

## CENTRAL CITY PARKING MASTER PLAN SUMMARY OF PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE

Thursday, September 15, 2005  
4:30 P.M. – 7:00 P.M.  
YWCA, 1122 17th Street, Sacramento

On Thursday, September 15, 2005, the City of Sacramento held a public open house for the Central City Parking Master Plan at the YWCA (1122 17<sup>th</sup> St). The open house provided an opportunity for the expression of a number of divergent views regarding the draft policy recommendations through a question and answer session, one-on-one discussions and written comment forms. Approximately 60 community members participated in the workshop. Attendees included representatives from the City of Sacramento; state and local organizations; local agencies; architects; engineers; area businesses; developers; neighborhood associations and residents. Media present included KCRA Channel 3. Project team members present included representatives from the City of Sacramento, DKS Associates and The Hoyt Company.

### **Open House Outreach**

Prior to the open house, the project team made extensive efforts to contact and invite community members and stakeholders to the public open house. Efforts included mailing more than 3,500 invitations to neighbors and key stakeholders; making more than 160 reminder phone calls; sending 214 email reminders, hand delivering newsletters to key gathering places, holding four stakeholder meetings; giving several community organization presentations; holding focus group meetings; notifying local print, radio and television media; and placing two sandwich board signs with helium balloons attached outside of the outreach center.

### **Open House Format**

The open house format included display materials, project presentation, question and answer session, and the choice to submit written comments. The open house provided attendees the opportunity to view display materials and speak one-on-one with project team members while the presentation offered a background of the Central City Parking Master Plan study and provided details about the draft policy recommendations.

Before the presentation, Fran Halbakken, City of Sacramento, welcomed the crowd, provided an overview of the project and introduced the project team. She continued by giving an overview of the project. After the introduction, Bill Loudon, DKS associates, presented details about the project including study findings and draft policy recommendations; an open question and answer session followed.

## Summary of Comments and Questions

The following is a brief summary of the key comments and questions made by attendees during the open house during the question and answer session:

- Does this study take into account that the streets are being swept for street cleaning Monday through Thursday from 8:00 to noon?
- Does Area 1 include Alkali Flat?
- In the off-street analysis, were parking facilities that may not be open to the public included?
- Regarding the on-street parking analysis, parking spaces are not marked off. How did you determine how many cars can park in any given area?
- What are the City Council's next steps with this? What are they going to do with this document since the City Council has only approved the goals and objectives and not the policies?
- There are large offices and buildings in downtown and West Sacramento, all have employees who need to park. Is the City of Sacramento working with the City of West Sacramento? What about parking and shuttles in West Sacramento since there is more availability there?
- I am concerned that in basic plan handicapped parking has not been included. Handicapped parking needs to be accounted for from the beginning because it takes almost double the space. Why is it not included as part of the plan? It will impact the numbers throughout. Is ADA parking being addressed throughout? The City is currently woefully out of compliance for providing handicapped parking. This needs to be a part of the initial part of the plan because it will impact counts.
- We cannot use our own on-street parking in Alkali Flat because the California EPA building employees are taking our spaces. Meters, signs for permit parking only and 30 minute limits are not working.
- In order to help solve the issue in my neighborhood [Alkali Flat], the City will need homeowners and businesses to write a petition?
- One of the draft policies refers to more enforcement, will enough operations and maintenance funds be included to adequately enforce parking violators?
- Off-street parking sometimes is not visible or clear. Something you should consider for the signage goal is to put a sign up that says off-street parking is available and where it is available.
- Regarding long-term parking, business owners are not providing enough parking for their employees. Employers have a responsibility to provide parking for their employees. This is not addressed adequately in the draft policies.
- There is a dunk-in-card machine that has been broken for four weeks. Are the dunk-in-cards being phased out? If so, how long would it take?
- Do employers provide RT passes and sponsor transit/carpool parking programs? Is that effective? It appears that it is less than expected and not as successful.

