



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

# PARKING ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES

November 17, 2011

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

Board Members PRESENT	Board Members NOT PRESENT
Andrew Phillips Roger Lewis Richard Stegner Landry Watson Gary Smith Tom Brady John Cunningham Ernestine Bonn Benjamin Nicholls Rob Weinberg	Michael McNeill Linda Stanley Jennifer Finnegan

CITY STAFF
Meredith Dibden Brown – Economic Development - CPD Program Mark Rogers – Transportation & Stormwater - Transportation Engineering

## 1. Roll Call and Introductions

Chair John Cunningham called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m. He recognized the new Board member, Andrew Phillips, representing the Downtown Community Parking District and then attendees introduced themselves. (Board member Benjamin Nicholls arrived at 3:10 p.m.)

## 2. Approval of Minutes

Minutes from September 15, 2011 were approved.  
**Motion: Tom Brady / Second: Gary Smith.**  
**Abstained – Andrew Phillips. Motion Passed 8-0-1.**

### 3. Non-Agenda Public Comment

None

### 4. Board Administrative Items Administrative Items

- a. None
- b. None.
- c. Richard Stegner commented on his interaction with a happy citizen who had obtained a City permit.
- d. Staff (Meredith Dibden Brown) advised that the annual Community Parking Districts Plans, Budgets, and Agreements were approved at Council on Tuesday, November 15, 2011. Council also authorized the Mayor or his designee to negotiate and execute an agreement with the Uptown Partnership, Inc. but did note that Council had offered assurances that projects for Bankers Hill/Park West and Five Points would not be implemented until representatives from those respective communities are seated. The first meeting with the newly seated members of the Uptown Partnership, Inc. will be held on Monday afternoon (November 21, 2011) in this same meeting space.

### 5. 2012 Proposed Meeting Schedule

The Chair, Mr. John Cunningham, requested a motion to ratify the 2012 meetings dates, time and location.

Dates: Third Thursday of the month

January 19	February 16	March 15
April 19	May 17	June 21
July 19	August (no meeting)	Sep 20
Oct 18	Nov 15	Dec (no meeting)

Time: 3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Meeting Location: Civic Center Plaza (CCP) 14<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room

**Motion: To adopt proposed schedule.**

**Richard Stegner / Second: Gary Smith. Motion Passed 10-0-0.**

### 6. Plaza de Panama Project and Parking Impacts

Staff provided background to the item by explaining that the Board had initially heard about the project a year ago and then at a recent meeting had suggested reviewing the Balboa Park parking plan (as associated with the proposed Plaza de Panama project). Staff was requested to schedule an update presentation and Ms. Bonn suggested that Ms. Vicki Estrada of Estrada Land Planning (who had worked on the Central Mesa Precise Plan) would be able to present relevant information. Staff advised that Planning staff had been unable to attend this meeting but the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was anticipated to be released in January or February 2012 and once released she would be able to have staff directly associated with the project present to the Board. Therefore, after this initial presentation and discussion, this item should be continued to a future meeting when the

EIR can be presented. She clarified that the interest and role of the Board is in reviewing parking impacts associated with the project and not the project itself.

Ms. Vicki Estrada, then explained her role in developing the currently adopted Plans for Balboa Park and noted that she is not a consultant to the actual Plaza de Panama project. She provided an historical overview of the planning in the Park, including the Bartholomew Plan from 1960, which resulted in many improvements, and then the adoption in 1989 of a Master Plan to continue this work. Development of the Central Mesa Precise Plan was authorized in 1989 and adopted in 1992. Ms. Estrada touched on the various configurations of parking, traffic, and pedestrian access that were proposed or discussed in the various planning documents and the desire to provide pedestrian linkages or corridors between the major institutions in Balboa Park. Key goals of the Plans (as related to parking and traffic) included creating a more pedestrian-oriented environment, reducing automobile and pedestrian conflicts, minimizing through traffic, improving public access through an improved integrated circulation system, providing convenient drop-off points, and improving parking management. She also touched on: the various transit that existed or has been proposed, primarily with regards to Park Boulevard (light rail, historic street car, and bus rapid transit); the temporary closure of the Cabrillo Bridge in the 1980's; the temporary closure of parking in the Plaza for events such as Earth Day.

Mr. Cunningham then entertained questions and comments from the public. Mr. Jarvis Ross provided a handout regarding an evening forum on the Plaza de Panama project and noted concerns about: paid parking in the Park causing impacts to adjoining neighborhood residents; needing more public transit; and the bypass bridge defeating the historic vision.

Another speaker offered to present information on traffic circulation to the board and inquired if the traffic study in the Precise Plan was still valid. Ms. Estrada indicated perhaps so since it's been such a long time since the study. Other public speakers representing SOHO commented glowingly on the current park Master Plan but suggested that the proposed project doesn't provide a holistic approach, will "kick the can down the road" in addressing park and parking issues, and there would be little net gain in parking for so many dollars being spent. Also, a paid parking study needs to be completed, and factor in the impacts of free parking around it. Ann Garwood suggested moving the garage to the other side of Park Boulevard and by adding the bypass bridge the future option to close the bridge is lost. There was also a question about how valet parking will be accommodated and Ms. Estrada indicated the proposed staging areas and noted that having valet parking is a condition of the existing lease but the actual location is not specified. She believes there are other options to configuring the valet service which will reduce pedestrian/traffic conflicts. There was some discussion about costs and the matrix in the Precise Plan where specific funding sources for improvements were not identified. While many projects have occurred, others certainly have not due to a lack of funding.

