Recommended Changes to Citywide Residential Permit Parking Program

These recommendations are provided to the City Council by Public Works to manage the on-street parking in residential areas. Implementing these recommendations will make residential permit parking easier to use for permit holders and non-permit users, create more consistency across all permit parking areas, and help to make enforcement easier. The recommendations require administrative, ordinance, and resolution changes.

Public Works based these recommendations on:

- SRF Consulting Group, Inc. study of permit parking completed in June 2017
- Review of each existing permit parking area
- Community input
  - Survey mailed to permit parking users (781 total responses)
  - Open Saint Paul online survey (354 responses)
  - Meetings with District Councils

What is the Residential Permit Parking Program?

The City of Saint Paul has 27 areas on public city streets called “permit parking areas,” which are managed by the Department of Public Works. The intent of residential permit parking is to provide some on-street parking for residents where there are competing parking demands by nonresidents such as commuters, patrons of colleges, downtown attractions, etc. Each permit parking area is numbered and is designated by signs on the street that state the area number and posted parking restriction. Permits with the area numbered printed on them are available for sale to residents who live within each specific permit area and also to nonresident owners of properties within the specific permit area. The permit must be displayed on the vehicle for the vehicle to be able to park in the area.

There are 4 main types of permits:

- Vehicle permits: stickers placed on rear window of vehicle, have ID # and Area # on them, $15 each, available to residents only
- Visitor permits: placards placed on dashboard of vehicle, have an ID # and Area # on them, address is handwritten on placard, $15 each, available to residents and nonresident owners for maintenance access
- One Day Hang Tags: tags hung on rearview mirror, have an ID # on them, Area # and address are handwritten, date is scratched off day it is used, $1 each, available to residents for their guests for one-day use
- Annual placards for nonprofits: placards placed on dashboard of vehicle, similar to visitor permit, individual limit for each eligible address
**Why was a study done?**
The Residential Permit Program was established in the early 1980s and has never had an extensive review. There was mutual interest between city staff and City Council Offices to make some changes to improve the management of on-street parking, better users’ experiences, streamline the program, and explore the use of new technology, specifically the use of the City’s AMANDA database and License Plate Recognition (LPR) to easily verify if vehicles are part of a permit parking area.

The City Council directed Public Works to conduct a citywide review of its Residential Permit Parking Program to do the following:

- Research best practices from other cities, comparable in size
- Review policy and pricing of all permit types including inconsistencies in the number of permits allowed in each area
- Review misuse of permits
- Provide guidance for city to convert to online system for permit renewals
- Provide guidance on how Police can provide better enforcement
- Provide guidelines for when to establish new permit areas
- Provide performance measures to evaluate existing areas
- Address inconsistent parking regulations between permit areas and within areas

**Overview of study findings**
The study concluded that the existing program is operating sufficiently and that there are no immediate issues that need to be addressed. Rather, some areas could be refined from a user’s perspective internally and externally. The study made recommendations for changes in 3 key areas: Administrative Functions, Enforcement Solutions and Policy Updates. A combination of field observations, public feedback, and research on other cities’ practices were used to address the existing parking program’s needs and opportunities for enhancement.

**Field observations**
Field visits were conducted in all 27 permit areas to see the use of on-street parking by permit holders and others as well as any violations. Steady use and adequate availability of on-street parking in the areas were observed. Based on observations, the residential parking permit areas can be categorized as: Neighborhood Commercial (ex. Grand-Victoria), Entertainment District (ex. Como Park), and Institutional Uses (ex. University of St. Thomas).

**User feedback**
A written survey was mailed to all permit users during the 2015-2016 renewal period. Most responded that they were satisfied with the system as is and thought the areas were needed.
Out of 781 responses, 707 responded, yes, they thought the permit parking was necessary in their area. The 3 categories they would like to see changed in their permit parking area were:

- More enforcement by Police (202 responses or 26%)
- Make signs in the area less confusing (137 responses or 18%)
- Permit quantity allowed (75 responses or 10%)

Public Works also provided an online survey citywide through Open St. Paul. A total of 354 responses were received. The key highlights from the online survey were:

- Permit signs are confusing (43%)
- More enforcement by Police (39%)

**Comparison to other cities**

The study compared St. Paul’s program to the following 6 cities of comparable size, comparing important topics such as petition requirements, policy and procedure for creating a new area, permit limits, permit fees, renewal process and enforcement techniques. The cities are:

- Minneapolis, MN
- Rochester, MN
- Duluth, MN
- Boulder, CO
- Chicago, IL
- Portland, OR

The table below provides a summary and comparison of these categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Enforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Petition</td>
<td>Parking Study Required</td>
<td>Staff Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Paul, Minnesota</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis, Minnesota</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester, Minnesota</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duluth, Minnesota</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder, Colorado</td>
<td>25 Requests</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Illinois</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, Oregon</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This category only represents the number of permits allocated per residential unit. Additional permits may be available for visitors, guests, or service vehicles, etc.

** The number of permits per dwelling unit vary between residential parking permit areas.

*** Permits are limited to the number of residents living in a particular area.
Recommendations for Residential Permit Parking

Administrative Changes

Allow renewals to be done online by creating a database for permit parking through the current AMANDA database.

