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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PURPOSE

This parking study was commissioned by the City of Pacific Grove City Manager’s Office to update and refine a 1984 parking study. This current study analyzes existing and future parking conditions Downtown, evaluates options for meeting future parking demand, and addresses parking management issues. This report has been revised slightly to respond to review comments from the Economic Advisory Committee.

The study area is the Downtown commercial district, principally the former parking assessment district. However, the study also addresses the pros and cons of installing parking meters for on-street parking near the American Tin Cannery.

The objectives of the parking study are:

1. To determine how much additional parking (both short-term and long-term) is needed to sustain a healthy downtown economy desired by the community.

2. To determine where additional parking should be located and how it should be provided: in parking structures, surface lots, or in satellite parking facilities connected by shuttle service.

3. To estimate costs and develop a basic financing plan for constructing additional parking.

4. To develop an implementation plan for meeting current and future parking needs.

5. To determine whether parking meters should be installed on-street near the American Tin Cannery, and if so, where and with what rates?

6. To address community concerns about parking issues, showing businesses and residents that the City of Pacific Grove is responsive to their concerns.

EXISTING PARKING SUPPLY AND TIME LIMITS

Most parking in downtown Pacific Grove is in on-street (curbside) spaces, indicative of a relatively limited parking supply. Off-street parking, providing about 42% of the parking supply, is primarily concentrated near the center of downtown, roughly between 17th and 15th Streets.

Of a total of about 1,453 downtown parking spaces, 59% are in on-street parking, 23% in lots open to the public, and the remaining 18% in private lots.
All of the public lot parking is located in the three central zones of the five study zones, that is in the area roughly bounded by 17th and 15th Streets, Central and Pine Avenues.

**OCCUPANCY LEVELS BY TIME PERIOD**

Parking occupancy counts were conducted between 11 AM and 3 PM on Wednesday, April 9, and Saturday, April 19. Wednesday occupancy levels were slightly higher, but overall occupancy levels were well below capacity in most locations both days.

The Wednesday peak hour was between 1 PM and 2 PM. At this time, 66% of all the parking spaces were occupied.

Adjusting for seasonal variations yields an estimated 77% peak occupancy rate for all parking during a typical summer peak.

**OCCUPANCY LEVELS BY LOCATION**

Occupancy levels varied slightly by parking study zone. During the weekday peak, the highest occupancy rate (71% in spring, estimated 82% in summer) was observed in Zone C. This is bounded roughly by 17th and Forest Avenue, south of Lighthouse Avenue. The lowest occupancy rate (61% in spring, estimated 70% in summer) was observed in Zone E, the area east of 15th Street.

**OCCUPANCY LEVELS FOR SPECIAL EVENTS**

Parking occupancy patterns are dramatically affected by special events. The special events that have recently attracted the most attention are held at the east end of the downtown study area: auctions at Hambrooke’s Limited and receptions at the Grove/Homescapes. Both types of events have attracted up to about 300 attendees, with average vehicle occupancy probably varying between 2 and 3 persons per vehicle, suggesting 100 to 150 vehicles.

WSA performed a limited “windshield survey” on Saturday, June 7, during an auction. Occupancy rates within about two blocks of Hambrookes were estimated. Virtually all of the parking in this area is on-street (curbside) parking. At 1 PM, on 13 of 20 block faces with parking permitted, all spaces were occupied. All remaining block faces were at 70 to 95% occupancy. The estimated on-street parking occupancy percentage was between 90% and 95%, over “practical capacity.” At the 46-space private lot on 14th Street between Central Avenue and Ricketts Row, only 30% of spaces were occupied. It should be noted that special event demand is heavily dependent on the exact nature of the event and may be mitigated by valet parking or other special features.
DOWNTOWN DURATION AND TURNOVER BY POSTED TIME LIMITS

As expected, there were clear differences in the duration and turnover among parking facilities with different posted time limits. For example, for weekdays, the average duration for a 24-hour limit spaces was over 5.5 hours, while it was 3.2 hours for a two-hour space and 1.3 hours for a one-hour space.

There was less of a range on-street, varying from 3.9 hours for unlimited/24 hour limit spaces to 1.7 hours for two-hour spaces and 1.6 for 90-minute spaces.

INAPPROPRIATE DURATION DOWNTOWN

The above figures imply a significant level of violations of time limits. Detailed analysis of turnover/duration counts confirms this. Of 159 weekday vehicles parking in two-hour spaces off-street, at least 42% stayed over the limit. Of 145 vehicles parking in 90-minute on-street spaces, 19% stayed longer. Of 63 vehicles parking in two-hour on-street spaces, 21% overstay. The actual percentages are likely higher since it was not possible to monitor every space constantly for a violation.

AMERICAN TIN CANNERY DURATION AND TURNOVER BY FACILITY TYPE

The average duration in the American Tin Cannery customer lot was 2.4 hours, both weekday and weekend. For the 90-minute on-street parking, the average duration was 1.3 hours. For the 12-hour meters over the city boundary in Monterey (a sample of 11 meters), the average duration of 2.8 hours suggests that most parkers are probably visiting the Aquarium/Cannery Row or ATC, but not both.

INAPPROPRIATE DURATION AT THE AMERICAN TIN CANNERY

Based on a detailed review of the 90-minute spaces, the vast majority of parkers on-street near the ATC are observing posted limits, with 14% staying long on the weekday and 17% overstaying on the weekend.

INTERVIEWS WITH DOWNTOWN "LOCAL EXPERTS"

Interviews were held with City staff, business representatives, property owners, and interested citizens.

There was general agreement that the existing parking supply is barely sufficient at most times and in most locations. The strongest concerns were expressed by several residents about spillover parking from local businesses, both for special events and, to a lesser degree, from routine operations. Residents indicated support for residential permit parking in the east end of
downtown (on 12th and 13th Streets). Some support was also mentioned for converting 12th Street to northbound one-way (which was rejected by the Traffic Commission).

Business people and residents foresaw increasing need for parking, even with the slow to moderate growth generally predicted. There was no agreement on where additional parking should be provided. The possible sites mentioned included the Fountain Avenue municipal lot, the Holman block, and satellite parking near the Monterey/Pacific Grove border.

**DOWNTOWN: FUTURE PARKING SUPPLY/DEMAND BALANCE**

**Land Use Assumptions**

The Community Development Department provided forecasts of future growth in downtown Pacific Grove by year 2010. These suggest a relatively low rate of growth, compared to many other communities in California. This is because downtown Pacific Grove is largely "built out."

The forecast increase in commercial floor area is 84,630 square feet. (This represents an increase of only about 8% from the existing.) Some 67 dwelling units in two new multi-family buildings are assumed, plus 25 residential units from gradual development of units on the second story above commercial properties. (The residential increase would represent more than a doubling from existing 60 units.)

New development would be concentrated particularly in parking study Zone B, which would host more than half of the new commercial square footage and about a third of the new dwelling units. This zone in the north central portion of downtown containing the Holman Building is roughly bounded by 17th, 15th Streets, Lighthouse and Central Avenues.

**Overall Future Supply/Demand Balance**

The supply/demand balance was forecast for year 2010, taking into account the expected new construction, decreased building vacancy rates, and increased business patronage. Loss of parking due to construction was also assessed.

The forecasts of growth in parking demand are heavily dependent on three fairly large redevelopment projects: (1) senior housing on the Fountain Avenue parking lot, (2) apartments on the Holman Building parcel, and commercial uses on the 520 Lighthouse parcel across from the movie theater. If these projects are delayed or do not occur, the growth in parking demand would be minimal and probably not sufficient to justify any kind of parking structure. Since this report was initially prepared, one of these projects (senior housing on the Fountain Avenue parking lot) appears less likely, partly because the Chamber of Commerce has endorsed another location outside of downtown.

"No Additional Parking" Scenario - For a weekday summer afternoon, a substantial deficiency is forecast if additional parking is not provided. (This scenario is purely for analysis purposes as
it is likely some parking would actually be built.) An additional 395 parking spaces would be needed to keep parking occupancy rates under 90% (practical capacity).

During special events, the estimated additional parking needed jumps to 515 spaces.

While this is a substantial amount of additional parking, equivalent to a medium-size parking structure, it represents only a moderate increase on an annual basis. The “routine” weekday summer afternoon need represents only about 30 spaces additional per year. Divided among the five study zones, it is equivalent to only six additional spaces per year per zone. It also represents only about a 27% increase over the existing supply.

The “special event” need represents only about 40 spaces additional per year. The increase in demand would be heavily concentrated in the east end of downtown. It also represents only about a 35% increase over the existing supply.

EVALUATION CRITERIA
The following criteria can be used for the comparison of alternatives to balance supply and demand:

1. Expected effectiveness at balancing parking supply and demand;
2. Cost magnitude and ability to fund;
3. Compatibility with General Plan and other plans;
4. Likely merchant/property owner and neighborhood support; and
5. Ease of implementation.

Realistically, these must be evaluated largely in a qualitative manner.

EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES
Based on the above criteria, the following alternatives rank highest on cost-effectiveness and feasibility for improving the future supply/demand balance:

1. New Downtown Parking Facilities

   1A. Parking Garage on Fountain/Laurel City Parking Lot (in combination with senior housing project)

   1B. Parking Garage north of Holman Building (in combination with apartments and/or retail)
1C. Parking Deck on City Parking Lot on 16/17th Street

2. Satellite Parking on or near Cannery Row Lot 7 with enhanced shuttle service.


4. Long-Term Pricing Increases and Trip Reduction Program.

These do not represent mutually exclusive choices. Rather, it may be possible to combine two or more of these. In fact, Alternative 3 is not a stand-alone option, but would only impact the supply/demand balance indirectly. It would provide in-lieu funding for additional parking, but might also tend slow down development and limit the growth in parking demand.

RATIONALE FOR ADDITIONAL PARKING

The future supply/demand analysis forecasts a potential significant shortage of parking. However, this is heavily dependent on three particular redevelopment projects proceeding. If these are delayed or not pursued at all, the need for additional parking becomes minimal.

Pricing increases and enhanced trip reduction efforts can play a valuable role in improving the future supply/demand balance. If growth approaches the maximum forecast for year 2010, without additional parking, Downtown Pacific Grove’s attractiveness for shopping, dining, recreation, and working will likely suffer. Downtown Pacific Grove does not have the kind of attractions (such as the Monterey Bay Aquarium and Cannery Row) that induce large numbers of visitors to stay for hours. With the shorter duration, visitors are less willing to use public transportation, such as the WAVE shuttle. Furthermore, there is not the “critical mass” of visitors that can justify the frequent shuttle service that could support satellite parking.

To be considered convenient for most visitors, parking must be within two (or possibly three) blocks. If one new facility is constructed, it would need to be centrally located. However, two new facilities spaced at least three blocks apart would provide better coverage.

EVALUATION OF SITES

The parking structure alternatives vary primarily on their capacity, cost, and proximity to major attractions (demand generators). Alternative 1B (parking garage north of the Holman Building) would add the highest number of spaces. Alternative 1A (parking garage on Fountain/Laurel lot) would add a moderate amount of parking, while Alternative 1C (deck on 16th/17th Street lot) and Alternative 2 (satellite parking in Cannery Row or at the American Tin Cannery) would be least effective if implemented alone. On a cost-per-net-new space basis, the Alternative 1C (deck) ranks best, with all other options significantly more expensive. Alternative 1A (Fountain/Laurel) and Alternative 1B (north of Holman Building) rank best based on proximity to major attractions.
FINANCING CAPITAL COSTS: ALTERNATIVE FINANCIAL TOOLS

There are two main aspects of financing capital costs: (1) funding source used to pay construction directly (bonds, City property sales, grants, or in-lieu fees) and (2) in many cases the tool used to pay continuing debt service on the bonds. Frequently a combination of different funding sources are used.

In-lieu Fees are development impact fees charged to pay for construction of new parking to serve land uses in areas where private provision of all required parking is undesirable or difficult. (The fees are “in lieu” of directly providing required parking.) In-lieu fees may be mandated, or the developer may have the option of building some or all required parking on-site.

Sale of City properties may be used to provide funding for parking construction. Excess or inconvenient property may be sold and the funds used to acquire private property and construct parking facilities at more convenient locations. Similarly, the City may contribute its land toward parking facility construction, but leave the actual construction to a private or nonprofit developer.

Grants are generally awarded only to innovative projects or those serving special groups, such as persons with disabilities or senior citizens.

Bonds are routinely used to finance parking facilities, spreading out the capital costs over 20 to 30 years. Bonds vary principally according to the method of paying debt service and securing the bonds. Major categories include:

Revenue bonds - These bonds will be a debt secured by parking system revenues.

Parking special assessment bonds would be a debt of a new parking district, secured by special assessments on benefiting property owners.

Redevelopment tax increment bonds are a debt of the Redevelopment Agency, secured by property tax increment, with any parking revenues or in-lieu fees available to fund debt service. These are only applicable in official redevelopment areas. Since the Downtown is not a redevelopment area, this type of financing is not currently applicable.

Certificates of Participation/Lease Revenue Bonds - These bond equivalents would be secured by the full faith and credit of the City’s General Fund. The City would legally issue Certificates of Participation, and a new parking district would be obligated through a lease or installment agreement to pay investors back.

Assessment districts are used to fund both parking facility development (property acquisition and construction) and operations/maintenance. For construction, property assessments typically pay off debt service on bonds.
Assessments are charged to property owners based on benefits received. The particular formula for determining the charges varies from district to district. Usually it includes such factors as: size of parcel or building area, private parking provided on-site, estimated deficiency (taking into account specific land use), and proximity to parking facility.

This has become much harder to implement under Prop. 218. Among key considerations, a registered engineer must identify specific and general benefits and assessment must only be for identified special benefits, with the City covering the general benefits. The district must be approved by property owners who would pay the larger share of the assessment. It is now possible for a valid assessment district to be annulled by a later vote of property owners.

A parking assessment district was used to fund provision of the City lots in Downtown. Assessments applied only to commercial properties and were based partly on parcel size.

**Housing Co-development** - Under one scenario, the City donates a municipal parking lot to a nonprofit housing association. The housing group gets grant and/or state funding to build housing and parking that it owns. In return for land, housing group leases parking to City very cheaply or makes it publicly available, with residents or their guests sharing parking.

---

**AMERICAN TIN CANNERY: PARKING METER INSTALLATION**

**Pros And Cons Of Meter Installation**

Parking meters are frequently installed in major commercial and tourist areas to promote turnover of the most convenient spaces, provide revenue, and assist in parking enforcement. However, merchants and customers often feel that parking meters are not only a cost factor and inconvenience, but they send a negative message to some prospective customers and visitors. The City of Pacific Grove has a General Plan policy discouraging parking meter installation, and they have not been used to date. There are a number of advantages and disadvantages of meters that are listed in Table 12-1.

Parking meters are being considered for the on-street parking near the American Tin Cannery (ATC) in Pacific Grove, in part because the City of Monterey already uses such meters within a half-block of the ATC.

**Conclusions**

The area within a block of the American Tin Cannery represents a unique location. There is a heavy demand during prime tourism periods for stays over 90 minutes and for multi-destination trips, including those who actually spend some or all of their time over the border in Monterey.
Parking meter installation in conjunction with extension of the maximum allowable parking stay (to three hours, or at least two hours) would provide incentives for turnover, while giving customers and visitors more choice. Currently, a family cannot realistically park, shop at the ATC, eat lunch, and take even a brief stroll on the Rec Trail within a 90-minute period.

The net revenues to the City also outweigh the potential disadvantages. The City of Pacific Grove should not “subsidize” parking by those actually spending most or all of their time in Monterey. Furthermore, the ambiance of the ATC area is not of a “friendly, small town” shopping district like Downtown Pacific Grove, but of a visitor-oriented area with major attractions.

RECOMMENDED DOWNTOWN PROGRAM

The recommended program to absorb significant growth downtown is a combination of measures:

1. Public parking at a garage on the Fountain/Laurel lot, ideally in conjunction with the senior housing project, but on its own if necessary.

2. A parking deck on the City lot at 16th/17th Street.

3. Changes in the zoning code to require all property developers, including commercial developers, to pay in-lieu fees, ideally supplemented by assessments on all property owners.

4. Parking pricing increases and trip reduction program.

5. Residential permit parking.

This program is predicated on meeting demand from new land uses downtown, particularly three assumed redevelopment projects: senior housing on the Fountain/Laurel parking lot, housing on the Holman Building parcel, and commercial uses on the 520 Lighthouse parcel across the street from the theater. Without these or equivalent projects, growth will likely be insufficient to justify a new parking structure. Since the initial preparation of this report, the likelihood of a senior housing project on the Fountain Avenue lot has diminished.

The Fountain/Laurel parking structure would add two subterranean levels under the entire existing municipal lot. About half of the lot would be retained for at-grade parking (with an option for two additional above grade levels). The other half of the lot closest to Laurel would be used for a 50-unit senior housing complex. This structure would add a net 110 to 190 spaces, at an estimated cost of $4.0 to 4.9 million.

