STATE OF

TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT

PLANS

IN CANADIAN URBAN AREAS

- * -

prepared by Transport Concepts

in conjunction with Sperling Associates Inc.

for Environment Canada

- * -

MARCH, 1995

Reader's Comments

Any comments on the contents of this report should be addressed to:

R. J. (Russ) Robinson
Transportation Systems Division
Industrial sectors Branch
Environment Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0H3

Review Notice

The contents of this report have been reviewed by the Industrial Sectors Branch, Environment Canada and approved for publication. Approval does not necessarily signify that the contents reflect the views and policies of Environment Canada.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 3

Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Transportation Demand Management 6
1.2 Study Background 6
1.3 Study Objectives 6
1.4 Report Structure 7

Chapter 2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Overview 8
2.2 Interviewing Approach 8
2.3 Provincial Sign-Off and Pre-Test 8
2.4 Responses 9

Chapter 3 TDM ACTIONS TAKEN

3.1 Introduction 10
3.2 Overall Pattern of Responses 10
3.3 Transit Improvements 12
3.4 Bicycle/Pedestrian Programs 13
3.5 Car/Vanpooling 14
3.6 TDM-Supportive Land Use 14
3.7 HOV/Bus Lanes 16
3.8 Parking 16
3.9 Employer-based TDM Programs 18
3.10 Education and Promotion 19
3.11 Other Actions 19
3.12 Results Expected/Achieved from Actions Taken 20
3.13 Most Successful Actions Taken 21
3.14 Disappointments 21

Chapter 4 TDM PROGRAMS FOR 1995

4.1 Introduction 22
4.2 Overall Pattern of Responses 22

Chapter 5 PRINCIPAL PLANS FOR TDM PROGRAMS BEYOND 1995

5.1 Introduction 24
5.2 Overall Pattern of Responses 24

Chapter 6 COMMITMENT TO TDM

6.1 Introduction 26
6.2 Awareness of CCME Requirement for TDM Plans .. 26
6.3 Overall Pattern of Commitment 26
6.4 Factors Motivating the TDM Commitment 28

Chapter 7 MAKING TDM WORK

7.1 Introduction 30
7.2 Obstacles to Effective Action 30
7.3 Proposed Solutions to TDM Obstacles 32
7.4 Role of the Provinces 32
7.5 Role of the Federal Government 33

Appendices:

A. Study Questionnaire
B. List of Respondents/Responding Communities

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

"TDM programs are most effective when you go out and do them. There is a lot of talk but, in reality, little is being done."

.... respondent for a mid-sized Ontario city

In Canada's 3 largest cities - Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver, it may be said that a concerted Transportation Demand Management effort is in place and further enhancement is planned. Elsewhere, with very few exceptions, there is more talk than action.

What has happened in our largest urban centres appears to be primarily a product of simply having run out of possibilities of handling traffic growth by accommodating more single occupancy automobiles. There is literally no choice but to do something else. That "something else" is a range of TDM initiatives.

Elsewhere - and this includes many suburbs of our largest cities - there is little sense of urgency calling for TDM measures. Congestion and cost concerns are not yet seen to be sufficiently serious, and - with the apparent exception of the west coast where there has been development of support for a "livable" environment - air quality is not viewed as a pressing issue.

Not one of the participants in this study suggested an awareness of the targets for TDM plans by local governments established by the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME). Consequently, such plans - at least in the form of single documents focused strictly on TDM - do not exist.

Many cities and regional governments do have Official Plans which incorporate calls for more TDM measures, most commonly involving strengthened linkages between land use and transportation. But, there may be reasons to doubt the public and political will to see these through to full realization. The interviews with officials from 58 local governments elicited many more expressions of concern over lack of support than comments about the need to act.

The information and insights developed in the course of this review suggest a number of avenues to raise understanding of the requirement for TDM and encourage appropriate action.

To start, the strong indicated correlation between community size and willingness to see the importance of TDM raises the question of whether it might not be appropriate to concentrate near-term TDM boosting efforts on only the larger urban situations .... perhaps those with populations in excess of 400,000.

One model for how to get recognition of the need may be suggested by the successful work in recent years of cycling advocates. It is evident that (what some respondents called) the "bike lobby" has had a major impact through being able to convince councils of the many positive contributions which increased bicycle usage can make to the urban situation.

Carefully targeted funding (perhaps, as some study respondents suggested, with incentives to reward the most strongly committed communities) can advance TDM. There is also a need for supportive legislation changes, including some which add to the ability to insist on compliance. It is important to organize TDM programs in ways which minimize overlap and confusion between the interested jurisdictions. As the real push to integrated TDM effort is a relatively "new" responsibility, there may be a need for "new" ways to carry this out. Additionally, there is a need to get the employers of those commuters more aggressively involved.

The federal government is recognized as having a role to play in terms of fostering the success of TDM. But, there is a critical obligation to ensure that this TDM role adds value to, and does not take away from, what is regarded as fundamentally a local area responsibility.

The observations of the local government officials contributing to this study suggest that the federal government can help by:

- promoting a "top level" recognition of the important reasons for more serious attention to TDM programs,
- backing up its insistence on need for action with TDM-targeted financial help (the apparent irony of federal "infrastructure" dollars helping to build local roads was noted by several officials),
- taking action to eliminate the current tax treatment of businesses which has the effect of subsidizing car parking while penalizing any attempt to help pay for transit use,
- developing and offering communications programs specifically aimed at raising public awareness of the true costs and impacts of the current dependence on the auto, and stimulating public recognition of the benefits to follow from greater use of transportation alternatives,
- facilitating exchanges of information across the country about TDM successes, and
- "showing the way tangibly" by having the federal bureaucracy aggressively implement TDM policies with its own employees right across the country - a model for this is presumably offered by the British Columbia government.

It is readily evident that the task of making a real dint in the public's "love affair" with the automobile is a hard sell. As the response to this study forcefully illustrates, expressions of good intention will do little. A more active TDM role by the federal government is endorsed by many local transportation and planning officials provided this respects the essentially "local" nature of the challenge.

This report is not intended as an overview of all aspects of TDM but rather contains the specific results of the survey of TDM plans within urban areas in Canada. For detailed information on the TDM initiatives relating to this study, the reader is directed to other publications such as "Transportation Demand Management - a policy challenge" by K. Morgan MacRae of the Canadian Energy Research Institute in Calgary.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Transportation Demand Management

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) is commonly defined as a program embracing a variety of measures to reduce the number of vehicle miles travelled and traffic congestion. The goal is to encourage a shift of urban commuting to more energy efficient and less polluting modes of travel.

1.2 Study Background

In 1990, the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME) agreed on a call to governments of larger urban centres in the Lower Fraser Valley and the Quebec-Windsor Corridor to develop transportation management plans aimed at reducing the emissions of Nitrogen Oxides and Volatile Organic Compounds.

This initiative is detailed in the CCME "Management Plan for Nitrogen Oxides (NOX) and Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) - Phase I" dated November 1990. Initiative N401/V401 states:

> *Urban Transportation management plans designed to reduce NOx/VOC emissions - all urban centres in Lower Fraser Valley and Windsor - Quebec Corridor with population greater than 200,000 by 1992 and greater than 100,000 by 1994.*

All of these plans were to be in place by June 30, 1994.

