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Chapter 1
Why Survey Households?

Understanding public opinion is key as Arlington County embarks on its first review of the Residential Permit Parking (RPP) Program in over a decade.
Background

Arlington County provides its Residential Permit Parking (RPP) Program as an option to help County neighborhoods manage demand for public curbside space. Neighborhoods may petition to participate in the program.

While many neighborhoods have organized support for a petition to participate since the program was initiated in the 1970s, others have chosen not to. The flexible nature of the County’s RPP Program has created a diverse parking environment where restrictions vary by neighborhood.

To support the first review of the RPP Program in over a decade, Arlington County sought to establish a current understanding of public opinion. This report summarizes information about the design, administration, and findings from the Spring 2019 Household Public Opinion Survey about the RPP Program.
Chapter 1

Residential Permit Parking Program Overview

The RPP Program is Arlington County’s primary tool for managing on-street parking demand, and the County is reviewing the program for the first time since 2005.

Questions This Chapter Answers

- How does the County manage on-street residential parking demand now?
- How should the County manage on-street parking demand in the future?
- Why was this household survey conducted?

Arlington County uses the Residential Permit Parking (RPP) Program to manage on-street parking in 24 residential zones. The intent of the County’s RPP Program is to provide convenient street parking for residents in balance with other uses of Arlington’s public streets. Arlington County is conducting a review of the RPP Program for the first time since 2005. The review is a two-year effort that began in fall 2017 to assess the program’s purpose and function and to identify potential policy changes.

As part of the review, the County identified a household survey as a tool to gather public opinion data about RPP Program efficiency, user experience, fairness, and the effectiveness with which it manages parking. Insights from the resulting Household Public Opinion Survey on the RPP (Household Survey), completed in spring 2019, will inform the larger review process and its outcomes.

Residential Permit Parking Zones

Arlington County uses the RPP Program to manage on-street parking on approximately 600 blocks in 24 zones across the county (see Figure 1). Approximately 9,300 households participated in the program in fiscal year 2018 by using one or more types of permits or passes offered through the program. These pass types include:

- **Vehicle-Specific Permits** – A decal placed on the vehicle bumper. Each household may buy up to three, at a price of $20 per permit for the first two and $50 for the third permit. Individual neighborhoods can petition to raise or lower the number of decals allowed per household.

- **FlexPass** – A dashboard placard specific to the household address and zone number. Each household may obtain one FlexPass for free.

- **Short-Term Visitor Pass** – A dashboard pass that is valid for three days, based on the dates written in by the resident. Each household may obtain one book of multiple visitor passes for free and pay $5 for each extra book.

In addition to residential permits, landlords may apply for a Landlord Permit.
To be eligible for the RPP Program, neighborhoods must:

• Attain support by petition from 60% of households on each block
• Have parking occupancy rates of over 75%
• Have over 25% of parking spaces occupied by out-of-area vehicles at least four days per week and nine months per year

**Multifamily housing units have extra eligibility requirements:**

• Duplexes and townhouses must have been built before 1997
• Units for more than two families must have been built before 1964
• The building must not charge separately for parking or the fee must be lower than the County’s RPP fees
• On-site parking, such as lots or garages, is not obstructed, and spaces are striped
• The building was not approved under Site Plan, Unified Residential Development Use Permit, or Unified Commercial Development processes
• No off-street parking is available within blocks through arrangement with the building’s management

During the review process, the County has placed a moratorium on new RPP petition submissions, whether to create new zones or to remove or modify existing zones.

Figure 1. RPP Zones in Arlington County

![Map of RPP Zones in Arlington County](image)
Household Public Opinion Survey on RPP

As part of the RPP Program review, an independent consultant (Survey Team) designed, administered, and analyzed the results of the Household Survey. Public input gathered from in-person “pop-up” events and an online comment box during an earlier phase of the RPP Program review informed the objectives and eventual design of the Household Survey.

Household Survey Objectives

- Evaluate public awareness of, participation in, and perception of the RPP Program
- Identify resident preferences for the future of the RPP Program
- Follow best practices in questionnaire design and sampling so the responses are representative of the County's population, and so responses from different sub-populations can be compared
- Inform data-driven policy decision-making by the Arlington County Board

This report summarizes the Household Survey design, analysis methods, and results. More detailed documentation can be found in Appendices 1 through 5.

Key Takeaways from this Chapter

- Around 9,300 out of 113,000 Arlington households participate in the RPP Program.
- Program eligibility is based on neighbor support and parking occupancy studies.
- Multifamily areas face additional eligibility requirements.
- In reviewing the RPP Program for the first time in over a decade, the County seeks to establish an unbiased public opinion baseline.
- The household survey supplements other review efforts by gauging public awareness of, participation in, and perception of the existing program and proposed/hypothetical changes.
Chapter 2
How was the survey designed?
Questions This Chapter Answers

- What makes a good survey?
- How was the Household Survey designed?
- How was the Household Survey distributed to residents?
Chapter 2

Household Survey Design

The Household Survey was thoughtfully designed to be a clear and effective way for respondents to provide feedback, generating unbiased results for the County.

To truly capture and reflect Arlington County residents’ opinions on the RPP Program, the survey had to be designed with the characteristics of the community and the needs of the respondents in mind. For maximum effectiveness, the Household Survey process included planning for four main components:

1. Sampling
2. Recruitment
3. Questionnaire
4. Administration

As shown in Figure 2, the Survey Team and Arlington County staff engaged in an iterative process to design the survey, with each component informing the next.

Figure 2. Survey Design Components
1) Sampling Plan

The Survey Team developed a sampling plan to gather responses from a representative sample of the Arlington County population and to attain sample sizes large enough to compare responses between different population sub-groups, including:

- Households eligible to participate in the RPP Program (i.e., living in an RPP zone)
- Households not eligible to participate in the RPP Program (i.e., living outside an RPP zone)
- Households living in different housing types (i.e., single-family detached, single-family attached, and multi-family)
- Households in different geographic sub-areas based on Arlington County planning corridors

Sampling Frame

The Survey Team used US Postal Service data and Arlington County’s street addresses dataset to develop the survey sampling frame. After constructing a comprehensive inventory of all residential addresses in Arlington County using the two data sources, the survey team attributed the households in the survey sampling frame with their housing type, RPP eligibility, and County-defined planning corridor location using Arlington County spatial data. The final sampling frame contained 111,932 households.

