FOCUS GROUP 1: Centrally-located Stakeholders

Attendees: Michael Metzger – McGrath Properties
Brandon Blaschke – Gebhardt Development
Mike Verveer – Ald District 4
Ledell Zellers – Former Ald District 2
Susan Springman – Mullins Group
Jason Ilstrup – Downtown Madison Inc.
Chris McCahill – State Smart Transportation Initiative
Ben Schmidt – Urban Land Institute
Tanaraa Teal-Tate – UW Madison
Curt Brink -
Kristin Brodowski – City of Madison
Bill Putnam – City of Madison
Noah Lee – City of Madison
Alexis Turner – City of Madison
Tom Lynch – City of Madison

Tom Lynch provided some brief background material which included:

- The findings of a license plate survey on two residential streets.
- The key goals of the resolution authorizing the Madison Ordinance Analysis of Parking Strategies
- A literature review of some current policy papers on the topic of parking.

Tom then facilitated a discussion on parking from the perspective of key stakeholder groups.

Residential Perspective

Dependence

- Some residents feel entitled to on-street parking. One participant shared, "Traditional [*i.e. in-residence homeowners*] neighborhoods and neighborhoods constructed prior to WWII rely on on-street parking."

Shortages

- New developments that are "underparked" or allow residents to opt-out of off-street parking rental, are allowing new residents to take on-street spaces from existing residents. People have a strong aversion to priced parking when there are free alternatives.
- Entertainment venues generate irregular demand for parking and make it difficult for residents to find parking.
- The much of downtown Madison was developed prior to WWII, so residential buildings often do not have off-street parking. As a result, off-street parking opportunities are rare.

Concerns with Existing Policies

- RP3 is seen as an ineffective measure. Participants said the shoulder of enforcement periods do not adequately prevent non-permit holders from taking up space from permit holders.
- Residents living in larger developments are frustrated they are ineligible for RP3. Residents feel penalized for living downtown.
- Residents are unhappy with there not being a parking permit for visitors or service workers (i.e. babysitter, caretakers, etc).
- Some say the fees associated with RP3 are not fair. Residents outside of RP3 parking areas are not charged any fee for street parking.

Employer & Developer Perspective

Employer Demands

- Participants shared an understanding that there is currently more demand for parking, particularly with new office developments. Offices are becoming more densely populated, with more employees per 1000 sq. ft.
- Some employees simply do not want to take the bus. So long as parking is available, driving to work is seen as time-saving and convenient, which tends to outweigh the perceived costs of alternative transport modes.

Interests of Developers

- Mixed-use properties can be cost-saving. Employers/renters that offer synergistic peak hours (e.g. offices operate during the day, restaurants/retail are popular in the evening, and residents park overnight), can allow a single centralized parking structure to meet the development's needs. However, as one participant shared, the demand for parking within multi-use properties is difficult to predict.
- Madison is in competition with other communities, so it is a priority for developers to satisfy the needs and expectations of their employers. If a developer is unwilling to provide the parking a client asks for, the client has the option to take their property out of downtown to peripheral communities.
- Recent RFPs by major employers listed minimum parking requirements. This makes it difficult for downtown developers to respond to these RFPs when there is a limited parking supply.
- Developers are motivated to provide "right size" parking, however see it as difficult to get it right (i.e. building uses change over time, needs assessments are imperfect).
- Property owners do not need to require renting of spaces from tenants, because there is enough demand for the space and they can rent those spaces to others.

Challenges for Parking Regulation

- Banks require adequate parking to finance a project. If the development fails, the lenders want assurance they can re-sell the property to other owners.
- Developers perceive a property without parking as "hard-to-sell."

Blue Sky – What would the perfect arrangement look like?

Efficiency

- All stakeholders are interested in getting people in and out of spaces quickly and efficiently. The current parking climate in downtown Madison is seen as inefficient.
- Participants would like to see parking used as a tool for developing a thriving community, rather than a problem that limits one.

Synergy and Long-term Thinking

- Mixed-use properties, as noted above, can be efficient land-use and an opportunity to reshape the parking problem.
- There is a need for better data to really evaluate and understand the parking needs of specific properties, neighborhoods, and the broader Madison community.
- We need to actively manage expectations around parking. Many drivers feel entitled to free parking and do not recognize the true costs of parking. We need to create new expectations around parking.
- A robust transit system would allow residents, tenants, and employees to feel confident in alternative transportation modes providing access to the downtown.

- Central to this project is the process of answering the question, "Who owns (or who should own) the street?"

FOCUS GROUP 2: Peripherally-located Stakeholders

Attendees: Gary Johnson – UW Health
Keith Furman – Ald District 19
Quin Purkey – UW Research Park
Chris McCahill – State Smart Transportation Initiative
Andrew Van Haren – Gialamas Company
Aris Gialamas – Gialamas Company
Kristin Brodowski – City of Madison
Bill Putnam – City of Madison
Noah Lee – City of Madison
Alexis Turner – City of Madison
Tom Lynch – City of Madison

Residential Perspective

Parking Demand

- Since peripheral areas of Madison were developed post-WWII, the scarcity of off-street parking opportunities is not a problem. Most residential buildings offer some attached off-street parking space.
- There is an increase in density for residential developments. Often, surface parking is not a viable option.
- Out-of-area residents use on-street parking spaces, some to catch buses.

Employer & Developer Perspective

Employer Demands

- Employers want structured parking for their employees, however the market is unwilling to pay for it. One participant shared their frustration with the city's process for assessing TIF funding. They believed the city underestimates the increments that will be generated.
- Like downtown, office spaces in peripheral areas are becoming more compactly staffed. The participants agreed that rather than 3 parking spaces/1000 sq. ft., 4 spaces is seen as the "new minimum"; 4.5 – 5 is common.
- Most employees live in suburbs or adjacent communities, so many employers see free parking as essential.

Interests of Developers

- For employers, the Westside and periphery are seen as more suitable for new offices (i.e. Epic, Exact Sciences), because parking is such an issue for downtown. Therefore, developers that focus in peripheral areas are not necessarily interested in seeing the downtown parking problem get better.

Blue Sky – What would the perfect arrangement look like?

Expectations around Parking

- For the users, when is the cost high enough to promote behavioral change?
- For employers, when is the cost low enough to prevent relocation and maintain Madison's competitiveness?

Transportation Infrastructure

- The city needs to lead in shifting the status quo. By investing in improvements to mobility and access between peripheral communities and Madison, the city will position developers and employers to see alternative transportation modes as a more viable mean of access.
- For developers, over-regulation of parking reduces Madison's competitiveness.
- The city needs to focus on inter-municipal communication and partnerships, to ensure Madison maintains its competitiveness. If parking policy changes similarly between adjacent communities, then it promotes an even playing field.
- Regarding park n rides and transit investments - can regional partnerships ensure that Madison and nearby municipalities share the burden of these investments?