1.3 Study Objective

Environment Canada would now like to identify the state of the transportation demand management plans in these areas.

Accordingly, Transport Concepts, in conjunction with Sperling Associates Inc., was approached to investigate and report on TDM actions taken and planned by the regional/municipal governments of the large and medium-sized communities targeted by CCME.

For control purposes, the 12 similarly-sized urban centres elsewhere in Canada were also investigated.

1.4 Report Structure

This report presents findings in terms of:

(i) TDM actions taken to date,
(ii) TDM actions planned for the current year,
(iii) primary TDM thrusts projected over the longer term,
(iv) the nature and level of commitment to TDM, and
(v) what needs to be done to optimize chances for success.

Chapter 2

METHODOLOGY

2.1 Overview

The findings presented here are based on a survey of the appropriate representatives (usually individuals in transportation planning functions) of 58 regional and municipal governments serving Canadian urban areas with populations in excess of 100,000. Some additional interviews were conducted with provincial and transit officials for clarification.

A copy of the questionnaire is presented in Appendix A. Study respondents are listed in Appendix B.

In this project, the consultants assumed responsibility for (i) identifying all qualifying local jurisdictions and their appropriate contact persons (ii) designing and validating the questionnaire (iii) arranging and conducting the actual interviews and (iv) reporting on findings. Interviews were conducted in either French or English, as appropriate.

2.2 Interviewing Approach

The questionnaire structure was guided, in part, by the definition of TDM action categories contained in the 1994 report of the Canadian Energy Research Institute. The interviewing process involved (i) contacting respondents to schedule telephone interviews (ii) mailing out of the questionnaire to enable respondent pre-preparation and (iii) the conduct of the actual telephone interviews through reference to the questionnaire. Interviews generally required 25 to 40 minutes to complete.

2.3 Provincial Sign-Off and Pre-Test

Before conduct of the main project, the questionnaire design and proposed methodology were reviewed with the client and with representatives of the provinces of British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec. The methodology was then pilot-tested on the four target jurisdictions in the greater Ottawa area.

2.4 Responses

Cooperation extended by those approached in the course of this study was excellent. The combination of mail and telephone techniques worked well in terms of providing respondents with direction as to the subject matter to be explored while also imposing a certain discipline (the telephone interview appointment) to ensure timely participation.

As must be expected, the more than 60 interviewees brought a broad range of experience to the responses given. Their answers require a certain filtering for different perspectives (eg: engineers-versus-planners), for different verbal skills, for different degrees of interest and preparation, etc. Nonetheless, the variance in frequency and/or intensity of reference to different actions and intentions makes it readily possible to discern a number of quite clear trends.

The relatively small size of the sample (58 local governments successfully contacted) suggests that attempts to quantify results ("x" said this, "y" said that) must be treated with some caution - particularly in terms of analysis of any breakdowns of the total group. It had been requested that findings for communities in (i) Southern British Columbia (ii) Southern Ontario (iii) Southern Quebec and (iv) the rest of Canada be separately reported and evaluated. Our examination of responses suggests that, while some distinctive responses may be inferred with respect to Southern BC, the other territories do not show sufficient differences from each other to generally permit comparisons with sufficient confidence. On the other hand, we have noted and will comment on, some significant variations between smaller and larger communities.

Chapter 3

TDM ACTIONS TAKEN

3.1 Introduction

This section of the report looks at the transportation demand management actions which have now been taken by local/regional governments serving populations in excess of 100,000.

The information presented here is derived primarily from responses to the survey enquiries about what has been accomplished in each of 12 distinct TDM action areas explored in Part A of the study questionnaire.

3.2 Overall Pattern of Responses

3.2.1 National Picture

The following table lists the 12 response categories and shows the number of respondents who indicated that they had implemented actual improvements in each of the indicated categories.

	Category	# Respondents
(1)	Public transit improvements	47
(2)	Alternative work hours	1
(3)	Bicycle/Pedestrian programs	39
(4)	Car/vanpooling	3
(5)	TDM-supportive land use	42
(6)	Auto-usage charges (except tolls)	0
(7)	HOV lanes	17
(8)	Parking pricing and regulation	18
(9)	Road pricing (tolls)	0
(10)	Telecommuting	0
(11)	Employer-based TDM programs	10
(12)	Education and promotion	20

The above respondent count relates to completed actions, regardless of the magnitude of such actions. In other words, this is simply a count of how many respondents reported that their jurisdictions had actually effected some sort of improvement over the recent past in each of the indicated TDM areas. It is to be noted that this count is very

much influenced by the fact that many local/regional governments have no authority, and play no role, in a number of the action categories.

Nonetheless, a pattern clearly emerges. The most common TDM programs to date relate to transit improvement, support of bicycling and pedestrians, and TDM-favouring land-use practices.

Certain of the potential actions areas - specifically: alternative work hours, auto-usage charges, road tolls, and telecommuting - have had no, or virtually no, employment at the local/regional level other than some limited tests of alternative hours and telecommuting by some governments with their own employees (which have not been included in the above count).

3.2.2 Southern British Columbia

The communities in the lower Fraser Valley reported a somewhat broader range of TDM actions than any other geographical area studied. In essence, the western jurisdictions match those elsewhere for commitment to transit, bike/pedestrian and land-use improvement while reporting higher involvement with employer-based TDM programs, vanpooling, and public education/promotion.

An evident factor in this is the GO GREEN Committee, which was started in the late 1980's. The partners in this endeavour are BC Transit, the Greater Vancouver Regional District, the BC government (four separate ministries involved) and the federal government. The purpose of GO GREEN is to build public understanding of the link between transportation alternatives and their concerns over air quality, congestion and cost.

While the vast bulk of the GO GREEN annual budget is spent on advertising and promotion campaigns to advance TDM themes, it was indicated that most of the time of committee members was consumed by efforts to "make things happen". It was argued that the normal government structure is just not adapted to the multi-faceted TDM approaches. For example: Who (in government) is responsible for vanpooling, or HOV lanes? No one player has the solution. Therefore, there is a requirement to get all of the interested parties together and coordinate/optimize their efforts. It was stated that, while the GO GREEN Committee does not deliver programs, it does help others to deliver.

3.2.3 Southern Ontario

The southern Ontario story is one of some serious TDM efforts by its largest regional and municipal governments, and a rather more relaxed approach elsewhere. For example, the City of Toronto reports that it has carried out programs in 9 of the 12 TDM

action categories while surrounding suburbs have, on average, identified recent work in less than 4 of the categories.

3.2.4 Southern Quebec

As elsewhere, transit, bike/ped and land-use programs are most commonly cited. However, there was also much comment on HOV lanes and on stricter regulation of parking.

3.2.5 "Other" Communities

The pattern here appears to be rather like that noted for the medium-sized cities within the Quebec-Windsor Corridor.

The fact that these particular cities are not associated with high levels of ozone, and hence not subject to the CCME call for TDM plans, is essentially irrelevant inasmuch as trip-reduction interest in virtually all communities across Canada is driven by concerns about congestion and road costs (rather than, or in addition to, concerns over air quality). See section 7.4.

3.3 Transit Improvements

To date, much of the attention on reducing the predominance of single occupancy vehicles has been focused on transit.

However, there have been only a few significant developments on this front over the past 3 or 4 years. One can cite the extension of Vancouver's "Skytrain", the growth of Ottawa's transit way, the Edmonton LRT university station, and the Greater Toronto Area's Fare Integration and Service Coordination (FISC) program.

