

COUNTYWIDE PARKING POLICY STUDY

Executive Summary



COUNTYWIDE PARKING POLICY STUDY
LITERATURE AND REGULATIONS REVIEW

Prepared for the

Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Miami Urbanized Area

by the

Center for Urban Transportation Research
College of Engineering
University of South Florida



December 1994

Center for Urban Transportation Research

University of South Florida
4202 E. Fowler Avenue, ENB 118
Tampa, FL 33620
(813) 974-3120

Director: Gary L. Brosch

Project Manager: John Bradley
Project Director: F. Ron Jones

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Literature Review Summary | 2 |
| Implementation Considerations | 6 |
| Review of Parking Management Technique Experience | 8 |
| Regulations Review | 11 |
| Summary | 15 |

INTRODUCTION

This work is intended as a small data collection and analysis study for future use with a much larger countywide Parking Policy Study to be commissioned by the Metropolitan Planning Organization (Unified Planning Work Program 95, Element 3.02). The purpose of this review study was not to recommend specific parking policies, that is the intent of the larger (and more locally concentrated) comprehensive study. The goal of this study is to present the Metropolitan Planning Organization with information to be used in conjunction with the development of the tasks associated with the larger policy study, which will be to conduct a comprehensive study of parking and recommend a parking policy complementary to development of the adopted Transportation Plan and Comprehensive Development Master Plan. Therefore, this Literature and Regulations Review did not recommend specific parking policies.

One half of this small study involved a literature review in two areas: first, nationally published generalized studies of the effects of various municipal parking policies that have been implemented in other parts of the country; and second, published studies regarding parking or parking-related policies in Florida, including Miami and Dade County. Over 100 books, studies, publications, and articles were reviewed for this study and some 27 items were included in the Final Report (primarily in abstract form) as *Appendix A: Literature Abstracts*. These abstracts were referenced under the seven general questions that this study was assigned to address. An extensive bibliography was also included with the study report.

The other half was a review of parking regulations that have been promulgated by the State of Florida, Dade County, and the municipalities within Dade County. These statutes, ordinances, regulations, and rules have been collected, reviewed, analyzed, and evaluated with respect to development requirements, provision and pricing options of governmental agencies, and direct and indirect effects they may have on the transportation system. The 1993 Florida Statutes were searched for parking-related individual statutes and these were presented in the Final Report as *Appendix B-1: Abstracts of State Parking-Related Statutes*; as were the Dade County Code (*Appendix B-2: Dade County Off-Street Parking Zoning Ordinances*) and the relevant ordinances from the 27 municipalities in the county (*Appendix B-3: Municipal Off-Street Parking Zoning Ordinances*). These statutes and ordinances were discussed along with four previous parking policy studies that had been conducted involving Dade County or Miami. Additionally, a set of municipal parking regulation matrices were developed so that a cross-jurisdictional analysis can

more readily be performed by the follow-on comprehensive countywide parking policy study.

A number of spontaneous interviews were conducted with various parking and transportation officials across the country during the production of this study. Municipal information, memos, and policy data were obtained from Portland, Oregon; Pleasanton and San Francisco, California; Bellevue and Seattle, Washington; and Montgomery County, Maryland. While these sources are not directly quoted in the body of this study, their assistance was greatly appreciated.

LITERATURE REVIEW SUMMARY

Parking is an important and integral element in overall local and regional transportation policy development. Parking issues arise in planning, urban development and redevelopment, economic growth, traffic congestion mitigation, air quality attainment, and other public policy areas. Parking has both long- and short-term impacts in these areas. Parking is fiscally important to many municipalities and metropolitan areas and may be perceived as of economic and marketing importance for developers. The supply of parking spaces can be an expensive proposition for governmental bodies, developers, and employers; paradoxically, parking spaces are often supplied "free" to parking users. Issues regarding parking supply provision, the economics of the parking user market, and equity questions surrounding employer-subsidized employee parking orbit around a central question: *How much parking is enough to satisfy commuters, visitors, shoppers, developers, and public policy objectives and under what terms and conditions should various parking policy strategies be applied?*

