

**CENTRAL CITY PARKING MASTER PLAN
SECOND STAKEHOLDERS' MEETING
TUESDAY, April 5, 2005
4:30 P.M. – 6:30 P.M.
Tsakopoulos Library Galleria
828 I Street**

MEETING SUMMARY

Members of the Stakeholders Group for the Central City Parking Master Plan met for the second time on Tuesday, April 5, 2005 at the Tsakopoulos Library Galleria from 4:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. The meeting provided an opportunity for members to receive an update of the study and give input on issues and potential strategies.

Attendees:

Chris Brown, 20th Street Neighborhood Association
Jennifer Finton, American Lung Association
Alisha Stanfield, Central Parking System
Cass Mastalski, CFB and 7th and J Building
Jon Robinson, City of West Sacramento Redevelopment Agency
Barry Wasserman, City Planning
Nicole York-Johnson, Convention, Culture and leisure
Danielle Hanover, Heller Pacific Inc.
Michael Cordano, James J. Cordano Co.
Judy Sundquist, Land Park Community Association
George Raya, Marshall School Neighborhood Assn.
Paul Harriman, NAG
Roy Jeske, Priority Parking
Jim Derby, State of California, DGS, Real Estate Division
Gerald A. Pollard, Republic Parking NW Inc.
Joe Lienert, Sacramento County
Art Smith, Sacramento Metropolitan AQMD
Marilyn Bryant, Executive Director, Sacramento TMA
Lisa Bates, SHRA
David Venancio, Standard Parking
Peter Jacobsen, Walk Sacramento
Bruce Holmes, Winn Park-Capitol Avenue Neighborhood Association
Dennis Stayton, Wong Center
Walt Seifert, SABA
Glenn Sorensen, Jr., Loftworks
Lisa Bates, SHRA

Project Staff

Fran Halbakken, 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

PowerPoint Presentation Printout
Stakeholder Issues and Potential Strategies

Fran Halbakken, City of Sacramento, initiated the meeting by welcoming attendees and introducing the project team, stakeholders then introduced themselves. John Long and Bill Loudon of DKS Associates proceeded with a PowerPoint presentation that included an overview of the parking study, summary of issues raised, and potential strategies for those issues. After the presentation Wendy Hoyt of The Hoyt Company facilitated the question and answer session.

Wendy Hoyt announced the breakout session and explained the purpose and guidelines for the session. Subsequently, attendees separated into workgroups, each group included a technical professional and a volunteer recorder. During the one-hour session, attendees shared comments and suggestions for potential parking strategies 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. Comments are attributed to specific stakeholders only when so noted by the group recorders.

Group 1

- Selling ads on tickets is a great idea (private companies already do it).
- Time limits for M Street is a good idea.
- Using money for neighborhood cleaning and project is good.
- There is not a shortage or parking, rather poor use of spaces.
- Example of revised management.
- City does a poor job of managing its lots to maximize use and revenue.
- The cost of spaces is very high.
- Cities out sourcing; monthly to:
 - Get higher turnover to get more revenue.
 - Revenue – based performance.
- Politicians want to cater to merchants. But this is a bad policy.
- Keep empty spaces near elevators.
- Encourage all-day to stay out of prime areas.
- Need experiences from other cities.
- Parking structures need to be clean, safe, and well lit.
- In-lieu of a parking district, have a walkable community.

- When using vacant lots (small parcels) temporarily, we will need to define temporary
- Need to open remote State lots to everyone.
- Who will assess for the Parking Assessment District? Property Owners?
- Prefer shared lots to single-user lots
- It is good to channel money back into neighborhoods that are impacted by traffic and parking.
- Keep on-street parking spaces on major streets and have them available for short-term users (meter major streets).

Group 2

- Review City policies for uses for the issue of providing appropriate and effective enforcement of parking regulations and restrictions
- Provide shuttle services for remote area, free shuttle service (C. Mastalski).
- Designate more delivery areas, vehicles double-parked (D. Stayton)
- Use vacant lot (D. Hanover)
- Have a centrally located City garage (G. Sorensen)
- Residents pay for residential parking. Issue 5 (addressing competition for spaces between businesses and residents in central city neighborhoods) is wrong, plan for the shortfall (B. Holmes)
- In regards to Issue 4 (treating parking supply as a factor in central city development planning), how difficult is it to take stand alone parking through system? (G. Pollard)
- New development should be tied to their parking plan (J. Robinson)
- In regards to Issue 6 (allowing parking rates and other mechanisms for generating revenue and financing to ensure that adequate parking supply is provided and maintained), it needs an advisory committee
- For issue 7 (providing appropriate and effective enforcement of parking regulations and restrictions), economic goals will need to be balanced with neighborhood goals, supply and demand is the primary issue, and a secondary issue is where do they park within the neighborhood with no planned parking? There needs to be incentives to revitalize and area and zoning and planning requirements (B. Holmes and J. Robinson)
- Parking Structures are needed that can serve a large developing area (garage at 16th and J Street)
- There needs to be balance, not too extreme one way or the other (B. Holmes, J. Robinson and G. Sorensen)
- Get some private sector funding – RT vs. TriMet (B. Holmes, J. Robinson and G. Sorensen)
- Need to think about shuttle service, expense of land, need for landscaping and lighting (Acorn 100% more expensive than box), and regulations
- Need to use vacant lots (D. Hanover and G. Sorensen)
- Need to set maximum parking requirement for new development.
 - 17th and J St. Office Max – 40-50 stalls on roof, but there are engineering problems: leaks/wear.
 - Stalls available for monthlies of the lofts (\$15,000, \$20,000 per stall)
 - City garage at H & 14th (\$26,000/stall four years ago) (C. Mastalski and J Robinson)
- The theme is:

