Agenda Item No.	Board Meeting Date	Open/Closed Session	Information/Action Item	Issue Date
10	01/09/12	Open	Information	01/03/12

Subject: Park Pay and Ride Report and Recommendation

ISSUE

Whether or not to expand the Park Pay and Ride (PPR) Program

RECOMMENDED ACTION

None, as a result of this action.

FISCAL IMPACT

Estimated annual revenue of $70,000 to $90,000 for the inclusion of three lots at Mather Mills, Sunrise, and Historic Folsom light rail stations. The future station at Franklin is planned to have over 500 stalls and will generate an estimated $84,000 annually.

DISCUSSION

Staff has provided a report on the status of the Park Pay and Ride (PPR) Program (Attachment 1).

Staff recommends expanding PPR to include Mather Mills, Sunrise, and Historic Folsom over the next year and a half by adding one station at a time over that period. It is further recommended that the new Franklin Light Rail Station when opened be included as a PPR lot.

As noted in Attachment 1, the current PPR program has no measurable impact on ridership. The program was accepted by riders and has not created unforeseen consequences. Inclusion as pay lots has had minimal impacts on the surrounding neighborhoods.

Staff has worked with representatives from the County of Sacramento, the City of Rancho Cordova, and the City of Folsom and discussed details of the program, potential plans, and impact analysis. Their input has been included in reaching the proposed recommendations.

Under CEQA rules, should the Board direct staff to prepare future additions to the Park Pay and Ride Program, staff will prepare an appropriate statutory exemption under Public Resources Code Section 21080(b)(8), finding the imposition of a fee at these stations is necessary to meet operating expenses and provide funds for capital project necessary to maintain service. As such, the fee is exempt from the CEQA.

In addition, should the Board direct staff to prepare future additions, a Title VI analysis will be accomplished prior to returning to the Board.

Approved: Presented:

Final 1/3/12
General Manager/CEO   Chief of Facilities and Business Support Services

Park Pay and Ride (PPR) Update

Summary of the Program Implementation

In 2008, staff sought ways to increase revenue and control costs. One of the initiatives was to explore charging for daily parking at district light rail stations. A study was conducted by Transit Marketing LLC concluding that by charging a $1 per day to park at a light rail station parking fee, ridership would not be affected on the light rail system. Other transit systems were consulted and all but one of the properties was charging or was planning to add parking fees.

In the summer of 2009, the Board authorized a pilot program at Watt I-80, Watt I-80 West and Roseville Road Light Rail Stations, and those receipts were added to RT's budget projections. The pilot program authorized a $1 per day parking fee and a monthly pass of $15. The price point for the monthly fee was based on projected work day furloughs for a number of local agencies. It has since become the media choice for most PPR users.

The three selected pilot lots were prepared for the program including adding parking machines, signs and stall numbers. RT's Marketing department conducted an outreach program at the stations and in the community to alert potential users of the lots of charges. Although there were a few complaints, the implementation went very well and compliance has been very high.

The ordinance, approved by the Board, created a fee structure and hearing process for adjudication of parking citations. 30 plus staff members were trained to write citations. Two staff members were trained to hear and determine initial appeals. Three staff members were trained and certified as hearing officers for the citation program. RT has had few appeals and they have been resolved at the initial step.

At the Board's direction, the program was expanded to include all RT park and ride lots located within the boundaries of the City of Sacramento. By October 1st 2010, Meadowview, Florin and the Power Inn Light Rail Stations' lots were added to the program. RT's success with implementation and compliance was duplicated with these additional lots.

PPR Program Costs Are Low

To date, the PPR program has been implemented and maintained by existing staff. RT has been able to recover the costs of the additional vending equipment within three months of including a lot into the PPR program. As a result, all additional revenue funds have added to RT's operating budget.

Revenue projections for the PPR program has been lower than expected. This is in part the result of 90% of PPR lot users purchasing a monthly discounted pass. Staff's original prediction was that only 60% to 75% of the users would purchase a monthly pass. The attractive pricing model has resulted in its success and has added to overall compliance with the PPR program.

Consequently, because of the high number of monthly passes being sold, related enforcement costs have been reduced. In addition, the daily parking pass vending machines on the platforms are not being used as much as expected, reducing costs related to the maintenance of these machines. Overall costs for the PPR program have been negligible for the initial pilot program and expansion.

