# **DRAFT FINAL REPORT**

# **Citywide On-Street Parking Management Plan**

(City Project No. 590-RPT)

City of South Gate Public Works Department – Engineering Division



#### **PREPARED FOR:**



**City of South Gate PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT ENGINEERING DIVISION** 8650 California Avenue South Gate, CA 90280



#### **PREPARED BY:**

#### MINAGAR & ASSOCIATES, INC.

ITS – Traffic/Civil/Electrical Engineering – Transportation Planning

23272 Mill Creek Drive Suite 240 Laguna Hills, CA 92653 Tel: (949)707-1199 • Web: www.minagarinc.com







CITY OF SOUTH GATE CITYWIDE PARKING STUDY

# **Table of Contents**

#### **1 - Executive Summary**

- 1.1 Overview of the Parking Management Plan
- 1.2 Citywide On-Street Parking Study and Community Outreach
- 1.3 Key Findings of the Study
- 1.4 Recommended Parking Strategies and Policies

#### 2 - Introduction

- 2.1 Background / Study Need and Purpose
- 2.2 Methodology

#### 3 - Analysis of Existing Parking Conditions

- 3.1 Parking System Inventory
- 3.2 Parking Demand Counts
- 3.3 Parking Utilization Findings
- 3.4 Parking Issues Analysis

#### 4 - Public Outreach and Feedback

- 4.1 Overview and Approach
- 4.2 Issues Raised by the Community
- 4.3 Strategies Supported by the Community
- 4.4 Analysis of Public Feedback
- 4.5 Index of Issues and Concerns

#### **5 - Parking Management Strategies Toolbox**

- **5**.1 Synthesis of Parking Issues and Challenges
- 5.2 Short-Term Strategies
- **5**.3 Mid-Range Strategies
- **5.4** Long-Term Strategies

## 6 - Recommended Parking Policies and Implementation Plans

- 6.1 Recommendations
- 6.2 Short-Term Parking Policies
- 6.3 Mid-Range Parking Policies
- 6.4 Long-Term Parking Policies
- 6.5 Citywide On-Street Parking Action Plan (Recommended Strategies)

#### Appendices

- Appendix A Parking Utilization Maps
- Appendix B Public Feedback and Survey Responses
- Appendix C On-Street Parking Inventory / GIS Database





# **Executive Summary**

#### 1.1 - Overview of the Parking Management Plan

The City of South Gate engaged Minagar & Associates, Inc. (Minagar) to complete a Citywide Parking Study. The goals of this study were to evaluate current supply and demand conditions on every public street and block within the City of South Gate, and to obtain public feedback and input on parking issues. Further, Minagar was tasked with developing recommendations and a comprehensive plan based on the results of the study and discussions with city staff, to guide the city management in implementing future strategies and carrying out effective parking policy.

The team's findings and recommendations in this Plan provide the City of South Gate a valuable toolkit of strategies to address its ongoing parking issues, and an opportunity to make important, impactful changes for its citizens that will help to ensure that the onstreet parking supply will continue to serve its residents and businesses well; that existing and future regulations are effectively and equitably enforced; that any changes to the City's parking regulations or enforcement of such regulations are strategically defined and well-communicated to the public; and that parking will not continue to be a deterrent to the quality of life for those who live and work in South Gate.

In cooperation with Katherine Padilla Associates (KPA), Minagar & Associates, Inc. and City of South Gate Public Works staff focused on identifying existing on-street parking deficiencies, particularly in residential neighborhoods, encountered throughout the City on a day-to-day basis. The parking study was founded on understanding the root causes of the parking issues, based on the collected parking data and community feedback. This knowledge was then used to develop a set of short-term, mid-range and long-term recommendations and policies to support the City in addressing these issues. Combined, the parking survey data, public outreach efforts, incorporation of community-wide input, and cooperation with City staff and management to develop parking strategies and policy recommendations form this "Parking Management Plan" to guide the City of South Gate in a clear direction to address on-street parking issues over the next 10 years.

## 1.2 - Citywide On-Street Parking Study and Community Outreach

A series of on-street parking utilization surveys were first conducted across the City of South Gate, over the span of several weeks, and covering every public street in the City. The surveys began with Minagar staff conducting walking audits along every city block to





estimate the amount of on-street parking space available at the curb based on frontage length between driveways, absent parking obstructions and prohibitions such as fire hydrants, driveways, No Parking signage and painted curb zones. Each street was then driven multiple times each day to observe the number of cars occupying these spaces in order to understand how the existing on-street parking supply was being utilized on a typical day. Field staff also reviewed the video footage to identify potential causes of the parking deficiencies observed during the surveys. The collected data was then aggregated and analyzed to identify parking utilization rates across each community zone within the City, and the locations and times during which on-street parking utilization exceeded acceptable levels.

Following the field data collection parking surveys, Minagar and its public outreach consultant, KPA, worked with city staff to coordinate several community outreach meetings to obtain useful and measurable public input. The community's feedback was reviewed and incorporated into the Study as a tool to further inform Minagar's recommendations, and its understanding of localized parking issues within the city. The Project Team also administered an online survey for South Gate residents to take and provide feedback on the various parking issues and potential solutions. A combination of multiple choice responses and custom comments from individuals was returned over a one-month period, with a total of 762 residents who participated in the online survey.

The most notable findings of the online survey revealed that while the majority of respondents agreed on the key causes of parking issues (*Too many cars/drivers per household* – 77%, *Residents not using their own driveways or garages to park their cars* – 62%, *Multiple cars are parked on the street, stored or seldom used* – 55%); with the exception of providing preferential parking permits to residents (60% agreed this was a viable solution) the recommended strategies which might help to rectify these issues did not garner strong consensus across the board (*Install marked on-street parking stalls* – 39%, *Encourage residents to use their driveways/garages* – 36%, *Increase parking/police enforcement* – 29%; and so on). This indicated to the Project Team that residents do experience common sets of parking problems—high demands, constrained supply, and poor parking behaviors by others—and yet, there appears to be no "one size fits all" solution. Rather, a multi-faceted strategy which takes into account local neighborhood issues and characteristics, and combines the efforts of both the residents and the City would be the best approach in any given situation to resolve the ongoing parking problems in the City.



## **1.3 - Key Findings of the Study**

Following are key findings from this study:

• <u>On-street parking on residential streets is the biggest issue.</u> The core issue is the widespread lack of available on-street parking on *residential streets*, i.e., the curbside space within the public right-of-way typically open for residents to park their cars in front of (or at least near) their home. Approximately two-thirds of all publicly-maintained roadways in City of South Gate is comprised of local streets<sup>1</sup>; that is, roadways with direct vehicular access from the public right-of-way to residents' properties. Therefore, while curbside parking does accumulate on major collector streets and arterial highways throughout the City, the data reveals that the principal volume of on-street parking accumulation (and thus the focus of most of the City's parking issues) occurs within local neighborhoods on residential roadways, where cars are commonly found lining both sides of virtually every street, each day all throughout the week.

One of the most noticeable issues when driving through residential streets in the City of South Gate is that virtually every local street is significantly narrow, to the point where the presence of on-street parking on both sides of the street significantly constrains the passage of two-way traffic. This is especially the case for larger vehicles such as utility services, vans and pickup trucks. Based on the City of South Gate's Municipal Code and Zoning Ordinance<sup>2</sup>, a "narrow street" is defined as a roadway which is thirty feet or less in width. On such streets, the Director of Public Works may authorize the prohibition of parking on one side in order to enhance public safety and improve traffic mobility, since the presence of curbside parked cars (approximately 7 to 8 feet in width from the curb face, with side-view mirrors included) on both sides of the street leaves very little room for concurrent opposing traffic (30' wide street – (2 x 7' parking lanes) = 16 feet / 2 travel lanes  $\rightarrow$  8-foot travel lane per direction). Unfortunately, since the vast majority of the City's residential roadways are 30 feet wide, and thus currently built to a "narrow street" standard, restricting parking on one side of every street for safety and mobility reasons may inadvertently cause a disproportionate number of residents who currently park on these streets—whether out of necessity or by choice—to be in direct violation of the City's parking code.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Management Partners. (2018, April 3). *Street Sweeping Evaluation Project Report*. Retrieved from City of South Gate City Council Agenda, May 8, 2018 Item No. 17.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> City of South Gate Municipal Code, Chapter 8.12, Section 040(J) pursuant to Ord. 1982 § 2, 4-11-95.





Therefore, in light of various pre-existing socioeconomic and operational factors discussed in further detail in this study which affect parking demand (e.g., population density, housing density, automobile ownership, frontage width, existing driveway dimensions, fixed street widths) two-sided on-street parking on narrow residential streets has not been prohibited by the City except on uniquely narrow streets such as Duane Way, Missouri Avenue, Deeble Street or Mariposa Lane where permitting it would render two-way traffic between parked cars impossible.

- Based on the field data collection, the highest on-street parking demands in the City exist in the neighborhoods west of Alexander Avenue (Zones 1 through 3), particularly during the weekday overnight hours and mid-day Saturday periods when most residents are home and the need for on-street parking reaches its peak. Neighborhood areas east of Alexander Avenue (Zones 4 and 5) also showed unsuitably high on-street parking conditions, only to a slightly lesser degree than the west side of the City. The highest concentration of frequently over-parked streets was found to be in the residential neighborhoods within a half-mile distance to the west and east of Long Beach Boulevard. The following is a summary of the peak parking utilization periods in each of the surveyed community zones in the City:
  - Zone #1 Alameda to Long Beach: 92%
  - Zone #2 Long Beach to California: 93%
  - Zone #3 California to Alexander: 77%
  - Zone #4 Alexander to I-710 Freeway: 68%
  - Zone #5N I-710 to east city limits, north of Imperial: 46%
  - Zone #5S I-710 to east city limits, north of Imperial: 58%

Based on industry practice, a maximally acceptable utilization rate for on-street parking is generally 85 percent. At this point, a driver can expect to find 1 free space for every 7 occupied. Above 85%, the parking accumulation has exceeded the functional capacity of the curb lane for convenient use, causing drivers (e.g., residents, guests) to park much further away from the intended destination/residence.

• <u>Supply Sufficiency</u>: Based on the above-described citywide parking utilization surveys it was concluded that South Gate's existing on-street parking supply, particularly within residential areas and during critical times of the day, is generally insufficient to meet localized demands. While most properties in South Gate do contain sufficient storage space in existing on-garages and driveways for multiple cars to be parked off of the street, on-street parking is much more convenient for many users and seemingly in higher demand in comparison to driveway/garage





parking. Factoring in the various constraints imposed by socioeconomic conditions and the limitations of the pre-existing built environment for residential neighborhood parking, it is seen that curbside parking is not immediately available to all residents, and that as a result many drivers wind up engaging in inconvenient or disruptive parking practices, such as rotating parked vehicles in driveways, premeditative double parking and "space saving", parking over sidewalks or front lawns, or finding an open curbside space much further away from their residence. Fortunately, there are a number of factors actively contributing to these localized shortages which can be alleviated now; for example, improving the use of parking spaces available on private property, adding more parking spaces on the street, or reducing the need for automobile ownership and parking demands. The efficiency of the current supply could be further improved by upping enforcement of existing parking and code regulations to make the existing curbside parking supply more readily available for regular users.

Public Perception of the Issues, and Community-Supported Strategies: The community mostly believes that the existing on-street parking deficiency is a matter of there being too many people per residence, owning too many cars, and an excessive number of cars on the street that should instead be parked in driveways and garages (or should not be there to begin with, as is the case of vehicles parked from nearby businesses, customer/employee vehicles of unpermitted home businesses, parked cars from residents of other streets, apartment tenants parked in front of single-family properties, or car sales/repairs on the street). In addition to the perception that neighbors prioritize the on-street parking lane over their own private driveways and garages, community members widely believe that simply the sheer number of resident car owners and automobiles per household is a root cause of the problem which causes the demand for on-street parking to extend beyond the limits of each individual property. Residents have also voiced a common concern over the intrusion of on-street parking by nearby businesses and schools, and the prevalence of unused cars left abandoned on the street which also contributes to the lack of available parking space. In terms of resolving the existing on-street parking problems, there is shared belief among the community that the best solution will involve a combination of the City implementing policies to affect parking availability, coupled with residents adopting new behaviors. Strategies that garnered the most public support included areas involving: preferential parking districts (residential on-street parking permits); better management and regulation of the existing onstreet parking system (e.g., marked on-street stalls, increased parking enforcement); and ways to encourage or compel residents to prioritize the use of their driveways

7





and garages for car parking (e.g., widening driveways, using garages for parking rather than dwelling space or storage).

• <u>Community Education</u>: Many community members are unaware of the countless causes behind the parking issues experienced in their own community, some of which they themselves may be contributing towards and can help alleviate. Existing parking regulations are one such aspect of the needed community education which is essential to the integrity of South Gate's public rights-of-way and on-street parking use. For instance, prohibitions related to parking large vehicles (i.e., greater than 7.5 feet wide) on residential streets; parking vehicles on the street for more than 72 hours in the same place; storing a non-operational vehicle on a public roadway for any longer than 12 hours; parking on a front lawn; and parking in a manner which blocks one's own driveway. Targeted outreach and education on "good neighbor" parking behaviors and City regulations and the benefits they offer to the community is essential.

## **1.4 - Recommended Parking Strategies and Policies**

Following are key action items recommended by this study:

- 1.) Present the recommended parking policies, or "Guiding Principles", described below and contained in this Citywide On-Street Parking Management Plan to City Council for adoption.
- 2.) Circulate this Plan to relevant city departments for future reference in leveraging the various "parking toolbox" strategies contained herein to mitigate on-street parking conditions in the short, medium and long term.

Summary of Recommended Parking Policies

- <u>Guiding Principle #1:</u>
  - Organize an internal Parking Task Force
- <u>Guiding Principle #2:</u>
  - Authorize Public Works to Implement As-Needed Parking Strategies on Public Streets
- <u>Guiding Principle #3:</u>
  - Direct Police Department to Address Operational Issues Related to On-Street Parking with More Parking Enforcement





- <u>Guiding Principle #4:</u>
  - Direct Code Enforcement to Focus on Addressing Private Property Issues Impacting On-Street Parking
- <u>Guiding Principle #5:</u>
  - Provide Private Property Owners with Opportunities and Strategies to Better Utilize Their Off-Street Parking Space
- <u>Guiding Principle #6:</u>
  - Implement Public Parking Strategies
- <u>Guiding Principle #7:</u>
  - Implement a Community Educational Campaign
- <u>Guiding Principle #8:</u>
  - Direct Community Development Department to Create Planning Initiatives to Enhance On-Street Parking Conditions

#### Summary of Parking Toolbox Strategies

The Team's combined efforts of field parking utilization surveys and public outreach resulted in the development of various parking toolbox strategies which could be applied to address specific parking issues encountered throughout the City. Through a series of screening steps, the following measures have been recommended for the City to implement as part of a short-term (within 1 year), mid-range (5-year) and long-term (10-year) plan:

## Short-Term Parking Strategies (within 1 year):

- Create a Parking Task Force to examine and address concerns raised in the Citywide On-Street Parking Management Study, and to guide the City's departments to implement the "Guiding Principles" and priority-list strategies developed in the citywide on-street parking action plan
- Remove/Reduce Red Curb Zones to Add Parking Space
- Stripe On-Street Stalls (Parallel)
- Increase Existing Code Enforcement
- Increase Parking Enforcement
- Allow Driveway Widening
- Develop an education campaigning program
- Involve Residents to Help Monitor/Enforce Parking Regulations
- Reach out to apartment owners to provide tenants with secure bicycle facilities to encourage more bike use and reduce auto ownership
- Improve public awareness of City-owned parking lots by installing wayfinding guide signage; publishing locations maps in visible places of public gathering or





on the City's website; and/or notifying the public of available parking lots through local newsletters or social media outlets.

• Work with local schools to develop neighborhood traffic management plans (NTMP) which incorporate parking mitigation strategies for faculty, staff and students who currently park on adjacent residential streets

## Mid-Range Parking Strategies (1-5 years):

- Expand Preferential Parking District (PPD) Program Citywide; Add New Streets
- Enter into an Agreement to Work with Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) to convert UPRR property to parking
- Improve availability and awareness of public transportation services including bus stops and discounted bus fares in order to help reduce auto ownership
- Establish Shared Agreements for Overnight Use of City/School/Private Lots
- Develop Incentive Programs to Get Residents to Use Their Driveways/Garages, or Encourage Residents to Discard Their Old or Unused Vehicles
- Add, Purchase or Construct Parking Lots for Public Use
- Explore Potential Web-Based Parking Finder Applications

## Long-Term Parking Strategies (5-10 years):

- Introduce Light-Rail (Eco-Rapid Transit) and Improve Connections to Destinations (First Mile / Last Mile)
- Reach out to businesses and explore feasibility of ride-sharing programs or parking incentive programs such as California's Parking "Cash-Out" Law (AB 2019) for employers who currently provide free parking
- Add More Citywide Bike Facilities and Active Transportation Program (ATP) infrastructure to Encourage Non-Motorized Modes of Travel
- Devise phased implementation plans to implement each of the short-term, mid-term and long-term strategies outlined in the Citywide On-Street Parking Study, based On prioritized factors such as City resources, funding, and the changing organization of local Community needs and demands.
- Oversee City staff implementation of parking programs
- Continually seek ways to improve city staff's coordination of parking-related planning and engineering activities with the reporting, monitoring and tracking of parking issues carried out by the City's Police Department/Parking Enforcement, and Zoning Code Enforcement personnel.
- Provide an Annual progress report to the City Council for review

Detailed information on the above measures are provided in the final section of this report.





# Introduction

#### 2.1 - Background / Study Need and Purpose

This report documents findings from a study that was commissioned by the Public Works Department of the City of South Gate, California. The study was conducted to inventory and analyze local on-street parking conditions and constraints throughout the City during various time periods of the week and Saturday, and to prepare recommendations that will provide the City with a tool box for practical strategies to address the different parking issues, including:

- Identifying existing observed parking deficiencies, particularly in residential neighborhoods, including their location and potential causes.
- Addressing immediate parking issues (i.e., quick fixes or "short-term" strategies).
- Addressing larger parking issues as part of an overall "toolbox" strategy to allow the City address its parking problems over longer, more gradually planned time frames.
- Positioning the City to better accommodate all ranges of future parking demands and shortages through planning strategies which reduce auto dependency and demand, and improve parking capacities and the utilization of existing storage, such as multi-modal/non-motorized projects, improved redevelopment policies

Recently, the City of South Gate has dedicated a significant effort to reanalyze its longstanding issues with curbside parking shortages on city streets, particularly through residential areas around the City. A variety of factors contribute to the noticeable on-street parking shortages encountered when driving through residential neighborhoods. The City of South Gate is ranked the 53rd most densely-populated city in the nation, behind nearby Cities of Hawthorne (#47), Lynwood (#42), Bell (#40), Lawndale (#30), Bell Gardens (#23), Huntington Park (#15), Cudahy (#13) and Maywood (#9) in Los Angeles County.

With such a high population density comes a higher-than-average number of dwellings per parcel, families per dwelling, and vehicles per square mile, yielding a higher chance of car ownership and thus parked vehicles per square mile. In addition, many of the denser neighborhoods in South Gate are highly auto-dependent, reflected by above-average car ownership rates as high as 3 vehicles or more per household citywide<sup>3</sup>; and 4+ cars per property in some of the denser neighborhoods such as Zone 3-SE/Zone 4-SW<sup>4</sup>, which is in the 99th percentile range of residential neighborhoods in the nation.

In addition, for many residents of South Gate there exist few viable alternative travel mode options besides the automobile to commute to work, shop and carry out regular errands.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> <u>Source</u>: CLR Choice, Inc. - <u>http://clrsearch.com</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> <u>Source</u>: Neighborhood Scout – <u>https://www.neighborhoodscout.com</u>





Presently, there are only a handful of public bikeways available to bicyclists in South Gate. They are located on the following streets and alignments:

## List of Existing Bikeways in South Gate

- Los Angeles River Bike Path From the North City Limit to the South City Limit
- Rio Hondo Bike Path From the North City Limit to the South City Limit
- Southern Avenue Bike Path\* From West of Truba Avenue to Burke Avenue
- *Gardendale Street Bike Lanes* From Garfield Avenue to the East City Limit
- Alexander Avenue Bike Lanes From Southern Avenue to the South City Limit

\* Located along the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) Utility Right-of-Way, parallel to the north side of Southern Avenue

The above bicycle facilities within South Gate serve as important alternatives to single-auto travel; however, as they are the only designated public bikeways within the entire City a great majority of residents still do not have sufficient access or reason to utilize them in place of owning a car to meet their transportation needs. Much of the residential parking shortages can be attributed to the inefficient use of other available, existing off-street parking facilities. For example, a large number of residents were observed to be occupying curbside parking space when there was sufficient storage available in residents' own driveways. In some areas, patrons of commercial properties were forced to use nearby available on-street parking when business parking lots were at-capacity. Other non-residential users were found to occupy curbside parking areas during "surge" times of the day; for example, parents of students temporary parking on-street during school pick-up and drop-off hours, or automotive sales/repairs shops storing vehicles on the street rather than on designated off-street lots, during normal business hours.

Other on-street parking shortage factors were found to be based in physical design constraints, which oftentimes influenced the behavior of drivers to voluntarily park their cars in the available space on private driveways. The predominant driveway standard in the City of South Gate is the single car-width driveway. Many cities provide 16-18 foot standard driveway widths for a single- or multi-family dwellings; however, most residential driveways in South Gate are only about 8-10 feet wide and do not flare out into the depth of the property. In addition to being aligned perpendicularly with the roadway and not allowing for a wider turning path with safe sight against toward traffic, this pre-existing design feature can potentially discourage residents from utilizing their own driveways and to park on the street. This impediment is further highlighted where multiple cars are parked in the driveway in front of the last parked vehicle. Due to the narrow width and typical inability to park side-by-side, cars parked head-in toward the back side of the driveway can effectively become "locked in".

Many other on-street parking constraints and issues have been identified, and are addressed in the Conclusions section.



# 2.2 - Methodology

The parking study was conducted on a citywide scale, within six (6) major designated areas numbered 1 through 5N and 5S, defined by the City of South Gate as the City's major neighborhood "zones". The first step consisted of the following two major tasks:

- Field scoping and meeting with the City to identify:
  - Field survey routes and regulatory traffic and circulation conditions that might bear on existing parking activities and on the field survey effort (e.g., street sweeping, trash collection, utility work and road closures, etc.).
  - $\circ$   $\;$  Locations of the on-street parking supply and demand routes
  - $\circ$  Area pertinent data to collect in the field; and
- An inventory of the existing supply of curbside, on-street parking and public offstreet parking lot along Tweedy Mile and around South Gate Park.
  - Included geotagged photos, details and locations of all existing curbside fire hydrants (where parking is prohibited by law), prohibitive parking signage and painted curb sections to regulate temporary and permanent parking activities. Data was collected by multiple field staff members using hand-held *iPad-Air2* tablets with *GeoJot+* asset management software installed.



Sample of Tablet-Based Parking Occupancy Inventory/Audit





As shown above, Minagar has provided the City of South Gate with a comprehensive database of these three on-street parking factors—on-street parking signage, painted curb sections, and fire hydrant locations—located and identified during the walking/tablet survey. The raw data was sorted, reassembled into individual assets and combined onto a unified Google Earth map (.kmz file). Using Google Earth Pro, the City of South Gate may identify, view the most recent photo of, track and inventory the quantities and locations of any parking sign, painted curb or fire hydrant located in the field at the click of a button. Each parking asset may be toggled on or off on the live map, and the City may choose to export any variety of datasets from the file into Microsoft Excel spreadsheet format.

