

## Subcommittee to the Accessible Parking Policy Advisory Committee

### Notes from meeting on December 11, 2012

The second subcommittee meeting took place from 10 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. on Tuesday, December 11, 2012 at one South Van Ness Avenue, 6th floor, Corona Heights conference room.

Members present: Ann Flemer, Bob Planthold, Stu Smith, Roland Wong (Jessie Lorenz was unable to attend)

Co-chairs: Ed Reiskin and Carla Johnson

Facilitator: Richard Weiner

Staff: Lisa Foster

#### Meeting outcome: list of criteria to evaluate potential policy recommendation

The central meeting goal was to develop a list of policy option evaluation criteria for the full committee to review at the December 18 meeting. Based on input from various committee participants, the subcommittee developed the list below.

#### EFFECTIVENESS CRITERIA

Effectiveness criteria	Measure <sup>1</sup>	Desired results
Makes it easier for people with disabilities to find parking in blue zones	Change in parking availability in blue zones	Improved parking availability in blue zones
	Change in supply of blue zones	Blue zone supply doubled to meet ADA's draft requirements for the public rights of way
Makes it easier for people, especially those with disabilities, to find parking in general metered spaces	Change in parking availability at general metered on-street parking spaces	Sufficient parking availability at metered on-street spaces (improved in congested areas)
Revenue (eliminates current revenue loss)	Net revenue to City, including costs and revenues related to the policy	Increase net revenue (to fund transportation such as paratransit)

<sup>1</sup> Most measures of change will be simple estimates expressed as "large improvement, slight improvement, same, worsen slightly, or worsen greatly".

**FEASIBILITY CRITERIA**

Feasibility criteria	Measure	Desired results
Approval feasibility	Policy/legal change requirements Likelihood of support Comprehensibility to policymakers	Sufficient comprehension and support to achieve approval
Ease of user interface	Whether it meets ADA requirements Whether policy is easy to understand	Fulfills ADA, and existing communications channels are sufficient to make outside visitors understand changes.
Implementation and operational feasibility	Capability (ability + resources + technology) of relevant agency/agencies to implement and operate solution Feasibility in other CA jurisdictions	Relevant agency/agencies have sufficient capability Feasible in other jurisdictions
Time needed to get new policy approved and implemented	Anticipated year of implementation	A mix of near- and far-term solutions

**FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

Further considerations	Measure	Desired results
Increases public trust in the validity of placards and placard use (reducing the assumption that people with hidden disabilities must be abusing placards)	Not discussed at meeting. <i>Suggestion for committee review: Reduction in news articles and public comments assuming that all placard holders without obvious disabilities are placard abusers</i>	Not discussed at meeting. <i>Suggestion for committee review: Fewer such news articles and public comments</i>
Recognizes diverse needs/requirements of the disabled community	Not discussed at meeting. <i>Suggestion for committee review: Whether or not policy is suitable for people with disabilities who are low income vs. not low income, and for different types of mobility impairments</i>	Not discussed at meeting. <i>Suggestion for committee review: Policy designed to be suitable for some variability in income and disability type</i>

## 1. Opening: Debrief and discuss key outcomes from November 27 full committee meeting

Reviewed draft meeting notes and briefly discussed. At the previous meeting the committee defined problems, and discussed results of problems and roots of problems. Additional problem not previously identified: some merchants are choosing not to renew green (short term parking) zones because the spaces are used for long-term parking by people with disabled placards. Green zones are for short term parking in front of businesses with quick customer turnaround, like dry cleaners and florists; and qualifying merchants [pay](#) to have a green curb painted outside their business. But by state law, people with blue placards can legally park at a green zone all day.

## 2. Develop list of criteria to use when determining whether to recommend specific policy options

The committee reviewed more than 29 suggestions for criteria. The facilitator pointed out that given the long list of criteria, the subcommittee needed to be thoughtful about what to include in the draft list, since these criteria would be applied to every policy recommendation. The goal at this meeting would be to make a list that can move forward to the full committee.

