

**CENTRAL CITY PARKING MASTER PLAN  
FIRST STAKEHOLDERS' MEETING  
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2005  
4:30 P.M. – 6:30 P.M.  
Sacramento Regional Transit Auditorium  
1400 29<sup>TH</sup> STREET**

**MEETING SUMMARY**

Members of the Stakeholders Group for the Central City Parking Master Plan met for the first time on Tuesday, February 1, 2004 at the Sacramento Regional Transit Auditorium from 4:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. The meeting provided an opportunity for members to receive an overview of the study, including project background and purpose of the project, and give input.

**Attendees**

George Raya, Marshall School Neighborhood Association  
Paul Harriman, NAG  
Judy Sundquist Land Park Neighborhood Association  
Bruce Holmes, Winn Park-Capitol Avenue Neighborhood Association  
Dennis Stayton, Wong Center  
Chris Lee, Trinity Cathedral  
Victor Waid, Cathedral of the Blessed Sacrament  
Christi Woodards, Westfield Shoppingtown Downtown  
Alisha Stanfield, Central Parking System  
Steve Chambers, Ampco System Parking  
Kipp L. Blewett, Rubicon Partners Inc.  
Roy Jeske, Priority Parking  
Gerald A. Pollard, Republic Parking NW Inc.  
Daniale Hanover, Heller Pacific, Inc.  
Cass Mastalski, CFB and 7<sup>th</sup> and J Building  
Glen Sorensen, Loftworks  
Collette Johnson-Schulke, Sutter Health  
Connie Miottel, Capitol Station District  
Jim Derby, State of California Department of General Services  
Joe Linert, Sacramento County  
Mike Wiley, Sacramento Regional transit District  
Jon Robinson, City of West Sacramento Redevelopment Agency  
J. P. Tindell, City of Sacramento Parks and Recreation  
Barry Wasserman, City Planning Commissioner  
Brian Abbanat, City Planning  
Dave Harzoff, City of Sacramento Economic Development  
Tom Kigar, CADA  
Ann Kohl, ECOS  
John Deeter, ECOS  
Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA  
Peter Jacobsen, Walk Sacramento  
Walt Seifert, SABA  
David Venacio, Standard Parking

Alana Neves, California Fruit Building Company  
Danielle del'Etoile, Downtown Sacramento Partnership  
Pamela Van Camp, Fremont Park Neighborhood Association

### **Project Staff**

Fran Halbakken, City of Sacramento  
Howard Chan, City of Sacramento  
Matt Eierman, City of Sacramento  
John Long, DKS Associates  
Bill Loudon, DKS Associates  
Vic Maslanka, DKS Associates  
Elsa Coleman, Elsa Coleman Consulting  
Wendy Hoyt, The Hoyt Company  
Kristy Day, The Hoyt Company

### **Handouts**

Agenda  
Project Overview  
Project Area Map  
Project Schedule  
PowerPoint Presentation Printout  
Stakeholder Issues Summary

Fran Halbakken, City of Sacramento, initiated the meeting by welcoming attendees and introducing the project team. After stakeholders introduced themselves, Ms. Halbakken described the role of the stakeholders over the course of the study. John Long and Bill Loudon of DKS Associates proceeded with a PowerPoint presentation that included project goals, Central City parking background information, and consultant team's work scope. After the presentation Wendy Hoyt of The Hoyt Company facilitated the question and answer session.

Vic Maslanka of DKS Associates followed the question and answer session with a review of stakeholder parking issues that stakeholders noted on their Stakeholder Participation Acceptance Form.

Wendy Hoyt then announced the breakout session and explained the purpose and guidelines for the session. Subsequently, attendees separated into four workgroups, each group included a technical professional and a volunteer recorder. During the one half an hour session, attendees shared ideas and suggestions for parking within the Central City. Finishing the session, the group recorder from each table reported back to the larger group while Kristy Day of The Hoyt Company recorded comments.

After each group was heard from, Kristy Day discussed the next steps for the Central City Parking Master Plan.

The following are key comments and questions recorded during the breakout session. We have broken the comments/suggestions into 11 major categories. Comments are attributed to specific stakeholders only when so noted by the group recorders.

### **Supply/Demand**

- There are 700 parishioners on Sunday, there is no need for Monday through Friday parking at St. Paul's
- Have demand management programs
- Add parking by adding markings in non-metered areas
- There is underutilization of parking on nights and weekends
- The loading and delivery areas are not adequate
- Businesses are encroaching on residents; there is double promising of spaces to residents and businesses (P. Van Camp)
- Supply and demand affected by congestion
- Focus on restricting work trips /29% on transit peak-focus on reducing demand
- Inventory needs to account for lots we cannot get in to and spaces sold for storage
- Demand for employee parking exceeds supply, plus consider the clients of businesses (J. Linert)
- Mailing lists are available; compare use by supply and demand (B. Holmes)
- Account for prior entitlement (B. Holmes)
- Supply versus demand, block-by-block (T. Kigar)
- Access to private lots maybe restricted (T. Kigar)
- Parking demand by SACOG (T. Kigar)
- Consider recreation and events (J.P. Tindell)
- Inadequate parking; people are parking in residential areas
- Residents can alert private parking companies of vacant lots, that could serve as surface lots
- There should be a proactive cap on parking
- Interim empty lots use for parking
- There should be more parking along the river (J.P. Tindell)
- Have more parking structures
- Work through employers with demand management

