

Parking Supply and Management Options for Dana Point

Prepared by: Richard Willson, Ph.D. FAICP

Date: June 20, 2017

Background

Dana Point stakeholders have concerns about parking in the Lantern District (Town Center), Doheny Village, and in residential neighborhoods. Previously commissioned parking studies offered data, insights, and recommendations, but they did not resolve parking controversies. In June, 2016, Dana Point voters approved Measure H, which regulates building height and parking. With regard to parking, the measure stipulates that...

“All parking requirements of Dana Point Municipal Code section 9.35.080, subdivision (e) shall be strictly enforced for each use within a building, including requirements for guest spaces for residential units which cannot be shared with retail requirements. In the Town Center area, parking spaces for residences shall be provided on site; no reduction of required parking spaces shall be granted for bicycle spaces: no credit for parking spaces on public property shall be given.” Source http://www.ocvote.com/fileadmin/user_upload/elections/pri2016/measures/h.pdf

This measure rejected a series of parking changes proposed by a previous consultant. In addition, the proposed *Doheny Village Form-Based Code* recommends an approach to parking that differs from standard city code requirements. This code uses a transect concept to identify different types of areas (e.g., “maker” district, “village neighborhood”) and sets form requirements that allow more flexibility in land uses than traditional zoning. Finally, some Dana Point residential neighborhoods have parking issues that residents want addressed.

In response, the City engaged stakeholders, commissioners, and elected officials in a new conversation about parking. This effort includes a survey (discussed here), a public study session on May 15, 2017, and this report. Over 180 people responded to the survey and over 100 people attended the interactive public workshop.

This report reviews the parking survey, the public workshop, and suggests a city-wide framework for action. Parking solutions are then reviewed for the Lantern District, Doheny Village, and residential neighborhoods. The report concludes with a two-year timeline for action.

Context for Parking in Coastal Communities

Coastal cities offer many attributes and amenities that attract residents, businesses and visitors. As a result, they often face parking issues related to their own residents and employees as well as a substantial visitor population that varies by season. Often, land availability is constrained and parking construction is expensive, so parking solutions do not come easily. Many coastal cities such as Ventura, Laguna Beach, and Santa Monica use parking management and innovative parking supply strategies to ensure that parking and the transportation system meet community goals.

Decisions about parking, while having technical dimensions, should stem from community vision and goals. In some parts of the City, these decisions must also meet Coastal Commission concerns about public access. This report combines the author's experience with information learned in the survey and community meeting. It suggests ways forward that are supported by best-practice research and the perspective of community members.

One of the key takeaway messages is that parking issues are different in the Lantern District, Doheny Village, and residential areas, suggesting that a uniform approach may not serve each area. On the other hand, stakeholders desire a coordinated and comprehensive approach so that piecemeal decisions do not lead to problems. In response, this report suggests a near-term "game plan" that the City can follow to address parking issues.

Parking is a fast-changing dimension of urban planning. There is new interest in livable communities that moves away from the traditional patterns of single land uses set back in a large expanse of surface parking. Livability goals includes mixed land uses, an active street, and transportation choices such as driving, walking, bicycling, and transit or shuttles. Achievement of these goals provide opportunities for households seeking lifestyles with lower vehicle ownership and businesses seeking to serve those populations. Social and demographic changes support this trend among the Millennial generation, residents seeking sustainable lifestyles, and baby-boomers looking to downsize. Self-driving and self-parking vehicles should also be considered. Even the modest advance of self-parking vehicles will allow "stacking" of vehicles in parking facilities that will reduce the amount of area devoted to parking, and self-driving technology may reduce private vehicle ownership, reducing total parking needed.

In many business districts, each building does not accommodate all the peak parking demand on site. Rather, there is a pool of parking that is shared among uses with different time-of-day occupancies. Dana Point has begun this process by leasing private parking and offering it as public parking. This makes parking more efficiently used than a traditional suburban style, single-purpose area. Parking pricing and time limits establish priorities for what parker uses what space. Where residential areas abut a business district, special attention is needed to address the impact of the business district on neighborhoods, namely employee and visitor parking overflow.