- The midday study focuses on the crunch time of 5:00 p.m. 11:00 p.m. Where I live, there are clubs, restaurants, etc. and parking demand is high after that time. There is some parking available in private parking lots as the daytime workers leave their offices. Are you looking at trying to utilize the private lots?
- People need to feel safe. Midtown is pedestrian friendly at night, but near 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> Streets it does not feel safe at night. We still want to encourage walking. Look at setting up urban walk and include regular patrols, better lighting, etc.
- Our office has devoted numerous hours of time and effort into understanding how other cities with intensifying urban cores have dealt with their parking issues. We have discovered that those cities that were most successful in bringing life back into downtowns and promoting the use of transit, bicycles and walking were those who eliminated parking minimums in many areas. The end result was that the market dictated how much parking was actually needed, and in turn the private sector met the actual needs. Furthermore, lowered parking requirements resulted in more individuals walking the streets, which in turn, brought about safer sidewalks and increased foot traffic for businesses.
- Regarding policies 1.2.1 and 1.2.2, they tie in with enforcement after 6:00 p.m. The City allowed restaurants to go in and the businesses did not provide enough parking for employees and patrons. Tickets are only a bandage for the larger problem at hand. Remove section 1.2. Create after hours parking or full time parking patrols. Developers can opt out of providing parking.
- Developers can opt out and pay a fee for parking where they pay a one-time fee per space that is not incorporated in the project. It is only one time, and long-term growth would indicate that that would be an unwise move; for example, the Twin Towers project downtown. There is inadequate parking since there are only approximately 1200 parking spaces and they will all be spoken for with the condo residents and the hotel.
- I disagree with in-lieu-of fees. I want less parking to help with the traffic issue.
- State employees had a program of reduced fare for alternative modes and they also do alternative workweeks (e.g. work 10 hour days four days a week) that reduce parking need. It is a good program.

**The following written verbatim comments and questions were submitted via flip charts provided during the open house:**

**Goal 1:**

This goal (in regards to economic development) will be in tension with goal 7. There will be times when maximizing parking revenue will hurt economic development.

1.2.1-2 Change to require mandatory parking construction.

**Goal 2:**

2.2 Drop the word “new.” Should read: Broker an agreement to supply parking in the Midtown entertainment district (particularly 2700 block of J Street).

Have the City take over lot at 20<sup>th</sup> Street. Have the City force owner to rent at night.

2.2 I find this the most helpful and practical of the goals.

**Goal 3:**

Objective 1: Consider certain blocks of resident-only parking like UCD Medical Center and City College neighborhood.

**Goal 4:**

Is street parking a right? There may be instances in urban settings where commercial use of these spaces is appropriate.

**Goals 5 and 6:**

Objective two seems contrary to perceived lack of spaces. Properly designed garages can be good CC neighbor.

**Goal 7:**

7.4 the best idea to date! No longer use parking funds for other uses. Put all parking revenue into one parking fund. Use funds for parking programs – new parking and enforcement.

I disagree. Look at putting extra money from fees and forfeitures to alternative modes, thereby freeing up more parking spots.

**Goals 8 and 9:**

Use parking funds to fund shuttle service in downtown core (river to freeway, freeway to river).

800 parking spaces at the Ziggurat Garage in West Sacramento currently go unused. A more convenient and properly marketed shuttle could help.

Other parking opportunities, both interim and permanent may emerge and should be explored via an institutionalized relationship of cooperation between West Sacramento and Sacramento.

Evening venue shuttle from under freeway lots to the Convention Center, Memorial Auditorium and area restaurants. It should be free.

Midtown is very walkable, but as one gets closer to the center of the city, the sense of decay (and urine smell) increases. A sense of safety is paramount.

Remove on-street parking to provide east-west bicycle corridors. e.g. L Street from 15<sup>th</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> Street.

**General:**

City should not issue on-street permits to people who have off-street parking spaces, except maybe for temporary construction or repair workers. Extra vehicles must be parked in rented space if necessary.