A member suggested creating two separate groupings of criteria, one focusing on effectiveness and feasibility (both political and practical). He also noted that some solutions might be infeasible in the short-term but possible to do later, and that such long-term solutions should not be rejected as impractical or not worth doing.

The question came up: Would these criteria become something we apply to all possible solutions? The answer was yes, and we could consider assigning each criterion weights which could allow recommendations to be scored.

A member voiced an objection to the suggested criterion: “remove the misperception that people with hidden disabilities don’t deserve placards.” It seems to concern an educational effort about prejudices, which seems outside of the work at hand, and perhaps it should be an appendix criterion.

- Suggestion that it addressed the question of increasing trust in the system; that if the system worked the issue would not exist.
- Concurrence that it’s a difficult criterion, a little outside the two categories of effectiveness and feasibility.
- Suggestion that the issue may be simply that placards are too easy to get, which in turn engenders little trust in the system.

### REVIEW OF COMMITTEE MEMBER CRITERIA IDEAS

The subcommittee then went through the input from individual committee members that had been submitted via email before the meeting.

**CRITERIA IDEAS SET #1**

- Simple enough for easy understanding by legislators, the media, and advocates from amongst people with disabilities.
  - Fits into ease of use criterion.
- Not seem punitive. People with disabilities need to know that placards and blue zones are not going to be taken away or become harder to get. Recommendations need to be framed positively.
  - Keep in mind for the approval feasibility criterion.
- Not have provisions that allow for easy reduction in the number and the siting of blue placard spaces. Allow for an easy increase in blue zones, especially if the draft amendments to ADA regarding on-street parking requirements get adopted.
  - Add blue zone supply and upcoming ADA requirements to the blue zone criterion.
- Easy to implement, including in other jurisdictions. Even a small town has to be able to implement. Whatever we try has to be applicable to any size town; for example, it can't rely on an expensive technology investment or create an undue burden for police.
  - Add outside jurisdictions measure to the implementation and operational feasibility criterion.
- Once the state legislation is in force, the SF experiment must be up and running within one year.
  - Time criterion addresses timeliness.
- Approval/legislative strategy (group generally agreed that these could be kept in mind for the approval feasibility criterion)
  - Significant plaintiffs in other successful disability related litigation (such as Californians for Disability Rights, and Calif. Council for the Blind, and maybe Cal. Federation of Independent Living Centers) ought to be made aware of the outline and draft concepts before a major public hearing in the legislature.
  - It may even be worth previewing a draft to three major disability-litigation public-interest law firms in California: Disability Rights Advocates, D.R.E.D.F., and Disability Rights California.
  - Agreement/acceptance—from DMV and maybe Calif. Med. Association-- that this experiment if feasible and likely to do no harm.
  - Neutrality—at least—from California League of Cities & from California Association of Counties.
  - And also from California Police Chiefs' Association. The latter is included because we don't want police agencies—which in many other jurisdictions do blue placard enforcement—to say they are being burdened with an "unfunded mandate".

**CRITERIA IDEAS SET #2**

- Compliance with disability access standards regarding meter design. If meter payment is one of the recommendations, then payment options also have to be accessible.
  - Included in ease of user interface criterion.
- Availability of blue zones in accordance with ADA Public Right of Way Guidelines (PROWAG) scoping requirements.
  - Add blue zone supply and upcoming ADA requirements to the blue zone criterion.
- Ease of implementation for placard users who visit SF and are not knowledgeable about parking status in SF.
  - Included in ease of user interface criterion.
- Availability of public awareness campaigns that inform long-term placard users and especially seniors and those with cognitive disabilities.
  - Keep in mind for ease of user interface criterion.