Sample Size Selection Procedure

The Survey Team determined how many households would need to be included from each population sub-group to meaningfully compare responses between different sub-groups. After identifying the sample size for each sub-group, the Survey Team randomly selected households from these groups. Different sub-groups had sample sizes based on their proportion of the sub-group population. For smaller sub-groups, a higher response rate was needed to meaningfully inform survey findings. The final sample for the Household Survey contained 60,000 households (Figure 3).

Key Terms

- **Target Population**: The entire set of units for which the survey data are to be used to make inferences. For the Household Survey, the target population included all households within Arlington County.

- **Survey Sampling Frame**: A list of units that defines the target population from which a sample is selected. For the Household Survey, the sampling frame was a comprehensive list of all residential addresses in Arlington County.
Figure 3. Final Sample of 60,000 Households that Received Postcard Mailers
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2) Recruitment Plan
The sampling plan established the main recruitment plan objective: to contact and incentivize 60,000 households to take the Household Survey. The Survey Team identified postcard mailers as the preferred mode of contact to encourage respondents to take the Household Survey. The recruitment plan recommended two rounds of postcard correspondence to improve overall response rates. As an added incentive for survey recruits, the Survey Team advertised that 10 Visa gift cards for $100 each would be awarded to survey participants via a random drawing.

Household Identifier Codes
A unique identifier code was printed on each household’s postcard that only the Survey Team had access to. The household’s unique code contained two digits representing the household’s sub-group followed by a five-digit sequential record number within each sub-group. This identifier ensured the Survey Team could filter on unique responses and enabled them to generate anonymized survey results. The codes were used to assign each survey response record to the correct sub-group in the data analysis process. The survey responses were anonymized before the analysis results were shared with the County.

Recruitment Postcard
The recruitment postcard design included an introduction to the Household Survey and an invitation to take the survey online via web address or over the phone through a call center number (Figure 4). The postcard included the same invitation in English, Spanish, and Amharic for the online survey web address, and in English and Spanish for the call center number. The Survey Team identified a range of potential independent call center providers, but could not identify a call center that would provide English, Spanish, and Amharic translation.

Figure 4. Survey Recruitment Postcard

See Appendix 2 for additional information about the Recruitment Plan.
3) Survey Questionnaire

The survey questions were developed through an iterative process. First, the Survey Team drafted a list of topics and a comprehensive set of potential questions for each one. Survey data assessments show that respondent drop-off rates increase with survey length. The Survey Team reduced the initial set of questions to develop a final questionnaire that survey respondents would be likely to complete. The team removed low-priority topics, reorganized high-priority topics to reflect a more logical flow in the questionnaire, and revised questionnaire wording to reduce cognitive burden for respondents. After finalizing the survey content, the Survey Team developed survey logic so that individual respondents would only see questions relevant to their sampling plan sub-group.

Topics

The Survey Team identified seven major survey topics, each with a set of sub-topics, based on the results from public outreach efforts conducted by Arlington County staff in summer and fall of 2018. The Survey Team prioritized the topics in a ‘topics guide’ for the survey to cover. The team prioritized topics based on the following considerations:

- Issues most commonly identified by the public
- Potential effectiveness of the survey for obtaining feedback about the topic
- Applicability of the topics to the target sub-groups identified in the Sampling Plan
- Limiting the survey length to encourage a higher response rate

The prioritized set of topics guided the development of the questions in the survey. The high-priority topics were:

- Topic 1 – RPP Program Satisfaction
- Topic 2 – Problems the RPP Program should solve
- Topic 3 – Eligibility for the Program
- Topic 4 – Program Fees
- Topic 5 – Program Flexibility
- Topic 6 – RPP and Infill Development
- Topic 7 – Demographics, Vehicle Ownership, and Parking Behavior

Using these topics as a guide, the Survey Team designed the questionnaire with completion time in mind to maximize the number of complete responses.

Branching Logic

The questionnaire used branching logic to determine which sections and question variations would appear for the different sub-groups shown in Figure 5. In addition to showing or skipping major sections, the Survey Team used branching logic to provide question wording and answer categories that would make sense for each type of respondent. For example, respondents who did not know about the RPP Program were not shown answer categories containing terms like "FlexPass."

Key Term

- **Branching Logic**: Used in survey design to customize which questions and answer categories are shown based on the respondent's answers.

---

1 https://www.surveymonkey.com/curiosity/survey_questions_and_completion_rates/
Figure 5. Branching for Sub-Groups Through Survey Questionnaire Sections

- All Respondents:
  1. Make your voice heard! / 2. Introduction
  - All respondents received the same question.

- Do not know about RPP

- Know about RPP
  3. Restrictions on Your Street
    - Subgroup received the same question.
    - Live on a street with no RPP restrictions / Don’t know
    - RPP restrictions are on street in front of home
  4. Opinion of Restrictions on Your Street
  5. Purpose of Parking Management
    - Subgroups received similar questions with variation in the wording and answer choices.
  6. Managing Parking Demand
    - Subgroups received similar questions with variation in the wording and answer choices.
  7. Program Eligibility
  8. Trade-off: Visitor Parking
  9. Trade-off: Flexibility vs. Enforcement
    - Subgroups received the same questions.
  10. Your Parking Characteristics
    - All respondents received the same questions, with one question omitted for those who did not know about the program.
  11. Your Visitors’ Parking Characteristics
  12. Residential Parking Preferences
    - For Section 11, subgroups received similar questions with variation in the wording and answer choices. For Section 12, all respondents received the same questions.
  13. Permit Misuse and Enforcement
    - Subgroups received the same questions.
  14. Your Housing
  15. Demographics
  16. Contact Information for Prize Drawing
    - All respondents received the same questions, with one question omitted for those living in multi-family homes.

See Appendix 3 for an overview of the topics guide and prioritization process, the sub-topics, related questions, and branching logic.
4) Survey Administration

The Survey Team opened the survey and mailed the first set of recruitment postcards on April 3, 2019. The survey remained open for a little under one month and closed on May 1, 2019.