Providing customers with the ability to renew online would be a huge win from a customer service prospective and a cost savings from the City’s perspective. Currently, almost 3,000 renewal forms are printed and mailed. Public Works currently uses Filemaker Pro and Police Parking Enforcement does not have direct access to permit information to check validity of permits. Traffic Operations is currently working with the Office of Technology and Communications to create an AMANDA database for permit parking and exploring the options for online renewals. Establishing the online renewal system will require additional time and will likely have ongoing maintenance costs.

Update and simplify the residential permit parking signs so that they are easier to understand.

Public Works will be developing a new type of sign that is more distinctive for those unfamiliar with Saint Paul permit parking restrictions. One of the changes to signs will include removal of the “except holidays” language, which appears on permit parking signs in some areas and creates confusion. Replacement of signs would require labor and material costs. Signs will be replaced as changes to areas are made and as ongoing maintenance is required.

Ongoing work with police to make enforcement easier.

“More enforcement by Police” was the top category selected by residents in response to the survey. 5 of the 6 cities reviewed in the SRF Consulting study use License Plate Recognition (LPR) technology to enforce residential permit parking areas. Saint Paul Police Parking Enforcement currently has LPR units in 4 of the vehicles and is pursuing acquiring a 5th one, but are not currently using them for permit parking enforcement.

Implementing LRP for permit parking enforcement requires a permit parking database that is accessible by the police and works with their LPR technology and additional LPR units. Public Works is currently working to create an AMANDA database for permit parking. Based on recent purchases, LPR units are approximately $12,000 each.
Some of the benefits and challenges of LPR are shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>License Plate Recognition Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High success rate of accurately identifying registered license plates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides a more effective means of collecting and analyzing data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking enforcement can cover an area with fewer staff and higher frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost savings can be achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automates the process and eliminates the manual searching for tags or window permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminates the need to produce/print permits (tags or window stickers) for vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate the illegal sales of printed permits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ordinance Changes**

**Revise the City Code to allow more flexibility for residents, who use a car that is not owned by them as their primary vehicle.**

To obtain a vehicle permits, residents must provide proof of residency in the permit area and proof of vehicle ownership as defined in Sec. 164.11 – Issuance of permits. Proving vehicle ownership may be more challenging for individuals who use a car that they do not own including students using a parent’s car, residents who lease a vehicle, and residents who use a company vehicle as their personal vehicle. Public Works recommends amending the ordinance to clarify that these residents would be able to purchase a vehicle permit.

Residents without proof of vehicle ownership would complete a form provided by Public Works and notarized to verify their primary use of the non-owned vehicle. This would be a one-time requirement for each affected vehicle.
Modify the public process requirements for changes initiated by the traffic engineer to allow greater flexibility in making minor adjustments.
Sec. 164.13 – Modification or removal initiated by traffic engineer currently allows the traffic engineer to submit recommended changes to permit areas to the City Council. Currently any changes including the addition of an address or removal of property because its use changes from residential to commercial or the reverse requires a full public hearing and notification process. Allow the traffic engineer to recommend modifications, which add or remove a maximum of five properties, to the City Council to be approved by resolution without a public hearing.

Clarify language in Sec. 164.13 – Modification or removal initiated by traffic engineer about the public process required. Recommendations made by the traffic engineer should require the same public hearing and notification process laid out in Sec. 164.08 and not additional ones.

Clarify language within the City Code to avoid ambiguity or confusion.
Define the terms “petition form” and “petition” in Sec. 164.05 – Petition to distinguish between them, if needed, or use just one of the terms. Currently Sec. 164.05 (b) refers to the fact that every petition form should be accompanied by a non-refundable filing fee. As this now reads, because a petition form is completed by each owner within the permit area, each owner would need to submit the fee as opposed to a single fee for the designation of or change in a permit area.

In Sec. 164.10 – Parking permit guidelines, edit language to reflect current processes and allow some flexibility in the future. Remove the requirement that the vehicle permit is on the “outside” of the vehicle as required in (d)(1) as this allows flexibility in using a sticker that adheres to the inside of a vehicle window. In (d)(2) remove “special event” placards as all placards are visitor ones and remove “special event” permits from Sec. 164.11 (3).

Resolution Changes
Create a master resolution to encompass all existing permit parking areas.
Rolling all the existing resolutions regarding permit parking areas into a single resolution would help clean up existing language and ensure that information about each permit parking area is consistent. A master resolution would allow for the standardization of permit types and numbers to create consistency across all permit areas. This would also help with any future changes to permit areas.
Standardize the permit types—resident vehicle permits are stickers and visitor permits are placards.
One of the goals of revising the program is to standardize the permit type so they are the same for all 27 areas. This is a change for Area 2 and Area 13. Area 2 currently uses transferable placards that look like visitor permits and no vehicle stickers. Area 13 can get any combination of vehicle or visitor permits up to 6 total.