As an example, if the City wishes to identify and re-assess the locations and details of all time-limited green parking in the City, this data may be selected from the Google Earth map and exported into a spreadsheet containing a line-by-line list of each green sign/curb, the lat/lon geographic coordinates of each asset, and the specific time duration specified on the sign.



The second step included an intensive on-street parking occupancy (demand) count program, conducted also on select city public lots, by which all citywide streets were driven and dashcam-video recorded to observe the number of occupied parking stalls and spaces in each direction, four (4) times each day over a span of several weeks including a typical weekend daytime shopping period on Saturday. Included the following time periods:

- Weekday Morning (AM) Period: 8:00am 10:00am
- Weekday Mid-Day (MD) Period: 11:00am 1:00pm
- Weekday Afternoon (AN) Period: 2:00pm 4:00pm
- Weekday Evening (PM) Period: 4:00pm 6:00pm
- One (1) sample neighborhood covering street sweeping times during the day
- One (1) sample neighborhood survey covering nighttime parking activity between the hours of 6:00pm and 10:00pm.







Sample of Dash-Cam Video Parking Occupancy Windshield Survey

The third step consisted of two analytical exercises. The first exercise consisted of evaluating parking utilization—that is. comparing and contrasting the available curbside parking occupancy (demand) different at times of the day with the available on-street parking supply during those times. The parking utilization analysis focused on identifying streets and

#### **Basics of Parking Utilization**

Parking Utilization looks at the number of parking spaces that are occupied versus those available at certain points of the day. This is generally described using the percent of parking capacity that is occupied.

For instance, the south side of an east-west running city street block where there is space for 20 cars to park along the curb between residential driveways, with 15 parked vehicles during a given time of the day, has a parking utilization rate of 75 percent during that time.

A maximally acceptable utilization rate for on-street parking is generally 85 percent. At this point, a driver can expect to find 1 free space for every 7 occupied. Above 85%, parking is beyond the functional capacity of the curb lane, causing driver (e.g., residents) to circle in search of a vacant space or use private driveways to park their car.

The example block described above would have available curbside space on the street for 5 more cars.





areas within each zone, times of the day and days of the week where parking activity was consistently high. This analysis, conducted on a block-by-block basis, identified the available parking supply, by block, and compared that supply to the existing number of off-street stalls that were counted during the days and hours of the inventory.

The fourth step in the study included presentations to City staff, and later to the local community and residents, the City Planning Commission, the Parks and Recreation Commission Citizen's Advisory Committee, the executive team and the City Council.

# 3 - Analysis

Following the field data collection effort, Minagar & Associates, Inc. assigned its in-house staff to manage the geocoded data collected from the field. Minagar staff developed a comprehensive on-street parking network model using *Microsoft Excel* to lay out the City's street system and on-street parking facilities in on organized, spreadsheet format. The workbook was coded and structured to clearly depict the inventoried on-street parking facilities, and to calculate and visually illustrate on-street parking trends from street to street, zone to zone, and between periods of the day.

The number of parking stalls per block was calculated as follows:

 Establish the effective length of a typical curbside parked car. The effective length of a curbside parked car consists of the length of the car itself plus the additional buffer space between it and another contiguously parked car. Based on *A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets* ("Greenbook")<sup>5</sup> the length of a typical passenger car design vehicle is 19 feet. In reality, modern sedan models are typically 14.5 to 16 feet in length, typical pick-up trucks range between 16.5 and 18 feet, some estate cars exceed 16 feet, and heavy duty pick-up trucks reach up to 19 feet in overall length. In order to establish a uniformly representative vehicle length dimension, a value of 16 feet was chosen as that which represents the length of the average passenger car parked on a residential street in South Gate.

In terms of the buffer space between parked vehicles, Minagar & Associates, Inc. conducted spot field measurements which revealed that this length ranged between 1 and 3 feet, depending on various factors such as the amount of open curb space

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO, 2018). *A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets*, 7<sup>th</sup> Ed. Chapter 2 Design Controls and Criteria, Exhibit 2-1. Design Vehicle Dimensions (US Customary), p. 17.





both in front of the adjacent car and the space remaining behind once parked, driveway location, and basic driver preferences. A typical on-street parking space buffer between vehicles was therefore selected as 2 feet.

Combining the above vehicle length and parking buffer dimensions, an effective onstreet parked car dimension of 18 feet per car was established. This 18-foot effective parked car length was further verified by measuring the lengths of several samples of chains of cars parked along the curb in different residential neighborhoods, which continuously measured out with car-to-length ratios of 1:18 (e.g., 36 feet for two cars, 54 feet for three cars, 72 feet for four cars, etc.). A review of other similar cities in the area, such as Maywood and Lynwood, reveal that marked on-street parking stalls ranged in length from 17 feet for an isolated space between driveways, up to 22 feet for larger marked stalls. For capacity estimating purposes in the utilization analysis, however, 18 feet was used as the empirically-derived typical parked car length on residential streets. This is due to the need to factor in local conditions and driver preference which reflect both the absence of marked on-street parking stalls and to some degree a willingness to accept tighter parking conditions due to the scarcity of available curbside parking. It should be noted that for design purposes, the length dimension of an actual designated on-street marked parking space running parallel to the curb in the City of South Gate would be preferably longer, typically 20 feet. The California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CAMTUCD)<sup>6</sup> states that the desirable dimensions of a curbside parking stall—for parking meter purposes, for example—are 8 feet wide by 24 feet long, with a preferred minimum length of 20 feet.

2. Determine the unregulated curbside parking supply. The unregulated curbside parking supply represents the total curbside space of a block face, exclusive of curved portions at intersection corners; regulatory controls such as parking signs, red painted curbs, and implicit No Parking zones at fire hydrants; and physical obstructions to vehicle or pedestrians access such as driveways and curb ramps. The long side length of residential blocks in the City of South Gate range anywhere from about 800 feet to 1,400 feet. Aerial imagery of each block face was reviewed on *Google Earth Pro*. Using the software's digital measuring tools, the unregulated curbside parking supply was calculated as a measure of [total length] ÷ [18 feet effective length per car]. For a typical 900-foot block in the City of South Gate, this would equate to roughly 50 cars which could ideally park on-street along a continuous curb in the absence of driveways and parking regulations. It is once

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> California Department of Transportation (Caltrans, 2019, March 29). *California MUTCD 2014 Edition, Revision 4*. Section 3B.19 Parking Space Markings, Item 11, p. 685, accessed 29 May 2019 from <u>http://www.dot.ca.gov/trafficops/camutcd/docs/2014r4/CAMUTCD2014-Chap3B\_rev3.pdf</u>





again important to note that, as mentioned in Step #1 above, in contrast to using a design dimension of 20 feet as with the case for an on-street marked parking stall, the 18-foot effective parked car length used in this step is relevant to the parking supply calculation (and by extension, the parking utilization analysis) because of its efficacy to produce a realistic parking utilization percentage when coupled with field-counted parking demand volumes. For example, a 75-foot curb length between two driveways can yield different on-street parking capacities, depending on the assumed parked car length. Using a 20-foot-per-car length would yield a capacity for 3 parked cars, assuming that a fourth car would elect not to obstruct driveway access. During the subsequent field data collection, however, under saturated parking conditions the unmarked 75-foot curb length would unquestionably incur a parking demand of 4 contiguously parked cars. Under the former assumption of 20 feet per car, the parking utilization would be overestimated by a difference of 33%, whereas under the latter assumption, the parking utilization would be estimated more accurately. The California MUTCD provides useful material on this matter, and in a typical design situation where on-street parking stalls are to be marked parallel to the curb, Figure 3B-21(CA) in Chapter 3B of the CAMUTCD would need to be considered.

3. <u>Determine the regulated curbside parking supply</u>. Using the geocoded Google Earth map database developed from the tablet/field surveys, curbside sections of the parking lane with fire hydrants, 24/7 No Parking Signage, red curb paint and driveways were noted and used to deduct the appropriate amount of parking space from the unregulated curbside parking supply to determine the curbside parking supply used in the parking utilization calculations.

The collected parking data was analyzed to better understand the following:

- The overall nature of on-street parking conditions throughout the City with respect to parking behavior, supply vs. capacity, and potential root causes of recurring parking deficiencies.
- Potential opportunities for implementable parking strategies, such as shared private/public parking, resolving impacts of commercial business on residential parking areas; short-term fixes (e.g., red curb rollback, reducing parking restrictions, expanding the City's Preferential Parking District (PPD) to new or modification street segments; opportunities to incentivize an increase in the use of public transit and/or bike facilities).



# **3.1 – Parking System Inventory**

The study area for the parking study was divided into six "zones" numbered sequentially from west to east, as defined below. For purposes of more granular analyses each zone was divided into a maximum of three additional sub-zones, typically by South, Central and North neighborhoods defined around the City's major east-west arterials (e.g., Firestone Boulevard, Southern Avenue and Tweedy Boulevard).

List of Citywide Parking Survey Zones:

- <u>Zone #1</u> Neighborhoods between Alameda Street on the west, and Long Beach Boulevard on the east.
- <u>Zone #2</u> Neighborhoods between Long Beach Boulevard on the west, and California Avenue on the east.
- <u>Zone #3</u> Neighborhoods between California Avenue on the west, and Alexander Avenue on the east.
- <u>Zone #4</u> Neighborhoods between Alexander Avenue on the west, and the L.A. River / I-710 Freeway on the east.
- <u>Zone #5N</u> Neighborhoods east of the L.A. River/I-710 Freeway and north of Imperial Highway.
- <u>Zone #5S</u> Neighborhoods east of the L.A. River/I-710 Freeway and south of Imperial Highway.

On-street parking spaces were counted to include both legally useable, unmarked curbs permitting on-street parking; and marked curbs permitting the use of temporary parking. Throughout the course of the Project, construction of major infrastructure and hardscape improvements along the length of Firestone Boulevard west of I-710 remained ongoing. Therefore, due to the frequent and unpredictable on-street parking lane closures, curbside parking on Firestone Boulevard was not counted toward the overall parking supply as part of this project. The inventory of parking spaces and parking stalls showed that there is a total of about 31,307 total unmarked on-street parking spaces available citywide (i.e., not prohibited for use by the public on a permanent basis, such as red curbed zones or at fire hydrant locations). Of this total, approximately 15% (14.96%) are located in Zone #1 (4,683); 22% (21.58%) are located in Zone #2 (6,757); 23% (22.51%) are located in Zone #3 (7,047); 22% (22.35%) are located in Zone #4 (6,996); **6%** (6.29%) are located in Zone #5N (1,968), and **12%** (12.32%) are located in Zone #5S (3,856). *Table 1* breaks these totals out by study area segment. The average number of available parking spaces per block is approximately **16 spaces**, with an average rate of <u>17 spaces/block</u> throughout Zone #1, <u>15 spaces/block</u> in Zone #2, <u>18 spaces/block</u> in Zone #3, <u>15 spaces/block</u> in Zone #4, <u>18 spaces/block</u> in Zone #5N, and <u>17 spaces/block</u> in Zone #5S.











#### TABLE 1

#### Citywide On-Street Parking Supply, by Zone and Sub-zone

Zone #1 - between Alameda St. & Long Beach Blvd.	4,683
North - north of Firestone Blvd.	251
Central - between Firestone Blvd. & Tweedy Blvd.	2,517
South - South of Tweedy Blvd.	1,915
Zone #2 - b/w Long Beach Bl. California Av.&	6,757
North - north of Firestone Blvd.	3,475
Central - between Firestone Blvd. & Tweedy Blvd.	2,328
South - South of Tweedy Blvd.	954
Zone #3 - b/w California Av. & Alexander Av.	7,047
North - north of Firestone Blvd.	1,744
Central - between Firestone Blvd. & Tweedy Blvd.	2,537
South - South of Tweedy Blvd.	2,766
Zone #4 - b/w Alexander Av. LA River/I-710	6,996
North - north of Firestone Blvd.	311
Central - between Firestone Blvd. & Tweedy Blvd.	3,115
South - South of Tweedy Blvd.	3,570
Zone #5N - East of LA River/I-710 (North of Imperial Hwy.)	1,968
Zone #5S - East of LA River/I-710 - (South of Imperial Hwy.)	3,856
North - north of Gardendale St.	570
West - west of Union Pacific R/R	2,152
East - east of Union Pacific R/R	1,134
TOTAL	31,307

#### 3.2 - On-Street Parking Occupancy Counts

#### Initial Video/Windshield Surveys

Parking occupancy was counted during the Summer months of 2018. The counts were originally conducted on typical weekdays, with specific survey days scheduled between Monday and Friday on the basis of the need for field surveyors to circumvent street





sweeping routes and avoid the collection of partial curbside parking counts. The occupancy counts were taken by reviewing windshield survey footage of each street collected during four different time periods during the day on weekdays. The four time periods were chosen to cover peak parking periods in the morning (AM/school drop-off period), mid-day (MD/lunch period), afternoon (AN/school pick-up period), and evening (PM/commuter period) hours in an attempt to capture critical parking issues in both commercial and residential areas. Saturday counts were conducted from 10:00am to 2:00pm to cover the peak shopping period during the typical mid-day period.

#### Follow-up Video/Windshield Surveys

Following the completion of this initial data collection plan, Minagar & Associates, Inc. had subsequent discussions with City staff regarding two additional concerns: (1) on-street parking utilization during street sweeping hours, and (2) on-street parking utilization during the late night hours, based on a commonly held presumption amongst citizens and city officials that peak on-street parking activity occurs at nighttime when residents are expected to all be home and generating the highest demand for cars parked on the street. Based on these discussions, Minagar conducted two additional sample parking occupancy surveys on Wednesday, November 14, 2018, to assess each issue on a smaller, controlled scale. The resulting data was then used to project how each issue would impact on-street parking throughout the rest of the city, and on different days of the week.

The first set of sample parking occupancy counts was conducted in the central part of Zone #2 between the hours 8:00AM and 10:00AM, which is posted with No Parking signage (for street sweeping purposes) on one side of each street between the hours of 7:30AM and 11:30AM, generally. The first additional survey area was limited to the residential neighborhood bound by Long Beach Boulevard on the west, Dearborn Avenue on the east, Southern Avenue on the north, and Tweedy Boulevard on the south. The second set of sample counts was collected later that night in the southern part of Zones #3 and #4 between the hours of 6:00PM and 10:00PM, during which time it was conveyed to Minagar that on-street parking demands were perceived to be at their highest. The second additional survey area was limited to the residential neighborhoods bound by Tweedy Boulevard on the north, Abbott Road on the south, Otis Street on the west, and Atlantic Avenue on the east.

## 3.3 - Parking Utilization Findings

The following section describes parking utilization throughout the City. Utilization patterns are examined by time of day, day of week, and geographic zone location. The findings of the





parking utilization analysis reveal that there is an average on-street parking utilization, on a citywide basis, of 64% between the hours of 8:00AM and 6:00PM when street sweeping is not considered as a capacity-limiting factor. While a 64% parking utilization rate may suggest that existing on-street parking conditions are generally acceptable in the City, a more detailed look reveals that this is not necessarily the case for three important reasons, which thus require a more granular analysis. The first reason is that many long stretches of arterial streets in the City (especially in industrial type zones in Zones 5N and 5S) are devoid of any on-street parking activity all throughout the day, the resulting aggregation of which positively affects the weight of the City's overall parking utilization and somewhat misrepresents the City's most parking sensitive areas; namely, that of densely populated residential streets with limited on-street parking capacities.

For example, the most critical parking utilization issues were found to be located on the west side of the City in Zones 1, 2 and 3, and less so in Zones 4 and 5N/5S. During the weekday PM survey period (4:00-6:00pm), for example, Zone #1 on the whole is parked at 80% utilization, and Zone #2 is parked at 81% utilization. On the weekend, Zone #1 is parked at 74% utilization; Zone #2 is parked at 92% utilization; and Zone #3 is parked at 93% utilization. According to this data, the available supply of on-street parking spaces in these highly-parked areas would be about only one or two spaces per typical block.

The second reason is that the initial set of parking occupancy data was collected specifically outside of street sweeping hours, in order to capture an ideal situation in which both sides of each street are being utilized for parking purposes when street sweeping is not occurring. While this time parameter is a reasonable one to incorporate into the data collection—considering that street sweeping restrictions account for only about 10% of the time that any given street is prohibited for daytime curbside parking between Monday and Friday—it does not take into account the "spillover effect" that occurs when street sweeping causes on-street parked cars to relocate not onto private driveways but to the other side of the street.

Thirdly, from the additional nighttime survey it was determined that the sample survey zone in the southern part of Zones #3 and #4, was indeed parked at a higher utilization rate than during any other time of the day. While the PM period parking occupancy evaluation revealed a utilization rate of 61%, the follow-up survey conducted at night after 6:00PM showed that the total on-street parking demand increased further by about 15%, yielding a nine percent increase in the overall on-street parking utilization rate to 70%. Therefore, while the City's streets may not experience an overall parking deficiency at all times of the day and all days of the week, this does not discount the fact that many streets experience unacceptably oversaturated parking conditions at specific times of each day and





week which must be addressed, particularly during the weekday and weekend nighttime hours.

To expand on the third point above, Minagar estimated the on-street parking utilization for the remainder of the City based on an extrapolation of the data from the follow-up sample nighttime survey runs in Zones #3 and #4. Using this data, and not including any potential on-street parking capacity reductions for commercial streets swept after midnight, we increased all parking demands for Zones #1-5 by a similar +15%, which yielded the following nighttime on-street parking utilizations:

- Zone #1: 92% (+12% increase from 4-6pm)
- Zone #2: 93% (+12% increase from 4-6pm)
- Zone #3: 77% (+10% increase from 4-6pm)
- Zone #4: 68% (+9% increase from 4-6pm)
- Zone #5N: 46% (+6% increase from 4-6pm)
- <u>Zone #5S: 58% (+8% increase from 4-6pm)</u> Citywide: 76% (+10% increase from 4-6pm)

A complete summary of the parking utilization analysis is found on the attached tabulations accompanying this report.





# 4 - Public Outreach and Feedback

#### 4.1 - Overview and Approach

Building on the results of the in-field parking utilization analyses, the public outreach phase helped to ensure that (1) our observations were with what the community in-line was experiencing; (2) that neighborhood-specific priorities could be taken into account, as indicated in Tables 4 through 6 and discussed below, and (3) that each strategy moving forward would be supported by public acceptance that correlates with South Gate's local context. In order to first verify that our identified parking issues matched the understanding and experience of local residents and businesses, the Team engaged with the City and residents in several ways, including focus groups, community input sessions and online/write-in surveys. The goals of the public outreach were as follows:



- Present the preliminary findings of the citywide data collection effort and parking utilization analyses. The public outreach meetings provided a good opportunity to build awareness of study purpose, present to the public the findings of the field data collection and existing parking utilization analyses, discuss the issues identified by our Team to be driving the current on-street parking problems, and present some practical short-term, mid-range and long-term strategies to resolve these particular issues.
- <u>Understand the daily on-street parking experience of South Gate residents, and ascertain what the public believes are some of the best ideas available to try and resolve these issues. What are the biggest problems from a resident's perspective?</u>
   <u>When/where/how are they happening, and what might be done about it?</u> Public input from the community meetings helped the Team gain information on residents' daily experiences with on-street parking in various neighborhoods throughout the City, as well as identifying what are the current challenges and barriers to improve





the current parking experience. The findings of the parking utilization assessment revealed that on-street parking in residential zones comprised the vast majority of the City's parking deficiencies. Therefore, while the Citywide Parking Study intends to address the concerns and interests of all relevant users—including residents, businesses, visitors, guests, and the non-motorized traveling public—the community engagement effort made sure to place the experiences and concerns of local residents at the center of these discussions and the development of potential strategies and solutions.

• Ensure that future parking-focused programs, policies and implemented strategies align with local community, regional and statewide initiatives. The City of South Gate wishes to promote a greater vision to improve the quality of life for its citizens and businesses, a vision which includes revitalizing communities to produce lower auto dependencies, higher public transportation usage rates, and provide an improved master plan for circulation and access. The public outreach sessions with residents and businesses provided some insight on how our proposed recommendations would scale to this long-term vision, how each strategy would be received by the public and how they might work within South Gate's city and regional context. Obtaining and documenting public feedback on citizens' current views about regional and long-term strategies such as light rail transit, active transportation and public transportation improvements will help to ensure that this project remains relevant to local needs and that potential policy changes in the future will remain in line with regional and statewide initiatives.

The project team conducted several different activities to obtain public input, including eblasts, write-in surveys, community meetings and online feedback questionnaires. The feedback solicitation focused on first identifying the spectrum of parking issues experienced by residents on a day-to-day basis, and then establishing a consensus as to what are the biggest perceived problems facing on-street parking and what the public believes to be the most and least effective solutions to these problems. Together with city staff, Minagar & Associates, Inc. worked with its public outreach consultant, KPA, who has extensive experience with bilingual community engagement processes, to facilitate the various outreach sessions.

As discovered in the "Show of Hands" surveys conducted for the community meetings in Zones 2 through 5, a popular view held by at least one third of the participating public is that the solution to the ongoing parking problems will require the active assistance and cooperation from residents themselves, a partnership between the residents and City staff, and would likely involve a combination of different programs. Therefore, the City of South





Gate's partnership with residents will not simply be about informing residents, but rather will have residents help to inform (and in some special cases, enforce) decisions by developing a process of a shared decision-making.

As discussed in detail below, the specific methods and level of participation of residents and businesses will depend on the type and importance of each strategy, so that different neighborhoods and stakeholders will have varying levels of participation in certain situations. Up to this point, our Team has simply sought input and feedback from participating residents and businesses. However, as the City develops its on-street parking management plan moving forward, a greater level of participation will be needed to involve residents and Neighborhood Watch leaders as "experts on the ground" to direct neighborhood-specific parking policies and augment the capabilities of the city staff. To do this, the implementation paths for each short-term, mid-range and long-term strategy includes a list of logistical issues, regulatory considerations and potential tradeoffs—for example, the tradeoff between implementing a new parking permit zone to manage onstreet parking demands versus the added time/energy and financial burden for residents to manage guest parking and also annually renew their permits—so that neighborhoodspecific solutions are driven by the direct support of its own residents.

A total of five community meetings were held to collect input from community members for the Citywide Parking Study. Each meeting presented the same content in the same format. Following is a summary of the meetings. The City of South Gate distributed 26,200 community flyers citywide door-to-door. KPA e-blasted meeting notices three times to the City's Neighborhood Watch Captains and other community members who had provided their contact information during two pop-up events held in Spring 2018. In addition, KPA contacted by phone all Captains and sent a personalized follow-up email with an attached flyer asking Captains to distribute to their neighbors and social networks.

Mr. Arturo Cervantes, the City of South Gate Assistant City Manager and Public Works Director, opened four of the community meetings, welcomed participants, and served as moderator. Mr. Jose Loera, City Traffic Engineer, moderated the fifth community meeting. They introduced the Study, described its goals and objectives, and stated that the City of South Gate is conducting a Citywide Parking Study to identify all issues and quantify them, and then create short-range, mid-range and long-range practical solutions to address the most pressing concerns. As discussed above, the purpose of the meetings was to share with the public the data that has been collected through the study; provide a forum for the public to share the parking challenges that they are experiencing in their neighborhoods; present preliminary ideas as possible practical solutions; and ask the community to provide their opinions.





