

Accessible Parking Policy Advisory Committee

Notes from meeting on December 18, 2012

The third Accessible Parking Policy Advisory Committee meeting took place from 10 a.m. to 12 p.m. on Tuesday, December 18, 2012 at one South Van Ness Avenue, 7th floor, Union Square conference room.

Attendees

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Ed Reiskin, Carla Johnson, Pete Curran, Ann Flemer, Dorene Giacomini, Edna James, Henry Karnilowicz, Bonnie Lewkowicz, Jessie Lorenz, Bob Planthold, Stu Smith, Roland Wong, Deedee Workman

FACILITATOR

Richard Weiner

STAFF

Lisa Foster, James Lee, Lea Militello, Jay Primus, Annette Williams, Bryant Woo

Meeting outcome: decide on criteria for evaluating policy options

EFFECTIVENESS CRITERIA

Effectiveness criteria	Measure ¹	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
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)
Reduces placard misuse	Expected change in placard misuse	Reduction in placard misuse
Recognizes diverse needs/requirements of the disabled community	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	Policy designed to be suitable for some variability in income and disability type

¹ 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 Ease of explanation 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
Financial feasibility	Fiscal impact to City	No adverse fiscal impact to City
Time needed to get new policy approved and implemented	Anticipated year of implementation	A mix of near- and far-term solutions

DISCUSSION POINT:

- Would the policy increase public trust in the validity of placards and placard use (reducing the assumption that people with hidden disabilities must be abusing placards)?

FINAL SCREEN:

- Are the set of chosen proposals compatible with one another?

1. Opening

Notes from last meeting were reviewed and no changes made.

2. Decide on criteria to consider when determining whether to recommend specific policy options

A subcommittee member briefly reviewed the draft list of criteria for evaluating policy options that was created in the subcommittee meeting the previous week. See [notes from the December 12 subcommittee meeting](#) for list of draft criteria, including measures and desired results.

The full committee discussed these criteria, and altered, eliminated, and added to the list during the course of this meeting. One factor (increase in public trust) was determined to be important for further consideration, but not an evaluation criterion. And one (eliminate revenue loss) was eliminated as a criterion. See beginning of meeting notes for final list.

EFFECTIVENESS CRITERIA

1. Does the policy make it easier for people with disabilities to find parking in blue zones?

Discussion:

- The measure for this distinguishes between a change in supply vs. change in availability. What's the difference?
 - Supply refers to the actual physical space on street, for instance the number of blue zones actually painted.
 - Availability refers to how many of those spots are empty at any given time, usually expressed as a percentage (e.g. 20% availability means two out of 10 spaces are open).
 - Supply can affect availability but availability is what matters to drivers.
- Suggestions:
 - Using "availability" and not "supply" would be consistent with the measure for the second criterion.
 - Focus on "supply" may be a solution rather than a measure. Should adopt Public Rights of Way Accessibility Guidelines (PROWAG) draft recommendations as a solution.
 - Drop "supply"

Vote: with new wording, all committee members said they "strongly endorsed" this criterion

2. Does the policy make it easier for people, especially people with disabilities, to find parking at regular metered on-street spaces?

Discussion:

- In practice, when applying criterion to policies, how will this play out? What if a policy meets this criterion but in other ways is unacceptable—will we be forced to agree with a policy just because it meets this criterion?
- Why are we dealing with regular parking at all? I think these are apples and oranges. We should stay focused on more parking in the blue zones. RESPONSES:
 - It's hard for people with a blue placard to find parking because there are so few regular parking spaces available, in addition to insufficient availability in blue zones.
 - This is for everybody, to make it easier for everyone to find a space near where they want to go. People are cruising for parking, causing congestion and pollution and making more right turns across crosswalks, making it harder for everyone to find a parking and just navigate the city, including disabled people.

Vote: Strongly endorse: almost all participants. One member voted #2 (support with reservations) and one for #5 (I would block if I could)

3. Does the policy eliminate current revenue loss to the city?

Discussion and comments:

- Is making revenue a goal? This will affect policy decisions.
- The criterion is neutral (eliminate loss) but the measure is not (net revenue gain). Maybe we should reword the measure.
- We need to be conscious about from whom we would be making money. We want to build/keep the public trust that the blue placard program is working. Especially in the context of concurrent discussions about people paying different fares on transit based on income, we have to be careful.
- Business owners feel that everyone should pay for metered parking. There's a perception that blue placards give unfair advantage.
- Wasn't this criterion, as originally conceived, related to covering enforcement costs rather than making money?
- Don't assume this means charging money for parking. Just getting rid of placard abuse will save money.
- Maybe we need a cost criterion, not a revenue criterion.
- Maybe we should reword to say "eliminate revenue loss due to abuse". Or "revenue costs neutral" may not be an important criteria.
- Abuse is the focus, not revenue.
- I think the word "revenue" is the problem. We do need a financial criterion, which perhaps would fit in the feasibility category.
- Shall we remove this criterion? Cost should show up somewhere, but maybe not here.
- Revenue is clearly an important consideration. We need to know whether a policy will cost the city.
- Suggestion: staff develop wording for a new criterion.
- The key is managing demand (maybe using pricing) rather than raising revenue.