The general tenor of transit improvements identified in the survey is more accurately described by the respondent who stated that "We have improved .... but not by much.". While a great many types of improvements to the effectiveness and efficiency of transit service were flagged, most fell into one of the following categories: (i) limited trials (ii) relatively low-cost actions (iii) modest steps in long-term programs. The recent story of transit in Canada is one of evolution rather than revolution.

The availability of funding for transit appears to have been a major constraint. Indeed, several of the reporting communities indicated that they were forced by budget difficulties (in most instances, associated with traffic losses) to reduce service.

Frequent mentions of certain transit programs during the survey may be presumed to suggest their growing availability across the country. Programs in this category include acquisition of natural gas buses, acquisition of low-floor buses, provision of more bus shelters, transit priority measures including bus/HOV lanes and traffic light pre-preemption, express routes, community buses, park n' ride, vehicle tracking and communications systems, improved schedule coordination, various incentive pricing schemes, user advisory councils, and cooperative planning/arrangements with major traffic generators - eg: universities, hospitals.

To draw on a phrase frequently employed by study participants, it is perhaps "too early" to draw a definite conclusion. But, the fact that transit services in both Vancouver and Victoria showed traffic trends more positive than the results recorded by a great many of their eastern counterparts may, in part, be a reflection of the seemingly broader TDM emphasis on the west coast.

3.4 Bicycle/Pedestrian Programs

Many local/regional governments report that they have now developed Official Plans that call for primacy of bicycle and pedestrian needs over those of the automobile.

During the past five years, many of these governments have specifically produced and acted on comprehensive bicycling plans. This, rather than transit, is the area that appears to have seen the greatest commitment to new developments.

A number of jurisdictions have planned and implemented their bike programs in conjunction with citizens advisory committees. Several study respondents referred to the central role of "bike lobbies" in advancing local government support of cycling in recent years. It would appear that grassroots movements have played a major role in persuading local politicians that the quality-of-life, good exercise, recreational, and low-cost appeals of bicycling merited their significant support.

Much of what has been accomplished is viewed as primarily responding to recreational demands. Indeed, in a large proportion of the jurisdictions surveyed, the primary responsibility for bicycle programs has been vested in Parks and Recreation Departments. Extensive networks of bike pathways have been developed in parks, along rivers and through ravines. Nonetheless, it is clear that more communities are now moving to support the bicycle as a straightforward transportation mode by designating certain urban roads as bike routes, painting lanes, and/or widening paved surfaces.

Bicycle parking on municipal lots and at bike racks/lockers in downtown areas are offered by a number of jurisdictions. There is increasing integration in many instances between bicycle and transit employment through "bike 'n ride" facilities at transit stations and, in some instances (most commonly on larger vehicles such as trains and ferries),

through the allowance of some bicycles on transit vehicles.

Several communities now promote their bicycle networks through the provision of route maps. A few have zoning requirements spelling out bike parking requirements for new developments.

Pedestrians typically share the burgeoning off-road pathway networks with bicyclists. While many bicycling programs were described by respondents as "new", the investment in support of pedestrians was often referred to as an "ongoing" part of a longstanding undertaking.

Nonetheless, a number of respondents did indicate that greater attention was now being paid to pedestrians through commitments to always build sidewalks in new areas, and through enhanced safety and security measures including better lighting, and more crosswalk protection. Also a number of communities now have zoning requirements that call for all new developments to be within walkable distance from a transit stop - commonly regarded as 400/450 metres.

3.5 Car/Vanpooling

There is a carpooling service with ride-matching and suburban lots operated by the provincial government in the Greater Toronto Area.

In Southern British Columbia, the private Jack Bell Foundation provides approximately 75 vans to pools of commuters. The vanpoolers pay operating costs. The BC government and the Greater Vancouver Regional District look after administration expenses.

However, apart from these relatively modest initiatives, there has been little substantive progress with installing car/vanpooling. The minimal result may be traced in good measure to a rather widespread perception that this TDM avenue has not been effective. Several of the study respondents referred to problems with attracting and sustaining user interest, while others spoke of these pools diverting traffic from transit. Several communities were identified as having been involved in establishing carpool operations that subsequently failed.

3.6 TDM-Supportive Land Use

- "We finally got an Official Plan which has lots of policies, but we have not done much. We (in Transportation) do check proposals from developers, but we've done that for years."

- "Some policies are being followed, others are not."

- "The Plan requires a specific percentage of multifamily units for higher density, but Council usually overrides."

An enquiry into actions to encourage land-use practices supportive of the alternatives to the automobile almost always produced a reference to an "Official Plan" purported to favour higher densities and support transit/bicycling/walking. However, as the above quotations suggest, the actual realization of TDM-supportive land use practices has been rather less dramatic.

It can be reported that many communities have adopted higher-density requirements or - in a number of instances "neo- traditional " designs (mixed use, intensification, traffic calming) - along main traffic arteries, around transit stations and/or in city centres. This more concentrated land use was identified as being motivated by assessment, as well as quality-of-life, considerations. Some respondents suggested that such zoning would only produce real TDM benefits over the longer-term.

A few jurisdictions have attempted to impose TDM requirements as a condition of their approval of larger commercial developments.

Toronto has had a policy since 1991 calling for the submission of TDM plans by all commercial developments requiring 75 or more parking spaces. The types of measures which developers are expected to address in the preparation of these plans include:

- incentives to use other modes
  - subsidization of transit passes
  - provision of bike parking/showers
- control of the supply and operation of on-site parking
- establishment of ride-share or car pooling programs,
- implementation of flexible work hours.

It is reported that between 10 and 20 developments have now provided TDM plans under this policy.

The Toronto program is said to be easier to apply when the developer is, in fact, the "employer" at the site. In such cases "operational" arrangements such as transit passes and ride-share programs can be negotiated. Where the developer is building to accommodate other companies (which will be the employers at the site), TDM arrangements are more likely to be of a "physical" nature, such as the amount of parking, and bike facilities.

Vancouver and Victoria have both demanded TDM plans as a prerequisite of their approval of recent hospital redevelopment projects. The City of Ottawa negotiated less parking at the new national headquarters building of Canada Post Corporation in exchange for a discount on transit passes.

Some cities - including Ottawa and Surrey - are now preparing Official Plans and Transportation Plans concurrently, with the obvious intention that the two be fully linked. One city reported a move to coordinate these two dimensions through a formal merger of transportation and land-use planning into a single department.

3.7 HOV/Bus Lanes

HOV and bus lanes are emerging as a TDM opportunity in Canada's largest population centres.

- Metro Toronto now has 65 lane kilometres of HOV rights of way in place with the Official Plan calling for an eventual 300 kilometres.

- Montreal has HOV lanes along arterial roads in about 10 locations, as well as contra-flow bus-only lanes on some St Lawrence River bridges.

- Vancouver has HOV lanes on the approaches to the Lions Gate and Second Narrows bridges.

- Ottawa offers transit service over almost 40 kilometres of bus-only lanes (including its "transitway" system)

- Calgary dedicates one downtown street to the exclusive use of LRT trains.

- Winnipeg has a 5-block long contra-flow bus lane on one downtown street.