Using a PowerPoint, Mr. Fred Minagar from Minagar & Associates, Inc., presented the parking utilization analysis by first describing the data collection process used to quantify parking issues and causes in the City. The findings of the Parking Utilization throughout the City were described in terms of the percentage of parking supply versus the amount of parking demand, measured and documented through field studies during which the technical team drove all city streets utilizing dash cameras and handheld GPS asset trackers. The findings of the parking utilization analysis, coupled with field observations of parking behaviors, resulted in the documentation of key causes contributing to parking issues were presented. Examples of key issues included South Gate's dense population; the high level of car dependency; City street regulations (e.g., placement of red curbs on City streets); public behaviors (e.g., non-use of garages and driveways, drivers that park their cars in the center of limited area on the curb, taking up two spaces rather than allowing space that another driver can use; and the lack of code and parking enforcement. A detailed description of the issues is provided in the next section.

Minagar then presented ideas for potential practical solutions. At this stage, the list of strategies did not constitute an exhaustive list of recommended measures. It was explained to the public that these ideas—categorized by *Short-term*, *Mid-term* and *Long-term* implementation time frames—were intended as preliminary concepts only, with the purpose of the meeting being only to collect further opinions from the community in order to refine these concepts. The following is a sample of strategies presented during the community meetings:

## Preliminary/Conceptual Strategies Presented at Community Meetings

Short-term (can be implemented in less than 1 year)

- Reduce red curbs to increase on-street parking space
- Stripe parallel on street parking stalls
- Increase enforcement by adding/hiring new parking code enforcement officers
- Promote public transit services/provide public information
- Promote use of city parking lots
- Allow driveway widening on private property
- Remove barriers to "Driveway Sight Angles"; driveway red-tipping

## Mid-term (can be implemented within 3-5 years)

- Create an Ordinance to reduce 15-feet required parking distance from fire hydrant to 10-feet.
- Consider angled parking on wider street
- Develop Active Transportation Plans including walking and biking networks





- Design and build new and improved pedestrian paths on school routes and shopping centers
- Encourage employers on Ridesharing Incentive Programs

Long-term (can be implemented within 5-10 years)

- Expand Citywide Parking Enforcement Program
- Invest in Long-Range Transportation Alternatives (e.g., EcoRapid Light Rail)
- Implement the City's Bicycle Facility Master Plan
- Expand the City's Preferential Parking Districts (PPD) Program (Residential Parking Permits)
- Invest in "First-Mile/Last-Mile" Improvements and Enhancements

The five community meetings held featured the same presentation and format. Each meeting was specially designated to one of five zones established by Neighborhood Watch (i.e., Zones 1, 2, 3 4 and 5N/5S), although community members were invited to attend any meeting that they wish. Public input on the perceived cause(s) of parking problems, and potential paths to resolve these issues, was solicited through direct participation at each meeting, including "show of hands" surveys, individual testimony, and write-in surveys. The solicitation of public input at each meeting involved the sharing of residents' and businesses' perceived cause(s) of parking problems and potential paths to resolve these issues, through direct participation such as "show of hands" surveys, individual testimony, comment cards and write-in surveys. Table 2 below summarizes the tally of verbal and written feedback returned at each meeting:

Meeting Date/ <u>Location</u>	No. of <u>Attendees</u>	<b>No. of C</b> o <u>Verbal</u>	omments <u>Written</u>	Total <u>Comments</u>	
January 10, 2019/City Hall	70	32	15	47	
January 14, 2019/City Hall	68	31	6	37	
January 16, 2019/City Hall	71	34	12	46	
January 17, 2019/S.G. Park	137	26	6	32	
January 22, 2017/S.G. Park	47	25	8	33	

TABLE 2
Summary of Input/Responses from Community Meetings

Community comments have limitations, and should be considered qualitative in nature. Perception seemed to dictate the sentiments of the community, and





therefore the comments, and in many cases comments could not be substantiated by facts. To this end, the data collected during community meetings should not be accepted as a scientifically or statistically-valid representative of the greater population of the South Gate, since opinions are collected from a self-selected audience of community members who choose to attend the public meetings. Rather, it should be thought that the comments simply reflect opinions by which the project team can begin to determine trends of commonly shared issues. In any case, the consultant team accepted into account all opinions and suggestions submitted by community members throughout the public input process. Further testing of issues in their local contexts should be conducted prior to implementing parking strategies.

In the appendix section of this report is a series of matrices compiled and organized to reflect the most frequently mentioned issues and supported potential strategies, according to those who spoke at the community meetings and submitted written comments. The City also extended an open invitation for community members to submit comments to the city staff outside of the public meetings, via email or by phone call. Approximately 14 comments were received in that manner, and each was incorporated into the attached matrices. It should be noted that while public comments and tallies are categorized by Meeting Date/Zone, community members were invited to attend whichever meeting was most convenient even if outside their residential zone, and therefore tallies may not necessarily reflect 100% of the opinions of community members residing in each zone. In addition, the project team developed an online survey for South Gate residents to take and provide feedback on parking issues and solutions. A combination of multiple choice responses and custom comments from individuals was returned over a one-month period. A total of 762 residents participated in the online survey.

After compiling the various individual and group responses obtained from each community zone meeting and the online surveys, an analysis was conducted on the complete data set to understand the nature the public feedback. Verbal and written comments, as well as the "show of hands" surveys were categorized in terms of either describing a particular parking issue or concern, or being in support of or against a particular corrective strategy. Similarly, the online surveys were categorized in terms of public support for or against a particular recommendation or parking strategy, as well as other areas of inquiry such as support for parking permits, city parking policies, and level of willingness to participate in various parking demand reduction strategies. From these assessments Minagar was able to generate a list of the most common perceived parking issues and solutions, from the public's perspective, from the various public input forums.







## 4.2 - Issues Raised by the Community

Based on the totality of the public feedback, we see that there are several specific issues which residents frequently cite as contributing factors to the ongoing on-street parking problems in their neighborhoods. As shown in Table 4, for example, to the online survey question, "What is causing parking problems in your neighborhood?" the majority of survey takers, i.e., over 50% of all participants, agreed on the following three (3) major issues:

- Too many cars/drivers per household (77%)
- Residents not using their own driveways or garages to park their cars (62%)
- Multiple cars are parked on the street, seldom used, just stored (55%)

The two additional issues identified below also garnered a relatively significant number of responses to this question in the online survey:

- Apartments don't provide enough parking for number of residents per unit (42%)
- Not enough parking enforcement or code enforcement (35%)



# TABLE 4

# Online Survey Response Summary Q1: What is causing parking problems in your neighborhood?

Total Number of Participants Surveyed:		762	
Listed Cause of Parking Problems	# of Affirmative Responses	Percent Responded	762
Too many cars/drivers per household	587	77%	587
People not using their own garages/ driveways to park	469	62%	469
Multiple cars are parked on the street; seldom used, just stored	416	55%	416
Lack of available off-street parking for apartment tenants	319	42%	319
Not enough parking enforcement or code enforcement	268	35%	268

Similar concerns were raised in the verbal and written comments, each of which was tallied into specific categories of known parking issues or potential solutions. Since verbal/written comments were accepted on a voluntary basis and without any survey controls for topic or prompt response, a percent-in-opposition/favor-of could not be established when analyzing the feedback as a gauge of public sentiment. Nevertheless, in looking at the most commonly mentioned parking concerns, as illustrated in Table 5, it is seen that the same few key issues did rise to the top of the list. They are as follows:

- Too many drivers per household *36 responses*;
- Lack of available off-street parking for apartment tenants 26 responses;
- Cars stored on the street for sale, servicing or repair 17 responses; and
- People not using garages/driveways to park 16 responses





TABLE 5
Most Commonly Mentioned Parking Issues via
Written/Verbal/E-mail/Phone Feedback

Parking Issue	Total	Zone	No. of Responses, By Zone		
Too Many Drivers	36	1	6	6	
		2	8	8	
		3	10	10	
per nousenoid		4	9	9	
		5N/5S	3	3	
		1	3	3	
Lack of Available		2	6	6	
Off-Street Parking	26	3	3	3	
		4	5	5	
		5N/5S	9	9	
	17	1	5	5	
Cars Stored on the Street for Sale, Servicing or Repair		2	1	1	
		3	5	5	
		4	4	4	
		5N/5S	2	2	
	16	1	2	2	
People Not Using		2	4	4	
Garages/Driveways		3	6	6	
to Park		4	1	1	
		5N/5S	3	3	
Cars Parked on the Street from Nearby Business Employees		1	3	3	
	13	2	0	0	
		3	5	5	
		4	1	1	
		5N/5S	4	4	

Citywi	de On-Street Parking Action Plan - Index of Issues and Concerns City of South Gate, CA
Parking I	ssue (PI)
PI#	Sequence chain of on-street parking issues and effects
<u>A</u> ll Park	ing Utilization Factors Affected
A-01	Lack of accurate/periodic data collection, evaluation and monitoring to understand where and how the worst OSP issues are occuring, in order to inform strategies → Missed opportunities to establish appropriate PPDs, direct law enforcement, etc.
<u>B</u> ehavic	oral Issues and Causes
B-01	Front driveway depth (e.g., corner lots) too short to park car(s) → Discouragement of front driveway use
B-02	Front driveway width (e.g., less than 16 feet) too short to park multiple cars side-by-side → Discouragement of front driveway use
B-03	Absence of available driveway to park car $ ightarrow$ Parked cars forced on-street $ ightarrow$ Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand
B-04	Single-family properties owners with leased-out garages/extra rooms not allowing renters to park on the property $\rightarrow$ Renters forced to park on the street $\rightarrow$ Higher-than-expected on- street parking demand
B-05	Absence of available garage to park car $ ightarrow$ Parked cars forced on-street $ ightarrow$ Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand
B-06	Garage-in-back residential lot layouts → Long driveway lengths → Discouragement of back driveway use
B-07	Narrow street widths (e.g., less than 30 feet curb-to-curb) with on-street parking on both sides → Unsafe/poor sight distance and/or sharp/perpendicular turning angles for pulling in and out of driveway → Discouragement of parking on-site
B-08	Very narrow street widths (e.g., less than 24 feet curb-to-curb) with "No Parking" on one side → Unsafe/poor sight distance and/or sharp/perpendicular turning angles for pulling in and out of driveway → Discouragement of parking on-site
B-09	On-street parked cars too close to or blocking residential driveways → Unsafe/poor sight distance and/or sharp/perpendicular turning angles for pulling in and out of driveway → Discouragement of parking on-site
B-10	Fixed visual obstructions near front driveways (block walls, yard fencing) → Unsafe/poor sight distance and/or sharp/perpendicular turning angles for pulling in and out of driveway → Discouragement of parking on-site
B-11	Fixed visual obstructions near front driveways (parkway trees) → Unsafe/poor sight distance and/or sharp/perpendicular turning angles for pulling in and out of driveway → Discouragement of parking on-site
B-12	Fixed visual obstructions near front driveways (street lights, utility poles/cabinets) → Unsafe/poor sight distance and/or sharp/perpendicular turning angles for pulling in and out of driveway → Discouragement of parking on-site
B-13	Speeding traffic on residential streets → Increase safety risk of pulling out of and using residential driveways for parking→ Discouragement of parking on-site
B-14	Non-fixed visual obstructions near front driveways (passing by traffic) $\rightarrow$ Unsafe/poor sight distance and/or angle for pulling in and out of driveway $\rightarrow$ Discouragement of parking on-site
B-15	Non-fixed visual obstructions near front driveways (platoons of students walking on the sidewalk) → Unsafe/poor sight distance and/or angle for pulling in and out of driveway → Discouragement of parking on-site
B-16	Non-fixed visual obstructions near front driveways (bumper-to-bumper lines of on-street parked cars) → Unsafe/poor sight distance and/or angle for pulling in and out of driveway → Discouragement of parking on-site
B-17	Non-fixed visual obstructions near front driveways (large commercial vehicles owned by residents) $\rightarrow$ Unsafe/poor sight distance and/or angle for pulling in and out of driveway $\rightarrow$ Discouragement of parking on-site
B-18	Non-fixed visual obstructions near front driveways (large commercial vehicles owned by nearby businesses) → Unsafe/poor sight distance and/or angle for pulling in and out of driveway → Discouragement of parking on-site



Citywio	le On-Street Parking Action Plan - Index of Issues and Concerns City of South Gate, CA
Parking I	ssue (PI)
PI#	Sequence chain of on-street parking issues and effects
B-19	Non-fixed visual obstructions near front driveways (trash cans placed at the curb) → Unsafe/poor sight distance and/or angle for pulling in and out of driveway → Discouragement of parking on-site
B-20	Security gate blocking access to property driveway → Discouragement of parking on-site
B-21	Lack of code enforcement on unpermitted garage-to-living space conversions → Garages prevented from being used to store/park carst → Parked cars forced on-street → Higher-than- expected on-street parking demand
B-22	Residents using garages exclusively for storage space of personal belongings or non-operational vehicles $\rightarrow$ Garages prevented from being used to store/park carst $\rightarrow$ Parked cars forced on-street $\rightarrow$ Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand
<u>C</u> apacity	v Issues and Causes
C-01	Underutilized roadway width (e.g., Firestone Plaza) where parallel parking exists → Unrealized opportunity for added on-street parking
C-02	Underutilized railroad right-of-way (e.g., Southern Avenue) adjacent to heavily-parked residential streets → Unrealized opportunity for added parking supply to alleviate local parking demands
C-03	Underutilized private/public parking lots (e.g., churches, parks, schools) adjacent to heavily-parked residential streets → Unrealized opportunity for added parking supply to alleviate local parking demands
C-04	Small Lot configurations within Low-Density Neighborhood (NL) Zones → Narrow residential frontage width (<50') and closely-spaced driveways → Lower-than-expected on-street parking capacity per property (e.g., 1 car/property)
C-05	Excessive No Parking red curb zones taking up available on-street parking space near intersections → Constrained on-street parking supply
C-06	No Parking areas near fire hydrants taking up available on-street parking space → Constrained on-street parking supply
C-07	"Space saving," using trash cans or dumpsters to deter/prevent others from parking, or to reserve for later on-street parking space for oneself or guest(s) → Constrained on-street parking supply
C-08	Legal "double-parking" on-street due inattention to basic parking etiquette → Constrained on-street parking supply
C-09	Legal "double-parking" on-street to deter/prevent others from parking, or to reserve for later on-street parking space for oneself or guest(s) -> Constrained on-street parking supply
C-10	Long "No Parking" time frames (e.g., 4 hours) during street sweeping activities → Constrained on-street parking supply
C-11	Very narrow street widths (e.g., less than 24 feet curb-to-curb) with "No Parking" on one side $\rightarrow$ Constrained on-street parking supply
C-12	New developments not providing adequate on-site parking facilities to satisfy generated parking demands → New projects offload parking supply burden to nearby/adjacent public streets → Constrained on-street parking supply
C-13	Lack of parking enforcement on vehicles exceeding allowable curbside parking duration (temporary green curb zones) $\rightarrow$ Reduces parking turnover rate and prevents other customers from potentially utilizing the space $\rightarrow$ Customers of local/nearby businesses parking on residential streets $\rightarrow$ Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand
C-14	Apartment/condo complexes (e.g., Calden Apts.) not providing residents enough on-site/off-street parking per unit $\rightarrow$ Lack of available off-street parking space $\rightarrow$ Constrained on-street parking supply
C-15	Apartment/condo complexes charging residents high fees to park on-site/off-street → Apartment/condo residents opting to park on residential streets → Constrained on-street parking supply
<u>D</u> emano	Issues and Causes



Citywi	de On-Street Parking Action Plan - Index of Issues and Concerns City of South Gate, CA
Parking	ssue (PI)
PI#	Sequence chain of on-street parking issues and effects
D-01	Unaccommodated parking demands in certain heavily-parked areas (Non-PPD related) → Spillover parking onto adjacent/nearby streets/blocks → Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand
D-02	Not enough parking permits per household → Unaccommodated parking demands on overcrowded Preferential Parking Districted (PPD) streets → Spillover parking onto adjacent/nearby streets/blocks → Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand
D-03	Unaccommodated parking demands from other, overcrowded streets/blocks (Neighboring city, e.g., Cudahy) → Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand
D-04	Unaccommodated parking demands from nearby/adjacent restaurants and bars → Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand
D-05	Businesses using nearby/adjacent residential streets to park business-related vehicles → Cars For Sale → Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand
D-06	Businesses using nearby/adjacent residential streets to park business-related vehicles → Cars requiring service repair/maintenance → Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand
D-07	Resident in possession of extraneous vehicles requiring parking → Company/work vehicle(s) in addition to personal vehicle → Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand
D-08	Lack of code enforcement on non-permitted business out of homes → Residence generating non-residential traffic and customer-parked vehicle(s) → Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand
D-09	Lack of Parking Enforcement → Perpetuation/continuance of violations and improper on-street parking occupancies → Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand
D-10	"Space saving," parking or storing vehicles in an on-street parking space to deter/prevent others from occupying the space, or to reserve for later on-street parking space for oneself or guest(s) → Forces car parking from private property onto the street
D-11	Socioeconomic constraints (low income, high unemployment, low education) → High cost of living / low affordability → High population density: too many households/parcel (e.g., converted garages into dwelling space) → Too many cars per property
D-12	Socioeconomic constraints (low income, high unemployment, low education) → High cost of living / low affordability → High population density: too many families per dwelling → Too many cars per property
D-13	Population density: too many people per family (driving-aged members vs. family size) $\rightarrow$ Too many cars per property
D-14	Occurence of multiple dwelling units per parcel (detached accessory dwelling units (ADUs) or "granny flats") → Population density: too many households/parcel & people/families per dwelling → Too many cars per property
D-15	Lack of opportunities/reasons to stay local $ ightarrow$ High auto dependency/ownership $ ightarrow$ Too many cars per property
D-16	Lack of viable options to switch travel modes $ ightarrow$ High auto dependency/ownership $ ightarrow$ Too many cars per property
D-17	Running personal errands requiring multiple, spread-out trips to various destinations → Lack of available solutions more timely than single-auto use for running errands → High auto dependency/ownership → Too many cars per property
D-18	Lack of code enforcement on non-permitted covered garage-to-living space conversions → High population density: too many families per dwelling → Too many cars per property → Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand
D-19	Nowhere to safely store bicycle for convenient use $\rightarrow$ Lack of bicycle facilities $\rightarrow$ High auto dependency/ownership $\rightarrow$ Too many cars per property
D-20	Limited public bikeway infrastructure $ ightarrow$ Lack of bicycle facilities $ ightarrow$ High auto dependency/ownership $ ightarrow$ Too many cars per property
D-21	Long commute distances requiring auto travel $ ightarrow$ High auto dependency/ownership $ ightarrow$ Too many cars per property
D-22	Limited public education about biking options $ ightarrow$ High auto dependency/ownership $ ightarrow$ Too many cars per property
D-23	Inconveniently long distance to transit facilities $\rightarrow$ Limited use of mass transit as an alternative transportation mode $\rightarrow$ High auto dependency/ownership $\rightarrow$ Too many cars per property



14
Citywide On-Street i diking Action i idn - mack of issues and concerns
--

City of South Gate, CA

Parking I	ssue (PI)
PI#	Sequence chain of on-street parking issues and effects
D-24	Lack of availability of more suitable transit facilities (e.g., subregional light-rail services) for commuting, recreation and errands → Limited use of mass transit as an alternative transportation mode → High auto dependency/ownership → Too many cars per property
D-25	Access to mass transit services insufficient to the level of considering replacing personal auto → Limited use of mass transit as an alternative transportation mode (also impacts Walk Score) → High auto dependency/ownership → Too many cars per property
D-26	Mass transit ridership costs not cost-effective enough to the level of considering replacing personal auto → Limited use of mass transit as an alternative transportation mode → High auto dependency/ownership → Too many cars per property
D-27	Limited means of getting from bus stops to final destinations → Limited use of mass transit as an alternative transportation mode → High auto dependency/ownership → Too many cars per property
D-28	Low "walkability" (i.e., walking distance to amenities) from residential neighbhorhoods → Low- to moderately low "Walk Score" → High auto dependency/ownership → Too many cars per property
D-29	Low "pedestrian friendliness" (i.e., mix of population density, block length, intersection density) for residents
D-30	Employers reserving off-street parking spaces for their clients → Employees from local/nearby businesses parking on residential streets → Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand
D-31	Lack of designated employee parking areas for businesses → Employees from local/nearby businesses parking on residential streets → Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand
D-32	Lack of available space within designated employee parking areas for businesses → Employees from local/nearby businesses parking on residential streets → Higher-than-expected on- street parking demand
D-33	Lack of conveniently-located employee parking areas for businesses → Employees from local/nearby businesses parking on residential streets → Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand
D-34	Lack of safety/security provisions within designated employee parking areas for businesses → Employees from local/nearby businesses parking on residential streets → Higher-than- expected on-street parking demand
D-35	Lack of enforcement of improperly parked employee vehicles on residential streets → Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand
D-36	Inadequate guidance (wayfinding signage) for motorists to locate public (city-owned) parking lots → Underutilized public lots → Customers of local/nearby businesses parking on residential streets → Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand
D-37	Inadequate guidance (digital location information) for motorists to identify and navigate to public (city-owned) parking lots → Underutilized public lots → Customers of local/nearby businesses parking on residential streets → Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand
D-38	Lack of information for motorists to see how much public parking is available/open, and where $\rightarrow$ Underutilized public lots $\rightarrow$ Customers of local/nearby businesses parking on residential streets $\rightarrow$ Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand
D-39	Public parking lots do not feel "safe enough" for many users → Underutilized public lots → Customers of local/nearby businesses parking on residential streets → Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand
<u>C</u> apacit	y and <u>D</u> emand Issues and Causes
C/D-01	Resident parking large commercial vehicle (e.g., towing or construction truck) brought home from work on the street, often encroaching on multiples spaces → Constrained on-street parking supply + Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand
C/D-02	Non-residential sites (church) generating visitor parking spillover onto adjacent/nearby streets/blocks → Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand



Citywio	le On-Street Parking Action Plan - Index of Issues and Concerns City of South Gate, CA								
Parking I	Parking Issue (PI)								
PI#	Sequence chain of on-street parking issues and effects								
C/D-03	Non-residential sites (adjacent business weekend events) generating visitor parking spillover onto adjacent/nearby streets/blocks -> Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand								
C/D-04	Non-residential sites (public park facilities) generating visitor parking spillover onto adjacent/nearby streets/blocks $\rightarrow$ Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand								
C/D-05	$-5$ Staff and/or faculty members of grade schools parking on adjacent/nearby residential streets $\rightarrow$ Constrained on-street parking supply + Higher-than-expected on-street parking dema								
C/D-06	Parents of grade school students parking on adjacent/nearby residential streets to drop off or pick up their children during the AM and early PM peak traffic hours → Constrained on- street parking supply + Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand								
C/D-07	East L.A. College (ELAC) parking permits too expensive $\rightarrow$ ELAC students opting not to purchase off-street parking permits $\rightarrow$ ELAC students parking on adjacent/nearby residential streets $\rightarrow$ Constrained on-street parking supply + Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand								
C/D-08	Resident in possession of extraneous vehicles requiring parking $\rightarrow$ Personal registered vehicles not intended for active use $\rightarrow$ Vehicle(s) parked/stored on-street and moved 48 hours at a time or on trash pick-up/street sweeping days without being used $\rightarrow$ Constrained on-street parking supply + Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand								
C/D-09	Resident in possession of extraneous vehicles requiring parking → Personal registered vehicles not intended for active use (advertising For Sale) → Vehicle(s) parked/stored on-street for longer than 72 hours → Constrained on-street parking supply + Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand								
C/D-10	Resident in possession of extraneous vehicles requiring parking → Personal registered vehicles not intended for active use (junk/disabled car requiring service repair/maintenance) → Deterioring vehicle(s) stored on-site force working vehicles to park on the street → Constrained on-street parking supply + Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand								
C/D-11	Resident in possession of extraneous vehicles requiring parking → Personal registered vehicles not intended for active use (junk/disabled car requiring service repair/maintenance) → Deterioring vehicle(s) parked on-street for longer than 72 hours → Constrained on-street parking supply + Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand								
C/D-12	Resident in possession of extraneous vehicles requiring parking → Personal unregistered vehicle → Vehicle(s) parked/stored on-street for longer than 72 hours → Constrained on-street parking supply + Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand								
C/D-13	Resident in possession of extraneous vehicles requiring parking → Providing professional mechnic services for customers' vehicles requiring repair or maintenance → Vehicle(s) parked/stored on-street for longer than 72 hours → Constrained on-street parking supply + Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand								
C/D-14	Street vending occurring on residential streets in the curbside parking lane → Constrained on-street parking supply + Higher-than-expected on-street parking demand								

