DOWNTOWN PARKING COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, September 11, 2008
7:30 A.M. – 9:00 A.M.
Gebhard Meeting Room
630 Garden Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

---

1) CALL TO ORDER: 7:30 a.m.

2) ROLL CALL

DPC MEMBERS	Attendance
Marshall Rose	Present
Bill Medel	Present
Randy Rowse	Not Present
Kate Schwab	Present
Tom Williams	Present
Jim Hammock	Present
Bill Collyer	Present

CITY STAFF PRESENT :
Browning Allen, Transportation Manager
Victor Garza, Parking / TMP Superintendent
Brandon Beaudette, Administrative Assistant
Rebecca Jimenez, Parking Supervisor
Jay Hillje, Parking Resource Specialist
Rob Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner
John Ledbetter, Principal Planner

LIAISONS PRESENT:
Grant House, City Council

Others Present

3) PUBLIC COMMENT:

None.

4) APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF JULY 10, 2008.

T. Williams asked that his statement regarding the refurbishing of the Railcar in Item 5 be changed to when and not if.

It was moved by J. Hammock and seconded by Kate Schwab to approve the minutes. The motion was carried 5 yeas/0 nays.

5) PLAN SANTA BARBARA – GENERAL PLAN FRAMEWORK: DRAFT POLICY PREFERENCE REPORTS

R. Dayton gave an update on the Plan Santa Barbara – General Plan Framework: Draft Policy Preferences. He outlined two phases. The first phase was a public outreach process in 2007 and Development Trends workshops in April and May of 2008. The second phase consisted of public workshops focused on key policies that arose out of the first phase.

R. Dayton noted that the Planning Commission had received the General Plan Update Framework document on September 10th and will be commenting on the document on the

September 11th. He welcomed feedback from the Downtown Parking Committee as he would have and opportunity to share this feedback with Planning Commission that afternoon.

R. Dayton continued that the public was asked to focus on three categories in terms of parking, Residential, Employee, and Customer. Public feedback stated that it wanted ample customer parking and was ok with reducing customer parking if it meant congestion relief. Reducing congestion was greater than any other concern.

M. Rose asked about the concept of "unbundling". He wanted to know how a developer would know the demand of a project. R. Dayton clarified that demand is based on everyone that uses a site. He continued that currently one space is required per unit. One concern that continuously came up in public workshops was that housing downtown is not "workforce housing" due to cost of housing. Meaning that people need to live and work downtown. To get there planners need to get the market to tighten. The cost will come down if the number of people that can be there is narrowed. Another way would be to limit parking which would further tighten the market. That is what has been done in other communities although it doesn't guarantee developers will build them.

J. Hammock stated that charging for on-street parking is concern of his and feels that the committee would be very interested to hear more about items such as this. R. Dayton responded that he is broadly talking about issues currently and there would be more time to discuss items when the plan goes to environmental review in Phase III. M. Rose added that he is concerned that the plan is being presented to the Planning Commission before one of the city committees has had a chance to weigh in on the document. R. Dayton responded that this is a draft proposal policy that still needs to be scrutinized by transportation staff and this committee.

M. Rose continued that the policy states that there is a preference for on-street parking without input from this committee. T. Williams added that priced parking is also stated in the document and that puts downtown in an economic disadvantage. R. Dayton clarified that the policy states that parking is priced according to convenience which means this committee could determine that level of convenience. M. Rose stated that could be debated on how a level of convenience could be determined.

B. Allen asked if staff edited the policies that were brought up by community feedback. R. Dayton stated that was correct. The feedback was tested through polling but staff did not edit any feedback. M. Rose is very concerned that the committee can not provide a cohesive comment to be presented to the Planning Commission. R. Dayton added again that no analysis has been made and every committee and commission was told to attend the public workshops. M. Rose replied that he did not feel comfortable going to a public workshop as an individual to weigh in as a committee.

M. Rose also pointed out some errors in the Existing Conditions Report. R. Dayton clarified that the Draft Policy Preferences Report has nothing to do with the Existing Conditions Report and was created before it. He added that the Existing Conditions Report is only three weeks old and still needs to be corrected but the two reports are not connected.

B. Medel is really concerned how the scheduling of this process is being handled. He feels that if the boards and committees are just getting these draft policies then it should not be going to the Planning Commission. Public outreach should be done before the Planning Commission sees this document. J. Ledbetter interjected that it is important to remember that the Draft Policy Preferences reflects the public outreach up to this point. They are currently at a stage where they still need to know what the project description and an alternative will be to be analyzed in a technical manner. There will be a full year before it goes through environment review and

council approval. In the meantime they will go back to the different committees to receive feedback.

M. Rose asked if J. Ledbetter could clarify what is the process for Planning Commission meeting. J. Ledbetter replied that all they are doing is identifying what policies are being identified by the public and they are looking for feedback from the Downtown Parking Committee on how current policies and new ones stack up.

M. Rose asked if affinity groups like the Downtown Organization have weighed in. J. Ledbetter answered they had not. B. Collyer added that he attended the public workshops and that parking was not discussed so it is difficult for him to give credence to parking issues in the Draft Policy Report.

B. Allen stated that he would be willing to hold a Special Downtown Parking Committee Meeting to have more time to discuss the Policy Preference Report. M. Rose wanted clarification on what polices they were to weigh in on. J. Ledbetter replied that comments on Section C would be most beneficial. It was agreed that a special meeting would be held to discuss Section C of the Policy Preference Report.

G. House closed by stating that City Council is not going anywhere without input from all the Boards and Commissions. He asked that the Downtown Parking Committee please distinguish between implementation and policy. Then determine what alternatives for implementation, concerns of that implementation, and how to handle those concerns.

6) DOWNTOWN PARKING COMMITTEE TERMS

Due to time constraints this item was postponed until a later Downtown Parking Committee meeting.

7) MONTHLY REPORT ON GRANADA GARAGE PERFORMANCE

Due to time constraints this item was postponed until a later Downtown Parking Committee meeting.

8) OPERATIONS UPDATE

No updates were given

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 9:21 a.m.