

Dan Kent
Vice President of Initiatives for the
Galvan Foundation

Mr. Kent,

I read the parking study done by the Creighton-Manning Engineering (CME) firm for Galvan's development on N. 7th Street which you were kind enough to send me yesterday. As a 4-year resident and car owner in the neighborhood that will be directly affected by your planned development with at least 157 more cars needing a parking space, I find this so-called study to be beyond insulting. It is just plain inaccurate and poorly done, not worth the paper it was printed on. But, somehow, it seems to fit the need you are required to have for your planned apartment buildings. Funny how studies can do that sometimes.

CME sent observers into the "study area" ONCE for two hours last summer to create this study and form conclusions. They did this on the night of Thursday, July 9, 2020, from 10:30 pm to 12:30 am to see how many free (unmetered) on-street parking spaces were available in the 5 minute/quarter-mile walking range of your proposed development. They refer to this as "peak demand conditions on a weekday." No study of weekend peak demand was done.

Last night, on a similarly typical evening (though colder) as July 9th, I did essentially the same thing -- for well over an hour, starting at 10:30, I walked all the streets outlined in Table 2 of the study and recorded what parking spaces were available and what were taken. To show the contrast in findings, I will offer your data from Table 2 and then offer what I found last night. Are you ready?

Franklin St -- **24 SPACES TOTAL/5 SPACES OCCUPIED/19 AVAILABLE**
LAST NIGHT -- **9 SPACES/9 OCCUPIED/0 SPACES AVAILABLE!!**

Dodge St -- **12 / 9 / 15** available spaces (**a math error in your favor by 12!**)

LAST NIGHT -- **12 / 10 / 2** available spaces

N. 6th from Clinton to Washington -- **10 / 0 / 10** available spaces

LAST NIGHT -- **THERE ARE NO LEGAL PARKING SPACES HERE!** (the most there ever have been is 2, and those were taken away in August)

N. 6th from Washington to Prospect -- **10 / 5 / 5** available spaces

LAST NIGHT -- **8 / 8 / 0** **NO SPACES AVAILABLE!**

N. 6th from Prospect to State -- **10 / 6 / 4** available spaces

LAST NIGHT -- **11 / 11 / 0** **NO SPACES AVAILABLE!**

N. 6th from State to Columbia -- **19 / 11 / 8** available spaces

LAST NIGHT -- **11 / 10 / 1** available space

N. 7th from Washington to State -- **10 / 2 / 8** available spaces

LAST NIGHT -- **6 / 4 / 2** available spaces

N. 7th from State to Columbia -- **16 / 8 / 8** available spaces

LAST NIGHT -- **10 / 8 / 2** available spaces

Washington St. from 5th to 6th -- **60 / 33 / 27** available spaces

LAST NIGHT -- **31 / 31 / 0** **NO SPACES AVAILABLE!**

Prospect St. from 5th to 6th -- **60 / 23 / 37** available spaces

LAST NIGHT -- **32 / 28 / 4** available spaces

State St. from 5th to 6th -- **60 / 25 / 35** available spaces

LAST NIGHT -- **33 / 29 / 4** available spaces

State St. from 6th to 7th -- **16 / 11 / 5** available spaces

LAST NIGHT -- **13 / 11 / 2** available spaces

Columbia St. from 6th to 7th -- **13 / 6 / 7** available spaces

LAST NIGHT -- **13 / 11 / 2** available spaces

Last night I saw a total of 19 available spaces in your study area. CM claims that they saw 176 available spaces 5 months ago.

Why, Mr. Frank, do you suppose that there is such a discrepancy between our two studies and that CME found 9 times more available parking spaces than I did? For starters, CME found 10 spaces where none currently exist. But the bigger problem with the study is one of grand omission in that it pretends that the reality of ALTERNATE SIDE PARKING is non-existent in the City of Hudson. Unlike CMH's study, all of us car-driving residents without a driveway or a garage cannot afford to pretend that Alternate Side Parking doesn't apply to us. It's a reality many of us live with daily and, unless the rule is suspended, we all are expected to be aware of it and abide by it. You can't pretend to offer a serious study about parking in Hudson and fail to mention it once. It's absurd.

For example, the city's alternate side parking rules (unless they are suspended, which is rare) are in effect on State Street between 5th and 6th, where I live, which means that nightly **THERE ARE NEVER 60 SPACES TO CHOOSE FROM!** Unfortunately, notwithstanding your study, we only have about half that number available to park in overnight.

And in the winter on Washington and Prospect streets they also lose half of their available spaces, as they did last night. And the other months of the year these residents are also forced to keep their cars on one side of the street twice a week at night or get a \$15 ticket. It says it in no uncertain terms right on the signs all along both sides of those densely populated streets full of cars. But since your study wasn't done on a Monday or a Tuesday, your numbers would not reflect this. Do I need to highlight any other streets to show you how flawed your "study" was?

