

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Jayne Miller, Community Services Administrator

DATE: June 18, 2007

SUBJECT: Resolution to Approve Ann Arbor Discovering Downtown Parking Policies and Actions Recommendations

Attached for your review and approval is a resolution to approve recommendations for Parking Policies and Actions developed by the A2D2 Steering Committee and a memorandum containing detailed recommended parking policies and actions. The A2D2 Steering Committee parking strategy policy deliberations occurred in two phases of work incorporating several opportunities for highly interactive public involvement.

### Background

On March 20, 2006, City Council approved the Implementation Plan for the Downtown Development Strategies Final Report and directed staff to begin work on priority elements of the plan.

On July 17, 2006, City Council approved the work plans for the following initiatives:

- Create special overlay zoning for the downtown that identifies areas of similar character
- Streamline the development proposal process (process mapping and technology improvements)
- Incorporate a set of essential design standards
- Pursue a comprehensive parking strategy for the downtown
- Work with the Historic District Commission to clarify criteria for development

In the development of the work plans, City Council requested that each project be completed by June 2007. The Council appointed advisory committees for each project in October 2006 to assist staff and the Steering Committee in developing these recommendations.

The Downtown Development Authority engaged the firm of Nelson\Nygaard to inventory current parking supply, demand and characteristics of users in a Phase I report. Phase II builds on the data obtained in the first phase effort and resulted in the development of a Toolbox containing a series of policies and actions. The Toolbox was subjected to two rounds of intensive stakeholder input as described below.

## Public Outreach – Feedback on Potential Parking Policy Options

Initial public and policy board input was received during the week of March 26-30, 2007, when the Project Team presented a spectrum of potential parking policies and strategies as an initial Parking Toolbox to:

- A series of focus groups: alternative modes advocates, residents, commuters, and business leaders
- An assembly of policy board members: Ann Arbor City Council, Planning Commission, Ann Arbor Transit Authority (AATA), and Downtown Development Authority (DDA)
- The general public (in the form of a publicized Open House held at City Hall)

Detailed feedback received during these events is documented in previous project memoranda and available on the A2D2 website. The results of the first round of input were compiled into a series of recommended policies and actions, which were then subjected to a second round of public involvement activity, May 7 – May 11, 2007. The second round of public input consisted of an identical roster and schedule of meetings as the initial round, outlined above. Following review of the input received during the public process and after thoughtful consideration of opportunities and constraints by the A2D2 Steering Committee, a detailed set of recommended Parking principles was drafted as follows.

### Recommended Principles

The following eight principles comprise a comprehensive Parking Policy for Downtown. The principles are ordered by level of priority, beginning with a general principle/ policy statement, then proceeding through four demand-related principles, before addressing the recommended supply management approach. This intentionally reflects an emphasis on the high level of multi-modal assets within the Downtown community, and the value of capitalizing on these assets to reduce parking demand prior to taking supply-oriented actions.

#### A. First Principle

Ann Arbor's public, stakeholders, and policy makers have provided clear direction that parking is important, but in the context of the overall transportation system. This contrasts with the base assumption in many downtown districts that transportation needs will first be met through personal vehicle accommodation. The First Principle of the Downtown Parking Policy is therefore -

1. *Parking is one part of a multi-modal transportation approach to providing Downtown access and mobility.*

#### B. Demand Principles

Downtown parking management should expand upon established strengths. Years of thoughtful parking management have provided many strong qualities

upon which to build, beginning with the Park Once/ Shared Parking mobility environment created by the DDA parking system

The success of the municipal parking system gives the City and the DDA great control over the location, design, and volume of parking supply for the district. Just as importantly, it allows them to shrink the land use impact of parking within Downtown, while maintaining accessibility. Such benefits have been critical to the revival of numerous downtown districts (see Appendix). The second principle of the Parking Policy therefore is to –

2. *Seek to accommodate all Downtown parking activity within the DDA parking system.*

This places a responsibility upon the City and the DDA to meet current and anticipated levels of demand more completely than it does today. Providing new structured parking spaces is almost always the most expensive means of providing access and mobility for downtown districts. Accommodating demand through more economical means – such as shifting demand to alternative modes, including ridesharing – will therefore be a necessary component of achieving the second Policy principle. This is an approach closely aligned with current DDA practice, a practice that will serve as the third principle of the Downtown Parking Policy –

3. *Seek the most cost effective means for providing Downtown accessibility.*

The central challenge of providing meaningful access via modes other than low-occupancy personal vehicles is that success requires changing peoples' travel habits and inclinations. Ann Arbor, however, has two important assets to support increasing alternative mode shares for Downtown users. The first is its populations' demonstrated willingness to embrace and utilize a wide range of mobility options. The second is a stated civic and popular desire for environmentally sensitive, "smart" growth development for Downtown. Support for alternative modes, therefore, lays in the means themselves, as well as ends beyond reducing demand accommodation costs. The fourth principle of the Downtown Parking Policy therefore is to –

4. *Support modes of access that promote efficient land use patterns, environmental sensitivity, non-motorized mobility options, and the community's overall quality of life.*

Broad policy support for such modes can lend them stability – freeing their funding from traditional and immediate performance measures, and allowing the stable presence required to gradually affect local and regional transportation inclinations.

Another challenge for maximizing the benefit of Downtown's multi-modal assets is the transportation culture of the surrounding region. The majority of visitors and commuters entering Downtown each day reside in areas where virtually no trips beyond recreational walking and biking are completed without the use of a personal automobile.

Changing the perceptions of mobility options among visitors is most difficult. The City, however, as one of Downtown's largest employers, has a great opportunity to reshape the transportation culture of Downtown commuters through its own employees. The fifth principle of the Downtown Parking Policy, therefore, is that –

5. *The City administration will assume a leading role in defining preferred commuter transportation patterns within Downtown by encouraging alternatives to single-occupancy vehicle commuting among its elected officials and employees.*

C. Supply Principles

Accommodating and encouraging continued success of Downtown, however, is likely to mean that demand will continue to grow, and that eventually some of that demand will have to be met with new parking supply. Serving the Policy's second principle for capturing the bulk of district parking activity within the public parking system will require that capacity be maintained for those that are willing to pay for it. This will be especially crucial to accommodating demand from new developments and attracting developers to the public parking system as an alternative to constructing on-site parking. The next principle of the Downtown Parking Policy is therefore to –

6. *Maintain sufficient parking supply to allow purchase of monthly parking access instrument on demand, or following a waiting period of no more than 30 days.*

Reducing or eliminating the wait list for monthly parking, and making the process of acquiring permits (or passes) more transparent, has been identified as a key objective to support business attraction and retention in Downtown. Such a change will also be a key step in validating developers' faith in the parking system, a key to the success of potential In-Lieu fee programs, and/ or the continued use of parking permits in-lieu of on-site parking. If parking is to be built, following the direction of the second principle outlined above, it should preferably be part of the municipal parking system rather than within individual developments.

On the other hand, a wait of 30 days can provide an opportunity for new tenants to assess their level of parking needs before investing in a monthly permit. Incentives to try a commuter bus, or the go!pass, or biking for a month may help overcome a portion of the immediate inclination to drive and park without considering other options.

None of the above changes the fact that building parking is expensive (roughly \$36,000 per structured-parking space in 2006). While the Toolbox Actions section below identifies means for reducing the overall level of space construction, building new parking supplies will remain very costly. Therefore, the next principle of the Downtown Parking Policy is to –

7. *Maintain a formalized process for funding new parking.*

The DDA should work with the City to establish conditions in which the DDA can expect a coordinated effort in planning and funding new parking construction. The DDA has a solid record of making parking pay for itself, including the cost of adding new supply. However, the continued use of the municipal parking system as an economic development tool obligates all those invested in this approach to pitch in when deals push economics beyond the standard funding and planning processes.

The first step in this process will be determining when more parking is needed. This last principle of the Downtown Parking Policy is likely to remain the most challenging, and is therefore examined in more detail below –

8. *Maintain a formalized process for determining when new supply is needed.*

Such a process should follow the first six principles of the Downtown Parking Policy, by reflecting the practical and principled emphasis on exhausting demand management options before addressing capacity constraints with new supply.

Recommended Policies and Actions

Attached please find a detailed memorandum containing a comprehensive set of recommended downtown parking policies and actions in support of the principals articulated above. The policies and actions are consistent with parking management practice and are responsive to the unique attributes of the City of Ann Arbor as they reflect the input received during the project's planning and public involvement processes.

Prepared by: Eli Cooper, Transportation Program Manager  
 Reviewed by: Jayne Miller, Community Services Administrator  
 Approved by: Roger W. Fraser, City Administrator

Attachment: Recommended Parking Policies and Actions – June 4, 2007

**R-261-6-07****RESOLUTION TO APPROVE ANN ARBOR DISCOVERING DOWNTOWN  
PARKING POLICIES AND ACTIONS RECOMMENDATIONS**

Whereas, On March 20, 2006, City Council adopted Resolution R-94-3-06 to approve the Implementation Plan for the Downtown Development Strategies Final Report;

Whereas, On July 17, 2006 City Council adopted Resolution R-332-7-06 to approve the work plans for high priority projects related to downtown zoning, urban design guidelines, historic preservation criteria, parking, and development processes;

Whereas, On October 3, 2006, City Council adopted Resolution R-448-10-06, appointing five Ann Arbor Discovering Downtown (A2D2) advisory committees to work with staff on the A2D2 work plans;

Whereas, The Downtown Parking Strategy Advisory Committee has met since November 2006 to review recommended Parking Principles, Policies and Actions;

Whereas, The recommended Parking Principles, Policies and Actions were subject to two rounds of stakeholder involvement including specific target audiences as well as opportunities for public input all through the planning process;

Whereas, The recommended toolbox of policies and actions are designed to address parking utilizing a series of supportive strategies, are targeted to immediate, short and long-term timeframes and are both comprehensive and strategic,

RESOLVED, That City Council approve the attached recommendations dated June 18, 2007; and

RESOLVED, City Council directs staff to provide a schedule for implementation of the recommendations including action steps no later than September 2007.