**CRITERIA IDEAS SET #3**

- Is the solution difficult/easy to understand or enforce?
  - Understanding is included in ease of user interface criterion.
- Does a solution recognize the diversity of need within the 'disabled' community? I'm very much interested in ideas that better segment by specific need rather than the mere 'existence of a disability'. Is impaired mobility enough of a disability to gain access to all benefits associated with a disabled person placard?
  - This engendered a long discussion, which concluded that this should be added to the list of criteria, reworded to reflect the distinction between income diversity and functional ability. Member pointed out that addressing need based on affordability is consistent with the idea being floated for an income-based fare structure, but that it can become a very large monitoring issue with administrative and privacy issues raised.
  - Committee agreed that the original submitter should be consulted for clarification, which was obtained after the meeting: *"The current state (and local) practices are one size fits all, but the community of disabled parkers is more diverse than that and we've reached a tipping point where providing all of them the same services is detrimental to parking access overall. It's also leading to fraud."*
- Does a proposal improve or impair revenue available for parking and access-related services such as enforcement and customer service?
  - Revenue criterion should cover this.

- How does a proposal impact businesses that are dependent on parking for customers?
  - Member asked whether it's true that businesses really do rely on parking in front of their businesses. Does data support this, or is it a truism and an expectation on the part of the business, whereas in fact increased pedestrian traffic may be more important to their business?

#### CRITERIA IDEAS SET #4

- Implementation feasibility (does it require changes to state or city codes or laws?)
  - Included in implementation and operational feasibility criterion.
- Negatively impacts legitimate placard holders
  - It would be difficult to define "legitimate" or come up with a measure for "negative impacts". List has some criteria addressing some specific ones; perhaps those will address her suggestion.
- Increases DMV's role and responsibilities
  - The implementation and operational feasibility focuses on the capability of relevant agency/agencies to implement and operate solution.

#### CRITERIA IDEAS SET #5

- Effect on disabled veterans.
  - Members thought this may be too specific. Was the legislation created to give vets a benefit?
- Effect on demand for disabled transportation services from SFMTA (e.g., could increase if parking fees for blue zones are implemented.)
  - This can be covered under the operational feasibility criterion. The point seems to assume that people would shift to paratransit or fixed route transit if parking wasn't free.
- SFMTA ability to solve problems within its networks other than by increase in revenue.
  - Suggestion that rather than being a criterion, this seems to be challenging the problem statement related to revenue.

#### PROCESS AGREEMENT:

- Notes should include updated chart and be sent to subcommittee by end of day today and sent to committee on Thursday.

### 3. Policies and programs at other jurisdictions

Reviewed very briefly (see agenda item #5, below)

#### 4. Draft Agenda for full committee meeting

The draft agenda was discussed and several points brought up:

- Whether it was necessary to verbally present the draft criteria list at the meeting if it was sent out to the group ahead of time, but most agreed that it was, because: it's a large group of people, there are some complexities in the list, and it's a good introduction to get everyone on the same page.
- Whether it was necessary to use the five "Gradations of Agreement" for every criterion. It was agreed to delete this from the draft agenda, since the gradations might be useful only in certain circumstances (as there seems to be a high level of agreement on some of them). We should rather see which criteria have majority support, and only use the gradations for those criteria where this is not clear.
- Whether the goal of agenda item #3 (presentations about policies and programs at other jurisdictions) is to come up with a subset of solutions that can be run through the criteria. It was agreed that it would be premature to discuss the merits of each policy at the upcoming meeting.
- A request for information about the legislative history at the state level, so we know why we have the rules we have today. This may not be possible to complete by the next meeting but is a good idea for the following one.
- How do we find out where else in California or the U.S. cities are dealing with this problem right now: through the League of Cities? The CPPA? Is this a strategy for later? Does it make sense to have a presentation to the committee?
- The goal of the next meeting, besides agreeing on a list of evaluation criteria, is to hear about and be inspired by the many creative solutions that are being tried in other areas.

#### 5. Meeting close and evaluation:

The meeting closed with a brief overview of different policies in various areas, and a request for a state-by-state summary of legislation.

Evaluative comments were generally positive, with thanks for keeping the group on track and kudos for accomplishing much in a short time. The model of using a small group to deal with issues more deeply between large group meetings seems to be working well.

#### REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION:

State-by-state summary of legislation.

Legislative history at the CA state level, so we know why we have the rules we have today.