

**Central City Parking Master Plan
Initial Stakeholder Feedback on Parking Issues**

Stakeholder	Parking Issues/Comments
A	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. K Street retail needs parking. 2. Need more parking on L, to help retail on K Street Mall. 3. Additional parking will make shopping better in Central Business District
B	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Availability of parking on evenings and weekends. 2. Slowing traffic on Capitol Ave, which is not strictly a parking issue but is related, particularly as parking affects traffic circulation. 3. The general attractiveness and open space in the Midtown Area and how parking impacts that.
C	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More diagonal parking.
D	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of signage 2. During "Old Sac" Events the parking garages closed forcing all the monthly customers to find alternate parking. At the same time visitors are coming to the west end to find parking. 3. Inconsistent parking enforcement.
E	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The lack of off-street parking for entertainment venues (i.e. Harlows, Empire, K-Bar). The City needs to require these bars to provide off-street parking for their customers. Since the businesses do not lease parking spaces at nearby parking structures, their customers park all over the adjacent neighborhoods. At 2 am we have drunks making their way to their cars, which usually are blocking our driveway. <p>At 2 am we have to listen to these folks shouting at their dates, say goodbye to their friends, and just being a nuisance.</p> <p>Residents of Midtown will no longer tolerate large bars not taking responsibility for the parking needs of their customers. For me, living so close to Harlow's, Blue Cue, and El Centro - parking is a major issue.</p>
F	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 200 spaces required for office (existing) Building located at 926 J Street (at 10th) 2. 200 spaces required for office (existing) Building located at 1107 9th Street (at K) 3. 100 spaces required for 1600 K Street office building (existing) located on the corner of 16th and K St.

**Central City Parking Master Plan
Initial Stakeholder Feedback on Parking Issues**

Stakeholder	Parking Issues/Comments
G	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Miss-use of decals & placards 2. Enforcement of parking in alleyways & empty lots 3. Enforcement &/or non-enforcement on Garbage & Street Sweeping days.
H	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Zoning for private parking lots and garages is stringent and makes it difficult to get permits to operate lots and garages as paid parking facilities 2. Beautification ordinance for parking lots makes the cost of turning unused surface parking lots greater than the return. Many empty lots that could be used for public parking go unused for this reason.
I	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop policies that support and encourage shared parking so commercial lots can be used at night to alleviate parking demand by non-resident uses so residents can park by their homes. 2. Support a car share program for new residential development that wants to reduce parking it must provide, and for existing Midtown residents. 3. Develop a structure for commuter parking to pay for enforcement of residential parking zones. Residents should not have to pay for a problem created by commuters.
J	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quantity of spaces 2. Location of spaces 3. Cost of parking
K	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The continued decline in the central core area - from 7th to 10th, and J to L Streets 2. Safety & Security - If people feel that downtown is unsafe, they won't come to shop & park. 3. Continue to encourage downtown residential and entertainment uses to create a 24 hour downtown environment.
L	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Residential Parking 2. Share the burden 3. Creating alternatives

Central City Parking Master Plan Initial Stakeholder Feedback on Parking Issues	
Stakeholder	Parking Issues/Comments
M	<p>1. Parking Plan/Strategies should include promoting the use of the extensive transit service in the Central City. It should examine options to expand that service through circulators and street car service.</p> <p>2. The Parking Plan should also consider utilizing the more than 6, 000 parking spaces available at light rail stations (soon to be over 7,000).</p> <p>3. The Plan should promote the concept of "park once" and develop strategies to promote transit for multiple trips in the Central City.</p>
N	<p>1. After 3 Decades of Parking Variances (almost all new projects request variances) and most renting residents now rely on on-street parking.</p> <p>Landlords often rent out their required residential parking spaces to businesses or commuters with the rational that residential renters can get a permit to park on the street.</p> <p>Garages are often rented for storage, further eroding the existing off street parking capacity.</p> <p>Add in the increasing volumes of Commuters, State-County-City workers, shoppers, service vehicles, etc.... who now all rely on the same on-street parking spots and we are already faced with a deficit capacity.</p> <p>Infill will compound this problem without good planning.</p> <p>We can't punish existing residents for decades of Planning Commission variances.</p> <p>2. Suggestion to require agreements allowing after hours use of off-street parking lots for auto-oriented destinations like restaurants, bars, 2nd Saturday, live theaters, etc.</p> <p>3. Suggestion to require all new housing and office space to include a transferable 20 year RT pass. Ask Bev. Scott to issue a new RT Decade Pass in support the City's infill policies.</p> <p>4. Suggestion to further improve on-street parking with increased angled parking and street lights.</p> <p>5. Enforcement is the common denominator that protects all stakeholders and regulates access.</p> <p>Since enforcement drives private and government parking revenues, we need to recoup a daily (per space) contribution from off street users to support the enforcement that FILLS those spaces.</p> <p>This Parking Lot assessment is bourn by the user (not the business)</p>