Submitted by: Community Services

Date: June 18, 2007

**APPROVED  
BY ANN ARBOR CITY COUNCIL**

**June 18, 2007**

**CITY CLERK  
ANN ARBOR, MI**

121 West 27<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 705  
New York, NY 10001-6207  
(212) 242-2490 FAX: (212) 242-2549

## MEMORANDUM

**To:** Eli Cooper, City of Ann Arbor  
**From:** Nelson\Nygaard Project Team  
**Date:** 25-May-07  
**Subject:** Recommended Parking Policies and Actions

Following a second week of public outreach activity, and further consideration of existing opportunities and constraints, the following memo contains a final set of Downtown Parking Policies and recommended actions in support of the Policies.

### I. RECOMMENDED PARKING PRINCIPLES

The following eight principles comprise a comprehensive Parking Policy for Downtown. The principles are ordered by level of priority, beginning with a general principle/ policy statement, then proceeding through four demand-related principles, before addressing the recommended supply management approach. This intentionally reflects an emphasis on the high level of multi-modal assets within the Downtown community, and the value of capitalizing on these assets to reduce parking demand prior to taking supply-oriented actions.

#### A. First Principle

Ann Arbor's public, stakeholders, and policy makers have provided clear direction that parking is important, but in the context of the overall transportation system. This contrasts with the base assumption in many downtown districts that transportation needs will first be met through personal vehicle accommodation. The First Principle of the Downtown Parking Policy is therefore -

1. *Parking is one part of a multi-modal transportation approach to providing Downtown access and mobility.*

#### B. Demand Principles

Downtown parking management should expand upon established strengths. Years of thoughtful parking management have provided many strong qualities upon which to build, beginning with the Park Once/ Shared Parking mobility environment created by the DDA parking system.

The success of the municipal parking system gives the City and the DDA great control over the location, design, and volume of parking supply for the district. Just as importantly, it allows them to shrink the land use impact of parking within Downtown, while maintaining accessibility. Such benefits have been critical to the revival of numerous downtown districts (see Appendix). The second principle of the Parking Policy therefore is to –

2. *Seek to accommodate all Downtown parking activity within the DDA parking system.*

This places a responsibility upon the City and the DDA to meet current and anticipated levels of demand more completely than it does today. Providing new structured parking spaces is almost always the most expensive means of providing access and mobility for downtown districts. Accommodating demand through more economical means – such as shifting demand to alternative modes, including ridesharing – will therefore be a necessary component of achieving the second Policy principle. This is an approach closely aligned with current DDA practice, a practice that will serve as the third principle of the Downtown Parking Policy –

3. *Seek the most cost effective means for providing Downtown accessibility.*

The central challenge of providing meaningful access via modes other than low-occupancy personal vehicles is that success requires changing peoples' travel habits and inclinations. Ann Arbor, however, has two important assets to support ambitions to support alternative mode accessibility for Downtown. The first is its populations' demonstrated willingness to embrace and utilize a wide range of mobility options. The second is a stated civic and popular desire for environmentally sensitive, "smart" growth development for Downtown. Support for alternative modes, therefore, lays in the means themselves, as well as the ends. The fourth principle of the Downtown Parking Policy therefore is to –

4. *Support modes of access that promote efficient land use patterns, environmental sensitivity, non-motorized mobility, and the community's overall quality of life.*

Broad policy support for such modes can lend them stability – freeing their funding from traditional and immediate performance measures, and allowing the stable presence required to gradually affect local and regional transportation inclinations.

Another challenge for maximizing the benefit of Downtown's multi-modal assets is the transportation culture of the surrounding region. The majority of visitors and commuters entering Downtown each day reside in areas where virtually no trips beyond recreational walking and biking are completed without the use of a personal automobile. Changing the perceptions of mobility options among visitors is most difficult. The City, however, as one of Downtown's largest employers, has a great opportunity to reshape the transportation culture of Downtown commuters through its own employees. The fifth principle of the Downtown Parking Policy, therefore, is that –

5. *The City will assume a leading role in defining preferred commuter transportation patterns within Downtown by encouraging alternatives to single-occupancy vehicle commuting among its employees.*

### **C. Supply Principles**

Accommodating and encouraging continued success of Downtown, however, is likely to mean that demand will continue to grow, and that eventually some of that demand will have to be met with new parking supply. Serving the Policy's second principle for capturing the bulk of district parking demand in existing supply will require that capacity in the municipal parking system be maintained for those that are willing to pay for it. This will be especially crucial to accommodating demand from new developments and attracting developers to the public parking system as an alternative to constructing on-site parking. The next principle of the Downtown Parking Policy is therefore to –

6. *Maintain sufficient parking supply to allow purchase of parking permits on demand or following a waiting period of no more than 30 days.*

Reducing or eliminating the wait list for monthly permits, and making the process of acquiring permits more transparent, has been identified as a key objective to support business attraction and retention in Downtown. Such a change will also be a key step in validating developers' faith in the parking system, a key to the success of potential In-Lieu fee programs, and/ or the continued use of parking permits in-lieu of on-site parking. If parking is to be built, following the direction of the second principle outlined above, it should preferably be part of the municipal parking system rather than within individual developments.

On the other hand, a wait of 30 days can provide an opportunity for new tenants to assess their level of parking needs before investing in permits. Incentives to try a commuter bus, or the go!pass, or biking for a month may help overcome a portion of the immediate inclination to drive and park without considering other options.

None of the above changes the fact that building parking is expensive (roughly \$36,000 per structured-parking space in 2006). While the Strategies and Actions sections identify ways to reduce the public cost of space construction, building new parking supplies will remain very costly. Therefore, the next principle of the Downtown Parking Policy is to –

7. *Maintain a formalized process for funding new parking.*

In addition to current sources of funding, a Parking and Transportation Fund can provide new sources of revenue derived from recommended Toolbox Actions, including:

- Charging for evening on-street parking;
- Valet Parking;
- Other demand-responsive pricing strategies;
- In-Lieu Fee options; and

- Charging all parking by hourly use – Sunday and Holiday exemptions can be continued at the discretion of the City and the DDA.

This new source of funds can be added without changing the construction planning process. However, there will continue to be times when a concerted effort is needed to build more parking more quickly than the current process can deliver optimally.

The DDA should work with the City to establish conditions in which the DDA can expect a coordinated effort in planning and funding new parking construction. The continued use of the municipal parking system as an economic development tool obligates all those invested in this approach to pitch in when deals push economics beyond the standard funding and planning processes.

The first step in this process will be determining when more parking is needed. This last principle of the Downtown Parking Policy is likely to remain the most challenging, and is therefore examined in more detail below –

8. *Maintain a formalized process for determining when new supply is needed.*

Such a process should follow the first six principles of the Downtown Parking Policy, by reflecting the practical and principled emphasis on exhausting demand management options before addressing capacity constraints with new supply. Options for such a process are examined below.

**Step 1: Track Conditions**

- **Track the Market:** The DDA currently does an exemplary job of monitoring the local business and development markets. Staff is well informed on what is going on in real estate and development markets, and who is doing what within these markets, including innovative development and transportation strategies. This level of involvement with the business community will continue to provide invaluable guidance for managing parking supply.
- **Track Utilization:** In the first phase of the study, the Project Team outlined a series of regular data collection efforts recommended for the DDA to use as part of its parking management program (see Final Report – Appendix D). Formalizing a process for tracking utilization using the occupancy tracking technology the DDA already has will be the first step in maintaining the ability to track near-term parking needs.
- **Coordinate on Economic Development Strategies:** The recent Google deal (400 free parking permits offered to lure an influential employer to Downtown) points to the reality that parking access can play a major role in economic development. The City, the Chamber of Commerce, and the DDA should therefore meet early in the process of such deals to determine the potential volume of permits being discussed, the potential value returned to the City for providing this incentive, and to begin developing an approach that follows the

established Downtown Parking Policy.

**Step 2: Determine When to Build**

Once processes for determining utilization and near-term projections are set, determining when to build can take a number of approaches.

In the long-term, a market-based approach is preferred. This relies upon letting demand determine rates for all forms of parking system use. Once that has been established, and Toolbox and other parking demand management strategies have been exhausted, occupancy can serve as the trigger for either higher rates, or new construction. The steps for this approach are outlined below.

*Market Approach*

- Allow demand to determine rates - preserving some availability at all times and in key areas (though not necessarily in all facilities at all times).
- Use management strategies to moderate demand and rates.
- Build parking when Toolbox options are exhausted, revenues are secured to pay for it, a desirable opportunity arises, and demand is sufficient to support it.

The simplicity of market-based approaches is attracting a tremendous amount of attention from planners and public parking managers across the country. However, concerns about disparities in the ability of various market segments to pay are common, especially where alternative mobility options are limited. While mobility options are not an issue within Downtown, other concerns have been raised during the study that may complicate market approach.

The disparity between the market price that might be set by parkers within the University community and those within the business community has raised concerns about the business community being priced out under a pure market-based pricing system. Similar concerns involve the potential of long-term parkers to drive rates too high to attract visitor parking. The Project Team is convinced, following focus group meeting with business leaders and real estate brokers, that the lack of predictable parking access is currently a greater deterrent to employers than parking costs. However, it appears likely that student demand could potentially drive purely market-responsive rates prohibitively high for employees, even if parking options were readily available.

Similar concerns involve the potential of long-term parkers to drive rates too high to attract visitor parking. These are certainly legitimate concerns – private enterprise and short-term visits are two key components of Downtown’s diverse economy and land use vitality. An alternate approach to strict market-pricing may be able to support a continued mix within the parking market, while preserving much of the potential for pricing to manage demand. Such an approach is outlined below.

### *Augmented Market Approach*

- Identify market segments that may be priced out of the parking system under a fully market-based approach
- Estimate rate ceilings needed to preserve parking system access for these market segments.
- Allow demand to determine rates up to this level – preserving some availability at all times and in key areas (though not necessarily in all facilities at all times).
- Use Toolbox strategies to manage demand and availability, and to forestall reaching rate ceilings.
- Build parking when Toolbox options are exhausted, revenues are secured to fund it, and a desirable opportunity arises or rate ceilings are reached.

