



SPECIAL JOINT MEETING DOWNTOWN PARKING COMMITTEE & TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, May 13, 2010
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

	<u>Attendance</u>
Randy Rowse	Present
Tom Williams	Present
Eric Kelley	Present
Bill Collyer	Present
Matt LaBrie	Present
Gene McKnight	Present

CITY STAFF PRESENT :

Browning Allen, Transportation Manager
Victor Garza, Parking / TMP Superintendent
Brandon Beaudette, Administrative Assistant
Rob Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner
Rebecca Jimenez, Parking Supervisor
John Ledbetter, Principal Planner

TCC MEMBERS

	<u>Attendance</u>
Hillary Blackerby	Present
David Tabor	Not Present
Steve Maas	Present
David Pritchett	Present
Keith Coffman-Grey	Present
Edward France	Present
Mark Bradley	Present

LIAISONS PRESENT:

Grant House, City Council

OTHERS PRESENT:

Debora Schwartz, Planning Commission
Gary Lenker, New Beginnings Counseling Center

3) PUBLIC COMMENT:

G. Lenker from New Beginnings Counseling Center gave a background and an update on the RV Parking Program. The program has to take a 10% cut in funding from the General Fund. He stated the program could not be sustained with that cut. R. Rowse asked if this could be brought back as an agenda item at a later Downtown Parking Committee meeting. He is interested to see the numbers on the transition of individuals out of the program.

4) APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF APRIL 8, 2010

B. Collyer would like the minutes amended to show M. LaBrie moved to approve the Annual PBI report not R. Rowse.

It was moved by B. Collyer and seconded by M. LaBrie to approve the minutes. The motion was carried 5 yeas/0 nays.

5) REVIEW OF MEMO TO CITY COUNCIL IN REGARDS TO DOWNTOWN PARKING BUDGET

R. Rowse would like to further edit the proposed memo before sending it on to the City Council. He stated that he would like the message that the Downtown Parking Program is under pressure from other General Fund needs. He feels the memo needs to come from the Downtown Parking Committee and not staff generated. T. Williams suggested an itemized list with the accompanying dollar amounts of the items that are affecting the Downtown Parking fund.

E. Kelley moved that R. Rowse draft a memo of concern to the City Council on behalf of the Downtown Parking Committee. The Committee would get a copy of the letter and would either talk to council members individually or be present at a public council meeting. G. McKnight seconded the motion. The motion was carried 5 yeas/0 nays.

6) PLAN SANTA BARBARA – REVIEW OF THE DRAFT GENERAL PLAN UPDATE AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (DEIR)

R. Dayton provided a background on Plan SB.

R. Rowse asked how the data was gathered. R. Dayton answered that the stats are based on a computer model that utilizes large amounts of empirical data. The model is then checked based on volumes from existing data.

R. Rowse stated if you limit commercial growth then you potentially limit residential growth. He believes that there seems to be a disconnect between commercial and residential growth. J. Ledbetter replied that R. Rowse is correct in thinking there is a disconnect. He added that different tools are being looked at to increase affordable housing but are doing what is able to be done by looking at the different tools.

G. McKnight inquired if Commercial Growth includes the Airport property. J. Ledbetter answered that it does. G McKnight added that with a lower cap on commercial growth then need to allow some growth downtown. If not the vitality of downtown suffers. J. Ledbetter replied that he appreciates that comment as he has not heard much from commercial owners in regards to the cap. He believes it is good for the Planning Commission and City Council to hear this kind of input.

S. Maas noted that in Santa Barbara, subsidizing is not as effective as improving service for alternative transportation. He also added that the robust TDM would substantially increase the service for the bus lines. The cost to provide such service would need to be accounted for.

M. Bradley believes the model does separate out commuters from other users. That would be useful to know. Model could also point out time spent in one's vehicle during traffic congestion. This would be meaningful to a lot of people. He would like to see more information from the model.

D. Pritchett stated he appreciates receiving the letter from the Downtown Organization. However, the letter doesn't speak to congestion. How much congestion are the business owners willing to tolerate? Perhaps if that is stated then that will help determine as a city what must be done to achieve that level of congestion. He recommends this can be done by the Downtown Parking Committee and the Downtown Organization.

R. Dayton wanted to add that priced parking cannot happen at this economic time. The cost could be done incrementally according to the economics at the time rather than the environment.

DOWNTOWN PARKING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

May 13, 2010

Page - 3 -

H. Blackerby is sold on the robust TDM but asked what a moderate TDM means and can it be effective. R. Dayton answered that the moderate TDM can be effective and the Parking Survey would be a good indicator of the pros and cons of the different strategies.

