

PROPOSED RECERTIFICATION OF RESIDENTIAL PERMIT PARKING PROGRAM AREA B1. INTRODUCTION

On May 25, 1993 Title 5 of the Pittsburgh Code Chapter 549, of the Residential Parking Permit Program (R.P.P.P.), section 549.06 was amended so that the Parking Permit Officer (Planning Director) would verify to City Council every four years that affected residents still need and desire the program. This ordinance currently reads that in determining to renew a designated area for the R.P.P.P., the Parking Permit Officer (Planning Director) shall certify the continued existence of the primary impactor on which official designation was based, and certify that seventy percent of households, by petition, survey or combination thereof, still desire participation in the program. Part of this verification includes a briefing of the City Planning Commission prior to submitting verification to City Council.

2. R.P.P.P. DISTRICT

The area to be recertified is Area "B", Central & West Oakland (see map on page 6). This district includes all of Buffalo Street, Chesterfield Road and Feeney Way in West Oakland and is generally bounded by the Boulevard of the Allies (non-inclusive), Halket Street, Forbes Avenue (non-inclusive) Coltart Avenue and Bates Street in Central Oakland.

3. BACKGROUND

Originally, the reason for lack of sufficient legal on-street parking spaces for residents in Central & West Oakland, Area "B" was due to employees to the various Oakland Hospitals and the students and employees going to the University of Pittsburgh which saturated this residential neighborhood with parked vehicles.

The Central & West Oakland residents desired to reduce this volume of non-residential parking on residential streets by establishing a residential parking program as a means of achieving this reduction. Area "B" R.P.P.P. was approved in June of 1983. It was expanded in February of 1991.

4 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Recertification is based on the questionnaire results, parking survey, an analysis of primary impactors, and feedback from community leaders.

The following is a summary with the key points highlighted:

a. QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

**By sending out questionnaires, the R.P.P.P. was able to determine that the majority of Central & West Oakland residents still desired the program. Of the 478 questionnaires sent in 2000, 42 were returned (9%) showing that 83% (13% more than the required criteria and 5% more than the last recertification) who had an opinion were still in favor of the program. The questionnaires showed that only 18% of permit holders, with an opinion, believe the program had created hardships for them, 65% found it easier or the same to park near their homes in the last year, 35% found it more difficult**

- o 76% of the permit holders, with an opinion and lived in the permit area prior to the program implementation, found it very difficult to park near their home prior to the implementation of the program.
- o 71% of the permit holders, with an opinion, are satisfied with the boundaries of the program.
- o 72% are satisfied with hours of the program.
- o 64% are satisfied with enforcement of the program.

The greatest number of complaints was regarding the need for increased enforcement (27 comments), rental units with too many permits (7 comments), need for larger boundaries (5 comments) and extending the program to 24 hours (4 comments). The cost of maintaining the program (office staff, enforcement and supplies) is currently \$673,494. Enforcement costs alone are \$419,137.00. This far exceeds the \$240,000.00 that currently comes in from permit fees. Since the Residential Parking Program does not generate any additional revenue, an increase in enforcement would not be a viable option with the current budget constraints. Under the law we must sell permits to every resident. We check the occupancy of each address to make sure only residents legally living there get a permit. While most people were happy with the boundaries, a few wanted them to expand. However, Area B is surrounded by the University of Pittsburgh to the north, hospitals and RPPP Area D to the east, RPPP Areas E and M to the south and hospitals and Area C to the west. There is nowhere we can expand the district. Extending the hours of the program would only increase the enforcement cost (see comment above). I found it interesting that 5 residents took the time to write that if it wasn't for the Residential Parking Permit Program, they would not be able to park at all.

b. PARKING SURVEY RESULTS

**The Parking Survey Results showed that the program is still needed for Central & West Oakland and was effective in providing at least 16% more spaces in the West Oakland section of Area "B" and 35% more spaces in the Central Oakland section of Area "B" for these residents to park in on the streets surveyed.**

The results of the on-street parking inventory and parking accumulation counts for the summer of 1999 of each street is presented in Table A (page4). Area "B" was surveyed on July 13, 1999. The total spaces available in Area "B" are 310 with 334 permits in use during the 1999 - 2000 permit year. However, this does not take into account the available off street spaces. Only those streets surveyed are included in the chart. Since Buffalo Street and Feeney Way no longer exist, we have taken them off the chart, but those spaces and permits existed when the survey was done.