Leading up to and throughout the survey administration phase, the Survey Team undertook the following actions to ensure successful administration of the survey:

• Conducted survey testing with a pilot survey for Arlington County staff

• Administered the survey through two modes: self-administered online survey and interviewer-administered phone survey

• Provided the survey in three languages: English, Spanish, and Amharic

• Monitored survey response rates

• Responded to email inquiries from respondents who had difficulty accessing the online survey

The phone survey required call center staff to administer the survey. Call center staff provided respondents to the phone survey with one opportunity to stop responding to the survey questionnaire:

• A stopping point was added after the last trade-off question (Section 9), during which call center staff administering the survey would ask the respondent if they wanted to answer a few additional questions.

• If the respondent answered “yes,” the staff proceeded through the rest of the survey sections.

• If the respondent answered “no,” the staff would end the survey and ask for the respondent’s contact information for the prize drawing.

The call center version used the same online platform for the call center staff to enter the responses. The call center version was only available in English and Spanish. For the survey logic of the call center version, see Appendix 3.

Key Takeaways from this Chapter

• The survey design consisted of four major components.

• The sampling plan ensured a representative sample from Arlington County residents across subgroups of interest.

• The recruitment plan supported the survey distribution to 60,000 households in the sample.

• The questionnaire was designed to create a logical flow for survey respondents in different subgroups.

• The survey was administered online and by phone, with Spanish and Amharic translations available for the online version.
Chapter 3
Who Responded to the Survey
Questions This Chapter Answers

• How were the survey data weighted and analyzed?
• What types of households responded, and where are they located?
• How do respondent distributions compare to County population distributions?
Chapter 3

Analysis Methods and Respondent Distributions

The survey achieved a response rate that allowed for robust results. Responses were made representative of the County population by appropriate weighting to the final sample.

A typical household survey of this type and scale would receive a response rate of about 2.5%. The Household Public Opinion Survey on RPP went out to 60,000 Arlington households and received 4,539 responses, for a response rate of 7.5%. Figure 6 shows the approximate locations of respondent households. To be assured of feedback with a statistical significance for countywide results, a response rate of 1.7% was required. To ensure statistical significance for each sub-group, higher response rates ranging from 2.1% to 14.7% depending on the group were required. See Appendix 1 for more information.

Figure 6. Final Set of 4,539 Households That Responded to Survey
Analysis Methods

The final household sample was weighted according to the stratification variables, which were based on RPP eligibility, housing type, and planning corridor location. Because only a fraction of the Arlington County household population took the survey, weights are used to measure the number of households in the population that are represented by each household in the sample and enable the final estimates to be more representative of the Arlington County household population. The weighting was used to adjust for the disproportionate sampling of sub-groups and to compensate for non-response within stratification groups. The final weights ranged from one respondent household representing 5.7 households in the County to one respondent household representing 81.3 households in the County, depending on the sub-group. The weights summed across all of the respondent households needed to be equivalent to the household population of Arlington County. The reported weighted percentages provided estimates that are a better representation of the Arlington County household population. This can be confirmed by comparing the weighted survey distributions to the Arlington County distributions according to the US Census Bureau’s 2013-2017 American Community Survey (ACS) five-year estimates.

After the final household sample was weighted, the Survey Team performed the following types of analysis:

- Comparison of respondent distributions and actual Arlington County distributions of respondent demographics and geographies
- Frequencies and weighted distributions for program feedback questions
- Cross tabulations between sub-groups and program feedback questions
- Tests of statistical significance including design-adjusted t tests and chi-square tests
- Logistic regression modeling on multiple variables to estimate how much more likely certain sub-groups are to have specific parking experiences or opinions about the program
- Geo-spatial density analysis of multiple question responses

Appendix 4 includes additional information about how the final household sample was weighted.

Key Terms

- **Target Sub-groups**: Sub-populations categorized by RPP eligibility, housing type, and planning corridor location.
- **Stratification Groups**: The mutually exclusive combination of sub-groups, for example, RPP-eligible single-family homes in the Columbia Pike area.
Who Responded to the Survey?

The following distributions compare the respondent households to the weighted households that better represent the Arlington County population, and where available, to census data from the ACS five-year estimates from 2013-2017.

**Demographics: Income**

High-income households were overrepresented among respondents. Households making over $100,000 per year comprised 70% of the respondents, while according to the county-level ACS five-year estimates, these households comprise 56% of the Arlington County population. Low-income households were least likely to respond to the survey. The discrepancies between county-level ACS five-year estimates and the weighted percent of respondent households arise because the survey weights were not post-stratified to income distributions. The Survey Team determined that income was not consistent across the stratification variables (e.g., planning corridors and RPP eligibility) and therefore would lead to over weighting in some stratification sub-groups. It should be noted that the weighting did reduce the over representation of the highest income earners—for example, households making $200,000 or more comprised 28% of the respondents, while comprising 22% of the Arlington County population. After weighting, this income group comprised 20% of the weighted households. Weighting also improved the representation of the lower income sub-groups—for example, households making less than $24,999 annually comprised only 3% of the respondent households, even though 10% of the county population is in this income group. After weighting, the lowest-income households comprised 4% of the weighted households.

**Figure 7. Income Distribution Among Respondents, Weighted Households, and County Population**
Demographics: Gender

Men were slightly more likely to respond to the survey than women, but the gender distribution of survey respondents is close to the population distribution. Weighted and unweighted distributions were equal when rounding to whole numbers.

Figure 8. Gender Distribution Among Respondents and County Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-binary</strong></td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographics: Race and Ethnicity

White/Caucasian residents comprise the majority of the Arlington County population and were overrepresented among respondents, while Hispanic/Latino, Black/African American/Afro-Caribbean, and Asian/Pacific Islander residents were under-represented. For example, census data estimates that Hispanic/Latino residents make up 16% of the Arlington County population, but only 4% of survey respondents identified as Hispanic/Latino.

The survey condensed race and ethnicity into a single question to increase response rates, while the ACS considers Hispanic/Latino ethnicity separately from race and does not have a Middle Eastern/North African category. Survey respondents who chose multiple racial/ethnic categories were categorized as multi-racial for the purpose of this survey.