Standardize the number of permits per household—3 vehicle permits and 2 visitor permits per household in all permit areas.
Another goal is to standardize the permit limits so they are the same for all areas. Area 8 can purchase unlimited vehicle and visitor permits. This would actually raise the permit limits for Area 1, Area 2 and Area 3 to match the other area limits. After a review of past 3 years sales data, most residents only purchase some combination of vehicle and visitor permits adding up to a total of 3 permits, so raising the limit for some areas is not likely to mean residents will change their purchasing habits. The recommendation also specifies that the visitor permit limits should now be 2 for Areas 1, 2, 8 and 13.

Standardize the number of nonresident owner visitor permits—2 visitor permits in all permit areas.
In most areas, nonresident owners can purchase 2 visitor permits. Currently, Area 26 can only purchase 1 visitor permit and there is some conflicting information that states that Areas 2, 3 and 13 can purchase area permit limits for visitor permits. For consistency, all areas should be the same.

Make specific changes to permit parking areas to create consistency of time restrictions across the whole area, to the extent possible, to make use and enforcement easier.
See specific area recommended changes for more detail.

Merge specific permit parking areas, specifically around the University of Saint Thomas, to make use and enforcement easier.
See specific area recommended changes for more detail.
Recommendations for Changes to Specific Residential Permit Parking Areas

In addition to the recommendations to enhance the overall permit parking program, Public Works has drafted specific recommendations pertaining to each permit parking area. These recommended changes to existing permit parking areas are a result of the SRF study along with a comprehensive review of each area.

Criteria Used to Determine Specific Area Recommendations
The following benchmarks, which follow the guidelines established in the permit parking ordinance for the creation of a new area, were used to determine whether to keep, modify, or monitor an existing permit area:

1) Minimum area requirements for residential permit parking of 8 contiguous block faces
2) Participation rates of 75% based on the last 3 years of sales data
3) Create more uniformity in the parking restrictions for the area to assist with use and enforcement

Additional information about these benchmarks and how they were determined follows.

Minimum area requirements based on Rules in City Code
The following requirements taken directly from Chapter 164 of the city code were considered as benchmarks for whether or not to keep or monitor an existing permit area for possible removal in the future.

Sec.-164.03.Minimum area requirements for residential permit parking requests.
(a) Requests for the designation of a new residential permit parking area must meet minimum requirements of at least eight (8) contiguous block faces or four thousand (4,000) lineal feet of block frontage. One (1) block face is defined as one (1) side of a street for one (1) block.

The city code was revised in 2011 to increase the minimum size requirement for a new permit parking area. The rationale is that there needs to be at least a several block area size of parking shortage to make creating an area worthwhile.

Participation rates of 75%
The SRF study recommended using the percent of permits sold in an area as criteria for determining whether or not an area should be eliminated. Staff reviewed past 3 years sales data rather than the 1 year reported in the June SRF report. Staff also compared percentage of
properties participating to the 75% requirement for creating a new area, stated partially here from city code:

**Sec. 164.05 Petition**

(b) The petition shall be signed by seventy-five (75) percent of the owners of all tax parcels within the proposed area, with an occupied structure located thereon.

The city code was revised in 2011 to increase the minimum required petition area from 60% to 75% because petitions that were just over 60% created controversy between residents. Since 75% is a clear majority, it shows that residents value the permit parking program and are using it out of necessity.

**Uniformity in Parking Restrictions**

Based on discussions with Police Parking Enforcement staff, the following best practices were considered to create more uniformity in parking restrictions and assist with use and enforcement:

1) Multiple types of parking restrictions, especially within a single area, are confusing and difficult to enforce

2) Limited Time Zones such as 1 or 2 Hour Parking Except by Permit is very difficult to enforce and should be avoided wherever and whenever possible
### Summary of Specific Area Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Description of Changes, if any</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Add 3 individual addresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Add 3 block faces, remove 2 individual addresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Simplify signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Remove 1 block face, simplify signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Change sign restrictions on 2 blocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Merge with Area 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Merge with Area 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Merge with Areas 19 and 20, change sign restrictions on 1 block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Merge with Areas 18 and 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Merge with Areas 18 and 19, change sign restrictions on 2 blocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Add 1 block face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Change sign restrictions on 6 blocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Change sign restriction on partial block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Specific Recommendations for Ward 1’s Residential Permit Parking Areas
Areas 1, 3, 8, 28

Area 1: Selby-Snelling by O’Gara’s and Whole Foods

Recommendation: Keep area, leave as is, but monitor as conditions may change due to redevelopment
Overview of Area: Area 1 has 41 properties, 75 living units and 40 parking spaces.

Reasons to maintain:
1) Although a review of the last 3 years of sales data shows 68% property participation rate, the proximity of this area to a commercial district, the Vintage on Selby Apartments, and the new soccer stadium, could lead to additional parking demands and impact residents.
2) This area was modified in October of 2015 based on changes in area conditions with the Vintage Development and neighborhood input. The “2 Hour Parking, 24 Hours a Day, Except by Permit” restriction was requested by the Union Park District Council as a compromise to residents and area businesses. By design Selby Avenue between Snelling and Saratoga is posted as “2 Hour Parking 7am-8pm” with No Permit Parking Restriction and the east side of Saratoga between Selby and Laurel has no restrictions. The 4 corner properties adjacent to the open parking on Saratoga are eligible to purchase Area 1 permits.
3) If the permit parking restrictions were removed, residents in properties above O’Gara’s, who have no off street parking, may have difficulty finding parking nearby on the public street.
4) If the permit parking restrictions were removed, residents of the Vintage Apartments may opt out of paying to park in their underground ramp and be in competition with area residents.
5) If the permit parking restrictions were removed, commuters may use this area as a refuge to park all day and access bus and light rail.