**The following written verbatim comments and questions were submitted via comment cards at the Public Open House:**

**Comment 1:**

I have been ticketed four times for parking in our own driveway. Every time I get one, it coincides with my complaints about slum lords and local hookers and drug pushers. In fact, the last ticket came the same day as a hate letter by people representing these groups. The City alleges that my car was blocking the sidewalk. My entire front yard is concrete to the street. There was always room for walking, wheel chairs and strollers. I am active in disabled rights groups. Folks in wheel chairs appreciate my ramps and saw no trouble with where I was parking. The City claims that the sidewalk does not move back and forth in relation to the street. I have supplied pictures of this to the City. Four other neighbors have received these tickets after they complained about drug pushers in the neighborhood. I was parking so far back because my next door neighbor has four apartments and NO parking. The two flats across the street were allowed to block off 1/2 of the driveway.

The coin meters are often broken. It is hard to have only quarters. Berkeley allows nickels and dimes in meters. Some meters take cards, but they do not take ATM or VISA. What cards are these? I have gotten a ticket for parking over a curb, even though I was no where near a side walk. The City rules for fighting tickets violate due process! The referees always side with the City. If you want to appeal higher up, you have to pay a fee equal to the cost of the ticket! I refuse to do this and cannot afford this. Other Sacramentans are angry about this. The City has contracted out its collection to another city. This is unacceptable, especially since that city sends bills with its name, not Sacramento and with no references.

When the City felt that I owed on a ticket, they tried to collect from our taxes (and did) and they also tried to collect the same fee from my registration. I went to the City and they showed that I owed nothing. But DMV said that there was still a lien. I had to go back to the City and found that the ticket applied to a license plate that since had been stolen off my car. I paid this though I still disputed the tickets. However DMV still showed that I owed the money. I have had a parking meter reader tell me that I had to park near grass when I was picking up a person in a wheel chair. There is a shortage of accessible parking. e.g. none near Starbucks at 35<sup>th</sup> and Broadway. Many parking spaces require a person to walk in street or car right of way.

I am glad that you got rid of Ace Parking. They were corrupt and discriminatory against their disabled employees. If you park in the lot near the Capitol or below Capitol Plaza, you cannot use the same validation for both and they are validated differently. You do not tell folks how to get parking debit cards. When you use the all day lots, they list on price, but a larger price is charged on your card. There is no place to park at any light rail station near Oak Park. The lot at the 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue Station seems to

be part of the light rail station. However, after parking there for months, I got a ticket because it was a "City lot." No where does it say that it is a City lot. Finally I found an RT manager who knew that the City bought the lot and local businesses rent it for their employees. The sign warns not to "improperly park." It used to be at knee height. Oak Park should have a shuttle to light rail. Vacant land near the Fruitridge and City College stations and create parking! I often have to park downtown because I have to go to West Sacramento afterward and the Yolobus does not go to Union Square.

**Submitted by:**

Linda E. Roberts  
3519 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Sacramento, CA 95817  
(916) 454-9330  
lroberts52@earthlink.net

**Comment 2:**

I would like to see the parking spaces in front of the apartment building located at 13<sup>th</sup> Street (corner of O Street) with painted parking lines, so drivers would use only one parking space, thus accommodating more parked cars. I have not noticed if this is a problem elsewhere in the downtown area. I am a resident of CADA and sometimes get discouraged trying to squeeze into a tiny space.

**Submitted by:**

Judy van Rooyen  
1228 O Street, #104  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**Comment 3:**

Four days a week, one side of the street does not allow parking to clear leaves and debris. This eliminates 25% of the on-street parking for four hours. City Works and maintenance are often trimming trees or fixing streets on these same days, eliminating access to even more spaces. Encourage City Works and services to be done on Friday through Sunday to ease the loss of parking.

8.3 If you want to encourage carpooling, make the best downtown parking available to carpoolers only. A carpool lane on the highway is the incentive for the commute; give the choicest spots to the carpooler at a reduced or no-cost rate.

8 To encourage the walk from readily-available Zone 1 parking, which largely empties out after 6:00 p.m., to the restaurants and clubs in Zones 2, 3, and 4. Establish "corridors" which have more lights and security/police on foot. People will not park downtown at night if it is perceived as risky.

