

**MEETING DATE: 07/12/10**

**AGENDA ITEM: Review and Discussion of Walker Parking Study and  
Directions to Staff on the Study.**

**ATTACHMENTS**

| <b><u>Item</u></b> | <b><u>Description</u></b>               | <b><u>Pages</u></b> |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1.                 | June 29, 2010 Community meeting minutes | 1 - 8               |
| 2.                 | Walker Parking Executive Summary matrix | 9 - 16              |
| 3.                 | Parking rate comparison                 | 17                  |

## COMMUNITY MEETING WALKER PARKING STUDY PRESENTATION

June 29, 2010  
7:00 P.M.

### COMMUNITY MEETING MINUTES

#### CALL TO ORDER & ATTENDEES

The Public Meeting for the Walker Parking Study Presentation was called to order at 7:10 p.m.

A sign-in sheet was circulated for attendees at tonight's meeting. Approximately eleven (11) individuals attended the meeting, almost all of which were resident's of Linwood Howe's Residential Neighborhood Association. Jessica Whaley and Ken Kaufman were unable to attend on behalf of the Downtown Business Association (DBA).

George Plato was scheduled to attend but was unable to due to illness an informed City staff that he would be submitting his comments on the report in writing in lieu of attending in person. Doug Newton, Culver Hotel Manager was in attendance.

After a brief introduction by Christopher Evans, Project Manager Redevelopment Agency, Steffen Turoff of Walker Parking, gave a PowerPoint presentation of the Downtown Parking Study's content, conclusions and recommendations. Upon conclusion of the presentation, a question and answer session was conducted.

#### Q & A: Community Questions and Concerns:

**Resident:** Did the study include residential street parking?

**Steffen Turoff:** No.

**Resident:** Did you study the residential area adjacent to downtown at all?

**Steffen Turoff:** No.

**Resident:** Is there enough parking downtown to meet the needs of the businesses?

**Steffen Turoff:** Yes, but people are parking in the most convenient spaces, which results in nearby parking structures being used to their capacity, and other areas are not being used.

**Resident:** Did you study how to get the street parking off Van Buren?

**Steffen Turoff:** No, but the downtown parking is currently sufficient in amount to meet needs.

**Resident:** But that parking isn't free, so they park in our neighborhoods.

**Resident:** I think Brotman visitors are parking at "The Bank of the West" and "Chase Bank".

**Resident:** Can you put parking meters on Irving to deter people from parking there since it is free and convenient?

**Steffen Turoff:** We recommended all commercial areas that don't currently have meters to be metered and to increase the frequency of patrols to prevent abuse.

**Resident:** Can you install meters on Lafayette, Irving and Van Buren?

**Steffen Turoff:** I don't think it is wise to push everyone into their garages in the residential areas.

**Resident:** How do we prevent street parking from filling up in residential areas?

**Steffen Turoff:** Establish a permit parking program or downtown parking will always spill over. It won't stop until then. If the residential street parking is still full after that, then, increase the parking permit fees that the residents pay to encourage them to park in their garages and driveways.

**Resident:** Even with permit parking on my street, it isn't being enforced. I see abuses occurring.

**Steffen Turoff:** The permit parking system only works if the City enforces it by issuing citations. Otherwise, motorists learn quickly that they will not be cited and take advantage of this knowledge.

**Resident:** Those who work downtown often park on Lafayette Place because parking in the structures cost too much for the employees. How are you going to address this issue?

**Steffen Turoff:** Any available free parking will always be used first when demand for parking is high or if employees don't want to pay for monthly parking.

**Resident:** It cost \$15 to obtain a parking permit. In a household with three drivers, that's a lot of money!

**Resident:** Explain ways how valet or a validation program could help encourage people to not park in residential neighborhoods due to the convenience it provides.