Key Toolbox strategies and actions that may support this approach, and forestall the need to build more parking by protecting specific parking markets include:

- **Debit Accounts and Hourly Rates** – A debit account system that charges all parking based on hourly rates would make monthly parking costs much higher for residents compared to commuters. Charging all customers for each hour of use will roughly triple the monthly cost of residential versus commuter parking. This greatly favors employees over students, though it would also likely encourage more on-site parking provision at new residential developments.
- **First Hour Free** – One hour of free parking for debit account holders favors the per-hour cost of visitor parking over that of commuter or resident parking without offering students sufficient time to park free of charge.
- **Other Discounts** – Discounted hourly rates can be offered to debit account holders based on length of local residency and employer participation in Travel Choice Coordinator meetings.

## **II. TOOLBOX ACTIONS**

A sequence of parking management actions based on the Toolbox is proposed below. The sequence is based both on implementability of each action, and the necessary sequence for maximizing the cross-support potential of select actions – supportive actions in place prior to supported actions, or mutually supportive actions implemented together.

### **A. Support Actions**

#### **1. Establish a Dedicated Funding Source**

Set up a dedicated funding source for Toolbox Actions by establishing a *Parking and Transportation Fund*. All parking revenues generated by new parking-related policies, strategies, and actions (including an In-Lieu fee) should be directed to this fund, similar to the DDA's current system of dedicated funding accounts. Such a fund should be dedicated to providing revenues for Toolbox Actions, and other public investments that improve Downtown accessibility, including:

- Sidewalk and streetscape improvements;
- Parking enforcement;
- Parking construction;

- Commuter Benefits programs; and
- Transit service.

Such dedicated revenue funds have been used to great success in smaller city downtown districts (see Appendix for examples).

## **2. Create a Supportive Context**

*a. Establish a Parking and Transportation Oversight Committee:* Many recommended actions will benefit from a coordinated approach to Actions. Such an approach has been the key to other successful efforts before – go!pass, getDowntown, the Link. The key parties involved in these efforts will remain the key parties for implementing the recommendations below. However, since these recommendations have been developed from outside, an oversight committee can play a vital role in bringing parties together and identifying the key benefits each strategy holds for each.

The existing Ann Arbor Discovering Downtown (A2D2) steering committee can serve well in this role while it remains intact. Before disbanding, however, the committee should construct an appropriate replacement to support the Downtown Parking Policy, and oversee strategic Actions of the Toolbox.

*b. Maintain on-Going Parking and Transportation Conditions Review:* A program for regular parking conditions monitoring was proposed and detailed in Appendix D of the Phase I Final Report. This program was recommended as a means for supporting parking management via timely and relevant utilization data. A program that utilizes the McGann electronic data collection system and moderate-cost labor should be established to regularly collect data as described in the appendix, including:

- Occupancy – By facility, by day, week, calendar month, year;
- Average and Peak occupancy – By facility, by Sub-Area, daytime and evening;
- Hours at or above 90 percent occupancy for each facility;
- Turnover;
- Tracking effects of Alternative Mode promotions;
- Tracking effects of gas prices, transit fare programs;
- Time limit enforcement; and
- Customer perceptions, experiences, and travel patterns via windshield surveys.

In addition, data on mode use, and feedback on Travel Choice options, can be tracked under the direction of the Travel Choice Coordinator (see below).

*c. Lead by Example:* The City, as one of the city largest employers, can play a crucial role in defining transportation priorities by directly supporting Parking Policy Principle 4 – support for alternative modes. Recommended immediate steps include:

- Setting quarterly, one-on-one meetings between the City’s benefits coordinator and the Downtown Travel Choice Coordinator (see below);

- Ceasing to subsidize employee parking costs – or offering a cash equivalent benefit to non-drivers; and
- Full participation in the go!pass program.

## **B. Immediate Actions**

### **1. Maximize Downtown's Accessibility through Non-Motorized Modes**

*a. Maintain All-Season Sidewalk Access:* Ensure that street plowing does not leave sidewalks and crosswalks inaccessible. Enforce shoveling/ sidewalk clearance laws.

*b. Prohibit "Right Turns on Red":* Feedback from Downtown employees and residents indicate a significant level of concern over pedestrian safety and comfort, especially at intersections, and especially regarding turning vehicles. Direct project team observation also supports the need to calm turning movements and prioritize pedestrian crossing. Prohibiting right turns on red (RTOR) within Downtown can provide measurable improvement in pedestrian crossing safety and comfort.

While the benefits of allowing RTOR for motorists and overall traffic flow are well known, the disadvantages for cyclists and pedestrians (especially those with limited vision) are often not. In the simplest terms, allowing RTOR effectively turns the red light into a yield sign. One study documented that, with RTOR, 15 percent of drivers do not stop, and 42 percent make a rolling stop.<sup>1</sup> The drivers that do stop tend to inch into the crosswalk space in hopes of finding a gap in traffic. Often drivers check to the left for approaching traffic, and fail to pay attention to people walking from the driver's right side.

Having vehicles constantly turning is most problematic for pedestrians with limited vision, as they rely on engine noise to judge when and where to cross the street.

*c. Establish Leading Pedestrian Intervals:* A novel technique gaining favor among pedestrian safety experts is the leading pedestrian interval (LPI). An LPI re-times the signal phasing so that the pedestrian phase begins a few seconds before the vehicular phase. Typically, this permits a pedestrian to get halfway across the street and establish presence in the crosswalk before vehicles start turning, thus increasing the tendency for drivers to yield as required.

Figure 1 and Figure 2 show an intersection with a 6-second LPI. The first image shows the WALK phase; the second image shows the WALK plus green phase. Note that most everyone has cleared the crosswalk before the van turns. The general rule is that the LPI phase should be long enough to allow people to walk half way across the intersection at four feet per second – a 48-foot wide street would receive a 6-second LPI.

<sup>1</sup> Zegeer, C.V. and M.J. Cynecki. *Methods of Increasing Pedestrian Safety at Right-Turn-on-Red Intersections*, Final Report. Report No. FHWA/IP-86/10, Federal Highway Administration, Washington, DC, 1986.

Figure 1 – Leading Pedestrian Interval – Pedestrians First



Figure 2 – Leading Pedestrian Interval –Turning Vehicles Second



LPI signaling at all signalized intersections within Downtown can support pedestrian crossing safety and comfort, especially once RTOR are prohibited.

*d. Increase Non-Motorized Transportation Funding:* The DDA has two sidewalk programs, both of which use TIF funds. The first is a sidewalk maintenance program, which sets aside a fixed dollar amount of funding for repair and replacement of sidewalks, tree pit and grates, tree, light poles, etc. This program has been in place for roughly 10 years, and according to the DDA appears to be catching up with deferred maintenance that should free up funds in future years.

The other program is a capital improvements program that identifies desirable, transformative streetscape projects designed to change and improve the way Downtown is used and perceived. These are multi-year projects, with comprehensive planning and public outreach activities preceding physical improvements. The most recently completed project was a State Street Area improvement project. Funding for these projects is not set until final project design is approved.

Community input, however, clearly indicates that non-motorized transportation should be a top transportation priority, for reasons beyond reducing parking demand. The 2006 *City of Ann Arbor Non-Motorized Transportation (NMT) Plan* states:

*A comprehensive non-motorized transportation system based on best practices is of paramount importance to the health, safety, and general welfare of the citizens of Ann Arbor.*

Increasing the current five percent set aside of transportation funds the City provides can be used for projects that fall in between the regular maintenance and large scale renovation projects funded by the DDA – occasional purchases of new street furniture, intersection configurations, plantings, and completing bike lane and sidewalk networks leading into Downtown for examples. The Parking and Transportation Fund is another potential source of funding for such actions.

## **2. Formalize a Downtown Travel Choice Coordinator Office**

Raising the profile of the activities carried out by the getDowntown program can increase the impact of existing services and reduce commuter parking demand. This will also be crucial to the success of virtually all Toolbox options. On a “wholesale” level, the Coordinator would work with Ann Arbor’s businesses, property managers, and hotel managers who, in turn, would work with their respective employees, tenants, and guests to advance travel options. On a “retail” level, the coordinator would provide public information and education to end-users via City-wide information campaigns, commuter websites, direct mail, and at bus stops and commuter retail stores.

There is currently a great deal of “best practice”-level travel choice programs available to Downtown commuters. The Downtown, however, is surrounded by a region that is unaccustomed to having travel “choices”, and as such many commuters are less likely to go looking for these options. While current marketing efforts are marked by effective

graphic design and clever messaging, designating an official office as a clearinghouse for information on these programs is recommended as a means of reaching out directly to employees. Recommendations include:

- Communicating the existence of the office through City websites and informational materials;
- Marketing the Coordinator role directly to local businesses, making full use of the Chamber of Commerce's connection;
- Taking the lead by directing City benefits staff to work directly with the Coordinator office;
- Establishing a series of quarterly Travel Choice networking meetings between the Coordinator office and Downtown employee benefits personnel; and
- Adding at least one additional full-time and one part-time, staff member to support the Coordinator.

The getDowntown office is currently housed within the Chamber of Commerce and financed through AATA, DDA, and the City – with the Chamber providing some accounting support as well as physical space and marketing. This arrangement appears to work well. Other options include bringing the office into the DDA organization, or making it an official City department/office.

### **3. Expand Car-Sharing**

Car-sharing services are provided through ZipCar at UM facilities on three campuses, including central campus. Use of this service has been increasing since its Fall 2006 Actions. Expanding this program into DDA facilities can provide support for alternative mode options for more Downtown commuters. One of the most challenging mode shift barriers is the occasional need for work day access to a personal vehicle, for either professional and personal trips. Access to car-share vehicles can be effective in accommodating these trip needs for those that may have rode a bus or a bike to work.

### **4. Provide Free or Discounted Rideshare Parking**

The best few spaces in each structure should be reserved for registered car- and vanpool vehicles until 10:00 AM. Parking rates should be discounted or lifted entirely. Rideshare participants can communicate through the Downtown Travel Choice Coordinator which structures they prefer. This information can then be used by the DDA to determine how many spaces should be set aside at each location.

Any costs of such a strategy will be more than offset by reduced costs related to demand for new parking spaces.