Mr. Cunningham then entertained questions and comments from the Board members. Mr. Rob Weinberg asked about additional testing of impacts from closing the Cabrillo Bridge and it was clarified that the previous closure was only to west-bound traffic. Mr. Gerry Braun, from the Mayor's Office, advised that last summer the Rules Committee had requested information from City staff on conducting such a test and the Park & Recreation Department Director submitted information on the logistics and costs and the idea was not pursued. Testing costs would have to be borne by the City while the overall projects costs are not. However, the EIR will provide projections on the impacts using other techniques.

Mr. Tom Brady cited the average cost per parking garage space of \$25,000 as estimated by UCSD and noted that the North park garage often sits empty and therefore noted his concern for the potential of garage-related costs being borne by the City if the garage revenue does not cover the debt service and other garage costs. Especially, with free parking nearby. He also, commented on parking usage by staff and volunteers and suggested that perhaps there needs to be time-limited parking, such as 2 hour zones, which would encourage greater use of the garage and free-up spaces for visitors. Also, perhaps there could be two hours free in the garage with subsequent time being paid parking.

Mr. Benjamin Nicholls suggested a closer look at alternatives by reviewing how people could use transit and where they could park to use transit. There is a lack of transit infrastructure so people park close by and transit short distances. He suggested a joint use on weekends of the City College garages. He also commented that plazas seem to work better with some cars than without.

Ms. Ernestine Bonn commented on her past involvement with park planning and the zoo expansion. She noted that the proposed zoo parking would have added a lot more parking and created less impact than a garage in the center of Balboa Park. She asked if Ms. Estrada would have a different recommendation now on a central parking structure, to which Ms. Estrada replied that it would probably not have been as high a priority and perhaps have been better if located east of Park Boulevard, however, there is still a need for central parking. Ms. Bonn also commented that she did not believe the goals of the proposed project aligned with the goals of the adjoining neighborhoods which are in the middle of plan updates.

Mr. Gary Smith noted that only eight percent (8%) of parking spaces are being proposed to be converted to paid parking and questioned whether there is likely to be a parking impact which the Board should be addressing. Mr. Smith talked about whether paid parking spaces would get used; the impact if paid parking was enacted throughout the park; other possible solutions for financing the garage; and the likely impacts to the west-side neighborhoods if the Bridge was closed. Mr. Smith suggested that it was most likely that there will just be shifts in parking patterns within the park itself and therefore does the Board really need to concern itself with this. He also commented about improving transit access and frequency and linking to Smart Corner but noted that this topic is not within the Board's purview.

Mr. Richard Stegner suggested that the valet program, with 100 parking spaces, will significantly contribute to traffic congestion within the park and that people should park their own cars.

Mr. Landry Watson commented that a variety of numbers had been listed during the presentation and discussion and asked if the EIR will have precise numbers. He also commented on the parking financing. Mr. Smith noted per the on-line project information that 521 of the existing 6500 spaces will be replaced by the garage and thus become paid spaces which equates to eight percent (8%) of the spaces. He also commented that based on CCDC's experiences with two garages in downtown that bond payments there are covered by roughly 130 monthly parkers and occasional visitors which is around 10% average occupancy. Mr. Braun also commented that the current MOU for the project requires an analysis of revenue and costs (using a likely cost of \$5 to park for five hours or so) and the City will size the project to match the revenue with costs above this being borne by the project committee.

Mr. Roger Lewis noted that with only 54 spaces being removed from the plaza that this is an insignificant loss of parking however, a whole project is being moved forward to replace it which seems premature. He suggested that a forward looking project would be preferable to a project to commemorate or memorialize what may not have worked in the past and does not make sense for the future. He also commented about providing parking at Inspiration Point with which Mr. Smith concurred.

#### **7. City’s Residential Permit Parking Program Ad Hoc Committee Update – Information Only**

The Chair, Mr. Benjamin Nicholls, provided a recap of progress to date . The committee is in the research phase and establishing existing conditions. The first meeting (in September) included a general review of the program and identification of some initial issues. The second meeting (in October) was a review of enforcement procedures and policies. The next meeting (to be held in the new year) will focus on administration and actual program costs. Board members asked to be included in future meeting notifications which Mr. Nicholls and staff agreed to coordinate.

#### **8. City Parking Regulations and Processes – Information Only**

Mr. Gary Smith advised that he had received some feedback from La Jolla Traffic and Transportation committee and would be revising his document and submitting an updated draft in the new year.

#### **9. Board Priority Items**

This item was tabled to the next meeting.

#### **10. Updates from Represented Constituencies – Information Only**

This item was tabled to the next meeting.

#### **11. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:27 p.m.

---

Final Approved:	January 19, 2012
Motion by:	Tom Brady / Second Benjamin Nicholls
	Approved as corrected 9-0-0
Revisions to Draft:	Updated department name for Transportation Engineering staff from “E&CP” to “Transportation & Stormwater”; corrected typographical error for year in Item 6 Paragraph 2, Line 14 from “19080’s” to “1980’s”.

---