***"Christopher Evans: The City has received a grant to implement real-time monitoring system in downtown in which motorists will be informed by electronic signs how many parking spaces remain in each of the downtown parking structures. The signs will be placed in several areas around and leading to downtown."***

**Resident:** What about the use of validations by the businesses?

**Steffen Turoff:** What draws customers to an area is the destination itself, not validations. As long as there is parking available at a reasonable price, you will have customers. The price is not the biggest concern or even parking convenience. The most important thing is the availability of parking.

**Resident:** It is difficult to get a majority on our block to sign a petition to obtain permit parking. Can't the City help make it easier by taking the lead to make determinations on a block-by-block basis without us having to ask for it?

***"Gabe Garcia:*** *We did do this for Lynwood Howe neighborhood and established a district already. All residents need to do is obtain signatures on a block-by-block basis for its implementation since it is already approved."*

**Resident:** But that is hard to do! Some are opposed to the idea -- there needs to be an easier way. Why do we need 100% signatures?

***"Gabe Garcia:*** *We only require 75% approval of the residents on any given block. Currently, and we are studying how other cities are administering their system in order to determine if we should change our 75% threshold policy."*

**Resident:** We gathered 65% petition signatures at one time and that wasn't enough! The threshold should be reduced. Also, why are we required to have 66% of us to buy permits too? If they don't buy the permits, then the program discontinues. Why?

***"Gabe Garcia:*** *Sometimes neighbors sign because they feel pressured to, but didn't really want to participate in it after all. This is made evident in the fact that they don't subsequently buy a permit."*

**Resident:** The Study recommends the first permit be priced at \$0, the second \$35. That's not right. Steffen Turoff: The cost is only a minor detail in the grand scheme of things and the City Council can set the rates as they see fit, just so long as it is implemented and enforced.

**Steffen Turoff:** We counted cars, not people and why they are parking where they do. Instead, we focused our efforts on where and how long they park during specific times of the day.

**Resident:** My apartment building is on Watseka and our building is built in 1927. We were supposed to be allowed to park in the Watseka surface parking lot, but now we aren't allowed to do so when they built the Watseka structure. Please consider permit parking on Watseka for its residents, and not just parking meters for its commercial uses.

**Resident:** Are you going to change the residential permit rates?

**"Gabe Garcia:** *We're open to discussing and studying our existing rates and how they compare to other cities."*

**Resident:** How about installing more signage in the area to encourage good parking practices?

**"Gabe Garcia:** *We're considering expanding and reducing districts throughout the city to give us the flexibility we need. We have to consider people parking on immediately adjacent blocks as a way of working around parking restrictions on any given block. That is why districts are formed – because we know any parking program implemented will be impact the entire district."*

**Resident:** We should increase signage as a deterrent to abuse.

**Resident:** I live on Van Buren and it is a nightmare having to find a space to park in. The sign says don't park in this residential neighborhood already and it doesn't help at all. We get a lot of restaurant customers parking on Van Buren. We need to find a way to stop this. I also observe them driving the wrong way on a one-way street!

**"Gabe Garcia:** *The City Council adopted 1 hour parking from Mon-Fri during the day in Linwood Howe already. Resident: But people are abusing the system! We also get theater parkers too. We need more canvassing and enforcement. Gabe: Contact me separately and talk to your city councilmember to help out."*

**Resident:** I wanted to let you know that true or not, we residents are convinced that the city has a silent policy of not enforcing parking in the area. It may not be true, but I wanted to let you know what the residents are saying.

***[Staff note: According to PD, an average of 125 citations are issued per month to motorists in the Lynwood Howe parking district area.]***

**Resident:** Is it legal to feed a 1-hour meter over and over for several hours?

**"Gabe Garcia:** *Yes, it is legal to feed the meter passed one hour as often as you choose to."*

**Resident:** Employees downtown are taking up all the metered spaces and are feeding them throughout the day and that needs to stop and be made illegal, since it isn't right. Those parking spaces should be for customers so they don't park in our residential neighborhood.

