



Winooski Parking Management Plan

Project Kickoff Meeting – Advisory Committee January 26, 2021

Welcome

- Introductions
- Project Team
- Role of the Advisory
 Committee



Study segments



Team Structure





Study Goal

Develop tools and analysis to inform <u>how parking regulations</u> can be changed to achieve city **transportation and land use objectives**.

These will include:

- How actual demand compares to parking supply based on observed conditions (data on parking occupancy on key streets)
- Local required minimum parking standards versus national averages
- Scenarios on future parking demand with changes in land use and policy
- Management strategies to respond to changes in land use growth and parking supply



Concepts of Parking and Scope of Work

- Parking concept and shared parking
- Shared Parking analysis methodology
- Parking supply
- Parking demand
- Modeling changes in land use, parking regulations, and transportation policies
- Outreach and public engagement
- Documentation
- Schedule





Developed a TDM and housing cost calculator to help identify how parking costs affect housing affordability

Other relevant work

Citywide transportation master plan



Downtown parking study focused on the city garage

Other relevant research on parking policies (example CarShareVT)



Vehicle Parking

The residents, guests, employees, and customers within any land use is expected to generate a certain amount of vehicle parking. That parking could be offered immediately adjacent to the land use or a point further away requiring a walk.

If individuals have other travel modes available to them that would decrease the amount of vehicle parking associated with that land use.

<u>Best practice guides</u> on the amount of parking that may be necessary to meet user demands come from: Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) and the Urban Land Institute (ULI)



(ITE) Traditional stand- alone land use parking demand. Ignores nearby land uses

(ULI) Parking generation rates and sensitivity for how a collection of land uses may lower net parking supply needed to meet individual land use demands





Shared Parking Concept



Benefiting from land uses that have different times and days of the week in peak parking demands

Key times

- Weekday daytime
- Weekday evening
- Weekend daytime
- Weekend evening



Typical Time of Day Parking Demands





Parking Supply

On-Street

- Identify study streets
- Block by block number of spaces
- Restrictions noted
- Coded into GIS shapefile
- Currently 73 segments



Off-Street

- Address by address estimate of supply of parking
- Field work and desktop
- Create address based polygons in GIS
- Currently 515 parcels





Parking Demand

Decentralized data collection effort using a collection template.

On-Street

- Block by block
- Time of day & date
- Counts of number of vehicles present

Off-Street

- Address by address observation of parking demand
- Time of day & date
- Surveys / outreach / self reporting?

Encourage more observations



Demand vs Supply

- Compare observed parking demand with the parking supply.
- Using the land uses in the study area estimate what the demand would be using national parking models.
- Calibrate the model to match the observed parking demand.

Scenarios

- Vary the land use in the future
- Vary the parking supply
- Vary both land use and parking supply
- Vary pricing and other regulations to lower parking demand



Data Collected So Far

Main Street

Tigan St to Bellevue Street (SB) Bellevue Street to Stevens St (SB) Stevens St to W. Spring St (SB) W. Spring St to Union St (SB) Union St to Maple St (SB) Maple St to Railroad Bridge (SB) Railroad Bridge to Mansion St (NB) Mansion St to Platt St (NB) Platt St to E. Spring St (NB) E. Spring St to Lafountain Street (NB) Lafountain Street to Burling St (NB) Burling St to Bellevue Street (NB) Bellevue Street to Tigan St (NB)