Figure 9. Racial/Ethnic Distribution Among Respondents, Weighted Households, and County Population
Demographics: Language

Most survey respondents (89%) speak English only, with 10% of respondents speaking English and a second language and less than 1% speaking only a different language. The survey results are not exactly comparable to census data, because the ACS tracks languages spoken at home by level of English. For example, according to census data, 71% of Arlington County residents speak English only, with the next most common language being Spanish. The ACS estimates that 14% of county residents speak Spanish at home, of which 10% also speak English “very well” and 4% is less proficient in English. These results suggest that those who speak only English were over-represented among respondents compared to the county population. Because of both linguistic and cultural barriers, limited-English households tend to be more difficult to reach for surveys and public engagement more broadly. The Spanish version of the survey received several hundred responses, but the response rate from the Spanish-speaking community could have been improved by translating the recruitment postcard into Spanish for an additional wave of recruitment in areas with higher concentrations of Hispanic/Latino residents. The Amharic version of the survey did not receive any responses, potentially because the recruitment postcard was not available in Amharic. However, the Ethiopian community is dispersed throughout the county and the greater region, making it difficult to select neighborhoods that would receive postcards in Amharic if they had been available.

Figure 10. Distribution of Languages Spoken by Respondents, Weighted Households, and County Population
Demographics: Housing Type

Households in single-family detached homes were over-represented among survey respondents (46% of respondents). Results were weighted to reflect a more accurate population distribution of 25% single-family detached, 6% single-family attached (such as townhomes and duplexes), and 69% in multi-family homes (such as apartments and condominiums).

Figure 11. Distribution of Housing Unit Types Among Respondents and Weighted Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Weighted Respondent Households</th>
<th>Unweighted Respondent Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Detached</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Attached</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where Do Respondents Live?

Planning Corridors

Three planning corridors were included as sub-groups: Rosslyn Ballston, Columbia Pike, and Route 1, shown in Figure 13. These areas tend to have RPP restrictions in single-family neighborhoods near multi-family neighborhoods. The planning corridors used for the survey do not exactly match those used by the Arlington County Department of Community Planning and Housing Development (CPHD). The corridors used in the survey are larger than those used by CPHD so that they encompass the nearby neighborhoods with RPP restrictions. The corridors used for the survey were also built with Census Block Group boundaries so that demographic

Figure 12. Housing Unit Types in Arlington County
results could be compared with census data. Overall, other areas of the county that predominantly contain established single-family neighborhoods had the highest percent of respondents (29%), while the Route 1 area had the lowest percent of respondents. However, all other areas in the county outside of the three planning corridors and the Rosslyn-Ballston planning corridor responses were weighted to represent a higher share and the Columbia Pike and Route 1 responses were weighted to represent a lower share to match the county household population distribution.

**Figure 13. Arlington County Planning Corridors Used for Sample Stratification**
Figure 14. Planning Corridor Distribution Among Respondents, Weighted Households, and County Population

RPP Zones
Residents of RPP zones (those that have RPP restrictions on the street in front of their home) comprised 32% of respondents, but only 10% of the county population lives inside an RPP zone. The final sample was weighted to reduce overrepresentation of RPP zone residents. Zone 6 is the largest in terms of percentage of county population living within it (1.9%) and had a disproportionately high percentage of respondents. Zones 1, 2, 3, 6, and 7 were most overrepresented, while Zones 15, 16, 20, and 23 had very few respondents.
Figure 15. RPP Zone Distribution Among Respondents, Weighted Households, and County Population
Civic Associations

Respondents living in the Arlington Ridge and Aurora Highlands Civic Association areas were most likely to respond to the survey. The Survey Team did not have data for the number of households per civic association, so it is unknown whether any civic association is over- or under-represented in the data.

Figure 16. Top 5 and Bottom 5 Civic Association for Survey Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic Association</th>
<th>Percent of Respondent Households</th>
<th>Weighted Percent of Respondent Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Ridge</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora Highlands</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballston - Virginia Square</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal City</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashton Heights</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Valley Nature Area</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th Rd S</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverwood</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain Bridge Forest</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivercrest</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Takeaways from this Chapter

- 4,539 households responded, for a response rate of 7.5%.
- High earners, white residents, English-speaking households, single-family households, residents living in RPP zones, and Rosslyn-Ballston area households were most likely to respond.
- Sample weights reduced the share of overrepresented groups and boosted the share of underrepresented groups.
Chapter 4
What Do Residents Think About the RPP Program
Questions This Chapter Answers

- Do residents know about and participate in the program?
- Do residents want to have restrictions on their streets? Why or why not?
- How do residents think future demand should be managed? How should the program be structured? Who should be eligible to participate?
- Do residents think that permit costs should vary?
- What influences how residents perceive parking issues?
Chapter 4

Program Awareness and Participation

Residents living inside and outside of RPP zones offered feedback on their experience with the program and with parking in general.

The following results are the most important highlights from the survey. All percentages are weighted to compensate for non-response and to better reflect county household population distributions. Results are presented in the following format: X% (X) where percentage is the weighted result and the absolute number in the parenthesis is the unweighted frequency (i.e. actual number of respondent households).

See Appendix 5 for a ‘data book’ of detailed survey results.

Awareness

Most people (79%) are aware of the RPP Program. The households that are least likely to have heard about the RPP Program are people:

- Living in the Route 1 area (34% of Route 1 area households, compared to 15-23% of other areas)
- Living in multi-family housing (27%, compared to 7-10% for single-family housing types)
- Who identified as Black/African American, Asian, or Hispanic/Latino (42%, 35%, and 32%, respectively, compared to 20% of White households)
- Without children in their household (23% of households without children, compared to 16% of those with children)

Figure 17. Did you know that Arlington County has a residential parking permit program?

Yes: 79% (3,909)  No: 21% (621)
**Current Restrictions**

Most people do not have restrictions in front of their home (which is in line with the statistic that 90% live outside RPP zones). Notably, 7% of households did not know if there are parking restrictions on their street. Households that are least likely to have RPP restrictions on their street are people:

- Living in the Columbia Pike area (76% of Columbia Pike area households)
- Living in single-family attached homes (76% of households in single-family attached homes)

**Figure 18. Are there RPP restrictions on the street in front of your home?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21% (1,579)</td>
<td>72% (2,188)</td>
<td>7% (139)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level of Participation in RPP Program**

Eligibility for the program was determined using the household identifier code, and participation was determined from responses to the question “What best describes your participation in the Arlington County Residential Permit Parking Program?” with selection options for different permit types. Since most households are outside the RPP zones or may be in specific types of ineligible housing, they are not eligible to participate (91%). However, of households that are eligible, most use permits. Very few eligible households do not use permits.