The 16th/17th Street deck would add a net 80 spaces at an estimated cost of about $1 million.
Debt service on revenue bonds issued to pay for construction could be paid from three primary sources. The largest single source would be parking in-lieu fees charged to future developers. New parking assessment on all nearby commercial property owners would provide another share. The final share would come from user charges on those parking over two hours at the new parking facilities. In addition, it is assumed that the senior housing development would contribute at least $450,000 toward future parking for use of the lot and construction of 40 parking spaces, with reimbursement from state or nonprofit housing grants.

An alternative to forming new parking assessment districts would be to funnel net revenues from new parking meters near the American Tin Cannery to pay for new Downtown parking facilities. These meters are expected to generate roughly $150,000 annually. However, it would undoubtedly be debated whether ATC area meter revenues should go for parking in another commercial area.

This program would be evenly balanced between supply increases of about 190 to 270 spaces and parking management actions reducing the demand by about 200 parking spaces. This program would also tend to strike a balance between protecting the environment and the pedestrian-oriented quality of Downtown on the one hand and convenient motor vehicle access desired by most customers and visitors on the other hand.

This program would not preclude the provision of additional parking in Cannery Row or at the American Tin Cannery that could act (secondarily) as satellite parking. However, given the implementation difficulties and the potential for Downtown parking needs to take a back seat to local uses, it would not be prudent to rely on this option. However, this is an opportunity to provide parking that meets several needs: additional Cannery Row/Aquarium parking, additional ATC parking, and remote parking for Downtown Pacific Grove visitors. Furthermore, it should not preclude providing reserved, on-site parking for residential properties. (Residential development would have the option of actually providing parking on-site or paying in-lieu fees to support off-site parking.) However, the recommended program does discourage scattered parking facilities for small commercial developments.

**PHASING AND IMPLEMENTATION**

Since the pace of development appears relatively slow and the recommended program is based on growth to year 2010, it is not necessary to implement all measures within the next several years. In fact, it would be wise to reassess the pace of development after two to three years to determine if growth is headed toward the maximum forecast in this study. If so, the highest priorities should be for changes in the zoning code to ensure that in-lieu fees are collected from developers. Within the next several years, the Fountain/ Laurel senior housing/public parking project should be defined, along with pricing changes and trip reduction efforts. The Fountain/Laurel garage (or an equivalent project) can be constructed within the next five years.
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However, this is a relatively favorable time for bond financing, with interest rates low and not likely to dip much lower.

The 16th/17th Street deck (or an equivalent project) can likely be deferred for five to ten years. Changes in parking demand can be monitored annually or more often to determine the need.
Chapter 1
INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE
This parking study was commissioned by the City of Pacific Grove City Manager's Office to update and refine a 1984 parking study. This current study analyzes existing and future parking conditions Downtown, evaluates options for meeting future parking demand, and addresses parking management issues.

The study area is the Downtown commercial district, principally the former parking assessment district. (See Figure 1-1.) However, the study also addresses the pros and cons of installing parking meters for on-street parking near the American Tin Cannery.

The study was conducted by Wilbur Smith Associates (WSA), an international parking and transportation consulting firm. International Parking Design (IPD) provided limited conceptual design and cost estimating assistance. City staff assisted in providing data and direction.

The objectives of the parking study are:

1. To determine how much additional parking (both short-term and long-term) is needed to sustain a healthy downtown economy desired by the community.

2. To determine where additional parking should be located and how it should be provided: in parking structures, surface lots, or in satellite parking facilities connected by shuttle service.

3. To estimate costs and develop a basic financing plan for constructing additional parking.

4. To develop an implementation plan for meeting current and future parking needs.

5. To determine whether parking meters should be installed on-street near the American Tin Cannery, and if so, where and with what rates?

6. To address community concerns about parking issues, showing businesses and residents that the City of Pacific Grove is responsive to their concerns.

BACKGROUND
The 1984 parking study provided a useful analysis of conditions and several recommendations. While some of the findings in this study are generally valid, a great deal has changed in the past 13 years. The opening of the Monterey Bay Aquarium on October 20, 1984, the recent opening of the new outer wing of the Aquarium, and the American Tin Cannery outlet mall have all increased tourism in Cannery Row and Pacific Grove. Downtown Pacific Grove itself seems poised for
substantial growth, with the antique mall and bank recently opened in the Holman Building, the improvements to the Lighthouse movie theater, and a thriving restaurant and retail trade.

Reliance on 13-year-old data is inadvisable. Therefore, extensive new surveys were conducted. However, the 1984 study still provides a valuable foundation.

Findings in the 1984 study are summarized in Table 1-1. Perhaps most importantly, it recommended a three-phase program of improvements, with minor surface parking expansions in Phase I and two new parking structures in the latter phases, which have not been built.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUMMARY OF 1984 DOWNTOWN PARKING STUDY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>TOTAL PARKING SUPPLY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>PARKING SUPPLY BY TYPE OF SPACE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>PEAK PARKING OCCUPANCY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>AREAS WITH HIGHEST PARKING OCCUPANCY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central/South Zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>LARGEST FUTURE PUBLIC PARKING SUPPLY SHORTAGES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zone B</strong> (bounded roughly by Lighthouse, Central, 15th, and 17th Streets) would need 280 additional spaces at buildout to maintain 85% occupancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zone A</strong> (bounded roughly by 17th, Cypress, Central, and Short Street) would require 280 new spaces to maintain 85% occupancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This current study updates and refines the 1984 study in a number of key ways:
Legend:
- Parking District
- 1984 Study Area
- Possible Sites For Parking Structures
- Zone Of Highest Parking Occupancy in 1984 (77%)
- Lots with 100+ Parking Spaces
- Natural History Museum
- Holman Building
- City Hall

*NOTE: Figure only shows selected parking structure sites.

PACIFIC GROVE BUSINESS DISTRICT STUDY AREA AND PARKING STRUCTURE SITES

BASEMAP-3/16/98
1. New observations on parking occupancy rates are included.
2. Future conditions are forecast based on more current growth assumptions.
3. Options for improving the supply/demand balance are explicitly compared in an evaluation matrix.
4. This study addresses several issues that were not mentioned in the 1984 study:
   - satellite parking facilities;
   - residential permit parking; and
   - installation of meters near the American Tin Cannery.

CITY POLICY STATEMENTS ON PARKING

This section highlights major policy statements in the General Plan and the Economic Revitalization Strategic Plan.

General Plan Policies

The General Plan includes the following key policies and program statements on parking and transportation. Underlying both documents is the realization that parking is very important to the local economy. For example, Pacific Grove’s parking convenience must be looked at in comparison with potential competitors for tourism dollars.

Program O. Limit growth in vehicle miles traveled to about 4.5 percent between 1994 and 2005, particularly by discouraging employees and residents from driving alone.

Program P. Support the TAMC Congestion Management Program to encourage developers and major employers to prepare trip reduction plans.

Program Q. Develop a trip reduction program for City employees.

Program T. Encourage and facilitate formation of one or more Transportation Management Associations (joint public-private organizations that encourage use of alternatives to solo driving) in areas such as Downtown...

Program U. Support the use of parking management strategies as part of employee trip reduction programs, including voluntary establishment of parking fees for private parking provided by employers.

Policy 9. Encourage visitor use of public transit, private tour buses, bicycling, or walking.

Policy 11. With the exception of properties in the former Downtown Parking District, require new development to provide adequate off-street parking.
Policy 12. Consider establishing new parking districts in the Downtown and Central-Eardley commercial areas.

Policy 15. Develop a specific circulation plan for the Downtown that addresses parking, among other things.

Policy 16. Promote the efficient use of available public parking facilities.

Policy 17. Consider constructing an additional public parking facility Downtown.


Policy 19. If future growth in traffic volumes requires removing on-street parking places to provide additional traffic lanes, ensure that the spaces are replaced with an equal number of off-street spaces in the same vicinity, when feasible.

Program Z. Implement and maintain public parking control measures, such as time limits and other controls, as necessary. The City discourages the use of parking meters.

Policy 20. Support re-establishing the Del Monte Express train between Monterey and San Francisco.

Policy 21. Work to assure that Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST) bus service responds to local needs.

Policy 25. Create and maintain a safe and convenient system of pedestrian and bicycle pathways throughout the city.

Policy 30. Require bicycle parking facilities at all new major public facilities, business and employment sites, shopping centers, and popular visitor destinations.

Program MM. Encourage existing business to supply bicycle parking facilities...

Program NN. Provide bike racks for visitors and bike lockers for employees at City Hall, the Community Center, and other City facilities.
The Economic Revitalization Plan policies are listed in Table 1-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUMMARY OF ECONOMIC REVITALIZATION STRATEGIC PLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. OBJECTIVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Business Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Business Attraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Business Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Beautification and Public Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Parking and Traffic Improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. PARKING RECOMMENDATIONS

- Update existing parking studies to determine how well the current parking supply meets current and future demand.
- Evaluate possible parking supply increases, including parking structures, lots, satellite parking facilities. Public/private partnerships and financial alternatives need to be considered.
- ID satellite parking locations, establish shuttle service between satellite lot(s) and downtown.
- When satellite parking is available, reduce or eliminate business parking permits on City lots within the downtown district.
- Review parking needs and solutions for other business districts.

3. PEDESTRIANS & TRANSPORTATION - Selected recommendations

- Improve pedestrian access to the downtown area and other business districts, by providing street furniture, restrooms, appropriate development standards, and convenient parking opportunities.
- Repair and improve walkways on Forest Avenue between Lovers’ Point and Downtown.
- Explore creative methods of intra-City public transportation to include shuttle service and access to satellite parking areas (e.g., Asilomar shuttle service to the downtown and other business districts).
- Expand the WAVE to provide shuttle service between the Asilomar Conference Center and the downtown district.

FORMAT

This report is divided into several main sections. Part I presents background data and analysis. These background chapters describe the study procedures, existing parking supply and occupancy levels, supply/demand balance, turnover/duration patterns—both for Downtown and for the American Tin Cannery and the immediately surrounding areas. The background section continues with a summary of interviews with Downtown “local experts” and forecasts of the future parking supply/demand balance.
Part II presents findings and conclusions. This includes a broad evaluation of options for balancing supply and demand and then a more detailed evaluation of parking structure alternatives. A conceptual plan for funding new parking facilities follows. The body of the report concludes with analysis and recommendations regarding a comprehensive Downtown parking program and for parking meters near the American Tin Cannery.

The Appendix includes detailed results of the parking occupancy survey and land use forecasts.
Chapter 2  
METHODOLOGY

SURVEY PROCEDURES
Although parking supply inventory summaries and counts were available from the 1984 Barton-Aschman study, these were considered too outdated to be useful except as historical background. Therefore, the following counts were conducted:

- parking supply inventory of downtown and American Tin Cannery areas, classifying every parking space by type and time/user restriction;
- parking occupancy counts, weekday and weekend midday;
- "windshield" parking occupancy estimates, including detailed supplementary estimates during a Hambrookes auction; and
- parking turnover/duration, weekday and weekend midday.

The inventory and counts were conducted by experienced WSA staff during April 1997. As confirmed by the Chamber of Commerce, no major events occurred during survey periods that would bias results.

SEASONAL AND DAILY PATTERNS
Since the project started in April, and occupancy counts needed to be scheduled during Spring, it was necessary to make seasonal adjustments. Based on sales tax and transient occupancy tax patterns by month, the parking demand estimate was increased 15% to approximate a summer peak demand. (See Figure 2-1.)

SUPPLY/DEMAND MODEL
WSA has developed a spreadsheet supply/demand model that estimates future parking demand on a block-by-block basis. It is customized for each study area. Typically this demand estimate is compared to two or more supply scenarios to identify future deficits or surpluses. The model bases demand estimates on national rates of parking needed per square foot or dwelling unit for different uses. These demand rates are then adjusted to match observed local patterns, then multiplied by assumed future land uses.

To be used this way, the model requires certain inputs. Some of these were supplied by the City but two key items were not available: existing land uses (building area by block and type of use) and detailed assumptions about the future land use types. Parcel (land) areas were available. Using a floor area ratio of 1.8, building area was estimated for each of five zones. However, it is not appropriate to use such crude estimates for block-by-block demand estimates. The City also provided a list of underutilized or vacant parcels likely to be developed for additional commercial
provided a list of underutilized or vacant parcels likely to be developed for additional commercial uses, along with similar assumptions about new housing units. Since there are major differences in parking demand rates among different types of commercial development (such as restaurants versus offices), this is another reason why it is not possible to estimate future parking needs precisely.

Supply/demand estimates take into account such factors as changes in land uses and parking, decreased building vacancy rates and increasing popularity of downtown Pacific Grove.

INTERVIEWS
In-person or telephone discussions were held with the following individuals:
- Mike Huse, City Manager;
- Tony Lobay, Community Development Director;
- Judy McClelland, Chief Planner;
- Jon Reither, Police Chief;
- Dennis Boehje, Housing Analyst;
- Don Gasperson, Traffic Commission;
- Skip Amos, Resident;
- Moe Ammar, Chamber of Commerce President;
- Jan Henson, General Manager of American Tin Cannery;
- Patricia Collin-Smith, Resident;
- George Grayson, Resident;
- Beau Finklang, Groves/Homescape Owner; and
- Nader Agha, Holman Building Owner.

In addition, WSA staff met the Economic Advisory Committee at the beginning of this project. Discussions were also held with outside specialists in parking finance.

FINANCIAL ANALYSIS
Costs and potential funding sources for a new downtown parking structure are estimated. Revenues based on permit and possible transient fees were estimated, based on the demand estimates referred to earlier.

Financing and development costs were estimated, based on recent project experience and discussions with finance specialists. A simplified forecast of income and expenses was prepared. Innovative financing techniques, especially related to a joint senior housing/public parking
PARKING MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

Management and operations techniques to improve parking efficiency are reviewed. These include residential permit parking, installation of parking meters at the American Tin Cannery, employee parking and trip reduction efforts. This is based on other WSA project experience and background research.
Chapter 3
DOWNTOWN: EXISTING PARKING SUPPLY AND OCCUPANCY LEVELS

EXISTING PARKING SUPPLY AND TIME LIMITS

Most parking in downtown Pacific Grove is in on-street (curbside) spaces, indicative of a relatively limited parking supply. Off-street parking, providing about 41% of the parking supply, is primarily concentrated near the center of downtown, roughly between 17th and 15th Streets.

As shown in Table 3-1, of a total of about 1,453 downtown parking spaces, 59% are in on-street parking, 23% in lots open to the public, and the remaining 18% in private lots. This is a high proportion of parking open to the public compared to many larger downtowns with substantial office development.

Most of the off-street parking in public lots is limited to two hours, but about a quarter of this parking is apparently unrestricted or has 24-hour limits. Most on-street spaces are limited to two hours or less, but a substantial proportion (28%) of this parking is not restricted.

All of the public lot parking is located in the three central zones of the five study zones, that is in the area roughly bounded by 17th and 15th Streets, Central and Pine Avenues.

OCCUPANCY LEVELS BY TIME PERIOD

Parking occupancy counts were conducted between 11 AM and 3 PM on Wednesday, April 9, and Saturday, April 19. Wednesday occupancy levels were slightly higher, but overall occupancy levels were well below capacity in most locations both days. (Results are shown in Table 3-2 and illustrated in Figure 3-1.)

The Wednesday peak hour was between 1 PM and 2 PM. At this time, 66% of all the parking spaces were occupied. However, there was little variance during the Wednesday midday period. On-street parking, for example, varied only between 60% and 66% for this four-hour period. The Saturday peak hour was between 2 PM and 3 PM. On Saturday, there was minimal variation by time of day.

