CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT (CBD) TOLLING PROGRAM

Appendix 4D, Transportation: Parking Data for Commuter Rail Stations

2023

Contents

4D.1, Parking Utilization at Commuter Rail Stations in the Regional Study Area

Table 4D.1-1. Long Island Rail Road Parking Data for Stations with over 85% Utilization Rates

BRANCH	STATION	PARKING SUPPLY	AVAILABLE PARKING SPACES	PARKING UTILIZATION%
Port Washington Branch	Port Washington	1,048	21	98%
	Manhasset	648	19	97%
	Great Neck	364	0	100%
Oyster Bay Branch	Locust Valley	161	6	96%
	Glen Cove	151	5	97%
	Glen Street	130	10	92%
	Sea Cliff	154	0	100%
	Glen Head	184	13	93%
	Roslyn	308	3	99%
	Albertson	20	0	100%
	East Williston	186	26	86%
Hempstead Branch	Garden City	225	14	94%
	Bellerose	39	0	100%
	Floral Park	627	82	87%
Port Jefferson Branch	Stony Brook	479	5	99%
	St. James	241	27	89%
	Huntington	3,447	276	92%
	Cold Spring Harbor	1,058	0	100%
	Syosset	1,189	0	100%
	Hicksville	3,941	39	99%
	Westbury	895	9	99%
	Carle Place	13	0	100%
	Mineola	1,811	181	90%
	Merillon Avenue	163	0	100%
	New Hyde Park	576	29	95%
West Hempstead Branch	Lakeview	65	1	98%
Ronkonkoma Branch	Mattituck	116	17	85%
	Ronkonkoma	5,817	291	95%
	Central Islip	904	0	100%
	Deer Park	1,876	0	100%
	Farmingdale	529	26	95%
	Bethpage	857	34	96%
Babylon Branch	Babylon	1,989	159	92%
	Copiague	740	15	98%
	Massapequa Park	710	99	86%
	Massapequa	1,781	18	99%
	Seaford	1,219	12	99%
	Wantagh	1,427	29	98%
	Bellmore	1,894	0	100%
	Merrick	1,613	97	94%
	Baldwin	1,595	80	95%
Montauk Branch	Amagansett	35	2	94%
	Great River	102	9	91%
Long Beach Branch	Long Beach	529	79	85%
	Oceanside	604	12	98%
	Centre Avenue	121	18	85%
Far Rockaway Branch	Woodmere	249	10	96%
	Hewlett	789	39	95%
	Gibson	66	1	99%
	Valley Stream	1,461	205	86%

Note: Data reflects 2018 conditions.
Source: Metro-North Railroad

Table 4D.1-2. Metro-North Railroad Parking Data for Stations with over 85% Utilization Rates

BRANCH	STATION	PARKING SUPPLY	AVAILABLE PARKING SPACES	PARKING UTILIZATION%
Harlem Line	Mount Vernon West	221	11	95%
	Fleetwood	658	33	95%
	Bronxville	204	10	95%
	Tuckahoe	298	15	95%
	Crestwood	283	14	95%
	Scarsdale	824	16	98%
	Hartsdale	797	16	98%
	White Plains	1,931	290	85%
	Valhalla	319	16	95%
	Hawthorne	355	18	95%
	Pleasantville	261	13	95%
	Chappaqua	1,296	65	95%
	Mount Kisco	617	31	95%
	Bedford Hills	362	18	95%
	Katonah	731	15	98%
	Goldens Bridge	976	29	97%
	Purdy's	406	20	95%
	Croton Falls	319	32	90%
	Brewster	458	0	100%
	Southeast	1,010	91	91%
	Pawling	211	11	95%
	Wassaic	342	41	88%
	Tenmile River	68	9	87%
Hudson Line	Garrison	291	38	87%
	Ludlow	33	0	100%
	Poughkeepsie	1,123	45	96%
	New Hamburg	813	81	90%
	Beacon	1,680	0	100%
	Cold Spring	223	0	100%
	Peekskill	474	47	90%
	Ossining	906	9	99%
	Scarborough	442	0	100%
	Dobbs Ferry	573	11	98%
	Ardsley-on-Hudson	134	0	100%
	Irvington	304	3	99%
	Tarrytown	758	38	95%
	Philipse Manor	134	0	100%
	Hastings-on-Hudson	435	9	98%
	Greystone	250	0	100%
	Glenwood	106	0	100%
	Yonkers (Buena Vista Garage)	598	30	95%
New Haven Line	Port Chester	843	76	91%
	Rye	696	35	95%
	Harrison	739	0	100%
	Mamaroneck	627	19	97%
	Larchmont	1,036	0	100%
	New Rochelle	1,585	0	100%
	Pelham	391	8	98%
	Mount Vernon East	739	52	93%

