

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

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, March 5, 2020

6:30 P.M.

Public Works Conference Room, First Floor

Folsom City Hall

50 Natoma Street, Folsom, CA 95630

These notes are a draft and will not be final until approved by the Ad Hoc Committee at a future date.^[NDC1]

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:33 p.m. by Steve Heard.

II. ROLL CALL

Members Present:

Kenton Ashworth

Paul Keast

Shannon Brenkwitz

Cindy Pharis

Steve Heard

Murray Weaver

Karen Holmes

Members Absent:

Charles Knuth

Kyle Middleton

Phil Rotheram

Jim Snook

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. Loretta Hettinger, Folsom resident, called the Committee to action, stating that the Historic District needs a parking structure rather than more parking studies. She is concerned the businesses and residents will suffer without a parking structure being built to address the growing need. She requested the Committee make a recommendation to proceed with the parking structure sooner rather than later.

IV. APPROVE MINUTES

- a. Regarding February's meeting minutes, Steve Heard asked if anyone had any edits.
- b. With no requested changes to be made, all committee members voted to approve February's minutes. Murray Weaver motioned to accept the minutes. Karen Holmes seconded the motion. In Favor: All. Opposed: None. The motion passed.

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS

- a. Regarding review of the draft report, Nora De Cuir noted that the group looks like it is for consensus, meaning that all parties can live with what is in the report.
 - i. Paul Keast inquired as to where parking meters were referenced in the report. Nora De Cuir responded that they were discussed on page 15 of the report where they were listed as a potential funding strategy.
 - ii. Paul Keast continued that he did not see a definitive number of parking spaces which may result from the parking solutions. Steve Heard responded that it is unknown how many spaces are available as a baseline, although hot spots are known. Nora De Cuir reflected that she heard a desire from Committee members to have additional data on what these solutions result in regarding available parking spaces. She asked staff if it is feasible to estimate this.
 - iii. Mark Rackovan responded that there is a chronological element to the parking situation: there are enough spaces currently, but people are not using them correctly. Additionally, spaces will be lost going forward with development and there will also be increased demand. Current parking management is about utilizing a suite of strategies but eventually there will not be enough spaces period. He added that short-term high priority solutions may not create new parking spaces unless the solutions are implemented properly by phases.
 - iv. Returning to draft report review items, Shannon Brenkwitz stated that on page 6 in the 5th paragraph, there are actually 3 rather 2 developments. She also noted that on page 10 permit parking is discussed. She is concerned about enforcement for permit parking and for this same reason, would like to avoid time limit parking altogether. She would like to see residents only on Figueroa.
 - v. Karen Holmes agreed that enforcement is critical. She would like to see something done about the lack of parking restrictions on Saturday and Sunday when businesses need it the most. She would like to see something done on Leidesdorff outside Trader Lane. It could be metered as a starting point for parking garage funding.
 - vi. Murray Weaver reminded the group that business owners are opposed to meters. He is concerned meters in the commercial district will push parking

issues in discuss our updated webinar-focused workplan and discuss remote meeting options into the neighborhoods.

- vii. Karen Holmes responded that merchants are not taking into account the turnover will be faster in front of those businesses with meters while longer term parking is available in the garage. She urged that there needs to be a willingness to grow while someone will always be ruffled.
- viii. Nora De Cuir reminded the Committee that last meeting the group recognized solutions need to work together to have the desired impact. She acknowledged parking meters sound like there is not as much agreement from the Committee so she suggested the recommendation could be to monitor and adjust, noting this item will be returned to down the line.
- ix. Mark Rackovan responded that the case studies he studied had meters used adaptively with nominal fee charged for parking, with a higher fee during peak times or in hot spots. The system was meant to create turnover with revenue coming from citations. He noted that parking meters should be part of a broader strategy. He agreed with Shannon Brenkwitz that the City should utilize a permit program rather than time limits, which tend to tie up valuable enforcement.
- x. Shannon Brenkwitz would be best to have the entire residential area of the Historic District be permit parking. She suggested residents could have 2 spaces in front of their house but can buy more—only residents should be able to buy a permit.
- xi. Nora De Cuir responded that she would change the wording from “time limits” to “residents only” and could note the cost and limit permits per household as Shannon suggested.
- xii. Mark Rackovan clarified that to do this the City would create an ordinance to amend the municipal code and create a process and procedures so the citation would be a violation of the municipal code.
- xiii. Steve Heard stated his concern with a “residents only” permit program and no time limit due to church locations in neighborhoods. Many people are unable to walk very far and parking could hinder their ability to attend.
- xiv. Cindy Pharis stated she is fine with church goers being waived of a residential parking permit on Sundays but not for other meetings on other days.
- xv. Nora De Cuir confirmed that she would note in the report that implementation would have to address church parking and businesses in residential areas.
- xvi. Nora De Cuir reflected that the group seemed settled on a parking permit program. However, she noted that parking meters were not agreed on and thus would be moved from the short-term high priority report section.
- xvii. Kenton Ashworth suggested the City could implement pilot program for parking meters as a trial run. He mentioned Austin, Texas as an example.
- xviii. Shannon Brenkwitz stated that on page 7 under the “Key Issues and Opportunities” section, the language should be changed in light of the change to residential parking only. Also, she inquired as to where the report addressed moving light rail users out of the parking garage.