**Steffen Turoff:** Walker Parking recommends that meters not be allowed to be fed beyond their initial time period allowance however, this is very difficult to enforce. As an alternative, we recommend increasing the hourly rates in a progressive manner to discourage abuse. For example, though the first hour may be only \$1. The second could be \$2, the third \$4 and the fifth \$5. This is a self-policing way of discouraging employees from parking in the metered areas.

**Resident:** I live on Irving and people are blocking my driveway leading to our apartment building. I don't care about signage, I would rather they don't block our driveways. I have to call the Police in order to get out of my house! Sometimes it takes an hour for the Police Dept. to show up so I'm late in getting where I need to be.

**Resident:** Let's install cameras throughout the neighborhood and increase citation fees significantly in order to deter abuse. The City could make a lot of money on enforcement that way.

**Resident:** Won't increasing monthly parking rates, especially eliminating the two-hour free parking encourage customers to park in our residential neighborhood!

**Steffen Turoff:** To discourage this, I recommend implementation of a permit parking only system coupled with enforcement to avoid this from occurring in the future.

**Resident:** Why do the residents have to pay for their own permits on their own street! That's not right. We're being penalized for living next to a successful downtown.

**Steffen Turoff:** Any permit fee is established by the City Council and are thus a policy decision.

**Steffen Turoff:** Living next to a successful downtown area is a going to be a trade off.

**Resident:** Yes, it is lovely to live next to a successful downtown, but Santa Maria BBQ stinks when it cooks and my visitors don't like to smell it either.

**Resident:** Parents of the students pick up and drop off their kids and also use a lot of neighborhood parking when they visit. Did you study that?

**Steffen Turoff:** No, only the commercial areas.

**Resident:** Why not create resident only parking on weekends in our neighborhood?

**"Gabe Garcia:** *Currently, policy dictates that a threshold of 25% of parking on any given street has to be non-residents in order for it to be considered a problem."*

**Resident:** Doesn't the City Council look to staff to obtain recommendations?

**"Gabe Garcia:** *Staff outlines options to the City Council so they may make educated decisions. We do analyze those options as well."*

**Resident:** On page 63, table 20 it says the City will make \$1.3M more if they give up 2-hour free parking. Page 60 says that the salary for each ticket writer is \$32K without benefits. How much does it cost really? Another staff report written previously indicated that it cost \$69,500. Vehicle maintenance is another \$10K annually. How are we to fund parking enforcement officers with all our current budget woes right now? We just laid off 60 city staffers!

**Steffen Turoff:** The simple answer is that citation writing makes the city money regardless of how much their salary costs. It can be a source of income for the city.

**"Christopher Evans:** *Why is that?"*

**Steffen Turoff:** Because there are so many violations out there to cite. We all know that enforcement is weak right now, but if hired, it will pay for itself, so keep that in mind.

**Resident:** Won't Parcel B's development impact the parking supply?

**Steffen Turoff:** On a conservative basis, even at the peak period we still have at least 600 spaces that are available and it will take a lot of new development to make a dent in that ample surplus. Yes, down the line we may run out of parking as development resumes, but not within the next five years.

**Resident:** So the Study concludes that we can use these 600 for future development parking needs?

**Steffen Turoff:** Yes, it the Study is a guideline for future development that intends to share in the pooled parking program. For larger development however, they should be building their own parking and not relying upon the pooled parking program to meet their needs.

**Resident:** Who owns Parcel B?

**"Sol Blumenfeld:** *The Agency."*

**Resident:** Why does it sit empty all the time?

**"Sol Blumenfeld:** *It's a potential redevelopment site that is leased for Studio and Hotel parking needs right now. We will make some decisions soon for Parcel B's short and long term uses. If we don't develop it within the next five years, one option is to use it as a parking lot that is open for general public use."*

**Resident:** Shouldn't the businesses be responsible for telling their customers where to park and that it is free for the first two hours to discourage parking in residential areas?

**"Christopher Evans:** *Currently, Pacific Theaters has 4 hours free parking with validation."*

**Resident:** Yes, but do they tell their customers prior to their arrival to see the movie of this?

**Resident:** How come Topson Downs is parking on Irving if there are so many pooled parking spaces available? This company has 140 employees.

