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Executive Summary

Walker Consultants (“Walker”) was engaged by the Village of Spring Lake, Michigan (“Spring Lake” and/or “Village”) to perform a parking study (“Study”) for the downtown in Spring Lake, Michigan.

The Spring Lake Central Business District is a mix of businesses, services, and recreational and entertainment uses. With recent growth in business activity and regional tourism appeal, Spring Lake seeks a parking study to assess current and future conditions and ensure that public parking needs are being met.

Our primary task in the Study is to numerically identify and quantify current parking conditions, assess supply/demand alternatives and management opportunities for the Village, and consider improvements that offer users a higher quality of service, create the necessary parking turnover and space availability to support businesses, and meet the needs of employees and long-term users.

Our work process is divided into three primary Study areas:

1. Parking Supply/Demand Analysis
2. Future Conditions
3. Recommendations
Walker conducted field surveys on Thursday October 01, 2020 and Friday October 02, 2020 to inventory the existing parking supply, evaluate utilization patterns occurring across a typical weekday and weekend, and quantify existing supply/demand conditions.¹

In our field surveys, Walker observed and documented the following conditions, which form the basis of our supply/demand analysis:

- Overall, there is ample space availability across the CBD with approximately 1,238 ± private and public spaces serving existing Village businesses;
- Approximately 64 percent of the total inventory is privately-held off-street parking for business users, 36 percent of the space inventory is publically-owned and available (446 surface lot and on street spaces);
- Three occupancy space counts were performed occurring: Thursday (2 p.m.), Friday (10 a.m.), and Friday (6 p.m.) with a peak total occupancy recorded during Friday morning;
- System wide, occupancies peaked across the Friday morning hour of 10 a.m., when 363 of the existing 1,238 total spaces (or 29 percent) were recorded occupied, indicating a large surplus of parking spaces throughout the downtown, publically-available spaces had a 38 percent occupancy at the peak-hour (with 171 of the existing 446 publically-available spaces recorded occupied) with over 270 public spaces vacant across the study area;
- Parking "hot-spots" exist at two public lots in the CBD core area ("Stan’s Lot" and “Dollar General Lot”) with occupancies of 65 and 68 percent respectively, but with spaces still available across the peak daytime hour surveyed;
- Across the central business district periphery, high space vacancy exists with many lots below 50 percent occupancy;
- Low walking tolerances and pedestrian access challenges shaped by state highway M-104 inhibit greater use of public parking stalls “north of M-104” which have high rates of vacancy; and
- Opportunities for shared parking usage exist with ample private lot space vacancy and lower-utilization facilities “south of M-104” at local area church lots, e.g. Harvest Chapel Lot and First Baptist Lot, the Barber School Lot, and others, during peak weekday and weekend evening hours.

¹ Note, our supply/demand survey occurred in early October 2020. While Covid-19 has impacted the local economy, the businesses observed within the study area were noted open to the public at the time of our field survey. Many services and restaurants had normalized operations, with several business owners confirming this during the time of our stakeholder outreach. The only notable user absent from this survey is the music/entertainment venue Seven Steps Up, still closed for concerts as of Fall 2020. We believe that the occupancies observed are representative of typical weekday and weekend parking conditions across the Village of Spring Lake central business district.
Based on the field data collected, stakeholder interviews and the survey administered, and our extensive experience with parking policies across downtown districts nationwide, we advocate the Village pursue the following recommendations to manage the parking issues observed. These recommendations, explored in greater detail in the “Recommendations” section of this report, are summarized as follows:

1. Implement an employee parking strategy that would assign employees to parking lots intended for long-term vehicle storage; move employee-owned vehicles from short-term, on-street spaces to more remote off-street spaces or remote on-street locations
2. Pursue shared parking agreements between the public and private sectors and assign employees to use these parking locations at no charge
3. Perform quarterly parking space occupancy studies, communicate the results of these studies to stakeholders, and solicit stakeholder feedback
4. Improve existing downtown parking wayfinding and signage
5. Add a parking resource page to the Village/DDA website
6. Improve pedestrian access and safety challenges to promote greater downtown walkability
7. Add bike parking areas to enhance downtown non-motorized mobility access
8. Evaluate the creation of a short-term, fifteen-minute parking space for food and beverage services along Savidge Street
9. Form a parking advisory committee

We believe that the parking management recommendations cited above will address “hot-spot” challenges, satisfy stakeholder and user needs, and ensure that the Village is deriving maximal benefits from its existing parking resources. The following figure provides a summary of study recommendations and an opinion on implementation timescale and probable costs anticipated.

Figure 1: Implementation and Probable Costs Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1: Implement an employee parking strategy</td>
<td>1. Implement an employee parking strategy that would assign employees to parking lots intended for long-term vehicle storage away from convenient spaces intended for customer use; move employee-owned vehicles from short-term, on-street spaces to more remote off-street spaces or remote on-street locations.</td>
<td>FY ’20-’22</td>
<td>No initial direct costs anticipated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2: Pursue shared parking agreements</td>
<td>1. Pursue shared parking agreements between the public and private sectors and assign employees to use these parking locations at no charge. Harvest Chapel lot and First Baptist lot remain viable candidates for shared use agreements since</td>
<td>FY ’20-’22</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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weekday daytime and evening occupancies remain low. Appendix C provides a shared parking agreement sample template. Monetary costs TBD.

| R3: Perform quarterly parking space occupancy studies | 1. Perform quarterly parking space occupancy studies, communicate the results of these studies to stakeholders, and solicit stakeholder feedback to evaluate the efficacy of the employee parking strategy. | FY ’20-’24 | Nominal costs |
| R4: Improve existing downtown parking wayfinding and signage | 1. Vehicular directional signage and facility identification sign packages should be installed to direct motorists to available public parking assets.  
2. At a minimum we recommend core business district lots (“Dollar General” and “Stan’s Lot” be named and signed with directional wayfinding signage posted along Savidge Street and facilities signed at ingress/egress locations. | FY ’20-’22 | $-$ $ |
| R5: Create a downtown parking resource page off the Village/DDA website | 1. The Village has an opportunity to collaborate with local downtown partners to create a downtown parking webpage that is attractive, customer-friendly and integrative with other social media tools. | FY ’20-’22 | $ |
| R6: Address pedestrian access and safety challenges, promote greater Downtown walkability | 1. Maintaining the existing sidewalk network to enhance pedestrian connectivity;  
2. Adding street plantings and trees to offer pedestrian shade and comfort;  
3. Installing wayfinding and signage directing users to area parking and attractions;  
4. Adding sidewalk furniture including benches and wayfinding kiosks for user recreation and benefit;  
5. Providing adequate lighting so that people feel safe walking on | FY ’20-’25 | $-$ $ |
| R7: Evaluate bike parking across the Central Business District | 1. Installing bike corrals in the public right-of-way and/or in dedicated on-street or off-street spaces can enhance bike access and storage throughout the community, invite greater non-auto access and mobility, and help activate the CBD core area. | FY ’21-’25 | $ |
| | 2. We recommend the Village install (1) one corral area adjacent to the Fuel and Stan’s block. | | |

| R8: Consider an on-street flex parking space along Savidge Street corridor to serve curbside pick-up and delivery operations | 1. Pilot (1) one “15-minute only” commercial flex space on Savidge Street between Division and Jackson Streets to serve businesses like Mama Mia’s, Fuel, and Stan’s between daytime business hours. | FY ’20-’22 | Nominal costs. |

| R9: Create a downtown parking advisory committee | Create a voluntary committee of downtown stakeholders to advise the City on parking issues. | FY ’20-’24 | No initial direct costs anticipated |

