### Parking Search Caused Congestion: Where's all the fuss?

#### Rachel Weinberger, Adam Millard-Ball, and Robert C. Hampshire







#### The New York Times

The Opinion Pages | OP-ED CONTRIBUTOR

#### Gone Parkin'

By DONALD SHOUP MARCH 29, 2007

Los Angeles

MOST people view traffic with a mixture of rage and resignation: rage because congestion wastes valuable time, resignation because, well, what can anyone do about it? People have places to go, after all; congestion seems inevitable.

#### **Observations**

•A large percentage of traffic in business districts is due to drivers searching for curb parking. In a <u>15-</u> block area of Westwood CA, cruising for parking generates •950,000 excess vehicle-miles of travel per year, •wastes 47,0000 gallons of gas, and produces per year •730 tons of greenhouse gas carbon dioxide per year\*



\* Donald Shoup, The High Cost of Free Parking, American Planning Association Press, 2004.

		Share of	Average
		traffic	search
Year	City	cruising	time
		(percent)	(minutes)
1927	Detroit (1)	19%	
1927	Detroit (2)	34%	
1933	Washington		8.0
1960	New Haven	17%	
1965	London (1)		6.1
1965	London (2)		3.5
1965	London (3)		3.6
1977	Freiburg	74%	6.0
1984	Jerusalem		9.0
1985	Cambridge	30%	11.5
1993	Cape Town		12.2
1993	New York (1)	8%	7.9
1993	New York (2)		10.2
1993	New York (3)		13.9
1997	San Francisco		6.5
2001	Sydney		6.5
2005	Los Angeles	68%	3.3
2007	New York	28%	
2007	New York	45%	
2008	New York		3.8
2011	Barcelona	18%	
Average		34%	7.5

Source: Shoup, The High Cost of Free Parking, 2011

Research Question: What fraction of drivers are *really* cruising for parking?

#### Data-Driven Models of Parking Search

#### **GPS** Datasets:

- University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute
  - 11,148 trips over 5 years in Ann Arbor
- Commercially obtained dataset
  - 173,782 trips in San Francisco over a month period
- California Household Travel Survey
  - 270 trips terminating in San Francisco

# What is cruising for parking?

Trip length is at least 200 meters longer than the shortest legal path and 50% of identified excess occurs within the 400m of destination.

Figure 3 Definition of Cruising



#### Figure 2 Trip Trace with Driving and Walking





# Cruising is much lower than 34%!

		UMTRI	Commercial	
1	Relevant GPS traces	13,503	556,908	
2	Low-resolution traces*	469	444,219	
3	Traces ending on freeway	59	4,475	
4	Traces where map-matching fails**	3,145	10,769	
5	Usable GPS traces (row 1 – row 2 – row 3 – row 4)	9,830	97,445	
6	Cruise (actual trip is at least 200 meters longer than shortest legal path and 50% of identified excess occurs within the search area)	570	4,747	
7	Percent Cruising (row 6/row 5)	5.8% <b>[1]</b>	4.9%	
8	Average excess distance for cruising trips	548m	660m	
9	Average distance cruised for all trips (row 7 * row 8)	32m	32m	
	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>I Relevant GPS traces</li> <li>Low-resolution traces*</li> <li>Traces ending on freeway</li> <li>Traces where map-matching fails**</li> <li>Usable GPS traces (row 1 - row 2 - row 3 - row 4)</li> <li>Cruise (actual trip is at least 200 meters longer than shortest legal path and 50% of identified excess occurs within the search area)</li> <li>Percent Cruising (row 6/row 5)</li> <li>Average excess distance for cruising trips</li> <li>Average distance cruised for all trips (row 7 * row 8)</li> </ul>	Image: constraint of the search areaUMTRI1Relevant GPS traces13,5032Low-resolution traces*4693Traces ending on freeway594Traces where map-matching fails**3,1455Usable GPS traces (row 1 - row 2 - row 3 - row 4)9,8306Cruise (actual trip is at least 200 meters longer than shortest legal path and 50% of identified excess occurs within the search area)5707Percent Cruising (row 6/row 5)5.8%[1]8Average excess distance for cruising trips548m9Average distance cruised for all trips (row 7* row 8)32m	Image: Market instant