**"Joe Susca:** *Though Watseka and Cardiff do not have any employee parking available for their use, we did offer them use of Ince. Instead of accepting staff's offer however, they decided to rent their spaces on Irving, which was closer to them."*

**Resident:** I've observed motorists parking in the loading zone for six months in a row without being cited.

**"Sol Blumenfeld:** *I think we can all agree that enforcement needs to be stepped up."*

**\*\*\*\*\***

**CONCLUSION:** - (Additional Comments Submitted By George Plato)

1. Against eliminating the 2-hour free parking in the structures.
2. Concerned about meter feeding and interested in policies that reduce or eliminate the practice.
3. Suggested that employee permits for Cardiff be reduced or eliminated in order to move employees to less busy structures.

**Adjournment**

There being no further discussions, at 8:55 p.m. on Tuesday, June 29, 2010, the Public Meeting for the Walker Parking Study was concluded.

**MEETING RECORDER:**

Joe Susca,  
Project Manager, Redevelopment Agency

**APPROVED:**

Christopher Evans,  
Project Manager, Redevelopment Agency

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Over the past decade Downtown Culver City has experienced a significant increase in popularity as a dining and entertainment destination. As a result, the City has experienced a significant increase in the demand for parking by visitors and employees. At the request of the Culver City Redevelopment Agency (RDA), Walker Parking Consultants conducted a comprehensive analysis of the Downtown parking system in order to gauge its ability to manage current and future demand for parking in the area.

Our analysis revealed that a significant number of the existing 2,768 parking spaces located within the Downtown<sup>1</sup> are underutilized during peak demand periods on both weekdays and weekends. Parking conditions primarily in the Cardiff Parking Structure and on the street tend to obscure the fact that hundreds of parking spaces remain empty in Downtown, even when occupancy rates in the aforementioned locations approach peak capacity.

To the extent that visitors and employees encounter a lack of parking, our findings indicate this is due primarily to inconsistencies between pricing and policies among different parking facilities; the most sought after parking spaces are often priced at the same rate (or less) than spaces that are less convenient. The result is that visitors, employees, transient and monthly parkers all tend to compete for the most convenient and least expensive spaces, creating localized parking impacts and perceived parking shortages, while other spaces in the area remain unoccupied.

Our analysis also suggests that an active and comprehensive approach to managing the entire system, from on-street to off-street, enforcement to validation programs, would increase both the efficiency of the system and revenue generation. Just as the pricing and policies for each space and parking facility must be looked at in terms of the parking system as a whole, the different management policies of the system must be viewed comprehensively as well.

In order to achieve the goals of the study, which are ultimately to make parking more convenient and accessible for the public in an efficient and cost effective manner, we recommend the implementation of adjustments in pricing and changes in parking management policies, including the City's and RDA's internal management of its parking resources.<sup>2</sup> We make our recommendations with the following goals in mind:

---

<sup>1</sup> Downtown defined herein is the area coterminous with "CD Zoning District" in the City's Zoning Ordinance and General Plan and shown in Figure 1 in the report. It is synonymous with CD, Commercial Downtown District, and Study Area.

<sup>2</sup> Throughout this report we will discuss the "parking system," which contains assets owned by the RDA (such as the Ince and Watseka Parking Structures) and the City (such as on-street parking spaces). To the extent possible we try to distinguish between these two entities within our discussion. However, at times we discuss issues that relate to the entire system and therefore both the RDA and the City. In these instances, for the purposes of this report, we use the term "City" to refer to both the RDA and City.

- Enhanced customer service and convenience;
- Turnover and space availability;
- Revenue generation;
- Ease of Implementation;
- Maximization of resources and efficiencies.