This study investigates the literature regarding seven aspects of parking policy and its effects:

1. Parking's role in inducing and sustaining travel related to both pattern and volume, especially with respect to encouraging single-occupant vehicle (SOV) travel;
2. Parking's use as a governmental control for land use and zoning;
3. Parking's purpose in local government revenue generation;

4. Parking's role and function in economic growth and development attractiveness from both public and private sector perspectives;
5. Parking's roles in institutional issues such as development financing and joint development;
6. Parking's place in the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) era of transportation planning, programming, and funding and;
7. How parking management strategies could be considered as a real option to alleviate traffic congestion.

The literature's conclusions about the seven issue questions posed by the Metropolitan Planning Organization are summarized as follows:

1. Parking's role in inducing and sustaining travel related to both pattern and volume, especially with respect to encouraging single-occupant vehicle (SOV) travel.

Parking policy can have profound effects upon single-occupancy vehicle use as a commute mode, and parking pricing policies are the most effective tool in reducing SOV use by commuters. Negative parking policy (quantity restrictions, price increases, parking taxes, etc.) are not efficient, however, if positive commuter mode choice alternatives are not concurrently offered. Parking policy reform must be offered in a "win-win" situational context. Until instruments of parking policy are put into place, it will not be possible to make precise determinations as to actual impacts on the parking user marketplace. An important part of parking policy reform is the monitoring of effects and adjustments for unintended consequences.

2. Parking's use as a governmental control for land use and zoning.

Parking policy can be a tool towards government control of land use and planning programs; however, it is only one tool in the planning toolbox. Past mistakes in the use of zoning regulations to affect parking user demand behavior may make parking reform a "difficult sell"

to political officials, lenders, developers, employers, and commuters. An areawide parking policy education program that includes state, county, and municipal officials; developers, lenders, and employers; public and private sector employees; and other affected parties has the potential to produce the most equitable policy. The development of a consistent and areawide approach to parking issues may result in the most efficient use of land zoned for parking.

3. Parking's purpose in local government revenue generation.

Parking can be an invaluable revenue generation resource; however, some degree of public sector control of the parking market is an obvious prerequisite to such generation. Metered on- and off-street public parking, a parking tax, vigorous enforcement of parking statutes and ordinances, and areawide regulatory authority are potential assets for developing such market control. While political judgements will determine how much control is possible, a clear presentation of the benefits of parking policy reform can make the political decision-making process less controversial economically. For example, by mandating that parking-generated net revenue (after capital costs, implementation and enforcement expenses) be directed towards transit, the citizen is offered a free market choice: to pay for parking and subsidize transit, or use transit and reap the rewards from others' parking payments. In Florida, the purchase of parking is considered as a taxable transaction subject to the (currently) six percent state sales tax. The remittances from parking sales tax collection could be legislatively earmarked for a particular use, such as transit subsidies.

4. Parking's role and function in economic growth and development attractiveness from both public and private sector perspectives.

The role of parking in economic growth and development attractiveness has been one wrapped in myth and a basic lack of communication among the actors involved, resulting in a perpetuation of these myths. Today's economic circumstances have presented the public sector with an opportunity to change the private sector's perceptions regarding parking's role in development attractiveness. Lenders and developers now demand more precise estimates of the actual return on their investments, and the primary focus of the public sector's re-education process must be this one simple fact: there is no such thing as "free" parking. When employers recognize that the

actual cost to them for supplying free parking to their employees can be the same as supplying company-paid health care, employers are much more inclined to assist in public sector parking policy reform. Again, public sector education of the private sector is the key to parking policy cooperation. Therefore, an area for further investigation would be the "marketing" of parking policy reform to the various actors in Dade County. Many metropolitan areas have already faced the situations that Metro-Dade faces now. Some have not come to grips with parking problems. However, those that have seem to have continued to grow and develop through coordinated public/private cooperation.

