

**City of Folsom
Historic District Parking Solutions Ad Hoc Committee**

MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, February 6, 2020

6:30 P.M.

Public Works Conference Room, First Floor

Folsom City Hall

50 Natoma Street, Folsom, CA 95630

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:31 p.m. by Steve Heard.

II. ROLL CALL

Members Present:

Kenton Ashworth	Kyle Middleton
Shannon Brenkwitz	Cindy Pharis
Steve Heard	Phil Rotheram
Karen Holmes	Jim Snook
Paul Keast	Murray Weaver

Members Absent:

Charles Knuth

Staff Present:

Dave Nugen, Folsom Public Works Director
Mark Rackovan, Folsom Engineering Manager
Pam Johns, Folsom Community Development Director
Stephanie Campbell, Kearns & West
Nora De Cuir, Kearns & West

III. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

- a. Mike Brenkwitz, Folsom resident, submitted a one-page document tabulating future development parking needs for the Historic District by building.
- b. Jerry Bernau reminded the Committee that the current parking garage is for a specific building.

IV. APPROVE MINUTES

- a. Regarding January's meeting minutes, Cindy Pharis clarified that on page 2 she placed a red dot due to the poor access and high cost of the proposed solution. Additionally, she

requested attribution for her statement of page 6 be changed to Murray Weaver and that on page 8 the 500 spaces referred to a deficit, not an addition. Paul Keast clarified that he was not opposed to parking permits or the process but thought it would be a hard sell. Paul will go with it if others would like to support this idea.

- b. With requested changes to be made, all committee members voted to approve January's minutes. Jim Snook motioned to accept the minutes. Karen Holmes seconded the motion. In Favor: All. Opposed: None. The motion passed.

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS

- a. Regarding staff follow-up on the Folsom Hotel site, Mark Rackovan presented slides on the location from a prior parking study comparing how different locations scored in each criteria column as well as a parking garage cost estimate comparison. The original parking concept would be 6 stories for 200 spaces overall with the height of the structure being 4 stories higher than the Folsom Hotel.
- b. Regarding in-lieu parking conditions, Pam Johns stated that it was difficult to track down this information but a few properties were found which may qualify retroactively for in-lieu fees. If the City established an in-lieu fee payment, they would go back to the conditioned projects and request payment for their share, although these circumstances were not as widespread as initially thought. She added that the city staff could discuss with City Council what those conditions would yield, but the City would still need a study by a professional consultant regarding the fair use cost in today's terms.
 - i. Murray Weaver asked how much this might yield per stall. Dave Nugen replied that each stall may be upward of \$25,000 although this may not be the number a nexus study would come up with.
 - ii. Paul Keast asked how many spaces were in question. Pam Johns responded that it would be between 6 and 20 spaces per development.
 - iii. Shannon Brenkwitz inquired as to which entity involved with the property would be responsible for payment. Pam Johns responded that the developer would be but this entity has turned over in many cases. Pam Johns continued that they city is not sure receipt of these monies could be relied upon or how much they might yield.
 - iv. Dave Nugen confirmed that the cost per stall is in the \$28,000 range, but a nexus study would adjust this number by modeling all the uses for each building per stall to be divided between all the users, making the overall cost less.
 - v. Paul Keast asked if the current garage is for entire district. Pam Johns stated that it is but there is currently a limited agreement for rideshare users. Mark Rackovan added that the parking garage is only used for transit until the City needs it for day-to-day use which is happening now.
 - vi. Jim Snook stated that he called the person who built the gaslight building to discuss in-lieu fees who relayed that there was a discussion at the time but no need then for in-lieu fees. Pam Johns responded that some developments were conditioned to pay in-lieu fee but some of these projects are 20 years old, making it difficult for the City to pursue these funds successfully.
 - vii. Karen Holmes stated that it seems farfetched that the City would get funding from these fees. She added that if any funds were collected they would have to

- be earmarked for district parking. She went on to posit that better enforcement, even of current rules would alleviate some of the current parking issues.
- viii. Mark Rackovan stated that in order to capture fees for parking the City would need to create a mechanism. Enforcement has come up in past studies but the City still needs to create an enforcement position. Due to the costs associated with overhead and staffing, citation revenues would be partially consumed. Mark still would like the Committee to make this recommendation.
 - ix. Dave Nugen added that enforcement may be a net zero cost but could have significant impact on overall improving the parking issue.
 - x. Karen Holmes responded that enforcement could be more palatable than an expensive parking structure.
 - xi. Shannon Brenkwitz confirmed her support of earmarking funds as well as figuring out additional solutions like enforcement and time limits to avoid compounding the problem.
 - xii. Karen Holmes stated that it would not be a bad idea to have meters on Sutter, Leidesdorff, and Trader Lane.
 - xiii. Shannon Brenkwitz clarified that the issue mostly occurs from 10 pm-2:30 am on Thursday through Saturday nights.
- c. Paul Keast had follow-up questions from last meeting including if the new state ADU process could create more parking issues. Pam Johns responded that the City will have more ADU conversation offline with any ideas to be taken into consideration. The City has asked the state follow-up questions to be able to answer questions at the Historic District workshop. Paul Keast asked if ADUs would be exempt from parking permits. Pam Johns responded that she was not certain on detail but offered that anyone can come to the workshop or follow-up with her.
 - d. A conversation regarding the exact number of parking spots in deficit then occurred with some disagreement on the exact number. Nora De Cuir responded by stating that the group can collectively agree to refer back to most recent study's numbers.
 - e. Next, Kyle Middleton presented an informal study he conducted over 24 hours responded to by 50 people in the Historic District. He did this to address concerns that paid parking would diminish business revenue. Overall most people did not support paid parking—he is happy to provide the information by request.
 - i. Phi I Rotheram suggested the installation of a sign on the parking structure's first floor stating that unlimited parking is available one floor up, rather than the ground level 6 hour time limit.
 - ii. Jim Snook state that the survey has typical responses and again referred to the need for parking management and enforcement.
 - f. Then, Nora De Cuir moved on to prioritizing solutions previously identified by grouping them into 4 groups: "short term high priority", "short term low priority", "long term high priority", and "long term low priority". The group began by agreeing that enforcement is a high priority short term item.
 - i. Regarding the "creating more designated employee parking zones" item, Paul Keast felt like the business owners should take responsibility for this item, not the City. In response, Nora placed the item into "ideas on hold".

