La Jolla Coastal Access & Parking Board Meeting MINUTES January 28, 2021 | 4:00 PM – (Via Zoom as allowed by COVID 19 Modifications)

2020-2021 Board Members	Agenda Items	
CPA Appointments Ray Weiss- present Tom Brady- present	Call to Order. Zoom Protocol 4:07 meeting called to order by treasurer Dave Abrams	Jodi Rudick, Executive Director
Dave Abrams- present Town Council Appointments Ann Kerr-Bache-present Nancy Warwick-present	Motion to approve November minutes by Tom Brady. Second: David Abrams. Unanimous (Robert Mackey abstained)	Dave Abrams, Treasurer
Tony Harris - absent LIVMA Appointments Robert Mackey (Owner La Jolla Golf Carts) - present Gabriela Guevara (Owner, Blue Apparel) - present Brett Murphy (Owner, La Jolla Sports Club) - absent Staff Jodi Rudick, Executive Director, La Jolla Village Merchants Association	 2) Public Comment (Limited to 3 minutes, no action can be taken) 3) Financial Update – No change. FYI Only a) Documents have been completed to assign new signers to bank account. (Dave Abrams, Brett Murphy, Jodi Rudick) b) Funds in Bank – 17,827.21 c) Funds in Account with City i) Shuttle "Bucket" - \$278,447 	Dave Abrams
	ii) Non-shuttle - \$121,724 4) MTS Trolley and Feeder Bus Route Update - New express route 140 will connect La Jolla Village with Balboa Trolley stop. Signage at bus stop will be needed to guide passengers.	Information, Dave Abrams
	5) Smart Parking Signage- Selection of Proposal and Vendor a) 10 Revised proposals received. b) Matrix used to rank options with pricing being weighted heaviest. c) Three finalists were interviewed on January 25, 2021. Interviews were	Those on selection committee (Robert Mackey, Jodi Rudick, Brett Murphy, Dave Abrams) discussed the proposals and interviews conducted with the three finalists. Rudick also shared the complete matrix which ranked all proposals.
	recorded and all board members received access to all proposals. Summary of Finalists: i) Flash Parking – 2 year cost – \$61,000 (1) Pro – Least Expensive, Accurate count guaranteed or no cost to association. (2) Con – Less experience with specific solution ii) Parking Logix – 2 year cost - \$71,900 (1) Pro - Ranked 2 nd lowest in terms of cost; extremely experienced in solution presented. (2) Con – Uses sensor technology which is less sophisticated than camera technology, no local presence outside	It was determined that the lowest bidder (Flash Technologies) offered the best solution overall: State of the art, expandable, ability to grow with the program, onsite support during installation and launch, experience in the parking technology business. While they did not have local ownership (as did Ensight Technologies) they bid was over 50% lower than the local solution. Parking Logix was eliminated as their sensor technology is not the state-of-the-art solution offered by Flash Parking's
	of 3 rd party subcontractor located in	camera systems.

	<u> </u>
Los Angeles iii) Ensight Technologies – 2 Year Cost - \$96,300 (1) Pro – Locally owned and operated, uses latest technology, has experience in specific solution (2) Con - Most expensive of final three options d) Full committee voted on final choice.	Two parking experts (Brad Elsass, ACE Mobility and Brett Rudrude, LAZ Parking) were on hand to offer their insight and experience regarding the finalists. It was confirmed that both ACE and LAZ were comfortable with all the proposals presented. It was confirmed that ACE and LAZ will be interfacing directly with the selected vendor to manage the installation process at their respective garages. After full board discussion, Ann Kerr Bache made a motion to move forward with Flash Technologies. It was amended that Ensight Technologies would be notified that they were the backup choice and would be contacted if, for any reason, Flash was unable to complete the project as proposed. 2nd by Ray Weiss. Flash Technologies was selected unanimously. Winning proposal along with top three proposals and vendor interviews will be posted on LJVMA website as required.
6) Smart Parking Next Steps - Bring proposal to community groups in February. Suggest i) LJ PDO ii) Parks and Beaches iii) Traffic and Transportation iv) CPA v) Coastal Commission vi) Draft budget to start the process of accessing funds. 7) Next Meeting – February 25, 4:00 PM via Zoom	Rudick explained the community support process. Action - Ann Kerr Bache made a motion to present the Flash Parking Technologies proposal to the various community groups as well as the Coastal Commission and the City of San Diego in order to begin the budget process. 2 nd Robert Mackey. Motion passed unanimously.