*Costs opinions are provided on an order of magnitude basis in 2020 dollars. Actual costs will vary.*
01 Existing Conditions
Introduction

The Village of Spring Lake ("Village") engaged Walker Consultants ("Walker") to perform a downtown parking study ("Study") for the central business district in Spring Lake, Michigan.

Geographic Profile

Located in the Tri-Cities area of Western Michigan, the Village is a peninsula surrounded by Spring Lake to the north, the Grand River to the southwest, and Lloyd's Bayou on the southeast. Michigan State Highway 104 (M-104) passes directly through the central business district, connecting the adjacent townships of Ferrysburg and Grand Haven to the Grand Rapids metropolitan area via routes Interstate 96 (I-96) and US Highway 31.

The Tri-Cities area is a popular destination for outdoor recreation and seasonal tourism with numerous state parks and publicly-accessible beaches.

Project Background & Study Goals

The Village and the Spring Lake Downtown Development Authority ("DDA") are actively planning for future growth and development downtown.

In July 2020, The Village of Spring Lake Downtown Design Guidelines were released to the public to provide and promote "appropriate design standards and a general urban design framework for private and public development." The manual is intended to guide future development projects and stimulate additional community investment addressing architecture, zoning, streetscape, and vehicular and pedestrian circulation.

Village and DDA officials recognize that parking access and availability remain critical components of downtown’s existing and future success. To ensure that downtown parking needs are being met, that the parking supply is adequate to accommodate current and future demand, and that parking resources are being managed effectively and efficiently, the DDA conducted a Request-for-Proposal (RFP) seeking the assistance of a qualified firm to deliver the downtown parking study.

Walker was selected as the representative firm in August 2020 and formally initiated the Study in September 2020. The final report is anticipated to be delivered in November 2020.
Study Process

The following figure depicts Walker’s Study Process.

Figure 3: Study Process

---

**Step One: Discovery/ Stakeholder Input**

The first step of the Study was to elicit critical stakeholder input to discover and document the experience of parkers in the downtown. Information was derived from two (2) virtual input sessions held Thursday October 08, 2020 and Friday October 09, 2020 via video conference technology. Participants were invited to share individual thoughts, concerns, and ideas related to the downtown user parking experience with opinions shared relative to visitor and employee parking issues and opportunities. Additionally, a ten-question user survey was issued via Survey Monkey and posted to the Village social media pages to solicit additional community feedback engaging a broader audience. Approximately 138 survey responses were collected informing Study findings and recommendations. Full user survey results are provided in Appendix A: Downtown Parking Survey.
Step Two: Supply/Demand Analysis

In addition to the qualitative user feedback the Study team received, quantifiable parking survey data was collected across the study area during a formal community field visit. Numerical parking space inventory and occupancies were recorded over a two-day period on Thursday October 01, 2020 and Friday October 02, 2020. The field data collected is intended to provide a “snap-shot” of existing conditions and inform judgments rendered about the existing parking adequacy downtown.

Step Three: Future Needs Assessment

Future developments stand to impact existing parking space availability. Walker assessed the impacts that anticipated future developments will have on the existing parking system. Parking space demand resulting from land use development scenarios provided by the Village was modeled. Walker received future development information, e.g. proposed type and quantities of land uses, for purposes of informing the outcomes of the model.

Parking generation modeled was then compared to existing baseline conditions uncovered in our field survey to assess future parking space adequacy across five-year and ten-year planning horizons, providing Village officials with a tool to assess future parking needs.

Step Four: Review of Parking Policy and Practices

After establishing baseline conditions, we reviewed existing parking policies and practices providing an objective outsider’s look at the current rules that govern (or do not govern) parking and the activities that the Village employs to enforce (or not enforce) these rules. We reviewed existing parking enforcement policies and practices, existing parking wayfinding and signage, current design guidelines and ordinances influencing parking, as well as the community’s existing land use patterns influencing parking and walking behaviors.

The purpose of this analysis is to objectively assess the performance of the existing parking program and uncover opportunities for improvements to enhance user benefits and better managing existing resources.

Step Five: Alternatives Analysis

While additional parking infrastructure might not be needed at this juncture, we considered alternative scenarios in which additional parking supply could be added, providing a high-level assessment of impact and costs should additional spaces need to be constructed at a future date.

In this alternatives analysis we considered proximity to current and proposed demand drivers, available sites and locations, as well as site feasibility, and probable order of magnitude costs.
Step Five: Recommendations and Implementation

In the final phase of our analysis, we formulated a series of recommendations for the Village and stakeholders to evaluate, and an implementation matrix which details recommended item timelines and probable order of magnitude costs.

Study recommendations are intended to address current stakeholder challenges, future conditions as modeled, and practical improvements that the Village can make to enhance the overall user parking experience and ensure that parking services are being optimized to benefit multiple users.

Report organization

The report is organized by the following content sections:

1. Existing Conditions
2. Future Conditions
3. Study Recommendations

Discovery

Project discovery is an information-gathering process intended to be a “deep-dive” exploration into the unique issues, user-experience, and operational workings of the downtown parking system.

Qualitative and quantitative methods were employed for the Study and include virtual stakeholder outreach sessions as well as an online community survey.

The qualitative information received from our community engagement process, as well as the field data collected and summarized by Walker, formed the basis for the Study’s analytical conclusions and recommendations. Additionally, parking management best practices and Walker’s own municipal consulting experience nationwide influenced Study recommendations.

Virtual Stakeholder Input Sessions

Two (2) virtual input sessions were held on October 08, 2020 and October 09, 2020 to receive direct stakeholder feedback, enhance Study project understanding, and provide stakeholders and residents with a formal opportunity to engage the Study.