We explored increased parking fees for the purposes of improving efficiency, increasing space availability, and generating additional revenue. We found that adjusting the existing parking fee structure would result in significant additional revenue for the City and the RDA. However, we note that while the added revenue is substantial, in many cases it is secondary to the funds that can be saved by using pricing cues to manage the existing supply of spaces thereby saving land, construction and opportunity costs associated with constructing new parking facilities.

Finally, we note the effects of mispricing parking go beyond efficiency, cost and access issues and that these effects must be considered in light of broader planning goals. Among them, mispricing parking can contribute significantly to traffic congestion, both localized and in the larger area, as well as discourage the use of alternative forms of transportation, most notably by employees who can park inexpensively in Downtown.

The following summarizes our recommendations from each section of the study as presented in the scope of services:

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### *1. PUBLIC PARKING STRUCTURES SUPPLY AND DEMAND - CARDIFF, WATSEKA AND INCE*

#### Immediate:

- A. Replace the existing policy of offering two hours of free parking in the Cardiff and Watseka Parking Structures with a \$1.00 per hour fee. Implementing an hourly rate should improve space availability for customers and visitors, by redistributing long-term parkers to other locations. This policy would also enhance management (including the elimination of parkers moving their cars every two hours to gain longer periods of free parking), and increase revenue. Although it would generate less revenue, a policy that may be more agreeable to some stakeholders would be to charge \$1.00 for the first two or three hours of parking. At a minimum, we strongly recommend that the free period be eliminated or at least significantly reduced.
- B. Replace the free period in the Ince Parking Structure with a \$0.50 per hour fee for the same reasons as those provided above. We note that, given its current low occupancy rates, the Ince Structure should be priced lower than the Cardiff and Watseka Structures. Charging a flat \$0.50 or \$1.00

fee for the first two or three hours of parking would reduce the revenue generating potential of our recommendation. As with the Cardiff and Watseka Structures, we strongly recommend that the free period be significantly reduced.

- C. Eliminate the “additional two-hour free” validation and substitute with the \$2.50 maximum charge per the terms of the RDA’s agreement with OliverMcMillan.<sup>3</sup>
- D. Increase the fee for monthly contract parking by \$10.00 per permit in the Cardiff and Watseka Structures to encourage long-term parkers to park in locations that are currently underutilized. This action would effectively reduce long-term demand in the busier Cardiff and Watseka Structures, provide additional spaces for visitor parking in these same structures, and generate additional revenue.
- E. Obtain the “reasonable approval” of the Developer and theater operator for any parking rate increases per the RDA’s Disposition and Development Agreement with OliverMcMillan (“DDA”).

#### Short term:

- F. Monitor parking occupancy in each of the structures on a frequent and regular basis (bimonthly at a minimum), to determine whether the parking fee structure for transient and monthly parking is having the desired policy results or requires adjustment.
- G. Use our pricing recommendations to set a goal of no more than 90% occupancy in the spaces available for public parking in each of the parking structures for a typical peak day.

## **2. OPERATION OF THE PUBLIC PARKING STRUCTURES**

#### Immediate:

- A. Actively work with the Pacific 12 Theaters in order to:
  - Ensure that only eligible patrons are allowed to validate their parking tickets in order to protect the revenue integrity of the system; the location of the movie theatre “clamshell” validating machines creates significant challenges for properly managing the validations;
  - Monitor the number of movie validations provided on an hourly and daily basis to enhance management of the parking system.

<sup>3</sup> Per the RDA’s agreement, it is no longer under obligation to offer an additional “two-hours free” with validation to movie patrons.

- B. Standardize the validation system for film production and event parking in order to increase oversight and monitor and protect revenue. Validations should be tracked.
- C. Eliminate the sticker validation program to simplify parking operations. If the RDA chooses to continue the program, we recommend replacing the current system with alternatives ranging from validators and “follow-up” tickets to scanned on-line validations, which can be employed to better track and streamline the program and associated revenue issues.
- D. Enforce the policy that requires the Brotman Hospital employees to utilize Watseka’s nested area by ensuring that the equipment’s “anti-passback” features are in use in order to increase the availability of parking for the general public the Watseka Structure.