Your study concludes that on any typical weekday night in the study area , **65%** of total spaces are available. Last night, I found that **10% of spaces were available in your study area. TEN PERCENT. Would you call that being at or near parking capacity?** I have lived here for 4 years and you might want to know that **this is not unusual**. It is often a little better (more available spaces), but NEVER as good as what your study purports. Not at night. The amount of available spaces that I documented is what most people around here expect, especially with so many people now moving to Hudson. Parking spaces are less readily available than they used to be in the past 5 or 6 months. Please drive or walk around my neighborhood any night of the week and you will see that, unlike your laughable study, I am offering you the current reality. Oh, and stop by on a Saturday or Sunday sometime -- it can be worse. Yes, maybe below 10% availability. But how would you know -- CME took one look at parking on ONE weeknight in July and drew wide conclusions from that 2 hour period. When I hear the word ENGINEER, I think of someone who approaches things scientifically so that they can be accurate with their findings. Do you think that way, too, Mr. Frank? Do you believe that CME was adequately scientific in their approach to the study they created? They did a study of parking in the City of Hudson and did not acknowledge the issue of alternate side of street parking rules once. Would you call that acceptable?

ALSO, today I did my own little parking study in the municipal lot on Columbia Street which you are so confident that tenants of yours and residents in the neighborhood (including myself) wouldn't mind to park in overnight or any time of the day. "Hey everybody -- it's ONLY a 5-minute walk from your abode and you'll only have to cross 4 streets, including the truck route. And you won't have to fill the meters on the weekends!" Here is what your study claims: "There are 123 parking spaces associated with the lot located on Columbia Street which includes 109 metered and 14 permit parking spaces." However, the picture provided in the nearby margin of a PERMIT PARKING ONLY sign was not even taken in the lot on Columbia -- **it was taken in the municipal lot on Union Street, well away**

from your “study area.” There aren’t even any permit parking only spaces in the Columbia lot. How does a “mistake” like that happen?

Your study claims that the lot has a total of **123** metered parking spaces.

TODAY I COUNTED A TOTAL OF 89 AVAILABLE SPACES. Every winter the DPW removes 12 spaces in 3 corners of the lot for space to pile snow should it fall. There are 8 spaces only to be used for electric vehicles, and 12 to be used only for City Hall employees. 89 plus 12 plus 8 plus 12 gets us close to 123. Today at noon, there were **50 vehicles parked in the 89 total spaces**, leaving **39 SPACES FOR THE GENERAL PUBLIC.** While there are no special permit signs in the Columbia lot, there are 2 poorly located signs detailing the **alternate-side rules in effect EVERY NIGHT for the lot.** My calculator tells me that if there are 89 spaces in a parking lot, but only half can be used on any night, there will be **spaces for 45 cars on any given night. 45, not 123, or about a third of what CM found.**

Mr. Frank, are you aware that for several years the City of Hudson has been doing its best (which is to say, very little) to get visitors to our city to park in the municipal lots to ease the crush of cars trying to park on Warren Street? As Hudson continues to be a destination for people from all over the world, many arriving by automobile, It would be a victory if visiting cars chose the Columbia street lot first, where spaces are free on the weekends, before trying to park on the street. How would we be able to achieve this victory if your tenants and me and my neighbors are forced to park in the Columbia Street lot?

In conclusion, Mr. Frank, the study you paid CME to make for you and us (and that you plan to soon offer to the City of Hudson Planning Board) does not stand up to the most basic scrutiny. It is laughable, even despicable. If it were a project for a graduate school class in Traffic Planning it would have received an F. REDO! And that is what I suggest that you do as well, Mr. Frank. Pay your friends at CM to do another study, but this time widen your impact zone to a 10-minute walk from your proposed development. Maybe then you will find the 157 free parking spaces that you are so desperately searching for. Cus’ I can tell you right now, they are not to be had in my

neighborhood, even if you include the spaces in the municipal lot no one should be forced to park in.

Whatever you do in the future regarding your plans for my neighborhood, please don't waste our time with trash like this so-called study, it is insulting to be bothered with such rubbish from so-called professionals like yourself and CM. You should be ashamed. We all deserve better than this sloppy work full of falsehoods, omissions, misrepresentations, and bad math.

The parking study by CME ends with this sentence: "The available parking supply located within an approximate five-minute walk is more than adequate to accommodate the proposed development." You don't really expect us to believe that, do you, Mr. Kent? Do you believe it?

Bill Huston

(518) 653 1418

huston.bill@gmail.com