Input session outcomes included the following:

- Issues identification regarding downtown parking;
- Documentation of existing parking conditions at the employee and customer-level;
- Convening a group of downtown leaders and stakeholders to articulate a common community challenge and vision for parking downtown; and
- Enhanced communications with the downtown community.
Issue Identification

Over the course of the sessions held, participants expressed ideas and concerns related to parking in the downtown. The following list depicts a summary of discussion items raised by stakeholders:

- Generally, there is not a parking problem, there are ‘time of day’ and ‘day of week’ space availability challenges specific to one popular public lot (commonly referred to as the “Stan’s Lot”) which provides easy and convenient (back-door) business access;
- The ‘Stan’s Public Lot’ shares multiple users amongst existing block tenants unlike many other businesses across the downtown that have private single-use lots;
- Employee parking versus customer parking uses and needs discussed;
- Some employees are currently occupying spaces best suited for customer and visitor use;
- Some stakeholders are open to seeing time-hour limits imposed to induce turnover and space availability;
- There is a need for “pick-up” and “loading” space for restaurant take-out operations;
- Fuel and Stan’s bar/restaurant patrons are parking on street as well as at available surface lots;
- Fuel has a small amount of onsite parking spaces currently being occupied by outdoor dining seating capacity in response to the Covid-19 pandemic;
- Generally, there is a low walking tolerance for daytime customers and visitors;
- Stakeholders agree that employees could walk further distances with better lighting and pedestrian safety;
- M-104 is a state highway that runs directly thru the CBD carrying significant passenger and commercial truck traffic volumes;
- One traffic signal/pedestrian cross-walk exists throughout the entire M-104 (Savidge Street) downtown corridor which creates speed zones and pedestrian access challenges bifurcating the CBD into “north M-104” and “south M-104” areas;
- Public parking north of M-104 is under-utilized with many existing user destinations located south of M-104;
- The existing parking wayfinding and signage is incomplete and inadequate;
- Public parking facilities are not signed and lot public parking access is unclear;
- There is a lack of knowledge of public parking areas amongst Village visitors;
- Public parking information is not found online or on the Village/DDA website;
- Significant space vacancy exists across local area churches with significant space inventory within close walking proximity to the core CBD;
- Seven Steps Up Live Music + Events venue attracts a “park-once” type-user who visits surrounding restaurant/bars;
- Event parking users are more likely to walk additional blocks for parking;
- Michigan winters minimize the distance people are willing to walk and creating a seasonal affect;
- Lack of snow removal and snow-piling affects inventory and space availability in some areas;
- The future Chophouse restaurant might offer valet parking options north of M-104;
- The Village is adding approximately 28 parking spaces at Tanglefoot Park one to two blocks south of the CBD core;
- An alley pedestrian walkway is proposed that will connect Tanglefoot parking area to CBD;
- Location of farmer’s market and impact to CBD parking availability;
- There is a lack of sufficient bike parking across the CBD; and
- Opportunities exist for greater shared parking usage.
Supply/ Demand Study

The findings of the supply and demand component of the project are the foundation of an effective parking plan. Before we can identify opportunities to develop or improve parking or recommend changes to existing parking policies, we must first have a solid understanding of existing conditions within the Study Area. Our understanding of existing conditions begins with stakeholder outreach to determine parking habits and preferences of typical users which includes an identification of obstacles and opportunities for improvement as reviewed in the previous sections of this report. These qualitative findings are combined with the parking supply and demand survey to develop a comprehensive picture of parking conditions in the downtown. This analysis provides a framework for recommendations that result from the study process.

The project team conducted field inventory and occupancy counts on Thursday October 01, 2020 and Friday October 02, 2020 to observe typical parking conditions in the downtown Study Area. The objective of our field work was to answer the following questions:

- What is the parking supply?
- What is the parking demand?
- Is there a surplus or deficit?
- Is additional parking required? If so, how much?
- Who needs additional parking?
- Is the parking program achieving its goal of parking space turnover and availability?

Study Area

The parking study area, as determined by the Village, is bounded by Exchange Street and the Grand River to the south, Liberty Street and Spring Lake to the north, Church Street to the east, and the Grand River (bridge) to the west. The Study Area comprises the entire Spring Lake commercial business district area and includes daytime office, professional services, retail, food and beverage restaurants, as well as governmental, recreational, and entertainment functions. M-104 (“Savidge Street” named locally) runs through the center of the study area and divides the commercial business area into “north” and “south” downtown zones.

The following figure depicts the Study Area.
How Many Parking Spaces are in the Central Business District?

The project team identified approximately 1,238 ± spaces across the Study Area supporting commercial use.

Excluded from this space inventory is privately-owned parking located in driveways and attached- and detached-garages associated with townhouses and single-family homes, gas stations and fleet/boat storage facilities, as well as access-controlled/ gated properties.
Figure 5: Parking Space Inventory

- **On Street ± 144 spaces**
- **Public Off-Street ± 302 spaces**
- **Private Off-Street ± 792 spaces**

Source: Walker Consultants, 2020
Approximately 64 percent of the existing parking inventory surveyed within the commercial business district is privately held off-street parking providing onsite access for business customers and employees, with a few existing private lots offering public access across daytime and evening hours.

The commercial business district, anchored by M-104, contains many single-use parking lots supporting retail, professional services, and fast food/fast casual restaurant businesses. Many of these businesses provide off-street surface lots in front of their buildings, visible to M-104 motorists offering direct ingress/egress from M-104 (Savidge Street).

This suburban-type parking accommodation is an over-whelming feature of the built environment today, with the exception of two or three core blocks of greater commercial density and uniform building fabric.
**Figure 7** depicts a typical building pattern found across the CBD. M-104 auto-frontage access and single-use front parking lots create a low-density suburban context for much of the downtown area.

**Figure 8** depicts an example of more sensitive urban design principles applied across the Spring Lake CBD delivering a more urban context with such features as comfortable pedestrian sidewalk widths, minimal-to-no building setbacks, building façade orientation towards the street creating a ‘street wall’, no curb-cut (drive-way) sidewalk interruptions, on street parking providing a safety buffer and off-street parking located in the rear of the building. This fabric is only found across 2 or 3 core blocks downtown today.

The Village of Spring Lake maintains four public parking lots across the CBD providing 235 public off-street spaces. Including the Spring Lake District Library lot and Barber School lot, 302 off-street spaces are Village-owned. Additionally, the Village maintains 144 ± on street spaces conveniently located for commercial usage representing approximately 12 percent of the total space inventory.

More than 90 percent of the on street space inventory across commercial areas is unregulated with no time limits or user restrictions imposed. Both on street and public off-street parking throughout the CBD is provided at no charge to users.
Parking Occupancy

Walker conducted parking space occupancy counts on Thursday, October 01, 2020 and Friday, October 02, 2020. Counts occurred on Thursday at 2:00 p.m. and Friday at 10:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. to capture typical weekday and weekend conditions. Friday’s evening count occurred simultaneous with a charity event occurring at Stan’s Bar and Restaurant as well as a homecoming football game.