(These are raw occupancy counts. Adjusting for seasonal variations yields an estimated 77% peak occupancy rate for all parking during a typical summer peak.)
## Table 3-1

### PARKING SUPPLY

#### DOWNTOWN AREA PARKING SUPPLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Public Lots</th>
<th>Private Lots</th>
<th>On-Street Spaces</th>
<th>Area Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Unlim/24 Hr</td>
<td>2 Hr</td>
<td>Under 2 Hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area A-E</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### AMERICAN TIN CANNERY AREA PARKING SUPPLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATC Lot</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>On Street</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>157</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>126</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>157</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Zone</td>
<td>Off-Street Lots - Spring</td>
<td>On-Street - Spring</td>
<td>Total - Spring</td>
<td>Total - Summer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Spaces</td>
<td>1:00 PM Occupied</td>
<td># of Spaces</td>
<td>1:00 PM Occupied</td>
<td># of Spaces</td>
<td>1:00 PM Occupied</td>
<td># of Spaces</td>
<td>1:00 PM Occupied</td>
<td># of Spaces</td>
<td>1:00 PM Occupied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Area Total</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC Area</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Spring (observed) occupancy rates increased 15% to approximate summer peak. "Surplus" represents vacant spaces, assuming 90% of supply represents "practical capacity." (Surplus shown is in addition to 10% margin of supply reserved for peak-of-the-peak demand.)
### Table 3-2B

**PARKING OCCUPANCY BY AREA - WEEKEND MIDDAY**

City of Pacific Grove, Peak Hour 2:00 PM

Survey Date: 4/19/97 Saturday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking Zone</th>
<th>Off-Street Lots - Spring</th>
<th>2:00 PM Occupied</th>
<th>On-Street - Spring</th>
<th>Total - Spring</th>
<th>Total - Summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Spaces</td>
<td>2:00 PM Accum</td>
<td>Percent Occupied</td>
<td># of Spaces</td>
<td>2:00 PM Accum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Area Total</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ATC Area | 148  | 146  | 99% | 157  | 145  | 92% | 305  | 291  | 95% | 100.0% | -31 |

**Note:** Spring (observed) occupancy rates increased 15% to approximate summer peak. “Surplus” represents vacant spaces, assuming 90% of supply represents “practical capacity.” (Surplus shown is in addition to 10% margin of supply reserved for peak-of-the-demand.)
OCCUPANCY LEVELS BY LOCATION

Occupancy levels varied slightly by parking study zone. During the weekday peak, the highest occupancy rate (71% in spring, estimated 82% in summer) was observed in Zone C. This is bounded roughly by 17th and Forest Avenue, south of Lighthouse Avenue. The lowest occupancy rate (61% in spring, estimated 70% in summer) was observed in zone E, the area east of 15th Street, although as noted below, this changes dramatically during special events.

Saturday occupancy levels tended to vary more than during the weekday. The peak weekend area was Zone A (72% in spring, estimated 83% in summer). The lowest occupancies during Saturday were also observed in zone E.

Within zones, occupancy levels also tended to be fairly stable. No block was found to have an occupancy rate over 90% during Spring counts.

OCCUPANCY LEVELS BY FACILITY TYPE

On-street parking was used to a greater degree than off-street on Saturday, but the opposite was true on weekdays. During the Saturday peak hour, off-street parking was 53% occupied, compared to 65% occupancy for on-street parking. During weekdays, 71% of off-street parking was occupied, compared to 64% of on-street parking.

OCCUPANCY LEVELS FOR SPECIAL EVENTS

Parking occupancy patterns are dramatically affected by special events. The special events that have recently attracted the most attention were held at the east end of the downtown study area.

WSA performed a limited "windshield survey" on Saturday, June 7, during a Hambrook's auction. Occupancy rates within about two blocks of the auction house were estimated. Virtually all of the parking in this area is on-street (curbside) parking. At 1 PM, on 13 of 20 block faces with parking permitted, all spaces were occupied. All remaining block faces were at 70 to 95% occupancy. The estimated on-street parking occupancy percentage was between 90% and 95%, over "practical capacity." At the 46-space private lot on 14th Street between Central Avenue and Ricketts Row, only 30% of spaces were occupied.

It should be noted that the impacts of a special event are heavily dependent on the particular characteristics of the event. The impacts may be mitigated by valet parking or other special programs.
NOTE: Seasonally adjusted to summer occupancy.
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DOWNTOWN: EXISTING PARKING SUPPLY/DEMAND BALANCE

TYPES OF PARKING GENERATORS

Based on data provided by the Community Development Department, there is an estimated 1.1 million square feet of existing non-residential building floor area within the downtown study zone and about 60 dwelling units. The building area is equivalent to two to three high-rise office buildings. These are fairly evenly distributed among the five study zones, with the sole exception that Zone E has only an estimated 106,000 square feet. (Zone E is the area east of 15th Street.)

The predominant land use in each zone is retail, with the exception of Zone E, which includes a substantial amount of residential uses and church property. Each zone, except Zone B, has a substantial amount of office space (estimated 7,000 to 15,000 square feet in each).

There is a substantial amount of public or non-commercial use, particularly governmental buildings (City Hall and related) in Zone C, and the Natural History Museum in Zone B.

EXISTING SURPLUSES

When occupancy levels exceed 90%, drivers are tempted to trawl for parking spaces or park illegally. Accordingly, 90% occupancy is considered “practical capacity.” The “effective parking supply” therefore represents 90% of the total parking supply. Any parking unused from this effective parking supply is considered surplus parking. The level of parking accumulation over 90% occupancy is a “deficit.” Each zone has a small to moderate surplus of parking, based on the adjusted weekday peak pattern. The largest surplus is in Zone B (59 spaces) and the smallest in Zone C (26).
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DOWNTOWN: EXISTING TURNOVER/DURATION PATTERNS

DURATION/TURNOVER PATTERNS BY DAY OF WEEK

“Turnover” is the number of new vehicles per parking stall during a given time period, here over a five-hour midday period. Often, it is expressed as an hourly rate. “Average duration” is the average length of time each vehicle parks. They are closely related, but turnover takes into account parking spaces that remain vacant throughout the survey period, whereas average duration ignores parking spaces that remain completely vacant throughout the survey period.

A representative sample of parking spaces was checked over a four-hour period, both weekday and weekend. Adjustments were made so that the listed duration figures are estimates for the entire day.

For off-street parking, weekday average duration was slightly longer than weekend. (See Table 5-1.) For a sample of 24-hour spaces in the Fountain Avenue lot, for example, the weekday duration averaged over 5.5 hours, while the weekend duration averaged 4.4 hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TURNOVER/DURATION SURVEY - DOWNTOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Area Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Hour Turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Duration (Hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Area Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Hour Turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Duration (Hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Area Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Hour Turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Duration (Hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/G/Blue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turnover rates were quite similar weekend and weekday. For on-street parking, turnover was slightly faster during the weekend.
DURATION AND TURNOVER BY POSTED TIME LIMITS

As expected, there were clear differences in the duration and turnover among parking facilities with different posted time limits. For example, for weekdays, the average duration for a 24-hour limit spaces was over 5.5 hours, while it was 3.2 hours for a two-hour space and 1.3 hours for a one-hour space.

There was less of a range on-street, varying from 3.9 hours for unlimited/24 hour limit spaces to 1.7 hours for two-hour spaces and 1.6 for 90-minute spaces.

INAPPROPRIATE DURATION

The above figures imply a significant level of violations of time limits. Detailed analysis of turnover/duration counts confirms this. Of 159 weekday vehicles parking in two-hour spaces off-street, 42% definitely stayed over the limit. Of 145 vehicles parking in 90-minute on-street spaces, 19% stayed longer. Of 63 vehicles parking in two-hour on-street spaces, 21% overstayed. The actual percentages are likely higher.
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AMERICAN TIN CANNERY: EXISTING TURNOVER/DURATION

DURATION/TURNOVER PATTERNS BY DAY OF WEEK

Turnover and duration patterns at the American Tin Cannery were fairly similar both weekday and Saturday. However, weekend turnover was significantly greater on the weekend, both in the ATC customer lot and in 90-minute spaces on-street. (Definitions of terms are provided at the beginning of Chapter 5.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weekend Saturday 4/19/97</th>
<th>Weekday Wednesday 4/9/97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spaces</td>
<td>5-Hour Turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC Lot</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 min.</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlimited</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 hr. meter</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DURATION AND TURNOVER BY FACILITY TYPE

The average duration in the customer lot was 2.4 hours, both weekday and weekend. For the 90-minute on-street parking, the average duration was 1.3 hours. For the 12-hour meters over the city boundary in Monterey (a sample of 11 meters), the average duration of 2.8 hours suggests that most parkers are probably visiting the Aquarium/Cannery Row or ATC, but not both.

INAPPROPRIATE DURATION

Based on a detailed review of the 90-minute spaces, the vast majority of parkers on-street near the ATC are observing posted limits, with 14% staying long on the weekday and 17% overstaying on the weekend.
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INTERVIEWS WITH DOWNTOWN "LOCAL EXPERTS"

OVERVIEW
Interviews were held with City staff, business representatives, property owners, and interested citizens. The full list of interviewees was presented in Chapter 2. The following are highlights of each interview.

There was general agreement that the existing parking supply is barely sufficient at most times and in most locations. However, special events at the Grove/Homescapes and Hambrooke’s lead to temporary shortages on occasion.

The strongest concerns were expressed by several residents about spillover parking from these businesses, both for special events and, to a lesser degree, from routine operations. Residents indicated support for residential permit parking in this area (on 12th and 13th Streets). Some support was also mentioned for converting 12th Street to northbound one-way (which was rejected by the Traffic Commission).

Business people and residents foresaw increasing need for parking, even with the slow to moderate growth generally predicted. There was no agreement on where additional parking should be provided. The possible sites mentioned included the Fountain Avenue municipal lot, the Holman block, and satellite parking near the Monterey/Pacific Grove border.

The following are key comments of interviewees, listed by affiliation and topic.

BUSINESS/PROPERTY OWNERS
1. Parking Conditions and Problems
1-A Believes there are numerous inefficiencies in public parking allocation:
   - All on-street parking should have T-bar striping to discourage inefficient parking (taking up two unstriped spaces by parking in the middle)
   - Too much “no parking” space (e.g., Natural History Museum bus zone)
   - Too much handicapped parking
   - Don’t reserve parking in Lot 4
   - Use City Hall lots for public parking on weekend

1-B Monthly fees very low.

1-C Residential permit parking fine in true residential zone. However, some residents complain about employee parking actually in a commercial zone, and some residents have mistaken idea
that it is a purely residential zone. Problem is too little off-street residential parking and residents who don’t want to use parking that’s available.

1-D As a condition of approval, Grove/Homescape agreed not to oppose implementation of a parking assessment district, in which they would be billed to support additional parking.

1-E Grove/Homescapes has had six functions so far, two served by valet, using parking at the Fountain Ave. municipal lot (behind theater), three bused in from Pebble Beach hotel, and one walk-in event. Wants to have up to 500-700 attendees in future. [Note: approved for approximately 300, per Uniform Building Code, subject to six-month trial.]

1-F Grove/Homescapes encourages employees to park in municipal Fountain Avenue lot (behind theater). Customers like to park on Lighthouse Avenue.

1-G Doesn’t perceive significant existing parking shortage, but one is developing.

1-H Commercial owners need more parking and can afford to build it.

2. Future Growth
2-A Thinks growth will be relatively slow downtown (about 10% in 10 years).
2-B Holman Building patronage may increase significantly

3. Proposed Solutions
3-A Consider three options for long-term parking solution:

    a) Tear down 17,000 GSF building on Central Ave. next to Holman lot and build garage with 3 to 5 levels of parking on Holman lot with access on Central Ave.

    b) City buys two parking lots from Nader Agha or swaps the Fountain Avenue land for these lots. Then Nader can build senior housing and parking on the Fountain Ave. lot. For example, ground floor split between commercial and parking, two parking levels, then senior housing on top.

    c) Both a and b together.

3-B Parking district served well for 25 years. A new parking district could build a parking garage and buy private lots to operate as shared public facilities.

3-C Explore satellite parking structure near Aquarium (at or near Carrow’s).

3-D Thinks business people would support assessment district funding for new parking structure if City “shared” costs, e.g., by obtaining grant.
RESIDENTS

1. Parking Conditions and Problems
1-A Residential permit parking is inconvenient for guests, e.g., if each household only has one guest pass.

1-B Doesn’t believe feasible to increase parking significantly on-street. Handicapped parking is minimal, considering the high proportion of elderly.

1-C Problem of employees/merchants parking in front of stores very old.

1-D Residents frequently park 2-3 blocks away from home due primarily to employees of Grove/Homescapes parking on-street. However, customers have also parked in private driveways.

1-E Concerned about past and potential damage to residents’ vehicles due to narrow streets and commercial traffic.

1-F 12th/13th Street near Lighthouse should be rezoned to residential with residential permit parking.

1-G Support for residential permit parking heaviest on 13th St., less on 12th St.

1-H Noted that Grove/Homescapes has received Council use permit for special events with attendance up to “300-plus” people and that the facility had advertised earlier capacity for 540 people. Residents and Pasta Mia concerned.

1-I Personally in favor of residential permit parking and believes a majority (though not overwhelming majority) of neighbors also favor.

1-J Has heard of one neighbor concerned about church parking on Ricketts Row.

1-K Residents frequently walk 1 to 1.5 blocks to park near home, while visitors have taken up parking on their block. Volatile situation.

2. Future Growth

Residents did not express opinions on future growth.
3. Proposed Solutions
3-A Suggests more 20-minute zones, preferable to loading zones. Increase turnover. Use compact size curbside stalls.

3-B Personally supports turning 12th Street into one-way. Concerned about Grove truck parking.

3-B Supports either residential permit parking or adding one-way streets toward Lighthouse to discourage parking on it. Thinks residents above Lighthouse are split on support of residential permit parking and cost would be a factor. Businesses should pay ideally.

CITY STAFF

1. Parking Conditions and Problems
1-A Need to address residential spillover near 12th and 13th Street

1-B Residential permit parking will probably spread across Eardley, to Evans. Better to do it at once not piecemeal.

1-C Parking is at a premium now.

1-D Lighthouse Avenue median parking contributes to significant level of accidents, but customers and merchants love it.

2. Future Growth
The Community Development Department provided detailed forecasts of development. Only one significant pending project was identified: the senior housing project.

3. Proposed Solutions
3-A Probably could use split level access for Fountain Avenue deck to minimize number of ramps.
Chapter 8  
DOWNTOWN: FUTURE PARKING SUPPLY/DEMAND BALANCE

Changes in the supply/demand balance will be due primarily to several factors:

- new land uses;
- changes in building vacancy rate;
- changes in the parking supply (including parking "built over" for new land uses);
- changes in public transit service;
- attractiveness of downtown to visitors; and
- changes in transportation technology.

The forecasts of growth in parking demand are heavily dependent on three fairly large redevelopment projects: (1) senior housing on the Fountain Avenue parking lot, (2) apartments on the Holman Building parcel, and (3) commercial uses on the 520 Lighthouse parcel across from the movie theater. If these projects are delayed or do not occur, the growth in parking demand would be minimal and probably not sufficient to justify any kind of parking structure. Since this report was initially prepared, one of these projects (senior housing on the Fountain Avenue parking lot) appears less likely, partly because the Chamber of Commerce has endorsed another location outside of downtown.

LAND USE ASSUMPTIONS

The Community Development Department provided forecasts of future growth in downtown Pacific Grove by year 2010. These suggest a relatively low rate of growth, compared to many other communities in California. This is because downtown Pacific Grove is largely "built out."

The forecast increase in commercial floor area is 84,630 square feet. (This represents an increase of only about 8% from the existing.) Some 67 dwelling units in two new multi-family buildings are assumed, plus 25 residential units from gradual development of units on the second story above commercial properties. (The residential increase would represent more than a doubling from existing 60 units.)

New development would be concentrated particularly in parking study Zone B, which would host more than half of the new commercial square footage and about a third of the new dwelling units. This zone in the north central portion of downtown containing the Holman Building is roughly bounded by 17th, 15th Streets, Lighthouse and Central Avenues. However, the absolute amount of new square footage in any one zone is fairly small. Even in Zone B, the additional square footage
is equivalent to only two to three floors of a single Downtown San Francisco high-rise office building and this is growth over a period of 13 years.

Vacancy rates are expected to gradually decrease. As building space fills up, the parking demand increases, usually without an increase in the parking supply. This is taken into account in the later parking supply/demand forecasts.

TRANSPORTATION AND OTHER FACTORS INFLUENCING DEMAND

The level of auto ownership, parking pricing, and the availability of alternative modes influence parking demand. Auto ownership is not expected to change substantially by year 2010 as auto ownership is nearing its practical maximum. Public parking is currently free or very inexpensive in Pacific Grove. For example, annual permits to park in Lot 4 are only $10 per month, which does not even cover typical operating and maintenance costs. This is to some extent a policy decision. Parking in the commercial and visitor areas of Monterey, by contrast, is significantly more expensive. The monthly parking rates in municipal facilities range from $30 to $50 per month. Hourly parking at the Cannery Row 1 garage is $1 per hour to a maximum of $8, while the meters are 75 cents per hour.

The primary potentials for increased use of alternative modes include: passenger rail service to Monterey or Seaside from the San Francisco Bay Area (and possibly Santa Cruz) and additional shuttle bus service. The Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) is intensively investigating potential passenger rail service between San Francisco Bay Area and Monterey County. Several different scenarios have been considered for intercity, recreational travel service. Several Monterey station sites are being considered, including Fisherman’s Wharf. Such service holds the potential for bringing more visitors to the Monterey Peninsula without a car who would not need to park.

Downtown Pacific Grove and the Asilomar Conference Center are now served by the WAVE shuttle bus that runs between downtown Monterey, Del Monte Center, and Cannery Row. Service is only scheduled during summer and peak visitor periods, running every 30 minutes. Buses run in a loop along Ocean Park out to Asilomar and inbound on Sunset and Lighthouse Avenue. This is not very convenient for Downtown customers. If new passenger rail service were implemented, shuttle service would probably also increase. Proposals for shuttle service between Asilomar conference center and downtown Pacific Grove have also been made.