Resident Parking Survey

City staff developed an on-line parking survey (Citywide Parking: Community Survey) to learn more about parking perceptions. The survey was available in April/May, 2017 and received 187 responses. It queried respondents for their ideas about parking issues and solutions and provided an opportunity for open-ended comments. The survey closed May 31, 2017. It provides a rich source of information going forward. The following summarizes brief takeaways from the survey:

- Respondents agree that different areas in Dana Point have different parking needs (93%).
- Business districts perceived as most impacted by parking are the Lantern District (64%), Dana Point Harbor (58%) and Doheny Village (10%). (Multiple answers were permitted.)
- The top three priorities for the City are "provide convenient and accessible parking", "maintain a small town walkable form," and "support a park-once pedestrian vision."
- A "park once" pedestrian-friendly vision has support (53% said yes; 28% said maybe).
- Residents prefer to shop or dine in a "Main Street environment" over a retail strip-mall setting (65%)

- Awareness of public parking lots in the Lantern District and Doheny Villages is low – 30% of respondents are not aware of them and an additional 14% have never used them.
- Residents are willing to drive around looking for a space, *within limits* (45% said 1-3 minutes, 41% 3 – 5 minutes).
- Respondents’ willingness to walk 3-5 minutes to get to a store or restaurant is mixed – 33% responded that they are “likely” or “very likely” to do that.
- Safe walking paths are important (75% rated this as a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale of level of importance).
- Residents support improved space designations, public parking lots, and time limits. More respondents oppose metered parking than support it.
- The top four neighborhoods perceived to be impacted by parking are Dana Hills, Monarch Beach, Dana Woods, and Niguel Shores.
- In questions about residential neighborhoods, 27% said they parked on street “often, everyday” and 32% said “sometimes.”
- In residential areas, the strongest support is for parking enforcement, improved signage, improved and revised curb markings, and residential parking permits.

The parking survey also provides a rich set of specific concerns and suggestions in response to open-ended questions. The City could create a multi-department staff team to review these specific suggestions and develop responses.

Overview of Public Workshop

A public workshop was held on May 15, 2017, with members of the City Council and Planning Commission present. The event was intended to gather public input on parking issues. It included a presentation on parking concepts, interactive stations facilitated by city staff, and a joint City Council/Planning Commission study session. The interactive stations allowed attendees to visit as many stations as desired. They addressed the Lantern District, Doheny Village, residential neighborhoods, general parking preferences, and citywide parking. This summary does not do justice to the level of detail and insights provided. As the City moves forward with parking programs in specific districts and neighborhoods, details from the workshops can inform analysis and policy development.

A wide variety of discussions occurred at the interactive stations, facilitated by City staff as summarized below.

Lantern District interactive station. Participants marked on maps and wrote comments on flipcharts and notes. Major themes concerning parking supply and management included: preventing employee and customer parking in residential areas, permit parking, creating more public lots (subterranean or structure), parking requirements for restaurants, shared parking opportunities, use of post office parking lot, and managing special event parking. Regarding alternative transportation, comments were made about complete streets, walkable alleys, bus route improvements, bike share, and the risk of excess parking harming livability. Comments also noted the need for a financial reality-check about cost of providing public parking.

Doheny Village interactive station. Participants marked on maps and wrote comments on flipcharts and notes. Issues were noted with street sweeping days, trash pickup, a need for more parking, better crosswalks, opposition to road diets (and roundabouts), lack of enforcement on street cleaning days, the

need for capacity for truck deliveries, short-term parking for pick-up/dropoff, and a desire to keep parking free. Regarding parking design, some preferred subterranean parking or alternative structures using new technology. Regarding particular problems, street parking at the end of Las Vegas and Sepulveda was mentioned. On a broader note, beach access from Doheny Village was stated as a major problem, both the route and pedestrian safety, and walking access to the Palisades.

