

Parking study file #18-0950

TAPS speech #1 for City Council December 11, 2018

My name is Debbie Dobias. I live at [REDACTED].

Long Beach *could* be a shining example of how to do parking right while still accomplishing its Mobility goals. Many new parking programs *can* pay for themselves and help fund others. WE ARE ASKING FOR YOUR HELP AND NEED YOUR LEADERSHIP TO DO THIS.

For 4 years of trying, we failed to get the City to look at the parking issues and solutions. The TAPS lawsuit asked for a court order that would have required the City to *follow* CEQA laws. *Not* following those laws would make parking problems worse, resulting in more traffic and air pollution. TAPS did *not* ask for money. The City's CEQA attorney led the City to settle. When we agreed to the settlement, we gave up something valuable - the court orders.

The intent of the settlement was to bring data, professional evaluation, and *new* options to you. The City agreed in the settlement that the parking study would do certain things, bringing an unusual opportunity to make things better. The study was required to be solution-oriented, comprehensive, inclusive of all users of parking, identify funding, recommend pricing strategies, find ways to integrate private parking for public use, protect existing residential parking, review all existing standards, and make *any* recommendations deemed warranted *based on the data analyzed*.

Tom Modica, Eric Widstrand, and Carrie Tai are City professionals who are trying to address the parking issue. They had thorough, creative, open and honest discussions on multiple fronts. At some point something changed, especially on the subject of the Downtown parking regulations. When Draft 2 came out, it looked like *big holes* had been punched in the study. THERE IS A PARKING PROBLEM IN DOWNTOWN LONG BEACH AND WE DO NEED TO ADDRESS IT.

Now the City is concluding the study without adhering to the work scope, leaving out things that are *crucial* to planning. For \$250,000, you got something that looks more like staff report, stating little more than what the city was *already* willing to do. History tells us that very little will change regarding action on parking if you turn over further action to staff now UNLESS YOU DECIDE TO HELP OUT YOUR RESIDENTS AND REALLY WORK WITH US TO FIND SOLUTIONS.

We ask that you hold a study session on parking with the Planning Commission. Include Michael Kodama because he has more expertise on parking and TOD than anyone on city staff that has worked on parking. We ask that you declare a Moratorium on accepting *new* development applications until you have the data and professional evaluation that's needed to plan better for parking.

2 min 45 sec

TAPS speech #2, Mike's comments

My name is Laura Greco and I live at _____.

What we know tells us that the plan in this study will make very little difference in our ability to park as more people are added to our area.

This is not just our opinion but also that of parking consultant Mike Kodama, who TAPS paid to advise us and give feedback to the study team. We've provided you with his written opinion of the parking study.

In his Memo, he says that important things are missing from the study that are needed to make their recommendations work. He points out how some of their key conclusions are not backed by data. For instance, he says, "...it should be noted that field observations stopped at 6pm and therefore the analysis missed some of the impact related to residential parking needs later in the evening."

He also says it's a false statement to say that there is no parking problem downtown, explains why, and says, "It does not analyze blocks but rather only looks at total numbers for a large project area."

(Laura adds part about please consider making further alterations to the study. Don't just receive and file.)

This study relies heavily on parking management to solve parking issues without 4 key needs to accomplish that: management, a parking plan, parking for new buildings, and a funding plan.

1. Parking Management – The study only describes how parking management is currently spread over multiple departments and tells the City how to go about hiring management should they decide to do so. Kodama said, "It is important that the City of Long Beach find a parking manager to focus on this complex issue. I cannot think of a large city without a parking manager or parking department....It is critical that the parking management program not be seen as a one-time deal. It must be continuous, collaborative and comprehensive."

2. Parking Plan – The existing Downtown Plan considers visitor parking, not parking for residents and employees. The area needs a comprehensive Parking Plan that is balanced to include the needs of all types of parkers.

Kodama points out several things that should be considered, including using incentives rather than more enforcement in an area that has parking issues.

Regarding residential permits, he says we need, "a new approach to develop residential parking permit programs and management options beyond the concept of residents setting up a Parking Assessment District or hiring their own parking management/operation firm themselves."

2 min 40 sec

My name is Layne Karkruff and I live at [REDACTED].

This parking study probably will not make parking easier for people because there is too much missing from the study.

This study relies heavily on parking management to solve parking issues without 4 key needs to accomplish that: management, a parking plan, parking for new buildings, and a funding plan.

#3. Parking for new buildings –

Mike Kodama says this in his Memo to the City:

How can KOA find no evidence that new development in Downtown Long Beach has triggered any parking shortage or that there is no need to reconsider parking requirements for new development without an analysis linking parking requirements and utilization to existing and proposed square footage? This analysis is incomplete without that...

...it is not a comprehensive program as it does not address the extremely important issue of residential spillover parking, does not set parking priority users in sub-areas around the Downtown commercial core nor developed an evaluation methodology based on parking data.

In addition, any analysis of future parking demand must consider the loss of parking spaces usually associated with new development in a dense, downtown environment

#4. Funding – Many parking studies include an analysis of new revenue streams from parking programs. They combine that info with an analysis of parking pricing. The result is a planning tool that allows the city to create a funding plan to improve parking. Parking improvements besides big parking structures are available like automated parking, loan programs, and partnering with developers.

This study does not provide such an analysis.

Mike Kodama says this in his Memo to the City:

It is also suggested that potential parking revenues be reinvested back into a parking management system.

This can be from the parking management program. This is not a new concept and has been effective in cities such as Portland, Seattle, Ventura, Pasadena, San Diego and many other places. It creates transparency and opens up a willingness to pay for parking knowing that it is being reinvested back into the community with the parking issues.

2 m 30 sec