

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

**MEETING MINUTES**

Thursday, December 5, 2019

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 Chair Steve Heard.

**II. ROLL CALL**

Members Present:

Kenton Ashworth  
Shannon Brenkwitz  
Steve Heard  
Karen Holmes  
Charles Knuth

Kyle Middleton  
Cindy Pharis  
Phil Rotheram  
Jim Snook  
Murray Weaver

Members Absent:

Paul Keast

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. Ernie Sheldon Jr., Folsom resident, brought copies of a possible solutions document he created based on what he has heard at the Committee's meetings thus far.

**IV. APPROVE MINUTES**

- a. Regarding November's meeting minutes, Steve Heard stated pages 3-4 had a few items which were made by him yet inaccurately attributed to Steve Banks. Shannon Brenkwitz requested the explicit purpose of the committee be stated as "...alleviating the residential parking issue..." on page 5. Cindy Pharis requested her statement be changed

to refer to the intersection of Riley and Scott streets as a good location for a parking garage.

- b. With the above changes to be made, all committee members voted to approve November’s minutes. Phil Rotheram motioned to accept the minutes. Jim Snook seconded the motion. In Favor: All. Opposed: None. The motion passed.

**V. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

- a. Nora De Cuir introduced the solution screening activity the facilitation team crafted to assist in the continued discussion and evaluation of potential solutions. She clarified that the purpose of this activity was to screen for how well each proposed solutions met the proposed criteria, allowing the facilitation team to sort solutions into those which will be included in the initial draft report and those which require further refinement. During the solution screening activity, the committee members spent the better part of an hour placing a red, yellow, or green sticker on each of three posters placed around the room.

Results of this activity are shown below:

Solution Screening Activity		Does the solution conform to City standards as established by the Historic District Design and Development Guidelines, the Folsom Municipal Code, and any other adopted City ordinances, policies and requirements?	Does the solution integrate with the existing character of Folsom Historic District?	Does the solution promote safety after dark, while mitigating for adverse effects such as light pollution of surrounding area?	Does the solution maintain a positive customer experience and support economic activity in the Historic District?	Is the solution practical for residents of the Historic District?	Is the solution practical for employees of Historic District businesses?	Does the solution address parking needs in the locations where parking is currently deficient?	Does the solution address projected parking needs associated with future development?	Does the solution leverage existing programs, projects or public investment?	Would the solution benefit a variety of user types (e.g., light-rail transit users, commuters, customers, employees, delivery and public services, special event visitors, residents, residential visitors) and work together with other parking solutions?	What is your current level of support for this solution? (Green = Support; Red = Do not support; Yellow= Undecided)
<i>This activity is intended to help focus the group discussion but is not intended to remove any proposed solutions from consideration. This is to identify areas of agreement and further investigation. Screening questions are listed to the right in blue with proposed solutions below.</i>												
Establish new parking management programs.												
Establish a designated Uber/Lyft loading zone (s).												
Consider establishing valet parking services at key locations.												
Provide shuttle options to parking garage and light rail.												
Design, implement and enforce residential parking permit program.												
Update private development parking requirements, including establishment of in-lieu fee for parking.												
Provide and promote commuter benefits to encourage alternative modes of transportation.												
Establish program to enhance pedestrian safety to, from and around the existing parking garage.												

Solution Screening Activity												
<p>Please use a sticker to indicate your response.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes</li> <li>Undecided</li> <li>No</li> </ul> <p>This activity is intended to help focus the group discussion but is not intended to remove any proposed solutions from consideration. This is to identify areas of agreement and further investigation. Screening questions are listed to the right in blue with proposed solutions below.</p>		Does the solution conform to City standards as established by the Historic District Design and Development Guidelines, the Folsom Municipal Code, and any other adopted City ordinances, policies and requirements?	Does the solution promote safety after dark, while mitigating for adverse effects such as light pollution of surrounding area?	Does the solution maintain a positive customer experience and support economic activity in the Historic District?	Is the solution practical for residents of the Historic District?	Is the solution practical for employees of Historic District businesses?	Does the solution address parking needs in the locations where parking is currently deficient?	Does the solution address projected parking needs associated with future development?	Does the solution leverage existing programs, projects or public investment?	Would the solution benefit a variety of user types (e.g., light-rail transit users, commuters, customers, employees, delivery and public services, special event visitors, residents, residential visitors) and work together with other parking solutions?	What is your current level of support for this solution? (Green = Support, Red = Do not support, Yellow= Undecided)	
Continue to optimize existing management programs.												
Offer behavioral incentives to reward beneficial parking behavior (for example, such as discounts for showing proof of parking garage use at events, or discount codes for Uber/Lyft).												
Improve and expand wayfinding signage to encourage use of preferred facilities and options and addressing the needs of visitors entering the Historic District from varying directions												
Continue to work with special event organizers to manage parking demand during events.												
Continue to enforce the zoning code in the public right of way.												
Implement adaptive management strategies (could include establishing time for Staff or Council to reassess parking situation in Historic District).												