- xix. Nora De Cuir responded that she was focusing on fine-grained questions about timing of when solutions get will be rolled out but that not all the mechanics of these recommendations will be reflected in the report.
- xx. Cindy Pharis requested a mention of placing tighter restriction on passing variances be in the report.
- xxi. Pam Johns responded that this group could consider a recommendation to add special findings to the current zoning code update and to consider tougher requirements to be granted a variance. Nora De Cuir confirmed this is in the existing solutions. Pam Johns continued that a variance is a legal mechanism to make sure not the City is not precluding people from utilizing their property thus providing the opportunity for variances is mandatory.
- xxii. Paul Keast stated that he supports the variance consideration. Additionally, he understands Bidwell is being rezoned as mixed use and wondered if the Committee can recommend mixed use rezoning for Sutter Street. Pam Johns responded that this suggestion is not necessarily tied to a parking solution and thus is not within the Committee's purview. Nora De Cuir stated that Pam Johns and Paul Keast can discuss this issue at a different time.
- xxiii. Steve Heard stated that he would like the first sentence to read "...in response to frequent and ongoing concerns regarding the issue of nonresidents taking up spaces...". Shannon Brenkwitz disagreed stating that she felt the problem was pervasive. Nora De Cuir responded that all Committee members agree on the gravity of problem and asked if there was another word to convey the gravity. Karen Holmes suggested removing the word altogether.
- xxiv. Steve Heard referred to the line reading "...must be aligned with city's municipal code..." and inquired if this was correct. He requested "and to ensure..." be added to the statement. Steve Heard requested the sentence reading "...deserving of adequate protection..." be in body of report so it is not missed. Regarding the sentence reading, "...to be enjoyed by current residents..." he requested "visitors"...for generations to come" be added.
- xxv. Steve Heard referred to the problem statement: "...occupying available on-street parking spaces..." and stated that not everyone is from the commercial district who is stressing the parking spaces. Nora De Cuir suggested it read instead "...visitors to Historic District destinations..."
- xxvi. Steve Heard referred to the problem statement: "...at all hours of the day and night..." stating that "available" is redundant and he is not sure "...all hours of the day and night..." is correct. Shannon Brenkwitz responded that she did not want to weaken the statement as it is almost all hours. Nora suggested it could read "...throughout the day and into the early morning hours..."
- xxvii. Steve Heard referred to page 6 of the report: "...overall there exists a lack of 522 parking spaces..." stating that it would be better to say "...considering future growth...". Mark Rackovan stated that it could read "...with buildout there will be a deficit of 522 parking spaces..."
- xxviii. Steve Heard noted that the report should discuss the need to enforce rules against people putting out orange cones, "no parking" signs, or cars which have

not moved in months. Nora responded that she intended to capture this on page 11. Mark Rackovan noted that page 11 should say “municipal” not “zoning” code.

- xxix. Nora De Cuir responded to Shannon Brenkwitz’s concern regarding the importance of enforcement being clear in the report by recommending strengthening a statement to read “...consider dedicated parking enforcement position to enhance the current program we have...”.
- xxx. Cindy Pharis stated that on page 12 for long-term high priority, she did not like the example of incentives.
- xxxi. Paul Keast noted that there was an interesting dynamic between what commercial district does not like and how it will impact residents.
- xxxii. Karen Holmes responded that often businesses are looked at to create solutions but that an extra layer of burden should not be created. A different example could be useful.
- xxxiii. Murray Weaver stated that anything we can do as merchants is a good thing. He stated that he displays a poster of free parking areas—all merchants could do this to help educate visitors.
- xxxiv. Nora De Cuir noted that the example will be taken out and Murray can give his example if the Council requests one.
- xxxv. Nora De Cuir stated that no additional meetings are on the schedule aside from the presentation date. She requested Committee members contact the consultant team if they have technical edits or other concerns in the report language. She added that consensus recommendations are not mandatory but ideal and it seems this group close, making for a very strong recommendation.
- xxxvi. After a request made by the Committee for an additional meeting date option, Nora De Cuir proposed the following:
 - 1. March 13: Any final comments on the draft report are due to Nora by email no later than March 13.
 - 2. March 20: A revised redline showing consolidated changes will be distributed to the group and available on the City’s website on March 20.
 - 3. April 2: If anyone absolutely cannot live with the revised draft and believe an additional meeting is necessary to resolve conflicts, Thursday, April 2, is being held at the regular time for that discussion. If that meeting is needed, a public notice will be issued no later than March 27.
- b. Regarding the April 28, 2020 City Council Presentation, Nora De Cuir informed the Committee that at least two representatives for each respective community (business and resident) will be needed to present the report via a PowerPoint presentation. She shared a rough draft of the slides to give the Committee an idea of how this presentation will run.
 - i. Pam Johns added that City staff typically give a verbal introduction for title slide and then turn over the presentation to the Committee. She noted the City Council wants to hear from the Committee directly and be given the

opportunity to ask questions. The presentation will likely last only 15-20 minutes.

- ii. Nora De Cuir noted that Steve Heard and Shannon Brenkwitz are willing to represent the residential members. Karen Holmes volunteered Jim Snook to join her in representing the business owners.
- iii. Nora De Cuir stated that the consultant team can develop an outline/run of show, breaking down target time frames for each slide. The team will update the slide deck to reflect the discussed revisions.
- iv. Steve Heard offered to present the slides at the beginning and end. He then thanked everyone for a great experience and their invaluable input.

VI. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

- a. Mike Brenkwitz, Folsom resident, inquired as to whether or not the Committee is still considering stating explicit timelines for each “short-term” and “long-term” items in the report.
 - i. Dave Nugen suggested 1-2 years for short term items and 5 years for long term
 - ii. After Committee members noted approval of these suggestions, Nora De Cuir confirmed that on page 9 a sentence will be added stating the Committee recommends short-term projects be addressed within 2 years and long-term projects addressed within 5 years.

VII. NEXT MEETING DATE

- a. Nora De Cuir confirmed the next meeting date as April 28, 2020 which will be the City Council presentation.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

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