**Figure 19. Participation in the RPP Program**

- Household buys permits: 9% (1,297)
- Household is not eligible to participate: 91% (3,072)
- Household is eligible but not buying permits: 0.5% (66)
**Program Feedback**

**Do Households Want Restrictions on Their Streets?**
Most households want to keep parking as it is now, whether they have RPP restrictions on their streets or not.

**Keep Existing RPP Zones**
Most households in RPP zones want to keep restrictions on their streets (72%). Households most likely to want to keep existing restrictions were people:

- Living in single-family households (attached and detached) (91% and 82%, respectively, compared to 57% of those in multi-family homes)
- Households that use permits (93%, compared to 50% of households not using permits)

**Figure 20. Are you in favor of keeping the residential parking restrictions on the street in front of your home?**

| Yes: 72% (1,365) | No: 20% (156) | No Opinion: 8% (66) |

**Keep Streets Outside the RPP Zones the Way They Are**
Most households outside of RPP Zones do not want to add restrictions on their street (61%). Households more likely to want to add RPP restrictions are people:

- Living in the Columbia Pike area (22% of all Columbia Pike households, compared to less than 14% of households in other areas)
  - Single-family households in the Columbia Pike area were most likely to want to add restrictions (36% and 38% for detached and attached homes, respectively)
- Living in single-family attached homes (37%, compared to 17% of single-family detached and 12% of multi-family homes)

**Figure 21. Would you like the street in front of your home to have residential permit parking restrictions?**

| Yes: 14% (487) | No: 61% (1,299) | No Opinion: 9.7% (191) | Need More Information: 15% (353) |
Why Do People Want/Not Want Restrictions on Their Streets?

Those who favor restrictions want to assure their own parking and prevent others from parking

Parking near their home and discouraging commuter parking are the top two most common reasons for favoring RPP restrictions, whether among those in RPP zones or among those outside RPP zones who want to add restrictions.

Figure 22. Select the top 3 reasons why you want to keep/add restrictions on your street

- In RPP + Want to keep restrictions (Q4a)
- Outside RPP + Want to add restrictions (Q4b)

- To make sure that I can park near my home: 79% (871) / 76% (269)
- To discourage commuter parking: 77% (811) / 66% (221)
- To discourage parking by residents of nearby apartment or condo buildings: 40% (415) / 39% (158)
- To discourage parking by business customers: 37% (367) / 37% (117)
- To improve neighborhood safety: 35% (368) / 40% (149)
- To reduce litter and noise: 20% (196) / 24% (94)
- Other: 12% (142) / 19% (72)
Respondents who selected “other” as the reason for why they wanted to keep or add restrictions provided the following sample of write-in reasons (direct quotes have been abbreviated for clarity):

- "To discourage parking by O’Connell students"
- “[To discourage on-street parking by] VA Hospital Center employees and patients”
- “To reduce parking by local business employees. Restaurant staff used to park on our street. The spots would be taken from 4pm-2am every day. Fine, except I can’t park when I get home and also hear the noise at 2am when workers head home.”
- “To discourage work vehicles, commuters, and have parking for my guests”
- “To eliminate nonresidents from leaving their cars parked for days at a time”
- “[To] discourage commercial and stored/abandoned vehicles…”
- “To discourage car with Maryland license plate parking…”
- “To stop Maryland registered vehicles using our street for free parking when flying out of National airport”
- “I would like to have just one space where I can park in front of my home I’ve lived in for 45 years.”
- “To restrict neighbors with numerous tenants from occupying more than two parking spots in the same street”
- “To allow folks to walk safely on our street which already has limited parking to/from our homes”
- “To reduce illegally parked cars blocking sight lines at the intersection near an elementary school.”
- “We live directly in front of an on-ramp to the interstate (..) and people (..) park (..) in front of our house for the tolls to go down…”

I would like to have just one space where I can park in front of my home I’ve lived in for 45 years.
Those who oppose restrictions view street parking as a shared public resource

Households who do not favor restrictions feel that everyone should have access to public street parking (80%). Separately, more than half of the households who do not favor restrictions feel that they are unnecessary because parking is already easy to find. These groups included:

- **Residents of Rosslyn-Ballston** (88% of households in the area, compared to 76-80% of other areas), even though they were less likely to say that restrictions are not needed because parking is easy to find (only 33% of households in the area, compared to 45-74% of other areas)

- **Those living in multifamily homes** (84%, compared to 71% of those living in single-family detached homes), even though they were less likely to say restrictions are not needed because parking is easy to find (only 43% of multifamily homes, compared to 64% and 86% of single-family attached and detached homes respectively)

- **Renters** (83% of renters, compared to 77% of homeowners), even though they were less likely to say restrictions are not needed because parking is easy to find (only 40% of renters, compared to 69% of homeowners).
  - Renters were also more likely to think that costs for permits and passes are too high (42%, compared to 30% of homeowners)

Figure 23. Select the top 3 reasons why you do not wish to have restrictions on your street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyone should have access to public street parking</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is already easy to find parking</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cost of permits &amp; passes is too high</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are nearby businesses that could use the parking</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process to get passes is difficult</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb space is better used for other things</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are nearby facilities that could use the parking</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents who selected “other” as the reason for why they do not favor restrictions provided the following sample of write-in reasons (direct quotes have been abbreviated for clarity):

- “It is difficult and expensive to host get togethers including children’s parties and playgroups at homes where permits are required.”
- “I want visitors to be able to park easily when they visit.”
- “Any charge to park in front of your own house is wrong.”
- “Residents should have free street parking; taxes are too high.”
- “Should not have to pay to park my wife’s and son’s car in front of our house.”
- “We currently don’t have a problem with commuters parking in our immediate neighborhood.”
- “Right now parking isn’t an issue. If it were, I would want restrictions.”
- “I live in a residential neighborhood and most residents use their garages/driveways to park.”
- “Want parking for local service providers.”
- “The county should focus on public transit instead of accommodating cars: any program that makes it easier to use a car in areas with Metro/bus access is a long-term disservice to the community.”
- “It is unfair to multifamily renters who cannot get parking passes.”

