regulation is per County ordinance

Town of Shelby

Relevant current conditions, practices and policies:

- ⇒ Not much Town-owned parking

Opportunities to support TDM in the next few years:

- ⇒ Support trails to reduce vehicle traffic and parking demand in La Crosse

Village of Holmen

Relevant current conditions, practices and policies:

- ⇒ No on-street parking problems
- ⇒ Some parking limitations for the Festival Foods on N. Holmen Dr., but this will be alleviated when the store moves

City of Onalaska

Relevant current conditions, practices and policies:

- ⇒ No charges for on-street parking
- ⇒ No public parking lots, other than the lot for City Hall
- ⇒ No off-street parking required of downtown properties
- ⇒ Require 2 parking spots per unit for residential, 1.5 stalls per 2 employees, 1 stall per 100 SF of retail space
- ⇒ Partnership with Gunderson Lutheran Medical Center to build a 660-space ramp, which does not charge for parking. The City bonded for the project.
- ⇒ Believe local parking stall requirements are low, sometimes lower than what private sector development wants; no upper limit on parking stalls

Opportunities to support TDM in the next few years:

- ⇒ Downtown parking is working fine now without off-street parking requirements or off-street public lots but expect this to change as infill/redevelopment projects continue. Prepare for this to become an issue within the next couple years.

City of La Crosse

Relevant current conditions, practices and policies:

- ⇒ 3,422 spaces in 5 parking ramps, about 335 spaces in surface lots, and about 1,500 on-street
- ⇒ The newest ramp was purchased by the City at a cost of \$17.2 million, plus there is about \$13.8 million in outstanding debt on the other 4 structures
- ⇒ A staff of four (3 full-time, 1 part time) to track and maintain parking areas; issue about 30,000 citations per year

- ⇒ No off-street parking requirement in most of downtown
- ⇒ City's annual cost for parking facilities is about \$2.2 M, while revenues are about \$1.7 million
- ⇒ The City does not charge for on-street parking, but generates revenue through citations
- ⇒ Feeling that regulations are generally a good match to what businesses and developers want to provide – occasionally they want to provide more than required, but usually not

Opportunities to support TDM in the next few years:

- ⇒ Three phases of improvement
 - Restore pay stations downtown to get more revenue from prime parking spots
 - Direct parking revenue from pay stations to support the downtown through a parking benefit district
 - Become a true utility and close the gap between revenues and expenses
- ⇒ Improving enforcement with license plate recognition technology

Gunderson Lutheran Health Care

Relevant current conditions, practices and policies:

- ⇒ Have about 3,700 spaces at the south side site
- ⇒ Parking frequently in high demand. At peak use find now more than 30 spaces vacant
- ⇒ Neighborhood parking is becoming a problem – it now extends about five blocks into the surrounding neighborhood in every direction
- ⇒ Spend about \$150,000-\$200,000 per year in maintenance
- ⇒ Have shared ride and biking programs believed to be saving as many as 400 spaces
- ⇒ Have a low-interest loan program that promotes home purchases within walking distance of the hospital; have had 10 participants so far

University of Wisconsin-La Crosse (Victor Hill)

Relevant current conditions, practices and policies:

- ⇒ Have about 2,800 spaces on campus
- ⇒ The Parking and Transportation office is funded by permit sales

- ⇒ Parking rates are \$1/hour, \$244/year for residents, \$194/year for commuters (this is about average across all UW campuses). This pricing seems to be adjusting demand effectively to meet supply – any student who lives on campus and needs a permit can get one.
- ⇒ The City enforces 2-hour parking limits around the campus to manage on-street parking; Neighborhood parking extends about 5 blocks from campus
- ⇒ Alternative transportation methods promoted by the University include MTU, SMRT Bus, biking and bike share, short-term car rentals through Enterprise
- ⇒ Transitioning to a different type of permitting that takes photos of each license plate.
- ⇒ Commuter lots are all over-sold, by design, to optimize utilization

Downtown Businesses

Relevant current conditions, practices and policies:

- ⇒ Downtown businesses have been working with the City to explore parking issues

Opportunities to support TDM in the next few years:

- ⇒ Downtown businesses are willing to put everything on the table for discussion, including the management of parking demand with pricing, and using technology to improve efficient use. Noted by Will: more efficient use due to pricing and technology may increase use, and traffic. [Counterpoint by Jason Valerius while writing this summary: pricing strategies will lead some users – those who prioritize the lowest cost – to choose transportation alternatives that don't require parking. A shift in parking pricing and usage practices will enable future downtown business growth with a lesser growth of parking spaces and vehicle traffic.]
- ⇒ Downtown Mainstreet, Inc. (DMI) wants to serve as a conduit to business owners for purposes of this discussion.

Transit

This discussion included a review of facilities, practices and programs related to transit and carpooling, especially by commuters.

Process

Policy Board members were asked to complete a Transit Worksheet and report the results to the Board at its April 19, 2017 meeting.

The questions asked were:

- 1) Describe, in brief, the transit services that you know are available to residents of your jurisdiction. Comment specifically on how those services are used during weekday AM and PM commuting periods, including specific ridership numbers.
- 2) Describe what you know about “reverse” commuting patterns in your community, meaning the commuter travel of residents in La Crosse to jobs other jurisdictions. If you are one of those jurisdictions, what do you know about the workforce transportation needs of your major employers?
- 3) Identify the location of any park and ride locations within your jurisdiction, either formal (public and marked as such) or informal (private parking lots known to be used by transit riders and/or carpoolers). Describe the use of those lots, with as much specificity as possible about typical utilization.
- 4) How do your current adopted plans (e.g. comprehensive plan) support increased use of transit and carpooling? Please share that language, especially any specific projects or investments identified in plans.
- 5) Identify one thing *your jurisdiction* could do within the next two years that would decrease commuter vehicle trips in/out of central La Crosse by getting more people to carpool or use transit. (For example, this could be an investment in planning or implementation of stronger regional transit service, efforts to encourage or even facilitate carpooling or vanpooling, etc.)