- ii. Regarding the “consider establishing valet parking services at key locations” item, Steve Heard commented that the location this is a challenge because businesses around Riley and Sutter are already impacted and thus do not have much space for valet parking. Shannon Brenkwitz was concerned with valet parking impacting the residential area.
 - 1. Kyle Middleton asked who the valeting is for and who would pay. Steve Heard felt the businesses could pay. Karen Holmes added that the Historic District board has had these conversations and decided it is up to the businesses and is not a municipal item.
 - 2. Murray Weaver felt valet parking would be tough to implement and rather the focus should be on rideshare solutions.
 - 3. Mark Rackovan responded that the light rail lots and parking garage are lightly used on high traffic evenings so this solution should be utilizing lots a little farther away, maybe 2 blocks or so.
 - 4. Nora De Cuir filed the item as long term low priority.
- iii. Regarding the “provide shuttle options to parking garage and light rail” item, Murray Weaver stated that he is already doing this some and it gets a fair amount of use back and forth from the garage. Nora De Cuir asked if this is working well, then does the Committee ask for the City to do more or if it is for businesses to address. Mark Rackovan responded that Murray Weaver beat the City to punch—the City already had a Historic District shuttle in the works just before Murray Weaver instituted his. He added that the City could be involved in implementing this solution. Nora De Cuir filed the item as short term low priority.
- iv. Regarding the “considering angled parking and change to one way” item, Nora placed this as an on-hold item.
- v. Regarding the “provide and promote commuter benefits to encourage alternative modes of transportation” item, Steve Heard stated that he agrees with behavioral incentives of this nature could be beneficial. Nora De Cuir filed the item as long term high priority.
- vi. Regarding the “establish designated rideshare zone” item, Kyle Middleton expressed concerned about having a designated space. Pam Johns clarified that the space may only be used during certain hours with the signage being there so rideshare drivers know that that space is used during those hours. Dave Nugen further clarified that the space is not reducing parking but rather is reducing demand. Murray Weaver stated that the item should be short term high priority because it is less expensive and makes a big impact late at night on residences but will leave it up to the City to determine specifics. Dave Nugen added that these solutions must be utilized in concert with one another to be effective.
- vii. Regarding the “residential parking permit program” item, Nora De Cuir suggested this be a short term high priority item.
- viii. Regarding the “lighting” item, Nora De Cuir suggested this could nest under a safety program and placed it in the short term high priority column.

- ix. Regarding the “improve wayfinding” item, Nora De Curi filed this as a short term high priority item.
- x. Regarding the “improve overall circulation design” item, Nora De Cuir stated that it seems people want to keep this item on the table but not be a big part of the conversation. Jim Snook responded that wayfinding could improve this issue. Nora De Cuir filed this as a long term low priority item.
- xi. Regarding the “consider use of underdeveloped lots for infill parking” item, Shannon Brenkwitz suggested this item as long term low priority in case opportunities arise to purchase lots.
- xii. Regarding the “update private development parking requirements including establishment of in-lieu fee for parking” item, Pam Johns felt this item is actually two separate items. She added that the updated parking requirements are happening anyway by end of year but that the in-lieu fee can be considered by committee.
- xiii. Regarding the “develop additional parking garage” item, Shannon Brenkwitz thought this item should be short term high priority to encourage getting started on this right away. Mark Rackovan reminded the Committee that they had wanted to discuss creating a special parking district to assist in funding an additional parking garage. Dave Nugen added that he thought this was a long term item though the funding mechanism is a short term high priority like the in-lieu fees. Nora De Cuir filed this as a long term high priority item.
- g. Regarding the Committee’s review input on the draft report, Nora De Cuir stated that the consulting team primarily found that Committee members felt the report did not convey the inherent time pressure and would like to use stronger language in conveying the urgency of the issue. In response to seeing the stronger language, Steve Heard requested the second paragraph have added to it that the Historic District is “vital to the economy and central to the heritage and founding of City”.
- h. Nora also stated that there was feedback on needing to be clearer on limits of employee survey data as well as an added statement regarding the need to supply access for first responders and adequate enforcement. Steve Heard responded that people should not be able to put up “no parking” signs in legally unenforceable areas.
- i. Finally, Nora stated that the consultant team is looking to get the next round of the draft report for next meeting packet. The Committee can spend the next meeting polishing the report with final submittal by April 28.

VI. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

- a. None.

VII. NEXT MEETING DATE

- a. Nora De Cuir confirmed the next meeting date as March 5, Thursday, at 6:30 p.m.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

- a. The meeting is adjourned at 8:35 p.m. by Steve Heard.