

# Downtown Parking Study Summary (as of DSAC meeting #5)

**Re-cap Data:** statistics in shaded areas were not provided by consultants or city

## 1. Spaces -

	April		July		1998	2002
	Thur	Sat	Wed	Fri		
a. On-street peak hour counts	73.3%	57.2%	80.8%	74.7%		
b. Off-street peak hour counts	59.7%	34.6%	65.4%	60.8%		

- o Public Off-street\* 61.7% 80.5%
- o Private Off-street\* 58.4% 73.4%

(\*average of individual lot peak hour #'s calculated from data in the consultants' tables)

c. Public peak hour (on/off street**)	66.8%	80.71%		
(** 2016 study area / calculated from consultants' tables)				
Public peak hour (on/off street***)	??	??	70.0%	74.7%
(***) smaller 1998/2002 study area / consultants have the raw data!				

d. total spaces in the 1998/2002 area (field counted in August)	1,453	1,453	1,180	1,214
---	-------	-------	-------	-------

**2. Violators** (industry standard 5 to 7%) 8.8% 8.4% 9.6% 8.4% (for on-street only)

## 3. Permits (sold by Diamond Parking) and city staff passes (issued by city)

	Apr	May	Jun
a. three months of permits sold	715	743	771

b. city staff issued permits (according to Diamond Parking): **120**

	April		July	
	Thur	Sat	Wed	Fri
c. "unique" permits counted	365	71	302	286
d. counted permits in peak hour	159	17	115	133

e. city staff passes counted in "Louisiana" area on afternoon of 9/14: **99**

f. The following table shows how many permits are sold in each area compared the available spaces available in each area:

	garage	Louisiana	Hospital Hill	East area	Newport
Permits sold	364	174	30	124	69
Passes issued		120			
Spaces available	574	317	31	167	104
% of capacity	63%	93%	97%	74%	66%

(spaces counted in August and September)

**4. Financial sustainability** - Per 2015-17 city budget. Please be aware this is a 2-year budget.

- a. Income (fines and permits): \$1,288,642
- b. Expenses: (\$998,148)
- c. Reserves (seems to match historical fee-in-lieu of parking data) \$1,370,000

**Additional Data needed?**

**1. DSAC member: “We all hope someone else uses alternative modes of transportation”**

**a. Bike parking** – Adding bike racks does not seem to be the answer. Someone needs to determine what will make more of the current employees and/or visitors ride bikes before relying on this alternative. Please do not rely solely on the opinions of the few bike enthusiasts who do bike to work. The questions need to be answered by those who are not currently riding their bikes to work.

	<u>Spaces</u>	<u>bikes</u>	<u>% filled</u>
- in the downtown core right-of-way****	310	78	25.2%
- in some of the larger “office” sites****	56	6	10.7%

(\*\*\*\*counted on 9/14 between 2pm to 3pm - #of bikes over lunch hour should be higher)

**b. Employee transportation** – The current % of employees walking, biking or riding the bus seems very low. A survey may be useful if questions are aimed at seeking why more employees are not using alternative modes and what improvements to the alternative modes of transportation infrastructure would lead to a higher percentage of employees choosing an alternative mode of transportation. If a plan of action cannot be based on good data, this parking plan should not make assumptions on the increase usage of alternative modes of transportation.

**c. Requirement of employment** – Shouldn’t this concept be researched? I don’t expect very many employers, employees or landlords will agreed with the Mr. Williams suggestion made in the “parking 101” workshop that using alternative modes of transportation should be a requirement of employment.

**2. Parking in “Old Bend Neighborhood”**- Determining how many employees are parking in this neighborhood seems essential to the success of this downtown parking planning. A survey of what is happening in this neighborhood would be easy to accomplish.

- a. Establish a baseline by counting the number of vehicles parked on-street in this neighborhood early in the morning prior to the normal business hours.
- b. Count the vehicles every hour thereafter until mid-afternoon.
- c. Perform the count on several days that are not impacted by events in Drake Park.

**3. Farmer’s Market?** – Staff may want to conduct a walk to investigate the next farmer’s market.

**4. Sharing Private Parking Lots?** – The private lot owners should be contacted to validate prospect.

## Interpretation of the data:

### 1. The 85% rule of thumb –

a. What % should this plan aim for? In the last DSAC meeting, a committee member made an excellent point of noting the “85%” criteria was intended to be the upper limit. In the consultants’ presentation “parking 101”, the consultants used an illustration with a pyramid. The second tier from the top was a range of 70-85% with the label of “efficient supply”. Should this “plan” aim for 85% or a slightly lower figure to allow for a contingency?

b. Does the City’s Growth Management’s “guiding principles” conflict with the 85% rule? In January 2015, I was in a meeting with several representatives of the city’s growth management department. I was told the city would need to comply with a state mandate to reduce parking per capita by 10%. The representative implied the mandate would be achieved by reducing the parking provided by large retail parking lots that had been designed to handle Christmas shopping. However, since that meeting, city staff seems to be on a campaign to reduce parking wherever and whenever they can. Does staff have a different set of “guiding principles?” In a publication entitled “Where do we grow from here.” Robin Lewis, transportation engineer with the City of Bend stated, “*The more congested the streets, the more people are willing to consider alternative modes of transportation.*” Is this congestion and parking shortage a vision of the future that the citizens of Bend share or desire or is this a vision of only staff and 2030?