 $0\% \ 10\% \ 20\% \ 30\% \ 40\% \ 50\% \ 60\% \ 70\% \ 80\% \ 90\% \ 100\%$

Weekday AM Weekday PM







Data Collected So Far



Weaver Street







GIS Tool

| 🥞 2) Generate Parking Demand | - | | × |
|--|--------|-----------|--------|
| Parking Lots File (.xlsx) | | | |
| | | 2 | 3 |
| Parking Sheet Name | | | |
| Lots | | | |
| Parking Index Column | | | |
| Lot_UID | | | |
| Generators File (.xlsx) | | | _ |
| | | 6 | 3 |
| Generators Sheet Name | | | - |
| Generators | | | |
| Generators Index Column | | | |
| Location | | | |
| Land Use Demand File (.xlsx) | | | |
| | | 2 | 3 |
| Generator Demand Sheet Name | | | _ |
| LandUse | | | |
| LUC Field Name | | | |
| LUC | | | |
| Adjustment Factors File (.p) | | | |
| | | 6 | 3 |
| Output Eile Felder | | | - |
| | | | |
| | | | 2 |
| Output File Name | | | - |
| spacesLeft_timeseries | | | |
| Create Pickles | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | \sim |
| | | | |
| OK Cancel Environm | ents | Show Help | >> |
| OK Carcer Environm | - norm | onom neip | ~~ |

| Name | Location | LUC | Туре | Size | Unit | EmpUID | ParkingL |
|-------------------------|----------|-----|-----------------------|-------|---------|--------|----------|
| Optometrist | 10482 | 63 | Medical/Dental Office | 3.643 | ksf GFA | 1 | 3;5;2;6; |
| Salon | 10859 | 10 | Retail | 7.176 | ksf GLA | 2 | 3;5;2;6; |
| HOME DEPOT U.S.A., INC. | 11052 | 10 | Retail | 100 | ksf GLA | 3 | 3;6;5;1; |
| WAL-MART STORES, INC. | 11105 | 10 | Retail | 100 | ksf GLA | 4 | 3;5;2;6; |
| | | | | | | | |

RSG developed a GIS based implementation of the ULI Shared Parking methodology that distributes the parking demand from any land use to the nearby parking areas.

The total demand can be compared to the supply of parking using the shared parking data.

Accounts for distances between the land use and parking lot.

Month

T,

December

| | | | | | | Day | weekend 💌 | | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-------------|------------------|----|---------------|-----------------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------------|
| | | | | | | Sum of spaces | Column Labels 🔻 | | | | | | |
| 6 | | Toolb | ОХ | | | Row Labels | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Grand Tota |
| | | 1 | | | | 12:00 AM | 102 | 58 | 316 | 198 | 318 | 215 | 1207 |
| | | Interta | ace | . | ~ | 6:00 AM | 102 | 58 | 293 | 198 | 318 | 215 | 1184 |
| | | | | labular output | OT | 7:00 AM | 102 | 58 | 258 | 198 | 318 | 215 | 1149 |
| | | 1 | | domand for anoth | | 8:00 AM | 102 | 58 | 170 | 198 | 318 | 215 | 1061 |
| | | | | demand for each | | 9:00 AM | 102 | 58 | 0 | 198 | 296 | 215 | 869 |
| | \sim | | | by time of d | | 10:00 AM | 102 | 58 | 0 | 198 | 220 | 140 | 718 |
| | | | | by time of u | ay | 11:00 AM | 102 | 58 | 0 | 198 | 143 | 101 | 602 |
| Show Help > | > | | | | ' | 12:00 PM | 102 | 58 | 0 | 198 | 103 | 41 | 502 |
| | | | | | | 1:00 PM | 102 | 58 | 0 | 198 | 87 | 0 | 445 |
| | | | | | | 2:00 PM | 102 | 58 | 0 | 198 | 20 | 0 | 378 |
| | 0: | 11 | E | Deutsia al ete | | 3:00 PM | 102 | 58 | 0 | 198 | 20 | 0 | 378 |
|) | Size | Unit | Empuld | ParkingLots | | 4:00 PM | 102 | 58 | 0 | 198 | 53 | 0 | 411 |
| al Office | 3.643 | ksf GFA | 1 | 3;5;2;6;1 | | 5:00 PM | 102 | 58 | 0 | 198 | 89 | 6 | 453 |
| il | 7.176 | ksf GLA | 2 | 3;5;2;6;1 | | 6:00 PM | 102 | 58 | 0 | 198 | 114 | 63 | 536 |
| il | 100 | ksf GLA | 3 | 3;6;5;1;4 | | 7:00 PM | 102 | 58 | 0 | 198 | 127 | 92 | 5// |
| 1 | 100 | ksf GLA | 4 | 3;5;2;6;1 | | 8:00 PM | 102 | 58 | 0 | 198 | 186 | 108 | 652 |
| | | | | | | 9:00 PM | 102 | 58 | 0 | 198 | 237 | 173 | 768 |
| | | | | | | 10:00 PM | 102 | 58 | 9 | 198 | 318 | 215 | 900 |
| | | | | | | 11:00 PM | 102 | 58 | 192 | 198 | 318 | 215 | 1083 |
| nputs | s are | land u | se, siz | e, type, | | | | | | | | | |
| | ب ا م | . | أدابير مراد | | | | | | | | | | |