Several of these cities and a few smaller ones also provide some exclusive bus lanes over relatively short distances - for example: bus malls downtown, and bus entries to shopping centres.

3.8 Parking

Parking regulation is invariably the responsibility of individual cities rather than regional governments.

Many local municipalities in the Toronto, Montreal, Ottawa and Vancouver areas report proactive steps to regulate at least some parking in ways favouring employment of alternatives to the single occupancy automobile.

These communities have generally acted to reduce the minimum amount of parking required and/or the maximum amount of parking spaces allowed for recent commercial developments/redevelopments.
This practice has been applied to certain locations - eg: near transit stations, in mixed-use neighbourhoods, in the downtown core, or on (what is referred to as) a "site-specific" basis.

Montreal reports that it has issued no new permits for street-level parking lots in the city centre since 1986 and it has doubled the cost of permits to operate such lots. The objective is to encourage the development of this land. It does not worry about below-ground parking because it believes that far fewer cars will pay the higher charges that these require.

A number of larger jurisdictions offer "cash in lieu" provisions whereby developers may pay the city to forego part of the bylaw requirement to provide parking spaces for their (usually, commercial) clients. In Montreal, the charge is $3,000 for each space the developer wishes to have waived. However, respondents stated that this approach has had only limited success. It is, typically, a voluntary program, and many developers are said to favour keeping all of their parking space entitlement.

The City of Regina has employed an interesting variation on the "cash in lieu" theme whereby commercial developers may purchase bus passes in lieu of provision of parking at the rate of 5 passes for every 2.5 parking spots eliminated. The city then requires that these passes be sold at a 50% reduction.

Many cities across Canada have raised parking charges in the recent past. In a number of instances, this step was at least in part associated with a policy of encouraging short-term over long-term parking. The idea, of course, is to try to attract shopping and tourism visits to downtown while persuading all-day workers to use transit or other alternatives to the car.

The manipulation of parking by price, regulation, or control of supply is far from being universally supported. Several study respondents described parking as a "contentious" issue. Merchants and developers are reported to favour (what they view as) sufficient parking on/around their sites, and they are not hesitant to lobby Councils for same.

Indeed, several medium-sized cities in Ontario (but outside the Greater Toronto Area) reported that their primary current parking emphasis was to increase parking availability in support of downtown development.

3.9 Employer-based TDM Programs

An integrated program to encourage employers to work with their staffs on identification and utilization of transport other than the single occupancy vehicle has been put in place in Southern British Columbia.

BC Transit, with provincial, regional and municipal support, has spearheaded the establishment of a 2-day Employer Transportation Administrator (ETA) training program to teach employers how to install and run TDM activities for their staffs. About 100 people representing large employers have now been through the training, and an association of ETA's has now been founded to help sustain commitment.

An example of what has resulted from the program was given in the context of Camosum College in Victoria which has increased parking rates (to provide funds to assist other modes), installed bicycle racks, introduced a carpool program and provided subsidized bus passes. Bus pass sales at the college doubled.

The B.C. government has entered into a TDM-related understanding with the City of Victoria tied to no increase in single occupancy vehicle use. One facet of this is bus pass purchases through payroll deduction. One thousand employees have signed up. One provincial department is reported to have 77% of employee commuting trips by other than single occupancy auto.

The BC government is proposing to adopt TDM practices for all of its facilities in Victoria by the end of 1995, in Vancouver by the end of 1996 and in the regions by end-1997. It is felt that the size and evidence of the provincial presence will allow its insistence on TDM programs to serve as strong "levers" to influence other employers. It was suggested that the federal government could also usefully set a TDM example.

In response to probing into reasons for employer (particularly private sector employer) interest in TDM programs, it was suggested that many saw this as a vehicle to reduce those costs associated with the provision of employee automobile parking. Additionally, it was suggested that the BC Transit TDM program deliberately went after employers concerned about their public profiles and wanting to be seen as environmentally responsible.

Elsewhere in Canada, steps to have employers play a part in the TDM process have been largely limited to commitments imposed or requested in connection with the formal approval of larger commercial developments or redevelopments. Reduced parking requirements, subsidized bus passes, bicycling facilities and ride-share practices have been the most common ingredients. See the prior discussion in section 3.6.

Some local governments in Central Canada have implemented TDM measures (most commonly: restricted parking, bike accommodation, flex hours, telecommuting) with

their own employees - but, there has been little or no conscious effort to "export" what has been attempted and learned to other (eg: private sector) employers.

Not all TDM efforts involving employers have been unmitigated successes. One Toronto suburb approached 102 companies as possible subjects for a ride-share program, but found only
8 serious prospects, and only two that offered to participate. The project was subsequently dropped.

3.10 Education and Promotion

Much of the TDM public education/promotion responsibility in southern BC is handled by the GO GREEN Committee which, as was noted earlier, is a partnership of BC Transit, the Greater Vancouver Regional District, the BC government and the federal government. A budget of $300,000 is invested annually in television commercials, bus signs, highway signs and brochures. The four current 15-second tv ads address (respectively) the advantages of vanpooling, walking, bicycling and transit.

Elsewhere, TDM-related education/promotion objectives are typically pursued through the marketing programs of the various transit operators, and through the communications efforts of citizens' advisory panels (most commonly set up to support bicycling needs).

A number of communities also promote interest in alternatives to the auto through special events such as "Clean Air Day", "No Car Day" and "Bike-to-Work Week".

3.11 Other Actions

The regional and municipal governments disclaim any current responsibility/authority for road tolls or other auto-use pricing. A number of these same jurisdictions have at least experimented with alternative work hours and telecommuting - but only with their own staffs, and usually with no obvious intention of seriously attempting to "export" these to other entities.

It remains, however, to draw attention to one other avenue for encouraging alternatives to the single occupancy vehicle that just may prove to be very important. It is within the power of local governments, either by design or by indifference/inaction, to simply let automobile congestion get worse .... with the expectation that this will ultimately drive some to alternative modes. A Vancouver respondent spoke of the "metering" effect of having reached (at certain times) the capacity limit of the Lions Gate and Second Narrows bridges. An Ottawa interviewee cited a deliberate planning decision to not widen a certain arterial road until bus traffic from the area it served achieved a targeted

proportion of all trips.

One concern with any decision to simply let congestion worsen is that more motorists will then try to find new routes through residential neighbourhoods. However, it was noted that this risk can be countered by various techniques for "traffic calming".

3.12 Results Expected/Achieved from Actions Taken

Study respondents were asked (see appendix A, question 14) to (i) choose that one of 3 options which best described their expectations of the TDM programs they had in place and then (ii) choose that option from among 4 presented which best indicated how they felt their TDM programs had in fact performed. Overall responses were as follows:

TDM Program Expectations	# Respondents
o minor improvement	25
o moderate improvement	15
o significant improvement	5
	45

Results Achieved To Date	
o exceeded expectations	2
o met expectations	14
o short of expectations	8
o too early to assess results	21
	45

The above readings reinforce other indications to the effect that a great many municipal/regional governments do not see their TDM roles to date as having been particularly important or effective. The above table also should be appreciated with the recognition that some respondents (representing jurisdictions with smaller populations) did not feel that their TDM activities were even worth providing an answer to question 14. A common comment was
"I can't answer that, we haven't done anything yet".