Residential neighborhoods interactive station. Maps were displayed for three residential parts of the City: East of San Juan Creek, South of Stonehill Drive, and North of Stonehill Drive. Participants were asked to place numbered stickers on locations where parking issues exist. The categories were 1) cars blocking sidewalks and driveways, 2) need more enforcement, 3) rental overcrowding, 4) local employees using street parking, 5) RV's, inoperative vehicles, 6) impacted by special events and/or schools, 7) visitor and tourist street parking, 8) residents not parking in garages, and 9) sober living homes. The stickers and comments reveal a wide variety of concerns that should be addressed at a specific level. The distribution of the stickers indicates that certain streets and/or specific neighborhood blocks have a high incidence of problems.

General parking preferences interactive station. Participants answered a series of questions by voting with dots and writing comments. There was a strong preference for a walkable main street versus surface lot shopping center environment. Respondents indicated a range of distances that respondents were willing to walk after they park, a range of ratings of the city's current parking from "good" to "poor," and most respondents said they would use a central parking structure with shuttle service.

Citywide parking interactive station. This station provided devices so that attendees could complete the *Citywide Parking: Community Survey* described previously, complete a comment form, and view maps and parking information. Among the comments mentioned, suggestions included requiring or providing underground parking or parking structures. The comments endorsed parking management, charging for parking, updating parking regulations, providing better busses and shuttles, introducing shared-use bikes, and addressing special event spillover into residential neighborhoods.

A Suggested City-Wide Framework

There are many benefits to addressing parking requirements and adopting a more actively-managed parking system. They include responding to the concerns of residents and businesses, promoting economic development, supporting sustainability and livability, improving the parker's experience, and making neighborhoods work for residents. A parking program should be driven by a vision that sets out basic aims and translates them to principles concerning parking supply and management. While an extensive process could be used to develop a parking vision for Dana Point, the following suggests a vision and principles based on the author's knowledge of best practice, consideration of existing conditions, and the feedback received in the survey and workshop.

Potential Dana Point Parking Vision: *A parking infrastructure that serves the broader Dana Point community vision by getting people where they need to be with a high level of customer service, transportation options, parking choices, safety, financial feasibility, and environmental sustainability.*

This potential vision should be compared to the vision and goals in Dana Point's various land use and economic development plans, and then revised to support the guidance provide in those documents. Three main principles may be considered to implement that vision.

Principle 1: *Create order and reduce anxiety by getting the right user to the right parking space.* This principle is implemented by prioritizing parking spaces in different parts of the city for user groups such as customers, residents, employees, and others. These priorities can be developed through a coordinated city/stakeholder effort to develop clear parking policies and use rules. Once established, these priorities are implemented through parking management technologies and information systems that ease the space search process.

Principle 2: *Use resources efficiently.* Efficiency is achieved by making sure that parking spaces are well-used, through parking management and shared parking, and that public expenditures on parking are cost effective. The most convenient on-street parking spaces should serve many parkers per day, with longer-term parking directed to off-street and remote parking. Accountability in this regard is supported by regular reporting on parking programs, parking occupancies, enforcement, and revenues.

Principle 3: *Encourage alternative transportation and “park once” concepts.* Walking, bicycling, shuttles and transit can reduce the total parking spaces needed and contribute to livability and sustainability objectives. Parking management is part of a “green city”.

Parking is of sufficient concern in Dana Point that a new commitment to coordination, management and transparency is suggested. Regular coordination is desirable between city departments involved in parking, and with the County Sherriff (parking enforcement), other public agencies such as Orange County (OC Parks, Orange County Transportation Authority), the Chamber of Commerce, resident groups, and business entities.