Area 3: Mitchell Hamline School of Law

Recommendation: Keep area, leave as is, but monitor

Overview of Area: Area 3 has 6 block faces, 2,885 linear feet, 82 properties, 104 living units and 152 parking spaces. It is north of Area 9.
Reasons to consider future removal or modification:

1) We would not create Area 3 today as a new area because it does not meet minimum size requirements of 8 block faces and 4,000 linear feet.
2) A review of last 3 years sales data shows 66% of properties participating which is less than the 75% required to start a new permit area.
3) The parking pressure in Area 3 is the same as the surrounding area north of Summit Avenue.
4) For consistency, consider changing the restrictions on Holly from “1 Hour Parking 2 pm-8:30 pm, Monday-Friday, Except by Permit” to the same posted restriction as rest of area: “No Parking 8am-8pm, Monday-Friday, Except by Permit.”

Area 8: Snelling and Iglehart

**Recommendation:** Keep area, leave as is but monitor as conditions may change with the opening of the soccer stadium

Overview of Area: Area 8 has 5 block faces, 17 properties, and 39 parking spaces.

Reasons to consider future removal:

1) Area 8 does not meet the minimum size requirement of 8 block faces.
2) A review of the last 3 years of sales data shows only 35% of properties are participating.
3) Area 8 is adjacent to a number of limited time zone parking restrictions—making signage in the area confusing and making it more difficult to enforce.

Area 28: St. Paul College

**Recommendation:** Keep area, leave as is, but monitor as conditions may change with opening of Higher Ground Academy

Overview of Area: Area 28 has 14 block faces, 44 properties, 374 living units, and 242 parking spaces.

Reasons to Maintain:

1) Area 28 meets the size requirements and a review of the last 3 years sales data shows a high participation rate of 75%.
2) With 374 living units and 242 parking spaces, there is a potential shortage of available parking for residents.
3) Area 28 is a high parking demand area as it is located south of St. Paul College, north of the St. Paul Cathedral, and west of the Selby-Western commercial node.

4) The majority of the area is posted “No Parking 7am-7 pm, Monday-Friday, Except by Permit.”
Part of Dayton is posted “2 Hour Parking 7am-7pm, Monday-Friday, Except by Permit” to allow short term parking near the cathedral. No changes to these restrictions are proposed.
Specific Recommendations for Ward 2’s Residential Permit Parking Areas
Areas 6, 7, 9, 13, 30

Area 6: Summit and Mulberry

Recommendation: Keep area, leave as is

Overview of Area: Area 6 has 7 block faces, 132 living units, and 87 parking spaces.

Reasons to Maintain:
1) Even though Area 6 does not meet the minimum 8 block size requirement, it is near downtown and the Xcel Energy Center.
2) It is adjacent to Area 28, but not close enough to combine the areas as it is separated from the surrounding areas.
3) 100% of the properties are participating.
4) With 132 living units and 87 parking spaces, there is a potential shortage of available parking for residents.

Area 7: Smith Avenue and West 7th Street

Recommendation: Keep area, modify slightly to adjust the permit area

Overview of Area: Area 7 has 287 living units and 405 parking spaces.

Reasons for Changes:
1) Area 7 is near downtown and parking is impacted by the commercial properties along West 7th St. and the Xcel Energy Center.
2) A review of the last 3 years of sales data shows that 70% of property owners are participating. Some streets such as Forbes have low permit sales, but with new development in the area demand for parking could go up.
3) The current restriction of “No Parking 7am-8 pm Except by Permit” is the only one used for the entire area and is working well.
4) Addresses 445 and 447 Smith Avenue should be removed from Area 7 permit parking because they have been recently redeveloped from single family homes to the Waldmann Brewery. The parking restriction on the west side of Smith between the alley and Goodrich adjacent to the properties should be changed to “2 Hour Parking, 24 hours a day/7 days a week.”
5) Add the block of Goodrich Ave between W 7th and Smith Avenue and the east side of Douglas St from Goodrich to W 7th St to Area 7. Waldmann and Bad Weather Breweries have recently opened and residents have petitioned to be added.

**Area 9: Grand Avenue and Victoria Street**

**Recommendation:** Keep area, simplify signage

Overview of Area: Area 9 has 17 block faces, 431 living units, and 344 parking spaces.

Reasons for Changes:
1) Based on a review of the last 3 years of sales data, the participation rate is 90% of properties.
2) Time restrictions for visitors (non-permit holders) are confusing in Area 9. The current time restriction for most of Area 9 is “No Parking 11am-2am, Except by Permit.” This restriction is confusing because many visitors to adjacent businesses interpret it to read 11pm-2am. The recommendation is to simplify the signage.
3) Create consistency across all permit areas by eliminating the 1 vehicle/1 visitor permit per household for 810-836 Grand Ave, which targets 6 properties arbitrarily.