“Any charge to park in front of your own house is wrong.”
How Should Future Demand Be Managed?

Based on whether they had restrictions and whether they wanted to keep, add, or remove restrictions, respondents were asked to select their preferred demand management measures in the case of hypothetical parking demand increases. Of the respondent groups who provided unique proposals for managing demand, 2% to 9% recommended that either the County or private developers build more parking.

Have Restrictions and Favor Them: Permit Supply

Respondents who live in RPP zones and want to keep restrictions were asked about permit-related measures for demand management. Lowering the maximum number of permits, either alone or in combination with a permit cost increase, was the most popular option among 49% of households. Increasing the cost of permits was preferred by 39% of households. Using a combination of permit supply and cost adjustments was preferred by 20% of households. Those favoring permit cost increases as a demand management measure were more likely to have a higher income (approximately 45-50% of households making at least $100,000 per year, compared to approximately 16% of households making less than $24,999 per year).

Figure 24. If parking space availability became a problem on your street, which of the following measures would you most support to manage parking demand? (Have and favor restrictions)

- Lower the max number of permits, but keep cost same: 29% (339)
- Lower the max number of permits and increase the cost: 20% (287)
- Do not change the max number of permits per household, but increase the cost: 19% (304)
- Other: 14% (211)
- No opinion: 12% (113)
- Do nothing: 6% (97)

Of the 211 households who selected “other,” 3% said that the County should build more parking, 6% said that new housing construction should include more parking, and 91% provided a response not related to building parking.
Respondents who selected “other” provided the following sample of write-in ideas for demand management (direct quotes have been abbreviated for clarity):

• “On my specific street, five permits should be auctioned. Everyone here has off-street parking and a two-car garage. No reason we should get subsidized storage.”

• “Build free parking garages.”

• “More active enforcement of parking violators.”

• “Non-residents almost always take 2 spaces for 1 car. Mark the spaces.”

• “Increase the period that the permit should be in effect (1 [hour] earlier and later)”

• “Limit the maximum number of permits per household for those homes with driveways.”

• “Increase enforcement.”

• “Create a parking lot or garage to accommodate all the dense development the county has allowed in a residential area creating the parking problem.”

• “That’s not the issue; it is mainly event related parking…”
If Parking Became a Problem: Keep or Add Restrictions

Based on answers to earlier questions, a small number of households (only 12% of the all respondents) were asked about how to manage future parking demand with an additional answer option of “Add RPP restrictions.” Those who had no opinion about keeping existing RPP restrictions (66 respondents) or who wanted to add restrictions to their street (487 respondents) most favored adding RPP restrictions as measure to manage future demand.

Figure 25. If parking space availability became a problem on your street, which of the following measures would you most support to manage parking demand? (No opinion about existing restrictions or want to add restrictions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add RPP restrictions</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install signs that restrict the number of hours that people can occupy a space</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install parking meters in areas with high demand</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do nothing</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 45 households who selected “other,” 2% said that the County should build more parking and 98% provided a response not related to building parking.

Comments

- “Provide RPP so I can park near my home!”
- “Each household should have a parking space in front of their house and not one household with four vehicles takes all the parking spaces including in front of my house.”
- “Install signs and not allow parking by non-residents on weekends and nights.”

Provide RPP so I can park near my home!
Time Restrictions Outside RPP Zones

Respondents who did not know about the RPP Program, wanted to remove existing restrictions, or did not want to add restrictions today were asked to select their top choices among options not related to permits, including time restriction signs and parking meters. Installing signs with time restrictions on parking was the most popular demand management measure. Residents who favored parking meters were more likely:

- **Living in the Route 1 area** (30% of Route 1 households)
  - Of Route 1 households, those living in multi-family homes were most likely to favor parking meters (31% of those living in multi-family homes)

- **Living in the Rosslyn-Ballston area** (24% of Rosslyn-Ballston households)
  - Of Rosslyn-Ballston households, those living in multi-family homes were most likely to favor parking meters (24% of those living in multi-family homes)

Figure 26. If parking space availability became a problem on your street, which of the following measures would you most support to manage parking demand? (Do not favor restrictions)

![Bar chart showing the following responses:]
- Install signs that restrict the number of hours that people can occupy a space: 35% (973)
- Install parking meters in areas with high demand: 17% (356)
- Do nothing: 13% (322)
- No opinion: 10% (248)

Of the 697 households who selected “other,” 5% said that the County should build more parking, 2% said that new housing construction should include more parking, and 93% provided a response not related to building parking.
Respondents who selected “other” provided the following sample of write-in ideas for demand management (direct quotes have been edited for clarity). Since these respondents had previously expressed that they were unaware of the RPP Program or did not favor restrictions, they were not provided with the answer option to add RPP restrictions; however, the most common write-in answer reflected a preference for permit parking as a demand management measure.

- “permit parking with easily available guest passes.”
- “Residential parking permits.”
- “RPP sounds like an ok approach, but I want to know how it impacts my neighbors in apartments who need to park their work vehicles.”
- “Permits are fine, but do not charge homeowners for passes - or eliminate charges for low income and people who have caregivers.”
- “A mix of Zoned Residential Parking and time-limited open parking.”
- “Zone stickers.”
- “Don’t issue so many passes for the area—issue only what it can accommodate.”
- “Offer incentives for people to use their garages.”
- “Reduce parking and encourage public transit.”
- “High demand areas in Arlington should have a combination of meters, passes and parking lots to support city growth.”
- “Support diverting taxes to a public parking garage in Rosslyn.”
- “Provide more affordable parking areas/garages, and make Rosslyn more bike/walking friendly.”
- “Add signage pointing to nearby private garages.”

"RPP sounds like an ok approach, but I want to know how it impacts my neighbors in apartments who need to park their work vehicles."
What Program Structure Is Preferred?

Flexible Structure, Enforcement, and Ease of Understanding

Most households prefer a flexible program structure even if it requires a trade-off with enforceability and ease of understanding program rules. The breakdown among households using permits and households outside RPP zones was the same after rounding, with 52% of households (51.6% of those using permits and 52.3% of ineligible households) preferring a less-enforceable flexible structure compared to 41% of households (40.5% of those using permits and 41.1% of ineligible households) preferring a simple structure that is more enforceable.

