

Parking Survey Results

Summary

Seventy-five Friends responded to our survey. For most, on-site parking was personally not important. However, ten respondents have mobility limitations and for three of them on-site parking is very important.

Most think guests will regard on-site parking as important. Before Covid, two out of three people arrived by car. Most visited the meeting house more than twice a month and most would prefer in-person participation at the meeting house when that's possible again.

About one in ten would not be likely to attend if they arrived and had to park off site, and the assurance of a ride from off-site parking did not make attendance more likely. When asked if \$365,000 was a reasonable expenditure to create on-site parking, one in ten said no, four said yes, with the remaining half being undecided. Eight in ten were willing to help fund a parking project if necessary, typically at a level of over \$1,000.

Contents

- Summary
- Discussion of Results
- Appendix
 - The Questions
 - Charts and Graphs of responses
 - Verbatim Comments
 - Table of responses (anonymous)

Discussion

We set out to inform our thinking about the issue of parking by learning how many people drive and whether they are willing and able to walk from off-site parking. We also wanted to gauge the felt need for on-site parking relative to the cost involved. This is not intended as a vote or poll and is not statistically rigorous. Rather it provides an overview of the range of attitudes and needs of individual Friends. Finally, we sought to ask Friends to look to the future and consider how parking or lack of parking might influence use of our meetinghouse by the larger community and those seeking a place of worship.

Most people don't see on-site parking as essential to their attendance. But when asked how the lack of it may affect participation by guests, it was seen as more important. This is not surprising, regular attenders are bonded as a community whereas guests not so much. But the question calls for the respondent to imagine the attitude of others. We tend to project our personal opinion on others, so the importance to guests may suggest that it is also more important personally.

For the past year, we have met exclusively by Zoom online meetings. Nine out of ten people would prefer to meet at the meeting house and would do so even if they didn't find parking on the property. We

asked a follow-up question to see if having a ride from off-site parking would increase the attendance. This question may not have been well understood because fewer people said that they would be likely to attend if a ride was assured. It's safe to say that the assurance of a ride did not greatly increase the likelihood of attending. People may have been considering Zoom attendance as an alternative if they couldn't park on-site.

We presented the anticipated cost of creating on-site parking in the context of expenditures approved or considered in the past. Few Friends (1 in 10) were opposed to an expense comparable to what had been previously offered for purchase of the adjacent parking lot. Four in ten were undecided, and half felt it reasonable to spend \$365,000 for the project. Most were willing to consider contributing \$1,000 or more.

Our meeting, as a community, is engaged in a placemaking exercise which contemplates the uses of the property by both our regulars and the neighborhood at large. We asked how important it is to foster community uses. About six in ten see it as important. Four in ten are indifferent or see it as not important.

The Meeting appears divided on the importance of being proactive about assuring that our meeting has parking that it controls in the future. Half see it as a six or seven on our 7point scale. The rest give it lower importance (1 - 4 of 7 points).

About half of the respondents find it important to be proactive about compliance with regulatory parking requirements.

Questionnaire Team:

Katherine Borish <kborish9@gmail.com>

Mark Haber <expatsjp@yahoo.com>

Marguerite Chandler <margueritechandler@mac.com>

Mark Ratliff <mratliff70@gmail.com>

Richmond Shreve <rbshreve2@gmail.com>

Jasmine Spence <jasminemeray@gmail.com>

Peter Vari <petervariusa@gmail.com>