Solution Screening Activity												
<p>Please use a sticker to indicate your response.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes</li> <li>Undecided</li> <li>No</li> </ul> <p>This activity is intended to help focus the group discussion but is not intended to remove any proposed solutions from consideration. This is to identify areas of agreement and further investigation. Screening questions are listed to the right in blue with proposed solutions below.</p>		Does the solution conform to City standards as established by the Historic District Design and Development Guidelines, the Folsom Municipal Code, and any other adopted City ordinances, policies and requirements?	Does the solution promote safety after dark, while mitigating for adverse effects such as light pollution of surrounding area?	Does the solution maintain a positive customer experience and support economic activity in the Historic District?	Is the solution practical for residents of the Historic District?	Is the solution practical for employees of Historic District businesses?	Does the solution address parking needs in the locations where parking is currently deficient?	Does the solution address projected parking needs associated with future development?	Does the solution leverage existing programs, projects or public investment?	Would the solution benefit a variety of user types (e.g., light-rail transit users, commuters, customers, employees, delivery and public services, special event visitors, residents, residential visitors) and work together with other parking solutions?	What is your current level of support for this solution? (Green = Support, Red = Do not support, Yellow= Undecided)	
Expand use of existing facilities.												
Create more designated employee parking zone(s), including the vacant parcel on the west side of Riley St. between Sutter Alley and Figueroa St.												
Improve overall circulation design to improve the way people get in and out of Historic District and to parking areas (Consider no turns onto Riley, no left turn onto Sutter and instead direct traffic to Leidesdorff; Consider directing traffic north on Riley).												
Consider angled parking from Leidesdorff to Sutter on Wool and from Wool to Decatur on Sutter												
Consider improved lighting in and around Railroad Block Parking Structure.												
Build new facilities.												
Consider additional public parking garage (location options include: on NW corner of Leidesdorff Street and Gold Lake Drive; on SW corner of Leidesdorff and Riley Streets; on NW corner of Canal Street and Scott Street; and others)												
Consider use of small undeveloped or underdeveloped lots for infill parking.												
Continue to improve pedestrian and bicycle access.												

b. After the activity was complete, Nora asked for reactions from the group on the activity.

- i. Shannon Brenkwitz asked for further clarification regarding what “no turns off Riley” meant from the activity.
  1. The marked-up satellite image from the November meeting was shown to the group for reference. Additionally, Steve Heard responded that coming down Riley, drivers tend to turn onto Sutter Street rather than continue straight or turn toward the garage, but there could be reconfiguration of the streets here to encourage drivers toward the parking garage.
  2. Mark Rackovan responded that there has been research into this issue which showed this would be an expensive solution due to the safety issues caused by the hill’s crest impeding visibility at that intersection. The intersection would have to be raised or a roundabout would have to be created—solutions which would be not only expensive but have challenging ramifications to adjacent infrastructure.
  3. Dave Nugen added that there will be a financial factor for all solutions considered, but, ultimately, there must be cost-benefit considerations made regarding which solutions will be pursued.
  4. Steve Heard stated that improving the current parking garage is likely a priority over building a new one as the current one is not used to capacity.
  5. Phil Rotheram asked if the City has data on the volume of traffic moving north versus south trying to turn onto Sutter Street.
    - a. Dave Nugen responded that the City can only really model the potential solutions.
    - b. Phil Rotheram added that he lives by the intersection being discussed and sees many drivers attempting to turn left onto Sutter going north. He suggested rather than altering this intersection, drivers could be made to turn left at Natoma and right onto Reading to direct drivers to the parking garage.
      - i. Dave Nugen responded that Reading is very narrow for this type of rerouting.
  6. Jim Snook brought the discussion back to the Riley turn, by suggesting a sign denoting Sutter Street access to the parking garage.
  7. Kyle Middleton stated that he wanted to make clear what the problem is the Committee is trying to address. He added that data would be useful to understand what is happening with parking and traffic flow currently.
    - a. Nora De Cuir responded that problem areas were recorded on the map last time, but that it is a good question to know what will go into the group’s recommendation report versus what staff will continue to research.
    - b. Shannon Brenkwitz responded that the answer will include having more parking. She added that a parking garage is needed but finding a funding stream will be an issue. She suggested