- Strategies should be interwoven with City zoning, planning and regulations.
- There are neighborhood concerns
- Create the highest best use
- In the short term, more parking is needed immediately
- Long-term - build a centrally located City garage with 20,000 stalls
- Other notes:
 - Parking is a bad way to promote walking, transit.
 - Transportation Choice = One of the most-studied, best understood human behavior in urban setting. Use empirical evidence of walking radii, headway tolerance (transit), hours of operation, mode split to come up with coordinated program.
 - People living in cities should expect some parking conflicts; It's a bad idea to try and eliminate all conflicts, because the only sure way to do that is totally separate residential from commercial, which is antithetical to smart urban planning.
 - Bad idea to use a la carte menu approach; transportation only works in a systematic program. I.e. people need to know where parking is, be willing to pay the price in terms of money and delay to use it, and feel safe using it. One breakdown and people won't use remote lots, etc.
 - Parking is a great economic development tool: Meets substantive need of developer (lowers development cost) and allows city ancillary public benefits, i.e. shared parking, design control, location control.
 - West Sacramento and Sacramento parking plans should be coordinated substantively i.e. include relevant portions of each other's jurisdiction in each study. i.e. Ziggurat garage has hundreds of spaces at very low rates relative to central city market rate.

Group 3

- Capacity (Supply and Demand)
 - Identify parking deficits
 - Identify parking surpluses
 - By time of the day / day of the week.
- State carrying capacity
 - Short-term versus long-term parking and relationship to access points
- Cost-benefit statement
 - Huge cost versus where else that investment could go (residential, commercial, structures, remote facilities, alternative uses, etc.)
- Linkage between parking rates, fuel costs and transit fares
 - Estimate 20% transit.
 - Transit Fare box.
- How do you Forecast
 - 2, 5, 10-year window
 - What is happening in the transit system?
- Description of what other locales are doing
 - Case studies and best practices

- Enforcement
 - What rate structure of enforcement should be? (Look at London)
- TDM
 - Needs to be more than transit
 - Bike/walk/rideshare
 - Subsidize carpools
 - No 10-hour meters on-street
- There is a very delicate balance of parking need by type of user (keep whatever we do realistic)
- Security is an issue, how to assure security with parking facilities
 - Design standards (design features/lighting)
- Coordinate with light rail
 - Park in destination locations that are safe.
- What is the cost of parking?
- Additional comments (B. Wasserman):
 - Linkage between fuel costs, RT costs, parking rates/ set up a methodology.
 - Enforcement issues – fines, methods of citation (London, UK)
 - Assessment of impacts of reduced parking availability (San Francisco, San Diego, San Jose, Portland, Seattle, etc.)
 - Be sure to study differences between demands at peak, non-peak, evening, weekend, etc.
 - Relation of parking facilities/strategies to street patterns/capacities.
 - Major event planning.
 - Air quality impacts of alternatives proposed – show
 - Cost/benefit analysis regarding high cost of structures i.e. build - no build
 - “Carrying Capacity” of downtown, of each neighborhood, of major corridors (for parking based on planning and environmental concerns)
 - Relation of transit headways to parking location
 - Post and enforce City’s idling ordinance, especially near outdoor eating areas and residences.
 - Provide secure public bicycle parking/cages in some public parking garages
 - With new lots and rooftops, provide maximum shade to reduce heat from cars and paving materials

Group 4

- Businesses like Harlow’s use other private parking on a shared basis, for example Sutter Hospital, to make neighborhood quieter. How to accomplish? No metered parking there, but restaurateurs may not have incentive to do this, but a business collective might have wherewithal. Permit only after certain time.
- Need more information on parking – What’s available.
 - Changeable signs
 - Fixed signs

- Advise of non-City operated parking (standard sign for parking [all parking, like in Europe].), especially around events (and alternative modes to get to events).
 - Problems with a-frames
- Include bicycle parking in scope
 - Events valet parking
 - Long term
 - Short term
- City should establish a partnership with RT to decrease demand
- Parking Assessment District supports enforcement
 - Make users pay instead of property owners - for enforcement and other costs
 - Users (all off-street patrons) pay - widest possible participation
- Citywide, \$100 per space per week is collected by lot managers. Enforcement is our best off-street parking marketing tool.
- Money from parking could go to:
 - Neighborhoods
 - Transit
 - Community Projects
 - Enforcement technology / equipment and labor
 - Bike parking
- Wholesale rate for parking validation (as well as RT bus passes). Parking should be thought of in conjunction with transit/land use and not in isolation.
- Any changes should include public outreach and they should be more than report, have an interactive approach
- Encourage “efficient land use” (strategy 2) and not just alternative modes
- There should not be special rules for temporary use vacant lots because temporary becomes permanent