While these improvements would tend to hold down growth in parking demand, their influence is expected to be fairly limited. Because there is a significant question of whether they will ever be implemented, no passenger rail or additional shuttle service is assumed.
OVERALL FUTURE SUPPLY/DEMAND BALANCE

The supply/demand balance was forecast for year 2010, taking into account the expected new construction, decreased building vacancy rates, and increased business patronage. Loss of parking due to construction was also assessed.

“No Additional Parking” Scenario - For a weekday summer afternoon, a substantial deficiency is forecast if additional parking is not provided. (This scenario is purely for analysis purposes as it is likely some parking would actually be built.) An additional 395 parking spaces would be needed to keep parking occupancy rates under 90% (practical capacity).

During special events in the east end of downtown, the estimated additional parking needed jumps to 515 spaces. This may be covered entirely by valet parking or other special programs.

While this is a substantial amount of additional parking, equivalent to a medium-size parking structure, it represents only a moderate increase on an annual basis. The “routine” weekday summer afternoon need represents only about 30 spaces additional per year. Divided among the five study zones, it is equivalent to only six additional spaces per year per zone. It also represents only about a 27% increase over the existing supply.

The “special event” need represents only about 40 spaces additional per year. Divided among the five study zones, it is equivalent to only eight additional spaces per year per zone. It also represents only about a 35% increase over the existing supply.

Additional Residential Parking Supply Scenario - For purposes of analysis, the above forecasts assume no additional parking would be provided. In fact, it is very likely some additional parking would be provided. The zoning code requires additional parking for new residential uses. It technically requires additional parking for professional offices Downtown, but the General Plan appears to support a variance or waiver. Furthermore, market forces and lending institutions strongly support parking, and would make it difficult to build some projects without parking. For example, if the Fountain Avenue lot were used for senior housing or other development, additional parking to serve both residents and the general public is likely.

The City has no requirement for additional parking for commercial properties, beyond the professional offices. Rather than requiring private property owners in Downtown to build numerous small parking lots, the City decided in 1964 to fund the purchase and development of City parking lots through a commercial parking assessment district.

Assuming that new senior housing would actually provide its own parking for residents (40 spaces) and that new apartment units in a stand-alone development would also have an average of 1.8 spaces per unit, this would represent an increase of 89 spaces. This would not make a major difference in the supply/demand balance. A deficiency of 306 spaces (426 spaces during special events) is still forecast. Moreover, the additional residential parking would likely be dedicated to residents and therefore would not improve the parking situation for commercial employees and customers.
PARKING SUPPLY/DEMAND BALANCE BY LOCATION

The expected change in the supply/demand balance by zone is illustrated in Figure 8-1, assuming (for analysis purposes) no additional parking is provided.

The biggest forecast deficiencies are for the north central Zone B (near the Holman Building) and the south central Zone D (near the Fountain Avenue parking lot). The deficiency in Zone D is due largely to the expected loss of the Fountain Avenue parking lot to senior housing or other development project.

While the eastern Zone E is forecast to have a small surplus on a routine basis, it is forecast to have a substantial deficiency (90 spaces) if special events are held in this zone. The two remaining Zones A and C, are expected to have small deficiencies.
DOWNTOWN PACIFIC GROVE PARKING STUDY

Parking Study Zone

ROUTINE
+26
<-.52>
<-.26>

Existing Surplus

Net Change in Surplus
from 1997 to 2010

Forecast Future Surplus or Deficit, 2010

ROUTINE
+36
<-.64>
<-.182>

ROUTINE
+36
<-.225>
<-.189>

ROUTINE
+40
<-.10>
<-.130>

ROUTINE
+40
<+.30>
<-.90>

SPECIAL EVENT

(1) Surplus equals number of vacant spaces during summer weekday afternoon that could be filled and still stay under 90% occupancy (practical capacity).

(2) Parking demand increase based on forecast new construction (from Pacific Grove Community Development) and increased building occupancy and business patronage. Also takes into account loss of existing parking due to construction.

SPECIAL EVENTS at Grove Homescapes or Hambrookes assumed to draw 300 people/2.5 per vehicle.

Figure 8-1
PARKING SUPPLY/DEMAND BALANCE

Wilbur Smith Associates
PART TWO
FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS
Chapter 9
DOWNTOWN: ALTERNATIVES FOR BALANCING FUTURE SUPPLY AND DEMAND

OPTIONS FOR BALANCING SUPPLY AND DEMAND

The options for balancing supply and demand can be categorized as:

1. New parking facilities in Downtown
2. Satellite parking outside Downtown
3. Management, regulatory, and restriping

Option 1. New Downtown Parking Facilities - The possibilities for new Downtown parking facilities include: new parking surface lot(s), building a single level (deck) over an existing lot, or building a multi-level parking structure.

Building additional surface parking lot(s) is usually financially feasible only in districts in which (1) there are undeveloped lots or low-value, rundown properties of sufficient size; and also (2) property values are relatively low. No convenient lots were identified that are not already being used for parking. Furthermore, property values are now too high to suggest that additional surface parking is cost-effective. Therefore, this option can be eliminated.

Parking decks (one level above grade) are typically cheaper per space than multi-level structures. This is primarily because structural strength requirements are less, elevators are not needed, and mechanical ventilation is not needed. Of course, parking decks add usually a relatively small amount of parking, typically 80 to 150 spaces if built over existing parking lots.

Multi-level parking structures have the advantage of minimizing the amount of land required per parking space and providing the greatest number of new spaces. They also tend to be visually prominent and easy to find. However, potential disadvantages include higher capital and operating costs, concentration of parking in one location, and sometimes greater environmental impacts.

Option 2. Satellite (Remote) Parking - This option would provide shuttle bus service from either an existing, underutilized parking lot or a new parking facility. The WAVE shuttle already provides this type of service. The WAVE serves the Custom House garages in downtown Monterey and Del Monte Shopping Center that generally have vacant parking, connecting them with the Aquarium, Cannery Row, and downtown Pacific Grove.

The City of Monterey Planning Commission is now addressing the issue of parking availability in the Cannery Row and New Monterey areas, including possible satellite parking, such as at Fort Ord.
Four potential sites for satellite parking include: (1) existing parking at Lovers Point, (2) a new parking facility near the Monterey/Pacific Grove border (on the Monterey municipal lot 7 near the intersection of Foam and David), (3) a new parking structure on the existing, privately owned American Tin Cannery site, (4) existing parking at underutilized Fort Ord sites, or (5) existing parking at Asilomar. Among the key criteria for successful satellite parking facilities are the following: (1) parking deficiency in the target area that makes it difficult to find parking, (2) a location either close to the desired destination (within a mile) or in an “intercept” location on a major route to the destination, (3) sufficient, easily accessed parking at the satellite facility, (4) sufficient demand to justify frequent shuttle service, (5) convenient, well-marketed shuttle service, and (6) guaranteed parking availability during peak visitor periods.

These criteria would tend to rule out all except new parking near the Pacific Grove/Monterey border. Parking at Lover’s Point is too limited to be attractive. Parking at Fort Ord is too distant to be attractive to most visitors or employees, and shuttle service would be highly expensive. (Shuttle service is successfully provided for special events such as the AT&T golf tournament.) Asilomar is not visible or accessible to most visitors and is not on an “intercept” route for customers or employees.

The Foam/David Cannery Row Lot 7 site is approximately 0.8 miles from Downtown, is on a major intercept route, is convenient to the current WAVE route, and has the potential for cost sharing between the Cities of Pacific Grove and Monterey. As a municipal parking lot in a city now impacted by parking, it is a prime location. However, the complexities of cost sharing may make implementation difficult. Furthermore, the City of Monterey has considered constructing a deck or structure on this site (consistent with its General Plan policy), but has deferred that based on desire to limit traffic in Cannery Row in favor of using the Del Monte Center parking lot for remote parking served by the WAVE. Also, there are four private parcels that would need to be acquired.¹

The American Tin Cannery lot is close to Lot 7 and shares many of the advantages. As private property, property acquisition or lease arrangements could make implementation extremely difficult. However, American Tin Cannery management indicated support for a parking structure, so long as costs were shared.²

**Option 3. Management, Regulatory & Restriping Actions** - There are numerous parking and transportation management actions that can be taken to improve the future supply/demand balance on the margins. None of these are expected to have a dramatic impact. However, it would be feasible and desirable for some of these programs to be implemented to provide about half of the forecast 395 to 520 space deficiency, with the remainder provided by one to two new parking structures.

---

¹ Jo Lyons, Parking Manager, City of Monterey, telephone discussion. July 24, 1997.
² Jan Henson, General Manager, American Tin Cannery, telephone discussion, September 9, 1997.
These parking and transportation management actions include:

- Parking Restriping
- Changes in the City's Zoning Parking Supply Standards
- Changes in Parking User/Time Restrictions
- Enhanced Parking Enforcement
- Employee Parking Programs
- Parking Pricing Changes or Meter Installation
- Valet/Attendant Parking
- Trip Reduction Programs
- Residential Parking Permit Programs

Parking Restriping is not likely to provide sufficient additional parking to materially change the supply/demand balance. Spot checks by WSA did not indicate any widespread "waste" of parking space nor opportunity for significant increase in the parking supply. These checks included measuring on-street and off-street parking stalls at several locations as well as informal checks on extent of "no parking" and handicapped parking zones.

Changes in User/Time Restrictions - Time restrictions appear generally appropriate based on turnover/duration survey. There is justification for extending the time limits on some of the two-hour off-street parking, but this would not change the effective parking supply. Reduction in the number of 24-hour or unrestricted parking spaces or provision of customer-only parking areas would effectively increase the parking supply by increasing the turnover rate. Parking spaces in Lot 4 do not need to be assigned, but could be shared among monthly permit holders.

Changes in Zoning Code - The zoning code currently does not require additional parking for commercial development with the possible exception of professional offices.

Given the pedestrian-oriented, fine-grained development pattern downtown, it is not desirable to encourage developers to provide small parking lots for relatively small projects. Rather, a combination of in-lieu fees for new development and parking assessments on all development would be preferred. These are discussed in more detail in the Financial Plan later in this report.

Enhanced Enforcement - While parking enforcement was not directly assessed, there is no indication that stricter enforcement would significantly change the supply/demand balance. While there were a notable number of vehicles parked longer than time limits, with stricter enforcement, many drivers would simply move to other locations with longer time limits or shuffle their cars.
Employee Parking Programs - Employee parking programs attempt to motivate or require employees to use less convenient parking or to use alternative modes to commute to work, thus leaving more convenient parking for customers. These programs are generally not effective without strong business support, such as Chamber of Commerce involvement. This does not really address the basic problem of overall forecast parking deficiency, nor is there any indication of strong merchant support to date.

Parking Pricing Changes or Meter Installation - Parking demand is heavily influenced by prices. Parking is generally free to customers and other short-term visitors. Parking in municipal lots for employees and other long-term users is either free or very low cost. The permit cost for Lot 4 reserved spaces is only about $10-11 per month. This apparently is only enough to cover administrative costs of the space, probably not even covering operating and maintenance costs. (Construction and land acquisition costs were already paid by the former parking assessment district.)

The City has a General Plan policy discouraging parking meters. This is consistent with the view of many small and medium-size cities in California that short-term customer parking should be free to encourage patronage. However, this should not preclude higher rates for long-term parking, close to market levels. Some idea of market rate for parking can be determined by examining the City of Monterey rates for monthly parking at municipal parking facilities, which are $30 to $50 typically. Hourly parking at the Cannery Row 1 garage is $1 per hour, while meters are 75 cents.

Valet/Attendant Parking - Valet or attendant parking is generally used only in areas where the parking supply is extremely restricted, at least during special event periods. The Grove/Homescapes has already used this valet parking for special events and plans to continue to do so. The labor costs and inconvenience involved make this infeasible for routine customer/visitor parking in Downtown.

Trip Reduction Programs - Trip reduction programs either mandate or encourage use of alternative modes or work schedules to limit auto use. They are rarely implemented strictly to reduce parking needs. Under a voluntary program initiated by TAMC (Transportation Agency for Monterey County), the City has encouraged developers and large employers to propose programs to reduce auto use. The City already has a Trip Reduction Ordinance that requires developers to submit programs for reducing site-generated traffic through such measures as transit/ridesharing information, bus shelters, bicycle storage, and telecommuting programs.

Trip reduction programs are valuable and can result in marginal to moderate reductions in auto use, and therefore in parking needs.

Residential Permit Parking Programs - Residential permit parking zones are typically implemented to “protect” residential neighborhoods from “spillover” parking from adjacent commercial or institutional land uses. They do not directly address the supply/demand balance
# TOT Receipt History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>1st Quarter</th>
<th>2nd Quarter</th>
<th>3rd Quarter</th>
<th>4th Quarter</th>
<th>Total Year</th>
<th>% Change from Prior Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>$290,968</td>
<td>$393,115</td>
<td>$480,686</td>
<td>$322,563</td>
<td>$1,487,332</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>$304,192</td>
<td>$420,842</td>
<td>$509,711</td>
<td>$363,746</td>
<td>$1,598,491</td>
<td>7.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>$311,523</td>
<td>$408,712</td>
<td>$530,986</td>
<td>$380,087</td>
<td>$1,631,308</td>
<td>2.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>$346,469</td>
<td>$483,753</td>
<td>$574,134</td>
<td>$413,920</td>
<td>$1,818,276</td>
<td>11.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>$343,399</td>
<td>$472,357</td>
<td>$608,679</td>
<td>$423,801</td>
<td>$1,848,236</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>$393,968</td>
<td>$489,509</td>
<td>$637,884</td>
<td>$454,573</td>
<td>$1,975,934</td>
<td>6.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>$383,704</td>
<td>$516,892</td>
<td>$696,757</td>
<td>$488,708</td>
<td>$2,086,061</td>
<td>5.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>$506,791</td>
<td>$628,126</td>
<td>$750,161</td>
<td>$540,541</td>
<td>$2,425,619</td>
<td>16.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>$546,627</td>
<td>$624,262</td>
<td>$810,273</td>
<td>$592,000</td>
<td>$2,573,162</td>
<td>6.08%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Chg from Prior Year  | 7.86% | -0.62% | 8.01% | 9.52% |

## TOT History

Graph showing TOT receipts history from 1989 to 1997 with a line chart for each quarter and year.

3/31/98
ECONOMIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
AGENDA

April 28, 1998
3:00 p.m.
Pacific Grove Community Center
515 Junipero Avenue

1. Call to Order

2. Public Comment (An opportunity for members of the public to address the Committee on items not appearing on the Agenda. Comments are limited to three minutes per speaker.)

3. Receive Minutes of Regular Meeting held February 24, 1998 *

   Action: Receive minutes

   Note: The regular meeting of March 24, 1998, was cancelled due to a lack of a quorum.

4. Status Report on Phone Line Availability (Pacific Bell)

   Reference: Moe Ammar

   Action: No action; information only

5. Discussion of Preliminary Budget for Fiscal Year 1998-99 *

   Reference: City Manager Huse

   Action: Discuss and take action as appropriate
6. Discuss Pacific Grove Downtown Parking Study Prepared by Wilbur Smith Associates

    Reference: City Manager Huse
    Action: Discuss and take action as appropriate

7. Update from Committee Members
   a. Pacific Grove Chamber of Commerce
   b. Commercial Property Owners
   c. City of Pacific Grove/Community Members

8. Adjournment

* Indicates supplemental report is attached to Agenda
TO: MEMBERS OF THE ECONOMIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FROM: CITY MANAGER
MEETING DATE: APRIL 28, 1998
SUBJECT: MINUTES OF MEETING HELD FEBRUARY 24, 1998

RECOMMENDATION
APPROVE MINUTES OF EAC MEETING HELD FEBRUARY 24, 1998

DISCUSSION
The attached minutes relate to the Economic Advisory Committee meeting held February 24, 1998. The recommended action is to approve the minutes.

FISCAL IMPACT: None

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

Michael W. Huse
MICHAEL W. HUSE
CITY MANAGER
Present: Sandy Koffman, Chair, Robert Huit, Vice-Chair, Michael Adamson, Richard Stillwell, Dan Turrentine, Julie Work-Beck, Jan Hansen, Ronald Schenk, Don Whitesett, Beautification Committee ex-officio member

Staff: Michael Huse, City Manager, Moe Ammar, Pacific Grove Chamber; Pat Deese, Contract support staff.

Guests: Don Riehl, Country Club Gate Center, Mary Davi, Lucky Real Estate Representative, Rick Craig, Craig and Grant, and John Fischer

1. Call to Order

Meeting was called to order by Sandy Koffman, Chair, at 3:00 p.m. in the Pacific Grove Community Center. Koffman asked that an item be added to the agenda: Discussion of Year-Round Banners. Committee agreed to add this item to the agenda after item 7, which needed to be tabled due to the fact that Chair Koffman had to leave early.

2. Public Comment

None

3. Approve Minutes of January 27, 1997, Meeting

Upon a motion by Huit seconded by Stillwell, the minutes from the January 27, 1997, regular meeting were approved.