and preferred parking area



Scenarios

- Model effect of changing onstreet parking on Main Street
- Model effect of reducing offstreet parking minimums
- Model effect of increasing the land uses on the study area streets
- Model effect of changing other policies such as pricing, modal integration, resident only, etc.

Run the model with changes in land use and changes in the parking supply

Run the model with changes in land use and keeping the parking supply fixed

Estimate effects of these policies. Then reduce the parking demand factors and run the parking model



Policy and Regulatory Review

- 1. Review and consider changes to current city **parking management strategies** including enforcement, pricing, payment mechanisms, enhancing modal integration, etc.
- 2. Review and consider changes to the city's Municipal Code and Land Development **Regulations** and other related **standards** such as those used by Public Works involving the design, maintenance, zoning requirements on number and management, of parking facilities.
- 3. Identifying how further support of **multimodal transportation planning** through either the local land use regulations or through financial or otherwise, supporting non-car modes could reduce parking demand. No specific modeling will be done for this task, but rather a review of how the application of transportation demand management during the subdivision or site plan process can be applied to reduce the total amount of vehicle parking necessary.
- 4. Other policies, regulations, or investments that the city can change to support shared parking in the city.

The project team will use a review of other resources including adjacent municipalities, local and regional parking studies, case studies from other local governments, previous work carried out by the team, and other professional input to guide the recommendations.





Outreach and Public Engagement



Outreach and Public Engagement

Public

- Project website
- Public comment portion of Advisory Committee meetings
- Surveys

Advisory Committee

- Stakeholders across the city
- Public, landowners, developers, policy
- Meet at critical junctures
- Assist with data collection as appropriate

Technical Committee

- Guiding the project and decision making
- Day to day contact and feedback
- Monthly meetings
- Assist with technical aspects of the study



Advisory Committee Input

Current

- What challenges do face regarding parking?
- What opportunities exist to improve parking experience?

Future

- What challenges do you think will emerge?
- What opportunities do we have to reimagine how parking is managed?

Follow up after tonight

- Additional data collection
- Survey on where people are parking







Schedule

| Tasks | 2020 | | | | | | | |
|--|------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Ν | D | J | F | М | Α | М | J |
| Existing Supply | | | | | | | | |
| Existing Demand | | | | | | | | |
| Build Model | | | | | | | | |
| Collect Data | | | | | | | | |
| Calibration | | | | | | | | |
| Scenarios (future land use and supply) | | | | | | | | |
| Regulations and Policy | | | | | | | | |
| Documentation and Presentations | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | 0 |



Schedule

| | Scheduled Deliverable Timeline |
|---|--|
| Existing Supply | End of January 2020 |
| Existing Demand | |
| Build Model | End of January |
| Collect Data | End of February |
| Calibration | Mid-March |
| Scenarios (future land use and supply) | End of April |
| Regulations and Policy | End of April |
| Documentation and Presentations | |
| Kickoff Mtg | Mid-Jan |
| Technical Team Mtg | end-Feb, mid-March, mid-April, mid-May, mid- June |
| Advisory Committee / Public Meetings | January, March, May, June |





DESMAN

Jonathan Slason

Director Jonathan.slason@rsginc.com

Andy Hill

Director of Consulting Services President of New England Parking Council ahill@desman.com