5. Parking's roles in institutional issues such as development financing and joint development.

Areawide parking policy reform, the education of private sector actors, and intergovernmental cooperation can be used as a focal point for positive approaches to the institutional issues circulating around development financing and economic growth. Other metropolitan areas that have been the core instigators of progressive and comprehensive parking management programs and development policies have not suffered in the least from parking policy reforms. On the contrary, positive quality of life and civic responsibility issues have tended to overcome negative first impressions of parking policy reform strategies. Of particular interest in Dade County should be the future possibilities in public/private joint developments in present and future transit corridors. Parking policy reform offers opportunities to create interest in such developments by making them more attractive to the private sector.

6. Parking's place in the ISTEA era of transportation planning, programming, and funding.

Although the available parking policy literature makes no reference to the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA), there would appear to be opportunities to obtain federal funding for pilot programs under the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program -- in particular peak-period pricing. By placing parking policy reform under the Metro-Dade MPO and using ISTEA funding, start-up TMAs may also be made more attractive to both the public and private sectors. The role of ISTEA in parking policy reform efforts and strategy implementation seems relatively undeveloped and deserves deeper investigation.

7. How parking management strategies could be considered as a real option to alleviate traffic congestion.

Parking management is not the only answer to traffic congestion mitigation. However, parking management strategies are some of the more significant tools in the traffic congestion mitigation toolbox. Parking management strategies include: peak-period pricing, transportation demand management (TDM) programs, and the parking tax. The availability of all of these strategies creates the opportunity to adapt incremental changes geared to specific geographic areas. The larger follow-on policy study should provide sufficient recognition of the importance of each strategy as it may be applied in Dade County. It is important to filter the recommendations that are produced by the larger study through the lens of this literature and regulatory review.

IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

Many parking policy strategies were addressed in the reviewed literature. Included below is a brief outline of the relative effectiveness of these strategies in selected jurisdictions. Success or failure of a particular policy instrument varies with both location and time. Yet, even a "failure" may lead to a more successful follow-on policy in a particular jurisdiction. Additionally, no specific policy instrument will find "success" in every jurisdiction upon every attempted implementation. Economic instruments such as employer cash-out, in-lieu-of fees, parking taxes, peak-period pricing, or impact fees are the most politically difficult to implement. Any and all of these government-induced public parking policy economic instruments (whether incentives or dis-incentives) face various forms of political hurdles. Addressing and overcoming such hurdles requires, from the outset, a recognition that such political hurdles exist; followed by an holistic approach to public parking policy development, implementation and enforcement issues. Sound policy analysis and political pre-positioning during the policy development stage, an effective marketing plan during implementation and enforcement, and accurate identification of (followed by responsible accommodation for) unintended consequences are possibly the only absolutes of parking policy-making. Recent literature reviewed and interviews conducted for this study indicate that the use of singular parking policies as stand-alone strategies is giving way to more integrated approaches, recognizing that parking policy (including economic incentives and dis-incentives) represent but one aspect of transportation planning. However, integrated approaches

require study in three areas: asset inventory and assessment, identification of beneficial policy opportunities, and recognition of the overall policy's political vulnerabilities. As more regional planning coordination takes place in growing metropolitan areas, area-wide parking policy development becomes politically more difficult on one hand (as more actors and issues are identified), and somewhat easier (as policy decision-making becomes less "local") on the other.

Economic instruments, including employer cash-out programs, parking taxes, and in-lieu-of fees, can be important modifiers of parking user behavior. The political question is: *May they be implemented?* Strategic area-wide parking policies that are based on sound research and analysis (and on a well-developed political foundation) are policies that may lead to an integration of parking policy with general transportation and development planning. Identification of all the relevant issues and actors (and their hierarchical roles and individual agenda) is important to the success of parking policy reform.

The strategies and their reported results outlined below were often referenced in the literature that was reviewed for this study and it must be noted that a number of jurisdictions implemented more than one strategy. Many of these metropolitan areas were under specific or general mandates to "do something" regarding air quality attainment or traffic congestion. Some, however, also saw these strategies as ways to improve the local quality of life, and approached the search for effective policy instruments with a positive civic attitude. From the literature, it would appear that those areas that developed the broadest and deepest degrees of public/private cooperation seemed to have the most "success".

