

ADDENDUM

Overview

In 2011, Rich and Associates completed the Downtown Grand Forks Parking Study. The comprehensive report included an inventory and review of parking in the downtown, as well as other data collection, stakeholder interviews and surveys. The data collected underwent statistical analysis and survey feedback from user groups. The Study contained 17 specific recommendations that complied with Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) and Urban Land Institute (ULI) standards.

In 2014, a review of this report was undertaken by the Planning & Community Development Department at the request of the Mayor and the Grand Forks City Council. An eight member stakeholder group met over a 6-month period to revisit the original recommendations in light of current conditions. This document is an addendum to the original Study, providing status updates and revisiting the recommendations in the original report based on the 2014 stakeholder review. This document is not meant to stand alone but rather in concert with the original report.

Review Committee:

The following individuals served on the Downtown Parking Study Review Committee.

Bret Weber (Chair) and Doug Christensen – Grand Forks City Council

Bill Palmiscno and Vicki Erickson – Grand Forks School Board

Emily Burkland and Jonathan Holth – Downtown Development Association

Marsha Gunderson – Historic Preservation

Matthew Leiphon – Downtown Resident

Recommendations

- 1) Alleys (page 26): No change in status.

Recommendation: Reaffirmed.

- 2) Lighting (page 27): This is improved in both ramps; however, the corporate ramp should be painted to brighten the lighting.

Recommendation: Staff will incorporate into the parking budget.

3) Encourage bike ridership (page 27): No change in status.

Recommendation: Reaffirmed.

4) Encourage transit ridership (page 31): No change in status.

Recommendation: Reaffirmed.

5) Signage (page 32): The Central Parking Ramp signage was updated after the reconstruction in 2012. In addition, identification signage has been placed on both ramps.

Recommendation: Reaffirmed.

6) Marketing (page 37): No change in status.

Recommendation: Reaffirmed.

7) Parking Duration/Allocation (page 41): No change in status.

Recommendation: Reaffirmed.

8) Special Events Parking Plan (page 45): No change in status. One note was made to include EGF parking information where applicable.

Recommendation: Reaffirmed.

9) Discourage the Development of New Private Parking Lots in the Downtown (page 45): No change in status.

Recommendation: Reaffirmed, including the exception for Central High School.

10) Stripe all on-street parking spaces (page 46): This has been completed.

Recommendation: N/a

11) Parking Enforcement (page 47): Utilize current workforce available but increase use of technology (see recommendation #12).

Recommendation: No increase in staff, but utilize current workforce available.

12) Using Technology (page 48): The study discussed handheld technology. Other technology may be available as well that could make enforcement more efficient.

Recommendation: Reaffirmed, including having the parking fund assist in purchasing the equipment.

13) Anti-shuffling ordinance (page 49): No change in status.

Recommendation: Reaffirmed.

14) Create a sinking fund for maintenance and upgrades to parking lots (page 49): No change in status.

Recommendation: Reaffirmed.

15) Parking Ramps (page 49): No change in status.

Recommendation: Reaffirmed.

16) Parking Assessment Districts (page 56): No change in status.

Recommendation: The recommendations were reaffirmed and Recommendation B had two options. The Form-Based code as shown in 2011 Study was recommended with one change: add an additional exception for Empire Theater as an events center at 0.08 (see below).

All Properties	3.15
Exceptions	
High School/Mission	1/employee + 1/5 students/bed
Hotels/Motels	1.00/room
Residential	1.00/unit (50% Senior)
Church	0.2
Theater	0.15/seat
Warehouse	0.2
Events Center (Empire)	0.08

17) Sale of Central Parking Ramp (page 62): No change in status.

Recommendation: Reaffirmed, this option was considered in 2011 by the Grand Forks School District. The School District is now pursuing other parking options. The report includes information to consider if a new offer is pursued with a different entity.

New Developments

The 2011 Downtown Parking Study provided substantial background on the Parking Supply vs. Demand in Grand Forks. Map 4 of the Study attached below indicates the surplus or deficit by block in the

downtown. Even though some blocks are shown as being deficient the available parking may exist on a neighboring block.

Each new development proposal should be evaluated on whether parking is available for the new development within a reasonable walking distance. In many cases new developments may be expected to provide a combination of on-site parking as well as off-street parking in alternative locations for employees or residents.

The consultant provided a table in which to do this analysis (Table F) in the report. This tool should be implemented as part of a development review process for new proposals in the downtown.