Notes:

OSP: On-Street Parking, i.e., curbside space in the public right-of-way which could be utilized for the parking of vehicles

A/B/C/D: On-Street Parking Utilization Factor most closely correlated with the identified issue's subsequent sequence of cascading effects and causal results

- A: Affects All Parking Utilization Factors
- B: Parking Behavior (influences cars to park on the street rather than on private property)
- C: Capacity (Limits the normal/expected OSP capacity; Reduces the existing OSP space; Impedes opportunities to optimize/increase OSP storage)
- D: Demand (Increases the baseline traffic generation and/or the addition of parked cars on a given street)





### 4.3 - Strategies Supported by the Community

Public support for potential parking strategies was gauged from three different methods: (1) written/verbal comments, (2) a "show of hands" survey at community meetings, and (3) through online survey feedback. Table 6 depicts the most commonly mentioned parking strategies from the first of these methods. From 195 total written, verbal, e-mail and phone call-based responses, 108 (55%) of these included feedback that expressed support for five parking strategies, in particular:

- 1.) Creating New Preferential Parking Districts (PPDs) in Residential Areas on a Case-By-Case basis;
- 2.) Implement More Code/Parking Enforcement;
- 3.) Allowing for Driveway Widening to Accommodate More Off-Street Parking;
- 4.) Reduce 72-Hour On-Street Parking Time Limit to 24-Hours, and Issue Tickets; and
- 5.) Adding More Painted Curb Areas

Table 7 presents the results of the "show of hands" surveys, which openly polled citizens at the meetings by asking for a raised hand in favor of the stated parking strategy. The responses with the most and least favorable parking strategies were as follows:

### Most Favorable Strategies:

- 1.) Increase Parking Enforcement
- 2.) Increase Code Enforcement
- 3.) Direct Involvement of Residents in the Solution
- 4.) Implement Parking Permit Programs (no-fee permits, preferably)
- 5.) Solution that Requires a Combination of Programs
- 6.) Striping Stalls on the Street
- 7.) Increase Parking Prohibitions (e.g., adding red curbs)
- 8.) Using Empty Parking Lots at Night (e.g., city/school lots)
- 9.) Partnership between City and Residents to Solve the Issues
- 10.) Incentives to Help Residents Use Their Driveways

Least Favorable Parking Strategies:

- 1.) Less Parking/Code Enforcement
- 2.) Improve Bus Transit
- 3.) Implement No Overnight Parking (regardless of permits)





TABLE 6
Most Commonly Mentioned Parking Strategies via
Written/Verbal/E-mail/Phone Feedback

1 5 5   Create New Preferential 2 0 0	
Create New Preferential 2 0 0	
Parking District (PPDs) - 34 <u>3</u> 0 0	
Case-by-Case Basis 4 16	16
<b>5N/5S</b> 13	13
1 3 3	
More Code/Parking	
Enforcement 27 3 0 0	
4 15	15
5N/5S 9	
<b>1</b> 6	;
Allowing Driveway	
Widening 20 3 0 0	
4 5 5	7
5N/5S 7	
Reduce the 72-Hour	
On-Street Parking Time	10
Limit to 24 Hours; $20  3  4  5  5$	
Issue Tickets	
Add More Painted	
Curb Areas	8
<b>5N/5S</b> 5	





	Zone		2		3		4		5	Т	otals		Rar	ık
Topic/Recommendation	No. of Attendees		68		71	1	.37		47	#	Avg.%	#	Avg. %	Avg.
Parking Enforcement - Yes		-	20%	-	-	96	70%	25	53%	121	48%	1	1	1
Code Enforcement - Yes		14	20%	-	-	49	36%	24	51%	87	36%	2	2	2
Solutions Require Help from Residents		27	40%	21	30%	-	-	-	-	49	35%	5	3	3
Parking Permits - Yes		14	20%	11	16%	36	26%	21	44%	81	27%	3	7	4
Free Parking Permits		-	-	-	-	44	32%	-	-	44	32%	7	4	5
Solutions Require a Combination of Programs		34	50%	-	-	14	10%	-	-	48	30%	6	5	6
Striping Stalls on the Street - Yes		-	-	21	30%	10	7%	20	42%	51	26%	4	8	7
Prohibiting Parking (e.g., add red curbi	ng)	27	40%	-	-	14	10%	-	-	41	25%	8	9	8
Using Empty Parking Lots at Night (City	/School)	17	25%	1	2%	-	-	21	44%	39	24%	9	11	9
City and Residents Both Need to Solve		-	-	20	28%	-	-	-	-	20	28%	14	6	10
Expanding Bus/Shuttle Service - No		-	-	-	-	33	24%	-	-	33	24%	12	10	11
Incentives to help residents use their d	lriveways	-	-	16	23%	22	16%	-	-	38	20%	10	13	12
2 Permits per HH Allowed?		7	10%	10	14%	19	14%	-	-	36	13%	11	18	13
Widen Driveways; Add Off-Street Parking Space		14	20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	20%	20	12	14
Striping Stalls on the Street - No		-	-	-	-	18	13%	-	-	18	13%	17	17	15
Alternative Transportation (e.g., light rail transit) - No		-	-	11	16%	-	-	-	-	11	16%	21	14	16
Business Incentives for free residential parking - Yes		-	-	-	-	16	12%	-	-	16	12%	18	19	17
Ridesharing - No		-	-	10	14%	-	-	-	-	10	14%	22	16	18
Parking Permits - No		-	-	1	1%	8	6%	10	21%	19	9%	16	24	19
1 Permit per Household Allowed?		-	-	-	-	14	10%	-	-	14	10%	19	21	20
Reduce Car Ownership - Yes		0	0%	15	21%	4	3%	-	-	19	8%	15	25	21
Fix Problems with New Businesses cau	sing issues	-	-	4	5%	-	-	-	-	4	5%	13	27	22
Reduce Red Curbs		-	-	15	21%	7	5%	8	17%	30	14%	30	15	23
3 Permit per Household Allowed?		-	-	-	-	6	12%	-	-	6	12%	28	20	24
Educate Public about how to reduce pa	rking issues	7	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	10%	26	22	25
Business Incentives for free residentia	l parking - <mark>No</mark>	-	-	-	-	10	7%	-	-	10	7%	23	26	26
Add Bike Lanes		-	-	-	-	-	-	5	10%	5	10%	29	23	27
Expanding Bus/Shuttle Service - Yes		3	5%	-	-	1	1%	4	8%	9	5%	24	29	28
Alternative Transportation (e.g., light r	ail transit) - Yes	1	1%	5	7%	-	-	2	4%	8	4%	25	30	29
Bike-friendly policies		3	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	5%	31	28	30
Ridesharing with financing incentives	- Yes	-	-	4	5%	3	2%	-	-	6	4%	27	32	31
Reduce Car Ownership - No		-	-	3	4%	-	-	-	-	3	4%	32	31	32
Code Enforcement - No		-	-	-	-	1	1%	-	-	1	1%	33	33	33
No Overnight Parking (regardless of pe	ermits)	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0%	0	0%	34	34	34
Improved Bus Transit?		0	0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0%	35	35	35
Parking Enforcement - No		-	_	-	-	0	0%	-	-	0	0%	36	36	36

# TABLE 7Summary of "Show of Hands" Survey – Ranked by Level of Support

Note: The "Show of Hands" survey was not devised until after the Project Team's meetings with community members from Zone #1; therefore, relevant response language and summaries shown in the table above reflects only feedback from Zones #2, #3, #4 and #5N/5S.





Table 8 presents the public feedback results to the online survey prompt, "Choose 3 solutions that could help solve the parking problems". Only one potential on-street parking strategy—providing parking permits for residents on certain streets—garnered a majority level of support (60%). Other potential strategies as listed below were shown to have support from about 1 in 4 participants on average, indicating possibly that (1) the potential solutions to the parking issues should be expected to be more diverse than the issues themselves, and (2) that perhaps a neighborhood- or block-specific parking plan which leverages one or more these specific strategies from a suite of options and tailors them to local issues and conditions may be the preferred approach. The relatively low percent of agreement as to what solutions might best work to alleviate the parking problems might also indicate a lack of confidence in the effectiveness of those certain strategies.

<u>Most Favorable Strategies – Online Survey (percent in agreement):</u>

- Provide parking permits for residents on certain streets (60%)
- Mark parking spaces on streets (39%)
- Encourage residents to use their driveways and garages for parking (36%)
- More Parking/Police Enforcement (29%)
- Convert vacant railroad land to parking lots or structures (24%)
- Reduce on-street parking limit from 72 hours to 48 hours (or 24 hours) (21%)
- Require converted garages to provide adequate parking on property (21%)
- Allow owners to create parking pads on their property (18%)
- Allow the use of city, business, or school parking lots overnight (17%)
- Allow private driveways to be widened (16%)
- More Code Enforcement (14%)
- Other (e.g., overnight on-street parking restrictions; reduce car ownership; shared parking strategies)

Additional survey questions were answered pertaining to vehicle ownership, driveway/garage use, parking permits, city parking policy, level of willingness to engage in certain parking demand alleviation strategies, and basic information about the survey participant. The results of the public feedback on these survey topics is summarized below.





### TABLE 8

### **Online Survey Response Summary Q4:** *Choose 3 solutions that could help solve the parking problems*

Total Number of Parti	cipants Surveyed:	762							
Parking Strategy	# of Affirmative Responses	Percent Responded	762						
Provide parking permits for residents on certain streets	456	60%	456						
Mark parking spaces on streets	299	39%	299						
Encourage residents to use their driveways and garages for parking	278	36%	278						
More Parking/Police Enforcement	220	29%	220						
Convert vacant railroad land to parking lots or structures	183	24%	183						

### Summary of Remaining Online Survey Topics

#### **Topic Area: Vehicle Ownership**

### Q2: How many cars do you and members of your household own?

- 2 cars 289 responses (37.9%)
- **3 cars** 286 responses (37.5%)
- **4+ cars** 135 responses (17.7%)
- 1 car 50 responses (6.6%)
- **0 cars** 2 responses (0.3%)





# Q5: Which of the following would encourage you to reduce the number of vehicles you own?

- **None of the listed options** 483 responses (63.4%)
- Safe, pleasant paths to walk or bike to transit from my neighborhood 210 responses (27.6%)
- Access to improved transit, including buses and light rail transit 141 responses (18.5%)
- Information about public transit, such as routes and schedules 65 responses (8.5%)

### <u>Topic Area: Driveway/Garage Use</u>

### Q3: Do you use your garage or driveway for parking your car(s)?

- **Yes** 702 responses (92.1%)
  - Garage or driveway 667
  - Other [please specify]:
    - Garage used 6
    - Apartment carport/space used, on-street if needed 10
    - Garage No, but Driveway Yes 19
- I don't have a garage or driveway 62 responses (8%)
- **No** 25 responses (3%)
  - Neither garage nor driveway used 17
  - Other [please specify]:
    - On-street parking because driveway is inconvenient, unsafe or too narrow/short to use – 6
    - Driveway parking is prohibited by landlord 2
- Not specified 2 responses (0.3%)

### **Topic Area: Parking Permits**

# Q8: If parking permits become a solution, how many per household should be provided?

- **Two per household** 356 responses (47%)
- **One per household** 317 responses (42%)
- **Three per household** 89 responses (12%)





### **Topic Area: City Parking Policy**

- **Q7:** Should the City develop policies to attempt to...
  - Encourage the use of garages and driveways 409 responses (54%)
  - Create a citywide parking district (requires permits) 396 responses (52%)
  - Create parking districts on certain streets (requires permits) –323 responses (42%)
  - Allow residents to widen their driveways to park more cars 297 responses (39%)
  - **Create more parking on the street** 275 responses (36%)
  - Allow residents to create parking pads on their property 271 responses (36%)
  - None of the listed options 13 responses (2%)

### **Q9:** Do you think the best solution requires:

- A combination of city implementing policies and residents adopting new behaviors 574 responses (75%)
- **The City implementing policies** 109 responses (14%)
- **Residents adopting new behaviors** 50 responses (7%)
- No opinion 29 responses (4%)

### **Topic Area: Parking Demand Alleviation Strategies**

- **Q6:** Would you be willing to do any of the following to alleviate parking problems in the City?
  - Use my garage and driveway for parking 387 responses (51%)
  - None of the listed options 191 responses (25%)
  - Use shuttles or ride-share, such as Uber or Lyft 143 responses (19%)
  - Ride a bicycle or walk to my destination, or to transit, whenever possible 132 responses (17%)
  - Use public transit, buses and/or light rail transit 104 responses (14%)
  - Reduce the number of cars that I and/or members of my household own 84 responses (11%)
  - **Other (please specify)** 64 responses (8%)
    - Already use driveway and/or garage to park vehicles, with little to no onstreet parking use – 38
    - Would purchase a parking permit 7
    - $\circ$  Other responses 19





#### Survey Participant Information

### Q12: In which "Zone" do you reside?

- Zone 3 California Ave. to Alexander Ave. 191 responses (25%)
- Zone 2 Long Beach to California Ave. 187 responses (25%)
- Zone 4 Alexander Ave. to LA River 168 responses (22%)
- Zone 1 Alameda St. to Long Beach Bl. 110 responses (14%)
- Not specified 56 responses (7%)
- Zones 5N and 5S East of LA River to East City Limit 50 responses (7%)

### Q10: How long have you lived in South Gate?

- More than 15 years 529 responses (69%)
- **6 15 years** 142 responses (19%)
- **1 5 years** 84 responses (11%)
- Less than 1 year 7 responses (1%)

### Q11: What is your age group?

- **31 50 years** 455 responses (60%)
- **18 30 years** 224 responses (29%)
- **51+ years** 83 responses (11%)

### 4.4 - Analysis of Public Feedback

The community outreach effort was a key component of the process for understanding the existing parking perceptions and conditions in each neighborhood zone throughout the City. Public, business owner, and community stakeholder input, sought through both live meetings and online surveys, provided the Team with valuable insight into the existing parking challenges which are perceived by the public as being the most important to discuss, as well as which strategies are the most widely-supported and ought to be prioritized in addressing these problems. In comparing the public's feedback of each side on this matter—i.e., identifying the problems versus developing the relevant solutions—it appears there is a consensus around providing a better, more *consistent structure* behind the way that on-street parking is consumed, managed and regulated. Despite the number of complaints about poor parking behavior from neighbors, people do in fact seem to understand that the parking problem is largely driven by the residents themselves, and therefore a joint effort between the community and city would provide the most effective solution.





Based on the three modes of public feedback—in-person "show of hands" responses, verbal/written feedback, and online survey responses—the approach residents seem most interested in taking is to improve the enforceability, and self-enforceability, of on-street parking issues. The parking strategies with the highest levels of agreement revolve around attempts to structuralize the residential on-street parking supply and establish a better sense of order (e.g., marked on-street parking stalls, residential parking permits/zones, increased parking enforcement) while also providing promising opportunities for residents better accommodate their parking demands off of the street to (e.g., incentivization/encouragement programs to promote driveway and garage use; allow front driveway widening; adding "red tipping" curb paint at driveway edges to improve driveway sight and clear access; converting vacant railroad land to residential parking).

On-street parking structuralization, which has its costs as discussed below, comes in the form of measures such as marking out visible parking stalls on the street, or establishing new Preferential Parking Districts (PPD) where supported by adjacent residents on a particular street. PPDs, for instance, help to provide a consistent means to provide residents a reserved space to park on their neighborhood street. PPDs also force the behavior of utilizing private driveways first, rather than the on-street space.

Similarly, marked on-street parking stalls also provide a self-regulating benefit, forcing residents to prioritize their driveways and garages while also maintaining an increased sense of balance of the remaining on-street parking congestion. This is due to the fact that while striping uniformly-spaced and designed parking stalls replace the disordered overcrowding of bumper-to-bumper on-street parking, they also typically result in fewer available spaces on the street. Additionally, some residents consider block-wide parking stall markings to be an unsightly neighborhood feature. Nevertheless, on-street stalls do allow for the disambiguation of otherwise open parking space along the curb. This provides a useful solution to poor parking behaviors such as double-parking; reserving on-street parking with dumpsters or trash cans; parking too close to adjacent cars without sufficient room for others to pull out; overcrowding the street with parked cars.

A third major concern in this area was related to complaints of improperly parked vehicles occupying on-street parking space that should otherwise be made available for other residents. The public voiced a desire to increase existing rules by code and parking enforcement to eliminate problems affecting the available on-street parking supply, such as the storing of personal cars on the street for sale or repair, running unapproved businesses





from a residence and generating excessive on-street parking from customers; and residents storing their business vehicles on the street while using their driveways for personal cars.

Areas of disagreement, or lack of clear consensus, with the above sample strategies and approaches were found within the specifics of each program, such as:

- Whether PPDs should be established on a citywide basis (similar to the neighboring City of Cudahy which prohibits all overnight parking without permit on a city-wide scale), on a zonal/neighborhood basis in order to minimize shifting parking problems from one street to the other, or simply on a street/block basis which is the current practice in the City.
- Whether to stripe parking stalls on the street at all, or whether the location of such facilities should be studied and approved on a case-by-case basis.
- Whether independent parking lots made possible through the creation of a shareduse agreements with adjacent non-residential properties or converting railway land to residential parking is suited for the local community, would provide the intended solution to the existing parking demand, and would not instead create an even greater parking demand.

Along with other similar measures, the full picture of the community's feedback shows that, at the risk of potential tradeoffs and some conflict between neighboring parties, the vocal public is generally willing to work with the City and be flexible when it comes to increasing parking regulations and enforcement in order to provide a more consistent and structured on-street parking environment.

### 4.5 – Outreach with Business Owners and School Officials

On June 3, 2019, Minagar & Associates, Inc. along with the City of South Gate staff attended a public meeting held with business leaders and neighborhood schools to discuss the Citywide Parking Study in relation to business and school operations throughout the City. Unified School District officials were invited to the meeting; however, none were present. Therefore, as only business representatives were present, the primary issues raised, and their relative responses from the City and Project Team, included the following salient items pertaining to business-related parking challenges:

- Q: Who will issue parking permits for public parking lots along Tweedy Boulevard?
  - A: Issuance of parking permits for City-owned lots Tweedy is yet to be decided. Presently, the existing lots are open to the public during normal business days free of charge and without the requisite of a parking permit.
- Q: Who will accept liability for any vehicle stored in public lots overnight?





- A: The City of South Gate maintains primary liability within City-owned/public parking lots.
- Q: Does the City plan to issue permits for some residential areas?
  - A: This is yet to be decided; however, it is very likely that the existing Preferential Parking District (PPD) will be expanded in the future on a case-by-case basis.
- Q: Is the City looking into future land for parking lots/structures?
  - A: No, not at this time.
- Q: Can a business owner purchase land and create a parking lot to charge residents for parking use?
  - A: Yes, a private business owner may do so and charge residents fair-market fees to utilize such parking facilities based on the given parking supply and demand.

### **5 - Parking Management Strategies Toolbox**

### 5.1 - Synthesis of Parking Issues and Challenges

The following section presents a detailed collection of the on-street parking issues and challenges both observed in the field and raised by concerned citizens in the public forums at each of the City's community outreach meetings. Strategies and potential solutions to address each issue are presented in the next section.

# **<u>Issue</u>**: Population Density – High Number of Residents per Property Increases the Parking Demand

### Primary Cause/Factor(s):

- Multiple Dwelling Units per Parcel (e.g., detached accessory dwelling units (ADUs) or "granny flats")
- Multiple Families per Dwelling Unit (e.g., converted garages into dwelling space)
- Family Size / Number of Driving-Aged Members
- Socioeconomic Factors (high cost of living; high unemployment; low income; low education levels)

**Discussion**: "Too Many Drivers/Cars per Household" was the most common issue raised by concerned citizens at each of the public outreach meetings. According to historical data





tracked by the City of South Gate, in recent years there have been approximately 23,400 households located on 13,000 residentially-zoned parcels in the City (~1.8 households per parcel), and a household density of 3,182 per square mile which far exceeds the County average of 280 households per square mile. These factors reflect a higher-than-average number of residents, which in turn yields a high level of car ownership and thus high demand for parking.

The fifth most commonly raised concern by citizens at the public outreach meetings was that other residents in the community have "multiple cars parked" on the street. Given that most residential properties allow curbside frontage for only a single car (in some cases two), for there to be reports of "multiple cars" parked on the street by a single property would indicate a large number of residents living within the property in question, if those vehicles could not be accommodated within that property's driveway or garage. It is also important to note that in accordance with the City of South Gate's zoning code standards, property owners intending to build a granny flat/secondary unit shall also provide a minimum of one (1) 10'x20' on-site paved parking space for the second dwelling unit. It is unclear, however, if and how this requirement is regulated or the degree to which it is successful in effectively keeping any such additional parking demand generated by the occupation of ADU within the property and off of the street.

# <u>Issue</u>: "Lack of Available Off-Street Parking Spaces", Forcing More Cars to be Parked on the Street

**Primary Cause/Factor(s):** "Lack of Available Off-Street Parking" was a frequently raised issue identified throughout the public outreach process. The opinion statement in itself could be interpreted to mean that either there is an actual parking supply deficiency within the private property limits, or that there is a lack of *convenient* parking or access to parking on a private property. As discussed below, for single-family homes it is estimated that the off-street parking supply of any given residence should be sufficient to accommodate a normal demand of parked cars. In the absence of factors external to zoning regulation such as auto dependency or number of families per household, this may not be the case in very unique situations such as properties without a garage, without a driveway, or without reasonable access to either the driveway or garage due to special characteristics of the lot such as configuration, sizing or location (e.g., some street corners). Since the scope of the Citywide Parking Study data collection effort was primarily limited to that of on-street parking, it cannot be verified at this time whether there indeed is lack of available off-street parking, when and/or where it occurs, or the extent to which it is affects on-street parking utilization during such times and in what areas. Nevertheless, a relatively large number of residents have vocalized concerns about this being an ongoing issue, for example, with apartment complexes and/or condominium tracts providing residents with only one (1) on-site space per unit.





**Discussion**: "Lack of Off-Street Parking Spaces" was the second most common issue raised by concerned citizens at each of the public outreach meetings, and the fourth most common issue raised in the online surveys. A sampling of several different neighborhoods throughout the City estimates that on average, the paved driveway length behind the sidewalk for a typical low-density residence in South Gate is 95 feet. This does not include the expanded area of driveway which flares out to meet the width of the garage entrance toward the back of the lot (+2 extra spaces), or the paved drive within the garage space itself (+2 spaces).

This would mean that on average, between 4 and 8 passenger cars may be parked off-street at a given residence. Based on ITE's "Parking Generation" Manual (4<sup>th</sup> Edition), on a national average scale single-family homes generate a peak weekday parking demand of 1.83 parked cars per dwelling unit. Even assuming a secondary dwelling unit on the property, the peak parking demand for a single-family residence comparable to that which may be found throughout South Gate would be 2 DU x 1.83 Spaces/DU = 3.66, or 4 parking spaces, which can be accommodated by the typical South Gate driveway.