**Area 13: Irvine Park**

**Recommendation:** Keep area, remove east side of Walnut St between Exchange St and Ryan Park Ave to open up parking near Irvine Park, simplify signage

Overview of Area: Area 13 has 15 block faces, 68 properties, 117 living units, and 142 parking spaces.

Reasons to Maintain:
1) A review of the last 3 years sales data shows participation rate of 87% which is well above the 75% threshold.
2) Area 13 is near the downtown and is impacted by the parking demands of the Xcel Energy Center.
3) There is only one restriction for the entire area. The current restriction is “No Parking Except Holidays Except by Permit.” For simplicity, “Except Holidays” will be dropped when signs are replaced.
Note: Area 13 is immediately adjacent to Area 7 at the intersection of Forbes Ave/Exchange St/Elm St. No changes to posted restrictions are proposed because Area 7 is less restrictive and further from downtown than Area 13.

**Area 30: Shepard Rd Upper Landing**

**Recommendation:** Keep area, leave as is, but monitor as conditions may change

Overview of Area: Area 30 has 15 block faces, 299 living units, and 161 parking spaces.

Reasons to Maintain:

1) Area 30 meets the minimum size requirements and the past 3 years of sales data shows an 83% participation rate.
2) There are 299 living units and 161 parking spaces in the area, so there is a potential shortage of available parking for residents without anyone else parking in the area.
3) The current posted parking restriction for the entire area is “2 Hour Parking 8am-6pm, Monday-Friday, Except Holidays, Except by Permit.” The reason for 2 hour limit is to provide short term parking for nonresident patrons of nearby businesses and access to the river and park facilities.
4) As of the last few years, residents with permits have shared that they are having difficulty finding available parking within the permit area. This area should be monitored for this reason and adjustments may need to be made to address this issue.
Specific Recommendations for Ward 3’s Residential Permit Parking Areas
Areas 12, 21 (small portion of), 25, 27

**Area 12: University of St. Catherine**

**Recommendation:** Keep area, leave as is, but monitor

Overview of Area: Area 12 has 17 block faces, 127 properties, 135 living units, and 314 parking spaces.

Reasons to consider changes:
1) Area 12 meets the size requirements and a review of the last 3 years of sales data shows a participation rate of 74%, which is close to the 75% threshold.
2) Create consistency across areas by making sure the time restrictions are the same—“No Parking 8am-4 pm, Monday-Friday, Except by Permit.” This eliminates the “4-7 pm” restriction on Randolph and the “8am-Noon Sat” restriction for the rest of the area.
3) Remove Palace Ave between Cleveland and Prior from permit parking due to low permit sales (10/15 properties of 67% participation rate) over last 3 years.

**Area 21 (small portion of): Summit and Prior section (East side of University of St. Thomas)**

**Recommendation:** Keep area, leave as is, but monitor

Overview of Area: Area 21 has 7 block faces, 94 properties, 112 living units and 208 parking spaces.

Reason to maintain:
1) Participation rates based on sales data is well over 75%.
2) A few years ago, the entire area of Area 21 successfully petitioned to change the time restrictions to “No Parking, 8am-5pm, Monday-Friday, September 1-April 30, Except Holidays, Except by Permit.” Other than being a lot to say on a sign, the restriction seems to be working well and there are no proposals to change it. The area only needs to be enforced during the school year, which requires less Police enforcement.

**Area 25: Cretin**
**Recommendation: keep area, leave as is, but monitor**

Overview of Area: Area 25 has 11 block faces, 114 properties, 117 parking spaces and 246 parking spaces.

Reasons to consider future removal:
1) A review of last 3 years sales data shows low permit sales with a participation rate of 40%, well below the 75% threshold. Participation is lowest on Hartford Ave with only a handful of properties on the block purchasing any type of permit in the last 3 years.
2) There are currently 3 different and confusing time restrictions that vary by calendar year. Other parking restrictions may be able to achieve the desired parking options.
3) Recommendation Future consideration is to remove the permit area and replace it with parking restrictions. The restriction could be “No Parking 7am-4 pm, Monday-Friday” or “2 Hour Parking, 7am-4 pm, Monday-Friday.” This restriction could be on one side of the street. This restriction has the advantage of preventing the long term student parking, but the disadvantage of preventing the resident from parking long term.

Note: Some neighborhoods near high schools have petitioned for a Limited Time Zone which is a much less restrictive process than permit parking and addresses the parking issues.

**Area 27: Cleveland and Ford Pkwy**

**Recommendation: keep area, leave as is, but monitor**

Overview of Area: Area 27 has 9 block faces, 77 properties/living units, and 188 parking spaces.

Reasons for future removal:
1) A review of last 3 years sales data shows a participation rate of 62%, which is under the 75% threshold. The participation rate is especially low on Finn, Kenneth and Pinehurst east of Kenneth. Removing only those blocks would bring the area under the threshold of 8 block faces minimum.
2) The current restriction for the entire area is “2 Hour Parking 8am-8pm, Except by Permit,” which is more difficult for Police to enforce.
3) The residential area surrounding the Cleveland/Ford Pkwy business node is similar to many other residential commercial nodes in St. Paul, which do not have permit parking near them.
Specific Recommendations for Ward 4’s Residential Permit Parking Areas
Areas 2, 10, 14, 15-24, 26, 29

Area 2: University of Minnesota St. Paul Campus

Recommendation: Keep area, modify slightly by adding a few additional properties, monitor

Overview of Area: Area 2 is a large area, with 469 properties, 685 living units and 1298 parking spaces. It was created to address nonresident issues created by the University of Minnesota St. Paul campus and the State Fair.