### **5. Offer Free "Limited Use" Passes for Employers with Evening Operations**

There is currently fairly low demand for the existing 4:00 PM – 9:00 AM parking permits. Such passes, however, may serve the needs of employees working evening shifts. While purchasing permits at \$30 each for a restaurant full of employees appears an unattractive option for many employers, the DDA may consider offering these passes for free in an attempt to shift employee demand away from curbside spaces. Such an offer

could be made dependent upon attendance of Travel Choice Networking sessions (see below).

### **6. Implement a Valet Parking Pilot Project at Maynard Structure**

Valet service offered at the Maynard parking structure will serve a number of purposes, including:

- Increasing daytime capacity at a facility that is popular among visitors and commuters;
- Offering options for evening visitors to the State Street area;
- Decreasing search traffic along State Street in evenings; and
- Increasing efficiency of space at Maynard, especially at top floors.

During weekdays, all non-permit parking should be accommodated by valet services. These can be used to concentrate the space required to accommodate visitor parking, potentially freeing up more permits for this popular structure. The top floor (or one tower) of the structure could potentially be reserved for valet-served vehicles, which would eliminate the current practice of saving first level spaces until 10:00 AM that creates some resentment among permit holders and those waiting for permits at the structure.

During evenings, valet service can add a parking convenience and personal comfort for customers willing to pay for it. On-street capacity in this area is limited, sending many customers to structures. Valet service can save them time, and eliminate the need for reluctant customers to navigate a parking structure.

A valet fee can be charged in addition to standard hourly rate costs for parking duration. The current structure operator is an experienced firm in valet services, simplifying Actions and operations. This should be a revenue positive program.

### **7. Operate Evening Link Service**

The Link service has been steadily gaining ridership, and business owners have noted that their patrons have begun using the service. Evening service can relieve on-street parking demand by providing a viable transit option for visitors and employees. While the Link currently runs until 11:00 PM, service after 6:00 PM is limited to central campus and university housing areas. Extending the evening route to reach Downtown's evening destinations would provide a viable transit option for visitors and employees of some of the more popular Ann Arbor restaurants and entertainment venues.

The same funding sources for current service would be appropriate for an extended evening service. The Parking and Transportation fund is another potential source. Routes may need to be augmented to adjust to unique evening trip characteristics. Current Link service operates at a cost of about \$77 per business hour. Assuming that existing evening service operates at about half the cost, extending evening service into Downtown would presumably cost about \$40 per business hour. For 6PM-11:00 PM service, that would mean \$200 per evening – an annual Monday – Saturday cost of

about \$63,000 for 12-month service. Operating under the current 8-month service plan, the Downtown evening extension would cost about \$44,000.

### **8. Establish a State Street Area Parking Benefit District Pilot Project**

The State Street sub-area of Downtown should be used to begin a pilot Parking Benefit District (PBD) to demonstrate the benefits of using on-street pricing to manage availability and generate funds for public improvements. Like just about all on-street parking in Downtown, spaces along this street are filled to capacity in evenings. High demand for evening uses combines with the cessation of parking regulations at these spaces to reduce availability to almost nothing. Market pricing these spaces can use pent up demand for these spaces to generate public benefits, while improving availability for those willing to pay for the convenience these spaces offer. At the same time, the excess capacity available at the off-street facilities in the evenings means that no parking demand must go unmet. Elements of the PBD pilot must include:

- Previous Actions of free Overnight parking permits to businesses with evening operations, Valet Parking pilot, and extended Link service to provide additional access options for evening employees and patrons;
- Roll out of multi-space on-street meters offering electronic and cash payment options;
- At a minimum, covering State Street between Washington Street and South University Avenue with these new meters;
- Preferably, covering Liberty Street and William Street between State Street and 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue; North University Avenue between Thayer Street and State Street; and Maynard Street as well;
- Extending the \$1 per hour rate for curb spaces on these blocks until 9:00 PM;
- End time restrictions at curb spaces after 6:00 PM (so that on-street spaces meet the needs of evening parkers);
- The City empowering the DDA to adjust rates in response to parking occupancy, with the express goal of attaining approximately 85 percent occupancy on most blocks (see Redwood City ordinance in Appendix);
- Completion of the DDA's current Wayfinding and Information program providing State Street customers with clear directional information on off-street options, locations, and availability; and
- Direct return of all post 6:00 PM meter revenue to a State Street Area Association Parking and Transportation Fund – similar to the larger P&T Fund, which would provide revenue for parking, transportation, and related improvements to be identified by the State Street Area Association. This fund, while managed by the DDA, can be used at the discretion of the SSAA and the Parking and Transportation Oversight Committee (see above).

The pilot program should be at least 12 months in duration to adequately track its effectiveness as parking patterns adjust to evening pricing, and revenue accumulates. If successful, the pilot should be systematically expanded to include additional State Street Area streets, to the level that it proves effective in maintaining availability targets.

### **9. Complete the Information and Wayfinding Campaign**

The DDA currently has projects underway for Parking Information signage and Wayfinding. A proposed signage system offering information on the availability and location of parking will begin on the freeways surrounding Ann Arbor, continue at the off ramps, lead visitors to downtown, provide directions to the four downtown districts, specific destinations and parking, and then direct them back to the freeways.

The Wayfinding signage system will include extensive pedestrian signage to encourage a “park once” environment. Such a campaign should also guide bicyclists looking for routes, racks, and lockers and provide estimated walking distances (in minutes) to popular attractions.

Other Wayfinding investments worth considering include:

- Extend and maintain Next Bus/ Last Bus Technology all through the system;
- Utilizing Michigan’s 511 transportation telephone hotline resources (see Appendix); and
- Electronic information kiosks at the transit center, in or near parking structures, and at any other activity centers.

### **10. Implement Express Commuter Bus Service**

The AATA has been investigating long-range express bus service options for the last few years. Obstacles to these services have included:

- Capital investment expense;
- Regulatory and judicial restrictions on capital investment in “over-the-road” coach vehicles;
- The current AATA focus on intra-county service; and
- Focus on “subscription” service, in which ridership commitments ensure full buses and full farebox recovery.

Express bus service, however, is of direct financial interest to the DDA, should such a service prove likely to reduce demand for additional off-street parking inventory. In addition, the University and the Chamber of Commerce have both stated interest in supporting true express service to areas of high commuter demand. Such service would directly address key barriers to transit identified in Phase I among commuters interested in transit use. In addition, focus group feedback has indicated that express buses could be attractive to current drivers seeking a more productive, less expensive, and/ or more environmentally conscious commute – commuter that have said they themselves would take such a bus.

While the AATA appears near a solution, involving contracting services outside of the Authority, a concerted effort and support among parties with vested interest in these services could prove instrumental in getting the buses on the road. Such an effort could also result in key improvements to eventual service, including:

*Non-Subscription Service* – Subscription service provides economic assurance to the AATA for what constitutes a new type of service for Ann Arbor. However, subscriptions

go against the notion of providing flexible transportation choices for Downtown commuters. The level of commitment required is likely to greatly reduce the service's appeal to those that are unlikely to give up a driving commuter entirely. A service that provides more options for "trying it out" is likely to be more effective at slowly "converting" drivers over to transit.

Should key parties be convinced that a standard commuter bus service would serve their interests, reliance upon a subscription-style service framework might not be necessary. Effective service design and planning can provide very high farebox recovery rates for peak-only express service (see Appendix) compared to standard bus operations. Interests outside the AATA may see this opportunity as more than worth guaranteeing to make up eventual farebox recovery gaps.

*Extra-County Options* – The greatest impact on off-street parking demand may come from service that reaches out to communities beyond Washtenaw County. While the AATA is not averse to such geographical expansion, reducing parking demand is likely not its top service planning priority. An expanded planning effort may therefore be necessary to maintain this objective in express bus routing.

### **11. Track Technology Investment Opportunities**

Technology is constantly evolving, while Actions costs for established technologies tend to continually decrease. Investment opportunities should be tracked and planned for including:

- Payment Options – Debit Accounts for hourly parking, Smart Cards that can pay for on- and off-street parking as well as transit, new meter technology;
- On-street occupancy tracking (see Appendix); and
- Use of Michigan's 511 (transportation telephone hotline) resources.

### **12. Expand the Guaranteed Ride Home Program**

This program can provide an important transportation "safety net" for Downtown employees committed to alternative commute modes. The current program is limited to registered Rideshare participants. Expanding the program to other populations of committed alternative modes users, such as car-share members and monthly transit customers, can help alleviate the fear of these deeper commitments and make alternatives more attractive and feasible for commuters.

### **13. Coordinate Park and Ride Improvements**

AATA is currently working on options for improving existing Park and Ride service, as part of its Transit System Development study (Parsons Brinckerhoff, Michigan, 2007). The City, County, the Chamber of Commerce, the University, and the DDA should work with the AATA to implement improvements that can address barriers to expanding bus commuting into Downtown. Possible considerations might include:

- Placing stops within shopping centers to accommodate multiple rider needs (i.e., groceries and other errands);

- Incorporating some existing stops as the last stop before Downtown on some Express service routes (potentially one existing Park and Ride stop for each new express bus route); and
- Providing real-time information about bus operations and travel time to Downtown at the Park and Ride facilities.

#### **14. Leave Parking Exemptions in the Zoning Code**

Current practices, such as parking exemptions and allowing acquisition of monthly permits to serve in lieu of meeting on-site requirements, are considered best practices for downtown parking management, and have served many such districts well.

Imposing minimum parking requirements, by contrast, may relieve some pressure on the DDA inventory and permit wait list, but will also solicit a number of conditional changes that run counter to established Smart Growth and parking management policies, such as:

- Introducing more driveway/ sidewalk intersections and increasing vehicle traffic at these points;
- Reducing foot traffic on Downtown streets as building tenants arrive at their front door by car; and
- Reducing overall efficiency of parking supply – more spaces are used less (as shown through the existing private parking inventory).

Many of the conditions generating interest in removing parking requirement exemptions can be addressed through Actions of Toolbox strategies and the establishment of the Downtown parking policy. Such conditions include:

- Lack of parking availability and lengthy, inconsistent permit wait lists, which complicate the use of Parking System spaces to meet development-related demand; and
- Lack of funding sources for parking system expansion.