Therefore, in order for a given residential neighborhood in South Gate to have an actual offstreet parking deficiency, the peak number of automobiles parked at a residence would need to exceed 4 cars, which is likely to occur if the number of driving-age residents per household exceeds the national average accounted for in ITE's parking rates. Alternatively, an apparent "lack of off-street parking spaces" could be attributed to a multi-family residential site such as an apartment complex or condominium homes, of which the peak parking rates established by ITE are 1.23 and 1.38 parked cars per dwelling unit, respectively.

While multi-family off-street parking facilities were not surveyed as part of this study, if it were the case that these sites do not provide a sufficient number of on-site parking spaces to cover the 1.23 or 1.38 spaces/DU parking ratio, then a spillover of the tenants' parked cars into the surrounding residential neighborhood could be occurring in those areas, and would better account for complaints about there being a lack of available off-street parking.

# **<u>Issue</u>: Lack of Parking Enforcement, Leading to Offenders Continually Violating the Parking Code Impunitively and Contributing Further to Poor Parking Utilization</u>**

**Primary Cause/Factor(s)**: Need for Improved Reporting System; Parking Enforcement Possibly Preoccupied with Checking Other Areas; Potential Lack of Staff Resources

**Discussion**: Many residents have raised concerns regarding the lack of enforcement of ongoing parking violations, both during routine time periods when parking is prohibited during a fixed, scheduled period of time (e.g., street sweeping hours, Preferential Parking District time windows) and other unscheduled times when an improper parking violation





is called in and reported to the Police Department and no subsequent action is taken against the violator. The repeated lack of enforcement of the Parking Code in these instances encourages violators to perpetuate improper parking behavior which contributes to the poor utilization of on-street parking.

#### **Issue:** Long Driveway Lengths Disincentivize Parking on One's Own Driveway

**<u>Primary Cause/Factor(s)</u>**: Garage-in-Back Residential Lot Layout.

**Discussion**: Long driveway lengths are a causal factor tied to the lack of private driveway/garage use for parking, which was rated as the second most common issue raised in the online surveys (fourth most common issue from the verbal/written feedback). The vast majority of residential lots are laid out with the garage unit in the back of the lot, which lend to long and narrow driveway configurations that widen only at the back of the lot, instead of at the front of the property near the street as with garage-in-front layouts. This configuration disincentivizes parking in driveways—thereby increasing the use of on-street space—due to the impaired ability for multiple parked cars on-site to quickly and selectively pull in or back out of the driveway.

#### Issue: Narrow Driveway Widths Disincentivize Parking on One's Own Driveway

Primary Cause/Factor(s): Driveway Widths Less Than 16 Feet

**Discussion**: Narrow driveway width is also a causal factor linked to the lack of private driveway/garage use for parking, which was rated as the second and fourth most common issue raised in the online survey and verbal/written feedback forum, respectively. The current Zoning Code requires that driveway widths be limited to the width necessary to access the permitted parking spaces. In the vast majority of cases in South Gate, this means providing the minimum width necessary (as low as 8 feet) to allow a standard passenger car to simply reach the garage. Unless the property owner elects to voluntarily widen the driveway independently, this unfortunately limits the average single-family residence to a one-car width driveway, which impairs the ability for multiple parked cars to quickly and selectively pull in or back out, and thereby disincentivizes the use of the private driveway as the resident's first option for parking.





# **Issue:** Poor Sight Distance Pulling In/Out Disincentivizes Parking on One's Own Driveway

#### Primary Cause/Factor(s):

- Fixed visual obstructions near the driveway (block walls, gates, fences, sharp/perpendicular turning angles).
- Non-Fixed visual obstructions near the driveway (passing by traffic, platoons of students walking on the sidewalk, other on-street parked cars)

**Discussion**: Poor driveway sight distance is another causal factor linked to the lack of private driveway/garage use for parking. Visual obstructions make it difficult, time-consuming and in some cases unsafe to pull out of and/or into a given driveway. This challenges the driver to prioritize using the driveway to park over an on-street space, which encounters fewer sight distance obstructions and thus an easier, faster, and safer parking experience.

# **<u>Issue</u>**: Driveway Gating Blocks Access and Disincentivizes Parking on One's Own Driveway

### Primary Cause/Factor(s): Security gates.

**Discussion**: The voluntary use of security gates, and thus the blocked access to one's own garage, is another factor which contributes to many residents parking on the street instead of in their own driveway or garage. For security purposes, many residents install legal wrought iron security gates or chain-link fences along their property line at the entrance of their driveways. Unfortunately, in such situations for vehicles to be parked on the property this requires drivers to spend an excessive amount of time temporarily stopping to exit their vehicle, unlocking and opening the security gate, re-entering the vehicle, pulling up into the driveway, parking and exiting the vehicle, and then returning to the gate to close and re-lock it. The need to open and close driveway gates to gain access to the property and garage thereby disincentivizes the use of driveways and increases parking utilization on the street.





#### **Issue: "Space Saving" on the Street Disincentivizes Parking in One's Own Driveway**

#### **Primary Cause/Factor(s)**:

- Parking on the street (or placing trash cans or dumpsters) first before using one's own driveway as a deterrent or preventative means from others parking in front of the subject's home.
- Parking in front of a neighbor's property to ensure an on-street space at the subject's own home for guests.

**Discussion**: Residents engaging in practices to reserve on-street parking spaces directly ties to the problem of deprioritizing the use of one's own private driveway/garage, which was rated as the second most common issue agreed upon by online survey participants, and the #4 most common issue identified from the verbal/written feedback responses. Residents typically do not want others parking in front of their home, mainly to ensure that the space is made available for their own use or for guests, but also because an implicit (but not legal) entitlement of ownership over the public space along one's own frontage. The need for "space saving" thus causes residents to prioritize parking on the street and disincentivizes the use of one's own driveway, thereby increasing parking utilization on the street.

### **<u>Issue</u>**: Employees from Local/Nearby Businesses Are Parking in Residential Areas, Reducing the Available On-Street Parking Supply for Residents

**Primary Cause/Factor(s)**: Typically caused by (1) employees not following the direction of employers to park in specific areas where there are minimal residential uses, designated for employee parking; or (2) employers not giving any specific direction as to where employees should park resulting in employees locating the nearest available (residential) on-street space near the business site; or (3) employers not providing sufficient off-street parking for employees.

**Discussion**: Many residents who live near commercial and retail centers have complained about the constant overflow of employees of certain businesses parking on residential streets adjacent to the business. This increases the on-street parking demand in those residential areas and reduces the available space which would otherwise be available for residents' use.





**<u>Issue</u>**: Business Customers Parking in Residential Areas Located Near Commercial Areas- Instead of Using Private or Public Parking Lots, Occupying Nearby Residential On-Street Parking that could otherwise by Used by Residents

#### **<u>Primary Cause/Factor(s)</u>**:

- Inadequate (Wayfinding) Information for Motorists to Locate Public Parking Lots
- Lack of Information for Motorists to see how much Public Parking is Available/Open

**Discussion**: Based on a weekday survey of available City-owned parking lots in South Gate, it was determined that most of the City's public parking lots are left underutilized throughout the majority of the day. It is reasonable to estimate that where drivers who do not know about or choose not to park in these lots alternatively park in nearby residential areas, this activity contributes to the added on-street parking demand in residential neighborhoods near the thresholds to commercial centers.

**<u>Issue:</u>** Cars are Parked and Stored On-Street for Longer than 72 Hours, Reducing the Available On-Street Parking Supply for Residents with Active Parking Needs

**<u>Primary Cause/Factor(s)</u>**: Lack of convenient (or available) space on the private residence to store a vehicle which is intended not to be used.

**Discussion**: The State of California Vehicle Code (CVC Section 22651(k)) provides local jurisdictions with the authority to tow away vehicles that have been parked or left standing upon the public roadway for 72 or more consecutive hours in violation of the local ordinance authorizing such removal. When car owners violate this law by exceeding the 72-hour on-street parking duration without moving or relocating their vehicle, this prevents others from being able to use the space which effectively reduces the available on-street parking supply.

**<u>Issue</u>**: Vehicle Repair and Maintenance Occurring within the Public Right-of-Way, Occupying On-Street Parking Space that could otherwise be Used by Residents.

**<u>Primary Cause/Factor(s)</u>**: Both professional mechanics using public roadways to temporarily store and/or conduct auto repairs, and private residents performing their own auto repairs on the street.

**Discussion**: Citizens have complained about automotive shops using residential streets as overflow areas to park vehicles to be worked on. In addition, many private residents





attempting to save money by performing their own repairs (not including motorists making emergency repairs on vehicles that break down while operating on city streets) end up doing so alongside the curb on residential street because of lack of access to driveways or private garages. In addition to affecting "quality of life" standards in some neighborhoods and potentially posing a safety risk where automotive work is being conducted adjacent to a travel lane, the vehicle in repair often stays on the street for several days, occupying a parking space that could otherwise be used by other residents.

### <u>Issue</u>: Car Sales Occurring on the Street, Occupying On-Street Parking Space that could otherwise be Used by Residents

**<u>Primary Cause/Factor(s)</u>**: Individuals Parking Cars on the Street for the Sole Purpose of Advertising them For Sale

**Discussion**: Pursuant to the authority granted to the City of South Gate by Section 22651.9 of the California Vehicle Code (CVC), under certain conditions the City is permitted to tow away vehicles for being improperly parked for the purposes of advertising the vehicle for sale. Nevertheless, citizens have complained about various individuals in their neighborhoods parking cars with "For Sale" signs on residential streets, and in some cases businesses using city streets as de facto used car storage areas to sell used vehicles. In addition to posing a potential safety hazard by creating distractions for drivers and pedestrians, and inviting prospective buyers into the roadway to examine the vehicle for its price tag or other physical conditions, the presence of the parked vehicles reduces the available on-street parking supply for the adjacent residents.

# **<u>Issue</u>**: Automobile Dependency Increases Car Dependency and Thus Increases Parking Demand

**<u>Primary Cause/Factor(s)</u>**: Lack of Better Non-Motorized Travel Mode Options, such as:

- Limited Bicycle Facilities
  - **Discussion**: There are 125 miles of streets in the City of South Gate, and only 7.3 miles of bike lanes (i.e., bike lanes on less than 6% of city streets). In addition to other important aspects such as commute distance, distance to transit facilities, and public education about biking options, the limited bikeway infrastructure is a partial contributor to the public's lack of use of bicycling as an alternative mode of travel to autos.
- Lack of More Suitable Transit Facilities (i.e., Light-Rail Service)
  - **Discussion**: Existing transit in South Gate consists of Metro Local Bus lines and the City of South Gate's *Get Around Town Express* (GATE) local transit bus





system. There is currently no convenient connection to the regional rail network or alternative transportation options to reach regional destinations from within the City. The nearest Metro station is nearly one (1) mile west of city limits, at the Firestone Boulevard/Blue Line Station in Los Angeles. This limited access to the regional mass transit system is another partial contributor to the public's lack of use of alternative travel modes compared to auto travel.

- Long Block Lengths / Walking Distances
  - **Discussion**: Long block lengths disincentivize walking as viable mode of transportation. The average block length in Los Angeles is about 600 feet. In South Gate, typical block lengths include 800 and 900 feet throughout the City. A commonly cited rule is that <sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> mile is the maximum acceptable distance a person is willing to walk to access his/her local transit system. Looking at Zone 1 Central (Alameda to Long Beach Boulevard, north of Tweedy Boulevard), however, where east-west blocks extend up to 1,400 feet (1/4 mile), it is unlikely that any residents in these neighborhoods routinely walk to their destinations and that auto dependency is very high.

# **<u>Issue</u>: Moderately Low "Walk Scores" in Residential Neighborhoods Increases Car Dependency and Thus Increases Parking Demand</u>**

**Primary Cause/Factor(s)**: Long travel times/distances to reach amenities on foot

**Discussion**: The *Institute of Transportation Engineers* (ITE) recently reported on an urban multi-family residential parking study conducted in 2015, in which one of the factors determined to mostly likely correlate with parking utilization was "Walk Score". Walk Score is a metric developed by a private company comprised of a board of transportation and urban planners, as well as leading academic researchers, which measures the walkability of an address.

Although limited in its methodology (does not calculate whether there are sidewalks, how many lanes of traffic one must cross, how much crime occurs in the area, or typical weather conditions for walk), the score provides a generally accepted measure of how readily errands can be accomplished on foot for a given location. The score is calculated by analyzing hundreds of walking routes and walk times to nearby amenities, through a cross-cutting analysis of data sources such as Google, Education.com, Open Street Map, the U.S. Census, Localeze, and community user-added places.

Minagar & Associates, Inc. performed a select sampling of different neighborhoods in South Gate which showed that, while some areas near commercial districts (e.g., Tweedy Boulevard, Long Beach Boulevard) rank in the high-70s and high-80s ("Very Walkable"),





most residential neighborhoods have a Walk Score in the low- to mid-60's ("Somewhat Walkable") which rank in the category just above "Car Dependent" according to Walk Score®.

**<u>Issue</u>**: Narrow Residential Frontage Width (<50') Allows for Limited On-Street Parking Space

**<u>Primary Cause/Factor(s)</u>**: Small Lot Configurations within Low-Density Neighborhood (NL) Zones.

**Discussion**: Lot widths less than the normal standard of 50' (e.g., 30', 33', 40') allow for only one (1) on-street parking space, whereas the normal standard 50-foot width for residential lots within NL zones allow for two (2) on-street parking spaces.

**<u>Issue</u>: Residents Converting Garages into Dwelling Space, Preventing Garage Storage for Parked Cars and Incentivizing Residents to Park on the Street</u>** 

**<u>Primary Cause/Factor(s)</u>**: Unchecked zoning code violations on the permitted conversion of garage space into a living space per the City's Code and requirements of the South Gate Community Development Department.

**Discussion**: Some residents have complained about neighbors using their garage space as an unpermitted dwelling unit—in certain cases aside from an existing ADU in the backyard—which simultaneously adds an unpermitted parking demand at the residence and eliminates two on-site parking spaces. This contributes to both an increase in parking demand and a reduction in the available on-street parking supply since the added vehicles are more likely to park on the street than in the driveway.

**<u>Issue</u>**: Residents Using Garages as Storage Space for Personal Belongings or Non-Operational Vehicles, Preventing Garage to be Used for Parking Purposes and Incentivizing On-Street Parking

**Primary Cause/Factor(s):** Basic practice of accumulating more possessions than can be stored within the dwelling unit or readily disposed of (or repaired and registered/insured, in the case of non-operational vehicles deteriorating in the garage space).

**Discussion**: Some residents have complained verifying that their neighbors parking multiple vehicles on the street and not in garages, because there is no room to fit a vehicle due to the storage of personal goods. The use of a garage for storing goods is not illegal; however, the behavior does contribute to the lack of private off-street parking storage space which should be utilized before attempting to store cars on the street. An in-depth





study conducted by UCLA of 32 dual-income families in Los Angeles found that 75% of middle-class Angelenos no longer use garages for cars; rather, the storage space is used for accumulated belongings and household clutter such as construction materials, excess furniture, toys, and other miscellaneous material goods (source: *https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10834-006-9052-5*). This causes more vehicles to spill out from residential driveways and onto the side of the street, reducing the available parking supply for other residents.

# **<u>Issue</u>: Unaccommodated Parking Demands in Heavily-Parked Neighborhoods Causing Spillover Parking Problems on Adjacent/Nearby Streets</u>**

**<u>Primary Cause/Factor(s)</u>**: A street (or one side of a street) with particularly high parking demands located next to another street (or opposite side) with low parking demands, such as an apartment complex located across the street from a single-family residential tract.

**Discussion**: Several residents complained about spillover parking issues from a nearby street onto their street during certain times of the day. As a result, the residents in one area are forced into penalty to unfairly incur the transferred parking burdens imposed by another area which cannot meet its parking demands.

# **<u>Issue</u>**: Residents from Other Neighborhoods Using the Available On-Street Parking that should otherwise by Used by the Actual Residents of the Street

**Primary Cause/Factor(s)**: Possibly oversaturated parking conditions on the nearby street; or guest /visitor without a permit to park on a Preferential Parking District (PPD) street.

**Discussion**: Some residents complained about residents from around the corner or across the street in the adjacent city parking vehicles in front of their homes on their street, occupying the needed space and inflating the on-street parking utilization.

### **Issue: "Double Parking" on the Street Reduces Available On-Street Parking Space**

#### **<u>Primary Cause/Factor(s)</u>**:

- Improper parking behavior; inattention to basic parking decorum.
- Intentional, temporary occupying of multiple spaces in order to prevent others from occupying the space.





**Discussion**: Double parking occurs when a vehicle is parked on the street in a manner which prevents the otherwise parking of two vehicles on the street. This is the result of either (1) drivers inadvertently utilizing the available curb space inefficiently, or (2) drivers intentionally engaging in a form of "space saving" in order to prevent other drivers from occupying the second on-street parking space. This causes there to be one less parking space available for use on the street, thereby reducing the on-street parking supply and increasing the on-street parking utilization.

#### **<u>Issue</u>**: Restricted On-Street Parking Areas at Intersections Reduce Available On-Street Parking

**<u>Primary Cause/Factor(s)</u>**: Painted Red Curb Zones near the Corner

**Discussion**: At the vast majority of unsignalized intersections throughout the City, the adjacent sections of curb near the corners—typically up to 15 or 20 feet—are painted red to designate a "No Parking Any Time" zone. Although these red curb zones are intended to prevent vehicles from parking near the corner and interfering with intersection sight distance for conflicting traffic movements, in certain cases where the painted curb sections are more than necessary, or unnecessary altogether, then the available on-street parking space is reduced.

**<u>Issue</u>: Narrow Traffic Lanes Constrict Lateral Roadway Movements, which Disincentivizes Parking on One's Own Driveway</u>** 

**<u>Primary Cause/Factor(s)</u>**: Combination of Sub-Standard Street Widths (≤30') and Permitted On-Street Parking on Both Sides of the Street

**Discussion**: While the standard Residential Street is 40 feet wide from curb-to-curb (*refer to: South Gate Standard Plan No. 108*), most of the residential streets in South Gate are built at a sub-standard width of 30 feet from curb-to-curb, with unrestricted curbside parking allowed on both sides of the street. This condition lends to a constrained roadway width, with traffic in both directions as well as vehicles pulling into and backing out of driveways competing for the same shared roadway space.

Assuming an 8-foot width from the curb face for the parking lane, the 30-foot wide residential streets commonly found throughout South Gate neighborhoods afford only 7-foot simultaneous travel lane widths in each direction (30' total width – (8' x 2 sides) = 14' for two-way traffic,  $\div$  2 travel lanes = 7 feet per direction). Ideally, 12 feet is the desired travel lane width, with 10-foot widths acceptable in conditions where space is limited. Given this significant mobility constraint on through-traffic on the large majority of





residential streets, movements into and out of private driveways is subsequently impacted which in turn disincentivizes use of private driveways.

**<u>Issue</u>:** Towing/Construction and Commercial Vehicles Parked on the Street, Occupying On-Street Parking Space (Often Encroaching on Two Spaces) that should otherwise be Made Available to Residents

**Primary Cause/Factor(s)**: Typically, residents who bring their work trucks home and park them on the street.

**Discussion**: The City of South Gate prohibits the use of public streets for parking large, commercial vehicles when not actively in-use (*refer to Section 8.12.070 of the City Code*). This includes vehicles in excess of twenty (20) feet, having a gross vehicle weight in excess of 5 tons (10,000 lbs), wider that 7.5 feet, or otherwise used for transporting an individual for-hire/compensation/profit. Despite this stated prohibition, many residents have submitted complaints about individuals parking large commercial vehicles overnight on residential streets. While it is often convenient for commercial vehicle drivers to take their work trucks home while on-call in order to prevent the unnecessary side trip back to their employer before answering a service call, commercial vehicles parked on residential streets (especially narrow ones) are typically oversized and present a safety and mobility risk to other road users. In addition, commercial vehicles tend to occupy enough space which might otherwise be made available for two passenger cars, parked end-to-end along a short section of curb.

**Issue:** Auto Crimes Committed on Cars Parked on the Street

**Primary Cause/Factor(s)**: Lack of On-Street Protection for Cars; Exposure to Street Activity

**Discussion**: Many residents have complained of burglaries, damage and break-ins to their vehicles parked on the street. As a partial result of the inability or indecision of these residents to park their vehicles on their property, vehicles parked on-street are more susceptible to damage from passing cars, and theft from criminals where visibility is limited among the other parked cars on the street.

<u>Issue</u>: Schools or Colleges Using the Available On-Street Parking that could otherwise by Used by Residents

**Primary Cause/Factor(s)**: Staff and/or faculty members parking on residential streets during the day.





**Discussion**: A number of residents who live across the street from certain schools in South Gate have raised concerns over staff and/or faculty members of those schools not utilizing on-site parking and rather parking their cars in front of residential properties during the day. This reduces the available on-street parking which could otherwise be used by the resident, during school hours.

#### **<u>Issue</u>**: Restricted On-Street Parking Areas at Fire Hydrants Reduce Available On-Street Parking

**Primary Cause/Factor(s)**: Restricted Parking Zones at Fire Hydrants

**Discussion**: On average there are about two curbside fire hydrants per block throughout each residential neighborhood in the City of South Gate. Section 22514 of the California Vehicle Code (CVC) prohibits any person from parking, stopping or leave standing any vehicle within 15 feet of a fire hydrant, unless the distance has been otherwise reduced by a local authority-adopted ordinance or resolution. Implicitly this means that by default if unmarked by curb paint, then there is a 30-foot length of curb (15 feet on both sides) where on-street parking is prohibited, i.e., the on-street parking supply is decreased and on-street parking utilization increases.

<u>Issue</u>: Street Vending Occurring on the Street, Occupying On-Street Parking Space that could otherwise be Used by Residents and Inviting Additional Traffic and Parked Cars

**<u>Primary Cause/Factor(s)</u>**: Street vendors setting up vending stands on the side of a residential street.

**Discussion**: Some residents have complained that street vendors on their street regularly park their vehicles, vending stands and/or other movable equipment at the edge of the roadway on residential street in a manner which obstructs the available curbside parking lane. This both prevents that curbside space to be used for residents to park their cars, and also attracts other auto users to park nearby and occupy additional on-street parking space intended for residents of the street.

**Issue:** Residential Driveways Being Blocked by Other Parked Cars on the Street

Primary Cause/Factor(s): Inconsiderate and/or inefficient parking behavior





**Discussion**: Several citizens complained about vehicles parked on the street in front of their properties who have done so either by encroaching on the side transitions/flares, which makes it both unsafe and difficult for residents to exit the driveway; or by partially blocking the clear width of the driveway apron itself. In order to prevent other vehicles from blocking one's own driveway, a resident may occupy the on-street parking space adjacent to the driveway itself, thus discouraging the use of his or her own private driveway as a first option for parking.

## **<u>Issue</u>: Residents Operating Unpermitted Businesses Out of Their Homes, Generating Added Traffic and Parking on Residential Streets</u>**

**<u>Primary Cause/Factor(s)</u>**: Unchecked zoning code violations on the permitted land use within a residential dwelling space

**Discussion**: Some residents have complained about neighbors running unpermitted business operations from their homes, which have apparently drawn additional traffic into residential neighborhoods causing available on-street parking spaces to become occupied by the customers of those businesses.