Table A presents for each block face and for area “B”, the following information:

- o Number of residential parkers on each street.
- o Number of non-residential parkers (without permit or visitor pass) on each street
- o Number of visitor pass parkers on each street.
- o Total number of parkers.
- o Total available spaces for each street.
- o Percentage of resident parkers on each street.
- o Percentage of non-resident parkers (without visitor pass or permit) on each street.
- o Percent of spaces occupied on each street.
- o Percent of spaces occupied on each street prior to the program.
- o Difference between the percent of space occupied on each street prior to the program to the street surveys of the summer of 1999.

As shown on Table A, the total percent of spaces occupied in 1999 was 63%. Of these 25% were non-resident vehicles. Approximately 37% of parking spaces are still available for residents to park in. Before the program over 90% of the spaces were unavailable to the residents.

**As a result of the program, there are 16% more available spaces in West Oakland and 35% more available spaces in Central Oakland. This shows that the Residential Parking Permit Program has definitely worked for the Central & West Oakland, Area “B”.**

c. PRIMARY IMPACTORS

The ordinance requires us to identify that the primary impactors are still in existence. In the questionnaires 10 residents complained that students were parking on the street illegally and another 6 residents complained the hospital workers were parking on their street illegally. **Based on these comments University of Pittsburgh and the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center are still in existence and pose a parking threat to the residents in Area B.**

d. FEEDBACK FROM THE COMMUNITY

**On August 15, 2006, we held a meeting for the Area B and C permit holders. There was agreement that R.P.P. Area “B” be recertified for an additional four years without any changes.**

<b>STREET NAMES</b>	<b>END STREETS</b>	<b>RES. PARKERS</b>	<b>% RES PARKERS</b>	<b>NON-RES. PARKERS</b>	<b>% NON-RES PARKERS</b>	<b>VISITORS' PASSES</b>
Chesterfield Road	Terrace to Fifth	39	67%	11	19%	8
Coltart Avenue	Iroquois to Zulema	33	70%	9	19%	5
Halket Place	Iroquois to Louisa	14	70%	5	25%	1
Halket Street	Iroquois to Zulema	8	31%	15	42%	3
Louisa Street	Coltart to Halket Place	7	63%	1	9%	3
<b>Total</b>		<b>101</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>20</b>

<b>STREET NAMES</b>	<b>END STREETS</b>	<b>TOTAL NO. PARKERS</b>	<b>TOTAL AVAILABLE SPACES</b>	<b>% SPACES OCCUPIED</b>
Chesterfield Road	Terrace to Fifth	58	71	82%
Coltart Avenue	Iroquois to Zulema	47	97	48%
Halket Place	Iroquois to Louisa	20	24	83%
Halket Street	Iroquois to Zulema	26	39	66%
Louisa Street	Coltart to Halket Place	11	27	41%
<b>Total</b>		<b>162</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>63%</b>

<b>SECTIONS</b>	<b>% SPACES OCCUPIED</b>	<b>% SPACES OCCUPIED PRIOR TO THE PROGRAM</b>	<b>% DIFFERENCE</b>
Chesterfield	82%	98%	-16%
Coltart, Halket Place, Halket Street & Louisa	56%	91%	-35%

## 5 RECERTIFICATION

As conclusion, our analysis has shown that, 83%, 13% more then the required criteria of 70% for inclusion into the program, who had an opinion, are still in favor of the program. Second, the Residential Parking Permit for the Central & West Oakland, Area "B", has freed-up at least 63% available spaces for the residents as reflected in 1999 survey, compared with less then 10% of the spaces available before implementation of the program. Third, the primary impactors the Oakland Hospitals and the University of Pittsburgh still pose a danger of their employees, students and visitors using the residential streets for their parking. Last, at a meeting where all the permit holders were invited to attend, there was agreement to recertify area "B" (Central & West Oakland).

**Because of this analysis, it is recommended that R.P.P.P. Area "B" (Central & West Oakland) be recertified.**