- establishing what solutions are needed first, then looking at how those solutions can be financed.
- c. Steve Heard stated that it is a good idea to have folks go straight to the parking garage rather than through the residential neighborhood. He added that there will need to be a multi-pronged approach to avoid unintended impacts for redirected parking in adjacent areas.
8. Nora De Cuir stated that in the activity, an additional public garage got a fair amount of support so this solution will likely be implemented. She added that the activity showed support for behavioral changes and creating Uber/Lyft loading zones.
    - a. Murray Weaver stated that better Uber/Lyft signage around the 600 block would really help since there is currently no visible or convenient loading zone nearby. He added that incentives could be used to make sure these loading zones will be used.
    - b. Pam Johns responded that she has heard about those solutions being implemented in other cities with the community giving rave reviews in response. The City of Folsom is open to this solution.
  9. Phil Rotheram inquired as to how the Committee members felt about drivers being routed through residential areas to reach the parking garage.
    - a. Shannon Brenkwitz responded that she is more concerned about non-residents parking in the residential area rather than merely driving through.
  10. Kyle Middleton stated that there are different time lengths of solutions for the group to think about. He added that many Folsom residents may not care as much about the Historic District parking issues so the group may need to consider that other residents do not see a parking garage or other more costly solutions as a priority for city spending.
  11. Steve Heard suggested that an Uber/Lyft loading zone could be located next to the Hacienda. He added that permits paid by residents may be a good interim solution to ultimately help to fund a parking garage.
  12. Mark Rackovan stated that the conversation has presented fantastic ideas. First, regarding the Uber/Lyft loading zone location, City staff have already held a meeting with the Folsom police and an Uber representative. In this meeting it was discussed that the loading zone should likely be moved away from the Sutter intersection since people coming out of the establishments late at night tend to congregate. Rather the loading zone should be more on the periphery near Scott or Decatur. Mark added that there are both short- and long-term strategies that should be focused on. Wayfinding could be a useful short-term strategy, but eventually there will need to be a parking structure. With this in mind, now is time to develop a funding plan for

this improvement. Parking permits can be part of the funding strategy, but overall, multiple funding streams could be bonded to afford a big ticket item like a parking structure.

- ii. Nora De Cuir checked in with the group regarding final thoughts and concerns on the items discussed, the activity overall, as well as how the recommendation report will be filled out.
  1. Murray Weaver responded that he felt it was crucial to have a pick-up spot or two at each side of Riley right outside of the venues rather than risk having the ride-share services loading people in the neighborhood.
    - a. Mark Rackovan clarified that the area discussed had been on Scott Street by the steakhouse, the block between Sutter and Riley, only a half block from the Powerhouse Pub.
  2. Jim Snook stated that loading zones for delivery could be utilized by Uber/Lyft at night. He added that there should be one on every block on Sutter to make it as easy as possible.
  3. Nora De Cuir asked to clarify if geofencing for an Uber/Lyft loading zone was the only option.
    - a. Mark Rackovan clarified that the discussion had centered on late night pickups which is why the geofencing was being considered in the afore-mentioned location to avoid driving through a large group of people.
    - b. Pam Johns offered that staff could follow up on respective solutions.
- c. Nora De Cuir then moved the discussion to establishing the agenda for the next meeting. She stated that Thursday, January 9 would be the next meeting, a week later than usual, to avoid holding it too close to the New Year. She added that the facilitation team would like to start bringing back portions of report to the committee, including writing up some of items looked at tonight. She offered for members to work with the facilitation team individually to discuss items but confirmed that all decisions would be made in the official noticed meetings. She asked if anyone would be interested in this offering, to which Steve Heard, Phil Rotheram, Shannon Brenkwitz, Karen Holmes, Murray Weaver, and Cindy Pharis all raised their hands.
- d. Phil Rotheram asked when the recommendation report is due.
  - i. Steve Heard stated that the city council meeting where recommendations would be presented is in early March.
  - ii. Pam Johns clarified that the Committee can ask for an extra 2-4 weeks if necessary.
  - iii. Mark Rackovan added that the report can be just a presentation of the committee's recommendations and findings for March and then the final report can be turned in later.
- e. Nora De Cuir stated that next time the Committee will take a more detailed look at the potential solutions by bringing back more information to assist in discussion.
  - i. Phil Rotheram inquired as to what will be done with the solutions that have less dots.

1. Nora De Cuir replied that the team will look at how those items should be addressed.
- ii. Cindy Pharis stated that all committee members agreed a parking garage is necessary. She asked if everyone also agreed that the ideal spot is by the Gold Lake Center, since it was unclear on the activity poster.
  1. Nora De Cuir answered that it was as yet uncertain how specific recommendations would be to the City Council.
    - a. Pam Johns added that different locations might be seen as desirable depending on the criteria considered.

**VI. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

- a. None.

**VII. NEXT MEETING DATE**

- a. Chair Steve Heard confirmed the next meeting date as January 9, Thursday, at 6:30 p.m.

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

- a. The meeting is adjourned at 8:28 p.m. by Chair Steve Heard.

DRAFT