Arena South

Parking and Development Transition Strategy
Background

• DASH lots
  – Ownership and management
  – Downtown core shift
  – Future development intent

• Area 1 disposition and Arena Place development
New Parking Supply and Development

- Areas 4 & 5
  - Development status
  - Net parking supply increase
- Potential for additional parking supply in Arena South
- Goals:
  - Create plans for potential or impending displacement
  - Ensure plans support current business and business expansion
Outreach and Engagement

• On-going engagement with Arena South parking customers
• What we’ve heard:
  – Priorities and concerns:
    • Convenience
    • Safety/Security
    • Cost
    • Predictability and certainty (for companies and employees)
  • This is time sensitive!
The Lay of the Land

• Current monthly cards on Areas 4 and 5:
  – 731
    • Diverse range of customers
      – Advantage Sales and Marketing: 103 cards
      – Rockford Development: 91 cards
      – 100 Grandville LLC: 76 cards
      – Friend of the Court: 63 cards
      – ProCare Systems: 54 cards
      – DDM Marketing and Communications: 38 cards
      – Bank of Holland: 29 cards
      – United Way: 27 cards
      – Grand Rapids Community Foundation: 25 cards
      – Broadway Systems: 24 cards
      – 100+ accounts with 1 or 2 cards

• Current monthly cards available in all City owned parking assets Downtown:
  – 810
    • Currently, supply exists within the system to accommodate all Area 4 & 5 customers
    • New approaches and solutions are necessary

• Demand will continue to grow, and new investment is required
Proposed Transition Strategy

• Economic incentives:
  – Transitional relocation pricing structure
    • Close proximity and remote parking
    • First Right of Refusal for relocated customers upon construction of new supply
  – Parking Cash-Out programs for employees
Parking Cash-Out

- Employer paid parking encourages solo driving
- Parking Cash-Out has been shown to decrease parking demand via economic incentive
- Employees make their own commuting choice
- High-quality transit helps decrease demand, but is not a determining factor
### Case Studies

- 1993 – Los Angeles Central Business District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE STUDY LOCATION</th>
<th>DRIVER Pays for Parking</th>
<th>EMPLOYER Pays for Parking</th>
<th>Stimulated Increase in Solo Share</th>
<th>DRIVER Pays for Parking</th>
<th>EMPLOYER Pays for Parking</th>
<th>Stimulated Increase in Auto Trips</th>
<th>Price Elasticity of Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Wilshire, Los Angeles</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>+34%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>+18</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner Center, Los Angeles</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>+44%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>+28</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Century City, Los Angeles</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>+17%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>+14</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Center, Los Angeles</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>+32%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>+28</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Ottawa, Canada</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>+7%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case Studies

- 1993 – Los Angeles Central Business District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRAVEL BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>Driver Pays for Parking</th>
<th>Employer Pays for Parking WITH Cash Option</th>
<th>Employer Pays for Parking WITHOUT Cash Option</th>
<th>Effect of Cash Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solo Driver Share</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled (per Employee per Day)</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled (per Employee per Year)</td>
<td>3,919</td>
<td>4,383</td>
<td>5,230</td>
<td>-847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline Consumed (Gallons per Employee per Year)</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>-50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

Commuters' Responses to the Cash Option for Travel to the Los Angeles Central Business District
## Case Studies

- **1995 – Case Study (Patrick Siegman – Stanford Transportation Analyst)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Location</th>
<th>Scope of Study</th>
<th>Assumed No. of Employees</th>
<th>Financial Incentive per mo. (1995 $'s)</th>
<th>Decrease in Parking Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group A: Areas with little or no public transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Century City District, West Los Angeles</td>
<td>3500 employees surveyed at 100+ firms</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University Ithaca, NY</td>
<td>9000 faculty &amp; staff</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando Valley, Los Angeles</td>
<td>1 large employer (850 employees)</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue, WA</td>
<td>1 medium-sized firm (430 employees)</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weighted Average of Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>13780</td>
<td>46.75</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group B: Areas with fair public transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Civic Center</td>
<td>10000+ employees at several organizations</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Wilshire Blvd., Los Angeles</td>
<td>1 mid-size firm</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington DC Suburbs</td>
<td>5500 employees at 3 worksites</td>
<td>5500</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Los Angeles</td>
<td>5000 employees surveyed at 118 firms</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weighted Average of Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>20930</td>
<td>109.52</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group C: Areas with good public transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington, Seattle Wa.</td>
<td>50,000 faculty, staff &amp; students</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Ottawa, Canada</td>
<td>3500+ government staff</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weighted Average of Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>53500</td>
<td>21.53</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weighted Average Over 3 Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>88210</td>
<td>46.35</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Transition Strategy

• Supply-Side solutions
  – On-Street V.I.P. permit program
  – Specialized business loading zones
  – Conversion of visitor spaces to monthly permits
  – Temporary surface parking options
  – Construction of replacement and new supply in conjunction with new development to drive cost effective solutions

• Critical compliment
  – DASH reconfiguration
Proposed Transition Strategy

• Demand-Side solutions
  – Downtown Employee Transit Pass Program
  – Expanded Park-and-Ride options

• Supplemental services
  – CarShare
  – Car and Van pool programs
  – Uber Business service
  – Private “Parket-place”
Proposed Transition Strategy

- DGRI Mobility Management services
  - Consultation, education, training, surveying, custom plan development

- Parking Services & Downtown Ambassadors
  - Safety escorts
  - Free off-hours shuttling service
Parking Services & DGRI

- On-demand rides
- Safety escorts
Next Steps

• Continue transition plan development with stakeholders
• Maintain consistent and regular communication with stakeholders and customers to monitor progress
• Continue to qualify supply investment opportunities and proceed with viable projects
• Continue to implement mobility options and solutions
• Development and Transition Plan approvals
  – Parking Commission
  – Downtown Development Authority Board
• Questions, comments, suggestions...