### **<u>Issue</u>: Street Sweeping Activities Reduce Available On-Street Parking Space</u>**

### **<u>Primary Cause/Factor(s)</u>**: Day/Time-Restricted No Parking Zones

**Discussion**: Street sweeping in South Gate occurs once a week per street, during the weekday daylight hours, and primarily in one direction per block at a time during one of three established four-hour time windows: 7:30 to 11:30AM, 10AM to 2PM, and 12 to 4PM. On certain streets these hours vary slightly, and some street sweeping occurs during the late-night hours in commercial or industrial areas. When street sweeping regulations are observed, the on-street parking capacity is temporarily reduced to approximately half during that time.

<u>Issue</u>: Parents Picking Up and Dropping Off Students Park in Residential Areas, Occupying On-Street Parking Space that could otherwise be Used by Residents on those Streets.

**<u>Primary Cause/Factor(s)</u>**: Morning and early afternoon peak drop-off/pick-up hour traffic at schools

**Discussion**: There are 23 grade schools and 1 community college in the City of South Gate comprising 28,000+ students citywide, the student-per-square mile ratio of which is nearly





12 times the County average. Many residents are therefore likely to be affected by grade school parking impacts during the morning and early afternoon peak hours of school traffic. Based on the public feedback meetings, many residents in these areas have complained about the sheer volume of parents who park alongside their residence in order to wait to pick up their children. In addition to creating significant side friction with the adjacent traffic lane, these parking surges drastically increase the on-street parking demand on residential streets near school during those hours.

## **Issue:** On-Street Parking Restrictions on One Side Reduce Available On-Street Parking

**Primary Cause/Factor(s)**: Painted/Signed Red Curb Zones along Full Block Lengths

**Discussion**: A handful of street segments—such as those along Duane Way, Missouri Avenue, Deeble Street, Hildreth Avenue or Mariposa Lane—are marked and signed with red painted curb and "No Parking Any Time" signs from corner to corner between the block ends, on one side of the street. Although these red curb zones are installed on one side of a narrow street (typically 24' from curb to curb) as a means to maintain two-way traffic, the on-street parking supply at these location is essentially reduced to 50% in such cases, and those residents whose side of the street is directly prohibited from parking are at a 100% loss to allow any vehicles to be parked on-street.

### 5.2 - Short-Term Strategies

Based on the findings of the parking utilization surveys and the feedback from the in-person, verbal, written and online survey public outreach efforts, it was decided that implementing a multi-faceted approach based on implementation time frames, neighborhood parking characteristics, community priorities, and relative strategy effectiveness, would serve the needs of the City in the most effective manner.



First, a list of "short-term strategies" was developed to help address immediate parking concerns in a way that could be implemented over a span of one year or less. These recommendations include the following options:

• Allow case-by-case residential permits to modify existing driveways and frontage areas to encourage more driveway use:





- Widening driveways, driveway approaches and/or flares to accommodate additional parked vehicles, side-by-side without having to drive to the back of the lot;
- Eliminating sight problems that discourage residents from easily and safely backing in/out of their driveways, such as lowering or removing walls, shrubs, gates or fences near the ends of driveways, or "red tipping" driveways to allow small adjacent curb sections next to the side flares to be marked with red paint to prevent parked cars from blocking driveway sight.
- Allow case-by-case petitions by residents to request the City to evaluate specific red curb sections near intersection corners in order to scale back any existing on-street No Parking zones which may be excessive and could yield additional parking space. All red curb assessments and curbside parking evaluations shall comply with the California MUTCD;
- Reduce local fire hydrant red curbing requirements to 10' by ordinance (and mark 10-foot painted sections at each hydrant), and permit the utilization of driveway widths as part of the effective distance to curbside hydrants.
- Increase code enforcement to prohibit unlawful of residential dwellings for business purposes, driveway-to-bedroom conversions;
- Increase parking enforcement to minimize the improper use of on-street parking, such as large commercial vehicles on residential streets (e.g., trucks, auto repair/sales vehicles, warehouse employees), cars parked on the street for the sole purpose of sales or repair, curbside parked vehicles without parking permits in preferential parking districts, or cars parked on the street for longer than 72 consecutive hours.
- Work with local grade schools to create circulation and parking plans for faculty and staff to utilize on-site parking areas rather than spilling over into adjacent residential areas.
- Marking "parking tees" to optimize the number of safe and legally-sized on-street parking stalls, compel residents to park in their driveways first, and minimize the occurrence of double parking, driveway blocking and other problematic parking behaviors.





• Increase usage of underutilized public parking lots. The weekday parking occupancy surveys revealed that the majority of public parking lots near Tweedy Boulevard and around South Gate Park are vastly underutilized throughout the day, with few exceptions. The City of South Gate could improve public awareness of open lots by installing wayfinding guide signage, publishing locations maps on the City's website, or notifying the public of available parking lots through local newsletters or social media outlets.

### 5.3 - Mid-Range Strategies

Mid-range parking strategies would occur over a period of 1 to 5 years, and include measures such as:

- Expanding the City's Preferential Parking District (PPD) Program to a citywide level, allowing various neighborhood zones to petition for a new PPD on a case-by-case basis;
- Convert Underutilized UP/RR Property to Parking Lots. This strategy could involve either 1) leasing the existing, available underutilized UP/RR land based on a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the City of South Gate and the railroad company for a specified number of years; or 2) purchasing a portion of the land from UP/RR to construct the surface parking stalls.
- Purchase parking lots or construct new lots for public use
- Establish Shared Agreements for Overnight Use of City/School/Private Parking Lots
- Develop Incentive Programs to Get Residents to Use Their Driveways/Garages
- Explore Potential Wed-Based Parking Finder Applications

### 5.4 - Long-Term Strategies

Long-term recommendations would take place over a 5-10 year span or longer, and should be coupled with the City's greater vision to *improve quality of life*, and revitalize South Gate as a community with lower auto dependencies, higher public transportation usage rates, and improved master planning of circulation and access within localized neighborhoods throughout the City. The major components of this vision include the following umbrella strategies:





- Light Rail Transit
- Active Transportation Plans
- First-Mile/Last-Mile implementations
- Local Public Transportation
- Transit-Oriented Developments (TOD)
- Improving Education Levels, Incoming, and Lowering the Cost of Living

Examples of the above strategies include taking significant steps to convert a large number of auto-dependent users to bicycle, transit or ride-sharing uses to remove auto trips from the roadway and thus eliminate the need for additional on-street parking. Incentive strategies such as improving the availability, accessibility and reach of public transportation routes (e.g., bus stops, discounted bus fares, educating the public on how to reach and take the bus, and using FM/LM strategies to get users to their destinations faster).

*Eco-Rapid Transit* presents one of the above types of broad, mass transit related strategies which could reduce auto ownership and thereby minimize the need for onstreet residential parking in the City of South Gate. Eco-Rapid is a joint powers authority (JPA) created to pursue development of a transit system, primarily light-rail (LRT) in nature, that will connect over 4 million residents to



the regional transportation system, linking economic development and transportation facilities along a 40-mile corridor between Bob Hope Airport in Burbank, to Downtown Los Angeles, to the City of Artesia.

The City of South Gate falls within the project limits of the Eco-Rapid Transit's "Southern Corridor" between Artesia and Downtown Los Angeles, which is presently going through an alternatives analysis and is expected to be built by the Year 2028. The system will enhance and increase transportation options for residents in the City of South Gate who travel through this part of the region. LRT systems can run swiftly through cities to connect pedestrians with storefronts, sidewalk cafes, parks and promenades. Having a modernized, dependent LRT option in the City of South Gate would mean a reduction in traffic congestion, and thus a reduction in the number of cars owned and parked on City streets.

Another solution to reducing auto dependency would be to pursue grant funding and infrastructure projects that promote non-motorized travel modes. This could include updating the City's *Bicycle Transportation Plan* (October 2012) to ensure (1) that the City's





goals, policies, actions, and funding sources for bikeway facilities as outlined in the plan are current; (2) that potential new opportunities to fund and expedite bicycle infrastructure projects have been explored and identified; and (3) consideration has been made to address improving and/or introducing other alternative travel modes, beyond bicycle use, that may help car owners reduce their need to own and park a car. The City might consider building on the Bicycle Transportation Plan to further develop a complete, Non-Motorized Master Plan which combines all viable multi-modal options available to the public, such as pedestrian infrastructure and walkability enhancements; *Safe Routes to School* projects; Complete Streets improvements; Metro local transit and South Gate's Get Around Town Express (G.A.T.E.) services; multi-purpose trails; exploration of micromobility options for the City of South Gate, such as Lime, Bird or Jump (Uber-owned) services to provide shared e-bike and/or dockless scooter pilot programs to the City; as well as encouragement and education programs to promote alternative uses to single-auto travel. Successful applications for State-funded grants for programs such as the Active Transportation Program (ATP), Safe Routes to School (SR2S/SRTS) and Highway Safety Improvement *Program* (HSIP) would not only support the City's efforts to improve school route walkability and enhance non-motorized connections to local destinations, but would also allow the City to create incentives for locals to substitute their automobile use for other less impactful and more cost-effective means of transportation which do not require a car to park.

Other means of reducing auto dependency involve an alternative look at future planning and zoning of redevelopments and capital improvement projects in the City of South Gate, whereby new projects could be comprised of more mixed-use components that, at a minimum, would contribute to and be planned around less auto travel and more ridesharing and non-motorized travel modes. A dedicated planning vision could allow such projects to allow for work, live, and leisure activities all within the same area and a high level of regular route transit. This approach to land use development/redevelopment would afford the City the highest level of non-automobile transportation and yield the least amount of parking impacts, and thus would reduce the need to provide the number of parking stalls that might otherwise be required in an area that does not have a mix of uses and high-level transit services.

Physical design characteristics of an improved transit system could include provisions of pedestrian-oriented street amenities such as wider sidewalks, pedestrian scale street lighting, and benches and informational kiosks that are associated with each transit stop. As evidenced by feedback from certain local users of the Tweedy Boulevard parking lots who expressed a desire for better lighting and "safer" conditions, the result of these physical improvements would be easy, safe, convenient access for non-auto users. In





addition to enhancing local transit services and pedestrian/bicycle facilities, any long-term solution to the parking issue should include the following three elements:

- 1. Willingness of Neighborhood Watch Captains and property owners to work cooperatively with the City so that strategizing to resolve parking issues can be addressed in a comprehensive manner, rather than an individual property basis.
- 2. Consideration of impact to existing local parking activities, including impacts to Preferential Parking Districts (PPDs).
- 3. Maximization of public parking lot utilization. Whether through the revitalization of existing underutilized public parking lots, or acquiring vacant land (e.g., across alleys or next door to commercial buildings near heavily-parked residential neighborhoods) for additional parking lot development, many residential are impacted by parked cars intended for commercial destinations. New strategies should consider directing shoppers and retail users away from residential streets and to designated free parking lots provided by the City, where available.

### **6 - Recommended Parking Policies and Implementation Phasing**

This section details the recommendations designed to assist the City of South Gate improve citywide on-street parking, including equipping City Council with the necessary tools to guide future parking policy and the City Departments with operational strategies to implement parking solutions on a short-, mid- and long-term basis. The recommendations were developed internally through the collaboration of technical team members, city staff and the executive management team, while also informed by the collected field parking data, best practices in peer communities, and input from the community.

It is important to emphasize a number of key points. First, on-street parking behavior and demand is influenced by a number of factors. Parking is not solely about the amount of space on the street or its regulations, but also about residents' need for on-street parking in the first place, and how they choose to use this space and prioritize it over their own driveways and garages. The City must continue to think about how the demand for on-street parking is intimately connected to car ownership, the lack of viable replacements for automobile travel in the City of South Gate, and the various causes behind why parking on private property is constantly deprioritized over parking on the street.

Second, there is no single, catch-all solution to the City's on-street parking challenges. Although increasing parking enforcement and adding more parking spaces through curb





lane restriping/demarcation will provide short-term capacity benefits for on-street parking, these measures will not provide long-term success in and of themselves. Therefore, any approach to addressing the City's on-street parking issues must involve a partnership between the City and residents, and comprise a package of recommendations tailored to the local conditions and designed to support other complementary strategies.

Third, expectations must also be realistic, as progress will be incremental. It will not only take time for the City to plan and implement the recommendations in this section, but also to realize their benefits and adjust as conditions change over time. In addition, negative feedback throughout this process is guaranteed, as certain groups and individuals will be affected by the parking policies, such as changes to existing red curbed zones, addition of new PPDs, increased parking enforcement and zoning code enforcement, etc. However, the phased action plans outlined in the next section, along with regular management of the Plan by the proposed "Parking Task Force", will help guide the City through navigating implementation of the strategies.

Fourth, due to the well-known, pre-existing constraints—such as narrow street widths, high population/housing density and car ownership—impacting on-street parking conditions throughout the City, the recommendations describe approaches that seek to better manage the *utilization* of the existing parking supply, and ensure that the City's resources are utilized in the most cost-efficient manner possible to achieve this goal. This includes providing strategies to maximize the on-street parking supply while simultaneously minimizing the demand, and optimizing the ways in which the available space is used by those needing to park on public streets.

The materialization of these solutions will be realized through the implementation of the recommendations provided in this Plan. This, however, should not prevent the City's Task Force from exploring new strategies or any other combination of opportunities in the future that may exist outside of this Plan, especially as new technologies emerge and transportation needs shift that may alter or redefine the City's overall approach to parking management.

### 6.1 - Recommendations

### Policy #1: Create an internal Parking Task Force

1.1 <u>Summary/Purpose</u>. Create a "Parking Task Force" composed of an advisory group of city staff and/or management personnel who will serve to inform the City Council and offer recommendations to identify and address parking and circulation issues in





South Gate. The purpose of the Task Force will be to apply the knowledge, principles and strategies both ongoing and developed as part of this citywide on-street parking study to formulate specific implementation plans to present to City Council for consideration and implementation moving forward.

- 1.2 <u>Task Force Duties</u>. The Parking Task Force would be responsible for the following duties:
  - Establish principles for parking in South Gate;
  - Review existing goals and policies of the City's General Plan in relation to the parking component of each Element;
  - Periodically review and update the recommended parking strategies and requirements outlined in the Citywide On-Street Parking Study;
  - Devise phased implementation plans to implement each of the short-term, mid-term and long-term strategies outlined in the Citywide On-Street Parking Study, based on prioritized factors such as city resources, funding, and the changing organization of local community needs and demands.
  - Oversee City staff implementation of parking programs;
  - Continually seek ways to improve city staff's coordination of parking-related planning and engineering activities with the reporting, monitoring and tracking of parking issues carried out by the City's Police Department/Parking Enforcement, and Zoning Code Enforcement personnel.
  - $\circ~$  Provide an annual progress report to the City Council for review.
- 1.3 <u>Task Force Membership and Composition</u>. The Parking Task Force would have two variations, including (a) an *Executive* group, and (b) an *Interdepartmental* group:
  - (a) The executive group would include four (4) interdepartmental members appointed by the City Manager, including the Public Works Director, Planning Director, Police Department Chief and Director of Parks and Recreation, or their designee(s).
  - (b) Department personnel would include members such as a Senior Code Enforcer, Public Works/Project Implementer, PD staff, various other clerical staff, etc. who would communicate with one another to carry out the objectives of the Parking Task Force.
- 1.4 <u>Meetings</u>. The Parking Task Force would be expected to hold meeting on a regular basis (for example, quarterly) at an agreed upon date and time that is convenient for the availability of its members, as well as keep records of agenda and minutes.



### Policy #2: <u>Authorize Public Works to Implement As-Needed Parking</u> <u>Strategies on Public Streets</u>

- 2.1 <u>Summary/Purpose</u>. Public Works shall be encouraged to provide opportunities for more parking on public streets. Authorize the Department of Public Works to implement operational improvements on city streets to increase parking capacity (e.g., ADA improvements, adding on-street parking spaces, etc.) which will provide improved and more accommodating facilities, and will support quality public works infrastructure services to the South Gate community.
- 2.2 <u>Duties</u>. Implementation of as-need parking strategies by Public Works would involve, generally, any and all short-term improvements necessary to enhance the capacity and utilization of on-street parking on city streets, including the analysis, engineering and development of plans and specifications, and the subsequent installation of signs and pavement/curb markings for improvements such as:
  - (a) Marked parking stalls on the street.
  - (b) Modified painted curb sections at fire hydrants
  - (c) Reduction of red curb zones in favor of on-street parking space(s)
  - (d) Addition or modification of residential Preferential Parking Districts (PPDs)

### Policy #3: <u>Direct Police Department to Address Operational Issues</u> <u>Related to On-Street Parking with More Parking Enforcement</u>

3.1 <u>Summary/Purpose</u>. The management of the City's on-street parking system will not benefit from any enduring success without an effective enforcement program to reduce improper parking practices and increase parking turnover where it is needed the most. In fact, through the Team's public outreach of the Citywide On-Street Parking Study, it was discovered that much of the community feedback was centered on appealing to the City to provide increased parking enforcement. Although not largely quantified in the field, the windshield/drive surveys did confirm some of the extensive parking violations occurring on the City's on-street parking system in many neighborhoods.

However, because the existing parking enforcement effort is extremely labor intensive, it would appear that the City's parking enforcement officers become assigned to neighborhoods that generate the most complaints, and therefore parking enforcement cannot be sustained long enough in any one area to change behavior. Therefore, in order to make long-lasting reductions in routine parking




violations to preserve the integrity of time-limit parking restrictions, designated PPDs and other curb space priorities, it is recommended that the City adopt a policy directing law enforcement to provide additional resources to increase its parking enforcement.

If parking enforcement can be given sufficient tools to transform its current system from being reactive and complaint-driven to being a more routine and proactive one, the results will lead to fewer violations and more available on-street parking, as well as lend to the success of other parking management strategies. In addition, depending on the level of such violations and the ability of the City to enforce them, the cost of parking enforcement may also be able to pay for itself.

- 3.2 <u>Sample Recommendations</u>. In order to help reduce the number of parking violations occurring on city streets, and to improve the widespread availability of on-street parking, PD is encouraged to explore and pursue extended parking enforcement options such as:
  - (a) Hiring additional staff to focus on parking enforcement (e.g., offer part-time or full-time position, depending on need as determined by the Police Department, for a qualified individual(s) to augment the PD's existing parking enforcement staff)
  - (b) Consider implementing a "Warning System" to facilitate public acceptance of ramped up parking enforcement activities. For first-time violators a warning system would give some reprieve to those who may not necessarily be familiar with certain parking regulations in place. The City could explore means of implementing a cost-effective and timesaving warning system whereby first-time offenders would receive a "null" parking ticket indicating the cited parking violation with a rubberized stamp, for example, stating "WARNING TICKET ONLY: future violations will result in a fineable infraction".
  - (c) Third-party technologies to improve parking enforcement efficiency, such as:
    - a. GPS-enabled, automated license plate reader (LPR) technology installed on Parking Enforcement trucks to digitally "chalk" vehicles parked longer than 72 hours, or otherwise identify and log improperly parked vehicles in designated "No Parking" locations such as in PPDs;
    - b. Modernized handheld ticketing device
  - (d) Directing parking enforcement to focus on residential "hot spot issues" (e.g., most common complaints identified in the Community Outreach effort) such as vehicles parked over 72 hours, parking over sidewalks and in front of driveways, storing inoperable vehicles on the street, parking on corners, etc.



Policy #4: <u>Direct Code Enforcement to Focus on Addressing Private</u> <u>Property Issues Impacting On-Street Parking</u>

- 4.1 The purpose of this policy is for Code Enforcement to place an increased emphasis on investigating and enforcing existing private property code violations that negatively affect public on-street parking. This may include:
  - (a) Ramped up efforts to cite zoning code violations such as:
    - Nonapproved garage conversions, causing an unpermitted shortage in the available space for parking cars on the property;
    - Unpermitted business uses in residences, generating an undue volume of business clientele in residential areas not zoned for or capable of handing business traffic
    - Parking cars on front lawns
  - (b) Improving the code violation reporting system. Currently, the City is in the process of developing a mobile app to allow concerned citizens to report improper use and other activities, for both Code and Parking Enforcement to investigate and enforce.

# Policy #5:Provide Private Property Owners with Opportunities and<br/>Strategies to Better Utilize Their Off-Street Parking Space

#### 5.1 <u>Sample Recommendations</u>

- (a) Adopt formal procedures to allow residents to obtain a permit to widen their existing front driveways, thereby incentivizing self-parking on one's own property over parking on the street. This program could include an additional incentive bonus by starting out as a "One(1)-Year Driveway Widening Pilot Program" in which encroachment permit/inspection fees would be waived for the first year.
- (b) Plan a "Community Garage Clean-Out" Event. Most of the residential properties in the City were built many decades ago when the area was subject to less stringent parking demands than today's standards, including properties with a one-car garage per unit, and driveways that cannot accommodate a multiple cars side-by-side in the front driveways area. Therefore, much of the residential parking tends to occur in the front yard areas and spill out immediately onto the street, resulting in garages being





used for storage instead of vehicular parking. In order to encourage residents to park in garages, this strategy would provide a community-wide opportunity for residents to clear out space in their private garages and on their back driveways, in order to allow a reclaiming of cluttered storage space for car-parking purposes. The event could also include a gathering of "For Sale" cars to sell all at once, or provide a bulky-item pick up service with large trash bins on select days and locations as an opportunity for residents to discard unnecessary items stored in garages. An benefit of the garage clean-out program would be to use the occasion to also educate and encourage people to learn about the City's on-street parking management program.

# Policy #6: Implement Public Parking Strategies

- 6.1 <u>Summary/Purpose</u>. Investigate public parking opportunities for residents.
- 6.2 <u>Sample Recommendations</u>.
  - (a) Find ways to utilize public parking
  - (b) Partner up with Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) to promote the usage of their underutilized property to parking spaces
  - (c) Shared Lot agreements with adjacent businesses for overnight parking
  - (d) Planning Department Initiatives
    - Reconsider parking policies for upcoming new developments and accessory dwelling units (ADUs)
    - Look into new parking restrictions
    - Study and reform parking code requirements
    - Monitor and evaluate the need for additional parking construction
    - Improve parking governance in commercial areas adjacent to residential neighborhoods (e.g., Tweedy Mile, commercial and industrial zones along Firestone Boulevard, Atlantic and Long Beach Boulevard)

## Policy #7: Implement a Community Educational Campaign

7.1 <u>Summary/Purpose</u>. Minagar recommends that the City invest some of its resources to embark on a "Community Education Campaign" to provide information to community members about best parking practices, opportunities for residents to involve themselves as part of the ongoing parking solutions, and existing parking regulations and their benefits. By building on top of the City's existing comprehensive citywide safety education program (i.e., "Safety Awareness For





Everyone", or S.A.F.E.) administered by the Public Works Department, the City already has a solid platform to develop such an educational plan.

- 7.2 <u>Sample Recommendations</u>.
  - (a) Upgrading online parking services and information. Since most informationfinding today is done through the internet, a critical component of the educational campaign would be to provide the public with a centralized online resource offering instant, useful information that is easy to find, navigate, understand and use. A web page hosted on the City's website, or on a secondary site, could be created which allows residents and employees to quickly locate and access important, user-specific information related to parking, such as nearby available public lots, shared parking facilities, PPD zones, bus stops and the most readily available transit services in their area of need.
  - (b) Promote transportation demand management (TDM) strategies to the public and private sectors such as carpooling and vanpooling ride-share programs, public transportation services, improved facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians, flexible work hours, telecommuting, and parking management strategies and incentive programs such as California's Parking "Cash-Out" Law for employers who currently provide free parking to their employees.
  - Part of the educational campaign could also include an "On-Street Parking (c) Information Guide" that illustrates priorities, procedures, and options for citizens and community groups to proactively assist the City in managing parking in their neighborhoods. By using the results of the public feedback obtained from the citywide community meetings, the pamphlet/guide straightforwardly could be devised to acknowledge, identify and describe many of the common parking problems encountered on public streets around the City, and how citizens can actively participate in the resolution of these problem.