In essence, representatives of only 20 out of 58 jurisdictions studied (34%) felt their TDM efforts could be expected to produce something better than minor improvement. Only 16 of 58 (28%) believed that the result they expected had now been achieved or exceeded. The frequent insistence that it is "too early to assess results" can be interpreted as the product of two influences: first - a number of respondents stated that they "had not done much" yet, and secondly - there was an often-expressed view that many TDM actions

will take a long time to produce results.

The relatively low numbers for serious expectations and satisfactory results are in significant measure a reflection of governments which feel that they do not have traffic congestion, infrastructure cost or air pollution problems warranting major TDM attention. Such jurisdictions are more likely to be among the smaller regions/municipalities studied. A number are suburbs of the largest cities.

Interestingly, exclusion of those local governments outside the regions of NOx/VOC concern has virtually no affect on the distribution pattern reported in the above table. The percentage of the sample expressing a minor improvement expectation only changes from 43% to 44% when responses from the Prairie, Northern Ontario and Atlantic cities are not counted.

Those study participants who did comment on results achieved largely referred to their perceptions of transit performance.

3.13 Most Successful Actions Taken

Not surprisingly, most of the actions described as successful related to the three TDM categories associated with the bulk of attention to date, ie: transit, bike/pedestrian, and land-use. Nevertheless, there were some apparent regional emphases. Several Quebec province respondents stressed the success with reserved HOV lanes. Several of the western participants cited the Jack Bell vanpooling program.

3.14 Disappointments

In terms of programs which have not met expectations, the interviewees commonly mentioned transit system traffic declines and recollections of past experiments with carpooling that had failed. But the most pervasive response was in the nature of expressions of frustration over their perceived difficulties in getting the full support and participation of key elements of the public/private sector.

Chapter 4

TDM PROGRAMS FOR 1995

4.1 Introduction

After the questioning about TDM actions which their jurisdictions had now taken, respondents were asked to again go through the list of 12 TDM categories and indicate steps planned for the current year. This section looks at their answers.

4.2 Overall Pattern of Responses

4.2.1 National Picture

The following reporting of respondents indicating 1995 action plans produces a distribution which is basically similar to that shown in 3.2.1 with respect to TDM actions already taken:

	Category	# Respondents
(1)	Public transit improvements	34
(2)	Alternative work hours	1
(3)	Bicycle/Pedestrian programs	35
(4)	Car/Vanpooling	3
(5)	TDM-supportive land use	27
(6)	Auto-usage charges (except tolls)	0
(7)	HOV lanes	13
(8)	Parking pricing and regulation	14
(9)	Road pricing (tolls)	0
(10)	Telecommuting	1
(11)	Employer-based TDM programs	7
(12)	Education and promotion	8

Transit, bike/pedestrian programs, and land-use emerge as the leading TDM vehicles. HOV lanes, parking, working with employers, and education/promotion are also important in some contexts.

The response pattern suggests that the current year will largely see a replay of the TDM actions of the past several years. Much of the respondent commentary about 1995

plans would appear to support this assumption. There was frequent employment of such expressions as "continue to ....", or "once again .....".

4.2.2 Southern BC

A number of anticipated 1995 milestones were flagged by Southern BC respondents, including:

- implementation of the GVRD ride-matching service
- completion of the TDM program with all BC Government offices in Victoria
- tabling of the "Livable Region Strategic Plan"
- approval of the South Coast Transportation Plan
- filing of a telecommuting study
- introduction of the third utility bike route in Vancouver
- downtown residential construction on the Expo 86 site
- introduction of cycle path on an abandoned rail line in Victoria.

4.2.3 Southern Ontario/Quebec

The current year is expected to include these developments:

- the opening of another 23 kilometres of HOV lanes in the Metro Toronto area, as well as additional lanes in Montreal and Quebec City
- more focus by Metro Toronto on TDM measures in the workplace with a pilot project for its own employees and the publication of a new TDM workbook for employers
- a marketing test by the City of Markham of a ride-share program employing newly-developed software
- amalgamation in the Region of York of the several existing municipal transit systems on its territory
- addition of a southeast extension to Ottawa's transit way.
- implementation of communications programs by the Communauté urbain de Québec to sell TDM to employers, and transit to the general public.

Montreal area municipalities are reported to be awaiting major proposals from the Quebec Ministry of Transport this Spring.

4.2.4 Elsewhere in Canada

A clear majority of the anticipated 1995 actions were identified as simply continuations of "ongoing" programs to improve transit or add to bike/pedestrian infrastructure.

Chapter 5

PRINCIPAL PLANS FOR PROGRAMS BEYOND 1995

5.1 Introduction

The study participants were also asked to look ahead and identify up to three principal TDM actions which their jurisdictions would be taking in the period beyond 1995.

The nature of this enquiry, ie: asking for no more than 3 plan areas to be identified, does have the effect of reducing the number of responses recorded. Also, some respondents abstained from answering this question on the grounds that the direction of their work would come from the Official Plan (or equivalent) which was currently in the process of being developed or revised.

5.2 Overall Pattern of Responses

Again, as illustrated below, the bulk of the answers from those who responded to the future plans enquiry simply yielded "more of the same" - ie: a pattern of answers similar to those from the earlier surveys of actions taken and actions expected in 1995.

	Category	# Respondents
(1)	Public transit improvements	23
(2)	Alternative work hours	0
(3)	Bicycle/Pedestrian programs	14
(4)	Van/Vanpooling	4
(5)	TDM-supportive land use	10
(6)	Auto-usage charges (except tolls)	0
(7)	HOV/Bus lanes	8
(8)	Parking pricing and regulation	5
(9)	Road pricing (tolls)	2
(10)	Telecommuting	0
(11)	Employer-based TDM programs	5
(12)	Education and promotion	2

From the answers given, it may be inferred that - while many municipal and regional governments appear to be anticipating "more" of the TDM projects now embraced (more bike paths, more HOV lanes, etc.) - most are not envisioning significant change in the future way in which they will address TDM challenges and opportunities.

However, it can be reported that respondents for two of the larger jurisdictions did project significant new emphases aimed at trip reduction:

- the spokesperson for GO GREEN foresaw a program to evaluate the "true" costs of all modes leading to a reallocation of government transportation resources towards those shown to be most efficient

- the representative for Metro Toronto indicated an intention to introduce a "TDM package" - including a "user pricing element" which would generate funds to help support transit, cycling, walking - the "package" would also include employer outreach, school information activities, and various factors to facilitate TDM.

Chapter 6

COMMITMENTS TO TDM

6.1 Introduction

This section looks at the apparent level of commitment by the local governments to TDM. While the information presented here draws on responses to certain of the survey questions, it relies heavily on general respondent comments throughout the interview sessions, and on the answers to specific probes employed during the telephone phase relative to reasoning behind the reported TDM action plans.

6.2 Awareness of CCME Requirement for TDM Plans

When asked whether their TDM objectives and intentions were detailed in one integrated planning document, the majority of interviewees (37 respondents) answered "no". Those who responded "yes" (14) did so on the grounds that transportation information was incorporated in the jurisdiction's "Official Plan" or similar document. "Yes" they said, "we have everything in the O.P."

Not one respondent volunteered knowledge of an obligation to produce a "TDM Plan" in response to direction from the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment. Indeed, with one or two exceptions, there was no recognition of the work of the CCME relative to transportation planning.