Feedback Results

La Crosse County

Relevant current conditions, practices and policies:

- ⇒ The County supports MTU, SMRT Bus, and shared ride transit
- ⇒ Working on commuter bike routes and connectivity
- ⇒ Note that there has been a shift to more employment in communities other than La Crosse [alleviating trip demand in/out of La Crosse?]

- ⇒ Noted 7 park and ride lots in the County, all but one informal

Opportunities to support TDM in the next few years:

- ⇒ Work to develop a Regional Transit Authority [as a means to fund transit]
- ⇒ Require developments to be transit-ready, including greater concentrations of units/space and reservation of site space and public right-of-way for bus stops and dedicated transit lanes (this isn't happening now)
- ⇒ Extend SMRT Bus to Tomah and Arcadia (working on this now)
- ⇒ Require County employees to pay the full cost of parking

Town of Onalaska

Relevant current conditions, practices and policies:

- ⇒ No park and ride lots, either formal or informal
- ⇒ Concern that current MTU schedules are incompatible with second shift workers

Town of Medary

Relevant current conditions, practices and policies:

- ⇒ No Town transit system
- ⇒ Limited employment base, little demand for reverse commuting out of La Crosse
- ⇒ No designated park and rides, though it is likely that people use the Office Depot/Midwest Natural Gas parking lot as such
- ⇒ Parking regulation is per County ordinance

Opportunities to support TDM in the next few years:

- ⇒ Survey residents about their commuting practices and preferences
- ⇒ Designate a park and ride location

Town of Shelby

Relevant current conditions, practices and policies:

- ⇒ Transit within the town provided mostly by Bullet Cab and A-1 Taxi in the rural areas, plus MTU in the urban Town islands
- ⇒ No official park and ride locations
- ⇒ No transit policies in the comprehensive plan

Opportunities to support TDM in the next few years:

- ⇒ Develop or designate park and rides along the major corridors (33, 14/61) and offer transit service to downtown La Crosse
- ⇒ Extend MTU service one mile further in Shelby

Village of West Salem

Relevant current conditions, practices and policies:

- ⇒ Have a large park and ride lot, which is the one WisDOT lot in the County
- ⇒ Local commuter patterns out of the Village split roughly evenly between La Crosse and Tomah
- ⇒ Shared ride taxi trips have dropped off with the loss of compensatory rides

Opportunities to support TDM in the next few years:

- ⇒ Support SMRT Bus

Village of Holmen

Relevant current conditions, practices and policies:

- ⇒ Shared ride taxi is the only service currently available; it is used mostly by seniors and teenagers
- ⇒ Reverse commuting out of La Crosse is likely limited to one or two local manufacturers
- ⇒ No designated park and ride lots. Carpoolers to jobs in Arcadia meet at each other's homes in Holmen

Opportunities to support TDM in the next few years:

- ⇒ Designate a site for SMRT Bus to pick up/drop off, possibly near Village Hall and/or on north side
- ⇒ Encourage use of new transit options as they become available

City of Onalaska

Relevant current conditions, practices and policies:

- ⇒ Main local methods of ride sharing are MTU and carpooling
- ⇒ MTU in the City includes 1 full-time route and 1 part-time route
- ⇒ Comprehensive Plan calls for increased use of MTU

- ⇒ No designated park and ride lots, but people use the mall, City Hall, and Walmart parking lots
- ⇒ There have been challenges with the shared ride service

Opportunities to support TDM in the next few years:

- ⇒ Plan development to accommodate increased transit service
- ⇒ Increase the frequency of MTU service to improve its attraction – focus on this
- ⇒ Extend MTU service to Riders Club Road
- ⇒ Review again the Main Street route to identify opportunities to improve it

City of La Crosse

Relevant current conditions, practices and policies:

- ⇒ MTU serves 36 square miles and 70,000 people
- ⇒ MTU operates several special programs to facilitate ridership, including the U-Pass program with the universities, Community Link (specialized transit), and the Works Pass program (serving Gunderson Lutheran, Mayo Health Systems, Duratech)
- ⇒ Average trips on a school day – 4,100; average trips on a non-school weekday – 3,316
- ⇒ 831,000 revenue miles, 159,000 total rides, 11,600 special needs rides
- ⇒ MTU is trying new things:
 - Modified routes
 - 30-minute service to Gunderson Lutheran
 - MTU-Go circulator route
 - MTU app to show when bus will arrive
- ⇒ Park and rides serviced by MTU include:
 - La Crescent Community Center
 - Texas Roadhouse
 - Shopko (SMRT, VAR)
 - K-Mart (Organic Valley serves this site with vans)

Opportunities to support TDM in the next few years:

- ⇒ Work on getting to the national average 5% of commuter trips using transit, up from 2% today

- ⇒ Look for opportunities to revise contracted routes (8, 9, 10) so that MTU resources can better serve City residents
- ⇒ Work toward 15-minute service during the AM/PM commutes
- ⇒ Expand employment-focused service subsidized by employers