

## EAST SAN RAFAEL NEIGHBORHOOD PARKING STUDY SESSION BACKGROUND MATERIAL

The Canal, Spinnaker and Baypoint neighborhoods are located on the east side of highways 101 and 580. The Canal neighborhood incorporates several large apartment complexes that were mainly built in the 1960's and 1970's. Existing parking in the area cannot accommodate the current population.

In order to identify solutions to this need for parking capacity in the area, the Department of Public Works entered into a contract with W-Trans following a request for proposals from traffic consultants.

The consultant conducted field studies, examined existing parking analysis documents prepared by Public Works in 2014, and developed a list of recommendations to improve existing parking throughout East San Rafael. These alternatives were documented in a draft Parking Study Report detailing the advantages and disadvantages of each and recommended short-term, medium-term, and longer-term solutions. Excerpted from the report, the recommendations are as follows:

**Table ES-1 – Recommended Parking Strategies Summary**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Benefits</b>	<b>Drawbacks</b>
<b>Short-Term</b>	Time Limited Parking	Effective strategy to provide turnover of parking residential and commercial areas	Requires regular enforcement; does not entirely address the issues of spillover or the overall parking deficit
	Public-private partnership/ Off-Street Parking	Utilizes existing parking facilities (Bowling Alley, Mi Pueblo) to add up to 329 spaces	Requires private businesses to be willing to lease their parking spaces; Majority of cost falls to the City to incentivize owners, maintain lots, and provide security
	Transit Opportunities	Reduces the reliance on vehicles for travel; minimal cost to residents	Cost of subsidizing passes on the City or Marin Transit

<b>Mid-Term</b>			
	City-Owned Parking Lots	Increases City-owned parking supply by 119-346 spaces; Costs of permits can offset administrative costs; Spaces can be short or long-term	High cost – up to \$2.3M; Would provide some but not total relief to address 582 space shortfall
	Parking Permits	Reduces spillover; Encourages parking turnover; Provides equitable way to manage parking in East San Rafael; Parking demand will be reduced and relocated	Requires regular enforcement/admin staff; Revenue from permits needs to be over \$200/year to cover the cost of administration (\$435,000 per year); Requires capital expenditure for signs, permits, maintenance, etc.; May result in relocation of parked vehicles outside of East San Rafael
	City Parking Code	Ensures that any development or redevelopment within the Canal Neighborhood subarea provides sufficient parking to meet the City's current code	
<b>Long-Term</b>			
	Parking Structure	Can significantly increase parking supply and provide long-term parking for East San Rafael residents	High cost of \$25,000 or more per space; limited opportunity sites available

The consultant and City Staff presented the findings of the draft study at a community meeting at the Albert J. Boro Community Center on July 12, 2017 and received significant feedback from the more than 100 people that attended the meeting. The feedback was wide-ranging and was summarized by W-Trans as follows:

*1. Proposed Recommendations*

*a. Schedule*

- i. Resident questions whether a 12 month timeline for evaluation an appropriate length; should the city reevaluate sooner? Within 3-6 months and not one year*
- ii. Residents want the city to prepare now for permit parking (i.e., move ahead with amending the code, assess permit distribution and plan, to swiftly deploy phase 2)*
- iii. Some residents feel stepped phase approach is ineffective and will require all phases simultaneously to solve the problem*
- iv. Some residents support stepped phase approach*

*b. Funding*

- i. Resident claims increased enforcement would pay for itself*
- ii. Resident proposed privatization of parking structure to expedite construction*

*c. 24 hour rule*

- i. Residents in favor of 24 hour rule with increased enforcement*
- ii. Residents question how many cars will be displaced by 24 hour rule*
- iii. Residents have concerns over 24hr rule and whether it accommodates guest passes and how it will work once permit system is installed*