The informational brochure can also include a section promoting viably alternative modes of transportation that are available to South Gate citizens as a means of legitimately replacing automobile use and ownership (e.g., showing easy-to-understand public transit routes, maps, services, and incentive cost structures); encouraging residents to engage in "good faith" parking behaviors with their neighbors; and/or providing information on



how to properly report improper parking activity or parking-related code violations to the appropriate City department for follow-up enforcement.

(d) In coordination with the recommended increase in parking enforcement, the City could design and produce a small, inexpensive public service notice to include along with each first-time offender warning tickets intended to advise residents of basic parking rules and to prevent future violations, indicating items such as parking regulations relevant to a particular street, commonly violated parking rules, PPD or time-based parking zone limitations, etc.



Sample S.A.F.E. Brochure Created by the City of South Gate to Inform Residents of the City's Ongoing On-Street Parking Improvement Efforts and to Promote Good Parking Practices



#### 6.2 - Short-Term Parking Plan

The following parking strategies have been prioritized for implementation over the short-term period, by the Year 2020:

Summary of Selected Short-Term Parking Strategies:

- 1. Remove/Reduce Red Curb Zones to Add Parking Space
- 2. Stripe On-Street Stalls (Parallel)
- 3. Increase Existing Code Enforcement
- 4. Allow Driveway Widening
- 5. Involve Residents to Help Monitor/Enforce Parking Regulations
- 6. Promote the usage of City-owned parking lots
- 1. *Remove/Reduce Red Curb Zones to Add Parking Space*. This measure would require Public Works to first conduct an engineering analysis based on the CA MUTCD to evaluate the applicability of red curb paint removal, whether for a given requested location or on a proposed neighborhood-wide basis, and then to assign maintenance crews to visit the site(s) and remove the curb paint along with any posted sign restrictions. Assuming a removal cost of \$1/LF plus staff time to evaluate a given red curb section, labor to remove the paint and document the removal, it is estimated that a typical 20-foot red curb section would cost approximately \$20 to remove to free up the available curbside space for parking.

Other ways to reduce red curb zones to add parking space would be for the City of South Gate to approve a local ordinance or resolution per CVC §22514 to reduce the citywide fire hydrant "No Parking" requirement by local authority ordinance from the standard of 15 feet in each direction. Revised red curb zones at fire hydrants would only be considered where the reduction of such a zone could provide for at least one (1) additional on-street parking space. If the City decides to permit a No Parking distance adjacent to fire hydrants totaling less than 10 feet in length per location, as measured along the curb or edge of the street, then the existing red curb must be modified to reflect the reduction, or new red curb paint installed where none previously existed. For fire hydrants located adjacent to residential driveways, the City may consider whether to include all or a portion of the existing driveway width as a part of this in this reduced measurement, since blocking driveways is prohibited, and then provide a red curb painted section along remaining balance of the 10-foot requirement adjacent to the driveway. There are approximately 1,220 fire hydrants in the City of South Gate. At a unit cost of \$1/LF to install or remove red curb paint, the rough cost for a citywide fire hydrant No





Parking zone modification plan would be in the range of 12,200 for all hydrants ( $1.00 \times 10$  feet/hydrant location x 1,220 fire hydrant locations).

- 2. *Stripe On-Street Stalls (Parallel)*. This measure would require city staff to first produce basic engineering plans to specify standard parallel parking dimensions per the CA MUTCD<sup>7</sup> (typically 24 feet for interior back-to-back spaces (or 20 feet when separated by a 4-foot buffer), and 20 feet for exterior spaces. plus 2-foot buffer for locations requiring parking, or 18-foot stalls for back-to-back locations constrained between driveways), and then deployment of field crews to install the marked stalls on the street. Based on a unit cost of \$2.50/LF of 6-inch thermoplastic paint, it is estimated that each parking stall would cost approximately \$200 per location (\$100 material installation + \$100 engineering and labor fees).
- 3. *Increase Existing Parking Enforcement*. This measure would increase enforcement of existing parking rules and regulations in the Municipal Code, including coordination with the Police Department (SGPD) to hire additional personnel to conduct parking enforcement activities to ensure that enforcement demands can be met. This measure would cost approximately \$18.25 per hour for each additional officer, or \$37,950 per officer based on 2,080 work hours per year.
- 4. *Allow Driveway Widening*. This measure would permit residents to widen their existing paved driveways to accommodate two side-by-side parked vehicles simultaneously. Most single-family residential properties in South Gate have front driveways which range from 8 feet to 12 feet wide (10 feet on average), and front vard depths ranging from 16 to 22 feet in length (19 feet on average) from behind the sidewalk to the front-most facing wall of the residence. A minimum width of 16 feet is recommended to accommodate two side-by-side parked vehicles; therefore, assuming an average maximum driveway widening of 6' wide by 19' long, an additional 114 square feet (2.11 cubic yards for a 6" thick slab) of concrete driveway is a reasonable estimate for a typical residential driveway widening project. This measure would include approximately \$500 in administrative costs to review and approve a driveway widening permit and provide on-site inspection. The estimated average construction cost to widen a residential driveway, at an average unit cost of \$920 per cubic yard of concrete work, is therefore \$1,942 per 2.11 cubic yards of concrete (114 square feet). The total cost due to each resident requesting the driveway widening would amount to approximately \$2,450 for a typical widening

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> *Figure 3B-21(CA). Examples of Parking Space Markings*; Chapter 3B – Pavement and Curb Markings. 2014 California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD, Effective March 29, 2010).





job for one (1) additional car in the front yard area, providing a total front driveway area of approximately 320 square feet.

- 5. *Improve Partnership between the Residents and City to Report and Enforce Parking (and Parking-Related Zoning Code) Regulations.* This measure would require the development of a program to collaborate with residents in order to enhance the effectiveness of reporting improper parking activity and/or parkingrelated code violations, for the betterment of local on-street parking conditions. This measure would educate the public on the City's reporting system, including use of mobile and web applications, and help the City receive reports on and track parking code violations in local neighborhoods.
- 6. **Promote the usage of City-owned parking lots**. This measure would seek means of of improving public awareness of City-owned parking lots by installing wayfinding guide signage, publishing locations maps in visible areas of public gathering, or notifying the public of such available parking lots through local newsletters or social media outlets.

#### 6.3 - Mid-Range Parking Plan

The following parking strategies have been prioritized for implementation over the midrange period, 1 to 5 years:

Summary of Selected Mid-Range Parking Strategies:

- 1. Expand PPD Program Citywide;
  - a. Add New Streets
  - b. Conduct a financial evaluation of PPD permit pricing to meet resident needs while accounting for adminisrative and enforcement costs; set prices to reflect demand and available curb space; and/or limit the number of new PPDs which may be approved over a given time (e.g., annually)
  - c. Increase/adjust the # of allowable permits per property.
  - d. Continue to establish PPDs to provide on-street parking supply equity among properties along a street, and to ensure residents and their visitors have a place to park
  - e. Coordinate with Public Works to monitor occupancies annually. If occupancies consistently reach 85 percent in residential areas, evaluate whether a PPD would be appropriate.





- f. Coordinate with Public Works to establish a process to remove or redefine existing residential PPDs, achieved in a similar way as the petition and parking survey count method proposed as the basis for establishing new residential parking restrictions.
- 2. Partner up with Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) to promote the usage of their underutilized property to parking spaces
- 3. Establish Shared Agreements for Overnight Use of City/School/Private Parking Lots
- 4. Develop Incentive Programs to Get Residents to Use Their Driveways/Garages
- 5. Explore Potential Web-Based Parking Finder Applications
- 6. Improve Public Parking Wayfinding
- 1. **Expand and Refine PPD Program Citywide**. This measure would involve creating a standardized process to review, approve and administer new preferential parking districts throughout the City. The estimated cost is estimated at \$20 per residence included in the PPD, plus \$80/month per parking enforcement staff member required to patrol and enforce the new PPD, plus \$100 per posted sign.
- 2. **Convert Underutilized UP/RR Property to Parking Lots**. This measure would involve coordinating property rights with the Railroad Authority and other regulatory agencies to build a surface parking lot within existing underutilized railway right-of-way. The overall effort would involve typical project features, such as contracting and performing the necessary planning and engineering work, permitting, bidding and contracting the materials and construction, and also administration project costs. The estimated cost to design and build an asphalt-concrete surface parking lot on the existing compacted dirt areas within the UPRR right-of-way is about \$3,000 per parking space.
- 3. **Establish Shared Agreements for Overnight Use of City/School/Private Parking Lots.** This measure would require City staff to work with school administrators and private businesses to draft, adopt and enact local shared-parking agreements with neighborhood residents. The estimated cost for such a program would be approximately \$20,000 to account for professional hours to develop the plan, coordinate with various public and private organizations throughout the City, and provide management and administration of each program on an annual basis.
- 4. **Develop Incentive Programs to Get Residents to Use Their Driveways/Garages.** This measure would develop a city program to host a "Community-Wide Garage





Clean-Out" event, with the goal of providing the community at-large with opportunities to make space in their garages to reduce the number of vehicles parking on the street. The program would involve organizing an annual community event to promote the added benefits of cleaning up unwanted items from garages; solicitation of non-profit support to collect any unsold items that residents would like to donate; involvement of the City's Waste Management services to organize a waste disposal component at the event (including disposal of hazardous waste such as antifreeze, unused pharmaceuticals, car batteries, used oil, paint, pesticides, home-generated sharps waste, e-waste, etc.); and conducting promotional activities to provide notice to citizens and administer the registration of private citizens wishing to participate. It is estimated that an annual program cost of \$10,000 would cover the above required services, including the securing of a venue site to hold the event.

5. *Explore Potential Web-Based Parking Finder Applications*. This measure would explore the use of cloud-based parking solutions using mobile devices and web applications to manage local parking supplies and demands. A variety of emerging technologies are becoming available for this purposes, and thus individual software and technology developers would need to be contacted and consulted to ascertain the relative applicability in the City of South Gate, as well as the scalability of the software and the range of potential costs to the City for such tools.

#### 6. *Improve Public Parking Wayfinding:*

- Develop additional signage for existing public parking facilities. Where possible leverage previous designs and combine the City's new "SG" logo with the universally identified capital letter 'P' in a universal color such as blue or brown, and update street pole banners to reflect this method of identification;
- Develop additional signage for new public parking facilities created through shared or leased parking agreements;
- Develop additional signage for new public parking facilities created through leased parking agreements;
- Initiate a project to evaluate and select an Advanced Parking System (APS) to implement at select locations through the City. The APS will obtain information about available parking spaces in nearby city-owned lots, process and present the data to drivers by means of variable message signs to both guide drivers in congested areas to the nearest parking facility with empty parking spaces, and also to guide drivers already within parking facilities to empty spaces;
- Evaluate and select a smartphone application with Advanced Parking Systems (APS) technology to provide real-time parking information;





- Create a map(s) of public parking facilities, including location and number of spaces, and post to the City's website;
- Identify additional methods and opportunities to inform the public as to the locations of public parking.

### 6.4 - Long-Term Parking Plan

The following parking strategies have been prioritized for implementation over the long-term period, 5 to 10 years

<u>Summary of Selected Long-Term Parking Strategies:</u>

- 1. Enhance Citywide Public Transportation Introduce Light-Rail (Eco-Rapid Transit) and Improve Connections to Local Destinations (e.g., through First Mile / Last Mile infrastructure improvements)
- Reach out to businesses and explore feasibility of ride-sharing programs or parking incentive programs such as California's Parking "Cash-Out" Law (AB 2019) for employers who currently provide free parking
- 3. Add More Citywide Bike Facilities and connections, and Active Transportation Program (ATP) infrastructure to Encourage Non-Motorized Modes of Travel
- 4. Devise phased implementation plans to implement each of the short-term, mid-term and long-term strategies outlined in the Citywide On-Street Parking Study, based On prioritized factors such as City resources, funding, and the changing organization of local Community needs and demands.
- 5. Oversee City staff implementation of parking programs
- 6. Continually seek ways to improve city staff's coordination of parking-related planning and engineering activities with the reporting, monitoring and tracking of parking issues carried out by the City's Police Department/Parking Enforcement, and Zoning Code Enforcement personnel.
- 7. Provide an Annual progress report to the City Council for review
- 8. Educate businesses and help coordinate leasing agreements for shared parking facilities
- 9. Consider License Plate Recognition (LPR) technology to digitally "chalk" vehicles parked longer than 72 hours, or otherwise identify and log improperly parked vehicles in designated "No Parking" locations such as in PPDs. The LPR system should integrate with the City's residential parking website in order to reduce the need for physical parking permits; reduce staff time needed to administer, monitor, and enforce the residential parking program; allowing permit holders to more easily manage their accounts





online; and allow City administrators to oversee the database system and user accounts.

- 10. Enforcement and Ambassadors Expand enforcement from a complaint response basis to routine monitoring if data demonstrates that parking duration or double parking is an issue. Extend hours into the late evening if needed.
- 11. Re-evaluate enforcement needs and adjust enforcement levels as necessary
- 12. Consider purchase of and training on modernized handheld ticketing devices to expedite parking enforcement duties
- 13. Invest in and implement socioeconomic strategies. Explore widespread socioeconomic strategies to reduce citywide residential population/density, increase income and education levels
- 14. Invest in and implement socioeconomic strategies.
  - Improve local job market and opportunities to promote local travel and reduce car ownership. Approve developments to create jobs (e.g., Employment Resource Center, Azalea Regional Shopping Center) to lower unemployment, improve housing affordability, reduce population density and reduce auto ownership per household.
  - Explore feasible mid-term solutions to reduce the occurrence of multiple families per household/parcel.
  - Provide education improvement opportunities for working age citizens (e.g., ELAC Expansion) to increase household income and improve affordability, reduce population density and reduce auto ownership per household
- 15. Develop planning and zoning policies to ensure wider minimum street widths.
- 16. Work with L.A. County Metro to implement free/discounted local shuttle services.
- 17. Reduce wide-scale auto dependency and encourage transportation alternatives; Introduce light rail transit (LRT) options.
- 18. Encourage/set policies for TOD (Transit-Oriented Developments).
- 19. Evaluate the effectiveness of local curb lane management policies and adjust as needed.
- 20. Explore 1-way street circulation plans to enhance mobility and encourage driveway use.

Citywide On-Street Parking Action Plan - Recommended Strategies City of South Gate, CA									
Reco	Recommended Strategy (RS) — High Priority strategies shown in bold/highlighted Primary Department(s) Responsible								
RS#	Priority	Description	PW	PD	CD	PR	CE		
Guid	ing Prind	ciple Area #1: Organize an Internal Parking Task Force							
1.01	ST	Create a Parking Task Force to examine and address concerns raised in the Citywide On-Street Parking Management Study, and to guide the City's departments to implement the "Guiding Principles" and priority-list strategies developed in the citywide on-street parking action plan	PW	PD	CD	PR	CE		
1.02	ST	Reduced fire hydrant 'No Parking' zones. Convene with city departments to discuss, draft and obtain approval on a local ordinance or resolution per CVC §22514 to reduce the citywide fire hydrant "No Parking" requirement by local authority ordinance from the standard of 15 feet in each direction.	PW	PD					
1.03	ST	Reduced fire hydrant 'No Parking' zones. Conduct study to identify red curb zones at fire hydrants where the reduction of such zones could provide for at least one (1) additional on- street parking space (use Minagar's fire hydrant geo-coded database to organize work effort).		PD					
1.04	ST	On-street parking stalls (parallel). Discuss implementation strategy and formulate plan to install on-street marked parking stalls.	PW	PD	CD				
1.05	ST	On-street parking stalls (parallel). Authorize on-street parking stall pilot project, or citywide with opt-out clauses via resident petition.	PW	PD	CD				
1.06	ST	Reduced on-street parking limit. Convene with city departments to discuss, draft and obtain approval on a local ordinance or resolution to reduce the 72-hour time frame to 48 hours (or 24 hours)	PW	PD		PR			
1.07	MT	Investigate limiting the number of allowable registered vehicles per household or dwelling unit.			CD		CE		
1.08	LT	Establish principles for parking in South Gate;	PW		CD				
1.09	LT	Review existing goals and policies of the City's General Plan in relation to the parking component of each Element;			CD				
1.10	LT	Annual review. Periodically review and update the recommended parking strategies and requirements outlined in the Citywide On-Street Parking Study;	PW		CD				
1.11	LT	Annual review. Periodically evaluate Parking-related ordinances to align current Parking practices and enforcement with City policy.	PW						
1.12	LT	Parking enforcement coordination. Coordinate Parking enforcement activities among all City departments including Police, Community Development and Code enforcement, Public Works, and Parks and Recreation.	PW	PD	CD				
1.13	LT	Devise phased implementation plans to implement each of the short-term, mid-term and long-term strategies outlined in the Citywide On-Street Parking Study, based On prioritized factors such as City resources, funding, and the changing organization of local Community needs and demands.	PW	PD	CD	PR	CE		
1.14	LT	Oversee City staff implementation of parking programs;	PW	PD	CD	PR	CE		
1.15	LT	Continually seek ways to improve city staff's coordination of parking-related planning and engineering activities with the reporting, monitoring and tracking of parking issues carried out by the City's Police Department/Parking Enforcement, and Zoning Code Enforcement personnel.	PW	PD	CD		CE		
1.16	LT	Provide an Annual progress report to the City Council for review.	PW	PD	CD	PR	CE		
Guid	ing Prind	ciple Area #2: Authorize Public Works to Implement As-Needed Parking Strategies on Public Streets							
2.01	ST	Driveway "red-tipping". Install red curb next to residential driveways upon resident request to facilitate access and use of private driveways for parking.	PW						
2.02	ST	Reduced red curb zones at intersections. Conduct an engineering analysis, based on the CAMUTCD and with due regard for liability concerns, evaluating the applicability of red curb paint removal at intersections where on-street parking may be added in place, whether for a given requested location or on a proposed neighborhood-wide basis.	PW						
2.03	ST	Reduced red curb zones at intersections. Assign maintenance crews to visit selected sites and reduce or remove 'No Parking' red curb paint along with any posted sign restrictions.	PW						
2.04	ST	Reduced fire hydrant 'No Parking' zones. Commence citywide program to design and delineate reduced fire hydrant-related red curb zones, in accordance with the engineering study and by local authority ordinance.	PW						
2.05	ST	Reduced fire hydrant 'No Parking' zones. Perform removal/reduction/modification of red curb zones at select curbside fire hydrant locations to add on-street parking space	PW						
2.06	ST	Identify neighborhood streets and blocks to restrict on-street parking for trucks	PW						
2.07	ST	On-Street Parking Stalls. Commence citywide program to design and delineate curbside "parking tees" to optimize the number of safe and legally-sized on-street parking stalls, compel residents to park in their driveways first, and minimize the occurrence of double parking, driveway blocking and other problematic parking behaviors.	PW						
2.08	ST	On-Street Parking Stalls. Implement signage and striping installations as part of the citywide on-street parking stall program.	PW						
2.09	ST	Angled On-Street Parking. Evaluate feasibility of angled parking where conditions allow (e.g., on sufficiently wide streets such as Firestone Plaza or Firestone Place), to increase the number of on-street spaces and to compensate for a low parallel parking supply.	PW						
2.10	MT	Establish parking data collection program. Conduct annual on-street parking utilization counts between the hours of 10AM and 6PM on a typical weekday during the school year to ensure that desired occupancy levels are maintained and to measure the effects of parking strategies.	PW						
2.11	MT	Monitor parking occupancies in one year and compare to existing data. Re-evaluate annually-collected parking data to guide on-street parking management and make decisions about parking regulations, strategies and enforcement efforts. If occupancies on residential streets with unregulated parking consistently reach 85 percent, evaluate whether a PPD would be appropriate to add or reconfigure in terms of physical extents or parking restrictions time periods.	PW						
2.12	MT	Preferential Parking Districts (PPDs). Create a standardized process to review, approve and administer new preferential parking districts throughout the City	PW		CD				
2.13	MT	Preferential Parking Districts (PPDs). Define locations and criteria for implementation of new PPD segments.	PW		CD				
2.14	MT	Preferential Parking Districts (PPDs). Implement new PPD streets/segments if neighborhood meets program critia (e.g., 75% petition request by residents, documented parking problems, etc).	PW		CD				



Citywide On-Street Parking Action Plan - Recommended Strategies City of South Gate, CA							
Recommended Strategy (RS) — High Priority strategies shown in bold/highlighted					artment(s)	Responsil	ole
RS#	RS# Priority Description			PD	CD	PR	CE
2.15	MT	Preferential Parking Districts (PPDs). Identify and mitigate or remove barriers to driveway sight distance within the public right-of-way (e.g., trees, bushes, sign clutter, street furniture, etc.)	PW		CD		
2.16	MT	Preferential Parking Districts (PPDs). Provide on-street parking priority to corner properties with undersized driveways.	PW		CD		
2.17	MT	Add street sweeping operators to cover more area in less time, optimize routes, reduce street sweeping No Parking time windows and modify existing signage to reflect time changes.	PW	PD			
2.18	MT	Conduct feasibility study to widen existing narrow residential streets in order to facilitate two-way traffic, driveway movements and on-street/off-street parking.			CD		
2.19	MT	Implement curb lane management policies and programs for perimeter streets at public school sites.					
2.20	LT	Implement residential street widening improvements per Feasibility Study, as applicable.	PW				
2.21	LT	Implement as-need parking strategies by Public Works would involve, generally, any and all short-term improvements necessary to enhance the capacity and utilization of on-street parking on city streets, including the analysis, engineering and development of plans and specifications, and the subsequent installation of signs and pavement/curb markings for improvements such as:					
2.22	LT	Parking on Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) right-of-way. Work with Community Development to initiate a parking lot design project on UP/RR leased/acquired property, including engineering work, permitting, bidding, contracting the materials and construction, and administration project costs.			CD		
2.23	LT	Parking on Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) right-of-way. Commence design and build of asphalt-concrete surface parking lots on existing compacted dirt areas within UP/RR leased/acquired property.	PW		CD		
Guid	ling Princ	iple Area #3: Direct Police Department to Address Operational Issues Related to On-Street Parking with More Parking Enforcement					
3.01	ST	Implement proactive enforcement on a more regular basis in areas with the highest parking demands		PD			
3.02	ST	Implement first-offense warning system for parking violations		PD			
3.03	ST	Evaluate cost-effective options for administering enforcement		PD			
3.04	ST	Provide enforcement regulation information, such as fines and how to contest a citation, on the City's website for simplified public access		PD	CD		
3.05	ST	Increase parking enforcement. Minimize improper use of on-street parking, such as large commercial vehicles on residential streets.		PD			
3.06	ST	Increase parking enforcement. Minimize improper use of on-street parking, such as auto repairs by nearby businesses.		PD			
3.07	ST	Increase parking enforcement. Minimize improper use of on-street parking, such as auto repairs by residents.		PD			
3.08	ST	Increase parking enforcement. Minimize improper use of on-street parking, such as vehicle sales by nearby businesses.		PD			
3.09	ST	Increase parking enforcement. Minimize improper use of on-street parking, such as automobile service/maintenance by residents.		PD			
3.10	ST	Increase parking enforcement. Minimize improper use of on-street parking, such as cars parked on the street for longer than 72 consecutive hours.		PD			
3.11	ST	Hire additional staff. Police Department to hire additional personnel to conduct parking enforcement activities to ensure that ongoing enforcement demands can be met. Offer part- time or full-time position, depending on need as determined by the Police Department, for a qualified individual(s) to augment the PD's existing parking enforcement staff. PD					
3.12	ST	Involve Residents to Help Monitor/Enforce Parking Regulations. Develop program in collaboration with residents to enhance effectiveness of reporting improper parking activity, including the use of mobile and web		PD	CD		
3.13	ST	Parking Ambassadors and community service officers (CSOs). Conduct training of parking ambassadors/CSOs.		PD	CD		
3.14	ST	Parking Ambassadors and community service officers (CSOs). Assign parking ambassadors/CSOs to relieve officers, assist the Police Department in providing local parking enforcement, and monitoring improper parking on neighborhood streets (e.g., 72-hr. limit, abandoned cars, expired tags, double parking over marked stalls, parking in red curb zones, blocking sidewalks or front driveway approaches)		PD	CD		
3.15	ST	Prohibit and notify ELAC students not to park on residential streets	PW	PD			
3.16	MT	Parking enforcement staff to patrol and enforce the newly implemented PPDs		PD			
3.17	MT	Explore Overnight (e.g., 10pm-2am) PPDs in neighborhoods with oversatursated nighttime on-street parking utililzation.	PW	PD	CD		
3.18	MT	Expand enforcement if ticketing or parking turnover data demonstrates that parking duration is an issue		PD			
3.19	MT	Extend enforcement hours to cover critical peak nighttime periods		PD			
3.20	MT	Consider implementing a parking ambassador approach to parking enforcement in select neighborhoods		PD			
3.21	MT	Implement a graduated fine structure		PD			
3.22	MT	Work with Public Works to obtain annual parking utilization count updates, and target enforcement on block faces that regularly exceed 80% occupancy.	PW	PD			
3.23	LT	Consider License Plate Recognition (LPR) technology to digitally "chalk" vehicles parked longer than 72 hours, or otherwise identify and log improperly parked vehicles in designated "No Parking" locations such as in PPDs. The LPR system should integrate with the City's residential parking website in order to reduce the need for physical parking permits; reduce staff time needed to administer, monitor, and enforce the residential parking program; allowing permit holders to more easily manage their accounts online; and allow City administrators to oversee the database system and user accounts.		CD			
3.24	LT Enforcement and Ambassadors - Expand enforcement from a complaint response basis to routine monitoring if data demonstrates that parking duration or double parking is an issue. Extend hours into the late evening if needed.						