**Submitted by:**

David Zinner  
1716 N Street, #3  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 447-5470  
itsnottheheat@yahoo.com

**Comment 4:**

Please encourage the most efficient use of valuable central city space and eliminate unnecessary costs for residents and businesses. Use design standards, and implement policies that separate payment for parking from residential rental, and business space rental. Implement policies that encourage homeowners, business owners, property owners to rent parking space separately from other uses. Making housing and business affordable. Do not make those who do not drive subsidize drivers.

Please eliminate volume discounts on any publicly controlled parking space. Charge by the day or for shorter time periods to encourage commuters to choose other forms of transportation whenever possible. Renting parking by the week, month or longer period encourages commuters to drive even on days when they can conveniently use other forms of transportation. I want to move to a walkable city.

Please eliminate parking minimums; let the market and free, private enterprise provide for needed parking. The City of Sacramento should not be in the business of providing parking other than the most basic access such as emergency vehicles, transit, loading zones and handicapped accessible parking. Residence should not provide automatic free parking permits; a compromise might be allowing local residents and business owners an option to purchase market rate parking permits. Bicycle parking would be a bargain.

**Submitted by:**

Lindell Annette Price  
3672 Millbrae Road  
Cameron Park, CA 95682  
(530) 677-5052  
lindell@csus.edu

**Comment 5:**

I reviewed 8/25/05 draft policy recommendations and comments supplied by ECOS and TMA. I totally support their comments. If the City truly wants to be a livable city, it must adopt progress, forward thinking policies. The City must walk the walk. Support idea of employer subsidized transit, parking taxes for off-street parking that feeds multi-modal transportation. We have the seventh worst air quality in the nation. Ensuring future quality of life in the region means investing in transit. Price of land is too costly to spend on developing parking and favoring auto alternatives.

**Submitted by:**

Stacy Jarvis  
Sacto GPAC member  
P.O. Box 162832  
Sacramento, CA 95816  
Smjarvis07@yahoo.com

**Comment 6:**

Holding a public meeting in a building that requires an escort to take a person with disabilities through two locked areas unlawful. This is a public meeting. Shame!

Leaving The Plan for Disabled Persons parking requirements means that there will not be adequate space and area for meeting the space requirements of Federal and State law. Please refer to the 1995 ADAAG (pre-release) and the Public Rights of Way Access Board requirements. Access should never be an add-on. Persons have been using wheelchairs for 300 years. The initial plans MUST include all members of society. Not just some persons.

**Submitted by:**

Laura Williams, President  
Californians for Disability Rights, Inc.  
909 12<sup>th</sup> St., Ste. 200  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 447-2237  
(626) 335-0613  
le3293@aol.com

**Comment 7:**

The paraphrasing on the walls is confusing with the actual working on the Draft Policy Recommendations. The paraphrasing changes the meaning of 2.2.

**Submitted by:**

George Raya  
911 28<sup>th</sup> St., Apt. 1  
Sacramento, CA 95816  
(916) 492-1606  
georgeraya@comcast.net

**Comment 8:**

Whenever you add parking lots, be sure to plant shade trees and/or solar panels like those at CalEXPO.

**Submitted by:**

Gail Kara  
809 17<sup>th</sup> Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
kara@well.com

**The following verbatim comments were submitted via email:**

**Comment 1:**

Here is an old idea: A downtown streetcar circulator running Amtrak Depot to Third to "R" to 19th. Multiple parking above UPRR, along 19th corridor. Streetcars run along 19th to "I", to 12th, transition across 12th one block to "H", close loop at Depot. This approach anticipates car-free downtown.... See [peakoil.net](http://peakoil.net) for rationale. PeakingOil and disaster remediation should be modeled into ALL transport planning....see [peakoil.net](http://peakoil.net) article 374. Thank You!