*d. Permits*

- i. Residents feel permit system can't accommodate multi-resident units*

- ii. *Some residents don't want permits*
  - iii. *Some residents are in favor of permits*
  - iv. *Some residents want preferred permit issuing by neighborhood*
  - v. *Residents think permits should be cheaper*
  - vi. *Residents skeptical of predicted success of permits system*
  - vii. *Resident claimed that permit enforcement would be easier than 24 hour enforcement and therefor recommended*
- e. *Parking supply*
- i. *Residents want Windward Way lot*
  - ii. *Residents want parking structure*
  - iii. *Residents want the economics of the parking structure further evaluated because it will solve the problem*
  - iv. *Residents feel that increased enforcement will displace the problem to other neighborhoods*
  - v. *Residents suggest that parking garage be built and charge \$100/month*
  - vi. *Resident suggests altering Bellam Blvd median to supply parking*
  - vii. *Use of local parking lots at Mi Pueblo and Bowling Alley would displace people who need those spots for daily use*

Residents also provided additional feedback about maintenance, enforcement, housing equity, and other general feedback:

## 2. *Maintenance*

- a. *Residents report Spinnaker Point doesn't get enough street cleaning*
- b. *Residents want T's and L's painted on the pavement to delineate parking wherever possible*
- c. *There is a lack of ADA compliant on-street parking*

## 3. *Enforcement*

- a. *Residents reported lack of enforcement in commercial district during daytime hours with vehicles double parked*
- b. *Residents reported lack of response from authorities when parking violations are reported by the residents*
- c. *Residents complain that enforcement is not strict enough, cars get tagged but not towed*
- d. *Residents complain that people will move their cars only when the sweeper comes and then return them once the sweeper leaves*
- e. *Residents claim that up to 2010 enforcement was more strict*
- f. *Residents claim they receive multiple tickets in one month, see enforcement as discriminatory*
- g. *Resident claim people erase chalk markers all the time, enforcement ineffective*

## 4. *Safety*

- a. *Residents say that illegal car parking is a safety issue*
- b. *Residents say report should address safety*
- c. *Residents claim cars are racing through streets in search of parking, safety issue*

## 5. *Equity/Housing*

- a. *Residents fear increased parking enforcement will displace individuals/families*

- b. *Residents say that some people have multiple cars that don't get used*
- c. *Residents suggest that landlords need to help alleviate the problem of high density*
- d. *Resident suggested putting parking structure on Community Center site and incorporating the community center and parking together*
- e. *Residents offer perspective that the issue is an equity issue and that a collaborative effort to find affordable housing alternatives is needed to solve problem*
- f. *Residents feel economic disparity is cause of problem, the poor won't be able to afford cost of permit*
- g. *Residents feel that permit won't solve problem, need to work together to provide housing for Canal residents*
- h. *Residents question if city has considered the unintended consequences of a permit system with regards to equitable treatment of Canal residents*
- i. *Residents say that many are not on leases and cannot provide proof of residence*
- j. *Residents expressed desire to convene landlords to include them in the solution process*

#### 6. *Specific complaints*

- a. *Sonoma Street – 20 commercial vehicles parked every night*
- b. *Sonoma Street cars parking on sidewalks and red zone pose a safety risk*
- c. *Vehicle at Baypoint and Dowitcher tagged but not towed*
- d. *Francisco Boulevard unsafe for cyclists because of parking demand*
- e. *20 VW busses parked in commercial district possibly being "rented" to provide sleeping space*
- f. *Parked cars in commercial district have no license plates*
- g. *Oversized/commercial vehicles parked in residential neighborhood take up spaces*

Staff is seeking input from the Council regarding the recommendations listed in the report so that we can proceed to address the parking concerns outlined in the draft East San Rafael Parking Study.

The fiscal impact to the City of the recommendations contained in the draft report is significant depending on what, if any, recommendations are enacted. Some costs can be recovered through increased enforcement and/or permit fees if Council decides to pursue those options. Other recommendations including the creation of additional parking or a parking structure are more financially challenging. A public private partnership with the bowling alley and/or Mi Pueblo has unknown costs depending on the agreement reached with the owners of those properties.

#### **ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Draft East San Rafael Parking Study
2. W-Trans memorandum of the comments received.