

From: [Josh Olson](#)
To: [Transportation Commission](#)
Subject: Legistar 82915
Date: Tuesday, May 14, 2024 10:25:19 PM

You don't often get email from jo.olson03@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Hi,

I'm writing in neither support or opposition of this plan. I support BRT and would like the North-South route to face the least path of resistance for approval. I also recognize that "Bus Rapid Transit" has standards that this BRT route would not meet based on the proposed plan.

My main issue with the current proposal is that we are prioritizing around 20 on-street parking spots instead of a bus-only lane. Bus Rapid Transit (and good transit service) relies on dedicated lanes, which this will not have if we prioritize parking.

I read the parking study done by Metro Transit and I'm not convinced. It seems like the parking spots are only used frequently during small portions of the day. BRT would be running practically all day, 4 times an hour (or more). As a bus rider, I think it's important to prioritize this convenience.

As a bike rider, I went to Park Street. It's unsafe, loud, and not friendly to shoppers. Studies have shown that places with better bike and pedestrian infrastructure attract more business. On street parking doesn't solve this, in fact when I used to drive over to the area to go to the restaurants, I specifically parked on the side streets so I would not get sideswiped leaving my car. I witnessed multiple families doing the same thing when I biked over there three weekends ago to assess the situation.

I also observed as Metro did that most of the parking is unoccupied. This was at a point of time during the day and can't be extrapolated, but Metro seemed to come to the same conclusion. The area is significantly underutilized, except for a few spots during a couple hours in the day.

I appreciate Metro explaining the decision it came to in its report. I'll provide my own summary as a bus rider and biker.

1. We should prioritize bus efficiency for a Bus Rapid Transit system. This increases the number of riders that will take the bus, reducing traffic in the City
2. Parking is expensive, the City gets no revenue from the current on-street parking, and maintaining on-street parking to "save small business" is a questionable tactic given how hostile the environment is to shoppers currently. Making the environment better for shoppers (by slowing down the cars) would bring about more commerce and is a better solution
3. In the City we have a recommended hierarchy of traffic needs. It goes peds > bikers > transit > cars > parking. We are explicitly breaking that hierarchy by going with the parking option
4. While this might not be the biggest issue for this area, we set a precedent that we can continue to take away the benefits of transit for many and prioritize private drivers in private vehicles who pay nothing to go to the area. When do these compromises stop? At what point

can we still call it a Bus Rapid Transit system?

For the concerns about residential parking, I think it's a mess that should be reformed. I think a great place to start would be a [Parking Benefit District](#). If the area has spots that are desired by shoppers/employers, the City should make the *public parking spots* (these are not owned by individuals as much as they think they are) revenue generating. They clearly have some value. By enforcing the market rate for parking, you can pump the revenues back into the community with the PBD into what they care about. Neighborhoods in Austin, TX and Pittsburgh, PA are generating over \$200,000 a year by charging the people who don't live in their neighborhood and partake in the luxury of driving and parking in the area (instead of taking the bus, biking, or walking) and as a result they are expanding sidewalk networks significantly or paying for extra police patrols. It's a huge win for the neighbors. We are talking millions of potential investment in less than a decade.

Thank you for considering my comments,
Josh Olson