

## Three Reasons to Reconsider 90 Minute Parking In the Western Downtown Remarks Given the Davis City Council on December 9 Regarding Its December 2, 2003 Action

By John Lofland, 523 E Street, 758-5258, jlofland@dcn.org

I ask the Council to reconsider its December 2, 2003 decision to change 2 hour to 90 minute parking in the western part of the downtown.

I offer three reasons for this request. **First**, plausible evidence exists that this change will have serious negative impacts on the area north of Fifth and east of B. **Second**, this plausible evidence was known by relevant City officials who failed to see its significance. **Third**, two major parties affected by the change were not notified of the process and given an opportunity to voice their concerns.

Let me very briefly elaborate on these three reasons for reconsideration.

**First**, the empirical fact is that central Davis has highly restricted parking except for the area northeast of Fifth and B. The first and easiest new parking area for parkers displaced by the impending 90 minute rule is that unrestricted district.

This is because in a series of "preferential" parking decisions made over several years, Councils have created a very tight system that forms a noose around the Old North neck.

[A color-coded map of central Davis is shown.]

As depicted by this map, the Old North is a bright green island of opportunity in a sea of red and blue prohibition.

This tight system is so full of swarming cars zeroing in on empty spaces that small changes in it cannot but make big waves in parking behavior

This is exactly what we have already experienced in the Old North in the last year as a result of recent UCD and other changes. The 90 minute change will produce another wave, perhaps even a stronger one.

**Second**, in the process of coming to the 90 minute parking decision, the acute-tightness facts I have just explained were

not addressed, despite the fact that the Old North Neighborhood Association has been lobbying the Public Works department on parking for about a year. (It lobbied Public Works more than other City units because Chapter 22 of the City Code instructs us to do so. Perhaps we should not believe everything we read.)

I myself appeared before your Safety Advisory Commission in November and presented the very chart and the analysis that I have just shown you. No member of SAC or staff disagreed with what I said. Indeed, Staff reported that a remedial response to the problem I depicted was underway.

*However, none of this Old North and SAC activity on parking seemed to have been injected into the process of making the 90 minute decision. It is as if the two topics were kept in separate compartments.*

**Third**, two major parties affected by the 90 minutes decision were not told that a process of making it was underway.

1. You might snicker when I say it but you should not: potentially displaced parkers were not consulted about the problems it creates for them. They are after all obeying the law and just trying to go about their legitimate activities. Have they no rights? Should they not be told what is happening and allowed to participate in deciding what happens to them?

(I was especially amused by the part of your session here last week in which staff carefully enumerated downtown interest groups consulted but ignored parkers.)

2. Even more egregious, to me, the Old North Association or other area residents were not apprised of this impending change.

This despite the fact that people in that area have a very active organization that is officially recognized by the City as its legitimate representative. It has been acting on the parking problem in regular contact with city officials.

The first lapse regarding parkers is amusing. This second lapse regarding adjacent residents is breathtaking.

I personally follow downtown and related matters more closely than many people and I was not aware of the 90 minute proposal until I saw the action on TV this last Tuesday.

You may say I should pay better attention. My answer is that I am like you. I cannot inspect the internal provisions of every little item that comes along. The world is simply too full of other matters to which to attend.

And, I and others are not yet paranoid enough to presume that any City action in the downtown will have negative consequence. We therefore do not critically analyze every proposal. (Sadly, this incident may prompt revision of this presumption.)

Personally, I think all of us were blind-sided, in effect if not in intent.

In conclusion, I would characterize all this as two important failures in the process.

One, the process failed in knowing but not recognizing information that was critically relevant on Old North parking and its relation to a new 90 minute rule.

Two, the process failed by ignoring two major categories of parties affected by the action. Your action might have been the same anyway, but you would have at least known our views.

As I said at the outset, I ask your reconsideration.

Thank you for your time and attention.