### **Alternate Modes**

- How you make better use of available space is through shuttles, valet, discounted taxi rides and pay for parking passes for employees (M. Wiley)
- Coordinate with transit, pedestrians, and bicycles (J.P. Tindell)
- Do not restrict amount of parking to force a behavior change that encourages transit; encourage transit rather than penalize downtown
- Encourage use of the trolley system
- Encourage park once – trolley system – pedestrian friendly
- Zone policy encourage walking
- Transit is the solution (J. Deeter)

### **Use**

- Need more cross-use of parking
- Develop policies that support shared parking; alternate hours of use
- Need more cross-use of lots (Caltrans versus County of Sacramento) (J. Liners)
- Open garages on weekends for free
- Parking should be short-term for on-street, long-term in parking garages (through employees and state employees)
- Do not have ten hour meters
- Need better utilization of existing parking
- Encourage use of off-street versus on-street parking
- When considering state parking for shared use, security is a big issue
- People wanting to park long-term should park on off-street parking
- Open up Caltrans lots to others (e.g. the County is nearby, but is unable to use the State-owned lot)
- Add motorcycle space (long-term and short-term)
- Empty lots need permits for use, fence off (J. Linert)
- Visitor space is needed (J. Sundquist)
- Better use of exiting spaces
  - Shuttles
  - Valets
  - Marketing
  - New lots
  - Shared parking arrangements
  - Shuttle rides for government workers
- After-hours use of empty garages and surface lots would possibly relieve the problem, but those facilities are not always available; there are “red flag” areas without adequate parking
- There is a public urination problem with off-Street parking facilities (G. Raya)
- Business/residential shared parking climate doesn’t have to have nexus (they can walk)

### **Development/Planning**

- Try to develop an interesting downtown environment, a town that is alive at night
- We are concerned about responsibilities of developers
- Small downtown lots do not allow for incorporated parking; we need more innovative development solutions
- Cycle infill and parking, mixed use – planning consideration
- Developer concern market driven
- Analyze parking impacts on development costs land (W. Seifert)
- Parking (lots) locations must be analyzed in terms of impact on land use and circulation system
- Street parking locations should relate to potential minimum walking distances for users by type and age
- Adequate parking should be required with new development (G. Raya)
- Concern that new development should have parking
- The Master Plan parking versus parking by project

### **Cost**

- Revise parking fees annually to help meet goals
- Direct parking revenue to neighborhood improvements such as sidewalk cleaning, repair, etc.
- On/off-street parking is priced different
- Fees vary by area and time of day (demand)
- Financing option (J. Linert)
- Fee for parking lot (J. Linert)
- Structure alone - \$15,000 per stall construction (W. Seifert)
- People will park for free in neighborhoods to avoid paying (J. Linert)
- Beautification costs money (J. Linert)
- Shading, heating limit, 16<sup>th</sup> and J Streets (J. Linert)
- I am most interested in financial aspects; high parking prices for staff is a competitive disadvantage in comparison with Arden Fair Mall. (C. Woodards)
  - Thirty-seven managers left Westfield Shoppingtown Downtown Plaza when the Galleria opened.
  - Westfield encourages people to come and stay all day, but costumers are only given three hours of free/validated parking.
- More return on parking through rates, get more return
- Is the City's goal to break even?
- Off-street should run as a business

#### **Enforcement**

- There needs to be enforcement for delivery trucks that are parked for hours without getting tickets
- There is abuse and enforcement is needed i.e. handicap parking, loading vehicles
- There needs to be enforcement
- People block driveways (J. Sundquist)

#### **Security/Safety**

- Security concerns (S. Chambers)
- Elderly advised to park on-street to avoid garages (S. Chambers)

#### **Innovation**

- Other cities use a revolving fund to jump-start their programs (J. Linert)
- Seek out solutions from other cities
- Focus on Area 2, it is a good place for a car share program
- Look at Bay Area and Boston--flex car
- Put parks on top of parking garages (J.P. Tindell)
- Should implement flex car use

#### **Business/Residential**

- Businesses do not have enough parking and this encroaches on the residents who live there
- Do not want to force people out (residential), we want smart growth
- Merchants get penalized when others abuse parking because they are forced to continue to do business
- Supply, cost, and safety affects viability of businesses
- Parking should be balanced with residential needs
- Parking affects businesses
  - Employees of downtown parking
  - Viability of business

- Competitive disadvantage is a suburban area
- Policy affects parking; triggering the above
- Bars and night life create evening conflicts for residents (J. Linert)
- Residential parking is important (J. Deeter)
- There are a lot of problems on nights and weekends (Joe)
- The neighborhood gets “flooded” with people going to Harlow’s and other places in that area and the neighbors do not like it (G. Raya)
- 16<sup>th</sup>/J/K Street has an older crowd, not going to walk three blocks from a remote space to go home
- Livable community circulation system impact
- Lack of parking makes it difficult to market downtown

#### **Maintenance/Operation**

- Driveways across sidewalks impact pedestrians
- Shorter spaces, central markings did not do for Old Sacramento
- Motorists/pedestrian visibility (P. Jacobson)
  - Motorcycle space before crosswalk
  - Pull back car spaces before crosswalk
  - The City is already getting comments

#### **Other items for the study team to consider**

- Account for prior entitlement
  - Work will not account (physical only) zoning administration procedure (B. Holmes)
- R Street is supposed to be transit-orientated with high density mixed use (B. Holmes)
- The study area should include R Street Corridor since there are infill issues there (P. Seifert)
- Consider the location of spaces to parks (J.P. Tindell)
- Market how and why to come downtown, make it alive and attractive
- Better use of existing parking is through marketing
- Could not get financing without parking spaces, need flexibility with policies