At the same time, the requirements attached to developments seeking bonus FAR for their projects provide the City with some leverage over larger development projects, and their impact on the parking system and potential spillover parking issues. Continuing to allow developers to opt out of meeting requirements on-site through the establishment of In Lieu fees will further develop the potential benefit of these requirements, by making shared parking options more attractive (see In-Lieu Fees, short-term recommendations below).

#### **15. Facilitate Shared On-Site Parking**

Shared parking can be encouraged through zoning (by not counting parking square footage against allowable floor area or requiring a match of shared spaces for all dedicated spaces built on-site) and/or requiring shared parking as part of any type of conditional-use permit or negotiated plan approval process, as Arlington County, VA, does. At a minimum, shared parking needs to be allowed by Ann Arbor's zoning code as a way of meeting or reducing parking requirements.

The DDA (or other third-party incorporated entity) could negotiate for shared parking, manage parking, and hold liability. Making shared parking work requires a forum for addressing disputes or concerns among various property owners and ensuring consistent management practices. A third-party entity could also lease parking lots from individual property owners and manage them so that motorists perceive all the parking in the district as a common pool. More important, by leasing the parking lots, the third party entity can assume all liability for incidents that occur in the parking lots, relieving individual businesses and property owners from that burden.

#### **16. Pursue Existing Joint-Development Opportunities**

The City and the DDA should coordinate with the District Library's current expansion feasibility study. This may present a uniquely opportunity for joint development of the surface lot adjacent to the site (see Task 4B memo). A library extension would present a favorable use combination with a structured/ below-grade shared parking facility. The site location is also favorable for meeting existing and future demand in the district, being within close proximity to two heavily used structures – Maynard and 4<sup>th</sup> & William.

The site of the former 1<sup>st</sup> & Washington Street structure presents another ideal opportunity for Joint-Development expansion of the off-street inventory.

#### **17. Continue Seeking Joint Development Opportunities**

Developing on existing lots is preferable from an urban design perspective to building up at existing structures. While some regular parking customers have expressed vehement opposition to building upon lots, opposition to taller structures is just as strong among many residents, and many of the concerns over losing surface parking to garage conversion can be addressed through thoughtful design controls.

Incorporating new parking supplies within mixed-used developments provides a number of benefits, including:

- Providing active uses at the site of parking – housing (above) and commercial uses (in front) can place increased pedestrian activity at the site of garaged parking, reducing the negative impact of parking on sidewalk activity;
- Increase comfort with structured parking – active uses make parking structures feel less isolated and more secure;
- Efficiency gains – Uses place parking customers on-site, mixed-uses are conducive to sharing of spaces;
- Shared expense – public/private financing can provide economic efficiencies over separate, smaller developments;
- Increase public support for construction – this is the preferred form of parking development among stakeholders; and
- Providing a unique opportunity to provide low-cost housing in Downtown.

Certain uses are more appealing than others, and finding the right mix of uses and parking will be key to the success of projects. A recent proposal to develop underground parking with a courthouse and police station on the lot next door to the library, for

instance, incorporated uses that heightened, rather than lowered, concerns about using the proposed parking structure.

Until opportunities become available, continued expansion of existing structures may be necessary to meet latent and potential midday off-street parking demand.

### **18. Identify Priority Areas**

Use Phase I data to identify areas of potential expansion priority. Based on the data collected and analyzed in Phase I, the Main Street sub-area currently has heavily utilized structures immediately surrounded by highly utilized on-street spaces, indicating a high potential area for expansion. Seeking desirable expansion opportunities in these areas should begin immediately. In the longer-term, utilization data for structures should be updated and tracked using existing tracking technologies to guide decision marking. On-street utilization updates can be completed with minimal staffing requirements.

## **B. Short-Term Actions**

### **1. Implement Non-Motorized Transportation Plan Recommendations**

A number of recommendations contained in the *2006 City of Ann Arbor Non-Motorized Transportation Plan* could provide particular support for the recommended Downtown Parking Policy. Prohibiting ROTR and implementing Leading Pedestrian Intervals are discussed above as part of immediate Actions recommendations. The following short-term Actions are also highly recommended:

- installing crossing islands for Huron Street crosswalks;
- Installing a mid-block crossing on Washington Street that lines up with the alley west of the Liberty Square structure;
- Converting First and Ashley streets to two-way traffic, with bike lanes on Ashley; and
- Extending on-street parking one block south on west side of Main Street below William Street.

### **2. Establish A Pilot Valet Program in the Main Street Area**

Contrasted with the State Street valet recommendation, valet stations in the Main Street area should be placed on the street, close to popular destinations. This can both bring services closer to popular destinations and shift demand (cars) to wherever availability is greater. While this will require the loss of some key curb spaces, converting off-street spaces to virtual on-street spaces can produce tremendous overall capacity gains. Spaces that are loading zones prior to 6:00 PM would provide the best locations for these stations, as they may feel like less of a “taking” than a metered space.

Using DDA facilities to store valet-parked cars can address resident concerns that valet activity could increase traffic and noise on their streets. Accommodation of valet-served cars can be used to fill top floors of garages where valet parking can produce capacity gains of roughly 40 percent, as more cars can squeeze into the same space via attended versus self-parking.

An additional resource for valet parking could be underused, private accessory lots, which may offer proximity benefits compared to some DDA garages, and could relieve access congestion or high demand at some structures. Care should be taken, however, to ensure that these locations do not create increased traffic within residential areas surrounding Downtown.

### **3. *Install Additional Multi-Space Meters***

In addition to the meters installed for the State Street PBD, such meters should continue to replace the current standard meters when opportunities arise. The new meters offer a number of key customer conveniences, including:

- Accommodating credit/ debit card payment at meters, as well as cash;
- Payment and notification by cell phone; and
- Paying only for time used.

In addition, these meters offer a number of other benefits in comparison to the current meters:

- Reduced sidewalk “clutter” – fewer installations per block;
- Increased capacity – new meters allow car lengths to define how many spaces are on each block, standard meters tend to estimate, erring on the side of undercounting; and
- Enhanced pricing options.

### **4. *Investigate Additional Parking Benefit District Opportunities***

Assuming successful implementation of the State Street Area Parking Benefit District (see Immediate Actions above), opportunities to create additional districts should be monitored. While the Main Street Area Association strongly opposes one of the main components of such districts – charging for on-street space when demand exceeds 90% - demonstrated benefits from the State Street Area PBD may attract future support. Additionally, this area holds a great deal of promise for successful PBD Actions. The high level of evening parking demand, the concentration of higher-end restaurants, and the ease with which centralized valet stations could provide “bottomless” virtual curb access in this area all bode well for an area with tremendous potential turning pent up parking demand into public benefits while shifting demand from overburdened inventories to under-used structures.

### **5. *Host Quarterly Travel Choice Networking Sessions***

The Downtown Travel Choice Coordinator will host quarterly sessions to share new information between the Travel Choice office and Downtown benefits coordinators, including available program updates and employee feedback on existing programs.

### **6. *Provide Parking Discount to Networking Sessions Participants***

Previous year attendance at the Coordinator’s Networking Sessions can be used to offer discounted parking rates for Downtown employers. A per session discount rate can be assessed for each session attended. For example, a five percent discount could result in a 20 percent 2009 rate reduction for employees whose representative attended all four 2008 sessions. No action beyond attendance need be compulsory to attain the

discount, but regular attendance of these sessions is likely to result in travel choice information filtering down to employees whose employers had no previous interest in communicating such information.

### **7. Replace Monthly Permits with Debit Accounts**

Daily parking rates that are drawn from a funded debit account can be based on existing monthly permit rates by dividing the monthly charge by 20 (represents an average number of business days per month). A debit account system would provide useful management benefits, including:

- Rewarding occasional use of alternate commute modes;
- Tracking unused cards;
- Encouraging permit turnover - Cards would be less transferable, discouraging employers and property owners from holding onto permits following turnover; and
- Establishing a payment system that will enable new pricing and discount options.

Weekend parking can be held exempt from account charges to continue encouraging employees to use permits to shop and visit Downtown at these times.

### **8. Operate Summer Link Service**

Assuming evening Link service proves successful, it will be important to provide service continuity through the summer months. Levels of service can be adjusted relative to reduced demand. However, some service should remain through these months to maintain ridership gains.

### **9. Expand Express Commuter Bus Service**

To the extent that initial service proves successful and creates new areas of demand, new routes should be identified and funding secured.

### **10. Commission A Downtown Pedestrian Improvement Study**

Parking and Transportation funds can be used to fund a study of Downtown streets to address safety and mobility issues and identify solutions such as:

- Mid-block crossings;
- Crosswalk striping;
- Curb extensions/ bulb-outs;
- Medians/ Refuges;
- Intersection Stop Lines; and
- In-pavement lighting at selected crosswalks.

This can build upon recommendations identified in the *2006 Non-Motorized Transportation Plan*, while providing a specific focus on maximizing pedestrian mobility within Downtown.

### **11. Formalize an In Lieu Fee Option**

Current on-site requirements for bonus development are sometimes met through the acquisition of monthly parking permits. This is a preferable alternative to new on-site

parking construction. Formalizing a fee option similar in nature to this practice can offer a number of advantages, including:

- Making the development process more predictable – Current options are unknowable until negotiations with the DDA are completed. A formal fee process would make the costs and opportunities of not building on-site available up front; and
- Provide funding for expanded parking and transportation options – The current process produces demand pressures on the existing system, and produces minimal revenue benefits to the parking system.

Offering annual or monthly fee options, as opposed to one, lump-sum fee, can help with project financing. If fees are kept below the cost of providing dedicated parking on-site, and parking spaces are generally available nearby, such a fee can be very attractive to developers. For this option to work, waitlists for parking permits can be no longer than 30 days, so developers can rely on the parking system to provide access for their tenants. (See Appendix for further details.)