Attachments and Links:

Link to By Laws http://www.lajollacpa.org/CAP/LJCAPBoardBylawsAmended&Restated(2011-09-

06).pdf Link to MOU: http://lajollabythesea.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/MOU.pdf

<u>Link</u> to Wayfinding and Parking Communication Plan - https://www.slideshare.net/lajollavillagemerchants/parking-and-wayfinding-proposal

<u>Link</u> to RFP for Real-Time Occupancy and Wayfinding Solution (Submission Deadline: October 20, 2021) http://lajollabythesea.com/wpcontent/uploads/2020/09/Wayfinding-RFP-Draft-9.28.2020-be-jr.pdf

Language From MOU - How Funds Can be Spent --

Whereas the permit conditions creating the La Jolla Parking and Transportation Fund provide that at least

- 50% of the funds shall be reserved for the implementation of a remote parking reservoir and shuttle system. (CCC suggests a connector shuttle between the new Trolley stations and La Jolla Village. Funds are on hold until Trolley Expansion is closer to completion.)
- 50% of the funds may be used for other short term and/or long term parking and traffic circulation related programs of improvements, and further provide that, should the City of San Diego establish its own program for implementing the recommendations of the La Jolla Parking and Transportation Plan, and that program is approved by the Commission as a revision to the City's Local Coastal Plan (LCP) implementing ordinances, the funds may instead be used in accordance with the City's approved program.

Response from Coastal Commission – November 11, 2020

Hi Jodi.

To follow up on our phone call just now, I presented the most recent information you sent me regarding the electronic signage plan and parking space tracking system to staff this past Tuesday. Staff's response was fairly positive, and we believe that you all may on to something good with regards to reducing traffic in the village and improving public access. However, staff does have the following comments that we will want to see be addressed in any final proposal that you prepare. Specifically:

1) Staff understands the logic of placing the large digital sign listing all the garages at the intersection of Torrey Pines Road and Prospect St, given that is the main entrance most visitors take into the Village. However, given the prominent location of the intersection, staff thinks it is likely that there my be opposition to that siting. This does not mean the opposition would be correct or that it would bar the placement of the sign there, but to play it safe, you should identify one or two other "back-up" locations further into the Village in case the intersection location does not pan out (such as where Coast Boulevard splits off from Prospect).

La Jolla Coastal Access & Parking Board C/O La Jolla Village Merchants Association | www.lajollabythesea.com

858-230-2725 | | 7590 Fay Avenue, Suite 404 | La Jolla. CA | 92037 | jodi@lajollabythesea.com

2) Because this project is driven in part by what you identify as a lack of awareness by the general public of all the garage resources within the Village area, and because the main benefit proposed by this plan is to get visitors off the street sooner and thereby reduce traffic, staff will want any final parking program and its related printed and digital material (such as websites and apps) to list all the garages in the Village area for the public to see, not just the four garages participating in the trial. Obviously, parking space availability would only be listed for the four garages with the sensors installed, but the app and website should still list basic information about all the garages (e.g. location, number of total spaces in the garage, rates if possible) so that visitors can quickly see where they can park.

3) This trial will be a significant expenditure of publicly-held monies that, while anticipated to provide a public

access benefit, will directly benefit private properties and businesses, as the cost of the signage and related software is being borne by the MOU funds. In recognition of that private benefit and the anticipated greater use of the garages by the public due to the signage, staff will want to see some sort of concession regarding parking rates, either through lower hourly rates, an initial free parking period before fees kick in, or some combination of the two. A model that works in a similarly popular coastal destination is in Santa Monica, where a system of garages (https://www.smgov.net/uploadedFiles/Departments/PCD/Transportation/Motorists-Parking/City-Parking Map-Web.pdf) serves the high visitor volumes while offering fairly low rates and an initial free parking period (https://www.smgov.net/uploadedFiles/Departments/PCD/Transportation/Motorists-Parking/2019%20Parking%20Rate%20Table.pdf). Staff is not saying that the Santa Monica model must be mirrored directly regarding rates or free parking duration (though that would be nice), but we will be looking for something like this in the final project seeking acceptance from us under the MOU, and if it is not present, we are going to inquire as to why.

That above summarizes staff's comments at this time. Please let me know if you have any questions regarding the above, and please keep me updated as you progress in selecting a vendor and finalizing the duration and details of the program so that any potential questions or concerns staff may have can be identified before contracts are signed and you seek final authorization under the MOU.

Thanks.

-Alex Llerandi