A suggested first step in this coordination is the creation of a Parking Oversight Committee that could, for example, meet quarterly, receive parking occupancy and financial monitoring reports, respond to issues and special events, promote shared parking arrangements and the leasing of parking for public uses, and provide information to stakeholders and advice to city agencies. An example of the composition of such a committee could include a representative from the following groups:

- Planning Commissioner
- Dana Point Financial Review Committee
- Dana Point Traffic Improvement Subcommittee
- City resident
- Chamber of Commerce representative

If this oversight committee concept is of interest, the City Council could develop a mandate for the committee and appoint its members.

Suggestions for Districts and Neighborhoods

Lantern District

The Lantern District (Town Center) is the heart of Dana Point. Because it includes the Pacific Coast Highway and was developed in the automobile era, many existing buildings reflect highway-oriented design, with low-scale, single-use buildings and surface parking. It lacks publically-owned off-street parking facilities. The 2008 *Town Center Plan* was adopted to encourage the Lantern District revitalization. It includes public improvements intended to support private reinvestment and

development. It also calls for a pedestrian-friendly environment for shopping, dining, entertainment and the wide range of activities that give meaning and identity to a town center.

Going forward, suburban-style strip development is not consistent with this vision. Normally, parking reform accompanies a new vision, including lower (or eliminated) minimum parking requirements, more shared parking, and parking management. In this case, the voters decided to maintain the current parking requirements, which are typical of suburban design standards. These requirements will stifle housing and economic development because of the cost of building high supplies of parking, and/or because it is simply impossible to provide the required parking on the site. Cities across the nation are reconsidering parking requirements in their business districts.

Until such time as the voters reconsider this issue, the existing parking requirements are maintained and certain parking management strategies, such as off-site parking, are prohibited. The most onerous parking requirements are those for residential development¹ and restaurants².

There are significant opportunities, however, to more actively manage parking in the Lantern District, including the following.

- **Manage on-street parking.** Currently, on-street parking does not have hourly time limits and it is free. This is at odds with many coastal communities. The problem with this practice is that long-term parkers, such as employees, can occupy prime spaces all day, which creates the impression there is a parking shortage when, in aggregate, there is not. Allowing that practice is not “getting the right parker to the right space.” Time limits and/or parking pricing can help improve the efficiency of parking use by increasing the turnover of the most popular spaces, making it easier to find a space, and encouraging use of spaces that have vacancies. Many communities price on-street parking and offer free off-street parking as an alternative. Pricing parking can generate revenue to improve parking, provide alternative transportation, or provide other community benefits such as district maintenance. Communities that build off-street public parking but do not manage on-street parking often find that stakeholders still perceive that there is a parking shortage. This is because parkers seek on-street spaces before using a structure or underground facilities. They still encounter full parking in popular on-street locations. On-street management is the prerequisite for many other parking strategies.
- **Provide remote parking for employees and long-term parkers.** By shifting some long-term parkers to other locations, this practice can increase parking availability and convenience for short-term visitors, such as those going to shops and restaurants. The remote parking can be within walking distance or served by shuttles, and it can be year round or seasonal. An evaluation of suitable sites should be conducted (cost of securing, shuttle or walk times, management arrangements, etc.).
- **Evaluate shared valet parking.** A shared valet program allows for vehicle drop-off and pick-up in multiple locations in a district, encouraging visitors to park once and walk within the district. Valet systems can improve the visitor experience by allowing patrons to avoid searching for a

¹ Per unit ratios: studio = 1.5 spaces/studio, 2.0 spaces per 1-bedroom, 2.5 spaces per 2-bedroom, plus 0.2 visitor parking per unit. Ratio of covered versus uncovered varies.

² Per 1,000 square feet ratio: 10 spaces for dine-in < 4,000 square feet; 40 stalls + 20 spaces per 1,000 square feet for restaurants > 4,000 square feet; 10 spaces or 20 spaces per 1,000 square feet for fast food.

space. They increase the use of spaces normally empty in the evenings as the valets can park cars in spaces that parkers may not be aware of or entitled to use.

