

**CENTRAL CITY PARKING MASTER PLAN
SPECIAL STAKEHOLDERS MEETING
THURSDAY, MARCH 6, 2006
4:30 P.M. – 6:30 P.M.
Regional Transit Auditorium
1400 29th Street**

Members of the Stakeholder Group for the Central City Parking Master Plan met for the fifth time during a special meeting on Thursday, March 6, 2006 at the Regional Transit Auditorium from 4:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. The meeting provided stakeholders an update to the project, highlights of updated draft policy recommendations, experience from other cities, and an open comment session.

Attendees

Michael Malinowski, Applied Architecture, Inc.
Johnnise Fosterdowns, California Restaurant Association
Patty Kleinknecht, Executive Director, Capitol Station District
Fedolia Harris, City of Sacramento
Traci Michel, City of Sacramento
Teresa Haenggi, City Parks and Recreation
Ann Kohl, ECOS
George Raya, Marshall School Neighborhood Association
Bill Burgua, Marshall School Neighborhood Association
Paul Harriman, NAG
Gerald A. Pollard, Priority Parking
Joe Lienert, Sacramento County
Don Smith, Sacramento Regional Transit
Jeane Borkenhagen, Sacramento Metropolitan AQMD
Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA
Sotiris Kolokotronis, SKK Development
Bruce Holmes, Winn Park-Capitol Avenue Neighborhood Association

Project Staff

Fran Halbakken, City of Sacramento
Howard Chan, City of Sacramento
Matt Eierman, City of Sacramento
Michael Melvin, City of Sacramento
Bill Loudon, DKS Associates
Elsa Coleman, Elsa Coleman Consulting
Wendy Hoyt, The Hoyt Company
Kristy Day, The Hoyt Company

Fran Halbakken, City of Sacramento, initiated the meeting by welcoming attendees, introducing the project team and providing an overview and update of the project. Fran Halbakken and Howard Chan, City of Sacramento, proceeded to present the latest version of the Draft Policy Recommendations. After Bill Loudon of DKS Associates and Elsa Coleman of Elsa Coleman Consulting discussed relevant experiences from other cities, stakeholders were invited to provide comments during an open comment session facilitated by Wendy Hoyt, The Hoyt Company. Kristy Day, The Hoyt Company, closed the meeting by outlining opportunities for continued public involvement.

The following are key comments and questions recorded during the meeting:

Alternate Modes

- There is a lack of bicycle parking in the central city. For example, there is no bicycle parking at the Community Center and two new midtown coffee shops have opened without any bicycle parking.
- Recommend that businesses be required to provide bicycle parking in front of their business.
- There is a lack of bicycle space on Regional Transit (RT) light rail cars. For many, the light rail stops are still a number of blocks away from their destination and riding a bike and taking light rail is a necessity to their commute, but there are not enough bike spaces on the cars. More people would use RT if they could also ride a bicycle. Having an intermodal exchange is important, we need to maximize options for bicycles.
- RT has doubled the number of bicycles that can be on light rail.
- You need to incentivize transit. There should be a transit pass hanging on the back of every door for every new resident of a new residential development. If there is a policy like this, which supports transportation, it corrects itself. And if RT can discount blocks of passes (such as a 70% discount), it adds new customers and adds more money.
- We already know variances are being granted by the City for residential development. Give residents one parking space/unit and a residential transit pass make it a “decade pass”. Then need to market this, lets talk about the fun side of what a resident would have access to and monitor how successful this is. This builds in a solution for new residents.
- Why restrict it to new residents? Why not when you get a residential parking permit you also get a discounted RT pass (partnership with the City and RT). Then you are putting back into the system.
- RT could work out this incentive program.
- Some people moving into downtown may not be up on the urban lifestyle, so this kind of discounted annual pass could come with the house and it is already there for them.
- They could get their RT pass right out of escrow.
- If it costs \$2,500 for a block of passes and the cost for one parking space is about \$25,000, then you get a higher value with a pass versus the cost of a parking space.
- Additional parking competes with transit, air quality, and congestion. How would Goal 8 work? Would requirements go down and who monitors that?
- Take parking fees and put them into transit. Think about increasing bus lines to downtown.
- When you talk about expanding the transportation management program, is this the City’s requirement that Ed Cox is a part of? The policy for this could provide funding from monitoring and enforcement of the existing program.

Parking Surcharge

- Regarding the parking surcharge, it needs to be called a “user fee”. Residents should still have access, but we agreed that visitors should pay. We all have to contribute. A user fee addresses this more than a parking surcharge. The State and City and private parking companies need to be involved with this. Look at the residential visitor pass that costs \$30, it all adds up to a lot of money.