Short term:

- E. Implement access control for the parking structures that uses pay-on-foot technology (POF) in each of the parking structures to address the following:
  - Enhanced throughput (faster exiting of vehicles) resulting in shorter queues for patrons;
  - Improved operating conditions afforded through the ability to operate 24 hours daily with minimal staffing;
  - Improved revenue security;
  - Promotion of better air quality resulting from less vehicle queuing;
  - Enhanced customer service.
- F. Given the age of the equipment in the two oldest structures and the existing challenges in queuing experienced particularly in the Cardiff Structure, implement POF in the Cardiff and Watseka Structures in the near term and in the Ince Structure in the long term.
- G. In the Watseka Structure, install an LED dynamic message to specifically instruct the public when nested spaces are available. Control message from the parking office, or automatically schedule with the raising of the gate arms, so that the sign need not be manually changed.

Long term:

- H. Implement a series of functional design improvements, particularly at the exits, in order to increase the speed of exiting procedures and reduce queues.

**3. RDA PARKING OBLIGATIONS PER OLIVERMCMILLAN DDA**

Immediate:

- A. Create an employee parking strategy per the terms of the DDA using the recommendations regarding the management of employee parking contained in this report.
- B. Require that the Ince structure adjacent to 60 “30-minute” parking spaces for Trader Joe’s and be open on weekends from 7:00 AM but establish with OliverMcMillan that the current 45-minute designated time limit and 8:00 AM opening hour is sufficient for the operation at this time.
- C. Note that the RDA is in compliance with the provision to provide at least 1,922 parking spaces within the designated perimeter of the development area.

#### 4. ON-STREET PARKING

##### Immediate:

- A. Extend the hours of operation and enforcement of all parking meters until 11:00 PM to encourage turnover at curbside spaces and increase visitors’ access to convenient parking in the evenings. This policy is particularly important to implement on Thursday through Sunday evenings given the high occupancy observed at metered spaces on those days. The generation of revenue is an important, but secondary, goal of this policy.
- B. Enforce parking meters all day on Sunday to encourage turnover and increase visitors’ access to convenient parking spaces. The high on-street occupancy observed in the metered spaces throughout the day on Sunday indicates that this action would enhance short-term availability throughout the day and discourage spillover parking in the neighborhood.

##### Short term:

- C. Eliminate time restrictions on metered spaces but encourage turnover using a system of higher and/or tiered rates that discourage, but do not specifically prohibit parking on the street for longer than two hours to enhance flexibility, convenience and the overall experience for visitors. This recommendation would also facilitate parking enforcement although reduce potential revenue from citations.
- D. As part of the previous recommendation, gradually increase parking meter rates from the current \$1.00 to \$1.50 per hour, particularly during the busier Thursday through Sunday periods in the most impacted on-street parking locations. To enhance revenue and promote consistency within

the system, this change could be implemented on a seven-day per week basis.

- E. Increase the availability of parking cash keys<sup>4</sup> by encouraging their sale to the public at cashier booths in the garages. We note that the City's pilot program to install on-street pay stations that accept credit cards is a positive step toward added customer convenience.

Long term:

- F. Meter all on-street parking spaces within the study area that are currently enforced through time-limited parking policies, to enhance revenues and reduce spillover parking in residential neighborhoods.

## 5. ON-STREET PARKING ENFORCEMENT

Immediate:

- A. Engage in specific citation tracking measures of the issuance of citations to maximize the efficiency of enforcement officers and generate increased revenue.

Short term:

- B. Ensure that parking enforcement officers consistently use an electronic ticket writer system that allows electronic tire chalking and maintains electronic records of enforcement activity as described within the report.

Long term:

- C. Require Parking Enforcement to work cooperatively with a proposed Parking Department and Parking Manager to create a comprehensive parking management strategy for the Downtown.
- D. Consider creating an "Ambassador Program" to empower and train parking employees to provide hospitality, tourism and public safety services to downtown patrons and businesses in addition to their parking enforcement duties.