REVIEW OF PARKING MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUE EXPERIENCE

| Technique/Location | Reported Results |
|--|--|
| <p>Parking Cap</p> <p>Boston, MA Portland, OR</p> | <p>Not Reviewed Increase Under Study by City</p> |
| <p>Parking Tax (Implemented)</p> <p>Los Angeles, CA San Francisco, CA Toronto, Ontario, CDN Chicago, Il Newark, NJ Baltimore, MD New York City, NY Philadelphia, PA Pittsburgh, PA Washington, DC</p> | <p>Significant revenue generation has been reported from most locations (see TRI-MET <i>Parking Tax Survey Update</i>, in Appendix A of the Final Report). However, no current literature reported on the <u>effects</u> of this policy in these jurisdictions.</p> <p align="center">" "</p> <p align="center">" "</p> <p align="center">" "</p> |
| <p>Parking Tax (Proposed)</p> <p>San Francisco Bay Area, CA Montgomery County, MD Portland, OR Pleasanton, CA State of Washington</p> | <p>Postponed Rejected Under Study Under Consideration Failed</p> |
| <p>Employer Parking Cash-Out</p> <p>Pleasanton, CA</p> | <p>Under Consideration</p> |

REVIEW OF PARKING MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUE EXPERIENCE

(continued from page 8)

| Technique/Location | Reported Results |
|--|---|
| Parking Quantity Reductions for New Developments Schaumburg, IL Austin, TX Boulder, CO Chester County, PA Napierville, IL Port Arthur, IL Skokie, IL Seattle, WA Anne Arundel County, MD Oakland, CA Broome County, NY E. Brunswick, NJ | Not Reported " " " " " " " " " " " " Failed Not Reported " " " " " " |
| Transportation Demand Management Programs Seattle, WA Portland, OR Pleasanton, CA Sacramento, CA Bellevue, WA Los Angeles, CA | Success Success Success Failed Success Failed |
| Peak Period Pricing Madison, WI | Successful, but... |

REVIEW OF PARKING MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUE EXPERIENCE

(continued from page 9)

| Technique/Location | Reported Results |
|---|--|
| Infrastructure Impact Fee Orlando, FL | Failed |
| "Payment-in-Lieu-of" Programs Orlando, FL Mill Valley, CA Burbank, CA Lake Forrest, IL | Failed Not Reported " " " " |

REGULATIONS REVIEW

State Statutes

The State of Florida Statutes directly quantify only the supply of handicapped parking (to meet the federal requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act) and directly enable the enforcement of on-street parking violations. The state assigns primary regulatory power over off-street parking supply provision to the counties (or the applicable metropolitan planning organization) and, to a lesser extent, to the municipalities. Of greater potential importance, however, the state statutes require the implementation of the state sales tax on pay-for parking transactions. Metropolitan planning organizations may attempt to arrange for the legislature to " earmark " that the revenues so generated be directed to transportation.

County and Municipal Parking-Related Zoning Ordinances

The twenty-seven municipalities in metropolitan Dade County are representative of any such area. Each reflects the values of its respective population through its ordinances and regulations. These values are often visible in zoning ordinances that specify parking supply provision conditions for new development. Many of the municipal ordinances address set-backs, landscaping and screening, construction materials, and other aesthetic or mechanical facets of parking supply provision. These ordinances are not included in the scope of this study. Rather, the overall parking policy-reflective ordinances that specify parking stall size, provisions for compact car parking spaces, mixed-use development parking supply totalization methodology, regulatory flexibility, and categorizations of land uses were the study's focal points. These five areas are shown in matrix format in the *Parking Policy Comparison Matrix*, presented in both this Executive Summary (page 14) and as *Matrix C-4* in Appendix C of the Final Report. Representative land-use categorizations, although not included in this Summary, are presented as *Matrix C-6, C-9, C-11, and C-13* in Appendix C of the Final Report.