- **Improve signage, wayfinding, and information systems.** These systems are especially valuable to help first-time visitors and can markedly improve satisfaction with the parking experience. They include static signs, changeable message signs, sidewalk and pathway treatments, and electronic guides to available spaces. Increasing awareness of the City's leased public off-street parking could improve perceptions about parking convenience.
- **Explore ways to reduce the cost of providing parking.** These can include brokering shared parking arrangements to allow more efficient provisions, using mechanical parking, allowing underground parking construction under the public right-of-way, allowing tandem parking for two-bedroom residential units³, or reducing required space size and aisle dimensions.
- **Promote the use of the in-lieu parking fee option by private developers.** The cost of the in lieu fee is substantial (\$40,000) and may deter developers from using that option. Yet that is the primary tool to generate funds to build a shared parking structure, and so should be encouraged. The in-lieu program may particularly help small sites in which parking construction costs are high because of inefficient parking layouts. A shared structure can respond to parking demand by various land uses during different times of the day.
- **Expand the public parking lease program as demand warrants.** The City should measure occupancy regularly, anticipate changes in demand patterns, and adjust/expand the program as appropriate. It can conduct outreach to property owners in collaboration with the Chamber of Commerce. This effort can also encourage peer-to-peer private sharing arrangements, such as those used by resorts.
- **Periodically review the cost of the public parking lease program and compare it to options for creating a shared public lot, structure, or underground facility.** A financial analysis can show how expansion of the lease program compares with the land and construction costs of providing a shared structure. For context, the City of Orange has begun work on a parking structure on a former city surface lot. The cost per net space added is nearly \$50,000, exclusive of land costs.⁴
- **Develop parking management tools to reduce commercial parking impacts in residential streets next to the District.** For example, a "no parking" rule for non-residents after 10 PM would reduce incidence of neighborhood disruption when bars and restaurants close, or alternatively, a residential permit programs could restrict parking to residents. Passes could be issued to residents for their visitors.

Because new development is currently underway, it is desirable to measure on- and off-street parking on a regular basis to see how parking patterns may change. For example, a new occupancy study might be conducted after the Raintree Partners project opens and reaches stabilized operations.

³ For residential uses, tandem parking is only allowed in duplexes. All other residential uses must request a Minor Conditional Use Permit.

⁴ The 611-space structure is being built on a 172-space surface lot, yielding 439 spaces added. The cost of the structure is estimated at \$20.5 million, yielding a cost per space added of \$46,697.

Doheny Village

The proposed *Doheny Village Form Based Code* includes innovative planning regulations designed to create a dynamic walkable neighborhood. The code uses a transect concept to develop building form regulations that allow for a wider variety of uses. Transect types include Village Neighborhood: Small Footprint, Village Neighborhood: Large Footprint, Maker District, and Village Main Street. These neighborhoods and streets have been planned to form a walkable community.

The proposed Form Based Code includes parking requirements that are different than the City-wide requirements, as might be expected in with this new district concept.⁵ The recommendations are in line, however, with the supply level being required by many other California jurisdictions that are seeking to create livable communities. It is also consistent with parking demand data observed in places of this type.

Six considerations are presented below to support the parking approach in the proposed code:

- 1) Reformed parking requirements are necessary to achieve the design vision and economic feasibility. Using existing parking requirements will prohibit the efficient use of land anticipated by the code.
- 2) Housing affordability is enhanced by allowing developers to serve a residential market for those seeking new housing options with less parking. Currently, households seeking a lifestyle with fewer cars are prohibited from finding a new housing unit with less parking.
- 3) Doheny Village is separated from surrounding single family neighborhoods by freeways, major arterials and topography, reducing the chance of parking spillover impacts.
- 4) The proposed code does not impose parking maximums – developers may choose to build more than the minimum amount if they feel the market warrants that.
- 5) Residents and business attracted to the neighborhood will be aware of the parking supply in advance; those seeking suburban levels of parking will likely choose another neighborhood.
- 6) Homeowners Associations and rental property managers will control the number of vehicles parked on site in accordance with the supply, through HOA provisions, lease agreements, and monitoring procedures.