### **12. Implement Alternatives If Current Zoning Exemptions are Removed**

Existing minimum parking requirement exemptions for Downtown development are seen as unpopular, and are currently under consideration for removal. Should they be removed:

- In-Lieu Fee options will become even more crucial to preserving a Park Once environment;
- Exemptions for non-residential uses should be maintained;
- On-site parking at residential developments of a minimal size should be required to provide a specified match in public parking spaces on-site as well; and
- Design guidelines should be included to protect pedestrian-priority streets from parking access points.

### **13. Implement New Parking Requirements**

Regardless of the outcome for vehicular parking requirements, the following alternative requirements should be added to the zoning code:

- Minimum bicycle parking requirements equal to at least one bicycle space for every 10 vehicle spaces (in any City district) by land use;
- Preferential parking spaces reserved for registered rideshare vehicles; and
- A minimum requirement of 1 car sharing space per every 20 dedicated on-site spaces built.

## **C. LONG-TERM ACTIONS**

### **1. Manage All Parking Demand with Pricing**

Demand-responsive pricing for all parking should be a long-term goal for Downtown. Once high-tech multi-space meters are installed, the DDA will be capable of adjusting rates by time of day, day of week, and length of stay throughout Downtown. This will allow the elimination of time limits, a chronic source of enforcement headaches and parker anxiety.

Meter regulation should be in effect when and where unregulated parking consistently nets occupancy rates higher than 90 percent. Rates are adjusted in response to demand, targeting roughly 85 percent occupancy on all blocks. Note: the current color code system that helps identify time limit ranges at meters can be used to indicate more or less expensive parking locations.

Currently emerging technology that tracks occupancy and payment via a centralized computer system will soon become more common, and likely more affordable (see Appendix). This level of centralized, electronic, real-time occupancy information can indicate where availability and demand become out of synch with established targets. This can also simplify enforcement, reducing staffing costs.

Pricing off-street parking should follow a similar, though more broadly applied, approach. Introducing too many rate variables may produce too much confusion for this inventory intended to serve both long-term and short-term parking. And keeping simplified rates for off-street facilities provides an option for those that may find on-street meter rates confusing. Additionally, unintended consequences can follow when adjusting rates hourly within a long-term market – higher midday rates encouraging employees to drive to lunch for example.

Nonetheless, some rate adjustments are worth considering, once debit accounts and hourly rate structures are fully implemented, such as:

- Adjusting rates between locations; and
- Adjusting weekday versus evening and weekend rates.

For instance, Ann & Ashley might charge \$1 per hour during weekday hours and \$0.50 per hour during evening and weekend hours, while 1<sup>st</sup> & Huron might charge \$1.50 during the daytime and \$2 at night. The Actions of real-time signage at each facility will greatly improve the simplicity of communicating current rates for all drivers.

## **2. Offer Debit Accounts for Hourly Parkers**

Charge all parking based on hourly rates and offer debit accounts to all parkers. Rates can be varied by time of day, day of week, and location, in response to demand. To encourage non-commuters to establish accounts, the first hour of any parking can be offered free of charge at all times.

Under such a system, and assuming a flat hourly rate of \$0.80 per hour:

- Storing a vehicle for 20 hours per day for 28 days would cost - \$448.
- Everyday commuter use for a nine-hour day/ five-day week would cost - \$133 per month.
- Weekly two-hour parking would cost - \$3.20 per month.

**Figure 3 – Parking Hours and Costs by User**

Parking/Cost Comparison	Visitor	Commuter	Resident*
Monthly Parking Hours	8	180	560
Monthly Parking Cost	\$4	\$133	\$448
Cost/ Hour Average	\$0.50	\$0.74	\$0.80

During times of supply constraints, the DDA can choose to temporarily stop offering accounts and place applicants on a wait list pending additional supply or demand management impacts. In following with the Downtown Parking Policy however, wait lists should not exceed waiting times of 30 days.

### **3. Offer Off-Street Parking Discount Options**

Providing a discount from standard hourly rates may be preferable to protect access for key Downtown populations.

- *Permanent residents* – Discounted hourly rates, or flat monthly rates, for those with at least one year of primary residency registered within the DDA boundary.
- *Employees* –
  - Discounted or free monthly, 4PM-9PM access permits;
  - Discounts for annual participation in Travel Choice networking sessions (see short-term actions above);
  - Hourly rate caps – should demand continue to push rates above employee affordability, rate caps could be installed, triggering additional space construction rather than rate increases once availability drops under a capped rate.
- *Visitors* – First hour is free for all. This represents a much deeper discount for shoppers vs. commuters and residents, and will encourage their use of debit accounts, which in turn can reduce garage queuing.
- *In-Lieu Fee Contributors* – Discounted hourly rates for residents of buildings whose developers paid In Lieu fees. Level of discount can be tied to proportion of In-Lieu fees paid to on-site spaces built. This can amount to substantial discounts for residents of such buildings that acquire a permanent resident discount as well.

### **3. Implement Seamless Payment Systems**

“Smartcard” technology can be used to allow customers to use one card to pay for on-street and off-street parking, as well as transit. This can greatly increase the appeal of setting up a Downtown Parking and Transportation debit account. Such a system is being tested in Washington, D.C., the success of which will likely result in an evolving technology that at some point will be highly feasible for Downtown.

#### **4. Install Pedestrian Countdown Signals**

Installation of such signals, as recommended in the 2006 NMT Plan, can continue the progress of shorter term pedestrian mobility investments.

#### **5. Retro-fit Existing Structures**

Street-oriented uses at the ground level of garages will help reduce the negative impact of existing, stand alone structures on sidewalk activity. This is a key, not only to maintaining vibrant, comprehensive pedestrian networks, but improving sense of personal security in and around structures.

#### **6. Unbundle Parking Costs**

The unbundling of parking costs from space rental/ purchase costs for residential uses in new Downtown developments can:

- Encourage developers to build only the number of parking spaces for which there is a market;
- Lower housing costs for those that choose not to purchase or rent parking; and
- Create a development environment attractive to those seeking to reduce their own automobile use.

A minimum monthly lease rate for such spaces can be set to a percent of comparable parking costs at a DDA facility – Cost of monthly permit, or 25% of cost of 720 hours of hourly parking (24 hours for 30 days). See Appendix for further details.

### **III. BEYOND THE TOOLBOX**

This report has outlined policies and programs for short- and long-term Actions, each of which have been vetted through the public, stakeholders, focus groups, and policy makers. In the process of generating these options, the Project Team has also developed the following additional programs for consideration.

#### **A. Contracted Permits**

Existing monthly parking permit contracts limit the flexibility of parking management at affected structures. The practice of such contracts should cease. Employers holding significant permit volumes under contract – 10 or more – should be encouraged to work with DDA and getDowntown staff, as well as the eventual Travel Choice coordinator, to identify:

- Potential Travel Choice strategies for reducing employee permit demand; and
- Compensation options for contract reductions.

Once wait lists have been eliminated, the value of these contracts will be greatly diminished, increasing the feasibility of “buying” them back.

#### **B. Washtenaw County Courthouse Plans**

The County is planning to relocate Juvenile Court from the Platt Road Family Court facility to the existing Downtown courthouse building by 2010 (See task 4B memo – Key Organization Interviews). This is expected to create demand for 120 new spaces, in addition to the 300 monthly parking permits currently allotted to County employees at

the Ann & Ashley parking structure. It is not anticipated that any of this demand will be accommodated on-site. The existing 300 permits represent subsidized parking for nearly 90 percent of the County's 340 Downtown employees.

The City and the DDA should make it clear that no new contracted permits will be made available at either the Ann & Ashley or any other DDA structure. The existing ratio of permits-to-employees is already extremely high. Instead, the DDA and the getDowntown staff (as well as the eventual Travel Choice coordinator) should work with the County to identify:

- Potential Travel Choice strategies for reducing employee permit demand; and
- Compensation options for contract reductions.

### **C. Premium Permits**

It may be advisable to maintain a handful of the premium monthly permits at each facility as a revenue generator. These permits however, should be market-priced in order to extract the maximum revenue value of dedicated spaces within a shared inventory. Revenues should be dedicated to the P&T Fund.

### **D. Marketing Residential Parking Permit Program**

The Project Team has no recommended changes to the current approach to implementing Residential Parking Permits in the neighborhoods surrounding Downtown. While many of the Toolbox actions outlined above are likely to create increased parking demand outside the DDA boundary (on-street pricing, continuing the parking requirement exemptions for new development), the Project Team does not recommend implementing RPP in neighborhoods that have not demonstrated majority support for it. While the presence of significant student populations in some neighborhoods may present a barrier to establishing majority support in neighborhoods that could benefit from the program, Actions outside of the established petition process would likely result in significant backlash. Rather, the Project Team would recommend marketing the benefits of the program to residents, and providing program flexibility to cater to local demand conditions. The bottom line is to offer the program (as the City already does), but not force it on any neighborhood that does not want it.

### **E. Violation Forgiveness**

Establishing a practice of "first time forgiveness" for parking violations will be an important public relations effort that can ease acclimation to new parking management practices. A friendly note, informing violators of new policies, as opposed to giving them a ticket, can be an effective means of communicating changes to valued customers, and can help reduce perceptions that changes are simply enforcement-revenue generators.

### **F. Increase Campaign to Get Bicycles Off of Sidewalks**

There is currently far too much bicycle traffic on Downtown sidewalks, especially on high pedestrian-traffic blocks. An effective campaign to shift bike traffic from these walkways must include a combination of educating bike riders and making Downtown

roads safer and more comfortable for them. A campaign to accomplish this should be conducted through the Travel Choice Coordinator Office, and could include:

- Lobbying to legally prohibit bicycle-riding on Downtown sidewalks, and enforce prohibition in key areas;
- Implementing an education campaign;
- Involving the University;
- Completing bike-lane routes through Downtown;
- Installing shared-use arrows on streets lacking capacity for full bike lanes; and
- Placing “Share the Road” signs along Downtown streets – especially at Downtown entry points.