**Submitted by:**

Gunnar Henriouille  
(916) 944-1259  
[gunnarh@cwo.com](mailto:gunnarh@cwo.com)

**Comment 2:**

As you know, I've filed a number of complaints with you [City ADA Coordinator] and the City of Sacramento regarding the City's on-street "accessible" parking and given you my opinion that presently those "accessible" on-street parking spaces within the City of Sacramento are in violation of California Government Code, Title II "programmatic" accessibility requirements and possibly other state and federal access codes/regulations. Although the City manages/creates/installs on-street parking spaces for the public to use, most if not all of those "accessible" spaces the City of Sacramento has installed do not provide the necessary and required access for those individuals using wheelchairs and their vehicles with either a side or rear wheelchair lift or ramp. It is my opinion that most if not all existing on-street "accessible" parking spaces have a number of deviations from standard accessibility design concepts including non-complying signage (pole mounted signs at approximately 3-4 feet in height instead of at the required 80 inches in height-a blind/low visioned pedestrian could walk into one of those non-complying signs and injure themselves), non-complying passenger loading zones (those "accessible" spaces with grass within the passenger loading area are not accessible. Grass is not considered an accessible ground surface material), and in many if not all locations, if the "accessible" parking space user accesses or egresses their vehicle from the rear of their vehicle, there is no accessible path of travel (curb ramp) from the street where they deploy their lift/ramp. This condition typically requires those persons to use the vehicle way (street/road) to go around their vehicle into a traffic lane to get to the closest intersection where there is hopefully an accessible curb ramp that would provide an accessible route to the sidewalk.

Although I was pleased to hear from you and now see that the City of Sacramento will be having a public hearing to discuss the City's Central City Parking Master Plan, I am very concerned that during our latest phone conversation, you informed me that the City of Sacramento plans on creating a new on-street accessible parking policy within the next nine months. What happens to those of us who must continue to use the existing non-complying and unsafe "accessible" on-street parking spaces in the City of Sacramento for the next nine months? Are we to continue facing the kind of conditions

I have described to you? The existing "accessible" parking spaces jeopardize the safety of every individual that uses a lift/ramp equipped vehicle. Waiting nine months before corrections are even thought about is not an acceptable response from the City.

I received an email from you recently that was informing the disability community about the City of Sacramento's efforts to start requiring accessible taxi cabs. Will these vehicles have back-loading ramp systems for those users in wheelchairs? If that's the case and no changes are made to the present on-street parking, you will have an additional "program" accessibility problem/violation since I don't know of many individuals, including cab drivers, that can lift a person and their electric wheelchair off the street, over the curb and onto the sidewalk (or the reverse) and I don't think that the City of Sacramento wants to have that liability! Additionally, since many of the existing parking spaces are similar to the space in the attached photos, if they are designed in a similar fashion, with no space behind the "accessible" parking space, a person using a vehicle with a back loading ramp/lift will not be able to deploy their ramp/lift because there is no room to do so.

I am once again attaching the 5 digital photos I took while in Sacramento recently. Those photos visually describe the "accessible" on-street parking space design presently used by the City of Sacramento.





Lastly, I want to inform you that I am forwarding this email message to FHWA/DOT as a formal public right-of-way complaint and asking that the City of Sacramento be investigated by that federal agency with regard to this and other related public right-of-way access violations I have raised. Included in this complaint is the City's apparent lack of a clear policy that should have been created years ago to ensure that construction in the public right-of-way includes the mandates for the required temporary accessible path-of-travel and accessible barricade system and that those systems are maintained throughout any construction project. For your information, I have attached an example of one city's (the City of San Francisco) efforts to create a policy to protect all pedestrians (including those of us with disabilities) and provide an alternate, accessible path-of-travel when they are maneuvering through a public right-of-way construction site.

This email is also being forwarded to a state-wide list of persons with disabilities who may distribute this string of emails as they wish.

Thank you.

*(San Francisco's policies referenced in this email can be found at [http://www.sfgov.org/site/sfmod\\_index.asp?id=7539](http://www.sfgov.org/site/sfmod_index.asp?id=7539))*

**Submitted by:**

Richard Skaff  
303 Ashton Lane  
Mill Valley, Ca. 94941  
Voice & Fax: 415-389-8628  
Mobile: 415-497-1091  
rmskaff@comcast.net