6.3 Overall Pattern of Commitment

Most representatives of the local governments who were approached demonstrated some awareness of the concepts of Transportation Demand Management. But, very few really talked about a "program embracing a variety of measures" to reduce trip-taking. Rather, the "rule" was one of some action on individual TDM elements, but with little linkage between the parts.

For example, transit service is a long-time responsibility charged to a separate authority. The encouragement and support of bicycling - described by one official as having "a life of its own" - was commonly referred to as a response to the "bike lobby" assigned to the Parks and Recreation department. Land-use planning has been a stand-alone responsibility dealing with "what can be built where".

Respondents typically indicated that a broad range of organizations had a say in whatever TDM roles their jurisdictions were playing ... internally: planning, engineering, transit, parks and recreation ... externally: surrounding municipalities, regional governments, provincial governments, and the federal government. Several commented that this division of responsibility was an obstacle to focusing effort and consolidating commitment.

In part 3 of this report, we had seen that many local governments did not attach much (if any) importance to their advancement of an integrated TDM program. We had noted that less than one-third of the responding jurisdictions reported expecting something better than minor improvement from their involvement in this regard. This "low key" perception would appear to be further confirmed by the fact that only four interviewees (2 from BC, 2 from Ontario) reported that they could identify members of their staffs who were "exclusively assigned" to TDM roles.

With a few exceptions - notably in BC - there seems to have been relatively little effort to date to directly involve the private sector in the TDM process. Many activities which could be advanced through business participation - eg: shower and storage facilities for bikes, flex hours, telecommuting - seem to have stalled at the level of internal programs for the local government's own employees with no conscious effort to "export" what has been learned to a broader environment.

There was no strong sense of urgency in the comments advanced in the course of the interviews. There was very little reference to the seriousness of air pollution problems and scant recognition of TDM as the required antidote. Reflecting the position of many medium and smaller jurisdictions, one respondent referred to TDM in these words: "There is no burning need, it is not an issue.".

However, some rather more encouraging signs were provided by many of the interviews.

Significantly. it is clear that the regional/municipal governments with responsibility for the largest population concentrations (Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver) are generally furthest along in terms of TDM actions. In other words, there is some correlation between (presumed) magnitude of need and level of response.

Additionally, one may cite frequent references to commitments in more recent Official Plans to (i) population intensification and to (ii) favouring of biking, walking, transit over the auto. A number of jurisdictions talked of a new emphasis on linking land-use and transportation planning.

Several respondents spoke of the establishment of specific and challenging targets for the future share of traffic to urban centres to be claimed by transit. Two interviews (with officials from large-population jurisdictions) produced references to having set targets for

reducing emissions.

But, it also needs to be reported that enough reservations were advanced about expressions of future local government intent for TDM to suggest that some measure of skepticism would be wise. There were, for example, a number of references to TDM-supportive plans of the bureaucrats being aborted by the elected local councils in light of developer, merchant or other intercessions.

6.4 Factors Motivating the TDM Commitment

TDM may be viewed by CCME as a primary vehicle for reducing air pollution. But that, in the first instance, is not how it is seen by the majority of this country's local governments.

Rather, first and foremost, TDM is embraced as the least-cost, least-hassle approach to responding to future traffic growth and the related threat of congestion.

On the one hand, communities foresee rising populations and growing traffic demands. On the other hand, they have to anticipate funding difficulties together with strong public resistance to any neighbourhood demolitions associated with road construction.

As one respondent stated: "We cannot build enough roads to handle the traffic growth. We have to do something else.". That "something else", in many instances, is TDM.

However, two other dimensions of this issue merit recognition.

First, there are some (usually larger) local/regional governments that do clearly report that they are also motivated to push TDM because they do also see an air quality improvement opportunity.

- The west coast GO GREEN program, for example, is intended to build public understanding of the link between transport alternatives and their own concerns over air quality, congestion and cost.

- The City of Vancouver respondent advised that officials feel encouraged about their policy to not build any more roads because of the increasing public environmental awareness.

- The Toronto TDM motivation was expressed as relating to auto congestion and the "environmental consequences".

- The underlying rationale for Montreal's TDM activities was described as an "improvement in quality of life".

Secondly - on the other extreme, it must be noted that spokespersons for a number of the relatively smaller communities studied (100,000 - 400,000 population, both inside and outside the NOX/VOC problem areas) reported that their administrations saw neither major congestion nor major air quality problems on the local horizon and, thus they felt little or no need to commit to anything approaching a full TDM program.

(There were, of course, some exceptions to the smaller-city indifference. It is perhaps useful to flag the city of Victoria which indicated that its several TDM undertakings were driven by a desire to act now when it was just "starting to have big city traffic and environmental problems".)

In summary, therefore, it can be reported that the largest centres view TDM as a response to a combination of congestion, cost and air quality difficulties, while trip reduction actions by medium-sized jurisdictions are more likely to be driven by just the first two concerns, and many of the smaller communities (including some suburbs of largest cities) tend to question their need for TDM at all.

Chapter 7

MAKING TDM WORK

7.1 Introduction

This final section of the report is based primarily on responses to the questions posed in part E of the study questionnaire which addressed actions needed to make TDM more effective in the future, and the related roles for the provincial and federal governments.

7.2 Obstacles to Effective Action

Study participants were asked to identify the "single main obstacle to success with (their) planned further TDM actions". The specific wording of this query was intended to cut through "list making" to get right to the fundamental worries.

Just over one-half of those responding to this specific probe (25 interviewees) made reference to difficulties in obtaining and maintaining the support of the public and/or politicians - or - indicated that their area simply had no real requirement for TDM.

- "TDM is seen as a marginal activity. It is not taken seriously."
- "People don't perceive a need (for TDM) today."
- "TDM was in our earlier plans as well, but little was done because there is no real public lobby pushing for this."
- "They (the public) all want their two-car garages. They come to meetings to resist change."
- "Council tends to go for programs with short-term pay-offs, like roads."

The second greatest number of mentions (12) related to anticipated lack of funding to carry through with the TDM measures. This might be interpreted as further evidence of ambivalent political support.

On the other hand, one should not lose sight of the fact that TDM is commonly cited as a response to a lack of funds. If more funds were made available, would these go into TDM, or into roads?

Some respondents (4) deplored an absence of legislative authority as their main future TDM obstacle.

- "We lack legislative support from the province .. particularly in terms of gaining some authorities so the city can cause things to happen."

This question of empowering legislation was also mentioned by several other study participants in the course of the interviews, but not always from the same perspective. Some argued for "teeth" to force appropriate TDM compliance, while others indicated that they were not persuaded that the reporting and enforcement aspects in place in certain American states would be effective in Canada.

Three other participating officials (including two from larger jurisdictions) identified coordination problems (or, as one interviewee put it - "too many cooks") as the leading obstacle to future TDM success.

- "We can do certain things, but if other cities are not serious, our work will have little effect."

- "Too many agencies are trying to respond to too many priorities. It is not coherent."

While the number one obstacle for only a few, the question of intergovernmental coordination - like that of legislation - had attracted a number of expressions of concern during the course of the surveying. At least one group of governmental organizations has come to a conclusion that normal bureaucratic structures do not work well for TDM programs, and has attempted an alternate solution. A brief discussion of this effort by the British Columbia GO GREEN Committee was previously covered in report section 3.2.2.