Reasons for changes:
1) Add specific addresses 2295 Como, 2124 Como and 2130 Como to Area 2. 2295 Como is a new housing development that has petitioned to be added. Owner of 2214 and 2130 Como has petitioned to be added because their on street parking was removed with the Como Avenue street reconstruction project to provide for on street bike lanes.
2) Change the permit type to match all other areas. This area currently uses only placard type permits rather than the vehicle stickers and visitor placards used in other areas. This change creates consistencies across all areas, eliminates staff time needed to handwrite addresses onto permits, and ensures more privacy for residents because their street address will no longer be displayed.

Area 10: Curfew Street

Recommendation: Keep area, leave as is, but monitor.

Overview of Area: Area 10 has 2 block faces with 23 properties, 37 living units and 40 parking spaces.

Reasons to consider future removal:
1) Does not meet the minimum requirements of 8 block faces.
2) Area is too small for the City to administer permits efficiently, manage parking effectively, and enforce adequately.

Note: Review of the last 3 years of sales data shows the majority of permits were purchased for properties on the east side of the street. If kept, restriction should be removed on west side of street. If street is not sufficiently wide for two sided parking for emergency vehicle access, post “No Parking” on west side.
Area 14: Sherburne Avenue

Recommendation: Keep area, leave as is, but monitor.

Overview of Area: Area 14 has 8 block faces and 85 properties. It was initially created to address parking issues created by auto dealerships along University Avenue.

Reasons to consider future removal:
1) While the area meets the minimum size requirement of 8 block faces, a review of the last 3 years of sales data shows a participation rate of only 41%, which is well below the 75% required for a new petition area.
2) Auto dealerships are no longer an issue in this area.
3) This area is near the LRT Green line, but is no different than any other area near light rail.
1) Current parking restriction is “2 Hour Parking 8am-6 pm, Monday-Friday, Except by Permit” which is more difficult for Police to enforce in a small area.
Areas 15-24: St. Thomas Area

Recommendation: Simplify permit parking around St. Thomas campus. Reconfigure the 10 existing areas into 7 permit areas by combining areas to create a better parking supply to demand ratio, decrease the number of different parking restrictions in each area and make the restrictions for all the areas more uniform and consistent.

Overview of the Areas: The St. Thomas area currently has 10 individual permit parking areas with many different parking restrictions. There has been an increase in the number of multiunit houses, the demand for parking, and reported permit misuse in some of these areas in the last few years. Student housing and parking creates additional complexities in these areas. Note: The SRF study recommended combining all 10 areas into one area. These 10 areas were originally one area (Area 5), but were broken down into 10 separate areas because some residents who lived on one side of the large area would park on the other side to attend classes.

Overall area St. Thomas Area Recommendations

• **Standardize posted time restrictions to “No Parking, 8am-8pm, Mon-Fri, Except by Permit.”** Most of the permit parking areas 15-24 already have this restriction.

  Affected blocks:
  - Selby Avenue between Exeter and Cleveland (1 block, Areas 15)
  - Woodlawn Avenue between Princeton and Goodrich (2 blocks, Area 23)
  - Fairmount Avenue between Woodlawn and Cretin (2 blocks, Area 23)
  - Mount Curve between Princeton and Fairmount (1 block, Area 23)
  - Cleveland between Ashland and Laurel (1 block, Area 18)

• **Explore short term parking on some streets adjacent to the campus to create turnover and encourage long term parkers to use parking lots and ramps.** The recommended time restriction is **“2 Hour Parking, 8am-6pm, Mon-Fri.”** This time restriction was implemented recently on the east side of Cleveland between Summit and Ashland and is working well. This is a limited time zone and does not require permit parking rules to implement.

  Affected block:
  - North side of Summit Avenue between Cretin and Finn (1 blocks, currently unrestricted, approximately 20 spaces)
• **Increase the No Parking restriction on Mississippi River Blvd for better sight lines and safety reasons.** Mississippi River Blvd has a southbound bike lane that makes the street too narrow to allow parking on the east side without a vehicle crossing the centerline. The street width varies between 28’ and 30’ between St. Clair and Marshall. The restriction “No Parking Except by Permit” was installed along properties with access to Mississippi River Blvd so guests could park periodically. Ideally, the entire segment should be posted No Parking, but the exception is understood. Residents along this segment should understand No Parking may be implemented in the future. Residents currently in the system could still purchase permits even with this change.