- The residential visitor pass did not go over that well, residents freaked out over the cost of the visitor pass.
- Everyone needs to share the pain and residents set a precedent with this residential visitor pass. This is a good example.
- If the City is planning on having a parking authority (City's desire to increase revenue), where is the money going to go? It needs to focus on the results we need.

Off-Street

- Need to use vacant garages because this would help solve some behavioral issues within the neighborhoods during the evenings within the entertainment areas in the central city. One issue is that visitors are blocking driveways.
- Regarding Goal 2: Formulate interim surface parking lot policy; it is going before Council in April. Who is working on this policy? Can we see this before it goes to Council?
- There is a lack of definition for off-street parking and Goal 1 in terms of development/growth in midtown. There is a lot of gray area in some recommendations. Development is just now becoming profitable, so now developers are coming in and now we will be making it harder for them. We do not address this by forcing people to take mass transit. This is more of what we were doing before. I would hate to see nothing accomplished with this study and have to readdress this one to two years from now.

Implementation

- We should focus on the policies that we can implement quickly while we are working on the longer-term issues. We can implement off-street policy immediately. This is a safe bet. We can use what is already there, what is existing. This can be done safely. We can focus there, then focus on other policy recommendations such as in-lieu-of fee. We do not want mistakes.
- Do stakeholders get to give input on which policies should be the priority?
- I feel we are not ready to finalize this. Things still have not been resolved. I am concerned that you will have people testifying at City Council, and that person could be influential and it is not what we had envisioned. For those who have not been a part of this group, they do not have the background. You need definition of terms.

Enforcement

- Enforcement of neighborhood passes is just as important as ADA enforcement. Is anyone monitoring this?
- The City needs to mark on-street spaces because there are a lot of potential spaces taken up by people who are not using the space efficiently. This needs to also be enforced, this will create more space.

Handout by Stakeholder

- I am Michael Malinowski and me being here is an act of desperation. I have contributed concerns, but I do not see that they are being addressed. I put together a four-page memo to give to the team to consider. I have a copy here that I will circulate tonight and email to anyone who would like a copy.

Note: a copy of this document is provided at the conclusion of this summary.

General

- On the PowerPoint presentation, on Goal 9, there are only four bullet points. Did we lose the others recommendations that went along with Goal 9?
- What do you have the power to do when this is all done? Will this change the way that parking revenue is used?
- When will changes be posted in the next draft of recommendations?
- Do a case study or a micro assessment for new developments. That way, you can take a look at a couple of new projects to see how they are doing faster, rather than waiting years to get the numbers in.
- Residents' parking should be based on the size of the unit. A smaller rental unit where the developer is required to have the same amount of parking as a bigger unit is not good. So I am happy to see this come out of the focus group.
- Regarding Goal 1 and the residential minimum, what area and products are you addressing?
- Some feel the red zone is wasted space, but it is not. A lot of hard work went into trying to preserve public safety with the use of red zones.



Central City Parking Master Plan
Comments on 2/28/2006 version

March 4th 2006

General

I support the idea of creating a Parking Authority which would

1. Administer all funds generated by parking and parking fines
2. Insure all funds would be used in the geographical areas they were generated from to increase the parking supply
3. Have the authority to reduce or increase parking rates or waive parking fees altogether for events or to resolve specific issues.
4. Study the impact of parking policy on an ongoing basis on the viability of business and residential values. Include in this consideration of
 - a. Consumer choice – how choices of where to shop, eat and do business are affected by the cost of parking, presence or absence of parking meters, and parking availability and it's proximity to the destination.
 - b. The impacts of parking controls on established business and residents and property values.

Comments on body of report

Goal 2
"Supply Parking to Meet Need"

There is in this section a lack of "creative ideas which might help to enhance existing or create additional parking supply. I believe strongly that some process that is simple, inexpensive for applicants, and allows for ongoing review of 'experimental parking development' should be put into place, so that there is a continuous process of parking innovation and parking evaluation.

I also believe that there should be a general policy to encourage 'innovative parking solutions' on both private and public property with the intent to maximize supply during hours of shortages. This policy should recognize that if innovative solutions are required

M. Malinowski AIA
Architect

(916) 442-6955
fax 442-6649
mfm@appliedarts.net
www.appliedarts.net
2420 K Street
Sacramento, CA 95816



to go through the full process of securing variances, the cost and time delays associated with same are inherently disincentives. Experimental or trial studies of innovations monitored by the Parking Authority might be considered as alternatives to full blown entitlements.