M

City	Citywide On-Street Parking Action Plan - Recommended Strategies City of South Gate, CA									
Recommended Strategy (RS) — High Priority strategies shown in bold/highlighted					Primary Department(s) Responsible					
RS#	Priority	Priority Description		PD	CD	PR	CE			
3.25	LT	Re-evaluate enforcement needs and adjust enforcement levels as necessary		PD						
3.26	LT	Consider purchase of and training on modernized handheld ticketing devices to expedite parking enforcement duties		PD						
Guid	ding Prin	tiple Area #4: Direct Code Enforcement to Focus on Addressing Private Property Issues Impacting On-Street Parking								
4.01	ST	Increased Code Enforcement. Increase code enforcement of existing parking rules and regulations contained in the Municipal/Zoning Code					CE			
4.02	ST	Increased Code Enforcement. Increase code enforcement to prohibit improper use of residential dwellings for business purposes					CE			
4.03	ST	Increased Code Enforcement. Increase code enforcement to prohibit converted garages as living space (driveway-to-bedroom conversions)					CE			
4.04	MT	Involve Residents to Help Report Code Violations. Develop program in collaboration with residents to enhance effectiveness of reporting code violations, including the use of mobile and web applications to help the City receive reports on and track code violations in real-time.	PW		CD		CE			
4.05	MT	Identify and work with property owners to mitigate or remove barriers to driveway access and sight distance (e.g., vegetation overgrowth, block walls, fences, driveway gates)			CD		CE			
4.06	MT	Take steps to require and ensure that existing and future permitted converted garages provide adequate parking on private property					CE			
4.07	LT	Continue short-term and mid-term recommendations.	PW		CD		CE			
Guid	ding Prin	ciple Area #5: Provide Private Property Owners with Opportunities and Strategies to Better Utilize Their Off-Street Parking Space								
5.01	ST	Formalize application permit process for a "One(1)-Year Driveway Widening Pilot Program" in which residents may obtain approval to widen their existing front paved driveways with encroachment permit/inspection fees waived for the first year.	PW				CE			
5.02	ST	Residential Driveway Widening. Upon approval of permit request, allow residents to widen their existing paved front driveway widths on their property to accommodate two side-by- side parked vehicles simultaneously.			CE					
5.03	ST	T Residential Driveway Widening. Upon approval of permit request, allow residents to reconstruct undersized driveway approaches per APWA standards and specifications to improve PW users' driveway accessibility.					CE			
5.04	МТ	Create incentive programs leading residents to use their driveways/garages. For example, develop a city program to host a "Neighborhood Garage Clean-Out" event to provide community opportunities to sell or salvage unused vehicles occupying parking space on private property, and to make space in garages for parking in order to reduce the number of vehicles parked on the street.			CD	PR	CE			
5.05	MT	Explore Potential Web-Based Parking Finder Applications	PW		CD					
5.06	LT	Continue short-term and mid-term recommendations.	PW		CD	PR	CE			
Guiding Principle Area #6: Implement Public Parking Strategies										
6.01	ST	City-owned parking lots. Create a man of public parking facilities (location and number of spaces) and post to the City's website.	PW	1	CD	PR				
6.02	6T				65					
0.02	31	City-owned parking iots. Publish public service annoucements/nouces in the city newsletter advertising the general locations and availability of public off-street parking spaces.	PVV		CD	PK				
6.03	ST	City-owned parking lots. Publish public service annoucements/notices on the City's website advertising the general locations and availability of public off-street parking spaces.	PW		CD	PR				
6.04	ST	City-owned parking lots. Publish public service annoucements/notices on the City's social media outlets advertising the general locations and availability of public off-street parking spaces.	PW		CD	PR				
6.05	ST	City-owned parking lots. Promote usage and seek means of improving public awareness of City-owned parking lots by publishing location maps in visible areas of public gathering	PW		CD	PR				
6.06	MT	Parking Wayfinding. Promote usage and seek means of improving public awareness of City-owned parking lots by installing new themed wayfinding guide signage to existing city(public) off-street parking lots.	PW			PR				
6.07	MT	MT Parking Wayfinding. Develop additional signage for existing public parking facilities. Where possible leverage previous designs and combine the City's new "SG" logo with the universally- identified capital letter 'P' in a universal color such as blue or brown, and update street pole banners to reflect this method of identification.								
6.08	MT	Parking Wayfinding. Develop additional signage for new public parkng facilities created through shared parking agreements	PW							
6.09	MT	Parking Wayfinding. Develop additional signage for new public parkng facilities created through leased parking agreements	PW							
6.10	MT	Parking Wayfinding. Initiate a project to evaluate and select an Advanced Parking System (APS) to implement at select locations through the City. The APS will obtain information about available parking spaces in nearby city-owned lots, process and present the data to drivers by means of variable message signs to both guide drivers in congested areas to the nearest parking facility with empty parkings spaces, and also to guide drivers already within parking facilities to empty spaces.	PW		CD					
6.11	MT	Parking Wayfinding. Evaluate and select a smartphone application with Advanced Parking Systems (APS) technology to provide real-time parking information	PW		CD	PR				
6.12	MT	Parking Wayfinding. Create a map(s) of public parking facilities, including location and number of spaces, and post to the City's website	PW		CD	PR				
6.13	MT	Parking Wayfinding. Identify additional methods and opportunities to inform the public as to the locations of public parking.	PW		CD	PR				
6.14	MT	Shared parking. Allow different businesses to enter into shared parking agreements amongst themselves to take advantage of offsetting peak periods.			CD					
6.15	MT	MT Shared parking. Allow non-residential property owners to enter into shared parking agreements with nearby residents (e.g., within 150-300 feet, or along a particular block) share common off-street/on-street parking resources to meet offsetting parking needs								

M

City	Citywide On-Street Parking Action Plan - Recommended Strategies City of South Gate, CA									
Reco	Recommended Strategy (RS) — High Priority strategies shown in bold/highlighted					Primary Department(s) Responsible				
RS#	Priority	ity Description		PD	CD	PR	CE			
6.16	MT	Shared parking. Reconvene with business owners and document inventory of shared parking opportunities			CD		ĺ			
6.17	MT	Shared parking. Develop shared parking agreement templates and resources			CD		1			
6.18	MT	1T Shared parking. Define development/business incentives for participating in shared parking programs			CD		1			
6.19	MT	MT Shared parking. Broker shared parking agreements with property owners, businesses and residents			CD					
6.20	MT	Shared parking. Evaluate shared parking opportunities for employee parking			CD		1			
6.21	MT	Shared parking. Establish shared agreements for overnight use of City/School/Park/Private Parking Lots. Work with school administrators and private businesses to draft, adopt and enact local shared-parking agreements with neighborhood residents. Including development of plans, coordinatation with various public and private organizations throughout the City, and PW management and administration of each program on an annual basis.		CD	PR					
6.22	MT	Parking technologies. Explore the use of cloud-based parking solutions using mobile devices and web applications to manage local parking supplies and demands. Contact and consult with software and technology developers to ascertain the relative applicability of such public parking solutions in the City of South Gate, as well as the scalability of the software and the range of potential costs to the City for such tools.								
6.23	MT	Parking technologies. Evaluate and select a smartphone application that provides real-time parking information for City-owned parking lots.	PW		CD					
6.24	МТ	AT New public parking lots. Purchase new parking lots or construct new lots for public use. Acquire land rights to create additional public parking areas where there is an identified need and PW CD		PR						
6.25	MT	New public parking lots. Identify opportunities and locations to create new overnight public parking lots for residents	PW		CD	PR	Í			
6.26	MT	New public parking lots. Conduct functional and financial analyses for constructing new long-term surface parking lot or parking garages	PW		CD	PR	(			
6.27	MT	Explore use of parking meter technology and their locations, particularly in commercial areas such as Tweedy Mile or Firestone Boulevard.	PW		CD		Í			
6.28	LT	Parking on Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) right-of-way. Coordinate with UP/RR to enter a lease agreement to use railroad right-of-way on the north and south sides of the railroad tracks between Armore Avenue and Independence Avenue, for public parking.			CD					
6.29	LT	Parking on Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) right-of-way. Partner up with UP/RR to promote the usage of their underutilized property for parking purposes where approved through mutal agreements.	PW		CD					
6.30	LT	Parking on Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) right-of-way. Coordinate property rights with the Railroad Authority and other regulatory agencies to build a surface parking lot within existing underutilized railway right-of-way. Option #1: lease the existing, available underutilized UP/RR land based on a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the City of South Gate and railroad company for a specified number of years; or 2) Purchase a portion of the land from UP/RR to construct the surface parking stalls.	PW		CD					
6.31	LT	Parking on Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) right-of-way. Work with Public Works to initiate a parking lot design project on UP/RR leased/acquired property	PW		CD					
6.32	LT	Parking on Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) right-of-way. Work with UP/RR to investigate opportunities to incorporate public parking into future non-rail development on UP/RR property.			CD					
Guic	ling Prin	ciple Area #7: Implement a Community Educational Campaign								
7.01	ST	Educate public about how to reduce parking issues	PW	PD	CD	PR	CE			
7.02	ST	Improve & promote good parking behavior and common courtesy amongst residents		PD	CD		L			
7.03	ST	Encourage residents not to double park and to pull forward or back as far as possible to occupy the available space alonside the curb.			CD		<u> </u>			
7.04	ST	Promote the utilization of existing garage and driveway space.			CD		CE			
7.05	ST	Communicate the benefits of removing or keeping gates open to facilitate use of driveways for parking			CD					
7.06	ST	Educate the public on the City's existing and upcoming reporting system leveraging the use of mobile and web applications	PW	PD	CD					
7.07	ST	Develop online residential parking resources (phased strategy). Install downloadable PPD applications and renewal forms online print, fill out, and mail the forms from home.	PW	PD	CD		1			
7.08	ST	Preferential Parking Districts (PPDs). Inform residents on the City's proposed fee structure for PPD permits and maximum permit allocations per dwelling unit in order to encourage residents to use on-street parking judiciously. Encourage residents to recognize that the use of public space for residential on-street parking is not free, but a privilege that is funded in part by all South Gate residents.			CD					
7.09	MT	Develop online residential parking resources (phased strategy). Update the City's existing web page and provide comprehensive information on its residential preferential parking program, including addressing the rationale for the program, the process for acquiring permits and petitioning forresidential parking as well as provide all necessary forms and documents.	PW		CD					
7.10	MT	Neighborhood Garage Clean Out Event to lead residents to use their driveways/garages for parking. Use the occasion to educate and encourage people to learn about the City's on-street parking management program.			CD	PR				
7.11	LT	Develop online residential parking resources (phased strategy). Establish online payment systems for permits and fines by credit card or banking account, as well as or fillable PDF applications and renewal forms.	PW		CD					
7.12	LT	Educate public on the existing availability and future city plans for transportation demand management (TDM) strategies, such as carpooling and vanpooling ride-share programs, public transportation services, improved facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians, flexible work hours, telecommuting, and parking management strategies and incentive programs such as PW California's Parking "Cash-Out" Law for employers who currently provide free parking to their employees.			CD	PR				



City	Citywide On-Street Parking Action Plan - Recommended Strategies City of South Gate, CA							
Reco	ecommended Strategy (RS) — High Priority strategies shown in bold/highlighted			rimary Dep	artment(s)	Responsib	ole	
RS#	Priority	Description	PW	PD	CD	PR	CE	
7.13	LT	Maintain a long-term educational campaign on parking management in South Gate which incorporates an on-street parking information component, illustrating priorities, procedures, and options for citizens and community groups to proactively assist the City in managing parking in their local neighborhoods. The educational campaign will also provide a means by which PW CD residents may continue to provide input on ongoing parking issues and potential new strategies moving forward.		PR				
Guic	ling Princ	ciple Area #8: Direct Community Development Department to Create Planning Initiatives to Enhance On-Street Parking Conditions						
8.01	ST	Reach out to apartment owners and multi-family building managers to provide tenants with secure bike facilities			CD			
8.02	ST	Improve public notice of existing transit facilities	PW		CD			
8.03	ST	Create permitted exemptions for short-term parking permits for contractors (e.g., 30-day) and in-home care professionals (e.g., up to one year) who may be operating an approved business at a residence.			CD			
8.04	MT	Reconsider parking policies for upcoming new developments and accessory dwelling units (ADUs)			CD		CE	
8.05	MT	Look into new and/or more stringent off-street parking restrictions		PD	CD			
8.06	MT	Study and reform parking code requirements			CD			
8.07	MT	Monitor and evaluate the need for additional parking construction	PW		CD			
8.08	MT	Improve parking governance in commercial areas adjacent to residential neighborhoods (e.g., Tweedy Mile, commercial and industrial zones along Firestone Boulevard, Atlantic and Long Beach Boulevard)			CD			
8.09	MT	Preferential Parking Districts (PPDs). Conduct a financial evaluation of PPD permit pricing to meet resident needs while accounting for adminisrative and enforcement costs; set prices to reflect demand and available curb space; and/or limit the number of new PPDs which may be approved over a given time (e.g., annually) CD						
8.10	MT	Preferential Parking Districts (PPDs). Increase the # of allowable permits per property.	PW		CD			
8.11	MT	T Preferential Parking Districts (PPDs). Continue to establish PPDs to provide on-street parking supply equity among properties along a street, and to ensure residents and their visitors have PW CD						
8.12	MT	T Preferential Parking Districts (PPDs). Corodinate with Public Works to monitor occupancies annually. If occupancies consistently reach 85 percent in residential areas, evaluate whether a PW CD would be appropriate.						
8.13	MT	Preferential Parking Districts (PPDs). Corodinate with Public Works to establish a process to remove or redefine existing residential PPDs, achieved in a similar way as the petition and parking survey count method proposed as the basis for establishing new residential parking restrictions.			CD			
8.14	MT	AT Work with businesses generating high, event-driven traffic and parking on nearby residential streets to consider implementing valet-assist parking services to (1) reduce the number of cars driving around looking for a space who may eventually wind up parking on residential streets; (2) increase parking turnover, and (3) allow twice as many cars into a lot due to stack CD parking.						
8.15	MT	Work with businesses generating high, unavoidable event-driven traffic and parking on nearby residential streets to engage in good neighbor efforts to compensate for spillover parking impacts (e.g., free tickets to events and sporting functions to residents near schools)			CD			
8.16	MT	Ensure that school sites generating student-driven parking (e.g., Legacy HS, East L.A. Community College Expansion) provide adequate on-site parking	PW		CD			
8.17	MT	Work with businesses with quick turnarounds and/or delivery needs (e.g., banks, dry cleaners) to mark loading/unloading zones along the curb within the public right-of-way.						
8.18	MT	Work with Parks and Recreation to expand GATE (Get Around Town Express) bus/shuttle service CD PR		PR				
8.19	MT	Work with local schools to develop neighborhood traffic management plans (NTMP) which incorporate parking mitigation strategies for faculty, staff and students who currently park on adjacent residential streets						
8.20	MT	Investigate the potential need, viability and benefit of "cut-through" pedestrian paths between residential neighborhoods and commercial or school areas to encourage walking as a viable PW CD						
8.21	MT	Coordinate with Unified School Districts and individual elementary/middle schools to augment existing Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Plans with parking/circulation plans in order to minimize the use and impact of pick-up, drop-off and facuilty/staff parking on public streets.						
8.22	MT	MT Update city practices, principles, policies and standards to improve minimum lot size dimensions for new applications/projects.		CD				
8.23	MT	Improve public transportation ridership, visibility, availability and accessibility. Add new and/or improve existing bus stops.			CD			
8.24	MT	Improve public transportation ridership, visibility, availability and accessibility. Implement discounted bus fares to encourage ridership.			CD			
8.25	MT	Ensure Conditions of Approval for new developments to locate employee parking on-site.			CD			
8.26	MT	Require development projects to implement and/or contribute toward Transportation Demand Management (TDM) improvements as part of approval.	PW		CD			
8.27	MT	Design and build new pedestrian paths; improve walkability of school routes and downtown walking areas to encourage foot travel.	PW		CD			
8.28	MT	Work with local schools to improve and increase school busing, carpooling, vanpooling and/or shuttling services to remove single-occupant auto trips from city streets near schools.	PW		CD			
8.29	MT	Codify and set conditions for new developments to provide Free Parking to customers and tenants			CD			
8.30	MT	Planning and zoning to consider ending approval of garage-dwelling and SFDU-to-MFDU conversions			CD		CE	
8.31	MT	MT Work collaboratively with other departments to develop fund prioritization plan for long-term parking improvements. Study the opportunity costs of using land and funds for automobile PW CD		PR				

M

City	Citywide On-Street Parking Action Plan - Recommended Strategies City of South Gate, CA							
Reco	mmended	Strategy (RS) — High Priority strategies shown in bold/highlighted	Primary Department(s) Responsible					
RS#	Priority	Description	PW	PD	CD	PR	CE	
8.32	LT	Address the need to maintain City transportation infrastructure - consider polices, programs, and improvements that can reduce maintenance and administrative costs, or generate revenues to help fund capital needs for mass transit or non-motorized projects and/or parking reduction programs.	PW		CD			
8.33	LT	Work with local businesses to promote preferential parking for carpools and vanpools, in order to help reduce the need for single-auto employee parking.			CD			
8.34	LT	Approve developments with adequate on-site parking facilities to increase off-street parking capacity	PW		CD			
8.35	LT	Explore options to implement traffic management associations providing parking brokerage services, so that facilities with excess parking capacity can seek, lease or trade it to others. Facilitate the benefits of flexible parking requirements between all building owners in a given area, new just developers of new facilities.			CD			
8.36	LT	Use zoning as a tool to encourage new developments to be more pedestrian friendly, such as defining pedestrian-oriented shopping or mixed-use areas, and discouraging the placement of parking between the building and the street (rear parking lots preferred).			CD			
8.37	LT	Encourage new developers to implement "green parking lots" (e.g., turf grids) where deemed appropriate, in order to address issues encountered when attempting to meet developmental off-street parking supply requirements, such providing an overabundance of typical paved parking stalls, discouraging pedestrian or bicycle travel, or detracting from the character or visual appearance of the surrounding community.			CD			
8.38	LT	Encourage employers to participate in a "Cash Out" program for the value of employee parking, in order to fully or partially subsidize parking and offer workers the option to give up their parking space in exchange for its monetary value.			CD			
8.39	LT	Decrease population density through multi-use developments with adequate parking provisions			CD			
8.40	LT	Improve planning and zoning policies to better scrutinize the potential parking impacts of high-density residential developments where the surrounding on-street parking infrastructure cannot support the anticipated demand.			CD			
8.41	LT	For MFDU owners who do not provide sufficient parking, consider implementing a tax and create a 5-year plan to use funds for street resurfacing or other local parking improvements.			CD			
8.42	LT	Invest in and implement socioeconomic strategies. Explore widespread socioeconomic strategies to reduce citywide residential population/density, increase income and education levels.			CD			
8.43	LT	Invest in and implement socioeconomic strategies. Improve local job market and opportunities to promote local travel and reduce car ownership. Approve developments to create jobs (e.g., Employment Resource Center, Azalea Regional Shopping Center) to lower unemployment, improve housing affordability, reduce population density and reduce auto ownership per household.			CD			
8.44	LT	Invest in and implement socioeconomic strategies. Explore feasible mid-term solutions to reduce the occurence of multiple families per household/parcel.			CD			
8.45	LT	Invest in and implement socioeconomic strategies. Provide education improvement opportunities for working age citizes (e.g., ELAC Expansion) to increase household income and improve affordability, reduce population density and reduce auto ownership per household			CD			
8.46	LT	Preferential Parking Districts (PPDs). Work with Public Works to define comprehensive criteria for implementation of new PPDs; accept and review applications/petitions; identify new or modified locations; implement PPDs where neighborhoods meet program criteria			CD			
8.47	LT	Preferential Parking Districts (PPDs). Evaluate effectiveness of PPDs on an ongoing basis	PW		CD			
8.48	LT	Develop planning and zoning policies to ensure wider minimum street widths.	PW		CD			
8.49	LT	Work with L.A. County Metro to implement free/discounted local shuttle services.	PW		CD			
8.50	LT	Reduce wide-scale auto dependency and encourage transportation alternatives; Introduce light rail transit (LRT) options.	PW		CD			
8.51	LT	Assess viability of First-Mile/Last-Mile (FM/LM) implementation.	PW		CD			
8.52	LT	Maintain, update and implement the City's a Bicycle Facility Master Plan.	PW	ļ	CD			
8.53	LT	Pursue ATP Funding for bike paths, bike lanes, bike routes and/or cycle tracks.	PW		CD	PR		
8.54	LT	Take steps to ensure the City of South Gate sees the benefits of future light-rail transit (LRT) systems (e.g., Eco Rapid Transit)	PW		CD			
8.55	LT	Encourage "park once and walk" shared parking environments to discourage commercial parking in residential areas near popular destinations.			CD			
8.56	LT	Encourage/set policies for TOD (Transit-Oriented Developments).			CD			
8.57		Evaluate the effectiveness of local curb lane management policies and adjust as needed.	PW	<u> </u>	CD			
8.58	LT	Explore 1-way street circulation plans to enhance mobility and encourage driveway use.	PW		CD			

Notes:	Responsible Department(s)
ST Short-term priority/implementation (Within 1 Year)	PW: Public Works PD: Police CE: Code Enforcement
MT Mid-term priority/implementation (Within 1 to 5 years)	CD: Community Development / Planning
LT Long-term priority/implementation (Within 5 to 10 years)	PR: Parks and Recreation Department