Most households (77%) have never requested parking enforcement, which indicates that for these households, enforcement is not a primary concern, and suggests that they may be more open to a flexible program structure that is harder to enforce.

Figure 27. Trade-off: Program Flexibility vs. Enforcement and Program Understandability

![Chart showing preference between flexible and simple program structures]

Weighted Respondent Households

52% Prefer a flexible program structure

41% Prefer a simple program structure

Figure 28. Have you ever requested parking enforcement in your neighborhood?

![Chart showing yes and no responses]

Weighted Respondent Households

77% No

23% Yes
Cost of Permits

Currently, the first FlexPass and first Short-Term Visitor Pass book purchased by a household are free, while vehicle-specific permits (decals) vary in cost based on when the permit was purchased during that permit year, with the third permit costing more than the first two permits. The survey solicited feedback on other cost variation possibilities. Respondents could choose multiple options. About 39% of households thought that the cost should not vary. Variation based on number of vehicles owned by the household, age of the resident, and whether or not the household has access to [off-street] parking were the most preferred options for varying permit prices.

Figure 29. The cost of a permit should vary based on the following:

Lower-income households were more likely to select "ability of the individual to pay for the permit" as a factor for varying permit prices, with 25% of households making less than $24,999 selecting that answer choice, compared to 22% and 15% of households making $50,000 to $74,999 and at least $100,000, respectively. Households in the highest income bracket of $200,000 or more were most likely to select “the cost should not vary” (36% compared to 21%-30% of lower income brackets).

Eligibility

Most people think that all residents of the neighborhood, regardless of housing type, should be eligible for parking permits.

Figure 30. Which type of resident should be eligible for a parking permit?
Respondents provided the following sample of additional feedback at the end of the survey regarding eligibility (direct quotes have been edited for clarity). Common themes included desire to incentivize use of existing driveways while accounting for the driveway capacity and expanding eligibility to more multifamily homes.

- “I believe Arlington County needs to review 1) How many spots [per] unit they make new construction allot for residents. .65 spots in not sufficient in South Arlington where the nearest metro is miles away. 2) How they view multifamily dwellings in the scope of RPP, and why they are discriminated against in favor of single family homes (which have driveways). 3) How they view older constructions, like mine, which was built in 1964, which did not allot enough parking because Arlington was very different over half a century ago. We are not allowed to apply for RPP because we have 1.2 parking spots per unit, regardless of the number of bedrooms. How can a 2-person condo with 2 working adults exist in Arlington without the availability of street parking?”

- “While it appears that we are not eligible for the RPP Program (I think because we have a driveway?), I would like us to be eligible for guest parking permits.”

- “Households with driveways (…) should not be eligible for more than one permit. Residents must be reminded that streets are a public resource and so is street parking.”

- “Factoring availability of carport/driveway/garage needs to take into account the capacity of the space. Our driveway can only fit one vehicle, while our neighbor’s can fit two.”

- “One note I wanted to make - I do think that homes with sufficient private parking (eg. carports, garages, etc.) should not have access to parking permits, but I live in a small standalone home that was converted into small apartments so it only has 2 private parking spots for all 3 apartments. My other neighbors do not move/use their cars more than once or twice a month so I have to park on the street everyday despite technically having “access” to private parking, so the County should still make sure that there is at least one spot guaranteed for each unit before implementing any new rule changes for homes that have private parking.”

- “My main opinion on this is that people living in apartments and other multifamily homes should have some type of option for street parking permits. The garages in the apartment buildings around here are expensive, and many residents can’t afford to pay for the monthly garage permits.”

- “We have limited guest parking in our town houses yet we are prohibited from getting residential permits nearby. I think we should be able to even if we need to pay extra especially for visitor passes.”

- “Currently, multifamily housing is ineligible to participate in an RPP if it meets parking requirements in the code. [Single family homes] can participate even if they meet parking requirements in the code. I ask that an RPP be applied consistently across housing types. Either all housing that meets parking code requirements be deemed ineligible or all housing types should be eligible. Arlington strives to attract residents from all income levels -- please stop privatizing streets for residents that in the top income brackets that can afford [single family homes].”
Non-Resident Eligibility
The survey asked about eligibility and permit pricing for the following non-resident groups:

- Landlords and property managers
- Business owners/employees
- Service providers (e.g. medical homes care, social work, childcare, construction/home improvement)
- Business patrons/customers
- School staff/teachers
- Car-share vehicles (such as Car2Go)
- Visitors to community centers, libraries, or other community facilities

In general, people tended to prefer same-price eligibility or no eligibility. Eligibility at the same price as residents was most preferred for service providers, school staff, and visitors to community facilities. No eligibility was most preferred for business patrons/customers and users of car-share vehicles. Though most households did not prefer charging a higher price for non-resident permits, the non-resident groups most preferred for a price differential were users of car-share vehicles, business owners/employees, and landlords/property managers.

Table 1. Should the following groups of people be eligible for a permit to park on an RPP-restricted street near their destination?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Resident Type</th>
<th>Yes, at the same price as residents</th>
<th>Yes, at a higher price than residents</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service providers</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School staff/teachers</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors to community facilities</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landlords &amp; property managers</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business owners/employees</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business patrons/customers</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car-share vehicles</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Visitor Parking

Most households (66%) think that visitors should be allowed to park in residential on-street parking spaces for a limited time without a permit. Households that do not live in an RPP zone or are eligible but do not use permits are more likely to prefer visitor street parking with time restrictions instead of a permit or pass, while households that participate in the RPP Program are more likely to prefer visitor street parking that is restricted with a permit or pass.

Figure 31. Choose which statement about visitor parking you agree with most:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limit visitor parking time without requiring a permit: 66% (2,144)</th>
<th>Require visitors to have parking permit: 28% (1,531)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limit visitor parking time without requiring a permit: 66% (2,144)</td>
<td>Require visitors to have parking permit: 28% (1,531)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion: 6% (193)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Currently, most households have their visitors use street parking. Among households in RPP zones, 85% had their most recent visitor park on the street, compared to 85% of households outside RPP zones. Households outside of RPP zones were given the option to select that their visitor parked in the nearest RPP zone with their own permit; only 0.3% of households had a recent visitor who did this.