#### **IV. ACTIONS: IMPLEMENTATION FACTORS**

##### **A. Cross-Support**

While the recommended actions are not presented as an “all or nothing” package, many of the actions offer various levels of cross-support for one another. Some actions, such as setting up a Parking and Transportation Fund will lend support to most. The level of success for actions, on the other hand, may greatly depend on the Actions of many other, supportive actions. Sometimes the support factor is financial; sometimes it lies in adding incentives for modal shifts. Many strategies will also benefit from both forms of cross-support. Express bus service for instance will greatly benefit from:

- Changing the monthly parking permit system to a debit account system – a change that would provide a financial incentive for drivers to occasionally commute by bus;
- Funding from the Parking and Transportation Fund, which in turn is supported by on-street pricing, In-Lieu fees, and any other action that result in increased parking revenues;
- Expanded Car-Sharing, which can provide a fall-back option for those that may occasionally need a personal vehicle during the workday but would prefer to commute by transit; and
- A Travel Choice Coordinator that can market the benefits of the new service.

The combination of extending Link service into the evening, introducing evening on-street pricing, and providing valet services represents another form of cross-support. The most controversial of these actions is evening on-street pricing. This action, while widely supported among public outreach participants, is strongly opposed by some within the business community. However extending Link service and establishing valet parking are each widely and strongly supported by this community. By implementing all three, not only would visitors be presented with a set of new evening access options, but a potential compromise may be attained.

Figure 4 summarizes the cross-support relationships among each of actions recommended in this memo.

Figure 4 – Cross-Support Factors Among Toolbox Actions

Toolbox Actions	Parking and Transportation Fund	Express Commuter Bus Service	Evening Link Service	DDA-Managed Valet	Evening On-Street Pricing	Park and Ride	Travel Choice Coordinator	Expanded Car Share Program	Discount for Rideshare Vehicles	NMT Programs	Parking Information	Wayfinding	Zoning - No Minimums	Joint-Development Supply Expansion	Technology Investments	Debit Accounts/ Payment Options	In-Lieu Fees	Unbundling
Parking and Transportation Fund		π	π	π	π	π	π	π	π	ππ	π	π	π	π	π	π	ππ	π
Express Commuter Bus Service	π					π	π	π					π			ππ	π	π
Evening Link Service	π			π	ππ		π						π		π	π	π	π
DDA-Managed Valet	π		π		ππ						π	π		π				
Evening On-Street Pricing	π	π	ππ	ππ		π	π		π	π	π	π		π	ππ	ππ		
Park and Ride	π	π			π		π	π			π		π			π	π	
Travel Choice Coordinator	π	π	π		π	π		π	π	π	π					π	π	π
Expanded Car Share Program	π	π			π	π	π						π	π		π		π
Discount for Rideshare Vehicles	π				π		π				π		π	π		π	π	π
NMT Programs	ππ				π		π				π	π	π				π	π
Parking Information	π			π	π	π	π		π			π		π	π		π	
Wayfinding	π			π	π		π			π	π				π		π	π
Zoning - No Minimums	π	π	π			π		π	π	π				π		π	π	π
Joint-Development Supply Expansion	π			π	π						π		π				ππ	π
Technology Investments	π		π		ππ		π				π	π		π		π	π	
Debit Accounts/ Payment Options	π	ππ	π	π	ππ	π	π		π	π			π	π	π			
In-Lieu Fees	ππ	π	π	π	π	π	π	π	π	π	π	π	π	ππ	π	π		π
Unbundling	π	π	π	π	π	π	π	π	π	π	π	π	π	π	π	π	π	

π = Cross-Supportive Relationship  
 ππ = Strong Cross-Supportive Relationship

## **B. Feasibility**

This section outlines preliminary projections of financial costs and institutional efforts required for implementation of the Immediate and Short-Term Actions recommended above.

### **A. Immediate Actions**

#### **1. Establishing the Parking and Transportation Fund:**

Minimal new cost. A few administrative-level staff hours to establish.

For years, the DDA has maintained similar funds, into which it transfers revenue from its TIF income. These funds are maintained to ensure that specific investment needs always have funding. Since 1997, the Housing fund has provided approximately \$1.4 million to nearly a dozen downtown projects including affordable housing for seniors, teenagers, transitional housing for addicted men, and more.

Other dedicated funds include a Maintenance Reserve Fund for pedestrian improvement projects and a Parking Maintenance Reserve to pay for the repair and maintenance at parking facilities.

The proposed fund would not be much different from these. The only significant difference would be that parking activity would determine funding levels directly. Essentially the sources of revenue would be any new revenue-positive parking management strategy, including incremental income from meters after 6:00 PM.

#### **2. Maintaining Oversight Committee:**

No new costs.

The existing committee is expected to remain intact throughout the Immediate and Short-Term Action timeframe (3 – 18 months).

#### **3. On-Going Parking and Transportation Conditions Review:**

The recommended, on-going effort to review parking and transportation conditions will require a moderate staffing investment from the DDA Parking Operations staff and the Travel Choice Coordinator. Primary DDA staffing responsibilities with cost estimates include:

- Extracting digital information from the McGann system – Set up: One time cost of 40 staff hours; Maintenance: 1 staff hour per week.
- Meter Occupancy Surveys – 40 intern-level hours, twice annually; 32 staff hours, twice annually.
- Windshield Surveys – 12 intern-level hours, twice annually; 24 staff hours, twice annually.

Figure 1 presents a summary of staffing cost estimates for these actions.

**Figure 5 - DDA Staffing Cost Estimates for Recommended Survey Program**

Actions	Staff Level	Hours	Annual Iterations	Estimated Hourly Rate	Estimated Cost
McGann Extraction	General	40	1	\$35	\$1,400
	General	1	52	\$35	\$1,820
On-Street Surveys	Intern	40	2	\$15	\$1,200
	General	32	2	\$35	\$2,240
Windshield Surveys	Intern	12	2	\$15	\$360
	General	24	2	\$35	\$1,680
<b>Total</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>\$170</b>	<b>\$8,700</b>

A basic level of quarterly and annual travel pattern surveying should also be conducted by the Travel Choice Coordinator and staff. These surveys would track use of travel choice benefits as well as overall modal use among Downtown employees. Office staffing costs would include:

- 40 intern-level hours and 24 staff hours for annual surveys; and
- 24 intern-level hours and 16 staff hours for quarterly surveys.

Figure 6 provides an estimate of the overall staffing costs of these options.

**Figure 6 – Estimated Staff Costs for Basic Travel Choice Office Surveys**

Staff Level	Hours	Annual Iterations	Hourly Cost	Estimated Cost
Intern	40	1	\$15	\$600
General	32	1	\$35	\$1,120
Intern	24	4	\$15	\$1,440
General	20	4	\$35	\$2,800
<b>Total</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>\$100</b>	<b>\$5,960</b>

#### **4. Lead by Example:**

Anticipated implementation costs for this Action include:

- City’s Employee Benefits Administrator staff training – Initial meeting with Travel Choice Coordinator to discuss plan for promotion of travel options to City employees (8 one-time staff-level hours);
- Quarterly meetings with Travel Choice Coordinator (16 annual staff-level hours – four for each meeting and follow-up actions);
- Go!pass participation - \$5 annually for 801 employees (\$4,005).

Eliminating subsidization of parking costs will save the City money that in turn should be used to fund alternative transportation options, include Commuter Bus fares, Zipcar accounts, bicycle storage and changing facilities, etc.

#### **5. Maintain All-Season Sidewalk Access:**

Minimal new cost.

This is enforcement of existing “shoveling” laws and more thoughtful or thorough street-plowing practices. Minimal cost associated with extra diligence – slightly slower plowing, enforcement staff hours to cite untended sidewalks. Marketing

campaign through direct mailing recommended to notify property owners of the extent of their responsibility and it's importance to the community.

**6. Prohibit "Right Turns on Red":**

No new costs.

State Department of Transportation must be solicited for approval at State road intersections.

**7. Establish Leading Pedestrian Intervals:**

No new costs.

State Department of Transportation must be solicited for approval at State road intersections.

**8. Increase Non-Motorized Transportation Funding:**

Funding level to be established by City, based on overall transportation funding. Doubling the current commitment (from 5% to 10% of the overall transportation budget) is recommended.

**9. Formalize a Travel Choice Coordinator Position:**

New costs will include additional staffing, and increased marketing investments. Recommended positions include at least one additional full-time, and one part-time, staff member to assist the Coordinator.

Annual new staffing costs related to recommendations:

- Full-time staff costs – \$35,000, plus benefits.
- Intern costs - \$15,000 each.

The getDowntown program is currently housed within the Chamber of Commerce and financed through AATA, DDA, and the Chamber. While re-locating the position to other organizations might offer some benefits, restructuring will bring costs as well. A marketing budget should be established based on the number of travelers to be reached. At \$2 per year per employee, the cost would be \$100,000 for Downtown Ann Arbor's approximately 50,000 employees.

**10. Expand Car-Sharing:**

No new costs. Careful selection of location should result in no added costs, and opportunities to share revenue with the car-share provider.

Coordination with the University, which has successfully worked with Zipcar in placing 6 shared vehicles on its campuses, will be important for maximizing the benefit of this strategy.

**11. Free or Discounted Rideshare Parking:**

Minimal cost. Maximum loss for 50% discount is \$0.40 per space per hour – less than \$20 per week, per space.

**12. Free “Limited Use” Passes for Employers with Evening Operations:**

Virtually no new cost:

- New cars will be filling empty spaces, not displacing any paying customers.
- New users are not currently significant consumers of passes at current prices, therefore the discount (or give-away) amounts to little to no lost revenue.

**13. Valet Parking Pilot at Maynard Structure:**

This is, at worst, a revenue-neutral action. For evening services, revenue from valet fees should more than offset program costs. For daytime services, capacity gains for permit-parking can garner significant savings in both direct revenue and reduced demand for new parking spaces.

Capacity gains can be as high as forty percent, but conservatively assuming a one-third capacity gain, parking for 100 visitor vehicles can be accommodated by 75 valet-controlled spaces, compared to 100 individually accessible spaces. Setting aside 25 fewer spaces for shoppers means roughly 25 more permits that can be offered. At \$125 per permit each month, that’s over \$3,000 in new revenue from existing spaces each month. Compared to a construction cost of \$36,000 per structured space, eliminating the demand for 25 new spaces amounts to nearly \$1 million dollars in savings. Additional savings could be realized if this program were expanded to multiple sites.