Vote: 8 members said they would strongly endorse *removing* this as a criterion, and replacing it with one that addresses fiscal feasibility.

FEASIBILITY CRITERIA

4. Approval feasibility

Discussion:

A short discussion ensued. One member suggested changing “comprehensibility to policymakers” to something else such as “buy-in from policymakers,” but Bob Planthold pointed out that they mean different things, and reiterated the importance of policies being readily understandable. The wording was let stand.

Vote: All strongly endorsed this criterion.

5. Ease of user interface

Vote: All strongly endorsed this criterion.

6. Implementation and operational feasibility

Discussion:

- Why would our policies need to be feasible in other jurisdictions? Issue of other jurisdictions seems huge. Are we talking about applying these policy options just to San Francisco, or statewide?
 - We’re focusing on SF, but because some solutions may require changes in state law, it is also important to consider other cities.
 - People who come to SF from other areas need to be able to figure out our system.
 - We’re a big city and a magnet for people from other places. People from smaller towns need to understand why parking is managed the way it is here.
 - People from smaller cities should be able to see the logic of how our system works so they can apply the same logic, to avoid ending up with two classes of people with disabilities (those in big cities and those in small cities).
 - We should create something that could be customizable.
- Should we include cost in this criterion? It may work better to create a separate criterion for financial feasibility, such as “no adverse fiscal impact”
- State law will likely be broader and simpler than what we’re dealing with but it could allow for test/pilot programs
- State law doesn’t need to be prescriptive.
- We also need to consider compatibility between policies. When we make recommendations, we have to ask: can these solutions work together in a package? Do any feasibility criteria prevent solutions that might be packaged from being compatible with each other? We will have to check at some point but this doesn’t have to be a separate criterion

Vote: Strongly endorse: 11 (no dissenting votes)

7. *Proposed new criterion:* Financial feasibility. Measure: Fiscal impact. Desired results: No adverse fiscal impact.

Vote: Strongly endorse: 11 (no dissenting votes)

8. Time to get new policy approved. Measure: anticipated year of implementation. Desired results: some policies will be near-term, some long-term.

Vote: Strongly endorse: 11 (no dissenting votes)

FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS

9. Does the policy increase public trust in the placard system (reducing the assumption that people with hidden disabilities must be abusing placards)?

Discussion and comments:

- I don't think this is the role of this committee
- We did remove it from criteria because it's important and relevant but not necessarily something we should do
- It could be useful; a feedback situation that ought to be considered
- I don't think it's necessarily a criterion but it is important that people see the placard program as trustworthy. It seems more like a filter, a discussion point for evaluating policies, but it shouldn't necessarily sink a proposal.

Vote: There was general agreement that this is not a criterion

10. Does the policy recognize variation among people with disabilities in terms of disability type and income?

Discussion and comments:

- Current practice is "one size fits all" but this is proving detrimental and leading to fraud.
- Physical ability to feed meter vs. financial ability to pay.
- We might want to address type of disability in terms of temporary vs. permanent, too.
- If it's expensive and unnecessary to create different levels, we shouldn't spend our time on it.
- Without something like this, we have no criterion that addresses fraud or abuse
 - This is a good point, but this criterion doesn't necessarily address fraud.
- There are several kinds of fraud—placards too easy to get, placards being misused (by wrong people). We may need education. This would be a solution rather than a criterion.
- Should we write a new criterion in the effectiveness category? (see below)
 - Measures/desired results to be written later
 - This new criterion does not reflect diversity needs, which should be left as a separate criterion within "effectiveness" category

Vote: Strongly endorse: 11; Support with reservations: 1, on the fence: 1

11. New proposed criterion in “effectiveness” category: Would the policy lead to a reduction in the misuse of placards?

Discussion: as above

Vote: strongly endorse: everyone

3. Presentation on policies and programs in other jurisdictions, follow-up discussion

The presentation will be available online in the resources section at <http://sfpark.org/resource-category/accessible-parking-policy/>. There was insufficient time for any questions or discussion.

4. Identify additional data needed to evaluate potential policy options

There was insufficient time for this agenda item.

5. Closing

PUBLIC COMMENT

One member of the public spoke, saying that enforcement of placard abuse should be easy. Why does the SFMTA use two people to enforce when only one is needed? Increasing enforcement would make a big difference. Staff responded with an offer to review over the phone the background information presentation, which included an enforcement section. That presentation is available here: <http://sfpark.org/resources/accessible-parking-background-information-presentation/> (PDF).

MEETING EVALUATION

- Excellent.
- Really great to see what other jurisdictions are doing.