Some specific examples of creative approaches that might be considered to enhance parking:

1. Parking standards could be relaxed to more accurately reflect midtown geography and actual use of private property for parking. The typical lot width in midtown is 40 feet. Current City standards do not allow the most efficient parking configuration (90 degree back out) in a 40 foot width. There exist many examples of lots which have 90 degree backout parking in 40 foot which have functioned for years without undue problems.
2. The city is one of few jurisdictions which does NOT allow parallel parking on private property; this should be revised, consider the county's long standing and functional standards in this regard.
3. Tandem parking should be permitted on private property without an entitlement process which is expensive and time consuming.
4. Triple tandem parking might be useful in certain business situations, examples of this in midtown exist some of which have been functioning for some time without undue problems.
5. Angled parking layouts which work in 40 foot lot widths should be studied; present dimensional requirements are limited; and examples exist which while not meeting present dimensional standards have long term been working without undue problems.
6. Landscape and shading requirements should be have some flexibility in interpretation permitted at the staff level, so that non traditional geometry or concepts can be considered. If needed, non traditional concepts can be allowed on a trial interim basis as test cases. An example of a non traditional geometry which presently is not permitted is cabled overhead vine trellises for shading in lieu of trees.
7. Parking should be considered for non traditional vehicles such as the street legal 'GEM' type micro vehicles which are much smaller than cars.
8. City streets which presently do not have on street parking should be considered for such. An example is X Street and 28th Street freeway frontages, where added parking might also have the added benefit of slowing traffic. It could also be that such areas might have parking permitted on weekends or other times as needed to relieve local peak demands due to apartments, etc.

M. Malinowski AIA
Architect

(916) 442-6955
fax 442-6649
mfm@appliedarts.net
www.appliedarts.net
2420 K Street
Sacramento, CA 95816



9. Development which provides SURPLUS parking should be permitted; such development might allow for 'transfer of parking rights' as a private sector initiative.
10. Fees and fines should be dedicated to creating parking structures in midtown, and not get put into general operating budgets where they are unlikely to be used to create new parking.
11. Short term parking should be permitted with staff review for example during peak restaurant use hours on non-traditional surfaces such as turf stone and decomposed cement stabilize granite. Such surfaces might have other uses during non-peak parking times such as outdoor visual relief spaces supporting adjacent office or residential uses.
12. Residential 160 foot deep parcels might be permitted to provide short term parking during peak use hours with minimal improvements.

Goal Number Three

Goal Number Three is poorly worded and as such is counterproductive to achieving the intended result in the best possible way. A goal should be a broad objective. As this goal is presented, it limits consideration of methods used to meet the goal to the three approaches listed in the goal itself. There is NO advantage to limiting the possible ways to achieve a goal. The broad goal is to 'manage parking supply efficiently'. There are likely to be other ways to do this beyond those three listed (using time limits, rates, and enforcement).

Innovative methods and approaches to 'managing the parking supply' should be encouraged by policy. This policy should provide a mechanism for continuing improvement and innovation in the management of the available parking supply. As part of this mechanism, there should be an annual review of parking management techniques that have been developed, studied, or implemented in other communities nationwide, to insure that we in Sacramento are always at the cutting edge of best management practice. This annual review should also consider the potential of negative impacts from management approaches on business, and residences and how to ameliorate any such negative impacts.

3.2.4 **I am strongly opposed to adding meters to time restricted parking in midtown.** The existing time restricted parking was in place while most of the buildings in midtown were developed and the businesses rely on such parking for their ongoing viability. I am convinced that meters are a detriment to consumer choice in patronizing midtown business. When customers can choose where to

M. Malinowski AIA
Architect

(916) 442-6955
fax 442-6649
mfm@appliedarts.net
www.appliedarts.net
2420 K Street
Sacramento, CA 95816



go, it is likely if all else is equal they will choose NOT to patronize establishments that have metered parking.

No time restricted parking should be changed to metered parking without a 2/3 majority of affected property owners concurring. To impose meters on such areas which have historically not had them, without the consent of the property owners most affected, is contrary to goal number one as it could well be detrimental to the economic viability of the properties affected.

I hope to have comments on other portions of this document, but in the interim want to get these important points AGAIN into the public forum, as they have not been reflected in the document to date.

Michael F. Malinowski AIA
President
Applied Architecture Inc
2420 K Street
Sacramento CA 95816

Midtown Property and Business Owner.

M. Malinowski AIA
Architect
(916) 442-6955
fax 442-6649
mfm@appliedarts.net
www.appliedarts.net
2420 K Street
Sacramento, CA 95816