It is suggested that the City develop parking management measures for the Doheny Village to accompany the vision of the code and the proposed parking requirements. The headings list on the next page refer to the descriptions provided for parking management in the Lantern District (noted previously); additional text refers to differences in approach for Doheny Village.

⁵ The proposed parking requirements are as follows: studio or 1 BR – 1 space/unit; 2+ bedrooms, 2 spaces per unit. For non-residential uses, the plan proposes no parking requirement for buildings < 1,500 square feet, and 2 spaces per 1,000 square feet above the first 1,500 square feet.

-
- **Manage on-street parking.**
 - **Provide remote parking for employees and long-term parkers.**
 - **Improve signage, wayfinding, and information systems.**
 - **Explore ways to reduce the cost of providing parking.**
 - **Promote the use of the in-lieu parking fee option by private developers.** The larger parcels in Doheny Village offer the possibility of a shared public parking garage supported by in-lieu fees. The cost of this type of parking is lower (e.g., \$20,000 - \$30,000), so a lower in-lieu fee might attract more developer interest.
 - **Coordinate with HOA's, leasing agents, and property management to manage resident parking supply.** Property managers and HOA's can register residents' vehicles and assign them to appropriately-sized spaces. Parking rules can be included in HOA agreements and lease provisions. Property managers can enforce parking rules, such as the number of vehicles on-site, parking location, and prohibition of use of garages for other purposes.
 - **Expand the public parking lease program as demand warrants.**
 - **Periodically review the cost of the public parking lease program and compare it to options for creating a shared public lot, structure, or underground facility.**

Residential Neighborhoods

The workshop revealed a number of issues for residential neighborhoods. One issue is an increased level of household occupancy and vehicle ownership that increases the use of on-street parking. A second issue is that residential garages may not be used for parking, and therefore increase on-street parking occupancy. Third, some neighborhoods are impacted by spillover parking from commercial districts. Finally, there are concerns with safety, speeding, and on-street parking habits.

The following ideas are suggested for residential parking areas on public streets. They should not be applied uniformly but based on the particular parking issues in each neighborhood. Neighborhoods should participate in the development of new rules, progress should be tracked over time, and adjustment should be made as conditions change.

- **Enforcement of the existing 72-hour on-street parking time limit.** This will discourage storage of unused or seldom-used vehicles on the street.
- **Improved street cleaning protocols, policies and technology.** Some communities are considering a policy whereby the space can be reoccupied as soon as the street cleaner has passed, rather than be vacated for the entire posted street cleaning period. This reduces the disruption of street cleaning.
- **Review "no parking" curb markings.** This review should consider turn movements, line-of-site issues, driveway clearance, and other safety factors.

- **Consider an “after 10 PM” parking prohibition for non-residents on streets affected by business districts.** Such a program could issue permits for residents and a number of passes for their guests, but prevent employees and late-night customers from disrupting residential neighborhoods late at night.
- **Adopt residential permit programs where appropriate.** Residential permit programs prohibit those without permits from parking at certain times or at all times, depending on how they are structured. They are commonly used in neighborhoods around commercial districts, universities, and other major activity centers. Cities generally require certain levels of parking occupancy before considering permits, and require a level of neighborhood approval for permits. Residential permits are allocated in proportion to the available on-street spaces, with an appropriate oversell rate. Visitor permits are issued to residents to accommodate their guests.
- **Develop a remote parking option for resident’s vehicles that are seldom driven.**
- **Enforce prohibitions on apron parking (between the sidewalk and the curb) to preserve ADA access.**
- **Address speeding, cut-through traffic and other issues that affect parking.** This can be achieved with signage, road configuration changes, public education programs, and enforcement.
- **Use code enforcement if garages are converted to other uses.**
- **For neighborhoods abutting commercial districts, consider parking meters in selected areas.** Residents would be exempted from paying, but non-residents would pay for short-term parking, with the revenue from the meters being return to the neighborhood for extra services such as street tree trimming, sidewalk improvements, parks programs, etc.