## 6. REVENUE ENHANCEMENT

Short term:

- A. Implement the parking rate increase recommendations contained in the Public Parking Structure and On-street Parking sections of this report.

---

<sup>4</sup> The City offers to the public a parking "Cash Key," a prepaid plastic key which a City brochure describes as allowing "the user to purchase parking time on Culver City meters without the use of coins."

- B. Implement the rate schedule for residential parking permits and citations in residential permit areas contained in this section of the report and aggressively pursue enforcement in these areas.

## 7. CITY HALL PARKING STRUCTURE

### Immediate:

- A. Require all City Hall employees to park on the P2 level of City Hall instead of on P1.
- B. Make P1 explicitly available to the public for parking both during the day and on weekends, including employees of Kirk Douglas Theatres, and explore the use of the P2 level of City Hall for theatre employees.

### Short term:

- C. Install signage within the district and at the entrance to the City Hall Garage that publicizes the availability of public parking on the P1 level.
- D. Install Parking Access and Revenue Control equipment (PARCs) at the entrance of the parking structure that is the same as that used by the other public structures; manage P1 comprehensively as part of the public system.
- E. Use an attended “pay-on-entry” system to regulate usage of the structure by visitors should usage of the facility by the public cause unacceptably high occupancy rates before PARCs equipment is installed.

## 8. PUBLIC PARKING LOTS

### Short term:

- A. Use the lot at 9300 Culver Blvd (Parcel B) for convenient and paid public parking during busy evening and weekend periods until the parcel is developed. The City should first test demand using an attended, flat fee, pay-on-entry system.
- B. Promote the availability of the Canfield Lot for public parking with better signage. Explore the market for paid evening parking at the location during peak periods using an attendant and a flat fee, attended pay-on-entry rate structure.
- C. Determine the level of demand for employee parking at the 9415 Venice Boulevard lot for low-cost employee parking, given that the lot may serve some employees for whom parking in other peripheral locations is not a viable option.

## 9. POOLED PARKING PROGRAM

### Short term:

- A. Eliminate the current Pooled Parking Program and replace with a monitored system of parking credits to track allocations of required parking spaces and recognize the cost and value of the parking resource being provided to new development.

## *10. FUTURE DOWNTOWN PARKING SUPPLY AND DEMAND*

### Long term:

- A. Recognize the current surplus of spaces in the public system, while sufficient to manage current imbalances in demand, is insufficient to fully meet the future parking demand that will be generated from the development projects planned for the area. Except for that development that has already been planned using public parking facilities, most future, large-scale development will require its own on-site parking.

## *11. ADMINISTRATION OF THE PARKING OPERATION*

### Immediate:

- A. Establish a parking operations entity that would manage parking related issues, both off- and on-street. A Parking Department would, at least initially, be staffed by one senior level position that has managerial responsibilities.
- B. Locate the Parking Department within the Finance Department, given the importance of the careful monitoring of parking revenue, in part due to its use as a “scorekeeper” for tracking trends in the system.
- C. Parking enforcement and meter collections positions remain in the Police Department although frequent and close cooperation with the Parking Manager is necessary.

### Short term:

- D. Assign the duties and responsibilities to the parking operator per the operator agreement as is recommended in Appendix D -Parking Operator Contract Review, of the report.<sup>5</sup>
- E. Implement the best practices with regard to the maintenance of the Parking Structures as is recommended in Appendix E - Facility Maintenance Program of the report. Note that much of this maintenance could be performed by the parking operator or other contractor.

---

<sup>5</sup> This recommendation may be a “long-term” rather than “short-term” recommendation depending on the timing of any new or revised contract between the RDA and the parking operator.

