



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

PARKING ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES

February 17, 2011

**Civic Center Plaza
1200 Third Avenue, 14th Floor
San Diego, CA 92101**

Board Members PRESENT	Board Members NOT PRESENT
Frank Alessi Roger Lewis Richard Stegner Benjamin Nicholls John Pilch Tom Brady John Cunningham Ernestine Bonn Rob Weinberg Linda Stanley Jennifer Finnegan	Paul Robinson Michael McNeill

CITY STAFF
Meredith Dibden Brown, CPCI - OSB - Community Parking District Program Lt. Randal Jones, San Diego Police Department Gary Pence – E&CP - Transportation Engineering Mark Rogers – E&CP - Transportation Engineering

OTHERS	
Nancy Moors Mark Fitzgerald	Ann Garwood Walter Rosenkranz

1. Roll Call and Introductions

Chair John Cunningham called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m. and attendees introduced themselves. Board member Benjamin Nicholls arrived at 3:17 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

Minutes from January 20, 2011 were approved.

Motion: John Pilch / Second: Frank Alessi. Motion Passed 10-0-0.

3. Non-Agenda Public Comment

Nancy Moors, as an Uptown business owner and resident, acknowledged City staff for their oversight of Uptown CPD funds and for their actions to provide a facilitator for the Uptown CPD reorganization.

4. Board Administrative Items Administrative Items

- a. None
- b. None
- c. Ms. Ernestine Bonn commented that with the closure of the Uptown Partnership office that cards need to be ordered from City Parking Administration which entails standing in line at the office with people paying parking citations. She inquired as to other options and about merchant discounts for selling cards. Mr. Frank Alessi commented that parking cards may be purchased or reloaded at the Downtown Information Center in Horton Plaza but the hours are limited. It was suggested that the City's website be updated and perhaps the Cities libraries could sell cards. There was also discussion about the Board's priority list and staff advised that in consultation with the Chair that the priority items would be agendaized for future meetings.
- d. None.

5. Information - Updates

The Chair reviewed the list of board members associated with the Updates and noted the vacancies and those members termed out but continuing to serve until a successor is appointed.

- a. Downtown CPD – Mr. Alessi advised that the Governor has proposed eliminating Redevelopment in the State and as such CCDC's future role is uncertain as is the potential process in dealing with assets such as the Downtown parking garages built with proceeds from tax increment backed bonds but where a portion of the annual CPD allocation received by CCDC is pledged for bond debt service. The city has 17 project areas. Assets may accrue to a successor agency such as a city or county but the associated potential liabilities may be an issue. There may be more information from the State as of March 1, 2011.
- b. Uptown CPD - None – vacant.
- c. Mid-City CPD – Mr. Roger Lewis reported that the North Park Pac and Mid-City CPD funded a parking study under the auspices of a working group and the report was finalized with approval from various community groups. One of the recommendations of the parking study is to implement a pilot paid parking program (in the vicinity of the parking garage) and survey certain blocks regarding parking issues.
- d. Pacific Beach CPD - None – absent.
- e. La Jolla CPD – None - vacant.
- f. Old Town CPD – Mr. Richard Stegner discussed a study including park and ride issues associated with the Transit station at Old Town and the lack of spaces in the MTS lot and the use

of Old Town visitor parking by transit riders. He also noted that Mission Hills, as part of the Uptown CPD, will have five new multi-space pay stations installed this fiscal year.

- g. CD1 – Mr. Tom Brady noted that the UC system is building student dorms without sufficient parking even though many students drive leading to parking issues for residents. He also commented on the valet parking issue on Prospect Street as was discussed at the La Jolla Traffic and Transportation Committee and that the apparent value of a space is \$50,000 but questioned as to who realizes the value.
- h. CD2 – Mr. Cunningham noted that almost all of Downtown’s meter utilization had been mapped as a pilot project to assist in locating 75 new multi-space pay stations (meters) which should be installed in April/May. The old meters will be stored by the City for use elsewhere. The new meters accept credit cards and parking cards but can’t get money back for unused time. The DPMG board members are knowledgeable local representatives who advise CCDC and the City on local parking matters.
- i. Ms. Bonn commented that North Park Planners voted on mitigation for the Quarry Falls project including Texas Street improvements such as lights, paths, wall, and signage but funding needs to be identified for the maintenance. She also noted that the installation of stop signs is not noticed to the planning group or the CPD advisory body. The North Park Planners also voted against the Plaza de panama project since they favor parking outside Balboa Park or near the Zoo.
- j. CD4 – None - vacant.
- k. CD5 – Mr. Rob Weinberg comments that nothing is going on.
- l. CD6 – Ms. Linda Stanley noted that with increasing enrolment of students at Mesa College that this is increasing the demand for parking and impacting the local community and creating traffic issues. The residential parking program which operates in the College area and Cortez was mentioned.
- m. CD7 – Ms. Jennifer Finnegan further commented about residential parking permits issued near SDSU and that enforcement ends at 7:00 p.m. which is an issue when there are evening events or classes. However, it was noted that campus police cannot enforce such permit parking. Also, Cox Arena has been collected a traffic mitigation fee of \$1 per ticket which will sunset soon therefore research is underway as to how these funds might be used for traffic management and control.
- n. CD8 – None – vacant.
- o. CPC – Mr. John Pilch noted no issues but he is waiting for his successor who is in the vetting process.
- p. BIDC – Mr. Benjamin Nicholls indicated he had no report but noted that there are also issues in Uptown and Pacific Beach related to residential parking but that it is very hard to get such a permit district created. It was suggested that this be a future agenda item but not a top priority.
- j. At-large Representative – None - absent.

