

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

**MEETING MINUTES**

Thursday, November 7, 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

Kyle Middleton

Cindy Pharis

Phil Rotheram

Jim Snook

Murray Weaver

Members Absent:

Paul Keast

Charles Knuth

Staff Present:

Dave Nugen, Folsom Public Works Director

Steve Banks, City of Folsom Principal Planner

Stephanie Campbell, Kearns & West

Nora De Cuir, Kearns & West

**III. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR**

- a. Mike Brenkwitz, Folsom resident, brought photos of where there are “residential parking only” signs and where cars still are parking to prove enforcement, not just signage, is necessary.

**IV. APPROVE MINUTES**

- a. Cindy Pharis stated that on item 3a, the meeting summary should be corrected to say “...315 spaces in the parking garage.” This item should also be changed to say the report “...showed a need for 1000 spaces.” The same item should be changed to reflect more specificity by stating “...adjacent to commercial area of the historic district.”
- b. Karen Holmes stated that items 4 and 5 should be altered to say “...similar to the Lakes Center.”
- c. With the above changes to be made, all committee members voted to approve October’s minutes. In Favor: All. Opposed: None. The motion passed.

**V. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

- a. Regarding the first discussion item: summary of relevant case studies, Dave Nugen stated that city staff member Mark Rackovan had prepared studies of other historic areas similar to Folsom’s own Historic District. The tables attached to agenda item were provided to provide background on solutions which could potentially be applied to, although no two solutions were alike.
  - i. As Dave Nugen began to go through the City of Monterey plan slides, Dave stated he would send out a link for the webcast of this presentation if it exists. He stated that staffing and hiring issues would exist as the cost associated with a number of the proposed solutions. In regard to paid parking, Dave stated that the existing parking garage is already built for this type of payment system, but there would be an additional cost to bringing the system online. In regard to rate adjustments based on comparable cities, Dave stated that there were different types of demand drivers to consider when structuring rate schemes. In regard to permit parking, Dave stated that different systems could be utilized such as reserving spots or creating valet services. In regard to loading zones, Dave stated that these types of systems could be utilized as a way to manage security concerns. Regarding wayfinding, Dave mentioned the successes Folsom had seen in using the wayfinding signs on the existing parking garage. Dave Nugen mentioned that he would be interested in if a webcast of the presentation existed in order to hear comments and concerns from Monterey’s city council and the attending public.
  - ii. Nora De Cuir offered that Mark Rackovan would like members to ask additional questions so he could follow up on with the City of Monterey or perform additional research as necessary.
  - iii. Phil Rotheram stated that he would be interested to see how Uber pick-up spots have changed dynamics of parking and what could streamline traffic flow and parking issues. He also underlined the need to educate drivers on access points to manage traffic flow. Dave Nugen responded that he liked the idea from a traffic management point of view and could get in touch with Google to have them recommend certain routes to streamline traffic flow with the city’s input.

1. Steve Banks offered that there was an Uber/Lyft pick-up location at Folsom Live which worked well. This type of solution would be easy enough to implement, though communicating with users is the next step.
2. Murray Weaver stated that nighttime-oriented businesses have utilized Uber/Lyft, but there is still room for the city to have better communication with Uber/Lyft regarding setting up proper pick-up locations
3. Jim Snook stated, on the topic of case studies, that the committee should be focusing on cities where residential zones are directly adjacent to the Historic District, as he is concerned that people would park in residential areas to avoid meters in commercial district.
4. Dave Nugen responded that a preferential parking plan must go hand-in-hand with other parking measures like meters to avoid pushing the problem to adjacent areas.
5. Kyle Middleton stated he would like to know how a designated Uber/Lyft loading zone would impact the committee's goals.
6. Steve Banks responded that for the Folsom Live event, having the loading zone location on Leidesdorff did not block traffic and, overall, it worked well.
7. Shannon Brenkwitz expressed her agreement with Kyle Middleton. She stated that having many different loading zones or valet parking could work, but the area likely will still need a garage. Additionally, she felt it may not work to have an Uber/Lyft loading area next to the parking garage.
8. Phil Rotheram stated that the wayfinding signs need to be visible. Additionally, he expressed his interest in how shuttles or autonomous cars could be used
9. Murray Weaver conveyed his belief that Uber/Lyft customers are helping to mitigate parking issues.
10. Kenton Ashworth offered that Uber/Lyft will assist with research to figure out where the best pick-up locations would be, even providing signage for the designated loading location.
11. Kyle Middleton responded that he does believe Uber/Lyft could be helpful but implored the committee to consider how these types of loading zones could affect the residential area since people may choose to be picked up in the residential area rather than the designated loading zone. He felt enforcement of proper loading zone utilization would be crucial.
12. Cindy Pharis conveyed concern that the case studies presented so far were not at a small enough scale to be applicable to Folsom's parking issues.