Note, our supply/demand survey occurred in early October 2020. While Covid-19 has impacted the local economy, many businesses observed within the study area were noted open to the public at the time of our field survey. Many services and restaurants had normalized operations, with several business owners confirming this during the time of our stakeholder outreach. The only notable user absent from this survey is the music/entertainment venue Seven Steps Up, still closed for concerts as of Fall 2020. We believe that the occupancies recorded are representative of typical weekday and weekend conditions.

The following figure depicts the results of all occupancy periods recorded.

Figure 9: Total Parking Space Occupancy

![Figure 9: Total Parking Space Occupancy](image)

Source: Walker Consultants, 2020

Total recorded occupancy peaked on Friday at the 10 a.m. hour, with 363 occupied spaces, or 29 percent of the total parking supply observed occupied. Appendix B: Supply/Demand Field Data provides a detailed table of full occupancy results by facility.

The following table summarizes occupancy results by field count times and parking space type.
Table 1: Occupancy by Parking Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Type</th>
<th>Inventory</th>
<th>Thurs. 2 PM</th>
<th>% Occupancy</th>
<th>Fri. 10 AM</th>
<th>% Occupancy</th>
<th>Fri. 6 PM</th>
<th>% Occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public lots</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private lots</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Street</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,238</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Walker Consultants, 2020

Ample public space availability exists across the study area across all hours of the day as revealed by our supply-demand study. However, “hot-spots” exists across a few core blocks “south of M-104” more approximate to several user destinations. M-104 creates pedestrian access challenges for parking areas “north of M-104” which had significantly lower utilization rates.

The following “heat map” displays parking occupancy at the peak Friday 10 a.m. hour. The colors associated with the occupancy percentages are meant to give a general guide to current parking occupancy levels. Green equals block’s that have 0-49.9 percent parking occupancy and yellow equals blocks with 50-69.9 percent occupancy.
The two public lots, “Stan’s Lot” and “the Dollar General Lot,” had occupancies of 65 percent and 68 percent respectively (shaded in “yellow”) indicating healthy utilization rates, but with spaces still available at the peak hour observed. These two facilities serve a diverse mix of uses along the M-104 business corridor between Division Street and Buchanan Street.

This two-block, core-area is where the greatest density is found in the CBD with a concentration of professional services, retail, restaurants and bars, as well as entertainment and civic uses sharing the existing public parking on-street and off-street supply. Within one or two blocks of this core area, ample space vacancy exits representing opportunities to communicate existing space availability, promote greater utilization of existing resources, and explore public-private shared parking partnership opportunities.

Of note, other public facilities, such as the Jackson and Savidge Street lot and the Marina Lot, had utilization rates far below 50 percent representing an opportunity to yield greater utilization of these public stalls.

Additionally, private lots with significant space inventory, within a close one to two block walking proximity to the core CBD area, e.g., the Harvest Chapel lot and the First Baptist lot, were entirely empty across peak weekday daytime hours. This represents opportunities for the public and private to work together to address parking “hot-spot” challenges, promote greater user walkability, and better distribute parking demand across the study area.
Key Supply/ Demand Findings:

- Overall, there is ample space availability across the CBD with more than 1,230 ± private and public spaces serving existing Village businesses;
- System wide, peak occupancies were below 30 percent total, indicating a surplus of parking throughout the downtown, publically-available spaces had a 38 percent peak occupancy indicating ample public space availability across the study area;
- Parking “hot-spots” occur at two public lots in the core CBD area (“Stan’s Lot” and “Dollar General” Lot) but with spaces still available across peak daytime hours;
- Low walking tolerances and M-104 pedestrian access challenges inhibit greater use of public parking stalls “north of M-104” which have high vacancy rates; and
- Opportunities for shared parking use exist “south of M-104” with local area church lots, the public library lot, and the Barber School Lot.

Given the ample amount of parking available across the CBD and low utilization rates observed system-wide, we have identified several key recommendations for the Village to pursue to enhance parking management, address “hot-spot” challenge areas, and improve the user experience ahead of considering constructing any new public parking facilities.

Existing Policies and Practices

Walker evaluated existing Village parking policies and practices to uncover opportunities for improvements. This includes a review of the parking management, parking enforcement policies and practices, parking signage and wayfinding, existing land use impacts on parking, as well as program communications and public relations.

The following table summarizes the review of existing parking policies and practices.

Table 2: Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Evaluation Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the Village provide on street and off-street parking options?</td>
<td>Yes. The Village provides over 446 spaces throughout the CBD both on street and across public lots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the Village have parking time limits or rates?</td>
<td>The Village provides free public parking access across lots and on-street spaces. More than 90 percent of the existing on-street space inventory is unregulated. Approximately a dozen spaces are time limited as 15-minute, 30-minute, or 1-hour parking. These stalls are signed but not enforced. Public off-street lots allow for “parking 24 hours except 2 a.m. to 6 a.m. December through April”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does parking enforcement occur?</td>
<td>No. The Village does not conduct routine enforcement nor have a dedicated parking enforcement resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does parking wayfinding and signage exist?</td>
<td>Some signage does exist, however the signage is incomplete with critical wayfinding and directional signage missing at key intersections and an absence of facility “P” public parking signage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the Village have a dedicated parking website or webpage?</td>
<td>No. No public parking information exits on the Village website or DDA webpage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the core CBD area walkable providing adequate pedestrian comfort and safety?</td>
<td>Yes, but further improvements are needed. The core area of the CBD contains sidewalks with on street parking providing a safety buffer to segments of M-104 (Savidge Street). However, only one pedestrian cross-walk signal facilitates safe pedestrian access and use of parking facilities “North of M-104.” The Village Design Guidelines address pedestrian access challenges and recommended improvements which, if implemented, can improve parking access and usage across the CBD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the condition of parking facilities?</td>
<td>Surface lots and on-street spaces are in fair condition with no visible signs of surface asphalt deterioration and with parking striping clearly marked and visible for users.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Walker Consultants, 2020

After reviewing existing Village parking policies and practices, we believe that greater parking management can be applied across the Village CBD to address “hot-spot” issue areas, address user concerns, and better optimize the performance of the CBD parking system. In the following section we define and review features of well-run municipal parking management programs.
Parking Management 101

Communities decide to manage their parking for a variety of reasons. Traditionally, parking planning was largely concerned with providing an abundant number of free spaces at each destination. If the supply was ever insufficient, municipalities and businesses would create more parking. In recent times, however, there is a growing awareness that providing too much parking can be harmful, especially, when there are alternatives to address a community’s parking demands.