Affected blocks:
- Mississippi River Blvd from Princeton to Goodrich (1 blocks, Area 23, house numbers 124-186, 27 parking spaces)
- Mississippi River Blvd from house numbers 2241 to 2279, Area 24, 25 parking spaces)
- Mississippi River Blvd from house numbers 73 to 92 (1 block, Area 15, 19 parking spaces)

• **Simplify parking restrictions on Grand Avenue between Cretin Avenue and Cleveland Avenue (2 blocks, Area 22).** There are currently five different types of time restrictions:
  - No Parking, 8am-8pm, Mon-Fri, Except by Permit
  - 15 Minute Parking
  - 1 Hour Parking, 8am-6pm, Mon-Fri, Except by Permit
  - 2 Hour Parking 8am-6pm
  - 1 Hour Parking 8am-6pm

The recommendation is to keep the current restrictions on the west block. Make restrictions on the east block the same as on the south side of the street by adding the north side of the street to permit parking. The east block new restriction on the north side of the street would be “1 Hour Parking 8am-6pm, Mon-Fri, Except by Permit.”
Area 15: Northwest side of University of St. Thomas

Recommendation: Keep area, modify time restrictions

Overview of Area: Area 15 has 16 block faces, 135 properties, 140 living units, and 375 parking spaces.

Reasons for changes:

1) The participation rate in Area 15 is 69%, below the 75% threshold that is desired, but that is because the participation rate is low on portions of Cretin Avenue and Mississippi River Blvd. The participation rate is very high for the remaining streets in Area 15.
2) Area 15 has 2 posted permit parking restrictions: “No Parking 8am-8pm, Monday-Friday, Except by Permit” and “No Parking Except by Permit.” The recommendation is to replace “No Parking Except by Permit” with “No Parking 8am-8pm, Monday-Friday, Except by Permit” on Selby Ave from Exeter to Cretin.
3) No Parking will be added to a small portion of Mississippi River Blvd from house numbers 73 to 92 because the street is too narrow for two sided parking. Residents will still be able to obtain permits.

Area 16 (and Area 17): North side of University of St. Thomas

Recommendation: Keep area, Combine Areas 16 and 17

Overview of Area: Area 16 and Area 17 are both small areas, each with 8 block faces, and high participation. Area 16 has 86 properties, 145 living units and 223 parking spaces. Area 17 has 39 properties, 54 living units and 106 parking spaces.

Reasons for Changes:

1) Combining these areas provides more flexibility for residents to find parking in their area.
2) We are currently allowing some addresses in Area 16 and 17 near Cleveland Avenue to park in either area 16 or 17, which is going well so far.
3) Sales data from Areas 16 and 17 show high participation and that these areas are needed.
4) The majority of both areas posted time restriction is “No Parking, 8am-8pm, Monday-Friday, Except by Permit.” This will remain.
5) The north side of Selby from Cretin to Cleveland is posted, “No Parking Except by Permit.” This will remain.
6) “1 Hour Parking, 8am-8 pm, Monday-Friday, Except by Permit” was installed on Dayton and Wilder about 1 year ago at the time the Cleveland Avenue bike lanes were installed. The intention was to provide customer parking for nearby businesses, who lost parking on Cleveland Ave. It is recommended to keep this restriction.

**Area 17 (and Area 16): North side of University of St. Thomas**

**Recommendation:** Keep area, Combine Areas 16 and 17

See Area 16 for details

**Area 18 (and Area 19 and Area 20): East side of University of St. Thomas**

**Recommendation:** Keep area, Combine Areas 18, 19 and 20

Overview of Area: Area 18 has 12 block faces, 65 properties, 105 living units and 195 parking spaces. Area 19 has 18 block faces, 92 properties, 131 living units and 255 parking spaces. Area 20 has 14 block faces, 71 properties, 96 living units and 227 parking spaces.

**Reasons for Changes:**

1) There is confusion about where residents can park when there are multiple boundaries between abutting areas. By combining Areas 18, 19 and 20, there are fewer boundaries.
2) Combining Areas 18, 19 and Area 20 creates a larger area with more flexibility for the residents to park.
3) Sales data from these areas show that they are needed.
4) The majority of both areas posted time restriction is “No Parking, 8am-8pm, Monday-Friday, Except by Permit.” This will remain.
5) The restriction on both sides of Portland from Cleveland to Moore in Area 20 will be left as “No Parking 8am-8pm, Except by Permit.”
6) “1 Hour Parking, 8am-8 pm, Monday-Friday, Except by Permit” was installed on Laurel and Wilder about 1 year ago at the time the Cleveland Avenue bike lanes were installed. The intention was to provide customer parking for nearby businesses who lost parking on Cleveland Ave. It is recommended to keep this restriction.

**Area 19: East side of University of St. Thomas (and Area 18 and Area 20)**

**Recommendation:** Keep area, Combine with Areas 18 and 20

See Area 18 for details.
Area 20 (and Area 18 and Area 19): East side of University of St. Thomas

Recommendation: Keep area, Combine with Areas 18 and 19

See Area 18 for details.

Area 21: East side of University of St. Thomas

Recommendation: Keep area, leave as is

Overview of Area: Area 21 has 7 block faces, 94 properties, 112 living units and 208 parking spaces.