13. Dave Nugen responded that the solutions are likely scalable, even if not exactly the same. He added that there was not always parking solution information available for the smaller towns.
  14. Steve Banks added that people can be directed toward using these ride services.
  15. Phil Rotheram proposed that a discount coupon could be offered to encourage use within the Historic District.
- iv. Nora De Cuir stated that a number of items will be followed up on by Mark Rackovan including: how well Uber/Lyft loading zones are working; how shuttle programs are working in other locations; and whether or not other smaller cities have been looked into.
    1. Phil Rotheram: under table 3, under notes: San Rafael is very similar to Folsom and they require a certain percent of the time being regularly occupied parking spots in residential areas
    2. Shannon Brenkwitz: could be difference in how residents use the street parking
    3. Nora De Cuir: you want to know how they came to these thresholds
  - v. Nora: we want to look at a map, not only looking at the issues, but want to be creative about solutions discussed; be open in discussion but want everyone to go up to board and circle hotspots or mark down places where a solution would be best located
  - vi. Dave: several pages at different scales of google to mark up
  - vii. Nora: 2-3 min per committee member
  - viii. Karen Holmes: #1) this hillside is not being utilized, though there are acquisition issues, in order to not have this district be filled with high-rise parking structures, the parking structure here that could be leveled with Leidesdorff, could make parking go below and have retail on street level
  - ix. Steve Heard: #2) no turns onto Riley; no left turn on Sutter, go to Leidesdorff
  - x. Shannon Brenkwitz: #3) potential place for a parking garage; #4) hot spot for impacted parking
    1. Steve heard: when is this happening?
      - a. Shannon: evening is when double parking is happening; weekends especially
  - xi. Phil Rotheram: #5) Figueroa and Decatur has abandoned cars; #6) gravel and leftover mulch spilling out into the streets; street needs to get cleaned
    1. Shannon: don't want more residential parking spots but want employees to park in garage, get out of the residential area; all of Figueroa is impacted
  - xii. Cindy Pharis: #7) Wool form Sutter to Mormon and Figueroa to Riley are impacted; #8) corner on Greenback Lane is a good parking garage spot
  - xiii. Jim Snook: #9) existing garage needs to be better lit; #10) good area for surface parking for employees
  - xiv. Kyle Middleton: #11) want to direct traffic north on Riley; #12) impacted area on Decatur between Figueroa alley and Figueroa street; major event parking in

- impacting Sutter street; lose spots when skating rink comes online in winter (Dave: this is a private/temporary lot, not included in inventory)
- xv. Steve Heard: #13) could have angled parking from Leidesdorff to Sutter on Wool and Wool to Decatur on Sutter
  - xvi. Phil Rotheram: taking Decatur at certain times of day is dangerous because of the lack of stop signs so we need to think about impacts to residential; make it simple in terms of traffic flow to come to parking garage
  - xvii. Karen Holmes: more people now parking in the garage than there ever have been, but the dark at night is keeping people from using the garage as much as they otherwise would
  - xviii. Shannon Brenkwitz: people aren't going to park in the garage to avoid the walk unless we do something to keep people from parking in the residential district
  - xix. Phil Rotheram: the people circling are different users (trail users), rather than those going to the steakhouse (aka people going out to dinner)
- b. In regard to the agenda item on the identification of issues and potential solutions, Nora De Cuir introduced the topic by explaining that at this point in the committee process, the team will want to collect everything which has been discussed and sift through which solutions are implementable, seeing where all committee members can agree.
- i. Kyle: need to create new strategies, not just improve; overall strengthening solutions
  - ii. Karen Holmes: want to make more specific recommendations
  - iii. Steve Heard: these are general and we will fill in specifics; legal considerations are part of the equation, need to enforce regulations to ensure parking issues are not being pushed into different areas
  - iv. Kyle Middleton: what is our continued framework and strategy moving forward
  - v. Phil Rotheram: crisper language for 2,d; enforcement is critical
  - vi. Cindy Pharis: need to address variances issues; need to look at upcoming construction projects and how these will impact parking
    - 1. Nora: this might be the part of testing whether a solution is legal; not sure how this is related to a solution
    - 2. Shannon: financial hardship is used as a catch-all to grant variances; perhaps those with variances should contribute to a fund to go toward parking solutions; financial hardship is a subjective decision
    - 3. Phil: variances done for granny flats as well which causes more parking strain
- c. Receive and discuss screening criteria
- i. Nora: are these the right criteria; what do we need to add? Draft list of what we've heard so far
  - ii. Shannon: how does it alleviate parking issues in the residential area needs to be added
- d. Receive and discuss report outline
- i. Nora: this was developed as an example of what could be presented to council so the council could make decisions on these topics; want to know if we're on the right track

- ii. Shannon: need to call out specifically the lens of alleviating parking issues in residential areas
- iii. Phil Rotheram: need to be focused on future
- iv. Steve Heard: need to look at different strategies based on looking out to different lengths of time
- e. Establish agenda for the next meeting
  - i. Nora: do we want to screen items at the next meeting or alter this list at the next meeting
  - ii. Steve: would like to recap what we discussed tonight then go through screening criteria
  - iii. Karen: might as well jump in because this will be a working list
  - iv. Nora: can use this list as a first-pass screen to help us understand where we need to spend our meeting time
  - v. Phil: procedural question: are the consultants creating the report or how will we create the report?
  - vi. Nora: we can meet more frequently if the group can do that as well as what staff capacity can handle; could also draft subcommittees so that the Brown Act is not violated because it's not a quorum
  - vii. Phil: game for subcommittees
  - viii. Nora: folks should think about how folks want to proceed with working

**VI. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

- a. Rosario Rodriguez, Folsom business owner, stated we are still not sure what the cause of the issue is; Wool is almost always empty; is our perception and reality the same; hoping we would have quantifiables to inform our solutions; concern that if we go back to city to make a new parking structure if old isn't fully utilized
- b. Ernie Sheldon Jr., you haven't identified conflict between residential and commercial; how many events are necessary for business to thrive while residents may want none; this will rise up in thinking about solutions; need to think about where the conflicts are and then how to resolve conflicts
  - i. Snook: businesses want to keep district vibrant and charming and that's our goal and this draws people
- c. Nora: will update solutions list and go thru criteria

**VII. NEXT MEETING DATE**

- a. Chair Steve Heard confirmed the next meeting date as December 5, Thursday, at 6:30 p.m.

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

- a. The meeting is adjourned at 8:30 p.m. by Chair Steve Heard.