

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

MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, January 9, 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 Nora De Cuir.

II. ROLL CALL

Members Present:

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

Members Absent:

Steve Heard
Charles Knuth
Phil Rotheram

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, read and submitted a document stating that providing additional parking in the Historic District is vital to a thriving economy. He urged the

Committee to look at the real current and future parking needs and solutions by working together to find win-win scenarios for everyone.

IV. APPROVE MINUTES

- a. Regarding December's meeting minutes, no changes were suggested.
- b. With no changes to be made, all committee members voted to approve December's minutes. Murray Weaver motioned to accept the minutes. Shannon Brenkwitz seconded the motion. In Favor: All. Opposed: None. The motion passed.

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS

- a. Nora De Cuir reviewed the results of December's screening activity where green, yellow, and red dots were placed on posters to take the temperature on the Committee's approval or lack thereof for proposed parking solutions. The purpose of the review is to consider where there is agreement and where there needs to be further discussion.
 - i. Karen Holmes requested clarification on what "adaptive strategies" are. Pam Johns and Nora De Cuir clarified that utilizing an adaptive strategy would institutionalize a process to refine parking solutions moving forward. All Committee members agreed this is a common sense solution to implement.
 - ii. Regarding the "consider additional public parking garage..." solution, it is likely the single red dot could have been someone who preferred a different site.
 - iii. The Committee then reviewed items with more than one red dot.
 - 1. Regarding the "create more designated employee parking zone(s), including the vacant parcel on the west side of Riley St. between Sutter Alley and Figueroa St." item, Cindy Pharis stated she put a red dot because she objects to the lot due to its poor street access and projected high cost due to the amount of site grading necessary to make the site viable.
 - 2. Kyle Middleton confirmed that the lot is currently vacant and that it would have to be built out in order to support a parking area.
 - 3. Shannon Brenkwitz stated that she was a yellow on this item because she did not know the condition of the lot and thus how feasible a solution it would be.
 - 4. Jim Snook stated he would not want employees to be exiting out from that block onto Figueroa St.
 - 5. Karen Holmes stated that the small lot size may mean the payoff from the investment in making the lot usable is not adequate.
 - 6. Mark Rackovan stated it is possible the City could create a parking deck rather than re-grading the existing slope. Total parking spaces would probably be under 50 to allow for traffic circulation.
 - 7. Kyle Middleton stated his concern regarding potential adverse effects on residents and a lack of safety for employees. He believed the cost to make the lot usable would be too expensive for the amount of benefit gained.
 - 8. To address concerns expressed, Mark Rackovan stated that employees could be funneled to the lot and security could be addressed by patrol, shuttle, or additional lighting.

9. Shannon Brenkwitz changed her opinion to red because she agrees with Kyle that there needs to be a more comprehensive solution.
10. Nora De Cuir clarified there will be a discussion later in the meeting regarding shorter- and longer-term solutions.
11. Murray Weaver mentioned that he believes this is a poor location, poor access, security issues, and that there are better ways to spend money.
12. Paul Keast suggested Committee member take a look at it before the next meeting. Cindy Pharis offered to bring photos of the lot.
13. Mark Rackovan stated it would take a structural engineer to get a realistic estimate of how many spots this location could provide so even with photos the Committee could not be sure on the cost-benefit analysis for making this location a useable parking lot.
14. Kyle Middleton asked if there is a cost estimate.
15. Mark Rackovan stated he does not think it will be cheap because there will be a substantial amount of work involved to make the lot useable.
16. Steve Banks stated the lot will likely need some type of environmental review to be cleared for construction.
17. Jim Snook brought up that there would need to be a way to keep non-employees from using it.
18. Pam Johns stated this lot was evaluated in the past and found to be financially infeasible. She will bring back this information to the group for the next meeting.
19. Regarding the “consider angled parking from Leidesdorff to Sutter...” item, Cindy Pharis clarified she meant this item, which was originally her suggestion, would require the street being changed to a one-way.
20. Paul Keast asked why there is less angled parking now compared to the past.
21. Mark Rackovan suggested this may be partially due to enhance bicycle lane use safety.
22. Nora De Cuir suggested this change be made to the proposed solution.
23. Kenton Ashworth asked how many spaces this solution would add.
24. Mark Rackovan responded that the direction of the one-way would have to be considered for best traffic flow. He thought perhaps the parking spaces could be roughly doubled to around 20 spaces overall, although there would have to be buffers added for ingress and egress to adjacent lots.
25. Jim Snook offered that Leidesdorff could be converted to a one-way from Riley St. to the entrance of the hotel in the direction of the parking garage, a south-southwesterly direction.
26. Karen Holmes expressed her concern about having one-way streets anywhere in the Historic District due to the potential problems that could be created by this solution. Overall, she would like to see a better solution with more parking spaces.