Reasons to Maintain:
1) Participation rates based on sales data is well over 75%.
2) Area 21 is currently one block less than the required 8 block faces because it lost some block faces to Area 20 a few years ago. Lincoln Avenue between Cretin and Prior is twice as long as a typical block and would count as 4 block faces if two blocks.
3) A few years ago, the entire area of Area 21 successfully petitioned to change the time restrictions to “No Parking, 8am-5pm, Monday-Friday, September 1-April 30, Except Holidays, Except by Permit.” Other than being a lot to say on a sign, the restriction seems to be working well and there are no proposals to change it. The area only needs to be enforced during the school year, which requires less Police enforcement.

Area 22: South side of University of St. Thomas

Recommendation: Keep area, Leave as is, except for adding block of Grand between Finn and Cleveland to permit parking

Overview of Area: Area 22 is a large area with 25 block faces, 162 properties, 355 living units, and 472 parking spaces.

Reasons to Maintain:
1) Area 22 exceeds size requirement of 8 block faces, has a sufficient participation rate of 75%, and a sufficient parking demand to supply ratio.
2) Petitions in recent years have added blocks of Finn to expand the area. This demonstrates that permit parking is needed and beneficial to the residents.
3) The majority of the area has only one time restriction which is “No Parking 8am-8pm, Monday-Friday, Except by Permit.”

4) To create more parking spaces for Grand Avenue residents, the recommendation is to add the north side of Grand Avenue between Finn Avenue and Cleveland Avenue to residential permit parking. The new restriction on the north side of the street will be “1 Hour Parking 8am-6pm, Mon-Fri, Except by Permit.” The restriction on the south side of Grand between Finn and Cleveland is the same.

5) 2124 Grand and 2140 Grand have special restrictions that were imposed on them by the Planning Commission when new housing was constructed. The permits are issued directly to the property manager for distribution. This works well administratively and there are no proposals to change this practice.

6) Installation of bike lanes on Cleveland a few years ago effectively removed parking from 10 additional properties, increasing need for permitted areas.

**Area 23: Southwest side of University of St. Thomas**

**Recommendation: Keep area for now but monitor it, simplify permit time restrictions**

**Overview of Area:** Area 23 has 13 block faces, 84 properties/living units. There are currently four different types of time restrictions:

- “No Parking 8am-8pm, Monday-Friday, Except by Permit”
- “No Parking 8am-9pm, Monday-Friday, Except by Permit”
- “No Parking 8am-9m, Except by Permit”
- “No Parking Except by Permit”

**Reasons for Changes:**

1) Area 23 exceeds size requirement of 8 block faces and has a participation rate of at least 75%.

2) There was speculation that the construction of a new parking ramp for St. Thomas would eliminate the need for this area, but that does not appear to be the case at this time given participation rates.

3) No Parking will be added to a small portion of Mississippi River Blvd from Princeton to Goodrich because the street is too narrow for two sided parking. Residents will still be able to obtain permits.

4) The 4 different types of time restrictions are confusing for users and enforcement. The recommendation is to change the restriction to “No Parking 8am-8pm, Monday-Friday, Except by Permit.” This restriction is the least restrictive and is consistent with the majority of permit parking restrictions around St. Thomas. The impacted streets are the
south side of Goodrich from Woodlawn to Cretin, both sides of Woodlawn from Goodrich to Princeton, both sides of Fairmount from Woodlawn to Cretin and the west side of Mount Curve Blvd from Fairmount to Princeton. Princeton from Mississippi River Blvd to Woodlawn will remain “No Parking Except by Permit.”

Area 24: Northwest side of University of St. Thomas

Recommendation: Keep area, extend No Parking on some stretches

Overview of Area: Area 24 has 2 block faces, 20 properties/living unites, and 105 parking spaces.

Reasons for Changes:
1) A review of the last 3 years sales data for Area 24 shows a participation rate of 90%, which is very high.
2) No Parking will be added to a small portion of Mississippi River Blvd from house numbers 2241 to 2279 because the street is too narrow for two sided parking. Residents will still be able to obtain permits.
Area 26: Snelling Midway

Recommendation: Keep area, eave as is, but monitor as conditions may change due to redevelopment

Overview of Area: Area 26 has 12 block faces, 79 properties, 229 living units, and 203 parking spaces.

Reasons to maintain and monitor:
1) Area 26 meets size requirements.
2) Area 26 is located west of the new soccer stadium site, which could impact parking in the near future.
3) Even though a review of the last 3 years sales data shows a participation rate of 57%, there is the possibility of a shortage of available parking for residents with 229 living units and 203 parking spaces. Some residents might not participate in the permit parking program because they don’t have vehicles and use alternate transportation such as bus, light rail, bicycle or walking.
4) The current restriction for the entire area is “No Parking Noon-4pm, Monday-Friday, Except by Permit” and was designed to prevent all day commuters from parking in the neighborhood. The recommendation is to leave the restriction as is for now. If needed, it could be changed to “No Parking Except by Permit.”

Area 29: Como Zoo

Recommendation: Keep area, leave as is

Overview of Area: Area 29 is a large area immediately west of Como Zoo with 18 block faces, 139 properties, 145 living units and 326 parking spaces.

Reasons to maintain:
1) Area 29 meets size requirements and a review of last 3 years sales shows a participation rate of 70% which is close to the 75% required for new permitted areas.
2) The current restriction for the entire area is “No Parking 10am-4 pm, May 1-September 20, Except by Permit” is working well and no changes are proposed.