Central City Parking Master Plan Initial Stakeholder Feedback on Parking Issues	
Stakeholder	Parking Issues/Comments
O	<p>1. Sacramento County does not have enough parking to satisfy employee needs. Subsequently, we must contract for space, paying high rates to meet our demand for employee parking.</p> <p>2. The expense of siting and building a large parking facility in the Downtown Area.</p>
P	<p>1. Need for more flexible parking standards (e.g. be able to change parking ratios) along Richards Blvd. to accommodate large office complexes; mixed use.</p> <p>2. Need to create a Mini Parking Plan for N. 16th/N 12th Street "Gateway" District that provides on-street parking or common surface lots for small businesses/retail/services, within walking distance of emerging retail areas. Need to balance on-street parking needs with traffic circulation.</p> <p>3. Needs & importance of preventing car camping on the street.</p>
Q	<p>1. Planning - an example of poor planning would be the delivery area at 5th & J for Downtown Plaza deliveries. It is not adequate. Difficult to land new businesses downtown due to parking.</p> <p>2. Enforcement - Non-existent: 1) lack of response, 2) lack of repair to broken meters/painted curbs, signage.</p> <p>3. Politics</p>
R	<p>1. On-street is finite resource. More office, retail, entertainment & high density residential will place more pressure on the existing, older on-street residential zones. Requiring more enforcement for longer times on those zones. Impact fee on the cause of requiring the enforcement in lieu of residents being charged for access to residential permits. Is more off-street needed? If so, where with regards to planning for the build out of the central city w/ regards to infill. As high density infill occurs, should or will these residents be afforded the access to residential permit street parking given its finite nature or should we be looking at off-street strictly for them? Numbers of permits in residential zones that should be allowed per a given address?</p> <p>How we "frame" requirements for infill Artist Live/work space is beginning to be used as lofts 1 space 1000 sq ft or 1/unit regardless of footage??</p> <p>Until transit can provide adequate services resulting in decreased dependence on auto can we "afford" decreasing parking requirements in central city just to promote infill?</p>

Central City Parking Master Plan Initial Stakeholder Feedback on Parking Issues	
Stakeholder	Parking Issues/Comments
	<p>Existing use of lots by private owners that are not up to current surface, shading and landscape requirements. "Sunset" the exemption?</p> <p>Quasi entertainment zones within residential zones affecting the quality of life for residents yet the entertainment venue owners are only responsible for their street frontage, not their patrons parking behaviors.</p> <p>More of equal importance to follow</p>
S	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Parking maximums rather than minimums 2. Full for work trips 3. Design - Previous asphalt/cement - less land use disabled & ped access through parking lots - building at sidewalk - trees shading etc. See ECOS vision website: www.ecosacramento.net
T	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. City parking facilities private vs. public operation, including meter monitoring. Privates doing it cheaper? Focus Area 1 & 2 2. 16th Street corridor, growth plan for continued development with no or little parking requirements for the customers of the growing businesses Focus Area 2 3. Forecast L & K Street corridor reconstruction plan. Impacts immediate situation for existing parking and what type of development to replace dilapidated businesses. Focus Area 1.
U	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Keeping spaces available (to minimize congestion caused by "hunting" and to encourage people to come into downtown & Midtown) 2. Direct revenue (at least some) into neighborhood & streetscape improvements
V	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cost to retail customers. Validation programs and use of free parking to drive evenings and weekend customer base can be a valuable redevelopment tool 2. Perception. Downtown has a fairly good stock of parking, but the perception is that it is difficult, hard to find and expensive.

**Central City Parking Master Plan
Initial Stakeholder Feedback on Parking Issues**

Stakeholder	Parking Issues/Comments
	3. On Street handicap parking meter abuse. A large number of Downtown meters are consumed by parkers who display a handicap placard, but do not appear to be handicapped. While the large number of handicapped space in garages sit empty.
W	1. Currently our biggest issue is low building occupancy and the effect this has with parking revenue.
X	<p>1. Providing adequate parking for future increased public access and facilities along the River (particularly per Riverfront Master Plan) and to downtown parks.</p> <p>2. Location of facilities in relation to public and recreational/cultural facilities in Central City.</p> <p>3. Provide parking in locations with good access to transit, Bikeways, sidewalks that are also <u>Safe</u>.</p>
Y	<p>1. A thorough analysis needs to be completed showing the areas of greatest demand so that additional parking resources can be made available where needed.</p> <p>2. Need to make sure that the existing parking resources are being fully utilized on a 24 hour basis, e.g. Off-Street parking spaces used by office workers during the week should be used by others during evenings and weekends.</p> <p>3. Office workers should not be allowed to park in spaces in residential/retail neighborhoods.</p>
Z	<p>1. Meet parking needs in order to attract people to the downtown.</p> <p>2. Determine how resources can be shared and designed to provide adequate parking while addressing security concerns (security concerns of public & property owners.</p> <p>3. Be realistic with addressing parking issues. Do not use assumptions that are not proven out in the marketplace. (e.g. not everyone will use transit, carpool, etc.) Many people will drive their own vehicles despite incentives to do otherwise.</p>
AA	<p>1. Emphasis on mass transit use.</p> <p>2. Resident access to parking near their own home as well as business accommodation.</p> <p>3. Adequate high rise parking structures.</p>

**Central City Parking Master Plan
Initial Stakeholder Feedback on Parking Issues**

Stakeholder	Parking Issues/Comments
BB	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Lack of affordable off-street parking2. City resistance to privately-owned off-street parking3. Lack of on-street permits for businesses
CC	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Are existing and planned parking facilities adequate for the projected growth in the Central City in the next 10-15 years?2. Will new mixed-use and infill projects in the Central City offset parking requirements i.e., ill associated alternate commute strategies reduce parking needs?3. Is the conversion of K Street to vehicle use and parking a feasible strategy?