Note: Data reflects 2018 conditions.
Source: Metro-North Railroad

Table 4D.1-3. NJ TRANSIT Station Parking Utilization by Line

LINE	CAPACITY	USED	PERCENTAGE OCCUPIED
Atlantic City Line	4,415	2,849	65%
Bergen County Line	1,510	1,075	71%
Gladstone Branch	1,767	1,329	75%
Main Line	4,665	3,622	78%
Montclair-Boonton Line	5,629	3,940	70%
Morristown Line	6,998	5,532	79%
North Jersey Coast Line	7,759	4,968	64%
Northeast Corridor Line	25,254	20,184	80%
Pascack Valley Line	2,040	1,533	75%
Raritan Valley Line	4,682	3,484	74%
TOTAL	**64,719**	**48,516**	**76%**

Source: NJ TRANSIT
Note: Data reflects 2019 conditions.

4D.2, Parking Utilization at Commuter Rail Stations in the Regional Study Area including East Side Access

INTRODUCTION

As with **Subchapter 4D, "Transportation: Parking,"** this appendix describes the potential effects of implementing the Central Business District (CBD) Tolling Program (the Project) on parking with the East Side Access (ESA) Project included, using the same methodologies. The conclusions of the CBD Tolling Alternative with the ESA Project for parking effects are similar to the conclusions without the ESA Project: all tolling scenarios would result in a reduction in parking demand within the Manhattan CBD of a similar magnitude to the reduction in auto trips into the Manhattan CBD; and, with a shift from driving to transit, there would be an increased parking demand at subway and commuter rail stations and park-and-ride facilities outside the Manhattan CBD. The increase at any individual location would not be large enough to result in adverse effects related to parking demand and supply.

METHODOLOGY

The analysis of the potential effects of the Project with the ESA Project on parking conditions considered locations where transportation modeling predicts an increase in vehicle trips that would result from the Project. An abbreviated summary of the analysis steps from **Subchapter 4D, "Transportation: Parking"** is presented.

The methodology in **Subchapter 4D, "Parking"** used a tiered approach to evaluate the Project's effects on parking demand and supply based on the vehicular trips generated by the Project in total, and then at individual intersections if warranted. The first step in the tiered analysis is to determine whether a project could result in 50 or more additional vehicle trips during the peak hour in total. If surpassed, the second step in the tiered analysis is to determine whether a project could result in 50 or more additional vehicle trips during the peak hour at any individual intersection. According to the **Subchapter 4D, "Transportation: Parking"** methodology, that level of new vehicle trips may be large enough to result in a corresponding increase in demand for parking spaces at facilities within a quarter-mile of a project, and detailed analysis of the projected increase in demand for parking relative to existing parking capacity and utilization at individual parking facilities is appropriate at such locations.

The analysis of the Project's potential effects on parking with the ESA Project began with a review of Best Practice Model (BPM) results for the Project to identify commuter rail stations and park-and-ride facilities where there would be 50 or more new vehicle trips in the peak hours resulting from the Project and, if warranted, additional analysis would be conducted.