For this study a simplified matrix construction was chosen because it was virtually impossible to adequately show the variations in categorizations and vocabularies that are in use across jurisdictions. This area of cross-jurisdictional parking policy is ripe for reform. The *Parking Policy Comparison Matrix* was developed to show the similarities and differences in general

parking policies across jurisdictions. The remaining four land-use matrices were developed using artificial categories within land-use sectors. The four sectors are: residential, commercial, industrial, and public. These land-use sector categories are representative as opposed to specific. That is, the land-use sectors and their artificial categories do not necessarily match with any published categorizations of land-use types, and no such specificity is implied.

For the purposes of this study, the details of variations in required parking supply are less important than pointing out that there are inconsistencies and systematic policy differences. These inconsistencies and differences are to be expected in a fragmented jurisdiction such as metropolitan Dade County. However, the similarities across jurisdictions offer opportunities to create common policies. These general parking policy areas include:

1. **STALL SIZE** - Physical parking space size. There are some differences across jurisdictions (range: 8.5ft x 18ft to 10ft x 25ft), and it may be better to leave these physical differences as they are for now. Nevertheless, the various municipalities may wish to add language to their ordinances that offer some size commonality in the future. The "one-size-fits-all" parking stall dimensions of 8.5ft x 18ft, as suggested by Smith and Hekimian (1985) and as used by the County and seven of the municipalities, may be a starting point for discussion regarding cross-jurisdictional dimensional consistency.
2. **COMPACT, TOO?** - Does a municipal parking ordinance include required or optional provision of compact car stall sizes for certain percentages of parking supply provided? Only four municipalities directly allow a mix of smaller compact car parking spaces. The use of compact stalls requires a presumption on the part of zoning administrators that the actual user fleet mix can be accurately estimated. It may be more useful for jurisdictions to adopt the "one-size-fits-all" dimensions.
3. **MIXED USE ADDITIVE?** - Does the ordinance address mixed-use parking supply? A "NO MENTION" in the table simply means the subject is not addressed at all in the jurisdiction's ordinance. While a "YES" indicates that mixed-use site parking provision must be additive. That is, the parking provision requirements for multiple uses must be a cumulative figure derived by adding

together each use's discreet parking requirements to reach the total required at the mixed-use site. However, a "NO" means that wording in the ordinance allows some alternative method in determining total parking provision requirements for mixed-use sites. This is a definite area for progress, as alternatives in provision requirements for mixed-use sites can be a win-win situation for both municipalities and developers. The County and twelve municipalities mandate ("YES") additive mixed-use parking supply provision. Mixed-use sites that use an alternative provision quantity calculation method would be a beneficial cross-jurisdictional policy. It would be economically beneficial to developers and lenders on one hand, and assist in zoning land-use control on the other. Whether elaborate calculations (e.g.: Miami Beach, North Miami Beach) are necessary is questionable and should be open to debate.

4. **FLEXIBLE PROVISIONS?** - Are there some sections of the ordinance that allow for flexibility in the determination of parking space quantities required for land uses or for relief in supply mandates? A "NO MENTION" means that the ordinance makes no comment whatsoever. A "NO" indicates that there is no allowance for flexibility, while a "YES" indicates that there is some section of the ordinance that allows for discretion by planning agencies or relief from mandates. The County and fourteen municipalities had some ordinance provision that could be interpreted as "flexible". Again, this is an area where a countywide policy of flexibility may be cooperatively produced by simply adding wording to all of the municipal ordinance codes that allows for situational determination of parking supply quantities based on land-use, densities, local conditions, transit proximity, etc.
5. **CATEGORIES USED** - How many separate categorizations of land-use types were used in the ordinance that determined the quantity required for each land-use? The quantitative range (0 - 83) was extraordinary. This cross-jurisdictional complication was not helped by the extent of the categorizational vocabulary and additional codified land-use breakdowns that involve zoning districts, specific geographic locations, and even lot size. This represents an area ripe for streamlining, as no matter how many categories are delineated, planners cannot recognize every individual type of land-use.