Meanwhile, the DSAC may be surprised to know OAR sections clearly states **communities have an alternative to the 10% reduction** which seems far less challenging.

c. The size of the “area” effects calculation of the % of occupied spaces. As noted in the August 11 memo, a decision needs to be made to establish “subareas” that reflect a reasonable distance for a visitor/customer to walk after parking. In 1998/2002, the parking counts were separated into three zones. The consultants have the raw data to split the 2016 counts into the same three zones, plus the portion of the 2016 study beyond the prior studies three zones:

#### **Publicly controlled spaces only (the consultants have the raw data)**

<u>By zone</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>Apr (Thur)</u>	<u>Apr (Sat)</u>	<u>Jul (Wed)</u>	<u>Jul (Fri)</u>
Zone 1	85%	84%	?	?	?	?
Zone 2	66%	75%	?	?	?	?
Zone 3	56%	66%	?	?	?	?
<u>2016 add</u>	<u>na</u>	<u>na</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>?</u>
total	70%	74%	66.8%	?	80.7%	?

### 2. “Take the first spot” rule of thumb –

a. Motorists tend to park in the first spot they see after they have “arrived”. If many of the visitors/customers “arrive” to downtown by way of Wall Street or Bond Street, it is reasonable to expect parking on these two streets will always be utilized first. Parking will start at this center of downtown and expand outward as demand fills the core. I

suspect that even most motorists who know about the garage, will still try these streets first. It is human nature. Very few motorists will pass up a space on Wall Street or Bond Street to go to the parking garage. This rule of thumb may leave “pricing” as the only tool to encourage to go to the parking garage first.

**3. Does price matters?** – Lot 46 is a vacant parcel which is utilized by motorists without the consent of its owner and at no cost. It is filled by mid-morning nearly every day.

**4. Does location matters?** – The “Louisiana” area sells many more permits than the spaces available. Why are permits purchased for this area when the demand exceeds the supply? Is there a location motivation?

### **5. Five unexpected data results -**

a. The parking counts of a Wednesday in April matched the counts of a Friday in July when numerous special summer events occurring. The only comment made by the consultant was this data was “interesting”.

b. Heavy parking occurs at the north end and the south end of the study area in the first hour of the count. This finding seems to be a good indicator of where employees are parking. The consultants have failed to make any mention of this data. Anyone can walk these two areas at the beginning of a work day to see the heat map was accurate and this very significant piece of data which needs to be addressed in the “solutions” phase.

c. The parking garage was less than 50 % full in April. The garage seems to be the last resort for parking after the underutilized Newport lot.

d. The parking count for the Wednesday (July 20) exceeded the parking count for the Friday (July 22). Conventional wisdom would expect a Friday count to always exceed a Wednesday count. At first glance, the farmer’s market would appear to be the one different factor between these two days, but then note that Wednesday’s count exceeded the Friday count for every time period recorded on figure B. The Wednesday market doesn’t open until 3 pm. The farmers market is likely the reason for the peak count extending beyond the usual 1:30pm peak, but probably not for the higher count for the entire day. Perhaps the factors for the consistently higher hour-by-hour count for Wednesday verse Friday may have more to do with the schedules of the numerous special events for this “busiest week of the summer.”

e. The permits sold and passes used in “Louisiana” are 93% of the available spaces. Therefore, there should be no surprise that this area seems always full.

## **Solutions – Current Needs**

### **1. Is there a current “need”? Yes**

a. Reduce the use of the on-street parking of the “Downtown Core” by employees. This finding assumes the “Louisiana” area is part of the core.

b. Remedy the employee parking in the Old Bend Neighborhood if additional survey proves employees are parking in this neighborhood.

## **2. Current needs solution options:**

a. Use the cost of a parking permit to shift employee parking to the Newport lot and garage.

b. Sell fewer street permits, especially in the Louisiana area. This area is a natural extension of the downtown core and should be the second option for visitors/customers instead of the parking garage. Many visitors/customers “arrive” through this area or end up at this area if Wall and Bond streets are full.

c. Diamond Parking is the logical means to control how many permits are issued for each area and to educate the permit purchaser where to park.

c. The City of Bend is the largest employer in the downtown and is the biggest cause of the lack of parking at the south end of the downtown core. They should cease issuing free passes and purchase permits like every other employer that does not have their own lot.

d. Perhaps the location of the farmer’s market should be questioned if the market truly impacts the downtown parking to the degree July’s count seems to suggest.

e. Consider managing the schedule of events to prevent too many events from occurring at the same time.

f. Implement the “better communications” of the guiding principles

g. Potential code changes –

-establish a residential parking district for “Old Bend” with ordinances which allows for monitoring and enforcement. Study which residential parking ordinances in other communities have been the most effective and would be the most applicable for Old Bend. Some communities may have perfected their residential district management plan by trying several “plans” before finding a plan that works. Their experiences may be helpful to avoid “re-inventing the wheel.”

**Solutions - Future “needs”** - The discussion for hiring a manager, sharing private lots or financing for future needs seem premature until the future needs are examined in future DSAC meetings.