Suggested Next Steps

Dana Point residents and business have significant concerns about parking, but there are many innovative, cost-effective responses available. It is clear that solutions should be tailored to context, as the issues faced by the Lantern District, Doheny Village, and residential neighborhoods are different. While some parking actions are permanent and long-term, such as building a parking structure, many parking management measures can be adjusted and changed over time. Consequently, a process of incremental implementation, starting with the most pressing problems first, often makes sense.

The following (next page) provides a suggested timeline of actions that the City could take over two years in conjunction with other public agencies, residents, and the business community.

Year 1 Parking Implementation

City-Wide:	<p>Adopt a vision and principles for parking in Dana Point.</p> <p>Form a Parking Oversight Committee and give it a mandate.</p> <p>Form a Technical Steering Committee (Planning, Economic Development, Engineering/Public Works, Sherriff, OC Parks, parking operators, resort representatives, etc.).</p> <p>Investigate opportunities for a remote parking lot linked by shuttles that could serve the Lantern District, the Harbor, resorts, and Doheny Village (once development occurs).</p>
Lantern District	<p>Conduct a study of parking occupancy and duration (length of time parked) on the busiest blocks on PCH and Del Prado. Based on the results and consultations with businesses, establish a time limit on the most popular spaces, e.g., a 2-hour or 3-hour parking time limit.</p> <p>Prohibit non-resident parking on Santa Clara Avenue after 10 PM; consider blocks north of PCH for similar treatment.</p> <p>Develop additional marketing for the public parking program.</p> <p>Seek new opportunities for additional leased public parking.</p>
Doheny Village	<p>Adopt the proposed Doheny Village Form Based Code.</p>
Residential neighborhoods	<p>Analyze specific areas where residents have identified parking issues, conduct necessary studies, implement short-term parking management improvements.</p> <p>Consider non-resident parking prohibition after a certain time (say 10 PM) in residential neighborhoods impacted by commercial areas.</p> <p>Coordinate with the Sherriff on parking enforcement provisions; implement code enforcement concerning use of parking garages.</p>

Year 2 Parking Implementation

City-Wide:	<p>Create pilot program for remote parking.</p> <p>Release annual report from the Parking Oversight Committee.</p>
Lantern District	<p>Conduct a comprehensive parking occupancy study after the opening of the Raintree Partners development.</p> <p>Evaluate proposals from parking equipment vendors for parking meters on the most popular on-street spaces.</p>

Evaluate options for a public parking facility funded by in-lieu fees and parking revenues.

Doheny Village

Plan for parking management measures such as those implemented in the Lantern District for the opening of new development built under the new code.

Residential neighborhoods

Develop residential parking permit program for impacted neighborhoods.

City Resources on Parking

City of Dana Point website for parking: <http://www.danapoint.org/residents/city-news/parking>

Powerpoint presentation on parking delivered by R. Willson at the workshop: <https://youtu.be/HTTejpuQIV8>

Results of City of Dana Point Parking Survey: https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSfYvnOLAlrH_OgRqf2SmgR3Egync-bkouUJV3fVXmqSUAH-5A/viewanalytics

General Resources on Parking

The Shoupistas Facebook Group in parking innovation: <https://www.facebook.com/search/top/?q=the%20shoupistas>

Shoup, Donald. (2011) *The High Cost of Free Parking*. Chicago: Planner's Press.

Willson, Richard. (2013) *Parking Reform Made Easy*. Washington D.C.: Island Press

Willson, Richard. (2015) *Parking Management for Smart Growth*. Washington D.C.: Island Press