27. Kyle Middleton added that one-ways will create bottlenecks and general circulation issues particularly at certain times of day and for certain events.
 28. Cindy Pharis clarified that she suggested the one-way solution because Wool Street is so narrow and there are no sidewalks causing pedestrians to walk in the street. She thought a one-way could potentially create space for sidewalks to enhance pedestrian safety, meaning there would be additional benefit to this solution.
- iv. Nora De Cuir introduced the next conversation about what a permit parking program would look like. Additionally, Nora mentioned that the final report submitted by the Committee to City Council will summarize and synthesize the Committee's overall recommendations. Ultimately, this report will create a jumping-off point for the City Council to take further actions. The purpose of talking about a permit program provides a basis for City Council to have a productive conversation on the issue after the report is presented.
1. Kenton Ashworth suggested the Committee discuss what is important to them which can be presented to the City Council to ultimately find solutions.
 2. Mark Rackovan offered support for the Committee to discussing some more in-depth suggestions so they can be documented and used by the City in the future.
 3. Kenton Ashworth requested that the City staff present could let the Committee know from their years of experience what may not work.
 4. Shannon Brenkwitz expressed her desire to discuss the parking garage and permit parking issues with a few prepared statements. Reviewing her statements, Shannon stated he had looked back at the past studies on parking, seeing that there is a significant lack of existing parking spaces considering what has been suggested in these studies. She submitted a document with her suggestions for Sutter Street public parking lot funding which includes:
 - a. Creating a bond to pay for up front from fines, permits, etc.;
 - b. Creating a joint partnership between the City and a company to run the parking garage;
 - c. Applying for a federal grant;
 - d. Installing parking meters;
 - e. Collecting fines from illegal parking earmarked for parking solution;
 - f. Collecting a tax on downtown purchases;
 - g. Collecting a small parking tax from hotel stays; and
 - h. Collecting a parking tax on new developments city-wide.
 5. Also, Shannon Brenkwitz submitted a document with her suggestions for a permit parking program which includes:
 - a. Beginning permit parking program implementation in highly impacted areas;

- b. Allowing two permits per household for free with additional permits for a fee;
 - c. Enforcing parking program utilizing the Folsom police after hours and CAPS volunteers during the day;
 - d. Investing in permitted parking only signs;
 - e. Tracking areas adjacent to hot spots to make sure there is no overflow impact; and
 - f. Exempting churches from parking permits.
 - i. Murray Weaver responded that he appreciated the suggestions, adding that there are a myriad of funding solutions which could be tapped.
 - ii. Kenton Ashworth underscored the benefits of utilizing CAPS to enforce parking. He is interested in seeing if this helps push people to use the parking garage.
6. Nora De Cuir asked how many residential parking permits would be appropriate, what cost is reasonable, what types of signage, etc.
7. Mark Rackovan offered that if a parking permit program were successful in being implemented, it would require an alteration to the City's municipal code by passing an ordinance. Mark presented a slide with specific items which would have to be considered in a parking permit program.
- a. One item would be to create the initial boundary for where the parking permit would be located, being careful to avoid pushing the problem to adjacent areas. Initially, there could be small zones, perhaps around Figueroa Street where there is currently an issue.
 - b. Another item is the approval threshold. Approval of the program would mean the majority of property owners would have to consent by consensus or simple majority or other threshold.
 - c. Another item would be permits per address. Two to four permits per address could be considered to begin with.
 - d. Another item is visitor permits. This could look like having one or two per address with a limited duration before expiring.
 - e. Considering churches, these institutions should not have to have permits but should have some sort of enforceable signage in the case of church spots being used improperly. Businesses run out of homes like a bed and breakfast would have an exemption adequate to its needs.
 - f. Another item is employee permit purchase. Employees could purchase a permit at a higher cost, allowing them to park in the residential area.