Parking management attempts through policies and programs to strategically and efficiently manage what is existing and create added social benefit to include the following:

- Mitigating the need to over-build parking on-site for every land use
- Minimizing congestion caused by excessive “circling” or “cruising” for an available parking space
- Requiring less urban land be devoted to parking which is not a “highest-and-best use” of scarce land
- Supporting the goals of walkable urbanism
- Encouraging greater shared use between existing parking assets
- Utilizing existing infrastructure more efficiently to save capital costs
- Creating opportunities for greater retail foot traffic and street life vibrancy

Parking management is often the best solution to address real and perceived user parking issues and enhance overall community benefits. Key features of municipal parking management include the following:

- **Parking Time Limits.** Regulating user behavior using time limits is a means to inducing greater parking turnover and space availability within a system. In a typical commercial business district, the most convenient parking spaces, those with closer proximity to business entry/exits, should be regulated for greater short-term use. Employee users are often more familiar with a downtown parking system. Therefore, effective parking management programs promote employees parking in less convenient parking spaces since employees are longer-term users in comparison to customers and other short-term users. This can be accomplished by signing and enforcing short-term (2 to 3 hours) and long-term spaces (3 plus hours) to direct user behavior.

  Implementing time zones will vary by land use and mix of businesses in an area. Parking demand can change over time with different occupants and tenants generating different usage needs. Therefore, parking regulations should be flexible enough to adjust to changing conditions and patterns in a downtown.

- **Parking Enforcement.** Instituting a parking enforcement program for on-street and/or off-street facilities ensures that user compliance is being achieved and that posted regulations are being adhered to on a regular basis. Additionally, parking enforcement promotes more efficient user behaviors by directing long-term parkers to utilize greater off-street options and short-term parkers to occupy more on-street spaces. This better distributes the parking demand and supports necessary turnover and space availability for a system to operate effectively.
• **Parking Rates.** Providing parking to the public incurs direct and indirect expenses. While users might not be paying for a parking stall directly and believe they are enjoying “free” parking, costs exist and are passed along in the purchase price of goods and services and in the taxes levied by a municipality to maintain public parking infrastructure. Some communities elect to institute rates to recover the costs of administering public parking, resource the construction and maintenance of parking infrastructure, or as another means to induce parking turnover and space availability by using economics to regulate user behavior.

• **Shared Parking.** Shared parking means that a parking facility serves multiple users or destinations. Shared parking works most effectively when it takes advantage of multiple land uses “peak” and “off-peak” conditions promoting greater cross-utilization of a facility while supporting a “park once” model where users can access multiple destinations from one parking facility.

• **Improved parking user information.** Knowing “where” to find public parking can sometimes prove difficult for users and result in system inefficiencies and perceived parking problems. Important features to aid users of a parking system include: physical wayfinding and signage, uniform and consistent branding and marketing of parking locations, user maps and brochures, online website parking information, as well as electronic parking guidance systems (for operations with parking garage facilities).

As the Village anticipates future growth and development, engaging the “parking management playbook” will be important to address parking challenges, satisfy stakeholder and user needs, and ensure that the Village is deriving maximal benefit from existing parking resources.

While Walker is not recommending time limits or user rates at this juncture, parking management tools (reviewed above) exist for the Village to consider should future conditions warrant implementation. Walker considers future development conditions in the following section of this report.
02 Future Conditions
Future Parking Conditions

Walker evaluated the impacts that anticipated future developments will place on the existing parking system and modeled parking space generation resulting from land use development scenarios provided by the Village. The purpose of this analysis is to provide Village officials with a planning tool to assess future parking options and ensure that the community is sufficiently balancing existing and future user needs.

Walker requested a list of known future developments within a ten-year planning horizon across the Study Area. The following information was requested and received from the Village: project name, description, proposed land use(s), proposed land use quantities, estimated project delivery date as well as any noted impacts to the current parking supply within a ten-year planning horizon.

Parking generation was then modeled by applying a base parking demand ratio to the land use quantities provided, yielding notional parking space generation. To assess future parking space adequacy within a ten-year planning horizon, Walker compared notional parking space generation to existing parking space adequacy, adjusting for any additions and/or subtractions to the supply.

Future Development Projects

The following table depicts our understanding of the development project pipeline. As of Fall 2020, residential projects remain speculative with notional residential development anticipated to provide its own on-site parking. Because of the uncertainty of residential development and the Village expectation for developer-built on-site parking, residential parking space generation was not modeled.

Table 3: Anticipated Development Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Land Use Quantities*</th>
<th>Parking Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>109 Jackson Street</td>
<td>Office/Retail Mixed-Use</td>
<td>7,000 s.f.</td>
<td>9 spaces (Developer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38 spaces (Village)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Walker assumed an allocation of 5,000 s.f. commercial office and 2,000 s.f. retail for parking generation modeling purposes.

In our scenario, we consider a hypothetical parking demand generated for the 109 Jackson Street mixed-use building. It is our understanding the proposed three-level building will contain ground-floor retail.

Walker took the proposed land use quantities provided and modeled a notional recommended parking supply using Urban Land Institute (ULI) recommended base ratios. The following figure presents Walker’s own calculation based upon the information available.
Table 4: Notional Future Development Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>ULI Base Ratio*</th>
<th>Recommended Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>2,000 GLA</td>
<td>4.0 /kSF GLA</td>
<td>= 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>5,000 GLA</td>
<td>3.7 /kSF GLA</td>
<td>= 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>= 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Urban Land Institute. Shared Parking, 3rd Edition. All decimal places were rounded up to the nearest whole number.

Source: Walker Consultants, 2020

Walker’s modeled development scenario presents a recommended parking supply of 27 spaces.

The proposed project is anticipated to be developed on the southeastern corner of the existing “Stan’s Lot.” The 7,000 s.f. building and proposed parking area will replace 52 existing surface lot spaces with 47 re-configured spaces for a net loss of 5 spaces on the supply side.

Within a two-block area of the proposed project site, there is existing parking surplus which can absorb future demand generated, however this will require greater walking and shared resources. On-site parking for everyone will be challenging and greater walking must be promoted. No spaces should be held as reserved parking.

Table 5: Project Site Two-Block Radius - Future Adequacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supply/Demand/Adequacy</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing space surplus (within a two block site radius)*</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Future parking generation modeled</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equals: Future surplus</strong></td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This includes Stan’s (Public) Lot and Dollar General (Public) Lot vacancies at peak hour as well as on-street supply adequacy from Exchange Street between Division and Church, Buchanan, Jackson and Division Streets at peak-hour. Added public space inventory with any notional shared parking public-private arrangement was not factored here. If private spaces were accessible, beyond the existing two-block space surplus, these spaces could contribute to future public parking space adequacy.