Changes In Ridership Patterns

The attached "Park Pay and Ride Analysis" details the impact of the program on parking lot use. The patterns seen with the three pilot PPR lots has continued with the additional lots. Throughout the implementations, staff has used Sunrise and Hazel Light Rail Stations as a base line for analysis of lot use. These lots were chosen because they have had no parking changes and are a distance from existing PPR lots. The Sunrise and Hazel lots are comparable in size to those currently within the program.

Both the Sunrise and Hazel park and ride lots have experienced a reduction in use from -9.8% to -33.2% over the last two years, with an average reduction of use of approximately -19.1%. This change is not unlike the reduction seen at PPR lots where the reduction has been from -19.0 to -28.5%. The average reduction being -22.4% at PPR lots.

While use has been reduced at the PPR lots, we noted increases in the use of adjacent stations. This indicates that riders are still using the system, but may be boarding at a different location. Adding the changes at the adjacent lots to adjust for deflection, we see a change from -3.2% to -18.7% with an average decrease of -12.9%. The increase at the adjacent non-pay park and ride lots has increased an averaged of 58.5%. This behavior change is the key to understanding the impacts of the PPR Program.

The increased use of park and ride lots adjacent to PPR lots suggests a ridership neutral impact (or slightly ridership positive impact) of the PPR program. Conversely, staff would expect a loss in riders without the adjacent non-pay park and ride lots. This parking displacement suggests that it could be beneficial to manage the PPR program to encourage use of the park and ride lots based upon usage and capacity.

Future Expansion of the Program Outside of the City of Sacramento

The RT Board directed staff to meet with staff from the County of Sacramento, City of Rancho Cordova and City of Folsom prior to the inclusion of additional lots into the program. RT staff met with each agency staff on multiple occasions.

Details of the PPR program were shared including the statistics regarding impacts and site plans for each park and ride lot with a focus on those within their jurisdiction. The work included identifying impacts at each of the stations, a list of optional approaches and the expected outcomes.

Staffs from the County of Sacramento and the City of Rancho Cordova were supportive of the PPR program with some concerns about minimizing neighborhood impacts. As previously noted, RT staff remains concerned about implementing at every lot based upon staff's analysis that indicates deflection between the PPR lots to the park and ride lots.

Staff from the City of Folsom does not want to have PPR lots at Glenn (187 spaces) and Iron Point (227 spaces) Light Rail Stations. Unlike other district park and ride lots, these two lots are owned by the City of Folsom. The small lot (98 spaces) at Historic Folsom Light Rail Station is owned by RT. The Iron Point Light Rail Station Park and Ride is a particular problem for the City staff because these lots are full on most weekdays by 7:00 AM.   As a result, riders are allegedly parking their vehicles in the outlet stores parking lot near the Iron Point Light Rail Station. Folsom staff is concerned that the PPR program may create further concerns at these stations.

RT staff has suggested that a potential solution could be to relocate parking use to the Hazel Light Rail Station. This lot has a capacity of 432 but currently has an average daily use of only 80 and 110 cars. Making the Iron Point and/or Glen park and ride lots and/or the Sunrise park and ride lots into to PPR lots, based upon our analysis of the existing PPR lots, would shift parking to the Hazel park and ride lot. The Light Rail service difference between Sunrise and Hazel (15 minute v. 30 minute) is a factor that drives riders to park at the Sunrise park and ride lot.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The RT Board has authorized implementation of the PPR program at additional park and ride lots within the City of Sacramento. In light of the data analysis and input from staff of affected agencies, RT staff recommends that the Board revisit their direction.

Staff does not recommend expanding the PPR program to all park and ride lots located within the City of Sacramento at this time.   The data reflects that by leaving non-pay lots within the system, deflection may be avoided for those who

do not want to pay the nominal parking fee, yet desire to continue to ride light rail. The data shows quite a few riders deflecting to the free lots from the pay lots (see the attached data sheet). Although it cannot be stated definitively that ridership would be affected if all lots were converted to PPR lots, we believe that caution is warranted.

