

**CENTRAL CITY PARKING MASTER PLAN
STAKEHOLDER GROUP MEETING 4 of 4
THURSDAY, AUGUST 25, 2005
4:30 P.M. – 6:30 P.M.
Sacramento Regional Transit Auditorium
1400 29TH STREET**

MEETING SUMMARY

Members of the Stakeholder Group for the Central City Parking Master Plan met for the fourth time on Thursday, August 25th, 2005 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 and give input on the policy recommendations that will later be presented to the Sacramento City Council.

Attendees

Jennifer Finton, American Lung Association
Steve Chambers, Ampco System Parking
Dale Kooyman, Boulevard Park Neighborhood Association
Vince Smith, Central Parking System
Cass Mastalski, CFB and 7th and J Building
Julie Sontag, City of Sacramento
Teresa Haenggi, City Parks and Recreation
Danielle de l'Etoile, Downtown Sacramento Partnership
John Deeter, ECOS
Mark Hefner, Hefner Strain Realty Corporation
Stephen Huffman, Historic Old Sacramento Foundation, Inc.
Ann Kohl, ECOS
Seann Rooney, L Street Lofts
Gurjeet Toor, Loftworks
Bill Burgua, Marshall School Neighborhood Association
George Raya, Marshall School Neighborhood Association
Shawn Eldridge, Midtown Business Association
Paul Harriman, NAG
Gerald A. Pollard, Priority Parking
Kipp L. Blewett, Rubicon Partners Inc.
Walt Seifert, SABA
Joe Lienert, Sacramento County
Taiwo Jaiyeoba, Sacramento Regional Transit District
Marilyn Bryant, Sacramento TMA
Adoni Christie, SKK Development
Sotiris Kolokotronis, SKK Development
Jim Derby, State of California Department of General Services
Collette Johnson-Schulke, Sutter Health
Dennis Stayton, Wong Center

Project Staff

Fran Halbakken, City of Sacramento
Howard Chan, City of Sacramento
Matt Eierman, City of Sacramento
Mike Melvin, City of Sacramento
John Long, DKS Associates
Bill Loudon, DKS Associates
Wendy Hoyt, The Hoyt Company
Kristy Day, The Hoyt Company

Handouts

Draft Policy Recommendations
Focus Area Map

Fran Halbakken, City of Sacramento, initiated the meeting by welcoming attendees, introducing the project team, and giving a background of the project. John Long with DKS Associates proceeded with a presentation updating the stakeholders on the project. Bill Loudon of DKS Associates followed by providing an overview of draft policy recommendations. John Long concluded the presentation with an overview of a case study. All presentations included question and answer sessions. Kristy Day, The Hoyt Company, closed the meeting.

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

Project Update

- From my personal experience, the minimum parking requirement for residential should not be raised. The 16th Street residential project has demonstrated that new residential development can be built with one space per unit or less. (S. Kolokotronis)
- What does “supply parking to meet need” mean? Are you defining that by demand? We should be looking at the city as a whole. Development should encourage public transportation and other alternate modes. Some of the demand should be met with transit and trip reduction strategies and not with parking. (A. Kohl)
- 1.5 cars per residential unit is the average presented tonight. You’re talking about average cars, but not specifying if they are going on or off street. Do we need to include parking in the transportation plan for Caltrans as well? (P. Harriman)

Policy Recommendations

- Regarding the accounting procedures presented, there is one fund for parking. That is a big step and it has not been done before. It is positive and I support this. (G. Raya)
- Regarding recommendation 1.2.1 *Remove limitation on the maximum amount of parking that can be provided with new central city development* is in direct conflict with Goal 8 Promote alternative modes of transportation and walkable communities. Regarding maximums,

how temporary is temporary with testing this in the market place? (T. Jaiyeoba)

