
Date: Tuesday, June 14th, 2016

Attendees:

City of Rochester, Fisher Associates, Project Advisory Committee Members
See attached sign-in sheet.

From:

Sarah Hogan, RLA

Subject: PAC Meeting #3

These notes represent the writer's interpretation of the proceedings of the meeting.
Please notify Fisher Associates of any errors or omissions.

The meeting began at 3:00 with a PowerPoint presentation by Sarah Hogan from Fisher. The presentation began with an outline of the Project Status to Date. The consulting team noted the meeting would be two phases. The first phase would include a summary of the analysis to date including the public survey, parking supply and demand, and the needs and opportunities assessment – SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Strengths). The second phase would include a review of preliminary recommendations developed and solicit feedback from PAC members.

- **Public Survey – Summary of Findings**

- The public survey closed May 1, 2016 and included 464 online responses through Survey Monkey.
- 10 printed responses were collected from the survey boxes distributed in March 2016.
- The prominent mode of travel along the corridor is the automobile followed by walking then cycling and majority of the people are coming to the corridor for dining, bars/entertainment and shopping.
- The survey noted that 50% of users park on-street, 18% park off-street, 27% walk and/or bike, and 3% utilize transit.
- 70% of business owners were interested in shared parking / community lot.
- 50% of business owners were interested in a shuttle service.
- 40% of business owners have considered to expand their business contingent on additional parking.
- 60% of employees noted their employer provides parking.
- 60% of residents indicated they have adequate off-street parking.
- 44% of respondents were NOT satisfied with the current parking/mobility system.
- Majority of respondents are in favor of shared use parking and metered/pay stations were the least desirable solution.
- Meigs Street to I-490 was viewed as the area with the highest difficulty in finding a parking spot.
- Location, personal safety and convenience were the top three concerns with regards to parking location along the corridor.



-
- **On-Street Parking Themes:** Over-built streets, alternating parking on side streets and extensive curb cuts reducing capacity were a few themes outlined from the public survey with regards to the greatest parking and mobility issues.
 - **Off-Street Parking Themes:** Lack of off-street public parking, Alexander Park Garage underutilized for public parking and lack of “safe” off-street parking in close proximity final destination were a few themes outlined from the public survey with regards to the greatest parking and mobility issues.
 - **Signage and Enforcement** were two additional themes that surfaced in the survey with regards to difficulty understanding regulation signs, lack of way-finding signage and inconsistent enforcement.
 - Respondents also noted that snow removal and sidewalk maintenance reduce capacity.
 - More off-street parking, more bicycle lanes/rack and pavement striping to delineate on-street parking placed in the top three of solutions that would enhance parking and mobility in the corridor.
- **Parking Supply and Demand Analysis Summary**
 - It was noted to the PAC members that the baseline capacity number based on the current zoning code was still in progress. Several hurdles were encountered when pulling the parcel information for each property through Bureau of Planning and Zoning. The City was working through this information and was confident that we could obtain this information by our next PAC meeting.
 - Parking supply varies depending on capacity, location and regulations.
 - **Capacity:** The total parking supply within the study area is 5,993 spaces.
 - The following breaks down the Parking Supply number; 1,591 (27%) On-Street parking spaces, 4,402 (73%) Off-Street parking spaces.
 - **Location:** Location of parking within the study area shows the uneven distribution of on-street and off-street parking.
 - It was noted that the Marshall Street sub-area has considerably fewer on-street spaces.
 - Monroe Avenue between Alexander Street and Averill Ave lacks of on-street parking.
 - The Marshall Street and South Goodman Street sub-areas have comparatively higher off-street parking due to the presence of large parking lots (Monroe Square) and the Alexander Park parking garage.
 - The Canterbury Road and Belmont Street sub-areas offer a comparative supply of on-street parking, but a significantly reduced amount of off-street parking.
 - **Regulation:** Across the counting periods the legal supply of on-street and off-street parking is fairly consistent.
 - Regulations that effect supply include alternating parking, time span, and street cleaning regulations.