Source: Walker Consultants, 2020
Future Supply

Walker reviewed potential changes to the existing parking supply. Two proposed projects stand to increase the parking supply across select areas within the CBD.

1. **Tanglefoot Park.** A proposed 28 new spaces are anticipated with park redevelopments.
2. **Expansion of existing Jackson Street Lot/ Liberty Street Parking area.** An additional 14 angled-stalls could be added with an expansion of the Shade Lane parking area north of M-104.

An additional 42 ± spaces would provide more public parking options. However, walking and access challenges will still need to be addressed in order to realize greater Core CBD use of these resources.
03 Recommendations
Study Recommendations

Before any additional public infrastructure is built, or time limits or rates are considered, Walker recommends the following steps be pursued to address current and anticipated future parking challenges.

Recommendation Step One: Introduce an on-street and off-street parking strategy

**Issue:** Stakeholders agreed that some employees are currently occupying spaces better suited for short-term customer and visitor use.

Walker recommends that the Village implement a strategy to promote employee parking at more remote off-street lots and on-street spaces while maintaining more visible on-street spaces and off-street lot spaces (with closer business-door access) for shorter-term customer and visitor use. Our reasoning is three-fold:

- On-street spaces and behind the building surface lot spaces are the most visible parking spaces for motorists and closest to building entry/exits, therefore they should be treated as premium spaces;
- Motorists form perceptions of parking-space availability based upon the occupancy of these spaces;
- Employees, unlike customers and visitors, are familiar with the existing parking system and can walk an additional block or two for parking reserving more premium spaces for customers and visitors.

The Village and DDA should conduct an outreach campaign explaining the benefits of this strategy to stakeholders and business-owners as a means to induce greater turnover and space availability for business patrons. Informal rules and encouragement can be used instead of official regulation regarding employee parking practices. This requires “buy-in” and leadership from existing downtown businesses to achieve the desired goal.
Recommendation Step Two: Pursue public-private shared parking agreements to enable additional off-street parking supply for employees and long-term users

Private lots that often go underutilized, or, have ample spaces available across evenings and weekend hours (non-Sundays), are viable candidates for shared parking usage. Walker observed several lots that could serve as shared parking for evening and weekend users in addition to some lots offering weekday availability.

The Harvest Chapel lot and the First Baptist lot were entirely empty across peak weekday daytime and evening hours. This represents opportunities for the public and private to team together to address parking “hot-spot” challenges, promote greater user walkability, and better distribute parking demand across the study area.

Shared parking is a lower-cost opportunity for the Village to lease or acquire access to additional spaces on a monthly basis, while, providing an owner with a guaranteed monthly income stream for surplus spaces (if a financial arrangement is determined). Appendix C: Shared Parking Agreement Template provides an example.

There are reasons why this is a beneficial approach:

✓ From an environmental perspective, it is always preferable to make good use of existing parking resources before building additional ones.
✓ From a financial perspective, owners may be relieved of some insurance and other operating costs while the Village gets parking without spending money for a surface lot.

Several municipalities across the country utilize shared parking. In addition to the concern about ensuring that tenants still have spaces, there is a concern about the liability associated with having the general public parking on private lots. Some cities lease the lots from the private owners, which makes the leaseholder liable; the leaseholder carries the insurance for public parking in the lot, as well as paying other expenses such as lighting, cleaning, snow removal etc. A limitation of liability will be important.

Recommendation Step Three: Continue to monitor parking space occupancies and stakeholder feedback

The Village will need to continue monitoring user parking space occupancy and seek stakeholder feedback regarding the employee strategy being pursued to ensure that desired behaviors are being achieved and that customer space availability is in fact being improved. Quarterly parking occupancy studies should be performed, and this information should be disseminated to communicate space availability and usage trends.

If voluntary employee actions are not achieving desired outcomes, the Village should consider more formalized regulations implementing a mix of on-street and off-street time limits to better guide user behavior. This can include introducing two- or three-hour time limits on Savidge Street and perpendicular commercial block faces as appropriate and/or considering reserving a percentage of stalls in “Stan’s” and/or “Dollar General” public lots as short-term two- or three-hour only spaces; Monday through Friday 9 a.m. to 7 p.m. The exact quantity of short-term space allocation across these lots will need to be evaluated should the Village arrive at this decision-step.
Beyond the steps outlined above, if desired behavior is not occurring and occupancies are nearing 85 percent or greater on a consistent basis across core areas of the CBD, the Village should evaluate the feasibility of parking rates or additional parking infrastructure. We see the addition of new parking as a last resort option after less costly parking management methods have been pursued.

Furthermore, we currently do not see the density of activity or financial feasibility to support instituting parking meters across a nominal supply of existing on-street spaces along commercial block faces (fewer than 100 spaces).

**Recommendation Step Four: Improve existing parking wayfinding and signage**

**Issue:** The existing wayfinding signage is not properly communicating public parking locations and public parking availability.

**Recommendation:** Vehicular directional signage and facility identification sign packages should be installed to direct motorists to available public parking assets. Color scheme and signage design should be consistent and sensitive to downtown design guidelines while providing a strong visual cue to users.

The Village must agree upon one universal logo design and consistently brand and market this logo across all public facilities.

By naming existing public parking lots, the Village can enhance user awareness of public parking facilities and promote shared use of facilities for the benefit of many users.
Recommendation Step Five: Create a downtown parking resource page off the Village/DDA website

**Issue:** The Village and DDA do not have a website or webpage dedicated solely to downtown parking. A Google search for the words “Village of Spring Lake, Michigan Downtown Parking” yields no primary returns. More than 72 percent of survey respondents said they do not know where to find long-term parking downtown.

**Recommendation:** Spring Lake’s downtown parking system public relations and communications need to be prominent and user-friendly. The Village has an opportunity to collaborate with local downtown partners to create a downtown parking website or webpage that is attractive, customer-friendly and integrative with other social media tools.

A website or dedicated downtown parking page should at a minimum offer the following:

- A comprehensive downtown parking inventory.
- A means to respond to questions and requests from the general public for locations of parking facilities and public availability.
- Resources including but not limited to parking maps, business development packets, and brochures.
- Marketing of all publicly-available parking in downtown, regardless of public or private ownership.
- Provide day-to-day media relations, and generate press releases as needed.
- Provide public relations assistance to other downtown events as needed.