- * -

The reader will readily see that all of the above concerns tie together. One can draft a question that exemplifies this:

Will the politicians (collectively) be sufficiently persuaded that TDM is in the public interest to the extent warranting their full attention to ensuring sufficient funding, necessary legislative authority and a cooperative attitude??

Clearly, the contributors to this study have some doubts.

7.3 Proposed Solutions to TDM Obstacles

Most of the participating officials (25 of 39) identified the solution to overcoming the "main obstacle" to be some form of action to get the public and politicians to change attitudes associated with the "love affair" with the car.

- "We must increase public awareness of the costs and impact of the automobile."

- "Our citizens must understand that TDM can same them money. The realization is not there yet."

Again mirroring the specific obstacles which had been flagged, some respondents also called for new empowering legislation, increased funding, and stronger direction and support from more senior governments.

- "There must be top level recognition and commitment."

- "It is a political problem. Governments could find resources (for TDM) by transferring funds used to subsidize the auto."

Views on legislation, funding, direction and support will be discussed further in sections 7.4 and 7.5 which look at the respondent expectations of provincial and federal governments.

7.4 Role of the Provinces

Respondents generally indicated that it was their provincial government (rather than the federal government) from which they expected most direction and help relating to TDM undertakings. One study participant put the matter this way: "As problems are local, we need help from the level of government that is close to the local level".

Provincial financial assistance exists now for a number of TDM actions - an obvious example being transit. The position of most local governments on this matter was perhaps nicely summed up by the respondent who simply said "we always need funding". Some suggested that future allocation of funds for TDM should be more rigorously targeted. One person proposed that provincial funds be deliberately allocated in such a way as to "reward" those communities with most effective trip reduction efforts.

Provincial leadership should be shown in terms of "fixing the governance problem" so that the various governmental bodies can work together in a harmonious and efficient manner. The province should advance the TDM ideas and tools that "make sense". One official suggested the creation of a work unit at the provincial level to promote TDM - "there is a need to show the way".

The provinces should pass legislation :

(i) to allow certain new TDM programs to be implemented at the local level - eg: road tolls,

(ii) to address legal questions relating to certain existing programs - eg: liability with vanpooling programs, and

(iii) to provide communities with enhanced ability to require compliance in certain instances - eg: with respect to TDM programs to be operated by larger employers.

The provinces should offer workshops and information exchanges. Respondents indicated that they endorsed these communications roles for three distinct reasons - to learn what other governments are doing (trade "war stories") - to provide a forum for local governments to "feed up" to more senior levels so there is a better understanding of local realities, and - to "get the message out" to the general public about the need for TDM .

However, particularly with regard to workshops, there was a certain reserve. A number of interviewees noted that there had already been a number of TDM conferences, and that these are expensive in terms of time and money. It was suggested that all workshops will have to be carefully customized to respond to specific audience needs and expectations.

7.5 Role of the Federal Government

Perception of the contribution which the federal government should make to advancement of TDM is coloured by the view of a significant minority of local government officials who feel that Ottawa is too removed from the local scene. As one respondent put it: "The feds do not have a lot of involvement directly with the municipalities, this is a provincial role.".

There is concern that federal participation cannot respond with sensitivity to local needs and that adding another level of government adds to the TDM coordination problems.

However, others - in fact, a majority of those interviewed - are equally adamant that Ottawa can and should play a TDM role.

Respondents cited specific legislative assistance which the federal government can offer:

- to allow transit pass subsidization to be tax free
- to make parking a taxable benefit
- to raise fuel taxes
- to do something to encourage alternative fuels.

Federal funding of TDM would be welcomed, although many seem to doubt that much of this will be offered. One suggestion was that part of the federal fuel tax be dedicated to the promotion of environmentally sustainable transport options.

Ottawa's resort to TDM workshops and information exchanges will be welcomed by many local governments because (in the words of one interviewee) "The federal government does not know the (TDM) undertakings of regions and municipalities, and regions are not informed of what the federal government wishes to do.".

Some respondents stated that they believed that the government of Canada had a fundamental responsibility to set the TDM example. In this spirit, it was suggested that Ottawa should introduce the full range of TDM possibilities with its own employees as a "lever to influence the private sector".

On balance, it appears that there is a role for the federal government to play in support of realizing future TDM success. But this role needs to have enough substance to be credible, and it needs to be carefully crafted so that it adds value to (rather than conflicting with) lower-level initiatives.

APPENDIX A

STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE

TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT (TDM) PROGRAMS

Introduction

Sperling Associates and Transport Concepts have been asked by Environment Canada to prepare an inventory of TDM actions taken (or planned) by municipal and regional governments in the lower Fraser Valley and the Quebec-Windsor Corridor.

Therefore, we would appreciate your preparing answers to the enquiries presented in the following questionnaire. As already explained, we will call you at a convenient scheduled time to obtain and discuss your responses. PLEASE ANSWER ONLY WITH RESPECT TO ACTIONS/PLANS BY YOUR JURISDICTION.

PART A

Questions 1 through 13, immediately following, enquire about what actions have now been taken by your jurisdiction to implement TDM strategies. Please use cross-referenced separate sheets of paper if you require more space for your brief descriptions.

1. What actions have now been taken by your jurisdiction to promote better public transit?

   _____
   _____
   _____

2. What actions have now been taken by your jurisdiction to encourage alternative work hours?

   _____
   _____
   _____

3. What actions have now been taken by your jurisdiction to foster bicycle and pedestrian programs?

   _____
   _____
   _____

Appendix A (Cont'd)

4. What actions have now been taken by your jurisdiction to encourage carpooling/vanpooling?

5. What actions have now been taken by your jurisdiction to change land use patterns in ways which are more supportive of efficient use of transportation?

6. What actions have now been taken by your jurisdiction to make automobile owners/drivers more directly responsible for the costs they incur through the imposition of fees and taxes related to automobile usage?

7. What actions have now been taken by your jurisdiction to implement High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes?

8. What actions have now been taken by your jurisdiction to regulate the supply and/or price of parking?

9. What actions have been taken by your jurisdiction to employ road pricing?

Appendix A (Cont'd)

10. What actions have now been taken by your jurisdiction to encourage telecommuting?

_____
_____
_____

11. What actions have been taken by your jurisdiction to encourage and support employer-based TDM programs?

_____
_____
_____

12. What actions have now been taken by your jurisdiction to reduce vehicle miles travelled through education and promotion programs?

_____
_____
_____

13. Are there other TDM actions now taken by your administration which have not been identified through your answers to the preceding questions?

IF "YES", PLEASE IDENTIFY HERE:

_____
_____
_____

Appendix A (Cont'd)

PART B

Questions 14 through 16 ask about your assessment of the results of the TDM programs that your jurisdiction has put in place.

14. Which of the following options best describes your current expectations for the TDM programs you have implemented:
    ( ) minor improvement
    ( ) moderate improvement
    ( ) significant improvement

    Overall, would you say that the TDM programs you have implemented have: (CHECK ONE ONLY)

    ( ) produced results that exceed expectations,
    ( ) produced results that meet expectations,
    ( ) produced results that are short of expectations, or
    ( ) is it generally too early to assess results?

    Why do you say that? _____
    _____.