Municipal Parking Rate Survey

Per Appendix C of Comprehensive Parking Study

| Municipalities                             | Parking Authority                                        | Meter Rates                                     | Parking Meter<br>Enforcment Hours                                                                      | Parking<br>Structures/Lots Daily<br>Rate                                                    | Variable Time Rate (such as<br>unique evening rate)                                                        | Parking Structure<br>\$/per month                     |
|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| Culver City (current)                      | N/A                                                      | \$1.00 per hr                                   | 8 AM - 6 PM Monday -<br>Saturday                                                                       | \$1.00 per hr/\$8.00<br>max/2 hrs free                                                      | 2 hr validation for theater<br>patrons                                                                     | \$60 for 5 day<br>access, \$80 for 7<br>day access    |
| City of Santa Monica                       | Contract Operator/Parking<br>Office                      | (w/proposal to<br>increase to \$1.50<br>per hr) | 8 AM - 6 PM Monday-<br>Saturday                                                                        | \$2.00 per hr/\$7.00 max<br>w/2 hrs free                                                    | \$3.00 evening flat rate                                                                                   | \$82.50 (proposed to<br>be raised to<br>\$121.00)     |
| City of Beverly Hills                      | Parking Operations<br>Division                           | \$1.00 per hr                                   | 8 AM - 6 PM                                                                                            | \$2-\$3.00 per hr/ \$10 -<br>\$22.00 max w/1-2 hrs<br>free                                  | typically \$5.00 flat rate after 6PM                                                                       | \$65.00 - \$185.00                                    |
| City of West Hollywood                     | City of Beverly Hills<br>(meters) & Contract<br>Operator | \$1 - \$4.00 per hr                             | until 8 PM weekdays and<br>midnight on weekends                                                        | \$1.00 per hr until 5 PM                                                                    | \$6.00 evening flat rate                                                                                   | \$145.00                                              |
| City of Pasadena (Old Town)                | Parking Division                                         | \$1.25 per hr                                   | 8 AM - 12 AM daily                                                                                     | \$1.00 to \$2.00 per<br>hr/\$5.00 to \$6.00 max<br>/1.5 to 2 hrs free                       | \$5.00 evening flat rate                                                                                   | \$65 - \$90.00                                        |
| City of Inglewood                          | Transportation Division                                  | \$0.50 per hr.                                  | 7 AM - 7 PM daily                                                                                      | \$1.50 to \$2.00 per<br>hour/\$7.50 all day.                                                | Not Applicable                                                                                             | \$30 - \$50.00                                        |
| City of Hermosa Beach                      | Contracted Operator &<br>Community Services Div.         | \$1.00 per hr                                   | 10 AM - 10 PM 7-days per<br>week                                                                       | \$1.00 per hr, \$16 daily<br>maximum                                                        | \$4.00 peak evening flat rate;<br>\$6.00 flat rate on weekends                                             | \$50.00                                               |
| City of Redwood City                       | Finance Deptmt &<br>Contract Operator                    | FREE or \$0.25 -<br>\$0.50 per hr               | 10 AM- 6 PM; some free<br>all day Saturday; some<br>free all day Sunday; some<br>free all weekend; (NO | \$0.25 per hr base rate<br>non-peak; \$2.50 - \$5.00<br>per hr. peak (depends<br>on garage) | 4-hours free validation for cinema<br>patrons; 1-2 hours free with<br>validation by downtown<br>businesses | \$30 - \$60                                           |
| City of San Luis Obispo                    | Parking Services Division                                | \$0.75 to \$1.25 per<br>hr.                     | 9 AM to 6 PM Monday-<br>Saturday                                                                       | \$0.75 per hr/ \$7.50<br>max w/1 hr free                                                    | Not Applicable                                                                                             | \$40                                                  |
| Culver City (Walker Parking<br>recommends) | Parking Department                                       | \$1.50 per hr                                   | 8 AM - 11 PM 7 days<br>per wk                                                                          | \$1.00 per hr (Cardiff<br>PS, Watseka PS) \$.50<br>per hr Ince PS                           | \$2.50 max charge w/theater<br>validation                                                                  | \$70 for 5 day<br>access at Cardiff<br>PS, Watseka PS |