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

Under the CBD Tolling Alternative with ESA, relevant parking assets within the regional study area (28 counties in the New York metropolitan area), New York City outside the Manhattan CBD, and the Manhattan CBD were considered. Further details on those affected environments can be found in **Subchapter 4D, "Transportation: Parking."**

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative with the ESA Project would not implement a vehicular tolling program. The No Action Alternative would not substantially change demand for on-street and off-street parking in the regional study area, or within or outside the Manhattan CBD compared to existing conditions, but there could be a slight increase in demand coincident with increased traffic volumes from background growth by 2023. In the No Action Alternative, the demand for parking facilities and curbside spaces within and outside the Manhattan CBD would likely be comparable to current conditions, with limited available capacity, especially near heavily used transit stations. The ESA Project itself would not immediately change demand for commuter parking at Long Island Rail Road stations in the 2023 No Action Alternative conditions because it would initially divert a portion of existing ridership closer to employment destinations near Grand Central Terminal.

CBD Tolling Alternative

Regional Study Area

Results of the transportation modeling conducted for the Project with the ESA Project using the BPM show that all tolling scenarios evaluated would result in a decrease in the number of vehicle trips entering and leaving the Manhattan CBD and a corresponding increase in the number of trips made to the Manhattan CBD using public transit. Consequently, there would be a decrease in demand for parking within the Manhattan CBD and an increase in demand for parking at the region's transit stations and commuter park-and-ride locations. As discussed above, the ESA Project itself would not immediately change demand for parking at Long Island Rail Road stations in the 2023 No Action Alternative conditions since it would initially divert a portion of existing ridership closer to employment destinations near Grand Central Terminal.

Based on the BPM results with the ESA Project, the increase in commuters at individual stations or park-and-ride facilities outside the Manhattan CBD would be distributed throughout the region, and no locations would have increases in vehicle trips of 50 or more vehicles in the peak hour for any tolling scenario. Moreover, the new vehicle trips at stations would include some customers who would be dropped off without parking and therefore would not add to the demand for parking. Because other modes of public transit in the regional study area (e.g., subways, light rail) would incur even fewer additional vehicle trips as a result of the Project with ESA, those locations would also not exceed 50 more vehicles in the peak hour for any tolling scenario. Consequently, using the tiered methodology summarized above and described in greater detail in **Subchapter 4D, "Transportation: Parking,"** no adverse effect would occur to parking conditions at locations in the regional study area.

New York City Outside the Manhattan CBD

Based on the BPM results with the ESA Project, with the CBD Tolling Alternative, the number of commuters and visitors to the Manhattan CBD who would use transit for their journey would increase in all tolling scenarios. Although the BPM predicts it would be at far lower numbers than commuter rail and park-and-ride facilities described in the regional study area, some of these new transit users would drive to transit stations in New York City outside the Manhattan CBD to access transit to complete their journey. Consequently, the CBD Tolling Alternative with the ESA Project would increase the number of drivers who would seek parking near transit facilities in New York City outside the Manhattan CBD.

Based on the BPM results with the ESA Project, the increase in the number of travelers at individual transit facilities in New York City outside the Manhattan CBD would be distributed across the city, and no transit destinations would have increases of 50 or more vehicles in the peak hour. Moreover, the new vehicle trips at transit facilities would include some customers who would be dropped off without parking and therefore would not add to the demand for parking. Consequently, using the tiered methodology summarized above and described in more detail in Subchapter 4D, "Transportation: Parking," no adverse effect would occur to parking conditions at locations in New York City outside the Manhattan CBD.

Manhattan CBD

Based on the BPM results with the ESA Project, the CBD Tolling Alternative would reduce the number of daily vehicle trips to the Manhattan CBD in all tolling scenarios. This decrease in vehicle trips would also result in a decrease in parking demand in the Manhattan CBD. While the demand for parking spaces in the Manhattan CBD from residents within the Manhattan CBD would likely generally remain unchanged, the demand from those driving into the Manhattan CBD each day from other locations would decrease in comparison to the No Action Alternative. This reduction would be spread across the approximately 600 off-street parking facilities with nearly 90,000 parking spaces in the Manhattan CBD as well as the numerous on-street parking spaces in the Manhattan CBD. Therefore, the CBD Tolling Alternative with the ESA Project would not create or exacerbate a parking shortfall in the Manhattan CBD.