- What produces the difference in parking rates between government and non-government offices? The big difference between government and non-government is in the numbers regarding TMPs (Transportation Management Plans) because they give you an opportunity for Goal 8 and can be more aggressive with government. Handle with less parking and refine the language. (J. Deeter)
- I recommend refining the language in policy 1.2.1 to make the elimination of parking maximums conditional on development being in a location where there is little or no transit service. (J. Derby)
- Regarding Goal 4 in which there are actions to accommodate local or neighborhood-serving employment, it is important to acknowledge that there is also a lot of regional employment or businesses in the area as well. Not all of the businesses in the residential areas are local or neighborhood serving. It depends if the tenants pay for parking or not and this has not been addressed yet. (D. Kooyman)
- What is the number of parking permits that have been issued throughout the City? My assessment with the increase in residential parking is that something is missing. We need more data. The consulting team should do more research on the amount of parking needed for high-density downtown residential development like what is proposed for the central city. (S. Kolokotronis)
- We requested more detail from the City, and we got it, for off street parking in Old Sacramento. Because in the summer, 9 out of 9 Saturdays and 7 out of 9 Fridays, we are above 85% capacity. Policy 2.2.2 talks about shuttle buses. Can the City consider brokering some kind of arrangement to provide more parking or for getting the Embassy Suites hotel to use the Downtown Plaza/Old Sacramento garage for employees? Would a shuttle or more security be appropriate? (S. Huffman)
- We see owners of apartment complexes with garages encouraging the residents to park in the streets so that they can rent out the spaces in the garage. Secondly, the negative impacts of parking in Midtown are mostly due to late night entertainment and what goes with it like quality of life, crime and distance of parking for residents. There are garages sitting empty because the owners do not want the problems with the late night customers. Can the City do something to address the issues and get the garage owners to open them up? (B. Burgua)
- Nighttime use of daytime commuter parking has a lot of potential to solve problems in Midtown. (P. Harriman)
- I have an article here about people, parking, and cities and it compares Los Angeles, New York and San Francisco. In Los Angeles, people go into the City, park in a garage, go in a building then leave. It is auto oriented. The 5.2 policy does not deal with what we want. Also, I suggest switching goals 8 and 9 and put them first, and then we will have a more balanced approach. Getting people to use public transportation should be included in policies. Promote 8 and 9 as highest priority. If we are talking about the future, we need to look at

what we really want and look at publications and what they are saying regarding parking policy and congestion management. (A. Kohl)

- I am disappointed with how unprogressive the draft policies are. Regarding the bicycle signage policy, I assume this is dealing with the garage. Some funding from the parking fund should be used to provide more bicycle parking. More is needed besides just providing information and signage for bicycle parking. (W. Seifert)
- I am also surprised by the unprogressive nature of the policies. It will not create the kind of city I would be proud to live in. I cannot believe that the City Council had to recommend 8 and 9 and that it was not already included in all the working papers. I commend the City Council for progressive thinking. Regarding parking maximums and minimums: eliminating the parking maximums is very serious and seems to go in the wrong direction. There needs to be more support for use of alternative modes and trip reduction. Shuttle services will be a very expensive way to address parking shortage issues; this would quickly drain the parking fund. Look carefully at this. (M. Bryant)
- Is the data presented available on a block-by-block basis? The City might want to take a more micro-level view of parking deficiency before formulating plans for adding parking. There are hot spots and non-related areas in the “focus areas.” (K. Blewett)
- Regarding recommendation 5.2.1 *maintain existing City policy to prohibit the addition of new stand alone parking without associated parking-generating uses* does not seem necessary, it seems like a statement of the obvious. Do not build a garage where you do not need it. Developers do not want to build more because it is expensive and they would only build a garage if it were for a specific use. (J. Derby)
- What is the point of Goal 6 regarding bicycles? This is the only area that references bicycles. What are the policies about bicycle minimums, maximums, etc? Are there any right now? The recommendations for bicycle parking need to go beyond information and signage. There should be requirements for new development to provide it. The current list of recommendations seems totally focused on cars. (J. Deeter)
- Regarding bicycle parking, there is bad design in the new City Hall. They have bike lockers in the basement, but no way to safely get there. (G. Raya)
- These policies presented tonight, will they be adopted as is? How will individual recommendations be incorporated? How do I see it at City Council? (G. Raya)

Case Study

- We are proposing a 92 unit residential project for the Planning Commission. Some are talking about the parking issue. When developers sell new residential units in the central city, they want to make sure that the residents will be happy and live in the unit for a long time. It will add a lot of activity. We expect them to want to live there for the vibrancy. The City needs to address this conflict of

restaurant and entertainment development and new residents. Somehow we should address this conflict with activity and residential. (S. Kolokotronis)

- To address the bicycle parking comment earlier, most developers and parking companies are sensitive about bicycle needs and a lot of new developers know that bicycle parking is important and it is on the drawing board. (G. Pollard)