4. Presentation by Donald R. Riehl regarding Country Club Gate Center

Riehl introduced Mary Davi, Lucky real estate representative, and Rick Craig, Craig and Grant, the project developer.

Craig gave an overview of the three-year project, which will go the City Council on March 4 for approval, and reviewed project schematics. Highpoints of the project include:

- A 15,000 square foot expansion, with 10 feet added to the front of the facility (no changes to the parking lot)
- Building will be scaled down because it will be pushed into the hillside
- Facility will have two entrances, a new center façade, and similar roof elements
- Any trees removed will be replaced two-to-one in the forested area along the side and back of the building
• Facility will be expanded toward David Avenue

• Existing roadway along the David Avenue side of the site will be changed:
  • driveway will be relocated closer to David Avenue; existing driveway will be converted to a
    one-way, exit-only access to David Avenue for customer traffic and entrance access to the rear
    loading area for delivery trucks
  • retaining walls with planters will be installed for additional screening

• The dock area will be reconfigured:
  • two existing loading docks will be relocated and consolidated with the trash compactor, which
    will be housed inside the facility; there will be no changes to the grade and the building will
    screen the dock area from David Avenue traffic
  • safety will be enhanced by widening the dock area to allow trucks to pull in frontwise and turn
    around
  • remaining five-foot cement platform will be retained as a walkway

Davi shared with committee members photos of a Lucky store of similar design in the Arden Mall in
Sacramento. She said that this premiere design will only be featured in the Lafayette and Pacific
Grove stores. The expansion to a total of 38,320 square feet will allow Lucky to broaden the store’s
product selection and will provide additional employment opportunities within Pacific Grove. She
said that construction will be phased so that the store can remain open throughout the process.

Riehl then responded to committee members questions. He said that the proposed project incorporate
an additional 12,000 square feet in the new store layout and will move the allowable mass from one
area to another. He said the project design is nearly done and if it is approved on March 4, it will go
out to bid immediately and could conceivably be done in six to eight months, if there are no weather
problems. A full traffic study has been completed and the proposed changes to the side driveway
will clean up traffic in that area. He also indicated that the expansion of the store will improve
product selection because deliveries will not be limited to half-truckloads. The area behind the store
will be complete screened and delivery trucks will unload at a lower point within a fully enclosed
area, which will reduce noise. He said a landscape consultant and a forester have been retained and
will monitor the removal and two-to-one replacement of 52 trees.

Committee members expressed the hope that the project will attract employees back from the Sand
City store and will help retain Pacific Grove shoppers.

5. Discussion regarding Information Center a American Tin Cannery

Hansen said that the ATC’s number one goal is customer service. As a step toward in meeting that
goal, a Pacific Grove resident has been hired as a customer service representative who will service a
movable information booth within the outlet mall. The booth, which was professionally constructed
and highly visible, will be open Saturdays and Sundays until Memorial Day and then will be open
seven days a week. This new feature will provide the opportunity for cross-marketing of local events.
She is in the process of working with the City to develop signage that will draw Cannery Row visitors
into the ATC.

Koffman pointed out that the booth, which capitalizes on the City’s entrance at Cannery Row and the
Aquarium, will focus on brochures for local businesses and will assist with public restroom
accessibility. The City will evaluate options for replacing or enhancing the sign behind the Nob Hill
store and will collaborate with the City of Monterey on a joint mural project and directory on the back of the store that will guide visitors to the ATC information booth. She indicated that such a project would need to go to the Beautification Committee and Arts Commission for input.

Hansen said that any signage would need to include the location of the information booth and arrows with some specifics, which could be tied into the history of the area. She said that in 1997, over 765,000 cars visited the ATC, which equals approximately 3,825,000 customers. She said that visitors who are driving will go to the Chamber; foot traffic is what will need to be captured. The current sign is not large or high enough to catch visitors' attention.

Fischer pointed out that Aquarium visitors are directed to the ATC; we need to take advantage of the opportunity to invite visitors to come back and stay for a day or two.

Ammar said that the Carmel Plaza has such an information booth and the Del Monte Center has such a collaborative partnership with the City of Monterey. He asked what the maximum dimensions were that would allow exemption from any approvals besides the City Council. And offered the ATC Chamber staff support for the days not covered in her budget. He also pointed out that the booth offers the opportunity to cross-market the various Pacific Grove business districts.

Huse said the sign behind Nob Hill, is at the right-of-way limits, can be made taller and the same language used on other area signs can be used to identify the ATC.

Schenk suggested an archway tying in the Pacific Grove historic gate concept.

Huitt said that people farther down the recreation trail than the historic gate area need to be attracted. He said there are some questions that still need to be answered, but suggested that the idea be developed and then be brought back to the EAC for a recommendation to the City Council.

6. **Status Report on Luncheon Honoring Businesses Which Produce Transient Occupancy Tax Revenue**

Huitt reported that a request for half of the funding for the event was presented to the Council on 2/18 and was approved. He said the event was highly successful and thanked Ammar for his efforts in shepherding the event. He pointed out events such as this that express appreciation for the success and financial contribution of local businesses fit well with the committee's strategic plan business retention element.

Ammar said that April 23 is the date set for the next luncheon, which will recognize the City's top TOT generators. The proposed location is Joe Rombi's (not yet confirmed). He also pointed out that the entire hospitality industry is down (from January 2 to date) due to El Niño, Valentine's Day and the AT&T were not sold out, which is unusual.


This item was tabled due to the early departure of the Chair. Vice-Chair Huitt continued chairing the committee.

b. **Discussion of Year-Round Banners**

Huitt presented the Beautification Committee's proposed banner design, which incorporates copy that references Pacific Grove. The banners, which would be displayed on Lighthouse and Forest between local events, were approved by the Beautification Committee, subject to EAC approval.
Schenk said that there are more inquiries about the Pacific Grove lighthouse than butterflies at BayNet.

Whitsett said the Beautification Committee was authorized to have three designs done. The other two designs can be changed to include the local lighthouse and indigenous trees.

Ammar suggested displaying the butterfly banner during butterfly season. He suggested the sombrella material, which is far superior in quality, be used rather than vinyl.

Hansen said the butterfly design is too busy.

Huitt said the banners work best with graphic impact at a subliminal level and that past efforts to do a lighthouse were not successful. He said the butterflies and trees were stronger graphic images and suggested promoting the lighthouse in other ways.

Whitsett said the butterfly design was the one everyone liked, so it was the one that was developed. He said other subject matter and seasonal designs can be considered.

General committee agreement that the design needs to be reworked.

8. Update from Committee Members

a. Pacific Grove Chamber of Commerce

Ammar reported that the Chamber logged 33,000 visitor contacts last year.

#1 state was Texas
#2 was Florida
#3 was New York.
#1 foreign country was Germany

Adamson announced that City Manager Mike Huse will be named the Chamber’s City Employee of the Year at 6:15 p.m. at the Aquarium on March 17.

b. Commercial Property Owners

Work-Beck announced that “Anelle,” a division of “Exerciseables,” will soon go into the former “Lasting Memories” location on Lighthouse

Ammar said that he has been contacted by three businesses looking for downtown locations.

c. City of Pacific Grove/Community Members

Huitt presented the City’s sales tax by area report. The Sunset area didn’t show up on the report because it was presented in yellow. The statistics indicate that the combined Forest Hill and Country Club Gate Center area is the highest sales tax generator.

Huse reported that the City was conducting a day of customer service training for City employees, which is in line with the business development and retention elements of the EAC’s strategic plan. With the training, the staff will be better prepared to respond to residents and businesses.
9. Adjournment

Next meeting will be on Tuesday, March 24, 1998, at 3:00 p.m. in the Pacific Grove Community Center (Junipero Room), 515 Junipero Avenue. The committee adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Pat Deese
CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE

AGENDA REPORT

TO: MEMBERS OF THE ECONOMIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FROM: CITY MANAGER
MEETING DATE: APRIL 28, 1998
SUBJECT: DISCUSSION OF FY 1998-99 PRELIMINARY BUDGET

RECOMMENDATION
DISCUSS AND TAKE ACTION AS APPROPRIATE

DISCUSSION

The City of Pacific Grove is in the process of preparing its preliminary budget for Fiscal Year 1998-99. Following an initial review of the main components of the preliminary budget (revenue estimates and appropriation requests), it was determined that appropriation requests exceeded revenue estimates by $500,000 in the General Fund. This is an unacceptable situation that prompted a careful and, at times, painful review of budget requests. In the end, the shortfall has been significantly reduced to about $70,000, an acceptable level by today’s budgeting standards. However, this achievement came with a price including the elimination of some part time salaries, the removal of all appropriations for attendance at conferences and meetings, a reduction in workers compensation funding, the elimination of equipment appropriations, and a reduction in the Street Maintenance budget. In addition, it doesn’t appear that any transfer from the General Fund for capital improvement projects will occur in FY 1998-99.

Among the reductions recommended to the City Council by the City Manager is the elimination of Pacific Grove’s participation in the Time to Coast marketing program and the allocation for Professional Services within the Economic Revitalization Department budget. These recommendations translate into a reduction of $61,000. *Again, it must emphasized that this course of action is a recommendation and that final budget decisions rest with the City Council.*

The Committee is encouraged to discuss the proposed recommendations and develop a position for transmittal to the City Council. It is anticipated that the preliminary budget will be distributed to Council and the community by May 1, with public meetings scheduled to begin the second week in June.

**FISCAL IMPACT:** Budget reduction of $61,000 for FY 1998-99

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

[Signature]
MICHAEL W. HUSE
CITY MANAGER
TO: \ MEMBERS OF THE ECONOMIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: \ CITY MANAGER

MEETING DATE: \ APRIL 28, 1998

SUBJECT: \ DOWNTOWN PARKING STUDY

RECOMMENDATION

DISCUSS AND COMMENT ON PARKING STUDY

DISCUSSION

The Downtown Parking Study, for all intents and purposes, has been completed and is ready for public distribution and discussion by Council. However, in advance of that action the Economic Advisory Committee is being asked to review the document and formulate a position regarding its recommendations. These will be formally transmitted to the City Council, who will consider them when the Study is reviewed.

In terms of incorporating any changes in the document prior to distribution, that can be discussed with the consultant following the EAC meeting on April 28, 1998. However, in staff’s opinion the current document reflects compliance with the scope of work requested by the City. Nevertheless, any action taken by the Committee will be directed to the consultant for consideration of possible amendments to the Study.

The attached document has not been distributed to anyone except the Committee.

FISCAL IMPACT: None

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

MICHAEL W. HUSE
CITY MANAGER
in the commercial district, and in fact may exacerbate parking deficiencies or increase pressure on prime parking. This topic is addressed in more detail later.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

The following criteria can be used for the comparison of alternatives to balance supply and demand:

1. Expected effectiveness at balancing parking supply and demand;
2. Cost magnitude and ability to fund;
3. Compatibility with General Plan and other plans;
4. Likely merchant/property owner and neighborhood support; and
5. Ease of implementation.

Realistically, these must be evaluated largely in a qualitative manner.

EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES

Based on the above criteria, the following alternatives rank highest on cost-effectiveness and feasibility for improving the future supply/demand balance:

1. New Downtown Parking Facilities

   1A. Parking Garage on Fountain/Laurel City Parking Lot (in combination with senior housing project)

   1B. Parking Garage north of Holman Building (in combination with apartments and/or retail)

   1C. Parking Deck on City Parking Lot on 16/17th Street

2. Satellite Parking on or near Cannery Row Lot 7 with enhanced shuttle service.

3. Changes in Zoning Code to require in-lieu fees for new development, along with a new parking assessment district.

4. Long-Term Pricing Increases and Trip Reduction Program.
A large parking structure on the Fountain/Laurel site was considered in the 1984 parking study. A combined senior housing and public parking project has been considered by the City for the Fountain/Laurel municipal parking lot. Concepts have been developed by architect Paul Davis, working with the non-profit South County Housing Group. (An alternative site being considered for senior housing is near Lovers Point.)

These concepts call for about 50 units of senior housing with parking for residents at 0.5 space per unit plus partial replacement of the public parking. The concepts developed by WSA and IPD strive for a net gain in public parking, using parking under and next to the senior housing, with a maximum of two above-grade levels.

Additional parking on the municipal deck on the 16th/17th Street lot was also considered in the 1984 parking study. This is a relatively centralized, but landlocked site where adjacent uses are quite close.

The Holman Building block is zoned for the most intensive development in Downtown. Private parking to support on-site development may be constructed regardless of the decision on a general public parking structure.

The alternatives above do not represent mutually exclusive choices. Rather, it may be possible to combine two or more of these. In fact, Alternative 3 is not a stand-alone option, but would only impact the supply/demand balance indirectly. It would provide in-lieu funding for additional parking, but might also tend slow down development and limit the growth in parking demand.

These alternatives are assessed in Table 9-1. For purposes of comparison, the size of parking facilities (number of levels) is varied among the alternatives. This provides more information on how parking costs and impacts can vary by size of facility. However, it also affects the comparison of cost-effectiveness. The actual plan adopted by the City may well change the size of facilities.
# Table 9-1

## EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO MEETING FUTURE PARKING DEMAND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative #1A.</th>
<th>Alternative #1B.</th>
<th>Alternative #1C.</th>
<th>Alternative #2.</th>
<th>Alternative #3.</th>
<th>Alternative #4.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking Garage on Fountain/Laurel City Lot</td>
<td>Parking Garage North of Holman Building</td>
<td>Parking Deck on City Lot on 16th/17th Street</td>
<td>Satellite Parking in Cannery Row with Enhanced Shuttle Service</td>
<td>Changes in Zoning Code to Require In-lieu Fees for New Development, along with New Assessment District</td>
<td>Pricing Increases and Trip Reduction Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary Description

| Build 2 levels of public parking under 50-unit senior housing project. Retain existing parking at grade on third (upper) level, and optionally, build two levels above grade. | Build 3 levels of public parking under apartment and/or commercial project. | Build 1.5 levels of parking on top of existing parking lot. | Construct 2 additional levels of parking either on Monterey’s Cannery Row Lot 7 or on American Tin Cannery customer lot. Increase WAVE shuttle frequency and reroute to serve Downtown better. | Require all new downtown development/redevelopment to pay fees to support additional parking. Currently there is no commercial parking requirement except for professional offices. Also, if approved by property owners, re-institute parking assessment district | Increase monthly parking fees and institute charges for parking over 2 hours. Increase WAVE shuttle service and reroute to serve Downtown better. Provide preferential carpool spaces, carpool matching, and bicycle parking. |

### Primary Objectives

| To provide substantial new parking convenient to areas most in need, including new development on-site. | To provide moderate amount of new parking convenient to areas most in need. | To provide moderate amount of new parking that can serve multiple needs, including those interested in traveling by shuttle to Downtown. | To fund additional parking. | To reduce auto trips to Downtown, especially by employees, freeing up parking for customers. |

### EVALUATION CRITERIA:

#### Expected Effectiveness at Balancing Demand and Supply

| Moderate to High | High | Moderate | Low to Moderate | Moderate in combination with other measures. | Moderate to high if significant price increases. |

#### Cost to City and Ability to Fund

| Capital cost per space is High. However, it is possible the parking could be provided by a non-profit agency as part of the project, minimizing the out-of-pocket cost to the City. | High capital costs. Would likely require bond financing. | High capital costs. Would likely require bond financing. | Moderate capital costs (assumes costs would be shared with Monterey and/or Aquarium and/or American Tin Cannery) | Minimal cost. | Low initial costs. Operating costs, especially for WAVE, would be substantial. |

### Compatibility with General Plan and Economic Revitalization Plan

Table 9-1 continued

EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES
TO MEETING FUTURE PARKING DEMAND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likely Merchant/Property Owner and Neighborhood Support</td>
<td>Likely Merchant/Property Owner and Neighborhood Support</td>
<td>Likely Merchant/Property Owner and Neighborhood Support</td>
<td>Likely Merchant/Property Owner and Neighborhood Support</td>
<td>Likely Merchant/Property Owner and Neighborhood Support</td>
<td>Likely Merchant/Property Owner and Neighborhood Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably supportive, but likely concerned about how to pay for facility.</td>
<td>Probably supportive, but likely concerned about how to pay for facility.</td>
<td>Probably supportive, but likely concerned about how to pay for facility.</td>
<td>Questionable, due to possible concerns over effectiveness and cost-sharing arrangement.</td>
<td>Questionable, due to increased costs. Probably depends on balance of in-lieu fees vs. assessments.</td>
<td>Low support if parking pricing changes are high, moderate support otherwise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ease of Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat difficult. Requires cooperation with senior housing developer. Large capital costs usually funded with bond issue.</td>
<td>Somewhat difficult. Requires cooperation with private developer. Large capital costs usually funded with bond issue.</td>
<td>Fairly easy. Less coordination than other alternatives. Capital costs less than other Downtown parking facilities, but still probably requires bond financing.</td>
<td>Difficulty depends on extent to which Monterey or American Tin Cannery takes lead in implementing. City of Pacific Grove role may be limited. Monterey currently not interested in more Cannery Row parking. American Tin Cannery supportive, but says it cannot afford to build one.</td>
<td>Somewhat difficult. Assessment district requires property owner approval. In-lieu fees may be controversial.</td>
<td>Fairly easy so long as permit prices remain moderate. Requires coordination with MST.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OBJECTIVES FOR PARKING SUPPLY

Most alternatives mentioned earlier would increase the parking supply, while others would decrease or control demand.