- Most parking facilities are available at all times of the day and week however, the Alexander Park parking garage closes at night and on weekends. The effect of removing 1,500 spaces from off-street supply is documented in the utilization profiles.
 - Utilization profiles were presented for on-street and off-street for the whole study area and included an example of one sub-area, Canterbury Road and Monroe Avenue. Profiles for additional sub-areas will be outlined in the final report.
 - **On-Street Utilization:** Mike Godfrey noted that for on-street parking, utilization greater than or equal to 85% - 90% is typically viewed as having reached its functional capacity, an established threshold. An optimal range of parking utilization is typically viewed between 10% - 15% below the established threshold. The ideal range for on-street parking utilization is viewed between 70% - 85% for this study.
 - On-street parking utilization is lowest during the weekday daytime.
 - On-street parking utilization is at its highest during the weekend evening time.
 - It was also noted that all on-street parking utilization periods are below the 85% threshold.
 - **Off-Street Utilization:** Mike Godfrey noted that for off-street parking, utilization greater than or equal to 90% is typically viewed as having reached its functional capacity. An optimal range of parking utilization is typically viewed between 10% - 15% below the established threshold. The ideal range for off-street parking utilization is viewed between 75% - 90% for this study.
 - Off street parking suggest higher utilization due to several factors including people parking longer and less turnover.
 - Off-street parking utilization is highest during the weekday daytime.
 - Off-street parking also shows higher demand on Saturday evening and Sunday during the day. This increase in utilization occur at the same time as the Alexander Park parking garage is closed.
 - All off-street parking utilization periods are below the 75%-90% target range.
 - **Land Use:** The two land uses with the highest percentages of off-street parking are 'Office' and 'Public and Office'.
 - Bars and restaurants and mixed-use (which may include bars and restaurants), accounts for 14.5% of supply within the study area. Utilizations were calculated based on land use. For Bars and Restaurants this group does not reach the target range of 70%-85% utilization.
- **SWOT Analysis**
 - A traditional SWOT analysis was presented and highlighted the corridors Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats.
 - **Strengths** included the following examples:
 - Vibrant, eclectic mixed use corridor with adjacent residential neighborhoods



-
- Proximity to City Center and surrounding residential neighborhoods
 - Buildings with historic value and character
 - **Weaknesses** included the following examples:
 - Limited off-street **PUBLIC** parking
 - Unbalanced parking supply and demand
 - Inefficient parking lot layouts and access
 - Excessive travel lanes and lane widths
 - Poor condition of pedestrian infrastructure
 - Access barriers to pedestrian & vehicle circulation around I-490
 - Confusing, inconsistent, and incomplete on-street signage
 - **Opportunities** included the following examples:
 - Existing off-street parking supply
 - Shared use parking lots
 - Infill commercial development and re-establish the Street Wall
 - Technology – support enforcement and provide real time parking availability
 - Lane width reductions (based on volumes)
 - **Threats** included the following examples:
 - Increased traffic congestion - Inner Loop and City Center development
 - Zoning code / parking requirements hinder potential development
 - Cost of infrastructure improvements
- **Needs and Opportunities Assessment** followed the SWOT analysis. An extensive list was developed and included the following examples:
 - **Need:** On-street regulatory signage is confusing, inconsistent, and incomplete
 - **Opportunity:** Clear, consistent, and complete regulations would aid the decisions of those seeking appropriate parking for their needs. Time limit signage that is consistent across the study area would reduce confusion. Alternating parking signage that is more concise, switched fewer times per week, and switched during low-demand periods would provide users greater ease in following the regulation and reduce traffic congestion.
 - **Need:** On-street parking supply and demand is unbalanced
 - **Opportunity:** Adding additional on-street parking capacity would help redistribute demand. Added capacity is possible through a re-evaluation of street geometries and the number of required travel lanes. Shifting on-street demand to underutilized off-street lots would help redistribute demand.
 - **Need:** Parking enforcement is inconsistent
 - **Opportunity:** Improved enforcement can be accomplished through the simplification and consolidation of on-street regulatory signs. Time-limit enforcement can be accomplished through the installation of parking meters and/or smart technology. Shifting enforcement to a customer-



friendly approach that refrains from punishing first-time violators gives parkers an opportunity to learn local regulations.