Local businesses are often willing to provide parking information and links to additional parking resources from their business website’s or social media page. This can be very helpful in providing specific location data to their customers, while also providing a free portal to market parking services to potential patrons. If patrons are armed with parking availability and location information prior to arriving at their destination, their overall downtown experience can be greatly improved.
Examples of Downtown Parking web pages:

https://grandhaven.org/residents/downtown-parking/
https://www.sjcity.com/live-here/parking
https://www.downtownholland.com/parking

Downtown Holland DDA (Michigan) maintains an easy, user-friendly parking website that gives site visitors searchable information by parking user-type: visitor (public), employee, and resident.

Additionally, a downtown parking map (PDF) is available for users to print directly off the home page.

Recommendation Step Six: Address pedestrian access and safety challenges, promote greater Downtown walkability

**Issue:** Stakeholders shared how pedestrian access to public parking facilities “north of M-104” is challenging due to high traffic volumes and limited pedestrian cross-walks. Additionally, stakeholders shared that some customers and visitors want to park on site and do not want to walk additional blocks.

Improving the walkability downtown will address parking “hot-spot” challenge areas, better distribute parking demand across the entire CBD where space vacancy exists, and generate greater foot-traffic for local businesses.
To promote greater walkability, physical considerations include the following:

- **Maintaining the existing sidewalk network** to enhance pedestrian connectivity (snow removal in winter);
- **Adding street plantings** and trees to offer pedestrian shade and comfort;
- **Installing wayfinding and signage** directing users to area parking and attractions;
- **Adding sidewalk furniture** including benches and wayfinding kiosks for user recreation and benefit;
- **Providing adequate lighting** so that people feel safe walking on street across all hours of the day; and
- **Promoting good urban design** with no building setbacks, minimal curb cuts and sidewalk interruptions, and building façade orientation toward the street, to create urban environments that support and enhance walking activity.

While M-104 is a state highway, and the Village does not have direct authority over highway planning, it should pursue discussions with state highway officials to address pedestrian access and safety issues across the corridor to improve the pedestrian environment downtown and realize greater community walkability goals.

**Recommendation Step Seven:**
Evaluate bike parking across the Central Business District

**Issue:** The primary travel mode in the community today is the private car. Other non-motorized forms of access and mobility are not properly being accommodated with a lack of dedicated bike storage areas.

**Lakeside and North Bank Trails**

The Village maintains trail networks throughout the community. The Lakeside Trail is a paved trail illuminated by energy efficient LED lights, with snow removal during the winter months, for year-round enjoyment. The Lakeside Trail runs adjacent to the downtown and continues into the North Bank Trail, provided by Spring Lake Township, which is a continuation of the Rail-Trail that extends east 3.3 miles into Spring Lake and Crockery Townships.

According to the Village website “The North Bank Trail is a planned regional trail that will eventually extend to Nunica, Coopersville, Marne and Grand Rapids and will also connect to the Musketawa Trail and the future Spoonville Trail. The NBT will connect the east end of Lakeside Trail in the Village of Spring Lake to the southeast end of the existing Musketawa Trail, otherwise known as the Fred Meijer Pioneer Trail. Ultimately, the NBT serves as a regional link between the beaches of Lake Michigan and the Grand Rapids metro area.”

**Recommendation:** Installing bike corrals in the public right-of-way and/or in dedicated on-street or off-street spaces can enhance bike access and storage throughout the community, invite greater non-auto access and mobility, and help activate the CBD core area. Bicycle corrals are a collection of bike racks placed parallel to one another, usually on-street. Corrals allow for up to 10-20 bicycles to be parked in a space that typically one parking stall occupies. A typical corral costs $3,000 in materials and labor for the installation. Actual costs and labor will vary. **We recommend the Village install (1) one corral area adjacent to the Fuel and Stan’s block.**
Recommendation Step Eight: Consider an on-street flex parking space along Savidge Street corridor to serve curbside pick-up and delivery operations

**Issue:** In light Covid-19, food and beverage businesses have expanded curbside delivery and pick-up services. Flexible space is needed to serve businesses’ operations.

**Recommendation:** Enabling flex spaces vis-à-vis “15 minute only” signed zones can create greater space turnover and availability for “pick-up” curbside operations. We recommend the Village pilot (1) one “15-minute only” commercial flex space on Savidge Street between Division and Jackson Streets to serve businesses like Mama Mia’s, Fuel, and Stan’s between daytime business hours.

Recommendation Step Nine: Form a Downtown Parking Advisory Committee

Walker recommends that the Village consider forming a downtown parking advisory committee with broad representation of interests including members of the downtown business community and downtown stakeholders. The DDA should chair and oversee this committee process.

Walker recommends meeting on a quarterly basis to discuss parking trends and issues in downtown. The committee would not have any official government capacity or policy-setting role but could serve as a clearinghouse for the exchange of information and ideas.

The meetings would serve as an opportunity to help the Village deliver on its commitment to provide parking turnover and space availability to support downtown businesses and to assist the Village roll out public relations campaigns for downtown parking program improvements. The Advisory Committee can help educate their patrons and members on the benefits of any coordinated policy actions and provide the Village/DDA direct feedback on implementation.

The goal is to forge a valuable public-private partnership that advises, improves public communications, and balances the needs of the downtown parking system for the benefit of all users.
Appendix A:
Downtown Parking Survey
Q1 Choose the most important factors related to a parking space?

**Answered:** 134  **Skipped:** 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proximity (parking space is close to my destination)</td>
<td>32.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability (parking space is vacant and accessible to me)</td>
<td>32.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (free or inexpensive)</td>
<td>35.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>134</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Q2 How satisfied are you with downtown parking?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>20.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>21.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied or</td>
<td>27.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>8.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>20.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>8.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered: 134  Skipped: 0
Village of Spring Lake Downtown Parking Survey

Q3 Most of the time, are you able to efficiently find available parking in the downtown?

Answered: 134  Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>79.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4 Do downtown visitors and customers know where they can find public parking?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, always</td>
<td>7.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>45.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most often, not</td>
<td>40.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, never</td>
<td>6.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5 Parking rules, regulations, and public space availability is clearly marked and easily understood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>17.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly agree</td>
<td>44.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly disagree</td>
<td>30.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Village of Spring Lake Downtown Parking Survey

Q6 Public parking spaces are mostly in sound repair and condition.

Answered: 133  Skipped: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>24.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly agree</td>
<td>63.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly disagree</td>
<td>8.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q7 Long-term parking spaces are clearly identified and people know where to go for all-day parking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>6.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly agree</td>
<td>20.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly disagree</td>
<td>47.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>25.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered: 133  Skipped: 1
Q8 The presence and quality of pedestrian walkways in the downtown is adequate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly agree</td>
<td>43.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly disagree</td>
<td>13.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>15.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Q9 Downtown wayfinding is adequate and visitors are equipped with tools to help find their way from their parking space to their destination.