- g. Another item is the permit cost. The payment could occur one-time or annually. Additionally, there could there be a surcharge that would go toward a parking garage or other larger solution.
 - h. Mark Rackovan expressed uncertainty regarding what enforcement costs would be for a permit program. Permits and meters are easier to enforce than a time limit although there are more up-front costs.
- 8. Murray Weaver state that around \$30 is a great price for residents. He followed up by asking Shannon Brenkwitz how many residents would likely support a program like this. Shannon responded that the hot spot areas might agree but others would likely not be happy about having to pay to park in front of their house.
- 9. Murray Weaver stated that her block would be happy to support a parking permit program. Cindy asked Mark Rackovan if the parking signs on Persifer Street are being enforced. Mark responded there is no record of them being put up or when so they are not enforced.
- 10. Paul Keast asked about the impact of parking in regard to accessory dwelling units and how this issue would fit with a permit program.
- 11. Jim Snook stated that he sees there being a problem with only targeting the hot spot areas because this will have a waterfall impact on adjacent areas. He believed there may be issues with getting enough approval for a permit program.
- 12. Kyle Middleton mentioned that he sees this program being unpopular with Folsom residents.
- 13. Mark Rackovan stated that passing the ordinance would just make this an option rather than mandating the program. Mark added that there may need to be a special district created so all permit fees and associated revenue streams will be earmarked for parking solution funding.
- 14. Kenton Ashworth asked if there is a situation where there is resident parking only for a certain time period and if this type of solution could be helpful. Mark Rackovan replied that this solution is not currently being used in Folsom and that it would be difficult to implement.
- 15. Nora De Cuir asked what reflections the group has about permit parking.
- 16. Paul Keast responded that he believes a permit parking program would be a hard sell to the community but is willing to support it if the committee is in agreeance. Additionally, he expressed concern that renters would not be interested in this type of solution.
- 17. Nora De Cuir asked if Paul Keast would be ok with this solution in another area or if he is against it all together.
- 18. Paul Keast responded that he is not sure what the economic incentive is for the business community.

19. Mark Rackovan responded that he believes the solution does need to be holistic in order to make certain that no one group shoulders the entire burden of restrictions to remedy the issue.
 20. Kyle Middleton expressed concern that metering could have a hugely negative effect on the health of the business community.
 21. Karen Holmes responded that meters would be a great idea in the district. She continued stating that everyone knows there are issues with parking in the district and there has to be a change to make certain that the same issues do not continue. She believes paid parking is inevitable and if it solves a problem then she will support it.
 22. Jim Snook agreed that permit parking in the residential area is key and metered parking in the commercial district could be a good solution.
 23. Shannon Brenkwitz stated that some of these solutions requiring payment might only be utilized in the short-term until a garage is put in or other long-term solution.
 24. Karen Holmes stated that enforcement will be critical to the success of these programs.
 25. Nora De Cuir asked if only some places in the commercial district would be appropriate for meters.
 26. Kyle Middleton does not agree with permit parking in the commercial district.
 27. Karen Holmes stated that meters may help drive people to park in the garage.
 28. Shannon Brenkwitz mentioned that if all spots are metered then more revenue will be generated.
 29. Additionally, there was discussion on when there are spaces available in the parking garage. Light rail users are using the garage during the day currently, but Karen Holmes stated this allowance could be ended and light rail users could be directed to another parking location.
- v. Steve Banks presented the current Folsom parking standards, comparing within and outside of the Historic District for each land use type.
 1. Cindy Pharis brought up the variance issue and how the standards do not apply in all cases.
 2. Paul Keast asked how close the City is to having the number of required parking spots vs actual spots. City staff responded that this number is unknown.
 - vi. Steve Banks presented how Folsom’s parking standards compare to similar downtown and historic areas across California. Pam Johns added that parking is a unique, local issue and there is no exact match so Folsom’s parking solutions will be uniquely tailored to this area. In-lieu fee payments need to be set-up and analysis needs to be done to determine what the fee would be based on the cost of each space for the proposed parking garage
 1. Nora De Cuir stated that parking standards will be updated based on the zoning code revision process—people are encouraged to sign up for

updates on this process on the City website. Nora also clarified that in-lieu fees are a tool to generate resources but could be controversial.

- a. Shannon Brenkwitz responded that in-lieu fees are a good idea to generate funds. She asked how the number of spaces are decided for other cities and how could this be applied to Folsom.
 - b. Pam Johns replied that parking in Folsom should focus on lots which are not yet developed and how to guide what type of solution and development pattern Folsom would allow. In-lieu fees could be helpful to accomplish these goals.
 - c. Murray Weaver asked about how in-lieu fees have not been paid in the past.
 - d. Loretta, a prior Folsom city planner present at the meeting, clarified that the City stated people cannot be required to pay a fee of an unknown amount.
 - e. Murray Weaver stated that he would support in-lieu fees.
 - f. Pam Johns stated that parking standards are being reviewed and the committee could recommend changes in the report. In-lieu fees might have to be connected to a new parking study to justify a specific amount, requiring a larger community discussion.
- vii. Nora De Cuir handed out the draft report she began and requested feedback from committee members. She stated that feedback would need to be given directly to Nora rather than circulated amongst members.
 - viii. Paul Keast clarified that the City is looking at the deficit of 500 spaces to the Historic District. City staff confirmed this number.

VI. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

- a. Laura Fisher, Folsom resident, stated that it seems these issues are important to a small amount of people and she appreciates the process; lives on Mormon street; would support permitted parking on her street because of issues due to residents, not visitors; in-lieu fees are critical; don't want more variances; figure out what is required and hold people to it; funding is a necessary part of the process

VII. NEXT MEETING DATE

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

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

- a. The meeting is adjourned at 8:51 p.m. by Nora De Cuir.