The following objectives are recommended to assess alternatives that would increase the supply:

1. Provide convenient and attractive parking to support Downtown growth desired by the community. This requires:
   - sufficient parking to allow short-term customers to park within two blocks of their destinations even during peak periods, and
   - sufficient parking to allow employees and business owners to park within four blocks of their destination, recognizing that parking on the same block is ideal.
2. Provide long-term customer parking with the Downtown for the small percentage of customers who cannot conduct their business in two hours.

3. Concentrate additional parking in the areas of current and forecast future parking shortages, but provide a reasonable geographic balance of the parking supply, north and south, east and west in the Downtown.

4. Provide additional parking to minimize interference with walking, bicycling, and transit use.

5. As downtown areas intensify, the land area devoted to surface parking generally should be reduced in favor of active, attractive, revenue-generating uses, with more parking located in structures or in garages below new buildings.

**RATIONALE FOR ADDITIONAL PARKING**

Without additional parking, Downtown Pacific Grove’s attractiveness for shopping, dining, recreation, and working will likely suffer. Downtown Pacific Grove does not have the kind of attractions (such as the Monterey Bay Aquarium and Cannery Row) that induce large numbers of visitors to stay for hours. With the shorter duration, visitors are less willing to use public transportation, such as The WAVE shuttle. Furthermore, there is not the “critical mass” of visitors that can justify the frequent shuttle service that could support satellite parking.

To be considered convenient for most visitors, parking must be within two (or possibly three) blocks. If one new facility is constructed, it would need to be centrally located. However, two new facilities spaced at least three blocks apart would provide better coverage.

**TYPE OF PARKING NEEDED**

Additional parking is needed for both residential and commercial uses. The residential uses are assumed to include a mix of rental apartments and senior housing. Some of the apartment uses will be additional second-story apartment units above commercial properties. The commercial uses are an unspecified mix of retail, office, and restaurant.

**Residential Parking** - Residential uses require both resident parking and guest parking, generally with about one guest space per every two to four residential spaces. Parking required is often based on the number of bedrooms. For example, in Pacific Grove, each studio or one bedroom requires 1.5 spaces and each two-plus-bedroom unit requires 2.0 spaces. These requirements are reasonable and consistent with typical zoning requirements and technical references (although studio apartments often require only 1.0 - 1.3 spaces per unit.)

Senior housing requires significantly less parking. The National Parking Association recommends only 0.5 parking spaces per “elderly dwelling unit,” less than half the requirement for standard multi-family residential uses. City Housing staff believe that senior housing will
need about 0.75 spaces per dwelling unit. However, senior housing parking needs depend in part on the income level and health status of residents: healthy, affluent elderly have auto use levels approaching those of younger adults. The small units (550 square feet) will probably be most attractive to seniors living alone, those with relatively low incomes, and those attracted to downtown living. If guest parking can be provided from the general public parking, then 0.8 spaces per dwelling/unit for residential parking should be sufficient. Residents frequently expect their parking to be reserved. This tends to increase the amount of parking needed since guests are not able to park in the vacant residents’ spaces.

Senior housing will likely require a higher level of handicapped spaces than other residential developments.

Commercial Uses - Commercial parking varies depending on specific use. Restaurants, retail, and professional offices tend to require a high level of parking, while administrative offices require somewhat less. Retail parking requires a relatively high percentage of short-term parking (under four hours). One standard reference recommends that approximately 42% of the parking for retail be short-term customer/visitor parking, with 47% unrestricted long-term and the remainder for employee carpools. With the much greater turnover in short-term spaces, the actual number of users of the short-term spaces would be several times that of the long-term spaces.

---

3 Dennis Boehlje, Housing Analyst, City of Pacific Grove, telephone discussion, April 21, 1997.

Chapter 10
DOWNTOWN: EVALUATION OF PROSPECTIVE SITES FOR NEW FACILITIES

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Assuming one or two parking structures should be considered, the following evaluation criteria can be used to compare parking structure sites:

1. Current site status
2. Planned use
3. Site capacity
4. Pedestrian access
5. Security and visibility
6. Cost and cost per space
7. Vehicle access and traffic impacts
8. Proximity to major attractions
9. Likely patronage
10. Alternative uses of the site
11. Noise and visual impacts
12. Ease of implementation (including merchant and resident support)
13. Consistency with General Plan and zoning code

EVALUATION OF SITES

The parking structure alternatives vary primarily on their capacity, cost, and proximity to major attractions (demand generators). (See Table 10-1.) Alternative 1B (parking garage north of the Holman Building) would add the highest number of spaces. Alternative 1A (parking garage on Fountain/Laurel lot) would add a moderate amount of parking, while Alternative 1C (deck on 16th/17th Street lot) and Alternative 2 (satellite parking in Cannery Row or at the American Tin Cannery) would be least effective if implemented alone. On a cost-per-net-new space basis, the Alternative 1C (deck) ranks best, with all other options significantly more expensive. Alternative 1A (Fountain/Laurel) and Alternative 1B (north of Holman Building) rank best based on proximity to major attractions.

Cost estimates in Table 10-1 are very rough initial estimates. Parking structure costs are highly dependent on the site dimensions, the number of levels, and whether subterranean parking is included. Two options were considered for Alternative 1A. The first option would include two underground levels below the entire parcel plus at-grade parking on the top level, with senior housing built over one-half of the top parking level. The second option would add two above-grade levels to the parking assumed in Option 1. Alternative 1B would include two above-grade levels plus expanded at-grade parking in the Holman Building block. Alternative 1C would add...
1.5 levels above the existing municipal parking lot, limiting the bulk and impact on adjacent uses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE 1A. PARKING GARAGE ON FOUNTAIN/ LAUREL LOT</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE 1B. PARKING GARAGE NORTH OF HOLMAN BUILDING</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE 1C. PARKING DECK ON 16th/17th ST. LOT</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE 2. SATELLITE PARKING IN CANNERY ROW OR AT AMERICAN TIN CANNERY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Current Site Status</td>
<td>Municipal parking lot providing 2-hour and 24-hour parking</td>
<td>Private parking lot for Holman Building plus 17,000 SF, one-story retail/restaurant building</td>
<td>Municipal parking lot providing 2-hour parking.</td>
<td>American Tin Cannery private customer lot and Monterey City lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Planned Use</td>
<td>Being considered for senior housing project by City and nonprofit housing developer.</td>
<td>Developer indicates being considered for housing or hotel use, possibly with retail. However, no formal proposals are pending.</td>
<td>No plans or proposals for change.</td>
<td>No plans or proposals for change. The Monterey General Plan lists the Cannery Row lot as a possible site for added parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Site Capacity</td>
<td>Footprint about 36,000 SF. Three levels of primarily underground parking would add net 110 spaces, of which 30 to 40 spaces would be needed by senior housing (total 250 spaces including existing). As an option, two additional levels of parking above grade would add net 190 spaces instead.</td>
<td>Footprint about 40,000 SF, incl. 17,000 SF building. Three levels of parking would add net 265 spaces, of which about 50 would be needed by residential uses on-site (about 320 total parking spaces, including existing).</td>
<td>Footprint about 30,000 SF. 1.5 levels of parking would add net 80 spaces (about 182 total including existing).</td>
<td>Footprint of ATC lot about 52,000 SF. Footprint of Monterey Lot 7 about 40,000 sf Two above-grade levels of parking at ATC would add net 280 spaces (about 430 total including existing). However, much of this parking may be used for adjacent uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pedestrian Access</td>
<td>Access from Fountain Ave. and 15th St. No direct access to Lighthouse.</td>
<td>Access from Central and Fountain. No direct access to Lighthouse.</td>
<td>Access from 17th and 16th Str. No direct access to Lighthouse.</td>
<td>Access from Eardley or through ATC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Security and Visibility</td>
<td>Mixed use area suggests garage will be observed round the clock. Security of elderly residents somewhat a concern. Not highly visible to visitors.</td>
<td>Predominantly retail area with new housing suggests garage will be observed most of the time. Not highly visible to visitors.</td>
<td>Predominantly retail area. Should be observed most of the time. Slightly less visible than other Downtown options.</td>
<td>Mixed retail and residential area. Should be observed most of the time. Slightly less visible than other options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Total Cost/cost per space</td>
<td>Three parking levels option: Approx. $4 million in construction and indirect costs. Housing costs will increase significantly due to building height. Cost per net new space: estimated at $36,000. Adding 2 levels above grade option: Approx. $4.9 million, with a cost per net new space estimated at $26,000.</td>
<td>Approx. $2.5 million in construction/indirect costs, plus $2.7 million for land/building and demolition. Housing costs will increase significantly due to building height. Cost per net new space: estimated at $20,000.</td>
<td>Approx. $1.25 million in construction/indirect costs. About $15,600 per net new space.</td>
<td>Approx. $4 million in construction costs plus $2 million in land acquisition. About $20,000 per net new space, but many of these spaces not used for Downtown parking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 10-1 continued

#### EVALUATION OF PARKING STRUCTURE ALTERNATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE 1A. PARKING GARAGE ON FOUNTAIN/ LAUREL LOT</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE 1B. PARKING GARAGE NORTH OF HOLMAN BUILDING</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE 1C. PARKING DECK ON 16TH/17TH ST. LOT</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE 2. SATELLITE PARKING IN CANNERY ROW OR AT AMERICAN TIN CANNERY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Vehicle Access and Traffic Impacts</td>
<td>Could provide split access with one level accessed from Fountain and one from 15th. Can easily absorb additional traffic.</td>
<td>Access from Central and Fountain Ave., possibly from Grand. Due to size, potential for moderate traffic impacts.</td>
<td>Access from 16th and 17th Streets, which are quite narrow. However, small size will limit traffic impacts</td>
<td>Access from Eardley already congested. Due to proximity to Aquarium and heavy pedestrian volumes, significant traffic impacts likely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Proximity to Major Attractions</td>
<td>Within one block of movie theater and Holman Building. Within 3 blocks of Hambrooke's and Grove/Homescapes.</td>
<td>Within one block of movie theater and Holman Building. Within 3 blocks of Hambrooke’s and Grove/Homescapes. Within one block of Natural History Museum</td>
<td>Within 2 blocks of largest restaurant concentration. Within 3 blocks of movie theater, Holman Building and Natural History Museum</td>
<td>About 0.8 miles from Downtown (beyond walking distance for virtually all, but within a 5-minute shuttle trip). Also within 2 blocks of both ATC and the Aquarium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Likely Patronage</td>
<td>Good. Expected to be fully occupied within several years, particularly for special uses at Grove/Homescapes.</td>
<td>Moderate. Expected to be fully occupied by 2010.</td>
<td>Good. Expected to be full within several years.</td>
<td>Good. Expected to be full within several years. However, Downtown patrons may get squeezed out by ATC/Aquarium/ Cannery Row patrons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Alternative Uses of the Site</td>
<td>Housing, possibly with retail.</td>
<td>Housing or hotel, possibly with retail.</td>
<td>Retail possible, but no proposals. Likely to remain City parking lot.</td>
<td>No proposals. Likely to remain as surface parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Consistency with General Plan and Zoning</td>
<td>Consistent.</td>
<td>Height a question as zoning limits building height to 4 stories with 75% coverage, and new General Plan policies would tend to reduce heights. Two levels could be provided underground.</td>
<td>Consistent.</td>
<td>Consistent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Ease of Implementation, including Public/Business Support</td>
<td>See Table 9-1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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WILBUR SMITH ASSOCIATES
This chapter lists objectives for financial planning, then presents an evaluation of financial alternatives and a preliminary financial plan for proposed improvements. This plan (shown in Table 11-1) is conceptual in nature, primarily useful for determining financial feasibility. Also, the financial conditions (such as bond market conditions) may change markedly in only a year or two. If and when the City policymakers decide in favor of making these improvements, a financial advisor specializing in municipal parking (such as an investment banker) should meet with City Public Works, Finance, and City Manager’s office staff to refine this plan.

OBJECTIVES FOR FINANCIAL PLAN

The following objectives are recommended as the basis for a sound financial plan:

1. Seek adequate financial support to provide convenient, well-designed parking to support Downtown growth desired by the community.

2. Generate parking fund reserves, as there is no accumulated reserve.

3. Fund parking improvements primarily from new development, but also from existing property owners and users who benefit.

4. Adopt a program of in-lieu fees that encourages support of City-managed shared parking facilities, as opposed to scattered on-site facilities, and provides funding as the need for parking grows.

5. Monthly parking rates should be set at or approaching market rate levels (at least $30/month) to raise additional capital funds, as well as to encourage use of transit and alternative modes among those able to so conveniently.

6. Short-term parking should remain free to encourage patronage of Pacific Grove merchants.

CAPITAL COSTS

Construction costs vary markedly according to type of parking facility: surface lot versus single-level deck above a parking lot versus a multi-level above-grade structure versus subterranean garage. It is not possible to give a precise cost estimate without engineering design efforts beyond the scope of this planning project. However, as a general rule, surface parking lots cost about $1,000 to 2,000 per space to construct, above-grade structures (including parking decks) cost $8,000 to 15,000 to construct, and subterranean parking usually exceeds $15,000 per space and can be $25,000 or more. Furthermore, construction costs tend to rise with the height of the
structure. For example, a five-level structure costs about 19% more per space than a three-level structure and 44% more than a two-level structure. Parking decks have the cost advantages of not requiring elevators or mechanical ventilation and often using simpler ramping, but if built over an existing parking lot, they have the cost disadvantage of removing a significant percentage of the existing surface parking for ramps and columns.

These estimates include design, construction management, and contingencies, but do not include the value of land or financing costs. The land used for the parking facility either must be acquired, in which case it represents an actual out-of-pocket cost or it is donated by the City. If it is donated, there is still a “shadow cost” (the value of the land for other uses that could actually be recovered by selling the land). The value of the land should not be ignored.

Two parking construction projects are recommended: a public parking garage on the Fountain/Laurel lot, ideally in conjunction with the senior housing project, and a parking deck on the City lot between 16th and 17th Streets. These would be phased in over the next five to seven years.

If built as a two-level, 240-space subterranean garage (as assumed), the Fountain/Laurel parking facility would cost an estimated $2 to 3 million in construction costs ($20,000 to $30,000 per space). The cost could be reduced by about 40% by building this as an above-grade parking structure.

The parking deck on the 16th/17th Street lot would be about $1 million in construction costs (or about $12,500 per net new space).

The land value of each lot is estimated at close to $1 million (30-36,000 SF at $30 per square foot). If the Fountain/Laurel site were used for both senior housing and public parking, the land value would be split between the two projects. For the parking deck, the land value should be attributed entirely to public parking. Of course, in both cases, the site is already used for surface lot parking, but could easily be converted to another use.

In order to pay for construction, the City of Pacific Grove would undoubtedly need to issue tax-exempt bonds. Unlike many other California cities, Pacific Grove has no reserve fund for future parking facilities, so most or all of the costs would need to be covered by the bond issue. The following section discusses various types of bonds and the tools to generate a stream of income to pay off debt service.

In theory, it would be possible to construct parking on a “pay as you go” basis, collecting assessments or developer fees and in several years or a decade, building parking. However, this is inadvisable, as there would probably be a significant shortfall in the parking supply for several years.

---

Similar to a mortgage on a house, bond financing for parking structures incurs significant borrowing costs. In addition to interest payments, there are various initial fees. Interest payments on a typical 20-year bond add up to about 75 to 80% of the principal amount. The bond issue usually also covers:

- reserves;
- capitalized interest;
- underwriter’s fee; and
- miscellaneous fees.

These fees typically add about a net 15% to the size of the bond issue.

**FINANCING CAPITAL COSTS: ALTERNATIVE FINANCIAL TOOLS**

There are two main aspects of financing capital costs: (1) funding source used to pay construction directly (bonds, City property sales, grants, or in-lieu fees) and (2) in many cases the tool used to pay continuing debt service on the bonds. Frequently a combination of different funding sources are used.

**In-lieu Fees** are development impact fees charged to pay for construction of new parking to serve land uses in areas where private provision of all required parking is undesirable or difficult. (The fees are “in lieu” of directly providing required parking.) In-lieu fees may be mandated, or the developer may have the option of building some or all required parking on-site. In-lieu fees are often used in downtown areas where larger shared facilities are more efficient than scattered small parking lots—or in environmentally and historically sensitive areas such as Monterey’s Cannery Row where the City wishes to control the parking supply directly. In-lieu fees are quite common, used in Monterey, Mountain View, Carmel, Redwood City, San Mateo, and Danville, among many other communities.