Answered: 130  Skipped: 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>14.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly agree</td>
<td>44.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly disagree</td>
<td>33.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10 How often do you visit downtown and park?

Answered: 134  Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyday</td>
<td>15.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat regularly</td>
<td>72.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very rarely</td>
<td>11.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B:
Supply/Demand Field Data
## Appendix B: Supply/Demand Field Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility/ Block ID</th>
<th>Supply</th>
<th>Thurs. 2 PM</th>
<th>% Utilized</th>
<th>Friday 10 AM</th>
<th>% Utilized</th>
<th>Friday 6 PM</th>
<th>% Utilized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stan's Public Lot</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollar General Public Lot</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson &amp; Savidge Public Lot</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Lot</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Public Lot</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barber School Lot</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase Bank Lot</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Bank Lot</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffia Gallery/ Idle Hour Lot</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantegas Cleaner Lot</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutlers Crossing Strip Mall Lot</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyecare One Lot</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercy Healthcare Millpoint Station Lot</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill's Sport Lot</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruise &amp; Travel Experts Lot</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Baptist Lot</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvest Chapel Lot</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Financial Credit Union Lot</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Boy's Brewhouse</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518 Savidge Strip Mall Lot</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arby's Lot</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn's Lot</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald's Lot</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Inn Lot</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Off-street subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>1094</strong></td>
<td><strong>298</strong></td>
<td><strong>27%</strong></td>
<td><strong>327</strong></td>
<td><strong>30%</strong></td>
<td><strong>239</strong></td>
<td><strong>22%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## On Street Supply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Description</th>
<th>Parked</th>
<th>Occupied</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Savidge Street (between Park &amp; Division)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savidge Street (between Division &amp; Jackson)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savidge Street (between Jackson &amp; Buchanan)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange Street (North Block between Division &amp; Jackson)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange Street (South Block between Division &amp; Jackson)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange Street (South Block between Buchanan &amp; Church)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan Street (West Block between Savidge &amp; Exchange)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan Street (East Block between Savidge &amp; Exchange)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Street (East Block between Savidge &amp; Exchange)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Street (East Block between Savidge &amp; Exchange)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Street (West Block between Savidge &amp; Exchange)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Street (between Jackson &amp; Buchanan)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Street (between Division &amp; Jackson)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Street (between Division &amp; Park)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On Street subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>144</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>25%</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>25%</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1238</strong></td>
<td><strong>334</strong></td>
<td><strong>27%</strong></td>
<td><strong>363</strong></td>
<td><strong>29%</strong></td>
<td><strong>276</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publically-Available</strong></td>
<td><strong>446</strong></td>
<td><strong>175</strong></td>
<td><strong>39%</strong></td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
<td><strong>38%</strong></td>
<td><strong>143</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Shared Use Agreement Sample Template
Model - Shared Use Agreement for Parking Facilities

This Shared Use Agreement for Parking Facilities, entered into this ____ day of __________, ______, between _________________, hereinafter called lessor and _________________, hereinafter called lessee. In consideration of the covenants herein, lessor agrees to share with lessee certain parking facilities, as is situated in the City of ________________, County of ________________ and State of ____________, hereinafter called the facilities, described as: [Include legal description of location and spaces to be shared here, and as shown on attachment.]

The facilities shall be shared commencing with the ____ day of __________, ______, and ending at 11:59 PM on the ____ day of __________, ______, for [insert negotiated compensation figures, as appropriate]. [The lessee agrees to pay at [insert payment address] to lessor by the _____ day of each month [or other payment arrangements].] Lessor hereby represents that it holds legal title to the facilities.

The parties agree:

1. **USE OF FACILITIES** This section should describe the nature of the shared use (exclusive, joint sections, time(s) and day(s) of week of usage. -SAMPLE CLAUSE-[Lessee shall have exclusive use of the facilities. The use shall only be between the hours of 5:30 PM Friday through 5:30 AM Monday and between the hours of 5:30 PM and 5:30 AM Monday through Thursday.]

2. **MAINTENANCE** This section should describe responsibility for aspects of maintenance of the facilities. This could include cleaning, striping, seal coating, asphalt repair and more. -SAMPLE CLAUSE-[Lessor shall provide, as reasonably necessary asphalt repair work. Lessee and Lessor agree to share striping, seal coating and lot sweeping at a 50%/50% split based upon mutually accepted maintenance contracts with outside vendors. Lessor shall maintain lot and landscaping at or above the current condition, at no additional cost to the lessee.]

3. **UTILITIES and TAXES** This section should describe responsibility for utilities and taxes. This could include electrical, water, sewage, and more. -SAMPLE CLAUSE-[Lessor shall pay all taxes and utilities associated with the facilities, including maintenance of existing facility lighting as directed by standard safety practices.]

4. **SIGNAGE** This section should describe signage allowances and restrictions. -SAMPLE CLAUSE-[Lessee may provide signage, meeting with the written approval of lessor, designating usage allowances.]

5. **ENFORCEMENT** This section should describe any facility usage enforcement methods. -SAMPLE CLAUSE-[Lessee may provide a surveillance officer(s) for parking safety and usage only for the period of its exclusive use. Lessee and lessor reserve the right to tow, at owner’s expense, vehicles improperly parked or abandoned. All towing shall be with the approval of the lessor.]
6. **COOPERATION** This section should describe communication relationship. -SAMPLE CLAUSE-[Lessor and lessee agree to cooperate to the best of their abilities to mutually use the facilities without disrupting the other party. The parties agree to meet on occasion to work out any problems that may arise to the shared use.]

7. **INSURANCE** This section should describe insurance requirements for the facilities. -SAMPLE CLAUSE-[At their own expense, lessor and lessee agree to maintain liability insurance for the facilities as is standard for their own business usage.]

8. **INDEMNIFICATION** This section should describe indemnification as applicable and negotiated. This is a very technical section and legal counsel should be consulted for appropriate language to each and every agreement. -NO SAMPLE CLAUSE PROVIDED-

9. **TERMINATION** This section should describe how to or if this agreement can be terminated and post termination responsibilities. -SAMPLE CLAUSE- [If lessor transfers ownership, or if part of all of the facilities are condemned, or access to the facilities is changed or limited, lessee may, in its sole discretion terminate this agreement without further liability by giving Lessor not less than 60 days prior written notice. Upon termination of this agreement, Lessee agrees to remove all signage and repair damage due to excessive use or abuse. Lessor agrees to give lessee the right of first refusal on subsequent renewal of this agreement.]

10. **SUPPLEMENTAL COVENANTS** This section should contain any additional covenants, rights, responsibilities and/or agreements. -NO SAMPLE CLAUSE PROVIDED-

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this Agreement as of the Effective Date Set forth at the outset hereof.