**MMC TDM PLAN | City Review Comments 3/9/18** (Tom Errico, Bruce Hyman, Nell Donaldson)

**Context**

*Parking*

* The plan states that existing peak parking demand for patients, visitors, physicians, and staff is 3,122 parking spaces. Later, it states that the ‘average weekday parking demand’ in 2017 was 3,450 (1,200 for patients and visitors, and 2,250 for employees). These two figures should be reconciled - the average should be less than the peak.
* The calculation behind the baseline employee parking demand/employee figure should be clearly shown. It is difficult to tell what employee parking demand figure was used. (To the extent possible, the ratio should be based on actual observed demand.) It is also difficult to tell what employee population figure was used as a denominator. It was not 4,400 employees (which is the total estimated Bramhall employee figure used later in the plan), but 6,000? Where did that figure come from?

**Current Travel Behavior**

*Commuting Survey*

* Doublecheck terminology on frequency of survey. The plan states that the commuting survey will be completed ‘bi-annually,’ which means two times/year. This was the language used in the IDP, but it may be erroneous?

*Geospatial Analysis:*

* As stated in earlier comments, is there data on usage of UCar Share?

**Program Goals**

* In the future, employee parking demand/employee should be measured based on actual, observed employee parking demand (rather than estimated). The new employee garage should include technology that allows for the recording of actual parking demand.

**Parking & TDM Strategies**

*Current GOB Strategies:*

* Figure 6 should include both the existing and proposed bike network (see markup from original comments).
* Per the last Planning Board workshop, the TDM plan should inventory the type and number of bicycle parking spaces within the MMC Campus at each location to ensure that, at a minimum, 1) the total number of racks that meet the parking standards equals the number required and 2) also meets the standard that bicycle racks are adequately distributed within the MMC Campus at main building entrances, also as required by the Technical Manual.
* The discounts cited in Table 2 are not calculated correctly; the Metro discount is actually 40%, not 60%, etc.
* On-campus spaces should be identified for preferential carpool/vanpool parking.
* The parking cashout procedure seems unnecessarily cumbersome (e.g. submitting a form, etc.). Could this be made easier?

*Enhanced (Future?) Strategies:*

* As above, the system for subsidizing METRO passes seems cumbersome. Could passes be distributed up front on a monthly basis, rather than requiring employees to apply for a reimbursement? This is a barrier.
* As stated in earlier comments, are there METRO system/operational enhancements that could influence MMC employee use?  These concepts could be explored here.
* As stated in earlier comments, providing incentives for those who walk or bike could be effective in inducing mode shifts. Is there a way to connect with an employee wellness program?

*Education and Marketing Strategies*

* + As stated in earlier comments, what about challenges/incentives outside of GoMaine? MMC could provide their own.
	+ As noted above, what about connections to HR/employee health programs?

**Comprehensive Data and Goal Monitoring**

* + The plan states that parking demand data will be collected on a ‘semi-annual basis,’ or two times/year, which will provide two parking demand/employee data points for reporting in the annual monitoring report. Please confirm.
* As above, clarify terms re the frequency of the commuting survey.