Figure 32. How did you handle parking for your most recent visitors who had a vehicle?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outside RPP Zone</th>
<th>In RPP Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My visitors parked on the street</td>
<td>72% (1,668)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My visitors parked off-street on my property/at my building</td>
<td>24% (488)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know where my visitors parked</td>
<td>4% (76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My visitors parked in the nearest permit zone with their own permit</td>
<td>0.2% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not an answer option for respondents in RPP zones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Among households in RPP zones who had their most recent visitor park on the street, short-term visitor passes were the most common parking arrangement (41%), followed by FlexPasses (24%).

Figure 33. On-street parking arrangement for most recent visitor to household living in RPP zone

- My visitors used a short-term visitor pass: 41% (578)
- My visitors used my FlexPass: 24% (366)
- My visitors parked in the permit zone with no permit, outside of the permit restriction time period: 11% (144)
- My visitors parked further away, outside the permit zone: 7% (38)
- My visitors parked in the permit zone with no permit, during the permit restriction time period: 3% (31)
What Influences Perception of Parking?

Many factors influence perception of parking. In particular, where people park today, existing parking availability, and concern about future parking availability are three factors that influence how Arlington County households may perceive the RPP Program and that may inform household preferences. Specifically, households that have trouble finding parking or that are concerned about parking demand from new residents are often more likely to favor restrictions on their streets.

Households that participate in the RPP Program are most likely to park on the street (53%). Households that are eligible but not participating are most likely to park in a carport, driveway, garage, parking lot, or parking deck (41%). Households that are outside an RPP zone are most likely to park in a parking lot or parking deck (48%).

Households living in single family detached homes were most likely to park on the street (45%), compared to 36% of single family attached homes and 18% of multifamily homes.

When asked to think about their most recent parking experience, most households easily found a convenient parking space (52%), while only 14% had trouble finding parking.

Figure 34. Most recent experience parking on-street

Households that were most likely to have difficulty finding parking belonged to the following groups:

- **Low-income** (46% of those making less than $24,999 per year, compared to 24% of those making at least $200,000 per year)
- **Hispanic/Latino and Black/African American** (45% and 40%, respectively, compared to 28% and 33% of those identifying as White or Asian, respectively)
- **Living in multi-family and single family attached homes** (39% and 33%, respectively, compared to 9% of single family detached)
- **Eligible for RPP but not participating or outside of RPP zones** (34% and 31%, respectively, compared to 22% of households who use permits)
- **Renters** (40% of renters, compared to 24% of homeowners)

Groups that experience the greatest parking challenges also tend to have the least awareness of the program, lower participation rates, and less representation in terms of responding to this survey.
New Housing Construction

Concern about new housing construction is often raised in the public discourse about parking demand. While residents voiced concern about growth in Arlington County in their write-in answers, the survey also shed light on broad support for new housing construction in general. Half of Arlington County households would support new housing construction, while a quarter would not support any new housing construction. The 50% of households who are supportive of new housing construction were split between wanting to prevent new residents from parking on the street (26%) and accepting some parking by new residents (24%).

Figure 35. Opinions on New Housing Construction

These results suggest that residents' ideals—for example, the broadly supported notion that public street parking should be available to all residents (66% agree that residents of all housing types should be eligible)—and their lived experiences (52% residents find parking easily today) would lead residents to support more inclusive parking arrangements for incoming, new residents of the county.

Comments

• “We feel strongly that any new development should have enough off-street (preferably below-grade) parking to serve ALL its residents (not one car for every two apartments), visitors, and patrons.”

• “Too much attention to business community needs (customers, renters, etc.) with respect to parking. Not enough consideration for home owners and long term residents who have a vested interest in the community.”

"We feel strongly that any new development should have enough off-street (preferably below-grade) parking to serve ALL its residents (not one car for every two apartments), visitors, and patrons."
Conclusion

County residents generally are satisfied with current zone locations and flexible structure of the program. Most households welcome adjustments to the program to expand eligibility, reduce restrictions on visitors, and manage future parking demand.

- Arlington County households are generally satisfied with the RPP Program and current RPP zone locations.
  - Most households in RPP zones participate in the program.
  - Most households want the program to stay in place.
  - Most households living on streets with restrictions tend to want to keep the restrictions.
  - Most households living outside RPP zones tend to want to stay outside the program.
- Arlington County households have a range of values and concerns regarding parking and public streets.
  - Those who favor having restrictions on their street value parking near their home and discouraging commuter parking.
  - Those who prefer not to have restrictions on their street value equal access to the public street and already find parking to be easily available.
When faced with the hypothetical situation of higher parking demand in the future, households have demand management preferences that differ according to their eligibility for the program and their view of existing restrictions.

- Households outside RPP zones who do not favor restrictions prefer to use signs that restrict the amount of time someone can park on the street to manage demand.

- Using RPP restrictions to manage demand was the most popular option among the minority of residents who currently live outside an RPP zone but want to add restrictions.

- Households in RPP zones who favor restrictions prefer using a cap on the number of permits per household to manage demand instead of higher permit pricing.

Opinions on policy changes to the program

- Most households prefer a flexible program structure that is harder to enforce over a simple structure that is easier to enforce and understand. Most households have never requested enforcement.

- Most think that all housing types should be eligible for the program.

- Most think that service providers and school staff/teachers should be eligible to participate at the same price as residents. A plurality thinks that carshare vehicles and business patrons/customers should not be eligible to participate. Most think non-residents should either be eligible and pay the same price as residents or should be ineligible; car-share vehicles and business owners/employees were most likely to be selected as being appropriate to charge higher prices than residents.

- A plurality think that permit costs should not vary; the most popular factors for varying cost were number of vehicles used by the household, age (i.e., discounts for seniors), and other parking availability (i.e., access to a driveway, carport, parking garage, or parking deck).

The widely shared approval of the RPP Program likely stems from most residents’ experiences of being able to find parking easily today. Though some residents expressed concern about future parking demand parking by new residents, roughly half of households would support new housing construction.

Overall, the household survey has shown public preference for the RPP Program to remain in place in the locations where zones are currently located, and many would be supportive of changes to the program to expand eligibility to participate.