- **Preliminary recommendations** were developed and further studied. A time frame of short term (1-3 years), mid-term (3-5 years) and long-term (5-10+ years) were defined. The following outlines short, mid and long term recommendation ideas.
- **Short Term Recommendations, 1-3 Years**
 - Install pavement “tick” markings to define on-street spaces
 - Facilitate the creation of shared-parking lots
 - Creation of remote parking and Shuttle Service during peak hours
 - Utilize parking apps for smartphone users (Park Circa, Voice Park)
 - Continue to track utilization progress
 - Expand on-street parking access for ADA accessible spaces
 - Expand availability of Wadsworth Square public parking lot
 - Unbundle parking for multi-family residences
 - Zoning code review and revisions; parking requirements, form based code, incentive zoning, etc
 - Reduce variety of time limit signs and install missing signage
 - Provided wayfinding signage to public parking
 - Provide bus shelters, install seating and Incorporate bike parking facilities at bus stops
 - Provide countdown timers at lighted intersections
 - Repair and delineate existing crosswalks and mid-block crosswalks
 - Provide new crosswalks at midblock intersections
 - Continue efforts to support and incorporate defined bicycle lanes
 - Provide bicycle parking shelters to accommodate bicycle parking
 - Enforcement - shift to customer-friendly approach incremental fines
- **Mid-Term Recommendations, 3-5 Years**
 - Create a neighborhood parking benefit district
 - Establish Monroe Avenue Parking Manager/Committee
 - Residential permit parking in areas of high utilization – Marshall Street and Sumner Park
 - Explore acquisitions of private lots/conversion to public lots
 - Review and adjust travel lane geometry throughout the corridor
 - Review and change alternate parking regulations
 - Review and expand transit frequency
 - Install parking “bump-outs” / curb extensions for pedestrian safety
- **Long Term Recommendations, 5-10+ Years**
 - Expand parking technology
 - Convert existing parking lots to structured or stacked parking
 - Mixed use parking garage - Retail commercial on the bottom, 2-3 level of parking
 - Bridge enhancements at I-490



-
- Explore alternate transit options including a street car that connects City Center to Brighton

The PAC members were then invited to review three concepts that had been conceptually drafted by the consulting team. Three “hot spot” areas were presented and reviewed for potential infill development areas, additional public parking and reconfiguring exiting parking layouts. The concepts focused on re-establishing the street wall with mixed-use development and relocating parking to the rear of the building with an emphasis on accessing these shared parking lots through the side streets. Eliminating curb cuts and parking access from Monroe corridor would help alleviate traffic congestion.

NACTO (National Association of City Transportation Officials) sections were also presented and reviewed during this discussion. The consultant team looked at different street geometries along the corridor where on-street parking and dedicated bicycle lanes could be added.

Finally, Josh Artuso from the City opened up for discussion on the second public meeting where the analysis and preliminary recommendations would be presented. The consultant noted their attendance at the Spokes and Ink festival on June 4th was overwhelming successful with regards to public engagement and feedback. The Park Avenue festival was mentioned as an opportunity to reach out to the broader community to inform and solicit feedback on the preliminary recommendations generated. Joe Bovenzi from Genesee Transportation Council confirmed the festival would be a great opportunity for public outreach efforts.