15. What TDM programs (from among those which you identified in answering questions 1 through 13) have worked best?

    o _____
    o _____
    o _____

    Why? _____
    _____

16. What TDM programs (if any) have disappointed you in terms of results for the effort expended?

    o _____
    o _____
    o _____

    Why? _____
    _____

Appendix A (Cont'd)

PART C

Questions 17 and 18 move from a review of the TDM programs which you have put in place, to enquire about your plans for entirely new or significantly expanded programs.

17. What are your plans for the introduction of new or significantly expanded TDM programs in 1995?

(IF NO 1995 PLANS FOR AN INDICATED TDM SECTOR, LEAVE BLANK.)

(1) re: promotion of better public transit

(2) re: alternative work hours

(3) re: bicycle and pedestrian programs

(4) re: encouragement of carpooling

(5) re: changing land-use patterns

(6) re: auto use-related fees and taxes (other than tolls)

(7) re: High Occupancy Vehicle lanes

Appendix A (Cont'd)

17. (continued)

(8) re: regulation of supply and price of parking

(9) re: employment of road pricing (tolls)

(10) re: encouragement of telecommuting

(11) re: employer-based TDM programs

(12) re: TDM education and promotion

(13) re: other

18. What are your principal plans for actions to be implemented BEYOND 1995?

(1) most important program:

(2) 2nd most important program:

(3) 3rd most important program:

Appendix A (Cont'd)

PART D

Questions 19 through 21 look quickly at how your TDM program is being managed.

19. Are the plans for carrying out Transportation Demand Management responsibilities in your jurisdiction largely or entirely contained in one integrated document?

    YES ( ) NO ( )

20. What organization (organizations) is (are) responsible for overseeing realization of your TDM plans?

    _____

21. Are there personnel exclusively assigned to your TDM responsibilities?

    YES ( ) NO ( )

    IF "YES", please outline what their assignments are;

    _____
    _____

PART E

In a general sense, this final area of questioning addresses the challenge ahead for TDM and how it can be met.

22. What is the SINGLE main obstacle to success with your planned further TDM actions?

    _____
    _____

23. What needs to be done to overcome this main obstacle?

    _____
    _____

Appendix A (Cont'd)

24. Is there anything the federal government can do to help with your future TDM actions?

		YES	NO/Not sure
o	funding	( )	( )
o	legislation	( )	( )
o	workshops on TDM practices	( )	( )
o	information exchange	( )	( )
o	other: _____ (specify)	( )	( )

Please elaborate on your views:

_____

_____

25. Is there anything the provincial govermnment can do to help with your future TDM Actions?

		YES	NO/Not sure
o	funding	( )	( )
o	legislation	( )	( )
o	workshops on TDM practices	( )	( )
o	information exchanges	( )	( )
o	other: _____ (specify)	( )	( )

Please elaborate on your views:

_____

_____

26. Finally, are there any other observations about TDM programs that you would like to make? If "yes", please comment here:

_____

_____

Thank you
950103

APPENDIX B

List of Respondent/ Responding Communities

Hu Wallis
Air Resources Branch
BC Ministry of Environment, Lands & Parks

Martin Whicher
Program Officer - Transportation Unit
Ontario Ministry of Environment and Energy

Conrad Anctil
Service de la qualité de l'atmosphere
Ministère de l'environnement et de la faune

Bob Glover
Transportation Planning Manager
Burnaby District Municipality

Mike Lai
Transportation Engineer
District Municipality of Surrey

Ken Cameron
Manager of Strategic Planning
Greater Vancouver Regional District

Jiji Park
Transportation
City of Richmond

Rob Hodgins
Manager of Transportation Branch
City of Vancouver

Salah Barj
Analyste en transports, STO
Communauté urbaine de l'Outaouais

Pierre Del Sante
Directeur général adjoint
Société du transport de la rive sud de Montréal

Appendix B (Cont'd)

Pierre Bouvier
directeur de recherche et marketing, societe du transport
Communauté urbaine de Québec

Sylvie Cossette
Directrice generale de la municipalite
Municipalité régionale de côté de Champlain

Roland Morin
Chef de la division de circulation
Ville de Gatineau

François Terrier
directeur général société du transport de Laval
Ville de Laval

François Major
Conseiller en aménagement
Ville de Montréal

Yvon Jobin
Ingénieur en transport
Ville de Québec

Rob Pringle
Transportation Division, Planning Dept
Metro Toronto

Shirley Bailey
Policy Planner
City of Etobicoke

Colin Couper
Director of Planning & Environmental Studies
City of North York

Ed Watkins
Principal Planner, Transportation
City of Scarborough

Tim Laspa
Dept of Public Works & Environment
City of Toronto

Appendix B (Cont'd)

Robert Windsor
Director of Policy & Administration
City of York

Gene Chartier
Transportation Engineer
Borough of East York

Jim Bate
Senior Planner, Planning Dept
Regional Municipality of Durham

Bob Duignan
Traffic Coordinator, Public Works Dept
City of Oshawa

Dave McLeary
Manager of Policy Planning
Regional Municipality of Halton

Tom Eichenbaum
Assistant Director Engineering
City of Burlington

Len Gough
Manager of Long Range Planning
Town of Oakville

Bill O`Brien
Director of Transportation Services
Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth

James Coughlin
Director of Planning
City of St. Catharines

Rajan Philips
Head Transit Planning Section
Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton

Larry Morrison
Development Dept
City of Gloucester

Appendix B (Cont'd)

Bob Streicher
Manager, Engineering Section
City of Nepean

Chris Lyon
Licensing, Transportation & Parking
City of Ottawa

Rick Warner
Senior Planner - Transportation Planning
Regional Municipality of Peel

Samir El-Hage
Transportation Planner
City of Brampton

Mel Kayama
Transportation Planning
City of Mississauga

John Hammer
Director, Transportation
Regional Municipality of Waterloo

Bin Newell
Senior Planner
City of Kitchener

Jeff Mark
Director, Transportation Services
Regional Municipality of York

Wayne McEarchern
Planning Department
City of Vaughan

Irene McNeil
Transit Planner
Town of Markham

Appendix B (Cont'd)

Wes Hicks
Manager, Transportation Planning
City of Windsor

Donald Brooks
Engineer
County of Frontenac

Don Husson
Engineer & Road Superintendent
County of Middlesex

Harmon Nichols
Transportation Systems Planning Technologist
City of London

Brian Weir
Planning Technician
County of Peterborough

Gary Cousins
Director of Planning
Wellington County

Stewart Kelch
Assistant County Engineer
County of Essex

Colin Doyle
Roads and Traffic Engineer
Municipality of Saanich

Ken Reashor
Manager, Transportation Planning
City of Calgary

Brice Stephenson
Manager, Transportation Planning
City of Edmonton

Monique Kealey
Traffic Engineer
City of Regina

Appendix B (Cont'd)

Murray Totland
Transportaton Engineer
City of Saskatoon

Doug Hurl
Transportation Systems Planning
City of Winnipeg

Jim Stevens
Manager, Parking
City of Thunder Bay

Ray Hortness
Coordinator, Traffic and Transportation
Regional Municipality of Sudbury

Angus Schaffenburg
Planner, Planning and Operations
City of Halifax

J.A. Dejong
Director of Planning
City of St. John's

John Griffin
Traffic Engineer
City of Saint John

Maureen Ryan
Planning Department
County of Halifax

Chris Foord
Marketing Manager, outside GVRD
B.C. Transit (outside GVRD)