T. Williams commented he is only concerned with the economic vitality of downtown. Downtown is competing with the other areas that have plenty of free parking. The main priority is to increase vitality, not reduce congestion. Priced Parking goes against improving the economic vitality of the downtown.

M. LaBrie inquired if the model looked at housing and how it distributed housing downtown or was it by opportunity. R. Dayton replied that the opportunity was downtown so it wound up being the same.

M. Bradley stated that you can't separate congestion and economics. If your customers can't get to your place of business then no need to worry about parking. He wondered why the downtown businesses asked about parking management by its economic impacts. R. Dayton replied that it is the age old question. How can ample customer parking be provided.

E. Kelley commented that on-street parking is not full. So priced parking won't work now if already under 80% occupied. R. Dayton replied that priced parking can work now. It will work as long as not affecting customer usage then employees will start finding other parking and finally get alternative transportation. E. Kelley responded that employee will go to outer areas and that will still affect freeway congestion.

G. House stated he was glad to see these two groups come together to discuss Plan SB. He commented on how it would seem that Priced Parking would go against the economic vitality of the downtown. He pointed out that the Circulation Element exists to protect the economic vitality of Santa Barbara. He would like to hear from the various groups how can our living environment be made better so a strategy to achieve this goal can be selected. He added that some people find living downtown as a bad thing. As a business owner he views a downtown resident as a permanent customer. If there is a way to support downtown residents then it should be looked at. He would like the DPC to see how it can take the most advantage of the downtown parking lots.

7) DOWNTOWN ON-STREET PARKING SURVEY

R. Dayton presented the results of the Downtown On-Street Parking Survey which was conducted in June of 2009. The survey was conducted on a Friday in March between 11 am - 7 pm and a Saturday 3 pm – 11 pm. The survey provided an inventory of Supply, Occupancy, and turnover (duration). R. Dayton stated that the consultant was not able to be there and would prefer to bring them back at a later time to get down to the nuts and bolts of the survey.

R. Rowse talked about the methodology of the survey. Friday and Saturday can be a bit of an anomaly downtown as furloughs and Farmers Market can affect those days. In addition, some of the times were after enforcement hours so that also affects the survey. The survey does not identify the users so it is taking leaps to draw conclusions.

K. Coffman-Grey asked if the 75 minute zones include the Residential Parking Program (RPP). R. Dayton replied that yes they accounted for any Residential Parking Permits but not many were actually found.

D. Pritchett would like to see the data without the RPP. He stated that the data is inconclusive. He would like to see results that were more consistent. He also feels the lack of enforcement greatly affected the results. He also noted that showing the results of after enforcement hours could go a long way with rationalizing more Parking Enforcement Officer's.

DOWNTOWN PARKING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

May 13, 2010

Page - 4 -

G. McKnight commented that the length of stay would indicate that the parkers were not downtown employees. R. Dayton replied that surveyors witnessed employees shuffling/moving their vehicles. G. McKnight would be interested in seeing the occupancy of the parking garages on the dates the surveys were done. R. Dayton answered that the consultant has that information but did not draw any conclusions between the two. Again, he would like to have the consultant back to show any impacts.

T. Williams stated that enough people from the two committees have questioned the validity of the survey. He asked what the city plans on doing with the survey. R. Dayton replied that the right metrics were measured in the survey in regards to traffic congestion. The survey itself was relatively inexpensive to do if the committee's would like to redefine the survey.

E. France commented that he feels the survey provides a lot of good information. He would like to see a breakdown of employees, residents, and visitors to the downtown. He would also like to see elasticity including distance traveled and length of stay for the various groups.

E. Kelley noted that the length of stay of vehicles by the freeway would indicate they are employees are possibly residents. He would like to see the survey span more eastward as that area is notorious for employee parking.

S. Maas added that the types of surveys that are being requested are a whole different animal as it is a bit more intrusive to the participants. R. Dayton replied that these types of surveys are possible but would come at more of a cost.

R. Rowse agreed with S. Maas and would come at more of a cost. He added that if more decisions are going to be made then more conclusive data is needed.

T. Williams asked if there is a problem of there is plenty of parking. R. Dayton answered that is for the business owners to decide. If more customer parking is needed then different strategies need to be looked at.

M. Bradley ended with noting that the goals of the survey were occupancy and that was achieved. Interview sampling is difficult as a valid sample is hard to difficult to achieve.

8) ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 9:27am.