Comment from PAC/City:

The following comments were noted from PAC/City members throughout the presentation:

- PAC members had a discussion regarding the public perception of parking enforcement versus the efforts of the Bureau of Parking. Enforcement officers are continually in these neighborhoods enforcing regulations. It was noted, however, the difficulty of officers to efficiently enforce time limit signs due to the variety of signs and need to track when a vehicle parked. As a result, time limit enforcement is typically on a call-basis. Bureau of Parking indicated that a person can only receive one (1) ticket within a 24-hour period. Officers are trained to look for those who are using a ticket from a different day in order to park illegally.
- PAC members were surprised that survey respondents who used transit was low (3%). Erik Frisch stated that a bus stop optimization study has been completed recently. The optimization study looked at reducing the number of stops in order to increase efficiency and reduce travel times.
- Alternate parking signage is confusing. Survey respondents indicated difficulty with transitioning late at night (when people arrive home from work) and



- difficulty with people failing to make the transition during the alternating time effectively reducing the travel lane to one lane and increasing traffic congestion. Members of the PAC indicated that residents have asked the signs to be changed to a transition time either earlier or later in the day. MCDOT and Erik Frisch indicated earlier in the day would be difficult to those parking on-street during the day, and later in the day would be difficult for patrons of businesses. MCDOT also indicated that alternating parking signs within this area have changed four (4) times over the past thirty (30) years. The signs currently represent the best configuration/description of regulations and restrictions.
- o As a potential solution to the complexity of alternating parking signs, the City asked the PAC to review a sign from Los Angeles. The sign uses a visual representation of the regulation. The advantages of this sign were discussed: ease of understanding, visual representation of regulations, and color associations with 'No Parking' regulation. The disadvantages of the sign were also discussed: non-conformity with federal and state sign requirements, difficult to read fonts and symbols, and sign pole placement requirements that would require new poles for this type of sign. MCDOT was open to the idea and indicated that New York State DOT approval is needed for any sign that does not meet State/Federal requirements.
 - o Off-street utilization is low across counting periods and across the entire study area. PAC members were surprised to see low utilization for bars/restaurants during peak on-street parking times. High on-street utilization was often adjacent to an off-street lot with low utilization. This unbalanced utilization is due to the off-street parking regulations and restrictions.
 - o PAC members agreed that parking smartphone apps would be beneficial to metered parking and off-street parking facilities. These apps could have an explanation of regulations, and location of available parking and monitor utilization throughout the year.
 - o PAC members discussed the off-street parking utilization findings and the correlation to zoning requirements. The zoning code requirements seem excessive since the utilization rates for off-street parking are very low. These existing off-street parking areas, and off-street parking requirements for new development, greatly limit the potential development.
 - o MCDOT noted that any changes in intersections and road geometries would require a transportation and intersection study to determine load/capacity.



Action Items

- City to explore the Park Avenue festival as a venue for Public Meeting #3
- Coordinate and schedule Public Meeting #3.
- Finalize parking baseline number and provide analysis section.

The foregoing is considered to be a true and accurate record of all items discussed. If any discrepancies or inconsistencies are noted, please contact me immediately.

Thanks for your participation.

Sarah Q. Hogan

Sarah Q. Hogan, RLA
Project Manager

FISHER 
ASSOCIATES
135 Calkins Road, Suite A
Rochester, NY 14623

585.334.1310 ext. 230 (office)
585.704.8103 (mobile)

shogan@fisherassoc.com
www.fisherassoc.com

Sign-In Sheet

PAC Mtg. #3

6.14.16

| Name | Address | E-mail |
|-----------------|--------------|------------------------------|
| Cynthia Martin | Parking | CM1751@cityofrochester.gov |
| Joe Bovenci | GTC | |
| BRENT PENWARDEN | MCDOT | brenwarden@monroe.com.ny.gov |
| Josh Arturo | NBD-Planning | arturoj@cityofrochester.gov |
| DOUG BENSON | " | BENSON00@cityofrochester.gov |
| ERIK FRISCH | DES KENG | Frische@cityofrochester.gov |
| John Thomas | citizen | johntho1@gmail.com |
| Maria Ampule | MAMA | mlempete@gmail.com |