# Average Cruising Distance is the same in San Francisco and Ann Arbor!

		UMTRI	Commercial	
1	Relevant GPS traces	13,503	556,908	
2	Low-resolution traces*	469	444,219	
3	Traces ending on freeway	59	4,475	
4	Traces where map-matching fails**	3,145	10,769	
5	Usable GPS traces (row 1 – row 2 – row 3 – row 4)	9,830	97,445	
6	Cruise (actual trip is at least 200 meters longer than shortest legal path and 50% of identified excess occurs within the search area)	570	4,747	
7	Percent Cruising (row 6/row 5)	5.8% <b>[1]</b>	4.9%	
8	Average excess distance for cruising trips	548m	660m	
9	Average distance cruised for all trips (row 7 * row 8)	32m	32m	

## Distributions of Excess Travel and Repeated Blocks (cruising trips only)



### **Temporal Patterns of Cruising**









#### Figure 43 Probability of High-Cruising Trips in Ann Arbor Citywide











# Cruising is much lower than 34%!

		UMTRI	Commercial	
1	Relevant GPS traces	13,503	556,908	
2	Low-resolution traces*	469	444,219	
3	Traces ending on freeway	59	4,475	
4	Traces where map-matching fails**	3,145	10,769	
5	Usable GPS traces (row 1 – row 2 – row 3 – row 4)	9,830	97,445	
6	Cruise (actual trip is at least 200 meters longer than shortest legal path and 50% of identified excess occurs within the search area)	570	4,747	
7	Percent Cruising (row 6/row 5)	5.8% <b>[1]</b>	4.9%	
8	Average excess distance for cruising trips	548m	660m	
9	Average distance cruised for all trips (row 7 * row 8)	32m	32m	
	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>I Relevant GPS traces</li> <li>Low-resolution traces*</li> <li>Traces ending on freeway</li> <li>Traces where map-matching fails**</li> <li>Usable GPS traces (row 1 - row 2 - row 3 - row 4)</li> <li>Cruise (actual trip is at least 200 meters longer than shortest legal path and 50% of identified excess occurs within the search area)</li> <li>Percent Cruising (row 6/row 5)</li> <li>Average excess distance for cruising trips</li> <li>Average distance cruised for all trips (row 7 * row 8)</li> </ul>	Image: constraint of the search areaUMTRI1Relevant GPS traces13,5032Low-resolution traces*4693Traces ending on freeway594Traces where map-matching fails**3,1455Usable GPS traces (row 1 - row 2 - row 3 - row 4)9,8306Cruise (actual trip is at least 200 meters longer than shortest legal path and 50% of identified excess occurs within the search area)5707Percent Cruising (row 6/row 5)5.8%[1]8Average excess distance for cruising trips548m9Average distance cruised for all trips (row 7* row 8)32m	Image: Market instant

#### **Based on**

-R. Weinberger, A. Millard-Ball and R.C. Hampshire, "Parking Search Caused Congestion: Where's all the fuss?", *Transportation Research Board Annual Meeting*, 2016.

-R. Weinberger, A. Millard-Ball, R.C. Hampshire, T. Dykstra J.Karlin-Resnick and D. Perlmutter, "Parking-Cruising Caused Congestion," U.S. Department of Transportation, SBIR 14-2, Technical Report, 2016.

-Adam Millard-Ball, R. Weinberger and R.C. Hampshire, "Solving Cruising for Parking: Lessons from San Francisco," *Access Magazine*, 2016.

-A. Millard-Ball, R.R. Weinberger and R.C Hampshire, ``Is the curb 80% full or 20% empty? A Dynamic Parking Pricing Experiment in San Francisco," *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* 63 76-92, 2014

-A. Millard-Ball, R.R. Weinberger and R.C Hampshire, `` On the Analysis of Parking Elasticities," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 79.4 330-336, 2014.

# Supported By

- 1. CAREER Award, National Science Foundation
- Parking-Cruising Caused Congestion & Targeting Public Mitigation Investments, U.S. Department Of Transportation (USDOT) Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR) Phase I.
- 1. Risk Management and Modeling for Healthcare Services and Sustainable Transportation, National Science Foundation.