Fees are usually set to be below the actual cost of constructing parking on-site, but generally over $5,000 per space. One advantage of the fees to the developer is that they can usually be paid monthly so the developer essentially can spread out or finance the costs of parking. Monterey currently charges $52.50 per month per parking space required under the zoning code but not provided.

Thus, in-lieu fees may be accumulated (banked) and used to pay for new parking facilities directly or to pay off debt service on bonds. So long as the City shows sincere progress toward use of the fees for added parking, there is apparently no requirement to spend banked fees within a certain period.²

---

Sale of City properties may be used to provide funding for parking construction. Excess or
inconvenient property may be sold and the funds used to acquire private property and construct
city parking facilities at more convenient locations. Similarly, the City may contribute its land toward
parking facility construction, but leave the actual construction to a private or nonprofit developer.

Grants are generally awarded only to innovative projects or those serving special groups, such as
persons with disabilities or senior citizens.

Bonds are routinely used to finance parking facilities, spreading out the capital costs over 20 to
30 years. Bonds vary principally according to the method of paying debt service and securing the
bonds. Major categories include:

Revenue bonds - These bonds will be a debt secured by parking system revenues. Revenues may
include parking permit fees, in-lieu fees, and other user charges. The major advantage of this
method is that it will not expose the General Fund or other non-parking City funds. The chief
disadvantage is that parking revenue bonds are not considered creditworthy due to the uncertainty
over this revenue source. This is especially notable considering that growth of the revenue source
is not assured. Therefore, higher interest rates usually apply. Currently, the level of parking
revenues is so low that this would hardly support this source.

Parking special assessment bonds would be a debt of a new parking district, secured by special
assessments on benefiting property owners. Assessments are determined as described below. The
chief advantage of this method is that financing costs are borne based on benefits received. The
chief disadvantage is the difficulty in obtaining necessary approval from property owners who
would pay the larger share of the total assessment. Also, higher interest rates would be needed
due to the lack of certainty of collection of assessments, compared to property taxes.

Redevelopment tax increment bonds are a debt of the Redevelopment Agency, secured by
property tax increment, with any parking revenues or in-lieu fees available to fund debt service.
These are only applicable in official redevelopment areas. Since the Downtown is not a
redevelopment area, this type of financing is not currently applicable. The City would need to go
through an elaborate process to justify and officially adopt a redevelopment area. Typically,
cities, counties, and special districts argue (and even sue each other) over the use of property
taxes for such purposes.

Certificates of Participation/Lease Revenue Bonds - These bond equivalents would be secured by
the full faith and credit of the City's General Fund. The City would legally issue Certificates of
Participation, and a new parking district would be obligated through a lease or installment
agreement to pay investors back. Debt service could be paid from parking revenues. Likely the
General Fund would never actually be tapped.

The primary advantage is that pledged revenues need not exceed debt service requirements.
Financing costs would also be relatively low. This method can be approved by majority vote of
the City Council. Also, this financing technique "does not constitute indebtedness under the state
constitutional debt limitation and is not subject to other statutory requirements applicable to
bonds, including interest rate limitations, election requirements, competitive sale requirements, or semi-annual or fixed rate interest payment requirements. A major disadvantage is that any exposure to the General Fund can be controversial. Also, since some special assessment will likely be needed to support debt service, it may seem unnecessarily complicated to use this approach, rather than the traditional special assessment bonds.

**Assessment districts** are used to fund both parking facility development (property acquisition and construction) and operations/maintenance. For construction, property assessments typically pay off debt service on bonds.

Assessments are charged to property owners based on benefits received. The particular formula for determining the charges varies from district to district. Usually it includes such factors as: size of parcel or building area, private parking provided on-site, estimated deficiency (taking into account specific land use), and proximity to parking facility.

This has become much harder to implement under Prop. 218. Among key considerations, a registered engineer must identify specific and general benefits and assessment must only be for identified special benefits, with the City covering the general benefits. The district must be approved by property owners who would pay the larger share of the assessment. It is now possible for a valid assessment district to be annulled by a later vote of property owners.

A parking assessment district was used to fund provision of the City lots in Downtown. Assessments applied only to commercial properties and were based partly on parcel size.

**Housing Co-development** - The simplest scenario is for a non-profit housing group to pay the City to acquire or lease the site for housing. The payment, which would likely be underwritten by a state or foundation grant, could be applied toward public parking. Under another scenario, the City donates a municipal parking lot to a nonprofit housing association. The housing group gets grant and/or state funding to build housing and parking that it owns. In return for land, the housing group leases parking to City very cheaply or makes it publicly available, with residents or their guests sharing parking.

Another alternative would be for the housing group to lease parking to a new nonprofit entity. The nonprofit group leases parking to businesses and collects lease payments.

Creative financing approaches can be explored with public finance economists or investment bankers. In particular, combined subsidized housing and public parking projects should be investigated, such as the Frank Marr senior housing project in Oakland’s Chinatown, developed by the East Bay Asian Local Development Corporation.

---

OPERATIONS/MAINTENANCE COSTS

The operating and maintenance (O&M) costs for parking structures are typically higher than for surface parking lots. The costs for any particular facility depend on numerous factors including staffing, ticket dispensing (if any), mechanical and ventilation systems (if any), and various environmental factors that affect maintenance needs (such as weather). Typical surface parking lot operating and maintenance costs range from $100 to $200 per year, while parking structure costs are often about double that level.

While no figures were available from the City (and parking expenses are not budgeted separately), the City’s lots are run on a “spartan” basis with no attendants or ticket dispensing. Annual O&M costs should be considered in the decision of whether to build additional parking.

FEASIBILITY OF NEW STRUCTURE

Table 11-1 presents the conceptual financial plan for the recommended parking facilities. This is based on the following key assumptions:

2. Construction of a parking deck on the 16th/17th Street lot around year 2006.
3. Construction costs paid for from tax-exempt revenue bonds, with debt service repaid by a combination of developer in-lieu fees (40%), parking district assessments (30%), and user fees (30%).
4. Bond life of 20 years.
5. Interest rate of 6.0%.
6. The senior housing development would contribute at least $250,000 to the City for use of half of the Fountain/Laurel lot (equivalent to about $14 per square foot, about half of estimated market value). The housing project would also directly construct 40 parking spaces or pay an additional minimum of $200,000 for use of a combined public/senior housing parking structure. This is assumed to be reimbursed through state or nonprofit grants.

The first bond issue for the Fountain/Laurel structure would be for an estimated $5 million, and is assumed to occur around year 2000. Annual debt service would average about $450,000, with a high of about $540,000. To cover these costs, as well as the required reserve of about 40% above debt service, and annual O&M costs of about $100,000, about $650,000 should be collected annually.

The $650,000 annually could be split as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Type</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development in-lieu fees (40%)</td>
<td>260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking assessments or ATC meter revenues (30%)</td>
<td>195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User fees (30%)</td>
<td>195,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issuance of bonds could be delayed until at least $900,000 of in-lieu fees and parking assessments is collected or is imminent. This would be equivalent to two years' worth of these fees at the above rates. It may be possible for the senior housing and municipal parking structure bonds to be issued at the same time, cutting down on total financing costs.

The development in-lieu fees could be met with full payments in-lieu of 33 parking spaces, at $8,000 per space. This is equivalent to the parking required for 17 two-bedroom apartments or 10,000 SF of professional offices under prevailing Pacific Grove zoning requirements.

If the City allows developers to pay a much smaller monthly payment, rather than paying the fees in full to receive the building permit, it would be difficult or impossible to meet the in-lieu share in the initial years.

Parking district assessments could be levied on all commercial properties within four blocks of the parking facility, covering all parking study zones except Zone A. Dividing $195,000 annually by an estimated 811,000 commercial square feet within four blocks results in about 24 cents per square foot annual assessment. Thus, for a 10,000 SF single-story office building, the assessment would be about $2,400 annually.

The actual parking assessment formula would likely be more complicated than simply building square footage (as discussed earlier in this chapter). An alternative to parking assessments would be to use parking meter revenues from the American Tin Cannery (ATC) area and increase the in-lieu fees. The option of installing parking meters in the ATC area is discussed in more detail in a later chapter.

Parking user charges at $195,000 annually would be equivalent to an average $42 per month per space in the new parking structure. Transient (hourly) rates are typically higher. If parking were split evenly between transient and monthly parking, transient spaces would need to bring in about $4/day and monthly parking about $30 per month.

The second bond issue, assumed for year 2003 would be for an estimated $1.3 million. This would require additional funding about one-fourth again the levels discussed above. Since the area of benefits is different from the Fountain/Laurel structure, a separate assessment district is needed. There would be an overlap period of about 15 years when both bonds would be paid off. Then there would be a five-year period when only the parking deck bond would be paid off.

These levels of financial support appear feasible if there is strong commitment of the Downtown business community. It will be important for the business community to feel that the required parking charges are: equitable to all; balanced; necessary to insure a healthy economy; and affordable. Some members of the Economic Revitalization Committee indicated that the user charges in new parking facilities seem excessive when considered against the long history of free short-term parking. The potential for in-lieu fees to discourage development was also discussed.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking Structure Construction Costs (incl. contingency)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$940,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Other Indirect Fees</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Financing Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Debt Service</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$565,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations &amp; Maintenance Costs for New Facilities</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,460,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$550,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,690,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$690,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Bond</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-lieu Fees</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking District Assessments</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments for Use of City Lot for Senior Housing</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Charges at New Facilities</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC Area Net Meter Revenues (used to pay off meter installation)</td>
<td>$150,000??</td>
<td>$150,000??</td>
<td>$150,000??</td>
<td>$150,000??</td>
<td>$150,000??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$455,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,055,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$800,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,050,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$965,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 12
AMERICAN TIN CANNERY: PARKING METER INSTALLATION

PROS AND CONS OF METER INSTALLATION

Parking meters are frequently installed in major commercial and tourist areas to promote turnover of the most convenient spaces, provide revenue, and assist in parking enforcement. However, merchants and customers often feel that parking meters are not only a cost factor and inconvenience, but they send a negative message to some prospective customers and visitors. The City of Pacific Grove has a General Plan policy discouraging parking meter installation, and they have not been used to date. There are a number of advantages and disadvantages of meters that are listed in Table 12-1.

Parking meters are being considered for the on-street parking near the American Tin Cannery (ATC) in Pacific Grove, in part because the City of Monterey already uses such meters within a half-block of the ATC. Since the mid-block boundary line between the two cities is virtually invisible, this represents an inducement for Aquarium/Cannery Row visitors to park in the prime spaces nearest the ATC. Also, the ATC customer does not necessarily differentiate between how the two cities treat him or her regarding parking. Many customers probably already think of the on-street parking in the area as “partly metered” or restricted to residents.

The issue of meter installation needs to be considered along with the time restrictions, although they are separate matters. One option to promote turnover is to require everyone to leave within 90 minutes; the other is to encourage short stays through parking charges, but to extend the allowable parking duration, much as Monterey has done, with 10-hour meters common in Cannery Row.
Table 12-1

ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF PARKING METERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking meters, when accompanied by adequate length of stalls, appropriate time restrictions, and proper provision for loading zones thoroughly supervised and actively enforced, produce the following benefits:</td>
<td>1. If used where not warranted, they arouse resentment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Provide an accurate time check on parking, simplifying the detection of overtime parking and discouraging all-day parking.</td>
<td>2. Unless properly enforced, motorists learn that they can park overtime without receiving a summons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reduce overtime parking, increase turnover, and make parking available for more motorists.</td>
<td>3. Unless frequently checked, some motorists will park overtime by feeding coins into the meter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Aid merchants in metered areas by increasing turnover.</td>
<td>4. After meters have been installed, the desire to continue the revenue may discourage the elimination of curb parking when traffic demands warrant it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reduce personnel required for parking enforcement.</td>
<td>5. On streets where parking is prohibited during rush hours, the presence of meters may make enforcement more difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reduce double parking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Aid traffic flow by reducing congestion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Aid in the financing of traffic control and off-street parking facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


FORECAST REVENUES AND COSTS

Meter rates should be set at or near the rates used by Monterey for its Cannery Row on-street parking: 75 cents per hour. This would generate an estimated $180,000, based on the following assumptions:

6 hours average daily occupancy per meter  
\( \times \$0.75/\text{hour/meter} \)  
\( \times 305 \text{ days/year (excluding Sundays and holidays)} \)  
$1,372.50 per meter annually  
\( \times 132 \text{ 90-minute spaces} \)  
$181,170 total annually

As a comparison, the City of San Jose downtown core parking meters collected slightly under $3 per meter per day in 1995, which has increased to about $5 per meter per day.\(^1\) Outside the downtown core, the average was about $1.70 per meter. Occupancy levels are significantly higher near the American Tin Cannery, however, especially during visitor peak periods.

\(^1\) City of San Jose, Department of Streets and Traffic, Parking Services Budget, 1994-95; Nita Rabe-Uyeno, Parking Administrator, City of San Jose, telephone discussion, September 10, 1997.
The primary increased costs would be for the meters and installation, as well as new signage. These would largely be up-front capital costs, although there would be maintenance and replacement of meters and signs. Each meter is estimated at $200 with installation or $264,000, with signage costs estimated at $11,000 for a total of $275,000.2

Meter collection costs are estimated at $30,000 annually. Enforcement costs are expected to drop slightly or remain level, since with the red flag, less time is needed to check for overtime violations than with chalking tires or recording license plates.

Thus, expected revenues would cover the capital costs within two years and would net about $150,000 annually after that. These net revenues could be used for additional parking either in the immediate area or Downtown. (This amount is about a quarter of that needed to pay debt service and operating/maintenance costs for a Fountain/Laurel parking structure.)

CONCLUSIONS

The area within a block of the American Tin Cannery represents a unique location. There is a heavy demand during prime tourism periods for stays over 90 minutes and for multi-destination trips, including those who actually spend some or all of their time over the border in Monterey. Parking meter installation in conjunction with extension of the maximum allowable parking stay (to three hours, or at least two hours) would provide incentives for turnover, while giving customers and visitors more choice. Currently, a family cannot realistically park, shop at the ATC, eat lunch, and take even a brief stroll on the Rec Trail within a 90-minute period.

The net revenues to the City also outweigh the potential disadvantages. The City of Pacific Grove should not “subsidize” parking by those actually spending most or all of their time in Monterey. Furthermore, the ambiance of the ATC area is not of a “friendly, small town” shopping district like Downtown Pacific Grove, but of a visitor-oriented area with major attractions.

The ATC management and merchants should have significant say in the parking policy at this location. ATC management favors meter installation and an increase in time limits.3 They should be consulted before implementation details are decided.

2 City of San Jose, Building a Balanced Parking Program: The New Three Year Plan, February 1996.
3 Jan Henson, General Manager, American Tin Cannery, telephone discussion, September 9, 1997.
Chapter 13
CONCLUSIONS

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Of about 1,450 Downtown parking spaces, 59% are on-street (curbside) parking, 23% in lots open to the public, and the remaining 18% in private lots. All of the public parking is located in central area roughly bounded by 15th and 17th Streets, Central and Pine Avenue.

An estimated 77% of all Downtown parking is occupied during summer peak periods. Since 90% occupancy is considered “practical capacity,” there is a fairly small margin of surplus parking. Furthermore, during special events on the east side of Downtown, public parking in this area could essentially reach capacity.

Forecasting conditions by year 2010, a substantial deficit is forecast if no additional parking is provided. The forecasts of growth in parking demand are heavily dependent on three fairly large redevelopment projects: (1) senior housing on the Fountain Avenue parking lot, (2) apartments on the Holman Building parcel, and commercial uses on the 520 Lighthouse parcel across from the movie theater. If these projects are delayed or do not occur, the growth in parking demand would be minimal and probably not sufficient to justify any kind of parking structure. Since this report was initially prepared, one of these projects (senior housing on the Fountain Avenue parking lot) appears less likely, partly because the Chamber of Commerce has endorsed another location outside of downtown.

Under the “worst case” scenario, an additional 395 parking spaces would be needed to keep parking occupancy rates under 90%. During special events, the estimated additional parking needed jumps to 515 spaces. (Valet parking or other special event program may completely mitigate the incremental impacts of the special event.)

The recommended Downtown program for the substantial growth scenario is a combination of measures:

1. Public parking at a garage on the Fountain/Laurel lot, ideally in conjunction with the senior housing project, but on its own if necessary.

2. A parking deck on the City lot at 16th/17th Street.

3. Changes in the zoning code to require all property developers, including commercial developers, to pay in-lieu fees, ideally supplemented by assessments on all property owners.

4. Parking pricing increases and trip reduction program.

5. Residential permit parking.
CONCLUSIONS

This program would be evenly balanced between supply increases of about 190 to 270 spaces and parking management actions reducing the demand by about 200 parking spaces. This program would also tend to strike a balance between protecting the environment and the pedestrian-oriented quality of Downtown on the one hand and convenient motor vehicle access desired by most customers and visitors.