Instead of a full conversion, staff recommends a slow phased implementation, maintaining non-pay park and ride lots that also minimizes neighborhood impacts. Staff recommends that the Board revisit this issue and determine whether or not to add stations to the program based upon the changing circumstances. Over time, staff would expect the pay for parking model to become prevalent at most stations where conditions are appropriate for charging without harming our neighboring communities and businesses.

Staff recommends, at the next phase of PPR program implementation, to include the Sunrise, Mather Mills, Historic Folsom and the future Franklin park and ride lots. Inclusion of these lots will expand the program in a way that appears to be consistent with the objectives defined by the Board of generating additional revenue from parking but avoiding a loss of ridership. As a result, staff requests that the Board approve the attached Resolution to include these stations in the PPR program.

Park Pay and Ride Analysis Feb 2011

	Jan-08 Avg Wk Day	Jan-09 Avg Wk Day			Jan-10 Avg Wk Day		Feb-08 Avg Wk Day	Feb-09 Avg Wk Day			Feb-10 Avg Wk Day		Jun-08 Avg Wk Day	Jun-09 Avg Wk Day			Jun-10 Avg Wk Day	
Watt I-80	22	26	24	18.18%	14	-46%	21	24	23	14.29%	15	-38%	64	26	45	-59.38%	12	-54%
Watt West	137	150	144	9.49%	116	-23%	131	139	135	6.11%	109	-22%	164	142	153	-13.41%	105	-26%
Roseville Rd	809	802	806	-0.87%	604	-25%	754	725	740	-3.85%	580	-20%	917	741	829	-19.19%	533	-28%
Marconi	141	121	131	-14.18%	160	32%	130	120	125	-7.69%	173	44%	143	96	120	-32.87%	167	74%
Swanston	107	120	114	12.15%	119	-1%	105	105	105	0.00%	116	10%	98	104	101	6.12%	112	8%
Arden	40	40	40	0.00%	38	-5%	40	34	37	-15.00%	38	12%	42	43	43	2.38%	36	-16%
Power Inn	190	211	201	11.05%	152	-28%	184	184	184	0.00%	155	-16%	289	221	255	-23.53%	209	-5%
Watt Manlove	237	254	246	7.17%	241	-5%	248	227	238	-8.47%	238	5%	301	229	265	-23.92%	239	4%
Butterfield	109	127	118	16.51%	101	-20%	109	113	111	3.67%	106	-6%	131	112	122	-14.50%	102	-9%
Matherfield	192	158	175	-17.71%	164	4%	185	168	177	-9.19%	171	2%	226	163	195	-27.88%	140	-14%
Cordova Town	20	42	31	110.00%	17	-60%	21	24	23	14.29%	18	-25%	35	21	28	-40.00%	20	-5%
Sunrise	227	321	274	41.41%	293	-9%	276	367	322	32.97%	287	-22%	360	246	303	-31.67%	199	-19%
Hazel	82	100	91	21.95%	75	-25%	66	107	87	62.12%	83	-22%	128	80	104	-37.50%	59	-26%
Iron Point	185	213	199	15.14%	198	-7%	185	206	196	11.35%	197	-4%	213	211	212	-0.94%	164	-22%
Glenn	178	173	176	-2.81%	168	-3%	173	162	168	-6.36%	154	-5%	181	169	175	-6.63%	154	-9%
Sutter St	29	87	58	200.00%	81	-7%	34	78	56	129.41%	90	15%	92	91	92	-1.09%	75	-18%
47th	116	122	119	5.17%	130	7%	110	122	116	10.91%	127	4%	130	130	130	0.00%	112	-14%
Florin	178	209	194	17.42%	156	-25%	179	205	192	14.53%	166	-19%	350	179	265	-48.86%	138	-23%
Meadowview	603	588	596	-2.49%	502	-15%	545	547	546	0.37%	513	-6%	675	558	617	-17.33%	471	-16%
	3602	3864	3733	7.27%	3329	-14%	3496	3657	3577	4.61%	3336	-9%	4539	3562	4051	-22%	3047	-14%