6. Car2Go Presentation - Information Only

Walter Rosenkranz presented on car2go which is a new, flexible type of mobility solution based on short-term point to point car rentals. The company is interested in launching the concept in San Diego and perhaps running it with all electric vehicles. In order to initiate the program, the City’s municipal code would need to be changed to all for the initiation of vehicle rentals on-street. Since car2go also desires to use a certain number of dedicated spaces then an agreement or arrangement with the City would also be required. The Mayor’s office has indicated general support for the concept but has not approved a specific arrangement. The program was piloted in Austin, Texas starting in May 2010 using small Smart cars and now has 15,000

members with 4,000 rentals per week. Renters are charged by the minute with discounts for longer use. The members RFID card chip unlocks the car and then locks it at the end of the rental. The GPS units in the vehicles can constrain where the vehicle is parked at the end of the rental by not allowing the rental term to close out unless the car is parked within the appropriate area.

In San Diego, the company is proposing the operating area to be essentially Downtown and Mid-City in the area bounded by Friars Road to the north, SR-94 to the south, and around SDSU to the east. Experience indicates that one car2go vehicle with remove seven to 15 vehicles from the road and encourages transit usage. However, it only works with guaranteed parking spaces which they realize would not be free in San Diego but the end user would not be feeding a meter once the vehicle is parked. The signage on the vehicle would clue in parking enforcement staff to not issue citations. The company thus needs spaces and signage to help market the availability and location of the car2go vehicles. In Austin, the vehicles are used by a wide mix of people (not just students) and the company has also formed partnerships with businesses for car2go vehicles to be used for fleet services. San Diego has been selected as a result of the Electric Vehicle project, previous car-sharing activity in San Diego, and Downtown density.

There was some discussion about the proposal and what happens when vehicles tie up parking spaces. Mr. Rosenkranz indicated that the average time each vehicle was parked and not in use in a metered space was around one hour. However, if the car is idle too long then car2go staff moves the vehicle to another location. On-street parking is preferred to off-street lots because of the visibility of the vehicles and the associated marketing of the service.

8. Parking Meter Utilization Plan Update – Information Only

This item was taken out of order. Staff advised that the plan will be considered by City Council at the meeting of March 7, 2011 assuming that the docket closing deadline is met.

9. Pilot Bike Corral Installations Update - - Information Only

Mark Rogers from Transportation Engineering advised that the draft maintenance agreement has been approved by the advisory City Attorney and that a presentation on the pilot had recently been made to the Hillcrest Business Association. Ann Garwood made the public comment that bike lanes are needed before bike corrals.

10. Affordable Housing Parking Study Stakeholders Group Update

Mr. Pilch reported no update from Amy Benjamin since her emails apparently will not go through to him. Staff noted that an update should be provided at the next meeting by City staff.

7. Valet Parking Regulations and Processes

The Chair then returned to this item Mr. Gary Pence of Transportation Engineering indicated that he did not have a formal presentation but was available to answer questions about the City's Valet Parking program. Mr. Brady then provided some background on the request to have this as an agenda item. The La Jolla Traffic and Transportation Committee was discussing the request to relocate three of the 12 valet spaces on Prospect Street further east to in front of the Crab Catcher restaurant. As part of the discussion a representative of Ace Parking indicated that a five month trial would be appropriate to determine the effects of such a change. As part of the trial, he also offered

to pay \$50,000 to the La Jolla Town Council out of the parking revenue. Mr. Brady had then asked that given that a permit application costs \$700 the first time and then \$300 for a renewal, how does the City determine the price of the Valet Parking permit, how the permits are applied for, who qualifies to apply, and how changes may be made to the City's process. He also commented that the valet parking is critical for the businesses and one of these businesses had noted that with parking facilitating the turnover of customers that this then creates additional sales tax which benefits the City.

Mr. Pence then indicated that the permit cost is supposed to be linked to recovery of costs in administering the permit program. The program cost is audited annually and the expenses include his time and an assistant's time plus overhead, rent, etc. Recovering more than actual costs would likely make the fee a tax. Also, there is probably a difference between charging for services in the public right-of-way and on City-owned property. We could request an opinion from the City Attorney to clarify the matter. There was discussion about other costs associated with the program such as street maintenance, and loss of revenue from displaced parking meters. These costs are not factored in, therefore, it would require some legal analysis to determine if those expenses could be included for cost recovery.

Permits are typically issued to the valet company but businesses can submit the permit application. The council policy governing the Valet Parking program (CP 200-15) does not require community input in evaluating the request and generally there have not been issues from the community. There was concern about the use of a public resource generating private business revenue. There was also discussion about the fee calculation methodology and having the City attorney review the methodology and allow for the inclusion of other costs or loss of revenue. Mr. George Hauer, of Georges at the Cove restaurant, was concerned about increasing the permit fee, especially the concept of having valet service providers bid on spaces. Valet parking facilitates business and visitor spending which generates taxes, etc, and increases in fees would increase parking charges and discourage visitors.

This item was tabled to the next meeting due to time constraints.

11. Next Meeting Date and Locations

The next meeting date is March 17, 2011 and the location is the same - Civic Center Plaza 14th Floor Conference Room, 1200 Third Avenue, San Diego.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:32 p.m.

Final Approved:	April 21, 2011
Motion by:	Tom Brady / Second: Ernestine Bonn
	Abstained – Gary Smith. Motion Passed 9-0-1.
Revisions to Draft:	None