This program would not preclude the provision of additional parking in Cannery Row or at the American Tin Cannery that could act (secondarily) as satellite parking. However, given the implementation difficulties and the potential for Downtown parking needs to take a back seat to local uses, it would not be prudent to rely on this option. However, this is an opportunity to provide parking that meets several needs: additional Cannery Row/Aquarium parking, additional ATC parking, and remote parking for Downtown Pacific Grove visitors.

Furthermore, it should not preclude providing reserved, on-site parking for residential properties. (Residential development would have the option of actually providing parking on-site or paying in-lieu fees to support off-site parking.) However, the recommended program does discourage scattered parking facilities for small commercial developments.

PARKING SUPPLY INCREASES AND ZONING CHANGES

The parking supply would be increased primarily by municipal construction of two facilities: adding at least one level of parking to the Fountain/Laurel lot (adding a net 110 to 190 spaces to the existing parking) and a deck on the 16th/17th Street lot (adding a net 80 spaces). Construction costs would be paid for bonds, with debt service and increased operating expenses split among: developer in-lieu fees, a new parking assessment district, user charges, and possibly net revenues from new meters at the American Tin Cannery area.

Revenues from the in-lieu fees, which is assigned the largest single share, would be increased by expanding Downtown parking requirements for new development to include essentially all private uses. Currently, only new residences and professional offices must provide additional parking. Other commercial uses, including restaurants, retail, financial establishments, and the like are exempt. (It may be assumed that since ground floor space is virtually built out, the number of new uses would be quite limited. However, this is not necessarily correct.)

The following parking supply requirements are suggested for new Downtown land uses not currently covered by the zoning regulations:

- Retail
- Restaurant
- Bank/financial
- General (administrative) office
- Auditorium/cinema

3 spaces per 1,000 SF
5 spaces per 1,000 SF (or 1 space per 6 seats)
3 spaces per 1,000 SF
2 spaces per 1,000 SF
1 space per 4 seats
These rates are lower than those for typical suburban stand-alone uses. This is in recognition of the likely substantial "walk-in" patronage, the efficiency of shared parking, and the need to encourage uses that contribute to a lively Downtown district.

**MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES AND FINANCE**

The recommended parking management programs include three efforts:

- Parking pricing increases and enhanced enforcement;
- Trip reduction program; and
- Residential permit parking.

Parking pricing increases would tend to reduce demand slightly and produce revenue for improved maintenance and new parking facilities. The recommended elements include:

1. Increases on existing monthly parking permits to a minimum of $25 per month and ideally $30 per month.
2. New monthly parking charged at $30 per month.
3. Free parking for up to two hours in all short-term municipal parking facilities with $1 per hour for the third and later hours in the proposed Fountain/Laurel parking structure up to a maximum of $5 per day. This facility would need to be gated. Transient parking payments would either be made to an on-site attendant or via payment to a machine that would dispense a magnetic card allowing exit ("pay on foot").
4. Installation of parking meters near the American Tin Cannery, charging 75 cents per hour, possibly with net meter revenues used for Downtown facilities.

There is also the potential for significantly increasing turnover and citation revenue by stricter enforcement. A high level of violations at two-hour spaces was noted, and this could be the focus.

The trip reduction program would be aimed at increasing the use of carpooling, public transit, bicycling and walking by both employees and visitors. The City already has a program aimed at developers and major employers, but this could be expanded. Aggressive steps are needed to meet or come close to the City's General Plan goal of limiting traffic growth to about 0.4% per year. Although it is outside the scope of this study to develop a detailed program, the following elements should be considered.

1. Increased financial support for expanded WAVE service by City and Chamber of Commerce, and more convenient WAVE service to Downtown from Lovers Point and the American Tin Cannery/Aquarium area.
2. Provision of bicycle lockers and racks in municipal parking facilities
3. City sponsorship of annual or semi-annual ridesharing fairs with free carpool and vanpool matching for Downtown employees.
4. Provision of transit information to motels and Bed & Breakfast establishments.
5. Financial and political support for inter-city rail service between Monterey/Seaside and the San Francisco Bay Area (and possibly Santa Cruz County).
6. Free parking for registered vanpools with five or more passengers in municipal parking facilities.
7. Improved pedestrian connections and related signage between Lovers' Point and Downtown.

Residential permit parking is clearly an area of significant public concern. Residential permit parking should be allowed on 12th and 13th Streets on both sides of Lighthouse, outside the C-1 zone, probably limited to evening and weekend hours. Without a residential permit, two-hour parking would be allowed. (This would tend to preclude employee parking and guest parking for special events such as weddings or auctions. However, it would allow many other short-term guests, shoppers, and diners to park.) A maximum of two guest permits per household would be allowed.

Residential permit parking could be tied in to the provision of additional parking as discussed in our report. The residential permit zone would only be instituted after petition by at least 60% of the residents of each block and only if parking surveys indicated that on-street parking was at least 80% full for three consecutive hours on two typical weekend/evening periods. However, the City could take a proactive stance, possibly including surveying residents and conducting parking surveys.

Some of these provisions would require changes in Municipal Code chapter 16.41 governing residential permit parking.

Related to the residential permit parking issues, the City could pass an ordinance requiring a permit for special events expected to attract more than 150 visitors at one time. A parking program detailing how parking demand would be met without excessive neighborhood impacts would need to be approved by the Community Development Department. Typically such programs would refer to either valet parking or use of shuttle/charter buses to transport guests.

**SUPPORT FOR CONTINUED DOWNTOWN REVITALIZATION**

The parking program adopted must support Downtown revitalization. Some refinements may be needed to adhere to the objectives and principles of the revitalization effort. In particular, parking must be financed in a way that does not stifle desirable growth or overburden existing property owners and merchants. Parking should be provided in convenient locations. New parking facilities should be promoted as part of Downtown marketing by the Chamber of Commerce and the City.
COMPARISON TO 1984 STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS

The 1984 parking study recommended a phased program. Phase I (restriping existing lots and expanding curbside parking to add 95 spaces) was generally implemented. Phase II and III called for major parking supply increases that were not implemented: construction of a Holman's/Medical Clinic structure to add 330 spaces and construction of a structure between Lighthouse and Central, west of 18th Street to add 270 spaces plus 21,000 square feet of retail.

This new study forecasts a similar level of parking deficiency in the future if no additional parking is built and significant growth occurs. However, the recommendations are significantly different for the following apparent reasons:

1. Growth is proceeding at a slow to moderate pace. Provision of one or more large structures could result in excess supply for several years until demand catches up.

2. Stand-alone, multi-level parking structures are not consistent with the apparent desire of the community to maintain a pedestrian scale in Downtown. This desire was indicated in the recent General Plan revisions to “review and revise height and story limits to maintain compatibility of new and remodeled buildings with the existing character of Downtown” and to maintain a maximum floor area ratio of 2.0 to 2.3 for commercial/office uses.

3. Providing sufficient parking to meet all demand is not consistent with current efforts to limit auto traffic, including the General Plan policy calling for a maximum 4.5% increase in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in the decade between 1995 and 2005.

4. Parking is clearly being offered to drivers free or well below its market value. A more realistic pricing policy would tend to dampen demand somewhat.

5. The smallest deficiencies are forecast for the western end of Downtown, where one of the parking structures was recommended in the 1984 study.

6. Financing new parking facilities has been a major barrier to increasing the parking supply. With the passage of Proposition 218, which makes implementation of parking assessment districts more difficult, the financial barriers loom even larger.

PHASING AND IMPLEMENTATION

Since the pace of development appears relatively slow and the recommended program is based on growth to year 2010, it is not necessary to implement all measures within the next several years. The pace of development can be monitored to determine whether the largest assumed projects or their equivalents appear likely. If substantial growth does occur, the highest priorities should be for changes in the zoning code to ensure that in-lieu fees are collected from developers. As a development impact fee, parking in-lieu fees are not subject to Proposition 218. However, parking district assessments are, suggesting an extensive effort would be needed to determine whether there is a base of support and if so to expand on it. Within the next one to two years,
the Fountain/Laurel senior housing/public parking project should be defined, along with pricing changes and trip reduction efforts. The Fountain/Laurel garage (or an equivalent project) can be constructed within the next five years. However, this is a relatively favorable time for bond financing, with interest rates low and not likely to dip much lower.

The 16th/17th Street deck (or an equivalent project) can likely be deferred for five to ten years. Changes in parking demand can be monitored annually or more often to determine the need.
APPENDIX

CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE PARKING ---- WEEKEND SURVEY
SATURDAY
OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES
SURVEY DATE: 4/19/97 SATURDAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARKING STUDY ZONE</th>
<th>CITY LOT SPACES</th>
<th>11AM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>12:00 PM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1:00PM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2:00PM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>PRIVATE LOT SP</th>
<th>11AM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>12:00PM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1:00PM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2:00PM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARKING STUDY ZONE</th>
<th>ATC LOT SPACES</th>
<th>11AM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>12:00 PM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1:00PM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2:00PM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATC AREA</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SATURDAY
ON-STREET PARKING SPACES
SURVEY DATE: 4/19/97 SATURDAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARKING STUDY ZONE</th>
<th>ON STREETS SPACES</th>
<th>11AM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>12:00 PM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1:00PM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2:00PM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARKING STUDY ZONE</th>
<th>ON STREETS SPACES</th>
<th>11AM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>12:00 PM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1:00PM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2:00PM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATC AREA</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE PARKING ---- WEEKDAY SURVEY

**WEDNESDAY**

## OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES

**SURVEY DATE : 4/9/97 WEDNESDAY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARKING STUDY ZONE</th>
<th>CITY LOT SPACES</th>
<th>11AM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>12.00 PM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1.00PM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2.00PM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>330</strong></td>
<td><strong>230</strong></td>
<td><strong>70%</strong></td>
<td><strong>216</strong></td>
<td><strong>65%</strong></td>
<td><strong>234</strong></td>
<td><strong>71%</strong></td>
<td><strong>218</strong></td>
<td><strong>66%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARKING STUDY ZONE</th>
<th>ATC LOT SPACES</th>
<th>11AM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>12.00 PM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1.00PM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2.00PM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATC AREA</strong></td>
<td><strong>148</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
<td><strong>49%</strong></td>
<td><strong>95</strong></td>
<td><strong>64%</strong></td>
<td><strong>98</strong></td>
<td><strong>66%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>68%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ON-STREET PARKING SPACES

**SURVEY DATE : 4/9/97 WEDNESDAY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARKING STUDY ZONE</th>
<th>ON STREET SPACES</th>
<th>11AM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>12.00 PM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1.00PM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2.00PM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>863</strong></td>
<td><strong>520</strong></td>
<td><strong>60%</strong></td>
<td><strong>566</strong></td>
<td><strong>66%</strong></td>
<td><strong>549</strong></td>
<td><strong>64%</strong></td>
<td><strong>530</strong></td>
<td><strong>61%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARKING STUDY ZONE</th>
<th>ON STREET SPACES</th>
<th>11AM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>12.00 PM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1.00PM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2.00PM OCCUP.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATC AREA</strong></td>
<td><strong>157</strong></td>
<td><strong>123</strong></td>
<td><strong>78%</strong></td>
<td><strong>126</strong></td>
<td><strong>80%</strong></td>
<td><strong>116</strong></td>
<td><strong>74%</strong></td>
<td><strong>127</strong></td>
<td><strong>81%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An Estimate of Potential Development in Downtown Pacific Grove, 1997-2010*

1. The following table shows selected parcels in Downtown Pacific Grove that have been identified as vacant or underutilized, therefore having potential to be developed with general commercial square footage by the year 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Projected Square Footage of Commercial Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>623 Lighthouse Avenue</td>
<td>00629301</td>
<td>6396 (3198 x 2 stories)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617 Lighthouse Avenue</td>
<td>00629302</td>
<td>8600 (4300 x 2 stories)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214 Grand Avenue</td>
<td>00628206</td>
<td>2400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319 Forest Avenue</td>
<td>00628808</td>
<td>11520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223 Grand Avenue</td>
<td>00628311</td>
<td>4740 (2370 x 2 stories)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161 Fountain Avenue</td>
<td>00617404</td>
<td>8400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148 15th Street</td>
<td>00617403</td>
<td>4200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520 Lighthouse Avenue</td>
<td>00617809</td>
<td>38374 (19187 x 2 stories)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total projected square footage of commercial development in this estimate: **84630 square feet**

2. The following table shows parcels in Downtown Pacific Grove that have been identified as having potential to be developed as residential units by the year 2010, based on proposals under discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Area of Parcel in Square Feet</th>
<th>Projected Residential Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>542 Lighthouse Avenue (Holmans)</td>
<td>00617301</td>
<td>59765</td>
<td>27 apartment units (maximum potential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain Avenue Parking Lot</td>
<td>00628415</td>
<td>38080</td>
<td>40 units of senior housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. General Plan policies and Zoning regulations allow additional residential units to be developed on the second story above commercial uses in both existing and proposed structures in the Downtown. The number of estimated additional second story residential units in Downtown is 25.

**Summary:**
1. 84630 square feet of additional general commercial space
2. 67 residential units from specific proposed projects
3. 25 residential units from gradual development of units on the second story above commercial properties

See the accompanying map for the location of the parcels described here.

*The table includes sites that, in staff’s opinion, have greater potential for intensified development, i.e., sites which are vacant or significantly underutilized. It should be noted that this table does not represent build-out in the Downtown.*
CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE PARKING STRUCTURE
FEASIBILITY STUDY

BUDGET CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE

SITE -1 OPTION -1 (FOUNTAIN AVE. AT LAUREL)

SCOPE OF WORK: A three level below grade parking structure on a 270' x 126' foot print with approximately 250 spaces.

AREAS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>S.F.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slab on Grade</td>
<td>34,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevated Slab</td>
<td>62,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>96,390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ESTIMATED COSTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slab on Grade</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevated Slab</td>
<td>$1,247,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$1,587,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excavation</td>
<td>$252,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoring</td>
<td>$254,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining Walls</td>
<td>$254,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterproofing of Walls</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterproofing of Slab</td>
<td>$102,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Ventilation</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Sprinkler System</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevators</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,492,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub Total:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractor's O.H. &amp; Profit</td>
<td>$308,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$308,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST $3,695,000

Cost per S.F.: $38.33
Cost per Stall: $14,780

- The above construction cost does not include construction indirects such as costs for A&E fees, environmental review, soil report, survey, permit fees, testing, inspection, and printing costs.
CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE PARKING STRUCTURE
FEASIBILITY STUDY

BUDGET CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE

SITE -1 OPTION -2 (FOUNTAIN AVE. AT LAUREL)

SCOPE OF WORK: A three level below grade parking structure on a 270' x 126' foot print and two level above ground structure on a 126' x 120' foot print with approximately 330 spaces.

AREAS: Added area 30,240 S.F.

COSTS: Cost of underground parking $3,695,000
Cost of added two levels $816,000
*Total Construction Cost $4,511,000

Cost per S.F. $35.62
Cost per Stall $13,670

- The above construction cost does not include construction indirecets such as costs for A&E fees, environmental review, soil report, survey, permit fees, testing, inspection, and printing costs.
CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE PARKING STRUCTURE
FEASIBILITY STUDY

BUDGET CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE

SITE 2 (Lot At 16th & 17th Streets)

**SCOPE OF WORK:**
A two level above ground parking structure on a 270' x 126'
site with approximately 150 spaces.

**AREAS:**
- Slab on Grade: 24,460 S.F.
- Elevated Slab: 19,168 S.F.
- TOTAL: 43,628 S.F.

**COSTS**
- Slab on Grade: $245,000
- Elevated Slab: $422,000
- TOTAL: $667,000

**OTHER COSTS:**
- Site Work: $25,000
- Spandrels: $34,000
- TOTAL: $59,000

SUB TOTAL: $726,000
Contractor's O.H. & Profit: $109,000
Contingency: $109,000
*TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST: $944,000

Cost per S.F. $21.64
Cost per Stall $6.293

- The above construction cost does not include construction indirec
t such as costs for A&E fees, environmental review, soil report, survey, permit fees, testing, inspection,
and printing costs
CITY OF PACIFIC GROVE PARKING STRUCTURE
FEASIBILITY STUDY

BUDGET CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE

SITE 3 (542 Light House-Holmans)

SCOPE OF WORK: A three level above ground parking structure on a 280' x
126' foot print with approximately 320 spaces.

AREAS:
- Slab on Grade 35,280 S.F.
- Elevated Slab 60,858 S.F.
- TOTAL 96,138 S.F.

COSTS
- Slab on Grade $353,000
- Elevated Slab $1,339,000
- TOTAL $1,692,000

Other Cost:
- Site Work $40,000
- Spandrels $81,000
- Elevators $100,000
- TOTAL $221,000

SUB TOTAL $1,913,000
- Contractor's O.H. & Profit $191,000
- Contingency $191,000
- TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST $2,295,000

Cost per S.F. $23.87
Cost per Stall $7,172

- The above construction cost does not include construction indirec
t such as costs for
A&E fees, environmental review, soil report, survey, permit fees, testing, inspection,
and printing costs.