	-244	PPR Lots	-24.9%	-184	PPR Lots -20.7%	-259	PPR Lots -28.5%
	-53	Base Line Lots	-12.6%	-104	Base Line Lots -21.9%	-68	Base Line Lots -20.9%
	-205	PPR w/Adjacent	-18.7%	-131	PPR w/Adjacent -13.0%	-188	PPR w/Adjacent -3.2%
Baseline lots	-28	Sunrise	-9%	-80	Sunrise -22%	-47	Sunrise -19%
Lots adjacent to pay lots	39	Marconi	32%	53	Marconi 44%	71	Marconi 74%
	-25	Hazel	-25%	-24	Hazel -22%	-21	Hazel -26%

	Jul-08 Avg Wk Day	Jul-09 Avg Wk Day			Jul-10 Avg Wk Day		Oct-08 Avg Wk Day	Oct-09 Avg Wk Day			Oct-10 Avg Wk Day		Nov-08 Avg Wk Day	Nov-09 Avg Wk Day			Nov-10 Avg Wk Day	
Watt I-80	38	27	33	-29%	15	-44%	34	22	28	-35%	14	-36%	34	20	27	-41%	17	-15%
Watt West	166	131	149	-21%	115	-12%	140	128	134	-9%	100	-22%	140	113	127	-19%	116	3%
Roseville Rd	910	698	804	-23%	563	-19%	812	686	749	-16%	527	-23%	812	620	716	-24%	482	-22%
Marconi	132	84	108	-36%	177	111%	136	103	120	-24%	167	62%	136	100	118	-26%	150	50%
Swanston	98	94	96	-4%	123	31%	107	102	105	-5%	112	10%	107	91	99	-15%	97	7%
Arden	42	39	41	-7%	35	-10%	37	38	38	3%	35	-8%	37	33	35	-11%	44	33%
Power Inn	243	190	217	-22%	213	12%	224	179	202	-20%	153	-15%	224	132	178	-41%	150	14%
Watt Manlove	325	201	263	-38%	249	24%	297	219	258	-26%	261	19%	277	192	235	-31%	228	19%
Butterfield	129	102	116	-21%	107	5%	113	102	108	-10%	100	-2%	103	89	96	-14%	104	17%
Matherfield	226	146	186	-35%	148	1%	181	166	174	-8%	143	-14%	157	147	152	-6%	120	-18%
Cordova Town	52	20	36	-62%	22	10%	50	21	36	-58%	17	-19%	60	18	39	-70%	37	106%
Sunrise	389	223	306	-43%	197	-12%	374	257	316	-31%	219	-15%	349	307	328	-12%	189	-38%
Hazel	146	72	109	-51%	69	-4%	113	79	96	-30%	62	-22%	97	72	85	-26%	64	-11%
Iron Point	218	199	209	-9%	184	-8%	209	201	205	-4%	179	-11%	202	173	188	-14%	169	-2%
Glenn	182	153	168	-16%	166	8%	176	165	171	-6%	160	-3%	169	141	155	-17%	139	-1%
Sutter St	92	83	88	-10%	91	10%	87	82	85	-6%	78	-5%	79	78	79	-1%	90	15%
47th	156	108	132	-31%	115	6%	128	119	124	-7%	172	45%	121	105	113	-13%	158	50%
Florin	317	156	237	-51%	148	-5%	257	166	212	-35%	102	-39%	218	148	183	-32%	113	-24%
Meadowview	707	492	600	-30%	475	-3%	685	503	594	-27%	426	-15%	547	450	499	-18%	311	-31%
	4568	3218	3893	-30%	3212	0%	4,160	3338	3749	-20%	3027	-9%	3869	3029	3449	-22%	2778	-8%

	-163	PPR Lots	-19.0%	-195	PPR Lots -21.5%	-294	PPR Lots -19.8%
	-29	Base Line Lots	-9.8%	-55	Base Line Lots -16.4%	-126	Base Line Lots -33.2%
	-70	PPR w/Adjacent	17.1%	-245	PPR w/Adjacent -13.9%	-191	PPR w/Adjacent -12.0%
Baseline lots	-26	Sunrise	-12%	-38	Sunrise -15%	-118	Sunrise -38%
Lots adjacent to pay lots	93	Marconi	111%	64	Marconi 62%	50	Marconi 50%
	-3	Hazel	-4%	-17	Hazel -22%	-8	Hazel -11%
				53	47th Street 45%	53	47th Street 50%