METROPOLITAN DADE COUNTY PARKING POLICY COMPARISON MATRIX

| CITY | STALL SIZE | COMPACT, TOO? | MIXED USES ADDITIVE? | FLEXIBLE PROVISIONS? | CATEGORIES USED |
|----------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| BAL HARBOUR | 9 or 10 x 19 | NO | YES | NO | 7 |
| BAY HARBOR ISLANDS | 9 x 20 | NO | NO MENTION | NO | 7 |
| BISCAYNE PARK | 8.5 x 18 | NO | NO MENTION | YES | 5 |
| CORAL GABLES | 8.5 x 18 | NO | YES | NO | 33 |
| EL PORTAL | 160 sq.ft.min. | NO | NO | YES | 11 |
| FLORIDA CITY | USE DADE CODE | | | | |
| GOLDEN BEACH | NOT SPEC'D | NOT SPEC'D | NO MENTION | NO MENTION | 1 |
| HIALEAH | 9 x 19 | 7.5 x 16 | NO MENTION | NO | 10 |
| HIALEAH GARDENS | NOT SPEC'D | NOT SPEC'D | YES | NO | 14 |
| HOMESTEAD | 10 x 20 | NO | YES | NO | 18 |
| INDIAN CREEK VILLAGE | NOT SPEC'D | NOT SPEC'D | NO MENTION | NO MENTION | 0 |
| ISLANDIA | NO CODE | | | | 0 |
| KEY BISCAYNE | USE DADE CODE | | | | |
| MEDLEY | USE DADE CODE | | | | |
| MIAMI | NOT SPEC'D | NOT SPEC'D | NO | YES | 7 |
| MIAMI BEACH | 8.5 x 18 | NO | NO | YES | 59 |
| MIAMI SHORES | 10 x 25 max | NO | NO MENTION | NO MENTION | 5 |
| MIAMI SPRINGS | 9 x 19 | NO | YES | YES | 11 |
| NORTH BAY VILLAGE | 10 x 20 | 8 x 16 | NO | YES | 23 |
| NORTH MIAMI | 9 x 18 | NO | YES | YES | 83 |
| NORTH MIAMI BEACH | 9 x 18 | NO | NO | YES | 40 |
| OPA-LOCKA | 10 x 20 | 8 x 17 | YES | YES | 15 |
| SOUTH MIAMI | 9 x 18 | NO | NO | YES | 16 |
| SURFSIDE | 9 x 20 | 8 x 16 | YES | YES | 14 |
| SWEETWATER | 8.5 x 18 | NO | NO MENTION | NO MENTION | 10 |
| VIRGINIA GARDENS | NOT SPEC'D | NOT SPEC'D | NO MENTION | NO MENTION | 10 |
| WEST MIAMI | 10 x 20 | NO | YES | NO MENTION | 6 |
| DADE COUNTY | 8.5 x 18 | NO | YES | YES | 43 |

The *PARKING POLICY COMPARISON MATRIX* shows some of the typical impacts of jurisdictional fragmentation on parking policies across a large metropolitan area. However, it also can be used as a starting point for a program to bring municipal and county policies into harmony. Deeper insight into the differences (and similarities) between jurisdictions is available by comparing the abstracted Dade County and municipal ordinances included in the Final Report as *Appendix B-2* and *Appendix B-3*, respectively.

SUMMARY

Localized parking policy reform by itself may simply chase parking users around the county, never actually helping alleviate areawide congestion or air quality problems. However, areawide parking policy reform combined with intelligent overall transportation policy implementation can be a primary method of efficiently addressing the traffic congestion and air quality dilemmas. Efforts directed at traffic congestion mitigation will likely be less successful if parking policy is excluded than they otherwise could be if areawide parking policy strategies are implemented. While the literature reviewed for this study did not specifically address Dade County's problems, it did represent what other metropolitan areas have done in their attempts to address similar issues. The state statutes leave parking policy up to local jurisdictions or metropolitan planning organizations. The county and municipal ordinances represent a collection of "rules of thumb", "copy-cat" regulations, guesswork, conjecture, and complication.

Nevertheless, there remains the opportunity for the development of an areawide parking policy that may be effectively coordinated with other public policy strategies to address the areawide goals of transportation improvement, air quality enhancement, and economic development.