**14. Evening Link Service:**

Current service runs until approximately 6:00 PM at a per hour cost of roughly \$77. Existing evening service that runs until 11:00 PM is limited. Assuming that existing evening service runs at about half the cost of full service, the proposed service would amount to a new cost of roughly \$200 per night – approximately \$42,000 for eight months of service.

All parties involved in funding existing service – The City, the DDA, the AATA– have a vested interest in the benefits offered by evening service. All are recommended to be involved in the planning for, and funding of, the service extension.

**15. State Street Area Parking Benefit District Pilot:**

Costs of the program include:

- Roll out of multi-space meters offering electronic and cash payment options – about \$20,000 per machine (this Action is currently planned by the DDA; this recommendation is simply to start installation in the State Street Area, and possibly accelerate the planned roll-out); and
- Added evening meter-enforcement labor costs.

Revenue from the program can be expected from:

- New on-street parking charges (dedicated to new fund) – about \$2.70 per space, per night; and
- Valet fees.

Organizational and legal requirements of this program include:

- The City empowering the DDA to adjust rates in response to parking occupancy, with the policy goal of attaining approximately 85 percent occupancy on most blocks (see Redwood City ordinance in the Appendix); and
- Coordination between the DDA, the State Street Area Association, and the Chamber of Commerce – this will be critical to the success of the pilot. Additional input from the City, the AATA, and the University will be highly beneficial as well.

**17. Complete Information and Wayfinding Campaign:**

No new costs. This program is already funded and in the process of implementation.

**18. Commuter Bus Service:**

The AATA estimates the cost of contracting commuter bus operations at about \$330,000. This is for routes between Downtown and two cities, each running two morning peak and two afternoon peak trips. The contracted buses are highway coaches with high-back seats, reading lights, and overhead storage racks, offering at least 45 seats.

Coordination will be vital to implementing this service as this would be a new type of service for the area. A coordinated effort between the DDA, the University, and the Chamber of Commerce will be crucial to pushing its realization and ensuring that the maximum potential benefit is derived from this investment. None of these parties may have enough incentive on their own to implement such a service, however between the cost savings from reduced demand for new parking spaces for the DDA and the University, the potential to increase AATA's presence in the region, and the marketability of Downtown jobs for the Chamber, there is more than enough collective incentive to work out funding and implementation issues.

**19. Track Technology Investment Opportunities:**

Minimal staff time costs – approximately 32 general staff level hours per year.

**20. Expand Guaranteed Ride Home Program:**

Minimal new cost. Project Team experience indicates that the value of these programs lies in the assurance they offer to participants, and that participants actually rarely take advantage of the ride service. Representatives from the AATA stated that that has been the experience with the existing program so far as well.

**21. Coordinate Park and Ride Improvements:**

Moderate staff hour commitments – approximately 20 general staff level hours per month for four months.

Coordination between the AATA, the DDA, and the Chamber of Commerce will aid in the identification of ideal parking locations, building upon recommendations made in the recently completed “County-Wide Service Plan” completed by Parsons Brinckerhoff. . A group effort to survey employee perceptions of the value of various location options and stop amenities – spaces within a retail center parking lot, specific nearby uses, next/last bus and directional signage, etc. – offer the greatest potential for ridership gains.

**22. Leave Parking Exemptions in Zoning Code:**

No action recommended. No new costs.

**23. Facilitate Shared On-Site Parking:**

No new costs. Incorporated into proposed changes to zoning code ordinances.

**24. Pursue Existing Joint-Development Opportunities:**

No new costs – continuation of on-going efforts.

**25. Continue Seeking Joint Development Opportunities:**

No new costs – continuation of on-going efforts.

**26. Identify Priority Areas:**

Minimal new cost. Coordinated with “Conditions Review” discussed above. Roughly 16 additional general staff level hours for annual review of geographic constraint patterns.

The first step for this Action should be to use Phase I data to identify priority areas of potential expansion. Utilization data for off-street facilities should be updated and tracked using existing technologies to guide decision marking. Updating the calculations of on-street utilization can be completed from the Conditions Review data collection, with minimal staffing requirements.

## **B. Select Short-Term Actions**

### **1. Debit Accounts Replace Monthly Permits:**

Moderate cost.

The DDA has already introduced a “smart” card for parking customers. Interested individuals pay a \$10 deposit for the card and then place however much value they want on the card. At this point there are several dozen out in circulation and many more being requested by phone. .

Transitioning from DDA’s current initiative to a comprehensive “smart” card would be expected to require a moderate financial and staff time investment, since it would be building upon the current process.

### **2. Provide Parking Discount to Networking Sessions Participants:**

Minimal new cost. Discounts are recommended only when market pricing of off-street spaces results in rates that are too high to support local businesses. Discounts, therefore are tied to business development, and would only amount to a reduction of already increased rates, or a limit on new potential revenues from market-rate pricing.

### **3. Summer Link Service:**

Extending day and evening service, as recommended as a Short-Term action above, from an eight-month service to a year-round service would add roughly \$50,000 in service costs.

Funding and coordination for this service would be expected to continue in their current form.

### **4. Formalize In Lieu Fee Option:**

No new costs. Incorporated into proposed changes to zoning ordinances.

This Action will require a change in the City’s Zoning Code. Once established, this is a revenue-positive supply management strategy that shifts parking activity away from dedicated, site-specific inventories and into the shared, public inventory, while producing funds to support implementation of the parking management Toolbox.

### **5. New Parking Requirements:**

- Minimum bicycle parking requirements
- Preferential parking spaces reserved for registered rideshare vehicles
- Car sharing spaces

No new costs.

The minimal space needed to meet these requirements is assumed to have little impact on the appeal of Downtown development opportunities. In the long term, the positive affect on low-impact transportation options could further enhance Downtown's appeal as a uniquely accessible place to live,

Figure 7 below summaries the feasibility factors discussed above and provides a brief review of other factors likely to be involved in the successful implementation of each Action.



**Figure 7 – Actions: Implementation Factors**

Toolbox Actions	New Cost Factors	Preliminary Cost Projections	Key Institutions - Coordination and/or Funding	Other Funding Sources	Self-Funding	Revenue Generator	Basic Performance Measure/s
Parking and Transportation Fund	Financial Structuring	Minimal	DDA, City, and Neighborhood Area Associations	All incremental and new parking-related revenues	No	No	Public improvements, transportation investments
Conditions Review	Staff hours	Minimal	DDA	None Necessary	No	No	On-Street and Off-Street Utilization Efficiencies
Lead by Example	Staff hours	Minimal	City	None Necessary	No	No	City employee SOV commute share
Travel Choice Coordinator Office	Salary - Interns	\$15,000 per intern	City, AATA, DDA, Neighborhood Area Association, and the Chamber of Commerce	Parking and Transportation Fund	No	No	Downtown Employee SOV Mode Share
	Salary - Staff	\$45,000, plus benefits					
Expanded Car Share Program	None	Revenue guarantee	DDA, UM	None Necessary	Yes	Potentially	Revenue, Downtown Employee SOV Mode Share
Discount for Rideshare Vehicles	Lost Parking Revenue	Minimal - More than offset by reduced demand for new spaces	DDA, AATA	None Necessary	No	No	Downtown Employee Rideshare Mode Share

## Recommended Parking Policies and Actions

Maynard Structure Valet	Labor	Moderate	City, DDA, Neighborhood Area Association, and the Chamber of Commerce	None Necessary	Yes	Potentially	Revenue, Evening Off-Street Utilization, Parking Search Traffic
State Street PBD Pilot	New Meters	\$15-20,000 each	DDA	None	Yes	Yes	On-Street Availability and Parking Search Traffic
	Labor - Enforcement	Minimal - Additional enforcement costs offset by additional violation revenue	City, DDA, Neighborhood Area Association, and the Chamber of Commerce	None Necessary	Partial	No	
Evening Link Service	Operating Costs	\$76.53 per service hour	City, DDA, Neighborhood Area Association, and the Chamber of Commerce	AATA, DDA, City, getDowntown, UM, P&T Fund	No	No	Hourly Ridership, Parking Search Traffic
	Capital Costs	No new buses needed.					
Express Commuter Bus Service	Capital and Operating	Capital and Operating - \$330,000 annually for service to two cities	City, DDA, AATA, UM, Chamber of Commerce	Farebox, Parking and Transportation Fund, Federal Programs	Partial	No	Annual Ridership, Reduced Off-Street Midday Parking Demand, Parking Permit Turnover Rates
Track Technology Investments	TCC Office Staff Hours	8 Hours per month, networking and reviewing intern reports.	City, DDA, AATA, UM, Chamber of Commerce	None Necessary	No	No	Increased roll out of new transportation technologies
	TCC Office Intern Hours	8 Hours per week					

## Recommended Parking Policies and Actions

Park and Ride	Next Bus Systems	Moderate - variable	AATA, DDA, Chamber of Commerce	Parking and Transportation Fund	No	No	Annual Ridership, Reduced Off-Street Midday Parking Demand
	Lease Agreements	Moderate - variable		Federal grants			
NMT Programs	Additional Funding	Additional 5% of transportation budget	City	Not Applicable	No	No	Downtown Employee Bike and Pedestrian Mode Shares
Parking Information and Wayfinding	None	On-going, funded program	DDA	None Necessary	No	No	Evening and Weekend Utilization at Structures
Zoning - No Minimums	None	No action	Not necessary	None Necessary	-	-	Increased Private Parking Utilization Rates
Joint-Development Supply Expansion	Space construction	\$36-40K per space	DDA	Parking and Transportation Fund	Yes	Potentially	Midday Utilization, Permit/ Debit Account Wait Lists
Debit Accounts for Commuters	Moderate	Entry gate access systems, staff time for marketing	DDA	None Necessary	No	No	Wait List - 30 Days or Shorter, Short-term Parking Utilization

*Recommended Parking Policies and Actions*

Discount for employees of Travel Choice Networking participants	No new cost	Discounts only go into effect after increased off-street rates	DDA, Chamber of Commerce, City	None Necessary	No	No	Employer retention, office vacancy rates
---	-------------	--	--------------------------------	----------------	----	----	--